

preached by Archdeacon Mills in St. James' Church, Montreal, on March 12, 1899:

The Archdeacon said: "It was in the year 590 that Augustine and 40 monks landed on the isle of Thanet, sent by Pope Gregory, afterwards called the Great, for the conversion of the heathen in Britain."

The part taken by Popes in the conversion of the world is too prominent a fact in history to be ignored by honest historical students, and thus, the modern claims of Anglicans to have had a continuous Church of England throughout all ages from A. D. 183 or earlier, down to the Reformation, are from time to time admitted even by the most stalwart advocates of Anglicanism to be illusory. The fact that St. Augustine was sent by a Pope, with a company of monks to convert the Saxons is proof enough that a Church of England, independent of Rome previous to the schism of Henry VIII. is but a product of lively modern fancies. The Church of Christ is essentially subject to St. Peter's successor, because on St. Peter the Church was built by Christ, and to Peter was committed the care of Christ's whole flock, pastors and people, sheep and lambs; and even Christ's prayer for Peter was that His brethren, the other Apostles, should be strengthened or confirmed by Peter in the faith of which the Apostles were the custodians and pillars. Peter alone was constituted the foundation of the edifice, Christ being the chief cornerstone and the Builder.

It will be seen from what we have shown demonstratively that the Church of England has not the three qualifications admitted by the Bishop to be necessary to the Church of Christ. It does not represent antiquity or the Church of the Apostles; it is not Catholic representing the universal Church, but is a mere local institution cut off from the Church of all time and all nations; and its doctrine is an invention of the sixteenth century instead of having been transmitted from primitive times. It is an undeniable fact that it was instituted not by Christ, but by a worldly and arbitrary king who made a new Church which should accommodate itself to his lascivious longings; and he accomplished his will.

ELLIOT'S LIFE OF CHRIST.

Chicago New World.

Since the life of Christ was first written by the Evangelists, almost as many lives have been sent forth as there have been years since He appeared upon earth. The historical basis of all has been the same, but the manner of viewing the historical material, the interpretation of the facts, the conclusions arrived at, instead of the very old, have been transmitted from primitive times. It is an undeniable fact that it was instituted not by Christ, but by a worldly and arbitrary king who made a new Church which should accommodate itself to his lascivious longings; and he accomplished his will.

And so, as the social being, which he is, because his individual life is not possible without contact with his fellows, man is not free to defy the laws of social rectitude. Social liberty, of its own essence, indeed, binds him to those laws; for only beneath their sheltering aegis can it find its own safety and grandeur.

So necessary is civil society in the life of humanity, that we must hold it to have been decreed by the Supreme Power from which humanity issued. The solitary man is an impossibility. Our entrance into existence, our development from infancy to mature age, presuppose the family. Our further individual requirements, as well as the requirements of the family itself, call for the larger organism, which is civil society. The moment several human beings, or several families, co-exist in proximity to one another, co-existence must, the interests of one will clash with those of another; the ambitions of one will encroach upon the personal rights of another; the pride and covetousness of one will insult the timidity and weakness of another. Social life ceases altogether unless there be present, over and above individual and family, authority and power, capable of defending justice against brute force, and of substituting order and peace for chaos and war. Measures need to be taken for the growth whether of individuals or of the collective aggregation into which their co-existence which the mere individual can neither set in motion nor actively direct, and an authority there must be over and above the individual, that will care for interests, to the guardianship of which the talents and the energies of individuals are inadequate.

Never did men congregate without building up as from instinct the social organism in one form or another. Always and everywhere the social organism was the shield against peril, the stimulus to growth, the measure of prosperity and progress. As it grew into firmer and wiser bonds civilization advanced in beauty and power; as it descended towards decay and dissolution, barbarism spread its blighting shade. We hold that society is of divine institution, embodied in the divine origin of the race; that the rights and powers of society are of divine appointment. Society is no mere result of chance aggregations or of voluntary agreements of men; it is no mere human partnership freely entered into by men and rescindable at their pleasure. It is a vital part of humanity, born with humanity, from which humanity cannot liberate itself, under penalty of death. Society is an entity of itself, something beyond the individual will of men, possessing powers for its own protection and the furtherance of its mission, over and above aught that individuals can give to it. No one man, no number of men, have of themselves the right in justice to move, to restrain, the right of other men. Such right belongs only to Him who is the Master of all men. Inasmuch as society possesses such right, it derived it from God.

