

# The Catholic Record.

"Christianus nihil nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname.)—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME XX.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 29, 1898.

NO. 1,006.

## THOSE PRELIMINARIES.

McAllister.—Just seventy years after the third general council, the next one was held at Chalcedon in 451. Freeman.—The doctor makes the same mistake here that we corrected last week. The third general council was not at Constantinople in 381, but at Ephesus in 431. That of 381 was the second general. Last week we thought the error was a slip of the pen, but now that it is repeated it is evidently something more.

The doctor quotes Canon 28 of Chalcedon, which conferred additional authority on the Bishop of Constantinople, giving him jurisdiction over Pontus, Proconsular Asia, and Thracia. It also conceded to him the first place after the Pope. This concession was intended to give that Bishop precedence over the other Bishops of the East.

The doctor set out to prove contradictions between general councils and to infer from these contradictions that said councils were not infallible. He cited Canon 28 of Chalcedon for this purpose we must remind him of what we have before explained, namely, that contradictions or changes or abrogations of ecclesiastical laws or church regulations come not under the prerogative of infallibility; and that consequently such changes are incompetent to disprove infallibility. Infallibility guards only dogmatic decrees, dogmatic definitions of revealed truth concerning faith and morals. Canon 28 is legislative, not dogmatic, and hence even if it should be changed, if the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constantinople should be restricted to its original limits, and Pontus and Thracia excluded from it by some future council, it would be no argument against infallibility. Infallibility concerns only dogmatic decrees and Canon 28 is not a dogmatic decree. If Dr. McAllister had kept this fact—to which we called his attention at an early stage of those preliminaries—in mind, he would have seen that all the canons he has thus far quoted avail him nothing to prove the kind of contradictions that would disprove infallibility.

McAllister.—The point in question is the primacy and universal and supreme ecclesiastical authority of the Pope of Rome.

Freeman.—This is one of the points in question. Another is the contradictions of general councils, which you undertook to show.

McAllister.—The Canons of the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon deny that (the primacy) just as clearly and positively as the Canon of the Council of Nice.

Freeman.—We have shown in a former article that the Canon of Nice does not deny the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, and that it does not treat of that subject. As to the Canon of Constantinople, so far from denying the primacy it distinctly recognizes it. Here is the Canon: "The Bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome." How you can read this canon and then say it denies the primacy of the Bishop of Rome is a psychological mystery. This "first rank after the Bishop of Rome" refers to the whole Church, or only to the Eastern division of it. If to the whole Church, then the Pope is recognized as holding first place in the whole Church, then the Eastern part of the Church, then the Pope is recognized as holding first place there, for the Bishop of Constantinople is said to hold the first place after the Bishop of Rome. Look at it in what light we may the Pope is recognized as holding first place. And yet you say this canon denies the primacy! What hallucination has got possession of you? The fact is, the purpose of the canon above quoted was to give precedence to the Bishop of Constantinople over the Bishops of the East. And yet, in placing him above them, it states that there is still one above him, for he is recognized only as first after the Bishop of Rome. As the Bishop of Constantinople was made first among the Eastern Bishops after the Bishop of Rome, it follows that the Bishop of Constantinople recognized the Bishop of Rome as holding the primacy among all the Eastern Bishops, without any exception whatever. However the Eastern Bishops may have disputed as to their relative positions among themselves, the Bishop of Rome was recognized as holding first place—that is the primacy; hence, when the council would give exceptional distinction to the Bishop of Constantinople it said, he was first, after the Bishop of Rome. This Dr. McAllister calls denying the primacy of the Pope.

In the same way the Council of Chalcedon in Canon 28 makes Constantinople second after Rome.

McAllister.—Let me specify the points of proof that this "infallible" Council in this "infallible" Canon denied the primacy of authority of the Bishop of Rome.

