

# The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est. Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname).—St. Paclan, 4th Century.

VOLUME XXV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1903

1269

## The Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEB. 14, 1903.

DR. BARRY.

In reply to a correspondent we beg to state that Rev. Dr. Barry is a Catholic divine. We have not read his latest work on the Papal Monarchy. He has contributed to different periodicals and is the author of a few novels which of our mind are of doubtful value. He is of unquestioned talent and qualified in every way to be an effective man of letters. We look forward to the time when his brilliancy and scholarship will be given unreservedly to the Church. There is much to be done, and men like Dr. Barry should not waste time on trifles.

### AN EMINENT SURGEON'S HUMILITY.

Dr. Lorenz, the distinguished surgeon, received the degree of doctor of laws for the Northwestern University of the United States. In acknowledging the compliment he said: "I had the degree of imperial royal counsellor of the government from the Emperor Francis Josef. I think I am the worst counsellor of government to be found. In receiving this degree of doctor of laws, I am the worst doctor of laws in the world. But it seems nowadays that the less a man knows the greater is his degree."

### A FAMOUS NEWSPAPER WRITER.

By the death of M. de Blowitz the line of the old-time special correspondents becomes extinct. Up to within about two years ago, when, as he said, the Times cast me off as if I was an old horse no longer good for the harness, he occupied an unique position in Europe. He knew the people who did things, and which, perchance, contributed in great measure to his influence, he knew the things they were going to do. Unlike many of the present day correspondents he depended for news on facts and not on his imagination. He was always in touch with the exact political conditions of the hour, and prince and potentate were aware that his letters to the London Times were moulders of public opinion. He was in Paris during the siege by the Germans and kept his paper informed as to the condition of the city. After Sedan he told the world that Napoleon III. was an excellent runner. He was of the opinion that Disraeli was too great for the English mind. The citizen of the United States was characterized by him as being without varnish. We think, however, that in this his perspicacity is at fault. For the average subject of Uncle Sam is conspicuously slick and highly polished.

### ONE KIND OF HISTORIAN.

William Roscoe Thayer is one of the historians who distort facts, to make them fit in with preconceived opinions. Like all his tribe, he presses into service the writers who favor his view, and affects the while a profound respect for impartiality. He takes up the trail blazed by others and follows it blindly, slavishly, caring little whether it lead him to truth or falsehood. Because Dr. Garnett does not allude to Baron Corro's History of Alexander VI., Baron Corro is not worthy of Mr. Thayer's attention. If the gentleman had any sense of his responsibility to the public, and one iota of self-respect, he would have examined Corro's history for himself. To be led by the nose by Dr. Garnett is rather a pitiable role for an individual who takes himself so seriously as Mr. Thayer.

Toward the end of his letter he remarks that he cannot regard The Leo XI. of William Roscoe, issued in 1895, as a final authority for historians in 1903. Mr. Thayer of 1903 is of course distinctly superior to Wm. Roscoe of 1895, but it is rather startling to hear himself say it. We should like, however, to have some reason for the statement. The words "final authority" are without meaning, and are, it seems to us, but an artifice to cover up some of his tracks. Mr. Thayer does not take unalloyed delight in Roscoe's pages, and this for sundry reasons. Is it because he has no love for any writer who does not wax wrothly when discussing a personage or subject pertaining to the Church or because the "mind of a bigot is like the pupil of the eye; the more light you pour on it the more it contracts."

In a resume of the life of Alexander VI. he gives free rein to his prejudices. He charges this Pope with libertinism after his elevation to the episcopal dignity. In the first place the question whether Roderick Borgia had children

or not, is not beyond the domain of controversy. In 1880, according to Dr. Parsons, Loonetti published at Bologna an exhaustive work, highly commended by Leo XIII., contending that Caesar and Lucretia were not children of Cardinal Roderick Borgia, but of some Borgia especially loved by him, and that when their father had died these children were cared for by Roderick.

