

A NEW CHAMPION.

GEORGE PARSONS LATHROP GIVES SOME REASONS FOR BECOMING A CATHOLIC.

Story of His Seeking After the Light of True Faith—His Experiences with Different Sects—Their Weaknesses and Insufficiency—The Beauty and Truth of Catholicity—It Embraced Him, Not He It.

Having been asked by the Christian Register, writes George Parsons Lathrop, to state my reasons for becoming a Catholic, I will try to do so, although it is not easy to set them down in few words. Brevity sometimes appears to leave gaps in the line of thought, which are not intentional and do not really exist in the writer's mind. Besides, there is a vast number of critics who, upon this particular subject of belief, seem actually to seek and prefer misunderstanding rather than fair comprehension or comparison of views. What I am about to write is neither an apology nor a challenge. It is merely a short record made in good faith, which, if others take in bad faith, they may do so to their own detriment, but hardly to mine.

In the Churches of man I found, at last, only weariness, and so came as though inevitably—yet not weakly, but with my whole understanding—into the holy Catholic Church, the Church of God founded by Christ, Baptized and confirmed in the Protestant Episcopal communion, as a boy of fifteen I drew much good from it. Yet, from the first, I was troubled by the difficulty which Anglicans and Episcopalians seemed to have in making out clearly a divine commission to their Church; the laboriousness with which they toiled over their apostolical succession, and produced a mass of historical details which, at the best, was not very coherent, and never became at all inspiring. After some years of devout communion, what appeared to me the shortcomings and inconsistencies of Episcopalism became still more oppressive. It was a gentlemanly, cool, respectable form of religion; but with all its apostolic claims, it somehow did not disclose in itself the great, over-growing spirit of Christ. Although it acknowledged the virgin birth of Jesus, it, nevertheless, treated His mother, the Blessed Virgin, with a chilliness approaching disdain, that gave me shame for it and myself, and even cast a sort of shame upon her. It confessed the communion of saints; yet that communion was practically as dead to it as the saints themselves were in a physical sense. To some extent, the High Church made up for the deficiencies of the Low by a certain purity and beauty of services, exaltation of worship, and, sometimes, a kindly mingling of rich and poor in one congregation. But the High Church dwelt in isolation; and it suffered, as the whole Episcopal organization appeared to, from limitedness—a lack of height, breadth and depth, a want of firmness as well as of universality.

Much latitude of individual opinion was allowed in the Episcopal Church; but latitude of that sort does not constitute universality; for universality needs to have a central and all comprehensive view, depth, fixity and simplicity of principles, as well as harmonious correspondence between the whole and the parts. Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians I had known well for a long while before my baptism and confirmation. I had gone to their services innumerable times, heard their expositions of doctrine publicly and privately, and for two years attended a Presbyterian Sunday school and church. But now, when the Episcopal faith and forms and general position continued to seem so inadequate, I revisited from time to time some of these other organizations, hoping still that, with further experience, and with an intelligence matured at least by the passage of a number of years and by considerable thought, I might yet see in them some outline of that great realization, that living embodiment of true Christian religion, which every one in the very nature of the case has a right to expect. I even went often to the Unitarian meetings, not despairing of the possibility that, even where the divinity of Christ and the triune nature of God was in whole or in part denied, the flower of perfect faith might still be found springing up unawares. Finally, for a number of months, I attend a Congregational church.

Here let me say explicitly that I did not give up my faith, and that I had no intention whatever of formally "joining" any of these religious associations; for me, at least—and on this point I used my own intelligence, so far as it went, with honest purpose and earnest sympathy—they all seemed very partial, and far from fulfilling the idea of a universal Church. Yet I thought that, if I could find in any one of them that which I would have been glad to see—namely, a serene ardor, a sincere humiliation, a true devotion coming somewhere near ideal of a great Christian Church—I could at least worship with them happily.

