

at not being forced to miss it by reason of their absence from their own homes. We do sincerely hope that our esteemed contemporary is mistaken in its estimate of the extent to which this religious apathy has grown. We fondly hope that these beautiful religious customs of our early days are still as widely followed as they were then. —Catholic Review.

### DYSON HAGUE'S SERMON.

His Statements Criticized by Father Minehan.

(To the Editor of the Globe.)

In a recent Saturday number of the Globe its readers were treated to an extended report of the first of a series of sermons on the Anglican Prayer Book by the Rev. Dyson Hague of Wycliffe College. As long as this gentleman's utterances are confined to the walls of Wycliffe and the Church of the Redeemer no one will deem it worth while to contradict them in your columns. But when they are scattered broadcast by the Globe that important and enterprising paper will certainly allow its Catholic readers, whose Church has been assailed, the right of self defence. Defence is not very difficult in this instance. Indeed Falstaff himself could not come up to the performance of the gifted professor of Wycliffe. Could the gallant knight who manufactured eleven buckram men out of two peripatetic anything more delicious than the following statement of Rev. Dyson Hague: "A man after he was converted was still the same man that he was before. In the same way the Church of England before it was reformed and after it was reformed was still the same Church." St. Paul before his conversion was a bigoted Jew. After his conversion he was a zealous Christian. Yet as he was the same man as before it would follow from the reasoning of the Wycliffe professor that Judaism and Christianity are the same Church. A child can see the absurdity of this reasoning. St. Paul was the same physically and intellectually after his conversion as before, but he was not the same in faith. And it is difference in faith which makes different churches. Were the members of the Church of the Redeemer to be converted to Presbyterianism tomorrow they would be physically and intellectually the same, yet no one who knew what he was talking about would say that they belonged to the same church as before.

After this brilliant illustration we are prepared for a decidedly original handling of the facts of history, and are not disappointed. We are told that little is known of the early Church in England, and immediately after it is stated that "its form of government was Episcopal, that its faith was simple and its worship pure, that it held the great verities of the Christian faith, and none of the false doctrines which afterwards crept into the English Church were then known." Now, in order to know the nature of a church's government, to determine the nature of its faith, and especially to decide on the purity of its worship, an intimate knowledge is necessary. Yet here is a man who tells us that little is known about a church, and in the very next breath proceeds to certify to its form of government, the nature of its creed and the purity of its worship.

But Rev. Dyson Hague claims one crowning Wycliffe glory for the early church in England:—"It was totally independent of the Church of Rome. From the eighth century, however, the Church of England became more and more identified with Rome, and from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century the Church of England was governed from Rome." Here we have the following assertions: First, up to the eighth century the church in England was totally independent of Rome. Secondly, after that time she became more and more identified with Rome: in other words, she began to approach Rome more and more, but was not with her. Thirdly, the church in England became completely under Roman rule from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries.

Now let us test these three statements in the light of English history, and we will take as our guide not a Catholic, but a vigorously Protestant historian, Green. Writing of Christianity in Britain before the Anglo Saxon invasion, he states that: "Before the landing of [the English in Britain the Christian Church extended in one unbroken line across western Europe to the furthest coast of Ireland. The conquest of Britain by the pagan English thrust a wedge of heathendom into the heart of this great communion and broke it into two unequal parts." (Green's History of the English People, Vol. 1, page 66). Here it is distinctly laid down that before the Anglo-Saxon invasion the Christians of Britain form one great communion or body with those of Italy, Spain and Gaul, and hence there was no Church of England totally distinct from Rome. After the pagan English had driven the British Christians before them and practically wiped Christianity out of the land Christianity was introduced amongst the Anglo-Saxon conquerors by the Monk St. Augustine and his companions, who were sent by Pope St. Gregory in the year 597. These spread Christianity through the south and east of England, whilst the work of Christianizing northern England was mainly the work of Irish monks. In the year 664 a council was held at Whitby between the followers of St. Augustine and the Irish monks. The points in dispute between them were simply matters of discipline, namely, the form of tonsure to be worn and the day on which Easter was to be observed. That all acknowledged the supremacy of Rome

