

The Catholic Record.

Published weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES.
(Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidelity.")
REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY.
THE CANADIAN COFFEE.

Publisher and Proprietor—The Canadian Coffee.
Messrs. Lake King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and M. G. O'Donnell are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto and the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, Ottawa, Kingston, and the Bishops of Hamilton and P. Terboon, and leading Catholic Clergymen through the Dominion.
Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.
Articles must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.
Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat. Jan. 10th, 1891.

TRIUMPH OF TRUTH IN KINGSTON.

Christmas week we published one of the most erudite and historically scholarly letters that in our judgment ever emanated from the well-stored mind and facile pen of the Most Rev. Archbishop Cleary, of Kingston. We copied into our issue of that week the letter in question from the columns of the *Canadian Freeman* of Kingston. It was a rebuke addressed to the editor of that Catholic journal for a leading article on education, which appeared in a previous issue. The proprietor of the *Canadian Freeman* had allowed the article to appear in print without having thoroughly examined its orthodoxy, or without having submitted its propositions to competent authorities, as we believe, in a matter of faith and Church discipline, it ought to have done. It was, however, what is known in Church history, a *felix culpa*. It evoked from the able and eloquent pen of the Archbishop one of the best papers we have yet seen on the question of European civilization as entirely effected and brought to perfection by the teachings and spiritual government of the Catholic Church. The sentence of our contemporary which was likely to give most offence and which His Grace declares "was most glaringly erroneous and contemptuous," reads as follows:

"The consequence is that an educated common people no longer allow themselves to be looked upon as so many *nonentities* in either Church or State, and on every proper occasion they assert, in no unmeaning terms, the *manhood* and independence of freemen."

The Archbishop, in righteous indignation, exclaims: "Who has ever heard of the Catholic Church treating the children of redemption as 'nonentities' and crushing out their manhood and independence of freemen." "It shall be no longer," said the writer of the article. "But when has it ever been allowed?" asks the Archbishop. The learned prelate then in burning words delineates the Catholic Church grappling with every imperial or tyrannical menstrosity that ever in history attempted the degradation and enslavement of the human race.

"She fought perseveringly; she bled profusely; myriads of her brave sons and daughters died the martyrs' death. Victory at length crowned her struggle. Whose was the victory? It was the victory of individual man's pre-eminence of his rights to his 'manhood' and the independence of free men, in spite of every organized material force to oppress and to crush him."

Leaving the wonderful results of the early civilization, by the Church, of all the savage tribes of Asia and Europe, Archbishop Cleary shows how Attila, Genseric and Alaric, at the heads of successive and successful hordes, blotted out Roman civilization and laid all Europe in smoke and ruins. These sanguinary hordes of ferocious savages destroyed every vestige of Christianity and ruled over Italy, France, Spain and Germany in unbridled license with untamable dispositions and with no other principle than "woo to the weakest." These savage people became the object of the Church's tenderest solicitude. She sent missionaries from Ireland and from the East to conquer them by the teachings of the cross and the knowledge of Jesus Christ and His gospel of charity, mercy and gentleness. For their intellectual cultivation and social equipment she employed the best specimens of all former civilizations, which the Roman Pontiffs had been most careful to preserve. Everywhere, beneath the shadow of the church, arose the school for the education of the masses, while in the great centres of population the universities were found which are the boast of our modern civilization to-day.

The Archbishop then shows how the female sex was safeguarded, protected and honored by the Church's enlightened and strict enactments in favor of the sanctity of marriage and the stability of the social fabric, of which the very foundations were threatened by divorce laws and tyrannical oppression of the rich and the powerful. The Catholic Church has declared that woman is to be henceforth the

queen of the household, and accordingly must be treated with the consideration and gentle respect due to her dignity in public and in private, in the crowded thoroughfare of the city, in the theatre, in the drawing room—everywhere. Who does not see the far reaching power of these sublime principles in the fashioning of the world's civilization? Shall it be said that the Church sought to reduce woman to a "nonentity" and to deprive her of her just "independence."

So overwhelmingly convinced of his errors and false position was the writer of the obnoxious article that both the proprietor of the *Canadian Freeman* and the author of the article have called upon Archbishop Cleary to spare any further comments on what they acknowledge to have been an unconscious blunder on their part. The writer says in a letter addressed to the *Canadian Freeman*:

"No one regrets more fully than I the scandal that appears to have been given to our Catholic people and the pleasure it affords to the professed enemies of our holy religion, by the editorial article published in your issue of the 10th inst. on the subject of education."

