

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XX.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1898.

NO. 1048

**An Unpublished Poem.**  
TO NELLIE HENRY, WITH THE DAILY BLESSING OF FATHER RYAN.  
April 1, 1881.  
In the eclipse of your soul—  
Ah! me, they come to all.  
Across the sunshine shadows roll.  
O'er you, o'er each they fall;  
And when you cannot help but cry  
Oh, Christ! give more of rest and light!  
Oh, Christ! give less of toil and night!  
And when you cannot help but sigh  
For something dim and vague and far  
May words of mine be somewhat like a star,  
To ring around your feet  
Gleams fair and pure and sweet,  
To guide your way  
Each lonely day  
To the good, the just, the true,  
This prayer I breathe for you.  
—Abram J. Ryan.

## THE TRIUMPH OF WICKLIFFE

A Day With Rev. Dr. Kerr Boyce Tupper and His Pet Reformer.

The Rev. Kerr Boyce Tupper, D. D., of the First Baptist Church, delivered on last Sunday evening a sermon on "John Wickliffe and His Triumph Over the Papacy," which was a notable deliverance from several view points and which served to accentuate, as did the service, the inconsistencies of the Protestant sects. The differing views which even the members of one congregation hold are illustrated by their actions. On entering some lean their heads on their hands and pray devoutly, but the vast majority come into the church as to a social gathering and shake hands and chat. The humble usher escorts you to your proper place and there you find a hymnal entitled "Landes Dmmt" [Some Jesuit mist have sneaked in and stamped this Latin title on the book]. A psalm is chanted in alternate verses by minister and people and a hymn is sung by these private judgment advocates, in which the words occur, "Fear not, I will pilot thee."  
The sermon, however, is the principal feature of Sunday's exercises, and yet the cry is "the Bible, the whole Bible and nothing but the Bible." Catholics contend that Christ neither gave the New Testament nor ordered it to be written, but that He ordered His apostles to teach all nations by preaching. Their opponents argue that the Bible is the sole rule of faith and then exalt preaching to the most important place in their services. There was a novel feature introduced into the extemporaneous (?) prayer at this church. Near its close the organist was noticed to be fingering the keys and at the proper word he started up and the choir finished with a verse from a hymn. Ritualism is something to be condemned, say our Baptist brethren, but here is an effort at it which would be in much better taste were it less unexpected.

## THE TRIUMPH (?) OF WICKLIFFE

"Wickliffe's triumph over the Papacy" at last had its turn, and poor Martin Luther was ruthlessly robbed of the questionable honor of being the pioneer reformer. The array of reformers who preceded him, with their various "isms," were recited, as also the things which they battled to reform—among them Papal despotism, monastic corruption, the base life of the clergy, the criminality of *curricular confession*, Masses for the dead, the prohibition of the translation of the Scriptures, the keeping of human minds in bondage, of human souls in fear. The times demanded and unchained and unemasculated Bible, in order that it might be proved that Christ was true to His promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against the Church which He had founded.  
Here began a eulogy of the preacher's hero, who, he said, was as gentle as a lamb, though bold as a lion in redressing wrongs. He contended for liberty of conscience, the right of private judgment, an open Bible for all, without regard to age or condition, and justification without merits. The Bible he found in one of three conditions—chained, on dark shelves or burned in "hot flames." This was all the use they had for the Word of God. The Pope, it seems, according to Dr. Tupper, was not the chief obstacle to the Bible's growth, after all. The Norman conquest sadly interfered with the Bible's translation. A new language had to be instituted, and the people during the years cared nothing for manuscripts. Macaulay was quoted as saying that the Bible for centuries had dried up, and that up to that time there had not been a single translation into English handed over to the people. But in 1382 every man and woman in England knew the Word of God, old and young, rich and poor, ignorant and learned.  
The Queen of Bohemia then got her share of praise for making any one who stood in the way of the translation of the Bible amenable to the law. Despite the Archbishop of Canterbury and Pope Alexander V., who had said no man should read the Word of God, every one was permitted through Wickliffe's efforts to read it as he sat under his own vine. In 1378 his trial took place. The poor old man was quite alone and an earthquake broke up the assemblage at three different trials of Wickliffe, "a singular fact." He was condemned because he had given the Word of God to the people. Here Dr. Tupper got very dramatic, and quoted Wickliffe as saying: "If God be for me, who can be against

