

Church cannot be answerable for their errors and sins, which are explained, though not excused, by the manners of the times, or by statecraft. If you wish to know the tenets of the Church on this matter you should peruse the books which contain her authentic teaching. It is all comprised in one principle not presently invented to plead her cause, since it goes back to the thirteenth century, to medieval times, when the Church, having supreme sway, could easily have appealed to might; it was formulated by St. Thomas, the Philosopher of genius and the prince of theology. Here it is: 'The civil government ought to imitate God's government. Now God suffers, tolerates, permits errors and vices on earth, because in His goodness and justice He can draw from them a greater good; in like manner the Government ought to be tolerant for the greater good of its subjects.'

Such is the Doctrine of the Church,

her authentic doctrine, what she always taught prior to St. Thomas, what she always practised. Let us illustrate these principles by citing some examples, which we shall borrow from certain facts on which the Church nowadays has been most fiercely and wantonly attacked. When Charlemagne waged those well-known sanguinary wars with the Saxons to force them to embrace the Christian religion, one of his courtiers, a monk of wide renown, Alcuin, rose to remind the monarch of the rules of the true apostolate. 'Truth,' said he, 'is an act of the will, and not of restraint. You attract men to the faith, you cannot force them. Let the propagators of the faith be instructed by the example of the apostles; let them be preachers and not plunderers.'

After the massacre of Protestants called in history the 'Saint Bartholomew,' Pope Gregory XIII. had the Te Deum chanted and ordered processions by way of thanksgiving. Intolerance, cruelty! you exclaim. No; a mere mistake, a mistake shared in by the other European courts; for King Charles IX. had by his ambassadors spread the news of a conspiracy which he had escaped. When the Pope learnt the truth he 'shed tears,' says Brantome, both regarding his mistake and this abomination. And when, later, the Cardinal of Lorraine presented to the Vatican, Marceuilles, the very man who had slain Coligny on the 22nd of August, Pope Gregory exclaimed: 'He is an assassin!'

Now listen to the words uttered by Pope Innocent XI., when he heard of the constraint put on the consciences of Protestants under Louis XIV., which prepared the fatal and impolitic 'Revocation of the edict of Nantes': 'Christ never employed that method; men must be brought, not dragged, into the Church. Such has been the invariable policy of the Church. When the Jews, pursued and persecuted in all directions because of their exactions, were at a loss to find a refuge, they found protection in Rome, the city of the Popes; there, under the aegis of the Popes, they freely practised their religion. Like Christ, the Church stretches out her motherly hands to all men, invites them all, proposes the truth to all, but imposes it on none, out of respect for liberty.'

(To be concluded in our next issue).

'ORATE FRATRES'

AN ARTICLE FOR THE LAITY

(BY THE REV. J. GOLDEN, KAIKOURA.)

In the Old Dispensation there were whole burnt offerings, sin offerings, thanksgiving offerings, peace offerings. The Book of Leviticus abounds with directions respecting these different kinds of sacrifice. 'If his offering be a holocaust.' Again: 'And if his oblation be a sacrifice of peace-offerings, and he will offer of the herd.' 'Once more: "These are the sacrifices which you shall offer." In Ecclesiasticus we read: "Do not offer wicked gifts."

Sacrifices were offered to Almighty God from the very beginning. 'Abel also offered of the firstlings of his flock, and of their fat, and the Lord had respect to Abel and to his offerings (Gen. iv., 4). St. Paul, in treating of the fruits and efficiency of faith, refers as follows to the sacrifice of Abel the just: 'By faith Abel offered to God a sacrifice exceeding that of Cain, by which he obtained the testimony that he was just, God giving testimony to his gifts. The expression under review is consonant with altar and sacrifice. 'And he (David) built there an altar to the Lord, and he offered holocausts and peace-offerings' (i Paral. xxi). In Exodus we read: 'These are the sacrifices which you shall offer.' And again: 'So

