



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. II.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1852.

NO. 41.

THE IDEAS OF A CATHOLIC AS TO WHAT SHOULD BE DONE.

Translated from the French of Abbé Martinet, for the *True Witness*.

(Continued from our last.)

WHAT SHARE THE MONKS HAD IN THE CULTURE OF THE SCIENCES.

If the basis of modern knowledge be Catholic property, there is also a fair portion of glory to be claimed for the monks in the cultivation and growth of the sciences.

The great names of the seventeenth century are suffered to eclipse those which went before, many of whom were deserving of high praise. The bold flight taken by the natural sciences during that memorable century, proves that they must previously have had a long training. People and things feel their way before they walk; and they walk before they fly.

It was not for nothing that the men of his age erected a statue to the monk of Auvergne, Gerbert, the first French pope (Sylvester II), who first introduced the Arab arithmetic into France, Italy, and Germany; the Archimedes of the tenth century; the inventor of an organ to be played by steam—also of wheel clocks, and the author of that of Magdebourg.

There is also some honor due to the Franciscan friar of the thirteenth century, Roger Bacon, perhaps the most inventive genius that ever existed. The Protestant Vossius (Gérard-Jean) styles him a *miracle of science and of penetration*. Long before his namesake (Francis Bacon), he fathomed the void of Aristotle's philosophy, and appealed to observation and experience. But instead of confining himself to prescriptions, like the baron of Verulam, he led the way to, and became the true father of, experimental physics.

There is perhaps not one of our great modern discoveries, of which the germ, at least, may not be found in his numerous writings. Such is the opinion of the learned Brucker, who discovers therein, amongst other things, steamboats, the diving-bell, the burning-glass, optic mirrors, polyhedrons, the telescope, storming powder, &c.

The *Specula Mathematica* and the *Opus Majus* of Bacon were of no small service to Newton, as is remarked by the encyclopedists. "Therein are found some grand views and judicious reflections on astronomical refraction, &c."

Bacon had also the merit of first remarking the error in the Julian Calendar, and of proposing the correction to Pope Clement IV, in 1267. We are even assured by the editors of his works, Dr. Jebb and Dr. Friend, that it was from his data that the Gregorian Reformation was made some centuries later.

The English Franciscan was scarcely in his grave, when the properties of nitre, which he had discovered, suggested to a German Franciscan, Bertholet Schwartz, the idea of powder and fire-arms. That invention, which has exercised more influence on the destinies of the world than all the scientific labors of the age of Louis XIV, has certainly no equal, save that of printing. As for the latter, it appears to have been clearly demonstrated by two learned Italians, that *chirotypography*, or the art of printing by hand, was in use amongst the monks of the eleventh century, so that Guttenberg, Faust and Schœffer, were the inventors, not of printing, but of the press.

A place is also due amongst the precursors of science to that Raymond Lulle, of the third order of St. Francis, who knew all that was to be known in his time; to the Dominican Vincent de Beauvais, whose *speculum majus* has won for him the title of the *Pliny of the middle ages*; and also to Albertus Magnus, whose genius grasped at all, from theology even to mechanism, and to whom was applied that saying of Cicero, that *his body might be burned with his own writings*.

It was by amalgamating in their encyclopedic brains branches of knowledge, to all appearance the most dissimilar, that the learned of the middle ages put forth, through much smoke, immense volumes of light. They are twitted with dreams of the Philosopher's stone, and of judicial astrology, but apart from the fact, that posterity will reproach us with dreams of a much less innocent kind, it is acknowledged that the labors of the alchemists and astrologers have contributed much to the progress of Chemistry and Astronomy.

Again, it is the religious orders, and especially the Jesuits, who open and who fill the gallery of the great Mathematicians, Astronomers, and Physicians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

First of these is the German Jesuit, Christopher Clavius, surnamed the Euclid of his age, who reformed the Gregorian calendar, (Kepler being then no more than ten years old) and surmounted by that great work, the prejudices of all Europe.

