

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, APRIL 15, 1899.

NO. 1,069.

The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, April 15, 1899.

THE CORONATION OATH.

Dr. Fallon is lecturing through his pamphlet on the Coronation Oath to a very large audience. His earnest and spirited protest has awakened many an eloquent echo and has caused some good people to wonder that in our days, which to all seeming have cast aside every relic of barbarism, words as insulting as they are unjust should be placed on the lips of a sovereign who claims and receives the allegiance of countless Catholics.

We sincerely hope that Dr. Fallon's agitation may have the desired result. The words of that oath may have fallen pleasantly on ears when the hangman and torture chamber were in honor, but no one can hear them now without blushing for his fellows and feeling they proffer an unjustifiable insult to the memory of those who have contributed to the glory of the English and to those who yield to none in loyalty. "Who could suppose," says Charles Waterton in 1838, "that in these times of intense religious investigation we should ever see a British Queen forced by an execrable Act of Parliament to step forward and swear that the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, at which Alfred the Great, St. Edward the Confessor, and millions upon millions not only of Englishmen but of all nations, both before and since their time, have knelt, and do kneel, in fervent adoration, is superstitious and idolatrous? Had I been near her sacred person the sun should not have set before I had imparted to her royal ear a true and faithful account of the abominable oath. It is a disgrace to the British nation: it ought to be destroyed by the common hangman."

The Catholic Truth Society cannot be too highly commended for publishing the valuable and instructive pamphlet.

HIGHER EDUCATION.

We have much pleasure in presenting to our readers the honest and manly plea in favor of higher Education by the Rector and Faculty of the University of Ottawa. Outlining the scope and aim of true education, and demonstrating its necessity in our days, it calls upon Ontario Catholics to give their loyal support and encouragement to an institution which has been for some time past no unimportant factor in the intellectual development of Canada.

We have no wish to pose as the panegyrist of Ottawa University. Its record speaks more eloquently than any words we might pen. Its professors are efficient and painstaking—content if the souls entrusted to their care blossom and bring forth fruit, and reaping nothing for themselves save the consciousness of duty well performed.

We know some of the students who have come from his halls, and they are not air-castle builders or led astray by every flickering light of human opinion, but earnest, doing men's work and prizing as their richest treasure their heritage of Catholic faith.

When Bishop Guigues threw into being the college at Bytown, he builded better than he knew. He saw indeed that education was necessary for the maintenance of sound principles and for the worthy bearing of the responsibilities that weigh upon Canadian Catholics, but that the modest college should be supplanted in after years by the present magnificent buildings, and that its students should hail, not only from the Dominion, but even from Germany and France, never entered into his mind.

The hope may have cheered him in his work, but its realization must have seemed twenty years ago to belong to a far distant day. And yet, despite all manner of obstacles, it has fought its way to the front rank of the educational institutions of Canada. Ontario Catholics have a right to be proud of it: and they have likewise a duty to give it undivided support. It is for the fashioning and moulding of their children's souls—to give them a right knowledge of their duties to God—to make them understand that in a free country they should not be serfs and henchmen, when they can, and should, take their share of the highest positions of trust. There is not the shadow of

an excuse to justify them in sending their children to non-Catholic colleges. The idea of the superiority of Protestant institutions may linger in the minds of the parvenu and purse-proud Catholic, but it has long since ceased to be entertained by those who judge a college by the kind of man it turns out.

SPECIMEN OF HIS PREACHING.

The Catholic Standard and Times of Philadelphia has earned the thanks of the reading public for its splendid report of Father Pardo's lectures. They lack the finish of Father Rickaby's conferences, but the Jesuit of the States has much in common with his brother of England. Both are intensely in earnest and have the gift of clothing their thoughts in simple language. There is not a suspicion of pedantry about them and they believe in using the vocabulary of the people. Here is a specimen:

"We sometimes hear it said and we read it in books, too, that the Catholic Church chained the Bible. I read it only a few weeks ago in a publication meant to reach the eyes of intelligent people. What are the facts? When a Bible was worth \$1,000 it was a good thing to chain it up. I think you would take good care of one worth that. What did the Church do? She put it in the cathedrals where the people might read it, but fearing that some persons might get so taken up with its magnificence as to wish to take it home with them, it was chained. Now I ask is it fair to speak of this as if it were keeping the Bible from the people, whereas the reason it was chained was to keep it for all the people? When the New Zealand traveler spoken of by Macaulay comes to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's from London Bridge he will find that there was a people so inhuman as to keep a book containing the names, addresses and trades of citizens and called a city directory chained to the counters of apothecary shops, so no one could read it—a people so inhuman as to chain cups to the public fountains, so that no one could get a drink. Yet, dear brethren, it is just such twaddle that people have been accepting as history for three hundred years, and it is time in God's name to look into the question and to know that the Catholic Church never opposed the reading of the Bible, but wished it and bared its claims to teach with the inflexible voice of Christ and the doctrine of the Real Presence on the Bible."

