

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XVII.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MARCH 16, 1895.

NO. 856.

Old Memories.

Written for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
The evening stars, distant and high,
Beamed bright and glad.
And I, of all the mortals nigh,
Alone seemed sad.
Though fair it was a foreign sky,
That spanned the dome—
Methought a zephyr passed me by
And whispered "Home."
Then, fancy brought again to mind
A long quenched hearth:
There seemed to float upon the wind
Lost sounds of mirth.
And 'twas as if I had made
My soul rejoice,
When in sweet int'ray I played,
My mother's voice.
A rose-elad cottage next to view,
Stairs clear and fair,
Fondled by doting friends I grew
To mirth and cheer.
Oh! what has after effort sent
To compensate
That love-dreams hours we spent
In youth, blest state?
Next opens to my raptured gaze
A leafy aisle,
And shining through a sunny haze,
A moulding stile.
Paris a bright hedge flanking with flowers
A shadowed path
Near which, shade shrouded, darkly towers
The fairy Kiosk.
The mountains of my native land
Now loom in view,
And where I clasped my first friend's hand
And sobbed—adieu!
The sunny hills and valleys green,
The grass fringed lake,
Rise like the angel peopled scene
That love-dreams make.
The chime where I often prayed
I now can see:
A corner peeping willows shade
Comes back to me
There under tomb and emerald sod
Rest side by side
My dear, old friends whose souls with God
In peace abide.
Thus, on the evening of a day,
Neath foreign dome,
I thought of Ireland far away
And friends at home:
Asked, would no charm of them, alas!
Once more be given?
A zephyr seemed again to pass
And whisper, "Home."
MARTINE W. CASEY.
OTTAWA, Ont.

A PROTESTANT DEFENDER OF THE JEESUITS.

Boston Pilot.
Under the title, "A Centenarian Calumny," a Protestant scholar, Professor Charles C. Starbuck, of Andover, Mass., in a Protestant journal, the *Independent*, gives a complete and authoritative exposure and refutation of a popular calumny against the Jesuits—namely, that their rule, approved by the Pope, invests their superior with the power of commanding the members to commit sin, and obliging the members to obey such command.

The calumny originates in a mistranslation—a willful one it is to be feared—of the phrase *inducere obligationem ad peccatum*—in reference to the binding force of the rule of the Society of Jesus. Father Bernard Dühr, S. J., whom Mr. Starbuck quotes as having given special attention to it, finds no instance of the mistranslation in any Protestant writer earlier than 1792.

In view of Protestant credulity of evil where the Catholic Church is concerned—Mr. Starbuck cites with shame the Bishop of his own Church who lately quoted as genuine "that shocking invention, the *Montu Secreta*," and the Protestant journals of a certain class who every now and then publish "that coarse and clumsy forgery known as the Jesuit Faith"—he marvels at the late date of this other "abundant charge" adding grimly of its fosterers, "They seem to have made up by zeal in propagating the falsehood for their slowness in taking it up."

Mr. Starbuck can evidently neither understand nor sympathize with what he truly calls the "positively ferocious" joy of certain Protestants over aught of evil which they think they may have discovered in Catholicity. He does not love the Jesuits himself, yet where these much-maligned men are concerned, he pleads for the limits to the permissibilities even of theological slander. "Some charges," he says, "are psychologically possible, and some psychologically impossible." The Jesuits may have murdered Cardinal Toussaint or Henry of Valois, he admits. True, the evidence of such crime on their part has been shown to be very flimsy; but—with another fling at certain Protestants who desire to believe the worst of Catholics—"there is still so much (evidence) as, to a hearty good will, may perhaps admit of the conclusion."

"But," he continues, "That the original company of Christian priests, whose absolute personal indiscretion is not called in question, should, in the maiden innocence of their institute have applied to the Head of their Church for formal permission to impose on their members, for the greater glory of God, the obligation of violating God's essential will by the commission of sin, and that the Chief Pontiff, at a time when charges of pernicious teaching infinitely short of this had shaken his authority to its foundation, and left from him a good third of his flock, should, in the hearing of all the world, Catholic and heretical, have solemnly authorized this in the name of God, is an accusation of which it may safely be said, that what it charges is psychologically and logically, metaphysically, and, I might almost say, physically impossible. Not only are the motives assumed mutually irreconcilable, but the terms employed are absolutely self-contradictory."