Father Scheiner observed, in 1611, the spots on the sun's disc, and threw much light on the subject.

Father Gregory of St. Vincent, a pupil of Clavius, enriched Geometry with many immortal discoveries, and deserved to be placed by Leibnitz above Galileo, or Cavallieri, and ranged side by side with Fermat and Descartes. About the same time, Father Millet de Chales published, at Turin, the first complete course of Mathematics; and, conjointly with his colleague Grimaldus, furnished Newton with the fundamental principles of his optics.

Pascal saw his famous problems on the cycloid, simultaneously solved by Father Lalouere in France, and Wallis in England; and if the author of the *Provincials* spared no pains to asperse the work of the Jesuit, the latter has been amply avenged by Leibnitz and the Encyclopedists.

What a man—what a revolutionary genius in the sciences was Father Kircher, whose thirty-two works, written with remarkable elegance, have given to the world, on all manner of subjects, conceptions the most novel, the boldest, and the most fruitful! Instead of borrowing these, they have been feloniously taken, and in order to conceal the theft, the Jesuit has been accused of numerous errors, and set down, forsooth, as an absurd visionary. The curious cabinet wherewith he enriched the Roman College, is, in itself, sufficient to immortalise his name.

The Fathers Castel, Kilian, and, above all, Besco-wich, amply sustained the reputation of their society in the exact sciences, during the eighteenth century. We shall not hear speak of those *masters of the secrets of heaven*, whom the company sent to China and the Indies.

Although the other religious institutes may have had fewer motives, because of their vocation and purpose, for cultivating the sciences of which we speak, they have, nevertheless, produced men of note in these pursuits.

Such was Father Benoit Castelli, a Benedictine, the disciple of Galileo and the master of Toricelli; such the Milanese Jesuit Cavallieri, who, by his calculation of infinite decimals, takes his place amongst the first mathematicians of any age. Such again was Father Mersenne, of the order of Minors, inventor of the cycloid and of the reflecting telescope, falsely attributed to Newton or to James Gregory, as the encyclopedists all prove.

It is again to the Capuchin Friar Rheita, an excellent astronomer of the XVII century, that the encyclopedists attribute the invention of the *terrestrial telescope*. In our own time Father André de Gy, of the same order, has deserved by his scientific labors the praises of the learned.

The Fathers Fontana and Beccaria, (*des Ecoles-Pies*) have done no less honor to their institute, the former in mathematics, the latter by his experiments and discoveries in physic.

Amongst the many learned men who have made the Congregation of the Barnabites illustrious, we must not pass over in silence the names of Father Frizi, one of the most distinguished mathematicians and physicians of the last century, of Cardinal Gerdil, who might be called the Tostat of the eighteenth century, and who, even more than Father Avila, merited the famous epitaph:

Hic stupor est mundi, qui scibile discutit omne.

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN'S SEVENTH LECTURE ON PROTESTANT OBJECTIONS.

His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, in delivering his seventh lecture of the above series, chose for his subject "The Papal Supremacy," taking his text from Jerem. iii. 15, "I will give unto you pastors after my own heart, who shall feed you with knowledge and with understanding." He began by observing that the history of the Jewish Church, recorded in the Old Testament, presents a phenomenon which we should not have before expected, and which would have seemed almost unnatural, had it not been actually declared to us. When, after the first unfaithful specimen of royalty had departed from the scene of life, God gave His people another king. He raised up in the person of the second monarch "a man according to his own heart;" and under the rule of that king, even David, the prosperity of the Jewish people in worldly matters reached its highest point: the nations around were become tributary to the people whom God loved; their enemies, far and near, were quelled or brought to terms; and David was nearly permitted to see the earnest longing and desire of his eyes satisfied in the erection of the great and glorious Temple and House of God. But still, such was God's will, he did not live to see that day; that glory and happiness was reserved for his son Solomon, who should be a truer type, as he rested and reposed after his father's wars, of the great King of Peace. Solomon then made use of the treasures prepared by his father; and when the great Temple was actually built on Zion, whole holocausts witnessed its solemn dedication to the service of His majesty, and God

