

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, DECEMBER 25, 1897.

NO. 1,001.

FOR THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Christmas.
Again He cometh the Infant God, all love,
To woo a heartless world—heaven's light
To darkest earth down wins His flight,
And gladdens all with radiant smile,
O'er Zion's hills, amidst shepherds' lot,
The bending skies with angels' songs re-echo,
In hearts erst sad and peace and joy abound,
And earth and sky and love and truth have found.
Christmas, all hail! again the morning chime
In glad carillon summons young and old,
Through gathering snow and winds blown
From yonder North, and voices
Onward they press absorbed in thought
And hushed, the shepherds heaven taught, left
As when the shepherds heaven taught, left
To seek the Child God promised in olden time,
They through cathedral aisles in homage meet
And pour love's treasures out at Jesus' feet.
He came to give a dying world life,
Dark Error's mists He came to roll away,
And lead all souls to Wisdom's gentle way,
When shone His Star, grim Discord ceased his strife,
Came hid his head, the sun of Peace arose:
The arid desert blossomed as a Rose.
The Shepherds' faithful Faith he our reward,
The Wisdom's triple homage let us bring,
And deepest adoration as our Lord,
A crib, a cross of earth, a manger,
Our guardian—Christmas joys for evermore.
W. F.

THOSE PRELIMINARIES.

N. Y. Freeman's Journal.
McAllister.—The third general council met at Ephesus, Asia Minor, A. D. 431. This council was also called by imperial edict in dependence of the Bishop of Rome, although a Western associate emperor, Valentinian III., cooperated in calling it with the Eastern emperor, Theodosius II.
Freeman.—As we said in reference to the Council of Constantinople, it is enough that the convocation by the emperors had the sanction of the Pope. That the convocation of the Council of Ephesus had the Pope's sanction is evident from the fact that he sent legates to it. Pope Celestine wrote to the Emperor Theodosius, May 15, 431, saying that he could not be personally present at the Synod, but that he would take part in it by commissioners. (Hardouin Tom. I, page 1,473)
It is well here to note a few facts that preceded the calling of the Council of Ephesus. About four years previous to the council a discussion concerning the nature of the Incarnation arose between Bishop Cyril of Alexandria and Bishop Nestorius of Constantinople. This discussion greatly disturbed the peace of the Church in the East. Both Cyril and Nestorius appealed to Rome. Cyril in his appeal wrote: "It would be more agreeable if we could keep silence, but God demands of us watchfulness, and ecclesiastical custom requires me to inform your holiness."
This appeal from the prelates of the Eastern empire to the Bishop of Rome, in the Western empire, is a positive recognition of the primacy of the Roman See. This recognition is still more strongly evidenced by the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus, which were practically dictated by Pope Celestine. As we have already said, this recognition of the primacy of the Pope carries with it the acknowledgment of the necessity of his approbation before the decrees of a council can be binding on the whole Church. It is only in virtue of the fact that the decrees of a council are binding on the whole Church that the council is ecumenic or general.
On the appeal of Cyril and Nestorius to Rome the authorities there took up and examined the doctrines as respectively set forth by these two prelates. The doctrines of Nestorius were declared to be heretical, and the Pope wrote to Nestorius, informing him of the fact and requiring him, under pain of deposition, to retract and condemn the heresy he had been teaching within ten days after receiving the letter. The Pope at the same time wrote to Cyril of Alexandria, in Egypt, commissioning him to see that the required retraction was made or the sentence of deposition published. While Nestorius strove by various explanations and expedients to stave off the Roman sentence, he never at any time denied the Pope's authority in the case. If the Pope's supremacy had not been the common belief of the Eastern churches at that time it would have been most natural for Nestorius to have repudiated that supremacy, as an impertinent claim and a groundless assumption of authority, and protested against it as an innovation. He would have appealed to the faith and traditions of the people of the East against the usurpation of authority by them, a foreign, Western Bishop. He would thus have maintained his position against both the Bishop of Rome and the Bishop of Alexandria. But Nestorius did none of these things. Why? Because he knew the faith of the people, knew that an appeal against the recognized authority of the Bishop of Rome would be vain. No more convincing proof of the belief of the Eastern churches in the primacy or headship of the Pope need be offered than the conduct of Nestorius on this occasion, which meant so much to him.
Just prior to the assembling at Ephesus Bishop Cyril wrote to Pope Celestine asking whether Nestorius should be allowed to appear at the Synod as a member, or whether the sentence of deposition pronounced against him, after the period of time allowed for retracting had elapsed, should now still have effect. Reflect for a moment on this. Here is the patriarch of Alexandria in Egypt writing to the Pope of Rome to know if the Bishop of Con-

