

## PROTESTANT CONTROVERSY.

BY A PROTESTANT MINISTER.

Sacred Heart Review.

We have seen, by examination of that part of the Jesuit Constitutions which treats of the effect of the vows and precepts, that to explain *obligare ad peccatum* as meaning "to bind to the commission of sin" is not only a monstrous and sacrilegious contradiction of all Christian and Catholic doctrine, but throws the meaning of this section into hopeless confusion. Little-dale himself can do nothing with the chapter, but picks out the phrase from its context, and gives to it his own ignorant and malevolent interpretation as if it floated all alone in the world. We have seen that, if the phrase had been wholly unknown, instead of having been familiar for ages, it would be determined by the necessities of its place to its proper sense "to bind to anything up to the point of sin if neglected."

We have next examined the rest of the Constitutions and have been surprised to find, not only that they forbid obedience to be given to any command of a superior if it involves "any manner of sin, mortal or venial, direct or indirect, but that they go farther than this, and deny obedience to be due to superiors, or even to the Pope, if at any time it is "contrary to charity." It is therefore with full agreement both of his Society and of the Holy See that Ballarmin declares that not only must a sinful command of the Pope, should he give one, be disobeyed, but that a burdensome and unreasonable command, though not involving anything intrinsically sinful, is only casually, essentially, binding. Indeed, in his "Catholic Doctrine," he simply *ecclesiastical* law binds, if the fulfilment of it implies grievous inconvenience. Otherwise the Church would depart from the example of her Lord, whose yoke is easy and his burden light.

Seeing now that the Jesuit Rule on the one hand strongly urges the duty of subordination and on the other reiterates the rights of spiritual independence, it is not so strange, that, as Count von Hoesbroeck declares, the Jesuits have developed, both in practice and theory, a singularly pure morality. As the Count, having been for years a Jesuit, is now the leading antagonist of the Jesuits, and he speaks as such, his testimony is unimpeachable. He shows impotence of those who imagine Jesuit casuistry to have been devised in the interests of loose morals. He owns, of course, that not seldom writers lose themselves in such a labyrinth of cases of conscience, and need to be sharply brought up. The Jesuit Baumbach gives a list of some fifty or sixty such errors that have been condemned by the Holy See. The Jesuit Lehmkuhl gives a list of sixty-five. Hoesbroeck, of course, does not deny those papal condemnations, nor the justice of them, but he energetically maintains that the intentions of the Jesuit casuists have been most pure.

I have read a great many books about the Jesuits and almost all of them against the Jesuits. The impression which has left by these, but especially by Doctor Doellinger's learned and hostile writings, has been that the Order, beyond most orders, has fostered individuality of opinion in its members. There are certain bounds of conformity, it is true, but these are wide. I have been led to wonder whether any other order has equalled it in this respect. In reading Doellinger's reports, it has sometimes seemed as if the Society was carrying liberty of opinion almost to the verge of disorderliness. Of course an individual impression may easily be fallacious; yet when it rests upon tolerably wide reading in the matter, it is not without some weight. It helps to show that the common notion of the Society as an absolutely compact body of men, absolutely controlled by an absolute superior, is fanciful. Indeed, one Jesuit, quoted by Doellinger and Reusch, writing to another, complains that the members are so refractory that they have driven more than one General into a loss of mental power before his time. What a curious contrast to the popular notion!

Some eminent French Catholic, whose name now escapes me, a man not very friendly to the Order, remarks that in his view it has commonly acted, less as a unity than as a somewhat loosely aggregated congeries of provinces. Allowing that this view is probably somewhat overcharged, yet we must own that, say about 1600, the French, the Spanish, and some other provinces, seemed to pull apart in a way that must have given poor Claudius Acquaviva a sense of being a sort of monastic Phaethon, though happily for him one that escaped final wreck, and brought his horses well together. In view of these free and bold features of Jesuit history, less pronounced now, but by no means flattened out into monotony, even yet, some of the things said about the Order by people that imagine themselves to be great authorities, are very comical. Particularly, there is in New York a newspaper, of wide circulation and wide reputation, which without exactly committing itself to the A. P. A. is wont, about election time, to throw them, now and then, considerable crumbs of comfort. One correspondent asked what were the principles of the Jesuits. The sapient editor summed the whole matter up in a very small nutshell. A Jesuit's principles are simply the principles of his General for the time being. Now

