

The Catholic Record. Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. Single Copies—10 CENTS.

REV. GEORGE H. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LUCK, KING, JOSE, NICH, and P. J. NIXON are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, August 28, 1897.

DUELLING IN FRANCE.

The duel which took place last week in Paris between Prince Henri, of Orleans, and the Count of Turin, a son of the late Duke of Aosta, and nephew of the king of Italy, has again called public attention to the absurd and criminal practice of duelling, which, unfortunately, has not yet been eradicated from the continent of Europe.

Prince Henri of Orleans, whose position as representative of the royal line of Orleans does not support him under the Republican government of France, finds some revenue by writing for the Paris Figaro and the New York Herald, and it was through his newspaper articles to these journals that the difficulty arose which resulted in the recent duel.

The prince was appointed member of a Commission for the purpose of negotiating a treaty with King Menelik, offering favorable terms of commercial intercourse between France and Abyssinia, and for this purpose he went to the latter country last February. He was not as successful in his mission as he expected, as a more favorable treaty was made by Menelik with England on a basis of mutual concessions, and the prince's temper seems to have been somewhat soured by the issue, so that in his newspaper correspondence he made some caustic remarks on the evil dispositions entertained by Italians against the French.

He said that the Italians boasted, before the battle of Adowa, that if they entered Addis Ababa victoriously, they would give no quarter to Frenchmen whom they might find there, even to the small tradesmen, but that they added ironically "they would not inflict the death penalty on French women." He ridiculed the Italian officers for taking part in the celebration of their defeat at Adowa, and drinking a toast to the victorious Menelik. He repeated also the sarcastic remark of a French officer who was at the banquet and who is reported to have said: "Mon Dieu, Monsieur, I never saw a Frenchman drinking to the health of the Emperor William."

These criticisms were very offensive to a number of Italians, among whom were the Count of Turin, who is a Major in the Italian Army, also General Albertone and Lieut. Pini, all of whom sent challenges to the Prince to meet them in combat. The challenge of the Count of Turin was accepted, the others remaining in abeyance until the first encounter should be decided.

The meeting took place on the 15th inst., at 5 o'clock in the morning, swords being agreed upon as the weapons. Both combatants began the fight so vigorously as to astonish the seconds, and their determination to kill is described by Major Leontieff, Prince Henri's second, as terrible.

The fight lasted twenty-six minutes, and both combatants were wounded, but the injury to Prince Henri was most severe, his antagonist's sword having penetrated his abdomen, and coming very near to his intestines. When he received the wound, he clapped his hands to the spot and sunk back to his seat exclaiming that he could do no more. The doctors also, who were in attendance, declared that he was rendered by the wound clearly inferior to his antagonist, and the combat was accordingly stopped by mutual consent.

The Count of Turin's wound was on the back of his right hand, and it is stated that he would have been dangerously hurt only for the chance that Prince Henri's sword struck a button by which it was bent and rendered unfit for use, so that for the time being the combat ceased until he was supplied with another weapon.

Owing to the severity of the wound inflicted, General Albertone has withdrawn his challenge to the Prince, and though the latter is now in a fair way of recovery it is thought that the matter will not be pushed any further.

It cannot be denied that the Count

of Turin has shown a good deal of animal courage in going into France itself, his adversary's own land, in order to assert against a Frenchman the virtue and magnanimity of his countrymen. But duelling is none the less a folly as well as a crime against God and man, against religion and society.

If the Italian officers in Menelik's capital have been really so mean and so malicious as Prince Henri represents them to have been, the personal victory gained by their champion over Prince Henri will not prove them to have been either virtuous or magnanimous. The design attributed to them, to murder the Frenchmen of Menelik's capital, is none the less base because Prince Henri was unable to withstand the point of the Count's sword. If, on the other hand, they had no such intention, it would have been better, and the world would have admired them more, if they had shown that the Prince's accusation was a calumny. The violation of the law of God which prohibits the crime of murder, and as a consequence that of duelling, does not prove that the accusation was unjust. It is therefore not at all creditable to that portion of the people of Italy who have made this unlawful duel a matter of national rejoicing, as if by the honor of Italy had been completely vindicated.

