

## THE CATHOLIC RECORD,

Published every Friday morning at 388 Richmond Street, opposite City Hall, London, Ont.

Annual subscription.....\$2 00  
Semi-annual.....1 00

## RATES FOR ADVERTISEMENTS.

12 cents per line for first, and five cents per line for each subsequent insertion. Advertisements measured in nonpareil type 12 lines to an inch. Contract advertisements for three, six or twelve months, special terms. All advertisements should be handed in not later than Thursday morning. Terms to agents, twelve and a half per cent. on remittances, or one free copy to the getter-up of each club of ten.

We solicit and shall at all times be pleased to receive contributions on subjects of interest to our readers and Catholics generally, which will be inserted when not in conflict with our own views as to their conformity in this respect. All communications should be addressed to the undersigned accompanied by the full name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

WALTER LOCKE,

PUBLISHER,

388 Richmond Street, London, Ont.

## The Catholic Record

LONDON, FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1879.

TO THE GREATER GLORY  
—OF THE—  
BLESSED SACRAMENT.

## LOVE'S PRISONER.

"But is He lonely? Tend not here  
Adorning angels, as on high?  
Ah yes; but yet, when we appear,  
A softer glory floods His eyes.  
'Tis earth's frail child he longs to see;  
And thus He is alone—for me  
"Then, best of lovers, I'll draw near  
Each day to minister relief.  
For 'tho' the thoughts of year on year  
Of sin should make me idle of grief,  
Yet day by day, my God I see,  
'Sick in prison—all for me!"

ASSOCIATION FOR THE RELIEF OF  
POOR CHURCHES.

Approval of His Lordship Right Rev. John Walsh,  
D. D., Bishop of London.

The object of this Association is to furnish poor churches gratuitously with vestments, linen or other requisites for the service of the Altar, when the Pastors cannot otherwise procure them. No refusal being given in the case of absolute need, the only limit to a compliance with demands is an utter want of resources as the work of making vestments, etc., will proceed as long as material can be obtained.

This charity is made direct to our Lord Jesus Christ, which is our motive in urging Christian souls to aid this good work in every possible manner, either by subscriptions or donations of goods, such as silk dresses, damask, velvet, linen, muslin, linings, ribbons, curtains, carpets, embroideries, flowers, vases, candlesticks, etc.

Annual subscription, One dollar. Gentlemen can be admitted as members by becoming subscribers.

Donations in money or goods will be received by the Directress of the "Children of Mary," Convent of the Sacred Heart, 42 Dundas street, London, Ontario, where the good work will be carried on.

REASON AND THE REAL PRESENCE  
CONCLUDED.

We have already stated in our previous articles on the above subject that two other objections have been very strongly urged by opponents of the doctrine of the Real Presence, as proving its impossibility on grounds of reason. Archbishop Tillotson, in a discourse against Transubstantiation preached in 1864, calls the doctrine "a gross contradiction, because it implies that the same body is in so many several places at once, and that our Saviour gives Himself away with His own hands to every one of His disciples, and yet still keeps Himself to Himself."

The two parts of this objection imply the same difficulty, for if the same body may be by a miracle of God's power in more places than one at the same time, there will be no difficulty in admitting that our blessed Lord might give Himself to His disciples, without diminishing Himself.

The next objection which this writer advances is the same to which we called attention in our third article. It is as follows: "Transubstantiation is contrary to the clear and irresistible evidence of sense. He that can be brought to contradict or deny his senses is at an end of certainty."

Let us answer this last objection first. This objection, which implies that God cannot reveal a truth, which seems to be contradicted by the testimony of one or more of the senses, is worthy of an unbeliever who asserts that there cannot be a mystery in religion, but it is unworthy of a Christian who acknowledges that among the truths of religion which God has revealed, there are many mysteries, among the number the Trinity, the Incarnation of the Son of God, His death and Resurrection, all of which are derided by unbelievers as being above the reach of the human intellect, and therefore incomprehensible.

Tom Paine says of all mysteries of religion: "Mystery is the antagonist of truth. It is a fog of human invention and represents it in distortion. Truth never envelopes itself in mystery." (Age of Reason.) But he refutes himself when he says a little before: "Everything we behold is, in one sense, a mystery to us. Our own existence is a mystery. We cannot account how it is that an acorn, when put into the ground, is made to develop itself, and become an oak. We know not how it is that the seed we sow unfolds and multiplies itself, and returns to us such an abundant interest for so small a capital."

