

fourth Sunday of Advent and Christmas Day, comprise the time of Advent. These four Sundays with their respective week-days are a symbol of the four thousand years which intervened between the fall of our first parents and the birth of Christ. During this long period, Almighty God sent His prophets to foretell the coming of the Saviour Who should redeem mankind from the sins and degradation into which the world was plunged in its fallen condition. As the time approached, the prophecies of Christ's coming were more clear, and it was revealed to the prophet Daniel that the long-expected event would take place within seventy weeks (of years) or four hundred and ninety years "from the going forth of the word to build up Jerusalem again," which was utterly destroyed when the Jewish people were carried into captivity into Babylon. This decree of restoration was issued by King Artaxerxes in the twentieth year of his reign, and the prophecy indicated that in the middle of the last of these weeks of years, the victim and sacrifices of the Jews should cease, and that Christ Himself should be there- after the true Sacrifice of the world who should conform the covenant of God with man.

In this sense are taken the prophetic words, "In the half of the week the victim and the sacrifice shall fall, and there shall be in the temple the abomination of desolation; and the desolation shall continue even to the consummation and to the end;" and, "He (Christ) shall confirm the covenant with many in one week." (Dan. ix, 27.)

These predictions were intended to make the Jews prepare themselves by works of penance and the practice of all virtues, for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; for to Him God the Father "hath given power over all flesh that He may give eternal life to all whom God hath given Him. And this is life everlasting, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom God has sent." (St. John xvii, 2, 3.)

If we approach Jesus with true contrition and humility of heart during this time of preparation for His coming, He will be ready to receive us joyfully as the Good Shepherd of the gospel took gladly upon His shoulders the sheep which had strayed away from Him, and which He found after a diligent search.

We should be led to Jesus rather by motives of love than by those of fear of punishment, for though it is undoubtedly well that we should be brought to God even by motives of fear, those of love make our union with Him more complete. Christ Himself has told us that we must fear Him who can destroy both soul and body by condemning them to the eternal punishment of hell, rather than those who can kill only the body. This is a motive indeed why we should serve God, but it is a motive far inferior to that of love for Him who is infinitely perfect, and therefore who possesses all the qualities and attributes which deserve our love.

He is infinitely amiable in Himself, and, besides, we should love Him for His bounty to us. From Him every good and perfect gift comes to us in our hour of necessity, every grace which will enable us to resist temptation, and, above all, our redemption from sin and the power of the devil, without which we should still remain children of wrath. It was this thought which raised in the hearts of all the Saints that intense love for Christ which was their characteristic, as in the case of St. Paul who said, (Gal. ii, 20) "And I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me. And that I live now in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God who loved me, and delivered Himself for me. I cast not away the grace of God."

To receive the riches of God's grace during this holy time, every Catholic should be reconciled to God through the sacrament of penance, which is the appointed means of recovering God's friendship, and should receive the Holy Eucharist, without which heavenly nourishment our souls pine away and die from the want of God's grace and favor.

Trial stimulates growth in human virtues. Trial in the form of doubt is good. Without doubt we might have mental lethargy, but we would never possess the healthy vigor of scholarship. Trial in the form of labor is good. Without having to work we might become good eaters and good sleepers, but we would never be strengthened by the virtue of industry and endurance. No man should ever for a moment entertain the thought that his affliction is the indication that God has marked him as a failure. Let such remember that affliction is only a signboard that points to wider usefulness.—Rev. W. R. Rogers.

STALE SLANDERS.

Which Bigots Are Wont to Gloat Over.

The following able and convincing paper on "The Syllabus and the Inquisition" was read before the Australian Catholic Congress by Rev. Father Rennet, S. M.

Our enemies say: "When you are in a minority you clamor for equal liberty to all; but no sooner are you in the majority in the State than you deny to others what you had claimed for yourselves." This is a very sweeping and daring assertion made by non-Catholics, especially when we recollect the words of a Protestant writer: "The spirit of persecution is the original sin of heresy." Then let us examine the views of the Church towards liberty of worship.