LEO XIII.

Reports come to us that the health of His Holiness is failing. Some of them are mere inventions of the enterprising journalists, but there can be no doubt as to the fact that the sands of his life are running out rapidly. His children can but pray that he may yet be spared to guide and to instruct the world. Out of the fulness of his genius and the garnered wisdom of centuries, he has shown how well the Church can cope with modern problems and deal with the vagaries of scientists who have lost God in their foolish conceits. He has been the prominent figure in the intellectual tournaments of the age; and they who fight not under his banner cannot but admire his prowess. Prisoner as he is, there is no earthly potentate with power like unto his: and, without kingdom or material resources, he claims and receives, by reason of his intellectual and moral pre-eminence, the respect of even those who believe that Krupp guns, etc., mark the *ultima thule* of culture.

He is going down into the valley, but his teachings will be handed down and circulated amongst men: his sun is setting, but its rays will linger yet to show nations the path. From every clime prayers are pleading for him to be spared for a few years of the coming century.

NOTES BY THE WAY.

We have noticed that the agitation for the conversion of the benighted Cuban has so far produced little more than windy harangues and wordy resolutions. A few of our ministerial brethren have gone off to the "poor Romanists," but the grand missionary army with its supply of "truth and freedom" has not as yet moved from headquarters. Why the delay? The fields are white, white with the "harvest"; and there is money in it—to say nothing about the information that can be retailed out to Bible classes and Church societies. Perhaps they are restrained from precipitous movement by the thought that energy can be expended with much better effect at home. The divorce question needs a little attention, and the decline of population may be a question for profitable investigation. At all events they should sweep their own doorsteps before attempting to sweep those of other people.

It seems to us that the gentlemen who are yearning for the salvation of the poor natives should conduct their yearning on business lines. They are going, if the Lord does not call them to

another mission, to present the Bible to the victims of "Papal oppression." They intend to take a book that is desecrated daily by pulpit vandals—and is powerless, if we may believe some of their leaders, to satisfy the soul-hunger of myriads—and by it and through it to guide the natives to truth. They should certainly be conscientious enough to give nothing which is not genuine. We know that the preservation of the Bible is due to the Catholic Church, and that but for her efforts, in the days when war and rapine were in honor, there would be little work for either missionary or Bible Society.

They of course will not appeal to the authority which they are going to overthrow. A divine light radiates from every sentence of the Bible and they know, consequently, its God-like origin. That light, however, is not very dazzling, or why would men like Lyman Abbot amuse themselves with mutilating the volume? We could quote many others who have differed among themselves as to the inspiration of certain books, etc., but we fear to weary our readers with a subject that has been worn threadbare. We could not, however, restrain a movement of pity some time ago when we saw a newly created minister embarking for China. He looked intelligent and energetic, and will, if not entangled in a commercial scheme, do good work according to his lights.

And that young man will ask the Chinamen to do a thing which runs counter to ordinary common sense—to accept him as their guide to Heaven, on the strength of a roving commission from a missionary society! He who will not engage a domestic without a recommendation from her former employer will command the natives to give unto his keeping their hearts and minds, without being able to assure them that he is qualified to instruct and to guide them. He will ask them to accept the Bible as coming from God. How does he know? Who tells him that the translation which he tucks under his arm is not a medley of error and mistakes? Who assures him that the meaning he gets out of it is what was intended by the Spirit of God? Will he be assisted by light from heaven in order to instruct the objects of his zeal? No human light can help him, for revelation is above reason, and no assistance of the Spirit will be tendered to him in his difficulty. And yet he is going to teach and preach and to hold up the Bible—which, so far as he knows, may be a book which contains only some very beautiful lessons and counsels. The want of certitude in this matter has caused many who are hostile to authority in matters of religion to drift into infidelity. But the young man is like the prophets who run without being sent and who enter into the sheepfold not by the door but by some other way.

