

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1902

1219

The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, March 1, 1902.

USES OF A CATHEDRAL.

In the current issue of the Century Magazine, Bishop Potter descends on the uses of a cathedral. Referring to the suspense in the realms of fundamental beliefs, and to the persons passing through "a transition stage," he says that "something larger, higher, wider, roomier, more impersonal for the time being than the parish church is wanted for them, etc."

We are not sure we grasp all this, and have a suspicion that the prelate was administering a little soothing syrup to his spiritual children. His airy statement about suspension in fundamentals is characteristic: but we think he should be able to assign a better remedy than attendance at a cathedral. Admitting that many honest minds are for the moment adrift, we fail to see how they are going to get into a safe haven, merely because they are promised something wider and roomier than the parish church. One might as well send them to the Louvre or to the Pyramids. This is certainly a case of giving stones to those who want bread. And we may be pardoned for saying that we do not understand how individuals who derive no solace from parochial ministrations are going to be benefited by a cathedral. By what miraculous process will Anglican waters, grown stale and stagnant in parishes, be transformed into a source of life and refreshment when deposited within a cathedral? True, there is to be a voice in the cathedral, but one, in the words of an Anglican, "that never promulgated a doctrine or condemned a heresy." And if all the Episcopal divines are allowed access to its pulpits, the worshipper will hear enough to convince him that St. Paul must have been day-dreaming when he advocated the unity of faith.

Now, if the prelate had assured his public that instead of doctrinal mobility there would be doctrinal certainty, and had given some detailed information about his religious programme, there might be some hope for the un-churching denizens of Gotham. But to hold up something "wider and roomier"—a pulpit that must be the expounding ground of hopelessly irreconcilable opinions—as a panacea for indifference and doubt, is putting human gullibility to a severe test.

The Bishop rejoices in a pulpit to be dominated by no trustees or vestry or plethoric pew-holder. However, we do not think he need be unduly anxious on that score. The Anglican preacher is too well-bred a man to ruffle the feelings of the plethoric pew-holder. He is usually compromising and apologetic enough to satisfy the most exacting, and so long as he confines himself to literary and civic reform dissertations, and to essays on morality in general, he will have nothing to fear. But it will take more than an artistic edifice to give life to the "bough torn from the tree." "There is one God and one Christ," says St. Cyprian: "and His Church is one and the faith one, and the people one, joined in the solid unity of one body by the bond of concord."

If Bishop Potter could subscribe to this statement there would be some point to his talk on the uses of the Cathedral.

A DIVINE, INERRANT AUTHORITY.

In the book "Doctrinal and Doctrinal Disruption," we read:

"That old foundation, the Bible, in which all reformed Christendom rested itself at the beginning, as though it were a solid rock, has ceased in itself to be a foundation any longer. It moves, it shifts, it totters, it supports no structure unless something outside of itself shall be found which will support it."

So far our separated brethren have failed to find this something—divine, inerrant authority. But they can find it if they will:

"A path and a way shall be there and it shall be called the holy way; and this shall be unto you a straight way, so that fools shall not err therein."

INCONSISTENCY.

Some time ago we read a glowing account of explorer Peary's achievements in the far North. How he clung with indomitable endurance to the project of planting the Star Spangled Banner in places as yet undiscovered was an inspiring bit of writing. Peary and the others who court the dangers and privations entailed by their hazardous attempts to widen the sphere of human knowledge,

are fearless men, and worthy of any praise. And the plaudits accorded them are signs that some of us at least can be thrilled with the story of endeavor that is not actuated by love of the dollar. But what strikes us as being inconsistent is that many who look kindly upon Peary, and harp upon his heroic self-devotion and zeal for the cause of science, are so unduly severe on the restraints voluntarily imposed on themselves by the Religious of the Catholic Church. They will hymn praises in honor of the man who goes questing for what may rebound to the progress of mankind, but not for the man who binds himself to seek always the glory of God—a more difficult quest than the other.

THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

There is an idea, begotten of prejudice and ignorance, that Religious are men and women given over to dreams, who prefer the peace of the cloister to work in the world. We have also happened upon a life of a Religious who, according to his biographer, spent a good deal of his time in posing—unconsciously you know!—and weaving pretty pious air castles. This kind of a book is merely spiritual mush and has, so far as it has to do with the delineation of the life of a Religious, as much reliability as a tale of Munchausen's. The piety fashioned within the walls of a religious house is generally intelligent and virile; it is built up and welded together by ceaseless conflict; and, aiming at the mastery of the spirit, demands a strength of which worldlings have no conception. They are no dreamers of dreams—they who have chosen the better part. They are ready for any call of mercy and charity—and one of the phenomena in an age of self-seeking is to see a man immolating himself for others, and through his prayers safeguarding, perchance, the sinful from doom: humble and obedient, pure and poor. Freaks of fanatical enthusiasm; some say, but they are, as we know, the highest and worthiest occupation of a reasonable being and surest guarantee of success that means anything.

We are not a whit surprised that some newspapers in this country should have no adverse criticism of the recent action of the French Government. They view the matter through their own prejudices, and have not the excuse that may be put forward by the framers of the Law of the Associations, that they do not admit the truth of Christian religion. They are wandering in a maze of misapprehension and ill-concealed hostility, and are not as yet to all seeming beyond the influence of the receding monk of Germany. The hatred of religious institutions, says Balmes, has been inherited by philosophy from Protestantism. This is the reason why all revolutions, excited and guided by Protestants or philosophers, have been signalized by their intolerance towards the institutions themselves, and by the cruelty towards those who belonged to them. What the law could not do was completed by the dagger and torch of the incendiary. On this point, as well as many others, it is manifest that the infidel philosophy is the daughter of the Reformation. It is useless to seek for a more convincing proof of this than the parallel of the histories of both in all that relates to the destruction of religious institutions:—the same flattery of Kings, the same exaggeration of civil power, the same declamation against the pretended evils inflicted on society, the same calumnies; we have only to change the names and dates. And we must also remark this peculiarity, that in this matter the difference which apparently ought to have resulted from the progress of toleration and the softening of manners in recent times has scarcely been felt.

THE BOY SAVERS' SERIES.

They who have anything to do with, or are interested in "boy culture" should lose no time in procuring the "Boy Savers' Series" by Rev. Geo. Quinn, S. J. His first contribution to boy literature merited, and received, a warm welcome, and we are quite sure the second booklet, which is also practical and suggestive, will be endorsed in a similar manner. It is sometimes asserted that there is altogether too much hubbub about this kind of work. We, however, cannot see our way clear to subscribe to the statement, for we believe that if there be any work that has been denied a bounteous measure of sympathy it is precisely the one which concerns itself with the protection of the boy. Again, boys' societies

are looked upon as menaces to home life. Assuredly, home is the best place for any youngster, although some of them do not regard it in that light. There are always a few of them at large, either through parental negligence or because home attractions pale into insignificance before the street, and for these a well-regulated society is a refuge from temptation and vice. In fact after the Sunday school, the principal organization in a parish should be for the boys.

We may dilate on the responsibilities of parents, but, all said and done, there will be gamins who, unless we contrive to help and safeguard them, will find their way into organizations where vice and vulgarity have full sweep, or into non-Catholic societies. We are not going to say any more on this subject save to remind our readers of what Cardinal Wiseman said years ago: "Give me the boys and in twenty years England will be Catholic." The zealous laymen and clergymen who may be times be at a loss for expedients to hold the boys will find Father Quinn's pages very helpful and suggestive. The author terms his production a booklet, but it has more sound sense and insight into boy nature than many pretentious tomes. It is the very best thing on this subject that we have any acquaintance with, and we consider it indispensable to every Director who desiderates to be up to date.

