

Northwest Review.

"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

THE ONLY CATHOLIC PAPER PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH IN NORTH-WESTERN CANADA.

VOL. XIV, No. 45.

ST. BONIFACE, MANITOBA, THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1899.

\$2.00 per year.
Single Copies, 5 cents.

FATHER DRUMMOND, S.J., Replies to ARCHDEACON FORTIN.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir.—When, on the 15th January last, I preached a sermon in reply to Archdeacon Fortin's strictures on auricular confession, I had no intention of carrying on a prolonged controversy. I simply exercised the manifest right of giving one answer, and I intended thereafter to leave the question to the quiet reflection of an intelligent public. For I believe that the unavoidable recriminations arising out of a protracted controversy are seldom conducive to the spread of truth. Partisans on both sides are more apt to become embittered than convinced. However, since the Archdeacon has emerged from his four months' silence, and, in the words of an Irish bull, has once more opened his mouth only to put his foot in it far worse than before, I feel that I must, in all kindness, extricate him from that awkward posture. But I can assure you, sir, that I mean this to be the last time I shall attempt any such thankless operation.

POPE HONORIUS.
With his delightful neglect of explicit reference, Archdeacon Fortin writes:
"Father Drummond says in his reply: 'Pope Honorius was declared a heretic by his enemies.' In which reply did I say this? Not in the one on auricular confession, but in the previous one, made on December 8th, 1898, on 'The Real Presence.' Moreover, the Archdeacon omits a very important adverb, and changes the only verb in that short sentence. What I said, as appears in the Tribune of December 10th, 1898, page 5, column 2, paragraph 3, was: 'Pope Honorius was called a heretic only by his enemies.' Councils may 'declare,' and their declarations carry weight; but individuals may 'call' names, and nobody minds them. 'Now,' continues the Archdeacon, 'it is a matter of history that he was condemned as a heretic at the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, held in 680.' As there have been no fewer than four Ecumenical councils held at Constantinople, this one ought to have been mentioned as the third. Otherwise one is inclined to imagine that the Archdeacon thought there was only one. The Archdeacon adds that Pope Leo II. 'confirmed the finding of the council and gave his infallible verdict against Honorius.' I beg the venerable Archdeacon's pardon. Pope Leo II. did not altogether confirm the finding of the council. The third council of Constantinople had, in the heat of controversy, called Honorius a heretic, but Leo did no such thing, and we must bear in mind that no pronouncement of an Ecumenical council is final except in so far as it is approved

and confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff. He tells us that Honorius was condemned for weakness and neglect, as a favorer or an indirect and unintentional helper of heresy—a terrible reproach, indeed, for one in his position to receive, but very different from that of formal heresy. In his confirmatory epistle, sent to Constantine Pogonatus, Pope Leo says, "We also anathematize the inventors of the new error, that is, Theodore, the bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, ensnarers, rather than guides, of the church of Constantinople; and also Honorius, who did not illumine this Apostolic church with the doctrine of Apostolic tradition, but allowed it, while immaculate, to be stained by profane betrayal." In his epistle to the bishops of Spain, the same Pontiff says that "Honorius did not extinguish the incipient flame of heretical dogma, as befitted Apostolic authority, but, by neglect nourished it."
The whole of this question, which is too long for an exhaustive treatment here, will be found very satisfactorily solved in the Rev. Reuben Parsons' "Studies in Church History," vol. I., pages 432-448; Pustinet & Co., New York and Cincinnati, 1895; where it is evident that (1) there is no heresy in the writings of Pope Honorius; (2) that, even if there were, they are not dogmatic teachings of a Roman Pontiff, addressing the Universal Church, but simply the private utterances of the writer, and therefore not infallible; (3) that, finally, the infallible and Papally confirmed pronouncement of the Sixth General Council against Honorius did not condemn him for heresy but for neglect of duty. Consequently, I need not choose either horn of the Archdeacon's dilemma. There is a third horn which he has not noticed, and third horns are fatal to the intended effect of two-horned dilemmas. He says: "Either the accused Pope was an heretic, or else Leo II. could not be infallible in pronouncing him such." The third horn, which annuls the two others, should now read: "Or Honorius was declared by Leo II. to have neglected his duty in letters that had no pretensions to infallibility."
THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.
In order to prove that I was wrong in denying that the Church of Rome has ever taught anything contrary to the mind and spirit of Holy Scripture, the Archdeacon strings together a list of questions demanding several details of church discipline. This answer misses the point. I never pretended that every practice of the Catholic Church is explicitly taught in the Bible. No sensible person who believes that the Church is a living, growing organism could hold so absurd a theory. Even the majority of Protestants practically reject it, though, owing to lack of mental training, they are not aware of the contradiction between their practice and