The vengeful feeling displayed against France, if Prince Henri's statements are true, is just as discreditable now as it was before the duel took place, and it is not made any less so by the triumphant display of flags on the public buildings and across the chief streets of the cities of Italy, by the playing of military bands and the praises lavished on the Count of Turin by the official press. The courtesies shown to King Menelik we do not regard as discreditable. King Menelik deserves to be honored for his manliness and bravery in defending his people against foreign aggression, and there is no disgrace to the Italians if they have accepted their defeat at Adowa with a good grace, and if they paid due respect to the brave Negus who gained an honorable victory over them on a fairly fought field of battle. It is more disgraceful to have made the cause of the Count of Turin their own, and to have shown approval of his disregard of divine and human law. No long existing custom can make duelling lawful or reasonable.

The duel has fallen into disuse in England, and there is no reason why it should not be made unfashionable on the continent, but it is to be feared that inveterate habit will continue to prevail over good sense and Christian morals, as long as kings and princes and military commanders hold it to be the only salve to wounded honor, that the individual who has been insulted must recover his honor either by killing or maiming the insultor, or by giving the latter an opportunity to shoot or seriously wound himself.

What can be more absurd than the declaration of one of the Count's seconds while the preliminaries were being arranged, that, "It is now a quarrel between the two countries, and we wish that the whole Italian army could assist at this duel."

Prince Henri is no more than a private person, and it was a private person that he spoke disparagingly of the Italian officers. Why should there be a quarrel between two nations on account of this? It was far better that the two who were most concerned should fight the matter out by themselves than that the inoffensive soldiers of both nations should be drawn into slaying one another because one hot-headed soldier shows his poor wit while another takes him to task for his indiscretion.

THE MEANEST OF EUROPEAN SOVEREIGNS.

The news reaches us through a cable despatch that the Czar has refused to receive Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria owing to the quarrel of the latter with Austria arising out of M. Stoloff's remarks on the attitude of Austria in regard to the trial of Captain Boitcheff, a former aide de camp of Prince Ferdinand.

Captain Boitcheff had been guilty of the murder of his paramour, who was an Austrian subject, and owing to his position as an officer of Prince Ferdinand's staff a disposition was shown by the Bulgarian Government to shield him from the consequences of his crime, but the Emperor of Austria insisted that justice should be done, and the result was the Captain's conviction. This gave offence to M. Stoloff, the Bulgarian premier, who then made

some very insulting remarks concerning the Emperor and his family.

In an interview with the representative of a paper M. Stoloff said that the Austrian Government had been over officious in meddling with the Captain's trial, and that Austria cannot afford to be over paniculous on the score of morality, as the world has not forgotten the death of the Crown Prince Rudolph of Hapsburg.

These remarks gave great offence to Austria, and an apology was demanded, but M. Stoloff made matters worse by intimating that he is indifferent to Austrian opinion on the subject, though at the same time he denied that his sayings had been correctly reported. Diplomatic relations were not completely ruptured by the occurrence, but they were suspended, and the Austrian charge d'affaires at Sofia left the city as a protest against such an insult, leaving his secretary to attend to the business of his department.

Thus the matter stands at present, and no doubt Prince Ferdinand expected to gratify Russia by supporting M. Stoloff in the insult to the Austro-Hungarian Emperor. Russia, however, does not see fit to encourage impudence of this kind, and has inflicted this snub on Prince Ferdinand, notwithstanding his mean subservience which led him not long ago to hand over his infant son Boris to be "converted to and confirmed" in the Greek schismatical religion, for no other purpose than to please Russia.

But even this is not the last of Prince Ferdinand's meannesses. He is the first Catholic prince who has degraded himself so far as to pay a visit to King Humbert in Rome since the Pope has been kept a prisoner in the Vatican, and when he had thus descended as low as we would have supposed it to be possible for any man to go down, he found in his lowest depth a lower depth still in which he could show himself to be the meanest of Christian sovereigns. He went next to Constantinople, where he enjoyed for several days the hospitality of the assassin of the Armenians, Creteans, Thessalians, and even of his own countrymen, and has made with Abdul Hamid an interchange of courtesies and royal decorations. It is said also that he has formed with the Sultan an alliance offensive and defensive. This has been even unblushingly admitted by M. Stoloff, who said in another interview with an Hungarian paper:

"Bulgaria first set her hopes in Russia and then in Austria; but she found it useless to expect help from Europe. Prince Ferdinand, therefore, turned to Turkey, who, in event of war, will support Bulgaria with 100,000 soldiers. Prince Ferdinand would rather kiss the hand of the Sultan than abase himself before Europe."

It serves Prince Ferdinand right that he has received this last snub from his self-willed and mutable master.

THE UNITY OF CHRISTIAN FAITH.

