

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1899.

NO. 1101.

The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, November 25, 1899.

A NARROW MINDED BIGOT.

A rant of the lowest type named Rev. H. Steacy has loomed up at Ottawa. On October 6 he addressed the Orangemen at Billing's Bridge, on the war and several other things, and remarked incidentally that the Jesuits, the "hell hounds of Rome," were a drawback to the advancement of Canada. He may be bidding for a "call" to some ultra Protestant charge, but we do not imagine that any self-respecting parish will engage the services of such a foul-mouthed and ignorant humbug. It must be rather trying on the nerves of those who believe in the superiority of our picturesque civilization to have such individuals running loose in the community. He may be a very estimable gentleman in private life, but he should not be allowed on a public platform without a guardian. The Jesuits will, as in the past, continue still to do good work despite the graceful utterances of Mr. Steacy.

EUROPEAN INTERMEDDLERS.

"Love the little trade which thou hast learned and be content therewith," is very good advice. Judging by it there must have been individuals even in the days of Marcus Aurelius who were not content with their little trades. It is not a sin unpardonable to dabble in other people's business, if the dabbler contents himself with mere dabbling, but when he essays to give advice and to rebuke and criticize he must, not to say the least, be taken seriously.

Over in England just now there are a few gentlemen who have a miscellaneous assortment of schemes for the reformation and re-organization of everything in sight. The Roman Curia is their *but noir*. They would like to have it constructed according to plans approved of by themselves and their admirers. They may not mean it, but it is believed in by impressionable souls who imagine that the Italians, wedded to antiquated methods, cannot possibly keep the Church up to the times.

Now if the deft fingers of the Anglo-Saxon were permitted to readjust the machinery things would be different, and the Anglo-Saxon intellect would render invaluable assistance in the solving of intricate problems, and would awaken the Italians to the fact that they are living in the nineteenth century, and not in the fourteenth. All this creates a furor—making the unskillful laugh and the judicious grieve.

The members of the Roman Curia are generally practised theologians—men of acknowledged prowess and followers of a system which, whilst it conduces to clearness and grasp, can claim also the traditions and prestige of years of success. The Anglo-Saxon may be a theologian, but so far as he has not, owing, doubtless, to much novel-writing and other business, attained expert proficiency in that line.

So long as we keep the source clean and clear we shall have fresh water. Whilst waiting for the adoption of their schemes, they might devote their attention to remedying the evils at their doors, and spare us expressions of disrespect for methods stamped with the seal of authority's approval. Better be a henchman than a watchman on the towers of Israel with no better message than schemes begotten of vanity and presumption.

St. George Mivart, the very distinguished writer, has made recently an onslaught on the Pope for his "deplorable silence throughout the Dreyfus affair." He calls it an "appalling blunder." Perchance the condemnation of his brochure on "Happiness in Hell" is still ranking in his heart, or, with the characteristic modesty of the Anglo-Saxon, he felt it a duty to put the Holy Father right. At all events Dr. Mivart has manifested an incenseable lack of filial respect. What should the Pope have said about the Dreyfus affair? Did Dr. Mivart expect an Apostolic letter enjoining silence upon the Catholics who happened to be opposed to Dreyfus? Were they not within their rights in talking and criticizing, or were they to remain passive and to pick up gratefully the chunks of wisdom flung them across the channel. It is another case of a man not being content with his own trade. Ordinary

Catholics of the right sort believe in allowing the Pope to transact his own business in his own way, and Dr. Mivart may, with profit to himself and edification to the faithful, follow their example.

DREYFUS.

The Protestant historian J. E. Bodley, has, in the *Times* of a recent date, a very interesting letter on Catholics and the Dreyfus case. He tells us that "French anti-Semitism is a disorder resulting from the morbid condition of a nation which needs governing and which has had to endure a quarter of a century of anarchy." It is widespread because of the unhealthy state of the body politic, but clericalism is not even the chief agency for its dissemination. By an anomaly not unprecedented there are even Jews who aid the movement, and the bitterest clerical prints have been rivalled in their anti-Dreyfusism by the "Gaulois" of Arthur Meyer and the "Sotr" of M. Poincaré, who are both Israelites.

He goes on to say that even Manning would not have moved, as the English critics say the French Bishops ought to have moved, in the Dreyfus affair. If several of them had joined in a manifesto in his favor they would have been summoned before the Conseil d'Etat for defying the Canonical prohibition of a collective action by French Bishops. Some of our good friends may say they should have come out for the right no matter what consequences might follow. But where is the right? Is Dreyfus guilty or innocent? That is the conundrum of the century. Persons inclined to explosive sentimentality have quite made up their minds as to the innocence of the Captain, but others, like Mr. Steevs, are not so sure.