But supposing that he was married, we fail to see how children born to him should convict him of libertinism. In asserting that his oldest son was born fifteen years after Borgia became an Archbishop, Mr. Thayer does not manifest the precision and lucidity of statement that are wont to be associated with the historian. He is either ignorant of the facts of the case or intent on misleading his readers. He knows, or should know, that the purple did not at that time always presuppose sacred orders. A case in point was Roderick's Archiepiscopate of Valencia. He was merely the commendatory prelate of that See, and did not receive Holy Orders until 1476, about twenty-one years after the date implied by Mr. Thayer.

His career as Pope has already been reviewed in these columns. One word more about Mr. Thayer. To leave no doubt as to his status as an historian he bestows a commendatory word on Mr. Henry C. Lea's *Evolution of the Reformation*. He insinuates that nothing disparaging can be alleged against the authority of Mr. Lea. This is an excess of artlessness which can scarcely enhance Mr. Thayer's historical dignity. Mr. Lea is not an historian but a special pleader. He has been exposed time and again, but, thanks to the gullibility of admirers like Mr. Thayer, is still in the writing business. Dr. Bonquillan, late Professor of Moral Theology at the Catholic University of Washington, had something to say of his falsehoods and contradictions.

In conclusion we assure our non-Catholic brethren that we are ready to welcome any truth however distasteful. But the writer who does not dread falsehood and is open to a suspicion of animosity or partiality is not likely to give us this pleasure.

### A DISHONORABLE PAPER.

The Protestant Ministerial Association of Montreal held a meeting some days ago. The principal business was the reading of a paper by Rev. Dr. Amaron of St. John's Presbyterian Church on "Some Phases of the Religious Movement in Austria and France." We looked for some words of condemnation, but we found none. We read an account of the number of Austrians who had renounced Catholicity. The statistics given were labelled official, but whether they were manufactured in Montreal or elsewhere was not stated. From all this it appears that it is easy to entertain the members of the Association. But it would be to their credit had they scored the paper and placed themselves on record as the foes of the unsavory tactics which have characterized the Los Von Rom movement in Austria. This would have benefited the Association. But to allow the Rev. Dr. Amaron to insult their intelligence and probity is no passport to public approval.

To begin with this Los Von Rom has been a failure. It originated in perfidy and ended in dishonor, so far as its abettors were concerned. Dr. Engel, sometime leader of the Young Czech party, said in an address that German wishes above all things to Protestantize Austria in order to annex it. There is the origin of the Los Von Rom movement.

Its leaders, Wolf and Schönerer, have declared it as such. For this reason respectable Protestant papers and associations, notably the Protestant Consistory of Vienna, repudiated it. German fanatics have helped the movement with gold and calumny and have received in return the official figures of the Austrian conversions. Does the Protestant Association of Montreal favor treason? If not, why not assure us of the fact? Does it look kindly upon a propaganda planned for the sole and avowed purpose of disrupting the Austrian Empire? It would be well to have an answer if for no other reason than to lull the suspicion that we have anarchists masquerading in clerical gowns.

The movement, with all due respect to Dr. Amaron, was a political one from first to last. Its religious character was merely tacked on by cautious supporters to give it a semblance of decency. But its originator did not deal

in subtleties. Schönerer opposed all forms of Christianity. What he wanted was the establishment of Paganism—the worship of Woden.

The reverend gentleman kept all this out of his paper. He forgot to tell the members that Wolf, eloquent upholder of the "pure Gospel" and denouncer of the corruptions of Rome, has been forced to retire from public life. Schönerer also is well and unfavorably known in Vienna.

