

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 186 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

Editors: REV. GEORGE E. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern India," THOMAS COFFEY.

Publishers and Proprietors, Thomas Coffey, Messrs. Luke King, John Nich, P. J. Neven and Joseph S. King are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall, St. John's. Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measurement.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900. To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Its matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Blessing you, and wishing you success. Believe me, to remain, Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa, Adm. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 13, 1902.

In an editorial article in last week's paper, having reference to the persecution of the nuns in France, an unfortunate mistake was made in calling attention to the article in the "Toronto" Saturday Review, whereas we should have referred to the London, England, Saturday Review.

IS IT AUTHENTIC?

An American medical journal gives the following as a form of prayer used in Christian Science treatment for dyspepsia. It is said that a fee varying from \$1 to \$5 is charged for the prayer, and that credit is not given under any circumstances, as that interferes with the success of the treatment.

There is an inherent absurdity and profanity in the alleged prayer which makes us doubt whether such a form is actually used by the Christian Scientists, with the approbation of those who have the management of that so-called Church, nevertheless it appears to be in so strict accord with the Christian Scientist teachings that it is quite possible that it is employed as the medical journal asserts. It has, however, very much the appearance of a burlesque.

Our reason for doubting the seriousness of this formula is not that it disagrees with the Christian Scientist teachings, but that we can scarcely credit that the authorities of that organization should put into so plain and palpable a form the absurdities of Christian Science. We give the prayer, therefore, for what it is worth, with the proviso that we do not vouch for its authenticity. It is as follows:

"Holy Reality, we believe in thee and thou art the only reality in this patient's stomach. We will never say how sick we are. Thou art not sick. Indeed nothing in this universe is or ever was sick, or ever can be. Forgive us that we talked of our aches and said our food hurts, and that we thought medicine would help us. We know that there is no such thing as a diseased stomach. It is a carnal mind given over to the world and the devil! It is a mental twist, a false attitude, a Hermeticism of thought. What seems to be a disease is a parasite, the shadow of a lie. Help us to affirm that we have no dyspepsia, never had dyspepsia, never will have it, that there is no such thing, that there never was any such thing, and never will be. Amen!"

A DUNKARD MISSION.

It is announced in a dispatch from Richmond, Indiana, that the Dunkard Church there assembled in convention has decided to establish a mission in Canada. And why not? The Presbyterians, Methodists and Anglicans have established missions in Quebec for the purpose of proselytizing the Catholics of that province and of bringing them over to their respective folds, and the Dunkards who regard the Ontario Protestants as benighted people who have not the true light of the gospel are equally in earnest to spread that light among them. Do not they need evangelization as much as the Catholic French-Canadians? From the Dunkard point of view they need it still more, and the Dunkards feel that it is their special mission to impart that light.

The Dunkards are a kind of Baptists who, like the latter, had their origin in Germany, and they are called also Dunkers or Tankers. Their distinctive doctrines are somewhat similar to those of the Baptists, as, like this denomination, they are opposed to the baptism of children, and insist upon immersion as the only valid form of baptism. Their name denotes this, as it signifies "dippers," being derived from the Ger-

man *tucken, to dip*. They are the only Protestant sect which obeys the injunction in the Epistle of St. James v. 14, which directs the priests, or, as the Protestant version of the Bible has it, the elders of the Church, to visit the sick and "anoint them with oil in the name of the Lord."

A subdivision of the Dunkards hold that according to the Bible the seventh day of the week, or Saturday, is the Sabbath day commanded to be kept holy; and, as there is no commandment in the Bible to change the day, they maintain that all Christians should now keep that day holy. They maintain, therefore, that all the Protestant sects which lay so much stress on the obligation of keeping the Sunday holy instead of the Saturday are unfaithful to the Bible, as they keep the Sunday in conformity with the practice of the Catholic Church.

They point out that this is contrary to the primary principle of Protestantism which is that the faith of Christians should rest solely on the Bible as each individual reads and understands it, without reference to the authority of any Church. For this and other reasons they infer that the Protestant sects are badly in need of being evangelized.