Mr. Bodley eulogizes the French parochial clergy as the most virtuous and disinterested body of men he has ever known, and declares their attitude is less offensive to the Jews than that of English clergymen was fifty years ago to English Dissenters. He scolds the idea that the anti-Semitic press is in the hands of the Episcopacy. The clerical editors are first violent French journalists and then churchmen. Such journalists are unfortunately not confined to France.

THE WAR.

Our heart goes out in sympathy to the brave fellows in South Africa—to the Englishmen who are obeying orders and to the Dutchmen who are making their last stand for home and country. The Transvaal burghers may be unprogressive and intolerant, not so much however as current report would have it, and yet there are few even amongst their bitterest enemies who do not admire their stubborn pluck and unquestionable courage.

War bulletins chronicling this and that brilliant courage are read with avidity. "Soldiers dead" and "soldiers wounded" are phrases devoid of meaning to the ordinary citizen. What matters it that Captain — or Private — is still in death on the mountain-sides of South Africa? But what a burden of misery those bulletins bring into many households, to the wives and mothers who mourn for dear ones and who understand that war is hell.

Englishmen are too busy at the present time to arraign the individual responsible for the slaughter of their kin and kind, and of Boer farmers, but sooner or later they will have something strong to say to that Empire-builder who is watching the fight from Downing street.

We do not imagine for one moment that Chamberlain contemplated war. He was simply playing a game of international poker with Kruger, and trusted to skilful manipulation of the cards to win out. But Kruger called the game—and the rest we know. Mr. Chamberlain, we are told, is a man of "masterful personality," etc., etc. We admit he is a clever debater and past-master in the tricks of the politician, but that these qualifications are going to give him a niche in Westminster Abbey we are inclined to doubt. He is the proud possessor of a collection of orchids, but any idiot with money can be that. Then he is pious, quite unlike the infidel statesmen of France, for did he not appeal to the God of battles to give him victory in his war?

"To what God did he appeal?" asks Labouchère. "Surely not to the God of Christians worship! Would He interfere to give us victory in order to give the money-changers occasion to swindle fools out of more money, to enable grubbers after gold to crimp more blacks to do their work, to secure to Uitlanders in the Transvaal a vote after five years' residence on that land to make the Anglo-Saxon race paramount over men of Dutch origin in South Africa, and substitute slaughter for a more peaceful mode of settling a dispute? A vast number of our own countrymen have solemnly affirmed that right is not on our side, and that the war is a result either of Chamberlain's personal ambition or of his abysmal folly."

HIS WIFE'S RELIGION.

England has an Established Church, supported more or less cheerfully by the majority of the English people. The King or Queen of England, is by virtue of the office, head of the Church of England. Therefore the law that none but a Protestant shall occupy the throne can hardly be called unreasonable.

Almost all other offices of honor and emolument are open to Catholics throughout the British Empire; and not a few of the highest have actually been filled by Catholics.

In the United States there is no Established Church. Nay, even the Fathers of our country, the framers of our Federal Constitution, have enacted that there never can be one, and that all religions are equally under the protection of the law. No one, in our free land, is supposed to suffer anything through the action of Federal or State law, in lack of emolument or honors, for conscience' sake.

For no Federal office, for no State office, is there a religious test. The generous and simple hearts of youth, in the humblest of our village schools, for generation after generation have swelled with pride, as they read and believed the statement in their school books, that the son of the poorest farm laborer or artisan could make himself eligible for the highest office in the land.

No question of lofty lineage; no property qualification; no religious test! But, to-day, after over a hundred years of American freedom, a born American, the foremost of American soldiers, the hero of one of the greatest naval achievements of modern times, comes back from his victories, to triumphal processions, and all the honors, and gifts of a grateful people. He is hailed as our future Soldier President, as Washington, or Jackson, or Grant was; and all is well, until it becomes known that he is about to take unto himself a Catholic wife.

Mind! There is no question of Admiral Dewey's own religion. He is an Episcopalian, as Washington was; yet he might be a Presbyterian, a Methodist, a Unitarian, nay, a Theosophist or a quiet atheist, and it would not in the least impair his prospects.