The *Toronto Mail* had more than one article of jubilation over the *Canadian Freeman's* independent stand and Archbishop Cleary's *tyranny*. It could not conceal its exultant delight at the prospect of a fierce quarrel between a Catholic journal and an eminent Archbishop. The *Mail* is now covered with confusion at the unanswerable arguments of the prelate and the most humble submission of both writer and journalist. It must be acknowledged that both have shown a true spirit of Catholic obedience to historical truth and to ecclesiastical authority in submitting so unreservedly to the censure administered by the justly indignant Archbishop. Indeed both share with Archbishop Cleary in the glory of a peaceable and so triumphant a termination to what might have proved a scandalous controversy. The learned Archbishop has demonstrated plainly that no error or derogation from Church history and universal truth shall be permitted to creep into and be hidden in any Catholic publication under his jurisdiction and supervision. The mysterious writer and the known editor of the *Canadian Freeman* have pleaded guilty to unconscious error and confessed absolute willingness to submit to correction when administered by competent authority. As Catholics, both have done themselves honor before the community and have set an example that all honest and sincere Catholic journalists should deem it a duty, as they would invariably find it a profit, to copy and to follow.

The apology of the mysterious writer contains some beautifully worded passages, with which we may be permitted to terminate this article. For instance, in reference to his remarks on a blind and unreasoning submission to authority, which he said was no longer the rule but the exception, the writer says:

"As a sincere Catholic, possessed of common intelligence, and at least a fair knowledge of the catechism of Christian doctrine, I could not have deliberately intended, in writing those lines, to convey the meaning which I now confess they plainly bear to ordinary readers, for assuredly the acceptance of the revealed truths of Jesus Christ delivered to men by the Catholic Church in virtue of His commission to teach all nations is not a blind and unreasoning submission to authority, but rather the most perfect exercise of the human intellect under direction of the human will, purified and elevated by Divine grace."

In its concluding paragraph the writer says:

"I hope I have sufficiently repudiated all that is offensive to religion and to the Church in the editorial article of which I have been treating. As I have said, I retract the entire article and condemn it, because, on revision, I perceive it abounds in errors against religion and offensive language towards the Catholic Church."

The editor of the *Canadian Freeman* is no less eloquent in his Catholic humility and entire submission. He says in his latest issue, in a well written leader:

"We hope the Archbishop will graciously condone our regrettable mistake, as it was altogether a material and not a formal one on our part. We honor His Grace the more for his condemnation, because it is indicative of his high regard for official duty; and is well calculated as a practical lesson against the commission of like mistakes in the future. Our love and respect for him in his personal and official character remain undiminished. They are both increased many fold in view of recent events."

The Christian sentiments which dictated those professions of personal attachment and of filial obedience to episcopal authority are much to be admired, as they are deserving of the highest commendation. In pursuing them we are reminded of Fenelon, the pious Bishop of Cambray, ascending the pulpit to read the condemnation by Rome of a book he had written and then committing it to the flames in presence of the whole congregation. Such evidences of Catholic discipline and respect for authority are the source of the Church's greatness and indestructibility. But they are gall and wormwood to the editors of the bigoted press that revel in the prospect of inter-religious warfare and misunderstandings

between the faithful and the clergy, between the shepherd and the flock.

It is to be hoped by all who have read Archbishop Cleary's admirable letter on "Civilization by the Catholic Church" that His Grace will find time to consider the important subject in all its various moods and history. A series of letters from his richly furnished mind and memory, written with the sure and masterly pen he wields, would result in a book or pamphlet of infinite value to our own people, who require all the ecclesiastical knowledge of history they can get, and to the public at large, of whom many but want to know the truth to embrace it.

SAVONAROLA.

In a recent issue of the *Mail* there appears a paper by Mr. G. Mercer Adam on Savonarola, the Dominican monk who in the year 1494 attained control of the Government of Florence. It is sufficient in the estimation of many Protestants to justify the most atrocious conduct if the perpetrator be at war with the Pope, and this appears to be the only claim of Savonarola to the extravagant laudation which Mr. Adam heaps upon him. He says:

"There was no self-righteousness in Savonarola; only a beautiful sanctity and an humble self trust. In the monastery his great store of learning had been put to use as a teacher, and his success in that led his superiors to bid him go forth to preach."

