

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Miracles of Modern Infidelity."
THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Measures, Lake Kitch, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah Henry are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishop of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor and must reach London not later than Monday morning. Quotations and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

Agents or collectors have no authority to stop our paper unless the amount due be paid. Master Inland for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning. Please do not send us money. Quotations and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.
Ottawa, Canada, March 25, 1900.
To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.:
Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.
In matters of form are both good and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.
Blessing you, and wishing you success.
Believe me, to remain,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
+ D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Laval.

LONDON, SATURDAY, AUG. 27, 1904.

A GRACEFUL WRITER.

There is to our mind no English writer better equipped for service to truth than the Rev. Dr. Barry. He has imagination, a wide outlook and insight, the learning of many climes and a gift withal of clothing thought in graceful diction.

True it is that a United States reviewer in criticizing one of his novels dismissed him as a bungler in the field of letters. He may not be a "popular" fiction writer, but the same critic will not grudge him a place among the literary artists of this generation.

His "Newman," published by Charles Scribner's Sons, is one more proof of this. Our concern, he says, is with Newman as an English man of letters; but without reference to the texture of his beliefs and the times and movements at which they were acquired, it would be impossible to measure the energy with which he exercised his mental powers, or rightly to estimate their character.

Carlyle, in a splenetic mood, was for denying to Newman the quality of intellect; he could not imagine a mind intent on visions of churches and creeds as if they were revelations from the Unseen. But to the Oxford Student of 1830 they came with a solemn grandeur and a heavenly light upon them, not less awe-inspiring than the symbols beheld by Ezekiel of Isaiah under the ancient Covenant.

BARRY ON NEWMAN.

The portrait framed by Dr. Barry may not find favor with all the admirers of the great Oratorian. But that it is done well will not be denied. It is the picture of a man devoted to the cause of truth and virtue and spending himself for its success—of a lonely man misunderstood often and neglected—of a sower of infinite seed that has blossomed and brought forth fruit in myriad souls. The portrait is instinct with vitality. The figure that looks out from it is austere as befits the man who is always on the mountains companioned by visions that are denied to those in the valley. But, quoting Anthony Froude, Dr. Barry tells us that Newman's friendships were numerous and romantic; he had indeed a temper imperious and wilful, but along with it a most attaching gentleness, sweetness, singleness of heart and purpose.

A WELL POISED PICTURE.

The picture of his boyhood, of his earnest and scholarly manhood is traced by loving and dexterous hands. And the picture is poised well and in good light. The frame enclosing it may be gemmed overmuch by allusions and comparisons, but it never obscures the linaments of the Oratorian. Dr. Barry tells quickly the story of Newman's studies of the Fathers, of his part in the Tractarian Movement and of his struggles and hesitation till peace came in October, 1845, when he was received into the Catholic Church by Father Dominic, an Italian Passionist Friar.

To show his influence on the Church of England Dr. Barry tells us, in the words of Anthony Froude, that mysteries which had been dismissed as superstitions at the Reformation, and had never since been heard of, were preached again by half the clergy and had revolutionized the ritual in our churches. But where was the man who had wrought these changes? In retreat at Maryvale, an old disused college in

Warwickshire, lonely as he had been at Littlemore, or a simple student in Rome at Santa Croce looking out on the Campagna which he had traversed with such different feelings fifteen years previously, or wearing the habit of St. Philip Neri, a Florentine who was brought up near San Marco, who is called the "Apostle of Rome, and who in his oratory of the Chiesa Nuova had combined music, literature, divinity and the common life in a home which was not a cloister, under a Rule without vows, as of secular priests who should have inherited the large and calm spirit of the Benedictines. But whether in Papal Rome or Protestant Birmingham he led a life apart as he had done in Oxford.

A MASTERLY ANALYSIS.

Dr. Barry's analysis of the Apologia Pro Vita Sua which was read in clubs, in drawing rooms, by clerks, in the top of omnibuses, in railway trains, and we had almost said in pulpits is masterly and thought-provoking.

