The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXIV. LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1902 1215

The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, Feb. 1, 1902.

A WORD ABOUT CHOIRS.

Not a few people are accustomed to regard any deprecatory allusion to the style of music in many of our churches as meddlesome or entirely uncalled for. Not long since, indeed, we heard an outspoken advocate of music more in harmony with the mind of the Church dubbed a crank. Scarcely an elegant epithet, but one which is apt to be applied by those whose vocabulary is restricted to anyone reflecting on their pet opinions or modes of action. We must remember that the question of the kind of music to be employed in our Churches is settled. The competent authorities have spoken on the matter, and the rules in Papal Briefs and Episcopal Decrees are there for all to read and to be guided by. And, consequently, when an individual points to the legislation on this matter and to the half-hearted obedience rendered it, if indeed it is not disregarded altogether, we may well spare him our dispraise and criticism. For he is on very sure ground. We know that in many parts of the country, where choirs are mainly voluntary, care is taken in order not to wound their tender susceptibilities. Organ loft performers are proverbially hard to manage. But allowing for the imperfections of human nature, we do not think we should make concessions that militate against the pronouncements of our superiors.

A regulation of the Congregation of Rites says: Only such vocal music is allowed in the church as is of an earnest, pious character, becoming the house of the Lord and the praise of God, and, being in close connection with the sacred text, is a means of inciting and furthering the devotion of the faithful.

How much of the music we hear complies with this regulation? Does it incite the devotion of the people? Or is it oftimes to all seeming a performance given for the benefit of the organist and the leading singers?

Much as we admire the gentlemen who conduct our choirs, we cannot help thinking that a few of them imagine they are—pardon us the word—the chief drawing card of our places of worship. With this view in mind they announce to the public that such and such a voluntary will be rendered, or that the gifted soprano will warble a certain composition. All this is reprobated by decrees as exceedingly opposed to the glory and reverence of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. But the organists we have in mind regard it as a regulation from some pre-historic epoch—and they and their co-laborers go on their way applauding themselves and with no guide in the selection of music save caprice or vanity. Who has not seen in the daily prints an account of the music to be rendered at some church? At the end of the notice may be a few words intimating that a sermon will be given, but this is accidental. The publication of the programme may be for the purpose of inducing non-Catholics to come to our churches. But this kind of advertisement, so savouring of the world-spirit and burdened with the express disapproval of the authorities, will never convince non-Catholics that we alone have an altar and that on it is the Lord—our King and Master. We are not disposed to be contentious or hypercritical, but we confess to a feeling of horror and humiliation whenever our churches are crowded by those without the fold, drawn thither by the music, and behaving as if they were in a theatre. Let us, of course, by all means, allure all men to our churches. But if they do come let us give them something better than an "Ave Maria" fitted to the air of Mascagni's Intermezzo or to some other melody which they have heard, and, mayhap, more artistically executed, in the Opera house. Besides, we of the fold should be considered in the matter. We come to God's house to pray and not be distracted—to shut out from our souls the noises of the world so that we may hear His voice.

We can hardly expect at this stage to apply to our music what St. John Chrysostom says: Nothing so exalts the mind, and gives it as it were wings, so delivers it from the earth, and loosens it from the bonds of the body, so inspires it with the love of wisdom, and fills it with such disdain for the things of this life as the melody of verses and the sweetness of holy song. However, we may expect to have the "Kyrie Eleison" not hacked out of all semblance to a prayer, we may hope to hear a "Gloria" free from tediousness and insipid repetitions, and that glorious hymn of love and faith, the "Creed," not so grievously mishandled as it is at present; and we may come to realize that the regulations anent ecclesiastical music were not born from the dreams of an idle hour, but begotten of wisdom and of sense of what is due a place dedicated to the glory of God and were meant to be obeyed. Beyond this we can hope for little. Not for our generation the Gregorian chants beloved of Gluck and Mozart, the Introits and Graduals prepared by the Church to enable us to enter into the spirit of each festival. Still, as a writer remarks, though nothing is like the Gregorian Chant to adapt itself to the nature of our holy ceremonies there would be no necessity of giving up modern music. But this, let it be always remembered, is not to tyrannize over the authorized chant. As to our Catholics we venture to say they would soon feel the benefit unless all that pious writers, and serious ones (among them Pope Leo XIII.), have said about the blessing attached to the sacred music of the Spouse of our Lord in exciting the faithful to piety be only a dream of their imagination.

