

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1899.

NO. 1403.

## The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, December 9, 1899.

### TRUE CHARITY.

"They gave of their best." What a variety there is in people's "bests," both as regard kind and degree. With some of us it is worldly means. With others talents, but with everyone something. And the thing that counts is the disposition of the giver. We often feel like giving alms, but are without means. Then perhaps our talents can be used for the benefit of our neighbors, and help of this kind can be more delicately given.

But even those lacking talents or means are not empty-handed, for there is within reach of all the alms of cheerfulness—the help that a bright smile or a cheery word may give. Cardinal Manning tells us that every kind word and gentle tone and loving watchfulness in small things, by which the humblest and most homely life is turned into gold and transfigured in secret before God and the guardian angels, shall have a measure of bliss and glory.

### AMERICAN FICKLENESS.

Admiral Dewey is no longer the popular hero. A week ago he was the idol of frenzied crowds and to-day none so poor as to do him reverence. The sheets that had exhausted every full-some superlative in his praise are finding new vocabularies to find fitting words of contempt for him. It is alleged that the outcry is due to the fact that he deeded to his wife the house given him by his friends, but that reason is too puerile to satisfy anyone with pretensions to common sense. The cause of the unseemly clamor is that Dewey married a Catholic. Ever since he made that unpardonable blunder the bigots have been fuming and fretting and waiting for opportunity to spit out their venom at him. They caught gladly at the chance of the house episode, and Dewey is appreciating doubtless the value of the plaudits of his erstwhile admirers.

He has to-day, in the opinion of practical politicians, supposing he were to enter political life, no chance of winning the presidential election, because, according to the unwritten law of the United States, no man with a Catholic wife may be President. Sheridan, Sherman and Bland were discounted politically for the same reason. And even this law cannot stop the fustian and folly about their superior civilization.

### ADORNMENT OF OUR HOMES.

A thing that has often seemed to us as peculiar is the scarcity of religious pictures in some Catholic households. In the homes of the poor one finds an abundance of them: hideous caricatures very often, but regarded with as much love as if they came from the pencil of a master.

An old woman who is the proud possessor of a glittering monstrance representing Christ told us the very sight of it did her good.

"Did not He have to work? Wasn't He poor? And when I'm telling I think of Him and how He was treated!" The gaudy picture brought something very real before the vision of the old lady—the Nazarene with His wealth of love, the gentleness that spoke from the lips and beautiful eyes mayhap, made music in her tired old heart.

She is but a type of a class that is the very salt of the earth. She is one of the Catholics who hold straight course to the land beyond and who whilst here are tenacious of Catholic custom and regard no admonition as undeserving of attention.

Our spiritual guides have time and again exhorted parents to beautify the walls of their homes with pictures that will keep the inmates in mind of our Divine Lord and of His saints. And surely it is an advice to be heeded. Instead of having a picture more or less indelicate in our parlor why not have one of a man or woman who lived here and kept soul and body clean. We are not prudish in this matter. Good pictures are not confined to the depicting of sacred personages, but anything from a painter's brush that offends delicacy in any way should, no matter how excellent from an artistic point of view, be forbidden entrance into Christian households.

### LOOTING IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The news of Church looting and desecration in the Philippines has put our brethren over the border in combative mood. They have stiffened up perceptibly and ordered a set of resolutions, couched in very condemnatory terms, to be forwarded to the President.

Mr. McKinley, however, was either too absorbed in the study of the international problem or in the pursuit of the affections of the giddy electorate, to pay much attention to the matter.

Then an individual, a very reliable authority who had been out there, soothes the angry feelings of all concerned by stating that the tales of looting existed only in the imagination of the enemies of the administration. It was a pretty story concocted in a moment of inspiration, and will receive no doubt its reward from the proper authorities. It found believers amongst those who are politicians first and Catholics afterwards, and who would not be a whit perturbed if every church in the islands was razed to the ground.

The varnish has been rubbed off that story by the reports that come from San Francisco, establishing beyond doubt that the American soldiers carried off everything they could lay their hands on. Chalices, silver tabernacle doors, wrenched evidently from the altars of the churches, reliquaries, vestments, rosary beads, etc., were seized by the vandals and sold to enterprising curiosity shop merchants of San Francisco. It is of little avail to waste words on the matter. It is barbarism of the crudest kind. Chalices, etc., may have little meaning for the non-Catholic, but he understands that around them cluster the love and faith of thousands, and a soldier with a dash of chivalry in his nature would as soon think of stealing them as of drawing steel on a defenceless woman.