And again: "We know, therefore, as much as is necessary for us to know; and that part

of the operation that we do not know, and which, if we did we could not perform, the Creator takes upon Himself and performs for us. We are, therefore, better off than if we had been let into the secret, and left to do it for ourselves." Now, if even in the finite world of matter there are so many things incomprehensible to us, things which we cannot fathom, how many mysteries, incomprehensible truths, must there be in the infinite Deity whose ways are unsearchable? Of necessity there must be many things inscrutable in the works of divine wisdom; and if it be God's will to reveal these things to us, it is a part of the homage which we owe to Him that we should believe. Transubstantiation is a mystery. We do not see it with our eyes; nevertheless because we know that God has revealed it we must believe His word. We already showed in our first article under the present heading that it is so far from being against reason, it is quite consonant with the merciful dealings of God with man, and that it may be regarded as a logical consequence of the Incarnation, and equally credible with it. In the crib of Bethlehem the Divinity of Our Blessed Redeemer was not visible to human eyes; yet even Archbishop Tillotson's Church acknowledges His divinity. Why, then, should he make a difficulty against Transubstantiation that the change of bread and wine into His body and blood is not a visible change? We see, then, that if his objection has any weight whatever, it would militate equally against the doctrine of the Incarnation; and as it is acknowledged by our adversaries to be futile in one case, it is equally futile in the other.

But let us examine the objection in another way. Do the senses really penetrate into substance so as to assure us what the substance is which we see or feel or taste? In the ordinary course of nature, we rely upon the testimony of the senses, as to events which are taking place, but when the truth of God assures us that a miracle has been performed, and that the substances of bread and wine have disappeared, and that the substance of our Lord's body occupies their place, can we appeal to the testimony of senses, as contradicting revealed truth? Why it is well known to all philosophers that the senses do not penetrate to the substance of material things at all. They only testify to us that certain accidental forms are present, the taste, the color, the figure, &c.; but of the nature of the substance our senses give us no information. In fact, sensation itself is a perception of the mind, as all philosophers agree. Thus Sir William Hamilton says: "Sensitive apprehension is in truth only the recognition by intelligence of the phenomena presented in or through its organs." Thus the same sensations which outward objects cause in us, are frequently excited by internal causes. Such is the case in dreams. The sensations of light and color may be produced by pressing on the optic nerve, and all the sensations by electricity. See on this subject "Mansell's Metaphysics, page 82 to 84. Then the sensations derived from the appearances of bread and wine in the blessed Eucharist have no necessary connection with the substance which is there present, and cannot prove anything against the doctrine that the substance has, by the power of God, been miraculously Transubstantiated. This view of the matter does not destroy certainty, as Archbishop Tillotson asserts; for the certainty which we obtain by means of the testimony of the senses, is physical certainty, the same kind of certainty whereby astronomers can predict the rising and setting of the sun, the time when an eclipse will take place, and the like; but every Christian acknowledges that God can suspend miraculously the laws on which these events depend, as he did when Jesus commanded the sun to be still in the heavens, as our Blessed Lord changed water into wine at the marriage feast, as He calmed the storm at sea, healed diseases, and raised the dead to life by His word alone. Hence, the objection is of no force whatsoever against the religious mystery of Transubstantiation. It involves the denial of all miraculous interposition by God, a consequence which no Christian will accept.

We now come to the consideration of the final difficulty which has been raised, which is the first which we quoted from Archbishop Tillotson's sermon: Can a body exist in several places at once? As far as our natural experience goes, it cannot; but are we justified in asserting that in the supernatural order this is impossible? The question depends on whether extension is an essential attribute of matter, so that it is necessarily bounded by a certain length, breadth and thickness. Now many philosophers contend that this is not the case, and all agree that the question is beset with many difficulties, which have not been overcome, and perhaps, never will be. The nature of matter is not yet known, nor have its relations to space been satisfactorily established. Matter has in the natural order certain qualities of impenetrability, gravity, extension, and as a consequence of extension, divisibility; and in the natural order we may draw correct inferences, based upon these

qualities. Yet in spite of the usual impenetrability of matter, our Blessed Lord appeared suddenly among His Apostles, the doors being shut. In spite of gravity, He walks upon the waters, as Moses in spite of the same law stretched His rod over the Red Sea, and the waters stood like a wall on either side, and the Israelites had a dry passage through. Now extension and the divisibility of matter are qualities which are replete with difficulties even more inexplicable to man than the others named. Why then should we assert that they are beyond the control of the Almighty? The divisibility of matter to an unlimited degree, called the infinite divisibility of matter, is a consequence of extension; yet, if this be true, matter must be ultimately unextended; and unextended matter is incomprehensible to us. We are, therefore, in the region of the incomprehensible even when we consider the natural qualities of matter. Then we must not be too ready to say that God cannot effect what is incomprehensible to us as regards extension. Take away extension, and there is no difficulty in believing that Transubstantiation and all its consequences are possible to God. Professor Mansell says that the difficulties involved in the consideration of this subject are insoluble. Metaph. p. 310. Let us, therefore, not rashly place limits to Omnipotence in a matter of which the most learned men know so little.

