

The Catholic Record.

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

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 22, 1898.

NO. 1,005.

VOLUME XX.

THE ENCYCICAL. AN EPISCOPAL PASTORAL.

Toronto Globe, Jan. 17, 1898.

The Encyclical of the Pope on the Manitoba school question was read in all the Roman Catholic churches throughout the Province of Ontario yesterday. The translation used is practically the same as was published in the Globe of Monday last. The Encyclical was accompanied by a pastoral letter, which was also read, signed by the Archbishop of Toronto, the Bishop of Hamilton and the Bishop of London. Beyond the reading of the pastoral there was no comment made in any of the city churches on the Encyclical. The following is the pastoral read:

We have great pleasure in communicating to you officially an authorized English translation of the Encyclical letter which our Holy Father, Leo XIII., has recently addressed to the Canadian hierarchy. This memorable pronouncement, so long and anxiously expected, will mark an epoch in the religious history of Canada. Its luminous teachings on the various topics of which it treats are worthy of the great Pope who, in these perilous times, steers the bark of Peter: and, coming as they do from the Vicar of Christ, and with all the authority of his office, will serve as beacon lights to guide us on the path of duty amid the doubts and perplexities that too often beset it. This important Encyclical claims our serious attention and its claims are to be weighed and studied in its entirety. There is not a paragraph or a sentence in it that has not for us a definite meaning, and that does not deserve due consideration. Like the noblest works of a clock, no part of it can be neglected or ignored without detriment to the meaning and understanding of it as a whole. We, therefore, bespeak for it a careful study and consideration.

We need hardly assure our Holy Father, on behalf of ourselves and clergy and laity, that we give our undivided and hearty adherence to all its teachings and directions. Here we would willingly stop and allow the Holy Father to speak to us from the pages of his Encyclical, were it not our duty to advert to and condemn certain pernicious errors which, in connection with the discussions on the Manitoba school question, obtained a wide circulation, even amongst Catholics, and which aimed at, attacked and repudiated the divine rights and authority of Bishops and of the Church.

THE BISHOPS WERE ATTACKED.
Some of these errors denied the rights of the Church over the education of her children. Hence Canadian Bishops were fiercely attacked, abused and denounced for presuming to instruct their people on the rights and duties of Christian education. They were accused of undue interference with the political and civil rights of their flocks, and of depriving them of their just liberties. Education, it was contended, was the duty and function of the State. The children of the country, no matter of what religion, should be educated together in secular or non-religious knowledge, and the teaching of religion, banished from the school house, should be relegated to the home or the Sunday school. These poisonous errors are substantially the same as those set forth in the Syllabus subjoined to the Papal Encyclical "Quanta Cura," issued on the 8th of December, 1864. This Syllabus sets down the following propositions for rejection and condemnation:

"The whole government of the Public schools, in which the youth of any Christian State are brought up, can and ought to be assigned to the civil authority, and so assigned that no right be acknowledged on the part of any other authority whatsoever of interfering in the discipline of the schools, in the choice and approbation of the masters." (No. 45.)

"Catholics may approve that mode of education of youth which is distinguished from the Catholic faith and the power of the Church, and which concerns itself exclusively, or at least primarily, with the knowledge of material things and the ends of earthly social life." (No. 48.)

These dangerous and destructive errors, which banish God and His Christ from the school house and oust the Church from her divine rights over the education of her children, are substantially the same as those which, in connection with the discussion on the Manitoba school question, found expression on platform and in the press and formed the pith and substance of the charges of undue interference, of spiritual intimidation and intolerable tyranny launched as from catapults against the Canadian episcopate. Now, over against these grievous errors lies the teaching of the Church, which may be summarized as follows:

