

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 44 and 46 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. REV. GEORGE H. NORTGRAVES, Author of "Histories of Modern Italy."

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY. Agents for Alexandria, Glenora and Luskville—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto, and recommended by the Bishops of St. Boniface, Ottawa, Kingston, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

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

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., June 21st, 1890.

PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS.

The Rev. Dr. Langtry has taken occasion from a statement made by the Hon. C. F. Fraser during the debate on the Separate Schools, to introduce into the Anglican Synod a resolution affirming the necessity of extending to all Protestant denominations the rights enjoyed by Catholics to establish Separate Schools, in order that each Protestant denomination may be in a position similar to Catholics in this respect, and may have the same assistance from Government as is extended to the Catholic Separate Schools.

Dr. Langtry's resolution asserts that the Hon. C. F. Fraser and Hon. O. Mowat are mistaken in supposing that Protestant denominations have this right already, and that they can establish denominational schools where they see fit. It is a question of law, and though Rev. Mr. Langtry may esteem himself to be a very competent judge of the position which the Pope occupied in the Church sixteen hundred years ago, we submit that it is scarcely modest for him to assert that in the ability of interpretation of the laws of the Province of Ontario in the nineteenth century, the Commissioner of Crown Lands and the Premier of the Province are entirely mistaken, and Rev. Dr. Langtry is alone correct.

The Hon. Mr. Fraser, in his calm and dignified defence of the Catholics of this Province, answered the question of the Equal Righters: "Why should the Roman Catholics have any rights which we have not?" He said "he did not read the law as saying that Protestants cannot establish Separate Schools. He read quite the contrary. As a matter of fact there are nine Protestant Separate Schools in this Province, and as he read the law they could be established in every city, town and village to-morrow, and established by far more easy methods as to control, as to the giving of notice, and as to all that concerns the machinery of the schools than can Roman Catholic Separate Schools."

He quoted from the Protestant Separate School Act. "Upon the application in writing of five or more heads of families resident in any township, city, town, or incorporated village, being Protestants, the Municipal Council of the said Township, or the Board of school trustees of any such city, town, or incorporated village shall authorize the establishment therein of one or more Separate Schools for Protestants . . . and in every such case such Council or Board, as the case may be, shall prescribe the limits of the section or sections of such schools." It is added: "In any city or town the persons who make application, according to the provisions of section 2 of this Act may have a Separate School in each ward or in two or more wards united, as the said persons may judge expedient."

There is one restriction in the Protestant Separate Schools Act, the meaning of which Rev. Dr. Langtry seems to have entirely mistaken. The Anglican Synod will scarcely so stultify itself as to pass Mr. Langtry's resolution with so glaring a blunder, as to fact, as the resolution contains. Dr. Langtry's resolution declares that the evident aim of both speakers, namely, the Commissioner of Public Works and the Premier, "was to convince their audience and the country that any denomination of Christians might establish schools of their own and secure the school taxes for their support," but this, he adds, "is an altogether misleading inference, and no such right exists except in school sections where the teachers of Public Schools are Roman Catholics, and that even then there is no right to establish either Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Church of England schools, but only the non-denominational or secular schools of the land."

There is a clause in the Act, which limits the establishment of Protestant Separate Schools in rural sections, to sections wherein the Public School teachers are Roman Catholics. The clause is as follows: "No Protestant Separate School shall be allowed in any school section, except when the teacher of the Public School in such section is a

Roman Catholic." But it is perfectly well known that the term "school section" refers to rural school sections, and it is only to rural sections that this clause applies. Mr. Fraser pointed this out in his speech. He remarked that "this is the only restriction contained throughout the Act as to the general power. . . but the restriction applies only to the case of rural school sections, not to the case of cities, towns and villages, and there might have been a very good reason in the minds of those framing this law why there should not be a second Protestant school in a rural school section where already there was one taught by a Protestant teacher."

Mr. Fraser showed clearly that in the cities and towns and villages the law fully provides for the establishment of Separate Schools for Protestants wherever the Protestants desire to establish them. But if there is a restriction to their establishment in rural sections, the restriction was made in order to meet the wishes of Protestants themselves, who have no wish to facilitate the erection of Protestant Separate schools in thinly peopled localities, where the teacher is already a Protestant; but in all this there is certainly no argument against the reasonableness of affording every facility to Catholics to establish Catholic schools wherever they feel themselves able and willing to support them. And when this is the case it is but just and equitable that the Catholic schools should be fairly treated, and that no obstacle be thrown in the way of their efficiency and practical operation.

