

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XIX.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 16, 1897.

NO. 952.

**Take Heart.**  
Why do you worry and fret, dear?  
Your troubles will pass away,  
There is always a smile to follow a tear,  
And to-morrow's sun will bring good cheer,  
With the dawn of the coming day!  
Our smiles and tears in this world, dear,  
Are never far apart;  
In sorrow's hour there is comfort near  
And never a day so dark and drear,  
But some sunshine will reach the heart.  
For One there is above, dear,  
With a Father's watchful eye,  
Who sends the rainbow's arch of cheer  
To follow the storm and the bitter tear,  
And make life's morrow look bright and clear.  
As a cloudless summer sky!  
—Florence Bain Seymour in Sacred Heart Review.

### MISSIONS FOR NON-CATHOLICS.

Although very severe weather, says the N. Y. *Catholic Review*, ushered in the opening of the mission in St. Patrick's church, Dutch Kills, Long Island City, there was a good attendance throughout. Even on the night of the blizzard quite a goodly congregation gathered into the church. Father McGroven, and his able assistant, Father Blake, are well compensated for the discomforts of their surroundings, who willingly welcome them to their weather and better appointed parishes, when danger threatens from financial stringency.

The *Catholic Review* wishes every success to these two devoted and untiring clergymen. It was this devotion and zeal of theirs that prompted the providing the series of lectures, which Rev. R. M. Ryan delivered during the ten days preceding Christmas. The local press had very accurate reports of the lectures and commented at length on the extraordinary attention paid to them by the audience, a large proportion of whom were Protestants.

The following are a few specimens of the questions asked:  
"First. After the Lord created the world didn't He bless the whole world?"  
"Second. Why is it Protestants can not be buried in consecrated ground?"  
"First. Whether the Lord blessed the earth in the sense here referred to in the Scripture does not specify; but it does state that He cursed it after Adam's sin. Because... that hast eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat, cursed is the earth in thy work." Gen. iii. 17.

Second. Protestants in general do not want to be buried in Catholic cemeteries; and, having passed through life protesting against everything Catholic, it would be a shocking incongruity to lay their bodies to rest in the midst of those they protested against in life. Besides there is an agreement—quasi contract—entered into, when a cemetery is consecrated by the Church, that only her true and professing children shall be interred therein. These latter know it and provide a burial place there in consequence. Not to faithfully adhere to it would be unpardonably dishonorable.

"Two people belonging to the Church were married by the mayor because they did not want any one to know they were married for a while and they were under age. Can they be married again? Please tell how?"  
Let them go to their pastor and be guided by what he will tell them. They were guilty of a most grievous sin in getting married as they did. What an unhappy way for people to begin life!

"If a Catholic does not receive his Easter duty, and is taken sick in the same year, can a priest give him absolution?"  
He can, provided the sinner is truly contrite and makes a good confession.

"Kindly let me know what should a person do who feels convinced of the truth of Catholic teaching and yet has a reluctance to become a member of the Church?"  
Let God should take away the grace the weakling shows himself so unworthy of he ought pray earnestly for strength to avail of it, and ponder well on those words of our Lord: "He that shall be ashamed of Me and of My words, the Son of Man will also be ashamed of Him, when He shall come in the glory of His Father, with the holy angels," and this other in the same ninth chapter of St. Mark: "If thy hand or thy foot scandalize thee cut it off: it is better to enter lame into life everlasting than having two hands or two feet to be cast into the hell of unquenchable fire." Difficult as it may seem to break from old associations the difficulty is only seeming, and not at all to be compared with those here demanded by our gentle Master. The sooner such a one procures an interview with a priest, who will sympathize with and help him over his transient difficulty, the better.

"How is it that Mohammedan and other pagans are so faithful to their belief that they would sacrifice their lives for it. Please answer."

"Protestant. It to be true, which it is not—that the lives of Mohammedans would be sacrificed for their co-religionists if they renounced the arch-impator's teaching. The pagans and infidels who are willing to sacrifice their lives for their beliefs are unknown to history.

Those that are willing to barbarically slaughter Christians on account of their faith are very well known. The asker of this question must have been reading the newspapers backwards lately, or only such as were published in the *Yiddis Kiosk*.

