

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XIX.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1897.

NO. 999.

THESE PRELIMINARIES.

N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

McAllister—I challenge you to furnish any historical evidence that the decrees of the Council of Nice received official ratification at the hand of Sylvester, Bishop of Rome, either directly or through a legate or legates representing him.

Freeman—Gelasius of Cyzicus, a Greek historian of the fifth century, who wrote a history of the Council of Nice, says: "And Hosius was the representative of the Bishop of Rome; and he was present at the Council of Nice with the two Roman priests, Vitus and Vicentius." (Volumen Actorum, Council Nic. II., 5.)

By reason of the representative character of Hosius and the two Roman priests—and for no other conceivable reason—we find them first in the list of signatures ratifying the acts of the council. Several lists of these signatures are still extant, and though they differ in several things, they are alike in this, that they all place Hosius and the two Roman priests first. Of these signatures Hosius, in his "History of the Christian Councils," says: "On this subject the two lists given by Marsi may be consulted, as well as the two others given by Gelasius; in these latter Hosius expressly signs in the name of the Church of Rome, of the churches of Italy, of Spain and of the West; the two Roman priests appear only as assistants. In Marsi's two lists, it is true, nothing indicates that Hosius acted in the Pope's name, while we are informed that the two Roman priests did so. But this is not so surprising as it might at first sight appear, for these Roman priests had no right to sign for themselves; it was therefore necessary for them to say in whose name they did so; while it was not necessary for Hosius, who as a Bishop had a right of his own."

Here we have historical evidence that the Pope, through his representatives, gave his approbation to the Acts of the Council of Nice.

McAllister—The only ratification of sanction given to the decrees of the council was that by the Emperor Constantine.

Freeman. We have just seen that it was ratified by the Pope through his legates. The imperial ratification was neither necessary nor sufficient to give the council its ecumenical character, though it was necessary and sufficient to give to the Acts of the council the force of law in the empire. It gave no additional weight whatever to the dogmatic decrees of the council as articles of faith. For the latter the approbation of the head of the Church—the head of the State—was necessary.

This approbation was received from the Pope through his representatives, and it is for this reason that the Council of Nice has ever been regarded in the Church as ecumenical.

McAllister—It was the common practice, as Church history testifies, for the Emperor who called the council by imperial edict to ratify its decrees.

Freeman—To give them the force of law in the State, yes; to make them ecumenical, no. The imperial ratification was a purely civil affair. As laymen the Emperor had no right even to a vote on the dogmatic decrees. They had the power to enforce external acquiescence in them, but when they lost the power to compel, the council, so far as its civil effects were concerned, ceased to exist. These Emperors have passed away, and so has the force of law arising from their approbation, but the General Councils, so far as their dogmatic decrees are concerned, have the same force and vitality in the Church to-day that they had from the beginning. The imperial part has perished centuries ago; the Papal part—that arising from the Pope's approbation—still remains.

McAllister—What Constantine did for the Council of Nice was the ratification of the decrees of the Council of Constantinople, and Marcian for the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon.

Freeman—Yes, they made the enactments of these councils laws of the empire, and that was all. But, as we have nothing to do with them. It is only as articles of Catholic faith that the dogmatic decrees of those councils remain in force and are binding on the Catholic conscience to-day. And until they had the Papal sanction they were not articles of Catholic faith. It is this Papal ratification that gives ecumenical authority to a council, and without this ratification no council was ever recognized as ecumenical.

The first Council of Constantinople (381), though ratified and thus made imperial law by Theodosius, did not immediately receive the Papal sanction, on account of objections to certain of its canons. In consequence of this hesitation on the part of Rome another council assembled at Constantinople the following year (382), at which nearly the same Bishops who attended the council the previous year were present. The Bishops at this second council sent to Rome a copy of the decrees of faith composed the year before, and sought to justify it in those points which had been objected to. Soon after Pope Damasus gave his sanction to the council—or at least to that part of it that treated of dogma. Its dogmatic decrees were also sanctioned by Popes Vigilantius, Pelagius II. and Gregory the Great.