Concerning the Apologia, two things, writes Dr. Barry, may be said by way of epigraph or conclusion. It fixed the author's place not only in the hearts of his countrymen, but in the national literature. It became the one book by which he was known to strangers who had seen nothing else from his pen, and to a growing number at home, ignorant of theology, not much troubled about dogma, yet willing to admire the living spirit at whose touch even a buried and forgotten antiquity put on the hues of resurrection. No autobiography in the English language has been more read: to the nineteenth century it bears a relation not less characteristic than Biswells Johnson to the eighteenth. Contrasting the Apologia with Renan's "Souvenirs of my Youth," the author finds that the former was penned by a solitary, an enthusiast, from whom eternity had an awful significance, and the latter by an amiable dilettante, gracious and Greek of the Ionian school, the amused observer, the artist before all.

A WONDROUS CHRONICLE.

To Newman's logical powers Dr. Barry pays eloquent tribute. And not only eloquently, but gracefully and learnedly as becomes the literary artist and philosopher. And we mind also that Cardinal Manning thus alluded to this book: But we cannot forget that we owe to him among other debts one singular achievement. No one who does not intend to be laughed at will henceforward say that the Catholic religion is fit only for weak intellects and unmanly brains. This superstition of pride is over. St. Aquinas is too far off, and too little known to such talkers to make them hesitate. But the author of the "Grammar of Assent" may make them think twice before they expose themselves.

And the toil of it. Newman, after some thirty years of meditation, set about writing with infinite pains his "Grammar of Assent." Ten times he went over some of its chapters; over the last perhaps twenty times. Of this book it may be truly said "that it is the precious life blood of a master-spirit embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life." And in connection with Newman's care in writing and revising, our readers will remember how an opponent's overhaste in attacking his essay on the "Inspiration of the Canonical Scriptures" elicited the following comment: "Tis a pity," wrote Cardinal Newman, "he did not take more than a short month for reading, pondering, writing and printing. Had he not been in a hurry to publish he would have made a better article. I took above a twelvemonth for mine." A Robke indeed from "the one Catholic who understood his country and handled its prose as Shakespeare handled its verse and whose devotion to creed and dogma found expression in undying eloquence."

One can read and reread the "Grammar of Assent," and always with profit. It is at once a wondrous chronicle of a soul grappling with problems and a revelation of the power of genius. In his own way he answered the questions that had troubled him for years, and put the record of them in a book that should be appreciated and treasured. But our eyes are too accustomed to the glitter of the commonplace to take kindly to the white light that beats on these pages.

A THING OF LIGHT AND BEAUTY.

In conclusion Dr. Barry says: Letters, stories, sermons belong to the full description of a man whose language always sincere was wrought up little by little to a finish and refinement, a strength and subtlety, thrown into the forms of eloquence beyond which no English writer of prose has gone. It is invariably just, tender, penetrating, animated, decisive, and weighty. It is eminently pure.

It has learned to smile: it can be entertaining, humorous, pleading, indignant as its Creator wills. By it He will live when the questions upon which it was employed have sunk below the horizon, or appear above it in undreamt of shapes: for it is in itself a thing of light and beauty, a treasure from the classic past, an inheritance bequeathed to those peoples and continents which shall bear onward to far-off ages the language and literature that entitle England to a place beside Rome and Hellas in the world's chronicle.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S VISIT.

The Archbishop of Canterbury is on his way to Canada on a friendly visit to his conferees, the Bishops of the Church of England of the Dominion. We have no doubt he will be cordially welcomed by members of the Anglican Church in all parts of Canada to which his visitation will be extended, and deservedly so, for he is regarded as an amiable prelate who is honest in his convictions that the Church of England of modern date is identical with the Church which was recognized as the Church of England in pre-Reformation times, and that he is the lawful successor of the great Archbishop of Canterbury, St. Augustine, Thomas a Becket, Anselm, and others whose names will even be found written on the page of the history of England, and of the Church of the world.

This notion is, of course, a mistaken one, as the modern Church of England, established by Henry VIII. so late as the year 1534, is in every respect a different entity from the Church of England of former times. It differs therefrom entirely in doctrine and discipline, in liturgy, and above all in its head, its hierarchy, and mode of Government, which matters undoubtedly include all the essentials of a Church, even according to the most loose theories which have been invented by modern Church Unionists.