In France Dr. Amaron said a movement of a somewhat similar character was going on, but there it was chiefly among the priests, of whom "about six hundred had left the Church within the past five or six years." Where did he get his figures? In 1900 M. Merle d'Aubigne came to New York and put down the number of apostate priests in France at 80. In 1903, according to Dr. Amaron, there are 600. This is an astonishing increase, and we should like to have it verified. In the meantime we refuse to believe it because it is neither in accord with the record of France's priesthood nor with their national temperament. But supposing that six hundred left the Church what are they now? Protestants or infidels? It would be interesting to hear from the reverend speaker, because it is worth learning whether the old adage that a Frenchman may lose his faith but not his reason is still in honor. We do not deny there are some apostate priests, but that there are six hundred requires a better proof than the mere dictum of a Montreal minister.

But what kindness can he have for what he terms the religious movement in France? From the report of his paper it would appear that he assumes that the Protestants in France are united. Such, however, is not the case. The Protestants there are divided into different camps—the orthodox and the liberal. The liberal party is on the ascendant. With what party is he then in sympathy? If with the orthodox we have nothing to say save that he will find few apostate clerics under his banners, and that its influence counts for little, if anything, with the adherents of the Los Von Rom movement in France.

If with the liberal party, we pity him, and we cannot understand how he can proclaim himself to be a preacher of Christianity. For what is the programme of the liberal party? Stripped of its verbiage, it is rank infidelity. So intimate its leaders. They fraternize with Atheists, whose sole object is to de-Christianize France. "To make France Protestant is to make it Atchist."

What has a minister in common with this crew? Should he not give thanks that there is a power to combat it and to keep watch and ward over the name and honor of Christ.

### GREAT WEEK IN NEWARK.

FATHER SUTTON GIVES MISSION TO DELAWARE NON-CATHOLICS.

A course of free lectures to the public on the doctrines of the Catholic Church by Father Xavier Sutton, Passionist, established an unprecedented epoch in the history of St. John's Church, Newark, Del., of which Rev. George L. Ott is pastor. Newark is almost in the suburban vicinity of Wilmington, beautifully located and most healthy. There was a large attendance of the best and most intelligent people, representing all the families of all the denominations, including the professors of the college and school teachers. The interest and perfect order of the audiences were admirable, so well-mannered and attentive. This was a distinctive feature of the lectures, and speaks in highly commendable terms of the town of Newark. The audiences grew in number each evening, the nights of "Quo Vadis" and "Why I Am a Catholic" being the largest. Invitations had been sent to two hundred prominent citizens, including the ministers and the professors of the Delaware State College there. A striking feature each evening was a presentation of his book, "Clearing the Way," which almost all the non-Catholics were pleased to receive.

The subject of the first lecture was "Stambling Blocks." The principal points of the discourse were based upon human passions and human respect as prevalent obstacles to joining the Catholic Church; that passion and human respect so naturally and so largely govern and influence society. He declared most forcibly a striking fact, exemplified to-day in all circles of life, religions, political, civil and social that presents itself to all Catholics and adherents to the Catholic Church, how a father, mother, sister or brother might become a Mormon, an Atheist or an Agnostic and no serious consequences might follow, but to become a Catholic was to be disinherited or lose society, a deplorable injustice to any citizen of a great and free republic.

The second night the reverend speaker chose to introduce the subject of purgatory. He showed that it was

an old practice among all peoples long before the time of Christ. Christ never condemned it. His silence is a vigorous tribute of recommendation of its well-established usage among the Jews as to be recognized and followed by the Christian Church. Father Sutton earnestly entreated that the Protestants as non-Catholics should now universally, as a class, pray for our dead, truly a very original but wisely directed counsel to them. He showed the benefit of praying for the dead, and concluded with a practical illustration of the common belief of most non-Catholic creeds who teach that there exists no eternal punishment and therefore admitting a temporal punishment hereafter, which practically amounts to the same as the Catholic doctrine of purgatory.