Certainly, Catholics will throw no obstacles in the way of Protestants establishing religious schools if they desire to do so, provided always that in mixed schools there be no tampering with the faith of Catholic children by the introduction of Protestant teaching. It is one of the chief defects of the Public School system that there is no provision for giving a religious training, and if the Protestant denominations really desire to establish denominational schools, they should have full liberty to do so. Yet it does not appear that they do seriously desire it, for if they did they would scarcely be so strenuously opposed to Catholic Separate Schools. Even most of those who are willing to grant Catholics the liberty of enjoying their Separate Schools in peace appear to be of the opinion that it would be better that there were no Separate Schools at all. Whether Rev. Mr. Langtry's resolution be adopted or dropped by the synod, we are of opinion that most of the opposition towards carrying it into effect will come from his own co-religionists, who are not convinced that religious teaching should be imparted in the schools. It is to be remarked, however, that notwithstanding the opposition which the Protestant clergy generally have always shown in Ontario towards Catholic Separate Schools, the sentiment is certainly growing amongst them that there should be more religious teaching in the schools. Dr. Langtry's motion is an evidence of this, and the recent deliberance of the Presbyterian General Assembly of the United States is another evidence of the fact that they would not oppose religious teaching in the schools if they could only force Protestant teaching on Catholic children.

Thus this Committee of the General Assembly, dealing with the question of education, strongly denounces the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin which protects Catholic children in that State from being forced to use the Protestant bible as a text-book. On the question of religious education, however, the Assembly clearly enunciates the Catholic doctrine that hand in hand with intellectual training a moral training should be imparted. The Assembly Committee adds that otherwise "the schools may prove a curse rather than a blessing; but this moral training must be based on religion, otherwise its sanction will not be strong enough to grasp the conscience of the people, or its utterances obligatory enough to shape their character."

From this they draw the inference that the bible should "be restored to its true place in our system of education." Catholics maintain that the mere introduction of the bible as a text-book, sometimes accompanied with Protestant commentaries, sometimes even with infidel instruction, is not the kind of religious training which is needed. But in any case King James' version of the bible cannot be tolerated as the text-book from which Catholic children are to receive their religious instruction; still less can Catholics either in the United States or Canada accept the version of the American Bible Society which mutilates even King James' mutilated version.

Dr. Langtry portrays in strong language the evils which necessarily follow from the absence of religious teaching in the schools. His resolution says: "This synod cannot but regard with growing apprehension the practical exclusion of the teaching of that truth from the Public Schools of this country; they are persuaded that the daily record of breaches of trust, fraud, perjury, forgery and other crimes, which godless education would increase with which the columns of

our newspapers are filled, to say nothing of the agnosticism and growing unbelief which are spreading through the land, bear alarming testimony to the dire consequences which mere secular education is producing."

Surely with such testimonies as these to the importance of religious teaching in the schools, the Protestant clergy of Ontario would be more profitably employed in endeavoring to secure religious teaching for children of their own creed than in attempting to deprive Catholics of the freedom they at present enjoy to educate their children as good Christians and good citizens.

We fear that there is some cause for suspecting that Dr. Langtry's resolution is intended more for the purpose of finding some fault with Mr. Mowat's government than for the serious purpose of establishing religious teaching in the schools on a firm basis. We must say, however, that we believe Mr. Fraser's statement to be unassailable, that the law gives the Protestants of Ontario all the facilities they desire to establish Separate Protestant schools. If they do not make use of them, they should at least abstain from efforts to cripple the operations of the Catholic schools.

While the discussion on Rev. Dr. Langtry's motion was proceeding in the synod, the Rev. Dr. took occasion to say that the encroachments of the Church of Rome should be resisted. Such an insulting, narrow-minded statement ought not to have been permitted in a respectable body without being reproved by the other members. It is a reproduction of all the falsehoods which have been uttered by bigots during the last twelve months, but it seems to have been quite palatable to the members of the synod. Wherein do these encroachments consist? We are not aware that the most extreme fanatics have accused the Catholics of any encroachments upon Protestant rights, in Ontario, except in maintaining their right to freedom of education. Yet this is the very thing which Mr. Langtry is demanding now for the Church of England. It would seem, therefore, to be Mr. Langtry's opinion that the Church of England has a right to make encroachments, but that Catholics must submit passively to every tyranny. Rev. Dr. Langtry should have lived two centuries ago.

The final action of the synod on the motion was to lay it over until their next meeting, when it will be considered as unfinished business.

