

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 424 and 426 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE H. NORTHGRAVE.
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY.
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey
LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1906.

DOCTRINE AND DOGMA.

In the issue of the Montreal Witness for June 1st, under the heading "Doctrine and Dogma" answers are given to a number of queries made by "an Earnest Enquirer." Some of these queries pertain rather to ecclesiastical discipline than to dogma or doctrine. Most of these have, however, an intimate relation to Catholic doctrines, and we have no desire to impugn the generalized heading under which they are grouped, but we feel bound to point out some gross inaccuracies into which our contemporary has fallen in regard to several of these points.

1. The first enquiry is, "When did devotion to the Virgin Mary begin in the Roman Catholic Church?"

The Catholic Church could not with propriety be called "Roman" until St. Peter fixed his See in Rome. Yet it was undoubtedly the same church of Christ whether its visible head resided at Antioch or Rome. According to Eusebius, Peter, before going to Rome, preached the Gospel in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia and Asia Minor. After this he went to Rome about seven years after Christ's Crucifixion.

The Witness gives the following rather evasive answer to "Earnest Enquirer."

"Devotion to the Virgin Mary was far less prominent in ancient than in modern times."

Considering the fact that but few Christian books of the first three hundred years of the Christian era have come down to us, it would have been more modest of the editor of the Witness to have stated the truth by saying that Christian literature of that period is exceedingly scarce, and that, therefore, it is difficult from that source alone to judge to what extent the Blessed Virgin Mary was honored in the early church. Yet there are some testimonies even of that period which cannot be overlooked.

An angel of God, Gabriel, who is one of the chief angels—seven in number—who stand before the throne of God is commissioned by Almighty God to carry a message to Mary, and to address her as "Full of Grace," or as one who is in God's special favor, and who is "blessed among women," that is blessed above all other women, according to the Hebrew idiom. And the angel announces to her that she should fear not, because she has found grace with God.

This is a somewhat earlier honor paid to Mary than the editor of the Witness would have us believe was shown her. And Mary being informed that her cousin Elizabeth would soon bring forth a son, went to visit her, and immediately upon seeing Mary, Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost, and under this inspiration, also saluted her as "blessed among women." Mary herself, then also under inspiration, acknowledged that "All generations shall call her blessed, because He that is mighty hath done great things to me, and holy is His name."

It is astonishing with what care "earnest Enquirer" and the editor of the Witness avoid fulfilling Mary's prophecy, but Catholics will at least not be found disobedient to God's will in regard to calling her the "Blessed" Virgin, and "Mother of our Lord" as Elizabeth did.

We might also point out that the shepherds of Judea, and the wise men from the East who came under God's special direction to adore Jesus and pay Him homage could not have omitted to honor Mary who was necessarily the medium through whom they were enabled to show honor to Jesus.

At the marriage feast in Cana, Jesus anticipated His time for the manifestation of His glory, by changing the water into wine at the Blessed Virgin Mary's wish. Here was an extraordinary honor shown by Jesus Himself to His mother. This He would not have done if it had been His wish that she should be dishonored by mobs, as has been the case in Scotland in the defacing of her images, and the tearing of it down in churches, and in England where mobs have actually dragged effigies of the Blessed Virgin through the mire, and burned them. This was done when the so-called "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill" was passed by the British Parliament.

The waiters, or the married couple themselves, must have asked the Blessed Virgin's intercession with her Divine Son to obtain wine for the marriage feast at Cana, as she would not have been likely otherwise to have intervened as she did to obtain it by a miracle.

To this it must be added that when the Blessed Virgin was at the foot of

the cross with the Apostle St. John, the command of Jesus to Mary: "Woman behold thy son," and to St. John: "Behold thy mother" implied that John should regard her as his mother, and John obeyed this by "taking her to his own," which means that he regarded her truly as a mother. (St. John, xix. 26-27.) St. John, the beloved disciple of Jesus is the type of all true Christians who should regard Mary as their true mother also.