The learning and eloquence of Savonarola we do not deny, and it was on account of these qualities that the eloquent Dominican gained unlimited control in Florence. Neither do we deny that the eloquent preacher in the beginning of his career was honest and disinterested, and that it was his wish to make the people of Florence a virtuous community. But the pride of power was too much for him, and was the cause of his fall. It is a matter of opinion whether a Republican form of Government is preferable to a monarchy, and we have not a word of censure against Savonarola for having established a Republic in Florence. The destruction of bad books and immoral paintings by publicly burning them was also a laudable act, but it was carried to an excess when he was unrelentingly carried on against all works of art. It was, however, unpardonable in a monk to attack the authority of the Church, and to refuse obedience to the mandates of the Pope. It was for doing this, and for cruelly and illegally putting to death five prominent citizens of Florence that Savonarola was excommunicated by the Pope. These citizens were accused, it is true, of having rebelled against his authority, and of having attempted to restore Peter de Medici to the Florentine throne, but the laws of the Republic gave them the right to a fair trial, and they were entitled to the benefit of an appeal to the Grand Council of State, but this right was denied to them by Savonarola. For this illegal act of tyranny he was very properly punished by the decree of excommunication which the Pope issued against him.

Savonarola paid no attention to this decree, and in despite of it he continued to exercise sacerdotal functions. This was certainly not the conduct of a saint, such as Mr. G. Mercer Adam describes him to have been. Saints do not treat with contumely the decrees of their lawful ecclesiastical superiors, and even if Savonarola had been condemned on insufficient grounds, he should have yielded obedience to the Pope's decree. It is easy to see that it is in consequence of this act of rebellion that so many Protestants regard Savonarola as a hero. Not content with continuing to preach and to hear confessions, though he was deprived of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, Savonarola attacked the Pope's authority directly, and declared that he ought to be deposed. He even went so far as to establish at Florence an independent Florentine schismatical Church. He thus set at defiance the words of our Lord: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."

Savonarola was deposed from the presidency of the Republic, and condemned to death by the civil tribunal of Florence. It is unfair for Mr. G. Mercer Adam to accuse the Pope of being the cause of his death. It was, however, the law that a monk could not be subjected to capital punishment unless he were first degraded from his ecclesiastical position, and Savonarola was thus degraded so that the civil authorities could deal with him according to the laws. Mr. Adam styles him a martyr. A martyr is one who is put to death for his adherence to a good cause. This was not the case with Savonarola, who openly committed sacrilege by exercising ecclesiastical functions while he was excommunicated.

Savonarola made his peace with the Church before his death, and was admitted to receive the last Sacraments, but he was not put to death on account of his religious belief. He was condemned as the leader of a political party. Mr. Adam takes upon himself to say

that at this period the Pope succeeding each other were a "slak of iniquity." It is true that Alexander VI. has been violently denounced as immoral by many so-called historians, but the Protestant Roscoe has amply vindicated his character and has shown that he was truly an illustrious Pope, as were also his successors, Julius II. and Leo X. The abuse which has been lavished upon these Pontiffs is part of that conspiracy against historic truth which has been entered into in order to justify the revolt of Luther against the Pope's authority, but modern historical research has fully vindicated these Pontiffs from the slanders which have been so lavishly heaped upon them.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

One of the most interesting and lucid prophecies of the Old Testament bearing upon the coming of the Messiah is undoubtedly that written by the prophet Daniel, in reference to the number of weeks (of years) which would elapse before the coming of Christ. It is frequently read without due appreciation of its irresistible force, and at this season of the announcement of the tidings of great joy, the birth of our Divine Saviour, it will be useful to call attention to this wonderful revelation.

Of no book of the Old Testament has the authenticity been more virulently attacked than of the book of Daniel. But the boldest of infidels have not assigned to it a date later than the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, about 160 before Christ. It was, however, a part of the Jewish canon of Scripture, and it is named as such by the historian Josephus. The same writer tells us when this canon was finally established, namely in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, king of Persia, thus bringing us to about the year 435 before Christ, which is the date usually assigned for its formation, the reign of Artaxerxes having lasted from 424 to 464 B. C. It was not long before this that the prophecy under consideration was made, namely in the first year of Darius (x. 1) or about the year 537 before Christ. By many other evidences the authenticity of the book may be established, but it is sufficient that it was written before Christ, to show that it was a real prophecy, and if fulfilled in Christ it is a divine testimony to the truth of Christianity. We may add, however, that Josephus states that when Alexander the Great visited Jerusalem, the book of Daniel was shown him, wherein Daniel declared that one of the Greeks should destroy the empire of the Persians, and he supposed that himself was the person intended." It is there-fore clear that it was an ancient book when the visit to Jerusalem took place, 332 before Christ.

It had been foretold that the captivity of the Jews would terminate in its seventieth year, and Daniel says (ix. 2) that he understood this from the words of Jeremiah. He knew, therefore, that delivery was at hand, and that his people would return the next year to Jerusalem. He therefore offers a fervent prayer to God for the people of Israel, that God might show them mercy and restore the temple. It was then that God made a definite promise concerning the advent of the Redeemer, "Christ the Prince."

