



## AN EXPLANATION AND AN APOLOGY.

To the Editor of the Review of St. Louis Mo.

Sir:—

I bow humbly to the just rebuke administered by His Lordship of Dacca in "The Review" of July 26. The occasion seems to call for a full explanation, as painful as this must be to me. The communications of mine sent by him and reproduced by you were written at a period (Dec., 1892, to early part of 1895) during which I was under ecclesiastical censure, and was earning my livelihood by literary work in which I was wholly dependent on a Protestant, Liberal, and non-Christian constituency. While I had not lost my faith or formally apostatized, I was not looked upon by anyone as a Catholic writer, and was prevented by the exigencies of my position from writing from a Catholic point of view. After I had been relieved of censure and admitted to the sacraments through the kind offices of His Grace the Archbishop of Chicago, I sent a reparatory communication to the *Church News* of Washington, D.C., in which, among other things I made a full and unqualified withdrawal of all that I had written, which might have been in any way contrary to the Apostolic tradition and the teachings of Holy Church. I subsequently endeavored to make the influence which I had gained among the pagans of India tell in favor of the Catholic faith by contributing articles in defence and exposition of Catholicity to the *Sophia*, the organ of the Catholic Brahmans, and would have done further work in that line had not *Sophia* suspended publication.

I have not only made most strenuous "efforts to repair the scandal given," but have undergone "a long and serious penance" imposed upon me by Divine Providence; a penance which will continue as long as my good colleagues in the cause of Catholic apologetics and polemics feel moved to wield the scourge of discipline over my already well-mangled shoulders!

I have "studied my catechism" too; for, although I knew my theology pretty well before my lapse (well enough at any rate, to have thoroughly confuted my own errors), I thereafter made the two Summae of St. Thomas Aquinas my chief study for a number of years, beginning some time before my reconciliation.

While there are some statements in my communication to the *Pioneer* of January, 1894, which are absolutely incapable of explanation or defence, it is only just to myself to say that one of my objects in writing it was indirectly to promote the cause of Catholicity by giving ammunition to the pagans of India against the Protestant missionaries from this country and the general body of modern Protestant quasi-materialists. I was writing for Protestants and pagans, and the word "Christianity" was meant to refer (and would be naturally understood by the pagans to refer, in a communication from this country) to that kind of Christianity, or rather pseudo-Christianity, which predominates here, and which is the only kind which goes to India from the

United States, to-wit, Protestantism in its various forms.

The negations of Protestantism are not only opposed to the Catholic faith, but also to that common heritage of religious truth, derived from the primeval revelation, that permeates, in a corrupted form, all the great pagan religions, and especially Hinduism, which is derived from prehistoric times, and is merely a natural corruption (or maze of contradictory corruptions) of the faith of our first parents, instead of being essentially a system of pseudo-philosophic infidelity with a thin religious varnish, like Buddhism and Confucianism. Hinduism can certainly never propagate itself among Catholics, but it would act as an excellent dissolvent upon Protestantism, to which it is greatly superior. Protestantism names Christ, but is utterly a stranger to the real Christ of history, who speaks and acts through the Apostolic ministry and is present in the Holy Eucharist. Its fundamental errors it shares with paganism, and to these it superadds others unknown to the Gentiles.

In fact there is no form of paganism on earth which cannot be more successfully defended before the bar of reason than any form of Protestantism can be. Moreover, Protestantism repudiates many principles and undermines many institutions resting on the natural law which have been jealously guarded by Hinduism and some other pagan systems; and Protestantism errs even more through materialism and defect of religiousness than Hinduism does in the opposite direction of idealism and superstition.

The communications in question as published, have evidently been garbled in Hindu hands—just how much I cannot say. For example, I certainly did not state, and could not have stated, that I was "President of the Parliament and of all the conference connected with the latter;" for I was President only of the Scientific Section (at which, it is true, all the "conferences" took place, except those in the Catholic and Buddhist "inquiry rooms,") and of the subsequent "World's Congress on Ways and Means of Universal Religious Unity." Dr. Barrows, whose "Oriental secretary" I was, was the President of the Parliament of Religions.

But, taking it as it stands, much of the document (the second and principal one) will be found to be literally true, if the word "Protestantism" be substituted for "Christianity." The latter part of the sixth paragraph, beginning with the words, "Europe has always been indebted" is, of course absolutely false, in any and every sense, and I distinctly repudiate and denounce it, as well as everything else, in that or any other product of my pen, which has been in any manner or degree, however slight, inconsistent with the doctrines and traditions of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church in their most integral forms.

Swami Vivekananda, who was my intimate personal friend, was well aware, from private conversations, at the time the incriminating documents were written, that I did not believe in Hinduism but in the Catholic religion alone.

I am confident that nothing that

I have ever written as a Catholic (e. g., from January, 1884, to January, 1893, and from December, 1894, to the present time) will be found to contain anything not in perfect accord with the deposit of faith, the definitions of the Church, and the doctrines of the Angelic Doctor.