2. Earnest Enquirer asks next, when did the belief in Purgatory begin? The Witness answers: "The Council of Florence in the fifteenth century defined the belief in Purgatory. The doctrine of the availability of prayers for the dead was held long before that time."

Our contemporary did wisely to add the second sentence in this answer, for the doctrine of the utility of prayers for the dead existed before the time of Christ, as it exists still among the Jews.

Apart from the passages of the New Testament on which this doctrine rests, we have the Jewish practice mentioned clearly in the 2nd Book of Maccabees, xii. 43-46. Here we are told that the great Jewish leader, Judas Maccabeus, ordered twelve thousand drachms of silver to be sent to Jerusalem for sacrifices to be offered "for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection. For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. . . . It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from sins."

Thus it was (as it is still) part of the Jewish faith as revealed by God that prayers should be offered for the dead, that they might thus obtain forgiveness of their sins even after death. This evidently implies the existence of Purgatory, which is a middle place of punishment or suffering where some souls suffer for a time before they can enter into heaven.

Prayers for the dead are still found on Jewish tombstones, and the Jews have a standing rule under which children whose parents died before them, are obliged to visit the synagogue on the anniversary of their parents' death to offer prayers in public for them. This custom was not condemned by Christ, though He rebuked the false doctrines or beliefs introduced by the Scribes and Pharisees into their ancient creed. On the contrary He implied that this doctrine was the truth when He spoke of sins which shall not be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come. He implied that the belief that some sins are really forgiven in the world to come is the correct belief. This is in accordance with the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, which is merely a word adopted by the Catholic Church to signify the place where this forgiveness of sins occurs.

In further reference to this question we must remark that at the Council of Florence, held in 1438, the Schismatical Greeks agreed with the Western Church on the doctrine of Purgatory, but that was not by any means the beginning of the teaching of that doctrine in the Catholic Church.

Tertullian, in A. D. 197, wrote concerning the practice of the church, "We make yearly offerings for the dead." These offerings were sacrifices just as Judas Maccabeus had sacrifices offered in the temple of Jerusalem.

In another place the same writer says that a widow prays for the soul of her deceased husband, and makes oblations on the anniversary days of his death. (On Monogamy.)

St. Cyprian also in A. D. 270 said that it was then the custom to celebrate sacrifice for every deceased Christian. From all this it is apparent that the Witness editor is greatly in error in assigning the beginning of the doctrine of purgatory to the fifteenth century, and those who ask questions of him concerning Catholic "doctrine and dogma" will get very little information for their pains.

There are numerous other gross blunders in the series of answers given in the same article, but we must defer to another issue any further remarks thereon.

A PRESS despatch, dated Toronto, June 5th, informs us that Dr. Carman, general superintendent of the Methodist Church, returned from his trip to Japan. In giving his impression of the country, amongst other things he is reported to have said: "religion has all the scope it needs. All churches are perfectly free, and they have had the good sense not to have had separate schools. The old heathen religions are decaying." May we not ask the Bishop if the existence of Separate (or Catholic) schools will not have a tendency to bring about all the sooner the decay of the old heathen religions? Why, then, does he sneer at the schools in which Christianity is taught? What is to be gained, if, instead of the old heathen religions, we institute a godless school

system? Does the Bishop believe that the old heathen religions are as good as the religion of the Catholics? For a bigotry and a narrowness that would gladden the heart of a Pharisee of the ancient mould commend us to Bishop Carman, general superintendent of the Methodist Church.

THE APPLETON CO.'S CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA.

Concerning the need of a good and thoroughly reliable Catholic Encyclopedia we have already expressed our opinion in these columns, and in some specimen pages which were sent to us of the work which is now in preparation by the Robert Appleton Company of New York we saw the good promise that this work would give "full and authoritative information on the entire cycle of Catholic interests, Catholic action and Catholic doctrine."

