THE INTERMOUNTAIN CATHOLIC.

UTAH · IDAHO · NEVADA · COLORADO · WYOMING · MONTANA

Denver — A Catholic Paper For The Catholic Home — Salt Lake — Pro Deo, Pro Patria ~ (For God and Country) — Butte

Volume 4, No. 2. Fourth Year. | SALT LAKE CITY AND DENVER, OCTOBER 11, 1902. | Colorado Catholic, Eighteenth Year.

Some Errors of a Local Unitarian

Art. II—Rev. Thacher Mentions Jesus in the Same Breath With Buddha and Socrates—What Rousseau Said of the Blasphemy of Such Comparison.

[illegible] such as [illegible] Jesus [illegible] educated, [illegible] parents were [illegible] circumstances, if not [illegible] Joseph is called a carpenter, [illegible] this implies that he may have been a builder or a carver in wood, and does not indicate a humble calling. St. Paul said that Jesus, "though rich, for the sake of his [illegible] became poor." The rough-clad prophet John was overcome by the social position of Jesus, and said: "You come to me, to a man unworthy (by [illegible]) to be your shoes." —Rev. Philip S. Thacher in Salt Lake Tribune.

—◊—

A Christian minister, who would place the Savior of mankind on the same list with Buddha, Zoroaster and Confucius, has reached the last station on the Christian road that leads to nowhere.

Rousseau, a pronounced infidel, held that any comparison between Jesus and any man that ever lived was the product of a diseased brain. Replying to a comparison between the Savior and Socrates by some of his votaries, he wrote: "What prepossession, what blindness must it be, to compare the son of Sophroniscus (Socrates) to the son of Mary? What an infinite disproportion between one and the other! Socrates, dying without pain, without ignominy, easily supports his character to the last; and if his death, however easy, had not done honor to his life, it might have been doubted whether Socrates, with all his wisdom, had been anything more than a vain sophist. He invented, it is said, the system of morals. Others before him had put them in practice. He had only before to say what they had done and to reduce their examples to precepts. Aristides had been just, before Socrates had defined what justice was; Leonidas had died for his country, before Socrates declared patriotism to be a duty; the Spartans were sober, before Socrates recommended sobriety; Greece abounded in virtuous men, before he had defined virtue. But whence could Jesus learn among his contemporaries that pure and sublime morality of which he alone hath given the precept and example? The most divine wisdom made itself heard amid the most bigoted fanaticism, the simplicity of the most heroic virtue did honor to the vilest people on earth. The death of Socrates, peacefully philosophizing with his friends, appears the most agreeable one that could be wished for; that of Jesus, expiring in the midst of agonizing pains, abused, insulted and accursed by a whole nation, is the most horrible one that could be feared. Socrates, in receiving the cup of poison, blessed innocent weeping executioner who administered it, but Jesus, in the midst of excruciating tortures, prayed for his merciless tormentors. Yes, if the life and death of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus were those of a God. Shall we make the history of the Gospel is a mere fiction?"

—◊—

The author of this beautiful passage, as all know, an open and avowed infidel, chiefly has prototype, the Unitarian minister, he discarded Christianity, made no profession of religion. At lucid intervals he saw the truth clearly and admitted it as in the passage quoted. The Christian (?) minister who writes of "the obscurity of his (Christ's) birth and legendary history" should learn from the great infidel to say, "Shall we say the history of the gospel is a mere fiction? Indeed, it hath nothing like fiction in it; on the contrary, the history of Jesus is such as it well befitted as that Jesus should be. Such a supposition, far from solving the difficulty, only augments it."

The vain and futile attempt of the Unitarian to bring forward Buddha, Zoroaster and Confucius as rivals of Christ, places him lower in the scale of infidelity than Rousseau. His philosophy of comparison could be applied only where a certain equality existed, and under certain aspects where the superiority of one to the other is evident. Nothing human bearing the stain of corrupt nature can compare with Christ, in whom there was no sin.