their theory. Most Protestants observe Sunday as the obligatory day of rest; but where does the Scripture say that Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath, is abrogated, as a day of rest, and that the Sabbath must now be observed on Sunday? Most Protestants teach that infants should be baptized, but where does the Scripture teach this explicitly? Most Protestants pray to the Holy Ghost; but, to adapt one of Archdeacon Fortin's queries, "is there a single instance of an apostle addressing a prayer to the Holy Ghost?" And, to come down to particulars as the Archdeacon does, would he kindly indicate to me where Archbishops, deans, canons, and "venerable archdeacons" are mentioned in the Holy Scripture; and, since they are not mentioned, is not the use of these terms out of harmony with Scriptural teaching? According to the Archdeacon's strange logic, the answer would have to be: Yes, they are out of harmony. My answer would be: not at all; the fact that a doctrine or usage is not mentioned in Scripture is no proof that it is out of harmony with Scriptural teaching; that doctrine or usage may be a natural logical growth from the seed which is explicitly mentioned in the Bible and then it is in perfect harmony with Scriptural teaching.

INTERCESSION OF SAINTS.
For example, granting that the intercession of saints in heaven for men living on earth is not explicitly taught in the Bible, we prove its harmony therewith in this way. The Bible cites many instances of just men, while alive in this world, interceding with God for their living brethren: see Gen. xviii, 23; Job, xlii, 8; Jas., v, 16. But, if, while still on earth and liable to lose their souls, these just men could successfully intercede with God, how much more effectually can they do so now that they are confirmed in righteousness and reigning with Christ forever? Therefore prayer to them and especially to the Blessed Virgin, the Queen of all saints, is eminently consonant with the spirit of Holy Scripture.

THE ONE MEDIATOR.
Nor does this in any way interfere with the mediatorship of Christ Jesus (1 Tim., ii, 5), because all the graces we ask of the saints must come through the merits of Jesus Christ. We ask the saints to obtain certain favors for us, not of their own power, but, according to the well-known conclusion of the Church's prayers, "through Christ our Lord." If this sort of intercessory mediation interfered with the essential mediation of our Lord, it would follow that no one might ever pray for his neighbors: for it is clearly as much an interference with the mediation of Our Lord if you pray for your living relatives or friends, as it is if the Blessed Virgin Mary in heaven prays for us.

NESTORIANISM.
Let me dwell for a moment on what the archdeacon says about the Blessed Virgin. "The worship of the Virgin Mary," he asks, "is that in harmony with scriptural teaching?" Yes; perfectly so. Our Lord himself was the first to worship her, not, of course in the sense of veneration, as when He has subject to her in Nazareth (Luke, II, 51), as when He wrought His first public miracle at her request

(John, II, 3, 5, 9). The Archdeacon objects to her being "called the Mother of God, (as if God, who is everlasting, could have a mother)." And yet we read that "the World," i. e., the second person of the Most Blessed Trinity, "was made flesh" (John I, 14). There is in Christ no human personality, but only one Divine Person. Mary is the Mother of that Person. Therefore she is the Mother of God, though undoubtedly she is not the mother of that Divine Nature, which the Second Person has from everlasting. Similarly, our mothers are really called the mothers of our persons, although they are only in reality the mothers of our bodies and not of that which is best in us, viz, our souls. To deny to Mary the title of Mother of God is implicitly to set up two persons in Christ, one Divine and the other human; which is rank Nestorianism condemned by the Council of Ephesus in 431.