"Why has the Catholic Church ceased to keep holy the feast days of the Epiphany, Annunciation and Corpus Christi, when one of these was the greatest holy day of the year?"  
That she has done so, the lecturer declared, was news to him. The very same authority that had made these days, formerly days of rest, now permits servile work to be done on them, that the children of the Church be not for their devotion, deprived of their means of living, as they otherwise would in numerous instances. The great festivals of the year are Easter, Pentecost and Christmas. So far was the Annunciation from being regarded as the greatest feast of the year that it is not mentioned as a special feast at all until the sixth or seventh century.

"The question of Predestination gives me quite a little trouble. Please explain?"  
"I believe firmly that 'what is to be, will be.' So firmly, that I can not pray for anything. Nor can I feel concerned about anything—thinking on all occasions, if this or that is to be, it will be and all my worrying will avail nothing."

"Am I right?"  
"I do not mean by the above that I believe in predestination. Far from it."

It is a pity that people will insist on troubling themselves everlastingly about that phase of this question which really does not concern them at all. The author of the incomparable, "Imitation of Christ," tells us he was once perplexed, and found consolation in those words suggested to his soul.

"If thou didst know (whether he was of the number of the elect) what wouldst thou then do? Do that now which thou wouldst then do, and thou wilt be very secure." If we observe the divine law—as we easily may—we shall certainly be saved; if we do not, we shall as certainly be lost. This is the only thing of the future that we know with certainty. This is the thing "that is to be and will be," that we need most specially to concern ourselves about. Like all the most absurd application, as in the present instance, and is never wholly acted up to, by those quoting it.

All impending dangers from flood, fire accidents, etc., these parties are the first to take precautions, and the most impetuous in trying to escape; or from the morbid mental state indicated by these cogitations no magnanimity or heroism can be expected.

To the question: "Am I right?" the answer, of course, is No; you are entirely wrong. God made you a free agent and expects you will be up and stirring, as if everything depended upon your efforts. Leave the rest to Him; He will be wanting in nothing. Furthermore, if you do not believe in "predestination" you do not believe in Christ as the scriptures, which distinctly teach it. For whom He foreknew, He also predestinated; and whom He called: and whom He justified, them also He glorified." (Rom. viii. 29-30.) We, Christians are all called; it behooves us "by good works to make our calling and election sure." (2 Pet. i. 10.)

"Please inform the writer if it would be wrong to pray for a Protestant friend who has departed from this world?"  
It is not "wrong" to pray for any one living or dead.

"Please let me know how any one man, Pope though he is, has power to place an indulgence on, or take it off any particular prayer, shortening any one's stay in Purgatory?"  
Like all "hows" in the natural as well as the supernatural order this question is more easily asked than answered. It is like inquiring "how" the same sunshine makes some roses red, others yellow, or "how" the same grass eaten turns into feathers on the bird, hair on the ox and wool on the sheep—God so ordained it is really the only answer.

"Whatever," said the Son of God to St. Peter, "thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in Heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in Heaven." (Math. xviii. 18.) If God accepts the satisfaction offered by oneself for one's own sins, why may He not accept that which is offered by another. All Sodom would have been spared had there been ten just people found in it.

"In the last part of geology, the Age of Man, it tells of the first race of man, and of the rude eastern pots made by them and therefore geologists conclude that these people must have had some intelligence. But they do not know what these people were like. Now in the Church it is taught that Adam and Eve were the first man and woman, and it also traces down to all their descendants, it seems to know all about them. How is it they do not agree? Geology seems to teach that this first race had died out and another sprung up, while the Church traces

back without any interruption. Please explain?"  
This question is given, not because there is anything important in it, but as a curiosity; or rather as a type of its class, and forcibly illustrative of Bacon's dictum concerning the danger of a "little knowledge." The scientist's objections to religion are usually as "scientific" and accurate as this; and how little of either science or exactness there is here any ordinary person can see. With the guesses and speculations of geologists the Bible must be shown to be in harmony, or take the risk of being adjudged wrong! What could be more absurd? "How is it," the questioner asks, "they do not agree?"

Why does not the patient recover when "science" has prescribed the remedy? Through the patient's fault, of course—science cannot be as astray. Geology "seems to teach," etc.—how shameful that the Bible does not conform to its "scientific" teaching!