He assumes, however, the question:

Is it not true that the Papally ratified constitutions of the Society of Jesus declare that they "do not bind up unto sin, mortal or venial," unless at the command of a superior, given in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of obedience?

Pe answers: "Undoubtedly. The normal conclusion from this, to a normal frame of mind, would be that, as no superior can possibly, in the name of the Holy Lord Jesus, command that which the superior himself acknowledges as sin, the phrase *inducere obligationem ad peccatum* must have a technical sense which needs to be inquired out. Catholic theology has various technical terms, some of which, rendered crudely into English after the stiff, unidiomatic English fashion, convey a sense strangely remote from the sense intended. . . . 'Principality of the Holy See' is a phrase on which I have seen founded a grave Protestant argument against the temporal power, to which the words have not the slightest reference; in like manner, *obligatio ad peccatum*, rendered after the same fashion into English, would give us 'obligation to sin,' whereas the perfectly well-ascertained meaning in monastic Latin is 'binding under the penalty of sin.'"

Prof. Starbuck then shows that no Catholic enemies of the Jesuits in past times, nor even their greatest enemy in our day—Dr. Dollinger—have ever dreamed of preferring this charge against them; and that Dr. Steitz, who has given the most thorough Protestant exposition of this whole subject, "which has the more force from his intense antipathy to Jesuitism," protests against "fathering upon it" impossible enormities of immorality.

Dr. Steitz finds the same expression—so wickedly mistranslated in the case of the Jesuits—in the rules of the Franciscans and the Dominicans. Dr. Steitz, says Prof. Starbuck, "reproaches German Protestant learning, which we thus find to be not so all-comprehensive as we had imagined on the side of Roman Catholicism, with quietly assuming that the phrase *obligare ad peccatum* or *ad culpam*, is only found in the Franciscan, Dominican and Jesuit Rules, whereas, as he says, it runs through the whole of the medieval theology, and in the scholastic discussions of the binding force of monastic vows, and especially of monastic obedience, has always one and the same sense."

The words of St. Thomas Aquinas, the great authority with the original Jesuits, as to the binding force of the monastic rule, is even for Dr. Steitz, a sufficient explanation of the phrase *obligare ad peccatum*.

Professor Starbuck has not much patience with the dishonest attempt to evade the force of the demonstration of the true meaning of this phrase, by arguing that as a Jesuit is bound to "a certain blind obedience," he cannot inquire whether the command of a superior is sinful or not. The subject's obedience is limited to all cases "where it cannot be defined that any sort of sin is involved;" and the superior's power to command under pain of sin is limited to the precepts of the rule, in which no one has discovered anything unlawful.

He thus concludes his article: "The Constitutions and the great Jesuit writers, Suarez and Bellarmine, so explicitly use *obligare ad peccatum*, *sub peccato*, and *sub pena peccati* as equivalent that, now that Steitz has added to them Thomas, Dominic and Francis, there is no longer any excuse for persisting in this misinterpretation. Even Ranke fell into it at first but afterwards retracted. Gieseler, as Steitz points out, proved the error a good while before Steitz himself. The only American authors deserving attention whom I know to have fallen into it are Mr. Fay and *The Independent* reviewer of Rose's 'History of the Jesuits.' The misstatement, buried up in other matter, escaped the editorial eye. Let these two gentlemen read Steitz, Bishop Ketteler or Bernhard Dühr, and they will be glad to retract their unhappy mistake, which, after a run of a century, is now at last fairly exploded, and may be safely abandoned to the solid obstinacy of the Hessian Cabinet."

We wish Prof. Starbuck would do honest Protestants a further service by taking up for them in similar style another calumnious mistranslation of Jesuit teaching—"the end justifies the means."

SATOLLI AND THE POPE.

The *Delicate* Reviews The Seventeen Years of Leo's Reign.

