

The Catholic World.

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

VOLUME XX.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 8, 1898.

NO. 1063.

THOSE PRELIMINARIES.

N. Y. Freeman's Journal.
McAllister.—Until the middle of the fifth century the Church of Christ in her councils and doctrines was not Papal at all. The Roman Catholic Church had no existence. The Church of that day was entirely distinct from the Papal system. Since the claims of the Papacy did not exist, there could have been no Papal Church.

Freeman.—We have in former articles stated the relation of the Pope, the Bishop of Rome, to the councils, and we need not here repeat on the spur of Dr. McAllister's bald statement.

As to doctrines, every scholar in dogmatic theology knows that the creeds and dogmatic decrees of the first four councils—Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon—are doctrines that must be held as articles of faith by Catholics to-day. This sameness of belief is the strongest possible evidence that the Catholic Church of the nineteenth century is identical with that of the first four centuries.

When the doctor says that the Roman Catholic Church had no existence till the middle of the fifth century, he flatly contradicts the evidence of history and the testimony of the Fathers of the first centuries. His statement scarcely deserves a serious refutation. Even the Protestant historian, Dr. Schaff, in paragraph 50, volume second, of his history, traces what he calls the germs of the Papacy to the latter part of the first century—that is, sixty years after the crucifixion. In illustration he quotes the letter of Clement, Bishop of Rome, third from St. Peter—to the Church of Corinth. Of this letter Dr. Schaff says: "It can hardly be denied that the document reveals the sense of a certain superiority over all ordinary congregations. The Roman Church here, without being asked (so far as appears), gives advice with superior administrative wisdom, to an important Church in the East, dispatches messengers to her, and exhorts her to order and unity in a tone of calm dignity and authority, as the organ of God and the Holy Spirit. This is all the more surprising if St. John, as is possible, was then still living in Ephesus, which was nearer to Corinth than Rome."

This Clement to whom reference is made was made Pope from the year 91 to 102. Dr. Schaff states, further, that Victor, Pope from the year 193 to 202, excommunicated the churches of Asia Minor for a difference of ritual. Dr. Schaff recognizes the fact of the ascendancy of the Church of Rome and endeavors to give reasons for it. First among these reasons is her high antiquity. He admits, with apparent regret, that Irenaeus, Tertullian and Cyprian—all of the third century—conceded to the Roman Church a position of singular pre-eminence. He concludes his paragraph on the germs of the Papacy thus: "No wonder, then, that the Bishops of Rome at an early date were looked upon as metropolitan pastors and spoke and acted accordingly with an air of authority which reached far beyond their immediate dioceses."

Here is an unwilling witness testifying to the antiquity and paramount influence of the Roman Church and her Pontiffs. As Dr. Schaff refers to Irenaeus, who was the Disciple of Polycarp, who was a Disciple of St. John, the Evangelist, says: "By pointing out that tradition which the greatest, and most ancient, and universally known Church—founded and constituted at Rome by the two glorious apostles, Peter and Paul, derives from the apostles, and that faith announced to all men, which, through the succession of (her) Bishops has come down to us, we confound all those who in any way, whether through pleasing themselves, or vain glory, or blindness, and perverse opinion, assemble otherwise than as behoveth them. For this Church, on account of a more powerful principalty, it is necessary that every Church, that is those who are on every side faithful, resort."

It stands to reason that this third century Bishop knew more about the existence and authority of the Roman Church than does any Covenant minister of the nineteenth century. We might quote other Fathers of the Church of the third and fourth centuries to the same purpose, but it is unnecessary.