in matters of faith is evident from the answer of Colman the spokesman of the Irish monks, to the following question of King Oswiu, who was present: "You own, cried the King at last to Colman, that Christ gave to Peter the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven—has He given such power to Columba?" The Bishop could but answer "no." The result was the victory of Rome in the Synod of Whitby. (Green ibidem, pages 76 to 78.) Here is the testimony of a Protestant historian to the supremacy of Rome in Anglo-Saxon England in the middle of the seventh century (A. D. 664). Yet, according to Rev. Dyson Hague, the church in England did not become completely fused into the Church of Rome until the thirteenth century. To sum up the testimony of the historian Green, Christianity in Britain was one with Rome before the Anglo Saxon invasion. That event practically cut off British Christianity from that of Rome for a time, with the result that misunderstandings arose in matters of discipline, such as the tonsure and the observance of Easter. The authority of Rome triumphed in these matters of discipline and was not questioned at all in matters of faith in the National Council of Whitby in 664. Regarding the so-called Reformation in England Dr. Dyson Hague has the hardihood to speak of it as the "work of God," and of its authors as the great reformers whom God raised up. Macaulay, a bitter foe of Rome, writes this of Cranmer, the chief of these: "Saintly in his professions, unscrupulous in his dealings, zealous for nothing, bold in speculation, a coward and a timeserver in action." (History of England, Vol. I, page 57.)

Rogers, who is not a Catholic, in his Political Economy, page 122, describes the godly fruit of the so-called reformation in England in the following words, which will conclude my criticism of a few of the teeming misrepresentations of the Wycliffe professor:—"Before the reformation and during the time in which the various monasteries were in being the wants of such poor as were reduced to penury by great necessity were relieved through these sources of charity. Lands were generally distributed . . . guilds supported their own poor . . . absolute want was on the whole unknown. The scene changed after the period referred to. The monasteries were divided amongst the rapacious courtiers of Henry—the mass of the population fell into great distress . . . the whole policy of the court tended to the aggrandizement of the few and the misery of the many—population and misery were kept down by excessive persecutions."

Toronto, May 12. L. Minehan.

### "QUESTION BOX."

Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

"Anglican" asks: "When do Catholics claim the separation of England from the Roman Catholic Church took place, that is, admitting that she was ever Romanist?"

The separation was not easily or suddenly effected, but began in 1531, when Henry VIII. first claimed the title of Supreme Head of the Church, and may be said to have been completed when the Thirty-nine Articles were adopted in 1563.

"Puzzled" asked if Whit Sunday, Pentecost and Trinity Sunday are the same.

Whit Sunday and Pentecost Sunday are the same. Trinity Sunday is not; it comes the Sunday after Pentecost and marks the close of the time allowed for performance of the Easter duty.

"A Subscriber" would like to know in what years the following Sisterhoods were established, namely: Little Sisters of the Poor, Sisters of Charity, of the Good Shepherd, of Mercy, of Notre Dame.

The Little Sisters of the Poor were established in 1840; of Charity, in 1634; of the Good Shepherd, in 1646; of Mercy, in 1827; and of Notre Dame, in 1805.

"Irish Catholic" has a Protestant friend who persists, notwithstanding all protestations to the contrary, in believing that Catholics pay money to have their sins forgiven by the priest. He wants to know how he shall convince him to the contrary.

Don't try. If he has started out by doubting your word on this point, how can you expect him to believe anything else you say? He may be in the way of salvation, anyhow. If he believes as he speaks, invincible ignorance will be his valid excuse for not having the true faith.

"K. M.," an Episcopalian, cannot see the utility of Latin in our Church devotions, and says that with the "Book of Common prayer" he can follow the service in any country, no matter in what language.

With the variety that exists in Episcopalian services in this city alone we may be pardoned for doubting this assertion, but if we admit that the form will give the clue to the service without a universal liturgical language, how much more should it do so where both the language and the form are the same? Let our friend go to some Episcopal church where only a foreign tongue is used and try his theory. Even if the forms were alike, he would have more difficulty than a Catholic, particularly if the service had begun Latin being a dead language, is not subject to change, hence the liturgy is preserved from innovation.

"L. Z." attended the funeral of a Catholic friend and saw candles around the casket and on the altars, and asked why they are lit even when electricity and gas are also used.

Outside of their use for purposes of illumination, candles are an appropriate ornament and are emblematic.

The light, the burning and self-consuming of the candle reminds us of our faith, which must be lively; of our charity, which must be burning and diffusive, and of our devotion, which, like that of Mary Magdalen, must not spare sacrifices. A lighted candle is also a primitive and purely ecclesiastical ornament.