None of them, on re-examination, offered even that much to my mind. The congregations of these churches, although they included a great number of good, true, cultivated, uncultivated, pious people of admirable character, whose virtues I might emulate for a lifetime, perhaps, without being able to equal them, were so full of their own independent personal judgment and sufficiency to themselves that they could not humble themselves completely before God. For all their words of contrition, self-abasement, and filial dependence, they treated with God rather at a distance, as though with a

hurking dread that, if they gave in to His great power too much or too openly, it might somehow encroach unwarrantably upon their dignity, their integrity of private judgment, their rights as human beings. I do not say this in the way of a sneer, but because it is my candid conclusion, to which I was brought much against my will and desire, simply by observing them and trying to share in their service with a reverent mood. These churches interposed man between the soul and God—always man, man, man. A man in the pulpit who disclaimed infallibility of interpretation on his own part, and still denied that it existed anywhere, still preached his own views or opinions with an absoluteness which, in fact, presumed his infallibility. And he so preached to men and women in the pews who, also disclaiming infallibility on their part, made themselves practically infallible by rejecting or accepting what he said, in a spirit of absoluteness equal to his and at their own pleasure.

The Bible was the one rule of faith, and was admitted to be infallible. But there was no acknowledged rule or system of interpreting it. Any one might believe or disbelieve, privately, as much or as little of that infallible rule as he chose. What does an infallible rule amount to when there is no certainty in the interpretation of it? The account, then, so far as Protestants—and semi-Protestants, such as the Anglicans or American Episcopalians—were concerned, stood something like this: On the positive side, a general belief in one intelligent God, and a general belief in Christ, with great variety of views as to His relation toward God and man. On the negative side, inconsistency, dissension, lack of true and complete humility in worship or deed, and total absence of certainty as to interpreting the assumed infallible rule of faith. I had been so thoroughly imbued with dislike and dread of the Catholic Church that I confess I clung to an *a priori* conclusion that it would be even less able than these other religious bodies to supply anything satisfactory to the mind and heart; although I meant some day to investigate it, since a man should look into everything if he wishes to be well informed.

Meanwhile, I had some contact with German speculative philosophy, which certainly is interesting. But it appeared to me very much like a squirrel's rotary cage, in which the captive, by incessant industry, may travel seemingly an endless number of miles, yet arrive nowhere, and will find himself at last cooped exactly in the place from which he started. With the progress of modern natural science I sympathize intensely now, as I did during the long period of which I speak. A few of the eminent and brilliant men connected with that progress I have had the good fortune to meet or to know intimately; and I think God must take delight in them, because of the splendor of their intellects, their marvellous industry, and the wonders and beauties they have disclosed to us in the creation. If God made and loves the stars, surely he must love the great men of science, even though they sometimes throw out careless or inadequate utterances about the divine and moral constitution of His universe. What they had to utter on this subject, whether in books or privately, I listened to always with much attentiveness and good will. Huxley said once, during a conversation in which I ventured rather actively to combat his view, that he believed in "a malevolent God"; but I was totally unable to discover that any wholesome or constructive faith, or even a sound system of morals, could spring from this belief. Then there is Tyndall, with his theorem that matter contains "the promise and potency" of all life; and so perhaps it does, of all the life which we can see with the human eye. But where does matter come from? whence did it get that promise and potency? On the other hand, the late Professor Asa Gray, perhaps, of his generation, published a monograph in which he reconciled the Darwinian theory with the generally received Biblical account of the creation. John Fiske, the brilliant American expositor of Herbert Spencer, has issued two remarkable little books on "The Destiny of Man" and "The Idea of God," wherein he develops from natural science and sociological study a distinctly religious conception, ending with these words: "The everlasting Source of phenomena is none otherwise than the Power that makes for righteousness. That cannot be by searching find Him out; yet put thy trust in Him, and against thee the gates of hell shall not prevail." Herbert Spencer himself brings us up to the point of perceiving that natural science, when it comes to consider what even the visible universe is made of, re-terminates in a mystery—a mystery, it strikes me, as complete as that of the Trinity or of transubstantiation. So these philosophers and students differ widely among themselves in their conclusions or non-conclusions; and, even when they evolve the submissive, reverent, religious idea, they fail to give us any sure connecting link between the natural and the supernatural. Why? Because they have not the means, and never will have so long as they deny or decline the divine mediation through Christ.