Pope Blesses Knights of Columbus

At the meeting of the Grand Council of the Knights of Columbus at New Haven, Conn., Bishop Tierney was requested to send the Pope a message conveying expressions of the loyalty of the order. The reply is as follows: "The Holy Father is grateful for the sentiment expressed in the name of the Knights of Columbus, and sends with all his heart his apostolic benediction."

THE LIMITATIONS OF "LIBERTY."

The Anarchistic Menace.

Archbishop Ireland in the Boston Republic. The limitations of liberty! Rather should I say the conditions of liberty. Liberty is man's sweetest, most precious inheritance, his very birthright, made sacred and inviolate by the will of the Supreme Creator which no fellow creature, by whatsoever innate right, may obliterate or reduce. What seem its limitations are but the conditions of its life and vigor. Naught but liberty itself authorizes them, and thus authorized, they are, as liberty itself, holy and blessed, and are, as liberty itself, ratified by the eternal ordinances of the Almighty Master.

Liberty is the right of each one to be himself, to be what nature and nature's God will him, to expand and to grow in fullness of manhood and of manhood's appurtenances. Liberty is a vital element in his being; to deprive him of it, even in a degree, is to that extent to wrest from him a part of himself, a part of what he is, or of what he is striving to become.

LIBERTY'S TRUE USES. The value, the beauty of liberty, lie in this, that it permits man to be true to himself, true to his destiny, true to the aspirations that bear him onward toward the final goal of his being. It does not dishonor liberty by the prostitution of its name, covering with it infamous acts that turn man from the path of life and growth into devious pathways over which stalk decay and death. Acts of this kind destroy liberty, for they destroy man by destroying the high purpose of his being which liberty is born to serve. Acts of this kind are abhorred by nature and nature's God, and the supreme use of our liberty is to abhor them and to hold them unalterably alien to all that we are and to all that we aim to be.

LIBERTY UNDER SOCIAL LAW. As the moral being which he is, by the simple fact that he is rational and not merely animal, man, taken in his single individuality, removed as far as we may suppose from fellowmen, standing, however, always in the presence of his Creator from whom he is never removed, is not free from the laws of moral rectitude; his individual liberty does not allow him to violate those laws, faithful obedience to which is the condition of rational life and manhood. To live as the beast, in its ignorance of the higher life, in the satisfaction of its base passions, is not liberty, it is license. It is not the righteousness of manhood; it is the perversion of manhood.

And so, as the social being, which he is, because his individual life is not possible without contact with his fellows, man is not free to defy the laws of social rectitude. Social liberty, of its own essence, indeed, binds him to those laws; for only beneath their sheltering aegis can it find its own safety and grandeur.

CIVIL SOCIETY NECESSARY. So necessary is civil society in the life of humanity, that we must hold it to have been decreed by the Supreme Power from which humanity issued. The solitary man is an impossibility. Our entrance into existence, our development from infancy to mature age, presuppose the family. Our further individual requirements, as well as the requirements of the family itself, call for the larger organism, which is civil society. The moment several human beings, or several families, co-exist in proximity to one another, co-existence must, the interests of one will clash with those of another; the ambitions of one will encroach upon the personal rights of another; the pride and covetousness of one will insult the timidity and weakness of another. Social life ceases altogether unless there be present, over and above individual and family, authority and power, capable of defending justice against brute force, and of substituting order and peace for chaos and war. Measures need to be taken for the growth whether of individuals or of the collective aggregation into which their co-existence which the mere individual can neither set in motion nor actively direct, and an authority there must be over and above the individual, that will care for interests, to the guardianship of which the talents and the energies of individuals are inadequate.