Even the pagan emperor, Aurelian, recognized the existence of the Church of Rome and the wide-reaching authority of her Pontiffs. After his victory in the year 273 over Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra in Syria, the Christian Bishops complained to the Emperor against the heretic Paul of Samosata and his followers, who had possession of the Church property. Aurelian decided that the property should be handed over to that one of the claimants "to whom the Bishop of Rome and the Italian prelates of the Christian religion should write,"—that is to the one whose orthodoxy was recognized by the Pope. (Eusebius vii, c. 30.) This pagan emperor could have been but a little conversant with the relative authorities in the Church—and consequently his leaving the decision to the Bishop of Rome must have been suggested to him either by the Oriental Bishops or by Paul of Samosata himself. We must suppose some suggestion of the kind to explain the emperor's action in referring the matter to so distant a See as

Rome—to a See of different nationality and language.

The See of Antioch was avowedly dependent on the See of Rome, as is clear from the testimony of Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, in the council of Antioch: "It is customary, conformably with apostolic order and tradition, that the See of Antioch should be directed by the See of the Great Rome, and should be judged by it." (Kenrick's "Primacy," referring to Mansi, col. 1311.)

St. Basil the Great, Metropolitan of Caesara, in Cappadocia, in the year 370, thus wrote to St. Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria:

"It has appeared to us advisable to send to the Bishop of Rome, that he may look to our affairs; and to suggest to him that if it be difficult to dispatch some persons thence by a general and synodal decree, he himself, by his authority, may act in the case, and choose persons able to bear the journey, and endowed with such meekness and firmness of character as would be likely to recall the perverse to correct sentiments." (Epistle 69.) Evidently this Archbishop of Caesara in Syria in the fourth century believed the Church of Rome existed prior to the middle of the fifth century, and that her Bishop had far-reaching authority. Writing to Pope Damasus, the same Basil said: "Being disappointed in our expectations, and unable to bear our evils any longer, we have resolved to write and urge you to come to our relief and to send us some men harmonizing in sentiment, who may reconcile the dissent or restore the Church of God to harmony. . . . We ask nothing new, but what has been usual of old with our blessed men beloved of God, especially among yourselves; for we know by tradition, being instructed by our fathers, whom we have questioned, and by documents which are still preserved amongst us, that Dionysius, the most blessed Bishop of Rome, who was illustrious among you for the integrity of his faith and his other virtues, visited, by letter, our church of Caesara. Our affairs are at present in a most difficult and gloomy situation, and need greater care."

Wherefore, unless you hasten to our relief, in a little while you will scarcely find to whom you may reach the hand, since all will be brought under the power of heresy." (Epistle 70.)

Now why does this Eastern Bishop appeal to the head of the Roman Church unless he believed that there was in his time a Church of Rome, and that its head had authority in the East? Why did he not appeal to the Patriarch of Alexandria, Jerusalem or Antioch, or to the Bishop of Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantine empire in which he lived? Why pass over these neighboring authorities and go to distant Rome? One reason which we may assign with safety was that this Greek Bishop did not live in Pittsburgh in 1897. He was sixteen hundred years too early to see Roman affairs and the early Christian Church through Dr. McAllister's Covenantist spectacles.

We might here refer to the appeal of St. Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria, to the Pope, but it will come in more properly when we are considering the sixth canon of the Council of Nice, which the doctor takes up in his next letter—that of October 25.

The doctor may say in explanation of his meaning that the Roman Church was so conspicuous in the early ages and whose authority was so universally recognized in the whole Christian world, was not the Roman Catholic Church. But this denial is gratuitous, and begs the question. It imposes on him the necessity of assigning the time when the Roman Church ceased to exist, and the Roman Catholic Church took its place. Such an important factor in the religious world of the first centuries could not pass out of existence without leaving a record of her demise. No such time can be assigned. The doctor may say—as he does—that the Roman Church usurped powers in the fifth century which she did not previously possess. But this claim, even if we were to grant it, which we do not, would be proof positive that she continued to exist, for that which has ceased to be can never be restored. Thus his charge of usurpation proves continued autonomous identity. He may claim that she erred, but this, if granted, as it is not, would still prove continued existence, for that which exists cannot error.