Under the title "A Plea for Unity," there appears in a recent issue of the Presbyterian Quarterly a well-written and able article which is copied approvingly into the Toronto Presbyterian Review. The writer is Rev. Robert Ker. The very ability with which erroneous teachings on so important a matter as the extension and unity of the Church of Christ makes the errors thus maintained all the more dangerous and deceptive.

Mr. Ker's thesis may be stated in his own words. In the name of Christians of all sects or denominations, he says:

"We are one family; let us acknowledge it; so far from being ashamed, let us all glory in it. Any denomination may declare that it is nearest to the Scripture model, and lovingly endeavor to persuade all others to believe all which itself believes, and yet cordially acknowledge that we are all one family in Christ, and members of one another."

In view of these great things which we hold in common, let us love and acknowledge one another. Let us preach the gospel in each other's pulpits, join in a common communion at our several tables of the Lord. Let us assemble around one common mercy-seat in prayer. Let us co-operate in all evangelical missions, and let us show to the world, to each other, and to Christ, in every way, that His prayer is being answered in which He asked for His people that they might be one."

By itself the meaning of all this might not be perfectly clear, but taken in connection with the context of which it is a summary it is made evident that the writer's view is that the Christian Church is composed, not of members believing the same truths, and having the same sacraments as instituted by Christ, but of all denominations, whatever may be their

creeds and modes of Church government. Hence he says:

"It is a mistake to seek consolidation of organizations, and absolute uniformity in forms of creed, sacrament, worship, and government. It is based upon a misunderstanding of what Christian unity is. It is not the acceptance of a form; it is a common union with Christ."

These views are not altogether new among Protestants, and latterly, as the adherence to specific doctrines has become less prevalent, they have been more openly upheld than ever, and they are now very generally maintained by most of the advocates of Protestantism, though they are certainly not the teaching of the divines who issued the Westminster Confession of Faith, and it is a surprise to find them thus upheld by Presbyterians of the present day.

The Westminster Confession and the declarations accompanying it set forth plainly that Presbyterianism is the only true religion, and the Confession of Faith contains the only true doctrine of Christ; and they certainly do not tolerate such laxity of belief as Mr. Ker recommends in the following:

"I appeal to psalm-singing Presbyterian communions: Have you a right to refuse Church fellowship to those who sing uninspired hymns? And to the Baptists: Have you a right to deny communion to non-immersionists, and to rebaptize members of other denominations when they come to you, and to rebaptize and reordain their ministers when they ask orders in your denomination, when you acknowledge that they are Christians? I appeal to the Episcopalians: Though you accept the baptism of other denominations, have you a right to treat those going from us to you as if they had never been Church members, and to refuse the admittance of ministers of other sects into your pulpits? Do you not cordially concede that we are Christians, and do you not declare that when we die we go to heaven? How, then, can you say that we are not a Church, and that our ministers are not ministers at all? Can this be justified before Christ? Or would the great Apostle of the Gentiles approve it?"

It would occupy too much space in our columns to treat at length the whole theory of Church unity, and to refute all the plausible pretenses here set forth for the purpose of showing that Protestant sects generally are to be considered as constituting one Church of Christ, notwithstanding all their diversities of belief. There are, however, some points on which we deem it useful to make a few remarks.

We are told by Mr. Ker that absolute uniformity of creed, sacrament, worship and government is not to be looked for among Christians, and that therefore the consolidation of organizations, that is, the unity of sects into one body, ought not to be aimed at among Christians.

In regard to this we must say that the writer totally misunderstands the nature of the Church of Christ. It is very true that where Christ has not given us a revelation of creed, form of worship and of Church government, man is at liberty to believe as he will, and to adopt such modes of worship, and such details of Church government as are not repugnant to Christ's institution. But even in the last mentioned case, if the institution of Christ is not definite, it does not pertain to private individuals or to sects humanly instituted to settle for themselves the manner in which the Church should be governed.

It is agreed on all hands that Christ established a Church, and that He appointed His Apostles to be its first ministers, and the dispensers of His mysteries. He appointed His Apostles giving them power to continue His work on earth, saying, "As the Father sent me so I send you" (St. John xx, 21).

So we are expressly told by St. Paul that it is Christ's ordinance that there are Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers in the Church, "for the perfection of saints, for the work of the ministry . . . till we all meet in the unity of faith and knowledge of the Son of God." (Ep. iv.) The same Apostle tells us, elsewhere, (Heb. v, 4), that "neither doth any man take the honor of the Christian priesthood) to himself, but he that is called by God as Aaron was."

