

IV. Life of the Church

D. Church Rules and Regulations

138.

Sermon, Book 1, No. 12

Sunday Obligation

(Sermon for Purcell)

The God Whom we serve is so infinitely great and holy that He deserves to be adored, loved constantly, praised and glorified by all His creatures, but as the various occupations inseparable from human life will not permit us to be constantly employed in spiritual works, the Creator has appointed one day in seven which is to be specially consecrated to His service. This day is the first of the week, which He commands us to keep holy as He commanded the Jews to observe the Sabbath or Saturday. Remember, He says, remember to keep holy the Sabbath day. It is on this account that the Church designates it by excellence "the Lord's day." The Jews believed that they fully satisfied the precept by abstaining from servile works, by avoiding with an extreme and critical exactness every kind of labor, but for Christians it is not sufficient to refrain from secular employments, we must also devote it to good works and pious exercises. Our reflections on the subject may be therefore devoted in the first place to show that the Sabbath and festivals are designed for the repose of men and secondly that the Sundays and festivals must be specially consecrated to the service of God.

1. The observance of the day has been the subject of much controversy since the Reformation, as it is called, when the puritanical spirit, always anxious for exterior holiness, attempted to introduce a rigor in the observance of the day, oppressive to the heart and wholly inconsistent, as history proves, with the kind and loving spirit of the Christian religion. The observance of the first instead of the last day of the week is a precept not in the scripture but tradition. There is not a word in the Bible to authorize the substitution of Sunday for the Jewish Sabbath, but on the contrary, the most fearful denunciations are uttered against those who refuse to keep holy the Saturday or last day, according to the Pentateuch. But in the face of the written law, in positive contradiction, as it seems, to the commandment announced with such divine grandeur and solemnity on Sinai, the day has been changed from the one specified by the Almighty, and the only reason we can give for it is Apostolic Tradition. The Catholic Church has so ordered it, and God has said of her, he who hears you hears me. Ever since our Lord had risen on the first day of the week, Sunday has been the Lord's Day, the Christian Sabbath. In the early days of the Church its observance may be said to have commenced on Saturday night, as St. Augustine says in one of his sermons-- "Let all who can be present at night at the first vespers and matins, but on the day itself let no one be absent from the holy Mass." In our time the observance may also be said to

commence on Saturday, where the faithful come to the confessionals to purify their consciences. Thus it may be seen how uniform, how exact, how enduring, how sublime is that Tradition which perpetuates in God's Church His faith and its practice amongst all people and tongues from generation to generation. Every thing in the Church manifests its capacity to resist and overcome the encroachments of time. But by the same Apostolic Tradition there are certain festivals whose observance is equally ordained, such as the incarnation of the divine Word, the crucifixion, resurrection and ascension of our Lord and the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. The obligation of consecrating these days springs from the same authority which has changed the day of the Sabbath, from the order of the Church. And as in progress of time the martyrs died, the confessors preached, the doctors wrote, the hermits and anchorites fled to the deserts, as the children of the Church departed from age to age from earth, she who alone can give true immortality has set them in the firmament like stars and appointed days for their honor when we may remember their virtues and invoke their intercession. "The just, says the Psalmist, shall be in everlasting remembrance." Next to those of our Lord the festivals in honor of the Blessed Virgin were commemorated with the greatest devotion, and though in later times the Latin Church has been made glorious by her praise yet in the early days her festivals were observed as they still are throughout all the Eastern Churches, and in the Greek Church, her Immaculate Conception has been devoutly celebrated from the beginning. Now the Church commands the faithful to observe all days of precept as they do Sunday, by abstaining from servile works and by consecrating the day.

The body has need of repose. Sunday is a day of rest for the body, of tranquility for the mind. It would be impossible amidst constant tumults to elevate the soul. It is necessary to have a day to retire from life. We cast anchor in the stream of time, soon again to be [end of a page -- something is missing to complete this sentence.] We leave the darkness at the mountain's base, ascend above the thunder, and in the clear radiance and deep stillness of Sinai read the law and judge if we have kept it. The law of Moses was rigorous, terrible in its exactions. God even struck down an Israelite for taking up a withered branch, but the law of the Gospel is not so. It is merciful, it forbids servile works such as constitute the civil life of the Christian. Whatever tends to bind the mind to the daily occupation of the Christian is servile labor. It thus becomes ingratitude, for God asks one only out of seven. All actions necessary for the conservation of life and property are permitted. If a long ---- [overwritten] has, or if, as we read in the Gospel, a neighbor's ox should fall into a pit. So it is permitted to read or write on the Sabbath, provided it be nor for mercenary motives. In cases of importance also it is permitted to travel. The Church with her divine light gives a reasonable and just view to this as to every other subject.

But so soon as we depart from this law of love in our consideration of the

Sabbath, then we fall at once into errors. Jansenism and Puritanism. The mind is weakened by it in its capacity to judge, while all the passions are strengthened. Take the history of any nation. Take England under Cromwell, see how perverse is the will, see the rebound under Charles the Second. With an exterior of ultra Godliness, there is an interior life which is sure to be developed in the most shameful vices, vanity, self-conceit. The Puritan is also to the last degree intolerant, tyrannical and oppressive. No law of a generous nature can be traced to him; or if he finds it acting advantageously for others he will use his efforts to suppress it. When we took possession of California, the people from the States were shocked at what they called the desecration of the Sabbath. So they commenced and took possession of the land. Plundered, robbed, murdered, not a Mexican in possession! Another peculiarity, attending this extreme observance of the Sabbath, is that the people who practice it are even famous for starting extravagant opinions, social and political, by which society is disturbed. There is a dignity and repose in Truth unknown to error. The Sabbatarians in England persecuted each other, drove their brethren into exile and as soon as these grew powerful commenced the same course of persecution. All most devout on Sunday! The observance of the Sabbath in this Jewish fashion is fatal to the best qualities of the human heart. It compels nature to be a hypocrite however forcibly she may resist, it binds in worse than iron fetters the intellect of the child and hence you will often find the son of the Puritan the most abandoned, the most regardless even of appearances. It is this same spirit which is now agitating England. The people of great cities, suffering for air, for recreation, rush to have music forbidden! But this shows the consciousness prevailing in certain minds, that the people must be forced by law. The teachers of error have no supernatural hold on their flocks, and hence they strive continually to impart formal, rigorous and sanctimonious method to their actions. There is nothing of the love of God in this manner of keeping Sunday. There is in it no ray of His truth, no breath of His mercy.

