

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
THOS. COFFEY, L.L.D., Editor and Publisher

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

Messrs. Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. J. Prod'homme, and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD, Agents for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John's, Agent for district of Nipissing, Mrs. M. Reynolds, New Liskeard.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.

Apostolic Delegation.
Ottawa, June 15th, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey:
My Dear Sir:—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It strongly defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teachings and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting the best interests of the country. Following the lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country. I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success, Yours very sincerely in Christ,
DONATON, Archbishop of Ephesus,
Apostolic Delegate.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1906.

Mr. Thomas Coffey:

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. Its matter and 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. F. LACROIX, Arch. of Larissa,
Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 26, 1907.

PANTHEISM.

An esteemed correspondent, after reading a sermon upon the new theology, writes us: "Now that Eastern Theosophy is so popular in the West the subject of pantheism is very interesting. And the point which occurred to me is this—the real so-called pantheism of the East, which, being built on, does leave room for God, for in the Hindoo writings God does not evolve into the universe but is constantly represented as producing the universe as a man makes something for sport. These people are in fact evolving something out of their own brains, in place of adapting philosophy to theology or vice versa; or is it the father of lies?" In answer to our friend we might justly take the last question first: and say, yes, it is the father of lies who, deluding the children, sometimes elevates man to the deity and at others lowers the deity to the level of the creature. This waive of the hand would not satisfy any one, though in the ultimate it has much to commend itself. There are several forms of pantheism. All agree in denying the creative act of God; or, as Brownson puts it, the creative act of being producing all things from nothing. They all admit only one substance, which is the substance or the reality of the universe. The classes—at least the chief, are: 1st, the emanationists, or those who hold that all things emanate from the one being or substance which they call God, and return at length to him and are reabsorbed in him: 2nd, the autologists or followers of Spinoza, who assert that being or substance, with its modes or attributes, is the only thing that exists; and 3rd, the idealistic and egoistic, who hold that nothing exists but the soul, the ego, the ideas. It is in the last category we place most of the western theosophists; for the reason that whatever philosophy they profess, or whatever philosophy an analysis of their teaching will show, it is idealistic in its principle. Historically regarded it is Hegelian, and Hegel, though the greatest of modern philosophers, was a pantheist, an idealist of the highest type. According to Hegel God and the universe form a whole. There is an unbroken procession from the mineral to the plant, thence to man and on through various beings to God. It is God who manifests himself. In the mineral he is a mineral, in the plant a plant, in man, differing here from his other manifestations in that in man God manifests self-consciousness. God is the idea, the principle, the law and the term of all being and all reality, manifesting himself and determining himself in the sphere of thought, nature and the human spirit. This idea which is the totality of all being, the absolute being, considered in itself and as a rational notion, constitutes logic. Considered in so far as it quits itself, starts out from itself, and manifests itself in nature, it gives rise to natural philosophy. Considered in so far as it acquires consciousness of itself in man it forms the object of the philosophy of the soul. Even from these bare outlines it will be seen how pantheistic this philosophy is in principle. Nor was it long before its false pantheist principles were applied to the Incarnation by Strauss, and further developed by Renan. Not to enter more at length into a difficult and dry subject and to show the contrast between the Eastern and Western pantheists, we may briefly state that the former were Emanationists and the latter