stantinople would be allowed to appear as a member of a council to be held at Ephesus, in Asia Minor. Why did not the patriarch write to the Emperor on the subject, since both Constantinople and Ephesus were under his civil jurisdiction? Why should not the Emperor determine the rights or privileges of the Bishop of his own imperial city, and in a council of his own calling?
The Pope, in reply to the patriarch's question, wrote that God willeth not the death of the sinner but his conversion, and that Cyril should do everything in order to restore the peace of the Church and to win Nestorius to the truth. In consequence of this reply, Nestorius, at the assembling of the council, was invited by Cyril, who was president, to take part. He declined, however, under various pretexts, to be present or to retract his errors, and the council reaffirmed the Pope's condemnation of his doctrine and sentence of deposition.
McAllister.—Candidian, the representative of Theodosius, presided over the council, together with Cyril of Alexandria.
Freeman.—Candidian, who was captain of the imperial bodyguard, did not preside, and if the doctor had read Candidian's commission he would have known better than to say so. In the edict which Theodosius addressed to the council on the subject he said that Candidian was to take no immediate part in the discussions on the contested points of faith, for it is not becoming that one who does not belong to the number of bishops should mix himself up in the examination and decision of theological controversies. His duty was to protect the council in its deliberations and preserve order in the city. His functions were purely civil. From the beginning Count Candidian was an enemy of the council and a partisan of Nestorius. John, Bishop of Antioch, and Nestorius, with a few followers, got up at Ephesus what is called a council, or little council—we would now call it a side show—in opposition to the council over which Cyril presided. They held their meetings in another part of the city. In this side show Candidian made himself very conspicuous, and complained in it of how Cyril had contested his right to be present at the council over which he (Cyril) presided, and how Cyril had opened the Synod against his (Candidian's) protest. He did everything in his power to discredit the council under Cyril by misrepresenting its proceedings to the Emperor and by other inimical acts. It must be remembered that this conciliarism, in which Candidian made himself so conspicuous, was not the council afterwards recognized as the General Council of Ephesus. This title belongs to the Synod over which Cyril presided. It is not true, then, as the doctor erroneously states, that Candidian presided over the Council of Ephesus.
It is true, however, that Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, presided, as Dr. McAllister admits; but he does not state the important fact that it is expressly stated in the acts of the council that Cyril also represented the Pope.
Besides Cyril, who was the principal, the Pope sent other representatives. In his instructions to these subaltern representatives he said: "You will in all things consult our brother, the Bishop Cyril, and you will perform whatever you see to be in his power to decide, and we command that the authority of the Holy See be respected." They were not to mix in the discussion (between Nestorius and his opponents), but to give judgment on the views of others.
In his epistle to the prelates at Ephesus Pope Celestine wrote: "On account of our solicitude, we have sent you our brother priests, the Bishops Arcadius and Proclus, and the priest Paulus, who are of one mind with ourselves, who will be present at all that is done, and who will execute what we have established. . . . The legates are to be present at the transactions of the Synod, and will give effect to that which the Pope has long ago decided with respect to Nestorius, for he does not doubt that the assembled Bishops will agree with this."
The Pope was not disappointed. In the first action of the council the bishops said: "Compelled by the Holy Canons, and by the epistle of our Most Holy Father and Co-minister Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church, and covered with tears, we necessarily come to the sorrowful sentence against Nestorius." At the second action of session of the Synod, Firmus, Bishop of Cappadocian Caesarea, said to the Pope's legates: "The Holy Apostolic See, through the letters of Celestine, sent to the most religious bishops, Cyril of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, etc., before the present business, prescribed the sentence and the rule which we have followed. . . . Since Nestorius has not appeared when cited by us, we have put into execution that form, pronouncing against him the Canonical Apostolic judgment."
In reply the legates said, among other things: "We request that you order to be made known to us that which has been done in this Holy Synod before our coming in order that, in accordance with the decree of our blessed Pope, and with that of this holy company, we may also confirm it. That following the formula of the Most Holy Celestine, who has committed this task unto us, we may confirm the judgments