Again: It is acknowledged that God is invisible, being a spirit, infinite; and that therefore, He is in every place complete in His Godhead. Our soul is also an indivisible spirit, and is not confined to any ultimate atom of matter, but operates on all parts of our body at once. Most metaphysicians tell us the soul is complete in all parts of the body; all acknowledge that it is complete wherever it is needed as a motor of our organization. We need not enter upon this question; but it is clear that spirits are not ruled by the laws of space as known to us. It is acknowledged that we do not even know the relation of matter to space. It would be, therefore, very presumptuous for us to assert that God cannot so glorify a body as to make it independent of the ordinary laws to which matter in its natural state is subject. This view of the case is taken even by the Protestant theologian Leibnitz, who says in his "Systema Theologicum," published 1816: "So far from being demonstrated, as some flippantly boast, that a body cannot be in many places at once, it may, on the contrary, be solidly proved that, though the natural order of things requires that matter should be definitely circumscribed, no absolute necessity requires it." The circumstances of the Institution of the Blessed Eucharist show that our Lord meant His words to be accepted literally, when he said "this is my body: this is my blood." The promises recorded in the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel prove the same. The words of St. Paul concerning the belief and usage of the Christian Church, and the Patristic testimonies of the earliest date show that Christ had both the power and the will to effect the change implied. We have, therefore, every reason to pay to Him the homage of our understanding by believing this wonderful mystery, because, as St. Peter said to Him: "Thou hast the words of eternal life."

## IS THE SOUL MATERIAL?

It is too bad to blame the philosophers before we understand them, and indeed before they understand themselves. Science even in our day is only seeking after truth. She is very much in the position of Diogenes seeking over the world with a lantern for an honest man. She acknowledges this; and as long as she acknowledges it, and is content whilst on her search to keep her feet firmly planted on the terra firma of facts, we have no right to blame her; it is only when Icarus like, taking to herself the waxen wings of theory, she seeks to mount up too fast to wards the sun of truth, that we begin to fear for her and the result. We have always had a profound respect for Icarus. Though we lament his untimely end, we admire his courage. That he was rash, presumptuous, heretical in fact, and all that kind of thing, we admit, but though he eventually became food for the fishes, he yet lost his life in a noble attempt to reach the source of light and truth. His crime, if any, was not the searching after light, but the searching with waxen wings. We have many Icaruses amongst us, and notably amongst the scientists of the day. Now wax is a very good thing in its way, but a very poor material for fastening wings to human shoulders, especially when one wants to fly near the sun. Let our scientists remember this, and let them ever bear in mind that theory is only the waxen wings wherewith philosophy, Icarus like, seeks to fly to truth, and which when indiscreetly used is apt to be melted by the very light and heat of that truth which it seeks.

But this is not answering our question—Is the soul material? That the soul is not material, in the sense in which theologians understand matter, is certain; nor do the scientists as we understand them, wish to affirm it.

Theologians look upon matter and spirit as perfectly distinct, and in this sense it would not only be heretical but in every way absurd to say that "the soul is material." The scientists, on the contrary, look upon matter and spirit as identical in as much as they recognize in spirit the vivifying principle of matter. In this sense the dispute becomes a mere logomachy, and would be ended at once by a fast and sharp definition of terms. The scientists are heretical in words but not in ideas. That the scientists cannot establish their thesis of the identity of matter and spirit, we think; but then we are not a scientist, nor does it effect our present purpose; all that we are concerned for is, to show that any heresy there may be in the affair amongst scientists is material, not formal; heresy in terms, not in fact.

That our scientists do affirm this identity of matter and spirit, we think no one at all acquainted with the questions of the day will deny. M. Magy (De la Science) thus sums up: "Thus there is only one substance, 'material and spiritual at the same time; spiritual in its elements, material in its composition. The soul, conscious of its personal energy, conceives physical beings as forces 'acting on itself.' Ch. Leveque, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* puts forward the same idea. 'Matter,' he says, 'has at bottom no other substantial element than spirit. The essence of both is active force, consequently 'materialism has no reason to exist; there is no longer in nature anything but spiritualism; or to speak more correctly, dynamism. This dynamism has nothing which attacks 'the dignity and pre-eminence of the soul.'"