go to Doellinger and Reusch, and read their account of the protracted struggle between Thyrsus Gonzalez and his five Assistants over the publication of his book against Probabilism! The struggle lasted three years and was only determined at length by the intervention of the Pope. During the whole time the verdict of the Society wavered in the balance. At last it turned out in favor of the General, but decidedly against his opinions. And these are the limber Jesuits who, according to this blessed editor, have nothing to do when a General dies but to discharge themselves of their old principles and wait until the first circular of his successor shall inflate them with new! Probably the just elected General has to answer letters like this: "Reverend Father, am I this year to teach three Persons of the Godhead or only two?" "Reverend Father, am I now at the Mass to read out of the Bible, or the Koran?" "Reverend Father, are there seven sacraments this time, or nine?" The Editor will say that I am grossly caricaturing him. So I am, and I know it. He grossly caricatures the Jesuits, and has not wit enough to know it. How true it is, as Chancellor Oxen-jerna says to his son: "Go and see with how little wisdom the world is guided." This oracle of this newspaper has gone into millions of homes, and in every one of them has deepened ignorance and strengthened prejudice about the Jesuits.

Then there is good Doctor Lyman Abbott. By his will and knowledge he would not slander a fly. Yet in the Century Dictionary he calmly defines the Fourth Vow as "a vow of absolute submission to the Pope," something which, as we have seen, the Constitutions utterly refuse to mortal man. The Fourth Vow, as shown by itself, and as always defined in the Rule and in the Index, is simply "a vow of obedience to the Pope concerning missions." It is hard to say whether malice or heedlessness does more harm in the world. Heedlessness, I fancy.

A scientific inquirer, having ascertained beyond doubt from the Constitutions that *obligare ad peccatum* means "to bind under pain of sin," would next inquire how this phrase came to be used. Was it invented by the Jesuits? If so, then it is no wonder they have been misunderstood. Or was it an older phrase which they used as being of established force? He would go back to the Franciscans and to the Dominicans, three hundred years older than the Jesuit. In each of these he would find this portentous formula, which causes our Protestant hair to stand up on our evangelical heads, in unembarrassed use, never dreaming of being misunderstood by man, woman or child of the Catholic world, as indeed it seems not to have been misunderstood by man, woman or child of either the Catholic or the Protestant world for five hundred and eighty-two years from the time at which the innocent and pure-minded St. Francis brought it, as a phrase of perfectly ascertained meaning, into his Rule.

A comparison of the Dominican and Franciscan rules with the Jesuit will be interesting and instructive. Long as this abominable slander is in dying, it is by the help of this comparison that Doctor Stietz has given it its mortal blow. Charles C. Starbuck.

Andover, Mass.

## PRIVATE JUDGMENT - A HOO-DOO.

By Rev. L. A. Lambeth in the Freeman's Journal.

News-Tribune: "In other words, do they (Catholics) 'believe' a thing to be true which they know to be false?"

No. The Catholic is never required by the Church of Christ to believe as true what he knows to be false. She does not require impossibilities. When she pronounces a decision, the Catholic knows that it is true, and that any private judgment of his that conflicts with that decision must be false, and not knowledge, for knowledge is to know the true. It seems impossible for you to put yourself in the Catholic's place and understand the mental attitude of one who believes in the infallibility of the Church of Christ. You do not appear to see that no individual opinion or judgment that clashes with infallible authority can have any standing whatever in his mind. Let us put a case that may enable your Protestant mind to see it. Some one asks you if you believe in the infallibility of Christ. You reply that you do. Then he, the inquirer who does not believe in the infallibility of Christ, will say: "What! Do you believe a thing to be true which you know to be false?" What would you think of such a question? You would say: "My dear sir, have I not told you that I believe in the infallibility of Christ? Your question is therefore silly, for it supposes me to believe in His infallibility and not to believe in it at the same time. While I believe Him to be infallible, you cannot suppose that I can think that I know anything contrary to His teaching, for what is contrary to His teaching must be false, and the false, the unreal, the non-existent, is not an object of knowledge. While I believe in His infallibility, His teaching is to me the highest criterion of truth, the absolute criterion, to which my mind, as long as it is sane, must yield unquestioning assent."