But there are other reasons which destroy his claim. Had the Roman Church usurped authority and jurisdiction by the Churches, East and West, they would have protested against the encroachment on their rights. But we find no such protest in the fifth century—the time assigned by the doctor when the imagined usurpation took place. On the contrary, at the time referred to the authority of the Pope was emphatically recognized by the Council of Chalcedon in Asia Minor, in 451, as it had been recognized in the Council of Sardica in 347. Both these were Oriental Councils. As for the Churches in the West, the Pope's authority was never more fully recognized than in the fifth century. It was about this time lived St. Augustine, the great Bishop of Hippo in Africa. That he recognized the

authority claimed by the Pope is evident from the fact that he sent the acts of the African Councils over which he presided to Rome for Papal confirmation. We conclude, then, that the authority exercised by the head of the Roman Church, and so universally recognized in the fifth century, was no usurpation. The Roman Church, therefore, did not lose her identity by usurpation.

Nor did she lose identity by teaching error at the time assigned by the doctor. To charge the Roman Church with teaching error in the fifth century is to charge the whole Christian world at that time with teaching error; and to do this is to say that the Church founded and commissioned by Christ, and promised immunity from error, had failed. For the Roman Church was in dogmatic accord with the Christian world of that time. The general councils voiced the common belief of the time, and the Roman Church held, as she still holds, as articles of faith the dogmatic decrees of those councils. Hence to accuse her with having changed the faith is to accuse the whole Christian world with having lost the true faith. To do this is to deny the divinity of the Christian religion and to relegate it to the class of purely man-made institutions. It seems to us that this is too large a contract for even a Covenant minister. The Roman Church, then, did not lose her identity either by usurpation or error.

But aside from these considerations there are positive, historical evidences of continuous identity of the Roman Church from the first to the nineteenth century. We will confine ourselves to one proof. It is the line of succession of the heads of the Roman Church from St. Peter to Leo XIII. Both Irenaeus and St. Augustine used this argument to identify the Roman Church with the Chair of Peter. Both these great Fathers of the Church gave a list of the Popes from Peter down to the Pope who sat in the Chair of Peter in their own times. Irenaeus in concluding his catalogue, says: "In this order and by this succession, the ecclesiastical tradition from the apostles and the preaching of the truth have come down to us."

In his next letter—that of October 25—Dr. McAllister attempts to show that general councils have contradicted each other. In our next we will examine what he says on this point.

REV. FATHER ROSSWINKEL, S. J., ON "SPOOKS AND SPIRITS."

An Interesting Lecture Before The Philomathean Society, Detroit.

Catholic Witness.
"Spooks and Spirits" was the subject of a lecture delivered by Father Rosswinkel before the Philomathean Society of Detroit College on Wednesday evening, Dec. 22. After stating that the belief in a spirit world was universal to-day as it had been at all times, he introduced the teaching of the Bible and of the Church, and explained the origin of the good and evil spirits. "As spirits they are the creation of a Creator, who is goodness and from whom nothing but what is 'very good' can proceed. In as far as they are evil, it is the consequence of a free act of their perverse will. Father Rosswinkel said that the teaching of the Sadducees was revived for the purpose of furthering a well laid plan to discredit revelation. For, as Bayle, a fierce opponent of Christianity, remarks: "Prove to unbelievers the existence of evil spirits, and by that alone you will force them to concede all your dogmas." The Bible is explicit in its teaching on the existence of evil spirits, but word has been passed along that the teaching of the Bible is to be discredited. Therefore the existence of a spirit world is to be denied. The Church maintains the existence of a spirit world, but she is not to be deemed as the author of the Apocalypse; and therefore a spirit world cannot exist. Remarkable apparitions of the Blessed Virgin have taken place in recent times, but their reality would be a proof in favor of Christianity. Therefore again the existence of a spirit world is to be denied!

Father Rosswinkel maintained that no one was less superstitious than an intelligent Catholic, who gratefully accepts all the proved facts of science, but is not willing to accept conclusions in no way warranted. Science has not and will not be able to prove the non-existence of a spirit world.