From all this it follows that only such ministers of religion as derive their authority from Christ by succession and mission through the Apostles, are to be regarded as the ministers of the Church of Christ. None others have authority to dispense the mysteries of Christ, which are the sacraments and the channels of grace which Christ has instituted for the use of Christians to the end of time. Just as under the old law, the priesthood to which Aaron was appointed as the original stock, passed by lawful succession to the priests of later times, so

under the new law, the Christian priesthood must be transmitted and perpetuated by succession from the Apostles, and all who claim to be ministers of the Church of Christ must be regarded as impostors if they have not thus derived their authority in a lawful manner.

It is therefore not a matter of human choice, or fancy, or mere courtesy to offer fellowship in the administration of Christian sacraments, to ministers of every denomination which may claim to possess a lawful ministry; and if we are to obey the law of God we must say of those who have not the regular authority coming from the Apostles, that they are not Christian ministers at all. It was strictly forbidden under the old law for those who were not of the priestly order to offer sacrifice, or to take part in the performance of priestly functions. The same law holds in regard to the Christian ministry, and the Rev. Mr. Ker's appeal to the sects to introduce community of ministry by the interchange of pulpits, is contrary to the whole conception of the Christian ministry as taught in Holy Scripture, and by the practice of the Christian Church in all ages.

With regard to Mr. Ker's proposal that differences of doctrine should not be regarded as an obstacle to Christian unity, our remarks must be somewhat similar to what we have already said of the Christian ministry. Christ is the author of the Christian religion. He delivered His doctrine to the Apostles and commanded them to teach it in its entirety to all nations, saying: "Going, therefore, teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." (St. Matt. xxv, 20)

Elsewhere our Lord declares that "he that believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned." And the "Apostle of the Gentiles" declares that "without faith it is impossible to please God." (Heb. xi, 16.) This faith of which St. Paul speaks is defined (Heb. xi, 1), to be "the substance of things hoped for, the conviction of things that appear not." We must, therefore, pay the homage of our understanding to God, believing on His word, all things that He has revealed, even though they "appear not;" that is, even though they be incomprehensible to us. It is not for man, therefore, to agree to overlook some doctrines which God has revealed, and to permit them to be deliberately rejected from the Christian creed. Totally different from this is Mr. Ker's teaching. He gives us to understand that there are certain doctrines essential which all must believe, and on which all sects agree, but the doctrines on which they disagree he calls "non essentials," and says:

"The elevation of non-essentials into the place of essentials has the effect of obscuring the one great truth that the soul is saved by faith in Christ alone, and it places stumbling-blocks in the way of sinners trying to find their way to God."

It is at once evident that this theory that some doctrines of Christianity are essential and others non-essential was invented, not because it is the Christian truth, but because it serves as a kind of cloak to conceal the irreconcilable beliefs of the sects. It was first invented by the Lutheran Jurien for this purpose. Protestantism was re-proached by Catholic divines for the inextricable confusion it produced by its innumerable divisions on the most slender grounds, and it was to cover up the absurdity of so much self-contradiction that Jurien invented his theory. But Mr. Ker carries it a greater extreme than even Jurien contemplated, for, according to this new presentation of the case, there remains only one essential doctrine in Christianity, which is the necessity of faith in Christ, and Christians are free to reject everything else—apparently even Christ's Divinity and the inspiration of the Bible itself, as it has recently become the common practice to do.

Such a theory of Christian unity has no foundation either in scripture or in the constant belief of the Christian Church, by both of which it is strongly condemned, as we have seen above. Further, it is injurious to Almighty God, who is Truth itself, and who can neither deceive nor be deceived. We must therefore pay to Him the homage of our understanding by accepting His teaching without reserve, and without rejecting a single doctrine which He has revealed. Hence the revealed doctrines which some sects reject are just as necessary to true Christian faith as are those which Jurien and Mr. Ker

are pleased to call fundamental or essential.

How are we to reconcile what we have said here with those passages of Holy Writ wherein salvation is promised to those who believe, or who believe in Christ? To this we answer that this belief which is insisted on includes the acceptance of everything which Christ teaches, and it is only the impossibility of knowing the truth in full which can excuse some persons from mortal sin who do not believe all that Christ has taught, not from lack of good will, but because they are in a state of invincible ignorance, and do not and cannot know exactly all that God has taught. But the Church of Christ, which has been commanded to teach all that Christ has revealed, cannot enter into any bargain, even for the sake of unity, to gloss over or keep in the background any doctrine which its Master has inculcated.