Perhaps they do not know any better. They may belong to the uncaptured thousands who believe that things Catholic are to be abhorred. But whatever they are, they have stamped themselves as graceless blackguards who have as little respect for sacred things as for woman's purity.

### THE POLITICIANS' PATRON.

Garcia Moreno should be the patron saint of all politicians who wish to keep their hands out of other people's pockets and to show them men busied with the weighty affairs of state can be disinterested, chaste, temperate—in a word, all that believers in a hereafter should be.

His life reads like a fairy tale to us of the nineteenth century who are accustomed to associate vain and peculiar tricks with politicians and to have continually before us all species of jugglery, compromise and coercion as specimens of statecraft.

He believed that national stability was enduring must depend on God; and he saw to it, whilst he guided the destinies of Ecuador, that the stream of justice and morality coursed through every vein of the body politic.

How he re-organized the army, built schools and hospitals, in which times he gave proofs of heroic charity, and put down fraud with heavy hand, and never flagged in giving to the people confidence in his care the example of a truly Christian life, are matters of history. He proved beyond all doubt that a republic, recognizing God as Master in a practical manner, obeying the commands of His Church and placing all things national under His care, can reach a high plane of prosperity.

Garcia Moreno was a devout Catholic, and never, though burdened with responsibility and the cares of office, neglected to hear Mass every morning. He, as all true children of the Church are wont to do, loved the Pope with all his heart and soul. When the great powers of Europe stood calmly by and watched without protest the invasion of Rome by the Garibaldian horde, his voice rang out in denunciation of the sacrilege.

His speeches are fragrant with the aroma of simple piety that is all too rare. He was ever accustomed to ascribe his success to God and to His Immaculate Mother, and when he was done to death—simply because he was a Catholic—men of every race and creed who had sought of regard for singleness and nobility of purpose, for unswerving purity of life and splendid intellectual gifts, knew the world was the poorer for his death.

One man of that type would purify the politics of any country.

### CATHOLICITY'S INTELLECTUAL FUTURE.

The Church Holds Out the Only Hope for the Ultimate Safety of Christianity.

Boston Republic.

In the Nineteenth Century for November William H. Mallock, a nephew of the late Anthony Froude, the historian, and an author and journalist, has a remarkable article upon the future of the Catholic Church, from which we select some of the most striking and salient points. The task which Mr. Mallock has set for himself is thus outlined:

I shall endeavor to show that if the Christian religion holds its own at all in the face of secular knowledge, it is the Christian religion as embodied in the Church of Rome, and not in any form of Protestantism, that will survive in the intellectual contest. I shall endeavor to show also that the history of the great apostasia which Rome, as the champion of revelation, will offer to the human intellect, instead of being wrapped in mystery, are, for those who have eyes to see, day by day becoming clearer and more comprehensive, and that all those forces of science, which, it was once thought, would be fatal to her, are now, in a way which constitutes one of the great surprises of history, so grouping themselves as to afford her a new foundation.

Christianity, as we look back over the nineteenth centuries of its existence, will be seen to have passed through two similar, though contrasted, crises, greater and more momentous than any other that can be compared with it. The first of these was the ultimate and decisive victory which Christian theology gained over the secular thought of the ancient world. The second is the victory, no less decisive, which the secular thought of the modern world has gained over Christian theology. The first of these events is summed up in the words of the Emperor Julian: "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean." The second may be summed up in words which, willingly or unwillingly, the Church, then so triumphant, has had to utter to another teacher, words almost identical: "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean." The significance of this last confession it is impossible to over-estimate. It means that in the eyes of the very Church itself, which once claimed to be the custodian of all knowledge, science has established its position as the sole and final authority with regard to all subjects amenable to its methods and apprehension; and that the question which now confronts us is not, as it was once, whether theology can find room for science, but whether science can find room for theology. It is for Christianity, not for science, to give this question its answer; but if the answer is to carry the least weight, Christianity must look science fully and steadily in the face, and master, in their full meaning, the teachings which it would reconcile with its own.