of your Holiness." The fathers of the Synod acquiesced, thus recognizing the superiority of the Pope over them all.
We have given these quotations to show that the commanding and controlling personage in this Greco-Asiatic council was the Pope of Rome, and not the Emperor of Byzantium or his captain of the guards, Candidian. For the quotations we refer the reader to vol. III, page 10, and following; and also to Parson's Studies in Church History, vol. I, page 276, and following.
Dr. McAllister admits the evidence of the Papal power here, but refers to it as for the first time making its appearance. But he fails or rather does not attempt to account for the phenomenon that when, according to him, it first appeared it was universally recognized, submitted to and obeyed. He does not account for the strange fact that the Bishops of Greece, Egypt and Asia Minor suddenly woke up at Ephesus in the year 431 and found themselves Roman Catholics or Papists, and the still stranger fact that they appeared to be unconscious of any change had taken place in their faith, customs or traditions.
His theory of a first appearance makes it necessary for him to account for the sudden, universal and unconscious acceptance of Papal supremacy in the first half of the fifth century—a doctrine, according to him, unheard of before that time. If the Council had been held in the West or anywhere within the ordinary jurisdiction of the Western Patriarchate, the doctor might account for the first appearance of the primacy by referring it to the intrigue and local influence of the Bishop of Rome. But it was in Asia Minor, and composed almost exclusively of Greek, Asiatic and Egyptian Bishops. Their unhesitating acceptance of the Pope's superiority can be accounted for in but one of two ways. Either it was the common belief of the Eastern churches up to that time, or the Eastern Christians had their memories of the past utterly blotted out, and were suddenly and unconsciously converted to the belief in the Pope's supremacy, and had it pressed in upon them that they had always so believed. This, of course, would be a miracle. It comes then to this, that they had always believed in the primacy, or a miracle was wrought to induce them to believe it. If they had always believed in it, the primacy is established by the faith of Christendom. If a miracle was wrought, then the primacy is established on a miracle, a divine interposition. In either case the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, appears to be safe.
LECTURE BY REV. FATHER ROSSWINKEL, S. J.
"The Duties of Children."
Catholic Witness, Detroit, Dec. 17.
"Order is heaven's first law." And this confessed it is seen that some are higher in authority than others; some more rich, some more wise. This relation exists throughout all visible creation. Everywhere is manifested the submission of the inferior to the superior. Each member of the human family discharges its proper function and owns the will its sovereign. Supposing a revolution to take place in creation. Suppose the sun, released from present laws to wander aimlessly throughout space; here ever scorching by its proximity, there killing by its distance all vegetable life. Suppose the heavenly bodies, colliding, and the winds ceasing or roaring in a perpetual tornado; the earth refuses to yield her produce. Devastation ensues and terror. Creation is released from the fixed laws that govern it of gravitation, by rebellion against a higher authority.
Imagine a simple case in the human body—the eye refusing to exercise its sight, the hand declining its functions, the ear to close itself to pleasant sounds. Cast your eye on a land where anarchy prevails: a scene more horrifying cannot be. All laws are overturned, all power is destroyed, the ties of friendship are broken, and the tocsin of alarm arouses the frenzied mob, and what a century has built up a moment destroys.
Remove authority and you change the earth into a den of ravenous tigers released from their confinement, and engaged in a struggle of life and death in which the superior might of the stronger alone will decide against the weaker rights of the weaker. There will be tyranny from above and slavery from below; oppression and war against the weak will result from perversion of authority.
God is the God of order and peace, not of rebellion and disorder. Therefore He has assigned fixed laws for the material creation; everything is in harmony, union and concord. And He holds the moral world in subjection and unites it into one common family by His supreme authority, which He communicates to His visible representatives for whom, in His name and for His sake, He requires reverence and honor, obedience and love.
"I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have no other gods before me." So runs the commencement of the Ten Commandments, which contain the natural trait of reverence. And He