—◊—

"His parents were in comfortable circumstances if not wealthy." Testing this proposition by the rules of logic the Unitarian philosophy will be found deficient. "Joseph is called a carpenter, which implies that he may have been a builder or a carver in wood, and does not indicate a humble calling." Therefore "his parents were in comfortable circumstances, if not wealthy." This conclusion has greater extension than it has in the premises, thereby violating the second rule of logic, which says, that "no term must have greater extension in the conclusion than it has in the premises." Admitting his interpretation of "carpenter," all such are not "in comfortable circumstances, if not wealthy." Nor does the Greek word Tekton, for carpenter, imply " a builder or a carver in wood." It simply means a craftsman, or workman, whether in wood, iron, gold, etc. The ancient tradition and common opinion have always been that Joseph was a carpenter, or worker in wood. This tradition dates back to the first century, as is evident from an incident related by Theodoret (Lib. iii, c. 8). He tells that a sophist named Libanius asked a pious Christian one day, "What the carpenter's son was doing?" To which the Christian replied, "He is making a coffin for Julian." The imperial apostate soon needed the coffin.

—◊—

Reference to St. Paul to prove the Unitarian's proposition is not honest, as the whole verse from which the four words, "though rich became poor," proves the very opposite. It is taken from II Cor. xiii, 9. "For you the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich he became poor, for your sakes; that through his poverty you might be rich." Jesus, though rich in the treasures of grace, which, as the only begotten Son of the Father, were a part of his divine nature, yet chose poverty for his life in the flesh; and that in order that his poverty in temporalities might make his disciples rich in grace. Christ's poverty could not make the disciples rich in wordly goods. Evidently "riches" do not refer to the treasures of this world.

—◊—

"The rough-clad Prophet John was overcome by the social position of Jesus, and said, "You come to me, to a man unworthy to tie your shoes." This is the third and last proof given by Rev. Thacher to show that "his (Christ's) parents were in comfortable circumstances, if not wealthy." Evidently "social position" has more influence on the Unitarian creed than the poverty of Jesus mentioned in the text of St. Paul. Better call the gospel a legend than confound the profound respect of "the rough-clad prophet, John" for the son of God with his being "overcome by the social position of Jesus."

The journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem did not indicate that Joseph and Mary were in comfortable circumstances. Their resting place, the night Jesus was born, did not proclaim wealth, and his own words would not convey that notion. "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air nests; but the son of man hath not where to lay his head." (Luke ix. 58.) According to this testimony "the rough-clad prophet John," in honoring the social position of Jesus, the result of his "parents' comfortable circumstances," must have made a great mistake. In quoting scripture the Unitarian preacher has refuted himself.

(To Be Continued.)

Growth of the Faith in Kentucky

Being Part of the Life Work of Rt. Rev. Dr. McCloskey, Bishop of Louisville—Fiftieth Anniversary of Ordination to Priesthood—First President of the American College at Rome.

On Sunday last began the jubilee at Louisville celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of Bishop McCloskey's ordination to the priesthood. The laity honored it grandly on Sunday afternoon, an imposing procession of all the Catholic societies being the principal feature; the children on Monday and the clergy on Tuesday afternoon. Of the life work of the venerable bishop of Louisville, the Record of that city says:

Our revered and now venerable bishop is a native of Brooklyn, N. Y., where he was born on the 10th day of November, in the Lord's year, 1823. On that day, next month, he will have entered upon his 80th year. His parents were highly respected and prosperous citizens of Brooklyn. He is the youngest and sole survivor of five brothers. His oldest brother, the Very Reverend Dr. John McCloskey, the late president of Mount St. Mary's seminary, Emmittsburg, enjoyed a national reputation for ability and amiability; he was dearly loved by a wide circle of ecclesiastics. So, too, his next oldest brother, the lamented Very Reverend George McCloskey, formerly pastor of the Church of the Nativity, New York, and afterwards president of Preston Park seminary, Louisville, and vicar general, who died in these capacities on Aug. 3, 1890, loved and esteemed by all, and in particular by the large body of priests whom he had trained for their high calling. His two other brothers, successful merchants, died in recent years in our city. One sister, a most cultured lady, survives them.

