

## The Catholic Register,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,  
AT THE  
OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:  
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 1893.

### Letter from the Archbishop.

To all whom it may concern, greeting:

It has been already announced that it is intended to publish in this city a new weekly Catholic journal, to be entitled THE CATHOLIC REGISTER, having as editor-in-chief the Rev. J. R. Teefy, B.A., Superior of St. Michael's College, who will be assisted by other able writers.

It will be the mission of THE CATHOLIC REGISTER to promote, according to its ability, Catholic interests, to vindicate Catholic rights—religious, educational and civil—and to defend the Church against the falsehoods and calumnies of which she is too frequently the object.

Whilst thoroughly loyal to the form of Government under which we live, and devoted to the welfare of our country, it will be perfectly independent of all political parties, and free to approve or condemn them according to their deserts.

It will labor to promote peace and good will amongst all classes of the community, but it will not cry "peace where there is no peace;" peace through the truth, through right and justice, it will aim at promoting to the best of its ability, in the conviction that charity, right reason, and the best interests of the country demand it.

Far from antagonizing or attempting to crowd out the Catholic papers already in the field, it will be happy to co-operate with them in the furtherance of the sacred cause they all have at heart; and if mayhap any rivalry should exist between them, it doubtless will be but the rivalry of striving to excel each other in conscientious, zealous and judicious labors in the noble vocation of Catholic journalism.

We bespeak for THE CATHOLIC REGISTER a generous and hearty support from the Catholic public; and we recommend it in a special manner to the patronage, encouragement and support of the Clergy and Laity of this Archdiocese.

† JOHN WALSH,  
Archbishop of Toronto.

St. Michael's Palace, Toronto,  
New Year's Day, 1893.

### Is there Happiness in Hell?

Such is the strange title of a strange article in the *Nineteenth Century* of November by the distinguished English Catholic scientist, St. George Mivart. Of all places for scientists to poke and delve, hell is the most unexpected and the most unpromising of success; and of all the things to search for there, happiness is the last and most unlooked for. We would suggest, without meaning any irreverence, to the scientist to investigate the nature of the microbes in that warm region—the worm that never dieth; but to seek for happiness in a place which the Almighty and Sovereign Judge has destined for punishment gives a shock to our Christian feeling.

The question is so vast, deep and serious, involving the doctrine of the

supernatural, man's fall and final destiny, that any review article must fail to give a clear idea of the Catholic teaching upon the subject. For this reason, if for no other, the article is not prudent. The supernatural has not the same footing in literature, and especially in the literature of reviews, which it had; so that the careless, scoffing reader will surely take a wrong meaning out of what was meant to be purely explanatory within the teaching and tradition of the Catholic Church. Such is the state of the human mind that first a doubting question is raised, and then a sceptical answer follows. Men will read Mr. Mivart's article; and some, too ready to grasp at anything, will console themselves with the thought that perhaps the Church did not mean all that it has been teaching during her every century upon God's dread punishment of sin. When we treat in a review article upon a scientific subject it must be borne in mind that while we are using terms in a technical sense our readers are very apt to take them in a popular and vernacular meaning. What is "happiness?" What signification is to be given to "hell?" Distinction must also be made between baptized and unbaptized souls. Hell contains three punishments: that of the loss of God, the positive punishment of sense, and thirdly the eternity of both. It was from a consideration of the last named quality of hell that Mr. Mivart started his article. The Universalistic teaching, or the final restitution of all men, is irreconcilable with Catholic doctrine, which has always taught "that souls condemned to hell remain there for all eternity." And "not only are the damned, damned for all eternity, but their condition is least adequately represented by images of the most extreme and varied torture." He maintains, as we all do, that there is no needless torture, that "Hell is a law" and "no arbitrary infliction of a vengeful Deity." What happiness can be found in such a state? Mr. Mivart's answer is that "the very worst is felt by him to be preferable to non-existence." Referring more directly to unbaptized children and the punishment of loss, he concludes his article with the following remarkable sentence: "Hell in its widest sense—namely, as including all those blameless souls who do not enjoy that Vision—must be considered as, for them, an abode of happiness transcending all our most vivid anticipations, so that man's natural capacity for happiness is there gratified to the utmost; nor is it even possible for the Catholic theologian of the most severe and rigid school to deny that, thus considered, there is, and there will for all eternity be, a real and true happiness in hell."