A QUERY.

A correspondent wants to know something concerning Rev. Ethelred Taunton and his book, "The History of the Jesuits in England." We are not in a position to give any information save that he is a Catholic priest and a literary worker of merit. His book issued in the United States by the publishing house of J. B. Lippincott Company has not as yet come to our sanctum. We may remark that Father Taunton's history has been scored unmercifully by Protestant and Catholic reviewers. The Athenaeum of May 4, 1901, says that "Mr. Taunton's book should have had another title. It is a history of Jesuit intrigues, Jesuit ambition and Jesuit misdeeds in general, from a secular priest's point of view; but even in this respect it throws no fresh light on historical problems, and is by no means free from inaccuracies of detail and indeed the graver faults of partisanship." From this it appears that Father Taunton is a special pleader, a man with an axe to grind. But he will need all his ingenuity to delude us into believing that the history of English Jesuits has not been one of marvellous achievement or that it has been due to dishonorable methods. Of the reiterated assertions of the charge of historical unfairness and falsification, absolutely no convincing proof is given, says one reviewer, and we may dismiss them in the words of Andrew Lang, certainly an impartial and competent witness: "If ever one has met absolute, sportsmanlike fairness in the discussion of historical points which excite partisanship, it is among members of the Society of Jesus. No doubt this does not apply equally to all members of that or any other community of any sort. But speaking as a Protestant, one may declare that whatever the principle and training of the Society may be, they do not warp in individuals that not too common intellectual virtue, absolute fairness of judgment in historical questions."

NOTE AND COMMENT.

Some time ago we chronicled the account of the admission of Rev. Alvin Doran into the Catholic Church. Now a newspaper called the Living Church waxes wrathy over what it is pleased to term the apostacy of the reverend gentleman, and beseeches God Almighty to have mercy on his soul. To this Rev. Mr. Doran submitted a rejoinder, which the editor refused to publish. And therein he gave proof of the wisdom of the children of this generation. For, according to an illustrious Anglican, Macaulay, the Established Church is the most absurd and indefensible of all institutions now existing in the world. It is merely a chaos of conflicting and contradictory opinions. Devoid of all semblance of unity, with its ministers dallying with aesthetic vesture and seven sacraments and others holding but two and declaring all others not warranted by the Gospel: with some offering up Mass and praying for the dead and others professing them to be blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits: with their chiefs compromising in the manner in which they hold all truth and yielding weakly to the pressure of lay dictation: with all the bewildering variety of opinions which caused a popular author to exclaim that you can do anything you like in the Church of England provided you go about it decorously, its hold upon thinking men is a baffling enigma.

LIFE IN MANILLA.

Quite recently the daily press quoted a Methodist clergyman as intimating that life in Manilla is one grand sweet song. The natives are becoming more civilized and moral and sober. In view of the real facts the preacher must have been hypnotized or have fallen into the hands of some green goods evangelist who loaded him up for the home market. The most enthusiastic denizen of Uncle Sam's dominions have no cause to be joyful over the conditions that have arisen in the Philippines since their occupation by the United States troops. Bars, with all their demoralizing concomitants, have sprung as if by magic all over the city, and if, as Emerson says, the test of a country's civilization is the kind of man it turns out, the Filipino has reason to deplore his change of masters. We can readily understand why the preacher is prone to let his imagination run riot on this subject. The Philippines loom large as a happy hunting ground and it is to his interest to extol the advantages of the present day regime. But, happily, history is not made by ministerial fairy tales.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

(Continued.)