It is the result of labor of a man with a magnificent record as a "boy-saver," and we advise our readers to get a copy as soon as possible from the Messenger Library, New York City.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

(Conclusion.)

Before proceeding in regular order we wish to call your attention to a contradiction between two statements of yours, Mr. McCrackan, which we overlooked. You say in the first part of your letter, "God is the only cause." " * * * He uses means and instruments, but He is the only cause." And in a paragraph toward the end of your letter you say, "Mortal mind is not created, is not an expression of God, and His lies, therefore, cannot be traced to Him."

Now this mortal mind, which lies and is the father of lies, is something; and as God, according to you, is the only cause, He must be the cause of it; or, if He did not cause it, He is not the only cause. Now you may hold either of your statements, but you cannot hold them both, for, as you see, they contradict each other.

McCrackan—"I should not venture to write further concerning the doctrines of the Catholic Church on the subject of healing the physically sick, since the editor of the Freeman's Journal is far better qualified to speak of them than I am. Moreover, I am ready to acknowledge a certain inaccuracy in my statement: "The process of arriving at this knowledge, is not so much intellectual as spiritual." In this instance I felt into the common habit of making a distinction between Mind and Spirit, whereas Mind and Spirit are synonymous, and mean God."

Comment—"You mean that spirit and mind, when spelled with capital initial letters, mean God, in the Christian Science vocabulary. This explanation is necessary, because they do not mean that in any other vocabulary. McCrackan—"I should have explained, that I criticised the faculty called intellectual only in so far as it applies to that human reasoning which leaves divine realities aside, and deals with objects as they appear to mortal mind."

Comment—"It is not easy to see the drift of this explanation. The human mind does not leave divine realities aside. Even the atheist does not leave them aside; he must deal with them, and does deal with them, in the very act of denying them. He cannot deny that of which he has no idea, and to have an idea of a thing is to deal with it. The human mind also deals with natural or created realities, and with their appearances as well. Mortal mind is an invention of Christian Scientists, and as they have not given a definition of it, it is not clear what they mean by the term. They tell us that there is but one mind, one soul, and that is God; and then they talk of another mind which they qualify as Mortal. They appear utterly oblivious of the fact that those two statements cannot be both true. If it be true that there is but one Mind, it is certain that there is not another; and if it be true that there is another, it is false that there is but one. But contradictions like this are mere trifles to the Christian Science mind."

McCrackan—"To argue from a Mortal Mind basis is to miss the conclusions of true knowing, or real science." Comment—"From what basis do you argue? From the one Mind, which, you say alone exists, or from the Mortal Mind, which, you say, also exists? The fact is, you argue from or with the individual Mind that you are conscious of as directing all your reasoning operations. We do the same. It is all either of us has in the way of intelligence with which to draw conclusions. You probably meant to say that, to argue on the basis of the existence of a material world, is to miss

the conclusions of true knowing. But this statement is a mere begging of the question, and it is by no means admitting that to argue from the basis of the non-existence of the material world, is to miss the conclusions of true knowing or real science. The latter has the advantage over the former in that it is in accord with the common sense of the human race.

McCrackan—"If there is a Principle which governs the universe, including man, then the knowledge of this Principle must be the final, ultimate and only real science, and any attempt to deal with this first cause through a form of reasoning hampered by material beliefs, must lead the investigator astray and prevent him from reaching the goal."

Comment—"There is a Principle or Cause who created and governs this universe composed of spiritual and material beings. And any attempt to deal with His first Cause without dealing with His works that are immediate to the senses which He has given us to know them, must lead the investigator astray. In reasoning, we must take the data as we find them, and this material universe about us and our own consciousness of existence are the data, things as we find them. Matter is one of the facts that have to be investigated, and no fact can hamper sound reasoning. Your conclusion rests on the gratuitous assumption that belief in the existence of matter is false; and this assumption begs the whole question between us. You deny the existence of matter, and then, taking your unproved belief as the criterion of truth, tell all who do not believe as you do that they are hampering themselves and must go astray. The whole human race is and has been wrong from the beginning, and you Christian Scientists alone are right. That is the whole gist of your reasoning in the above quotation. It is certainly unhampered by the principles of logic, or by any consciousness of your fallibility. Your statement that men are hampered in investigations by "material beliefs," must be met by another, namely, that Christian Scientists are hampered by their spiritual belief which denies matter, contrary to the testimony of their own senses and the belief of mankind."