Now the Catholic believes with you that Christ is infallible; but he goes further and believes that the Church instituted by Him is infallible, for He instituted her to teach and commanded us to hear her. Hence, when you, in reference to the Church's infallibility,

ask the Catholic: Do you believe a thing to be true which you know to be false? his reply is word for word the reply you would give to the infidel who would ask you the same question in reference to the infallibility of Christ. He would say, further: "I cannot believe or know anything contrary to the teaching of the infallible Church of Christ, for what is contrary to her teaching must be false, unreal, non-existent." Your question is therefore absurd.

News-Tribune: "Is the editor of the Freeman's Journal a Catholic against his private judgment?" He is not.

News-Tribune: "I believe Catholics exercise their private judgment, just as do Protestants." Then you are mistaken. There is a radical difference. Suppose two men, A and B, neither Protestant nor Catholic, but who believe in the existence of God, get out together to learn the will and law of God and supernatural truth. It is clear that thus far they are on equal terms. Each has his individual reason. It is all he has; and for truths of the natural order he has nothing superior to it. Using their reason, our two travelers, by means of human history and human tradition, come to the knowledge that God has made a revelation to certain men and through their agency to mankind. They learn further that the Son of God came down upon earth, became man, taught His revelation, established His Church and departed from the world.

Thus far our travelers have moved along together, using their individual reason on human history and tradition. Observe that thus far they have nothing but this kind of history and tradition. They have historic records of facts and sayings, but no Bible yet; that is, no inspired records, for their reason is not competent to determine whether any book is inspired, because reason is of the natural order, while inspiration is of the supernatural order, and not cognizable by sight or touch, or any of our senses. Private judgment has a number of historic records and nothing more. To come to a knowledge that any of these records—and which if any of them—are inspired, some authority other than individual reason or private judgment is necessary. Private reason itself bears witness to this necessity, for it knows that it has not the faculty to distinguish the inspired from the non-inspired. It tells us that we must appeal to some authority competent to make the distinction; and that this authority to be competent must be unerring, infallible; otherwise it is no better than individual reason which testifies to its own insufficiency.

It is just at this point that the Catholic and the Protestant rules of faith differ radically. The Protestant has his private judgment, and a number of historic records or books, but he has not yet his Bible, for that means inspired books; and their inspiration must be determined before the Bible can be his Word of God. What is to determine for him this important question? His private judgment? That is admittedly incompetent. The books themselves? They cannot evidence their own inspiration. It must be assumed that they are not inspired until their inspiration is proved, and if not inspired their evidence is fallible and incompetent. You cannot assume their inspiration, and then quote them to prove their inspiration. That is a begging of the question. If the mere statement of a book that it is inspired proves its inspiration, the Mormon Book is inspired, for it claims to be, and the Koran is inspired, for it also claims to be. Any book may claim to be, as long as paper will not refuse ink. But, as a matter of fact, the Bible does not claim to be inspired. There is no statement in each and every book in the volume is inspired. There is no inspired list of books.

Private judgment and the books themselves being incompetent to attest inspiration, how can you come to a knowledge of their inspiration? By tradition? Tradition is infallible or fallible. If infallible, you admit an infallible authority outside the books, and in doing so you abandon your Protestant rule of faith—Bible and private judgment. If tradition be not infallible, it is no better authority than your own private judgment.

Will you appeal to the voice of Christendom? If so, we reason as above. That voice is infallible or fallible. If infallible, you abandon your rule of faith; if fallible, it is as incompetent to determine the question of inspiration as your private judgment is. To sum up, your individual reason is incompetent to determine the inspiration of the books which, when taken together, go by the name of Bible. The books themselves are incompetent witnesses. Tradition and the voice of Christendom you cannot accept as authority without abandoning your rule of faith.

According to your rule of faith, then, you stand with your private judgment in the presence of certain historic records and you have no competent authority to make anything more of them than mere historic records, no competent authority to attest to your inspiration. A very important consequence to you follows from this fact. It is that you are left with your private judgment, but no Bible. In order to have a Bible, that is, known inspired books, you must recognize an infallible witness to their inspiration. Anything less than such a witness does not justify a reasonable belief in their inspiration. As you deny the existence of such a witness, the books composing the Bible can be to you only what Bishop Potter and Dr. Briggs say they are—mere litera-

ture, and as such, subject to the same kind of criticism that other literature is. Having as a Protestant rejected the sole means of proving the inspiration of the books, you have no longer a Bible, no longer that which, with your private judgment, constitutes your rule of faith.