me?" His last moments were described thus: "Commending his spirit to God he sank quietly into his chair, was struck with paralysis and died." The Pope claimed his death was a judgment of God.  
Among the results of his death, according to the preacher, were these: Ten years after the House of Lords passed a bill that no man in the United Kingdom shall read the English language; twenty-four years after it was commanded that no writing of Wickliffe should be read by the people.  
The speaker told of Wickliffe's notes on the margin of his Bible, in which he showed he did not trust the people to interpret for themselves and was not very sure of his own view. "This I think, is the interpretation." When his attention was called to the phrase "do ye penance" and it was asked why he let that remain in his translation when he was against penance, he was quoted as saying: "I may be against something God is not against, I must give a correct translation."

## A HOPELESS TASK.

The effort to convict the Church of opposition to the Bible, which the labor of monks preserved for centuries, is among the hardest tasks of the anti-Catholic preacher. Father Turner, of the cathedral, speaking of "chained" Bibles in a lecture some years ago, said that some bright luminary in the next century discovering an old Philadelphia directory chained will say that the people were not allowed to read it, and these directories are far from being as valuable as the manuscript Bibles were. As far as unemasculated Bible, the sects have not got the whole Bible, and Wickliffe's Bible was practically condemned by Protestants themselves, for they awaited the publication of the English Catholic Bible of 1609 before publishing the King James version, and modeled it after the Catholic version, abandoning Wickliffe's, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Cromwell's, the Geneva and the Bishop's, all non-Catholic publications corrupted to advance certain religious and political views, and now the Revised version, which is still nearer the Catholic, replaces the King James. The Queen of Bohemia, who would not allow the publication of Bibles to be interfered with, was different from Queen Elizabeth, the Protestant Virgin Queen who persecuted Catholics for publishing it.  
As for translating the Bible into the vernacular, the Catholic Church was away ahead of Wickliffe. Early in the eighth century the Venerable Bede translated it into Saxon, then the prevailing tongue. There were seven editions of the Bible in German before Luther's time, and all of them Catholic.

## THE TRIUMPH (?) OF WICKLIFFE

The Catholic Church does not believe along with Dr. Tupper that the ignorant are as competent to interpret the Bible as the learned. Neither did Wickliffe, hence the marginal notes. The statement that in 1382 every man could sit under his own vine and read his Bible is certainly startling, considering that the art of printing was not yet in vogue, and for many years after was not in such a condition that every man could afford to own a Bible. Wickliffe was, according to his biographers, paralyzed a number of years before the day of his death and did not die so dramatically as depicted by the learned doctor, who for got to say that he died while hearing Mass. As to being alone at his trial, his supporters were so many that a riot was almost precipitated because the people thought an attack was being made on the presiding Bishop. As to the alleged earthquake: by what process of reasoning can Dr. Tupper urge that they were a judgment of Providence, which is not equally strong for the Pope's alleged utterance that Wickliffe's paralysis was? Sir David Brewer, LL. D., and Daniel Haskel, A. M., both Protestants, give in their "Chronological View of the World" any number of references regarding comets and earthquakes, but a *single* fact is that they do not name one near the period of the trials.  
If in 1382 every man, woman and child knew the Word of God, it was because the Church of Christ under His vicar the Pope was doing its work thoroughly. Somelike Wickliffe knew the Word of God, but did not heed it. Their publications and the Word of God were two entirely different things. There were things, as Wickliffe admitted, which he was against and God was not. The Papacy is one of them. It still lives, and Wickliffe, if here to-day, would not recognize a single Protestant sect as his own. Wickliffe acknowledged the Papacy when he appealed to the Pope against Archbishop Langham, but, losing his case, he then denied the authority of the court. The preacher who blames the Catholic Church because she does not recognize every man's writings and translations as the Word of God should not at the same time withhold from his people the facts of history. Despite the so-called reformers of past ages and those who misrepresent her at the present time, the gates of hell have not prevailed against Christ's Church.—Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

The consummation of madness is to do what, at the time of doing it, we intend to be sorry for afterward—the deliberate and intentional making of work for repentance.—W. Nevins.