It is a strange thing that we Catholics, who in all ages have suffered so much for conscience sake, and who walked to liberty in the blood of millions of our martyrs, should be so often accused of being illiberal and anxious to interfere with the political and religious rights of our fellow citizens. The world might at least remember that the first time liberty of worship was proclaimed it was the act of a Catholic—Constantine the Great. The liberty of conscience is different from liberty of conscience in this that the latter applies only to the interior dispositions of man, while the former refers to exterior acts of a religion.

LIBERTY OF WORSHIP WHEN ALLOWED.

How far does this liberty of worship apply to the different states of society? Is it to be proclaimed at all times? Does it extend to all sorts of sects?

Will it be safe to say that everyone is at liberty to follow exteriorly what inwardly he believes to be right? At first sight we would think that this liberty is to be denied to nobody. Still this principle will not stand the searchlight of reason. If, owing to circumstances of birth or education, to social environments, a man happens to be a Fetishist, will you claim for him the right to offer human sacrifices to his idols? Or if he be born a Hindu, will you, when he dies, allow his widow to offer herself a willing holocaust on the grave of her departed husband? I believe that even our greatest champions of liberty would not dare to go so far in their contentions.

Does it mean the right to practise and profess any religion so long as we do not interfere with other people, and that man ought not to condemn what God tolerates? God tolerates thieves and murderers, is that a reason why governments ought to be blind to their doings? A man may not interfere with other people, and, meanwhile, under the garb of religion, preach doctrines subversive to the society and the family; and a government has a perfect right, nay, a duty, to protect society against the ravages of religious madmen. Does it mean at least so far as a man professes to be a Christian he ought to be allowed to abide by and preach his own views? But what, if that supposed to be Christian, like the Aborigines and Husbies, added persecution and war to his preaching?

CARDINAL GIBBONS' DEFINITION.

Liberty of worship is well defined by Cardinal Gibbons, and his definition will throw a good deal of light on the other hypothesis I have to face, so I will give it here: "A man," he says, "enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right of worshipping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practising a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God. This religious liberty is the true right of every man, because it corresponds with a most certain duty which God has put upon him."

No government has a right to interfere with the religious belief of the subject who sincerely holds that he is right, who does no injury to anyone, and who does not attempt to force his belief on other people. The government, above all things, must be the keeper of our liberties and the guardian of our rights.

If in a state all the subjects belong to the true religion, the duties of the government are easily defined. It is bound to protect religion, and to prevent any one injuring it either by writing, speaking or plotting. But if all the members of a community belong to an heretical sect, will not also the government, for the sake of peace, have a duty to protect that sect against the interference of any other, and even against the introduction of the true religion of Christ?

RIGHTS OF GOVERNMENTS.

In the first case, by interference, the government would act against the fundamental principle of the sect's existence, viz., liberty of thought, and in the second it certainly has not the right, much less the duty, to prevent the diffusion of truth, and to keep its subjects in darkness with regards to the means of reaching their eternal destiny. No doubt the first duty of a government is to see to the temporal welfare of the people, but as all authority is from God, God cannot give any Government the right to put any hindrance in the way of the propagation of truth, and the establishing of the true religion. But what about a mixed community, whether the Catholics be in the majority or not? The government is bound to give to all equality of civil rights, and to all the same advantages for the education of their children. Even if in such country the Catholic religion was the religion of the state, the dissentients must be tolerated, and not interfered with so long as they do not try to upset the peace of the community. They have a right to tolerance, for, as Fenelon said to James II., "Grant civil

liberty to all, not in approving everything as indifferent, but in tolerating with patience what Almighty God tolerates, and endeavoring to convert men by mild persuasion." This is in perfect accord with our idea of faith. The government cannot force its own religious views, even when true, on any of its subjects. It cannot put error and truth on the same footing as regards protection, for error has no right by itself to be protected, but it has a right to tolerance so long as the man in error has not been disabused and enlightened.

Such, I believe, are the real views of the Catholic Church in reference to religious toleration. From them we can deduce clearly that in a Catholic community that will abide by the principles of the church, and will be guided by reason, there is no room for persecution or oppression. All the citizens can enjoy the same civil rights, all have a claim to their views being respected and tolerated, all can live at peace with their neighbors without allowing the happy union which ought to exist between the children of one common Father.