As the specimen pages sent us were but limited in scope, we could not see very far into the character of the work promised, but the array of names given as the authors whose work would be given to the English speaking world were for the most part well known for their ability to furnish reliable information on the subjects they were to treat, we did not hesitate to state our hope and expectation that the new volumes would be worthy of the best encouragement from all Catholics.

But there comes from British Columbia a warning voice which states plainly that the pages on Catholicism in Canada have been written in slipshod style, and that especially the portion which treats of British Columbia is most careless and inaccurate, exhibiting "supreme ignorance of the status of the church in that province, and that it is to be feared that the rest of the article in question is gotten up with similar carelessness, for which the editorial staff must be held responsible." We are told in fact that the information given of the church of the North-West as a whole is quite misleading.

We have not seen the article in question, the specimen pages sent to us being on other matters in connection with the church. Yet we cannot but suppose that the Very Rev. Vicar General and his able colleague who conduct the British Columbian Record at Vancouver are fully cognizant of the state of religion in that province, and that their criticisms on the pages which have come under their notice regarding that region are accurate.

By all means the editorial committee who have charge of the work should take care to verify the portions of the Encyclopedia which come under their jurisdiction before allowing them to be published and sent broadcast over the land under sanction of their names.

Among the errors noted by the British Columbian Record is the statement that there are two ecclesiastical provinces in British Columbia, one of these being presided over by an Oblate Archbishop at Vancouver. The fact is there is neither Bishop nor Archbishop at Vancouver city and there is but one Ecclesiastical Province, over which the Archbishop of Victoria presides.

THE CHURCH IN FRANCE.

There are strange rumors current in France to the effect that M. Combes will soon be called again to take the premiership of the nation. Should this be the case, it can only mean that the present French Chamber is not satisfied with the brutality exhibited by the present government but wants M. Combes back again to bring about a new reign of terror.

The programme of the General Council of Bishops has not yet been made known, but we are satisfied that it will be for the best, and as it will secure uniformity of action on the part of the hierarchy and the people, backed by the authority of the Holy Father, we have full confidence that the conclusions reached will indicate the wisest course it will be possible for the Catholics of the nation to pursue.

The policy of M. Combes was pushed already to the very verge of civil war, and it may be that, intoxicated with the recent success of "the Bloc" party, the atheists may push their extreme views until they bring about this result. We cannot, however, credit the hypothesis that such is the case, and we are still convinced that an energetic and devoted clergy with the prudent leadership of an able and determined political leader would gain that apparently doomed country back again to God and religion, if not at once, at least after a few years of an educational campaign, as it seems from recent events that France needs to be thus brought back to a sense of religion by a devoted, self-sacrificing and truly Apostolic clergy.

We cannot conceive that with the promise of Christ to remain with His church to the end of time, to defend it against all the powers of darkness, the church of France with its glorious Christian history is now about to be abandoned by God to the tender

mercies of a new line of Neros, Diocletians and Julians who are to sink the nation to a lower depth of degradations than it was reduced to fifteen or sixteen centuries ago.

An Apostolic spirit among the clergy is needed to bring back the glories of the reign of a Pepin and a Charlemagne, and in this way only shall France be saved to religion in her present crisis, but we believe that salvation will be secured, and we hope that the National Council just held will be a step toward the goal which must be reached to save France under the benevolent yet determined direction of Pope Leo X.

The brilliant and brave Cardinal Mery del Val, the Pope's Secretary of State, recently stated to a correspondent of the Paris Echo that "the time has arrived for the Moderates of France, those who are resigned and patient, to make a decision involving energy, discipline, and action; for all the evil that has been done has been caused by apathy and weakness. It has been the custom for the French (Catholics) to live without fear of the morrow, at the same time enduring injustices, vexations and persecutions, always with the idea that these are temporary difficulties. Now the time has come when you are to be trampled underfoot. Do not let them do this. Prepare defensive means adapted to your locality and resources."

This is what is required of Frenchmen at the present moment. They must not endure the disgraceful humiliations to which they are being subjected; but they must be ready to act in unison, and to this end there must be a leader of energy, such as was Herr Von Windthorst in Germany.