Never did men congregate without building up as from instinct the social organism in one form or another. Always and everywhere the social organism was the shield against peril, the stimulus to growth, the measure of prosperity and progress. As it grew into firmer and wiser bonds civilization advanced in beauty and power; as it descended towards decay and dissolution, barbarism spread its blighting shade. We hold that society is of divine institution, embodied in the divine origin of the race; that the rights and powers of society are of divine appointment. Society is no mere result of chance aggregations or of voluntary agreements of men; it is no mere human partnership freely entered into by men and rescindable at their pleasure. It is a vital part of humanity, born with humanity, from which humanity cannot liberate itself, under penalty of death. Society is an entity of itself, something beyond the individual will of men, possessing powers for its own protection and the furtherance of its mission, over and above aught that individuals can give to it. No one man, no number of men, have of themselves the right in justice to move, to restrain, the right of other men. Such right belongs only to Him who is the Master of all men. Inasmuch as society possesses such right, it derived it from God.

MORE THAN A MERE HUMAN COMPACT.

It is a fatal error, that of Jean Jacques Rousseau and of other of his school which sees in society the mere result of a voluntary contract among men, and derives its authority and rights from the free grant of those who are parties to the contract. Logically such error tears asunder the walls of the social edifice, and undermines its foundation stones.

If society depends upon my consent for its existence and its powers, and I am aggrieved by its action, why should I submit, beyond the measure of my judgment to its laws? Why should I allow it to direct my interests? If I am persuaded that far from being a help to me, it is a hindrance and an injury, why should I not dispute its right to live? If I withdraw from it the prop of my voluntary adhesion, what are its laws and penalties to me but the exercise of arbitrary despotism?

Rousseau's philosophy is the philosophy of social chaos and anarchy. The antidote to it is the doctrine of the divine origin of society, which has as its unshakable basis the divine origin of humanity. Put upon the face of society the impress of the divine and all is well. Then he who uplifts the hand against it, uplifts the hand against the Sovereign Master; he who bows the head in reverence before it, bows the head to the Almighty.

RESPONSIVE GOVERNMENT.

Then, however much it is true that we are "all created equal," that no man has by innate right authority over the other, it remains no less true that we are all—and all equally so—the subjects of the social organism within which we live and move; that this organism has over us, as from God, authority and power. "All men are created equal," no one more, deem him as you may with garments of splendor, honor him as you may with titles of distinction, surround him as you may with throngs of armed minions, is from himself greater in authority than I or has of himself the right to speak to me words of command. "All men are created equal." But take from among us one, making him the legitimate spokesman of society, gilding his forehead with its halo, placing in his hand its sword of defence: he is at once my superior and my master; he represents the social organism of which I am the subject.

Anarchism proposes to abolish all law, to destroy all social organization. There is the social philosophy of anarchism, such as is prated by a Proudhon, a Rakocini, a Kropotkin, and in a degree, at least, by a Tolstoy. Philosophic anarchism is defined in the Century dictionary: "A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal—absolute individual liberty." "The sense of solidarity" inherent in men, is, according to Kropotkin, the all-sufficient to secure social peace and progress, quite independently of laws and government, and would do so far more effectively than we could hope to have done by the aid of laws and government.

A strange word, indeed, it would be, where nothing more than the "sense of solidarity" were to be relied upon to protect life and property, and to direct the general concerns of the community! We could well afford to dismiss all such theories as idle dreams, fit only to amuse the fancy of dreaming dreamers, were it not that hardy stand reckless crowds, too willing to take such theories as justification of their own evil impulses. As it is, men who dress up in the garb of philosophy, and who cover their faces with the mask of a literary name, do immense harm, and at all times should receive the scorn and contempt of right-thinking men.

THE ANARCHISM OF ACTION.

