

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 181 and 183 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
THOMAS COFFEY.

Messrs. L. C. KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEN and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, adage measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

London, Saturday, July 18, 1891.

BABEL.

It scarcely needed that any new event should occur to show the inextricable confusion in which Protestantism of every form is at present involved, owing to the practical application of the first principle on which the whole system is founded.

It has never been called into doubt that the Catholic Church of to-day is the same organization which has existed from the days of the Apostles, and which was established by them and their successors throughout the world in obedience to the command of Jesus Christ to preach His gospel to every creature. Every one who has read the New Testament, even without profound thought upon the nature of the Church, is aware that Christ established an organization which He called His Church, and that He selected twelve Apostles with paramount authority, besides seventy-two disciples with subordinate authority, to preach everywhere His gospel as He delivered it to them; and He assured them that it would be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah on the last day than for that house or city which would not receive them.

That Christ's work on earth was intended to be permanent is also conceded; for He came to save mankind, not merely the generation amid which He lived; and so in giving His commission He promised that He would be with His Apostles "all days, even to the consummation of the world."

That the Apostles had successors is also clear. We are told in the Acts of the Apostles that they ordained priests in every city to carry on their work. Matthias was selected to fill the place of Judas, when the latter, after having betrayed his Master, hanged himself in despair. Timothy and Titus were appointed by St. Paul to preside over the churches established respectively in Ephesus and Crete for the same purpose. (1 Tim. i. 3; Tit. i. 5.)

That the Church continued to exist without interruption down to the date when Protestantism was established, and that there existed a ministerial succession with authority derived from the Apostles, and therefore from Christ, are also indubitable facts; and when the standard of revolt was raised the plea was that the Church had ceased to teach Christ's doctrine in purity and simplicity, and that a thorough reformation was required.

The pretensions of the new teachers could not be sustained unless they could show that each individual had a right to set himself up as a judge of the purity of the Church's doctrine, and that the Church had no right to repress such individual judgment. The doctrine of the supremacy of private judgment was thus made the fundamental principle of Protestantism, as against the Catholic doctrine that the Church has authority to decide all controversies of faith.

It was to be expected that when private judgment was thus made the Supreme Court of Appeal, errors of the most astounding character would be proclaimed on the house-tops as the real teachings of Christianity; and this is precisely what is taking place at the present time, while the various sects amongst whom these errors are openly taught find themselves unable to cope with them or to repress them without violating that very first principle upon which they justified their own revolt. They recognize perfectly well that the very foundations of Christian truth are menaced by the new doctrines. Thus among the Presbyterians, Dr. Briggs denies the inspiration of Scripture. Among the Episcopalians, Rev. Mr. MacQuarrie has done the same. Among the Methodists, Dr. Workman denies that any prophecy of the Old Testament had Christ in view as the Messiah. Such doctrines are seen to be subversive of Christianity, and in spite of the former professions of all these sects that each individual has the right to exer-

cise his own judgment in matters of doctrine, the teachers of these dangerous theories have been condemned, with various degrees of emphasis, as heretics.

Rev. Dr. R. Heber Newton, the rector of all Souls' Protestant Episcopal Church of New York, is also at this moment undergoing a trial by a committee of five, on a charge of heresy on three points: he denies, 1, the birth of Christ by a Virgin; 2, the bodily resurrection of Christ; 3, the verbal inspiration of the Bible. In a word, he attacks whatever is miraculous in the Bible. If Christianity be not a myth, the doctor is certainly a teacher of dangerous error, and we confess that for the sake of preserving even some semblance of Christian faith among the Episcopalians, we would be glad to see the Church court condemn Dr. Newton's doctrines. At the same time we are conscious that the court condemning him will proclaim its own inconsistency; for if he owes obedience to the authority of the Church in its doctrinal decisions, both he and his judges alike owe obedience to the authority of the Catholic Church, which they repudiated on the plea that private individuals have the right to judge every doctrine for themselves.

Is the world becoming more logical?