To the Editor of the *New York World*: The Pontificate of Pope Leo has now been numbered among the longest in the history of the Church and has been marked each year by some luminous act of profound wisdom and untiring solicitude for the good not only of Catholicity, but of mankind at large. No one in modern times has understood better than Pope Leo the needs of society in all branches of knowledge and fields of action.

It would seem as if, from the time when he succeeded Pope Pius, he had formed a grand plan, in which he took cognizance of all the needs of humanity and determined on the provisions

he would make for those needs during the whole course of his Pontificate.

We can best distinguish this design of the Pope in three particular directions.

Firstly, in the Holy Father's ardent zeal for the development of studies.

Secondly, in the continued interest which he has shown in social science.

And, thirdly, in his untiring efforts to bring peace into the Christian countries by the spread of civilization, the teaching of religion and the promotion of concord between Church and State.

With regard to studies, Pope Leo has already reared a monument of imperishable fame by the successive acts of his Pontificate. Early in his reign he turned his attention to the encouragement of the study of classical literature; of philosophy and the natural sciences; of theology and the various branches of sacred sciences, such as Biblical knowledge and ecclesiastical history; and of judicial sciences, especially of Roman law and comparative civil law.

To accomplish his aim he founded new chairs and new institutions in Rome for these various departments of literary and encyclopaedic knowledge, and called to his help well-ascertained meaning in monastic Latin is 'binding under the penalty of sin.'

Turning again to his policy of pacification, the ecclesiastical history of his Pontificate, the civil history of Europe, the universal history of the human race, will in the future have to give up pages of the highest praise to Leo XIII. Germany, Belgium, France and Spain profess their boundless gratitude for the peace giving interventions of Leo XIII. in many grave and critical emergencies, and for acts which have been of the greatest moment to those nations. Asia, too, and Africa, will be found joining in the chorus, and lauding Leo, who has so often and so resolutely labored to reawaken those old and fossilized portions of the earth to a new life of Christian civilization.

Now will America, throughout its length and breadth, withhold its tribute of loyal and generous veneration, esteem and gratitude to Pope Leo for those acts of his Pontificate which have at various times been promulgated, and by which he has shown his confidence and hope in the grand future of this mighty nation.

During the seventeen years of his pontifical rule nothing has been more remarkable or plain than the incessant growth of his benignant moral influence. To-day the Holy Father's words are listened to with deference by every court, by every Government, by every people. On every question touching universal human interests his counsel is sought eagerly, and welcomed gratefully.

Despite, then, all the adverse trend of mundane circumstances, despite the loss of the external symbols of his high authority, the Papacy has gained in power and splendor since the accession of the present glorious Pontiff. As Macaulay says in one of his most noble essays:

"The Papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigor."

FR. ARN. SATOLLI, Deleg. Apost. Washington, March 2, 1895.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Father Dubberley's Reply to Dr. Ryle—The Pope the Centre of Christian Authority.

London Catholic News.

Father Dubberley, S. J., preached at St. Francis Xavier's, Liverpool, on Sunday evening last, the second of his series of replies to an address by the Protestant Bishop of Liverpool, delivered at a diocesan conference some short time ago. The church was again crowded, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather. Father Dubberley took for his text the words: "Simon, Simon, I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou, being converted, confirm thy brethren." (Luke, iii., 32.) He said, after describing that it would be childish to deny that there were hopeless divisions on vital questions in the Church of England, his Lordship the Protestant Bishop of Liverpool, asked whether there was not a possibility of this question being satisfactorily settled by having a legal decision. His Lordship says that 'prohibitions against ritualistic practices by the ecclesiastical courts, were as useless to-day as the bows and arrows and flintlocks of ancient warfare;' and then His Lordship despairingly added that "there was nothing to be hoped for from the

work of God, and being the work of God, it must be perfect. There was also the idea of supremacy conveyed in these words of Christ. The Church was to be founded on a rock; any other Church that might be founded would be built on sand. Christ's Church was to be the "pillar and the ground of Truth;" it was to be able to support every doctrine, and would be able to uphold every kind of truth. Christ continued: "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven." Others could baptize, and Peter could baptize along with them; others could preach the Gospel and Peter could preach the Gospel; but what others would bind Peter could loose, and what others would loose Peter could bind. Peter was to have power over all. There was no restriction given in this promise that Jesus Christ made to St. Peter. The preacher continued to quote various incidents from the life of our Saviour to show that Peter was intended to have authority over all the other apostles and disciples of Christ's Church; and finally before His Ascension into heaven, He gave supreme authority to Peter. Peter was commissioned by Christ to feed His lambs and His sheep—the laity and the clergy of the Church. The promise of Jesus Christ was thus fulfilled: His Church had got a head.