Then, there is the practical anarchism, the anarchism of "action," as its followers love to call it—the anarchism of Bessie, a Goldman, a Most—, the anarchism of the crowd, which replaces books with bombs, and arguments with arson and murder. There is method in the madness of practical anarchism. What results, we might ask, can it hope to secure by the murder here and there of a civil ruler, or the destruction here and there of a palace or a warehouse? What results? The answer is: It is the propagation of ideas, the exemplification of the practicability of wholesale anarchism, at some moment in the not too distant future, when the multitudes will have understood fully its aims and processes.

Says a leader of European anarchism, Netscheyev: "We must break into the lives of the people with a series of rash, even senseless deeds, inspire them with a belief in their powers, awake them, unite them, lead them on to the triumph of their cause."

Says another, Brousse: "Deeds are talked of on all sides; the masses inquire about their origin; they discuss the new doctrine. It is not the life of one ruler that we so much covet; we seek a sanguinary advertisement."

Shall I quote a third, Jean Grave? "The struggle," says this apostle of anarchism, "should be directed chiefly towards the destruction of institutions, the burning up of deeds, of land surveys, of tax collectors' books, the expropriation of capitalists—all this to be done, by skirmishes, as it were, by small and scattered groups."

UNBELIEF AND SOCIALISM PARTNERS.

The propaganda of anarchistic doctrines and methods? There is the peril confronting us, far greater than any we may dread from the direct action of such as are already declared adepts of anarchism. The ground is prepared for the seeds, to a degree that, perhaps, we dream little of. Religious unbelief and wild socialism are potent co-workers with, and forerunners of, anarchism.

Take from the masses all faith in a Supreme Being; tell them they are sprung, in soul, as well as in body, from the dust of ages, that there is no moral arbiter save their own self, that no hope awaits them beyond what earth holds out—where, I ask, is moral power to come from? What will curb passion and command sacrifice? The world becomes the arena, over which cretates of a day scramble for their prey, the strongest carrying off the richer booty.

CROSSING THE BORDER.

Shall there be an appeal to fine-spun theories of vague and uncertain righteousness, to the ultimate welfare of humanity? This may suffice, when no storm of passion rages within, and no pressure of severe temptation comes from without. With the masses of men it is purposeless talk and vain

imagining. The masses without religion, without faith or hope have but a short step to make to cross the border into anarchism if anarchism promises them "bread and pleasure." When the masses never utter a prayer, never cross the threshold of a temple of the living God; when their leaders and educators preach to them that the soul knows no morrow, that God, if there is a God, is the unknowable—the social structure is tottering upon its base; society and its laws will soon disappear before the onward rush of passion's fury.

Then there is the wild socialism which we hear preached on all sides. I use designedly the qualifying adjective, wild, as the word socialism by itself is almost unlimited in its meaning, so many things it is made to cover. In a hundred ways, and under a hundred pretences, wild socialism darts daily into the ears of the people that wealth is unfairly distributed, that there is an irreconcilable conflict between capital and labor, that social justice is beyond the reach of the poor and the weak; and the people are maddened.

The economic question is the main factor in anarchistic agitations. Men are angry with their economic situation; they blame society, as at present organized, for their miseries and their failures; and unrestrained by considerations superior to their material interests, they rapidly reach the point where they see in the destruction of society the remedy of their ills. In what way they shall profit by the ruin and chaos towards which tend their efforts, they do not care to consider. Nothing will be lost, and something may be gained. That is wisdom enough for the moment.

LESS OBVIOUS INCITEMENTS.

The way is paved to anarchism in more manners than we imagine. The poor do wrong when they dream of economic equality with the rich; when their own improvidence is forgotten, and the blame for their poverty is fastened upon society and its government. The rich do wrong, when they accumulate wealth without due regard to the services of the laborer; when they flaunt their extravagance in the eyes of the penniless, when they forget that wealth is a social trust. Thoughtless agitators do wrong, who from the rostrum or editor's chair send over the land words of hatred arraying class against class. All of us do wrong, when we do not use our best efforts by word and by example to make men love their fellowmen and to strengthen among them the ties of a common citizenship and of a common brotherhood.

THE CHURCH IN MEXICO.

Letter from a Canadian Priest.