We now call attention to the third canon of this council, to which Rome particularly objected. We do this to show that this council, held in the year

381, and ratified by the Emperor Theodosius, recognized the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. This canon will prove the fallacy of Dr. McAllister's talk about the "pretensions of the See of Rome" making their appearance only in the middle of the fifth century. Canon third reads thus: "The Bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome."

This canon recognizes the Bishop of Rome as holding the primacy, and not only in the Western Patriarchate, but also among the Patriarchates of the East, that is to say, the primacy in the whole Church. The object of this canon was to give the Bishop of Constantinople precedence over the other Patriarchates of the East, that is, over Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus and Jerusalem.

To make him hold the first place after the Bishop of Rome would, in the view of the Fathers of the council, secure this precedence. They therefore believed that the Bishop of Rome held the primacy among all the Patriarchs and Bishops of the Church.

Why, then, it may be asked, did the Pope object to this canon which recognized his primacy? It was because this placing of the Bishop of Constantinople over Alexandria and other Patriarchates was an attack on their traditional rights, and the Pope, as head of the whole Church, would defend them. He would not permit a recognition of the fact of the primacy of his own See to cover a wrong done to other Sees.

We come now to the General Council of Chalcedon (451). Dr. McAllister tells us that the Emperor Marcian did for this council what Constantine did for the Council of Nice, that is, made the acts of the council laws of the Roman Empire. Here the doctor errs through forgetfulness that Constantine was the Emperor of the whole Roman Empire and his laws were co-extensive with the whole empire, while Marcian was only Emperor of the East—the Byzantine Empire. His writ did not run in the empire of the West, where Valentinian ruled. Consequently Marcian did not and could not do for the Council of Chalcedon what Constantine did for the Council of Nice. He could only give the Acts of Chalcedon the force of law in the Byzantine or Greek Empire. His ratification of the council had but local force and could not therefore make a general council of what was to him but a national one. Only the sanction of the Bishop of Rome, whose authority was recognized both in the East and the West, could give the acts of that Council force in the whole Church and make it ecumenical.

In emphasizing the ratification of the Chalcedon by the Emperor Marcian it was the doctor's purpose to obscure the relations of the Pope to that council. Let us now see these relations:

In the first place, the Emperor Marcian wrote to Pope Leo in reference to the proposed council. To this letter Leo replied, and, among other things, said he would more fully communicate to the Emperor, who was so anxious for a synod, his view on this subject by the new legates who would soon arrive." (Epist. 82, in Mansi, Tom. 6, p. 112.)

Second. The Emperor in his letter summoning the council said: "That which concerns the true faith and the orthodox religion is to be preferred to everything else. For, if God is gracious to us, then our empire will be firmly established. Since now doubts have arisen respecting the true faith, as is shown by the letters of the most holy Bishop of Rome, Leo, we have resolved that a holy synod shall be held, etc." (Hardouin, Tom. 2, p. 45.)

Third. In reference to this convocation the Pope wrote to the Emperor: "Since from love to the Catholic faith you wish this assembly to be held now, in order to offer no impediment to your pious will, I have chosen as my representative my fellow-Bishop, Paschasius, whose province appears to be less disquieted by war (by Attila) and have joined with him the priest, Boniface. These two, together with the previous legates, the Bishop Lucentius and the presbyter, Basil, and Julian of Cos, shall form the representatives of the Papal See at the synod, and, in particular, Paschasius shall there preside." (Epist. 89, in Mansi, Tom. 6, p. 125.)