McCrackan—"It is a question of understanding the nature of evil."

Comment—When you speak of the nature of evil you admit the existence of evil, for that which is not has no nature. Nothing has no nature. As you admit evil has a nature, you must admit it has an existence of some sort. You may call it a false claim, an entire fallacy, a false entity, as Mrs. Eddy does; but a false claim is a claim, a false entity must be an entity before it can be false; just as a counterfeit note must be a note before it can be a counterfeit, so sin must be a thing, an act mode or quality of some real being before it can be an evil thing, act, mode or quality.

Now, a false claim must have an origin—a cause. You have told us that God is the one sole cause of all things. He must, therefore, according to Christian Science teaching, be the cause of these false claims, false entities and fallacies. This is to deny His supreme goodness, holiness and perfection.

McCrackan—"To attempt to destroy sin by admitting at the start that it is a terrible reality places good on the defensive, and leaves sin a clear field for action."

Comment—On the contrary, to deny sin's existence is to leave it a clear field for action. If the United States Government denied the existence of counterfeit notes, and, acting on that denial, took no means to prevent their circulation, would it not leave a clear field of action to counterfeits? Must not the genuine notes of the Government be on the defensive against the false? To attempt to destroy these false notes while denying their existence would be an act of self-stultification on the part of the Government. It is an equal act of self-stultification in the Christian Scientists to attempt to destroy sin while denying its existence. The very attempt to destroy it is an admission of its existence—that is, supposing the attempter to be sane. You cannot destroy nothing. Therefore, what you attempt to destroy must be something.

You say that to admit that sin is a terrible reality puts good on the defensive. So be it; the very fact that good is on the defensive proves the existence of unjust aggression, sin; for all that opposes good is evil.

McCrackan—"It is like giving the enemy all the fortresses and trenches and then advancing against him over the open."

Comment—No, it is like recognizing the fact that the enemy has fortresses and trenches, and dealing with him in view of that fact. To deny the existence of the fort and call it a delusion, a false entity, does not make the advance over the open less dangerous. We can imagine a Christian Science general addressing his troops thus: My braves, do you see that fort there beyond the open, bristling with cannons and rifles? Well, you only think you see it, it is a delusion existing only in your minds. Forward, then, there is no danger whatever. Would not such military philosophy leave a free field to the enemy? Would not such a general be court martialed and sent to an asylum? That was not Grant's way at Donaldson, or Schley's with the ships of Cervera.

McCrackan—"This method (of opposing sin by recognizing its existence) has been tried for a long time, but its results do not correspond to the vast efforts put forth."

Comment.—And, therefore, you propose to destroy sin by denying its existence. But the murderer's denial of his sin does not abolish murder, nor does the thief's denial of his theft abolish thievery. Do you deny the existence of such sins? You certainly do when you deny the existence of sin. When you deny the existence of sin you deny that it is a sin to disobey the commandments: Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife. In your philosophy none of these forbidden acts is sin, for there is no such thing as sin—it is only a delusion. The dishonest debtor ought to rejoice in your new method of abolishing objectionable things. He can abolish his debts by denying their existence and telling the creditor that he is the victim of a delusion. The traitor can plead that there is no such thing as treason, and, therefore, he is not guilty of it. Sinners generally can pursue the tenor of their ways rejoicing, and give free hand to their passions, for sin has been abolished—by Christian Science! The Christian method of abolishing sin by ceasing to commit it is better.

McCrackan—"Suppose two men should agree to-morrow never to hate again, to make hate entirely unreal to themselves, no matter what provocation might arise; suppose a third should join the two, then a fourth, finally a hundred, a thousand, a million—would not hate disappear from the midst of these men as effectually as though it never existed?"

Comment—Certainly it would, and, therefore, Christianity forbids us to give place to hatred. But in your philosophy, why should hatred disappear? Is it because it is an evil or a sin? No, because you tell us that evil of sin has no real existence. Then hatred, not being an evil or sin, why should it disappear? If hate be not a sin, and gratifies the hater, why should he not enjoy it? And, if it be a sin, why do you deny the existence of sin?