But other enemies of Christ take a different course. They claim to abolish it all together. Run into extremes, anxious to make it a day of riot and debauchery. But they also fail. During the first French revolution, the infidel legislature abolished the Sunday. Men became irritable and unhappy, families grew desponding and gloomy, even the nature of brute animals rebelled, and they did not in the ten days do half the work which they had done in seven, and they became diseased and died in such numbers that the law was repealed. So far, the enemies of the Sabbath.

With us all is different. The Church commands us to keep the day religiously and rationally. Being the day appointed by the Lord for His special service, it is a day when we are more likely to receive graces. The cessation of servile labor is but a means by which it is proposed to arrive at a spiritual rest. The repose of the soul, the tranquility of the heart, piety and the practice of good works and religious exercises are all

commanded by the precept. Now the worst servile work is sin. This is the most scandalous violation of the Sabbath, to select the Lords' day to insult Him. To desist from daily labor, if you do not desist from sin, is no observance of the Sabbath, and yet is it not true that many people, and particularly many Catholics, give great scandal on this day. It was only, I believe, last Sunday that a Catholic, drinking and contending with the enemies of his faith in a place of public resort, yielded his life without a moment of preparation. How sad are the reflections which a pious relative must entertain when lamenting over such an unhappy death.

But it may be asked, "What is required on the Lord's day?" First devout attendance at Mass, remembering that it is on such days that we endeavor to correct errors of the weak, to enter again by a penitential spirit into the favor of God, reconciliation with our neighbor, that in union with the divine victim on the altar we should offer a contrite and humble heart to the Eternal Father. On this day we should form good resolutions, avoid in the present week the sins of the past, meditate on the Gospel, recall to mind all that God has done for you in particular and then beg to offer Him thanksgiving, and praise and pray for perseverance. And when this service has passed there is no violation of the Sabbath in sinless recreation. This has been the practice of the Church from the beginning. I wish, says St. Chrysostom, that the faithful on the Lord's day would elevate their minds to God at their first waking from sleep, that they would consecrate to Him their affections and then say to themselves, "This is the day of rest, this is the day when it is in a special manner my duty to prove that I am a Christian. On this day will I assist devoutly at the holy sacrifice leaving at the door of the church all my worldly cares and occupations."

Let us, according to this advice of St. Chrysostom, devote the day to almighty God and render to Him the homage we owe Him as our creator. Let us be careful not only to avoid giving scandal but to lead others by our good example to a religious life. Thus we will fulfill the law of the Sabbath here, and prepare to enjoy the repose which God will give us in His eternal Sabbath.

139.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Oct. 2, 1875 (6)

[Rest for the Workers]

[from the *Columbus Evening Dispatch*]

The people of Nicaragua are beginning to calculate the loss which the Catholic Church imposes on them. There are 82 feast days set down, says a local writer; this, calculating the laborers in Nicaragua at 15,000 at thirty cents a day average, gives an annual loss of \$3,600,000. To this sum has to be added the loss to agriculture, to the crops, &c., which cannot fail to

140 - A Local Question

make the loss amount to five or six millions, besides the sickness, killed and wounded, which generally attend such feast days.

The class of men who hire laborers at thirty cents a day are the ones who are always calculating how much religion costs them. It was so when the feasts were established by the Church. Owners of slaves, and employers of quasi-slaves, wanted all the work they could get out of them. The Church demanded, in the name of the Redeemer of all, time for the toilers to worship God and hear instruction. Hence the decree by which the observance of holidays and Sundays is made to consist of abstaining from servile works and assisting at Holy Mass. The Puritans by mixing the Jewish Sabbath with the Christian Sunday contrived to make its observance grotesque and hateful. They were bound, if the people *did* rest, they should not enjoy themselves!

140.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Sept. 5, 1878 (3)

A Local Question

Editor Catholic Columbian:

Are those persons whose toilet does not permit them to come before the Gospel of the Mass on Sunday, obliged to hear another Mass, and if they fail so to do are they to consider themselves guilty of mortal sin? Please answer to the interest of those who were reprimanded last Sunday.

And again, it would be to our interest to know, for what business Mr. D. M----- stands before the cathedral, every Sunday during the time of Mass, smoking cigars, and staring at persons as they enter church.

Ans. The regular tailor and hairdresser, belonging to this office, is off on a little vacation trip to the North Pole, and we must await his return for views on a theological toilet. Our own impression, at present, is that whoever comes to Church after the Gospel MISSES MASS.

2. We will ascertain from the young gentleman himself, whose name we suppress, the answer to the second question.

141.

Editorial, the New Orleans *Morning Star and Catholic Messenger*, Dec. 30, 1877

Permitted Sunday Activities

Editor Catholic Columbian: Can a conscientious Catholic go to a pic-nic on a holiday of obligation? Can one go walking, or play games, or read other than pious books, on those days, and on Sundays?

142 - The Easter Communion

ANSWER.

If a conscientious Catholic goes to Mass, and abstains from servile works on a Holiday or a Sunday, he has done all that he is obliged, under pain of sin, to do, and may partake of any amusement that is lawful on any day of the week. It would be better, however, to be very moderate in such amusements, and particularly avoid scandalizing those honestly infected with Puritan notions.

142.

Lecture, *The Catholic Columbian*, February 20, 1875

This lecture was given at St. Joseph Cathedral in Columbus at vespers on, apparently, Sunday February 14, 1875. The Catholic Columbian of February 6 under the headline "Instruction in St. Joseph's Cathedral" names Rosecrans as the speaker. No lecture was given on the next Sunday because the water pipes to the Cathedral had frozen and no steam could be made for heat that weekend.

The Easter Communion

The law of the Church commands all Catholics who are capable of it to receive Holy Communion at Easter, or during the Easter time, under the pain of mortal sin, and at the discretion of the ordinary who may publish their neglect or omit to notice it, as he thinks proper, of excommunication from the Church.

The Catholic Church, which is at the same time a divine and human institution, has a soul and a body like a man. The body is the hierarchy and all rightly baptized persons throughout the world. The soul is the grace of God--the Spirit of Grace Himself as some think.

A man separates himself from the soul of the Church by any mortal sin. He falls from his companionship with the angels, forfeits his citizenship in the heavenly kingdom, and becomes fellow with devils and reprobate men by a single act of willful disobedience to the law. You all know this well. You know that faith alone will not save us, but that faith without works is dead; that if a man had faith strong enough to perform miracles, but has not charity he is nothing. You know what the Council of Trent defined against Luther and Calvin who denied the necessity of good works for salvation.