Himself came down and visibly dwelt therein. And together with this special mark of God's special favor came also great worldly prosperity; the Jewish people reached that point of wealth and prosperity which they never outstripped in their onward progress as a nation, and the arts attained their fullest and grandest development, the like of which had never before been seen even in the luxurious East. Who would not say that now the worship of the true God was firmly established, and had reached its culminating point? How did King Solomon and the priests of the Most High God assemble there, and fondly fancy and flatter themselves that henceforth the God of their nation should become the God of all nations, and that the most distant people would bow down and submit themselves to the majesty of His name!

But in all these, their hopes, they were doomed to disappointment. Scarcely has Solomon slept with his fathers than the rude hand of a seducer leads, or rather sends, away ten tribes out of the twelve, and so became the author of a fatal and unholy schism. Ten tribes secede from the worship of the faithful few, and their miserable schism does but plunge them lower and lower in the depths of sin and error. Two only tribes remain faithful—the one large and important, the other secondary—and for 250 years the separation continues, a separation not merely political but religious also. And during those two centuries and a half, *where was the true God to be found?* Still in Jerusalem was the only temple in which He chose to be adored; the only line of pontiffs whose ministrations, as His priests, He deigned to recognise. They were few, those faithful ones, in Jerusalem; but, few as they were, God looked with regard on those few alone. Let us set aside, in our mind, the actual idolatry of the separated tribes; still, even if they had been true to God's worship in the midst of their actual schism, like the Samaritans, still every people who came to them in God's name would have to declare to them plainly, and without reserve, "salvation is of the Jews." Many, indeed, were the pontiffs at Jerusalem who disgraced their high and holy calling under the line of kings which lasted those 250 years; and deep are the mists of error and of darkness with which the history of the faithful few who clung to Judah and Jerusalem is obscured. But still it matters not; it is at Jerusalem, and there alone, that the line is to be found which God recognises; there is the House and the Temple of God; and there alone, out of all the world, has He established the seat of His promises.

And hence, my brethren, we should not be astonished if we were to find a similar event occurring in the history and fortunes of that Universal Church, of which the Jewish Church was but a faint and imperfect type. Were any one to say that the Church of God, after centuries of darkness and immorality, seemed to be on the eve of entering upon an age of lawlessness; at a time when all the elegant arts had reached their utmost height, and learning had begun to fill up the lips of the Priesthood; when it appeared that the ancient promises of wide and unbounded sway to the Universal Church of God were about to obtain their fulfillment; were any one to say this, I ask, would he be speaking probability?—and yet would he not have been far from the truth. At this very time, in the beginning of the 16th century, at the very period when the Christian Church was most extensively flourishing, there came upon it a blow exactly similar and parallel to that which befel to the Jewish Church under Roboan. And if that blow did not rend away a majority of the Christian world from the great Catholic community, still a very large and fair portion broke communion with the seat and centre of God's revealed worship. Now, I ask, after reading the history of the Old Testament, does this seem a strange and improbable thing? We think not. The Catholic knows and says that such was the case; we were *once* united from the East to the West; there was *once* but one altar, one form of prayer, one song of praise, one Church, one family, throughout the world; and it seemed as if the entire nations of the earth were on the very point of bowing down and doing obeisance before it. And just at this moment, there came a fatal blow, a wide-spreading schism; and it overspread many countries, also on the continent of Europe, and also this, our England, the "Isle of Saints." And yet, when this blow came, the Faithful felt and knew that there was, and could be, only one line of Priests and Pontiffs, on which God had set His seal; and so, like faithful Tobias of old, they were forced to have resort to the one centre of unity and seat of government; and to the ancient line of early Christian Bishops, from whom the utmost bounds of the earth had been brought into the obedience of Faith, and to whom all Christian kingdoms owed subjection.