Fourth. Pope Leo wrote a letter to the council, in which he said: "The decision of the Emperor to convocate a synod for the warding off of the wiles of Satan, and for the restoration of the peace of the Church, should be thankfully acknowledged. In this he had preserved the right and distinction of the Apostle, Peter, and had asked the Pope for his personal presence at the assembly. But this was permitted neither by the necessity of the times nor by previous custom. His legates, however, would preside in his place, and he would in that way, although not in bodily form, be present. As the synod knew from his Epistolical dogmatics what he believed to be in accord with the ancient tradition, they could not doubt what he wished. No opposition to the true faith should be allowed at the synod, as the true faith in regard to the Incarnation of Christ, in accordance with apostolic teaching, was fully set forth in his letter to Flavian." (Epist. 93, Mansi, Tom. 6, p. 131.)

Fifth. The council met at Chalcedon, a town in the Bosphorus, opposite to Constantinople, in 451. There were between five hundred and six hundred Bishops present. They were purely Greeks and Orientals, with the exception of the Pope's representatives and two African Bishops. At the first session Paschasius, who had been appointed by the Pope to preside, arose and said: "We have a commission from the most holy and most Apostolic Bishop of Rome, who is the head of all the churches, to see that Dioscurus (Patriarch of Alexandria) shall have no seat (or vote) in the council, and, if he shall venture upon this, that he be expelled. This commission we must fulfill. If it seem well to your highness (the imperial commissioners) either he must retire or we depart."

With this demand the council complied to the satisfaction of the Pope's representative. By it remembered, it was composed almost exclusively of Greek and Oriental Bishops. Here was a test of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome which the compliance of the council of Greek and Oriental Bishops recognized. Dioscurus held heretical doctrines about the nature of Christ, which occasioned the Pope's peremptory demand. He was finally condemned by the council. The presiding officer thus passed sentence: "I, Paschasius, Bishop of the Church of Lybiae, presiding over this holy synod, in the stead of the most holy and Apostolic Leo of the city of Rome, Pope of the Universal Church, have subscribed to the condemnation of Dioscurus, with the consent of the Universal Church."

We give this case to show that the Pope, not the emperor, was the principal personage and leading influence in this great council of the East, held one thousand four hundred and forty-six years ago.

The Council of Chalcedon at the conclusion of its sessions sent the Acts of the synod to the Pope in order to obtain his assent. In the letter of the council to Leo we read the following: "We acknowledge the whole force of the things which have been done, and the confirmation of all that we have accomplished to be dependent on your approval." The Emperor Marcian, like the council, requested the Pope to sanction the decrees made at Constantinople in a special epistle, which he said would then be read in all the churches, that everyone might know that the Pope approved of the synod.

Dr. McAllister tells us that Marcian did for the Council of Chalcedon what Constantine did for Nice. As Marcian asked the Pope's sanction of Chalcedon, we conclude, from the doctor's own admission, that Constantine asked the Pope to sanction the Council of Nice.

Was the doctor aware of all these intimate relations and the dominating influence of the Pope with the Council of Chalcedon when he wrote to make it appear that the Emperor was all in all and the Pope nothing? If he knew of them, did he deal honestly with his readers in suppressing them?

Pope Leo sanctioned and confirmed the dogmatic decrees of Chalcedon, and the council, by reason of that fact, was and is still recognized as ecumenical, although it was composed almost exclusively of Greek and Oriental Bishops.

TWO MODEL CONVERTS.

Anecdotes of Heroic Devotion to the Faith that Lukewarm Catholics Should Note.

Advising most earnestly the practice of going to Holy Communion frequently, and especially making the nine consecutive Fridays for final perseverance after the manner of the Apostleship of Prayer, Father Power told in effect these anecdotes which may edify many of your readers, writes the poet, J. R. Randall, in the Catholic Columbian.

"While giving a mission in Holy Springs, Miss., I became acquainted with a gentleman who had been converted from Protestantism. His zeal was remarkable. Although he lived twenty miles from a Catholic church where Mass was said periodically and with no regularity, he determined to make the nine consecutive Friday Communions.