Various phases of spirit manifestations were then explained, as "table talking, mind reading," etc. While very much might and could be explained either as downright humbug or by some natural principles, still there were certain phases which all professed explanations failed to explain. In confirmation of what the lecturer cited some well authenticated facts.

Father Rosswinkel stated he was far from believing all fairy tales and stories of hobgoblins, but the fact that certain houses and places were by the permission of God allowed to be infested by evil spirits was undeniable. The counterfeits of proof of the existence of the genuine article, and thus while again often deception is practiced, still more flippant people will be

satisfied with a shrug of the shoulder and an incredulous smile in recorded instances where hundreds of sober, intelligent persons were witnesses of certain manifestations, which baffled all natural explanations. The subject of "invasion," "obsession" and "possession" was then fully treated. Some of the unmistakable signs of genuine "possession" were stated and interesting instances narrated.

Father Rosswinkel concluded by stating the number of safeguards we had against the assaults of the devil. 1. They are creatures of God and are under His dominion. 2. The church has received power over them. 3. The holy angels, who are as soldiers for our welfare as the devils are for our ruin. 4. The power of the holy name of Jesus.

NOTABLE CONVERSION.

New York, December 29.—It has just been made known among High Church Episcopalians that Miss Marion Lane Garney, who founded the Church Settlement Home, connected with the Church of the Redeemer, 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 A. 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 Garney, who is thirty years old, turned her attention to the Catholic faith. Her conversion was brought about in some measure, too, by Father Henry Van Rensselaer, of St. Francis Xavier's church.

Miss Garney was educated in Wellesley College. She belongs to the historic old Boston family of Garneys. Quaker blood flows in her veins. On November 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 Garney changed her name from Marion Lane Garney to Marion Frances Garney. After partaking of her first Communion Miss Garney went into retreat at Poughkeepsie, where she is at the present time. It is said she will either go to the Franciscan Sisterhood or the Sisters of the Holy Souls in Purgatory. Both her parents are Protestants.

THE YEAR'S CONVERTS.

As has been the custom for several years past, the Paulist Fathers have compiled a list of distinguished converts to the Church during the past twelve months.

The list of foreign names, to which must be added those of Lord Encombe, the son and heir of the Earl of Eldon, and Lady Auckland, wife of Lord Auckland, whose conversion is chronicled in foreign exchanges just to hand, is as follows:

In England, the Hon. Albert E. Bingham, a son of the Earl of Lincoln, and Mrs. Albert Bingham. Mr. Herbert Rowbotham, wife of Herbert Rowbotham of the British South African Company; Robert E. Dell, an Oxford graduate and editor of the Surrey Mirror; the Hon. Mrs. Moore Smith and the Viscountess Canterbury, sisters of the Earl of Oxford; in France, Mrs. Terry, formerly Miss Sibyl Sanderson, the American opera singer.

The recent converts here include Dr. Grever, wife and seven children, Scranton, Pa.; Miss Marion Garney, a graduate from Wellesley College; Dr. Luke Robinson, San Francisco; C. E. Allen and Frederick Long, of Cleveland; Dr. Richard Lillis, San Francisco; Miss Bessie Livingston, Webster, Mo.; the Meriden Hospital, Meriden, Conn.; Clarence Whitaker, Colorado; Henry Augustine H. Boyer, formerly a Presbyterian minister in Chicago, now a student at St. Joseph's Seminary Yonkers; the Rev. E. L. Buckley, former rector of St. John's Episcopal Church, Newport, R. I., at present engaged in study in Europe for the priesthood.

A BRITISH SOLDIER.

Lawrence McCarthy, probably the oldest man in the world and the last survivor of the combatants at Waterloo, has just died in the workhouse at Nenagh, Tipperary, aged one hundred and fifteen years.