The sin, therefore, of neglecting the Easter Communion has nothing peculiar in it, as far as severing the soul from God's friendship is concerned. But it is counted so grievous a sin that the Church punishes it by excommunication--forbidding the Sacraments in life and denying Christian burial after death--to those who are proclaimed from the altar as guilty of it.

In the beginning of the Church there was no need of any such law. With the

sword of persecution hanging over their heads, men did not ask for Baptism who had not made up their minds to exchange this life for the eternal one. And so Communion, which is a mingling of our soul with the Redeemer's, and is a foretaste of heaven, was to them all in all, and they received as often as they could find opportunity.

But when the Church came forth from the catacombs, and became a power in the world, many were baptized because it was the fashion, and lived afterwards the same heathen life they would have lived had they never known the Sacrament.

There were two reasons why these scandalous and neglectful Catholics had to be noticed by some enactments of the Church: First, to neutralize the scandal of their neglect. Scandals will come. The young innocent heart of a baptized child opens out almost spontaneously to the teachings of faith. His aspirations are so high when he is yet pure, that the mother who tells him of heaven as his home, of Jesus Christ, savior and model of men, of Mary, type of all that is pure and beautiful in woman, of his guardian angel always hovering around him, of the loveliness of purity, generosity, fidelity, and all virtues, seems rather to be awakening his consciousness to what he knew already, than imparting information. And so he remains until he begins to see corruption in those to whom he looked for guidance and example, and hears sin made a matter of course and a jest. Then a taint of corruption steals slowly over his soul and by degrees makes him like the rest.

Men do not stay away from their Easter without other scandal. They are involved in other sins and in attachment to them. They are chained by habits of drinking or cursing or impurity or avarice, and they love their bondage--before they stand back from the Holy Altar. And the church wants to be able to say to weak souls that cannot understand how, if Communion is so good, these men who have been raised Catholics and ought to know, keep away from it. Be not scandalized by this example. These men are not Catholics. They were once, but like Judas they have sold their Lord for what they could get; one for sensual indulgence, another for money, ill-gotten, another for anger, another for impurity. They were Catholics; they are no longer. To the careless beholder they seem like green trees planted near the flowing waters; but a second glance shows them to be like trees blasted by cold or lightning, lifting up their sapless trunks and spreading out their leafless branches, a spectacle of desolation in the midst of life about them. They may still come to Mass through habit or fashion; but as they kneel with the rest before the altar when the Holy of Holies descends to his beloved resting place to bring healing to His people, what a contrast is the darkness in their souls to the spiritual light around them.

St. John saw, in the Apocalypse, one hundred and fifty-four thousand virgins brought from amongst men, who followed the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. And to the prophet Daniel was spread out a vision of the throne, surrounded by thousands and tens of thousands of ministering spirits. These are with Jesus Christ when he comes

down upon the altar, and, invisible to us, fill the sanctuary. They drink in the pious wishes--the acts of faith, hope, charity, contrition, adoration and thanksgiving--that come up like clouds of incense from the sincere and humble hearts of the kneelers, and lay them before their and our God. But there is darkness in the heart of the false and neglectful Catholics; the darkness of willful sin, through which the devils--rightful dwellers there, and masters--come and go, mocking him of whom they hold the mastery, and greedily looking forward to the time when death shall come and give them leave to drag that soul to their own eternal darkness.

Their example counts for nothing then, any more than the example of Judas. If it counts at all, it counts as a warning to all not "to be high-minded but to fear," and "in fear and trembling to work out our salvation."

The second reason why those neglecting their Easter duty were excommunicated was that they might be startled by the penalty into consideration of their state and consequent amendment of life. Excommunication is not a vindictive penalty, but a medicinal one; that is, it is intended not merely as a punishment of scandalous sins, but rather as a remedy. St. Paul, excommunicating the incestuous Corinthian, says he does so "to the destruction of the flesh," (the wicked desires of the flesh) "that the spirit may live." In our times excommunication is not so severe a temporal penalty as it was when this decree was made. Then, an excommunicated person was avoided by all who were not compelled by necessity to approach him, and to be buried outside of consecrated ground brought an inefaceable stain upon his family.

Now, a person has little or nothing temporal to fear from being deprived of the Sacraments--nay, many seek to advance their worldly ends by depriving themselves of them. Thus we find in our own country persons willing to stay away from Communion through opposition and contempt of Catholic education; for the sake of mixed marriages; in order to curry favor with a prejudiced anti-Catholic society; and for many other pretexts equally frivolous and perverse.

Hence, pastors in this country have seldom thought it best to publish the names of those neglecting their Easter Communion, as the pain and disgrace would be felt more by their friends and relatives who have not apostatized, than by the criminals, and the question of Christian burial will agitate the souls only of the innocent, after the guilty have gone to the judgment of God. Like professed unbelievers, they have no place where they can be struck for healing. Spiritual corpses they linger in death until the last trumpet shall awake them too late for any other purpose than to acknowledge the justice of God, and say: "Therefore we have erred."

Are there any among those listening to me who think of neglecting their Easter duty this year? Quite likely. Would it be too much to ask them to face the question for an instant: Is it prudent? is it profitable? is it honorable for me to stay away from the Sacraments during this solemn season? It is never prudent to risk much for the chance

of gaining little. If a man has a fortune secure, and throws it all into a doubtful venture with the hope of adding a little to it, you would call him a fool. Now you have within easy reach the grace of God, a principedom in His eternal kingdom, your eternal happiness. Is not this a fortune? It is all the soul covets. For this it was created. Time passes; riches take wings; pleasures fall on the taste; glory vanishes; health decays; but the soul remains forever. And forever its unquenchable thirst is after union with God. See what you risk by delay. There is always risk in putting off the time when you are going to regulate your lives. You may die suddenly, or, living, the desire to do better may die out in your hearts, and leave "your spirit dark and cold."

He who stands now at the door knocking may get weary and go away. But in the Lenten season this risk is increased to an appalling degree, for then the cry of the universal Church is going up to God for mercy; then everywhere on the face of the globe the priests are standing between the door and the altar crying out: "Spare, O Lord, spare they people!"; then countless deeds of alms, fasting and prayer are going up for a memorial before God, that all may be converted and live. If, in this clamor of the universe, the heart remains unmoved, what but the final crash of matter will be able to stir it up?

And why should you run this awful risk? What profit is there in delaying, week after week, what you propose to do some day?