We are thankful that the Fair-Vanderbilt wedding is past and gone. For some days we have been regaled with the news that the lady was looking well and getting ready for the event: and that the gentleman was avoiding everything that might prevent him from being in proper condition on the momentous day. What she wore and the silver and gold flung at her feet by stockjobbers and speculators were duly chronicled. And this is the civilization whereof many a heart is sick. This wild dance around the golden calf and vulgar admiration for mammon leaves a very bad taste in the mouth.

A METHODIST'S TRIBUTE.

Philadelphia Standard and Times.

The following is reproduced from the "query column" of the "Bulletin" of this city:

To the Editor of the "Bulletin":
Sir: Answering "Anna A. Midlen," respecting the membership of different religious denominations in the United States, permit me to say, as a Protestant and a Methodist, that I live opposite a Roman Catholic church, and I have no hesitation in saying that on Sunday, from daybreak until 10:30 o'clock, that edifice is crowded to the doors at least five different times with a congregation of from 1,500 to 2,000 people at each service. Winter and summer, rain or snow weather as well as fair weather, the same attend the beautiful Vesper service. What an inspiring sight it is, to even those who have no faith at all! Again, the Roman Catholic Church is open from sunrise until night during the week days. The rich, the poor, the aged, the young, the blind, and even the negro seem all on equality when they enter this church. We are all obliged, whether Presbyterian, Episcopal, Baptist, Lutheran or what, to admit that there is no such evidence of faith in any of our churches.

G. L. F. A.

TALK WITH A PARSON.

Parson—"The truth is not now, nor ever was dependent upon stilt for its standing."

You doubtless thought this a self-evident proposition, and yet it is not self-evident nor even true. By truth you mean revealed truth, and by stilt you mean evidence or witnesses.

There are certain self-evident truths, such as the first principles of reason, that are seen immediately by their own light, and there are other truths—equally true—that can be seen only by means of light or evidence external to them.

The sun, for instance, is seen by its own light, while the moon and planets are seen by light external to them, by reflected light. The sun may be said to be self-visible; the moon and planets are not self-visible, but visible mediately through a medium external to them; that is, through the light of the sun reflected back.

Now, there are truths that are related to the eye of our intelligence as the sun is related to the eye of the body. And there are other truths—equally true—that are related to the eye of our mind as the moon and planets are to the physical eye.

To the first class belong the first principles of reason; that is, certain fundamental axioms without which the mind could not even begin to reason. These are said to be self-evident, because they are so immediate to the mind that they cannot be made known by anything more immediate. They are indemonstrable because more direct and luminous to the mind than any demonstration can possibly be, and without them no demonstration is possible. To attempt to demonstrate them would be like attempting to exhibit the sun by the light of a dip candle.

These first principles of reason and of all science and truth are as follows: 1. Nothing can at the same time exist and not exist; 2. Every being is what it is, or every being is its own nature; 3. Every event must have a cause, or everything that begins must have its beginning from a cause external to itself; 4. Of two contradictions, one must be true.

These truths need no demonstration. All they require is an explanation, that the mind may see what is meant by them, and it accepts them by reason of their own light, and not by reason of any light or authority external to them. They are their own authority; or, to use your word, they require no stilt. To this class we may add geometric and mathematical truths and the axioms: The whole is greater than any of its parts; two things that are like a third thing are like each other. Here again no stilt is needed, no authority, no witnesses.

But these are not the kind of truths you are talking about. The truths you refer to are revealed truths, and they belong to the second class. They, like all events in time and space, are related to the eye of our intelligence as the moon and planets to the corporeal eye. They must be seen, and can only be seen, by reflected light, by the help of testimony, witnesses; or, to use your words again, they must come to our knowledge on stilt.

Let us begin with a familiar illustration to show how this second class of truths need testimony to bring them home to our minds. Mr. A. goes into a bank with a check drawn in his favor for \$500, and presents it to the cashier. The cashier examines it carefully, recognizes the signature, and knows the signer is fully responsible for that amount. He sees that it is drawn in favor of Mr. A. But he is not satisfied yet. He asks:

"Are you Mr. A.?"

"Why, certainly I am Mr. A. Do you not see my name on the check?"

"I see a name on the check, and I see you standing before me claiming to be Mr. A., but inasmuch as you are a stranger to me your mere word that you are Mr. A. is not enough for me. Any stranger could come in here and say he is Mr. A. The check does not identify you, nor do you identify the check. I know the check is good, not because you say it is, but because I know the signature; but I don't know you."