The spread of education has undoubtedly made the people of civilized countries more thoughtful; and though the human intellect will still have its vagaries, it seems to us, and we believe the majority of men will agree with us in believing, that these vagaries will take a more feeble hold with the masses of the people than they have done in less enlightened ages. There are still, and there will always be, differences of degree in the knowledge of the masses, and many will continue to be unable to follow out a principle to its legitimate conclusion; but the number of those who will insist upon consistency in religious belief must, in our opinion, increase, to use a mathematical expression, in geometrical progression. That is to say, the spread of education will become much greater in a given future generation than during the present, as it spreads from more numerous centres; and the ability to detect error will increase in a similar manner, unless unforeseen obstacles intervene to prevent so rapid an increase. The inconsistencies of Protestantism with its many phases of belief and unbelief must in this case become more patent to the world, and the multitude, thus beginning to reason upon them, must reject them.

The consequence of all this must surely be the ultimate rejection of Protestantism as a form of Christianity. There may be some who will continue to call themselves Protestants, and probably there will be many such; but for the most part these will be really persons without religious belief of any definite kind. They will be to all intents and purposes Atheists or Deists; and, indeed, considering the inextricable confusion now existing, we may say that this state of things exists already.

There is no resting-place for a reasoning mind between Catholicism and utter unbelief; and to one or other of these those who are logical among Protestants must drift when the disintegrating process which is now going on shall have been completed.

WAS ST. PETER BISHOP OF ROME?

In an article which appeared in our issue of the 4th inst., on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul, we gave extracts from the writings of St. Irenaeus, the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, by which it was shown that SS. Peter and Paul were the founders of the Church in Rome. As it has been the fashion with Protestant controversial writers to deny that St. Peter was ever in that city, it will be useful to give here some additional proofs of the constant tradition that St. Peter fixed his See in Rome, and that the line of Popes are his lawful successors as head of the Church on earth.

In his epistle to the Romans, St. Paul states that he had not yet visited that city, though he was anxious to do so. In this epistle, written about the year of our Lord 58, the Apostle says:

"I have often purposed to come unto you (and have been hindered hitherto), that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles." (13.)

At the time when St. Paul wrote thus there was already a flourishing Church in Rome, so that in the first chapter of the same epistle he returns thanks to God because "your faith is spoken of in the whole world;" and he adds: "I long to see you that I may impart unto you some spiritual grace to strengthen you."

As in the extract which we already gave from St. Irenaeus the establishment of the Church is attributed to both of these Apostles, it is clear that St. Peter's labors there were already fruitful before St. Paul's arrival. In attributing the founding of the Church in Rome to both apostles, St. Irenaeus, therefore, evidently means that St. Peter preached first, and St. Paul afterwards aided him in his work. There is thus a complete accord between Eusebius and St. Irenaeus, for the former says, in the second book of his ecclesiastical history, "He was the first who by the preaching of the word, in the city of Rome, opened the gate of the kingdom of heaven with the keys of his gospel."

Eusebius quotes extracts from Caius and Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, as well as from Papias, to show that St. Peter made his residence in Rome, and Papias states that it was there that St. Peter wrote his first epistle. In accordance with the custom of the early Christians, St. Peter calls Rome Babylon, on account of the iniquities to which its Pagan population were addicted. (1, 13.) As Papias, Caius, and St. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, were disciples of the apostles, it must be acknowledged that their testimony to St. Peter's residence at Rome is as conclusive as we have shown that of St. Irenaeus to be.

St. Jerome, explaining St. Peter's use of the name Babylon as applied to Rome, says:

"Peter in his first epistle speaks of Rome figuratively under the name Babylon, saying the Church which is in Babylon, elected together with you, saitheth you, and so doth my son Mark."

So also the Apocalypse of St. John speaks of Rome under the same name, Babylon, which he describes as being seated upon seven hills, and having power over the kings of the earth. This description agrees only with Rome, which was the only imperial city when the apostle wrote; and the only great city built on seven hills.

It must be noted, however, that the name Babylon is not given to the Christian Church, the centre of whose unity is at Rome, but to the Pagan Empire, which at the time St. Peter wrote was ruled by Nero, a most wicked sovereign and one of the most cruel persecutors of the Church. This distinction is made by St. Jerome in his epistle to Marcellas, where he quotes the denunciations of St. John against Rome as a reason why the latter should remove from Rome to Bethlehem. He adds:

"The holy Church is also there, and the trophies of the apostles and martyrs, the true confession of Christ, and the faith which the apostle preached, and which was persecuted by the Gentiles."