In early life the future bishop, after a course of studies in law, embraced the ecclesiastical state. He entered Mount Saint Mary's college and seminary at Emmittsburg, Md., which was then, as it is now, a celebrated institution of learning, it having given to the church in this country a large number of distinguished priests and illustrious prelates. In due course of years he passed through his classical, philosophical and theological studies, and, on Wednesday, May 8, 1850, he was promoted to the holy order of subdeacon at that seminary by Archbishop Eccleston of Baltimore. Two years and five months later, on the 6th day of October, 1852, he was ordained priest by Archbishop Hughes, in the old St. Patrick's cathedral, New York. After his ordination and for a short while he was stationed at the Church of the Nativity as assistant to his brother, the Rev. George McCloskey, the pastor. His learning and studious habits, however, led his superiors to assign him to the professional chair of sacred scripture, moral theology and Latin at Mount St. Mary's.

In the meanwhile the saintly Pope Pius IX, with far-reaching vision, was evolving a plan for the establishment, under his own eye in the Eternal City, of an American seminary. On the first day of January, 1855, in his letter to the bishops assembled in the first provincial council of New York, he proposed to them the establishment of such an institution—"proprium vestrae nationis Clericorum collegium in hac ipsa alma Urbe Nostra erigere velitis." The first practical step towards this end was taken by Mgr. O'Connor, bishop of Pittsburg, and at the request of the archbishop of Baltimore, whilst in Rome, in 1857, Pius X offered him the famous convent of Santa Maria dell' Umilta for the proposed American institution. At the time it was occupied by French soldiery.

This interiorly fine building was erected in the year 1602 as a retreat for ladies of noble but impoverished families. It passed to the care of the Order of St. Dominic. Many memories of historic worth cluster around it. It was rich in artistic decoration. The pontifical government purchased it in 1827, and handed it over to the Visitandines, who occupied it until 1848. In the year 1859 it was repurchased by the propaganda, partially with contributions from the United States, comprising the collections taken up by our bishops in their respective dioceses for the purpose, and given over as a seminary for the use of clerical students from North America. The college became very dear to Pius IX, its founder; he loved to visit it. One of its tablets records: "Pius IX, supreme pontiff, parent and founder of the College of the United States of North America, having celebrated the holy sacrifice in our house, nourished the students with the heavenly banquet, kindly inspected their home and honored all with his presence and conversation."

The American college was opened on the eve of the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, Dec. 8, 1859; but as the bishops of the United States had not then chosen a rector for it, the institution was temporarily placed under the direction of the Right Rev. Mgr. Bernard Smith, a Benedictine professor at the propaganda, pending the selection and election of a permant rector. Two months later they had arrived at a decision: their choice fell on the Rev. William George McCloskey of Mount St. Mary's college. About this time Georgetown university, Washington, conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. On March 3, 1860, he took charge of the college as its first permanent rector or president, and remained as such until May, 1868, a period of about eight years.

Under his rectorship the college prospered, fulfilling the high expectations of Piux IX, and the American hierarchy. Many of Dr. McCloskey's students afterward attained to high ecclesiastical positions. His grace, the late Archbishop Corrigan, was one of his students. Also, for a while, the present archbishop of San Francisco, Mgr. Riordan; Bishop Northrop of Charleston, Bishop Richter of Grand Rapids, Bishop Horstmann of Cleveland, the late Dr. McGlynn, the Rev. Dr. Parsons and others whose names are prominent in this country. The position of rector of a national college in Rome is a peculiarly delicate and gravely responsible one. It brings its incumbent into formal and intimate relations with the holy see and varied national interests. The utmost prudence and tact is obviously required of him who is appointed to this office. That Dr. McCloskey fulfilled the duties appertaining to it in an able, graceful and satisfactory manner is well known. Under his presidency of eight years the American college was ever the Roman home of our bishops, and the home-like attraction of our citizens when in Rome. On the occasion, in particular, of the great centenary celebration of the Apostles Saints Peter and Paul, June 29, 1867, when the bishops of the whole Catholic world gathered around Pius IX, many and loud were the praises bestowed upon the rector of the North American college because of his magnificent hospitality.

