

# The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

THOS. COFFEY, L.L.D., Editor and Publisher.

Advertisements for teachers, situations, wanted, etc., sent each insertion. Remittance to accompany.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

When subscribers ask for their paper at the post office it would be well for them to tell the clerk to give them their Catholic Record. We have information of carelessness in a few places on the part of delivery clerks who will sometimes look for letters only.

Messrs. Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record, Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John, Agent for district of St. John's, and Mrs. M. Reynolds, New London.

## LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.

Apostolic Delegation, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey

My Dear Sir:—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and, above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It strenuously defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teachings and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting the best interests of the country. Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and it will do more and more, as its wholesome influence reaches more and more Catholic homes. I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success, I am, Sir, very respectfully, Yours very sincerely in Christ,

DONATEL, Archbishop of Ephesus, Apostolic Delegate.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1909.

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, the CATHOLIC RECORD, and cannot but praise you upon the manner in which it is published. Its manner and form are both good, and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful. Blessings on you and wishing you success, believe me to remain,

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa, Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 2, 1909

## ARMINIANISM AND CALVINISM.

One of the difficulties in the proposed Church Union is the harmony of creeds.

Both the Presbyterian and the Congregationalist bodies are Calvinistic.

The difficulty therefore does not lie there. It is with the Methodists who are believers in Arminianism. How they are to be reconciled is hard to see.

Arminianism is the doctrine of the party formed among the Calvinists: so that it owes its origin to a separation from Calvinism.

From the start human reason tended to revolt against Calvin's horrible decree of predestination absolute—salvation and damnation meted out without regard to merit or demerit.

By its charity and mercy were expelled from the hearts of his followers. Revolt against the doctrine was given shape by Jacobus Arminius or James Herma-zoon of the University of Leyden. His doctrines are chiefly five.

The first, who professed them were known as Remonstrants. They were opposed to (1) Predestination in the defined form, as if God by an irrevocable decree had destined some men to eternal happiness and others to eternal woe without any other law than His own pleasure. The Remonstrants, on the contrary, thought that God by the same resolution wished to make all believers in Christ who persisted in their belief to the end blessed in Christ, and for His sake would condemn only the unconverted and the unbelieving. (2) The doctrine of election according to which the elect were counted as necessarily and unavoidably blessed, and the outcasts necessarily and unavoidably lost. The Remonstrants taught the milder doctrine, that Christ had died for all men and that believers were the only chosen in so far as they enjoyed the forgiveness of sin. (3) The doctrine that Christ died for the elect alone to make them blessed and no one else, ordained as mediator. (4) The doctrine that the grace of God affects the elect only, while the reprobates cannot participate in this through their conversion, but only through their strength. On the other hand, the Remonstrants hold that man has no saving belief in himself nor out of the force of his free-will, if he lives in sin, but that it is necessary he should be born again from God in Christ by means of His Holy Spirit, and renewed in understanding and affection, or will and all strength. (5) The doctrine that he who had once attained true saving grace could never lose it and be wholly debased. This very controversy which transplanted to England divided the early Methodists into two parties—the followers of John Wesley adhering to the Arminian view, those of George Whitefield professing the strict Calvinistic tenets. These two doctrines, so far as their history is concerned, have tended to divide rather than unite their different adherents. Unless both Calvinism and Arminianism have lost their definiteness division must continue and union be merely mute and only in name. A stand similar to this was taken by the Gomarists or followers of Gomar. They neither embraced nor condemned the rigorous doctrine of Calvin; they omitted the question concerning the antecedent decree and taught simply the preknowledge of original sin. As far as any explanation has been given of the proposed union, this seems to be the basis upon which

the Presbyterians and Methodists are seeking a common creed. The Presbyterians have a double advantage: first from the fact that Arminianism started from Calvinism; and secondly that Methodists are not nearly so tenacious of any doctrine as they themselves do.

