

late along with Cardinal Langénieux of Rheims and Cardinal Gibbons by the present Pope. His elevation gave the greatest satisfaction in Canada, for besides being popular as a prelate and a man of moderate opinions, he was the first Canadian who had received the Cardinal's hat. The Cardinal occupied a large place in Canadian affairs. He was a member of the Council of Public Instruction for the province of Quebec, and at the opening of the Quebec Parliament was habitually accorded a place next to the Lieutenant-Governor, taking precedence even of Ministers of the Crown. A writer in the *Toronto Register* gives the following estimate of the Cardinal as an ecclesiastical ruler. "By his firm, prudent, and successful administration of his great archdiocese he has proved himself one of the strongest and most keen-sighted prelates who ever sat on the episcopal throne of Quebec, and he has left a record behind him which tends to elevate and solidify the religious and moral status of the Catholic Church in British North America. And yet he did not attain to his eminent position by the exercise of brilliant or external qualities which the world is prone to call great. He rose by the constant and conscientious use of the solid endowments of mind and soul which left their mark on the hearts of all who came into contact with him. Everything he did was stamped with a seriousness of purpose and inflexible determination to uphold the supernatural power and dignity of the Catholic religion, and he seemed to realize vividly that the lives of priests who had given themselves to the service of the altar should be made a light and a guidance for the conduct of all men. With him the lines that separate the calm, religious world from the world of boisterous politics and grossness was very clearly defined. And no man strove harder to keep the corruption of the one from contaminating the sacred precincts of the other. He had an instinctive horror of the folly and delusions of the outside world, and where he could not abate or repress them he shrank from contact with them. In this respect, as well as in some other essential features, he much resembled the late illustrious Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis. Both of these great prelates, in some sense, seemed not to be of the world although they lived in it."

ENGLAND.—Ordination of the Rev. B. W. Maturin.—Our readers will remember the great stir which was caused in Anglican circles in England last year when the Rev. B. W. Maturin, a Cowley "Father," and a leading Anglican missionary, announced his intention of joining the Catholic Church. In due time that intention was carried out, and after being received, Mr. Maturin went to Rome to make such further study as might be necessary to prepare for ordination as a priest. He was ordained priest by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster on Tuesday, April 12, and in order to admit a large number of friends, inclusive of Anglicans, the ceremony took place in the church of the Carmelite Nuns, North Kensington, instead of being held in the chapel at Archbishop's House. The church was full, and contained several Protestant friends of Father Maturin, who, like the Catholics, after the ordination kissed his hands. He said his first Mass the day after in the same church, and was assisted by the Rev. Dr. Rivington, who had also once been a Cowley Father. The Maturins are an old Huguenot family who settled in Ireland, from whence seven of them at the present day having, like Father Maturin, graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, are understood to hold benefices in the Church of England.

RUSSIA.—Hoist With His Own Petard.—The following interesting story has been vouched for—not by any Catholic or religious paper, but by no less an authority than the *St. James's Gazette*:—"An iconoclast, at a Russian convent," says the *Gazette*, "has been hoist with his own petard in a significant way. An infernal machine was set near a picture of the Virgin Mary, in a convent at Kursk; the picture having a reputation for working miraculous cures. The machine exploded in due time and wrecked the surroundings, demolishing a cast-iron screen round the picture, damaging doors, and breaking down a wall. But the picture itself escaped unhurt. If there ever was any doubt among the faithful at the Snamenski Convent as to the wonder-working properties of their holy picture, it will be dispelled by this."

A CALUMNY THAT LIVES LONG AND DIES HARD.

It is the constant complaint of Catholics that non-Catholics habitually go to our avowed enemies for their ideas of our doctrines and practices rather than to the authorised and official publications of our Church. The result is that ignorance of our motives, belief, and actions, coupled with a miraculous credulity which is prepared to believe the most grotesque stories of us, and a deep-set prejudice which forbids nay, even resents—honest inquiry even when charging us Catholics with the most monstrous and wholesale crimes.

We have had two instances of this recently in Dunedin—the first in Rev. Mr. Saunders' onslaught on the Church, the second in Rev. Mr. Watt's. The latter made in the pulpit and published in the Press the monstrous statement that the Pope "is now known by the full blasphemous title 'his Holiness Lord God the Pope.'" The calumny appeared in the congenial pages of the *Dunedin Evening Star*. We immediately called for proof of Mr. Watt's statement. Our object was to show how vastly easier it is to fling offensive charges of this kind than to establish them by fact. The following is the greater part of our first letter to the *Evening Star*:

Sir,—It is not the custom of Dunedin Catholics to utter from either pulpit or platform calumnious attacks on the faith and sentiments of their Protestant fellow-citizens. This fact alone ought to shield us against such attacks from the pulpits of other denominations. Unfortunately it has not done so as regards one or two. We had not time to recover from the onslaught of the Rev. W. Saunders when Mr. Watt flings at us a wholesale charge of

rank blasphemy. The Pope, said he, "is now [present tense] known by the full blasphemous title 'His Holiness Lord God the Pope.'" Mr. Watt's terrible indictment assumes:

1. That this mode of address belongs to the present recognised Papal style.

2. His assertion of its "full blasphemous" nature implies a deliberate intention on the part of Catholics to deify the Pope or regard him as God. The context forbids the idea of a merely gross violation of propriety of speech, much less a clerical or printer's error.