This scrap of contemporary history, culled from the daily papers, furnishes the most interesting epigram on the "pride, pomp and circumstance of glorious war" we have seen for a long time. The world is moving to tears at the story of Belshazzar, blind, led by a child, and begging alms from the wayfarers; but it weeps at what is most probably a myth. Here is the case of a real hero of the present century—one of those who assisted saving Europe, and especially England, from becoming the prey of a tyrant swollen with insatiable ambition, left to die a pauper's death and fill a parish coffin. Probably one of these British lads, mere raw recruits, who marched to the field of slaughter to the rollicking strains of "The Young May Moon" or "The Fothering's Jug," and whose impatient spirit found it so hard to be kept standing in square all day long before the mad charges of Ney's cuirassiers. How beautiful to fight and die in defence of an empire that lets her humble defenders sink into beggars' graves while honours and riches and titles are lavished on the well paid generals who order the movements of slaughter! The United States Government is often reproached for the facility with which men can get on its pension list,

but how much more shame attaches to the rule that leaves its bravest soldiers often die of sheer starvation!—Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

A MASKED ENEMY.

It is not the bold and unmasked enemy that we need to fear. The man who attacks us in daylight on the open highway, and whom we promptly recognize and hand over to the police. But the stealthy assassin who emerges from the dark alley; the man or woman who pretends friendship, and is our covert foe; the soft voiced acquaintance who bequeils us into confidences which are our own undoing; the sunny plotters who flatter us in order that he may reap a benefit—these venomous reptiles can not be tied into a quivering mass and bundled off in a parrot wagon.

Even in the purely natural world danger lurks where we least suspect. While we seek safety from the fury of the cyclone or the fangs of an infuriated beast, the insupportable fissure in the embankment widens, and the mountain snows quietly melt into a raging torrent. The deadly deed is done, and it is easy to fight the course since which we are not to disguise and make no pretence. If the devil does not strike us with horns and eleven hoofs, breathing fire and flame, the whole world would unite to defy him and put him to rout; but the insidious ease and grace with which he plays a part is his best weapon, and his path is strewn with the wrecked lives of those who thought him an angel of light.

There is a new poacher in the preserves of the King, a fresh and devouring fire in the fair meadows of Christ. It is a belief which calls for Christian Science, and which is compounded of several vile heresies. A belief, did I say? It is rather a disbelief—an avowed negation, a contradiction of everything tangible, a denial of all but the unreal. The same fantastic persons who fall upon their metaphorical knees when the "spirit rappings" were heard, who worshipped at the shrine of Buddha and the occult, who thought altruism the only scheme of life, and Nirvana the condition of the blessed in death, who projected astral bodies and died in thought transference, now swarm like gnats around the leaders of this new craze, and hush with awe to their vivid and unintelligible theories.

And the fire is increasing. This is no false alarm. The "Christian Scientists" in Chicago had just closed their session, and cost more than \$100,000 and which is free from debt, and crowded at each meeting with hordes from far and near. Money poured in like rain, and the most of it was for the salvation; and the fever has seized, not the obviously unbalanced alone, but thousands whose perversion is to us no less a surprise than a grief.

From the hundreds of cases where this weird thing has wrought deadly harm, and of which I have been personally cognizant, I will mention one. Dr. Corcoran, it is well known that the "Christian Scientist" offers all the remedies of the physician and the herbs which were intended for the healing of the nation, and simply denies that the disease exists. A little girl was seized with throat, and a false membrane formed in the throat. The misguided mother at her proceeding to deny the child died, and was buried. A help of a healer of her own faith, made use of all the incantations it directed. In a short time the child died, and was buried. A few days after that, the mother met the old family physician, and her sore heart, beginning to repent, desired comfort.

"Doctor," she said, "sell me the truth. Would my babe have saved if I had called you?" "It was familiar with the case, and was indignant enough." Dr. Corcoran said that the membrane that had formed in the throat, "Amy would be well to-day."

The mother gave a shriek, and in a week was an inmate of an insane asylum. Instances like this are recorded daily; still, and as these are, they are innocent compared with the heresies travesties with which the Sacraments of the Church are burlesqued. But of this feature of the subject, a natural repugnance and a consciousness of the inability to do justice forbid me to speak further. Investigation will convince any one that I have not exaggerated.