JUSTICE VINDICATED.

Michael Angiolillo, or Colli, the Anarchist assassin who shot and killed Senor Canovas del Castillo, the Spanish Prime Minister, on Sunday, the 8th, was executed in his prison on Thursday, the 20th inst.

The cable despatch which announces the closing scene of this tragedy states that he heard calmly the news that he was to be executed so soon; and though he must have been aware that the execution of the sentence would not be delayed, as an announcement to this effect was made early in the week, it is said that he appeared to be surprised when on the preceding day he learned that it was to take place on the morrow.

Against the priests who offered their services to prepare him for death, he seemed to entertain a deep resentment, and he complained that they annoyed him, but said that they would obtain nothing from him, as he would die in his anarchical faith. He refused to enter the chapel, as he declared he was comfortable enough in his cell. This was, of course, bravado to show that he would die as he had lived, without the fear or love of God.

The execution was done by garrotting, a mode of punishment often employed in Spain, the operation being performed by an official from Burgos. Just before this took place, a priest for the last time offered him reconciliation with God, exhorting him to repentance, but he again refused the offer, saying: "Since you cannot get me out of prison, leave me in peace. I myself will settle with God." In this deplorable state of mind he was summoned to eternity. We are not, however, greatly surprised at the obstinate spirit manifested by this assassin, as he had evidently hardened his heart against the "grace of God long before his last fearful crime, the resolution to perpetrate which, he declared at his trial, he had formed at Barcelona more than a year before, namely, on May 4, 1896, when five Anarchists were executed for participating in the throwing of a bomb into the ranks of the Corpus Christi procession of the preceding year, thereby causing the death of twelve men, women and children.

At Barcelona Angiolillo was known by the name of Jose Santos, and, according to his own statements, he planned there the murder of Signor Canovas as an act of vengeance on account of the execution of his Anarchistic friends and associates, and it is known that he was implicated even in their plot. As he did not understand the management of explosives he used the revolver in perpetrating his crime. At his trial last week, Angiolillo's counsel presented the plea that he was demented when he committed the murder. The culprit himself repudiated this plea, but it was rejected, not on the ground of his repudiation of it, but because though it was known that he was a fanatic in the principles of Anarchy, it was held that he was not insane to the degree that would excuse him from responsibility for his deed.

Angiolillo attempted to justify his conduct before the Court by a political speech in which he arraigned the Government in regard to their management of the wars now going on in Cuba and the Philippine islands, but the presiding judge stopped his attempted speech, saying that it had no relevance to his case, and that it was no justification. The calmness of the judge and his moderation in speaking to the accused were remarkable in view of the excitement which prevails throughout the country on account of the atrocious deed so recently committed.

Angiolillo assumed a bearing of bravery at and before his execution, but this appearance which did not show itself at the close of the trial when sentence was pronounced against him. He is said to

have become deathly pale, and to be supported by his friends.

The promptitude in vindication of their judicial character, and creditable to Spain.

It is seemingly a readiness to express indignation of the capital punishment, but we cannot so on the present penalty is the only of which will keep beasts of Europe upon mankind.

Angiolillo declined to accept the offer of a priest to confess to have committed the deed was a chist meeting, and been made of us among whom is a companion of Signor er, named Isidoro

EDITORIAL

"New Protestants adopted by Professor man teacher of the of interpretation advocates; but found to be nothing of Epicurus"

An esteemed of that he considers to give the CATH subscriber is through self, to a Protestant; and asks us bers not to neglect "co operating light."

In the Church Lambarly, in W has the power to the choice in the payers whose Church. As the number the Church of the dissenters large majority a in this way the ally in the hands pay the piper. the curiosities Church establish entirely upon P trine and discip

Utah has been the semi-centennial of the Mormon settlement under Brig reported that the actors in the women—rather it is considered degraded by the polygamy. It the past year converts to M true it demon hold religion he the so called C State.

It is stated t Falls, Michigan disguised as a to make a conf was overhear been purposely cell. This st in the Americ far it has not true, a most t been adopted office of a pri to administer and to reconc to Almighty G there should any secular p lation is sacri thorties shoul as the detecti guilty of, an in such a way of for the pur tion. The e employed suc great as that subjected to s

Regarding Burké, it is a Thomas D'A the Dublin N the disting Roman Catho in his last i strange tha should not b any of the Edmund B stranger still the stateme We are cert we think if quired into be justified. Times.

We blame pass over g The Imitatio