Protestantism is the Faubourg St. Antoine of religion, always on the eve of revolt or in open rebellion. I despised of finding there the realization of order, the stability of a complete and unchanging truth. Yet, when I began in inquiring into Catholicity, I expected to find in it only the opposite extreme of a bigoted and somewhat unreasonable conservatism. History,

of course, had made me aware that much and perhaps the most of our modern enlightenment and civilization originally sprang from the Church—the revival of learning, the glory of painting and sculpture, many of the first shoots of physical science and the grandest architecture the world has known, that of the cathedrals. Protestant literature still echoed much of the Church's inspiration, and Protestant poets wrote of her lessons and legends with a fervor and beauty seldom aroused by their own religious associations. Great numbers of men gifted with the highest intelligence and ability

in various lines of learning, practical business, public affairs, were Catholics, both in former generations and in the present, even in non-Catholic countries. Still, so tough by books, periodicals, friends and old associations all hostile to the Church, that I still dreaded this great institution, with a terror of holy water and the sign of the cross which is said to be felt by a certain unpleasant personage. And, indeed, a Protestant, brought up in the system which is always denying some part of Christianity, stands perilously near the door of Mephistopheles—*der Geist der stets verneint* ("the spirit that ever denies"). The Catholic Church, in place of denial, is always affirming and renewing faith. Hence the instinctive recoil from it of the negative party. But, further, I had always been a firm believer in, a determined adherent of, political freedom; as I still am. The advancement of the masses in education, liberty, their attainment of the utmost human happiness, cannot be dearer to anyone than it is to me. I had been taught, in many quarters, to suppose that the Catholic Church was a menace to these things and to American popular institutions. Now that I know something about it, I am quite at ease on that point.

The Catholic Church was also generally accused of narrowness and arrogance in consigning to perpetual punishment those who do not enter its fold. Examination proved that it does not even attempt anything of the kind. It is not Calvinistic, like all His God's mere as infinite, like all His God's attributes—not measurable even by His Church on earth. It presupposes that all men, according to the light which they really were able to obtain, and the sincerity with which they lived up to that light. The Church, itself, however, has a clear function to perform, *i. e.*, to point out and lead to the way laid down by Christ; to remind all men that it is the single, true way prescribed, and to see that those who enter upon it walk straight and fulfil the duty they had assumed. At the same time, while it prays for itself and its flock, prays go up every day from

CATHOLIC SHRINES AND ALTARS all over the world for heretics, unbelievers, not only for the many pagans of modern society who masquerade under a thin pretence of Christianity, but also for needy souls of all times and generations. As to her own children, the Church actually expects that they will be held to a stricter account and judgment, all the more strict and searching because they have received more light than other people; but, if they have been true to this, they will endure the judgment better, and the Church decrees salvation better, and get their reward in richer measure. I cannot imagine a faith, nor more more logical and just, nor more divinely and humanely, deeply gentle. And so the common bugaboo for her and all adherents, that arbitrarily condemn everyone else without qualification, turns out to be what Charles Lamb would call a "popular fallacy."

Most intelligent persons hold it to be a self-evident truth that the human race cannot attain to the finest development in religion and spirituality—or in healthful, abiding, social and material prosperity—either through tyranny or mob law, or excessive individualism (which is another form of license), but that it must proceed by a wise balancing of authority with freedom. With that principle I fully agree. Yet Protestantism insists upon extremes of individualism in religion. Socialists and Anarchists uphold the same tendency in secular affairs, while also proposing to join with it a new sort of collective tyranny, and attempting to enforce their views by violence *i. e.*, by mob rule. In trying to form some impartial estimate of the Catholic Church, from the outside, I naturally sought to apply to it, as tests, the foundation principles of liberty and law, and to see, by these tests, how it bore upon the progress of our race to the hoped-for highest plane of religious, social, civil existence.