It should not be necessary for us to disclaim the name Babylon as applied to the Christian Church, but it becomes necessary to make this remark on the use of the word, as many Protestants are accustomed to apply to Christian Rome and the Catholic Church the denunciations pronounced against Babylon by St. John in the Apocalypse. This was done by Luther first in his book on the "Babylonish Captivity;" and his followers, the Centuriators of Magdeburg, have no better reason to give for receiving the Apocalypse (Revelation) as part of the Canon of Scripture than the fact that it speaks ill of Rome, under the name of Babylon. It is a poor cause which has to resort to such perversion of Holy Scripture to sustain it, yet the Westminster Confession of Faith actually founds upon these passages its implied statement that the Catholic Church is "the synagogue of Satan." (Ch. 25.) This is reason enough why we should refuse in a few words so blasphemous an assertion. The Confession quotes Rev. xviii. in support of its absurd teaching.

In further proof that St. Peter fixed his See in Rome we shall now quote a few more testimonies of the early Christian Fathers and writers:

Tertullian, who wrote about A. D. 195, within a century after the death of the Apostle St. John, in his book of Prescriptions, insists on the necessity of a line of Bishops coming down by succession from the Apostles, adding: "For in this manner do the Apostolic Churches reckon their origin." As instances of this Apostolic origin, he names Smyrna, where Polycarp was placed by John, and Rome, where Clement was ordained by Peter. He then challenges the heretics of his day to show so sure a succession: "Let the heretics counterfeit something of the same sort; for, after blasphemy, what is unlawful for them?" Then enumerating the churches which had either an Apostle or at least one appointed by an Apostle for their first Bishops, he mentions Achaia, Corinth, Philippi, Thessaly and Ephesus, then Rome:

"But if thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome, whence we also have an authority at hand. That Church, how happy! on which the apostles poured out all their doctrine with their blood, where Peter had a like suffering with the Lord; where Paul is crowned with an end like that of the Baptist; where the Apostle John was plunged into boiling oil, and suffered nothing, and was afterwards banished to an island."

St. Cyprian in a letter to Antoninus describes how Cornelius, who was then Pope, A. D. 251, was chosen "by the judgment of God and His Christ, by the testimony of all the clergy, and by the suffrage of the people . . . when the place of Fabian, that is, when the place of Peter and the dignity of the sacerdotal was vacant."

In a letter to Cornelius, the same illustrious Bishop denounces certain Africans who had set up a false Bishop, and yet "dared to sail and carry letters from schismatics and profane persons to the chair of Peter and to the principal Church (of Rome) whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise."

Eusebius in many places names St. Peter as first Bishop of Rome. One passage will suffice to show what he frequently asserts as an undisputed fact:

"Linus was the first, after Peter, to obtain the episcopate of Rome."

He also states that

"The providence of the Universal Ruler led to Rome that most powerful and great one of the Apostles, and, on account of his virtue, the leader of the rest, Peter, against that sad destroyer of the human race (Simon the magician)."

Elsewhere Eusebius gives details of the manner in which SS. Peter and Paul suffered death under Nero, adding:

"It is unnecessary to give further proof of these facts, for they are attested by evident, splendid and well known monuments which exist at this day."

It would be easy to adduce other proofs of St. Peter's residence in Rome, but it is not necessary to do so here. The tradition of his having gone there in the early part of the reign of Claudius, and of his death on the cross under Nero, dates back to the very age in which he lived, and there is no counter-tradition. It is attested by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Epiphanius, Optatus of Milevis, Orosius, the Emperor Theodosius, St. John Chrysostom, Hegesippus, Theodoret, Ambrose, Jerome, and numerous other writers who had every opportunity of knowing the facts and who have given many details of his life there. So positive is this testimony that all Protestants of weight, willingly or unwillingly, concede that the fact is undeniable.

We shall, therefore, conclude by giving this summary of proof from the "Doctrines of the Church" by His Eminence, the late Cardinal Wiseman:

"The monuments which yet exist in every part of Rome, and the testimony of ecclesiastical writers from the oldest times, put the fact beyond all doubt; and it is sufficient to say that authors of the highest literary eminence, and remarkable for their opposition to the supremacy of the Roman See, such as Cave, Pearson, Usher, Young and Blondel, have both acknowledged and supported it. Among the moderns, it may be sufficient to observe that all ecclesiastical writers of any note pretend to deny this fact."