On the evening of the 11th of May, 1867, the Diocese of Louisville was bereft of its third bishop, the saintly Lavialle, after a brief but fruitful episcopate of sixteen months. In due course the names of several ecclesiastics were proposed and submitted to the Holy See as his successor. Pius IX. chose none of them; not because they were not worthy or were not fitted for the exalted office, but because he had come to know and to esteem one who, under his immediate eye, he had found eminently qualified to preside over one of the oldest and most illustrious of American dioceses. The selection of Dr. McCloskey was a pontifical recognition of his merits, and of his successfud administration of the American college.

His consecration, as the fourth Bishop of Louisville, took place in the magnificent Chapel of the College, Rome, on the Feast of Our Lady Help of Christians, May the 24th, 1868. It was a gala day at the college and a notable one even for Rome. The consecrating bishop was His Eminence Charles Augustus Cardinal Count de Reisach, Archbishop of Munich. He was assisted by the personal friend of the Pope, Mgr. Frederick Francis Xavier de Merode, minister and almoner to Pius IX.; Archbishop of Melitene—a prelate whose fame is allied to that of Pius IX., whom he served with faithful devotion, and by Mgr. Nobile Viteleschi, Archbishop of Osimo and Cingoli.

Five and thirty years of episcopal life and work will have gone by on May the 24th, next, since that memorable day. They have been well filled years—years of episcopal burdens and years of splendid achievements. To few bishops is it given to have such fulness of years, such results, such merit before God and man, as are his in his now golden year. When, in the late summer of 1868, he humbly and unheralded—for he evaded the magnificent reception his clergy and people sought to give him—he arrived in his diocese, he found sixty-four for the most part unpretentious churches; today he presides over 135, for the greater part new and handsome temples of God. The eighty zealous Kentucky priests who rejoiced in the coming of their new bishop in 1868 have grown in number of 173 faithful, self-sacrificing ministers of God, mostly ordained by him, who are devoted to him, who love him, who revere him, and who ever seek to lessen his labors, his burdens, his trials, his anxieties, and to co-operate with him, heart and soul, in his ceaseless efforts for the glory of God and the salvation of priceless souls. The eight congregations he found in his episcopal city have grown to thirty-two, whose churches do honor to them and to the bishop who established them. In no episcopal city in the United States are found so many consecrated churches. With his coming came the Passionist Fathers, the Fathers of the Resurrection, the Sisters of Mercy, the Little Sisters of the Poor, the Franciscan Sisters and the Brothers of Mary. Under him educational institution have multiplied, imposing academies and colleges have been erected, parochial schools, whose structures vie with any in the land, have been attached to all the thirty-one city churches and to many of the principal churches outside of the episcopal city; fine new orphanages, superb hospitals and religious homes, convents and monasteries, have been erected or supplied; kindergartens have been established, and where, in the first year of his episcopate, only 2,000 children were attending the ten nine city parochial schools, there are today 7,000 in the thirty-one Louisville schools, and about 9,000 in the parochial schools of the whole diocese.

Such, in brief, was the Diocese of Louisville in the year of the consecration of our illustrious bishop, and such is the diocese on the eve of his Golden Sacerdotal jubilee, in the thirty-fifth year of his episcopate. It is a magnificent record of work in God's holy service. Therefore, on the 6th of October, now at hand, his beloved priests, religious people and children will crown him with a golden diadem of affection, honor, reverence and veneration, and will cry out with the disciples at Emaus: "Mane nobiscum, quoniam advesperascit" "Stay with us, because it is toward evening and the day is now far spent"): stay with us that our hearts may continue to burn within us; stay with us as long as Flaget stayed with us—"mane nobiscum!"