In the first place, the Church embodied moral law and distinctly maintained the absolute, unchanging need of authority. Every one, of course, needs that. But it also undertook to bridge that chasm between the natural and the supernatural which the philosophers of mere natural science cannot cross. How? The other so-called "Churches," it is true, accept in the main

THE MEDIATION OF CHRIST as a path over the gulf, but with so many limitations, exceptions and attenuations that their bridge becomes at last as unsubstantial as the rainbow bridge upon which heroes were supposed to walk into the Norse Valhalla. The Catholic Church, however, provides a solid structure, by means of the spirit and teaching of Christ present in it to-day, as received from Him and His apostles, and brought down through the constant living words of a great body of successive living men—the

solidity of a direct tradition, fortified by ample documentary evidence from the early Fathers. It does not flinch nor evade, but brings to us that spirit and teaching in vital completeness. The Bible is, for it, an inspired book, but only a partial record of the living relation of the new law entrusted to it by Christ, and continues to be the embodiment of that truth, the authorized and infallible interpreter of the partial written record. This authority it derives from Him; and, surely, it is a better one than the assumption of certain men that every man should be an infallible judge for himself. Dr. Briggs, the Presbyterian, now attacks the Bible itself—which, hitherto, was supposed to be an unimpeachable rule of faith for Protestants—and says it is full of error; a conclusion which would set individual interpreters even wider adrift than they are now. Professor J. H. Thayer, of the Harvard Divinity School, on the 20th of last April read to the Universalist Club an essay on "The Change of Attitude Toward the Bible," in which he pointed out that the Scriptures were not originally the chief source of spiritual light and life, and that the Church lived for generations without them, before they were written and compiled. The Church made the Bible, instead of the Bible having made the Church.

This was heralded in some quarters as "the new view of the Bible"; but it is, in fact, the view which the Roman Catholic Church has always held and holds to-day. Professor Thayer urged that the Bible, in view of its origin, should be understood and used "in the light of history." But where is the light of history, and what? Surely, the Roman Catholic Church, which has always maintained that the Bible was a document to be interpreted by the living truth confided to the Church, carries that light of history, as handed down to her. In this it is the light of Christ. And so, in their attacks upon the Bible as the sole rule of faith, Professor Briggs and Professor Thayer simply support the Catholic view; for they put that sacred volume in the place which the Church has always assigned to it.

As to the right of the Roman Catholic Church to define the truth for Christendom, we come at once to the primacy of Peter and of Rome as the centre of authority. On this I shall not waste words. Scripture texts which cannot be explained away support the original commission of Peter with much force, but, still more, the early instances of disputes referred to the Roman See, and settled by it. It is, in part, a question of historic detail, over which men may wrangle till the end of time, if they choose. But the gradual, steady, enduring growth of the Roman pontificate as the head of the Church, while maintaining through good and ill report, and in prosperity or disaster, the firm, clear, simple principles of Christ, is to me—with the corroborative evidence—assurance enough that it has carried with it the original sanction of Christ. Those who lose themselves in controversy over disputed details appear to me to be quarrelling about husks, while the life-giving fruit is close at hand to be enjoyed by them all.

In like manner, whatever may be said about possible or asserted or actual abuses within the Church, in the past or present, about rival Popes or wicked Popes, priests, etc., I, for my part, would reply as follows: Political corruption, civil war, the shame of great abuses like slavery, the possible or actual seating in the presidential chair of a man not really elected to the presidency of the United States—all these things do not and cannot absolve us Americans from loyalty to the ideal of our country. The citizen who, because of these things, real or imagined, should renounce his allegiance to the republic, would be universally denounced by the whole civilized race as a coward, a traitor, and probably as an arrant fool. Since this is the case, as regards one's love and loyalty towards his country, one's fidelity should at least be quite as strong toward the Church that

