

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XIX.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1897.

NO. 1,000.

The Christmas Treasures.

I count my treasures o'er with care—
A little toy that baby knew—
A little sock of golden hair—
A little lock of golden hair.

Long years ago this Christmas time,
My little one—my all to me—
Sat, robed in white, upon my knee,
And heard the Merry Christmas chime.

"Tell me, my little golden head,
If Santa Claus should come to-night,
What shall he bring my baby bright—
What treasure for my boy?" I said.

And then he named the little toy,
While in his hand and truthful eyes
There came a look of glad surprise
That spoke his trustful, childish joy.

And, as he lifted his evening prayer,
He asked the boon with baby grace,
He begged, he begged, he begged to see
He begged his little stocking there.

That night, as lengthening shadows crept,
I saw the white-winged angels come,
With music to my babe's room,
And kiss my darling as he slept.

He must have heard that baby prayer,
For in the morn, with glowing face,
He told me of the Christmas night—
They lured my darling from my side.

A little sock, a little toy—
A little lock of golden hair—
The Christmas music on the air—
A waiting for my baby boy.

But if again that angel train
And golden heads come back for me
To bear me to eternity,
My watching will not be in vain.

—Eugene Field.

THOSE PRELIMINARIES.

N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

McAllister—Not until after the middle of the fifth century was the papal claim set up that the sanction or ratification of the Bishop of Rome was essential to the legal validity of the canons and decrees of a General Council.

Freeman—That depends on what you mean by "legal validity." If by this phrase you mean that the Pope's sanction was not essential to give to the canons and decrees the force of civil laws, such as the sanction of the Emperor gave them in the empire, you should know that such a claim was not made at any time for the Pope. If, on the other hand, you mean by "legal validity" that the Pope's sanction was not essential to the dogmatic validity of decrees concerning matters of faith, then you are wrong. For there never has been and never will be a council whose dogmatic decrees are or will be received by the Church as articles of faith unless they have the sanction of the head of the Church—that is, of the Pope. In other words, no council can be a general or ecumenical council without that sanction.

We have seen that the first General Council, that of Nice, was sanctioned by the Pope through his representatives, Hosius of Cordova and the two Roman priests. These three, according to the records, signed the Acts of the Council first, before all the patriarchs and Bishops present; a fact which shows clearly a recognition of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, whom they represented. There is no other conceivable reason why this Spanish Bishop and the two Roman priests were permitted to take the first place unchallenged by the patriarchs and Bishops of the East, who were ever watchful of any encroachment on their prerogatives.

McAllister—The first appearance of this claim is found, as given by Church historians, in the letters of Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome, or rather the letters addressed to him about the middle of the fifth century.

There is here a nice bit of sophistry neatly tucked away in the phrase "as given by Church historians." It is not true to say that Church historians date the claim as first made in the fifth century. There are some anti-Catholic and anti-Papal historians who so date the claim, but there are others who do so positively and with better reason due to that date. To lump them together as the doctor does is to misrepresent the historians and mislead the reader—a thing he should not do.

The claim that the Pope's sanction is necessary to a council before its decrees are of Catholic force, or before it can be considered a general council, is simply the claim of the primacy of the Apostolic See in another form. The sanction of him who holds the primacy or headship in the Church is as necessary to the dogmatic decrees of the Church as the sanction of him who holds the primacy or headship in the State is necessary to the laws of the State. The signature of the head of the State makes a law of the whole State, and the signature of the head of the Church makes the decree of a council an authoritative decree of the whole Church. The analogy is perfect. There is no difference whatever so far as the principles of government are concerned. The signature of the head of the State is the guarantee that the State has spoken; the signature of the head of the Church is the guarantee that the Church has spoken. It is this guarantee that the faithful require before they accept the decrees of any body of men as articles of faith.