The Dunkards have dwindled down to but a small number of adherents in America. It was formerly estimated that they numbered about thirty thousand, but, owing to their oddities of speech and dress and other causes, the young people have abandoned them by degrees, and they are now reduced to less than eight thousand. They have confidence, however, that their tenets, which they maintain to be more scriptural than those of other Protestant denominations, have only to be made known to become acceptable to those who proclaim that they rest their faith on the Bible and not on the teachings of any Church.

SOUTH AFRICA AND IRELAND.

The London Daily Mail publishes a letter from its correspondent at the Hague to the effect that the Boers of South Africa, including those of Cape Colony and Natal, as well as of the newly acquired provinces which were recently the Republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, will at once begin an agitation on the model of the Home Rule agitation in Ireland, to obtain the early concession of complete Home Rule for the whole South African territory. It is expected that the first move in this direction will be made by the Boer generals, who will make proposals to the British government for much larger concessions to the Boers than the government is at present willing to grant, and these will be demanded as the price to be paid for the assistance afforded by them in inducing the burghers to accept the terms of peace, and to submit to British rule.

The Government, it is said, will require a large degree of foresight and firmness in order to deal with the situation. It is well known that the Government of the Empire some participation in the government of South African territory, but on the Boer side the demand will be for a full enjoyment of a share in the government much sooner than the authorities at Westminster may be disposed to grant so much, and without great firmness and foresight the situation will assuredly be very difficult.

The Boers of Cape Colony have already shown that they can even now rule that colony so far as gaining a majority in the Legislature is concerned, the government there being controlled by the Afrikaner Bond, which was unmistakably favorable to the fighting Boers during the whole course of the recent war.

The opposition is led by Dr. Jamieson, who was at the head of the raid into the Transvaal which was ended so disastrously for the British raiders at Majuba Hill. The policy of Dr. Jamieson is avowedly in favor of the suspension of the Cape Colony constitution, a step to which the Cape Government is, of course, bitterly opposed, and Mr. Chamberlain is so far also opposed to so extreme a measure, which would certainly beget intense dissatisfaction among the whole Boer population of the colony, and of the newly acquired colonies as well.

There appears to be little if any doubt that as soon as the colonial office, which at the present moment means Mr. Chamberlain, is satisfied that the Boers will be contented as British subjects, the franchise will be freely extended to them, and in the new colonies, as well as in Cape Colony itself, the fullest measure of Home Rule will be conceded which is consistent with their position as part of the British Empire. The people of Great Britain will also be quite satisfied that this shall be done, and strong hope is entertained that the Boers themselves will be even more prosperous under British rule than they could possibly be in their isolated position as the undisputed

masters of two small inland Republics which would depend upon the benevolence of foreign powers for access to the ocean, and a means of communication with the outside world.

Here the question arises: "If Home Rule may be safely given to a people who have so recently been in arms against British rule, and who are certainly not now enamored of that rule, but accept it sullenly because it has been enforced upon them after a fearful struggle, why should not some willingness be shown to extend the same privilege to Ireland?"

Time has shown that the people of Ireland will never be satisfied with anything less than autonomy; and it is certain that, if such autonomy were granted, the discontent which exists at present there would cease, and the mutual suspicion with which the people of England and Ireland regard each other would give place to a brotherly confidence. Surely it is as desirable that the experiment should be tried in Ireland as in South Africa; and we venture to say that if it were tried, once for all, the happiest results would follow.

Universal indignation was expressed by all lovers of human liberty when not very long ago Russia stretched a despotic hand over Finland and deprived that country of the autonomy it was enjoying, merging it practically into the Russian Empire. This ruthless act has already spread a pall of desolation over that unhappy country, and has driven thousands of its people, the bone and sinew of the land, to seek homes elsewhere. The same thing has occurred, and is still occurring in Ireland, and it is useless to expect that there will be cordiality between England and Ireland, the rulers and the ruled, until the same generosity be extended toward the people of Ireland which has been shown without reserve toward the new subjects which Great Britain has brought under her sway in South Africa.

Just here we may relate an incident, which puts the case in a strong light, while it makes evident the natural wit and sound sense of the well known multi-millionaire, J. Pierpont Morgan.