To our mind this is raising matter to the level of spirit, not lowering spirit to the level of matter; it is leveling up, not leveling down, and cannot therefore, we think, be said to be that heresy, which theologians would understand to be contained in the proposition "mind is matter." As we have said, we do not think that our scientists can establish their thesis, but that is a matter for the scientists, not for theologians. As long as they disclaim all intention of heresy, nay, even though their deductions should appear to be heretical, though we may warn them to beware, we have no right to accuse them of heresy.

We do not think that our scientists can establish their thesis of the identity of spirit and matter, because as at present understood it involves a certain number of absurdities. Ethetically we like their theory exceedingly. There is something grand if not sublime in the idea of one single principle (be it force or motion, for our scientists are not agreed amongst themselves) governing the universe. But we must not be carried away by sublimity to ride rough-shod over congruity. To attempt to prove the similarity of matter and spirit by giving to both the name of force is merely inventing a new term or using an old word in a new meaning. If our scientists think they have discovered some principle acting alike through spirit and matter, let them invent a new term to express it, and not try to deceive the world by the use of an old word in a new meaning. Force as hitherto understood cannot act equally on mind and matter; or to put the same proposition in a different form, any principle which acts equally on mind and matter is not force in the ordinary acceptance of the word; why then use a word which from its very nature will be liable to confuse? It is thus that our scientists lay themselves open to the charge of heresy, metaphysical and theological, when in reality, perhaps, if they defined terms they would be found guilty of neither. The Jesuit author of "Frar Gerund" relates how a certain preacher used to astonish his audience by the (apparently) most astonishingly heretical assertions, which when duly explained became the most innocent and orthodox of propositions. We fear our scientists are in a somewhat similar case. "Matter and spirit are one" is a sufficiently startling proposition to the non-scientific ear. But when on enquiry we find that all this proposition is intended to convey is that they are one in as much as they are acted upon by the same "force," we have a proposition which may or may not be true, but which, true or false, is a far more innocent proposition than at first emmeiated.

Here then is the whole controversy in a nutshell: 1. Either that principle commonly called "force" does not act equally on mind and matter, or our scientists have discovered a *modus operandi* which they do not understand and cannot explain; or, 2. That principle called by the familiar term force is a totally different principle altogether, and is so imperfectly comprehended by its discoverers themselves that for all practical purposes it may be considered not to exist. And this is science.

## SACERDOTES.

## TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

THE Subscription of Two Dollars for the year 1879 will now be received with thanks. A receipt for each payment will be sent immediately.

A few of our original Subscribers have not yet conformed to the rule of paying in advance. They are earnestly requested to do so at once. Their delay has been a source of considerable loss, which, if they understand the circumstances, they would be sorry to inflict on this undertaking.

## GERMAN NOTES.

TRANSLATED FOR THE CATHOLIC RECORD, BY VON.

The presidium of the St. Michaels Confraternity, of the diocese of Munster, Westphalia, Prussia, in their appeal to the Catholic population to contribute liberally for the support of the Holy Father, insert the following passage from the Pastoral of His Grace, the Archbishop of Bamberg:—"From personal experience we know that His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII. is rich indeed in the gifts of the Divine Spirit, and in spiritual blessings, but as regards earthly goods he is poor, quite poor. Would that this our authenticated conviction be known throughout the five continents in order to demolish the machination of lies about the wealth of our Supreme Pontiff. Be mindful, beloved archdioceses, that this is not a matter which concerns the august person of our Holy Father, who, in his apostolic frugality, has but few earthly wants, but it concerns the weal and woe of the Universal Church, and hence also the salvation of each and every one of us. It is true the Church of God is not of this world, but having assumed in this world a historical form, she cannot do without earthly goods as means for her spiritual work. And for this reason every living member of the Church, every good Catholic, is bound before God and his conscience to contribute, in proportion of his means, to the successful solution of this vital task of the Apostolic See. The thought that the Father of Christendom is really in want, must fill our soul with a holy shudder and, to some extent with shame. It is therefore our part, to somewhat alleviate him under the heavy burden that Divine Providence has put upon him. This is plainly a duty of honor for all Catholics of the earth. Therefore do we confidently appeal to the clergy and all the faithful of our Archdiocese with the urgent prayer:—Remember the fourth commandment! Remember our dearly beloved Holy Father, Leo XIII., in Rome. Do not relax in your customary offerings for him! Moreover make a united effort for an extraordinary gift, such as, in a spirit both pious and liberal, you exhibited on the occasion of the grand Jubilee of Pius IX., of most blessed memory. Whatever offerings good children make for their oppressed mother, the Holy Church, will be rewarded by God a thousand fold, by granting spiritual goods and blessing your labor. But we ourselves shall, by so doing, prepare our Holy Father great consolation." So far the Pastoral—the presidium concludes its circular thus—Catholic brethren, we are convinced that these affecting words would find an echo in the heart of our much beloved Chief Pastor\*. Therefore receive them as if they were an admonition addressed to you from his sorrowful exile. Unite together for making amends for any and every neglect, in order to bring up an extraordinary offering for our Holy Father. Do not relax in regularly contributing your Peterspence, and by doing so in this time of need and opposition, you will make manifest that you are steadfastly faithful children of our Holy Roman Catholic Church.