RIGHTS OF THE CHURCH.
The Catholic Church has the right to provide for, to direct and control the education of its children; and this right is derived from the Divine commission committed to her in the words of Christ, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. xxviii., 19-20.) Now this commission inculcates the duty of

teaching all the doctrines of faith and all the principles of morality. What ever regards the nature and attributes and moral government of God, as well as whatever concerns the conscience of man in his individual capacity as well as in his numerous social relations, all this is contained in the Divine commission. Now these subjects necessarily imply a direct or indirect connection with the various departments of human knowledge, and therefore the exercise of the Divine commission must embrace the direction and control of every system of education designed for the children of the Church, lest in any particular department of human knowledge they should be infected with errors or opinions at variance with their faith. So that the divine commission given to the Church implies a positive duty to teach all Divine truth, and the correlative duty or right to prevent the teaching and to oppose the propagation of every error opposed to God's revelation. This right of education belongs pre-eminently to the episcopal body, under the guidance of the Holy See, according to the words of the Apostles: "Take heed to yourselves and the whole flock wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you Bishops to rule the Church of God which His hand hath purchased with His own blood." (Acts xx., 28.) The Church, then, cannot abdicate her rights or abandon her duties in connection with the question of education, nor can she approve of any educational system that shuts her out from the school house and excludes her influence, her protection and guidance. She may, in certain circumstances, be compelled to tolerate systems not in harmony with her ideals, but she does so to avoid worse evils and under the stress of necessity. This is in brief the Catholic position on this important question of education.

ERRORS ON EDUCATION.
Errors cognate to those on education have been very much in vogue of late, and they are to the effect that Public men, whether politicians, journalists, professional men, etc., are not bound in their public or professional character by the law of God and of conscience, and are not therefore amenable to any control on moral grounds. So that it would be an invasion of their civil rights if, in the exercise of their sacred office, the pastors of souls should pronounce on the lawfulness of their acts in their moral aspects, or should venture to correct or censure them, if necessary, as in conflict with Christian duty and the rights of religion—that civil and religious liberty implies complete exemption from all moral obligation or control in the sphere of their public conduct and action.

These are dangerous errors and strike at the basis of public morality. They are in direct opposition to the teachings of the Catholic Church. Leo XIII. has declared in his Encyclical "Immortals Dei": "The true mistress of virtue and guardian of morals is the Church of Christ: to exclude her influence from the business of life, from legislation, from the teaching of youth, from domestic society, is a great and pernicious error. Real freedom, he affirms, is exercised in the pursuit of what is true and just; absolute freedom of thought and action, untrammelled by the laws of morality, is not liberty but license."

OBEDIENCE IS SOUGHT.
In heartily accepting the teachings and obeying the directions contained in this noble Encyclical, we are not only acting as becometh good and loyal Catholics, but we are trusting to the heavenly directed guidance that has never yet failed the children of the Church amidst the greatest doubts and perplexities and in the darkest times.

Cardinal Newman has made use of words that have a pertinent and instructive application here: "I have one resting point, just one: one plea which serves me in the stead of all direct argument whatever, which hardens me against censure, which encourages me against fear, to which I shall ever come round, when I hear the question of the practicable and expedient brought into discussion. After all Peter has spoken, student, no recluse, no abstracted student, no dreamer about the past, no projector of the dead and gone, no projector of the visionary, but who for eighteen hundred years has lived in the world; he has seen all adversities; he has shaped himself for all emergencies. If ever there was a power on earth who had an eye for the times, who has confined himself to the practicable, and has been happy in his anticipations; whose words have been deeds, and whose commands prophetic, such is he in the history of ages who sits on from generation to generation in the chair of the apostles as in the chair of Christ and the doctor of His Church."

What Augustus had in the material order, that, and much more, has Peter in the spiritual. Peter has spoken by the Spirit (by Leo now), and when was Peter ever unequal to the occasion? When has he not risen with the crisis? What dangers have ever daunted him? What sophistry misled him? When did ever any power go to war with Peter, material or moral, civilized or savage,

and got the better? When did the whole world ever band together against him solitary and not find him too many for them? These are not the words of rhetoric but of history. All who take part with Peter are on the winning side. The apostle says, not in order to unsay, for he has inherited that word which is with power. From the first he has looked through the wide world, of which he has the burden; and according to the need of the day, and the inspirations of his Lord, he has set himself now to one thing, now to another, but to all in reason, and to nothing in vain."