But in this free land, with no established Church, with all religions professedly equal before the law, there is one Church, the Catholic, under the name of the Presidency not belong to that Church, but good bye to his chances if wife or child or brother or parent is a member of it. All his soldier-record, all his statesman record, were they greater than Washington's or Jackson's or Lincoln's, or Grant's or Dewey's, are, is taken for granted, wiped out at once.

Henry McFarland, Washington correspondent of the Boston Herald, puts the popular prejudice on its feet in this fashion: "Admiral Dewey has finally turned his back on the Presidency, in the judgment of practical politicians, more completely than he could have done in any other way, by engaging Mrs. Hazen, for she is a Roman Catholic, and, rightly or wrongly, all politicians believe that no man who has a Roman Catholic wife can be President. They point to General Sherman, General Sheridan, Richard P. Bland and others mentioned for the Presidency, who could not be nominated because their wives were members of the Roman Catholic Church, under the prejudice, unreasonable as it may be, which they simply recognize as a practical fact to be dealt with in a practical manner."

Is this monstrous thing true? For our part, we doubt it, and we believe that if the Democratic party were to nominate Dewey for President, he would win in 1900 with as big a majority as honest Grover Cleveland had in 1892, were his wife the devout sister of the Pope himself.

But if through fear of that bug-a-boo, that "prejudice with the force of a law," as Daniel Dougherty called it, no political party should have the courage to nominate the one man who to-day could unite all parties, it is high time that the Catholics of the United States began a determined agitation against the political proscription to which they are subjected.

The Catholics of England number much less than two millions. Yet they have inaugurated a campaign against the Coronation Oath; and are not pained when it is pointed out to them

that one of their number fills the office of Lord Chief Justice, that another is Postmaster General, and that still another has been Viceroy of India.

Shall the co-religionists of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, of Commodore Barry and General Sheridan—who number at least twelve millions—endure without protest a proscription that sacrifices the political prospects of the country's foremost man not to his own conscience, but to his wife's conscience?—Boston Pilot.

THE WORSHIP OF THE VIRGIN.

A Succinct but Complete Exposure of a Controversial Trick.

From the New Zealand Tablet.

It was "old Hobbes" who said, in his "Leviathan," that "words are wise men's counters; they do but reckon by them, but they are the money of fools." Logicians tell us that most disputes and misunderstandings arise out of an abuse or misuse of words. Two centuries ago Bossuet pointed out that the dispute between Catholics and Protestants on the subject of the "worship" of images and the Blessed Virgin and the saints is to some extent a dispute rather about words than things. This is true even at the present day. The very word "worship" itself is one that readily lends itself to verbal jugglery and controversial legendary. Reference to any standard dictionary will show that it includes two such hopelessly and generically different meanings as (1) the mere respect or honor which a man may show to his fellow-man, and (2) the supreme adoration which is due to God alone. A class of callow pulpites and small controversialist pamphleteers avail themselves of this ambiguity of meaning to fix the tradition of an odious charge upon the Catholic body. The rank and file of their hearers and readers have no practical acquaintance with any but one—namely, the divine—form of religious worship. We have, of course, been frequently charged in coarser and more direct fashion with the monstrous crime of giving divine honor to our Lady. But the great tradition of the Protestant masses has been led in no small degree (1) by the ambiguity of the term "worship," as stated above, and (2) by the deadly ding-dong, persistency with which this command, presently new idea of its meaning has been for some centuries associated, in their minds, with the legitimate honor shown by Catholics to her whom God's angel found "full of grace."

It is only within comparatively recent times that the word "worship" has come to acquire the meaning of supreme adoration, as of the Godhead. The scholarly Protestant writer, Archbishop Trench, in his "English Past and Present" (6th ed., p. 245), shows that the word was originally written "worthship," and that it meant "honor" only. It retained that meaning exclusively for centuries. It remains still, though not exclusively. We recommend to the notice of a certain Devonport preacher a number of old English reprints which were issued in London and Birmingham in 1808 and 1809. Notable among them is "Revelation of the Monk of Evesham," written in 1196 and first typed by William de Machlinia in 1482. Throughout the whole of this curious work—which is an English forerunner of Dante's "Divina Commedia"—the word "worship" is used exclusively in the sense of "honor." Thus, a certain abbot is described as a man of "worshipful" (i. e., honorable) conversation; a monk is represented as being punished in purgatory for having unduly sought "worship" (or honor) at the hands of the people; and the writer describes how "our Lord did worship" (i. e., honor) his servant "—a holy bishop—by bestowing upon him the gift of miracles. And so on and on in a score of other passages throughout the work.