CHRIST'S CHURCH—A VISIBLE HEAD NECESSARY.

Now, the Church of Jesus Christ is both human and divine, and in this sense it partakes of the two-fold nature of the God-man. Nothing is grander than the conception of the Church—nothing more humble than the means by which that conception was put into execution. For the sake of the Church the prophets lived and prophesied; for the sake of the Church, great empires crumbled into dust, and yet when the time for action came, it was found that grandeur gave place to humility—twelve poor fishermen were chosen for the twelve apostles, with the cross as the standard; that faith was the means; that the poor fishing-boat was the cradle. And Christ Himself said this, for when upon one occasion the people crowded round about Him, He went into a boat and put off from the shore to address the multitude. It was Peter's boat, and Peter was the pilot; and the pilot of the boat—Peter—and the Church have since been inseparable. It was impossible amongst men to conceive that there should be an army without a general, a ship without a captain, an empire without an emperor, so it was impossible to conceive that Jesus Christ would establish the jurisdiction which He should call Church without having a head, Peter was the head of that Church, as we have the army with its general, the ship with its captain, the flock with its shepherd, the circumference with its centre. As the Church of God was the permanent incarnation of the Son of God, so, as St. Francis de Sales had said, the Church and the head are one.

PETER THE FIRST HEAD OF THE CHURCH.

When our blessed Lord gave instructions for the preaching of the Gospel for the conversion of the world, He took care, carefully and gradually, to prepare their minds that one amongst their number would be selected with supremacy of order and jurisdiction. When Almighty God chose anyone for any great work He not unfrequently gave that person a special name. Thus, He gave a special commission to Abraham and changed his name; when He promised Sarah a child He changed her name; He changed the name of Jacob, and the cradle represented called to our recollection the name of Jesus Christ the Saviour, and the name of Jesus Christ was given to Him by God. When St. Andrew came to his brother and told him that he had found the Messiah, and brought St. Peter with him to see the Messiah, we were told that Jesus Christ looked on Peter, and then said to him—"Thou art Simon, son of John, but from henceforth thou shalt be called Peter." This was the name that Jesus Christ gave him—this was the name of the first Pope. When He had given this name to Peter, our Divine Master allowed a certain time to elapse to permit this idea of supremacy to sink deep into the mind of Peter, and throughout his Pontificate he fully prepared His Apostles for the grand power which He intended to give them. Our Divine Lord made use of material images in order to accustom the minds of His Apostles that one amongst them would be chosen for the supremacy of order and jurisdiction. He chose His twelve Apostles, and Peter was named the first. Our Lord gave the order to the Apostles to launch forth into the deep, and He gets into Peter's boat. The order is given to Peter, and then Christ demands the Apostles to cast their nets—they are all to take part in the conversion of the world, all to have a share in the salvation of souls; but Peter is to be the first in command. Now we come to a promise: One day Christ turns to His apostles, and puts to them this question: "Who do men say that I am?" And the Apostles gave their opinions: "Some say You are Elias, others John the Baptist, others one of the prophets." Then our Divine Saviour turns to the apostles and He says to them again, "And who do you say that I am?" And in the name of all the apostles, St. Peter answers and says, "Thou art Christ, Son of the living God." And no sooner had St. Peter uttered these words than our Blessed Lord gave him a promise—"our Lord signaled the apostle by name, so that there can be no hesitation and no doubt as to which of the Apostles is meant—"Blessed art thou, Simon Barjonah, because flesh and blood have not revealed it to thee, but My Father, Who is in heaven; thou art Peter; thou art the rock foundation of My Church, the salvation of My Church." Notice that here we have the magnificence joined with the precision of Divine commissions. In the language of our Saviour there was no room for doubt, and the idea was grasped by all immediately—that Peter was the Rock, the foundation-stone of Christ's Church. Church said to Peter, "Upon the Rock I will build My Church." Therefore Christ's Church was not the work of man; it