It is authoritatively announced that the Archbishop is not making an archiepiscopal visitation in Canada on this occasion, though he will preach in many dioceses. It is easy to understand that this should be the case. The Archbishop has practically no jurisdiction in Canada, nor even nominally, except, perhaps, in British Columbia. The Canadian Church of England several years ago achieved its complete independence of the Church of England, but British Columbia was not included in the newly declared independent Church. Nevertheless, as we understand, it has been privately arranged that the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury shall not be asserted or exercised in that Province.

In the United States, the Protestant Episcopal Church, which is also the offspring of the Church of England, is likewise entirely independent both of the Church of England, and the Archbishop of Canterbury. Australia, though only a colony like Canada, has also an independent Church, so that with the independent Church in Ireland there are now at least four distinct independent Churches which have sprung out of the Church of England and claim to be almost identical with it in doctrine and mode of Church Government, so that they are still several branches of one Christian Church.

And yet the germ of divergence lies in the fact that these Churches are quite distinct from each other. This divergence has already manifested itself in the American Church, which retains, indeed, the creeds and thirty-nine articles admitted by the Church of England, but which deliberately omits all claim that there is in the priesthood any power of absolving from sin.

Thus in the Communion service, where the minister of the Church of England exhorts intending communicants to quiet their consciences by receiving the benefit of absolution, the Protestant Episcopal Church omits this exhortation, and it does the same in the order of visitation of the sick, where the minister of the Church of England is directed to absolve the sick person by virtue of the authority given by Christ to His Church "to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him."

The deliberate omission of these passages and several others sufficiently shows that the American Episcopal Church has departed from its prototype in a matter of most grave importance; and it is evident that time alone is requisite to make still more conspicuous the divergencies of the so-called branch Churches having their origin in Anglicanism.

It would be interesting to know how in the face of these facts, the theory of independent national Churches forming one Church of Christ can be reconciled with St. Paul's declaration to Timothy that the Church of the Living God is the pillar and ground of truth; or the teaching of the same Apostle in his Epistle to the Ephesians, that

Christ instituted various orders in the teaching body of the Church for the perfecting of the Saints, the preservation of the unity of the faith, and to effect that "henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive."

The object here proclaimed cannot be attained without unity under one head, such as exists in the Catholic Church spread throughout all nations.

It has been frequently said that in some sense the Archbishop of Canterbury is the Pope of Anglicanism. None repudiate this statement in description of his office more earnestly than Anglicans themselves; for the tendency of Anglicanism is to disunion, and not to unity of faith, which will necessarily be found in the Catholic Church only, because it has one head for the whole world.

The Archbishop's present position is not a bed of roses, for at the present moment, the internal dissensions in the Church of England, arising out of the High Church movement of the past half century, are beyond the control of the Anglican Episcopate, and a Royal Commission is now at work "investigating the disorders of the National Church." What the result will be, it is impossible to foretell, though the hope has been expressed by some Church papers that through the present visit to America, the Archbishop may pick up some ideas which will help toward a solution of present difficulties. We cannot imagine that such a result will come from the Archbishop's visit, for the same troubles which exist in England have arisen both in the Canadian and American Churches. It appears to us, therefore, that nothing more can be effected by the visit from a religious point of view, than somewhat more cordiality in the relations between the various "branches" of the Church.

The salary of the Archbishop of Canterbury is stated to be \$75,000 per annum.

THE SCOTTISH CHURCHES DECISION.

We gave in our last week's issue an account of the law-suit which was recently terminated before the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords, by a judgment in favor of the remnant of the Free Church which four years ago refused to go into the Union with the United Presbyterian Church.

Some farther light has been thrown upon the whole matter by the news which has since come by mail.

The United Presbyterian Church dates back as a distinct body under that name, to the year 1847; but in a certain sense it may be said to have an earlier history, as it was formed in that year by the Union of two Churches which had an earlier date: the Relief and Associate Churches.

The Free Church was formed in 1843 by a secession from the Established Church of Scotland.