McCrackan—"Suppose the agreement to be extended by degrees to all the evil appetites, to greed, to lust, pride, self-conceit, self-will, etc.—would not these sins be eventually blotted out altogether?"

Comment—From a Christian point of view such an edifying agreement would, with the grace of God to keep it, blot out all these sins. But from the Christian Science point of view it could not blot them out, for in its philosophy there is no sin; and no agreement can blot out that which has no existence. If evil or sin have no real existence how can an appetite be evil, how can greed, lust, pride, self-conceit be evil? It does not seem to strike you that in all you say here you imply real evils or sins and when you propose to abolish them by discontinuing them you simply revert to the Christian method, and abandon your Christian Science method, which is to deny the existence of the sins you would abolish.

McCrackan—"Is there a more effectual manner of destroying sin than by reducing it to an unreality, a falsehood, a lie?"

Comment—To reduce sin to an unreality by ceasing to commit it is wise, but to attempt to reduce it to unreality by the Christian Science method of denying its reality is otherwise. How can you reduce to unreality that which you deny to be real? If men, by agreement or otherwise, cease to commit sin, sin ceases to come into being; but a non-committed sin is not a falsehood or a lie—it is simply nothing.

McCrackan—"The hypothesis of two distinct documents in the early part of Genesis is at least held by competent Biblical scholars, and if it commends itself by internal evidence, it is entitled to careful consideration."

Comment—At best it is only an hypothesis; but even as such it is not the question between you and us. The question is to do these supposed two documents teach that there were two kinds of mankind created? Your Science affirms. But, as your interpretation is based on an hypothesis, it is at best only an hypothetical interpretation. And, as we deny the hypothesis, we deny the interpretation. A Science built on an undemonstrated hypothesis does not deserve the name of Science. It belongs to the art of guessing.—New York Freeman's Journal.

Rome can Stoop.

The Guardian, of Manchester, England, an Anglican journal, voices the following lament of the Protestant Church in Ireland in its latest issue: "Would that we could learn its secret (the Catholic Church in Ireland) of gaining the obedience—nay, the affection and zealous loyalty—of the poor. Rome can stoop, as the (Anglican) church in Ireland can not, down to the uneducated and poor and simple and bring religion—real, practical, vital religion—within the comprehension and into the lives of the little ones of Christ's Church. Would that we could learn something of her power of dogmatic instruction, her recognition of the house of God as a house of prayer, her work among communicants, her sense of the power and presence of sin, her discipline and her belief in herself." The tribute is attracting much attention.

Commence Now.

Thousands have died in the last year, and you have been spared. Do you appreciate this fact? If you had died during the last year, would you have been ready for the final judgment? If not, why not commence at once and make good use of your time and prepare for the inevitable? See if your life can be made to accord with the teaching of our Divine Lord, Who loved you so much that He gave His life for you; and as a still greater proof of His love remains upon our altars in the Sacrament of Love, to forgive, console and bless you. If you do not know Him and His love, learn it through the devotion of the Sacred Heart, Which will melt your heart and bend your will to His. Commence now and all will be well with you.

QUESTIONED BY YANKEES.

Incidents of the Non-Catholic Mission at Penacook, a Suburb of Concord.

Catholic Standard and Times.

Penacook, N. H., January 20.

Unusual interest was aroused in the mission to non-Catholics in the Immaculate Conception Church here, this being the first time such a mission was given in Concord. (Concord is the capital of the State, and Penacook forms one of the beautiful suburbs of the city.) Rev. D. Fitzgerald took a great interest in the works from the time Father Xavier Sutton first came into the diocese, and he was one of the first to secure the services of this missioner.