"J. F. M.," a Methodist who reads the Catholic Standard and Times, asks a number of questions, one of which (the last) is answered in the "Answers to Correspondents" column. The others are:

(1). Did not our Lord intend the Bible to be read and understood by all? Why, then, does the Church claim to be the sole interpreter of it?

Christ gave the Apostles and their successors authority to teach all nations, and commanded the faithful to hear them. For many years after Christ's ascension there was no Bible. The mere words of the Bible, unless properly interpreted, are often confusing, and as the Protestant Bishop Walton says, "The word of God does not consist in mere letters, whether written or printed, but in the true sense of it." There can be but one true meaning and but one infallible teacher.

(2). What is the essential difference between the Catholic and Protestant faiths?

Catholics accept the authority of the Church in all matters spiritual. Protestants claim to be guided by the Bible alone, only a part of which they have. Private interpretation has gone so far that it is no longer a novel thing among Protestants to find the Bible itself an object of their criticism. If Protestants can accept as genuine a book which owed its preservation to the monks of the Catholic Church, why can they not accept the teaching of that Church?

(3). Does not the Bible say that we are justified by faith? Why, then, does the Church teach that we must be saved by good works?

The Bible also says that "If I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing" (1 Cor. xiii, 2); and again, "the doers of the law shall be justified" (Rom. ii, 13); again, "Except ye do penance, you shall all likewise perish" (Luke xiii, 5); again, "But be doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves," etc. (James i, 22-27); "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone" (James ii, 17, and balance of chapter).

Catholics who have questions put to them by non-Catholic friends and are not prepared to answer them, may by addressing "Question Box," Catholic Standard and Times, 211 South Sixth street, Philadelphia, have the same given attention. Make our separated brethren acquainted with this department of the paper.

### THE PASSING OF GLADSTONE.

A great mind has gone out of the world. Full of years and honors, the greatest moral force of the present century next to the great Leo XIII., William Ewart Gladstone, has gone over to the illustrious dead. Two continents are saddened by the loss. In this country, which he never saw, and in which his name was yet a household word, he will be mourned by many. In Europe he will be regarded as an almost irreparable loss.

Mr. Gladstone stood for something new in politics, in the latter half of his public life. He represented the view that politics have a higher sanction than successful intrigue and superior material force. His political views were the reflex of his private life. He believed that justice and morality were factors that should not be overlooked in the business of the statesman. Yet so curious is human nature that the pursuit of these very objects may often lead a man into the perpetration of wrong. We cannot forget that the statesman whose impassioned utterances against Turkish oppression sent the armored fleet of England and the army of England to crush the national movement of Arabi Pasha in Egypt—a movement which was as just as any for which a man drew a sword in any age. Similarly, while Mr. Gladstone will always be remembered in Ireland as the man who lifted from her the incubus of the Established Church, the founder of a new principle in her Home Rule scheme of government, he will also be regarded as the man whose unjust financial policy imposed upon her a load of taxation which crushes her to this hour and is out of all proportion to the country's ability to pay as well as to her just share of the burdens of the imperial system. It was by his action that the income tax was extended to Ireland, in violation of the express disclaimer of the Act of Union, and it was his financial policy which fastened the enormous spirit tax upon Ireland now chiefly instrumental in the extraction from the country of several millions of dollars annually beyond her fair proportion.

These discrepancies in public action do not, however, blur the departed statesman's fame. There are ragged dints in the surface of the stony orb of night, but they do not mar the beauty of its spherical outline.

Since Edmund Burke's time there has been no figure in English politics comparable to Mr. Gladstone. He brought into public life a stainless personality, a scholar's mind, a philosopher's grasp of human things. Grand in conception, splendid in debate, full of that personal magnetic force which marks a man out as a party leader, he stood for the past half century absolutely without a rival.

It is something for Americans to be proud of that this great man found in their country a model on which to form his own character. Writing to an American correspondent when nearing his eighty-sixth year, he said: "I am reading with much interest your contribution to Washingtoniana, as I have almost idolized him for sixty years, since I read Marshall's life of him in five quartos." Years ago Mr. Gladstone wrote: "Washington is to my mind the purest figure in history." And on another occasion this: "I look upon Washington as among great and good men one peculiarly good and great; he has been to me for more than forty years a light upon the path of life."