has delegated the supreme authority to visible representatives to whom reverence and honor is due. "Honor thy father and mother, as the Lord thy God commanded thee, that thou mayest live a long time, and it may be well with thee in the land which the Lord thy God will give thee." By the fourth commandment God has created a barrier against social disorders which would be inevitable, and by it has transmitted certain powers to parents such as He wishes to be transmitted throughout society. Pope, Bishop, priest, president, governor, parent or subject, child. The law of order and harmony must ever remain the same, and whoever attempts to change it, destroys society and happiness. Such is the full meaning of the fourth commandment for the entire race.
These leading sacred duties imposed by the commandment on children would be only discussed to-night. "Cursed be that honoreth not his father and mother; and all the people shall say Amen." "The eye that mocketh at his father and that despiseth the labor of his mother in bearing him, let the ravens of the brooks pick it out and the young eagles devour it." These are a few of the many passages of Holy Scripture in which the sanction of this law is commanded upon children to pay honor, respect, love and obedience to God's appointed superiors over them, His representatives. How many a war has arisen from some insult, real or imagined, to an ambassador or representative of some foreign potentate? Can it be wondered then that God so jealously demands the honor, love and obedience for His representatives, the parents of their children and being Parental faults, even gross crimes, do not prevent the observance of this law. They may sadden the heart of the Christian child and render the fulfillment of the law difficult. But in spite of all this reverence and respect is due to the author of their being. It should be remembered the commandment is not "Honor a worthy father or a saintly mother." There is no qualification. Be the parent rich or poor, learned or ignorant, of high position, refined or coarse, a deceiver, a blasphemer, a scoffer, though he die the death of a felon; even with aching heart, prevent the observance of this law. "Cursed be that honoreth not his father and mother; and all the people shall say Amen."
All this, no doubt, is not in the nineteenth century tone, but they are nevertheless truths. The person of the parent is sacred and entitled to respect and honor under all circumstances, as the representative of God. An insult to him is an insult to Almighty God Himself. Whether he does his duty worthily or not, whether he is a faithful administrator of God's property or not, the observance may be rendered difficult, but there can never be any release from the obligation of paying him honor, respect and reverence.
The non-observance of this commandment is a notorious fact among the children of this land. A genuine respectful child was the exception. Children now are bold and impertinent, disrespectful to parent and old people. It is a matter of every day comment and cannot be denied. How different from some years ago. The question how has the change been brought about can receive no infallible answer. But a close observation and study of little people might lead one to suppose that the training and education of children at home and school lacks the careful assiduous development of a God given natural trait, namely reverence. Disrespect is unnatural. Notice the expression of reverence in the countenance of a young child, the folding of the hands, or movement of the lips, as he hears of earth, of the Infant Jesus in the crib, or of the Guardian Angel. Notice his reverent silence as he listens to an Aloysius, an Agnes, a Catherine, or one of the many heroes or heroines of the Church. And compare this with his excited interest in the narration of some secular event. As Guizot says, the Catholic Church is the greatest school of reverence in the world. In season and out of season, she presents high and noble models to the admiration and veneration of her children in Mary, Joseph and the child Jesus, with the apostles, martyrs, virgins, friends of Jesus Christ. A respectful deportment in God's house is insisted on; her sacraments are holy, and a holy preparation is required. Bishops and priests are entitled to honor and respect and she ever impresses the young minds of children with a proper idea of the honor and reverence due to him, the representative of God and therefore sacred in the eyes of the child.
In education recourse is had to "object" lessons; but what low, common, ordinary models are held up for the instruction of children; how unlikely to inspire reverence and veneration! No wonder, then, that reverence is wanting in children when nothing is held up to develop it, but all the opposite. Let parents see to it that the children never see, hear or read anything that tends to destroy or diminish this natural trait of reverence. Silly papers