You now understand the object of my words: it is, my brethren, to vindicate the Catholic doctrine of the *supremacy of the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, as*

the successor of St. Peter, the chief of Christ's Apostles. I have to deal with objections urged against this doctrine, not to give positive proofs in its favor; and yet the proofs of the doctrine itself will, one by one, appear, as we go onward, in answering the objections of Protestants: and to the latter it is my intention to reply, not so much by texts of Holy Scripture, or of the Fathers of the Church, as by adducing facts and considering their collective weight. For, as on a former occasion, I have preached here at length upon this subject, and have published what I then preached, I must refer you to that work, the "*Lectures on the Catholic Church*," if you wish to see the proofs of Catholic doctrines more fully brought out; for though I shall to-night have occasion to refer to the texts of Scripture, it will not be so minutely as you perhaps may desire. Yet do not think that, if such be the case, it is that I shrink from the subject; I urge you to examine closely and carefully the Scripture proofs as a preparatory exercise to the right understanding of this Lecture.

It is clear that all Christians hold that *some order of ministry or other is, if not an essential, still an important part of the Christian scheme.* There are, for example, those who believe that the right of appointing pastors to minister to each congregation is vested in the congregation itself, and that from time to time this inherent right and power are exercised in the appointment of a pastor, and that such a person exercises his ministry by a delegation of this right. The pastor assumes forthwith an ecclesiastical title, and teaches and preaches in the various "churches" of his sect or denomination; and these powers are held to be secured to the individual by virtue of some charter, derived from Christ Jesus and His Apostles. Others rise higher than this low view and doctrine, and hold that no such power can be delegated to pastors from below, but that it must come from without and from above; and whether the appointment come from one or from more, they profess to refer their claim to a chain of succession reaching up to the Apostles themselves, and that a single break in this magic chain will cut off and invalidate all ministerial acts; just as if one intermediate link in the electric wire be wanting the telegraph itself is powerless. Such would seem to be, in some sense, the doctrine of the English Protestant Church, in its service-book at least; it would seem as if it held that no true pastor can exist except he can trace his succession back, in an unbroken chain, to the Apostles, and through them to Christ Himself. And, at least to many members of the Protestant Establishment, this seems a very natural doctrine indeed, and that nothing can possibly be more in accordance with what we might beforehand have expected, than that Christ Himself should have invested certain teachers with certain powers, to act in His name to the very end of time: if so be that the Church was intended by Him to act to the end of time as the dispenser of those gifts to man. Such is the belief of another class, the Episcopalians. Now the Catholic Church goes a step further still. She holds and teaches that this Apostolical chain of succession is really and truly a doctrine taught by Christ Himself; but upon the very self same principle she also believes and teaches that, among all those Episcopally-ordained pastors, one pastor is, of necessity, supreme above the rest; and, further still, that this superior authority of one Bishop is traceable to the very words and commission of Christ Himself, and forms an integral part of the great Christian system of revealed truth.

Now, is there anything unnatural in this belief? Is there in it anything which you can detect contrary to what we might reasonably have expected to find there? If we already believe that all the clergy are not equal, but that some clergy are superior to others, is it ridiculous, I ask, that thousands, nay, millions of Christians should hold that, among all these Bishops, there is one invested with special power and authority over the rest of his brethren in Christendom? The very Church of England itself keeps up an approach to this very principle. As time went on, the Church found it necessary to appoint Archbishops over Bishops, and over these again Primates, and over these in turn, Patriarchs. And if this be the simple and natural, and necessary principle upon which episcopacy develops itself, is it absurd, I ask, for Jesus Christ, with His perfect knowledge of the needs of man, and of His Church's fortunes, to have done that which men themselves regard as so very needful, and find themselves, by experience, obliged to do? Is it absurd to suppose that God Himself should have made one Bishop by right superior to all others, when men make intermediate superiors? I know not how or why it is so, but in England it is popularly deemed something absurd to believe, that one Bishop has really superior power to others. This is a matter, I say, which is not argued against, but met with simple ridicule; and I cannot find it written in the Gospel