was the work of God, and being the work of God, it must be perfect. There was also the idea of supremacy conveyed in these words of Christ. The Church was to be founded on a rock; any other Church that might be founded would be built on sand. Christ's Church was to be the "pillar and the ground of Truth;" it was to be able to support every doctrine, and would be able to uphold every kind of truth. Christ continued: "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven." Others could baptize, and Peter could baptize along with them; others could preach the Gospel and Peter could preach the Gospel; but what others would bind Peter could loose, and what others would loose Peter could bind. Peter was to have power over all. There was no restriction given in this promise that Jesus Christ made to St. Peter. The preacher continued to quote various incidents from the life of our Saviour to show that Peter was intended to have authority over all the other apostles and disciples of Christ's Church; and finally before His Ascension into heaven, He gave supreme authority to Peter. Peter was commissioned by Christ to feed His lambs and His sheep—the laity and the clergy of the Church. The promise of Jesus Christ was thus fulfilled: His Church had got a head.

UNITY ESSENTIAL TO CHRIST'S CHURCH.

He (Father Dubberley) would now proceed to consider that in the Church of Jesus Christ there must be union. He had this emphasized in various texts of Scripture; they had established in texts in the New Testament. Thus, one of the last prayers that Christ made before His Passion was, "Holy Father, keep them in Thy Name whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one as We also are One." This was the teaching of St. Paul where he tells us that there are many members in one family under one head, but all the members go to form one body. Then St. Paul warned the Ephesians "to keep carefully the union of spirit in the bond of peace. He gave the Ephesians a kind of watchword—"There is but one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, and one God, the Father of all of us." Surely they could not have stronger expressions to prove that the Church of Christ must be one. Again, the Nicene Council, the first general Council of the Church, in the creed which was then drawn up, and which is used till this day, inserted the words, "I believe in one Holy Catholic Apostolic Church." The Scripture and tradition, therefore, told us that the Church must be one. Reason told us the same thing; reason told us that as the Church of God was a society of men of every nation gathered together to believe the one Faith which was planted on the earth by Christ, that society must have a head. In every society there was a union of right and a union of fact; a command, a union of fact which is passive and amends. Did we find this union of right and this union of fact in any heretical or schismatical Church? No; the word "heresy" implied the denial of the teaching authority of the Church, and the word "schism" denied the governing authority of the Church. Therefore, outside the Catholic Church he (the preacher) was forced to the conclusion that there was no union of right and no union of fact. The words schism and heresy meant separation, and consequently other Churches were isolated and alone. For example, in the Greek Church, if a Greek priest has any difficulty, he appeals to the Patriarch of Constantinople; and the Patriarch of Constantinople, if he cannot settle the question, appeals to the Sultan. In the Russian Church the Russian priests appeal to the Archimandrite, the Archimandrite appeals to the Holy Synod, and the Holy Synod appeals to the Czar. Can we be surprised if the teaching of the Sultan and the Czar do not coincide with the teaching of Jesus Christ? In the Anglican Church a difficulty finally comes for decision before the Privy Council of the Queen. But in the Privy Council there were many Catholics. Could a absurdity go further than this? In a Protestant church the congregation did not know what their minister believed, nor did the minister know what his congregation believed. Two Protestants might agree in the negotiations, but they would disagree in the affirmations of their beliefs. In a Protestant family a child might ask its father for an explanation of a passage in the Scripture; but the father, if he was true to his principles, if he believed in the right of private judgement, must leave the child to make any interpretation it liked. In the Catholic Church only was true union to be found. Father Dubberley proceeded to enlarge upon the unity of the Catholic Church, and pointed out that each succeeding Pope at Rome spoke with the voice of Peter. He showed the power which Peter's successor wielded in the affairs of the world at the present day, and said no religious institution possessed such influence as the Catholic Church. Throughout all ages, since the beginning of Christendom, the Pope had but

one longing desire: his hands were raised in prayer—the prayer of His Divine Master—that, as there is but one flock, and one Faith, so may all come to belong to this flock and this Faith.