A few weeks ago Mr. Morgan paid a visit to the British House of Commons in order to meet Premier Balfour and Mr. Wyndham, the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

In the course of conversation the case of Ireland was mentioned, and Mr. Wyndham humorously asked Mr. Morgan if he "could not form a trust for the settlement of the Irish problem."

Mr. Morgan replied promptly that "a trust would be just the thing required for a complete and satisfactory settlement—a trust in the people."

The reply was not merely a witticism—it was a statesmanlike solution of the difficulty which successive governments have found in dealing with Ireland. British statesmen have been reiterating from year to year that the people of Ireland cannot be trusted. If they had Home Rule, as Mr. Chamberlain has frequently asserted, they would oppress the Protestant minority in the country. Lord Salisbury has often given utterance to similar statements, and he chose the most inopportune moments for their reiteration. In fact almost as soon as Queen Victoria announced her gratitude to the Irish soldier who had saved the empire by their bravery in South Africa, Lord Salisbury followed with the public announcement that England could not consent to trust the people of Ireland with the right to govern themselves.

There is no reason for the assertion that the Catholic majority in Ireland would oppress the Protestant minority, for there was never any desire shown by the Catholic majority to oppress the Protestant one-fourth of the population. But if it were true that such an inclination existed, it would surely be no worse than the present situation which enables one-fourth of the population to oppress the other three-fourths, to obtain legislation to fill the purses of the landlords at the expense of the tenants, and to distribute all the public offices among the one-fourth, so that they might be able to grind the majority down to the earth.

But there would be no attempt at retaliation if Mr. Morgan's suggestion to "trust the people" were acted upon. It is because the people are not trusted that they do not trust the Government.

Irishmen all over the world have proved themselves capable of self-government—in Australia, in Canada, in the United States—and why should they not be trusted to govern themselves in their own land? It is for Mr. Wyndham to try the experiment of the trust which Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan has suggested.

Archbishop of New York.

A dispatch from Rome, dated Sept. 1, reports that the Propaganda, after a lengthy sitting on that day, decided to recommend to the Pope the appointment of the Right Rev. John M. Farley, auxiliary Bishop of New York, to the archbishopric made vacant by the death of Archbishop Corrigan; and the Right Rev. George Montgomery, Bishop of Los Angeles, Cal., as coadjutor to Archbishop Riordan, of San Francisco.

THE BIBLE IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS.

The curious resolution which was passed by a large majority of teachers at the convention of the United States National Educational Association which met recently at Minneapolis, has excited considerable discussion in the press, and, what is most worthy to be remarked, in the expression of Protestant opinion thereon, is that the religious press is for the most part favorable to the proposition, but the secular press for the most part does not consider it feasible or desirable to attempt to put it into practical operation.

The resolution is as follows: "It is apparent that familiarity with the English Bible as a masterpiece of literature is rapidly decreasing among the pupils in our schools. This is the direct result of a conception which regards the Bible as a theological book merely, and thereby leads to its exclusion from the schools of some states as a subject of reading and study. We hope and ask for such a change of public sentiment in this regard as will permit and encourage the English Bible now honored by name in many school laws and state constitutions, to be read and studied as a literary work of the highest and purest type, side by side with the poetry and prose which it has inspired, and in a large part formed."

The very apologetic tone assumed in this resolution in order to induce the National and State Legislatures to assent to the reintroduction of the Bible into schools under some pretext is the best proof we could have of the disastrous effects which have been brought about by the system of private interpretation of the Bible as the rule of Christian faith, without any appeal to the living authority of the Church of God.

The Bible is not to be regarded as merely a highly meritorious literary work. It is the Word of God, whatever may be the language in which it is read, whether English, French, German, Greek or Latin. It was formerly read in schools as the Word of God, and as the Word of God it was driven out from almost every public school curriculum in the United States. This is proclaimed by the resolution passed by the teachers, who assert that its theological character has been the cause of its exclusion.

Protestantism has taught hitherto that the Bible is the only source from which a knowledge of Christianity is to be obtained. Its merits as a literary work were not thought of as a reason for wishing it to be taught in schools, but its authority as a divine book; and now it is admitted that this is the very reason why it has been excluded!

