

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, AUGUST 21, 1897.

NO. 3.

DEVOTION TO OUR LADY.

Protestant Objections Considered and Answered by a Jesuit Father.

As at early daybreak in the Alps, darkness lingers deep down in the valleys long after the highest mountain peaks are streaked with the light of the dawn, so some forms of religious ignorance and prejudice often cling to uneducated minds and masses, after the educated have attained to a clearer knowledge of the truth, writes a Jesuit Father in an English journal. It is not often, now, that men of education and culture totally misunderstand the devotion of the Catholics to the Mother of the Redeemer, but most of the ignorant non-Catholics reproach their Catholic brethren with giving more honor to the Virgin than to Christ. They find fault with Catholics for calling her the Mother of God, for believing in her immaculate Conception, for praying to her, and for reminding them, in a tone of triumphant indignation, that there is only one Mediator?

Commonly, it is useless or impossible to enter into discussions with, or to give simple explanations of Catholic doctrine and practice to people who speak in this strain. They cannot follow them; they cannot apprehend them; they cannot keep to the point in question. Losing one's temper and indulging in strong language is no use either. Often the best thing a Catholic can do is to say nothing. In some cases, however, it may be desirable to show that there is sense in what Catholics believe and to bring it home to a man that he does not understand what he is talking about. Usually the only and the best way to do this is by asking simple questions. A few illustrations may serve as a key to this line of argument.

A man ridicules the idea of calling Mary, a creature, the Mother of God. He might be asked: "Have you a soul? Did your mother give you your soul? or was it made directly from God? Then your mother only gave you your body? Probably the man will admit that he did not receive his soul from his mother. The argument may then be pressed to a logical conclusion. If you only received your body from your mother? A woman is called the mother of the person to whom she gives birth, though the person does not receive his soul, but only the first beginning of his body from her. Who was the Person, to whom Mary gave birth? Was He a human person or a Divine Person? If He was a Divine Person she is rightly called the Mother of God, though she did not give Him His divine existence, nor even His human soul. All we imply when we call Mary the Mother of God is that Christ, the Person born of her, is a Divine Person. It is a profession of faith in the divinity of Christ. Those who deny that she is the Mother of God either mean to deny that Christ is God, or they do not know what they say.

How do Catholics make good what they say about the Immaculate Conception?

Does our friend believe that, in consequence of the fall of our first parents, all men are born in a state not of personal, but of what is called original sin? If he does not believe this, the question of the sinless conception of Mary has no meaning for him. If he does believe it, he may be asked: "Do you believe that Christ the Son, born of Mary, was a Divine Person, the Son of God? If so, do you really think it would have been becoming for Him to be born of a mother who at one time had been entangled in the degradation of sin? or was it more becoming that she should always have been a vessel of grace?" Do you admit that the sentence passed upon the serpent in the words, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed" (Gen. iii, 15), was the punishment pronounced by God on Satan, the seducer of Eve? If so, who is the seed of the woman who was to crush Satan? Is it not Christ, the promised Redeemer? If so, who is the woman? Is it not His mother? If so, then God solemnly proclaimed that He would punish Satan for leading the parents of the human race into sin, by putting enmity between Mary and him. By seducing the very parents of the race God had just created, His adversary gained an apparent triumph over God. God announced to him a punishment which was to annul the victory which he seemingly had gained: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed." If the relations between Satan and the woman, and the attitude the woman was to take against Satan, was directly established by God Himself, would it be very respectful to God to assert that the woman was, even for one moment, in a state of sin and degradation? Had Satan so far succeeded in the seduction of men that even the mother of the Divine Redeemer, had been brought under the ban of sin, he it only for a moment, would this not have been, for Satan, a victory rather than a defeat, a triumph rather than a punishment?

Could God preserve the mother of His Son from all taint of sin? If He could, should we not expect Him to have done so? Do not the words of Scripture: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman" give us

good reason to think that He did it? Some may argue that this is a new doctrine, unknown before Pope Pius IX declared it a dogma in 1854, and that Catholics hold it since that time, because the Pope ordained them to do so.