From the details of St. Peter's residence in Rome, as given by the Fathers, it would appear that he went first to that city in A. D. 42, and that he went to Jerusalem when the Emperor Claudius persecuted Christians and Jews, and that he preached afterwards and established Churches in various parts of Asia Minor. During the reign of Nero he returned to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom in A. D. 67. From his first visit to the city until his death there was, therefore, an interval of twenty-five years; but his residence there was not continuous during that whole period; and this accounts for the fact, which is sometimes adduced against his having been in Rome, that during this time we find traces of his being elsewhere. No Catholic pretends that his stay in Rome was continuous and uninterrupted.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.

In another column will be found the announcement of this celebrated institution of learning. With rapid strides it has grown to be one of the most prominent as well as one of the most complete universities on the continent of America. That this fact is most generally known and recognized is proved by the very large number of pupils who attend from the most distant parts of the Dominion and the United States. It gives us pleasure, indeed, to make mention of this circumstance, for the success of our Catholic institutions means the greater spread of our holy faith. We congratulate the good Oblate Fathers on their remarkable progress, and trust they will go on and on in the near and distant future spreading the light of faith and the blessings of purest culture amongst the people.

A MENACING FREEMASON.

The Freemasons of Boston have taken umbrage at the condemnation of their order which was passed by the convention of Baptist ministers held recently in that city. The ministers declared by the very decisive vote of 59 to 18 that a man cannot give his allegiance to God and Freemasonry at the same time, and that Freemasonry is an obstacle to the practice of religion. This is perfectly true; for, as a matter of fact, Freemasonry substitutes its empty forms in the place of the true worship of God; and, besides, it has been frequently put on record by its own officials, in Europe, at least, that its main object is to destroy religion.

In America this purpose is not put forward so prominently, but it is certain that its secret oaths are inconsistent with the duties we owe to God and to society; and in any case, the fraternization of the American societies with those of Europe makes of them all one body with a common ultimate purpose. It is, therefore, a society deserving of that general condemnation which has been issued against it by the Catholic Church; and it is equally forbidden for Catholics in America to become members of it as in Europe. If there were no other cause for this than the moral ground that it turns to ill use the name and personality of God, by the employment of unnecessary oaths, it would be sufficient reason why the Catholic Church should condemn it; for we know that "all false, rash, unjust, and unnecessary oaths" are forbidden by the second commandment of God. But there is irrefragable evidence that the oaths of the association are worse than unnecessary. They are capable of being turned to evil purpose, and they have frequently been so turned.

It will be understood, however, that in this country, where Freemasonry is not so actively hostile to the Catholic Church as it has been in Europe in the past, we have no need to entertain any individual rancor against Protestants who are members of the order. We agree to tolerate each others' differences of opinion, and Catholics may be personally friendly to Freemasons in their social relations with each other, while steadfastly refusing to become linked with their society. We claim that liberty for ourselves which we freely grant to others. It is, therefore, quite out of place for the Freemasons to defend themselves against the attack of the Baptists by making a flank attack upon Catholics, who are not interfering with them, though carefully avoiding to become identified with them in any way.

Notwithstanding this, the Boston Freemasons have thought proper to make a direct attack upon the Catholic Church in defending themselves against the Baptists; or at least their spokesman has done this. The Rev. Sullivan L. Holman, who is an ex-Baptist minister himself, and is still a member of Tremont Temple, a Baptist conventicle, though he has abandoned the ministry for a mercantile life, has thrust himself forward as the champion of Freemasonry against the attack inaugurated in the Baptist convention by Rev. Mr. Stoddard.

It is a quarrel between Baptists, or between Baptists and Protestants generally; and it is, therefore, evident that the attack of Mr. Holman upon Catholics is utterly out of place. It is an effort to create sympathy for Freemasonry by appealing to the unreasoning prejudices which very many Protestants entertain against the Catholic Church. But Mr. Holman may find out that he has made a mistake in this. He may discover before he has done with his cause that Catholics are perfectly able to defend themselves against his aspersions, and to carry the war into Africa too, so we would in a friendly way advise him and those who are of his ilk to be more cautious.

He says: "Masonry broke away from Rome at the time of the Reformation." He is evidently astray in his history. Masonry did not break away from Rome at the time mentioned, except in the sense that it became hostile to all religion, on account of which fact the Freemasons were cut off from the Church as rotten members; and they were interdicted in England long before the Reformation.