It is a curious fruit of the hitherto unrestricted power of Protestantism in the United States that the Bible which had for so long a time held its ground as part of the teaching of the schools is now begging for admission, no longer on the plea that man should recognize God in education, but because the Book has in it many beauties, such as oratorical and rhetorical passages, which make it possibly equal, or at all events nearly equal to Sir Walter Scott's tales, or Shakespeare's dramas, or Milton's epics.

There is no need of a lengthy argument to show in the face of such a statement as this that faith in the truth and inspiration of holy Scripture is practically dead among Protestants in the United States; and it is easily told who are its slayers. They are the ministers who have attacked the truth of one after another of the books of the Bible. Protestantism itself began by rejecting seven full books and several chapters of two other books which had been received before as undoubted parts of Holy Writ. When this rejection was accomplished, and every man was told that he is himself the only judge of what is Scripture, and that he alone is the supreme arbiter of its meaning, from the rejection of these books it was very easy to pass to the rejection of others, and to regard the whole scripture as nothing more than a human production. One by one, Judges, Isaiah, Daniel were rejected by higher critics, so-called, and then other books were attacked in succession, at first in regard to their history, and then as to their authorship, until it would seem at last that the authors who wrote them had been themselves almost mythical characters, and that their writings had no foundation, either historical or ethical; and to-day the children of those who placed undoubting reliance on the Bible as God's Word regard it as a human work of very inferior quality.

As the case stands, the Catholic Church alone is now the buttress of the Bible. She alone maintains that it is the infallible word of God, while those Protestants who still entertain some respect for the Book, which was once so revered by their ancestors, are now reduced to the straits of endeavoring to smuggle it into the schools as a work of considerable literary merit. It cannot be doubted that when they succeed it will be read there only as a profane work, and the last vestige of respect which is now entertained for it will soon be swept away.

The Bible does not itself say that it stands in its entirety the Word of God. Certain passages are indeed quoted by Christ and His apostles as God's Word, but once left the children in the schools informed that they are to regard the entire book as a human or a mere literary production, of the excellence and reliability of which they are themselves the only judges, and it will lose all its authority; and the statement that any part thereof is the Word of God will be regarded as a very empty claim. This claim cannot be established by any authority but by the decisions of the Catholic Church, "the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of truth."

As Protestantism does not recognize the authority of the Catholic Church, no reliable witness can be brought forward to prove the inspiration of the Bible, and its authority will therefore be rejected. Indeed the proposal of the teachers to have it read in school as a specimen of literature will place it upon a par with, or even a lower level than the works of fiction which will be read there, and we believe the result will inevitably be that what was once regarded as Divine Truth will soon be considered by Protestants generally as nothing more than a collection of amusing stories.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AGAIN. Office of the Christian Science Publication Committee for Ontario. Editor of CATHOLIC RECORD:

In your issue of the 16th you very justly take the Rev. Dr. Bayne to task because in his denunciation of Christian Science he incidentally attacks Catholicism. In the most kindly manner possible I would like to say that the editor of the RECORD has been guilty of the same misdemeanor when in resenting Dr. Bayne's attack upon Catholicism he condemns Christian Science.

Christian Science cannot properly be called an ism of Mrs. Eddy, since its adherents have demonstrated its truth convincingly to themselves and have thus made it their very own. Furthermore, it takes for its basic lesson the literal teaching of the Bible, "God is Spirit," and every statement contained in the Christian Science text-book is a consistent deduction from said premise. Christian Scientists are quite as conscientious and honest in their belief as are Christians of other denominations, and are quite as ready to explain their doctrine from a scriptural standpoint. Hence, there is no reason why they should not be treated with the same respect which is accorded to other denominations. They are making no fight upon other religions, and bid God-speed to every institution of the world, both secular and religious, which tends to the benefit of mankind.

Yours respectfully, C. R. MUNRO. 25 Grove Avenue, Toronto, 29th August, 1902.

We have received the above letter from the office of the Christian Science Publication Committee of Toronto, and in regard thereto we have to say that we do not deem it necessary to discuss the honesty of the convictions of members of the so-called Christian Science Church; but their honesty counts for nothing when the question is of the absurdity of Christian Scientist belief.