Those who argue in this way may be told that truth is unchangeable. What was true is still true, and must always remain true. The Pope, therefore, cannot make a new doctrine, nor declare anything an article of faith, except what was revealed by God before the death of the Apostles. What, in the opinion of Catholics, he can do is this: he can, with unerring authority, declare whether a doctrine has been revealed by God or not. The Catholics hold that he will not declare a doctrine revealed, unless it really has been revealed. Is not everybody bound to believe what God has revealed? and is not every truth contained in the Scriptures part of the Divine revelation? Is it not very necessary that the meaning of many important passages of Holy Writ be known? we know the meaning of such a passage for certain? Is every sincere Christian infallible, either by virtue of private inspiration or any other way, in his private interpretation of Holy Writ? If not, have we no possible means of arriving at any certainty on the meaning of most important passages of Scripture and of most solemn utterances of our Lord? What possible certainty have we, unless the Saviour preserves those from teaching error to whom He said: "All power is given to Me in Heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (Matt. xxviii, 18-20). What certainty could we have of what Christ taught, if we could go wrong in heeding official and authoritative declarations of him, to whom Christ has said: "Feed My sheep?" (St. John, xxi, 15-17).

Are Catholics, then, so very unreasonable when they see in the words: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman" an assurance that God meant to preserve the mother of the Saviour from all stain of sin, and when they hold this to be an article of the Apostle whom Christ charged to feed His flock (John xxi, 15-17), has declared it to be a revealed truth, in union with over six hundred Bishops, appointed by the Holy Ghost overseers of His flock, to rule and feed the Church of God, which He has purchased with His own blood? (Acts xx, 23)

Catholics who have to work amongst ignorant people may have occasion to hear their devotion to Mary represented as contrary to the spirit of the Redeemer, who, at Cana and on the Cross, called His mother simply a woman (John ii, 4, and xix, 20) did not take much notice of her when He was told that she was outside the place in which He was teaching (Matt. xii, 46-50; Mark iii, 31-35; Luke xii, 27-28), and gave her what looked very much like a rebuke at the marriage at Cana. (Jo. ii, 4)

A man who speaks in this strain might be asked: "Did our Lord ever say one word of warning against showing honor to His Mother? Do you, perhaps, mean to imply that He did not honor her Himself, with an intention to teach us by His example? Are you quite sure that He Who, as God, gave the emphatic commandment: "Honor thy father and thy mother" (Matt. xix, 19; Mark x, 19; Exod. xx, 12), failed to do this as man? Do you not read in the Gospels that our Lord lived at Nazareth with Joseph and Mary, and was subject to them? (Luke ii, 51) Was not this the keynote of His example? Do you discover a note of dishonor in it? Are you sure that the word 'woman' in the language spoken by our Lord implied an ordinary woman? and that it would have been more respectful to call her mother? May not the word 'woman' have been the customary term in use, or may He not have used the word 'woman' in pointed reference to the sentence passed on the serpent: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman?"

On one occasion His mother and some of His near relatives came to where He was teaching, and wished to speak with Him. When He was told of it, He said: "Who is my mother, and who are My brethren?" and stretching forth His hand towards His disciples, He said: "Behold My mother and My brethren!" For whoever shall do the will of My Father, Who is in Heaven, the same is My brother and sister and mother." (Matt. xii, 46-50; Mark iii, 31-35). On another, or more probably, the same occasion, a woman cried out: "Blessed is the womb that bore Thee, and the paps which gave Thee suck," and the Lord said: "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it." (Luke xi, 27-28)

What is there disparaging to His mother in what the Lord said? It is clear that He was anxious to impress

His hearers with the importance of believing and doing what He said. This He did most forcibly by comparing the blessing of willing and obedient faith with the privilege of being united to Him by the closest ties of natural kindred. What meaning was there in what He said, unless He regarded His mother as highly favored among women? (Luke i, 28-42)

BACK-NUMBER CHINIQUE.