ter Idealists. We do not mean to say that the division is a strict one, that they do not run into each other, or that emanationists are not idealists also, and vice versa. Brahminism is a mixture—sometimes one, sometimes the other: the world, according to this system, is only an emanation of Brahman returning to him at the end of a greater or less number of cycles. The universe began to exist by evolution, it will cease by involution or the return to Brahman, only to start afresh on its round again, as seasons succeed seasons. Wherein, it may be asked, lies the difference? Brahminism is purely, positively pantheistic. Hegelian philosophy, while pantheistic in principle, is atheistic in tendency and construction. It identifies nothing and being, and trampling under foot the great law of contradiction, it leads us to a God who acquires divinity in taking consciousness of himself in man, to a God who can never arrive at being really God, not only because God either does not exist or is the most perfect and absolutely unchangeable being, but, likewise because in Hegel's philosophy there is supposed to be an indefinite, eternal elaboration of a becoming—never a being, always a becoming. If error is more dangerous by reason of its seductive brilliancy and its deep concealment, then Hegelian pantheism is of all modern systems the most to be dreaded by its double evil of pantheism and atheism. Whatever objections religion may have to evolution, these it must have against Hegelianism; for the latter is evolution carried to the very pinnacle of the temple. Whatever evils may be found in rationalism they are to be found aggravated a thousand fold in this astounding exposition of the power of human reason, of which is written in the head of the work, denial of God and subversion of religion. With Brahminism there is no room for a creature: all is God, nothing but God. The creature, or what appears to be the creature, waits, longs, strives by waiting to be absorbed into God.

STEWARDSHIP OF WEALTH.

We see from some of our contemporaries that John D. Rockefeller, in the hour of his trial, is assuming a tone of injured innocence. He is appealing to a higher court than earth can offer, not for the remission of his fine, but for the righteousness of his cause. Like most wealthy men, he has found an adherent, one who will console him, who, notwithstanding the severity of the world, professes belief in the virtues of the Standard Oil Co. "John D.," says this Rev. Baptist Clergyman, "is a 'steward' and is responsible to God." As one of the journals remarks: "That is right; that is scriptural." There is no getting over the fact. But if Mr. Rockefeller or his rev. champion thinks that the Standard Oil Co. fulfills its stewardship by rebates and other methods, proved over and over against it, then justice fails in this world and the world to come. Or if these people think that they can hide behind the abstract company, direct its grasping claws, freely employ its selfish, unprincipled methods, and peace fully enjoy its ill got profits, without assuming the full responsibility before God Whom they pretend to worship, before society which called their company into existence, before the small capitalist whose struggle has been rendered so much harder by the company's misdeeds, we would expect the Arm of the Omnipotent to be shortened and His ear no longer attentive to the cry of the poor. Let no man talk of virtue which is not based upon charity and characterized by self-denial. The Standard Oil Co. has no soul, and therefore no virtue. We do not say this as singling out this notorious company; nor would we charge its President with being the only pebble on the beach. Wealth in this case, as long ago, in Scripture is quoted by this Baptist minister, is building its stor houses larger without question of any higher call. Wealth is reaping profit where it never sowed responsibility. Responsibility must keep pace with wealth, else wealth is ill-got and becomes a danger to the individual and a menace to society. The older conscience of placing the whole responsibility upon the individual may not have advanced commercial interests or stimulated commercial activity so much as the present method of limited companies, but it protected small concerns and prevented the centralizing grasp of business diplomacy. We cannot go back. Nor can society continually fine, imprison or otherwise punish these companies. Punishments follow crimes or misdemeanors. These cannot be the habitual conduct of their directors. Otherwise something is most seriously wrong: society is weak, the methods are unsound, or the end is unworthy. There is a great deal to be said on all these points. Whether is society drifting? As fast as the river of time will take it it rushes to socialism. If one argument stronger than

many another leads the unthinking to adopt socialistic theories, it is the career of a John D. Rockefeller and the cant of his apologist. Socialism will divide what these able but selfish men gathered without pity and hoarded without sufficient sympathy. When that division takes place under new masters, when stewardship shall be an obsolete term and right a word scarcely to be whispered under the breath, when wealth shall stand before the judgment of a living generation whose mind is untrained to respect authority and whose heart has never bowed to God—how will it stand with the plutocrats on that day? Wealth has always contributed more towards the destruction of institutions than for their construction or stability. Poverty and courage have done far more. It might not be the same in our modern civilization where wealth is so closely associated with industry, and where labor contributes the form whilst capital supplies the material. Notwithstanding, however, the good which wealth does by its activity, many of its old selfish habits cling to it, making it forget its fellows, binding it to sordid earth, and keeping it unmindful of its true Master and its higher calling.