And, sad to say, this is the same being who has radiating in all directions. No Catholic—God be thanked!—can equip with these disquisitions, the only good thing that there are many non-Catholics, not very far from the Kingdom, who are taking the wrong path at the dividing of the roads, and Satan laughs as he sees the charade.

Let us not mince words. The devil is abroad with honey on his tongue. He may wear a Worth gown and belong to the "first family," but still the same being who has been the enemy of man. We need a new crusade—a new renouncing of the devil and his works and his pomps; a new advance of our true and earnest spiritual wickedness in high places, and "God be with us" for a war-cry.—Flora L. Standler in Ave Maria.

RETROSPECT.

Between remembering the old year and looking forward to the new year, New Year's Day should be a busy one for a Christian. It ought to be a day of examination of conscience. Good Christians examine their consciences in some manner or other daily, and some are so vividly in God's presence that they scrutinize every act of their lives; and this is what it is to be thoroughly conscientious. Conscientiousness when cultivated is nothing less than habitual consciousness of the Divine Presence. To be sure, some persons are over-particular in examination of their consciences, and these are called scrupulous. But most of us are not scrupulous enough. The cultivation of the conscience tends to a constant realizing of the Divine Presence, and when this becomes habitual the soul becomes perfect.

There are two kinds of examination of conscience, both of which are good. One is done at fixed times by some arrangement with one's self honestly adhered to. The other is that of continuous consciousness of the Divine Presence, in which one does not let you pass an hour, or even a minute, without undergoing scrutiny. In the former case you examine your conscience, and in the latter you constantly examine you. "I have met numbers of persons," says a well-known Paulist preacher, "who never ever examine their consciences, and in the latter year they are ready at all moments to perform the highest spiritual duties."

But for most of us we may truly say that no practice will produce better results for persons of good sense than having fixed times at which we shall give our examinations of the day. And New Year's Day, of all days in the year, we should take account of our conduct towards God and our neighbor, and ourselves, and make good resolutions for the future. The fact is that on a day like this the old year rises up and demands examination. Sometimes we say, "the past is gone." But in truth there is no such great luck as that. It would be a very good thing for some of us if the past could be politely bowed out with the old year. But there is no such thing. The past year is an account-book

turled over to God's court to witness for or against us; let us try to get a favorable balance out of it. At any rate, let us know the truth about it.

Let us face about, therefore, and look back over the past twelve months, and look back into the days of our childhood, and the seasons of the old year. How did I begin the old year and how did I behave myself last winter? Did I make my Easter duty last spring? Did I attend Mass regularly and worship God through the summer, or did I make the Lord's Day one of carousing and drinking? Have I used my tongue for blasphemy, my body for lust, my soul for slavery to the evil one? Have I unjustly gotten any of my neighbor's property? Have I been brutal to my family? These are not only questions. But there's no happy New Year for you till you have answered them and many others besides, repented of your sins and made good resolutions for Christmas and Communion, and for a good life for the future.—Sacred Heart Review.

ST. PAUL'S.

Five thousand Freemasons, we read, attended the bi-centenary celebration of the building of London's Saint Paul's. We do not doubt it, and we believe it was an appropriate St. Paul's is almost the only religious pile of any note of which English Protestants can boast that was not torn from Catholic owners and appropriated to the new-diskovered worship. It was built to replace the beautiful Gothic structure raised by James Jones and destroyed in the great fire of 1666, and it is worthy of note by those who complain about St. Peter's in Rome being the fruit of general contributions of European Catholics that the money or building St. Paul's was levied off all the English counties, in some places by the gross collection of the Protestant squirearchy. St. Paul's cannot be regarded as a cathedral, in any strictly religious sense. It is a Freemason's edifice, built largely by Masonic subscriptions, and the forced contributions of agricultural clods, and it was right and proper that most of those who participated in the celebration should be people whose rites are so blasphemous and who are the banned enemies of the true Church of God. Externally and internally there is little in St. Paul's to proclaim its ecclesiastical character. It is more like a mammoth custom house, plus a dome, than a temple of divine worship, and before its main entrance stands a dilapidated statue of the nearest approach to a female saint of which English Protestantism can boast among its regulars, the decent living but common-place Queen Anne, who had only two prayers a day for the Church of England and devotion to her gin bottle. Everything is in keeping about St. Paul's. It has neither the solemnities of antiquity nor of modern sanctity, nor yet has it the attraction of architectural beauty; it is simply vast, bulky and pretentious.—Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

CROSSFIXES ARE ILLEGAL.