The Bible improperly attributed to Wyclif and dating from about the year 1382—translates Matthew xix., 9, as follows: "Worschippe (i. e., honor) thil fadir and thil modir; and our Saviour's words in John xii., 26, thus: "If any man serve me, my fadir schal worschippe (i. e., honor) him." A precisely similar meaning is given to the word in "The Babes' Book" (p. 37) published by the Early English Text Society; and to Langland's "Piers Plowman" and Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales." The two last-named works were written in the latter half of the fourteenth century, and are easily procurable by the general reader. We have counted no fewer than nine different places in which Shakespeare uses the word "worship" in the sense of mere honor and without any reference whatever to that supreme worship or adoration which is due to God alone. The authorized version of the Protestant Bible thus translates our divine Lord's words in Luke xiv., 10:

"But when thou art bidden, go and sit down in the lowest room; that when he that bade thee cometh, he may say unto thee: Friend, go up higher; then shalt thou have 'worship' in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee."

In the Church of England marriage

services the bridegroom says to the bride: "With my body I thee 'worship'" (meaning, of course, to "honor") In Cardwell's "History of the Confessions" (p. 200) exception is stated to have been made to these words by Dr. Reynolds. Thereupon "His Majesty looked upon the place 'I was made believe (saith he) that the phrase did impart no lesse than divine worship and adoration, but by the examination I find that it is an usual English term, as 'a gentleman of worship,' etc., and the sense agreeable unto Scriptures, 'giving honor to the wife,' etc. But turning to Dr. Reynolds, with smiling said His Majesty: 'If you had a good wife yourself you would think all the honor and worship you could do to her well bestowed.'"

Nobody misunderstands Tennyson which he urges a young man to "worship her (a maiden) with years of noble deeds;" nor Carlyle when he writes of the "hero-worship" offered to Mirabeau, Cromwell, Napoleon, Johnson, Rousseau, Madame de Staël and Robbe Burns. Here in the very midst of this Protestant land, Mayors and Magistrates are still addressed as "your Worship;" the master of an Orange lodge is styled by the brethren "Worship;" and the grand master the "Right Worshipful." A glance at Webster's or any good dictionary will show that "worship" still retains its original meaning of simple honor or respect. But it has also in the course of time acquired the later and far different signification of supreme divine adoration. It is needless to say that the merely relative "worship" or honor paid to a creature—even to the spotless Virgin Mother—differs not only in degree, but in kind, from the supreme "worship" of adoration which must be given to God alone. With Catholics the meaning of the word "worship" is defined and safeguarded by the terms of the Church's known teachings. It is quite another matter when the term is used of us with hostile or controversial intent and in the sense already indicated by Protestant preachers or writers. Without due explanation and definition the word as applied to our veneration of the Blessed Virgin, etc., is tolerably certain to mislead. It insinuates a gross and monstrous charge of idolatry. In the circumstances an honest man's plain duty is either to explain his meaning of the term or to seek a better one. Those who knowingly decline both alternatives ought to revise their moral code. Those who are ignorant of the slippery character of the term would do well to go to school again.

The teaching of the Catholic Church in the so-called "worship of the Virgin Mary" is well and tersely expressed in the following words of one of our great divines:

"The Church condemns the least expression which oversteps that clear line, never to be crossed, dividing supreme worship of God from the highest honor paid to His highest saint." We accord the Blessed Virgin peculiar veneration, just because God crowned her with peculiar honors. Huss, Wyclif and the early Reformers—Luther, the authors of the Bohemian, Tetrapolitan and Basle Confessions of Faith, of the Declaration of Thorn and of the Leipzig Colloquy (1631)—all agreed in a lesser and legitimate form of worship of the Virgin Mary."

In his preface to "The Story that Transformed the World" (1890), Mr. W. T. Stead says of the veneration of Catholics for Mary:

"Protestantism will have much leeway to make up before it can find any influence so potent for softening the hearts and inspiring the imagination of men as that of the true ideal of the womanhood of the world [Mary]."

One of the hopeful signs of the past fifty years is the steady advance of respect and veneration for the Blessed Virgin among our Protestant brethren. It is not to be stopped by abusive or begging question epithets nor by appeals to the feelings of ignorant hearers. As for the Catholic Church, her divine Founder prophesied that she should ever be the butt of the persecutor's hand and of the calumniator's tongue. We are the heirs of the blessings as of the trials of those who, when the Church was in the catacombs, were accused of worshipping the head of an ass. Foolish charges and covert insinuations of rank idolatry may and do cause local irritation and effect some local harm. It is our duty to repel them as far as we may. But if they form part of the Church's cross, they shall persecute and calumniate you."