A MESSAGE OF PEACE.
This masterful encyclical has been justly described as "message of peace to Canada." It is an appeal to the sense of justice of our people to Manitoba the educational rights of which they have been despoiled; it is a call on all fair-minded citizens to right the wrong that has been thus inflicted, and in this way to restore the reign of peace and good will amongst us. If it is true that justice exalteth a nation, it must be equally true that injustice lowers and dishonors it. When, in the human body, a member is hurt or injured, the whole body feels the pain and the shock; and so it is in the body politic. When any member of it suffers injustice or wrong, the whole body must be pained and disturbed; irritation, discontent and heart burnings will exist where security, peace and good will should hold sway. As good citizens anxious for the peace and happiness of our country, eager to promote its welfare and greatness, and to see all its sons laboring together in peace and good-will to build up a prosperous and successful State, we earnestly hope and pray that this message of peace, this plea for justice and right, coming to Canada from the great head of Christendom, will find a generous and noble response in all hearts and will result in securing substantial justice to the aggrieved Catholics of Manitoba.

ACQUIESCENCE BEGINS REMARKS.
In this connection we unreservedly endorse the following words of the pastoral letter of Archbishop McGinley read on Sunday last in the mother church of Canada, and we may add that we are in entire accord with that whole pronouncement: "We wish it to be clearly understood that in this school question, as well as in all questions which concern religion and conscience, we and all our venerable colleagues, and we know their thoughts and feelings, are above all political parties, and do not wish to ally ourselves with any one of them; what we want is not the success of a political party, but the triumph of a holy cause. May we not hope that all who love their fellow men, all who love justice and liberty will help us to win it? Shall it be said that in this splendid Dominion of Canada the poor minority of a sister Province shall still remain deprived of rights of which the assured and tranquil enjoyment was guaranteed by every title and which have been snatched away by force? The minority is weak: is that a reason why its members must be left to suffer under oppression, or a reason for refusing to rally to their defence? No; every man engaged in politics has a serious responsibility in this matter, and we hope he will realize it. Let arguings be bygone; what we look for is the hour of full and complete atonement for the wrong that has been inflicted: that hour can be brought nearer by the generous and sympathetic and united efforts of all whose hearts beat warmly for a noble cause. Let our public men, therefore, assemble together and in their wisdom and patriotism employ the means likely to put an end to the tension and suffering in which we are: they know what means are authorized by the constitution. Whether the remedy comes to us from the Winnipeg Government, by the reparation of the injustice that has been committed, or from the Government of the Dominion, by an effective and pertinent law, such as we had before asked for, or even, if it were possible, from the Imperial Government, our hearts will be gladdened, and the heart of the Sovereign Pontiff, we know, will be comforted."

In this way a solid and enduring peace will be secured to our country, a peace resting on the eternal principles of justice, right and truth, and which, like the sun, will shine with blessed impartiality on all classes of our fellow citizens. In this hope and assurance we publish and promulgate the Holy Father's encyclical letter, and we are confident that its teachings and directions will be received with the filial respect, docile obedience and hearty loyalty of our faithful people.

This pastoral letter, together with the Papal Encyclical, shall be read in all the churches of the Archdiocese of Toronto and the dioceses of Hamilton and London as soon after its reception as it will be convenient for the clergy to do so.

May the peace and blessing of Almighty God descend upon you and abide with you always.
John Walsh,
Archbishop of Toronto.
Thomas Joseph Dowling,
Bishop of Hamilton.
Denis O'Connor,
Bishop of London.

Toronto, Octave of the Epiphany, 1898.

THOSE PRELIMINARIES.