"He stated his resolve to the priest, who told him how difficult it would be to carry out. The gentleman was determined. He would make the effort. During the first essay, he, at one time, travelled sixty miles to find the priest. Inadvertently, before completing the course he drank water and broke the fast. He began again, and was frustrated by sickness of his wife which rendered his presence at home imperative. At the third trial he surmounted all difficulties, and, no doubt, prepared with the armor of faith in the advent awaited calmly the holy death promised to all loyal clients of the Sacred Heart.

"There was a locomotive engineer," said Father Power, "who made up his mind to receive Holy Communion during the nine consecutive Fridays in honor of the Sacred Heart and for the grace of final perseverance. He could manage to get to confession, but how to go to Holy Communion he could not understand, as he was on the road from early morning to early night. One night the priest was called upon and the engineer asked for the Blessed Sacrament. The priest hesitated, but when the explanation was vouchsafed he not only administered such an exhibition of solid piety, such courageous and inflexible devotion. So the engineer finished his nine Fridays under the stars and by night. There is no excuse for the majority of people, who have no such obstacles to conquer."

FAMILY FIENDS.

Divorce, Desertion, Irreligion, Lack of Attractive Power.

Catholic Witness.

The Rev. Father Roswinkel, S. J., continued his popular lectures at the Jesuit Church, Detroit, last Sunday evening, and the interest displayed showed not the slightest sign of abatement. Vespers were sung by Fr. Foley, S. J., after which Fr. Roswinkel delivered his lecture to the following purport:

The peculiar mark which characterizes the work of God is unity. This seal which is so conspicuously impressed upon the family marks it as in order, indeed, of the works of the creation, but the first in magnificence. A material unity is indicated in the sacred scriptures when they speak of two in one flesh; two roots, as it were, but united in one tree; and this unity cannot cease. But to this no further reference would be made, for there was also a moral unity. Some kind of unity or other is found in all organizations. Without it, then, existence would be an impossibility. The "common good" is sought by such organizations, on unified principles by prominent individuals who are styled philanthropists or lovers of men. Such have a specific end in view, subordinate to the common good, and so are constituted all societies commercial, religious or of other character, until they are no longer in sympathy with the principles or cease to labor for the cause or hinder it, by involuntary or other separation from its objects.

Our Divine Lord wished for unity to be a characteristic of the society which He founded, namely the Holy Catholic Church, and for which He labored during His life here, and which He bade His apostles to go and teach all, not only one another, but all; not only unity of ideas, but unity of mutual love, subservient only to love for their Creator. He wished us to follow Him as the one model as He Himself said "I have given you an example." There was to be unity, also, in their habits of life. And perhaps all is best expressed in the sublime, beautiful and pathetic prayer of our Divine Lord at the Last Supper. See the importance attached thereto: "I am not in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep them in Thy name, whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one as we also are one." And a few verses lower: "And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me; that they may be all one, as thou Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Unity was to indicate that Jesus Christ came down from heaven. "The world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast also loved me."

Among the primitive Christians there undoubtedly existed the true spirit of the Gospel. Their unity is attested by the graphic description of them as all of one heart and of one mind. But we live in times when, as St. Paul has remarked, men "will not endure sound doctrine; but according to their own desire they will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and will indeed turn away their hearing from the truth." No one can deny the religious differences among people, so much to be deplored—in itself a proof of the absence of God's work—and we hail with joy and offer our prayers for the success of the recent efforts towards the reunion of Christendom and the bringing together of the scattered fragments of Christendom, thus in a manner repairing the catastrophe of the sixteenth century. Americans can recognize the paramount value of unity. Is not the motto of our beloved country "E Pluribus Unum?" In song and in story are perpetuated the words "United we stand, divided we fall." The strongest proof of our love of unity is found in the fact that to preserve it, our noble "boys in blue" have shed their blood upon the battlefield. And is it not a sad fact that we leave so many to be desired in our family relations? Not only is the observance of moral unity lax, but even the material unity seriously threatened. It is an egregious error to suppose the state is composed of individuals. No! It is composed of families. The unity of the state, the stability and firmness of the nation depend on families.

Honor then to those who strengthen the bond of unity in the family relations!

