

ERIN-GO-BRAGH!

GRAND UNITED CONCERT

LECTURE

ST. PATRICK'S SOCIETY

CATHOLIC YOUNG MEN'S SOCIETY,

WINDSOR HALL,
ST. PATRICK'S NIGHT,

March 17th, 1893.

Grand Gallery (Reserved), \$1.00; Floor of Hall (Reserved), 75c; General Admission, 50c.

GOD SAVE IRELAND.

WEDNESDAY.....MARCH 8, 1893

ULSTER LOYALISTS.

So the great anti Home Rule meeting of March 2 has taken place, and the 'loyal' Orangemen of Ulster have most emphatically protested against legislative autonomy being granted to Ireland. Yes; even a prominent member of parliament advocated sedition and treason rather than submit to the country being governed in a constitutional manner by its own representatives. Yea, more; one notorious character—a good and fervent Papist-hater, an honest and sterling believer in King Billy and his parent-betraying wife, a real detester of "Pope and Popery, wooden shoes and brass money"—had the hardihood to call God to witness to the sincerity of his act, and he swore upon a Bible that he would die rather than submit to a government of the country by the country's representatives; he vowed, upon the volume of Holy Writ, to resist every measure of local self government, even to the death. We imagined that there was a law against unnecessary oaths, and that the very Bible, upon which this rabid political mountebank swore, forbids all swearing, especially of that nature. This is, indeed, too bad; to think that men who are "pious" and "loyal," should take oath to resist the very power that they had sworn in their allegiance to sustain. It must be a sad shock to the nerves of these holy and truly British subjects to find out that a statesman of the Empire had dared to propose the preposterous proposition of giving the Irish a right to manage their own affairs. You see the awful danger lies in the fact that these Catholics might by some mysterious means succeed in setting certain "Jesuitical" "occult forces" into motion, and thereby transferring the See of St. Peter to the Hill of Tara, or, perhaps, replacing Mr. Johnston, of Ballykillbeg, with the Cardinal Prefect of some Roman congregation. In a word, this Home Rule might turn into Rome Rule, and we would eventually behold the fearful reality of an Irish parliament dictating equitable laws for the country, regulating the internal affairs of a long-suffering nation, cheering the spirit of a down-trodden race, and (worst of all) dealing out even-handed justice to the great Orange faction of the north. Not only all these things might come to pass, but even the horrible fact would be revealed that the British Empire had been more firmly cemented by this act of tardy

justice, that the Imperial Parliament had been relieved of a mass of domestic legislation for Ireland that only clogged the machinery of government, and that the Island, so long a prey to famines and misfortunes, had been turned into a garden of prosperity.

It would be terrible to know and feel that all these results should follow the granting of Home Rule; and why? Simply because the establishment of a native legislature for Ireland would be the death knell of Orangeism; but not in the sense in which these gentlemen of "loyal" persuasion would expect, because the freedom to be then enjoyed by Catholic and Protestant, Nationalist and Unionist alike, would be so great, so triumphant that the Orange order would have no further excuse for existence; it would cease to have any *raison d'être*. Its old enemy, the Irish Catholic body, would have so defeated its every pretension or excuse for bigotry and hatred that the spirit of manhood left to the gentlemen of the North would force them to tear their lilies from their breasts and their detestation from their hearts. This is the real reason of so much determined opposition to Home Rule on the part of the Ulster extremists. To use the Gazette's expression, "this is the kernel of the Irish question."

The Gazette, usually exact and logical in its editorials, made a grave mistake on last Thursday, when it published that article on "The Kernel of the Irish Question." After telling its readers, speaking of the Home Rule Bill, that "the framer of the measure has also taken care to eliminate from the list of matters over which the Irish Legislature will have control those that are connected with religion," it has the hardihood to argue that "the kernel of the question" is danger from the influence of the Catholic clergy in matters political, as foreshadowed by their efforts in present day election, long before the time when they will have no reason for exercising self-restraint. How can the clergy of the Catholic Church, any more than the clergy of Protestant churches, have any power for over due exercise of influence to the detriment of each other, when the Bill establishing the Legislature "eliminates from the list of matters over which it has control those that are connected with religion?" Let us have frank criticism, straight opposition, fair attacks, but spare us such illogical contentions, especially when supported by a couple of detached expressions from the remarks of Judge O'Brien, phrases that are given without their context, and one of which—if it means what the Gazette would have its readers suppose it means—is a positive falsehood. That one line attributed to the priest at Clonard, "I will mark them and make it hot for them on the highways and the byways and at the communion rails, and I will put fire to their heels and toes." We do not possess all the remainder of the remarks from which the above was taken, but we are positive that no Catholic priest ever used these expressions exactly as conveyed in that article. The fact of Mr. Justice O'Brien being a Catholic by no means changes the fact that he is a nominee of a Tory government and the paid servant of the most bitter Unionists. We are surprised at the Gazette's article, and we can only explain it by supposing that the writer got his hand into a bag of nuts, he tried to crack the softest, but found the kernel rotten!

Monsignor Fabre has ordained the following reverend gentleman: Tonsure—Arthur Desautels. Sub-deaconate—Placide Desrosiers, Hormidas Ferron, S.J., and Brother Angele Maria, of the Order of Minors. Deaconate—Alexandre Perron. Later Messrs. Placide Desrosiers and Hormidas Ferron, S.J., were elevated to the deaconate, and Rev. Alexander Perron to the priesthood.