RIGHT REV. DR. WILLIAM GEORGE M'CLOSKEY, Bishop of Louisville

Discovering the True Religion

Art. IV—Concluding Remarks on the Disposition Required. A Dead Faith Will Not Gain Entrance to Heaven. Only One Road to be Chosen.

(Written for the Intermountain Catholic.)

In this article I wish to add a few concluding remarks on the dispositions and preparation of heart and soul necessary for sincere inquirers in order to attain a full and certain knowledge of the truths God demands of them to believe and live up to, in order to be saved.

It must be borne in mind that I am only concerned with persons who are honest inquirers, and, it may be added, with all who should wish to become so.

Too much importance cannot be given to the necessity of possessing the proper dispositions in this serious affair, because they are the foundations on which the whole building must rest.

Without the requisite and proper foundation the building cannot stand or last, but if well laid the structure will prove solid in the same proportion.

If the foundation required be not laid at all, the building cannot be raised at all.

It is useless for a man to think that he can build up "true" religion in his heart, if, in addition to a sincere wish to discover the "real thing," he is not also sincerely disposed to sacrifice "all earthy concerns and interests," in order to follow and live up to the truth once it is known to him with certainty.

A man wanting to get to a certain city will not benefit much by knowing and discovering the route, unless he actually travels by it. He may, like a finger-post, be able to point out the way, but this knowledge alone will never bring him to his desired destination.

There is only one road to be found by which we can get to heaven; that is, by living "faith." In other words, "true faith and good works." Nobody ever got there by any other route. Good works are essential. A "dead" faith will not avail, and the "faith without good works is dead." (James ii., 26.) True faith is no less indispensable then good works, for "without 'true' faith it is impossible to please God" (Hebrews xi., 6), and "He that believes 'it' not shall be condemned" (Mark xxvi, 16). It must be the "true" faith. "Part" of it will not suffice either, nor that kind of creed that will suit our passions, positions and earthly interests.

We may find out these solemn truths with the certainty of God's infallible Word, yet, the mere "knowing them" would never bring us to our journey's end—to heaven and God. To spend our time and energies in trying to discover them would avail us nothing if we should fail to make a practical use of our knowledge by embracing the true faith, and living in accordance with its teachings. Hence the necessity of our being not only sincere and earnest in endeavoring to discover the true road to heaven, but also, and more so, in our determination to walk therein.

If the sacrifices demanded of us be too great, in our eyes, then comes the "crux" that renders our "sincerity" to find out the way to no purpose.

Alas! hoy many thousands there are with whom this is the identical case and who spend their time and energies and talents in vain, in studying, discussing, searching for religious truth—with real sincerity and interest, but with "no will" to follow Christ on the narrow road of "living," true faith, or of making the sacrifices that He requires of them if they would enter with him into life everlasting. Consequently we find such people choosing their religion as they do their clothes—by fancy. They are often taken with the talents, gestures and style of a preacher, and without any careful examination of his doctrines, they presently adopt his creed!

Again, many adhere to a certain creed because it was that of their parents or family, which, if it were a justifiable reason before God, would, on the same principle, equally justify Jews, pagans and Turks in adhering to their respective impieties.

Others again, such as the great mass of the English, glory in their religion because it is the leading one of fashion established in their country, forgetting that the fashionable, polished and conquering nations of antiquity, the Greeks, Romans, Persians, Egyptians, Assyrians, were left, by the inscrutable judgments of God, "in darkness and the shadow of death," whilst a poor, oppressed and despised people, on the banks of the Jordan, were the only depository of divine truth and the sole truly enlightened nation.

In a word, the far greater part of even Christians of every denomination make the business of eternity subservient to that of time, and select the religion which best suits their interests, passions and conveniences, etc.

They do not seek "first" the kingdom of God and his justice, nor do many of them seek it at all.

The man who would save his soul at any cost cannot go with the majority on this well beaten track that leads others to perdition. He must select the narrow way.

In conclusion, for the benefit of the sincere inquirer, I here give, from the preface of the "Fifty Reasons" what were the dispositions of the illustrious Antony Ulric, Duke of Brunswick, in setting about his inquiry into the grounds and differences of the several systems of Christianity, when he began to entertain doubts concerning the truth of that in which he had been educated, namely, Lutheranism.