It would be as unjust to charge against me the false and foolish utterances to which I was driven during the period of my unfortunate alienation from the Church, as it would have been to charge against St. Augustine anything that he had written while a Manichean; especially as it has been and is the chief object of my life to serve the cause of the Catholic faith and unity, against heresy and separatism without and Liberalism within. I know of no way in my power of making a more adequate reparation for past errors.

I am grateful to Bishop Hurth for his prudent intervention, for it will give me an opportunity to furnish, through him, an ample retraction, correction, and refutation of the errors in support of which my name is being used in the Indian Empire.

MERWIN-MARIE SNELL,  
Spalding, Neb., July 28th, 1900.

### A SISTER'S PRIZE POEM.

[The first competition for the "Felicia Hemans" prize, which was founded in Liverpool by some admirers of the poetess of that name, took place recently. The prize is a bronze medal and £5, offered yearly for the best lyrical poem. The judges are the professors of University College, Liverpool. The winner is "Sister M. X." of the Convent of Notre Dame, Mount Pleasant, Liverpool, who submitted the following:]

#### DAY AND NIGHT.

Day came dancing over the sky,  
She smiled the whole of the way,  
And Earth felt the smiles creep over her face,  
And Earth laughed back at the Day.  
The daffodils nodded out of the grass,  
The blackbirds called from the brake,  
And the broad sweet light passed into my heart,  
When the eyes of the Day did wake.  
And my heart said, and my heart sang,  
"O Day, thy face is blest,  
Let thy smile for aye be sealed on my way,  
The Sunshine of God is best."

Night paced slowly over the blue,  
Her dark skirts swept the Earth,  
And Earth grew still as she felt her pass,  
And hushed her sounds of mirth.  
I stood alone with the full-eyed stars,  
While blackbirds and daffodils slept,  
And the peace of the Night passed into my soul,  
And I drooped my head and wept,  
And my soul said, and my soul sighed,  
"O Night, thy touch is blest,  
Be thy gentle shade on my spirit laid,  
The shadows of God are blest."

O Day! O Night! O Shadow and Light!  
Gray Eve and golden Dawn,  
Link your hands o'er the waiting Earth,  
O'er meadow and lake and lawn.  
Join your threads in the heart of man,  
O change of the changing years,  
O Shadow and Light! O Joy! O Pain!  
We need both the smiles and the tears;  
For the heart laughs, and the heart weeps,  
And in both is the brave heart blest,  
God's light shines bright in the day and night,  
And I know not which is best.

#### ALREADY HOLDS OFFICE.

When she had finished her remarks relative to something he had done that did not meet her approval, she spoke. "I don't see why you should want woman suffrage," he said. "You already hold office."  
"What office?" she demanded.  
"Speaker of the house," he replied.—  
Chicago Post.

### MISSIONARY METHODS.

*The Casket.*—

A good deal of light is being shed these days upon methods and results of missionary work in China. An American business man, Mr. Edward Runge, who has resided in that country for many years, was interviewed by the *New York Tribune* on his recent return to America, and spoke as follows:

The missionary is looked upon as a mischief-maker, and is consequently disliked and often molested. The missionaries whom I have seen in China were all well-meaning and enthusiastic young men and women, but in nearly every instance totally unfitted for the work. They were ignorant of the language and customs of the people, and they all underestimated the magnitude of the work in which they were engaged. The Catholic missionaries in China come better prepared for the work. They know the language and they come to stay. Furthermore, they become a part of the community by practising a trade or a profession. They show less anxiety to make converts, but they really make more, and there are many Chinese Catholics all over the Empire. . . . As a matter of fact there are no Chinese Christians except Catholics.

"They come to stay"—what a deep meaning these words have here! Generally they are used somewhat slangily, to signify assured success in some business venture. What do they mean in the case of a Catholic missionary? Most often he is a Frenchman, and we know how passionately the Frenchman loves his kindred and his native land. But when, at Marseilles, he steps on board the ship that is to bear him to China or Borneo or the islands of the South Pacific, he bids farewell to his kindred and his native land forever. What does he find in his new home to take their place? A strange race of people whose hearts seem impossible to reach, a variety of national customs to which he must conform though they sicken and disgust him. He must labor like a galley-slave, with no hope that his labors will ever be rewarded, or even known, on earth. He must walk by day and rest by night in the shadow of death. Yet this last circumstance is his greatest consolation; for he hopes that his death, whether bloody or unbloody, will win him a place among "the glorious chorus of apostles," if not among "the white-robed army of martyrs."