N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

Referring to the Sixth Canon of Nice, the meaning of which we explained in last week's article, the doctor says:

McAllister.—In his ecclesiastical history (book x, sec. 6) Rufinus gives a Latin version of the above Canon in which the churches outside of Rome, over which the Roman Bishop is said to have authority, are described by the words "Suburbicarian ecclesiarum." There is nothing corresponding to these words in the original Greek of the Canon.

Freeman.—Then why did Rufinus add to the Canon something that was not in it? Why should a translator take such liberties?

McAllister.—They were evidently added by the translator to give his idea of the extent of the authority of the Bishop of Rome. And the words added would confine that authority to within the comparatively restricted suburban limits.

Freeman.—That is to say he added to the Canon what it did not say—committed a forgery on it—in order to give his own idea of it—in order to give the Bishop of Rome! He was not the last to commit this disreputable offense to give their ideas of the Bishop of Rome. He was free to give his idea, but he was not free to palm it off as the doctrine of the Council by injecting it into a Canon he was translating. Rufinus had been excommunicated by Pops Anastasius and possibly resorted to a fraud to get even with the Bishop of Rome. He has had many imitators since the time of Luther. St. Jerome, a contemporary of Rufinus, says of him: "He teaches what he knows not; he writes of what he is ignorant."

And again, addressing him, Jerome said: "Thou hast so much knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages that the Greeks take thee for a Latin, and the Latins for a Greek."

It is not surprising that the doctor introduces Rufinus only to admit that he added to the Canon, and then to dismiss him. We may also dismiss him.

McAllister.—The Canon expressly states that the same authority exercised by the Bishop of Rome was to be exercised by the Bishop of Alexandria.

Freeman.—The Canon expressly states nothing of the kind. It refers to the custom of the Bishop of Alexandria, but it in no way limits the authority of the former. Rufinus evidently saw this when he thought it necessary to inject his own idea into the Canon in order to give the impression of limitation. Had this historian, who wrote sixty years after the Council of Nice, understood the Canon as limiting the authority of the Pope to the Roman province he would not have deemed it necessary to falsify it by additions of his own. The Canon did not say what Rufinus wanted it to say, and what Dr. McAllister wants it to say, and he made it say what he wanted it to say by adding to it words of his own.

To say that the governor of a State has the same authority in a District that the President has in the District of Columbia is not to limit the authority of the President to the District. In like manner, to say that the Bishop of Alexandria had the same authority in the Province of Egypt that the Pope had in the Province of Rome is not to limit the authority of the Pope to the Province of Rome. The broader jurisdiction of the President goes without saying, as did also that of the Pope in the Nicene age, and before and after it. In proof of this we referred last week to the case of the Patriarch of Alexandria and his schismatic opponents, and the Emperor of Byzantium appeal to the Pope, just as litigants in the several States appeal to the Supreme Court. This is practical evidence of their interpretation of Canon 6, proof that they recognized the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, proof that they knew that Canon 6 in no way touched or referred to that supreme authority.

McAllister.—The third general Council, held at Constantinople in 381, recognizes that city as the centre of another patriarchate, which, in respect to "prerogative of the patriarchate of Rome, for the reason that Constantinople in becoming the capital of the empire instead of Rome, was now in consequence a new Rome. I add a literal translation of this part of the third Canon of this general and "infallible" council: "The Bishop of Constantinople has prerogatives of honor after the Bishop of Rome, because it (Constantinople) is the new Rome."

Freeman.—Dr. McAllister errs in calling this the third general Council. It is the second. We prefer the more intelligible translation of the above Canon made by Helele in his history of the Councils. It runs thus: "The Bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome."

Or that of Dr. Parsons in his Studies in Church History: "Let the Bishop of Constantinople have the primacy of honor after the Roman Bishop, because that city is the younger Rome."