Cellbay was handled so masterly and yet so delicately that the most critical and delicate were deeply convinced and instructed in this most beautiful discipline of the Catholic Church. He explained it from the celiacy of Christ and His Apostles, that it was not of divine institution, but of Church discipline only; that the priest symbolized St. Paul's ideal minister of God as an apostle of God's work and a true soldier in the army of salvation. The comments of the audience were generous and appreciative of the masterly proof that all the ministers of God should be celibates.

The next lecture was on penance. The pith of the argument was convincing to all, that it was not a human institution because too repugnant to human nature both for the Catholic clergy and laity. No historical record of any such institution can be found. As a divine institution it dates back to the time of Christ and His Apostles. The Catholic priest, not as a man, but as a priest, by his office in that capacity as agent and ambassador and minister of Christ, using the delegated power of Christ to His Apostles and transmitted to their lawful successors, forgives sins. He quoted an incident in the life of Chief Justice Taney, of the Supreme Court of the United States. While kneeling before the confessional with his Catholic colored servants he was observed by the confessor and asked to enter the confessional at once. He humbly answered, "I am not the Chief Justice here, only the prisoner at the Bar."

The subject of the lecture Thursday night was "Quo Vadis," introduced by the incident in the life of St. Peter when meeting the Saviour outside the city of Rome in a vision, addressing his Lord "Quo Vadis?" His answer of argument forcibly classified the two methods of belief among non-Catholics and Catholics—the former the Bible, the latter the Church. He proved that the Bible for four hundred years was not and could not be the medium and method of the communication of belief to the world. All classes of society considered, and not until the invention of printing did it come into general use, and yet in those days it was obligatory upon all men to believe the words of Christ without Bibles, but the method of preaching and teaching were Christ's method and of the Apostles, and the Catholic Church. He alluded to the Bible being chained as an incident of non-Catholic rebuke, because the Bibles were so scarce and so expensive that they were only in the possession of the Church, and then in a public place, for the use of the people, had a chain to them like our city directories have in public places for the use of the public, but not for kleptomaniacs.

"Is there a hell?" was the subject for Saturday night's discourse.

In preaching on this topic Father Sutton said that the existence of hell could be proved by sixteen or eighteen passages of Scripture. He quoted an incident in the life of Henry Ward Beecher that came under his own personal observation. A cartoon appeared in the daily press representing Henry Ward Beecher as making the declaration, "There is no hell."

A picture of his satanic majesty was also represented, and he seemed to be in jolly spirits and very well satisfied, and he was saying, "I will get them next time." That it was a common thing to hear bad people deny the existence of hell. Many non-Catholics say that the belief in the existence of a hell is nonsensical, but the fact of a large audience of Protestants being present in a Catholic Church on a Saturday night, the busiest night of the week for most people, proved that at least they were anxious to hear this subject discussed.

Suppose, he said, that I had commenced to preach that the moon was made of green cheese, and invited you all to be present, I could hardly expect a large audience. How could God punish a man for all eternity for committing a sin of a moment?

Men even in this life make no distinction in the punishment meted out to those who commit premeditated crime and those committed in a moment of passion. He showed that hell was eternal, from numerous texts of Scripture, "Depart, ye accursed, into everlasting fire," etc. From arguments drawn from reason he proved that no change could ever take place in hell; that a man dying in enmity to God his soul must remain in perpetual enmity with God, since the punishment was not of probation, nor reformatory; that were two states in eternity—the state of love of God and the state of enmity to God. Eternity could admit of no change. He proved that suffering in itself and as to itself alone did not cleanse or purge of itself, but the

effect, depended upon the will of the sufferer.

In hell they suffer, but blaspheme God, while in purgatory they praise God in their sufferings. He explained the difference between the soul in purgatory, how that soul at death did not have the enmity of God; that as it departed this life in the state of love in purgatory, only a condition of separation, the suffering a cleansing suffering; purgation, but united with God in the bond of love; that purgatory was the state of love, only the condition of suffering as a purgation before entering Heaven.