The relative strength of these various Presbyterian Churches may be approximately estimated from the number of ministers of each Church according to statistics of the year 1872 when there were of the Established Church about 1,350, of the Free Church 957 and of the United Church 638 ministers. In addition to these there were 42 of the Reformed, and 26 of the "Secession Church."

There is no doubt that a motive of economy contributed greatly toward the Union of the United and Free Churches, the more so as the various denominations of Protestants were at the time of the union, and for some years previous, agitating for just such a movement, the principal argument in favor of union being the waste of energy resulting from the divided state of Protestantism, and the great extra cost entailed on the people by their being obliged to keep up two congregations and to support two ministers in many places where one might easily suffice.

What now turns out to be a serious matter in the act of union is that doctrinal differences between the two Churches were disregarded. The Free Church had hitherto maintained strenuously the doctrines of the Westminster Confession in regard to predestination and the eternal reprobation of the wicked, and the reasonableness of Church establishment where the Church can have the aid of the State, without being interfered with by the State in the administration of Church matters. But the United Presbyterian Church had left these doctrines dubious, inasmuch as it declared that the belief on these points is optional with each individual.

On the consummation of the Union in 1900 the majority of the members of the Free Church agreed to accept the dubious clause of the United Church, and the plea of the minority, who are popularly called "the Wee Frees," was that the Free Church on its organization had bound itself to maintain the

doctrines of the Westminster Confession forever, and the principle of establishment. From this they had departed by joining a Church which makes these open questions.

Two of the lords forming the Court dissented from the majority's decision which gives to "the Wee Frees" the proprietorship of all the property which had belonged to the Free Church. They maintained that the "real and only question" was whether the Free Church was forced to cling to its subordinate standards for all time, with so desperate a grip that she should lose hold and touch of the supreme standard of its faith, by which it meant the Bible.

These two law-lords are of opinion that a Church should be "capable of growth and development," which evidently means that they should be free to improve or change their doctrine as the majority sees fit. The majority of the lords, however, were of a different opinion, and the decision they arrived at will stand as the law, for from the Court which has so pronounced there is no appeal.

Most of the people of Scotland, even those of the Established Church which has no pecuniary interest in the dispute, seem to be astonished at the decision, and call it unjust; yet in ordinary cases, if parties who have been contributors to the building of a Church, or the purchase of Church property of any kind join afterwards some other Church, it is well understood that they cannot take with them their pecuniary interest in the Church they abandon. Their contributions were given for the Church they left, and the Church they abandoned justly retains them. But in the present instance, the seceders being numerous, were able to defy the minority and to take possession of the property by sheer force. The latter very properly, in our opinion, appealed to the courts of law, and in the end have gained their cause from the highest court of the Empire.

They did as honest citizens should do and have won, and we do not see that the majority have just grounds for complaint.

The property is the accumulation of sixty-one years, and was unreservedly given for the maintenance of Free Kirk principles. We cannot see the matter in the same light with those journals which maintain that it should be divided *pro rata* according to the respective numbers of adherents of the two Churches.

When the majority of the Free Kirkers four years ago decided to make a new religion, they should have been ready to make the sacrifices which the circumstances required, as their fathers did fifty-seven years before.

Now since the law of the case has been so clearly defined, it would be in order for the Established Churches of both England and Scotland to reflect that they came into possession of their grand churches by stealing them from the Catholics; and the dishonesty of the transaction is made clear by the recent decision of the law-lords. Christian theology, and the law of the land agree in the pronouncement that the time has come when due restitution should be made.

THE FREE CHURCH SITUATION IN SCOTLAND.

The decision of the Judicial Committee of the House of Lords whereby it is ordered that the stalwart remnant of the Free Kirk of Scotland shall have possession of the entire property which was owned by the Free Kirk before it absorbed itself into the new organization called the United Free Kirk, has completely dazed Presbyterians in Scotland of every designation.

Fifty-eight Free Church ministers was the number out of 970 who four years ago refused to enter into a union with another Church whose creed was more elastic and less definite than its own.