McCrackan—"In regard to the query suggested in the issue of Freeman's Journal for Oct. 26, concerning the value which may be set upon the evidence of physical healing in establishing the truth of Christian Science, I should like to add the following explanation." Comment—"Then there is such a thing as physical healing? which, of course, implies the existence of matter. But proceed with the explanation."

McCrackan—"Christian Science teaches that man is never sick. What is commonly called the healing of sickness is the waking up to this realization. The so-called evidences of sickness are false beliefs, suggested by mortal mind, and are based upon the testimony of false witnesses, called the physical senses."

Comment—"If the physical senses are not trustworthy when they testify that we are sick, how can you believe them when they testify that we are healed? Mrs. Eddy in her message to her followers (copyrighted in 1901) says: "I healed the deaf, the blind, the dumb, the lame, the last stages of consumption, pneumonia, paralysis, etc., and restored the patients in from one to three interviews."

When she made this statement to the world as proof of the value of Christian Science, she submitted the case to the judgment of the world, to be determined in the only way the world determines the existence of facts, namely, by evidence or demonstration. The world therefore has the right to demand the evidence. This brings us to our query which elicited your explanation."

In reply to the demand for proof Mrs. Eddy refers to the deaf, dumb, blind, consumptives and paralytics she has cured in three interviews. She presents this crowd of witnesses as those who were blind, deaf and dumb, and who now see, hear and speak; as paralytics and consumptives who now are free from these diseases. Such is the Christian Science case as presented by its founder, such the demonstration of the value of the science."

Now Mr. McCrackan, the knot of our query is this: If as you teach, the testimony of the senses and the suggestions of mortal mind are false, how did Mrs. Eddy know that those people were, or thought they were, afflicted, that one was blind, another deaf, another paralyzed, etc.? What meant her knowledge except through her physical senses and what you call Mortal Mind?

Both you and she say they were not sick, that they suffered under a delusion, a false thought, and needed only to be waked out of it. But how did she know that they suffered under a delusion or false thought? Oh, they complained to her that they were suffering under those afflictions. But how did she know that they complained to her of their sicknesses, unless through her physical senses and mortal mind. She had no other means of knowing that they were sick, or thought they were, except her mind and her physical senses, and these you hold to be false and lying witnesses. How, then, did she know that these people were blind, deaf, dumb, etc., when, according to you and her, she had no evidence but that of false and lying witnesses? She could not know; for false and lying witnesses are confessedly not sufficient evidence to establish a fact."

It follows that her proof of the value of Christian Science from the cures she claims to have effected, is utterly worthless unless she proves that those people were sick or thought they were, in the first place. But this proof she

cannot give, since the only possible evidence of it is the testimony of false and lying witnesses—the senses. Failing, as she must on Christian Science principles, to prove that those people were sick or afflicted, or thought they were, or complained that they were, she must, of course, fail to prove that she healed them; for if they were not sick, or falsely thought they were, they could not be healed of the sickness, or the false thought.

The first fatal defect in Mrs. Eddy's case is her absolute inability to prove that those people she claims to have cured were deaf, dumb and blind, or that they believed themselves to be. The second fatal defect is her and your equal inability to prove, without the aid of the senses, that those supposed afflicted people were healed. The only possible proof of their cure is the testimony of the senses; and these, you assure us, are false and lying witnesses. The following imaginary dialogue will put your case succinctly in the face of the world to which you appeal:

Christian Scientist—You want proof of the value of Christian Science. Here it is at hand. Here is John Doe. You have known him for several years, and you know that during that time he has been blind, deaf and dumb.