and story books, fables and sensationalism will destroy this one of the best traits that God has given to man. And parents must show honor, respect and reverence to those deserving. Then will they receive honor and respect themselves. Honor to whom honor is due, and the children will not refuse it. In passing one remark, as to a Christian audience: remember to watch your conversation. Walls have ears. Children are attentive listeners; though unable to give expression to them, they think big thoughts, and as the seed is sown so it will spring forth. In conversation be reverent and respectful; never ridicule anything unworthy, and as at home so at school, and a general improvement will result.
But yet children exist who do pay reverence, respect and veneration to all entitled to it and who are not ashamed of their parents, and do not call them the "old man" and the "old woman," and reverence the aged authors of their being. Would to God this were the rule and not the exception!
A second duty of children towards parents is love. But what is love! Only one other word, liberty, has been so profaned. As of liberty, so of love: it might be said "Oh Love, what crimes have been committed in thy name." There is only one true definition of love and that is taken from the Holy Scriptures. "Deus est Caritas"—"God is love." There is not and can not be love apart from God, without God as its foundation. Hence, St. John says: "Dearly beloved, let us love one another; for charity is of God." Where God finds love, He finds Himself. The intensity of love is so great that it could melt the hearts of all men into one, as intimately as the union of God, the Father, and the Son. Thus the Father has communicated to the human race a bond of love by which they may be united and a brotherhood of mankind formed, which charity alone can accomplish.
The love owed to parents should be an active and ardent effort on the part of children to become united with their parents in all things possible. Therefore, the child should share all the sorrows of their parents, thus relieving them of half the burden. The child, too, should share all his joys with their parents, thus doubling their pleasures. In all events and under all circumstances, the interests of the child should be the interests of the parents. And why? Because the parents are God's representatives, and love for God's representative must be founded on love for God. Parents have merited it. The produce of their blood, they have been supported by the toil and sweat of the parent; their material frame developed. They have received a prudent, tender watchfulness and the result of the parents' toil labor. There should be a deep instinctive feeling of filial gratitude on the heart of each for the discharge of those most sacred duties.
How sad it is to notice these fundamental principles disappear. The father's toil and sweat in providing a livelihood, an education, perhaps a competency; the mother's sacred care over their childhood, her vigils in sickness, are forgotten when the sun of their life is setting, and the shadow of the grave is upon their father or a tender young girl. There are terrible crimes committed in this regard. No wonder no blessing, but a curse rests on such outrage. And gratitude is possessed by all the animals.
You will always be in debt and can never liquidate the obligation to your parents. But show good will and all ways have a warm, affectionate heart for your old father and mother. Externally show your love for them by always being near them. Do not weary of being at home and spend your time upon the streets at night, or the company, leaving your parents alone at home; but be to them a constant source of joy, that they may point with pride to your manly conduct and behavior. The scene enacted in the story entitled the "Smiting of the Rock" should never be enacted, a story which contained the pathetic and beautiful moral, "He who loves his mother is not quite lost."
The last and most important duty is obedience. What is obedience? The traveler who hands his money to the highwayman does not obey the latter's command; he yields to force. They who obey externally, because they must, but grumble thereat, do not really obey. Obedience is the voluntary submission of the will to the authority of one who has the right to command. Look at the Holy Child Jesus: He came down from heaven, and was subject to his parents; Jesus Christ the omnipotent subject to weak creatures; obedient as God, the creator of heaven and earth, subject to two creatures. "I have given you an