You have not time? Idle sayings! For what have you time? What cares, what perplexities, what occupation claims the place of God in your soul? Why, God gave you time for no other purpose than to serve Him, and to attend to this among other duties. Moreover, what you owe to God takes no time from any useful occupation. You are not called upon to go into the desert, to bury yourself in a cloister, to forsake the care of those belonging to you, but simply to forsake sin and the occasions of it and return to God by a sincere and contrite confession of your sins.

You have habits and associations that you cannot abandon just now. This is an old snare of Satan's. The strength of any sensual habit lies in our affection for it, and in nothing else. Once set the will firmly against it, and its power is gone. Look back upon the sensual pleasures that have passed away in your life. What do you care for them now? Their remembrance stirs you no longer, unless with loathing. St. Augustine says that only while his mind was wavering between God and sin, the images of sensual pleasure floated about in his fancy, seeming to say, "Canst thou do without me?" But when his choice was made, his will was set to save his soul at all hazards; the images fled away and left his soul bathed in a serene and tranquil light.

You have listened to the voice of passion until you are persuaded that you would die were you to deny it gratification. You have been tossed to the lowest depths of your soul--remorse following indulgence, and desire again stifling remorse. The longer you remain thus the stronger will the habit become. You could not cast it aside yesterday;

142 - The Easter Communion

you think you cannot today; when, therefore? Today: this Lent: if ye hear His voice, harden not your heart.

What, moreover, can you gain by the risk? Your future, painted by hope in such entrancing colors, vast and bewildering colors as it appears, is still within the confines of this life; it is food for vanity, or avarice, or lust--things that are no more to you than they were to the generations gone before. Their pleasures, their glories, their riches, are buried with their bodies, and they are living still in heaven or hell. So your dreams of joy will pass away like a mist in the morning, and with the uplifting of the veil that now hides eternity, they will vanish and be forgotten: and can you bear to think of exchanging eternity for these?

I know that some, particularly young people, take a kind of pride in staying away from the Sacraments, and so resisting the persuasions of pastor, parents, and religious friends, to show that they have too much independence to be swayed hither and thither by the bidding of others. But this thought, born of petulance, could never enter their minds, did they allow themselves time to reflect on what is truly honorable.

There can be no true honor without real worth: no real worth without steadfast virtue. It is not honorable to resist the right: it is not honorable to slight a devoted love, such as a mother's always is; it is not honorable to be ungrateful for true friendship and sincere kindness; it is not honorable to seek the silly praise of those who care nothing for you, and who laugh at your striving to please them by despising your parentage and renouncing the practice of your religion; it is not honorable to enter on a career of dissipation and irreligion which leads to the loss of health, credit, friends and life; it is not honorable to despise your baptismal vows, to forget the promises you made in First Communion and Confirmation, to outrage Jesus Christ, your only steadfast friend; to abandon the ranks of the children of Mary, and go over to her enemies.

There is no honor in sin. Every peevish act that grieves your father's heart, that adds to your mother's gray hairs, that gives countenance to the spirit of disobedience to your pastor, is a source of remorse in this life and of wrath in the life to come. When, therefore, they urge you to fulfill your Christian duties, lend them a docile ear. Suffer not the Easter time to pass away without a change in your lives. Begin all the more heartily because of the corruption and indifference all around you. Materialism is the fashion now-a-days. But like all other fashions it may lose its power and crumble in a day. Be you, with God's guidance and instruction, through the Church, your own fashion--the fashion of fidelity to all Christian duties, and that fashion will endure forever.

143.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, June 12, 1875 (3)

Settled

A priest in Boston has been sued for saying that a man, calling himself a Catholic, who was married by a preacher or a 'squire, and, of course, married with some impediment between him and the woman, was living in a state of mortal sin.

The Know-Nothing newspapers say that the question now will soon be settled, and we shall see whether priests have the privilege of saying that people are in mortal sin whose conduct the civil authority has sanctioned. We doubt about the "settlement." If the courts fine a priest for saying that a certain action is mortal sin, he cannot cease saying so on that account. And when the court and priest come before the tribunal of Christ, which cannot be long hence, the real settlement must come.

It is an awful thing to say that a man is in mortal sin, more awful still for him to justify the saying. But what people who have turned their backs on God and sneer at faith should see of terrible in it, who can explain? Why, they would consider it dishonorable to their manhood and independence *not* to be in mortal sin! And yet they want a human judge to declare the priest a slanderer who says that they are not free from stain in the sight of God!

144.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, June 26, 1875 (2)

The Ill-Considered Monysillable Again

In the *Catholic Columbian* of June 12th we stigmatized the assertion "Catholic authorities hold that all married persons not married by a priest of the Catholic Church [are living in adultery]" as an "unmitigated lie."

The *State Journal* has the audacity to say that the case of the Boston priest sued for slander because he said that a certain couple were not lawfully married, proves the assertion to be not a lie, or the priest to be the liar.

Now this priest made no general assertion, but spoke only of a particular couple.

He did not say (as far as reported) that the reason of the invalidity of their marriage was because they were not married by the priest.

The assertion made to create ill-feeling and religious rancor, that Catholics regard the marriages of non-Catholics as invalid, and their children as illegitimate, is malignantly untrue.

They have not the Sacrament of marriage, but they have the natural contract--such as all men had before the coming of the Redeemer--and the civil contract by which the civil effects of marriage are legalized.

145 - Why Wedding Banns?

They do not pretend to have the Sacrament, and cannot therefore feel insulted at our saying they have not.

Most undoubtedly the civil courts have legalized marriages which the Church considers invalid. But the civil authority cannot go beyond its sphere. It can treat the property and offspring of such persons as if they were married, but it cannot save their conscience in the Day of Judgment.

There are many impediments that render marriage as a Sacrament impossible between parties which the civil law does not recognize. For example, divorced persons cannot marry sacramentally; nor those within forbidden degrees of consanguinity; nor those who have taken solemn public vows of perpetual chastity.

The presence of a priest is necessary to the sacramental validity of a marriage only in those places where the Decree of the Council of Trent invalidating clandestine marriages has been published.

If I should say of two Catholics married according to the civil law, that they are not married according to the law of the Church, I do not contradict the decree of the civil authority. The couple is free according to law to leave the Church, but the civil court has no jurisdiction to compel me to say that they are married according to the laws of the Church. God is the judge in these matters. The State can take the property, but God alone can handle the soul.

All we can say of unbaptized persons is that they have not the Sacrament of marriage, and they will say the same, we presume.

145.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, February 7, 1878 (5)

[Why Wedding Banns?]