Whatever of real truth concerning geology, biology and anthropology, is known, confirms rather than contradicts the sacred writings. Unlike would be philosophers the Catholic Church pretends not to know what she is not acquainted with. Hence she does not teach what is here attributed to her, the traceable continuity of all the descendants of Adam and Eve.

Will God judge in the same way those who never go to confession, as those who do?"  
God will judge all according to perfect justice; and, although what each one's judgment shall be is known only to the Divine Judge Himself, yet St. Paul warrants us in thinking that the two classes referred to will have very different treatments. For of the second class—those who go regularly to confession, and thus judge themselves—he says: "But if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But whilst we are judged, we are chastened by the Lord: that we be not condemned with the world." (1 Cor. xi. 31-32), which, of course gives itself no concern about calling itself to account—judging, accusing and condemning itself—as do faithful Christians who frequent the sacrament of penance.

### A FRENCHMAN TO AMERICANS ON LEO XIII.

In line of proof of what the author claims for Leo XIII. is the place which the *Forum* accords in its January number to its solicited article on that illustrious Pope, from the Vicomte E. Melchior de Vogue of the French Academy.

It should be said at the outset that the Vicomte de Vogue is no advocate of the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. He does not realize, although the American Arthur Warren did, after a short sojourn in Rome, the utility, if not the necessity, for the safeguarding of the Pope in his spiritual rights and for the true unity of Italy of a certain measure of territorial independence for the Head of this world-wide Church.

Possibly, however, this fact gives greater weight to his other admissions. Leo XIII., according to this writer, is in mind and in action, too, as far as the weight of tradition permits, the American of Paul Bourget's definition—the "man who invariably uses the newest methods."

Yet—and what a tribute this is to the vitality and comprehensiveness of the religion whose spokesman he is?—he is not thus an innovator, but "a restorer of forgotten traditions."

As the writer dramatically puts it: "He relies upon the example set by the great Popes of the Middle Ages, who, in their day, came down to the market place, stirred the crowds and led the people to new horizons."

Leo XIII. has revived the vast admirer and the bold procedures of a Gregory VII., of an Innocent III. Like them, with an action broad and resolute, he has cast the Fisherman's net over democracies beyond the seas. The originality of this genius and the most interesting trait for the historian lie in the fact that he should have found in the Middle Ages the secret of an intimate relation with the modern spirit: of an impulse to contemporary Catholicism.

The Vicomte de Vogue is not an admirer of Pope Pius IX., and it is a part of his Doreque literary method to deepen the shadows of temporal disaster and conservative character about the departed Pontiff, to emphasize the brilliancy of the victories won despite the legacy of adverse conditions by his successor.

Of Pope Leo XIII. in his relations with the government of the New Italy, the writer says that he profited by every error without committing a single fault himself.

Italy, however, was a restricted field for the exercise of his religious and diplomatic genius; and the Vicomte de Vogue recounts with enthusiasm the moral victories of the Statesman-Pope over the European Governments, especially over the Government of Germany.

The Pope's relations with Democracy are still more interesting to the writer, and he gives to Cardinal Gibbons and the American Bishops the credit of having rekindled the smouldering flame by which Pope Leo XIII. discovered his own natural bent, intensified by the powerful doctrine of his

Master, St. Thomas Aquinas, towards the cause of the people.  
"Since his appearance before the masses with the halo of the prophet, martyr to his convictions and protector of their cause—Leo XIII. has become even greater than before in the sight of all intelligent Europe."

The Vicomte touches on Leo's several great projects, the reunion of the Schismatical Eastern Churches with Rome;—he might have added the reconquest of England to the Faith of its great Apostle St. Augustine;—the reconciliation of political parties in France, and the return of that country, "with new political and social forms, to its former position of Christian vanguard"—the future of the United States.

Does the Vicomte grasp the connection between Christian Unity and true Democracy—their reciprocal smoothing of the way for one another? Perhaps not; but he realizes that democracies have nothing to fear from the extension of the Church and the Papal Power. The nations of the world, as he truly says, "No Longer need the minute and constant intervention sanctioned by penalties which, correctly speaking, belong to the theocratic system, and which may still be useful in dealing with some savage tribes of Africa or Oceania. But it is necessary to refute objections which common sense instinctively rejects."

No mother has yet been found who keeps her grown-up children in leading strings."  
He quotes the strong words of De Maistre, in the latter's great work on the Pope, in support of this position.