SOCIETIES.

We have received a long communication urging the formation of a society within the Church as universal as the Church itself, but with aims more social and temporal. It is useless to enter upon a plan which is too high up in air ever to be realized, and too low down to elevate its associates. We do not say this because we wish to throw cold water upon our friend's aspirations or because we are not desirous of seeing more union amongst our people. We deplore deeply the disunion and the want of public spirit, meaning, by this latter, a Catholic public spirit. Too often we are the sport of every wind and the toy of designing politicians. Our views too frequently are low, narrow and selfish. But notwithstanding these and many more objections we find union in the bonds of faith, more fellowship in the charity of God's Holy Spirit than in natural, self formed associations, more real benefit for all concerned, a stronger protection for the weak, a surer refuge for the wanderer, a greater reward for good deeds, an easier pardon for the fallen, truth more securely guaranteed and the fountains of life kept pure and free for all. There are many associations within the Church which are not only tolerated but earnestly encouraged by the different authorities. We see no reason for starting others. We do see strong reasons for the strengthening of those which already exist. In such matters we are chary about making suggestions; for whilst union is strength liberty is the dearest inheritance we possess. One other point: our correspondent calls our attention to the fact that we treated the Odd Fellows as an oath-bound society, whereas in reality it is only a strict promise. So far as our argument was concerned there was no difference.

MONTE CARLO.

We have received a long clipping concerning that most celebrated gambling resort of the Riviera, Monte Carlo, and the fearful tragedies traceable to its evil influence. Suicides have run up to the thousands—half of them hushed up to prevent scandal, none of them producing more than a passing notice, so dulled is the public moral sense by the surroundings. The extract sent us gives likewise a brief sketch of the financial history of a most profitable institution. One statement it contained evidently shocked our correspondent, that Pope Leo XIII., on the formation of the Casino of Monte Carlo, was one of the first and the largest outside shareholders. As Monte Carlo dates farther back than the accession of Leo XIII. to the Papal throne, the story looks dubious. We have confidence in any one of the late Pontiff's character and reputation to think that he would not knowingly put his money into such a concern, or draw its tainted profits. What the Pope does with his money is hardly our concern. He has a good conscience, and has as clear an idea of what he owes to his own honor as any man in the world. Our correspondent asks us to trace up the matter, and find out whether the accusation is true or false. If it is true, he wonders what is the good of reading the RECORD. We do not wish to criticize our correspondent. We think that such impetuous talk is childish. He should not be scandalized. He sees a statement in print reflecting upon a Sovereign Pontiff. Forthwith he calls upon an editor of a Catholic paper five thousand miles away, four years after the death of the Pope, whose good name is involved, and asks this editor to trace it to its source. It is quite right to be sensitive about the honor of our Sovereign Pontiffs; but we should have more confidence in them and less in newspaper gossip.

MR. OHAS. R. DEVLIN, M. P.

News comes to us from Quebec that Mr. C. R. Devlin, M. P., has resigned the seat for Nicolet, in the House of Commons, and has accepted the position of Minister of the Department of Colonization, Mines and Fisheries in the Provincial Government of Quebec. In this particular case, what Sir Wilfrid Laurier has a habit of looking about the provinces for the very choicest bits of timber for the Federal Cabinet. If the Provincial Governments once in a while turn the tables upon him and take from the Dominion House some of its best, and place them at the head of Provincial affairs, he cannot find fault. It is another phase of reciprocity. Mr. Devlin is a man of large capacity, a brilliant speaker, and of remarkable rectitude. We doubt not his career in Quebec will continue to reflect honor upon his faith and his country.

MR. OHAS. R. DEVLIN, M. P.