But non-Catholics will offer to this thesis two strong objections. They will say: "Your church is the most illiberal of all churches; it is antagonistic to all our modern liberties. Only look at the Syllabus, and remember the Inquisition. The Syllabus is the most intolerant page that has been written in modern times, and the Inquisition the most cruel tribunal the world has ever seen." These objections require some explanation.

THE SYLLABUS.

In the Syllabus I shall examine only a few propositions that go counter to the ideas of liberty, such as we find them in our present society.

The following proposition is condemned: "It is lawful for any man to embrace and profess the religion which he thinks to be true, trusting to the light of his reason." This proposition is condemned and justly so. It is simply a repetition of Pius IX's protest against those "who maliciously desire to derive all religious truths from the sole light of reason, and declare that a man has a primordial right to render to God the honor and the worship which he considers the best according to his own caprice." Man has no absolute right to do so. He has the right to search the evidences of religion, and the duty to worship God as He desires to be worshipped. To claim the right to worship God as we please is to deny the existence of one true religion, established by God for the guidance of man. The right of reason is not to make a religion of our own, but to search for the true religion.

In proposition 78 we read that: "In a community where all the subjects are Catholics the sovereign should not allow the free exercise of false religions." I have already partially explained this statement, which you may call very illiberal. You will object to me as a counterpart to this. What would you say if in a Protestant community the ruler forbade the introduction of Catholicism? The two hypotheses are very different the one from the other. If a burglar enters a house at night will you give him the same right to defend that house against its proper owner that you give the owner against the burglar? If a nation possesses the truth, has it not a right to protect it against intruders? And if intruders have despoiled the owners, have not the owners the right to come back and claim their property? However, this may not trouble our ever sensitive idea of liberty and equality, for although per se, a false religion has no right to toleration, still, owing to circumstances, and for the sake of peace, the legislator may tolerate false religions when it is in the interest of the people that he should do so.

"The Holy Father," says the author of "La Chiesse lo Stato" "does not condemn the hard necessity in which the state would be to tolerate and give liberty of worship to heretico religions. Such community is not in its normal state with regards to revelation, and the government must accommodate itself to circumstances. But what is condemned is, that this state of things is the best and the most conformable to modern progress." Differences of circumstances do not alter the principle. The Pope, says the Civiltà Cattolica, in answer to Mr. Gladstone, May 29, 1868, does not condemn the liberty of conscience and worship in se, but he condemns those who pretend that such liberty is the right of every man, and that this right must be proclaimed in every well-constituted society. The Pope condemns the right to the thing, while Mr. Gladstone makes him condemn the thing itself.

Such are the tenets of the Syllabus toward the subject we are treating, and they do not appear to be opposed to, but rather sanctioned by sound reason. Protestants and infidels of all shades unceasingly point to the Spanish Inquisition as a stain on the fair brow of the spouse of Christ. They represent it as one of those ignominies perpetrated by her, and for which she will never be able to find any excuse; nor can she wash away the blemish which, on account of it, will stick to her name to the end of time. They speak of its horrors as recorded by Llorente, forgetting that Llorente is essentially a biased authority. A traitor to his country, and a traitor to his conscience, he finds his delight in misrepresenting everything Spanish and everything Catholic. He himself admitted that in order that his statements might not be contradicted he had burnt most of the

documents referring to that tribunal. And we have proofs, irrefutable proofs, that some of his statements are false.

Was the Inquisition a purely political, or a purely religious, or a politico-religious tribunal? There are masterly minds supporting each of these three opinions. When I say that Dr. Hefele, Leo, Guizot, Lenormant, de Maistre, Rauke, and even Llorente himself, assert that it was a mere political tribunal, we must admit that this opinion has serious evidence in its favor. "The Inquisition," says Rauke, "was the means of completing the absolute authority of the kings." "It was an act of self-defence," says Lenormant, "against the dangers threatening the monarchy and the nation, against the conspiracy of the Jews and the Moors." When I see Pombal, the great persecutor of the Jesuits, speaking of it in the highest terms of admiration, it does not appear to me to have been a religious tribunal, although it had the mantle of religion, and its judges were monks, mostly Dominicans. We must not forget that they were not appointed by the Pope, but by the King. And they were never allowed to condemn any one to death, but simply to hand over to the secular tribunal the man who had been found guilty.