To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Canada:

Dear Sir—It may interest your readers to know a little about the great city of Mexico. I enclose a few remarks from the Mexican Herald, March 31st, 1902. There are one hundred and twenty Catholic churches in the city of Mexico and, for fervor and Catholicism, I do not think Mexico can be surpassed by any other city in North America. I visited the Most Rev. Archbishop of the city, and he enquired in particular about the status of Catholicity in Canada—and seemed to be very much interested in all that concerned the great northern part of our continent. The Church in Mexico has lost much of her former status, but she is yet Catholic to the core. The zeal and fervor of the Mexican women is the pride of the Catholic Church in this Republic. Charity abounds everywhere and self-sacrifice is a vital part of religion for every Mexican and all the institutions of the country corroborate this fact.

L. P. DESMARAIS, Pt. City of Mexico, March 31, 1902.

Mexican Herald Mar. 31.

"Holy Week in Mexico has afforded many interesting experiences for us," said Father L. P. Desmarais, of Baker's City, Oregon, Thursday evening, after completing a thorough round of the churches of the city.

Father Desmarais arrived in Mexico on Thursday morning, and he was joined Friday by Father P. C. Redings, parish priest of St. Mary's church in Washington, D. C., and Father M. J. Schneiderhahn of the St. Francis church, St. Louis, Mo. Father Desmarais has been for a number of years the parish priest of the Baker's City church, and he is spending a few weeks in Mexico for the purpose of studying the people, the national characteristics, their habits and customs, with a view to delivering a number of lectures on Mexico to the people of the western part of the United States.

Mexico City might give a number of the larger cities of the United States a few ideas on law and order among the people of crowded streets," continued Father Desmarais. "On Thursday evening during the hours that the streets were packed with pedestrians and the order which prevailed throughout the evening. Among the large crowds which thronged the thoroughfares I did not see one person who seemed to be under the influence of liquor, nor was there a single evidence of disorder of any sort. In itself that was a remarkable scene for one accustomed to the habits of the great crowds of the American cities, and Mexico is to be congratulated upon the excellence of the system which maintains these conditions."

"In visiting the churches I was particularly impressed by the devotion of the Indian children for the parish priests. Little folk, whose minds are yet unable to grasp the full meaning of religious things, but whose hearts are full of faith, are a most beautiful and inspiring sight. There is no mistaking the great influence for good being exerted by these fathers among the poorer classes throughout the republic of Mexico. Had the early races of American come under the influence of these good men the Indian question of the United States might have been settled in a way more creditable to the people of that country. In one of the churches here on Thursday evening I was struck with admiration at the sight of the

little Indian children pushing their way through the crowds to get an opportunity of kissing the hand of an aged Father who entered the church guided by a little boy. The elderly padre was scarcely able to make his way down the aisle of the church to the crucifix, but on every side he was greeted with the most sublime reverence.

As a Catholic priest I was pleased with a few remarks on Mexico made by Bishop Hamilton in Los Angeles, Cal., a few weeks ago, in which he referred to the virtue of the Mexican women. Bishop Hamilton is a prominent clergyman of the Methodist Church, and a grand old man. In a lecture on Mexico delivered in Los Angeles he lauded the purity of Mexican womanhood, which to me was very gratifying."

HONORING POPE LEO XIII. IN BALTIMORE.

Cardinal Gibbons' Pontifical Jubilee Sermon.

A Triduum or three days' prayer in honor of the Pontifical Jubilee year of Pope Leo XIII. opened on the morning of Low Sunday, April 6, in the Cathedral of Baltimore, Md., Cardinal Martinelli, the Apostolic Delegate, coming on from Washington to attend it. Cardinal Gibbons' sermon was, in part, as follows:

"For nearly two thousand years the Bishop of Rome has been the most conspicuous figure in the theatre of public life. The name of the Sovereign Pontiff is indelibly marked on the pages of ecclesiastical history. It is intimately and inseparably associated with the progress and enlightenment and the Christian civilization of the world."