You are wrong, then, in saying that "Catholics use their private judgment as Protestants do." We will now show you that they use it very differently. As we have seen, two men go together to a certain point. They agree that a revelation was made, and from his on earth, preached His doctrine, established His Church and departed. Thus far both have used their private judgment on the historic records, which they believe to be true in their statements of historic events. The difference comes in their manner of treating these records. The Catholic treats them as history, as he treats Josephus or Caesar, for as yet he has, like the Protestant, no evidence that they are anything more. He reads in them the life, miracles and words of Christ, and from His miracles and words is convinced that He is supernatural, divine. He reads that this divine person instituted a Church which He called "My Church," and declared that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, and that those who would not hear it were to be looked upon by His followers as heathens and publicans. He concludes that if Christ is divine, the eternal Son of God, His Church which He established to teach, and commanded us to hear, is unerring, infallible in teaching whatsoever He commanded; that is, revealed truth and law.

Having come to this conclusion by his private judgment and the historic records, he says: "I have found the competent authority on supernatural, revealed truth and law, the chosen mouthpiece of Christ Himself. I will obey His command and hear His voice. And in all things that concern revelation and law he places the lamp of his private judgment in homage at the feet of this divinely appointed teacher: just as those who lived in the time of Christ submitted their private judgment to Him, once they were convinced of His divinity.

The Catholic knows that this Church existed before any of the records were written, and he has come to a knowledge of it without the Bible, for as yet to him there is no inspired book. Having found an infallible authority, he, using the highest faculty of his reason, submits his private judgment to it, and appeals to it in all that concerns revelation. Henceforth he makes the judgment of the Church his private judgment. One of the first things the infallible Church teaches him is that the records he has been consulting are more than human records; that they were written by men inspired of God. He believes this because the Church teaches him, and no other reason.

In this way the Catholic passes from the records as mere history to the records as inspired writings. It is the only way. The Protestant, rejecting this method, has and can have no thing but purely human records on which to exercise his private judgment. The Christian world received the Bible from the Church, not the Church from the Bible. Protestantism inverted the order of facts. Hence the confusion.

Worth Ten Dollars a Bottle. Any person who has used Polson's Nervine, the great pain cure, would not be without it if it cost ten dollars a bottle. A good thing it is, worth its weight in gold, and Nervine is the most money in the world for all kinds of pain. It cures neuralgia in five minutes; toothache in one minute; lame back on application; headache in a few moments; and all pains just as rapidly. Small test bottles only cost 10 cents. Why not try it to-day? Large bottles 25 cents, sold by all druggists and country dealers. The Polson's nerve pain cure—Nervine.

The Flagging Energies Revived.—Constant application to business is a tax upon the energies, and if there be no relaxation, lassitude and depression are sure to intervene. These come from stomach troubles. The want of exercise brings on nervous irregularities, and the stomach refuses to assimilate food properly. In this condition "Farm-lee's Vegetable Pills" will be found a recuperative agent of rare power, restoring the organs to cheerful action, dispelling depression and reviving the flagging energies.

THINK about your health. Do not allow stomachic taints to develop in your blood. Take Hood's Sarsaparilla now and keep your blood well.

Are you suffering with corns? If you are get a bottle of Holloway's Corn Cure. It has never been known to fail.



Raised on it

Nestle's Food is a complete and entire diet for babies, and closely resembles mother's milk. Over all the world Nestle's Food has been recognized for more than thirty years as possessing great value. Your physician will confirm the statement.

Nestle's Food is safe. It requires only the addition of water to prepare it for use. The great danger attendant on the use of cow's milk is thus avoided.

Consult your doctor about Nestle's Food and send us for a large sample can and our book, "The Baby," both of which will be sent free on application. Also ask for "Baby Birthday Jewel Book."

68 St. Boniface Street, Montreal.



Surprise is the name of that kind of Soap:

THE ST. CROIX SOAP MFG. CO.

ST. STEPHEN, N.B.

## The Jones Umbrella "Roof"



## COVER YOUR OWN UMBRELLA

Don't throw away your old one—make it new for \$1.00. Recovering only takes one minute. No sewing. A clumsy man can do it as well as a clever woman.

TEN DAYS' FREE TRIAL. Send us \$1 and we will mail you, PREPAID, a Union Twilled Silk, 26-inch Adjustable Roof, (28 in. x 22 in. x 1.50). If the "Roof" is not all you expected, or hoped for, return it AT OUR EXPENSE and get your money back by return mail—no questions asked.