About a year ago there was great beating of drums and loud shouting of "Hallelujah!" in England. The mighty power of Rome was to get a knock-out blow, and the cause of Evangelicalism was to advance in forty league boots all over John Bull's isle. Chiniquy, the Great and Only Original Ex-Priest, had arrived in England, and he and the Protestant Alliance were going to "preach the pure Gospel" and drive detested "Romanism" into the sea.

Chiniquy and the Protestant Alliance started out bravely enough. Their plan of campaign was to unload "terrible revelations" wherever they could get an audience willing to pay an admission price to their "lectures." At first they did a land office business. But, alas, Chiniquy was a man with a past. Unfortunately for him and for the Protestant Alliance, too, the story of his past made a "mighty interesting reading." The Catholic Truth Society was so uncharitable as to refer to the record of Chiniquy. Well, the result was that people declined to believe Chiniquy, and in England to day the "power of Rome" is even mightier than when the King of the Ex Priests landed. He has left England to her fate and is now in Canada, mourning the failure of a mission that he had hoped would be a towering financial success.

Before leaving England Chiniquy paid a visit to Whitehaven and delivered a "lecture." Of course, what he said was "startling"; in fact, it was so extraordinary as to bring upon the disappointed ex-priest the ridicule of the Protestant vicar of Whitehaven, the Rev. T. S. Cunningham. It is worth while to record what this gentleman stands forth with great demands, naturally credentials of some sort are required," says he, writing to the Whitehaven Gazette. "But Pastor Chiniquy has no credentials. He tells a long story indeed of an appearance of our Lord to him personally, which is a sort of adaptation of the visions of St. Francis of Assisi, with all the beauty and reverence removed, and of a commission which he received from Christ to proclaim, and apparently to bestow, 'a gift.' But as the gift is simply that which every Christian, Roman Catholic or Primitive Methodist, can and does obtain, there is nothing remarkable herein. But without argument, proof, or anything else, Pastor Chiniquy proceeds to ride a very high horse indeed, and having cut off the powers of the simple priest-hood, proceeds to assume those of the Papacy itself. Personally, as an Anglican, I do not accept the Papal theory, but were I a Romanist I should certainly hesitate to exchange the limited infallibility of Leo for the unlimited infallibility of Chiniquy."

This Anglican vicar is of the opinion that when a man has reached the age of eighty eight years allowances must be made for him. Although Chiniquy is as old as that, Mr. Cunningham believes that some of his statements are of so remarkable a character that, in the interest of truth, they should circulate widely. And here is the delicious way our Anglican friend comments on a few "terrible revelations."

"On a certain occasion fifty masked men burst into his lodgings at Quebec to murder him, at the instigation of the Roman Catholic Archbishop, at 3 o'clock a. m. One of these ruffians struck a dagger into his breast with 'terrible force.' Escaping from his assailants by a very decided evocation, he is sufficiently recovered to knock up the Mayor of the city. This gentleman (presumably a Protestant, we are informed) constantly puts the great city of Quebec under martial law, and orders out British troops to the tune of a thousand for his protection. I imagined I was listening to a funny melodrama! Picture if you can 'martial law' proclaimed by a Mayor! and nearly ten regiments of soldiers, colonels, majors, captains, band, and colors, in charge of one Presbyterian minister! Nothing to exceed this has happened since the days of Elisha! I have half a mind (being a disguised Jesuit) to bribe someone to give me a black eye. I will then demand protection from the Mayor, the Border Regiment from Lancaster, with the Channel Squadron thrown in! Also the town under martial law, with gibbets and hangmen appointed in each ward! What glory for one black eye! Pastor Chiniquy remarks that Quebec kept its curious Mayor only ten days after these events, a natural outcome of his proceedings, I should say!

"On another occasion a priest suborned seventy-two false witnesses to swear that Pastor Chiniquy had burned down his (the priest's) church.