PROTEST OF POPE.

The Pope soon discovered the cruelty of the tribunal, and we see them protesting against its rigid actions. Pope Sixtus IX., says "Chambers' Encyclopedia," protested against the doings of the tribunal, but, notwithstanding his protest, the Spanish crown maintained its assumption. Then the Pope, feeling their protests unsuccessful, were compelled through prudence to tolerate what they were powerless to suppress. Seeing this, Paul III. exhorted the Neapolitans to resist its introduction into their country. Pius IV. addressed a similar exhortation to Milanese.

Only a few remarks on the working and the number of victims of the institution, and I have done.

1. The Inquisition had no right to bring to its bars any man who had always been a Jew or a Moor. Their powers extended to Moors (or formerly converted Moors) or to the Christianized Jews.

2. Clement VII., by a special decree ordered that the properties of the Moors should not be confiscated but retained for their children.

3. The celebrated auto-da-fé were represented at public meetings where Bishops, priests and lay people were watching the agony of the unfortunate victims in the fire. The auto-da-fé were nothing of the kind. They were simply the spectacle of those who, having adjudged their errors came publicly to make an act of faith and promise for the future to lead the lives of true Christians.

VICTIMS OF THE INQUISITION.

But what about the number of victims of the Inquisition? De Maistre, who is a very careful writer and exact historian, says that the number of capital punishments during the centuries of its existence did not come to 3,000. Mr. Legge, a non-Catholic writer in the Scottish Review (April, 1891) declares that instead of 8,000 mentioned by Llorente for a certain period, he cannot find more than 2,000—an average of forty a year. Compare this with some records of English tribunals. Hamilton, in his history of quarter sessions, gives the jail returns for Easter in 1598. He finds that during that year seventy-four persons were hanged in the jail. James Stevens gathers that if the average, in each country had been twenty a year, this would make 800 a year for the whole of England, that is, 11,200 in the fourteen years against the supposed to be 2,000 for the same period. Mr. Mackay (I continue to quote F. Smith) says that after the passing of the act against witches, under the promptings of John Knox, till the succession of King James I., 17,000 witches were burnt in Scotland, and 40,000 in England perished in the same manner between 1,600 and 1,680. And as Mr. Legge justly remarks, "even in supposing that the victims of the Inquisition would have been as numerous as certain people pretend, they would hardly have afforded the witch hunters' spot for fifty years."

It is well to notice here, in passing, that the witches were put to death on the religious grounds. What about the thousands upon thousands of Catholics who at the same period suffered for their faith in England, Scotland and Ireland?

THE BETTER COURSE.

Hence I conclude that instead of throwing our misdeeds of the past at each other's face, we had much better live in union and peace. The historian, in turning the pages of our history, finds many things that do no honor to any of us. In days gone by people had different views, other ideas than our own, and we can hardly do them justice by examining their actions with the microscope of our nineteenth century education. Better than quarrel about what is over, let us live in mutual esteem, helping each other in a world which has none too much happiness, and during a life that is far too short to be mispent in ramblings, quarrels, uncharitableness and disunion.

THREE MASSES.

The Holy See is considering the advisability of extending to the entire priesthood of the Roman rite the privilege which is confined at present to the Church in certain portions of the Spanish dominions of celebrating three Masses on All Souls' Day. The instinct of the faithful tends constantly to develop the logical nucleus of a popular devotion, and nowhere has this been

so marked as in the case of Catholic piety towards the Holy Souls. They are detained for a space in their purgatorial prison house, and they can be helped by our good works and prayers, and especially by the Adorable Sacrifice of the Altar, as the Council of Florence reminds us. Devotion to them can take no healthier form than the recitation of approved forms of indulgent prayer issued under the sanction of ecclesiastical authority, aims dead, and the application of the Mass. It is in the liturgy of this last form of piety that the purest and tenderest instincts of the Church display themselves; and devout Catholics are never remiss in adopting these instincts and making them their own. Give them rest forever, O Lord, and let the light that falls not shine upon them!—Providence Visitor.