The Vicomte de Vogue writes of Leo XIII. from personal acquaintance, as well as from a deep study of the acts and writings of His Holiness.  
He says:—  
"A lengthy conversation with Leo XIII. leaves the impression of a very broad and clear intelligence, truly Roman in the former sense of the word: of a gently inflexible will, persistent in the way it has outlined for itself; of a sincere liberalism which covers no clerical hypocrisy; of a hardy though enlightened faith, respectful of the faith of others; of a heart still warm, free from hatred toward his adversaries, without meanness, very affectionate toward friendly persons, paternally divided between the nations in his charge beyond his Italy."

The article cannot fail to interest readers of the *Forum* still further in the extraordinary personality which it describes, whose influence has over-passed all radical and religious bond-aries, and who has been in God's Providence spared long enough to develop his policy on so large a scale as to make a reactionary movement after him impossible.—Boston Pilot.

### CATHOLIC PRESS.

An American Society of Religious Education has been organized. The object of the society is "to awaken increased interest in the cause of religious education in all its phases, and to improve the methods of studying and teaching the Bible in the family, the Sunday school and the college." Why not also in the Public schools? Among the members of the organization are some of the most prominent non-Catholic educators, clergymen and professional men in the United States. The president is Reverend John E. Gilsbert of the Society of the Holy Child, and the secretary is Reverend Father J. E. Gilchrist, of Baltimore. All sane citizens are beginning to see that you cannot get grapes from thorns nor a moral people from children educated without morality.—Catholic Review.

Do Christians lack gentleness? Are they disposed to be harsh, litigious and unrelenting? But such is not the example furnished by the great founder of Christianity. Sometimes He came in collision with the Pharisee unbending orthodox and unforgiving morality. When He corrected them He corrected the Christians of future generations. "If all Christians would never have been written," Colonel Ingersoll wrote these words on the fly leaf of a volume of one of his anti-Christian books presented to the late Mrs. Sarah B. Cooper, his cousin. Granted that his misconceptions of Christianity furnished no excuse Ingersoll's blasphemous and granted that even if all Christians were like his cousin Sarah, he might still be Ingersoll of the anti-Christian platform—yet may it not be true that this intense resentment against the Churches that we often find in the world around us, is due to the unkindness, lack of human sympathy and inflexible uncharity of some Christians?—Catholic Citizen.

Why is the lecture not an attraction among Catholics? Because most of our lecturers have been clergymen, and most of their lectures, outside of glorifications of Ireland, have been sermons in disguise. The people get tired of paying half a dollar to hear what they could listen to for nothing at the next Sunday's Mass. Sam Jones, who says of himself that he has been more or less in the lecture business for fifteen years, gives this tip to public speakers: "People who pay

50 cents or \$1.50 at the door want entertainment. A lecture 'togo,' as the saying is, must have pith, p'nt and pathos. It must have common sense, logic, wit, sarcasm and humor. In other words, a lecturer ought to play upon his audience like a trained musician plays upon a piano, sweeping the whole keyboard." Is there a lecture in the Catholic market that has pith, p'nt and pathos, common sense, logic, wit, sarcasm and humor? If there is, let Fame announce where it is and who delivers it, for it has been sought for many years and is in great demand.—Catholic Review.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Congregationalist*, rejoices that the religious celebration of Christmas is no longer confined to Catholics and Episcopalians, and it asks: "Would not American Christianity be the gainer if the religious element in Christmas Day received more general public recognition? There can be no doubt, at least, that if every one professing the Christian name, were at one in honoring the Divine Christ, and desiring the peace and good will which He came to impart to men, that the unity for which He later prayed among His followers—would be near at hand.—Boston Pilot.

### WHO IS THE INTERPRETER?

Our excellent contemporary, the *Freeman's Journal*, says that if we deny "the necessity of competent authority in the interpretation of Scripture," we therefore "admit the sufficiency of incompetent authority." Even more; we admit the sufficiency of no 'authority' at all. So far as is important, the Scripture will interpret itself to any candid reader. Beyond that, it is not really serious, religiously, if people make mistakes on matters of form, ceremony or ecclesiastical order. Any one not a fool can understand the Sermon on the Mount. It needs no authority to interpret it. If people fail to interpret aright the utterance, "On this rock I will build my Church," it is a matter of no vital account, and Christ will interpret His own words by His own action. It is just as with election, another hard matter, which is God's business more than ours.—The Independent.