Jethro the kinsman of Moses offered holocausts and sacrifices to God.' 'Rising early in the morning, the Israelites offered holocausts and peace-offerings.' And the people of God were forbidden under penalty of death to offer their children to 'the idol Moloch.' This was an 'abomination which the Lord abhorreth, offering their sons and daughters and burning them with fire' (Deut. xii, 31). Those who were guilty of such heathenish abominations, 'dying let them die: the people of the land shall stone them.' One quotation more. This illustrates the ancient doctrine and practice of making oblations for the happy repose of the faithful departed. The valiant Jewish captain, Judas Machabeus, making a gathering, sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifices to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection. 'It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins' (ii. Mach., xii).

To sum up what has been so far advanced: The word 'offer' harmonises exactly with the idea of priest, altar, sacrifice. It is of ancient usage. It is the very best conceivable. Another

Apt and Time-honored Expression

is 'celebrate,' which comes in as a valuable auxiliary to express a definite meaning of its own. The priest has celebrated Mass is an orthodox expression. But a sacrifice is 'offered.' How forceful and appropriate are these terms in contrast with the bald expressions, 'read,' and 'said.' It follows that the sound and logical words should be carefully cultivated, while the objectionable modes of expression should be ruled out of court.

When we consider the nature of the Adorable Sacrifice offered on our altars, and when account is taken of the reverence, attention, and devotion required on the part of the congregation, how weak and inapt the common expression, 'hearing Mass.' Evidently 'assisting at holy Mass' and 'attending at holy Mass' are far better phrases, being more consonant with the obligation of the people. They harmonise with the meaning of Sacrifice and offering, as well as with the close connection existing between the congregation and the officiating priest. This intimate relation has already come under brief review. It is expressively set forth in the 'Oratione Fratres' of the priest: 'Pray, brethren, that my Sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty.' The writer in the 'Ecclesiastical Review' bans the expression 'hearing Mass.' Enough has now been advanced to show that he is amply justified in condemning this phrase. But a more suitable mode of expression he does not supply or suggest. We venture to offer 'attending' and 'assisting' as far more becoming and logical phrases.

We now come to a brief notice of other modes of speech respecting holy Mass, but which 'Layman' has not mentioned. Possibly America is not afflicted with them. Perhaps they are peculiar to this country. At all events, they are unknown in the land of St. Patrick's inheritance. We venture to say they are never heard of in any Catholic country. But they are abuses of language very rife in this fair Colony. It is self-evident they are not of Catholic growth or origin. They are aliens of a most undesirable nature. No Catholic should admit them into his vocabulary. Those who have adopted them should take and expel them forthwith. They are the offspring of an irreligious world and generation. Let them be cast forth to their owners.

Here are some specimens to illustrate our contention:—(1) 'Church is in'; (2) 'Church is out'; (3) 'Late for Church'; (4) 'Missed Church.' If by the word 'Church' is meant the people, surely the expression is most unsuitable. The people or the congregation are not known by the name 'Church.' The phrases 'Church is in' and 'Church is out' are slipshod modes of speech, bald attempts at expressing the proper thing. What is this proper thing? It is that the determined hour for holy Mass has arrived, or that Mass is concluded. Why not say, 'It is time for Mass'; 'The people are in the Church'; 'The priest is on the altar'? Instead of 'Church is out,' why not use the natural expression, 'The people are out of Church'? or again, 'Mass is finished'? Instead of 'late for Church,' why not say 'late for holy Mass'? Instead of the slipshod phrase, 'missed Church,' why not employ the more apt and correct expression, 'lost Mass,' or 'neglected Mass,' or 'late for Mass'?

In the sense we are considering, 'Church' is neither the sacred edifice nor the congregation. And surely the Holy Sacrifice cannot be designated by the term 'Church.' Neither is it apt or proper to call divine worship by the meaningless name of 'Church.'