The people of Penacook were anxious for the mission, and some of the prominent men acted as ushers, among them being Colonel J. C. Linehan, the well-known Irish historian; Thomas Driscoll and Fred Sebea. There was a large and representative gathering each evening of the non-Catholic residents not only from Penacook, but also from Concord proper, the electric cars affording every facility for the accommodation of the people. Boscawen is only a stone's throw from Penacook; it lends historic interest to the town, being noted as the birthplace of Governor Dix, the "War Governor," and it was here that Daniel Webster first hung out his shingle, as a brass tablet informs the passerby on the roadside. There, too, the lover of old historic and romantic tales will find the statue of Anna Dunstan. She, so the story goes, was captured by the Indians, and they had reached this part of New Hampshire, when during the night they slept, the brave girl succeeded in freeing her hands and feet from the thongs with which they were tied and, knowing that desperate measures were the only sane ones, she quietly cut the throats of the Indians and then started to return home. On second thought she returned to the dead braves and took their scalps, in order to have evidence of what she had done. The statue represents her standing holding the scalps in her hand. Well, times have changed since then; those "strenuous" days are over and "all is quiet along the Merrimac."

The typical Yankee is to be found here, his type predominating in the population—cool, calculating, not much given to sentiment, but quick to see the force of an argument and ready to concede to you the truth of what you say even if he does not submit his will to what the truth demands. As one gentleman remarked: "If these lectures continue, I'll be a Catholic." "Well," said his friend, "why don't you become one?" "Oh," replied the man, "there's not that much good in me."

QUESTION BOX.

The question box was well patronized, the questions indicating that they came from persons seeking light and information. There were many of the usual class, such as "Why do you pray to Mary?" "Where in the Bible are we commanded to say the beads?" etc. Some bore on the right of the Church to make laws, as, "Is it a sin to miss Mass or eat meat on Friday?"

"Yes," answered Father Sutton, "it would be a grave sin to miss Mass on Sunday or to eat meat on Friday. Christ said, 'Whatsoever you find upon earth,' etc. As a duly organized body the Church has power to make laws and to compel us to obey them under pain of sin, even of mortal sin."

"If a child dies before it is baptized, why should it go to hell? Don't the Catholic Church teach that it will?"

The Catholic Church teaches no such doctrine. The child that dies before receiving baptism is not admitted into heaven. Baptism gives us a right to heaven. However, as the unbaptized child has not been guilty of any personal sin, God will not condemn it to hell. He will give it a happiness suitable to its existence.

"Why are Catholics so cruel as to take their children out when a few days old to have them baptized?"

Catholics believe in the necessity of baptism, that every one to be saved must be baptized. Hence as there is danger of a child dying suddenly, they wish to have it receive this sacrament, so that if it does die it will be received into the kingdom of God.

"Why are Catholics anxious to have a priest when sick, even in preference to a doctor?"

The priest prepares the soul to meet its God. He gives the sacraments of the Church to the sick person, and as the salvation of the soul is more important than the health of the body, the Catholic is eager to have his soul in God's grace, so that if he should die he would be ready to give an account of his life to God. The doctor attends to the body; the priest attends to the soul. Is not the soul of more value than the body?

"What do the vestments worn by the priest at Mass signify?"

The priest in the Mass personates Christ, and each of the vestments is typical of the garments worn by Christ in His Passion. The amice signifies the piece of linen with which our Saviour was blindfolded (Matt. xxvi.); the alb represents the white garment with which Christ was clothed by Herod as a fool (Luke xxiii.); the maniple, stole and girdle represent the cords and ropes with which Christ was bound. (John xviii).

"Will you please read the fourteenth chapter of I. Cor. to the twenty-fifth verse and explain why it does not apply to the Latin language used in the Catholic Church?"