HUMAN reason may safely range around natural truths, but attempting to go beyond them, it must necessarily fall into the quagmire of error. Without desiring to demonstrate the verity of this proposition, we would simply request you to cast a retrospective glance over the past, and see those geniuses who have wandered far into the mire of error, because, declining to accept the aid of revelation, they strove, armed with reason alone, to wrench from the grasp of God those truths that He wishes not to be understood by men. Human reason may be compared to a man standing on a mountain before a city which the darkness prevents him from seeing. He has suspicions that myriads of his fellow-creatures peep the vale that lies before him, and their busy hum coming faintly to his ears, makes him long to be in their midst. Yet he cannot. Precipices are on every side, and were he to take a step, he would surely be dashed to pieces. When, however, the sun lights up the mountain in many-varied hues, the scene is changed. The city, bathed in splendor, stretches out before him. The sunlight, flashing on towers and gilded palaces—dancing on hill and vale—forms a picture which entrances his wondering gaze. Safely, by yawning gulfs, under overhanging cliffs, he may now choose his path, and reach the city.

In like manner man, accompanied by reason, stands before the city of God's mysteries. Vague and faint murmurs of their heavenly music, as with order and measure, they revolve around the throne of God, resound in his ears, but, restrained by his impotence, he cannot pierce the gloom that overshadows and shuts from his sight those secrets of the Almighty. Faith, taking pity on him, lends him her heavenly aid, and the mists are cleared away and a vast horizon of revealed truth bursts upon him. By the sunlight of God's all truthful word, darting on the vast region of revealed religion, he may see mysteries of whose existence he had never dreamed, and which, standing in serried and majestic phalaxes before the throne of God, will forever bid defiance to the investigations of reason. Let us be convinced of the weakness of the human intellect with regard to mysteries, and, humbly prostrating ourselves, let our lips murmur that word that has been the salvation of nations, that has brought many a soul, weary with the buffeting of error, into the haven of peace—"Credo," "I believe." I believe, but not blindly. Reason, though it fails must lean on its heavenly sister, Faith, resigns not its glorious prerogative of investigating a doctrine, of seeing whether, without any prejudice to our reason, we may embrace such or such a truth. It cannot indeed

inspect the essential parts of a mystery, but, gleaming from revelation that such a doctrine has been revealed, it can show the reasonableness of our believing it.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

In reply to our comments on his former letter, our esteemed correspondent, Anglican, has written a second communication as follows:

To the Editor of the Catholic Record:

Sir—I have read very carefully your two articles dealing with my letter on the above subject, but I think my main difficulty remains yet without being cleared away. The creed of Pius IV. declares "a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood" and to take place, and since the notion of the substance being a thing apart from all the qualities is given everywhere, and the word "substance" is now taken to mean all the qualities of any thing when added together; so that, as the weight and color and taste and wine are admittedly unchanged, it follows that the bread and wine are unchanged too.

The real question involved is as to the annihilation of the bread and wine. But this is no longer held by Roman Catholic theologians, though they are not at liberty to alter their terminology. The notion of transubstantiation depends entirely upon the "realist" view of substance, that it is something apart from all the qualities which are discoverable in physical bodies of any kind, as a g. the iron in a red hot bar is something apart from and over above the heat and redness we observe. But the universally received doctrine in philosophy now is that "substance" is nothing more than a collective name for all the qualities or "accidents" of bodies, and the Romans now grant that all the accidents of bread and wine continue after consecration and are not mere delusive phantasmas; they thereby admit that the substance of bread and wine remain though they are barred from stating this formally.

There is another minor point to which I would like to refer. Supposing the outward species of the consecrated elements to be corrupted, should the Flesh and Blood cease to be present and the former substances be again restored? Before closing this letter allow me to state clearly my belief concerning the Real Presence, so that you may not confuse it with the Lutheran views. The ancient teaching of the Church is that the bread and wine in the Holy Eucharist continue physically what they were before, but become spiritually what they were not before, the Real Body and Blood of Christ verily present. The notion of that Presence is and must ever be on earth a mystery, but it is not a presence which contradicts our senses or our reason. Faith has always grounds to go upon, and faith in the presence of our Lord at the altar is not unreasonable though it is above reason.

Our Lord is a spiritual yet most real presence within us. Neither can we see, taste, smell or feel our souls; we can do this only with our bodies. Yet a body which has no soul is not a man but a corpse. The real unseen presence of the soul makes all the difference between life and death, between a man and a corpse, and so the unseen Presence of our Lord Jesus makes all the difference between certain things being only common bread and wine and being His Body and Blood.