Catholics will always remember Mr. Gladstone with gratitude for the part he played in completing the work of emancipation by disestablishing and disendowing that monstrous fraud, the so-called Irish Church. His own leanings toward Catholicism were strong, but his political entanglements kept them from having their natural direction. Newman, who had been his friend for years, had great hopes of his ultimate conversion. On the eve of Mr. Gladstone's first visit to Rome in the year 1888, we find him making this remarkable declaration: "I am most earnestly anxious to become acquainted with the practice of the Roman Catholic Church, with its moral and spiritual results upon its members. It is of the utmost importance to the adjustment and development of my own conviction regarding the doctrine of the visibility of the Church, and the necessity of that doctrine to counteract the tendency to indefinite subdivision and ultimate infidelity which springs from the motion of a limitless private judgment."

Whether he was formally of the body of the Church or not in his later days, Mr. Gladstone was a profoundly religious man, and almost one in spirit with the Church in many things. We may trust that his good dispositions will count for much in this regard. His name is bright here below; let us hope his spirit will find light above. —Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

### THE ROOD SCREEN.

The question as to whether or not the rood screen in St. Peter's Church, Sunderland, England, should be removed gave rise to a long and heated discussion at the annual Vestry meeting last month. Some of the members contended that the screen was "wrong and idolatrous," and deplored the rapid strides the Church of England is making toward "Romanism"; while others held that symbols of the early Church were not to be despised. This discussion illustrates the deplorable feature of Ritualism. In the outward imitation of Catholic practices, which is all well enough, many lose sight of the doctrinal teaching of the Church. There is the danger for Ritualists, of whom the gentle Faber once said:

"They are a sect playing at Mass, putting ornaments before truth, suffocating the inward by the outward, bewildering the poor instead of leading them, reveling in Catholic sentiment instead of offering the acceptable sacrifice of hardship and austerity. This is a painful, indeed a sickening, development of the peculiar iniquity of the time—a masterpiece of Satan's craft." —Ave Maria.

### MEXICAN RAFFLE FAKE.

A Statement Regarding It from Rev. Herbert Thurston, S. J.

Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

About a month ago reference was made in these columns to a statement which appeared originally in the Christian Endeavor World and afterwards received wide circulation in the Protestant press regarding an alleged "raffle for the souls in purgatory" conducted by priests in charge of a church in Mexico. The Christian Endeavor World's authority for the publication was "Rev. Francis Borton, a missionary in Puebla." Mexico is a big place and the churches and clergy there have names, but the Rev. Mr. Borton has a poor memory for such things and "a church in Mexico" is as far as he could go in the matter of location. But neither his memory nor his imagination was at fault regarding the terms of the alleged raffle. As a matter of fact he was able to give the following "copy" of a notice posted on the door of this "church in Mexico":

"Raffle for Souls—At the last Raffle for Souls the following numbers obtained the prize, and the lucky holders may be assured that their loved ones are forever released from the flames of purgatory:

"Ticket 81—The soul of the lawyer, James Vasquez, is released from purgatory and ushered into heavenly joys.

"Ticket 41—The soul of Mme. Calderon is made happy forever.

"Ticket 22—The soul of the aged widow, Francisca de Parras, is forever released from the flames of purgatory.

"Another raffle for souls will be held at this same blessed Church of the Redeemer on January 1, at which four bleeding and tortured souls will be released from purgatory to Heaven, according to the four highest tickets in this most holy lottery. Tickets \$1. To be had of the father in charge. Will you, for the poor sum of \$1, leave your loved ones to burn in purgatory for ages?"

Touching appeals for the name of the "church in Mexico" and of the city or town in which it is located have been addressed to the Protestant press which so readily grabbed up and passed around this choice morsel of anti-Catholic literature, but the information is not forthcoming.

Well, the story got to England, and some one suggested that Rev. Herbert Thurston, S. J., who will be remembered as the learned priest who forced Rider Haggard to retract certain stories about the immuring of live nuns within stone walls, was well qualified to bring the Rev. Mr. Borton to task. In this instance Father Thurston finds it impossible, of course, to bring direct evidence of falsehood because the name and location of the

church are not given, but he nevertheless explodes the calumny in the following letter to the Liverpool Catholic Times:

"It may be worth while to say that lotteries to benefit the holy souls do take place in Mexico and, I believe, in some other Spanish-speaking countries. A number of people contribute money which goes to support the poorer among the clergy, and in return Masses are said for the holy souls, the intentions for which they are more particularly offered being decided by a lottery. The winner of the first prize in such a 'raffle' has usually at his disposal a ton of Masses, which he is free to apply as suffrages for his deceased relatives and friends.