Not only the laxity with regard to moral unity, but the frequency and the facility given to the severance of the material unity forebodes the death of the nation. To quote an example, the government statistics for the years 1830 to 1880, a period of fifty years, show that the population increased by

70 per cent., while the number of divorces increased by more than 500 per cent. Where must it all end if not checked? The New England States, as the abode of the Pilgrim Fathers, one would consider as characteristic of the national life. Statistics further prove that homes at the rate of three thousand a year are broken up and that a half million cases of divorce stand to the national discredit. The Morning Post of June 20 1883, calculated that, at the then existing rate of progress, in twenty years the number of divorces would equal the number of marriages! Where is it all to end? Examine the recent statistics and the alarming fact exists that the evil is on the increase. The purpose of the legislature seems to lead to the deterioration and destruction of families. Witness our own legislature. All honor to those who attempt to frustrate these infamous attempts against the good of the family. The matter would not have been referred to but for the fact that some Catholics have sometimes figured in these cases, scandalizing their neighbors, and practically denying their faith. That this fact exists shows that something is radically wrong in their homes.

Such, then is the hydra-headed monster, the consuming Moloch of families, Divorce. But close upon it follows a second fiend, one to be dreaded because sufficient attention is not paid to it: it is not sufficiently dragged before the light of day—family desertion. In the large cities of our States the facts are simply appalling. From the official report of a charitable institution in a city of 350,000 inhabitants, last year, on a certain day, they had on their books 400 deserted wives, clamoring for work or funds to procure bread for their starving children. Counting five to every family, there would be of every 17 families deserted! What a frightful condition! Four years ago in another place a conservation disclosed the fact of the existence of 73 such families, and a similar investigation in Detroit would probably furnish no better showing. It is a frightful condition of affairs and suggests some work for the ambition of the legislature against these fiends.

These may be termed uprooting fiends; they tear up families by the roots and destroy the material unity. But there are others which we may style "disturbing" fiends, which attack the family's moral unity. The principle must at once more be laid down that the family is from God and that nothing from any other source affects it. The father is the divinely appointed administrator of God's property, and all the rights, power, authority and privilege he possesses are derived from God, whose representative he is. Is it not then his interest, not to mention his duty, to see the honor and dignity of God respected in his family? An ambassador at the capital is the representative of some foreign potentate, and his honor and dignity rises and falls in proportion to the honor and dignity of his sovereign and country, and doubtless he sees their rights and privileges intact on account of his own position. So with the father—he is the defender of the rights of God, and it is his duty to see that the rights of God are respected and enforced in the little world over which he has been set by God, as head. God's voice alone imposes belief; let the father look to it that he obtain respect for teaching power. He must be the initiator of young minds and shape them in many subjects of which they know nothing. There is no necessity for a rigid uniformity in minor matters, such as politics. But the rule of St. Augustine, referring to the family, is also applicable to the family: "In dubiis libertas; in necessariis, unitas; in omnibus, caritas." "In doubtful matters, liberty; in essentials, unity; in all things, charity." No minimizing or compromising; the rights of the father are not to be interfered with, but must be positively enforced and protected by the head of the family. But how can this happen in families where extremes are found, where true piety and open hostility to Christianity exist at the same table? "Oh! religion is never mentioned," it is said. "On what foundation, then, is your home built? Not on Christ; and St. Paul says there is no other foundation. To recognize unity you must be agreed on unity. Is the foundation on atheism, irreligion or indifference? Atheism is the denial of all centers. You may prate and brag and boast of irreligion, but you dread it in the family, in a husband, a wife or dissipated child. Indifference is impossible. Can one be indifferent as to sanctity, education or other matters? Has God no claim? Is there no defender of His rights in your family? On what foundation are you building? Not on Christ, and again there is no other foundation."