It is true that "God is Spirit," and we do not blame Christian Scientists for teaching this; but we do say that to interpret these words as meaning that there is no other Spirit than God, as Christian Scientists assert, is a misinterpretation of Scriptural language.

We presume that Mr. Munro's assertion that the above words are from the bible has reference to St. John iv. 24. The "Beloved Disciple" wrote in his Greek original "Pneuma ho Theos." This is correctly translated in the Catholic and Protestant versions, the Revised Version being included, "God is a Spirit." The Revised Version gives as an alternative and possible translation "God is Spirit," which is placed in the margin.

This marginal translation Mr. Munro chooses in preference to that placed in the text, apparently because it affords an opportunity to attach to the words the Pantheistic meaning that there is no spirit existing but God.

This gloss is contradicted by many other passages in the Bible. Evil spirits are mentioned expressly in Judges ix, 23: "God sent an evil spirit." "An evil spirit came upon Saul." (1 Kings xviii, 10). (Prot. version 1 Samuel). We find similar statements in xvi, 14, 15, 16, 23; xviii, 10 of the same book, and numerous other passages of Holy Scripture.

In Num. xvi, 22, many spirits (good and wicked) are referred to, and we find such references throughout the Bible—notably in Apocalypse (Revelation) i, 4, where seven spirits are spoken of as occupying a high place in heaven before God's throne.

Other teachings of Christian Scientists are equally Pantheistic, which is merely a concealed form of Atheistic teaching.

We do not dispute Mr. Munro's statement that other people besides Mrs. Eddy believe in Christian Science, having made its teachings thoroughly their own; but all the same it is a humanly invented religion,

which we are not willing to accept in place of what is divinely revealed. The Christian Science papers continue week after week to state that "Mrs. Mary Baker C. Eddy is the Discoverer and Founder of Christian Science." This assertion is in the Christian Science Sentinel of Aug. 21, 1902, which is before us at this moment. We do not want a Christianity which was discovered by Mrs. Eddy; we want that which Christ revealed and taught.

In last Saturday's Toronto Mail and Empire one of the editors writes some very complimentary sentences of the late Mr. Kegan Paul, the great publisher, of London, England. At the close of the article he states that that gentleman had been a clergyman of the Church of England, but here he stopped. His heart failed him, and he could go no farther. It would have given him a desperate wrench had he added, as an honest man would have done, the words "but became a convert to the Catholic faith."

USAGE OF THE CHURCH IN REGARD TO RELICS. The authorized teaching and practice of the Church with regard to relics is eminently simple, reasonable and Scriptural. It is based on the principle that matter is capable of being used as a channel or medium of grace, and is susceptible of a union with a divine presence and influence. Thus, the Church specially venerates the bodies of the martyrs and other saints, because while they were on earth their bodies were the temples of the Holy Ghost and were the receptacles of countless graces. The graces and virtues of the saint were not virtues of the soul only; they belonged to the whole man, body and soul, which worked and suffered together. Next, Catholics believe that God is sometimes pleased to honor the relics of the saints by making them instruments of healing and other miracles, and also by bestowing spiritual graces on those who, for His sake, honor those whom He Himself has honored so greatly. In proof of this we appeal to the Old Testament, in which is recorded the resurrection of a dead body which touched the bones of Elisha, and to the New, which tells of grace and healing being imparted by the hem of Christ's own garment (Matt. ix, 20); by the shadow of St. Peter (Acts v. 15) and by towels which had touched the living body of St. Paul (Acts xix. 12). To the teaching of reason and of sacred Scripture may be added the testimony of the Fathers, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries generally, being witnesses to this belief in the Apostolic Church.