"As we are commemorating to-day the jubilee of our Holy Father Leo XIII., it is proper I should make some special allusion to the life of that illustrious Pontiff. Joachim Pecci, the family name of the Pope, was born on March 2, 1810. He has consequently entered upon his ninety-third year, and has almost spanned a century. He was ordained in December, 1837, and was consecrated Archbishop in 1843, nearly sixty years ago. He was already an Archbishop before the vast majority of this congregation were born, and he has already lived longer in the episcopate than any of his predecessors. He was created a Cardinal in 1853, and was elected to the Chair of Peter in 1878. Only two Popes have exceeded Leo in longevity, and only three supreme Pontiffs have ruled the Universal Church for a longer period, namely, St. Peter, Pius VII. and Pius IX., and if Leo survives another year, he will have been Bishop of Rome longer than even Peter or Pius VII."

Of the 239 Popes who have sat in the Chair of Peter, few of them have exerted a wider and more beneficial influence on the social, political and the religious world than the Pontiff now happily reigning. He is a consummate statesman, as well as an enlightened churchman. In the course of his Pontificate he has issued a series of masterly and luminous Encyclicals which have served as moral landmarks to his spiritual children and have commanded the respect and admiration of the civilized world."

The Cardinal dwelt especially upon his Encyclicals: "The first Encyclical on 'Christian Marriage,' which was published in 1880. He vindicates in strong and earnest language the sanctity and the indissolubility of the marriage bond. He tells us that the married couple are the source of the family, and the family is the source of society. Social life cannot be maintained in its purity and integrity unless it is sanctified at the fountain-head of the home."

"The Encyclical on the condition of workmen was promulgated in 1891, and duties of the laboring classes. A conflict between labor and capital is as unreasonable as would be a contention between the head and the hands. The interests of capital and labor are correlative. Capital without labor would be unproductive, labor without capital would be unprofitable."

"The third Encyclical treats of the 'Constitution of the Christian States.' This document clearly demonstrates that the Catholic Church can adapt herself to all forms of civil government."

"When I was invited to Rome by the Pope in 1887 to receive the insignia of a Cardinal, I delivered an address in the Church of Santa Maria in Trastevere, my titular church, and as I took this Encyclical for the text of my remarks, I cannot do better than to give the following abstract of the sermon which was pronounced on that occasion:

"Our Holy Father, Leo XIII., in his luminous Encyclical on the constitution of Christian States, declares that the Church is not committed to any particular form of civil government. She adapts herself to all. She leaves all with the sacred leave of the Gospel. She has lived under absolute empires, under constitutional monarchies, and in free republics, and everywhere she grows and expands. She has often, indeed, been hampered in her divine mission. She has even been forced to struggle for existence wherever despotism has cast its dark shadows, like a plant shut out from the blessed sunlight of heaven. But in the general atmosphere of liberty she blossoms like the rose. For myself, as a citizen of the United States, and without closing my eyes to our shortcomings as a nation, I say with a deep sense of pride and gratitude that I belong to a country where the civil government holds over its people the protection without interfering with us in the legitimate exercise of our sublime mission as ministers of the Gospel of Christ. Our country has liberty without license, and authority without despotism. She rears no wall to exclude the stranger from coming among us. She has few frowning fortifications to repel the invader, for she is at peace with all the world. She rests secure in the consciousness of her strength and her good will toward all. Her harbors are open to welcome the honest emigrant who comes to advance his temporal interests and find a peace-

ful home, but, while we are acknowledged to have a free government, perhaps we do not receive the credit that belongs to us for also having a strong Government."

"I may here remark parenthetically that, since our war with Spain, Europe has been impressed with our military power."

"Yes, our nation is strong, and her strength lies under the overruling guidance of Providence in the majesty and supremacy of the law, in the loyalty of her citizens and in the affection of her people for her free institutions. There are, indeed, grave social problems now engaging the earnest attention of the citizens of the United States, but I have no doubt that, with God's blessing, these problems will be solved by the sound judgment and common-sense of the American people without violence or revolution, or any injury to their individual rights."