THE FEAST OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

The feast of the Immaculate Conception is one of the most joyous and beautiful festivals that the Church keeps throughout the year. When sin entered into the world, sorrow and pain and disease and death came; and, on most of our festivals, however glad and glorious they may be, there is a minor note in the ecstatic chants, that recalls to us these sorrowful things. But the feast of Mary's Immaculate Conception tells us that when God chose her who was to be the living tabernacle, the nursing mother, the only earthly parent of Jesus Christ—of that Eternal Word, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God—He determined that not for one moment should the slightest shadow of even original sin rest upon her. By a special decree of His omnipotent will He exempted her from the curse and stain of her great forefather Adam; and from the very first instant of her existence she was sinless, stainless, immaculate. This dogma of the Church is often misunderstood outside her pale. People think that it refers to the virgin-birth of Jesus Christ rather than to His mother's sinless, instantaneous, unmarred and unclouded holiness from the first moment of her being. She is like the most spotless lily, the purest, untrodden snow, the clearest sky, the most radiant star; she is like the pure, fine gold that we bring for the chalice, the white, fine linen we use for the corporal, where our sacramental God shall rest; but she is more and holier than any or all of these. Her feast is heaven like with the beatitudes holiness of that spotless human tabernacle in which the true, Holy of Holies vouchsafed to dwell. To Catholic Americans this holy day of obligation is of especial interest, as it is the patronal feast of the United States.—Sacred Heart Review.

A GREAT CATHOLIC CONVERT DIES IN ROME.

Rome, Nov. 1 1900, America, Catholic America, is much the poorer to-day, for she has lost a distinguished son by the death of Mr. Heywood, and we cannot do better than commemorate him here. Only a long friendship and some curiosity, inquiry, made from time to time, enabled me to estimate, in any due way, his exceedingly great merits, and if the spell that friendship and reverence for its privacy have deterred me from speaking freely during his lifetime, the impulses most strongly impelling me now, are in the opposite direction.

He was, I contend, one of the finest, and, in every respect, most remarkable, intelligent which the Protestantism of America has yielded to the Catholicity of Rome, whither he came, after his conversion, to live in the very vicinity of the Vatican, in the old, pre-Reformation embassy of England, the land of his fathers, to the See of Rome.

But before I pass to what I consider as a proof of this, I may quote from one of his tragedies, that called "Herodias," a passage which commends itself by reason of its being a specimen, at least, of his thoughtful literary style. It is a chant by the Heavenly Host:

Light invisible
Light giving Darkness inscrutable;
Source unprovoked, Source all-receiving;
Boundless charity, which, yearning, endures,
For our still is:
Sternness unwavering, limitless, infinite,
Invincible firmness;
Omnipotent and sleepless Benevolence;
Vengeance asleep omnipotent;
Ever creating and recreating Creator, from fin-
ished creation resting forever;
Justice that seeth not, feeleth not; feeling
for all-sustaining pity;
Hidden and fathomless Mystery, mysteries
Hidden revealing;
Measureless grace all pervading; Charity all
centring;
Love invincible, all overcoming;
Holiness, holiness, holiness;
Father of Christos,
Glory, majesty, victory and honor be unto
Thee
Forever and ever and ever.
Amen.

Mr. Heywood was also a novelist, and he was actually engaged in bringing out a novel at the period of his illness. But it is to his essays that his passion my appeal for proof of his passion, and of a style finding his generally, and in a singularly exact way. These essays appeared as literary studies in the Sunday edition of the New York Sun, during the editorship of Mr. Dana, and it was well said of them, at the time, that they were "sufficient to give that journal as distinguished a character as Sainte-Beuve gave to the paper with which he was so long connected." At the close of the series, Mr. Heywood published them in a volume, "How They Strike Me, These Authors" (Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, 1877), a title which was almost as bad as the essays were excellent.

But the world is old enough now to distinguish a great mind, which, for moral, intellectual and social reasons,

has disdained to seek an outlet of suitable manifestation.