The Pope, then, in sanctioning a council of the Church only exercises an essential prerogative of his primacy of headship. Consequently the claim that the sanction of the Pope is necessary to accredit a council to the faithful as speaking for the whole Church is as old as the claim to the primacy. As the primacy of the Apostolic See or Chair of Peter was recognized from the beginning every attribute and essential prerogative of it was also recognized from the beginning. We have in a former article quoted the

evidence of some of the early Christian Fathers on this point and need not repeat it here. We may, however, insert some admissions concerning the antiquity of the primacy made by Dr. Philip Schaff, late professor of church history in the Union Seminary, New York. While this Protestant historian did not believe in the primacy or even in the episcopacy, he yet recognized the antiquity of both. In his "History of the Christian Church," vol. II, page 155, and following, he makes these statements: "Primacy and episcopacy grew together. In the present period (about seventy years after the crucifixion of Our Lord) we already find the faint beginnings of the Papacy." "The first example of the exercise of a sort of Papal authority is found toward the close of the first century in the letter of the Roman Bishop Clement (the third Bishop after St. Peter) to the bereaved and distracted Church of Corinth. * * * It can hardly be denied that the document reveals the sense of a certain superiority over all ordinary congregations. The Roman Church here, without being asked (as far as appears), gives advice, with superior administrative wisdom, to an important Church in the East, dispatches messengers to her, and exhorts her to order and unity in a tone of calm dignity and authority, as the organ of God and the Holy Spirit. This is all the more surprising if St. John, as is probable, was then still living in Ephesus, which was nearer to Corinth than Rome."

As the primacy goes back to the first century, its prerogative of giving official executive sanction to councils goes back to the same period.

We come now to Dr. McAllister's letter of Oct. 16, and find that he has already replied to much that is in it in reference to the councils. But something more in direct reply to the doctor's statements will be of use.

McAllister—The second General Council was that of Constantinople in A. D. 381. This was called by the Emperor Theodosius the Great. The Bishop of Rome had absolutely nothing to do with it.

Freeman—This council was summoned by Theodosius, Emperor of the East. The prelates of the Western Empire, under the Emperor Gratian, were not invited. It was not, then, so far as the convocation was concerned, a general council, either in a political or ecclesiastical sense. Consequently it had not in the beginning the authority of an ecumenical council. It acquired the character of ecumenicity only after its dogmatic decrees were confirmed by the Roman See.

It is well known that Theodosius convoked the synod to put an end to the heresies of Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, and of Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicia, in Syria. These heresies had been already condemned by Rome. The Greek historian, Sozomen, says, "When this question was agitated and the excitement daily increased, the Bishop of the City of Rome, being informed of it, wrote to the churches of the East, that, together with the Western Bishops, they should confess the consubstantial Trinity, equal in honor and glory. All acquiesced in this, the controversy being determined by the Roman Church, and the question appeared to be at an end."

But it was not at an end, and the Roman See having condemned the heresies, Theodosius, six years later, called a council of Bishops, under his jurisdiction, to be held at Constantinople. In his call he said: "We wish all the nations governed by our clemency to profess the religion which was delivered to the Romans by the Apostle Peter, as the Roman, says the council met. It reaffirmed the doctrine of the Trinity as explained by the Pope in his condemnation of Macedonius, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost. The council also added some articles to the Nicene Symbol. These are of faith to day throughout the Catholic world, not because defined by that council, but because, being defined, they were subsequently sanctioned by the Apostolic See. The Synod of Greek Bishops at Constantinople did not and could not commit the whole Church to its decrees. Only the head of the whole Church could do that. It was done by the Papal sanction. This sanction gave the decrees force in the whole Church, gave the council its ecumenical character and its decrees an ecumenical or universal force. We need not repeat here what we have already said on this point in last week's article in the Freeman."

He whom God will help no man's malice can hurt.—The Imitation.

If thou canst but hold thy peace and suffer, thou shalt see, without doubt, that the Lord will help thee.—The Imitation.

"THE CHILDREN."

Lecture by Rev. Father Rosswinkel, S. J.

The subject of Rev. Father Rosswinkel's lecture in the Jesuit church, Detroit, last Sunday evening, was "The Rights of Children." We copy the following report of it from the Catholic Witness of that city:

"If any man hath not care of his own, and especially of his household, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel," is the awful truth forced by St. Paul upon his disciple St. Timothy. If this were fully realized, it implies in the denial of the faith, the giving up of all hope of heaven, and therein is seen the application and importance of the instruction of the previous Sunday.

