

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Missions of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Agents: Luke King, John Nish, P. J. Neven, and Joseph S. King.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent.

Advertisers collect their amount due in advance.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.

Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900. Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

LONDON, SATURDAY, DEC. 13, 1902.

THE DIVORCE LAW IN CHICAGO.

One of the most curious and at the same time trivial reasons which we have as yet noticed to have been advanced in the divorce courts, why an application for a divorce should be granted, was given recently in a Chicago court by Mrs. Philomena Appleton, a teacher in an Englewood business college.

Mrs. Appleton told the court as her reason for the application: "I could not stand his vulgar spelling and manners."

To substantiate her complaint she produced several letters from her husband, but the one which had most effect upon the court was a reply to a letter from herself in which she had informed him that she could stand him no longer and would apply for a divorce.

"If you want to get that it will be all right with me if you can send me ten and I will let you out if you will send me what I want. Don't wait send it this week. Send it soon. Ten is a nuff. Anker."

The judge seemed to be of the same opinion with Mrs. Appleton that a man who writes the pronoun I with a small dotted letter, and a nuff for enough is not a fit consort for a school-maam, and the decree was granted.

We cannot doubt that the husband's deficiencies were perfectly well known to the wife when they were married, and even if the cause of separation might be regarded as sufficient, if there had been invincible ignorance of the case on her side, it should have to be said that she condoned his defect of education by marrying him notwithstanding such defect, and the decree should not have been granted.

We may presume, however, that the judge knows the spirit of the laws in his own State at least, and that his judgment was in accordance with it. But the case shows that all pretence that marriage is a permanent bond disappears with this decision. Surely the pretence can no longer be kept up among Protestants who have pious such laws that there is anything sacred in the marriage ties or obligations.

On what pretext, then, can the clergy lay claim to any right to perform the marriage ceremony in any case, if it is thus to be removed from all subjection to the divine law laid down for its permanency and indissolubility, such as, "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder?"

RITUALISM IN UNEXPECTED PLACES.

The official board of the Dominion Methodist Church at Ottawa, by a vote of 17 to 7, recently requested Dr. Rose, their pastor, to wear a professor's or teacher's gown in preaching.

The Ladies' Aid Society of the church has agreed to furnish the gown. There is some opposition to the decision, but it is not expected that it will be strongly persevered in.

The opposition are afraid that the movement may result similarly to the Ritualism in the Anglican Church, which has divided Anglicanism into two bitterly opposite factions of High and Low Church.

No denomination has been more hostile than the Methodists to the use of special ecclesiastical vestments in their Churches, on the ground that forms and ceremonies are calculated to turn the mind from the spirituality of religion, and thus to materialize the worship of God.

It would not be much of a surprise if the alarm were raised by the ritualists that the Church is being Romanized, as was done in an Anglican Church in the same city a few years ago when the prayer "Lord have mercy on us!" was sung by the choir in Greek.

It is true the vestments in the present instance are not ecclesiastical, but mundane, but the movement in favor of something indicative of the clerical office indicates, all the same, a hankering after a more elaborate ritual; and, if ritualism is desirable at all, many will believe that a ritual having a spiritual signification would be more appropriate to a church than one having a worldly meaning, even though the main purpose should be to make a show of the preacher's scholastic attainments.

AN ABSURD THEORY OF THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY.

A theory has been advanced of late years among infidels to the effect that St. Paul, and not Christ, is the real founder of Christianity as it exists at the present time, and as it has existed from the beginning of the second, or the end of the first century.

In certain books emanating from the propagandist centre of infidelity in New York this theory is maintained, and it is not difficult to see for what purpose. St. Peter is set up against St. Paul as advocating a Christianity altogether different from that of the latter; but St. Paul's theories prevailed, and thus the Christianity of the present age is derived from St. Paul, who is called the Apostle of the Gentiles, because, though he necessarily brought out his system from the Jewish law as its basis, he aimed at spreading its fundamental principles among all nations, so as to give the nations a knowledge of God similar to that possessed by the Jews.

This knowledge he propagated in the numerous countries and cities wherein he established Christian churches, without laying down any obligation to observe the practices of circumcision, the many purifications prescribed in the books of Numbers and Leviticus, and throughout the historical and prophetic books of the Old Testament, the new moons and other holidays, and the sacrificial rites of the law.

To supply these, and for the purpose of giving some sort of religious faith to those to whom he preached, and to keep up the religious enthusiasm which Christ inspired during His stay on earth, he used his supposed authority to modify the teachings of Christ, and thus brought forward the theories of the atonement, the power of grace, and even the Trinity, of which himself was the author, and which were entirely unknown to the other Apostles.

These were, according to this same theory, a constant opposition between Peter and Paul, whereas Peter desired to make the Gentile converts conform to the rites and forms of the laws of Moses as a condition of their becoming Christians.