We have advice from a place called Vonda, in Saskatchewan, that there is much choice land yet to be taken up in that district. We would advise any one who contemplates moving to the North-West to communicate with Rev.

A. P. Berube, Vonda, Sask. He will give them all necessary information in regard to location of land, price, etc.

A CANDID FRIEND.

Whilst the highest perfection claims that we should do without human consolation, still we feel the touch of a friendly hand and the force of a kindly word. So much noise is raised against the Church, from press, pulpit and platform that, without losing hope or confidence, we often wonder whether we are living in an age of free enlightenment, or whether any will come at all to understand us. One friend we seem to have, whose kind references to Catholicism and its practices are not of to day or of this year. We allude to the Rev. Mr. Ker, Rector of St. George's Church, St. Catharines, Ont. He seldom loses an occasion of impressing upon his flock the needs and dangers of the times. He bears honest and strong testimony to the work and faith of the Catholic Church. In his last discourse, at his Harvest Thanksgiving, he was quite pointed in his sympathy towards the Church. He saw a famine in the world, not the famine of bread or of thirst, but of the word of God. "On all sides," said he, "they heard complaints of public dishonesty, of 'graft,' of corporate wealth. Education had ceased to be considered a moral force, and the men who wrecked banks and ruined families were all educated men. It was clear that a godless system of education was responsible for the existing state of things, which already was causing profound alarm among the more thoughtful of the community." Mr. Ker likewise expressed his astonishment that preachers and men of public position could be found "belauding the condition of France, as if the upheaval of social order in that country was a movement principally directed against the Roman Catholic Church, and therefore entitled to Protestant sympathy." We agree with Mr. Ker, not merely because of our Catholicity, but because we are, and always have been, unable to understand how any one, no matter how bitterly they might be opposed to Catholicism, could find comfort just now in France. Yet there are such men. They do not read aright the words upon the wall. Toronto has a couple of them. One of them, Canon Cody, was very communicative last year to the students of Wycliffe College and likewise at St. Catharines to the younger students of Ridley College. This year it is Professor Ballantyne of Knox College. Both these gentlemen regard the state of France as the dawn of day instead of the deepening shadow of night. Let them lay to heart this testimony with which the Rev. Mr. Ker closed his Thanksgiving address. It is taken from the Belfast Weekly News, and may therefore be regarded as unprejudiced evidence. It is written by the ultra Orange staff correspondent:

MR. OHAS. R. DEVLIN, M. P.

"I spent my holidays in France. Lord Radstock was perfectly right the other day in saying that no Christian man should rejoice at the condition of religion and education in that country. France seems to be sliding down into the abyss of infidelity. You may not mention the name of God in the public school, but you may teach any ribald denial of Christianity. And that is the system which the Trade Unionists by an enormous majority demand for England and Wales."

MR. OHAS. R. DEVLIN, M. P.

After all this one who would entertain the thought that there exists between science and faith no kind of subordination would be greatly mistaken. That there is no subordination, so far as science is concerned, is very true; but, it is not true in regard to faith which is subjected to science in three ways. In the first place it must be noted in every religious faith, with the exception of the divine reality and the experience of it by the believer, all the rest, particularly religious formulae, is not outside the sphere of phenomena and consequently not outside the scientific domain. Let the believer retire from the world if he will; but so long as he is in it, he must obey the laws and judgment of science. In the second place if it is asserted that faith has God only for its object, we must understand by the statement that it is the God of the divine reality, and not the God of the idea. The idea is tributary of science when the latter rises in logical order to the absolute and the ideal. It is the duty of science and philosophy, then, to recognize the idea of God, to guide it in its evolution and if it accumulates foreign accretions to correct it. Hence the maxim of the Modernists: religious evolution must be coordinated with moral and intellectual evolution, or better still, subordinate itself to it, as one of the leaders of the Modernists expresses it. In brief, man will not tolerate the dualism in himself. Hence the believer is stimulated by so profound a need of synthesis that he harmonizes science and faith in such a way that the latter never antagonizes the conception the former forms of the universe. In this way Science enjoys complete liberty so far as Faith is concerned. But on the other hand Faith becomes the slave of Science, despite the fact that they are said to move in wholly different spheres. All this, Venerable Brothers, is contrary to the teachings of our predecessor Pius IX., who wrote that "in all that regards religion it is not for Philosophy to command, but to obey, not to prescribe