Such is the doctrine of the whole Anglican Church (in common with the whole Catholic Church for nine centuries) as set forth in her authoritative standard of doctrine, The Prayer Book. He is present in the sacrament, as the article says, "only after a heavenly and spiritual manner," and for the same reason "we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood," and God "vouchsafes to feed us with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

The 28th article declares: "The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." Hence your remark that my doctrine is "only the doctrine of the Tractarians or High Churchmen" is erroneous, since our authorized standard of doctrine plainly teaches the true Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, whether certain parties or individuals accept it or not.

The "Black Rubric" which you quote is a protest against any gross or carnal presence, and in no way affords the doctrine as stated above.

Your quotations from the Fathers will be found to be in perfect harmony with the Anglican doctrine as stated above. Thanking you, Mr. Editor, for the kind attention bestowed on my former letter, and hoping you will find room at an early date for insertion of this letter, I am Yours, etc,

ANGELICAN. Toronto, June 7th, 1890. We must in the first place call attention to the fact that what our correspondent now calls his main difficulty, the philosophical theory which he opposes to the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, does not appear in his former letter as a main difficulty at all. It is not surprising, therefore, that we should have made but slight reference to it. It is true, he asserted that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is founded upon a system of philosophy which is "probably false." But as we showed that the doctrine was held constantly in the Church, that it is derived directly from the words of Holy Scripture, which indicate, not the presence of bread after consecration, but the presence of Christ's body only, and that it was received by the ancient Fathers and teachers of the Church, we conceive that we answered fully the difficulty as he proposed it. We remarked that the system of philosophy maintained by St. Thomas is not the basis of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but the superstructure. It is, therefore, absurd to

say that even if that philosophy were proved to be erroneous, the doctrine of Transubstantiation should fall with it.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation existed before St. Thomas applied to it the terms of the Realistic philosophy, but the Realistic system was remarkably well adapted to its philosophical explanation. According to this philosophy, extension and the other qualities of bodies which fall under the cognizance of the senses are something distinct from matter itself, or material substance. Hence we can conceive of the miracle whereby the substance is changed, while the sensible attributes remain.

Can God cause substance to exist independently of the ordinary laws of space? St. Thomas maintained that He can; and notwithstanding our correspondent's declaration that the Realist's theory is probably false, we venture to say that it has never been demonstrated that substance consists simply of all the qualities or accidents of bodies, as our correspondent maintains. This is a theory, but nothing more, and inasmuch as it is undeniable that man does not know wherein the essence of substance consists, it would be extremely presumptuous to assert that Omnipotence cannot change the substance, while leaving the sensible qualities unchanged. The senses do not tell us what substance is. They tell us only that they are variously affected by the qualities of which they are cognizant.

As our correspondent admits that the words of Christ at His last supper, "this is My Body, this is My Blood," imply the real presence of His Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist, it was sufficient that we should show that they equally imply that the substances of bread and wine are no longer there. Anglican is careful to inform us that his view of the manner of Christ's presence must not be confounded with the Lutheran views, namely, those of Consubstantiation and Impanation. Of those Lutheran views we already explained the significance. Impanation signifies the real presence of Christ's body in, with, or under the bread, which is also supposed to remain in its proper substance. Consubstantiation supposes a hypothetical union of the substances of bread and the body of Christ. We showed from the nature of Christ's words that they imply only the presence of his body, as He does not say "My body is in, with, or under this bread." His words are "this is My Body," which certainly imply that the substance which was bread before is now His body.

Anglican certainly maintains that both substances are existent in the Sacrament. This is, it seems to us, substantially the same as Lutherans maintain; still we are willing to admit that in some details he may possibly explain the matter differently from the Lutherans. But what will be the gain of such an explanation? He will only succeed in showing that he has a new view of the subject which is not and never was the teaching of the Church, nor even the teaching of the Lutherans. His interpretation will therefore be open to the very objection which he erroneously brings against the Catholic doctrine, that it is neither found in the words of Christ nor in the teaching of the doctors of the Church in all ages. Now, as the constant teaching of the Church is the meaning of Christ's words as imparted to His Apostles, and by them imparted to the whole Church, it follows that Anglican's interpretation is quite alien from that of the Church at the period when he acknowledges that her doctrine was the doctrine taught by the Apostles. This period he fixes in his present letter to the first nine centuries. In his former letter he admitted twelve centuries. It does not show excessive confidence whereas he now reduces the period to nine.

But let us see whether the doctrine of the Church was what Anglican states it to be during those nine centuries. We already quoted several of the Fathers of the first part of this period, who assert plainly that the bread and wine are changed into Christ's body and blood, and even that the bread and wine remain only in appearance. Clearly in this expression the doctrine of the Catholic Church, our correspondent says only of these testimonies: "Your quotations from the Fathers will be found to be in perfect harmony with the Anglican doctrine as stated above." Such an answer to our quotations is very insufficient.