The angel Gabriel said to him: "Seventy weeks are shortened upon thy people and upon this holy city, that transgression may be finished and sin may have an end, and iniquity may be abolished, and everlasting justice may be brought, and vision and prophecy may be fulfilled, and the Saint of Saints may be anointed. Know therefore that from the going forth of the word to build up Jerusalem again unto Christ the Prince, there shall be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks; and the street shall be built again, and the walls in troublesome times. And after sixty-two weeks Christ shall be slain, and the people that shall deny Him shall not be His. And a people with their leader that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be waste, and after the end of the war the appointed desolation. And he shall confirm the covenant with many, in one week; and in the half of the week the victim and the sacrifice shall fail; and there shall be in the temple the abomination of desolation; and the desolation shall continue even to the consummation and to the end." (Dan. ix. 24, 27.)

The Hebrews used the word *shabua*, week, either for seven days or seven weeks. In the former sense it is used in Ezekiel xlv. 21, and in Daniel x. 3, where the addition of the words "of days" determines the meaning, but in Leviticus xxv. 8, it is used for seven years. So in the great Messianic prophecy we have a division of the seventy weeks into three epochs in which great events are to occur—events which could not and did not take place within so many ordinary weeks of days. The periods are first, the building of Jerusalem in seven weeks; under difficulties second, the period of sixty-two weeks from the completion of this work till the announcement of Christ's mission; third, one week during which Christ's mission is accomplished, the covenant

of God with His people being confirmed with many, and in the middle of this week take place the death of Christ, and the cessation of the Jewish sacrifices.

It could not be expected that these events of so great magnitude should be compressed within periods so limited as 49, 434 and 49 days respectively. As a matter of fact, when the edict of Artaxerxes was issued to rebuild Jerusalem, the time occupied was 52 days for the walls alone; (3 Eudras, or Nehemias, vii. 15), and this was an almost incredibly short period, so that the enemies of the Jews declared that "this work was the work of God. (16)"

That the prophecy was correct in regard to the troublesome times during the progress of the undertaking is evident from the efforts of their numerous enemies to defeat the project, so that even the workmen were obliged to carry a sword in one hand for self-defence (iv. 17,) while building with the other.

To these considerations we must add that the prophecies of Malachias and Aggeus promise that the "Desired of all nations," the "Angel of the Testament," should visit that temple which was then existing, and should fill it with glory. All these things point out that the weeks of Daniel are weeks of years.

Artaxerxes gave to Nehemias the authorization to build the temple in the year 454 before Christ, according to the best information attainable through scientific chronology. The building of the city should be completed in 49 years, and in 483 years from the same date Christ should appear in public: that is to say in the twenty-ninth year of the Christian era. This was the year in which Christ, being baptized by St. John the Baptist, began His mission. In the midst of the last week of Daniel, Christ should be slain, and the Jewish sacrifices abolished. This agrees perfectly with the event, for just three and a half years elapsed from Jesus' baptism to His crucifixion. We are then told that during this last week, that is the three-and-a-half years preceding and the three-and-a-half following the death of Christ, the covenant should be confirmed with many. This was also literally fulfilled, inasmuch as many followed Christ during His life, and many more in Judea became Christians during the short period while the Apostles continued their preaching to that country.

The destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and the Roman army in A. D. 70, when even of the temple not a stone was left upon a stone, fulfils the last part of this remarkable prophecy; and as none but God could enable Daniel to foretell these events with such accuracy, we reach the inevitable conclusion that Christ is the promised Messiah, the desired of all nations, the Angel of the new Testament, and that the Christian religion is divine.

AN UNJUST INSINUATION.

A cable despatch, referring to the defeat of Mr. Parnell's candidate in Kilkenny, says: "Had the priests kept out of the fray, it is now thought Mr. Parnell would have succeeded; but his Protestantism and the decree of the divorce court have too heavily handicapped him." The compiler of this despatch evidently wishes to make it appear that the Catholic people of Ireland are so bitter against Protestants that they will not work in harmony with them on political questions. The Irish people are firm in their religious faith because they believe in it, but their love of their religion has never been an obstacle to their love of fair play towards people of all creeds. So far removed from truth is the above despatch, that the Irish Catholics have even made it a rule to follow legally Protestant leaders in the endeavor to secure their political rights; and those rights, when gained, will be enjoyed by Protestants as well as Catholics.