By this theory the enemies of Christianity have hoped to weaken the hold which Christianity has upon the world, for if Christian teaching is merely of St. Paul's invention and not the teaching of Christ or God made man, it loses the whole of its power over mankind, and becomes nothing more than a school of inconsistent philosophy of no greater weight than that of the Platonists, Stoics, or Epicureans.

It ceases to be that faith which came down from heaven and which therefore commands our respect, obedience, and unhesitating belief in its truth.

A prominent gentleman of California, a Jew named Mr. Weinstein, has recently issued a book which, professing to give a philosophical turn to Christ's teaching, renews the errors of the New York infidels as described above; yet strange to say he does not describe St. Paul as an impostor, which he would be if Mr. Weinstein's theory were true, but he says of this great Apostle: "Paul began a missionary work that in time revolutionized the religious spirit of the world, and which is destined to continue moving onward as long as civilization shall stand."

These ridiculous theories of the original Pauline and Petrine sects of Christians have no basis either in Scripture, tradition, or history. They are purely fantastic imaginings which date as far back as the days of the Cerinthians and Nazarenes of the second and first centuries.

These sectaries, and especially the Cerinthians, entertained even a hatred of the epistles of St. Paul, because of this Apostle declaring the independence of Christianity from Jewish ceremonial laws.

There was no opposition between Sts. Peter and Paul, for they preached the same gospel, and laid down their lives for Christ together in Rome on the same day.

Their mutual affection is evident from what each one of these says of the other in their respective epistles.

St. Peter, who pronounces in 2 Pet. 20-21 that prophecy (of Scripture) is the speech "of holy men of God inspired by the Holy Ghost," pronounces

as head of the Church of God on earth, that St. Paul's epistles are part of the Scriptures, and therefore inspired, thus: "Our most dear brother Paul . . . hath written to you, as also in all his epistles . . . are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as also the other Scriptures, to their own perdition."

We have also St. Paul, three years after his conversion, going "to Jerusalem to see Peter"; no doubt to confer with him regarding the gospel as he had preached it.

In Jerusalem St. Paul saw Peter, and also James, whose field of operation was in Jerusalem; but he adds: "Other of the Apostles I saw none." (Gal. i, 19). This great Apostle adds here that throughout Judea he did not preach, yet he was known, for he had been heard of that "he that persecuted us in times past doth now preach the faith which once he impugned; and they glorified God in me." Surely all this does not show any lack of fraternal charity between St. Paul and St. Peter and the Jewish converts, whom the Cerinthian theory styled the Petrites, and so the theories of Mr. Weinstein and the New York infidels fall to the ground for want of foundation.

In the same epistle (ii, 9) we are told that "James, and Cephas (that is Peter) and John gave to me the right hand of fellowship; that we should go to the Gentiles, and they to the circumcision." (The Jews.)

Here we are reminded that Paul "withstood Cephas to the face" at Antioch. This text is the only foundation for the pretence of an opposition between the two Apostles. But St. Peter's fault was no more than "a certain imprudence in withdrawing himself from the table at which Gentile converts sat," lest he should give offence to his Jewish converts, as the Gentiles were uncircumcised. St. Paul blamed him for this, for the Gentiles might suppose therefrom that they were bound to fulfil the Jewish rites, which was not the case. St. Peter must have accepted the reprimand humbly and patiently, for the cordial and loving commendation which we have already quoted regarding "our dear brother Paul," and his epistles was written many years after the occurrence at Antioch.

It is evident, therefore, that Sts. Peter and Paul taught the same gospel, which had its origin from neither of them, but from their Master, Christ.

A CONDONATION OF HERETICAL TEACHING.

A sensational address which caused much excitement among the people, and indignation among the clergy, was delivered by the Rev. W. H. Freemantle, Dean of Ripon, England, before the Churchmen's Union on October 29th, in which he said that the question of the virginity of Mary should not be taken into account as a doctrine of Christianity, because, except in St. Matthew and St. Luke, the virgin birth of Jesus is not mentioned in the New Testament.

He also expressed doubt of the New Testament miracles, such as the resurrection of Christ, His raising of the dead to life, etc.

The Bishop of Ripon, the Right Rev. Dr. Boyd Carpenter, found it necessary to write a letter to the Dean imploring him, "on behalf of many devout and simple-hearted Christians, to reiterate his belief in the Creed of the Church. Such a statement, your friends and many hearts are looking for with anxiety."

The Dean, in his reply to this letter, ignores the controversial points, but declares emphatically "his belief in the absolute deity of Christ, and his sincerity in reciting the Creed."