Editor Catholic Columbian:

Some few weeks before Advent I went to our priest and notified him of my intention of getting married on the following day. He told me it could not be so soon; that our names must be published in the Church three times, and we must go to Communion and be married at Mass. Now I would like to know what right he had to put me off in this way? I am well known here, and so is she. What use is there in our becoming the talk of the congregation for three weeks, and getting the boys all ready to "tin-pan" us, when the day comes? GROOM AT LAST.

Ans. The law of the Church requiring the publication of the banns binds the priest as well as you. His right to put you off until you were called is a part of his right to avoid sin and save his soul. Christian marriage is a sacrament of the living and must be received in a state of grace. The nuptial benediction, in full, is given only at Mass. You and she are both well known where you live. Every one knows that you were

never married before, and that she has no husband, that you are not related by blood, very well. Are you ashamed of her, or is she ashamed of you, that you are so afraid of having your names coupled together in the talk of the congregation? An hour after the marriage "they will all know it," why not two weeks before? As for the boys and tin pans, if you do not like them, make a little trip out of their reach, and come back on the midnight train. A basket of apples and a jug of cider will silence the tin pans at any time, and the barbarians will give a whoop and go away.

146.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, April 25, 1878 (2)

Prohibited Books and Papers

It would be hard to tell how far the index of Prohibited Books obliges those half-instructed Catholics who do not know what it is, much less what books it has condemned. But the principles of the Index prohibiting certain kinds of reading are binding on the most ignorant of Catholics. This liberty of speech and liberty of thought, when it means liberty of lying, as well as telling the truth, and of thinking wrong, as well as right, may do for politicians and old country Free Masons; but it will not stand the judgment of God in the eternal world. Practically its own advocates condemn it, when it trenches on their own pet doctrines. The sphere of prohibited reading may be narrow in some and broader in other circles; but there is such a sphere even among artists; and therefore the principle is acknowledged by all. The trouble is to get an authority to mark the limits of the sphere. Common sense, however, settles these principles: All books that are blasphemous, heretical or immoral are prohibited; and it is a sin to read them unless under certain exceptional circumstances. The excuse, "I am in no danger, and will not be moved," is simply self-delusion. Any person idly reading a bad book or listening to wicked discourse can no more help being hurt than he can walk into fire and not be scorched. Those who say, "Never fear for me," are as if they threw themselves into a tar-barrel without intending to become defiled. There is no case in which the reading of professedly obscene books is not a sin. The cases in which the reading of infidel and heretical works is allowed are determined by the authority permitting. For Catholics, that authority is the Church, which has the right to decide what is correct doctrine, both in theory and in fact. Outside the Church the authority is fashion, interest, caprice. In the Church, therefore, the decrees of the Congregation of the Index bind consciences throughout the world and though ignorance of a particular decree may be an excuse for a violation of it, there can be no excuse for maintaining the theory that a man has the right to read what books he pleases.

147.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, August 8, 1878 (4)

[No Outside Appeals]

The *Western Watchman* is of the opinion that the Canon law, excommunicating those who drag ecclesiastics before civil courts, is not in force in this country, because we have no ecclesiastical tribunals. The argument is a plausible one--but it would prove too much. It would prove that cousins might marry, and that "*qui percusserit clericum*" [he who hits a clergyman] would only have to pay his fine. We take it that a man is a Catholic by submitting to the living authority of the Church. He has a right to remonstrate, petition, and appeal to superior authority; but if he appeals to outsiders, to the general public, or to civil courts, he is a traitor and apostate, St. Paul mentions this matter.

148.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, May 12, 1860

The "Commercial" and the Excommunication.

The Editor of the *Commercial* professes to have read Tristram Shandy, at last; but he must have read it, with singular inattention, to have found it "substantially different" from the cursing which he translated for his readers from the *Courier des Etas Unis* (or, the *Paris Debats*.)

He has found, however, an "authentic document, in a Catholic work, written by the leaned Benedictine," (Maurist), "Dom Martin Bouquet." The work of Dom. Bouquet is a "collection of French Historians," which he was pensioned by the French Ministry to make, in the beginning of the XVIII. century,--a work he performed, says Feller, drily, "with more industry than judgment." That such a document should be hunted up and printed to throw light on the Catholic doctrine of excommunication, only show a lamentable want of that general information which we have pronounced necessary to the editorial duties of such papers as the *Commercial*. That doctrine is a matter of "general information" in current literature, in European history, from Constantine to Francis Joseph; and a knowledge of it is necessary to the intelligent reading of any European, Continental paper. It is laid down in our five cent catechisms, in the moral theologies of Kenrick, Gury, St. Liguori, Scavini, and in innumerable works of controversy in circulation among us. The imbecile pomposity of the *Commercial's* referring to the *Magnum Bullarium Romanum*, as a source of information on this topic, is too touching a specimen of the vanity of human pretensions to excite anything but pity.

An excommunication is simply a separation from the Church. It is not a penalty for crime that is past, but for crime that is persisted in, so that the person

excommunicated, is separated from the Church by his own willful act. In the believer's mind, such separation implies horrible evils, loss of God's grace, of innocence, of heaven: evils, however, not imprecated by the Church, but invited and embraced by the evil-doer. The substance of the formula of excommunication is "we excommunicate such or such a one," or "let such a one be excommunicated." Whatever else may have been added in any act of excommunication, is simply due to the rhetorical powers of the pontiff or bishop excommunicating. There may be instances in history, wherein some obscure bishop of Gaul or England or Spain has tried to imitate the 108th Psalm in developing the woes consequent upon separation from the Church; but it is not the custom of the Roman Pontiffs to depict them.

Our Saviour's form of excommunication was "let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican,"--St. Paul's, "we deliver him over to Satan for the destruction of his flesh,"--and the pope's, "we declare him excommunicated."

As to excommunicating being three hundred years behind the age, nothing but the flippancy of a semi-educated anti-Catholic could have cherished such a thought.

It is not behind the age for every association, whether religious, political, social or commercial, to have, and to observe its rules of membership. It is not three hundred years since the "Knights of the Golden Circle" expelled one of their prominent members; and trials, and expulsions, among Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Masons, Odd Fellows, Red Men, &c., &c., are of daily occurrence. Ages ago it was an established rule that no man could be a church-robber and remain a Catholic. This rule was repeatedly asserted, acted on, and reaffirmed by General Councils. In the Council of Trent it was declared to have reference to the patrimony of St. Peter. Victor Emmanuel knew this rule. He knew that by robbing the Church he would cease to be a Catholic. He chose for himself--and ceased to be a Catholic. The pope has declared as much--is that behind the age?