Follow the names of the members of the presidium among whom we find five Counts and Barons; at their head, of course, Bismarck's uncompromising foe, the famous Baron Von Shoulenberg-Alst, from the following numbers of the Westphalian *Messenger*. He is an ardent Catholic of the diocese of Munster, and cheerfully responds to the above appeal, large sums being recorded by the Redaction of the paper.

\* Bishop Brinkman, Bishop of Munster, a victim of Kulturkampf, would have been sent to some fortress for opposing the decree of his deposition. But he preferred a life in exile to incarceration.

## A NEW BOOK ABOUT BISMARCK.

The following drollery (perhaps in derision of the Bismarck Book, by Bush) had a run through the Berlin Papers—"It is our privilege to announce to our readers a new book about Prince Bismarck, which, however, very cautiously is published in Russia, not in Germany, and of which, so far, no copies have been received, so that concerning it we know only as much as we have learnt from the following communications of a Russian paper."

"It is his *Vie et de Chances*, John, that narrates his experience. John had it well enough when he was with Bismarck, for he earned many an extra good fee, by allowing persons to take a peep at the prince, when in his bedchamber, through a small chink in the door of an adjoining room. Finally, however, he resigned this very profitable post, and his reasons for doing so were purely moral. Once upon a time when he was helping Bismarck to pull off his boots the prince remarked:—'John, you are a great rascal, you might become a distinguished diplomatist, if you only knew French.' After this John devoted his leisure-hours to the study of French, and two years later he remained Bismarck of those encouraging words. The prince happened to be in a good humor, and promised his footman an ambassadorship at some court of the second rank, but forgot afterwards to fulfil his promise, for which reason John left his service. Having, however, at his last interview with the prince, called him 'ungrateful,' he was sorry afraid that for this insult done to the Imperial Chancellor, he would be prosecuted, and hence fled to Russia, of which country he had heard Bismarck make the remark, that it was at present the only well-organized State, where a man of good intellectual faculties—without fear of rivalry—could make his way. Very witty are some of the passages taken from his diary:—'The prince is very strict with the ministers, so that one of them—I will not mention his name—after a Ministerial conference, came into my room and said:—'Alas, John, with how much pleasure would I change places with you!'"

When they came to the Palace to report, they would first inquire of me whether the prince had been dreaming of Count Armin or of Pope Pius, and when I answered in the affirmative, their Excellencies would tremble, and wrangle among themselves as to who should first enter his Cabinet (of State). One day Prince Bismarck got into an argument with a Russian diplomatist, to whom he wished to demonstrate that the political institutions of Russia and Germany were nearly alike, said the prince, 'We have a Parliament, you have a diet; we have the House of Lords, you the Senate; you have the freedom of the press, we have the freedom of the press; you have—' the prince stopped. 'But you have,' continued very sweetly, the Russian diplomatist, 'a Prince Bismarck, and we none!'" The prince smiled, and ordered, 'Beer for two.'

## THE CATHOLIC RECORD

## AS AN ADVERTISING MEDIUM.

We beg to call the attention of wholesale merchants and merchants generally to our large and rapidly increasing circulation. We venture to say that no paper ever started in Western Ontario obtained such a hold upon a community in so short a time as the Record. The circulation now exceeds 2,000. We can give proof of its efficacy from several merchants in London, both wholesale and retail, who have already benefited considerably by using the Record as an advertising medium.