Do not forget all that is necessary to the discharge of the one necessary duty, viz: the administration of God's rights and the representation of Him on earth. If the parent has given no care to his family he has denied the faith, and has been sinfully negligent and become criminally short in the discharge of his duties; his life was a failure and he could never hope for heaven. Let them pardon the repetition, but it was his earnest desire to brighten homes, and that the temporal and spiritual happiness of the children might insure the reward due to Christian parents, for there were no happy homes except such as were Christian homes.

In speaking of the rights of the child it should be noted that greater in justice might be done than men are generally aware of. Their rights began before they had seen the light of day. The withholding of their rights implied a neglect of duty. Neglect of duty implied guilt, and guilt implied that punishment would be inflicted to a greater or lesser degree. The history of Joseph and Mary should indicate how young people should prepare for the sacrament of marriage. For, in the first place, the child has a right to derive its life from a strong, vigorous, honorable and unpolluted source. Job's words are only too applicable—"Man born of woman, litting for a short time is filled with miseries (Job xiv, 1). Original sin darkens the understanding and weakens the intellect, and brought with it innumerable evils. And there are all the bad effects of sins committed previous to marriage, a list of which would appal one if revealed. Let them note the answer of our divine Lord to the significant question relative to the one born blind: "Who hath sinned; is this man or his parents?" And the answer was: "Neither hath this man nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him. It contains a sufficient warning against judging rashly, and at the same time urges the matter of self-examination and perhaps the necessity for severe penance.

The slaves of opium, morphine, cocaine, alcohol and other deleterious drugs the Church might permit, but never would wish to become parents, as they must inevitably prove unworthy administrators and representatives of God.

Children have in the second place a right to the protection and to the preservation of their lives. The Holy Scriptures on every page abound with instances where Almighty God has bestowed His blessing upon it, but denied heritage and pronounced a curse upon those who interfered with His laws. Read in the 35th chapter of Genesis the vengeance taken on Onan, guilty of "a detestable thing." Woe, woe to the parents who dare to interfere with the creation of the family and destroy life in its germ. The fires of hell can never burn too fiercely for such criminal gratification of animal passions and endeavors to escape parentage. Nor in conscience can those be seen in your home and among your employes who furnish means for such enormous crimes. They are wretched criminals. The truth will be proved, if not before, at least on the deathbed. Excuses of poverty, debility and such will fall to the ground, and judgment will be according to God's law.

After life has been received from the parent the right to life becomes sacred that the mother must be ready to become a corpse and the tomb of her child in procuring it. Still more sacred is the right to the spiritual life, the adoption into the family of God by baptism, by which alone anyone can become a Christian. Recent statistics prove that in the United States 482,000 children die yearly unbaptized, and are therefore deprived of the Beatific Vision; and this is due to criminal carelessness and to forgetfulness of the absolute necessity for the sacrament. Indeed, in preparing children for their first Communion, it is no longer safe to take baptism for granted. In view, then, of the disordered state of family conditions and the loss of faith, it was necessary to remind the people that baptism alone could make a Christian, and there was no substitute. One must know his bible, live an honest and philanthropic life, and yet not be a Christian unless he has received the adoption by baptism into God's family, by which alone he earns the right to heaven. Our Lord's words to Nicodemus are clear: "Amen, amen, I say

to thee, unless a man be born of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." It was the same motive that, according to St. Cyprian and St. Augustine, urged the early Christians to have their children baptized within one or two days after birth. This is no extreme view, but parents who, within one or two weeks, have not caused their children to be baptized run the risk of grievous sin.

Next the child has a right to an education which means the nourishment, the exercise and development of dormant faculties of the body and mind to prepare him for exertions to secure his happiness in this world and the next. Some mental training is necessary for which it is impossible to have a fixed standard, as it must be dependent on conditions and the talent, inclination, etc., to be considered. Besides this, the child has the right to have the faculties of the body developed and attended to with care. But the right to a moral and religious training though last in order of time is certainly first in importance. Book learning is not indispensable for happiness, but moral attainments are absolutely so. Some cultivation of intellect is necessary. Their education should begin at home, and children have the right to claim their parents as their educators, and parents may not abdicate from the discharge of that duty. Ten thousand reasons would never destroy the child's right to be under the education of the father and mother against the tyrannical encroachment of other systems.