CENTRES HIM WITH GOD through the actual indwelling of Christ and His original commission. In the second place, the Church asserts the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, which thus becomes a sacrament justified by His words literally, and forms a substantial link, spiritually and scientifically, between God and ourselves. Before going further, let me cite what the novelist Balzac, a Catholic and one of the greatest minds in literature, says in "Seraphita." It will help to explain the only rational mode in which matters infinite and spiritual have to be considered, if we are to apprehend them in any sense approaching truth. Speaking of the creative word of God, he says, "That word you scoff at, you men, although you know well that all visible works, societies, monuments, deeds, passions, proceed from the breath of your own feeble word, and that without that word you would resemble the African gorilla, the nearest approach to man." Then he goes on: "You firmly believe in number and in motion—a force and result both inexplicable, incomprehensible, absolute, like all else that is true in itself; but it is purely relative; it does not exist absolutely, and no proof can be given of its reality." Thus you will naturally find in nature two objects identically alike. In the natural order two and two never make four; to do so, four exactly similar units must be had, and you know how impossible it is to find two leaves alike on the same tree, or two trees alike of the same species. This axiom of your enumeration,—"i. e., that two and two

make four—"false in visible nature, is equally false in the invisible universe of your abstractions, where the same variance takes place in your ideas." Hence neither mathematics nor ordinary modes of reasoning will suffice to explain infinite mysteries.

Yet, as we have to accept and act upon formulas that sum up all our ordinary knowledge, so we have to accept formulas of extraordinary truth. Otherwise, we never would be able to act at all or to perform our common duties in this life. If we look at Christ, to begin with, simply as a man, He was at least the supreme man in all that is best. Therefore, being supremely above the average man, He partook

MORE OF THE DIVINE NATURE, or God, than any other creature. Viewed in that way alone, He was conjoined with God. There is a Power greater than ourselves, which controls our life and all its conditions, as even Agnostics admit. The greater must include the less. The whole is, at least, equal to the sum of its parts, and contains all that is in them. The Power outside ourselves, which Catholics and many others call God, includes all that we have. We possess personality. Therefore, that greater power, God, must possess personality. Christ, as the one Being uniting God and man in a superlative degree, possessed personality, both divine and human. Thus we have two persons of the Trinity—God and Christ. The Holy Spirit, as included in these two and emanating from them, is attested sufficiently, to me, by Holy Writ, by its presence in the Church, and by its evident working in the world. The Trinity of persons forming one God, nevertheless remains a mystery. But it may be partially apprehended by reflecting that each one of us human beings contains in himself the three elements called "reason," "will" and "instinct." These three seem entirely distinct when we look at them in one way. At differ a times we are controlled, as we think, by one or the other of them separately; yet we recognize that, somehow, they are connected and related. They are like three distinct persons in us; but we know that they are all one and our individual identity. And so each man carries about, in his own body and soul and mind—and in his instinct, reason and will—a type of the Trinity. It does not, therefore, seem so very hard to apprehend the trinitarian mystery.

Now, then, the Catholic Church brings Christ, our Lord, one with the Father, actually present before us and to us in His Body and Blood, at Mass and Communion. This, too, is a mystery, and cannot be grasped fully by the ordinary sense. But we have Christ's explicit word for it—the hundred various interpretations adopted within some years after Luther's reformation cannot even yet obscure—and we have the tradition and teaching of the Church. There is, also, if we need to use it, an obvious train of analogy in physical science, and in the general belief professed by all Christians as to

THE PRESENCE OF GOD in all portions of His universe. Nothing in our daily experience is more mysterious or astonishing than the chemical changes which take place at every turn, at every moment, when one substance comes in contact with another, when a liquid or a vapor is condensed into a solid or a solid substance is converted into gas, or when bread changes to sugar on being taken into the mouth. These changes have been defined, so far as we have been able to trace them; but they cannot be fully explained. They remain, largely, mysteries. We do not even know really what matter is, or what water and electricity are. Yet all of us, who admit the existence of God, say that He is present in every part of His creation, and may or must be present, in some way, in the very atmosphere around us at any moment. Why may He not, then, be really present as the actual yet glorified Body of His Son Jesus Christ, in the Blessed Sacrament, under the form of consecrated bread and wine? If you imagine anything else, you imagine something far more difficult, because it is vagueness and leads to nothing. Emerson said, "To eat bread is one thing, to love the precepts of Christ and resolve to obey them, is quite another." True, so far as it goes. But Christ said, "Take, eat; this is my body." And the Church accepts and believes the words of Christ, in preference to those of any human moralist, essayist, philosopher or poet, however pure or illustrious as a man and author. Far from their being any grossness or materialism in the doctrine or transubstantiation, or the real presence; it is the supreme triumph of spirituality over materialism, by annulling the mere appearances of matter, and recognizing that God as Christ is present under those appearances, according to His promise.