Both Calvinism and Arminianism are erroneous, more because they are both defective than because particular points in them are false. The question upon which they both hinge is the deepest and darkest abyss in all the waters of theology, concerning as it does the reconciliation of God's foreknowledge and majesty. The Calvinist looks at only one truth—the sovereignty of God. This is introduced everywhere—it explains everything—it sweeps into the ocean of oblivion all else. God is an absolute sovereign, disposing of all things as He pleases, makes one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor; has mercy on whom He will and whom He will He hardeneth. Particular texts of scripture are chosen without reference to others. They are unjustifiably emphasized and made to do duty for the whole plan of redemption and sanctification. It is true that God is sovereign master. There is another truth which the Calvinist overlooks—the free agency of man. He exalts God's majesty to the exclusion of man's freedom—and extends the sphere of the divine action so far that he leaves man out of the plan. The Arminian, on the other hand, in his efforts to exalt man and give him his proper sphere of activity, overlooks the divine agency, and virtually annihilates God—He attributes too much to nature and not enough to grace. God's majesty retains free will and uses it for His own greater honor and glory. The error sprang from a twofold source—the effect of sin upon nature and the character of grace. Sin, these reformers maintained, killed the soul. By original sin the soul was not merely wounded; it was dead. Nature and grace were therefore as antagonistic as death and life. All natural reason was gone, all free will, all natural morality, all natural religion were impossible enaccount of original sin. But without reason there can be no belief, and without free will no moral obligation. The Arminians saw this. They failed in their remedy, because they stuck to the total depravity of reason after original sin. Some of them rushed to the other extreme and embraced Pelagianism, exalting nature and restricting the office of grace. They have really concluded by being rationalists, disregarding the necessity of grace, have made the natural law sufficient and asserted only a natural morality. Surely these cannot in candour and truth after three hundred years of separation unite by a vote of any ecclesiastical court. Divergent ideas do not so easily harmonize, nor does conscience so quickly throw aside what it had been taught to keep so carefully.

What with some ministers turning their churches into theatres and others using the stage for church purposes the sectarians are fast bringing religion into contempt. Here is a Baptist minister in London who actually employs stage methods in his religious service. Down in Toronto a Methodist minister performed a marriage ceremony on the stage of the Majestic theatre between the acts and before a well filled house. Never mind the contracting parties; the officiating clergyman was a Rev. J. M. Wilkinson. Enthusiasm followed when disgust ought to have prevailed. It shows a baseness of religious instinct which nothing can excuse and turns into mockery what is a sacred right. For our part as Catholics when we read of such travesty upon the "great sacrament," we grow deeper in our gratitude to holy Mother Church for the precautions she takes and the care she exercises upon the administration of all the mysteries and sacraments. The Church is not posing. She is not playing a part or acting for effect. The ceremony did not pass by unnoticed. Even the Methodists themselves felt humiliated. They do not openly encourage or like the theatre, concerning which their ministers have said hard things. When therefore one of the ministerial brethren steps on the stage, marries a couple and gracefully bows to the applauding gallery, the Methodists of Toronto are indignant, they deny this gentleman's power, claiming that they know not the man. Their indignation assumes an extreme form. They question the validity of the marriage. It is their own cooking. Civil law threw open the gates as wide as possible to every one who in any sect might claim the title of reverend and gave him, as far as lay in its power, the right to perform the marriage ceremony. Now a doubt is thrown upon it. If conscience is not dead and society not absolutely corrupt the farce of the Toronto stage wedding ought to impress all as a most terrible drama in which all feeling of righteous virtue is ridiculed and the most sacred relations made the sport of the passing crowd and mocking passion. No guard-

ianship can be too watchful over those who hold in their hands the keys of the stability and happiness of society. We are glad to know that the Church to whom the care of all the sacraments, matrimony included, was intrusted, has different methods of securing respect for their administration and proper legislation regarding time, place and all other circumstances. The Toronto incident is a mere ruffle in the wave. All society is dreadfully lax upon the sacrament of matrimony, its dignity, its stability and its supernatural character. In vain can we hope to see an improvement. If come it will, it must come from the Church—not from sects which will allow stage acting, nor from the civil power which does not guarantee the indissolubility of the marriage tie. It must come from the one institution to whom these things were entrusted, and which through good repute and evil repute has been true to the trust—the Catholic Church.