The sculptor who undertakes to model in clay what afterwards he purposes to execute in stone or marble, protects his model until the conception is perpetuated in the substance of greater consistency. So the child, who is the conception of the man, should be as it were molded and modeled in clay and formed by the finger of the parent at home. Others may then follow, but at a distance, to solidify and perfect the model formed at home, which they must never destroy or even alter. Hence, it is plain that the atmosphere which surrounds a child must for many years be homogeneous. A tender plant must be reared in congenial soil. Otherwise great and irreparable injustice will be perpetrated when young minds yet pliable and without consistency are thrown into the mold of a school without pausing to consider whether it is beneficial or hurtful to transplant the young shoot from beside the waters that fertilize it to other soil. As a question of education and progress it is of greater importance than all branches of learning it is of primary importance, for it is more than any fact, than the three R's, than classical learning, physiology, geology or any other "ology." With all these the barbarism of passions and morals, the barbarism of impurity (which destroys our homes), of greed and luxury (which brings ruin and misery) are compatible. Much agitation has been lately raised against alcohol, Sabbath-breaking and the like. But more dangerous than all these is education without God and without Jesus Christ. In spite of the much vaunted universal education, lauded as a panacea for all ills, our penitentiaries are crowded, our penal reform institutions are full and more room is needed in our insane asylums. Children have a right to be protected against such systems, and by their parents, and this can only be effected by Christian education in the family at home.

One more reflection. God thought it worth His while to assume a human form, and pass thirty-three years on earth teaching His laws and inducing men to follow them. Your child has a right to be made acquainted with those laws, and it is not without injury that he is deprived of such teaching. The teaching of Christ's law is outlawed in our public institutions. And your children are sent where they are mentioned, Jesus Christ is not even mentioned. And yet you call yourselves Christian. And yet you call yourselves Catholic. To such it should be said, you have the power to withhold their rights, but to God above, who sent them to you, you will have to render a rigorous account for the injustice you have done.

Next your children have a right to a clean, healthy, home; not only in the sense in which it is said that cleanliness is next to godliness—a thing much to be desired and having a great influence on character—but rather referring to a moral-sanitary condition of the home. The chief good of our Christian schools is not so much the educational formal teaching of the Christian religion—but very little time is devoted to this. But the greatest good is derived from the Catholic atmosphere. We need feel no surprise, then, if a magazine picture of the Madonna has such a horrible effect upon persons whose minds are not so thoroughly equipped. Thus, then, the greatest good, the most lasting and most important for good is not the formality of the teaching, but the details of Catholic example and the effect of contact with Catholic surroundings. Just as a drop of water constantly falling upon the same spot, will make an indentation on the hardest marble.

Time would not permit a complete examination of this point, but there were one or two matters of the utmost importance. The age we live in is a picture and book-making age.

There was a time of persecution of Catholics for worshipping—not adoring, but paying respect to the handiwork of pious artists. The churches were sacked, the statues broken and the shrines desecrated. The time has passed, but the devil still works. When violence failed, he resorted to calumny, and the so-called reformers accused the Catholics of idolatry. And now we see sights that would make angels weep and which should put humanity to the blush. Are there not in our streets that from which a respectable man or woman would shrink. The flaring posters would cause pagans even to feel shame. And yet they are allowed, and there is no protest against them. All honor to our chief executive magistrate who recently caused to be closed one especially nasty show and bade them "Move on!" Their hideous and infamous wares are even done up in packages and delivered at our homes.

There is a sad and deplorable absence of Catholic emblems in the homes of Catholic families. Pictures and statues are seen representative of what was with pagans no doubt a religion, but suggestive of the worst passions. But how rarely is seen the "Blessed Virgin," the "Model Mother," "St. Joseph, the Model Father," the "Crucified Saviour, our Master," "The Holy Family," or the sweet St. Agnes. Glance at the books upon your shelves and tables. Those attractive exteriors should contain something valuable. Tear off that gaudy cover. The contents are highly poisonous. Another contains a mixture, a little good and much evil. In this is concentrated bigotry, in this there is misrepresentation and lying, in this perhaps the quintessence of immorality.