MR. OHAS. R. DEVLIN, M. P.

what is to be believed, but to embrace it with a submissive enlightenment by reason; not to try to fathom the depths of the mysteries of God, but to revere them in all piety and humility." (Brev. ad Ep. Wratislav, 1857.) The Modernists reverse this order. They have earned for themselves the reprimand administered by another of our predecessors, Gregory IX., who wrote of certain theologians of his time: "There are some among you who, puffed up with vanity, seek to subvert the dogmas of the faith by the use of profane novelties for that which was provided for you by the Fathers, who actuated by a desire of making an ostentatious display of knowledge wrest the Sacred Writings to make them agree with rationalist doctrines whilst at the same time they bestow no thought upon the question of benefiting their hearers." * * * Who seduced by unusual and bizarre doctrines overturn the order of things, making the Queen the servant, (Letter addressed to theological professors in Paris, A. D. 1223.)

MR. OHAS. R. DEVLIN, M. P.

The conduct of the Modernists, which is perfectly consistent, sheds still more light upon their doctrines, in their addresses and writings they seem to contradict themselves, to be wavering and undecided. That is far from being the case. Everything is weighed, everything is planned, but this is done in the light of the principle that faith and science are strangers to each other. Read a page of their works. The sentiments contained in it could be indorsed by a Catholic. Turn the page and you would imagine you were reading the work of a rationalist. If they write history they make no mention of the divinity of Jesus Christ; if they ascend the pulpit, they proclaim it loudly. As historians, they disdain Fathers and Councils; as catechists they quote them with respect. If you notice, there are for the most part quite distinct exegeses, namely, the theological and the scientific exegesis. In virtue of the principle that science depends in no way upon faith, the Modernists when discussing matters of philosophy, history, criticism, loudly voice their contempt for the teachings of the Fathers, the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the Ecumenical Councils, having no horror of following in the footsteps of Luther. If they are reprimanded for this, they declare that their liberty is trampled upon. In brief, seeing that faith is subordinated to science, they openly and at all times blame the Church for obstinately refusing to subordinate and adapt her dogmas to the views of the philosophers. As for the latter, after having made a clean sweep of the ancient theology, they set themselves to the work of introducing a new theology which will be more pliable as regards the vagaries of these same philosophers.

MR. OHAS. R. DEVLIN, M. P.

THE MODERNIST AS A THEOLOGIAN—IMMANENCE AND SYMBOLISM THE TWO GENERATIVE PRINCIPLES.

Here, Venerable Brothers, the Modernist theologian presents himself. The subject is vast and complicated. We shall condense it into a small space. The question is to conciliate science and faith by the simple process of subordinating faith to science. The method of the Modernist theologian consists in accepting the principles of the philosopher in their entirety and adapting them to the needs of the believer. In other words he accepts the principles of immanence and symbolism. The philosopher affirms that the principle of faith is immanent; the believer adds: this principle is God; the theologian concludes: God is then immanent in man. Result: theological immanence. In the same way, the philosopher declares that the representations of the object of faith are symbols; the believer adds: the object of faith is God in Himself; the theologian concludes: the representations of divine reality are, then, purely symbolical. Result: theological symbolism.