FREQUENT COMMUNIONS.

A correspondent seems to have doubts about frequent communion as explained in a paragraph taken from "Rome."

We should distinguish people who are well from those who are sick. Amongst those who are sick there are again two classes: those who can observe the fast required for communion, and those who cannot observe it, or who cannot receive holy communion fasting. Now, according to a decree dated Dec. 9th, 1906, holy communion is allowed to the sick who are confined to bed for a month with no hope of immediate recovery. If these are able to keep the fast their case presents no difficulty. They may have communion much more frequently. Let us suppose persons who cannot keep the fast: they are obliged to take a drink of water. Provided the confessor judges that they are not able to keep the fast they may take a drink, and may receive holy communion according to circumstances. If they are living in a community where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, or where Mass is celebrated, they may receive twice a week. Thus a professor or servant in a college or any member of a priest's household, or any sister or person living in a convent, may when ill have this privilege. In other places holy communion is allowed once or twice a month. It is to be noted that this decree speaks of people who are confined to bed. A later decree allows the same privilege to those who are sick for a month with no hope of recovery but who are not confined to bed. Frequent communion as urged by the Holy Father does refer to people who are well; for it means more than once or twice a week, and the ordinary time for communion is during Mass. Our correspondent's confessor is all right in his decision and generous in his devotion. We suppose that our correspondent is able to fast, in which case the number of her communions will depend upon the priest. Concerning the nun in the hospital who received daily communion, we presume that she fasted. It is necessary for one unable to fast to apply to the Holy Office; for others, no. We hope we have made it clear.

LUTHER.

Some one asks us why Luther left the Church, and, secondly, why the Pope condemned him. For several years previous to his condemnation Luther had displayed a tendency to side in arguments with un-Catholic doctrine and practice. Warm disputes had taken place concerning indulgences. Rome paid little attention to them, assuming that they derived their importance more from the heat of the disputants than from the doctrine positively. The first notice came from Germany itself when Luther was denounced to the Pope by the Elector of Saxony. Accordingly, in 1518, Leo X. summoned Luther to Rome. Frederick the Elector requested that the examination take place in Germany, and Cardinal Cajetan, a man of great learning and virtue, was delegated for the purpose. Luther asked for a delay of three days, which was granted. He declared on the following morning to the Cardinal that he had never intended to teach anything offensive to Catholic doctrine, to the Holy Scriptures, to the authority of the Fathers, or to the decrees of the Popes. A few days after making this solemn declaration he showed his duplicity by affixing to the convent wall, where it was lodged, a document in which he stated that he had not gone to Rome, that it was a place where justice once abided, but homicide now dwelled. He finally appealed from "the Pope badly informed" to the Pope better informed." He continued in increasing effrontery until Leo the Tenth's patience reached a limit. It was after long delay that the Pontiff published the celebrated Bull by which Luther was excommunicated. Its date was Sept. 15, 1520. Then the heresiarch burst out in all his fury. No language was coarse enough, no anger harsh enough to satisfy the wretch's passion.

He indulged in brutal invective, he burned the Bull and urged the people to leave Rome. "If," he said, "you do not separate from Rome, there is no salvation for your souls." To explain why Luther left the Church we should have to seek it in his character as well as in the formal action which really expelled the Augustinian. He was coarse in soul, lacking in humility and mistaking refinement for sinful luxury. After his return to Germany from his first visit to Rome in 1518 he manifested his malignity towards the Romanists, his contempt for scholastic theology, a passion for every novelty and a yearning to give a shock to the world. He was a man peculiar in character—sometimes excessively jolly, generally haughty, and as rash as he was cunning. If we add to these attributes the instinctive hatred of Germans in those days to the Papacy we find plenty of reason not to be surprised that Luther, although beginning well, soon displayed a spirit of insubordination and un-Catholic belief.