There is no essential difference between these two latter translations; but between them and that given by

Dr. McAllister there is an essential difference. The doctor's translation is declarative, while the two given above are legislative. He declares a fact or a truth that existed prior to its statement. The other two decree an ecclesiastical law which gives a rank or a prerogative which did not exist before. The difference between the translations, as will be seen by a careful comparison of them, is the difference between he has and he shall have or let him have. According to the doctor's translation the Council recognized an existent prerogative. According to that of Helele and Parsons the Council conceded by legislation a rank or prerogative that had no existence before. The history of this Canon and the discussion concerning it show that its purpose was to transfer the primacy after Rome from Alexandria to Constantinople. And here, as at Nice, Rome was made the norm or rule by which to determine degrees of prerogative. Constantinople was to be first in rank—after Rome, then Alexandria comes second—after Rome, Antioch third—after Rome.

McAllister.—It is significant that many high authorities of ancient times have contended that the Greek preposition "meta," meaning "after," in the clause "after the Bishop of Rome," refers only to succession in the order of time.

Freeman.—Some Greeks did so, but the Greek Commentator Zonares, preferring the truth, has combated this opinion, and added that the Emperor Justinian, in his imperial constitutions acknowledged a subjection of the See of Constantinople to that of Rome. (Beveridge Synodicon tom I, page 90.)

McAllister.—But this point need not be urged.

Freeman.—This point you bring in only to dismiss it as you did Rufinus. Probably you thought that both would leave at least the shadow of an impression. They cost nothing to introduce them, and their introduction involves no responsibility.

McAllister.—The argument is conclusive, apart from this representation, that this Canon conceded to the Bishop of Rome at most only a precedence of honor, and not a primacy of authority.

Freeman.—What argument is conclusive? We have read every line of yours since you quoted the Canon and have found nothing that by the most liberal construction can be called an argument. If you had an argument in your head after quoting the Canon, you must have forgotten to transfer it to your manuscript. But—

McAllister.—This Canon conceded to the Bishop of Rome at most only a precedence of honor, not a primacy of authority.

Freeman.—The Canon concedes nothing to the Bishop of Rome. His primacy of honor or of authority was not before the Council, was not the subject of legislation. The rank or status of the Bishop of Constantinople was the question in hand, and on that only did they legislate in Canon 3, which you have quoted in a bad translation.

McAllister.—This Canon conceded at most only a precedence of honor.

Freeman.—A precedence of honor to the Bishop of Constantinople over the Bishop of Alexandria and Antioch, yes. But it conceded nothing to the Pope. Canon 3 simply referred to the Bishop of Rome as the norm or rule from which to measure the relations of other members of the hierarchy to each other; just as the astronomer begins with the sun to reckon the relations of the planets. He does not count it. He speaks of the first planet next to or after it, the second, and so on. He does not count it because it is the centre—the centre of unity, that which constitutes the solar system one. Thus Canon 3 of Constantinople does not count the Bishop of Rome. It counts the first after him, and makes the Bishop of Constantinople first. The Fathers of Constantinople knew that the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome did not depend on their legislation, that his status was not a general Council dependent on him. They therefore did not attempt to concede to him authority and jurisdiction as something that was in their possession to give or retain. The Pope would not have accepted such concession. He would have condemned the Council that legislated on that principle as a heretical synod.

You speak of "infallible" Canons contradicting "infallible" Canons. You ought to know by this time the scope or extension of infallibility, and that it is concerned only with dogmatic decrees of Popes and Councils, and not with ecclesiastical legislation that changes as circumstances change in the course of human events. Thus far you have confined yourself to legislative Canons with which the infallibility of Pope or Council is not concerned. Just how or why you hope to disprove infallibility by citing legislation which infallibility has nothing to do is beyond the comprehension of the average mind.

Conversion of a Protestant Nun.

The Liverpool Catholic Times announces that Sister Monica, the head nurse of the Warwick Nursing Association, has announced her intention of

leaving the Church of England and joining the Catholic Church.

MR. MARION CRAWFORD.

Interesting Lecture on the Pope and the Vatican.