Here our contemporary first refuses to admit the sufficiency of any authority whatever to interpret the scripture, and then in the same breath claims that, "so far as is important, the Scripture will interpret itself to any candid reader." This claim commits it to the admission that there is a sufficient authority. Thus the *Independent* denies in one proposition what it affirms in the next. It may explain that it referred to authority external to the Scripture and the individual reader, but it should have said that, and not denied all authority whatsoever. The theory above set forth by the *Independent* first takes the Bible as a record of historical events, laws and thoughts that passed through men's minds in ages passed and then it makes this same record the sufficient interpreter of those events, laws and thoughts. This is contrary to the practice of mankind in all ages. The common sense that directs the race has never recognized the law itself as its own interpreter, and as a consequence men have always, wherever law of any kind prevails, established courts or other authority to interpret and apply the law to individual cases that require its application. This is absolutely necessary for the preservation of society and order. Our constitution would not be worth the paper it is printed on were it not that there is a court to interpret it, and to whose interpretation all must submit.

Just why this common sense, and at the same time most rational practice in the case of civil laws should be discarded when there is a question of divine law the *Independent* does not stop to consider or explain. Certainly, if private interpretation of civil laws would produce a state of utter lawlessness and disorder in the civil order, it would have the same effect when applied to the laws of the spiritual or religious order. The very existence of law, in whatever sphere—except pandemonium—supposes an authoritative interpreter. The theory of the *Independent* that laws are their own interpreters and executors must, common-sense dictates, be rejected as dangerous to society and subversive of all order. But there are other difficulties in the way of this theory, when applied to the divine law. It is not, and never was, the method appointed by the Divine Lawgiver. He who revealed His will to man has never left His word without a commissioned guardian and interpreter. In the Old Laws it was Moses and other inspired prophets, and the Sanhedrin. When the Son of God came among men He was the guardian and interpreter, and before He returned from whence He came He established an organism and commissioned it to teach mankind. That organism is His Church, of which He said: "He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican."

There are still other difficulties. The *Independent* says: "So far as is important the Scrip-

ture interprets itself to any candid reader."  
"So far as is important!" Who is to determine what is important and what is not? Does the Bible itself interpret this point and distinguish what of its contents is important or essential, and is not? It certainly does not. Then it is not a sufficient or satisfactory interpreter of its own contents. Who, then, will interpret? The individual reader? In the *Independent's* theory the reader is the learner, and the learner is certainly not competent to determine the relative importance of things that as a learner are yet unknown to him. Besides, those who claim to understand the Bible have never, by following their private judgment, been able to agree upon what is important and what is not. And even where they agree upon some one point as important, they do not agree on its interpretation. They all agree that the observance of a day of rest is important, but private interpreters do not agree as to what day to observe. The *Independent* interpreting itself to the *Independent* as a candid reader, tells us that it must observe the first day of the week—Sunday. It tells the equally candid Seventh Day Baptist that he must observe the last day of the week—Saturday. Now, taking the *Independent's* ground, one of three things follows: either the Bible does not interpret itself correctly, or the *Independent* or the Seventh Day Baptist is not candid. Assuming that the Scripture interprets itself to the candid reader, the *Independent* must assume that every reader who does not agree with its interpretation is uncandid, and every reader hesitating from it must consider it uncandid. Any theory that on practical application brings about this state of mutual suspicion and distrust is not a safe theory to follow.

The *Independent* continues: "Beyond that, it is not really serious religiously if people make mistakes on matters of form, ceremony or ecclesiastical order."  
Here again, who is it that must determine what is mere matter of form and ceremony? The Scripture itself or the candid reader? If God, through inspired writers, has revealed His will to men, it matters much whether people make mistakes or not. Everything that God has revealed is important. To deny this is to impeach His infinite wisdom. The mere fact that a truth or a law has been revealed is sufficient evidence of its importance. The truth, however difficult to understand, must be believed, and the law complied with until revoked. To treat mistakes on this point as matters of indifference is a very serious error.

The *Independent* continues: "Any one not a fool can understand the Sermon on the Mount."  
Possibly, but what of the rest of the Bible? Your theory must include the whole of it, and that it is not understood is proved by the existence of a thousand and more of jarring, conflicting and contradictory sects.