The 173 ministers who in 1843, under the leadership of Drs. Walsh and Chalmers, withdrew from the General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland, took this action upon a well understood principle. They did not object to the principle of an established Church. They believed that it is lawful for the State to serve God by giving aid to His Church, but not by dominating it, whereas the maintainers of the Established Church permitted the State to rule absolutely in regard to appointments to benefices. The difference between the two on this point was, indeed, very similar to that which existed between the Pope and the French Premier, M. Combes, in regard to the appointment of Bishops. The Pope held and holds that the right to appoint Bishops rests with him exclusively; yet he was willing for serious reasons to grant to Napoleon I. and to succeeding French Governments the privilege of limiting such appointments in such a way that the persons appointed should be acceptable to the Government.

The Concordat regulated the appointment in such a way that the Pope and

the Government agreed upon the person to be appointed, and that person was nominated by the Government, and then appointed by the Pope. This was expressed in the formula of the Pope's Bull by which the appointments were made. The disagreement which arose recently with M. Combes arose from the fact that M. Combes wished the Pope's Bulls to state that the French Government alone made the nomination and appointment, to which the Pope should agree whether it were acceptable to him or not.

To such an arrangement, the Pope did not, and will not submit. It was a somewhat similar dominance of the State in the appointment of Presbyterian ministers to which the Free Church ministers objected, though they would have made no objection if the state had made its appointments in union with the General Assembly's wish, or that of the congregations affected.

But in the course of time the principles on which the Free Church was built were less vigorously maintained, and it was thought to be less necessary to maintain any special doctrine than it had been previously. Indeed all Protestantism has become less firm in the maintenance of religious dogmas and is prepared to give up distinctive doctrines very readily. Hence the Free Church, four years ago thought the time had arrived, for the Free Kirk to strengthen itself numerically, and it combined with the so-called United Presbyterians and a new Church was formed.

The United Church was elastic in creed, and its distinctive feature was that it left many doctrines undecided. Such are the distinctively Calvinistic teachings of predestination and the absolute certainty of the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Free Church which fifty-seven years before had thought it necessary to give up all its temporal possessions for the sake of maintaining what it believed to be a truth, was ready in 1900 to give up truth for the sake of becoming a more powerful organization, and thus was formed the United Free Church, which combines the names of the two uniting Churches, to show how it came into existence. Really, however, the Free Church did not unite on even terms, but became absorbed into the United Church, giving up its peculiar doctrines.

As the majority of the Free Church who thus withdrew claimed all the Church property, and took it with them, they are much disappointed by the recent decision, and they have, indeed, already given it out that the remnant which refused to bridge cannot retain possession of the property awarded them, because they cannot use it for the purposes for which it was given to the Church.

The decision already given must be regarded as the law, as it comes from the highest legal tribunal in the British Empire, but Parliament may step in with a remedial measure which will give as much of the property to the "Wee Frees" as they shall be able to use, leaving the rest to the United Frees.

The sympathy of the Established Kirkers appears to be with the seceding majority of Free Church members.

We have said above that there were 58 stalwart ministers who clung to the old Free Kirk. Time has reduced this number to 24; and the number of their adherents is between four and five thousand.

THE "NEW CHRISTIANITY."

From D. S., of Hamilton, Ont., we have received a communication based upon some remarks made in a recent issue of THE CATHOLIC RECORD on "the New Hell."

A good deal has been said of late in the non-Catholic or Protestant magazines on this subject, from all of which it may be justly inferred that Protestantism has really for the most part arrived at the inference that hell is not to be so much to be dreaded as it has been in the past; and indeed not only has it come to pass that hell has been moderated in the view of many Protestants, but even "the passing away of hell" has also been a theme on which there have been numerous articles written by writers who are deeply interested in religion, and who still belong to sects which are neither Unitarian nor Universalist in theory. Hence, our correspondent, D. S., points out that certain religious newspapers have actually set forth a theory of Protestantism according to which all dogma should disappear from the ideal "New Christianity." Thus the Congregationalist and Christian World of 13th February, 1904, declares plainly that the Reformation inaugurated by Luther has at last entered upon a new period which is the logical extreme of Protestantism and the form which Protestantism has taken at least with more advanced thinkers, and to which has been given the name of "the New Reformation." The article here referred to states the matter thus:

"The religious conviction of the