The examination of the seventy-two occupies one long week. The presiding Judge (who is evidently also the town idiot) neglects to ask them the obvious question whether they saw the misdeed done until prompted by the wily defendant. Then they all cheerfully confess that they have seen nothing and know nothing, but have merely acted to oblige the priest. Upon this the unhappy ecclesiastic (whose need of a lunatic asylum is patent), is apparently without trial, consigned to the penitentiary for fifteen years! Not content with gloating over the discomfiture of his enemy (who was, he says, once his close friend), this excellent old gentleman informed his audience as a good joke that he had written him a taunting letter as he lay in jail. He also expressed much bitterness at his final escape, and hardly veiled satisfaction at his death six months after. It was an ugly, ignoble episode, received, I regret to say, with cheers and laughter. If any member of the Protestant Alliance will turn to the life of Francis Xavier (one of their detested Jesuits), he will find something to surprise him, possibly.

"Another time the priests suborn a woman with a bribe of two hundred acres of land (perjury in the States is expensive) to charge the Pastor with fearful things. This time he and his friends think he is done! But no! At 3 o'clock a. m. (a favorite hour with Mr. Chiniquy) his lawyer bursts in to say the plot is exploded, and that both priests will be hanged in the morning, unless they escape! Evidently the item of a trial is unknown to American jurisprudence. But the States are clearly a queer country when law is a foot, for the pastor informed the meeting that for fifteen years he was out on bail in the custody of various officials, and that he was brought up four times a year to answer for horrible crimes, every one of them the result of priestly perjury! Unlucky Chiniquy! What with this and twenty-five attempts at murder (these attempts, however, seem to have included every stone thrown in their direction), thy life has been of an exciting nature indeed, and thou hast come a long way to pour thy tale of woe into our ears in this 'Whitehaven! Peace be to thee! 'Till back to thy beloved French-Canadian! In the old times thou mightest have added one more to thy twenty-five assaults and batteries, but on Monday the Roman Catholics were wise in their generation, and added no more to thy martyr's crown!"

We may be sure from all this that the Rev. Mr. Cunningham is a hard-hearted person. But, oh, what shall we say of him when he dares to assert that nothing Chiniquy has said is of weight enough "to upset the religious convictions of a tomtit"? That certainly is a proof positive of treason to Protestantism, at any rate to such Protestantism as is represented by the English Protestant Alliance. Poor Chiniquy! Certainly he is a back number! Only brainless fanatics believe him. His decline is a sad lesson to the professional "ex priest."—Catholic News.

SAVONAROLA vs. LUTHER.

"Savonarola vs. Luther" is the title of a paper by the Rev. John Walsh in the current issue of the *Catholic Reading Circle Review*. Father Walsh's motive in writing this article was suggested by a paper read at a meeting of Methodist ministers, in which Savonarola was described as the forerunner of Luther. Father Walsh truly says that he who can recognize similarities between the personality and career of Savonarola and Luther is but a superficial observer. There was an immeasurable distance between Luther, the unfrocked, apostate monk, snapping every vow, and indulging every appetite, and Savonarola, who in spite of his disobedience to the Supreme Pontiff, which was unseemly and scandalous, lived a life of restraint and self denial. As a teacher Luther was the personification of inconsistency. He lived a life of open immorality and constantly contradicted himself in his doctrinal utterances. The Protestant Church of Zurich said of him: "How strangely does this fellow let himself be carried away by his devils. How disgusting are his morals and how full are his words of the devil of hell." His friend Zwingli said of him, "The devil is master of Luther to such a degree as to make one believe that he wished to gain entire possession of him." Of Savonarola it is said that his bitterest enemies dared make no charge against his moral character. "The Friar of Marco was clean in all senses," says Father Walsh. "Abstemious to the point of starvation, high-minded as an angel of the Lord, disdainful of princes who aimed at spiritual control, unceasingly occupied with his ministry and dealing as severely with himself as others." The conflict between Pope Leo X. and Luther was the outgrowth of doctrine pure and simple. Luther had formally denied certain truths which the Church had always accepted, and he was summoned to recant or take the consequences. But with Savonarola the case was quite different. He claimed to be a prophet, and it was quite within the legitimate province of the Pope to test his credentials to this unusual