The teachings of science, as bearing on the question of Christianity, will be found to group themselves into two great classes, which we may, with accuracy sufficient for our present purpose, describe respectively as the cosmic and the historical. By the cosmic teachings of science I mean all those teachings which bear on the relations of man to the matter of which this planet—his habitat—is formed, and the relation of this planet to the solar system and to the universe. By the historical teachings of science I mean all those teachings which bear on the development of man himself, since his species first came into existence, and especially on such of his developments, social and individual, as have taken place since he first began to be civilized.

Now, of these two sets of teachings the former may here be set aside—the teachings by which man's old view of the universe has been so completely revolutionized and so incalculably enlarged. For these teachings, if they affect Christianity at all, affect it mainly by their tendency to reduce the whole human race to insignificance, whereas it is the essence of Christianity to invest it with solemn and eternal import. If these teachings, then, all those which are an obstacle to our acceptance of all the others, and indeed to our acceptance of any religion whatsoever. We must therefore start with assuming that they are somehow or other be disposed of, and that religion, in spite of them, still has some locus standi; for otherwise, if no religion can be tolerated by science at all, it is obviously superfluous to discuss which of two forms of Christianity has the best intellectual equipment for effecting a final peace with it. We assume, then, that the Christian religion is a religion which may be true possibly. Our sole question here is whether, in the face of advancing knowledge, men can any longer believe it to be true actually; and the answer to this depends upon two great issues which have been raised, and are being thrust before us, not by cosmic science, but by historical. One of these issues is the validity of the various proofs on which the truth of the

Christian religion has hitherto supposed to rest. The other is the number and character of the dogmas, or distinct propositions, which the Christian religion enunciates, and without which it is not Christianity. The scientific history, then, with which Christianity has to reckon, in of two kinds—firstly, the history of the Bible, as revealed to us by scientific criticism and, secondly, the history, as revealed to us by similar means, of such dogmas or propositions, with regard to human or divine events as are held to be essential to the Christian religion to-day.

And now let me sum up in as few words as possible what science is teaching to do in the direction that have just been indicated, first with regard to the Bible, and secondly with regard to Christian doctrine. It tends to annihilate completely, in the eyes of every thinking man, the two great principles which are the foundation of what is called reformed Christianity. The first of these is the principle that the Bible contains in itself a clear indication of what Christian doctrine is, and is also its own warranty that everything which it says is true; the second is the principle that, if any further guide is required, we shall find it in the beliefs and practices of Christ's earliest followers, the fundamental assumption of every school of Protestantism being that its own creed is that of the first Christians, given back to the light by the removal of the superstructures of Rome.

Both these principles the scientific study of history is rendering, year by year, more completely untenable—indeed, we may say more completely unthinkable. While increasing the interest of the Bible in many respects, it is exhibiting the Biblical books as utterly incompetent in themselves to supply us with any system of coherent doctrine, or to prove it. While increasing the interest of the history of the Christian Church, it is showing us that the Christianity of Rome, instead of being primitive, the gradual growth of centuries; and that of the simplest creed professed in the austere of little Bethsela, as truly as of that which echoes under the dome and among the incense of St. Peter's, we may say that it resembles the creed of the first Christian age only as a man of fifty may resemble a child of five.

I will briefly substantiate and illustrate both these facts; and will then go on to indicate the supreme conclusion that is emerging from them—a conclusion which alike in the sphere of dialectics and history is dissolving the entire intellectual basis of the reformation.

Let us begin with the change which science has effected in our conception of the Bible. This change amounts to the complete annihilation throughout the entire Protestant world, that the Biblical books were dictated by the Omnipotent Spirit in such a manner that every statement contained in them was, when properly understood, absolutely free from error, and contained some message fraught with supernatural authority. In place of this belief science has forced on us the recognition that, whatever truths the Biblical books may contain, these truths are embedded in a mass of error—in legends pretending to be history, in reminiscences pretending to be prophecies and in the frequent inculcation of conduct not only immoral but monstrous. It has forced on us a recognition also of something still more revolutionary—something which concerns not the errors of the Bible, but its truths. It has forced us to recognize that the truths recorded in its pages are to be accepted by us if they are historical only on such grounds as would secure our acceptance of them if stated by any ordinary historian, and are to be accepted by us, if they are moral and spiritual, only because there is something in ourselves which prompts us to indorse them as morally and spiritually satisfactory.