These are glaring errors each more pernicious than the other as may be clearly seen by the consequences flowing from them. To begin with symbolism. Since symbols are at one and the same time symbols in regard to the object, and instruments in respect of the subject, two consequences must follow: the first is that the believer must not adhere strictly to the formula, in so far as it is a formula, but he should make use of it solely in order to reach absolute truth. The formula at one and the same time veils and unveils. It makes an effort to express itself without ever succeeding. The second consequence is that the believer must use these formulae according to his aid him for they are given to him in order to help his faith, not to hinder it; with proper regard, however, for the social respect due to formulae which the public magistrature has deemed suitable for expressing the common consciousness until such time as the same magistrature proves otherwise.

So far as immanence is concerned, the views of the Modernists are so divergent that it is hard to know what are their real opinions on this subject. Some of them hold that God is present in himself—which rightly understood, is irreproachable doctrine. Others maintain that the action of God is one with the action of nature, the first cause, penetrating the second cause, which is equivalent to the doing away with the entire supernatural order. Finally others hold views which can hardly be differentiated from Pantheism. These Modernists are consistent and thoroughly logical.

To this principle of Immanence, there is joined another which may be called divine permanence. It differs from the first in much the same way that experience transmitted by tradition differs from simple individual experience. An example which can be taken from the Church and the sacraments will illustrate this subject. The Modernists declare that we must not imagine that the sacraments of the Church were instituted directly by Jesus Christ. That would conflict with agnosticism which sees in Christ nothing more than a man, whose con-

science, like all formed itself by contrary to the which the Modern application made would be in evolution which development of for a changing era, finally, it would exactly in confor Still it is to be and the sacram immediately by f in this way: All ces were infolded conscience of Ch in its germ. live the life of say all Christian Christ. Now this is divine accor too, is the life of

And since th ages, produced sacraments, we all truth that since they come

By a similar prove that the mas, are divine.

This about Modernistic th but doubtless it for those who should be subse of science. Ev an application of other points w expound.

Up to this v ticularly on th faith. Faith is ernists has se these are worl turns. Let us have to say ab Dogma, we ha origin and na need which the upon his reli reader it clear This work con explaining t This must be tion and lo tions shaped b the Modernist vity. Aro secondary fo formed. Org a doctrinal c lists say, into sanctioned by as responding sciousness, th of Dogma, m between lo logical spec ever, are not of vitality. ligious with s slict between religion from finally, they for future de there would under this h the Sacram concerning v into the grav

Worship a ists is born o have shown, ties are the Modern is that of p presence of is that of p sanctifying called Sacra For the i are pure s they are en ers. They words which popular her true of redi trading ide the world. the ideas, the religio ists would clearly and state that tuted sole position the ell of Tren the Sacram order to m the-ma. (N genero.)

We have origin and According but simpl would exa say for the social respect due to formulae which the public magistrature has deemed suitable for expressing the common consciousness until such time as the same magistrature proves otherwise.

IMMANENCE.

So far as immanence is concerned, the views of the Modernists are so divergent that it is hard to know what are their real opinions on this subject.

Some of them hold that God is present in himself—which rightly understood, is irreproachable doctrine. Others maintain that the action of God is one with the action of nature, the first cause, penetrating the second cause, which is equivalent to the doing away with the entire supernatural order. Finally others hold views which can hardly be differentiated from Pantheism. These Modernists are consistent and thoroughly logical.

DIVINE PERMANENCE.

To this principle of Immanence, there is joined another which may be called divine permanence. It differs from the first in much the same way that experience transmitted by tradition differs from simple individual experience. An example which can be taken from the Church and the sacraments will illustrate this subject.

The Modernists declare that we must not imagine that the sacraments of the Church were instituted directly by Jesus Christ. That would conflict with agnosticism which sees in Christ nothing more than a man, whose con-

science, like all formed itself by contrary to the which the Modern application made would be in evolution which development of for a changing era, finally, it would exactly in confor Still it is to be and the sacram immediately by f in this way: All ces were infolded conscience of Ch in its germ. live the life of say all Christian Christ. Now this is divine accor too, is the life of

And since th ages, produced sacraments, we all truth that since they come

By a similar prove that the mas, are divine.