To some persons, belief so absolute and literal and ideal, though thoroughly in accord with the mysteries of natural science, will appear foolish. But as St. Paul remarked to the Corinthians, "The foolishness of God is wiser than men." In other things, the Catholic Church demands from believers an equal perception of the reasonable, an equal faith and trust. The dogma of

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION of the Blessed Virgin came to us from the fathers, and has been constantly held by the Church, although not defined until 1854. It is logical to conclude that, since she was chosen to be the mother of the God-Man, Christ, Mary herself must have been conceived in freedom from original sin. That is what the dogma of the Immaculate Conception means; and, so far as I can discover, the whole civilized world, in-

cluding non-Catholics, has practically admitted the truth of that dogma, century after century, by the respect paid to the Blessed Virgin, even by those who have been afraid to reverence her or ask for her prayers. As God honored Mary by making her the mother of Christ, so we human creatures should, in our turn, pay honor to her, and for no other reason. But this is a good reason. We hear much, in Protestant denominations, about the need of becoming "as little children," in order to enter the kingdom of heaven. But Protestants never become sufficiently like little children to reverence the Virgin Mother, although they may call their own mothers "angels," and worship them even to the point of kissing their mere pictures when those mothers are dead. Nor can Protestants be so childlike as to ask departed saints for prayers of intercession to God, although they do not hesitate to ask for similar prayers from their mothers, friends and preachers who may happen to be alive on this planet. Childlike submission is also needed before one can undergo the ordeal of the confessional and profit by the purification of conscience which which it prepares one for sharing in the blessed sacrament of Communion. But this childlikeness of confession, the simplicity, beauty and strength of which no one can ever know who has not gone through it, is denied to himself by the Protestant who denies so many other things.

It remains to me here to mention only two other matters—that of Indulgences and that of Papal Infallibility. Indulgence is not a pardon for sin, either committed or contemplated, and is, indeed, as far as possible from being that. It was, originally, the remitting of certain severe penance which sinners had undertaken to perform for days, months or years; and this remitting was

ALLOWED ON CONDITION that they would say prayers, do charitable works, etc., instead of performing other penance. In this way there came to be attached to prayers a number of days of "indulgence," *i. e.*, remittance from other penitential service; and such prayers may be offered either for the soul of him who prays or for the souls of the departed. But it is not assumed that they are efficacious unless the prayers be sincere. The number of days attached is proportional only, and is not construed as a finite measure of the infinite. Of the infallibility of the Pope, it is hardly necessary for me to repeat what has so often been explained, and was patent in the dogma itself as defined—that his infallibility is not personal, but simply *ex cathedra*, when he speaks for the whole Church as to faith and morals. The definition of this dogma, like that of some others, came in the course of time, when it was needful to bring it out clearly as a safeguard of the Church. If the Church were a mere relic, a fossil, it would have no occasion to explain itself, and, in fact, would have no voice to utter. But, as it is living in great strength, and always has lived in great strength, it meets the necessity of every period by defining its doctrine and position toward each question that may be put to it. This does not mean that it alters and adds to the faith of Christ, but simply that it develops more and more clearly the doctrines of that faith. If it were no more than an embodiment of "medievalism," as people sometimes hint, it would have little to say, and would not keep abreast of the times. The actual "medievalism" in the case seems to me to be that of the critics who keep going back to the discussion of some phase of the Church's past history in the Middle Ages; while the Church itself strides onward and applies the truth of the Master to every generation. Nothing struck me with greater surprise, or impressed me more powerfully, than the preaching of Catholic priests. As the soul, in their Church, was allowed to come face to face with God, through the Mass, and as the congregation bowed itself humbly before him, so the priests were effaced in His majesty, and, when they spoke from the pulpit, their works—instead of flowering out discursively in general essays, intricate erudition, or