Freeman.—Your sneers in inverted commas at "infallible" Councils and their contradictions remind me of the sneers of Voltaire, Tom Paine, and other infidels at the infallible Bible and its contradictions. They are the same kind of sneers, and have no better foundation. When you speak of "this infallible canon," referring to

Canon 28, you evince a culpable ignorance of the distinction between a dogmatic and a legislative decree. You should know by this time that infallibility is not concerned with legislative decrees. You can now go on with your specifications.

McAllister.—First—As to the two cities where the two ecclesiastical officials resided. It is argued that Constantinople, at this time the capital of the empire, was a new Rome, possessed of the same political prerogatives that old Rome had formerly enjoyed. This equality of municipal or political prerogatives is given as a reasonable basis for ecclesiastical equality.

Freeman.—Whatever may be the reasoning of this Canon—and neither Councils nor Popes are infallible in arguing—the fact remains that this Canon declares that Constantinople should hold the second place after Rome. This is a recognition of the Roman primacy, and not a denial of it, as you seem to imagine.

In their letter to Pope Leo, giving an account of the proceedings and asking him to confirm their work, the fathers of the same council that passed Canon 28, distinctly recognize the Pope's primacy. They say that the Bishops at Chalcedon had taken the Pope as their guide, in order to show to the sons of the Church the inheritance of the truth. As the head over the members, so had Leo by his representatives had the predominance (hegemony) among them. They then speak of the "wild beast Discursus" and his crimes, particularly of his having in his madness attacked even him who was by the Saviour appointed keeper of the Divine vineyard (the Pope).

In this same letter to Pope Leo the Fathers of Chalcedon refer to Canon 28 and say: "We have confirmed the long existing custom by which the Bishop of Constantinople ordains the metropolitans of the diocese of Asia, Pontus and Thracia, not so much in order to give prerogative to the See of Constantinople, but rather to secure the peace of the metropolitan cities, because in these, at the decease of a bishop, factions often broke out, as your holiness yourself knows, and particularly of Ephesus, which caused us so much trouble. We have also confirmed the synod of the one hundred and fifty fathers by which the second rank is assigned to the See of Constantinople, immediately after thy holy and apostolic See. We have done it with confidence, because you have so often allowed the apostolic ray which shines by you to appear to the Church of Constantinople, and because you are accustomed ungrudgingly to enrich those who belong to you, by allowing them participation in your own possessions. Be pleased therefore to embrace this decree as though it were thine own, most holy and most blessed Father. Thy legates have strongly opposed it, probably they thought that this good regulation, like the declaration of faith, should proceed from thyself. But we were of the opinion that it belonged to the Ecumenical Synod to confirm its prerogatives to the Imperial City in accordance with the will of the Emperor, assuming that, when thou hadst heard it, thou wouldst regard it as thine own act. We pray thee, honor our decree by thine assent; and as we have assented to thy good (doctrinal) decree, so may thy lotiness accomplish that which is meet toward the sons. This will also please the Emperors, who have sanctioned thy judgment in the faith as law; and the See of Constantinople may well receive a reward for the zeal with which it united itself with thee in the matter of religion. In order to show that we have done nothing from favor or dislike towards anyone, we have brought the whole contents of what we have done to thy knowledge, and have communicated it to thee for confirmation and assent."

Such is the letter of the Council of Chalcedon to Pope Leo, as we find it in Hefele's History of Church Councils, vol. 3, page 430. It recognizes the Pope's primacy in every line; it is a letter of those who recognize the supremacy of the Pontiff to whom they write.

Anatolius, the then Bishop of Constantinople, also wrote to Pope Leo asking approval and confirmation of the Council. Speaking of Canon 28 he said: "This had been done in the confidence that His Holiness regarded the honor of the See of Constantinople as his own, since the apostolic throne had from early times cared for the throne of Constantinople, and had ungrudgingly imparted to it of its own. As there is no doubt that His Holiness and his Church possessed still higher precedence, the Synod willingly confirmed the Canon of the one hundred and fifty fathers, that the Bishop of Constantinople should have the next rank after the Roman Bishop. The Synod had transmitted the decree to him (the Pope) for his approval and confirmation, and he adjured him (the Pope) to give this, for the apostolic throne was the father of that of Constantinople. (Mansi Tom. 6, page 171.)"