This about Modernistic th but doubtless it for those who should be subse of science. Ev an application of other points w expound.

Up to this v ticularly on th faith. Faith is ernists has se these are worl turns. Let us have to say ab Dogma, we ha origin and na need which the upon his reli reader it clear This work con explaining t This must be tion and lo tions shaped b the Modernist vity. Aro secondary fo formed. Org a doctrinal c lists say, into sanctioned by as responding sciousness, th of Dogma, m between lo logical spec ever, are not of vitality. ligious with s slict between religion from finally, they for future de there would under this h the Sacram concerning v into the grav

Worship a ists is born o have shown, ties are the Modern is that of p presence of is that of p sanctifying called Sacra For the i are pure s they are en ers. They words which popular her true of redi trading ide the world. the ideas, the religio ists would clearly and state that tuted sole position the ell of Tren the Sacram order to m the-ma. (N genero.)

We have origin and According but simpl would exa say for the social respect due to formulae which the public magistrature has deemed suitable for expressing the common consciousness until such time as the same magistrature proves otherwise.

IMMANENCE.

So far as immanence is concerned, the views of the Modernists are so divergent that it is hard to know what are their real opinions on this subject.

Some of them hold that God is present in himself—which rightly understood, is irreproachable doctrine. Others maintain that the action of God is one with the action of nature, the first cause, penetrating the second cause, which is equivalent to the doing away with the entire supernatural order. Finally others hold views which can hardly be differentiated from Pantheism. These Modernists are consistent and thoroughly logical.

DIVINE PERMANENCE.

To this principle of Immanence, there is joined another which may be called divine permanence. It differs from the first in much the same way that experience transmitted by tradition differs from simple individual experience. An example which can be taken from the Church and the sacraments will illustrate this subject.

The Modernists declare that we must not imagine that the sacraments of the Church were instituted directly by Jesus Christ. That would conflict with agnosticism which sees in Christ nothing more than a man, whose con-

science, like all formed itself by contrary to the which the Modern application made would be in evolution which development of for a changing era, finally, it would exactly in confor Still it is to be and the sacram immediately by f in this way: All ces were infolded conscience of Ch in its germ. live the life of say all Christian Christ. Now this is divine accor too, is the life of

And since th ages, produced sacraments, we all truth that since they come

By a similar prove that the mas, are divine.

This about Modernistic th but doubtless it for those who should be subse of science. Ev an application of other points w expound.

Up to this v ticularly on th faith. Faith is ernists has se these are worl turns. Let us have to say ab Dogma, we ha origin and na need which the upon his reli reader it clear This work con explaining t This must be tion and lo tions shaped b the Modernist vity. Aro secondary fo formed. Org a doctrinal c lists say, into sanctioned by as responding sciousness, th of Dogma, m between lo logical spec ever, are not of vitality. ligious with s slict between religion from finally, they for future de there would under this h the Sacram concerning v into the grav

Worship a ists is born o have shown, ties are the Modern is that of p presence of is that of p sanctifying called Sacra For the i are pure s they are en ers. They words which popular her true of redi trading ide the world. the ideas, the religio ists would clearly and state that tuted sole position the ell of Tren the Sacram order to m the-ma. (N genero.)

We have origin and According but simpl would exa say for the social respect due to formulae which the public magistrature has deemed suitable for expressing the common consciousness until such time as the same magistrature proves otherwise.

IMMANENCE.

So far as immanence is concerned, the views of the Modernists are so divergent that it is hard to know what are their real opinions on this subject.

Some of them hold that God is present in himself—which rightly understood, is irreproachable doctrine. Others maintain that the action of God is one with the action of nature, the first cause, penetrating the second cause, which is equivalent to the doing away with the entire supernatural order. Finally others hold views which can hardly be differentiated from Pantheism. These Modernists are consistent and thoroughly logical.