With due respect to our correspondent, we must say again that the Anglican doctrine is not that Christ is really present in the Eucharist. We do not deny that the doctrine was composed as a compromise doctrine which would not strike very hard against the opinions of Englishmen, whatever might be their belief on the subject; and for this reason all parties in the Church extract their own belief out of the Anglican standards, but it is well known that the great bulk of the Anglican body do not believe in the Real Presence, nor did any considerable number of them profess belief in it until the Tractarian movement grew strong in our own generation. The majority of the Anglicans, even now, do not believe in it, and for the most part the judicial decisions of the courts have

ing authority in the Church are against the doctrine.

The whole scope of the teaching of the Fathers of the Church is in favor of the change of one substance into another. Before St. Thomas applied the system of philosophy which he favored, their language may not have been at all times as clear as his language was, but there is no other doctrine in their view than that which the Church has always held, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or the change of substance. We will add a few instances of what they said upon this subject, but we will state first in regard to St. Thomas' philosophical doctrine that it is no part of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which existed before St. Thomas propounded his theory. Yet this theory has not been demonstrated to be erroneous, and certainly other fanciful philosophical theories, which may be right, or may be wrong, must not be taken as destroying the credibility of a divine revelation.

But it is a mistake to assert, as Anglican does, that modern philosophy, or, rather, modern philosophers, have succeeded in demonstrating the impossibility of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Speaking of extension as a quality, without which matter is inconceivable (to man), Sir Wm. Hamilton says (Metaphysics, vol. ii., 404), "It is not competent to argue that what cannot be comprehended as possible by us is impossible in reality;" and Lewes in his history of philosophy says:

"It has been said that the Creator Himself could not make a body without extension, for such a body is impossible. The phrase should be 'such a body is impossible for us to conceive.' But our indissoluble associations are no standards of reality. That we cannot conceive a body without extension is true; but that because we cannot conceive it, the contrary is false, is preposterous."

These are clear admissions, if we apply the principles to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, that it involves no contradiction to true philosophy, and that the philosophy of St. Thomas is merely supplemented, not overthrown, by these theorists.

We will add here a few patriotic testimonies to those already given, which show that Transubstantiation, and not Consubstantiation or Impanation, in any of their forms, was the doctrine of the primitive Church.

St. Gregory of Nyssa says: "We rightly believe that the bread is changed into the body of the Word of God, being sanctified by the word of God;" and "the nature of the things which are seen is changed." (Oratio Catechetica 37.)

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whom we quoted before, speaks in similar language, and St. Cyprian says this change is made, "not in appearance but in nature by the Omnipotence of the Word."

St. John of Damascus says (Book 4 on faith): "The bread and wine are changed supernaturally into the body and the blood of Christ, and they are not two but one."

Venerable Bede speaks frequently of this miraculous change. Among other things he says: "The form of bread is seen, but the substance of bread is not there; nor is any bread there but the bread which came down from heaven." The bread which came down from heaven is Christ Himself. (St. John vi., 41-51.)

Pope St. Gregory I. says: "The creator of our weakness, by that power wherewith He created all things from nothing, and by the unspeakable sanctification of the Holy Spirit, changed bread and wine, while retaining their own appearance, into His body and blood."

These passages suffice to show that the whole current of Catholic belief, within the period named by Anglican, was in favor of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

We may add here that Calvin in his controversies against Luther plainly states that the words of Christ in no way countenance the presence of bread and the body of Christ in the Eucharist at the same time, but that if the real presence is to be admitted at all, Transubstantiation must be accepted, and Consubstantiation rejected. When also the Lutherans sent the Augsburg Confession to the Greek Schismatical patriarch of Constantinople for approval, the latter denounced the doctrine therein taught, adding: "In the holy supper, after consecration and blessing, the bread is changed into the very body of Jesus Christ, and the wine into His blood by the power of the Holy Ghost."

This judgment shows that the tradition of the Greek Church was the same with the Catholic teaching, and, moreover, that this tradition must have dated back long before the period of the Greek schism, since it would not, otherwise, have been retained in the schismatical Church.

Rev. Father Henning of St. Patrick's Church preached his farewell sermon to his congregation Sunday morning. He leaves for New York this week in obedience to the orders of his superiors in the Order of the Most Holy Sacraments, to which he belongs. Father Henning was known as one of the most eloquent priests in Toronto and his departure is witnessed with regret. Rev. Father McInerney, also of New York and attached to the same religious society, will take his place as parish priest of St. Patrick's. Toronto World.