## THE RAFFLE FOR SOULS.

Statement of Facts by Archbishop Perfectus.

(Translation)  
Angelopolis,  
(Puebla de los Angeles, M. Mex.)  
September 26 1898.

To the Rev. Joseph F. Sheehan, rector of St. Mary Magdalen, Pucanito Hills, N. Y.:

Rev. Sir: A few days ago I received your letter, informing me of the attacks made in the newspapers of your country on my clergy, on account of our "Lotteries in Favor of the Souls in Purgatory."  
First of all, I must thank you for your kindness in sending me the information, because it gives me an opportunity of saying a few words to remove any scandal that the Catholics of New York may have suffered from these reports, and also of repelling the calumnious charges of superstition made against my clergy and faithful people.  
Whatever truth or falsehood there may be in the reports of the pious custom called "Lottery for Souls in Purgatory" (in Spanish, "raffle" on behalf of the souls in purgatory") in a few words I will explain to you what they are.

Shortly before the month of November, in certain churches, in which special works are performed in aid of the souls in Purgatory, the rectors of these churches make out a series of numbers, say, from 1 to 1,000. Opposite these numbers the faithful may write the names of the deceased persons for whom they wish the works to be performed, giving at the same time an aim of 10 cents or so to cover expenses. Certain special spiritual works are promised beforehand for the four or five souls whose numbers shall be drawn in the lottery. For example, for the first, the thirty Gregorian Masses; one Mass on each day for thirty successive days; for the second, a Silem Mass of Requiem; for the third, fourth, fifth, etc., a certain number of private Masses; and, besides this, some Masses are offered for all the souls in drawing. On the day appointed the drawing takes place, and then the works specified are performed, according to the established manner of the Church, for the souls of those whose names answer to the numbers designated on the lot. The money collected is given as stipends for Masses and for the other expenses. Thus the faithful are easily enabled to be the means of helping the souls in Purgatory, by the common works offered for all, and if their lot should be the one drawn they aid these souls by the special works also, which, otherwise, they could not obtain without some difficulty.

Neither have my priests given assurance that souls, even those aided by the special works, have certainly left Purgatory and gone to Heaven.

From what I have just explained to you, you will see, Reverend Sir, that there is nothing superstitious in this pious custom; and I will take care, and, with God's help, I shall use the greatest possible vigilance that no taint of superstition or sordid greed shall ever find an entrance here.  
After having read this perhaps you will say: If this is so, how did all these complaints get in the newspapers? How did all these scandals arise?  
If you ask me I will tell you. There are in this city two Protestant establishments from the United States. Their members not only scatter the tares of their detestable disquisitions among our Catholic people, but they also try, by every possible means, to vilify us before other nations as if we were sunk in the darkness of ignorance and superstition, that they themselves may appear as heralds of the truth and as the teachers of the people, and thus keep up the streams of money pouring into them from societies for the propagation of heresy. They are the originators of all the falsehoods and calumnies against us. Their manner of acting in trying to rob our Catholic people of their faith has this effect also: it has made the American nation detestable to Mexicans, as that is the nation from which these false prophets come. That these men and their methods are liable to be occasions of discussions and trouble in the future is easy to see.

I think that I have now complied with your wishes, and I will ask if you, as a favor, to explain this matter to those who have been scandalized by the reports concerning us, and at the same time warn them not to be too ready to believe similar stories reflecting on the Mexican clergy. By doing so you will do a service to our common mother, the Holy Church. With my best wishes and kindest regards, I am,  
Your servant in Christ,  
Perfectus,  
Bishop of Angelopolis.

—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

Oh, do not, in proof that you did not forget your departed ones, call attention to the pompous funeral display you ordered, to the costly casket, the profusion of flowers, the imposing monument. Vainly of vanities! It is help, help they need, relief for which they cry in the words of Joseph in Pharaoh's prison: "Remember me when it shall be well with thee and do me this kindness to take me out of prison."—Rev. John A. Nagelsien.