DIVINE PERMANENCE.

To this principle of Immanence, there is joined another which may be called divine permanence. It differs from the first in much the same way that experience transmitted by tradition differs from simple individual experience. An example which can be taken from the Church and the sacraments will illustrate this subject.

The Modernists declare that we must not imagine that the sacraments of the Church were instituted directly by Jesus Christ. That would conflict with agnosticism which sees in Christ nothing more than a man, whose con-

science, like all formed itself by contrary to the which the Modern application made would be in evolution which development of for a changing era, finally, it would exactly in confor Still it is to be and the sacram immediately by f in this way: All ces were infolded conscience of Ch in its germ. live the life of say all Christian Christ. Now this is divine accor too, is the life of

And since th ages, produced sacraments, we all truth that since they come

By a similar prove that the mas, are divine.

This about Modernistic th but doubtless it for those who should be subse of science. Ev an application of other points w expound.

Up to this v ticularly on th faith. Faith is ernists has se these are worl turns. Let us have to say ab Dogma, we ha origin and na need which the upon his reli reader it clear This work con explaining t This must be tion and lo tions shaped b the Modernist vity. Aro secondary fo formed. Org a doctrinal c lists say, into sanctioned by as responding sciousness, th of Dogma, m between lo logical spec ever, are not of vitality. ligious with s slict between religion from finally, they for future de there would under this h the Sacram concerning v into the grav

Worship a ists is born o have shown, ties are the Modern is that of p presence of is that of p sanctifying called Sacra For the i are pure s they are en ers. They words which popular her true of redi trading ide the world. the ideas, the religio ists would clearly and state that tuted sole position the ell of Tren the Sacram order to m the-ma. (N genero.)

We have origin and According but simpl would exa say for the social respect due to formulae which the public magistrature has deemed suitable for expressing the common consciousness until such time as the same magistrature proves otherwise.

IMMANENCE.

So far as immanence is concerned, the views of the Modernists are so divergent that it is hard to know what are their real opinions on this subject.

Some of them hold that God is present in himself—which rightly understood, is irreproachable doctrine. Others maintain that the action of God is one with the action of nature, the first cause, penetrating the second cause, which is equivalent to the doing away with the entire supernatural order. Finally others hold views which can hardly be differentiated from Pantheism. These Modernists are consistent and thoroughly logical.

DIVINE PERMANENCE.

To this principle of Immanence, there is joined another which may be called divine permanence. It differs from the first in much the same way that experience transmitted by tradition differs from simple individual experience. An example which can be taken from the Church and the sacraments will illustrate this subject.

The Modernists declare that we must not imagine that the sacraments of the Church were instituted directly by Jesus Christ. That would conflict with agnosticism which sees in Christ nothing more than a man, whose con-

science, like all formed itself by contrary to the which the Modern application made would be in evolution which development of for a changing era, finally, it would exactly in confor Still it is to be and the sacram immediately by f in this way: All ces were infolded conscience of Ch in its germ. live the life of say all Christian Christ. Now this is divine accor too, is the life of

And since th ages, produced sacraments, we all truth that since they come

By a similar prove that the mas, are divine.

This about Modernistic th but doubtless it for those who should be subse of science. Ev an application of other points w expound.

Up to this v ticularly on th faith. Faith is ernists has se these are worl turns. Let us have to say ab Dogma, we ha origin and na need which the upon his reli reader it clear This work con explaining t This must be tion and lo tions shaped b the Modernist vity. Aro secondary fo formed. Org a doctrinal c lists say, into sanctioned by as responding sciousness, th of Dogma, m between lo logical spec ever, are not of vitality. ligious with s slict between religion from finally, they for future de there would under this h the Sacram concerning v into the grav

Worship a ists is born o have shown, ties are the Modern is that of p presence of is that of p sanctifying called Sacra For the i are pure s they