In another letter on the same subject Anatolius said that the confirmation of Canon twenty eight depended upon the Pope—*cum et sic gestorum vis omnis et confirmatio auctoritatis vestrae beatitudinis fuerit reservata.*

The Emperor Marcian also wrote to

Leo urging him to announce his confirmation of the Synod of Chalcedon in a letter for publication in the churches, so that no one should longer doubt of his agreement, and thereby be able to excuse his own perversity. He should therefore as soon as possible send a decree of confirmation of the Synod of Chalcedon, so that no one might have any further doubt as to the judgment of His Holiness. (Mansi Tom. 6, page 213.)

Shortly after the Council, Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople, expelled the Archdeacon Actius and appointed Andrew in his place. Pope Leo wrote ordering the restoration of Actius and the exclusion of Andrew. Anatolius wrote assuring the Pope how greatly he was pained by the interruption of correspondence, and how far he was from setting himself against any order contained in Leo's letter. He had therefore restored Archdeacon Actius and excluded Andrew from the church. (Mansi Tom. 6, page 277.)

This incident affords a practical illustration of how Canon 28 was understood at the time it was passed and after, and that it did not deny the Pope's primacy of authority. The fathers of the Council, the Emperor Marcian, and the then Bishop of Constantinople were certainly more competent interpreters of Canon 28 than is Dr. McAllister, 1446 years after the Council. Would Anatolius have submitted to the dictation of Pope Leo if he believed the Council gave him equal authority with the Pope? Would the Emperor have besought the Pope to issue a decree confirming the Council, that might be read in the churches of the East, if he thought the Bishop of his own city of Constantinople had equal authority? What was it that made them all appeal for a decree of confirmation to this far-off Western Bishop in Italy? It was the belief, of the age, of the people east and west, north and south, that the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, was the head of the whole Catholic Church, and that his authority was supreme over all.

### FOLLOWED RECTOR ADAMS.

Another Noted Convert Among High Church Episcopalians.

It has recently come to light that Miss Marion Lane Gurney, who founded the Church Settlement Home, connected with the Church of the Redeemer, in New York, had renounced the Episcopal and had accepted the Catholic faith. Within recent years there have been other defections from the Church of the Redeemer that have attracted public attention, notably, when the former rector, Henry Austin Adams, and the Church's most affluent parishioner, Mrs. William Arnold, became converts to the Catholic faith.

It was largely through the influence of Mrs. Arnold and another Catholic woman that Miss Gurney, who is about thirty years old, turned her attention to the faith of the Church of Rome. Her conversion was brought about in some measure, too, by Rev. Henry Van Rensselaer, S. J., of St. Francis Xavier's church.

Miss Gurney was educated in Wellesley college. She belongs to the HISTORIC OLD BOSTON FAMILY OF GURNEYS.

Quaker blood flows in her veins. After her graduation Miss Gurney elected to devote herself to church and charitable work. She went to Philadelphia, where she joined the aristocratic St. Clement's Protestant Episcopal church and worked with the All Saints Sisters. After a short experience at St. Clement's Miss Gurney went to Morristown, N. J., and assisted the Sisters of St. John the Baptist.

A chance to work in New York presented itself to Miss Gurney nearly five years ago. She founded the Church Settlement House of the Church of the Redeemer. Rev. Mr. Adams was rector of the church. Mr. William Arnold, widow of a son of the late Richard Arnold, was the most liberal supporter of the parish. She received from her husband's estate about \$2,000. Mrs. Arnold rendered financial assistance in starting the Church Settlement House. Miss Gurney worked three years in building up the Settlement House and did not accept any money for her services. At the foundation of the institution there was only a handful of pupils. The number steadily increased until there were seven hundred children receiving instruction.