"As to the becomingness of this practice I express no opinion. It will be differently judged by different people. The principal involved does not seem to me to be very different from that by which many good Catholics make no scruple about 'betting a pair of beads' or playing a game of chance, the stakes of which are to be given in charity to the object designated by the winner."

"One thing, however, is certain. If any Mexican priest—which I utterly disbelieve—ventured to assure the winner in such a lottery that 'the soul of Madame Calderon is made happy forever,' etc., he would render himself liable to the severest censure, if not to suspension, if the case were reported to his Bishop. A friend long resident in Mexico, who gives me the above information, also assures me that this part of the statement quoted by your correspondent is a pure calumny."

### ADMIRAL DEWEY A CATHOLIC.

Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

Several times has the question been asked: "Is Admiral Dewey a Catholic?" In the numerous biographical sketches of the hero of Manila that have appeared in the press of the country care has been taken to speak of his early Protestant associations, but of the admiral's later religious life nothing has been said. It has come to be generally accepted, therefore, that he still clings to the Protestant belief of his youth. Such, however, is not the case. The following positive statement on this point, and the first we have seen, is made by the Catholic Universe, of Cleveland:

"Catholics have every reason to be proud of the part they are taking in the conduct of the war, though they are loath to refer to this and would not do so, except to silence the offensive mouthings of stay-at-home bigots. 'Those who express doubts as to the spirit of American Catholics in the existing emergency will be surprised to learn that this spirit is manifested in Admiral Dewey's brilliant achievement at Manila. Admiral George Dewey is a Catholic, a convert to the faith, and on the authority of one who was closely associated with the hero in the navy, we are informed that he is a very consistent and practical Catholic, too. There are scores of Catholic officers serving with equal loyalty and valor in Uncle Sam's vessels who only await the opportunity to demonstrate the same spirit displayed by the brave and successful commander of the Pacific squadron. A very large proportion of blue jackets who work the ships and man the guns are of the same faith."

"A like state of things exists in the army. At least two and probably more of the recently appointed major generals are Catholics, and in every grade of the service Catholics hold their own with others in proportion to their numbers, until we come to the men who carry muskets, in whose ranks they far outnumber those of all creeds combined, computed according to the religious census of our population."

"A knowledge of these facts might be expected to silence the tongue of cowardly insinuation, and it would if our critics prized the truth as they do their mean little prejudices."

### A FORCE WITHHELD.

What a much more enjoyable world this would be if the tendency to bestow praise honestly merited were half as common as the propensity to play the carping cynic or to indulge in perpetual fault finding! How many a fainting heart is suffered to lapse into hopeless discouragement for want of a drop or two of that stimulating elixir, the kindly commendation of relatives, associates, or friends! How many a snug Christian takes large credit to himself that he is no flatterer, and makes a virtue of what at bottom is possibly nothing else than disguised envy!

While it is no doubt true that, as Josh Billings well says, "flattery is like cologne water: to be smelled, not swallowed"; while it may even be granted that the too frequent or too protracted "smelling" is likely to result in more or less disastrous intoxication; it is nevertheless certain that ordinary men and women are most often in giving, not too much, but too little praise. The feticious apprehension that a child, or, for that matter, a friend of any age, will be spoiled if cordially and unstintingly commended for some act or work that has won for him our interior approval, has, in all probability, been accountable for worse consequences, than have ever followed from even the most injudicious plaudits.

"Give him a cheer!" said one in a crowd gathered around a burning tenement-house, as he saw a brave fireman hesitate and falter for a moment at the final effort that was needed to save a woman's life. "Give him a cheer!" And as the crowd responded with an admiring huzzah, new life and courage seemed infused into the hero. The needed stimulus had been applied; with a bound he gained the blazing room, only to reappear a moment later with the half-smothered woman in his arms. Yet there were probably in the crowd some pragmatical, self-conscious individuals who frowned at the demonstration as being quite uncalled for, "seeing that the fireman was merely doing his duty; and was, moreover, well paid, sir, by the city for doing it."