Christian—The only means I have of knowing that such a being as my friend John Doe exists, or that he is blind, or deaf, or dumb, are my physical senses. Are they good enough authority to justify me in believing that he exists?

Christian Scientist—Certainly not. They are lying witnesses, and not to be believed.

Christian—Very well, then; I do not know John Doe, and do not know that he was blind.

Christian Scientist—Well, I can assure you he is and was blind.

Christian—You forget that if my senses cannot be trusted you are in the same condition as Mr. Doe. I do not know that you exist. Nor can you, if you do not trust your senses, know that Doe exists, or that I, to whom you speak, exist.

Christian Scientist—Well Doe visited Mrs. Eddy, and now, you see, he can see.

Christian—Unless our senses can be trusted I cannot know that he can see. Nor can you.

Thus when the Christian Scientists discredit the senses in order to deny the material universe, they rob themselves of all means of proving their science; if they credit the senses to prove their healing powers, they must credit them when they testify to the existence of the material world. If they discredit them they cannot prove a cure, and if they credit them they contradict their doctrine of the non-existence of the material world, to which the senses testify. Either alternative is fatal.

McCrackan—"The Science of Knowledge that the testimony of the physical senses, as well as the suggestions of Mortal Mind, are false, establishes the fact that their opposites, namely, Spirit and Spiritual Understanding, are true, and alone can testify to the truth."

Comment—"First, we have not the Science of Knowledge that the testimony of the senses are false; and, second, if granted that the senses are false, it would not follow that spirit and spiritual understanding are true."

If the physical senses are false witnesses, what proof have you that your spiritual sense is not a false witness also? You have none; you take your spiritual sense on trust, and with no better—if as good—as proof as the rest of mankind have for the veracity of the senses. The Materialists, who go to the opposite extreme and deny the existence of matter, have as good grounds to say that the testimony of the spirit and spiritual understanding are false, and therefore their opposite—matter—is true, and can alone testify to the truth. Both are gratuitous and of equal invalidity. Both are a wretched, mendacious begging of the question."

McCrackan—"Christian Science must, therefore, be spiritually apprehended."

Comment—"It would be better if it could be intellectually apprehended, as that is the only way in which the human mind can apprehend things, spiritual or material."

McCrackan—"But the fact that men throw out the false beliefs of sickness through Christian Science, may justly be cited as evidence of the truth of Christian Science."

Comment—"We have seen that—rejecting as you do, the testimony of the senses—you cannot prove that men throw off sickness, or false beliefs of it. You have no right to appeal to the senses, which you repudiate as false witnesses. Your claims of cures, therefore, stand naked and mendacious, without the slightest shred of proof to verify them."

McCrackan—"Though the final proof must always be a matter of faith, interpreted as spiritual understanding."

Comment—"This is practically a confession that your science cannot be proved, a retreat from the court of reasonable inquiry. Faith, to be reasonable and in keeping with the dignity of man's intelligence, must rest on an authority whose veracity is demonstrated by cognizable proofs; otherwise it is hebetudinous credulity. We have seen that Christian Science has—in denying the credibility of the senses—deprived itself of the possibility of presenting cognizable proof of its claims, or even of its very existence."

Here we conclude our comments. We would not have given so much time and attention to Mr. McCrackan's letter were it not that he is a scholar, a

gentleman, an author of several books, and a man thoroughly capable of expressing himself with precision and clearness on any subject susceptible of clear and precise treatment. If he has been vague and contradictory it is because of the vague, misty and contradictory nature of the so-called science for which he stands as an exponent.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

THE ROSARY DEVOTION.

Why the Recital of the Rosary is not Monotonous.