And yet, printing is a Catholic art, invented by further God's word. Twenty editions of the bible were printed in Germany alone before 1530, when according to the garbled story, Luther gave the bible to the people. A story long exploded, for these editions are extant and to be seen in the various large libraries of the world. Like pictures, the press has been seized by the enemy. The inferiority of the Catholic press is but the imagination of conceited people. Is the picture overdrawn? Let them transfer their thoughts to their own homes. How many objects were in their homes that would excite good, elevating thoughts? How many that tended to worldly or bad thoughts? How many Catholic books were there of instruction and how many of questionable character? How many visitors were admitted to the home in the shape of Catholic newspapers, magazines or journals, and how many of opposite nature? Your own shrewdness will make you perfectly aware that your home should be kept clean, and for no other purpose. If otherwise, you are sowing the wind, and will certainly reap the whirlwind; you are sowing to the flesh and will of the flesh reap corruption. Write over your doors: "The house is magnificent, but there is little peace within." There will be no rusting of angels wings there.

It would be needless to further insist on the rights of children. They are of the first and last importance at home and at school. Fitting weapons must be placed in their hands for the battle of life. The parents are the shepherds whose duty it is to provide pasturage for the young innocent lambs. Let their home lead them to Christian aspirations. Is it to lead them to the Catholic Church or to the ballroom? Let the answer be given that night, and let their intentions be made manifest at this season by sensible presents for Christmas: good, useful, elevating gifts, worthy of Him in whose honor gifts are given, Jesus Christ, the Lord and friend of children.

The night's subject had by no means been thoroughly discussed; however, they should always remember that children's rights were the parents' duties. Next Sunday, the subject would be "vice versa," viz: "The duties of children," and consequently the rights of parents.

THE GOSPEL OF DESPAIR.

L'Independence Belge contains the summary of an address recently delivered by the Mayor of the University of Brussels to the students of that institution. M. Goblet d'Alviella is a prominent politician, a high dignitary in the ranks of Freemasonry, and has for years been predicting the ultimate triumph of philosophical-unbelief over Catholicism. Now however, he denounces it as necessary to warn his students against the rash conclusion which he formerly reposed in the resources of free thought. "Septicism, he confesses, has crept into every domain and has cast its baleful shadow over everything. We encounter it in philosophy, in morals, in art, in politics; in the international order where huge armaments oppress the world, in the economic order, where alcoholism and pauperism are its offshoots. No panacea being forthcoming from either radicalism or science, he concludes that many disappointed minds are inclined to seek a haven of safety by a reactionary movement in favor of authority. He appeals to the youth of the university to labor for the amelioration and consolidation of society, and in order to equip themselves for the work urged upon them, he makes a diagnosis of the following social ills: "The first ill is the coldness and indifference of the individual regarding the foundation of morals, the obligation of altruism, the very idea of duty and free will. M. Goblet d'Alviella must know well that the evil of which he complains is the direct outcome of the rationalistic principle of free thought. This disease is eating like a cancer into the life of society, universal anarchy extending to the practical as well as the speculative order is the development of the principles

to the advocacy of which men like M. Goblet d'Alviella are devoting their lives. His Gospel is therefore a Gospel of despair—reflections, social, moral and economic despair. How refreshing it is to turn from the paralyzing report of the meeting of the International Catholic Congress of Science at Fribourg. This Congress has already attained an importance to attract the attention of the civilized world. Its publications contain monographs on every great question of the age; on morals, theology, science, and history.

Written by men whose names are household words in every university and home of science, they apply the principles of Catholic and Catholic philosophy to the solution of every pressing problem and the removal of every evil that today afflicts society.—Chicago News North.

COL. INGERSOLL IGNORANT OR MENDACIOUS? WHICH?

Colonel Ingersoll was either an ignoramus or mendacious when in delivering a sermon (admission 50 cents) at the Auditorium Theatre in Chicago on Thanksgiving night he thus opened:

"For the blessings we enjoy, for the happiness that is ours, we ought to be grateful. Our hearts should blossom with thankfulness. Whom, what should we thank? Should we thank the Church? What good has the Church done? Has it taught man to cultivate the earth. To build homes? To weave cloth? To cure or prevent disease? To build ships? To navigate the seas? To conquer pain or to lengthen life?"

After this introduction he proceeds to say that only Nature should be thanked, together with the great men, the poets, the novelists and the inventors of steam, Nature and not the Church had instigated. The column had long been known at the Bar before he relinquished his pretension to embrace that of the lecturer, upon which thence to be a lawyer who cited or concealed law only to bolster his own particular case for his special client while all other lawyers studied the aspects against, as well as for their own clients, and so we were able to compass the whole truth of what was before them.