Cardinal Mery del Val points out that it is not for the Pope to lay down the details of organization and resistance to be made by French Catholics. The position of the Pope is to point out the good and the evil, to be followed and avoided, but man is a responsible being who must select for himself the means whereby he is to carry out the end he has in view whether for good or evil, and to merit accordingly for himself reward or punishment. This is what the people of France must do at the present moment. To this the clergy must advise them wisely, but the putting of this advice into practice must depend upon themselves individually.

THE DEATH OF MICHAEL DAVITT.

We deem it advisable to refer once more to the death of this most estimable and noble character, as further particulars are now at hand. In his death Ireland has lost one of the most strenuous of her advocates in the cause of Irish Home Rule. He departed this life, we are told, peacefully and painlessly, in the presence of his eldest son, Michael, and of his two daughters who had attended him most devotedly during a protracted and painful illness. Many of his most intimate friends were present at his departure from this life, including Mr. John Dillon who was for many years the leader of the Irish Nationalist party in the British Parliament. He was spiritually attended during his last illness by Rev. Father Hatton, and his death occurred in Dublin hospital.

His wife was also in constant attendance on him until a few days before death relieved him of his sufferings. She continued her constant care, only when she was herself taken ill, and was moved to another room in the same hospital, which she could not leave even to see him when he was in the throes of death.

Down almost to the time of his death, Mr. Davitt was able to speak to those friends who were at his bedside, and during his illness great sympathy was displayed for him by all classes in society, and even from those who had been most determinedly opposed to his political views.

Among the callers upon him was Lord Hamphill on behalf of Lord Aberdeen, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and the Countess of Aberdeen, and it is said that the exertions he made at the recent general elections undermined his health greatly, as he had even at that time lost much of his former vigor.

From his earliest youth he staunchly supported the Irish cause, and in fact he was an advocate of the employment of force as the only means to gain that freedom which was demanded by the Irish people. He was always outspoken in his opposition to all English parties, as he considered them all as opposed to any redress of Irish grievances, and his opposition went so far that he was highly elated at the Boer successes in the early stages of the Anglo-Boer war.

His father was a Mayo man who settled in Pennsylvania, but returned to Ireland, where Michael Davitt was born in 1846. He was, therefore, sixty years of age at his death. In 1852 Martin Davitt was evicted from his

home, whereupon he moved to England. Michael in 1856 worked in a cotton mill, and was afterward employed in various ways till he became a leader in the Fenian Brotherhood, in which organization he became so active that in 1870 he was arrested on a charge of treason-felony and condemned to fifteen years' penal servitude.

Seven years later he was released on a ticket of leave, and in 1879 he founded the Irish Land League along with Charles Stewart Parnell. The brilliant and violent manner of his propaganda of that association caused his arrest again in the same year, but he was soon released, and was again arrested in 1881. He was again released in 1882. During this last imprisonment he was elected to the Imperial Parliament for Meath county, but was disqualified as being under sentence for treason-felony. He contested Waterford city in 1891, but was defeated. He was elected for North Meath in 1892, but was unseated under an election protest. In 1892 he was returned for North-East Cork, which seat he soon after resigned, as he had become impoverished by the hard fighting he had to pass through for so many different constituencies. In 1895, however, he was again elected by acclamation to the House of Commons for East Kerry while he was absent, in Australia, and he retained his seat till 1899, when he resigned.

He then travelled through the United States, Canada, Australasia, the European Continent, Egypt, Palestine and South Africa. He published several works on his travels as well as on the chequered political history of Ireland.

Even his political opponents appear to understand now that his determined opposition to every English government while he was in Parliament, except during the short Parliament elected to put Mr. Gladstone into power, arose not from dislike or enmity to the people of England, but from his firm purpose to gain self government for his native country, which, he was convinced, would never be gained except through a decided opposition to every English government till Ireland should secure Home Rule.