"Well, I am Mr. A. That is a truth."

"It may be a truth, but it is not a truth to me, because I do not know it."

"Do you not see me? Did I not bring the check, and is not that my name on it?"

"Yes, I see you; I see that you are somebody, but I do not, in looking at you, see that your name is Mr. A. I see a name on the check, but I do not see that the name is yours."

"What, then, must I do to have the check cashed, since you do not believe the truth that I, Mr. A., am here before you?"

"You must go and get a stilt and bring it with you, and then I will cash the check."

"A stilt! A stilt. Are you crazy, sir? I am not lame—I have a pair of sound legs! What do you mean, sir?"

"Well, sir, I have been reading some luminous outgivings of an Iowa parson, and that is what he calls a witness. In plain American language, I want you to bring some one here who knows you to be Mr. A., and whom I know. We will call him your

stilt, to fall in with the parson's way of speaking. When he identifies you I will cash the check."

"But it is the truth that I am Mr. A., and does not that same parson say that the truth needs no stilt to give it standing?"

"Yes, the Iowa parson says that, but if you send him here with \$1,000 check we will teach him a different song before he gets his check cashed. We will tell him that, without a stilt, or a witness, to establish his identity, he can't get the money."

Mr. A. goes out grumbling and muttering something about Iowa idiots, and after a time comes in leaning on his stilt, Mr. B., a common friend of his and the cashier's.

"Cashier," says the stilt, "this is Mr. A."

"Ah, Mr. A., I am glad to know you—how do you do?"

"I am sound and well; but when I come to transact business with you again must I come hobbling on a stilt?"

"Oh, no; it will not be necessary. Mr. B. has been the accommodating nexus between my mind and the truth that you are Mr. A. It is true that you were Mr. A. before I knew it, but it was not a truth to me before I knew it. Until I knew it it was an inoperative truth, as you have discovered; but now that it has come to me on a stilt it brings you the cash. The trouble with you, Mr. A., is that you are not a self-evident truth. You are not self-luminous, and I had to see you through the light of your stilt, Mr. B."

This little financial transaction we hope will enable you, Parson, to see that there are truths that need stilt to become known.

Now, truths of the supernatural order are of this kind. As they are beyond human experience, and many of them beyond the powers of human reason to comprehend—supernatural—they must come to our knowledge by being imparted to us either by God revealing them to each individual immediately or by revealing them to all immediately through an organ or agency appointed by Him, and which could guard and deliver the revealed truths in His name and with His authority.

As you would call this organ or agency a stilt, then a stilt is necessary to transfer a truth from the divine to the human mind, since you, as a Methodist, do not believe that God reveals supernatural truths directly to each individual mind. You must believe as a historical fact that He used Moses and the prophets in the Old Dispensation; and it is equally a historical fact that He used the Apostles, the ministry of His Church, in the New Law, and commanded that ministry to teach all things, whatsoever He commanded, to all nations in all time. There is no way of coming to a knowledge of revealed truth, except by the way appointed by the Almighty Revealer. Outside of this way or agency there is no means of knowing with necessary certainty that what are presented to us as revealed truths are really revealed truths, or truths at all, for revealed truths do not carry in themselves the evidence of their being revealed; nor are they self-evident.

Let us take an illustration to show the difference between believing a truth that is self-evident and believing a truth that is not self-evident, but revealed. Take these two propositions: Nothing can at the same time be and not be; and, There are three persons in the Godhead. The truth of the first proposition is evident in itself: the mind sees it and sees that it cannot be otherwise. The truth of the second proposition is not self-evident; the mind cannot even comprehend how it can be. And yet we believe it with the same intensity and certainty of belief that we do the truth of the former proposition. The first is known because the mind sees it; the second is known because the Divine mind sees it and reveals it. The first needs no witness but itself; the second needs a witness to establish the fact that it has been revealed. Until this fact is established you cannot believe in the Divine Trinity, for it is a truth believed solely on the authority of God, and we must therefore know with infallible certainty that He has revealed it. This being of the class of things called events, it is necessary either that you see it yourself directly or that you see it through a witness, or an authority that can testify to you with a certainty that makes your belief a reasonable act and not an act of credulity. You do not claim that God has revealed to you directly any supernatural truths. You, then, even you, must use a stilt or a witness before you can know that any particular doctrine presented to you as revealed has in fact been revealed. The doctrine or supposed truth that is presented to you is in the position of Mr. A., who presents himself to the cashier. It needs to be identified as revealed before you can reasonably accept it as revealed.