claim in order to protect the alleged prophet from self-deception and the faithful from imposture. In reply to the first summons to go to Rome he wrote: "Accordingly, I beseech Your Holiness to graciously accept my very true and plain excuses (physical ailments) and to believe it is my ardent desire to come to Rome; wherefore as soon as possible I shall spur myself to set forth." In answer to the next summons he wrote, "Nevertheless, if there be no other way of saving my conscience, I am resolved to make submission so as to avoid even a ventral sin," and again, "As to my doctrines, I have been always submissive to the Church." Before the next summons reached him he had become involved in the vortex of politics, and, in 1496, as the supreme ruler of Florence, he made a treaty with the French Charles of Anjou which was against all Italian traditions and which, eventually, would have isolated Florence out of the pale of Italian principalities. It is evident from Savonarola's sermons and letters at this period that he believed the Pope was influenced by his political enemies to enforce silence, entrap him in Rome and thus accomplish his downfall and the enslavement of Florence. Becoming convinced of this in his own mind he did not think the Pope had the right to constrain his conscience, nor would he acknowledge that he was obliged to respect the excommunication or the suspension. The Pope displayed admirable patience and self-restraint in his dealings with the recalcitrant monk. The sentence of excommunication, pronounced against him on May 3, 1497, was full of paternal dignity. Cesare Cantu's estimate of Savonarola pictures him as "a man of faith, of supererogation, and of genius; he abounded in charity. Contrary to Luther, who confided entirely in reason, he believed in personal inspiration. He thought to guide the crowd by means of his passions, and, as always happens, he became the victim of these passions. Savonarola's end was deplored by all, and perhaps first by those who had caused it. In the churches of Santa Maria Novella and San Marco he is depicted as a saint."—Sacred Heart Review.

DOMINICAN NUNS.

The Various Congregations in This Country and Their Work.

In England there are at least four congregations of the Dominican order, writes Margaret E. Jordan in the *Vatican*, but Margaret Hallahan's is especially notable, owing to its having been the first founded in England, to its wonderful development amid adverse circumstances, to its having blended the recitation of the divine office with varied active duties, to its having possessed so remarkable a woman in its founders, and to its having given rare scope to literary genius, as has been displayed in the life of one of its members, Augusta Theodosia Drane, in religion Mother Frances Raphael.

In America there are several congregations, but that founded by Mother Angela Sansbury is especially notable, owing to its having been the first foundation of the Dominican order for women in this country, and the one from which have descended all the others in this country which are devoted exclusively to teaching. California might claim an exception to a certain degree, but the fact remains that, though its first Prioress came from a house already established in France, and another Sister came from an English house, yet these two found in America a Sister specially trained in the Ohio house to assist them. The Ohio congregation of St. Mary's of the Springs is the oldest daughter of St. Catherine's, Kentucky.

All the Dominican houses of the Third order in the United States are American in their origin, excepting the contemplative house in Hoboken, N. J.

The pioneer congregation, St. Catherine's of Kentucky, celebrated its diamond jubilee in the joyous Easter-tide of this present year, its founders having taken the habit on Easter Sunday, 1822. In the early thirties its first colony went forth and forms to day the flourishing congregation mentioned above, St. Mary's of the Springs, Columbus, O. Another small colony, under the fostering care of Father Mazzuchelli, O. P., has grown into the widespread congregation of the Holy Rosary of Sinsinawa Mound, Wisconsin. In Nashville, Tenn., Springfield, Ill., and Galveston, Tex., flourishing mother houses have grown from small colonies going forth from St. Catherine's of St. Mary's, Fall River, Mass., has now its mother-house. It was under the fostering hand of Bishop Alemany, O. P., that the California congregation was built up. In 1850 its first house was founded.