SENSATIONAL DISCOURSES—seemed to be wholly subordinated to the Lord and imbued with His spirit, in simple unconsciousness of self. For the first time in my life I felt as though I was in the presence of the apostles, and breathed the atmosphere of the early Christian Church, yet an atmosphere that belongs to the present as well as to the past, and must remain the same for all time. Nor can I possibly describe the reality of the supernatural influence which this true Church diffuses, as soon as one comes in accord with it. To speak in a manner comprehensible by the cynic or the secular philosopher or the Presbyterian who is anxiously waiting for the next revision of his creed, it is this great outflow from Christ, which makes one feel in the Catholic Church, that makes it so unlike the rotary case of German metaphysics or the sluggish pool of Episcopalism and the obnoxious tide of Protestant dissension. But even to say this by way of illustration seems half irreverent toward that Catholic faith and ritual which, amid so much of malice and stupidity on the part of the world, go on meekly in mingled humility and gloriousness from age to age.

So much, at present, for law and authority in the Catholic Church. As for liberty, it—as we find in every other sphere or function of our existence—grows directly out of law, and is strengthened and enlarged by it. The firm foundation gives the soul a buoyant and elastic movement; renewing it for good, supporting it against the evil in one's self or others; opening to it a field of pure, free, healthy, hopeful action through the broad area and to

the whole circumference. This liberty is not constant and to every one; it is reading and discerning the dignity of the vast range afforded to different capabilities, in happy independence yet drawing relations of all hours, on the presence in it of wisely conservative

MORALS AND mercenary aims of the greatest evils, on line carrying out unending sacrifices with the titillation of truth, accused of big likely to hurt indeed, flourish, and, if true, prejudice, will in the world. has said that, tions of Cathol is a good relig too, it is the brings heaven Christ real to sincere, unco ideal faith, w it, must make gentler, and the spiritual. If I were a Catholicism," be: I did not same reason sky. Cathol the encircling the earth mo included me, would be Ca they have ne fessing a fai about as rea say that, whi sunlight, he acknowledged to remark the need of decl public.

THE PAI For a Quebec side just on the which here miles, stanc St. Anicet, water side same name going either search of p eyes attra structure, a capacious for many m on either s obtained, A at first sig sized; for i unique sty perfect throughout its highly ances—and having it venience— any chura have ever pressed it ing the inful, chastr with what and high piety, of soon as o hundred for about was erect extremely. The p which is Rev. Fat powerful and fore tongue, persistent able mass which he of nearly who are beloved parishion eminent ial traits visitors istic of belongs. With acknowled is bent special and rel and whi sacred of the spi old of generat little t Such in assiduo indee

Month the-c follow to boys vince of of "Su s; th; a pret thim E light" than 2 petition number handled day in The dysen cessiv impur Wild cure f cause

JULY 25 MORALS AND mercenary aims of the greatest evils, on line carrying out unending sacrifices with the titillation of truth, accused of big likely to hurt indeed, flourish, and, if true, prejudice, will in the world. has said that, tions of Cathol is a good relig too, it is the brings heaven Christ real to sincere, unco ideal faith, w it, must make gentler, and the spiritual. If I were a Catholicism," be: I did not same reason sky. Cathol the encircling the earth mo included me, would be Ca they have ne fessing a fai about as rea say that, whi sunlight, he acknowledged to remark the need of decl public. THE PAI For a Quebec side just on the which here miles, stanc St. Anicet, water side same name going either search of p eyes attra structure, a capacious for many m on either s obtained, A at first sig sized; for i unique sty perfect throughout its highly ances—and having it venience— any chura have ever pressed it ing the inful, chastr with what and high piety, of soon as o hundred for about was erect extremely. The p which is Rev. Fat powerful and fore tongue, persistent able mass which he of nearly who are beloved parishion eminent ial traits visitors istic of belongs. With acknowled is bent special and rel and whi sacred of the spi old of generat little t Such in assiduo indee Month the-c follow to boys vince of of "Su s; th; a pret thim E light" than 2 petition number handled day in The dysen cessiv impur Wild cure f cause