Again: "If people fail to interpret aright the utterance, 'On this rock I will build my Church,' it is a matter of no vital account."  
The meaning of this is that it is of no importance whether we understand or not what the Son of God deemed it necessary to declare for our instruction! He built His Church on a rock, and commanded us to hear it under penalty of being deemed heathens and publicans, is it not of vital account whether we hear that Church or not? He establishes His Church that men might make no mistake about the revealed will of God, and he who fails to hear that Church is responsible before God for every mistake he makes by following a false theory of interpretation. —New York Freeman's Journal.

### A Threefold Offering.

Mother of grace and mercy,  
Behold how burdens three  
Weigh down my weary spirit,  
And drive me here to thee,  
Three gifts I place forever  
Before thy shrine:  
The three-fold offering of my love,  
Mary, to thine!

The Past, with all its memories  
Of pain, that sting me yet;  
Of sin that brought repentance;  
Of joy, that brought regret;  
That which has been—forever  
A bitter-sweet;  
I lay to lowest offering  
Before thy feet.

The Present, that dark shadow  
Through which we toil to-day;  
The slow drops of the chalice  
That must not pass away,  
Which I trust my future  
Still less despair,  
I place my present in thy hands,  
And leave it there.

The Future, holding all things  
Which I can hope or fear,  
Brings sin and pain, it may be,  
Nearer and yet more near,  
Mother! I doubt and shrink  
From all that must be,  
And what has been—forever  
In thy dear care forever  
I leave forever, my Queen!  
—Aldelaide A. Proctor.

ture interprets itself to any candid reader."  
"So far as is important!" Who is to determine what is important and what is not? Does the Bible itself interpret this point and distinguish what of its contents is important or essential, and is not? It certainly does not. Then it is not a sufficient or satisfactory interpreter of its own contents. Who, then, will interpret? The individual reader? In the *Independent's* theory the reader is the learner, and the learner is certainly not competent to determine the relative importance of things that as a learner are yet unknown to him. Besides, those who claim to understand the Bible have never, by following their private judgment, been able to agree upon what is important and what is not. And even where they agree upon some one point as important, they do not agree on its interpretation. They all agree that the observance of a day of rest is important, but private interpreters do not agree as to what day to observe. The *Independent* interpreting itself to the *Independent* as a candid reader, tells us that it must observe the first day of the week—Sunday. It tells the equally candid Seventh Day Baptist that he must observe the last day of the week—Saturday. Now, taking the *Independent's* ground, one of three things follows: either the Bible does not interpret itself correctly, or the *Independent* or the Seventh Day Baptist is not candid. Assuming that the Scripture interprets itself to the candid reader, the *Independent* must assume that every reader who does not agree with its interpretation is uncandid, and every reader hesitating from it must consider it uncandid. Any theory that on practical application brings about this state of mutual suspicion and distrust is not a safe theory to follow.

The *Independent* continues: "Beyond that, it is not really serious religiously if people make mistakes on matters of form, ceremony or ecclesiastical order."  
Here again, who is it that must determine what is mere matter of form and ceremony? The Scripture itself or the candid reader? If God, through inspired writers, has revealed His will to men, it matters much whether people make mistakes or not. Everything that God has revealed is important. To deny this is to impeach His infinite wisdom. The mere fact that a truth or a law has been revealed is sufficient evidence of its importance. The truth, however difficult to understand, must be believed, and the law complied with until revoked. To treat mistakes on this point as matters of indifference is a very serious error.

The *Independent* continues: "Any one not a fool can understand the Sermon on the Mount."  
Possibly, but what of the rest of the Bible? Your theory must include the whole of it, and that it is not understood is proved by the existence of a thousand and more of jarring, conflicting and contradictory sects.

Again: "If people fail to interpret aright the utterance, 'On this rock I will build my Church,' it is a matter of no vital account."  
The meaning of this is that it is of no importance whether we understand or not what the Son of God deemed it necessary to declare for our instruction! He built His Church on a rock, and commanded us to hear it under penalty of being deemed heathens and publicans, is it not of vital account whether we hear that Church or not? He establishes His Church that men might make no mistake about the revealed will of God, and he who fails to hear that Church is responsible before God for every mistake he makes by following a false theory of interpretation. —New York Freeman's Journal.

God often gives us in the short time that He hath a long time denied.—The Imitation.