But a change of affairs took place in 1893, when the rector of the Church of the Redeemer, Rev. Mr. Adams, resigned in favor of his assistant, Rev. William Everett Johnson. Several months later he announced his intention of accepting the Catholic faith. He publicly gave his reasons for leaving the Protestant Episcopal Church, declaring the clergy were not respected as they should be, that wealthy parishioners made rectors mere puppets and that there was considerable immorality among the laity.

MRS. ARNOLD had been a most liberal contributor to the church during Mr. Adams' rectorship. At one time it was stated that she intended to pay off the church indebtedness and build a parish house. The renunciation of the Episcopal faith

by Mr. Adams followed soon after this statement was made.

Mrs. Arnold left the Episcopal church and was received into the Catholic Church on March 14, 1894. It was said that the withdrawal of Mr. Adams from the Protestant Episcopal church led the wealthy parishioner to inquire into the Catholic belief. When the millionaire's widow abandoned the Episcopal creed the Church of the Redeemer lost its most liberal supporter. The Church Settlement House, at No. 329 East Eighty-four street, felt the loss materially. Mrs. Arnold fulfilled her promise to pay the rent for the full year of 1894, after which there were no claims against her.

The struggle of the Church Settlement House for existence was severe. Contributions for the maintenance of the house were few. One by one the resident women workers left, but Miss Gurney continued. Although Mrs. Arnold was out of the Episcopal Church, Miss Gurney kept in communication with her. Mrs. Arnold began to invite Miss Gurney to go with her to the Catholic churches. The head of the Settlement House accepted these invitations and became deeply interested in the faith of the Church of Rome. She frequently went to St. Francis Xavier's church, where she met Father Van Rensselaer, who had been reared an Episcopalian.

FATHER VAN RENSSELAER and Mrs. Arnold were naturally the persons to whom the young woman went in her hours of religious doubt. Finally Miss Gurney decided several months ago to leave the Episcopal Church and embrace the Catholic religion. She resigned as the head of the Church Settlement House. On Nov. 1 she was baptized in the new faith at St. Francis Xavier's church. She was confirmed at St. Patrick's cathedral about a week later by Archbishop Corrigan.

Father Van Rensselaer and Mrs. Arnold were her sponsors. Upon entering the Catholic Church Miss Gurney changed her name from Marion Lane Gurney to Marion Frances Gurney. After partaking of her first Communion Miss Gurney went into retreat at Poughkeepsie, where she is at the present time. It is said she will either join the Franciscan sisterhood or the Sisters of the Holy Souls in Purgatory.

### THE JESUITS AND THE EDUCATED CLASSES AMONG THE HINDUS.

The American Ecclesiastical Review states that a correspondent from India writes to it an account of the work done by the Jesuit Fathers in behalf of the educated classes among the Hindus. The Rev. F. Bartoli, S. J., professor at the college of St. Aloysius in Mangalore, recently gave a series of lectures on the evidences of natural religion. The syllabus before us is quite elaborate, and contains among other special topics the following: "The Primitive Religion—Origin of the Universe—The Nature of Man—Man's Final Destiny—Divine Providence. The philosophical manner in which these subjects are treated gives evidence of the high intellectual capacity of the people to whom they are addressed.

To the ordinary inquirer it may appear singular that the almost uninterrupted missionary labors of about three hundred years should not have produced any better results than are shown by the religious census of the country. Of 277,299,736 inhabitants only 1,925,992 are Catholics; that is to say a proportion of one to one hundred and forty five. This compares rather unfavorably with the wonderful strides made by the Church in the early days of Christian Europe and America. But there is a reason for this difference, which may be found in the local conditions of India. Here the vagaries of Mahometanism have enthralled the imaginative minds of the people; untrammeled speculative philosophy, pantheism, such doctrines as the transmigration of souls have completely charmed and, in a manner, benumbed the Hindu mind, so that it is difficult to gain access for the light of the Gospel.