That the change thus briefly indicated is a reality of the most momentous kind, and is no mere invention or exaggeration of anti-Christian critics, can be shown by reference to the writings of the apologists of Christianity themselves, and apologists belonging to the most diverse and antagonistic schools. I will confine myself to

THE EVIDENCE OF PROTESTANTS, whom the change affects most decidedly, and whose natural impulses would be to minimize it as far as possible; and for examples of such evidence I will go to three widely different kinds. One of them is an English asceticist, an intellectual leader of his party; another is the most popular exponent of the English Church possesses of evangelical theology touched with liberal sympathies; another is a German, one of the profoundest of the devout scholars of Europe. The first of these is the editor of Lux Mundi, a volume of high church apologetics, to which he himself has contributed an essay on Biblical inspiration. The second is the dean of Canterbury. The third is Professor Harnack. Canon Gore, as might naturally be expected, maintains that, in despite of science, the supernatural inspiration of the Bible is as defensible now as ever; but it is impossible to admit in stronger lan-

guage than his that science has so revolutionized our conception of what the Bible is as to force us to defend its inspiration on practically new grounds. His entire essay on "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration" is an elaboration of this thesis. It partly consists of hints as to what the new grounds will be; but its plainer and more emphatic passages are devoted to an acknowledgment of how great and how real is the change which makes a new defence necessary. In doing this he justifies himself with the authority of the bishop of Oxford. The bishop, Canon Gore tells us, has said in a recent charge, that "the holy scriptures of the Old Testament are now going through a process of analytical criticism which has, as we believe, no parallel for acuteness of investigation, carefulness of method and completeness of apparatus since the days in which they began to be regarded as a code of inspired literature, and certainly not since the days of our Blessed Lord's life on earth."

OUR CONCEPTION OF THE BIBLE IS, which, if not greater, is certainly not less, than "the changes involved in the acceptance of heliocentric astronomy."

Professor Harnack uses language which is almost precisely similar. "The most decisive step of all (in religious thought) was taken," he says, "when it was agreed that the understanding and exposition of the Old and New Testaments were neither to be regulated by any 'creed' nor be allowed, out of regard to the sacredness of the text, to make use of other methods than those universally recognized in the spheres of philology and history. The application of this rule to theology has produced a revolution which still vibrates through the whole of its domain. How has this come about?" he proceeds. "Whose work has it been? No one has done it, and every one has done it. It is a consequence of the historical sense, the rise of which indicates a revolution in the history of mankind no less great than has been produced by the discoveries of natural science. The conception of what knowledge means has altered." The only difference between the English High Churchman and the great German critic is that the former, with a curious and utterly illogical admissions to the Old Testament and shrinks from applying them to the New; whereas the latter knows and admits that their application extends to both and with regard to the latter, though he considers himself a critical conservative, his conclusions are, as we shall see presently, even more destructive practically than they are with regard to the former.

And now let us turn to the witness borne by the dean of Canterbury. In an article which I published last December in this review, I called attention to Dean Farrar's work, "The Bible: Its meaning and Its Supreme Act." In certain of his conclusions he differs from Professor Harnack, but his premises are absolutely the same. The Cardinal point he insists upon throughout his entire volume is that the Bible, from Genesis to Revelations, is a mixture of truth and error; that the view, so prevalent formerly, according to which it was a book demanding in all its facts our credence, or even our respect, would, if not abandoned by Christians,

REDUCE THEIR RELIGION TO AN ABSURDITY, and that the foremost duty of the modern Christian apologist is to show the skeptic and the infidel that Christians are concerned to defend, not the book as a whole, but select passages only. These, according to the dean, are indeed supernaturally inspired, but all the rest—and the rest is a large proportion of it—we may abandon as unconcernedly as we might abandon the books of Livy to the secular critic, who may destroy or spare it as he pleases.

Here, then, we have the admissions of three distinguished theologians who may be taken as representing the whole drift of opinion among the Protestant or reformed Churches; and from these admissions there follows one great conclusion which is not only obviously implied in them, but is also enunciated by these writers themselves. That conclusion is this, that the Bible, taken by itself, is no guide to true Christianity, and affords no proof that such and such doctrines are true. It is a guide and a proof only when some authority outside the book is able to ear mark what is true and essential in it, and distinguish this from what is indifferent and fallacious. We will return to this point presently; but there is another matter which we must consider first. We have glanced at the results of criticism on the character and authority of the Bible. It remains for us to see how it has affected our conception of Christian doctrine.