Lord Salisbury is a "plain blunt man," without a doubt, brutally blunt, very often. His address before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, a few weeks ago, was certainly very much out of harmony with his environment on that occasion. But how truly did he draw the contrast between Catholic and Protestant missionary methods when he said:

If an Evangelist or an Apostle, a Boniface or a Columba, preached in the Middle Ages, he faced the difficulties, he underwent the martyrdom, he braved the torments to which he was exposed, and the whole of the great moral and spiritual influence of his self-devotion acted without hindrance on the people whom he addressed. But now, if a Boniface or a Columba is exposed to this martyrdom, the result is an appeal to a Consul or for the mission of a gunboat.

The noble Marquis would not be willing to admit that a Protestant Boniface or a Columba is as impossible as a square circle, but we know that it is so. The missionary methods of the Middle Ages are the Catholic missionary methods of to-day. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, when warned by Lord Salisbury not to act in such a manner as would make it appear that missionary work was a mere instrument of the secular government which had been trying to make the missionary its tool; but who are they to try to thwart the secular government in its designs? Is not every Protestant body a creature of the secular government? Do they not all accept the rulings of the State in regard to the dissolution of the marriage bond? The Catholic missionary never seeks the protection of a gunboat; he may be powerless to prevent the interference on his behalf of the Government of which he is a subject, but he always sees that interference exercised with regret. The atheistic French Republic, which persecutes Catholics at home, fights for them abroad; the German Kaiser, who will not suffer a

Jesuit to dwell within the borders of the Fatherland, demands an indemnity when one of them is slain in China. If any of us rejoiced at this, we see now that this interference has done more harm than good. The missionaries never asked for it, never desired it. But the case is different with the Protestant missionaries. They have always fondly claimed to be the vanguard of civilization, by which they mean European commerce controlled by Europeans, to the destruction, as the Chinese believe, of the national existence of the Flowery Kingdom. The Catholic Church desires to lead the Chinese to a heavenly kingdom, with civilization as a means, not an end. Protestantism desires to civilize them, as it has civilized the aborigines of North America, by exterminating them if necessary. But to this the Boxers say: "No, not if we can help it."

Why has Protestantism been an utter failure in converting the heathen? In the first place because it is purely a human institution; it has not been sent to do this work. And in the second place, even if a human institution could do such work "a house divided against itself shall not stand." This is how Joseph Howard, the well-known New York correspondent of the *Boston Globe*, expressed it last Sunday:

An esteemed clergyman is reported as saying, apropos of the slaughter of the missionaries, that after all it was a blessing as it opened the door for further work of evangelizing these countless hordes. As I came down town this morning I saw, perhaps 100 Chinamen in Mott Street. They were about their business, industriously following the custom of the land. Assuming that we are all right and in no need of evangelization, and it becomes our duty to convert these benighted foreigners, to what shall we lead them? If you are a Catholic your reply is clear. If you are a Protestant, to which of the many creeds shall we "gently lead them on?" Heaven knows—and probably blushes for it—that we have enough creeds to "go around"—the High Church and Low Church Episcopalians, the Methodists North and South, the Presbyterians ditto, the Baptists hard shell and soft, and then come Universalists, Unitarians, Congregationalists and Quakers. To which communion table shall we invite the "heathen?" It strikes me we might quite as well spend some of the wasted time and the money, too, in bringing our own to a sensible commonwealth of understanding, as to send differing thinkers—often quarreling among themselves—to upset faiths that were born long before Christianity was a possibility, and which mean everything to those who have been drilled in their manual since childhood.

### CONVERTS

#### Who Have Recently Entered the Church in Other Countries.

We continue to hear of distinguished converts to the Church in other lands. Some who have come over recently are: Rev. C. R. Chase, late vicar of All Saints' Church, Plymouth, Eng.; Mrs. M. E. Curry, of Milton House, Swinden; Mrs. Alma Peterson, of Copenhagen, a Lutheran; Mrs. A. Lemele, of Tellickery, India; and C. Meenachaya, of Bangalor, an ex-judge and one of the most prominent Brahmans of the Mysore Province. Mr. Meenachaya for some years has been devoting his attention and study to religion, and his recent conversion has been the fruit of his labors. He belongs to one of the oldest, priestly and most respected Brahmin families of Madras. His father served with distinction in several districts of the Madras Presidency as principal Sudder Amin of the older times, and his grandfather, his namesake, as first interpreter in the old supreme court of Madras. This is perhaps the first instance in modern times of a highly educated Brahmin of an ancient family being received into our holy faith, and it is to be hoped that many similar instances may follow his example.

### MARRIAGES AT MASS.

In accordance with a decree issued by Bishop Thomas D. Beaven at the retreat of the Catholic clergy of Springfield diocese in Holy Cross college last week, all marriages hereafter performed in the diocese must be at a nuptial Mass, except under certain conditions.

In the cases where the marriage is not at a nuptial Mass the priests who perform the ceremony are directed to send to the Bishop, within three months from the date of the marriage, the names of the contracting parties and the reasons why the Mass was omitted.

In the order which has been issued to the priests of the diocese they are instructed to urge the people who have not been married with a Mass to return for a special Mass, no matter how long they have been married, so that they may be given the nuptial blessing.