Of late years much has been done to remedy the injustice with which Ireland has been treated, and Mr. Davitt himself was aware of this, so that his bitterness against England was much mollified in the last years of his career, though he never gave up his determination to uphold to the end the cause of Home Rule for Ireland. The resolution passed by the St. Patrick's Society of Montreal a few evenings ago, show how his efforts are appreciated by Irishmen everywhere. The following is the resolution, which will be endorsed by all Irishmen who have any love for the land of their birth:

"Resolved: That the St. Patrick's Society of Montreal has learned with profound regret of the death of the late Michael Davitt, the distinguished Irish patriot, whose life and labors were devoted to the amelioration of his native land: whose broad sympathies embraced every worthy movement of human liberty, whose memory will ever be cherished by all admirers of his courage and perseverance in promoting what he believed to be the cause of truth and justice. Resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the bereaved widow and family of the illustrious deceased, and to the press of Ireland and Canada."

It is stated that Mr. Davitt's property has, by his will, been left absolutely to his wife, and in the same document occur the words:

"To all my friends I leave kind thoughts, to my enemies, the fullest possible forgiveness, and to Ireland my undying prayer for her absolute freedom and independence, which it was my life's ambition to try to obtain for her."

May he rest in peace!

THE MODERATOR ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

The General Assembly, which is the supreme body of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, assembled last week in our city of London and elected by unanimous vote the Rev. Dr. Alexander Falconer of Pictou, N. S., for Moderator, or President.

There were about four hundred delegates present, among whom the Rev. Dr. Gregg, a former Moderator and a gentleman of broad views, is said to be the oldest and most venerable in demeanor, being now ninety years of age and still as vigorous as he is scholarly.

The retiring Moderator, the Rev. Dr. Armstrong, delivered a very effective and well reasoned discourse expressing his deep conviction that even from the Presbyterian point of view, primary education should be religious, and so thoroughly was he convinced of this that he was not for the cropping out of certain phrases which are wont to be frequently heard from the mouths of the followers of John Knox, that an attentive auditor might suppose that he was listening to a defence of Catholic education by a Catholic Bishop or priest against some of the most vehement attacks made upon religious primary

schools by the Presbyterian divines who in past years were the bitterest opponents of Catholic schools.

Dr. Armstrong declared that schools and colleges should not deserve to be pointed at as godless institutions; for purely secular schools as he conceives them are not only unchristian, but also narrow and unsentient.

He continued, according to the Globe's report epitomized:

"I am not contending for a state church, but I do contend that the absolute separation of church and state is a mere abstract political theory impossible of realization. I do contend against the separation between religion and the state, and I do contend against the state assuming the power to establish a system of schools, exclude the bible and religious instruction from them, and compel us to pay for them and send our children to them. We as Christian parents should shudder at the very idea of sending our children to an irreligious school or to an irreligious university."

"We are not to think of the state as something apart from ourselves. We are in the main a Christian people, and the state should be a Christian state, and if the state undertakes to provide schools, they should be Christian schools. And furthermore, as Christian people acknowledging the Lordship of Jesus Christ, I hold we should assert and maintain His Lordship over the whole domain of education, which is so vital to the advancement of His kingdom."

There is but one point in this contention in which we must disagree with the rev. doctor. It lies in this, that the state in a mixed community like Ontario, has for its subjects citizens of so many diverse creeds that it cannot actually furnish religious teaching; but at least it should not throw any obstacles in the way of parents who are willing to furnish such at their own expense, and it should not impose an extra burden of taxation upon parents who are willing to supply such teaching, though it might add proportionally or fairly those who supply it. In the difficulty of determining such proportion, the next best thing which the state can do is to pay according to results as it aims to do in Ontario to a certain extent and with a certain amount of success.

Rev. Dr. Armstrong continues: "I do not like to make rash statements, but I do not think our church is really aware of the importance of this duty (of teaching religion in the schools), or adequately realizes its profound meaning, or is intelligently helpful to parents in regard to its discharge."