Mr. Marion Crawford, the novelist, last night lectured to a very large and cultured audience in Association Hall upon the subject, "Leo XIII. and His Life in the Vatican." Mr. Crawford's features are too well known to call for remark, but his magnificent physique, erect and graceful figure and exceedingly pleasing manner, his clear, refined voice, the marvellous beauty of his language, the interest of his subject and his masterly handling of it, made a profound impression on his audience, and they left the hall not with the unpleasant feeling of disillusion, which is so often experienced on hearing a favorite author lecture, but with as warm an admiration for the man as for the author. The chair was occupied by Sir Oliver Mowat, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, and with him on the platform were Sir Frank Smith, Mayor Shaw, Rev. Father Teedy and Commander Law. Sir Oliver Mowat in introducing Mr. Crawford congratulated the audience and himself on the opportunity they were to have of hearing so distinguished a lecturer of whose writings he spoke with admiration. They could not but feel an interest in the history of Pope Leo XIII., who, besides intellectual gifts of a high order had other qualities which had won for him the respect of those not of his own faith, was the head of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world, and a person to whom millions of people bowed with reverence and in spiritual things rendered obedience.

Mr. Crawford first spoke of the conditions preceding the Pope's elevation—conditions which left forces against which he had to fight all his life. He would be referred to hereafter as a statesman rather than as a theologian, as one of those in Europe who had taken a foremost part in fighting to keep the peace, and in fighting against that great advancing wave of anarchy which threatened to cross the Atlantic. He then gave a picture of the man as he is and then the main political events of his reign. His account of the conditions which prevailed at the time of his Holy See election was brief but interesting. The description of the Pope himself and the anecdotes by which he illustrated his character and mode of life were to the majority of the audience the most pleasing part of the lecture. Of encyclicals Mr. Crawford said the Pope wrote many of them with his own hand. They were then printed in the private printing house of the Vatican, first appearing in the daily paper of the Vatican, being then translated into other languages and sent abroad.

After speaking of the Pope's position in regard to temporal power Mr. Crawford said that the idea that the Pope's political utterances were to be held inappreciable, to be considered as *ecclesiastica*, as infallible, was too absurd to be advanced to any thinking man. Infallibility had nothing to do with politics any more than the Pope's private life. The Marquis of Duffryn had told him that he considered Pope Leo to be one of the greatest living statesmen of the age, and it would not doubt be to the advantage of the world to follow the Pope's advice as in the arbitrations he had conducted, but to bind oneself to follow the Pope would be to create a dangerous precedent, because the next Pope might be politically as ineffectual as Pius IX. Supposing another Rodrigo Borgia should be elected, then American Catholics would be bound to follow his advice in choosing a President of the republic just as they would Leo, because such powers would be invested in the Papacy and could not become the property of one man, even if he had great opinions and was good, wise and conscientious. Some had interpreted the Pope's words to mean that every Catholic voter was bound to vote in accordance with the words of the Church and of his Bishop in particular, but this was certainly not true. (Applause.) A state of society in which society should be kept up in such political opinions as any one man, human and limited, could evolve from his own conscience, pure and upright though it may be, was neither logical nor desirable. There were points in the universal struggle for life which every man has a right to decide for himself, because they did not depend on questions of moral right and wrong. In closing, speaking of his long fight against the oncoming wave of anarchy, he said that although his Holiness would not be there to see the final battle he would still have a great weapon for those who came after him, for he had done more to strengthen and simplify the position of the Church than any other man.

"When the time comes, though they themselves be gone, the spirit they called up still lives to lead, the sword they forged lies ready for other hands, the roads they planned are broad and straight for the march of other feet, and they themselves in their graves have a share in the victory of those to come after them."

COLLEGE, BELLEVILLE, ONT.

Commercial Courses.
AND TYPEWRITING
SPECIALS APPLY TO THE PRINCIPAL.
W. THEO. SPETZ, President