There has not at any time been any opposition shown to Mr. Parnell on account of his Protestantism; nor have Protestants been at any time ostracized on account of their religion. Even at the present time, Protestant Home Rulers are sitting in Parliament for the most thoroughly Catholic constituencies, for which they certainly would not have been elected if religious bigotry prevailed. The loyalty with which Mr. Parnell himself has been sustained for ten years by the people as their political leader is proof enough that they are not animated by religious bigotry. It is only in the Orange constituencies of Ulster that a religious cry is ever raised at the elections, and in those localities no Catholic has the remotest chance of being returned at all.

It is a fact which is but recent, and consequently well remembered, that the Presbyterian General Assembly passed resolutions against Home Rule, founding their opposition to it on the plea that Home Rule would put the government of the country into the hands of the Catholic majority. The assembly would be quite satisfied with Home Rule, if the Government could be secured to the Protestant minority, but as this cannot be

the case, they prefer to see the Protestant tenants of half of Ulster continue to suffer from landlord oppression, rather than that Catholics and Protestants alike should have those grievances redressed which make Ireland the most distressed and poverty stricken of the civilized countries of the world.

A fact like this shows where the spirit of bigotry really prevails, but it is not among Catholics that this is the case. We must add, in justice to the non-conformists of England, that they are animated by a spirit of humanity and philanthropy which does not seem to exercise any influence in the councils of the Irish Presbyterian clergy. The writer of the cable despatch is, however, shamefully unjust towards a most tolerant and most Catholic people.

A DESERVED TRIBUTE.

As will be seen in another part of this week's RECORD, a number of the leading business men of Montreal have presented a very tangible testimonial of esteem to Mr. J. J. Curran, Q. C., member of the House of Commons for Montreal Centre. It is with genuine pleasure we note the high regard in which Mr. Curran is held. He is in every sense of the word a representative Irish Catholic, one, too, in whom that body may and do repose implicit confidence. Prudent, talented, eloquent is Mr. Curran—always in the front rank in time of need—ever taking active part in movements having for object the advancement of the city he so ably represents, and ever, likewise, watchful, and able and willing to guard and defend those of his kith and kin when unreasoning and unreasonable persons dare lift the hand that would strike from them those rights and privileges which they are entitled to share with their fellow-Canadians. Men of the stamp of Mr. Curran reflect honor on our country, and Irish Catholics especially have abundant reason to feel proud of his presence in Parliament, where his brilliant talents will find ample scope in taking a goodly share of the great work of building up our young Dominion.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION.

A respected correspondent has called our attention to some communications which appeared recently in the *New York Independent* on the Catholic doctrine of the necessity of intention on the part of the priest when he administers the sacraments. Mr. Henry C. Lea, the writer of the articles referred to, maintains that: "no priest or prelate can be certain that he enjoys the power of the keys, and no member of the laity can feel assured that any sacrament which he receives is validly administered."

Our correspondent says that he "has frequently seen similar statements to that of Mr. Lea," and he requests us to throw some light upon this doctrine of intention, and especially "to show whether or not Mr. Lea's inference, as above stated, be right or wrong."

The doctrine of the necessity of intention is clearly stated by the Council of Trent, and to give a proper conception of its meaning we cannot do better than to quote the words of its doctrinal decree: "If any one shall say that when the ministers of the Church are administering the sacraments, the intention of doing at least what the Church does is not requisite, let him be anathema."

It is to be remarked that the outward action which accompanies the administration of the sacraments is made a sacramental act only by the will and intention of him who performs it.

Thus, if we sit at table for the purpose of taking food, no one will imagine that the bread and wine, which we eat and drink thereby become the sacrament of the Eucharist, or if a parent brings his child to take a bath for purposes of cleanliness or health, no one could suppose that he is administering the sacrament of baptism, even though he were to employ the invocation of the Most Holy Trinity in the very words used in administering baptism. The words "I baptize thee" signify "I wash thee," and this washing with water might be employed for many different purposes. It is only because the person who performs it intends that it shall be a sacrament that it becomes a sacramental action.

The administration of a sacrament by its minister, the priest, is necessarily a deliberate act, in order that it may have sacramental efficacy. This follows from the nature of the sacraments as instituted by Christ. Our Lord indicates the necessity of intention on the part of the priest when He commands that the Holy Eucharist be celebrated in commemoration of Himself. The necessity of intention in administering the sacrament of penance is indicated when He authorizes the priest to make a distinction between those whose sins are to be forgiven and those whose sins must be retained: "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." The giving of absolution is a deliberate and judicial act which cannot be conceived to be performed unless the priest have the intention of doing it.