In addition to these, all engaged in teaching, there is yet another great force of Dominican nuns engaged in the same apostolic mission. This force may be called the mitigated Second order. It exists in two branches, one coming from Irtabson, Ger., the other from Cabra, Ire. Originally founded for contemplation and to help the missionaries by prayer, the nuns found themselves forced, in Germany, to

choose between dispersion or active duty. Naturally, they chose the latter, becoming teachers or hospital sisters. A small colony reached New York in 1853. At that early date it was impossible to establish themselves according to the original rule of absolute cloister and contemplation. They adapted themselves to the needs of time and place, opening a school in Brooklyn, and a few years later in New York city. Flourishing congregations in the United States can trace their origin to these German Dominican nuns. At a very early date some of them had founded a house in the West. Hospital work as well as schools have they built up, and in some of their houses they have devoted themselves exclusively to orphans and destitute children.

The branch of the Second Order of St. Dominic that, at a later date, came from Ireland, is flourishing in the South, notably in New Orleans. The work is educational. Through an editorial note of the *Rosary Magazine* we learn that it is to a nun in one of these Dominican houses that "the winter school owes its germ thought, its impulse and its first encouragement."

The congregation devoted to the care of destitute children in the Archdiocese of New York, founded by Mother Anthonius Thorpe, and that devoted to retreat work in the diocese of Albany, do not owe their origin to any of these mentioned in this present article.

In addition to the above forces of Dominican life in the United States, there exist here three other forces, all of which represent the personal action of St. Dominic. These are, first, the Dominican Fathers; second, the Contemplative Nuns, and third, the Dominican Tertiaries living in the world. In these three forms the order existed during the lifetime of the saint.

The fathers represent four provinces: Two distinctively American, one embracing the territory east of the Rockies, the other the states of California and Oregon; the province of Paris, which has fathers in the French parishes of Lewiston, Me., and Fall River, Mass., and the province of Lyons, which has its novitiate in Sherman Park, N. Y.

The Contemplative Nuns are in two dioceses: St. Dominic's Monastery in Newark, N. J., and Corpus Christi Monastery in Hunt's Point, N. Y. In both these houses there is perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. These nuns are part of the great Order of St. Dominic, but while the Fathers are called the First Order, the nuns, by way of distinction, are called the Second Order. Hoboken, N. J., contains also a Contemplative House of the Third Order, in which exists the Perpetual Rosary. Neither the Perpetual Rosary nor Perpetual Adoration are absolutely necessary in Dominican contemplative life.

Dominican Tertiaries living in the world exist in every section of the country; men and women, married and single, compose this branch of the order. Dominican nuns are not under the jurisdiction of the Dominican Fathers, but are under that of the Bishop or Archbishop of the diocese where the mother houses exist. But the various congregations are affiliated to the order by the Father General of the Dominicans, who resides in Rome.

The habit of all the Dominican nuns consists of a white wimple tunic and scapular, black woolen cloak, white linen bandeau and wimple, and black wimple veil with an inner veil and wimple of white linen. The form of the wimple and veil varies somewhat in the different congregations, and there are minor differences in religious customs, but Dominican life permits of this. The order was created by a great saint, not for one nation or one people, but for a world. Its rule is a flexible one. Like the Church itself, it has throughout centuries adapted itself to needs of ages and peoples in order to win souls to Christ. It is an example of variety in unity, unity in the faith of Christ, the work of the Church and the fatherhood of St. Dominic.

A Miracle.

A cure that appears to be miraculous took place at Loretto convent, near Lebanon, Ky., on last Thursday night. The patient was Sister Alfred, a novice at Loretto academy. Sister Alfred was taken sick with appendicitis seven weeks ago. Peritonitis followed, and during her illness she suffered much. On Wednesday a telegram was sent to her parents in Kansas that all preparations had been made for her funeral, as it seemed she had only a few more hours to live. She had had the last sacraments, and all were waiting for the end.

On Thursday night, however, between the hours of 11 and 12, Sister Alfred suddenly was freed from pain. She had had only fluid food for several weeks and had no appetite, but her appetite was craving and she said that she was as well as ever in her life, and wished to get up and go about. To her attendants, who had left the sick room for a few moments, the invalid stated that her cure was accomplished simultaneously with the appearance of what she firmly believes to have been an apparition of the Blessed Virgin.