## IS ONE RELIGION AS GOOD AS ANOTHER?

Rev. Father Calmer, in His Fifth Lecture, Discussed Truth and Error.

"Indifferentism, or, Is One Religion as Good as Another?" was the subject of Rev. Father Calmer's fifth lecture at St. Xavier's Church last Sunday night. Father Calmer introduced his lecture by comparing unbelief to the Dead Sea. He said that the spirit of unbelief is deathlike, and to inhale its pestilential breath begets moral ruin. As upon the shores of the Dead Sea grow apples of Sodom, fair to view, but when, if you touch, turn to ashes; so upon the shores of the Dead Sea of unbelief there ripens fruit, all fair without, but rottenness within.

This fruit is Indifferentism. Its teachings are not merely theoretical, but have a practical bearing, not only upon the daily moral life of the individual, but, like poisonous waters, they filtrate from the upper to the lower strata of society, sapping the foundations of the private and public faith of the people, so that before we are aware the whole superstructure of religion crumbles to ruin. How often do we not hear that religion is necessary—but why be so intolerant? Why not practice greater charity to your fellow-men? It makes little difference what a man believes: one religion is as good as the other; it matters not which one you profess, provided you are religious. Let the rising generation choose from among the thousand and one forms of religion, which, like a crazy quilt, covers the earth: God has given reason to man, and let each one's private judgment dictate the choice. It is intolerance not to put all on an equal footing; it is an undue restraint put on man's freedom of action.

These affirmations, at first sight, seemed vanished with plausibility; there is nothing narrow or cramped about them—but in truth when touched by the finger of sound sense they are found to be like the apples of Sodom—fair without and rottenness within. They are radically false, since religion, if at all admitted as necessary to all moral life, is essentially one. Religions cannot allow a variety of contradictory tenets, and if unity is of its essence, it is necessarily intolerant.

Absolute indifferentism, which is the total denial of all positive belief, is, perhaps, not so dangerous, if we have a spark of faith left, on account of its repellent form. Relative indifferentism, which consists in the admission of the compatibility of various creeds, all of which are true and necessary to salvation, no matter how opposed to each other, is more dangerous because more insidious. It is like being stung by a death dealing scorpion hidden in an bush behind a bank of fragrant flowers.

Father Calmer said that, as children of the Church, we are warned against it by the authoritative pronouncements of the Church. The encyclicals of the Pope condemned it. In the Syllabus, the catalogue enumerating the errors of the present age, we are forbidden to assert that eternal life may be attained by any and every form of belief: for it is evident that to affirm this would be the same as to assert that all religions are true. Popular prejudice may be roused; the teachings of the Church are said to be opposed to modern advanced thought, progress and reform.

Intolerance is the watchword of the Indifferentist, but arguments cannot be found, for reason plainly proves its consistency and correctness. Throw aside all bias and what does reason teach?  
In the ultimate analysis of the nature of religion, we find, in the first place, God, the Creator, to whom is due the service of reverence, love and obedience—it is not what the creature wants, but what the Creator demands; in the next place, there is the rational creature, who, by her nature, is morally bound to the Creator. He is a creature dependent on Him, and he must recognize and acknowledge this dependence. He cannot escape the law of this creaturehood. Now reason teaches that God is one, the alpha and omega of his being. There is, therefore, but one way of tending and attaining to this end, and that is by a service such as God has pointed out and by no other, since, as Supreme Lord and Master, He has a right to be served and worshipped as He commands. Who can gainsay this palpably plain truth? Moreover, men in this respect are equal, all dependent, and consequently this dependence and the manner of showing it are one and the same for all men. Therefore, reason teaches that religion, which consists in the recognition of this dependence and the acting out of the obligations which this dependence entails upon the creature, must be one and the same for all men. Paul of Tarsus put the conclusion of the argument pithily: "One God: one baptism; one faith."

The popular argument of the Indifferentist, is, as there may be various roads leading to the same terminus, so there may be various ways of tending and attaining to our final end—God. This is altogether a fallacious assumption. This would hold true if all the roads led in the same direction, but is totally false if they lead in diam-

etrically opposite directions. One would lead to, the other from, the object of our journey—and such is precisely the case with truth and error. Truth is not only the opposite but the negative of error. The veriest tyro in logic knows that contradictories cannot at one and the same time be true. Now religion is eternal truth, and cannot teach contradictories to be true. If one be true, the other is necessarily false.