ANSWER.

A correspondent wishes to know whether it is a mortal sin if you do not confess a sin you think may not be a mortal sin and yet you are in doubt as to whether it is a mortal sin. The sin should be confessed as doubtful. In the case of a scrupulous conscience a prudent confessor is not only the best judge but the best physician. It is for him to decide the gravity and nature of the sin and to prescribe both the remedy to follow in regard to the confession of doubtful matters. The second question which this correspondent asks refers to the omission of a doubtful sin in confession. "If one omits a sin of which he is in doubt whether it is the omission sinful?" An omission in confession is sinful when it is deliberate and when it renders the validity of the sacrament doubtful. We are drifting out into questions of conscience and casuistry whence we fear we could not return—nor could we satisfy our correspondent. The best plan is to ask a priest by putting a special case. There are two points upon which the doubt may turn. We may be certain that we have committed it; but we are in doubt about its gravity. To omit that sin deliberately in confession is to expose the sacrament to invalidity. The confession is bad and should be repeated entirely. If we are in doubt as to whether we committed a sin the doubt works in favor of the penitent, so that he is not obliged to confess it. Its omission therefore would not be sinful. We are in our statement of the case excluding lax conscience. Penitents for their own peace and consolation should seek the solution of them from those who can solve them best—their confessors.

TRAGEDY OR COMEDY.

A little historic acting went on about a fortnight ago in the Talbot Street Baptist Church of this city. It was well prepared and well acted. It was a kind of interlude between other parts of the service. The actors were two: the minister and a young man. About a week before the young man, tired of life, had taken a dose of chloroform with a view of terminating this world's woes at any rate. The minister, upon closing his sermon, which bore directly upon discouragement, openly referred to the case. "If the young gentleman," said the minister with great dramatic power and stage effect, "if the young gentleman is in the congregation, I would like him to come forward and sing." Of course the young gentleman was in the congregation; he had been told to be there. The minister had made arrangements—practised the parts each should play; and with great eloquence summoned the weak and erring to come forth and sing. The minister showed great art in calling upon the young man to sing. It spared the young man, it prevented any criticism upon his own delivery; and music is always agreeable in a play. "All the world's a stage," especially London Talbot st. Baptist Church.

FROM TORONTO comes a despatch stating that Mr. James Haverson, K. C., considers it unreasonable to cut off any more licenses in that city. This is an open question. Many will agree and many more will disagree with Mr. Haverson. But in the following additional statement he will, we think, find a majority against him: "There is a great outcry against the saloon, for men must drink, and they will drink. Horses drink water, and men—some at least—drink whiskey. Who would think of not supplying a sufficient number of troughs for the horses to drink? Then why not have enough accommodation for those people who want to drink anything else?" It is quite true that men must drink, as also the horses. A man feels out of sorts on occasion. The causes may be many, such as overwork, worry, going to bed in the "wee sma' hours," etc., and during working time, he feels he

should have something to spur on his latent energies. He takes to the saloon as a duck to water, and pours into his stomach something which the wine clerk compounds for him and calls a bracer. Common sense tells him that a good cup of tea or coffee would give him better staying powers for his work, but he brushes this thought aside and quaffs the stuff that puts him in an aeroplane for a short space. True for you, Mr. Haverson, the man takes to whiskey and the horse takes to water. Suppose the horse took to whiskey. What sort of service would he give his driver? Poor, weak humanity! how often it may take salutary lessons from the lower animals.