The idea that the Church has no right to govern herself, and decide who are members, and who not, is rather behind the age--it belongs to the times of defunct Gallicanism, Josephism, and French Constitutionalism, which were in vogue somewhat, in the XVIII. century. Why should the enemies of the Church be so anxious for the name of Catholic? Why should they desire to add to the guilt of impiety the meanness of hypocrisy?

149.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, November 12, 1853

Catholic Church Property.

The *Cincinnati Commercial*, announcing the late decision of Mons. Bedini, in the case of the property belonging to St. Louis' Church, Buffalo, referred to him by the

schismatical trustees, insidiously says, that thus a "novel principle" is proclaimed in Buffalo, it having been hitherto supposed, in that place, that Church property belongs to the laity as well as to the clergy.

Now we do not appeal to the fairness of the *Commercial* in what we are about to say. We found during the excitement about the school question, last spring, what we were to expect from *that*.--But as there may be some honest minds imbued with his false notions, we propose to explain how, according to the doctrine of the Church, ecclesiastical property is held.

1. In the first place then, ecclesiastical property belongs in fee simple, neither to the clergy nor to the laity, but to God. Pious grants, donations, &c. go not to this bishop or priest, or to that body of laymen, but to the Almighty. This is clear from the natural law; since property donated belongs to him, to whom the will of the donor consigns it. And it is true of all Church property--temples, vestments, chalices, &c., lands or money.

2. Hence, the revenues arising from Church property, belong to God, since property must "fructify to its owner." Now, revenues are to be administered according to the will of the person whose they are. The revenues derived from ecclesiastical property are therefore to be administered according to the will of God.

3. Now, here arises a difficulty which is solved differently by Catholics and Protestants, according to their different modes of faith, viz: who are the agents constituted by God to execute His will, in the administration of these revenues? Protestants, who do not believe that Christ founded any church, or gave to any body of men the power of teaching, and the authority of governing, generally make the civil government, whether despotic or republican--the executor of this will of God,-- thus "rendering to Cæsar" not only "what is Cæsar's," but also "what is God's." This they do, not because they have any scriptural authority for doing it, but because they see not, in their system, how else it can be done.

Catholics, on the other hand, believe that Christ founded a society, through which, the merits of His redemption were to be applied to future generations--and that He commissioned men as the ministers of His will, in this great work. St. Paul explains the Catholic doctrine on this point, by saying, "we are the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of His mysteries," and "we are the ambassadors of God." These men, sealed with the promise of the divine guidance, are the clergy. The clergy therefore are the ministers or agents of God, to do His will in the administration of His revenues, as in other matters pertaining to the government of His Church. We read no where in scripture that God commissioned laymen, whether kings or people, to be his ambassadors; but we do read that He commissioned His apostles "to go" with "all power and preach to every creature;" that He told Peter "to feed both His sheep and His lambs;" that the *Holy Ghost* placed Timothy to *govern* the Church of God. To the clergy, therefore, according to Catholic doctrine, belongs the administration of ecclesiastical

revenues.

Whatever be objected to this doctrine, its *novelty* can startle no one. It is as old as the Catholic Church. Those who do not believe the Christian Church to be constituted as we believe it to be, may find fault with this corollary of its essential principle; but it can be "new" to no Catholic who knows his catechism.

Innumerable decrees of councils and popes have excommunicated laymen usurping the dominion of ecclesiastical revenues--and the fact that such is the teaching of the Church is notorious.

Nor is any injustice done to laymen in depriving them of all control of Church property. That property does to belong (as many think) "to the body of which they are members." *It belongs strictly and exclusively to God.* Now, no man is wronged in being deprived of what is not his own. Therefore whatever abuses occur in the administration of ecclesiastical revenues, God only is the person wronged.

"But," it may be said, "if you deprive the people from all control of church property, what will prevent the priests from making a frightful misuse if it?" We answer, in the first place, we do not see why that matter should concern you so much. The property is God's, and people do not ordinarily trouble themselves much about the administration of another person's possessions. You cannot in conscience touch it. Why therefore fret about it? We answer in the second place, that misuse of Church revenues by Catholic priests, is guarded against by the most stringent laws. The canons allow each priest a living from the funds of the church to which he is attached, and what remains [the law] enjoins to be expended on the poor. The execution of these canons is entrusted not to the people but to the ecclesiastical superiors of the different regions; and apart from the supernatural guidance promised by Jesus Christ to His Church, that execution is less liable to be thwarted by fraud, deceit, or trickery, than if it were in the hands of the people. The reason why ecclesiastical discipline languishes in Mexico is because the Mexican church has been separated from Rome, whence the truth of doctrine and the energy of discipline are derived.

To sum our whole argument: we have maintained that Church property belongs to God; that the clergy are the authorized agents of God, to whom, therefore, pertains the application of Church revenues to the sacred purposes for which God designs them, according to the provisions of Canon Law. No reasonable man, it seems to us, can object to this.

E. The Catholic Press

150.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, December 10, 1859

The Work for Catholics.

According to recent estimates, there are in the United States 3,177,140 Catholic souls to be saved. The editor of the *Metropolitan Almanac* believes that this estimate falls short of the real number; but at any rate, there are over three millions of Catholics in the republic. Each one of these has a mind to be instructed, passions to be subdued, thoughts to be regulated, besides the other and grosser needs of humanity. Among all these there are forty-nine bishops, or a bishop for every 64,000, round numbers; 2235 priests, or a priest for every 1400. These three millions are made up of almost countless nationalities, and lie loose about over a vast half hemisphere. The bishops and priests have enough to do, in baptizing, marrying, confirming, giving Holy Communion, furnishing Mass on Sundays and Holidays, hearing confessions, anointing, and in the instructions which the receiving of the Sacraments requires. To be sure, if all men, women and children would attend properly to the reception of the Sacraments, the work would be done. But unfortunately, among these three millions there is not a soul which does not, from time to time, need counsel in doubt, light in ignorance, reproof in error, encouragement in well-doing--not one for which charity may not feel and zeal work. So in the great mass of the Catholic population there is not a single good deed or example, not a single holy word that is not needed. From the sermon, or book that moves millions, to the little flower gathered for the Virgin's altar, all are necessary to the edifying of the body of Christ.

Hence we love to see Catholic schools and catechism classes, no matter how poor and imperfectly conducted, thinking not so much of what they fail to do, as of what they do. We hail with joy each new Catholic book, though roughly written, if it be full of Catholic thought.