But Mr. Holman's next assertion is calculated to amaze all who have the least acquaintance with the facts. He says: "If the crisis which some predict should ever come between Rome and the United States, five hundred thousand Masons would stand true as steel to our institutions." In fact the pronouncements of the ultra-Protestant and Tory press in England and Ireland sufficiently indicate that the defeat of Mr. Parnell means the triumph of Catholic faith and the apotheosis of Christian morals in the land of St. Patrick. The London Times declares that the collapse of Parnell means the domination of the Irish priests, who have always hated the national movement, and therefore the MacCarthyites are little better than Parnell. One of the great misrepresentation of the Thunderer is "that the Irish priests and Bishops are op-

try. We are satisfied that loyalty of this kind is a very prevalent sentiment; but we submit that it is a most shortsighted policy for those who are really loyal to endeavor to excite religious dissension, and without reason to represent so numerous and influential a body as the Catholics as entertaining disloyal sentiments. We would remind this pompous talker that when the United States were in real trouble, it is known that the Catholics, in proportion to ratio to population, maintained the flag of their country to double the extent of any other class, by taking up arms in its defence; and the same is likely to occur again should occasion require it. It is only when we come to those who plucked the plumage of the American Eagle to feather their own nests that Freemasons were found in the front. We do not accuse the Order itself of being responsible directly for the acts of individual members; but we say that the Masonic principles, which ignore religion and conscience, are much more likely to beget traitors than the principles of Catholics, which inculcate loyalty to rightful authority.

The Freemasons will act wisely if they keep their present quarrel within the limits to which it belongs. It is a fight between themselves and the Baptists. Let it be fought out on that issue.

THE CARLOW ELECTION.

The lesson taught by the Kilkenny and Sligo elections was sufficiently instructive and would have proved of a healing and salutary character had Mr. Parnell and his zealous supporters taken it to heart. Unfortunately for them, and for the peace of Ireland, the lesson was unheeded. Owing to the sad demise of the late O'Gorman Mahon a vacancy occurred in the representation of Carlow. Here again, unmindful of previous defeats, Mr. Parnell determined to try the fortunes of war. Post haste from Steining, where the mock marriage with Mrs. O'Shea was solemnly registered, he hastened to Carlow, where in the halcyon days of his unlimited popularity his word was all-powerful and his endorsement of any man was tantamount to the election and a free ride over the constituency of that candidate. But Carlow's Catholic sentiment had received a rude shock in the scandalous proceedings of the late uncorrupted king. On every public hall of that unpurchasable county the handwriting was plainly visible to all: "He was weighed in the balance and found wanting." The late idol of the people, when stainless and covered with the laurels of victory he appeared before enthusiastic and devoted multitudes, can now scarcely obtain a hearing from a few trembling followers. His nominee, Mr. Kettle, a good man and of patriotic record, is rejected at the polls, chiefly through his having been recommended by Mr. Parnell. Never was so sad a spectacle witnessed in political warfare as that offered by Mr. Parnell and his few honest though misguided followers on the day after the election. It is well known that about one thousand Protestant and Tory voters exercised the franchise in the county Carlow against two thousand three hundred Catholic voters. The election proved that Mr. Parnell received the undivided support of the Tory electors and overwhelming defeat at the hands of his former friends, the Catholics, who, disgusted with his conduct, voted solidly and almost to a man against his nominee.

The lesson should be taken personally to heart not only by Mr. Parnell and his friends, but by every public man who is anxious to earn and retain the respect and the support of the Irish people. It is plain to be observed—and no man can close his eyes against the fact unless he is willfully blind—that no matter how popular a man may be in Ireland—no matter what services he may have rendered to his country—the purity of his moral conduct must at all times stand the test of public criticism; and that Ireland will acknowledge no leader and confide in the guidance of no man who is not, "like Caesar's wife, above suspicion." In fact the pronouncements of the ultra-Protestant and Tory press in England and Ireland sufficiently indicate that the defeat of Mr. Parnell means the triumph of Catholic faith and the apotheosis of Christian morals in the land of St. Patrick. The London Times declares that the collapse of Parnell means the domination of the Irish priests, who have always hated the national movement, and therefore the MacCarthyites are little better than Parnell. One of the great misrepresentation of the Thunderer is "that the Irish priests and Bishops are op-