Father Bartoli has met this difficulty in a practical way. After having studied the favorite theories of the Hindus he has invited the better educated amongst them to hear the other side. This has given him an opportunity of setting before them the contradictions and fallacies of their pagan philosophy, and of placing before them in the proper light the teachings of right reason under the guidance of revelation. These lectures cannot fail to advance the gradual awakening to religious enthusiasm in India, and to give it a right direction. It is hoped that the example of the learned Jesuit may find able followers, whose intelligent efforts may happily recall the times when the persuasive eloquence of St. Francis Xavier, of the Blessed Aquaviva and of the saintly Robert De Nobili led numerous souls into the fold of the True Shepherd.

At present there are 2,395 priests, of whom 1,599 are natives, administering to the spiritual needs of Catholics in India and Ceylon. One third of this number, however, are working in the Archdiocese of Goa, where there is

one priest to about 400 Catholics. The ecclesiastical seminaries number 32, with 926 students. The religious communities, especially of women, are rapidly growing, and with them the number of schools. The outlook is especially cheering in Ceylon, where the proportion of Catholics to the general population is one to seventeen (in India it is one to one hundred and forty five.) The Catholic schools in Ceylon are attended by twenty-eight thousand children. In the Archdiocese of Colombo the proportion of Catholics is still greater, that is, one to six, with a corresponding strength in Catholic activity.

### TWO NOTABLE ADMISSIONS.

William V. Kelley contributes to the January Harper's a critique of Doctor Buckley's recently published work upon American Methodism; and in his paper the Catholic reader will find two notable admissions. The first of these is the statement that the years immediately following the introduction of the Reformation into England saw that country at its lowest religious level. Our Protestant friends uniformly claim that England was at its worst before the Reformation, and assert that Protestantism came into being chiefly to elevate the national condition and character. Yet here is this writer speaking of England in later ages than those of Henry VIII., and characterizing that land then as one "whose condition, as is now conceded by numerous Anglican scholars, was the darkest known in the religious history of Christian Britain." Mr. Kelley's other statement is commended to the consideration of those Methodists who are given to impugning the loyalty of their Catholic fellow citizens or of indulging in Burchardesque alliterations; for, as will be seen, it declares that the first professors and practicers of secession were none other than the American disciples of John Wesley. Alluding to the division of the American Methodists into northern and southern churches this critic says: "It is apparent that this separation was an event of national importance and consequence, for General B. F. Butler read history correctly when he said that secession began in the division of the Methodist church in 1844, when the Southern Methodists withdrew to set up a separate body on account of trouble over slavery." The Episcopalian were not over loyal during the revolutionary period, and the attitude of the Presbyterians at that time was not above criticism. Now the Methodists are charged with having been the first secessionists, and, if this sort of thing continues, it will surprise nobody if it be shown that the only Americans who, at all times and in all places, have shown themselves loyal to this glorious country of ours are its Catholic citizens.—Sacred Heart Review.

### IS IT A MIRACLE?

Remarkable Cure of a Sister in Cleveland—The Doctor's Testimony.

Very frequently of late has the press of this country been called upon to publish reports of seemingly miraculous cures. In the total of five or six that have been noticed during the past six months there is none which presents more convincing evidence of supernatural intervention than that of a religious in one of Cleveland's charitable institutions. Last October, says the Catholic University of that city, the subject of the miraculous intervention was injured in a collision between a vehicle in which she was riding and a Woodland avenue motor. Her right arm was badly sprained and the ligaments torn and she suffered intense and constant pain in the member for nearly two months. In spite of the careful attention of several physicians, including some of the most eminent members of the medical profession in the city, she received no relief. A few days before Christmas the attending physician announced that it would be several months before the Sister could hope to regain the use of the arm.

She had recourse to prayer. A novena in honor of a saintly missionary who died a few years ago, a martyr to zeal in the wilds of Africa, was begun on December 15, in the hope that through his intercession the injured member might be restored. On December 21 the pain was so excruciating that the patient asked permission of her superior to have her arm opened and a portion of the bone removed in the belief that the operation would give relief. The request was not granted and the Sister was sent to the chapel to pray. While engaged in pouring out her heart in earnest petitions to the Almighty the Sister experienced a sudden cessation of pain, the first in months, and the same day she regained perfect use of the member. The swelling and inflammation disappeared and in a few hours there was not a vestige of the injury left. Nor has there been the slightest indication of a return of the trouble since.