The charge is one of the greatest gravity. It affects the vast majority of all Christian people. I give the statement a point-bank denial. The burden of proving it now rests on Mr. Watt. I invite him to do so, and that, too, in the strict terms in which his statement stands.

While awaiting his reply I may be permitted the following statement:—During a residence of many years in Rome I was frequently presented to the Pope. I am fully acquainted with the style of address used to him, both orally and in writing—in Latin and in at least five modern languages. The Catholic Bishop of Dunedin has had a much longer and wider acquaintance with the oral and epistolary mode of address used in the Vatican. Both of us can fairly claim to know something more of these matters than Mr. Watt. Yet neither of us ever heard or read of the Pope being addressed as "His Holiness Lord God the Pope." We can speak for the present time, to which Mr. Watt's statement exclusively refers, for we have both kept in touch with Roman news and Roman usage, and no such monstrous change as Mr. Watt's statement demands could have taken place without our knowledge. If Mr. Watt maintains that it did he will, of course, be ready with his proofs. It is a question of fact. Vatican usage is much better known than that of Windsor, and the decrees of hundreds of councils and the style of the Roman Curia are accessible to him.

I might let the matter rest here, and simply await the evidence of Mr. Watt in support of his charge. But I may be permitted some further observations which will facilitate discussion. Mr. Watt has probably pinned his faith to writers who, in this matter at least, deserved no trust; and perhaps he did not think it necessary to examine the sources on which they relied. Mr. Watt probably refers to an unauthoritative gloss or commentary on a decretal letter of Pope John XXII. The gloss in question was written by an unknown or little-known canonist named Zenzelinus, who says that "to deny that our Lord God the Pope (*Dominum Deum Nostrum Papam*) could make such a decree would be heretical." The introduction of the word "Deum (God) was a manifest copyist's error—the expression "*Dominum Deum Nostrum*" cropping up continually in Catholic liturgy and evidently confusing the copyist's mind by the similarity of sound with "*Dominum Nostrum Papam*." The blunder was a palpable one, and was afterwards corrected. The words referred to were never used as the Pope's recognised style even then, much less at the present time, as Mr. Watt contends.

Mr. Watt has probably, like myself, seen the printers' blunders in the "Wicked" and the "Uprighteous" Bibles (authorised versions of 1631, 1653). The first made *Exodus* xx., 14, read: "Thou shalt commit adultery." The second had it *Romans* vi., 13, and *I. Cor.* vi., 9, respectively: "Yield not your members as instruments of righteousness," and "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of heaven?" Disraeli says in his *Curiosities of Literature* (iii., 430) that "many libertines" urged the last text "against the reproofs of a divine." Are Anglicans to be condemned for such palpable blunders? If not, why should we? At a further stage of this discussion I shall place Mr. Watt face to face with some pretty "tall" titles given to English kings by James I. in his *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance*. The were not mere slips of the pen. It will be interesting to apply to them Mr. Watt's system of argument.

EDITOR N.Z. TABLET.

Dunedin, May 14.

ANOTHER BOUT.

This letter elicited the information that we had expected: namely, that Mr. Watt had relied for his "facts" on a violent no-Popery pamphlet—the usual quarry out of which controversialists of this class excavate their materials. Mr. Watt's letter contained three chief points:—(1) Lord Montagu said, in a no-Popery speech, that "the Pope is described in the Canon Law as 'Our Lord God the Pope';" (2) that an inscription on a triumphal arch described Pope Alexander VI. as "a god"; (3) that he (Mr. Watt) had "no personal acquaintance with the Canon Law."

In the course of our reply, we pointed out how hopelessly wide of the mark Mr. Watt's letter had gone, and that while professing to quote from Canon Law he had, in reality, only quoted from a no-Popery speech—which was quite a different thing; that this quotation gave not a scrap of detailed reference; and that Lord Montagu was even vastly less known as a canonist than as a politician. We referred to our previous letter, in which we had shown that no such title even formed part of Canon Law.

"If Mr. Watt (we continued) still maintains that such a title is given to the Pope in 'Canon Law,' I ask him to furnish me with detailed references. Or let him quote for me the decree of Synod, Council, or Pope which conferred such a title, and then show that such title is still in existence. The matter cannot be settled by second-hand and garbled quotations from hostile sources. Mr. Watt's admission of total unacquaintance of Canon Law puts him, in so far, quite out of court in this discussion. Are we to take a printer's blunder as a decisive test of the Pope's "full title," and set aside as worthless the testimony, official and otherwise, of the Catholic body, who might reasonably be supposed to know something about the matter.

"Mr. Watt quotes a Protestant divine who states that somebody—presumably a sign painter—stated on a triumphal arch that Pope Alexander VI. was 'a god.' I have not had time to see whether the statement is true. But in any case what has it to do with Mr. Watt's statement that the Pope's 'full' title is now