I quote, more or less in a hurry, and at random, from among the pages of his book of essays, in order to enable the Catholic American reader to judge if his conversion was not the tribute of a remarkable intelligence to the glorious servitude of the faith. Thus: "In one respect only, the intellectual power of Hawthorne seems to have been unrestrained by any definable limits. His vocabulary appears boundless. His thoughts thoroughly elaborated, are presented to the reader in their utmost development, exquisitely shaped, cleanly cut, sharply defined, wanting nothing. A reader of very quick intelligence may, indeed, find this perfectness of expression somewhat wearisome. He must passively receive the exuberant and wholly matured product of his author, foregoing the charm of that kind of cooperation which goes forward, when the reader's reason and imagination are called upon in some way to consummate the idea begotten in his mind by the writer's words. Slower apprehensions and less fruitful fancies, however, obtain only satisfaction from Hawthorne's fullness of utterance. In reading all his writings, you will perceive not more than one or two words that appear like gems, such, for instance, as 'immitigable,' and this rather from its rarity in other places than from its frequency here. From this mastery of words, this exquisite taste in diction, joined with a keen sense of euphony and of dulcet rhythm, comes no small part of this author's great reputation." (pp. 162-3.)

Of Miss Thackeray: "This is very graphic; it is also very thorough. Possibly the thoroughness of the description impresses you even more than its vivacity. You are struck by the conscientious exactitude with which every particular of the scene is noted and clearly set forth. While considering it, you forget that this is but a space, and a small space, in the background of a picture which you came to see."

This little glimpse of the intense faculty of perception which the book reveals in almost every one of the essays. Where this is not the dominant characteristic, there are others; the closest imaginable penetration, the exactest observation, the most objective general criticism. He was dealing with purely literary subjects, and these faculties played upon the authors who are such as Lytton, Black 'George Eliot,' Trollope, Tennyson (whom he very much excoriates), Joquin Miller, Bret Harte, the two Hawthornes, father and son, Motley and Turgidoff, who was then a novelty. The very same gifts he applied to philosophy and theology in "Lady Merton," and, I believe, I recollect him to have told me, in that which he was preparing for the press before his last illness.

His analytical gifts bear the chief relation to his outspoken plea on behalf of Catholicism, which "Lady Merton" and his last novel contain, because the disector can bear a better testimony to faith than the positive mind, but the constructive faculties of Mr. Heywood were strong, and doubtless in proportion with his powers of insight, but for the evidence of this I can, for want of space, only refer the reader to the poetical passage which I have quoted, and which is a deeply thoughtful and well-balanced striving to express the nature of God.

Into the brightness of that "Light invisible" he has gone; to the "Charity all-centring, love invincible, all-overcoming," toward which he dimly struggled in the prime and glory of his manhood when he came to dwell in the religious metropolis. He was the first son of the Puritans who was a Knight Commander of St. Gregory, and a Chamberlain of cape and sword to the Pope of Rome.

The Irish pilgrimage has been blessed twice by His Holiness: once in the Vatican, and once in St. Peter's. It numbers, strictly counted, about two hundred and thirty persons, four Bishops and the Cardinal primate of all Ireland. It has been organized by an Irish Olate of Mary Immaculate, Father Ring of Inchoore.

The college of St. Bede the Venerable, which Leo XIII. has founded, within the English college, for converts from Anglicanism is daily increasing. It numbers about ten more students this year, and expects not a few more before the re-opening of the Roman schools.

Mgr. O'Gorman, Bishop of Sioux Falls, who enjoys high esteem at the Vatican, has had a private audience with the Pope.

His Holiness is—let it be said, owing to his having had recently to suspend all audiences, for a little rest—very well, and unusually busy in audience-giving and blessing pilgrims.—Wm. J. D. Croke in Catholic Citizen.

Time takes heavy toll as we pass, one after one, the Janus-gated years, but he goes bravely on who bears with him the perfume of his Eden, and the romance of the morning, and the lavish heart of youth.—Benjamin F. Taylor.

THE ONLY PERFECT MOVING PICTURES

BIOGRAPH

Return of the Canadian Troops
Lord Roberts in Pretoria
New War Scenes
Many Other Views

The Famous Pictures

... of Pope Leo XIII.

LONDON OPERA HOUSE.

Thursday, Friday and Saturday, Dec. 6th, 7th and 8th.

Matinees daily at 2.30. Evenings at 8.15.

OWEN A. SMILY, Entertainer.

Popular prices—50 and 25c. Children 10c.