He says: "I earnestly implored the aid and grace of the Holy Ghost, and with all my power begged the light of true faith from God, the Father of lights, etc.

"Secondly, I made a strong resolution, by the grace of God, to avoid sin, well knowing that 'wisdom will not enter into a corrupt mind nor dwell in a body subject to sin' (Wis. I, 4), and I am convinced, and was so then, that the reason why so many are ignorant of the true faith and do not embrace it, is becuse they are plunged in several vices, and particularly carnal sins.

"Thirdly, I renounced all sorts of prejudices, whatever they were, which incline men to one religion more than another, and which, unhappily, I might have formerly espoused; and I brought myself to a perfect indifference, so as to be ready to embrace whichsoever the grace of the Holy Ghost and the light of reason should point out to me, without any regard to the advantages and inconveniences which might attend it in this world.

"Lastly, I entered upon this deliberation and choice in the manner I should have wished to have it done at the hour of my death, and in a full conviction that, at the day of judgment, I must give an account to God why I followed this religion in preference to all the rest."

This "truly" sincere, princely inquirer finishes this account of himself with the following awful reflections:

"Man has but one soul, which will be eternally either damned or saved! What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul! Matt. xiv., 26.) Eternity knows no end. The course of it is perpetual. It is a series of unlimited duration. There is no comparison between things infinite and those which are not so. O the happiness of the eternity of the saints! O the wretchedness of the eternity of the damned! One of these eternities awaits each one of us!"

Let this illustrious prince be the model of every truly sincere, determined inquirer.

C. E. REGLEY.

The Late Queen of the Belgians

[illegible] de Fontenay in Chicago Tribune.)

Although the late queen of Belgium had for several years past been a helpless invalid, and lived in much retirement at Spa, yet her death cannot fail to be deeply regretted throughout the land of her adoption, and it is certain to be a widespread thing there that her husband could have been more readily spared than she, her, without being in the last degree a slave to conventionalities or etiquette, she, by her kindly unselfishness, the most trying and [illegible] circumstances imparted to the throne of Belgium a respectability which her husband has done everything in his power to destroy.

A breath of scandal ever tarnished her name, although she was as proud and as gifted as her cousin, the empress of Austria, and, like her sister, she enjoyed the most marvelous power over horses, which she used to teach them all sorts of tricks that won', have brought them to any circus. In fact, I recall fifteen years ago her giving a hippodrome entertainment at Spa for the benefit of some charity which she was interested in, and the course at which she put her pets through all their astonishing clever feats. She was a splendid whip, a most accomplished equestrienne, a skilled [illegible] and possessed a perfect genius for [illegible] of hand. Besides that, she was remarkably cultured, simple and unaffected in her intercourse with people, especially with the peasantry in the district around Spa, where she made her home for so many years, and was entirely free from arrogance. She was not only deeply respected by the Belgians, but likewise popular and in much closer touch with them than her husband.

The flagrancy of the king's shortcomings was a cruel blow to her feelings, both as a wife and as a queen, and when to these were added her sorrows in connection with the tragic deaths of her son-in-law, Crown Prince Rudolph, and of her favorite nephew, Prince Baldwin, as well as the horrible scandal in connection with her eldest daughter, Princess Louise of Saxe-Coburg, she withdrew completely to Spa and but rarely appeared at any court function or in society.

Before she became a complete invalid, about a year and a half ago, she devoted herself to the care of her unfortunate sister-in-law, the demented Empress Charlotte of Mexico, and from the time that the latter was placed under restraint, in 1867, until eighteen months ago, she never allowed a single week to pass without paying the empress several visits.

—◊—

Indeed, the consort of Maximilian may be said to have owed her life to her. For when the chateau of Terveuren, in which the empress was confined, burned down in such a mysterious manner eighteen years ago as to suggest incendiarism, and the afflicted lady absolutely refused to quit her apartments, the queen made her way, at the risk of her life, into the blazing palace and gently led her sister-in-law out and into safety.