From this point of view we think highly of the Catholic press. Of course we editors cannot, as such, administer the Sacraments, or guide the Church. But we can reach many a spiritual want, and apply to it its remedy by laboring humbly in our vocation. We can refute many a calumny, remove many a doubt, banish many an evil thought, by one little effort of brain and movement of pen. And each one of these efforts counts in the great aggregate of work to be done by Catholics.

Of the twenty-three German, French and English Catholic periodicals published in the United States, each is doing something for the good of our 3,000,000 souls. Some, it may be, are in a higher, some in a lower sphere, but all are good. The light that shines in the valley is as much needed as what gilds the mountain top. The legends of Mary have their place as well as the articles on infallibility. The harvest is great, but laborers

151 - Supply Must Precede Demand

are few and must work together, or it will not be gathered.

151.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, June 12, 1858 (2)

Supply Must Precede Demand.

There is heard a mutual complaint between those connected with the Catholic press and literature of the country and the public, who are expected to patronize both. The one party complains that there is no generous patronage extended to labor and talent specially devoted to Catholic interests. The other replies that patronage cannot be given when nothing of worth or value is offered. In deference of the Catholic body, many examples might be cited to show that in no country have Catholic works of acknowledged merit received a more liberal and generous patronage. The writings of Balmes, Brownson's *Essays and Review*, Spalding's *Miscellanea*, shew no lack of patronage, considering the class of readers for whom they were written; and we are mistaken if the works of Wiseman, Newman and Faber are not more extensively read in America than in the country of their authors. With these, and many other facts before us, the want of public spirit in the cause of Catholic literature and Catholic intelligence, cannot be charged to the Catholic community. And for the low condition of our Catholic press we are to seek some other cause, since it is confessedly low, when viewed in relation to the numbers and intelligence of the Catholic community. In America, the paper, periodical, often the book, is issued on a presumption that whatever wears a Catholic badge on the outside, no matter what its intrinsic merit is, lays under tribute the whole Catholic community. Talent and labor are dispensed with, the Catholic title is alone deemed sufficient as a passport to support and patronage. In this presumption is chiefly to be found the reason why our Catholic press cannot compare with that of other countries, even with that of England, where the Catholic population is below us both in numbers and wealth.

Those who conduct the press there do not presume on gratuitous support. They furnish instructive reading--and find subscribers.--They adopt the practiced maxim of this practical age, that the supply must precede the demand. They furnish weekly papers--we may give as example the London *Register*--that diffuse among their subscribers all the Catholic intelligence of the day--with general information on all the events transpiring in the world. They give evidence of ability and scholarship in their editorial management. The paper is issued there with the view, as its style and character import, of being read by thinking, intelligent readers, and not made up of topics fit only for boys and girls in their teens. In looking over our Catholic papers week after week, few indeed are the topics we discover which are of any general interest, few are the questions discussed which convey useful intelligence to readers,

while an undue space and importance is given to some petty celebration, May parties, the elegant addresses on the occasion, and such like matters, as are nothing but trifles in the columns of a newspaper.

Catholics require such information as other people--they are interested in the history of the present day--and their Catholic press, as the safest medium for them, should convey to them the general information required--diffuse sound vigorous Catholic thought among them--elevate them to a manly independent tone, in feeling and action, as Catholics, in the contest they have to wage with the infidel world around them. As we have cited England as an example for our emulation in the Catholic press, with more reason might we place before us for imitation her Catholic periodical literature. By this the zeal and talent of a few Catholics are infusing a current of Catholic sentiment through a language eminently Protestant, and not only diverting the Catholic mind from Protestant literature, but even by the eminent ability displayed in the periodical *magazines* lately started, exercising an influence over the Protestant feeling of the country. Whatever of this kind is published in this country, except the one standard Review, seems to serve no other purpose than prove our weakness and inability. Yet we cannot believe that the Catholics of England, or any other country, are more liberal in patronizing works devoted to Catholic interests, than the American Catholics are--if works that merit patronage, and not mere baby toys, under the name of Catholic literature, are offered to them.

152.

Editorials, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, September 30 and October 21, 1854

[The Unfortunate *Tablet*.]

We are sorry to see the tone of the *Western Tablet's* last article against the TELEGRAPH. The disregard of truth in the desire to triumph, when exhibited by school-boys in their badinage of wit, is sometimes ludicrous; but it is painful in a Catholic editor.

We are sorry to see the supposed personal feelings of the senior editor of this paper made a matter of public accusation against him. He has, probably, as good reasons as most men for his preferences; but he would not wish that either his preferences or their reasons should be a scandal to the Church.

We are sorry to see the young editor of the *Tablet* appealing to the authority of a clergyman to sanction his abuse of another clergyman, a vicar-general of an archdiocese.

From a statement of the pecuniary affairs of the *Tablet* which appeared in that paper a short time ago, it appears that it is not supported; we are sorry that the tone of the paper does not permit us to regret it.

[Quarrels within the Catholic Press.]

"QUARRELING.--We observe with pain that some of our cotemporaries cannot get along unless they are in hot water with somebody. Quarreling is bad among newspapers of any class, but among Catholic newspapers it is, to us at least, most inconsistently so. The *Catholic Telegraph* has always acted with a kind of fatherly care over the Catholic press of the United States; but it would seem that some of our brethren of the tripod do not display much filial affection in return. Among the latter is our young friend of the *Western Tablet*, who breaks right out on the *Telegraph* with a perfect torrent of feeling--not *very* affectionate, nor according with the precept "In all things charity," which seems to have driven the editor of the *Telegraph* out of his sanctum, and obliged him to take refuge behind the chair of the "Vicar-General of an archdiocese." Seeing the position of the *Telegraph*, a Young Ireland sheet, published in New York city, comes to the rescue; but who, we fear, hurts him more in attempting to save him than the *Tablet* effected in trying to injure him.

"Gentlemen, cease your petty quarrels. We have got one common work to perform against a common enemy; and instead of showing a *broken* front, let us march forward a perfect phalanx, which, though small in number, is incapable of a breach."--*Detroit Catholic Vindicator*.

We have no doubt that our excellent cotemporary, in giving the above to the public, was sincerely desirous of making a true and soothing statement. We protest most earnestly, however, against the charge of having exhibited a dictatorial spirit towards our brethren of the press. We have taken no "refuge behind the chair of the Vicar-General of an archdiocese," but have expressed our regret that the senior editor of this paper should be singled out as an object of personal denunciation.