THE GLORIOUS CITY OF GOD.

Something on Devotion to the Foster-Father of Our Lord.

By the wise and timely action of Pius IX., devotion to St. Joseph has been greatly augmented in our day. As patron of the Universal Church, extraordinary devotion has sprung up for him on all sides. It was peculiarly fitting that the saintly Pius IX. should have been instrumental, in the hands of God, in bringing about this happy condition of things. As the Foster-Father of the Virgin, the Mother of Christ her most endearing title, the one by which she likes best to be known and honored—"The Immaculate Conception"—as declared by her own lips, it was most appropriate that the same Pontiff should crown St. Joseph with an aureole whose splendor and beauty is second only to that of his virgin spouse. Among his many glorious deeds these two great acts will ever endure to the hearts of devout Catholics the memory of Pius IX.

No saint is so worthy of our homage as St. Joseph. He occupies the most intimate relations with God, and stands in the closest proximity to Him. In the great work of the redemption, he performed a necessary part in the designs of Providence. As the Foster-Father of Jesus and the guardian of Mary, he had entrusted to his care the most precious treasure that has ever been confided to mortal keeping. His virtues corresponded to the dignity of his office, for the Scriptures declare "he was a just man in all his ways." He was possessed of a plenitude of grace and every virtue in its highest and most perfect degree. Inspired in his every act by a spirit of gentleness and love, he sought only the comfort and happiness of the cherished objects of his solicitude. No unkind word ever escaped his lips, no look of reproach went forth from his eyes. Meekness was in his countenance and charity in his heart. Though obliged to toil for the support of the household, he did not grow weary of the task or become dissatisfied with his lot in life. He rather loved the more his lowly station, since God so willed it; and his faith in Providence told him that what was the best of infinite wisdom was for the best.

Though descended from the house of David, yet he did not disdain to work as an humble artisan. St. Joseph cared nothing for either riches or worldly fame. He was contented and happy in the position which he occupied. He knew that God regards persons for what they are in His sight and no more. Judged according to that standard, St. Joseph was rich indeed; for having co-operated with the designs of heaven, grace constantly increased and multiplied in his soul. It will be seen that St. Joseph has great influence and power in heaven. Hence, pious Christians are accustomed to invoke his aid, confidently relying upon its assistance. The great St. Teresa de Jesus—the great mother of Carmel—has said that she never asked St. Joseph for a spiritual favor without receiving it. "To other saints," says she, "God seems to grant special favors, but to St. Joseph He accords all that he asks." "If any one should doubt the truth of my saying," St. Teresa continues, "I beg of him to make the trial for himself." The development and progress of the devotion to Joseph are largely due to the writings and untiring efforts of St. Teresa, who never ceased to proclaim his praises.

Many reasons then suggest themselves to pious Christians for honoring St. Joseph. The sceptre symbolizes his mission and his characteristic virtue. The lily is the type of his stainless purity. He is father of a new and spiritual generation, extolled in Holy Writ, "the memory whereof is immortal, because they are known both to God and to men."

Go to Joseph, then, poor hearts, broken by the forgetfulness of friends, neglected by the world, and keenly sensitive to rebuffs, and he against whom, together with the Virgin Mother, the doors of Bethlehem were shut most unkindly, will heal your heartache and dry your tears, and make you see in what seems most hard the loving Providence of God.

Go to Joseph, poor mother, whose heart aches for an only son, astray from Church and home; and he will bid you not weep as they who have no hope, but mingle prayers with tears, and thus win back your boy as Monica did her Augustine.

Guardian of honor of Mary, guardian of Christ Himself, St. Joseph of right claims the tribute of our affection and the homage of our love.

The St. Patrick's Concert to be given in London on the 19th will be one of the best entertainments ever held in the city. Secure your seats early!

Although we should address every one in terms dictated by politeness, we should not praise those present, except we consider it proper to engage them to persevere in a good work, or to encourage timid souls.