Dr. William Clark, one of the attending physicians in the case, makes the following statement: "I have been requested to make a statement concerning the sudden case of Sister—, whom I attended from

October 30 to December 22, 1897, for a very bad sprain of her wrist, by being injured by a motor car of the Woodland avenue line. The sprain was a very bad one, the ligaments of the wrist being badly torn; there was much swelling and great pain from the time of the accident up to the time she suddenly got well.

"Some weeks after the accident we had a consultation with Dr. C. B. Parker, and he united with me in the opinion that it would be at least from two to three months before she would be able to use her hand.

"Some days after that she came to my office, being able to use her hand just as well as before the accident; the swelling had disappeared and the pain also; the hand looked certainly as well as the other.

"She made the statement: that the cure was the result of a novena made to some person whom she supposed was a saint in Heaven, judging from his holy life and the circumstances of his death.

"I am not a believer in modern miracles to any extent, and I would ascribe this cure to some natural law or combination of circumstances, did I know of any. But I do not. I can give no reason why this wrist should get well so suddenly or so much short of the time I expected, and I will state that it is contrary to the laws of medicine that it should happen so.

"Whether this is the result of a direct intervention of God I leave others to say."

### CONTROVERSY NOT FRUITFUL.

We are too apt to drop into controversy and measure up argument by quoting passages of Scripture, when all the world is awry in religious matters because of these same methods. Let the world be once convinced that there is a sure and certain teacher who speaks with divine authority, and oh! how easy all these perplexing problems and distressing difficulties are solved. What sayeth the Voice? how teacheth the Church?—and every difficulty vanishes.

No longer are we a rift on the sea of rationalism, buffeted here and there by every wind of doctrine, without a light house to guide us by the rocks of error and into the haven of truth. And when once the convert grasps this principle, he is safely anchored. There is no drifting back into the wide sea again.

Non Catholics, too, want to be convinced of it, for with it alone comes peace, security, and certainty.—The Missionary.

### ARCHBISHOP RYAN'S ADDRESS.

At the New Year's reception tendered to Archbishop Ryan by the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, and the Catholic Young Men's Union, of Philadelphia, the Archbishop expressed his delight at meeting the representatives of the two organizations. "Of the Temperance Union, I am happy to say, I am a member," he said. "We read in the epistle of the first Mass of Christmas and New Year's day that St. Paul exhorts the people to live soberly, justly and piously. You see soberly comes first. You must be sober as temperance men, sober also in judgment, and you are men pledged in particular to this sobriety. You were not obliged to abstain, but of your own free will you have given up drink entirely and for the sake of our Divine Lord, and that is the spirit which will perpetuate every organization in which it is introduced; that is the supernatural motive. Thus you begin the new year sober in judgment, not misjudging those that have not joined you. Leave the judgment to Almighty God and to their own consciences. It is a delightful thing to me to meet you. I have taken interest in you ever since seeing the number approaching Communion regularly, and because you are abstainers from what is the greatest occasion of sin. Remove the cause and you remove the effect. The sacrifice you have made is pleasing in the sight of God, and you are doing good to those you induce to take and keep the pledge—not only good to them, but to their wives and families." He exhorted the members to renewed activity, saying that he who does not burn can not set on fire. "A love for the work born of what you have seen of the drinking habit is necessary to arouse enthusiasm. Be a missionary, a propagandist in this cause."—Sacred Heart Review.

### "Priestriden."

A low estimate of the Catholic population of the United States shows that there are a thousand Catholic laymen for every priest; and, according to the highest estimate of the sects, there are hardly three hundred Protestant laymen for each preacher. Perhaps it is for this reason that the expression "priestriden Catholics" has gone out of favor in recent times. The Baptists estimate that there are at present six thousand churchless pastors of their denomination in this country. This condition hardly conforms to our Lord's description of His Church, where the harvest is great, but the laborers are few.—Ave Maria.