No doubt, in all ages abuses have occurred with regard to relics, but the Church cannot, with any truth or fairness, be held responsible for these. As a writer in a recent number of the Month remarks: "Spurious relics and legends are no more part of the revelation guarded by the Church than the barnacles are part of the ship to which they adhere so tenaciously, nor has the Church ever really sanctioned them with her authority." On the contrary, she has, so far as possible, made express provision for the prevention of such abuses. So long ago as 1215, Canon 62 of the Fourth Lateran Council, inserted in the "Corpus Juris," forbade relics to be sold or to be exposed outside of their cases or shrines, and prohibited the public veneration of new relics until their authenticity had been approved by the Pope. The Council of Trent renews these prohibitions, and requires bishops to decide on the authenticity of new relics after careful consultation with theologians, or, if necessary, with the metropolitan and other bishops of the province assembled in council.

What has been said as to the Church's attitude and the Church's responsibility in regard to spurious relics applies also to unauthorized and purely legendary devotions and prayers. Many Catholics who have a zeal, indeed, but not according to knowledge, rush eagerly after any new-fangled and much-advertised devotion, and this notwithstanding that there is a superabundance of excellent books, and notwithstanding that by application to their priest they could ascertain at once the precise value of the particular prayer or devotion that is pressed upon them.—New Zealand Tablet.

Look on the Bright Side. "A little child shall lead them." An exchange relates a touching incident of child-like self-denial:

"A man met a little fellow on the road carrying a basket of blackberries, and said to him, 'Sammy, where did you get such nice berries?'"

"Over there, sir, in the briars."

"Won't your mother be glad to see you come home with a basket of such nice ripe fruit?"

"Yes, sir," said Sammy, "she always seems glad when I hold up the berries, and I don't tell her anything about the briars in my feet."

"The man rode on. Sammy's remark had given him a lesson, and he resolved that henceforth he would try to hold up the berries and say nothing about the briars."

Important Admission. The Christian Register makes a statement which should receive the attention of our Protestant friends of all denominations when it speaks editorially of the issue (which it believes to be the main issue) in religious affairs, between revealed religion and what may be called natural religion. The Register asks: "Is any religion given by Divine revelation and supernatural authority? If so, which religion has been so given, what are its credentials and what is its authority?" And it answers these self-proposed queries thus:—"When it comes to the final test, there is no escape from the most extreme position and the Church of God, or a total rejection of it. Revealed religion is infallible, if God knows the truth and knows how to tell it."

CARDINAL RICH.

To the President public: Sir—A profound impression has been all France by the closed one hundred schools, and by the which has shut up hundred additional.

It is our duty, official heads of the we feel on this occasion well as patriotic gratitude.

The first question self is: What are have called for this measure? There is no disorder in these establishments, which a tion of teachers who the law requires. There can be advancement given in keeping with the Catholic Faith, and belong to religious additional reasons Christian idea shall the education of the

This is a violent once directed against Bishop, it is our duty protest in the name against this sort the most cruel of the grounds that been systematic anti-Christian science dealing with school instruction from the Four years later members of religion were excluded on the grounds that Catholics, taught not permit teacher to

Families, by laws, established many sacrifices Great crowds of these schools. A vicious families acted the law aims at making free schools impudently closing of schools has no than the doing a structure in the had been excluded schools.

After the state evident facts, we stop to discuss it adopted for the After the declaration Waldeck-Rousseau the directors of the were safe. They called in question closing two schools had not and, besides, a m not order the establishments. Sired to afford, spirit of kindness equity, to the done so an opp with legal formal manifested this reasonable delays. delays was rendered the fact that per edge of the laws regulations ques the legality of t of the teachers. manifest an evic schools after evic employed to bring These measur able because F good feeling. Y dent, have, give view on more t all share it. The harmony of fee he had for relig The history of lesson. At the justclosed France the questions talis asserts that citizens had impos structive is the lative assemble essential condition order depends.

The first cry up from all parts lition was absp. Portalis, a man trusted with gion to the leg questions invic tion of social declared: "I will not suffer stay the uplit the heart."

The conscient fested itself in manner, especo vial questions talis asserts that citizens was pro come when the facts. There without educa education with gion." Then, works accomp Church among "Catholic pie tained our cha have we done vastation, wh ish our hosp Christian yir Charity, who lives to the fering and inf

M. Portalis tion, conclude deliberately d without effac own glory. E no religion be vailing condit countries, nor tical life of al the religion it is not a religion.

Pius VII. the Concord peace, France national tra