As the essence of heaven is the beatific vision, so that of hell is the loss of God. What it is exactly we know not, for "eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive what God hath prepared for those who love Him." Nor hath it entered into the heart to know what the Mighty and Just God has prepared for those who, with full light of under-

standing and free will, trample His law under foot and separate themselves from Him. If death find them in that state, they depart forever from Him who should have been the object of their love, and who would have been their reward exceeding great. Concerning the abstruse question whether existence in hell is better than non-existence, it will ever be found impossible for philosopher, scientist or theologian to determine. If we wish to go down into hell we had better go down for a far different purpose than to see if its dark chasms contain happiness; we had better visit it in spirit that we may avoid it in eternity.

One good idea pervades the mysterious article in question, that Catholic doctrine is more in accord with science, even upon this dark and terrible mystery of God's power, justice and sanctity. But we cannot help regretting that the article ever appeared. Mathematicians do not make good philosophers—it was so with Des Cartes, Leibnitz and Newton. Scientists do not make the best theologians.

### About Catholic Culture.

This is an age of words; an age of Telepathy, Theosophy, and Osmosis: of Evolution, Equal Rights, and the Revival of the Fittest. Words, words, mere words. Words without truth or thought or definite meaning. There is so much writing, reading and talking that there is no time to think, and with desolation are words made desolate because there is no one who thinks—even in his head. The word most used and abused, Mr. Ruskin says, is the word education. But its companion word has, we think, been treated almost as badly, and its companion word is—Culture. This poor, unfortunate, but very respectable word, has been set up, knocked down and trampled upon, hundreds of times by all sorts of people. We are going to set it on its feet again, and say a few words for it. We intend to give a few thoughts and truths about culture, especially about Catholic culture, that should be the object and aim of a Catholic Club.

Some people say culture is everything. Others say culture is nonsense, and worse than nothing. A third class says: When opinions are opposed and extreme, *in medio tatissimus ibis*—the middle course is safest and best. We are of the third class. We say, therefore, that culture is not virtue, nor religion: neither is it necessity, infidelity or vice. Again, culture is not learning, nor science, nor art. It may use all these; in a certain sense it supposes them all; but culture itself is not all nor any of them. Culture is not quite the same thing as education, much in the same way as education is not instruction; and the difference between instruction and education may help us to understand the difference between culture and education, and this last difference will tell us best what culture precisely is. Instruction means a putting or pouring in; education an educating or drawing out. Instruction helps to education,

is more or less necessary to education, but a man may be instructed without being educated. This process of instructing without really educating is so well understood in our schools, that we have a word, and a very good word, to express it: we call the process "examining." Instead of helping to educate, to develop, examining may easily stunt and destroy intellectual growth, which it is the purpose of education to promote and perfect. But instruction should lead to education, and education should lead to culture. Education is a means, culture a habit, the result or product of the educating acts. Culture, like education, is a Latin word, and is applied in its primary sense to the cultivation of the earth. If we may use the same figure to illustrate both, we should say education is the ploughing and planting; culture, the smiling harvest, the ripe and mellow fruit. When the Scripture says that, "God placed man in the paradise of pleasures to cultivate and keep it," St. Augustine tells us, that one meaning of this text is, that man was to cultivate himself; his own soul. But Adam was instructed and educated as soon as he was created; so, according to St. Augustine, to be cultivated means more than either; because culture is the perfection of both. Instruction and education should lead to culture: culture should lead souls to God.

The culture that should be the object and aim of a Catholic Club is not culture in general or any kind of culture: it is emphatically Catholic culture. We use the word Catholic here, not so much in its literary and philosophical sense. Culture is Latin: Catholic is Greek, and means universal; that is, unity in multiplicity. The Triune God is Catholic; but culture has to do only with God's image, man. And because man is God's image, he too is Catholic; and as man is, so should his culture be. Man is one and manifold: he is physical, mental and moral. And so there is physical, mental and moral culture. Catholic culture comprises all three. There are those who advocate physical culture only, who would treat man as if he were all and only muscle, and give us good walkers, runners and rowers. The fault with this kind of culture, as with secular education, is that though good enough as far as it goes it does not go far enough. There must be physical exercise for the healthful development of the body, but there must be mental exercise, too, for the healthy life of the soul, and the mental exercise that results in Catholic culture must be exercise of the intellect. We do not want that thing called "modern culture," no matter how "high." This modern culture is the food and the fruit of "modern thought." Thought is as old as truth, and culture is as old as Adam. Modern culture is not Catholic, because it is not mental, nor even manly. It ministers to the memory and imagination only, and serves up facts and fancy as food for the mind. But the mind will not be fed on facts and fancy only: the memory and the imagination may be; the intellect will not. The imagination says, "things are what they seem." The intellect, like Hamlet, "knows not seems;" it