At the High Mass on Sunday morning Father Sutton preached a critical lecture to Catholics on their duties and negligences regarding their faith and their practice of it. So for the first time in his career of non-Catholic missions he gave an instruction to the Catholic and non-Catholic children. It was well attended, and a number of non-Catholic children were present.

"Why I am a Catholic," the subject of the Sunday evening discourse, drew the largest audience. It was thought the regular Church services would lessen the number, but to the contrary. His theme embodied one grand chain of solid indisputable arguments in proof of the Catholic Church containing the essential marks of a religion that was undoubtedly Christ's religion and His alone; that Christ's religion was the only religion that was the religion for the masses of the people, that as truth was one, that unity was the first essential necessity of Christ's Church. No matter in what part of the world a man was, he found the Catholic faith identical the same, because it was the exemplification of truth, and that the truth was one and the same in every clime in all time.

Other Churches are not Catholic or Universal. Some limited only to small sections of the country, others only to countries; some take names from their founders, as Lutherans, Calvinists; others from the particular doctrines, as Baptists, non-Apostolic, Methodist Church, only little over one hundred years old, founded by John Wesley, which does not teach to-day the doctrine founded by Henry VIII., the oldest Protestant Church, little over four hundred years ago. The sanctity of the Catholic Church is manifest in the seven sacraments, the efficient channels of grace to meet every spiritual need of the soul.

That its name of Catholic signified its universality, as history testifies to its existence among all peoples of the earth in all ages down to the time of Christ. It was not a human institution, but the establishment of the Son of God Himself. That it had no man, no human mind to fashion it according to worldly notions, to admit, as the world's religions sects do, that it was the old Church, but that it had a divine origin, and that it was because the Son of God had pledged with an avowed promise that He would be with it all days, even to the consummation of the world, and the gates of hell would not prevail against it. If it has failed, Christ's promise has failed, and so Christ has deceived the world, and all Christianity has failed and religion has no claim upon our soul's interests.

It is a serious question, and upon it devolves the preference in the choice of the numerous creeds of adhering to the one true religion established by Christ, or the various sects established by those who severed themselves from Christ's Church. The lectures were the first of the kind ever delivered in Newark. The large audiences were repeated each evening, the same persons mostly, with new additions. The church was well filled for "Quo Vadis" and "Why I am a Catholic?" The leading people of the place and the most intellectual were present. The attention was most marked, the conduct and deportment of all present well exemplified the culture and refinement of the people. The members of the Church were also present; every one was welcome.

It is an event that shall never pass the memory of the hearers of the able and convincing explanation of Catholic doctrine. It will be a standing memorial of the greatest devotional week in the history of St. John's Church; a grand, instructive tribute of knowledge to Catholics in behalf of their Divine religion, and a most satisfactory exposition of the truths and doctrines of the Catholic faith to all the non-Catholic inhabitants of Newark.

Some of the questions proposed were in the Question Box and answered by Father Sutton were:

1. What is that little door on the altar which is kept locked so no one can see?
2. If Catholics profess to follow the Bible and tradition so closely why then have they changed the custom of baptizing?
3. Why do Roman Catholics repeat their prayers so many times when Christ says: "When ye pray use not vain repetition as the heathens do." (Matt. vi. 7.)
4. Does not the Scriptural passage (John 20. 23.) conclusively prove that Jesus conferred the same power on all the Apostles, and not as you teach that Peter was appointed to some peculiar authority. If so why did not the Saviour here hint at such pre-eminence?
5. Since the Bible directly states that there is but one mediator between God and man, how does the Catholic Church sanction her priests in that capacity?
6. I, for one, cannot see how the priest can change the bread and wine into the real Body and Blood of our Lord. We are told in St. Luke's Gospel: "This cup is the New Testament

in my blood, which is shed for you." Here is an undeniable figure whereby the cup is put for the wine in the cup. And this is called the New Testament in Christ's blood. How could the cup of wine in His hand be His blood when that blood was still flowing in His veins?