So in substance ran the prophecy. But "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her (the Church)." So ran the promise. An army of sons of Ananias can no more shake the rock foundations of God's Church than volleys of Pink Pills could shift the Rock of Gibraltar. And it is a bad cause that must needs support itself by falsehood.

A Hail Hit.

William J. Bryan has detected the keynote of the missionaries eager for government protection to their evangel in the Philippines, when he says, "One minister bears a command, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the word and scatter the blessings of civilization through the bursting of dynamite bombs.'"

PLAIN STATEMENTS.

Protestant View of Religion in the United States.—Amasa Thornton's Interesting Letter to the New York Sun.

In an interesting article in the New York Sun on "Civilization and Religion," Amasa Thornton thus writes of the churches in the United States: "What is the coincident state of religious faith in the United States?"

"The Christian Church is divided into three branches—the Protestant, the Catholic and the Greek. With the Greek we have so little association that I will not discuss it. The Catholic Church teaches and insists upon a religion which accepts the doctrine of reward and punishment in the next world. There is no equivocation about it and the result is that the training and education of the average Catholic in the United States makes him a respecter of property rights, keeps the lives of his wife and daughters pure, and is making the young American Catholic among the best of our citizens. That Church permits no divorces, and I am compelled to admit that it is very wise in that position. I do not say that the Catholic Church is the ideal one, but I am compelled to say that the result of its firm religious principle and uniformity of doctrine and teaching is tremendously in its favor."

"The Protestant Church has, in many of its large and strange denominations, gone practically away from the Bible and the old faith upon which Protestantism was built up and made strong. The Congregational Church is so far away from the religious faith of its New England ancestry that if any of the Puritan fathers could return to earth and see it they would repudiate all connection with it—and justly, too, for as a denomination it has no doctrine that is fixed, and a Congregationalist need now hardly believe anything that includes faith in the Bible. The great Presbyterian Church, which, under the teachings of Calvin and Knox, grew to be such a power for civilization, permits men who openly repudiate the Bible to teach in its great theological seminaries and preach in its pulpits. The Episcopal Church has grown to be an eleemosynary institution, to which resort men with broken religious backbones who are either forced or retired from the other denominations because of spiritual advisability. The Methodist church in the city of New York permits a young man to stand up in the clergyman's meeting and denounce the faith of the fathers and tear whole books out of the Bible."

There has been a great question in this city in the last few years whether the Presbyterian Church would not be swept entirely off its feet, and the danger is not yet passed.

"Most of the Protestant denominations have been more or less affected by the so-called 'higher criticism,' and have permitted their religious teachers to deny the authenticity of the Bible on the ground that scholarship demanded the surrender; but would not the best scholarship be a better and wiser work if it set itself to find out what had been the result of loss of faith in the Bible on the human race? If they did this, they would hesitate long before they would undertake to teach the masses to substitute fine-spu philosophy for that substantial faith, for in studying the history of society, they would find, as I have said, that with the decay of religious belief always came the decay of civilization. Then let them be thoughtful themselves if the prevailing loose opinions in regard to marriage and divorce, the appearance of the socialist agnosticism and its theories of the marital relation, the depraved teachings of the anarchist on the relation of the sexes and the sexual perversion of the times are not palpable evidences of the effect of the disappearing faith of our fathers. As for myself, when I look at the old civilizations and the point at which their disappearance began and find ours at the same point, I am compelled to the conclusion which will carry us to moral ruin if we do not get out of it. If history teaches aright, our civilization, in order to endure, like every other which has continued vigorous, must be based on a religion of strong faith, one that does not substitute a human philosophy for faith in a Being who cannot be comprehended but who shapes our lives."

I have heard Dr. Briggs quoted in an East Side saloon by a socialist over a glass of beer as evidence that even professors of theological seminaries no longer believe in the Bible. The average socialist propagandist feels that if he can shake the faith of hearer in his religion he has already got him more than half-way into the stockist ranks, therefore, his sock argument is that religious faith is dead and the Christian Church no longer believes in the Bible. If the learned divines and teachers of the Protestant Churches who are pushing the 'higher criticism,' should study the situation closely, they would find that they are potent influences in making socialists and anarchists."

"Will the great body of the Protestant Church bring the old ship back to its moorings, or will it leave the field entirely to the Catholic Church? I ask the question as a Protestant."