example that as I have done to you so you do also." Our Lord was subject to his parents. Disobedient? Did Jesus Christ, the highest type of mankind ever do anything debasing? Yet He was subject. You plead advancing years; you are no longer a child. For 30 years our Lord was obedient, even to the death on the cross.
Cast your eyes upon your model, the Lord Jesus Christ. There is no higher nobility than to know how to obey. It implies self-conquest. Obedience opens heaven; it is attendance closes it. Like wisdom, it is attended by all good things. But why obey? Because it is submission to the will of God, for the parent is the representative of God. Let parents arise to the dignity of their position. Let children love their parents and display a filial gratitude. Let them feel it an honor to be near their parents and when their needs are greatest, assist them. Never let them raise the standard of revolt or enlist under him whose banner bore "Non Serviam." "I will not serve," but rather under the standard of St. Michael, which proudly bore the motto "Who is like unto God." God says "Honor thy father and mother" and the Christian child fervently responds "Amen. So be it!"

QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

Can a man of average intelligence, who believes not in the personality of God or the truth of the religion of Christ, be held accountable because he cannot revolutionize his mind, and cause it to accept what is naturally repulsive to it? Is the mind not master of the mind?
1. If we met a man who says he does not believe in the personality of God we would assume on the start that he did not understand what is meant by personality, and that his idea of God was hazy and indefinite. Before attempting to explain we would require him to state what he meant by the terms God and personality. It is probable that a clear idea of the meaning of these terms would show the man of average intelligence that there is no incompatibility between God and personality. Personality does not imply necessarily matter, extension or limitation. It implies absolute unity or oneness and intelligence, and this oneness and intelligence is as compatible with the infinite Being as with the finite. The man of average intelligence who admits the existence of a finite person has no longer reason to deny the existence of an infinite person, possessed of infinite intelligence.
2. The truth of the Christian religion is established by evidence of such a character as to demand the assent of a healthy mind that knows the evidence. The trouble is that some men are apt to reject Christianity off hand and in ignorance. With prejudice as their architect they construct a fabric that is revolting to human nature and common sense, label it "Christianity," and shout, "Behold! Do you ask us to accept that? It is revolting. Reason rejects it." Quite true, but the thing which reason rejects is unreal, having no existence but in the mind that fabricated it, a house in the brain, or a bluebeard castle in the air. They naturally shrink from the monster their brain has conjured up and called Christianity—shrink as the fever patient or the victim of delirium tremens shrinks from disease created visions, because in his abnormal condition he has lost that delicate touch by which the mind distinguishes its own internal creations from external objective realities.
3. To say that a man cannot revolutionize his mind is the same as to say that if he be in error he can never get out of it. A man in such a state of imbecility would certainly not be a man of average intelligence. Men's judgments are formed from data, and every judgment presupposes the truth of the data. If on further information the data prove false the mind must revolutionize its judgments on the basis of the newly acquired information. The mind that does not claim the capacity to do this is humble indeed.
4. No truth is repulsive to the intellect; only the false, the unreal, the abnormal is repulsive to it. It never rejects truth as truth, though it may reject it believing it to be error.
The truth may, however, be very repulsive to our feelings or sentiments. The truth that he must die tomorrow must be repulsive to the criminal. But we must not confound mind or intelligence with sentiment or volition. To many every truth that induces obligation or curbs the passions is repulsive. But this sentimental impulse that repels the uncomfortable is not to be confounded with that intellectual impulse which rejects the false. In the former it is the will that is concerned; in the latter it is the intellect pure.
The mind is master of the man only in the sense that the intellect should direct the will in the way it apprehends to be right. But unfortunately when the will surrenders itself to what inventor Keeley calls a sympathetic outreach it can give the intellect an enforced leave of absence from the pilot house.—New York Freeman's Journal.
Pray for the dead, and the dead will pray for you.