"I know not whether Providence will spare me to pay homage to other supreme Pontiffs, but whether my life is short or long, or whatever may be the future line of Popes sitting in the Chair of Peter, I shall always cherish a special filial affection for the tenderest memories of Leo XIII.—Boston Pilot."

"SUPERSTITIOUS VENERATION."

Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

One of the most hackneyed charges brought against the Catholic Church and people is that they are unduly reverent to relics. It is amazing to the Mark Twain sort of mind that men should have a reverence for anything save a resuscitated or transformed joke or a hungry hoard of money. This attitude we often find in various writings, yet one is rather surprised to find exhibited in a publication like the *Chautauquan*—the magazine of modern "culture"—a bald-headed endorsement of such Philistine sentiment. The "superstitious veneration" of European people for relics impresses one of the "pilgrims" who vents the astonishment of superiority at the survival of ideas so much out of harmony with the music of modern progress. One of these gentle palmers was at Wittenberg lately and was shocked at what he found, or he found, as the case may be. The story of relics there is what would be called "a full one" in a trade advertisement. *Chautauqua's* gorge rises at the display.

"Why, this very castle church in Wittenberg was built as a shrine for one of the original thorns from the crown of Christ which the King of France gave the elector. Then other relics were added till eight great groups of them existed, carefully preserved in strong metal and wood cases. In this church there were 3,005 relics. They belonged mostly to virgins, widows, confessors, apostles, prophets and martyrs of the Church. One set was connected with Christ—bits of His cross, wisps of the original straw in the manger, pieces of His garments, hair and teeth, memorials of His mother, milk from the Virgin, pieces of her handiwork, and so forth. All persons beholding these relics were entitled to 143 years of indulgence. This was more merit than any one person would need, and he might share it with his friends. The traveler in Europe to-day sees enough pieces of the original cross to build a substantial house, and he hears enough old wives' fables about relics to fill the biggest book in the world. Excepting Assisi, no place was so famous for its relics as Wittenberg."

"Superstitious veneration" is the phrase used to describe the esteem in which these sacred objects are held. Why "superstitious?" Is it because their authenticity is questioned? No, but simply because they are directly related to the holy and martyr things of Christianity—the great facts upon which modern religion is based. One goes to Scotland and sees crowds grouped around the swords of Wallace and Bruce in Edinburgh Castle; he hears expressions of pity and admiration for the noble Wallace and the hero of Bannockburn; he goes to the Tower of London and forms part of a crowd who are asked by a Beefeater guard to "drop a tear" over the place where Lady Jane Seymour met her fate and is shown the axe which chopped off her head. He visits Nelson's old ship the "Victory" on the Thames and goes to Greenwich palace and views the relics of many a bloody sea fight in old days; he comes here to Philadelphia and beholds crowds passing in reverential awe through the place where American liberty was born and views the "relics" with admiration. This sort of veneration is not "superstition." What sort is it, then? Not being connected with things of heaven, does it not bear a suspicious resemblance to idolatry—to mere worship of pieces of metal and timber and faded rags and papers and antique furniture? A couple of months ago the world beheld the old cracked Liberty Bell carried on a long journey, escorted with great military and civic honors and cheered all the way by thousands upon thousands of people—the greater part of whom, no doubt, are taught to look upon the veneration of things connected with the sacrifice of Calvary and the martyrdom of those who died for Christ as an act of "superstition." The worshippers of the Golden Calf are again with us to-day, and they sneer at any sort of reverence but that paid to their own worldly deities.

Father Tom Burke.

The following anecdote is related of the boyish days of the famous Dominican preacher. He had committed some youthful prank deserving of condign punishment. His mother took him into an inner room, and, locking the door, knelt down and repeated the prayer, "Direct, O Lord, our actions," etc., after which she administered a sound thrashing. In after years Father Burke said: "When I saw my mother enter the room, make the sign of the cross, and solemnly invoke the Holy Ghost to direct her, I knew I could expect no mercy. I never got such a beating as that one directed by the Holy Spirit, and I have never forgotten it."