St. Paul in this chapter informs us that the gift of propheey is to be preferred to the gift of tongues. Just what the gift of tongues consisted in is hard to determine. Many writers of worth are of opinion it was a miraculous gift which came upon those early Christians when they were wrapt in ecstacy and they spoke in words not always intelligible to their hearers. St. Paul, however, in this chapter is reprobating the vain display of miraculous tongues in preaching or exhortations made by recent converts more to show their gifts than to glorify God or edify the people. When the priest instructs the people he speaks in the language they understand. When he uses the Latin language he is praying to God. What he says in Latin the people have translated in their prayer books in the language they understand. It is strange, when Protestants quote the opening words of St. Paul in this chapter that they do not read on a little further; in the 39th verse they would find their objection overthrown, "Wherefore, brethren, be zealous to prophesy; and forbid not to speak with tongues."

The lectures closed on Sunday night with a large audience present. Many copies of "Clearing the Way" were distributed, and, as usual, the lectures were the topic of conversation everywhere, many non-Catholics expressing their pleasure and satisfaction in having heard them.

During the mission to non-Catholics several priests from the Dioceses of Manchester and Boston visited the genial and hospitable pastor of Penacook, Rev. D. Fitzgerald, to study the practical workings of the non-Catholic missions as conducted by Rev. Xavier Sutton, and so impressed were they with the good effected that they were anxious to have a mission of like nature in their parishes. It is to be hoped that this interest will spread among priests and people all over the United States, until the good seed is sown in every locality where the great and holy doctrines of the Church have been misunderstood, defamed or totally unknown. "Other sheep, I have, though not of this fold." Who can resist that voice?

ANGLICANS AND THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

Replying to a correspondent who objected to certain Catholic features of his periodical, the editor of the Angelus, an Anglican organ published in Chicago, says:

"We are sorry that our correspondent should object to various commemorations of our Blessed Lady which have appeared in the Angelus calendar from time to time. Nothing so isolates the Anglican communion from the rest of Catholic Christendom as the lack of devotion to Our Lady, which unfortunately characterizes so many Anglicans. Finally, doubtless nothing so retards the progress of the Catholic revival in the Anglican communion as the neglect on the part of even advanced High Churchman to secure by invocation of Our Lady those inestimable blessings which would most surely flow from the special exercise by the Mother of God of her strictly subordinates and derived, but none the less important, intercessory function. It is for the purpose of suggesting special devotions to her that we notice so many of her commemorations in our calendar.

"We strongly incline to the belief that not a few of the cures effected at Lourdes are miracles worked by our Divine Lord at the intercession of our Blessed Lady and in response to the prayers of faithful Catholics. We think it not at all unlikely that the Queen of Heaven, Our Lady of Perpetual Mercy, Our Mother of Sweet Grace, did actually appear to the blessed Bernadette and announce to her, 'I am the Immaculate Conception.' At any rate, we wish we could see manifested by equally large numbers of persons in the Anglican Church the same supernatural faith which is shown by the pilgrims at the shrine of Our Lady of Lourdes. Perhaps if we in America had a Lourdes grotto we should be without Christian Science temples, and if we had a blessed Bernadette we should be without a Mrs. Eddy and a blasphemous Dowie."

The Individual Mission to non-Catholics.

"Catholic laymen in every station of life have the ability to perform miracles of missionary accomplishment, if they choose to properly employ it," says the Monitor. "They need not go out of their way to proclaim the doctrines of their Church, either. Nor is religious controversy the means to be used. Example is the most eloquent and convincing of all preachments. An institution or system is judged by its fruits. The fruits of Catholic faith are best exemplified in the conduct of those who sincerely profess that faith and live up to its requirements. It is within the power, and it is the duty of every individual who calls himself a Catholic to compel those about him to acknowledge the practical value of Catholic teaching as a living force for the moral and spiritual salvation of the human race. How many of us live up to the strict letter of our responsibility in the premises?"

Result of Christianity.

The polished manners, the highbred bearing so difficult of attainment—all that goes to constitute a gentleman; the carriage, grace, gestures, voice; the ease, the self-possession, the courtesy, the talent of not offending, the generosity and forbearance—these qualities, some of them come by nature, some are found in any rank, some are the direct precept of Christianity.—Cardinal Newman.

No labor is hard, no time is long, wherein the glory of eternity is the mark we level at.—Quarles.