—◊—

In these days, when royalty is so fond of traveling abroad, and when monarchs are often absent from their dominions for months together, Queen Henrietta distinguished herself by always remaining at home. Indeed, she only left Belgium thrice in the last quarter of a century, once to attend the wedding of her daughter, Stephanie, to the Crown Prince Rudolph at Vienna, the second time to be present at Queen Victoria's jubilee in 1887, and the third time to pay a species of farewell visit to her uncle, the Duc d'Aumale, at Chantilly, shortly before he died there.

The queen seldom interfered in political matters, and, indeed, the only time that she may be said to have done so was when she broke off the match between Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria and her daughter, Princess Clementine. The prince had already received the consent of King Leopold and of the princess, and the engagement had been announced, when, suddenly, the prince received a summons to visit the queen at Spa. What passed between them there is a matter of speculation. But the prince did not return to Brussels to take leave of either the king or the princess, but went off straight to Vienna, his departure being followed almost immediately by an intimation that the projected matrimonial alliance would not take place. It is believed that the queen either vetoed the match in consequence of the relations of the prince to the Roman Catholic church, by which he has been subjected to the ban of minor excommunication, or else that she warned him of the curse that is believed to rest on the reigning house of Belgium, and that the union would bring untold misery.

[illegible] visit for some w[illegible] yed health.

Father of the American Navy

Anent the fact that Sept. 13 was the ninenty-ninth anniversary of the death of Commodore John Barry, the father of the American navy, Martin I. J. Griffin, his biographer, in a letter to the Catholic Standard and Times, supplies some needed information in regard to the life of the gallant Irish-American whose fame is so much less than his deserts.

"I was asked today," he writes, " 'Was Barry any kind of a Catholic?' A priest not long ago told me he didn't think Barry had much Catholicity in him, as he attended Protestant service on his ship. But how can the practical faith of any man be known? Records are not kept of whether a man goes to confession monthly or yearly nor of his attendance at mass. I always count it as a fact, as the life around us assures us, that any Catholic in public life, or rich, hasn't much active faith in him. So I don't suppose that Commodore Barry, with the kind of life he lived, could have been classed with the monthly sodalists of today. Any active Catholicity there was in British America in Barry's early days was in Philadelphia. He could not have gone to mass anywhere else than in this city. He sailed to several of the West Indian islands, and it isn't likely there was any mass there if the authorities could prevent it. I don't suppose Barry in those days went on the secret hunt of any disguised priest among the Irish in the Barbadoes, St. Christopher or St. Eustatia. So all the church services he could get were in this city. Such were his opportunities to practice his faith. How do we do nowadays, in less troublesome times?

Barrys' second wife was a Protestant. They were married at Christ's church, Episcopalian. That's demerit mark, I grant. He repaired the dereliction by the conversion of his wife in two years. She lived a Catholic and is buried in St. Mary's graveyard with his first wife. One account I have written (in 1877) says the first wife was daughter of a Presbyterian minister. If that be true, then Barry's two wives became Catholics. His grown up slave was also baptized a Catholic. Barry contributed 'to the improvement fund of St. Mary's church in 1783. He had a pew there, and we must presume that he paid his pew rent. If he did that, it covered a multitude of delinquencies in those days—as it does now. He is buried in St. Mary's yard. That presumes that he died within the pale of the church. If the church was content, that settles with me his position. He never denied his faith. He was known as a Catholic. The only chaplain I ever found on the muster rolls of any of his ships was named Tim Geran. Tim may have been a Presbyterian, but I doubt that. A record made by one of his petty officers says that Barry, 'although Roman Catholic, was always present at worship on board performed by a Presbyterian minister, and enforced strict attention and orderly conduct.' Moral theologists will determine the extent of his offense. I wonder how the late Admiral Meade did when Protestant chaplains of his ship held services? How do all Catholic commanders in our army and navy? At any rate, Barry was known as a Catholic, e[illegible]

(Continued on Page [illegible])