The war on the High Church party in the Church of England has commenced, and it has been announced that henceforth they will have no peace until their "Romish" practices are completely banished from the English Church. Herbert, the Evangelical party in the Anglican Church has looked on in passive indignation at the exhibition in churches of crucifixes and confessionals and vestments and altars. But it seems that this passive attitude has now been definitely abandoned, and war to the knife is to be the motto henceforth.

The rector of St. Mark's, Marylebone, London, was "high," and had stations of the cross in his church and a crucifix over the pulpit. An indignant parishioner took the question into the law courts, and Dr. Tristram, of the probate and matrimonial division of the High Court, in his capacity of chancellor of the Diocese of London, heard the case. The written pleading filed in the case alleged that a "black brass crucifix" had been put up in the Church and prayed for its removal, as well as for the removal of the stations of the cross. The judge, in deciding the case, made an elaborate distinction between a cross and a crucifix. He cited a decision of the judicial committee of the privy council, affirming that a cross was legal, but implying that a crucifix was not. And, following the implication contained in this decision, the chancellor held that the crucifix was illegal and ordered it removed.

For Catholics, there is something decidedly ludicrous in the idea of a law court undertaking to settle questions of orthodoxy and correct church practices as between a clergyman and his congregation. It was the absurd incongruity of having questions of religion, belief and ritual determined by such a tribunal, as exemplified in the case of the Gorman judgment, that gave occasion to the realization of the fact that the position of the Church of England was wholly untenable. It may confidently be predicted that, if this victory of the Evangelicalists in the case of St. Mark's Church is followed up and pressed home, there will be a large number of conversions to the Catholic Church. Those who have hitherto been deluding themselves with a vain imitation of Catholic practices, will see that they have come to the parting of the ways, and that they must choose either to accept the reality, in place of the semblance, or to go back to the cold and lifeless Protestantism of the last century.—Chicago New World.

THE STUDY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

A favorite argument against the Church with certain of our Protestant friends is that it forbids or discourages the reading and study of the Scriptures by the people. You can find that argument in one form or another, in almost every Protestant book, paper and sermon, and although it has been refuted time and time again, it comes forth again as if its accuracy had never been questioned.

An Australian prelate, Dr. Delany, who is conductor to the venerable Archbishop Murphy, of Hobartown, gives this Protestant calumny against the Church a very effective denial by pleading for a better edition in English of the Bible than we now possess. Not that he finds any fault with the accuracy of our improved English versions, but for the reason that he finds fault with the accuracy of our translation of the Bible. He says, "I have an edition supplied with notes by the best Biblical scholars, and made accessible to every Catholic home."

Dr. Delany contends that it is one of the chief duties of the Church to present its Divine Founder to the people as he really is, and shows Himself in the Revealed Word. Sacraments, conferences and doctrinal works may all be very good, but if they do not show Christ to the people, but over and above all those works, he holds "that the inspired words of the Gospels, the words of our Lord Himself, set in a framework of interpretation such as shall convey to the reader that precise sense which the Church derives from them, is the most effective of all ways."

The same idea was expressed at greater length by the Holy Father in his splendid encyclical on the "Study of the Scriptures." The Church has always favored and encouraged popular reading of Holy Writ, her only concern in the matter being that the faithful shall be on their guard against perverted translations of the Word of God—over. The past year is an account-book

Coll ge

in America.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.

COLLEGE, F. C. A.