WHAT TO DO.—Take the measure (in inches) of your old umbrella. Count the number of outside ribs. State if the centre rod is of steel or wood. Full instructions for putting on the cover will be sent with all orders. Our special price list of different sizes and qualities mailed on request.

Send for our FREE book "Umbrella Economy" anyway. Your umbrella will wear out some day and you will be glad that you know about it.

THE JONES MULLEN CO., 386-388 Broadway, New York.

## A CLEVER IMITATION.

A certain attorney has two bright little children. They are quick at imitation, and have a talent for making up games in which they cleverly burlesque their elders. A few days ago their mamma found they were playing "doctor." The youngest child was the patient, with head strapped in a towel, and the older the physician, with a silk hat and cane. The mother, unseen by the little ones, listened at the door.

"I feel awful bad," said the patient.

"We'll fix all that," said the doctor, briskly.

"Lemme see your tongue."

"Out came the tiny red indicator."

"Looking very grave indeed."

Then, without a word of warning, the skilled physician hauled off and gave the patient a smart slap in the region of the ribs.

"Ouch!" cried the sufferer.

"Feel any pain there?" inquired the doctor.

"Yes," said the patient.

"What pain there?" inquired the doctor.

"It's all right," said the patient, edging away.

Thereupon the doctor produced a small bottle filled with what looked like either bread or mud pills, and placed it on the table.

"Take one of these pellets," the physician said, "dissolved in water, every seventeen minutes for the next day."

"How long must I take 'em?" groaned the patient.

"Till you die," said the doctor. "Good-morning!"

## CARLING

WHEN ALE is thoroughly matured it is not only palatable, but wholesome.

Carling's Ale is always fully aged before it is put on the market. Both in wood and in bottle it is mellowed by the touch of time before it reaches the public.

People who wish to use the best Ale should see to it that they receive Carling's.

Its easy enough to get it, as nearly every dealer in Canada sells Carling's Ales and Porter.

## CARLING

LONDON.

## INDIAN MISSIONS.

ARCHDIOCESE OF ST. BONIFACE.

MAN.

IT HAS BECOME A NECESSITY TO appeal to the generosity of Catholics throughout Canada for the maintenance and development of our Indian Mission. The resources formerly at our command have in great measure been exhausted, and the necessity of a vigorous policy imposes itself at the present moment, owing to the good dispositions of most of the pagan Indians and to the live competition we have to meet on the part of the sects. Persons needing this call may communicate with the Archbishop of St. Boniface, or with the undersigned who has been specially charged with the promotion of this work.

Our Missions may be assisted in the following manner:

1. Early subscriptions, ranging from \$5 to \$100.
2. Legacies by testament (payable to the Archbishop of St. Boniface).
3. Clothing, new or second hand, material for clothing, for use in the Indian schools.
4. Promise to clothe a child, either by furnishing material, or by paying \$1 a month in case of a girl, \$1.50 in case of a boy.
5. Devoting one's self to the education of Indian children by accepting the charge of a school on Indian Reserves—a small salary attached.

Entering a Religious Order of men or women specially devoted to work among the Indians; e.g. for North-Western Canada the Oblate Sisters, the Grey Nuns of Montreal, the Franciscan Nuns (Quebec), etc.

Donations either in money or clothing should be addressed to His Grace Archbishop Langevin, D.D., St. Boniface, Man., or to Rev. O. Cahill, O. M. I., St. Portage, Ont.

G. Cahill, O. M. I., Indian Missionary.

## Cobbett's "Reformation."

Just issued, a new edition of the Protestant Reformation, by Wm. Cobbett. Revised with Notes and Preface by Very Rev. Francis Aidan Gasquet, D.D., O.S.B. The book is printed in large, clear type. As it is published at a price of 25 cents per copy in the United States, it will have to be charged in Canada. It will be sent to any address on receipt of the sum, in stamps.

Thos. Coffey, Catholic Record Office.

## Every Housekeeper

wants pure hard soap that lasts well—lathers freely—is high in quality and low in price.

Surprise is the name of that kind of Soap:

THE ST. CROIX SOAP MFG. CO.

ST. STEPHEN, N.B.

## MEMORIAL WINDOWS

We make a Specialty of

High-Class Church & Cathedral Windows

Equal to any English or American Work.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.

HOBBES MFG. CO. LTD., London, Ont.