We fear that the "unbroken front" so commendably desired by our friend of the *Vindicator*, can never be "presented to the enemy" while the spirit of our Chicago cotemporary [the *Tablet*] remains what it is. That paper is now by its coarse denunciations, its reckless disregard of charity and truth, doing more against Catholicity, we fear, than for it. These are not looked upon by outsiders as *escapades* of boyish passion, but as the workings of a system; and the false charge that the Catholic religion permits the passions to run riot in her members, provided those members adhere to the faith, gains a coloring of apparent truth from a course supposed to be unrebuked among the Catholic body.

In what we say now we have no personal motive: to be vituperated as "untrustworthy," as "desirous of misrepresenting," as "malicious," as "sycophantic," as leagued in friendship with a paper, we have long since ceased to read--as enemies of an

Order, we have, when occasion called for it, studiously defended,--though hardly to be expected from one who shelters himself behind his character of Organ, is, nevertheless, no matter to us. When the dissolution of the *Western Tablet* shall take place, (an event which unequivocal symptoms show to be proximate,) or when the editor, advancing in years, shall learn to control his petty passions, or at least to hide them from the public, we may hope that the desire of the *Vindicator*, to which we cordially assent, will be finally gratified.

The Western Tablet was published in Chicago, beginning in 1852, by Daniel O'Hara. It is not known to have been published after 1855.

153.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, November 10, 1860

Catholic Fault-Finding.

A spirit of cavil and censure among Catholic writers would be a matter of regret. Literary abilities are worse than wasted, which are used in setting forth faults and imperfections, with no view to their remedy. The criticisms that have appeared within the last few months on our colleges and schools and seminaries, on the character and attainments of clergymen, on our mode of administering ecclesiastical property, were, no doubt, well intended by their authors; but to us they appear unwise, unjust and pregnant with mischief.

They seem unwise in fixing a standard of excellence beyond the need and capacity of the Catholic population in America. To blame any one for not doing what is not needed, is foolish. When we need great universities such as were founded by the Catholics of old England we will no doubt get them. When all the Catholics shall be so far Americanized that no awkward man, with an imperfect pronunciation, can remind them of death, judgment, heaven and hell, Providence will, we humbly hope, be ready for the exigency. The present is the day of small things; let us level our thoughts with our condition, and try to see what can be done with the materials we have in hand,--By work.

They are unjust because they implicitly charge apathy and supineness on the part of those who are laboring incessantly--the pastors of the Church. If we have not suitable schools, colleges and seminaries, our pastors should discover and seek to remedy it. Are they apathetic, wanting in zeal, as a body? Think of what they do, before you cavil at their supposed omissions. There is hardly a bishop in the United States, whose diocese has not grown up under his charge--who has not been personally, and pecuniarily liable for the orphan asylums, hospitals, religious houses, schools, colleges, seminaries, within his jurisdiction. They have been obliged to do all the duties

154 - Use of Intoxicating Beverages

of the missionary and administrator, at the same time. They have had to borrow and beg, and shift and manage; and while these censors are wondering why they do not endow a university with half a million they may be financiering to meet a payment of a small church debt, or a bill for their seminarians' half-year's tuition. What is said of the prelates is applicable, in due proportion to the pastors of the second order. It is unjust therefore to blame this overworked body for not having undertaken schemes, the realization of which belongs to a settled, and more than prosperous condition of Catholic society.

The spirit of censure is pregnant with mischief. Want of reverence is a peculiarity of the great Republic. Here, more than elsewhere, men are unwilling to take any good for granted in their neighbors, or to be cautious in throwing out praise and blame. And this want of reverence is fostered by depicting impracticable perfection, and complaining that the ideal is not reached. It may be freedom of speech, display of manliness, and all that sort of thing; but American Catholics have more serious work before them, than display. Liberty of speech, is a poor reason to allege for fault-finding. The son who would make common talk of the quarrels between his parents, or retail to his street companions the faults of his mother, could scarcely find an honorable excuse in the plea of manliness.

A censorious people is not an humble, loving people; and faith will not be long in dying out of the hearts where charity has become cold. The Catholic writer should set his face against sensation literature, and find work in using his powers and acquirements, his philosophy, his erudition, his knowledge of literature and of human nature in defending truth and in setting forth the beauty of holiness.

154.

Editorial, reprinted in the *New Orleans Morning Star and Catholic Messenger*, Dec. 30, 1877

Use of Intoxicating Beverages

From the Columbus, Ohio, *Catholic Columbian*, which is edited by the Right Rev. S. H. Rosecrans, Bishop of Columbus, we take the following:

LANCASTER, O., Dec. 6, 1877.

Right Rev. Bishop Rosecrans:

Rev. Sir: I respectfully submit you the following, and expect to see a direct answer in the next issue of the *Columbian*: Are Catholic Journals consistent in advertising drinking saloons, their Irish whisky or any other kind? Are Catholics consistent in giving countenance to public balls, and such like, (when Catholic ladies of the first standing in the country denounce them)? Are Catholics justified in selling intoxicating liquor on pic-nic grounds, and other places of amusement, the proceeds for

benefit of church? It is all done, and then denounced from the pulpit. I am with due respect,

SINCERE.

ANSWER.

Catholic journals deal in news, and saloons, and Irish whisky, "or any other kind," come under this head. Catholic journals, moreover, have to take advertisements to support themselves when subscribers are few and delinquent. As to public balls, we have given our decision in these columns, last week. "Ladies of the first (or second) standing," are not authorities in any moral theology we have ever seen. Catholics are justified in selling intoxicating beverages, at any place, to those who will not abuse them, and may appropriate the proceeds to what lawful purpose they see fit. Our correspondent must not be wise above what is written. The evils of to-day and the fanaticism provoked by them must not be allowed to abridge human rights.

155.

Editorial, *Diocese of Columbus: The History of Fifty Years 1868-1918* p 69

[Diocesan Organs]

Our friend talks a little too contemptuously of papers that are 'organs.' An 'organ' can make better music than a Scotch fiddle any day. He would not be 'burthened' with the approbation of any Bishop, yet he is a pious soul with an ink bottle full of obedience for the Pope and prelates of the Church.

The above was the last editorial written for The Catholic Columbian by Bishop Rosecrans. It was found on his desk after his death.

It was directed towards James McMaster, editor of the Catholic paper of New York City called The Freeman's Journal. McMaster was a convert to the Catholic faith. In an editorial in his paper he had made some comment about Diocesan "organs," and intimated that he did not want to be burthened with episcopal approbation.

McMaster was appreciative of Bishop Rosecrans. On the bishop's sudden death, the Freeman's Journal called him "brilliant" and said, "The Catholic Church has lost a distinguished Bishop; and we feel, personally, that we have lost a friend."