7. Do you claim that the decisions of the Pope of Rome are always infallible? If so, how do you explain the refusal of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, in the third century, to recognize his authority over him? Also the refusal of the Carthaginians to accept Neuvastus, sent from Rome to be their Bishop; also the refusal of the eastern church to conform to the Roman custom in the keeping of Easter when commanded to do so by Pope Victor, 190 A. D.

### OFFERED HIS LIFE FOR HIS BROTHER IN RELIGION.

A touching incident is connected with the death at the Hotel Dorton, Quebec, of Rev. Nicholas Burton, O. M. I., aged 70 years.

This venerable religious came from France to Canada in the early fifties. After teaching for a short time in the College of Ottawa, Canada, now the University of Ottawa, he was sent to Cauknapaga, Province of Quebec, to labor among the Iroquois Indians of that mission. There he remained for over thirty years, remaining among that tribe the zeal shown centuries ago, to its fierce ancestors, by the Jesuit missionaries. Although busy with the duties of his ministry he found time to devote to literary pursuits. He wrote a grammar of the Iroquois language, several volumes of instruction on religious subjects, and a comprehensive history of the Iroquois natives of that mission.

Early in December last Rev. Father Guertin, O. M. I., a young member of the Montreal community, fell sick and was taken to a hospital in that city. An operation was deemed necessary in his case, and fears were entertained by the physicians lest he might not survive it. This news was conveyed to Father Burton, who at once exclaimed: "My God, preserve the life of this young religious who can yet be useful to the Church! If it be necessary, take my life, in return for his recovery. But, before removing me from this world, allow me to celebrate the golden jubilee of my ordination to the priesthood." The sacrifice was acceptable to God. The venerable priest celebrated his jubilee on the 18th of December. That same evening he felt ill, and was taken to the hospital. On Christmas Eve, at the last Sacraments were being administered to him, a dispatch was received from Montreal, announcing that having safely passed through the operation the young priest had gone back to his community. A few minutes later Father Burton expired. R. I. P.

### One Thing to do During Lent.

This is one of Father O'Reilly's reminders in our Parish Calendar: "Are you as well informed on matters pertaining to your religion as you often feel you would like to be when your non-Catholic neighbor brings up the subject of the Catholic Church, or its bearing on any of the public questions of the day? No. Well, then, why not take a little time during the Lenten season to read up and inform yourself? Of course you can not take up a whole course of study during so short a time. Neither can you fully restrain your insatiable appetites, nor obtain complete control over your passions by the strict observance of Lenten regulations during so short a season. All that you can expect to attain to the success is a good beginning; and the hope is that the charm of a successful beginning may prove an inspiration to continue. Get a good book once a week from either our public or parochial library. If your finances will stand it, subscribe now for a Catholic paper or magazine."

### Two Questions.

Among many other questions (asked during a mission to Mormons in Idaho) the following were answered: "You as a Catholic priest preach that whiskey is our greatest enemy; you also preach that we should love our enemies. How is this? Answer: Yes, I preach that whiskey is your enemy and also that we should love our enemies; but I never preach that you should swallow them. The man that asked this question came up and shook hands with the priest."

"Is it allowed for a priest to draw blood by chopping off the head of a chicken? Yes, it is allowed and only forbidden in one case; when the chicken belongs to somebody else.—From the Missionary."

### Defended.

Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, is actively interesting himself in the fate of the English Passionist Fathers in the Catholic Church on the Avenue Hoche, Paris. He has taken steps to inform N. Delcasse, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, that the forcible dispersal of three Passionists would be reviewed with repugnance not horror by all sections of American, not alone Catholics, as a needless act of religious persecution which would be abhorrent to American ideas. In this way it would do much to alter the esteem and respect mutually existing between the two countries, which he (the Archbishop) had hitherto done his utmost to foster.

An error is the more dangerous in opposition to the degree of truth which it contains.—Amiel's Journal.