But you say the religious part is left to your wife. Who appointed her to this duty? Certainly not God. To her honorable position as a mother this task has not been assigned. God has not given you power to delegate your obligation. You cannot get any one to take up your priesthood; you, and no one else, must discharge the duties thereof; there can be no substitution. A family without a father is as a ship without a pilot, a state with-

out a governor. It cannot be admitted what is often said, that should God call one parent to Himself, it were better that the father died. Yet in view of the shameful education of Christian fatherhood so prevalent it might be better so. Certainly when the father dies, the best part of the family goes; he is the pilot, the government, the center of revolution and attraction.

But if a father abdicate his duties and responsibilities as defender of the rights of God, let him read the story of Eli. A similar fate will be his. To have a happy home one must have a Christian home, and this is not possible unless you are a good Christian father, an imitator of Christ, a defender of God's rights. So it is and so it will remain. This is the one rallying-point, all differences of antecedents and family traditions and all that is not in harmony obliterated, all united on this one point to give to God what is God's, not only individual homage, but the collective worship of the family, a common profession of faith and practice to correspond.

A lack of attractive power in the center of the family is a fourth fiend. Two in one, is the center round which all revolves, to which all is drawn; a center fixed, immutable and sympathetic. A confusion similar to the displacement of the poles, or the deviation of some nervous center, would follow a deviation of this center. When jealousies, disagreements between parents or open quarrels occur, a universal shock is experienced, and individual souls suffer. The center of attraction will never get back to its original position. The child by nature thinks its parents perfect, their knowledge boundless. They do not think their childish questions could embarrass those patterns and embodiments to them of all that is good and beautiful. Would that the sad experience of their lives could be spared! As years pass, they see in them blemishes and ugly deformities; instead of models of perfection, they find objects of disgust; instead of attracting they repel; instead of elevating they debase, and in place of purifying they pollute by their daily contact.

Some parents are described in a sardonic manner in a newspaper article on the training of parents. Fittingly the children are spoken of as the governors and the parents as the governed. Some parents abdicate gracefully and cannot regain their lost power. It is suggestive that a chair be founded at one of the Universities to instruct children in the art of training parents. The little tyrants place a high price upon their favors; obedience is rewarded, while smiles and frowns are the punishment of the reverse. But authority is from above, not from below. "Woe to the land whose king is a child," and woe to the home where a child is the ruling power.

The law of equality between child and parent is equally disastrous. To correct God's work is to spoil it, and any attempt to alter Providence will bring dire results. Not only will your rights be attacked, but affection will be lost. A schoolboy friendship only will exist between you and your children, yourself a novelty to be cast aside when some fresh attraction appears. Therefore they leave their homes, and leave you to the poorhouse or other charity. You have not learned to keep the respect of your children, and remember they will not love that which has proved unworthy of respect. Your proper place is at the head; you must always lead, not follow; you may bend, but you must not break; be a defender of the rights, of the honor and dignity associated with your position. Hence a high standard, elevated and attractive, which you must live up to. You must tune the souls of your children similarly to your own, and let your own tone be true, in harmony with the fundamental chord of the happy home of Nazareth, and a harmony will result, the prelude of that concert in which the angels join their melody, in the one large family in Heaven.

The discussion of another family field will be referred to later on. As December is the month of the Holy Childhood, "The Child" would be the subject of the following discourses. Woman's rights had frequently been heard of, but the rights of the child were hardly ever discussed. Next Sunday they will be enumerated from a Christian standpoint, and let parents, after hearing them, examine themselves and see if they have discharged their full duty to their children.

The Spirit of the True Missionary.

When Francis Xavier was about to depart from Rome on his great missionary work he was heard exclaiming in his sleep, "And yet more, O Lord, yet more." Long afterward he told his friend that on that night he had a vision. "The Lord had shown him all that he was to suffer in His service— that he was to suffer from every kind of weary journey, dangers of every kind, to deep rivers to cross, savage lands to explore, sickness, tortures, death; but at the same time were shown the lands he was to bring to Christ, the great numbers that would be saved; and his soul was so aroused that he cried out for more—more sufferings, and more souls brought into the kingdom of God."