The result in the latter case is analogous to that in the former. Just as it has destroyed the idea of a self-sufficient and historical Bible, so does it destroy the idea, equally cherished by Protestants, of a self-sufficient, an infallible, a complete primitive Christianity. It has, of course, been always known that two of the creeds at all events were not composed till long after the apostolic age. It has also been known that in the apostolic age

itself orthodoxy had to combat various forms of heresy; but historical criticism is now elucidating a new truth, namely, that the content of orthodoxy was only very gradually arrived at by the orthodox; and that the nature and mission of Christ, as understood by His immediate followers, was something widely different from the conception of them which prevades Catholicism and any of the Christian bodies that broke away from Rome. "The historical way of regarding the New Testament may not," says Professor Harnack, "and will not overlook the concrete features, in which and by which the life and doctrine of Christ were actually fashioned in their day. It seeks for points of CONNECTION WITH THE OLD TESTAMENT

and its developments, with the religious life of the synagogue, with contemporary hopes for the future, with the whole intellectual and spiritual condition of the world of Greece and Rome; and it finds that the evidence of such connection is unmistakable. The consequence is that the sayings and discourses of the Lord, and the image of His life itself, not only take their color—and it is a very definite color—from the history of the time, but they are also seen to possess certain definite limitations. They belong to their time and environment, and they could not exist in any other."

And if this is true of the life of Christ Himself and the doctrines recorded by the evangelists which He enunciated with His own lips, it is still more emphatically true of the earliest deductions from them, and the earliest deductions from them, which we find in the Apostolic Epistles. So far are apologists like Canon Gore and the Bishop of Oxford from being right in fancying that criticism is affecting the Old Testament only, that the New, though in a different way, is suffering an even greater change. For an indication of what this change is let us go to a treatise on St. Paul by another writer, an Anglican writer. This writer is Rev. S. Baring-Gould who, whatever we may think of the original views put forward by him, does nothing more in his methods and general principles than follow and illustrate those of the new historical criticism. The profound change that has been thus introduced into our whole conception of the origin of Christian doctrine is summed up in the following few words, in which the epistle to the Romans is contrasted by him with the epistle to the Galatians. "Since Paul," says Mr. Baring-Gould, "had written his epistle to the Galatians, he had reconsidered the arguments he had used in it; some he strengthened, some he laid aside. In the epistle to the Romans we have his matured thought. That is to say, the greatest of the early Christian thinkers, who claimed to have been converted by a special revelation of Christ—even he is represented as a man who won his way to the truth very slowly and not without many errors; his writings, which are accepted

AS PART OF THE SACRED CANONS, embody its errors and its blunderings, no less than his truths; and even his matured thought was not final or satisfactory. Even in the epistle to the Romans, Mr. Baring-Gould says, "the apostle was unable to think clearly, and consequently could not express what he felt in intelligible form." Instead of having revealed to us, once and forever, an infallible theologic system, he "never having a philosophic education," had done nothing more when he had made an "attempt" to formulate one. "He saw certain possibilities, he received mysteries, behind the facts of Christ's life and these he suggested; but he had not the discipline of mind, acquired by education other than that of rabbinic schools, to think out a complete system of theology."

The original Protestant position set forth by divines like Hooker, who denounced as one of the fundamental errors of Rome the doctrine that "scripture was insufficient without tradition," is by the Protestantism of to-day being itself denounced and repudiated; and a doctrine which, in some respects at all events, resembles that of Rome is more or less explicitly being set up by them in its place. This is the doctrine that as a guide to truth, or as a proof of it, scripture is altogether insufficient unless it is guaranteed and interpreted by some authority external to itself; and this authority has to answer two sets of questions: Firstly, since the Bible is a mixture of truth and error, it has to separate for us the inspired passages from the erroneous; and, secondly, since the inspired passages imply more than they say, since the Christian creeds are deduced from, rather than contained in them, and since equally earnest men have deduced from them very different conclusions, this authority must separate for us what is orthodox in dogma from what is heretical, just as it separates for us in the Bible the divine elements from the human. It is this authority, then, which, for the modern Protestant, is now confessed to be, as it always has been for the Catholic, the intellectual and logical foundation on which Christianity rests, and for the Christian world of to-day the supreme problem is: Of what does this authority consist, and how are we to identify its utterances?