THE HUMAN SOUL.

In the London *Tablet*, of February 11, appeared a letter signed "A. D." in which the writer asks a somewhat ticklish question with regard to the Origin of the Human Soul. The letter has called forth a reply, from a Rev. Father David, O.S.F., in the *Tablet* of February 18; both are quite short. We will reproduce sufficient of the first one to indicate the point at issue, and all that is necessary of the second one to give the principal argument in explanation or reply. We may as well state, at the outset, that the author of the first letter merely asks his question for the purpose of receiving opinions and information as to the teaching of theologians; that with the writer of the second letter we do not entirely agree on one point and we do not consider his explanations as sufficiently ample; and that whatsoever we express upon this subject comes from the editor of this paper and from no person else. The last statement is made in order that the whole responsibility of our reasoning may rest upon our own shoulders: if there is any merit in our articles, it is all ours; if there are errors, of fact or logic, they belong to ourselves: our editorials are uninspired and unaided from any outside source. This may seem an unnecessary statement, but having had several of our editorials attributed to certain reverend and learned gentlemen of this city, we desire to emphatically state that no person other than the editor, either directly or indirectly, has ever penned or dictated an editorial line for this paper since January 1892. After so much preface, *recenons a nos moutons!*

The first letter contains the following: "If the soul be an entity external to the body in its origin, and created by God now, at any given moment, can we think it possible that God brings it into being in a state of enmity with Himself? If it be a separate entity infused at a given time into the embryonic body, having no connection with the soul of Adam, how shall we account for the transmission to it of the taint of original sin, a taint due to the united action of Adam's soul and body? As I cannot conceive it possible that God created souls in a state of sin, and as I believe that this state of sin is a real one, I am inclined to say that as we derive our bodies from Adam, so in some mysterious manner the human soul is evolved from generation, and is not, as it were, fashioned by God for each given body, when the necessary degree of development has been attained by the latter. Unless, therefore, we believe that God created souls in a condition of sin to fit each individual body—or at least created them in a state outside His favour, I feel disposed to think that the soul of man is derived, together with his body, from his first ancestor." * * * *

So much for the first letter: now let us turn to Father David's opinion. * * * * Leaving aside material traducianism and other grotesque theories of a materialistic tendency, it is not allowable to any loyal Catholic to hold spiritual traducianism or generationism. Though it has not been formally defined by the Church that the soul of each human being is immediately created and infused by God, it is not an *open* question. It is, to say the least, an absolutely certain theological conclusion, unmistakably conveyed to us on various occasions, notably in the case of Frohschammer, by the authority of the Church. It is not allowable to put forward any kind of spiritual generationism, *even as probable*. As to the teaching of the Church concerning the nature and propagation of original sin,

it does not require or even favour any theory of this kind." After speaking of our theologians not agreeing as to the deterioration of the *natural* gifts having been brought about by original sin, as such, Father David closes by saying, "there is not the shadow of a shade of necessity, fitness, congruity, or reasonableness arising from the teachings of the Church concerning original sin demanding any form of spiritual generationism."

To put matters in a nutshell we will repeat in our own words the question propounded by the writer "A. D." "How can you account for original sin in a soul created pure by God, and not evolved from the soul of Adam?" The difficulty seems to be to show how God could create a soul in enmity with Himself; or if He did not so create it so, how it became affected by original sin; was it from Adam? In reply to this apparently puzzling question, Father David states that although "not formally defined by the Church that the soul of each human being is immediately created and infused by God, it is not an *open* question." To this we feel obliged to partly demur. He then states that the teaching of the Church on the subject does not require or even favour any theory of the evolutionary kind. He tells us it is heretical to hold that God could not create man as he is born at present; also that the essence of original sin is the privation of the gifts which God was not bound to bestow upon man. All this we do not think sufficient. In undertaking to reply to such a question, or rather solve such a problem, we should have thought the writer would have given us something more tangible and more complete.

In the first place, we cannot agree with the statement that what has not been defined by the Church is *not* an *open* question. There is a very elementary axiom that all theologians are supposed to have learned—"in dubitis libertas," in all questions where doubt exists there is liberty of belief: even the most reasonable of dogma, the Immaculate Conception, the Infallibility and others, while yet undefined as such, were *open* questions. Even the mitred heads of the hierarchy were raised against the promulgation of many undefined dogma, but the moment they were proclaimed *ex cathedra* the opponents of these articles of faith were the first to bow before the decision of the Church. Although we agree with Father David as to the fact of the immediate creation and infusion of the soul by God, being a certain theological conclusion, as far as authorities go; yet as long as it is not "formally defined," we think that it is a virtually *open* question—or else the principle above quoted is taught in vain by our theologians.

Coming to the second part of his reply, Father David merely asserts that the teaching of the Church is contrary to all theory of spiritual evolution from Adam, and to original sin demanding any form of spiritual generationism; but he does not give any reason why the Church so teaches. Suppose "A. D." were an infidel who wont accept the Church's teaching, we will try to convince him that God does not create the soul in a state of enmity to Himself, and that original sin is not transmitted by spiritual generationism? God gave Adam a nature that the Almighty was no more obliged to give Him than He was to create him. He gave Adam supernatural and preternatural gifts to which Adam had no right. By original sin man lost the supernatural grace, but God left him the means (through the sacraments) of regaining it. Baptism in the case of original sin; Penance in