You will probably say—in fact, your position compels you to say—that the Bible presents to you revealed truths and identifies them. But Father Nugent will smile at this, and ask you who presents to you the Bible and identifies it as the Word of God? He will tell you that the Bible contains revealed truths if it be inspired. But inspiration itself is a supernatural

event, and can come to your knowledge only through an authoritative and competent witness. Without such a witness your belief in the inspiration of the Bible is an act of credulity, not an act of true faith. Twist and turn as you may, you cannot get rid of the necessity of a witness who is the nexus or link between your mind and the revealed truth. Without such a nexus revealed truth can never become knowledge to you. The Bible cannot be that nexus to you until the witness assures you of its inspiration. We will say more on the Bible and its necessary witness when we come to that point in your letter, Parson.

Parson—"You (Father Nugent) demand that a human and fallible organization, made out of human and fallible men, shall be necessary to discover, endorse and authorize the truth. The view is pagan, and out of harmony with the whole teaching of Christ and the Apostles."

Parson—"You (Father Nugent) demand that a human and fallible organization, made out of human and fallible men, shall be necessary to discover, endorse and authorize the truth. The view is pagan, and out of harmony with the whole teaching of Christ and the Apostles."

Father Nugent demands nothing of the kind, and we are not aware that even the pagans ever demanded anything of the kind. Father Nugent recognizes the fact that revealed truth must have an infallible witness, or it cannot be known to men. You recognize this fact, for you hold that a book is the infallible witness. He recognizes further that our Lord when on earth established a Church and commanded its ministry, the Apostles, to teach mankind all that He commanded them to teach. This you do not deny. The difference, then, between you and Him is this: He believes that, inasmuch as the gates of hell were not to prevail against the Church which Christ established, that Church still exists, and fulfills her commission, and that consequently she is the infallible witness and interpreter of revealed truth. You, on the other hand, hold that the Church of Christ is not the infallible witness and interpreter of revealed truth. He takes our Lord at His word; you do not. Instead of the Church founded by Christ, you hold that a book, whose inspiration cannot be proved without the authority of the Church of Christ, is the infallible witness, and that you are its interpreter.

His position is reasonable; yours is superstitious, and contrary to the common sense and practice of mankind. Mankind recognizes a lawgiver as lacking common sense who establishes a code of laws and omits to establish a court to interpret them and an administration to administer them. No such a stupid lawgiver ever existed on earth—at least, history has no record of him. And yet this is precisely the position you place our Lord in, and the character you give Him. Father Nugent holds that he was the wisest of all lawgivers, and that when He established a system of laws He at the same time established an organization which He commissioned to interpret and administer His laws. This organization is known as His Church. This Church is to revealed truth what the administration and the Supreme Court are to the Constitution of the Republic. She is the interpreter and administrator of revealed truth and law. There is, however, this difference between the Church and the Supreme Court: The former teaches with the authority of Christ and infallibly; the latter teaches with the authority of the fallible people and fallibly.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

COMMON SENSE.

A common-sense and level headed writer in the St. Louis Church Progress falls to see that "higher education" elevates woman, but sees much in it that lowers her. The writer says: "I do not mean that woman should not be educated or even highly educated, but I mean that she should not be subjected to a 'system of higher education,' i. e., placing her on a level with men as a normal development, when she plainly is designed for a better and higher sphere. Would anyone talk of the higher education of woman sounds just as abnormal and foolish. Woman is far above higher education. The moment she abandons the bright particular sphere of her own unique prerogative that moment she descends and becomes the commonplace rival of man. The women who are constantly prating of higher education and proclaiming the equal rights of women are noticeably most unwomanly, the kind that men instinctively shun. Let women be educated as highly as possible, but on the line of her own womanly nature, not like a man, out like herself, without blotting but the queenly image of her own beautiful femininity, which gives her the virtue of her own peculiar sovereignty."—Carmelite Review.

THE TEST OF REAL CATHOLICISM.

Wherefore, if anybody wishes to be considered a real Catholic, he ought to be able to say from his heart the self-same words which Jerome addressed to Pope Damasus: "I, acknowledging no other leader than Christ, am bound in fellowship with your Holiness; that is, with the chair of Peter. I know that the Church was built upon him as its rock, and that whosoever gathereth not with you, scattereth."—Leo XIII.