"Schools cannot be neutral. Education without religion is irreligious. The negative character cannot long be maintained. The tendency is to become positively anti-Christian. Why consider the possibility? This all-important domain of Education may come under the control of a Minister of Education who may be a profligate or an infidel, or a weakling swayed by a narrow political clique. Christian parents, and the Christian church should awake to their duty in education—a duty no state should take entirely out of their hands."

At a MEETING of the Lillian Massey School of Household Science, lately held in Toronto, Bishop Vincent, we are told, "laid stress upon the possibility of high art in daily life, the beauty of the ministry of 'the sisterhood of service,' in the domestic sphere and in deaconess work in hospital and home, and the supreme worth of a good, beautiful, unselfish home life." It is most admirable to see women perform good works, but we wish to remark that at times they go far beyond their sphere, and delve into pursuits which belong more properly to the sterner sex. How can there exist, for instance, a good, beautiful unselfish home life when so many women are found neglecting it and going about the country attending missionary meetings, prohibition gatherings, Epworth League and Christian Endeavor conventions, etc.

THE EDITOR of La Presse of Montreal, tells a simple truth when he writes thus of Dr. Sproule, the Grand Sovereign of the Orange Order:

"While religious peace reigns in a general manner all over Canada we see every two or three months a political anarchist throw a bomb into the procession of good fellowship."

La Presse might also have included in his censure the editor of the Orange Sentinel—and there are others. But as long as the race of simpletons is with us, we may expect side by side with it, the race of knaves.

Another Minister-Convert.

At Nueva Gerona, Isle of Pines, off the Cuban coast, George West formerly an Episcopalian clergyman of New York City, was solemnly received into the Catholic Church by the Benedictine Fathers. A year ago he purchased a lovely estate on this island, where he devoted most of his time to the study of the Catholic religion. When he embraced Catholicity he adopted the name of David George. He leaves shortly for a brief stay at St. Vincent's Hospital, Manhattan, where his former colleague, Rev. Father De Costa, spent his last days, and, although in his fifty-eighth year, Mr. West intends entering a seminary in the States to study for the priesthood.

THE BOSTON HERALD CHURCH IN

The Boston Herald its anti-Catholicism to write as if the church worthy party to the church and state in been the Herald's beginning, and alth both here and in E time to time, been admit that there in question, the Herald ignored the other al has kept on malign France and praising and its partisans as trials. Of course it pected that the Her recent French elec some comment in its we were not surpris in a long editorial r ing passage:

"The issue of Fr received most atten that concerned with the state and the de determined in favo may be expected th in force for accom will be carried ou the clericals has a pathy for their e lessness of encour prolongation of ed publicly cour elies to submit to make the best of of the prosperity United States indicat dissolution of the ing the sacrifice hopeless situation pects."

Now as the mai parity between church and state the so called sepi Separation in Fr tends to be wh Government claim the residences bishops, the v sticks on the alt natorium—ever with the church Government doe church property by force to make sacred vessels to right whatever. Government det shall own chu law of the Cat must be owned church authori United States the church law. French Separat means. It op barresses the It violates the to destroy at or this separation known to us No; decided this country is only an is deprive the cl prestige and t the chariot wh attempt to con piece of clo attempt to di The separa state in Fran robbing of th it means that to own a chu hospital; it m determined to divine organ The Concord robbery of ec occurred at th century, and judgment of no attempt, no make restitut only takes po of this prop and a crime property be despotism, without the church in th a favor but of churches residences Brothers, Si tical institut this is real state. It is ated by a th thing Catho these facts tyanny th guise of l Herald's w tion, its c oncocei mean been an ou a studied i the Catholic

THE "BI

POPULAR I SOME H PROTESTE Professore foremost land to da hard blow ling the viewing " (by Arthu Historical says: "No w now that gotten of Rome. was a mo the clerg such mo every h rruption more au vout ad Even in times scandals Morton But it d Reform to acqu tion Bi face ag