REV. MR. GIBSON lately delivered a sermon in the Talbot street Baptist Church, in this city, in the course of which he made some very uncompromising references to those engaged in the whiskey business. For this very few, save those who are engaged in that industry, will find fault with him. While it may be considered necessary to allow spirituous beverages to be sold in hotels worthy the name, there should be no place for the saloon in our centres of population. The amount of harm done to the rising generation in these places is incalculable. We may say, however, to our brethren of the Baptist persuasion that temperance should always be an adjunct of Christian conduct. Too often have we had to refer to intemperate utterances in the Baptist churches, when reference was made to the Mother Church. It is pleasant to record a kindly word for the Mother Church on the part of Mr. Gibson. He stated that the Catholic Church in Quebec was ahead of all other denominations in the advancement of prohibition, and that out of one thousand Quebec parishes seven hundred were under prohibition. "We must give credit," he continued, "to our Catholic friends for this grand work." We desire to remind our Baptist friend, however, that prohibition in Quebec is altogether a different condition from that which applies to the world in Ontario. Through the spiritual ministrations of the priests, the people in many places have ceased to drink intoxicating beverages. Therefore there is no business for the whiskey seller. This is the prohibition that prohibits. The spiritual leaders of our separated brethren possess no such power for good over their flocks.

AN INCIDENT of a touching character took place in St. Peter's Cathedral on Christmas day. The sermon was preached by the Rector, Rev. J. T. Aylward. It was one appropriate to the occasion, leaving in the minds of his hearers an inspiration to thankfulness for all the inestimable favors received from Our Divine Lord—an inspiration to joyfulness because we were celebrating the natal day of the world's Redeemer. Before the conclusion of the discourse the Rev. Rector made reference to the absence on this Christmas festival of our beloved Bishop. Rome in its wisdom had decided to translate him to a higher and larger field of usefulness. It was, he said, a satisfaction to know that his great worth had thus been recognized by the Supreme Pontiff. But, nevertheless, the change had left that feeling of sadness which poor human nature is called upon to endure when those we love have gone out from us. There can be no doubt, the Rev. Father continued, that upon this occasion the heart of our late chief pastor beats warmly for his former flock. While we may not see him in person on this day his affections will turn lovingly towards those with whom he had spent nine years of ceaseless toil and unwearying activity. On this occasion, too, there will go to him to Toronto from every Catholic heart in London diocese the fervent "God bless you and spare you and guide you and guard you." During the present generation there will ever be a warm spot in the hearts of the Catholics of this western district for a chief pastor whom to know was to love. Before the Rector had concluded his remarks there were visible tokens of affection for Archbishop McEvay in every part of the sacred edifice.

AN EXTRAORDINARY evidence of affection for a priest took place recently at the Church of the Annunciation, Shenandoah, Pa. The occasion was the funeral of the Rev. Henry F. O'Reilly, who had been rector of that parish for thirty years. Twenty-five colliers, employing sixteen thousand men, were shut down to enable the workers to attend the funeral. In addition to this the Public schools were closed and all business suspended. More than two hundred priests attended the funeral services and Bishop Prendergast, of Philadelphia, celebrated the Solemn Requiem Mass. Father O'Reilly had endeared himself to all classes in the community and was a great power in the promotion of harmony in a section where labor disputes had often threatened to engender bitterness and disorder.

MANY OF OUR AMERICAN exchanges have of late been speaking quite strongly about the woman who thinks she has a mission to reform the world and takes flights from one end of the country to the other on convention business. This sort of work may be all very well in its way, but while the good woman is absent who is taking care of her family? Possibly she has no home work to perform. If such be the case she is not as blameable as one who has little ones who need training. Viewed from any light there seems to be a glaring unfitness about the appearance of a woman on a public platform. We have too many of them. It may be that they mean well and desire to advance the cause of Christianity and philanthropy, but they could do this more effectually were they to remain in their proper sphere. Many a young man is doing the saloons while his mother's time is taken up with delegation work.

FATHER TEEFY AT THE CANADIAN CLUB.