INDULGENCES.
The Archdeacon's perversion of the Catholic doctrine and practice of Indulgences belongs to so antediluvian an epoch of controversy that I will not dwell on it further than to say that this doctrine has ample scripture warrant in Matthew XVI, 19: "And I will give to thee (Peter) the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven;" also in II Cor., ii, 6-11, compared with I Cor., v, 3-5, where St. Paul grants a pardon or indulgence to the incestuous Corinthian whom he had previously excommunicated; that the Church never sanctioned unholy traffic in indulgences, which never included permission to commit sin; and that any Catholic manual will explain this matter to persons who honestly search for the truth.

PASCAL.
Archdeacon Fortin replies to my condemnation of Pascal as a liar by a bare denial, to which he adds the extraordinary statement that Joseph de Maistre's book "had no greater success" than certain "efforts" which "were received with shouts of ridicule by the whole of Europe." This is the first I and the majority of people familiar with French literary history have heard of these "shouts of ridicule." In France itself, which at that time swayed the literary opinions of Europe, Bouillet, in his "Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie," a work so anti-Catholic that it was placed on the Index expurgatorius, tells us that Pascal's "Lettres Provinciales" often betray passion and were condemned in France by the civil authority. At the present time the French-speaking admirers of Joseph de Maistre are much more numerous than those of Pascal. De Maistre was never suspected of insincerity; Pascal, while admitting that he had been decided by a friend who manufactured most of his quotations against the Jesuits, did not retract his "Immortelles Mentenses" and thus continued to encourage a lie. Voltaire, who was himself such a master of malicious slander, ridicules the idea of judging Jesuit morality by such a satire as the "Lettres Provinciales" (Lettres au Père Latour, 1746).

The Archdeacon speaks of Joseph de Maistre's "book" in a

way that betrays his ignorance of the original. He did not write a book on this question, but only one chapter in one of his 14 splendid volumes.

Perhaps the Archdeacon can put his hand on Chateaubriand's "Etudes Historiques." There, under the heading, "Histoire de France," he will find these words: "Et pourtant Pascal n'est qu'un calomniateur de génie; il nous a laissé un mensonge immortel."
Among the many gems I shall have to unearth in the course of this letter, I now come upon one that is a marvel of transparency. Anyone can see daylight through it. It is all made up of pellucid naïveté. We had often heard that George Washington would not tell a lie. But it appears that Blaise Pascal was infinitely better off in this respect. Not only he could not tell a lie, because, the Archdeacon kindly informs us, he "was one of the greatest mathematicians of his age; accuracy was the alpha and the omega of his character." Apply this delightful reasoning to a criminal accused of forgery, and see how it will work. "The accused is one of the most expert bookkeepers of his time; therefore no temptation can have made him tamper with the books he kept." The conclusion of an intelligent jury would be just the contrary. Precisely because he is such an acknowledged expert, temptation held out allurements unknown to ordinary bookkeepers, and he may very well have yielded to them, as Pascal did to the allurements of fame and to the applause of his heretical admirers. The fact that

ESCOBARDERIE
has come to mean an adroit falsehood, because Pascal misrepresented Escobar, does not prove that Escobar was a liar. What it does prove is the accidental immortality of Pascal's lies. As well might one argue that Captain Boycott was an atrocious monster, because the word "boycott" was coined through hatred of him. In point of fact those who knew him best say he was a very decent fellow.

PASCAL AT HIS BEST.
However, since the Archdeacon carries his admiration of Pascal so far as to assert that "the most absolute reliance can be placed upon whatever he published," I will take him at his word and quote for his benefit one strong passage from this brilliant writer and deep thinker on auricular confession. Speaking of self-love and of our anxiety to stand well with our fellow-men, he says:
"Is it not true that we hate truth and those who tell it to us, and that we love to have them deceived to our advantage and that we wish to be thought of by them other than we really are? Here is a proof of this which horrifies me. The Catholic religion does not oblige us to discover our sins to everybody indifferently; she only oblige us to conceal them from all men with one exception, to whom she bids us unveil the depths of our heart and to let him see us as we are. He is the only man whom she orders us to undeceive (désabuser), and him she obliges to inviolable secrecy, which makes his knowledge as if it were non-existing. Could one fancy any thing more charitable or more tender? And yet man's corrup-