"I truth, therefore, is absolute and not relative, what holds good in all other matters must hold good in the matter of religion. What sane man would admit that Christ was the Messiah foretold by the prophets, as the Christian asserts, and that both Jew and Christian are right; that Christ was true God of the true God, as all Christians hold, and that He was mere man, as the Arians of old, the Turk and Unitarian believe, and that all of them are right; that the gates of hell, the powers of error, shall not prevail against the Church, as the Catholic affirms, relying on the infallible assurances of the Christ, and they did prevail, if the Church needed a reformation in faith, as Protestantism supposes and that Catholicism and Protestantism are both right? The fact seems so patent that it is almost impossible to conceive how reason can fall so low in the scale of common sense as to assert the variety of religious belief and to deny the unity of religious faith."

Dr. Calmer next treated of liberty of conscience and tolerance. He said that liberty, which is so highly prized by modern thought, is misunderstood by it. Liberty, according to it, is license, and even that must not be morally restrained by law. The flower of liberty strikes its roots in the intellect and blossoms in the will. The object of the intellect is truth, and that of the will good. The flowers turn to print and the print of freedom is the true and the good.  
What, therefore, restrains man's intellect from error and keeps his will from evil aids him in perfecting his freedom by making it in some manner indefeasible, like God's. Hence, if unity is of the essence of religion, any doctrine or moral practice opposed to it must be restrained, for the simple reason that error and evil destroy the perfection of man's liberty. On the same principle the State restrains the spread of an epidemic by enforcing quarantine, and does not the restraint deserve the praise of the people whom it preserves from contagion and death? How inconsistent, then, to blame religion, which keeps men aloof from error and orders all false doctrines into a moral quarantine. How fallacious, then, the dictum that truth and error must be placed on an equal footing and be subject to an equal examination.

To put the case strongly, suppose someone were to assert that it would be well to re-establish in our midst the old Phoenician religion, with its human sacrifices to Moloch, would you tolerate it? Why? Because you think it barbarously wrong. But suppose he thinks it right? You are, therefore, intolerant. Such intolerance is a sacred duty. Now, the Church is infallibly certain, relying on the promise of Christ, that the spirit of truth would abide with her to the consummation of days. Consequently she holds all other creeds are far from the truth in proposition as they differ from the tenets of her belief, which rests as the threefold pillar of reason, authority and faith. Is she, therefore, to be censured for condemning the disseminators or false doctrines and endeavoring to lead them aright—for refusing to admit premises which would undermine the faith of her children? She must always bear in mind to distinguish between condemning error and the person who professes it. She proscribes the error, but feels sympathy for him who has been misled by it. This is true charity. The great lesson taught by the Prince of Peace from His manger pulpit is love for God and love for our fellow men.

"The freedom of conscience which we enjoy in this country is the country's debt to Catholics, as General Bradley F. Johnson has so ably shown in an address on the charter of religious liberty granted by that charter colony of Maryland. In that charter the great principle was laid down that Faith is an act of the will, and cannot be compelled by force or the will of other men. Still this does not give the right to believe what you please or that toleration should be extended to him. Freedom of conscience means to every earnest man only that thought should not be constrained by force and that faith should not be compelled by human law. The theory that every man has the right to think as he pleases, logically leads to indifferentism—for if it has the right to deny everything that I believe true, then I cannot be certain that what I believe is true, and if I am uncertain, faith is gone, and the man, the nation, the race whose faith decays is on the road to that disintegration which has overwhelmed the religion of Zoroaster and is overtaking that of Confucius, Brahma and Buddha. Every man has the power to think as he pleases. He can never have the right to think wrong."—Western Watchman, St. Louis, Nov. 3.

The sin that is not forsaken soon leads to another.