INTERESTING ADDRESS—A GLANCE AT THE VATICAN.

London Advertiser, Dec. 18.

At the noonday luncheon of the Canadian Club, held to day, Rev. Dr. Teefty, of St. Michael's College, Toronto, was the guest of honor.

He delivered a strong address on "The Vatican," explaining the art treasures there, and giving a detailed account of the work of the celebrated artists of antiquity, Michael Angelo, Fra Angelico and Raphael. He gave a close study of Pope Pius X., touching also on the work he had accomplished during his pontificate.

President Frank Lawson presided, and in introducing the speaker, referred to the fact that this was his first visit to London, and he felt certain that the Canadian Club would feel grateful of the honor conferred upon them.

FATHER TEEFY'S ADDRESS.

In opening Father Teefty expressed his regret at his inability to prepare something distinctly Canadian for the Canadian Club. Pressure of work at this time of the year made it quite impossible for him to do so. However, he was delighted to be present, and if the address was at all interesting to those present he would be satisfied.

He selected as his subject "The Vatican." To some it spelled museum, and to some it spelled something else, something very serious. The Vatican was a very irregular building. The Coliseum of St. Peter's was 585 feet in length, and 468 in width, but it could be placed on the ground floor of St. Peter's Basilica. The Vatican contained 11,000 rooms. When going through it, one was overcome by a feeling of reverence.

When going through it, we cannot talk," said Father Teefty. "We are drinking in the best history, and receiving impressions of which we cannot talk."

A WONDERFUL LIBRARY.

He referred to the library containing 24,100 manuscripts in every language in the world, and students could often be seen poring over these manuscripts trying to unravel their message.

In other rooms there are the numerous gifts to the Pontiffs, some of rare beauty and value, and others of great historic significance.

"Amid the curios is a love letter of Henry VIII. to Anne Boleyn," said Father Teefty. "I do not know how the Vatican came to get it," he added, amid laughter.

In Byron's day, he continued, the Vatican library was in charge of a cardinal, a famous polyglot, who spoke fluently sixty languages. It was of him that Byron said that he should have been interpreter for the Tower of Babel.

In the statue building, there were several groups of statuary, the two principal ones being the Laocoon group and the Apollo Belvedere group. Father Teefty described them in detail, explaining their history and their meaning.

GROWTH OF THE VATICAN.

The speaker then spoke of the great growth of the Vatican under the power of Pope Julius II. He was the Pope of temporal power, the man who freed Italy from French domination, and made her free. He brought Michael Angelo to the Vatican, and he began to enlarge and beautify. While a great ruler he devoted much time to the liberal arts, and was the patron of artists and scholars. Michael Angelo rebuilt and constructed the Vatican, until to-day it is the glory of the world.

He spoke of the great work of Fra Angelico, Michael Angelo, and Raphael, pointing out the work done by each in the great centre of the church.

The Sistine Chapel was especially spoken of and the great drama of humanity as depicted by Angelo on the walls and ceiling of the chapel was vividly described.

"The work of Michael Angelo, who had but two friends, Dante and Savonarola, has preached more sermons to humanity than any other preacher in church or pulpit," said Dr. Teefty.

The conclave at which the Pope is elected is held in this chapel.

Father Teefty spoke of the election of Pope Pius X., who on the first ballot had but one vote, but who was afterwards selected as head of the church.

This unknown man had ruled the church well. He was greater than Pope Leo XIII., great as he was. In France, he had opposed the Judaic minority in control, which had attempted to make France atheistic by banishing all religious teaching from the schools. He had also condemned modernism in his church in Germany, France, Italy and even among the English-speaking members.

"We may have our differences of opinion, wide differences, perhaps, but we all believe that Christ is the Son of God," said Dr. Teefty. "By applying Kant's philosophy to the miraculous birth they would seek to destroy our faith, but Pope Pius forced them out of the Church. He prevented again the great battle of Arianism."