Who has not observed the marked

effect upon a public speaker of the applause received from a sympathetic and responsive audience? How it spurs him on to higher flights, to more animated delivery, to nobler action, and more persuasive earnestness! As Mr. Gladstone once put it, the speaker gets from his audience "in vapor what he gives them back in flood." There is a constant action and reaction going on between orators and hearers; and thus, between them, "they zigzag up the mountain pathway until they reach the summit, whereon are conviction, decision and enthusiasm."

And so it is, in a lesser degree, in countless instances in our everyday life. A word of praise judiciously bestowed is a more potent force than the bestower may be aware of; while the approbation which, though evidently deserved, is intentionally withheld is oftentimes more disheartening than outspoken fault finding. —Ave Maria.

### NON-CATHOLIC MISSIONS.

The movement for preaching missions to non-Catholics grows apace. Permanent bands of missionaries have been organized for some time in a few dioceses, and occasional missions are given by zealous priests in many others. But the laity should not forget that they, too, have a share in this work, and that their duty toward non-Catholic missions does not end with a money contribution. It ought to be realized that the explanation of Catholic truth will be coldly received if the faithful themselves are indifferent and wanting in zeal; and the proclamation of a lofty standard of conduct will be without effect if Catholic lives contradict Catholic preaching. In explanation of the success of one of his missions, Father Elliott wrote in the Catholic World:

"Let us do justice to those who mainly caused it—the practical Catholics of the parish. When appealed to to be missionaries with us, to pray and to work as sent by God to save sinners, they took us at our word. They beset sinners with every form of spiritual attack and gave them no rest till they surrendered and came to the services. Even Protestants helped. These saw the big sign, or read the press notices which we managed to have inserted in the city dailies, and chafed their Catholic friends—not all in joke either—about attending to their religion. Two Protestants working down town with a 'factory' Catholic of the parish saw the sign, and one of them said: 'If I were a Catholic I would show my appreciation of my religion by going to that mission.' The other Protestant backed him up, and their earnest friend was finally shamed into making the mission, and related the incident to one of the missionaries—an illustration, by the way, of the decadence of Protestant prejudice."

This experience—by no means a rare one—is full of significance. All men respect earnestness and energy; and "the decay of Protestant prejudice" will be accelerated just in proportion as Catholics, clergy and laity, are energetic in preaching Catholic truth, and earnest in practising the virtues which their religion inculcates. —Ave Maria.

### THE OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

The Sabbath Recorder, of Plainfield, N. J., is publishing a long series of testimonials, from Baptist, Methodist, Congregationalist and Presbyterian sources, to the decline of Sunday-keeping, in the old Puritan sense, in this country. This decline is due, not, as these witnesses suppose, to the growth of irreligion; still less, as the erratic Recorder hold to the unlawful substitution of Sunday for the Sabbath (Saturday). The inherent weakness and transitoriness of error is being manifested, in this case, by the gradual disappearance of the false notions of Sunday observance invented by the Puritans and Presbyterians of England and Scotland, and the substitution, among the God-fearing part of the community, of a method of observance more in keeping with the spirit of the day. But there is danger of carrying the reaction against Puritanism too far.

The Catholic Church, on whose authority alone the keeping of the Lord's Day and other holy days rests, while requiring only participation in the Holy Sacrifice and abstinence from servile labor, has always recommended the devoting of a considerable portion of such days to religious worship, pious reading, edifying song and other spiritual exercises, and has discouraged noisy and boisterous public amusements during those sacred hours. Innocent recreation is perfectly lawful on any feast-day, and even particularly appropriate; but to forget God on His own day, or to remember Him for only one short half hour in the morning, is conduct unworthy of any one who calls himself a Christian.—Church Progress.

The Church teaches that men may be culpably out of its pale. Now, they are culpably out of it who are, and have always been, either physically or morally unable to see their obligation to submit to it. And they only are culpably out of it who are both physically and morally able to know that it is God's will they should submit to the Church, and, either knowing it, will not obey that knowledge, or not knowing it, are culpable of that ignorance.—Cardinal Manning.

Cardinal Vaughan's statement that "the number of converts received into the Church every month in England is between six and seven hundred," has brought a storm of protests and challenges upon the devoted Cardinal's head. The London Tablet, however, declares positively that these figures understate rather than overstate the progress of Catholicity in England. What a sowing of seed there was when Newman went over to Rome!