Is the recital of the Rosary monotonous? Is the constant repetition of the same prayers an element of distraction? It is certainly true that our rational faculties may become dulled or even biased by a monotonous exercise of mental energy, but it must be understood that we are not required to overtax ourselves in any work, spiritual or otherwise, beyond our capacities. In spiritual exercises, in works of charity and in the discharge of religious duties and in the obligations we are bound to fulfill, according to our state of life, we must be consistent, methodical and systematic. We must follow the precept as laid down in Ecclesiastes iii, 1: "All things have their season, and in times all things pass under Heaven." In that which relates to the subject under consideration the Church has wisely and beautifully devised the method of saying our beads in the following manner: The Rosary is subdivided into three distinct parts, each part implies a meditation upon the Incarnation, the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, familiarly known as the Joyful, Sorrowful and Glorious Mysteries, respectively. We begin to recite Our Father, followed by repeating ten times the Hail Mary or a decade, to which is attached a mystery in the life of our dear Lord or His Blessed Mother upon which we are to meditate while reciting the prayers. A versatile French writer compares the Rosary to a rosebush, and the comparison is so beautiful in conception, significant in application that a translation of his ideal thought will convey a better meaning and a fuller appreciation of this sweet devotion, so near and dear to the hearts of all the faithful children of the true Clu ch.

"The bough of the rosebush which embarks our gardens is composed of three parts—the green leaves, sharp thorns and charming flowers. These three parts symbolize well the serial parts of the Rosary. The green leaves represent the Five Joyful Mysteries, because they remind us of the joy and consolation of Mary in the Annunciation, in the Visit to St. Elizabeth, in the Birth of the Saviour, in the Presentation and in the Finding of Jesus in the Temple of Jerusalem."

"The thorns symbolize the Sorrowful Mysteries; that is, the Passion of the Saviour in full, the anguish of the Mother and the torture of the Son in the bloody Agony in the Garden of Olives, in the horrible Flagellation, in Crowning with Thorns, Carrying the Cross and the ghastly Crucifixion."

"Finally, the flowers of the rosebush, so delicate and perfumed, symbolize the Glorious Mysteries, which present to us Mary glorified in her resurrected Son, in her Son diffusing His Holy Spirit on earth, glorified herself in her triumphant Assumption and in her Coronation in the highest heavens."

If, then, the devotion of the Rosary is of such deep meaning and significance, are we surprised that our Holy Mother has blessed, by many signal favors and miracles, those who practice it until the end? We know that the Indulgences which attach to the pious practice have for object to remit the temporal punishment for sins committed and thus shorten our detention in the fiery prison house of purgatory.—J. S. in Catholic Mirror.

THE WORK OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL.

St. Vincent de Paul dealt with the whole range of human misery and suffering, from the case of the founding to that of poverty-stricken old age, from the instruction of children to the care of the insane. He organized women of the highest ranks of society, of the middle class, and even of the lower. He formed them into bands and associations to deal with every form of destitution and suffering. The Ladies of Charity and the Sisters of Charity were the most remarkable among these. He covered France with schools for the poor, and taught the daughters of the rich and noble to abandon home and pleasure to consecrate themselves to the education of their less fortunate brethren. But even all this was not enough for him, though it was the maximum for the so-called philanthropists. There was one step more, one higher aim, namely, to care for, to teach, to guard the immortal soul, and bring it safely back to Him from whom it came. To feed the body was good, to enlighten the mind was better, but above and before everything else, in the eyes of St. Vincent de Paul, was to purify, to guard, to save the soul. Even from this height he looked higher still, and saw, clothed in the rags of the poor, the person of his Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. He used to say, "I must not judge poor people according to their exterior or according as they speak, for often they are far from what they seem. Let us judge them by the light of faith, and we shall see in them the Son of God, Who wished to be poor, Who in His Passion lost almost the appearance of a man, Who appeared a fool to the Gentiles, a stumbling-block to the Jews."—American Herald.

The faith to which we belong is indeed a glorious faith.—Rev. J. DeHarbe, S. J.