Let us be parliamentary and settle the dilemma between ignorance and mendacity in Col. Ingersoll's position and say that he is ignorant of history. Otherwise he would know that in the dark ages it was solely the Holy Roman Catholic Church that saved far future ages the world's learning; and kept human intellects alive. But for the saving grace of the Church as General Ingersoll stated best in his famous "History of Civilization," the arts and letters of the world would have perished and the learning of those times would have had little learning at hand with which to pervert history. All this is at least "the good which the Church has done."

Has it taught men to cultivate the earth, asks the Colonel. But every Protestant history shows how the monks in scattered monasteries kept alive the best records of the methods of agriculture and taught such to the people around them; and encouraged these to build homes and practice the arts, and how to provide for their families, and how to body but of mind; and taught them how to conquer pain and lengthen life. As for navigating the seas has Col. Ingersoll ever heard of Catholic Ferdinand and Isabella, without whose worldly aid and churchly prayers Columbus would never have navigated the seas to discover Col. Ingersoll's country, Church missionaries in Florida, Canada, Louisiana, California, and in the great Northwest, first and alone therein disseminated civilization.

Except for the Crusaders of the Church the Mussulman would have captured and held in mortal and mental bondage the greater part of Western Europe. But for St. Augustine, who would have tamed the fierce Britons and impressed civilization upon the pagan Saxons and Danes? Was Dante or Pascal an infidel; or a churchman? Was St. Patrick when civilizing Ireland an Ingersollian or a priest of old Nature or a wise, devout churchman? Has Col. Ingersoll ever found a great intellect, author beyond Voltaire, Gibbon, Hume or Paine? Then how can infidelity inspire poetry? While statesmen, renowned poets and authors who were spiritually allied to the Mother Church can be counted by the hundreds.

Finally has Col. Ingersoll ever perused that eloquent eulogy of the Roman Catholic Church and of its benefits to the world that appears in the essay on the Popes by the Protestant historian, Macaulay, wherein he predicted that although in time a New Zealand traveler might some future day stand alone upon the London Bridge in a solitude around him "the Church of Rome would still exist in undiminished vigor?"

Col. Ingersoll is not ignorant but mendacious may fully position on the ignorance of his hearers or readers for Americans read and digest history that belies his fine periods founded on chimerical doubts.—Catholic Review.

LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN.

A "mere Irishman," Lord Russell of Kilowen, has been honored by the University of Cambridge with the degree of Doctor of Laws; and wonder of wonders—one of the grounds alleged by the Public Orator for the conferring of the degree was Lord Russell's defence of the Irish cause and his support of the late Mr. Parnell. Commenting on the event, the London Daily News says: "Lord Russell of Kilowen belongs to a more ancient and more widely diffused Church than that over which the Archbishop of Canterbury so lately presided. He is the first Catholic Chief Justice of England since the Reformation. There are at least two other Roman Catholics on the English Bench, Mr. Justice Mathew and Mr. Justice Day. But do not let us boast of our tolerance. At this moment the Lord Chief Justice is ineligible for the Woolpack; and when Mr. Gladstone brought in a bill which would have removed that obviously irrational disability, a Conservative House of Commons threw it out. With dismal fatality and execrable taste they called it a Russell and Ripon Relief Bill, because it referred to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland as well as to the Lord Chancellorship of England. To this day the Irish Verger can not enter upon his functions without formally abjuring the faith of the people he is to rule. The University of Cambridge is, of course, above such ignominious bigotry; and the Lord Chief Justice was received with hearty enthusiasm."

The rise of Lord Russell, a Catholic and an Irishman, to the place of Chief Justice of England ought to convince Catholics that their future lies in education. The American as well as the English people will make room for men of greatest intellectual attainment, even though they be members of a despised creed and a despised race. This is one good reason why Catholics, more than all others, should feel an enthusiasm and every influence that educates.—Ave Maria.

Behold that Heart which has so much loved men as to exhaust and consume itself for them, and I receive from the greater part of them only coldness and contempt.—Our Lord to Blessed Margaret Mary.

Never think that hast made any progress till thou lookest upon thyself as inferior to all.—The Imitation.