## COL INGERSOLL.

The Boston Herald for last Sunday contains a refreshing editorial on our great American blasphemer, Colonel Ingersoll, lately and telling the benighted citizens thereof how grossly absurd are the old superstitions about God, man, the Bible and Faith. The Herald pronounces him a "back number" and deals with him as follows:

"Age and superannation are no reproach to a man if only he quietly withdraws from public activity, and declines to lag a superfluous veteran on the stage. If he can no longer mentally keep up with the pace of advancing knowledge and imbibe new ideas; if such ideas as he has essayed with time and become mere fossils; if his true place is henceforth that of a specimen of a bygone period on the shelf of a museum of antiquities, why that is but the common fate of man. The trouble with Colonel Ingersoll is that, while he does not know it, he belongs in reality, clear back in the antediluvian theological age, the age in which huge theological scurians "tare each other in the slime," and called it ushering in the reign of sweetness and light.

With his remarkable gifts as a speaker, Col. Ingersoll might be a great power for good, if only he knew anything. But that is now past praying for. There is no constructive element in his mind, only a desecrative. He is totally destitute of the historic sense. Even in his avowed atheism, he is simply the narrow partisan dogmatist, with no fine sense of what a fate atheism implies. Contrast, for example, the truculent tone of his utterance on this issue in the Boston Theatre, last Sunday night, with the utterances of George John Romanes, a man of real science, who at one time equally lost his faith, although in later life, to his unspeakable joy, recovered it: "I am not ashamed to confess that with this virtual negation of God, the universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness. . . . When at times I think, as I think I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine, and the lonely mystery of existence as now I find it—at such times I shall ever feel it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible." What a contrast with the "Hurrah, boys! there is no God and I am his prophet. Admission, fifty cents, reserved seats one dollar!"

## A RICHLY LADEN PURSE.

List of the Priests of the Diocese of Kingston Who Contributed to its Weight.

The following is a list of the subscriptions to the purse of gold presented to His Grace Archbishop O'Leary by the priests of the Diocese of Kingston on the occasion of his reception in Kingston on the afternoon of the 17th of October:

Right Rev. Monsignor Farsley	\$100 00
Rev. Father J. S. O'Connor	100 00
" " J. Masterson	200 00
" " M. J. Stanton	200 00
" " C. Murray	50 00
" " T. J. Spratt	100 00
" " T. Davis	50 00
" " J. McDonagh	100 00
" " G. A. Cleary	100 00
" " P. A. Twomey	50 00
" " J. Hogan	100 00
" " T. Kelly	25 00
" " D. A. Twomey	50 00
" " T. McCarthy	50 00
" " M. J. O'Rourke	50 00
" " M. McLaughlin	50 00
" " J. V. Neville	50 00
" " M. Meagher	20 00
" " W. T. Bridonnet	50 00
" " T. P. O'Connor	40 00
" " C. Killen	15 00
" " J. O'Brien	25 00
" " J. Meagher	50 00
" " J. S. Quinn	50 00
" " J. J. Collins	50 00
" " M. J. Spratt	50 00
" " J. D. O'Gorman	50 00
" " A. Carson	20 00
" " J. J. Connolly	25 00
" " J. P. Kehoe	50 00
" " T. Carey	50 00
" " C. Duffus	50 00
" " J. McCarthy	50 00
" " W. McDonagh	25 00
" " J. P. Fleming	50 00
" " P. C. O'Brien	25 00
" " P. J. Hartigan	30 00
" " W. Walsh	50 00
" " T. Murtagh	50 00
Total	\$2,270 00

## HAS BECOME MONOTONOUS.

At a recent monthly meeting of the Methodist ministers in Baltimore, the Rev. Doctor E. S. Todd tried to stem a tide of abuse which was being poured on the Catholic Church and the Spaniards by a fellow-clergyman. With rare courage and candor Doctor Todd told his brethren that instead of throwing stones at the Church they should wish her God speed. And he found a supporter, too, in the Rev. Doctor Lathrop, who is supposed to be a Methodist of the Methodists. He spoke of the lack of fairness and wisdom shown in condemning the Church constantly, and said: "Let us not encourage this business of dragging Rome into all our sermons. I must say that I myself long since grew tired of hearing ministers making Romanism their topic. These were brave words and they were sadly needed, but we are afraid that they will not convert the ministerial bigots."—Sacred Heart Review.