As the Creed declares as positively as the Holy Scripture itself the birth of Christ from a virgin, it might seem at first glance that the Canon's views are orthodox; but it is quite well understood that he is as dubious as ever regarding the miracle of Christ's virgin birth, and the other miracles related in Holy Scripture, and that his declaration of belief in the Creed was made with a mental reservation in regard to the virgin birth. The most surprising part of the case is that the Bishop did not require a specific declaration of belief in the doctrine specially denied, and in the miracles recorded in Holy Writ. We are forced to the conclusion that he has no authority to insist upon a plain act of faith from his clergy in regard to the most positive teachings of Holy Writ and of the Church; or, if he has such authority, that he considers it of little importance whether these doctrines be denied or not, whereas that authority is not exercised.

What is the use of having a hypothetical "historic episcopate" if this is the way they are to "rule the Church of God" as it is stated in Acts xx, 28, they ought to do?

It will be a puzzle to straightforward Christians how "the faith once delivered to the Saints" is to be pre-

served in the Church if heterodox beliefs may thus be propounded to the people with the implied approbation of the Bishop, whose definite duty is supposed to be to preserve the faith of Christ without permitting it to be corrupted by the clergy at will.

If the Canon is at liberty to reject a doctrine taught by two Evangelists, there appears to be no reason why he should not be free to reject equally a teaching which is delivered by any two or even four or five writers of Holy Scripture; and if those doctrines may thus be rejected at will, it must follow that none of the Scriptural books are truly inspired, or that they are the Word of God.

Is this the ending to which three and a half centuries of religious reformation and an open Bible have brought the people of England and their Church?

HOME RULE.

It is pleasant to note the active and earnest interest taken in the cause of Home Rule by the Irish people of Canada; and indeed we might also claim that, besides Irishmen, there is a host of people of other nationalities who sympathize with the people of the Emerald Isle in their endeavor to obtain the blessings of Home Rule.

The meetings lately held in the larger cities, with the great Edward Blake as the principal speaker, have been well attended and contributions to the cause have been most generous. The speeches delivered by Mr. Blake, Mr. Devlin, and others, will serve to create a new interest in the cause of Irish Home Rule.

Indeed, from present appearances we may hope that at no distant date the people of Ireland will be enjoying the same freedom of action as we do in Canada in the management of their local affairs.

MGR. FALCONIO.

As will be seen by a report in another column, Mgr. Falconio, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, has been received in the capital of that country with every mark of esteem—indeed, we may say of affection. The news of his beneficent work in Canada has gone before him, and it was therefore to be expected that the ecclesiastical authorities and the laity of the great American Republic would extend toward the distinguished personage that warm greeting of which he is in every regard so worthy.

The Catholics of Canada will watch his career with interest. They have been given many reasons for loving him—not solely because of the exalted position he occupied, but likewise because of his gracious personality and his kindly heart. All the children of the Church are equally dear to him, and it is therefore no surprise that the affection entertained in his regard is universal.

INFANT BAPTISM.

The subject of a sermon delivered in a Baptist Church of Chatham by the Rev. J. J. Ross, the pastor, was "the Sin of Infant Baptism."

The preacher announced that the teaching he proposed to deliver would "hit" many of his own congregation, as well as the other congregations of the city, and that in fact he had been asked and advised by members of his own congregation to leave the subject alone and not speak of it; but after deep thought and study he has arrived at the belief that "infant baptism is a sin," and he pressed to be able to prove through biblical references that what he said is true.

He admitted that some Baptists do not agree with him in this belief, and stated that those who uphold infant baptism quote the words of Christ: "Suffer little children to come unto Me." The report does not state that he denied that this passage is inapplicable to the case, but it is to be presumed that he did so, for immediately afterward he is reported as having said: "It is right to baptize a child either by sprinkling or immersion, it is also right for them to take Sacrament. No one will say that it is right for children to be allowed to take Sacrament, and if we reject one, we must reject the other."

We are told by the reporter of the sermon that "throughout it was from an argumentative standpoint, and for each statement which he made he produced biblical references to support his belief. There is only a single biblical reference in his sermon as reported to sustain his teaching, so that we are unable to say on what grounds beyond this he made the assertion. We know, however, that no valid proof of the kind can be given. We will therefore say a few words on the one passage to which he does refer as a proof of his position, after which we will state the Catholic position on the subject.

The Rev. Mr. Ross says, according to the report: "He thought that a child should not be baptized until he or she was old enough to realize the meaning of Baptism,

It is stated in the gospels that only believers shall be baptized." This is evidently a reference to the gospel of St. Mark xvi, 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned."

There is no other passage in Holy Scripture resembling Rev. Mr. Ross's quotation, so that this is the only Scriptural passage referred to in the report of the sermon to show the sinfulness of infant baptism, and if it does not show this, that gentleman is utterly without proof for his main thesis.

There are two conditions here laid down on the fulfillment of which salvation is promised—belief in Christ and baptism—but there is not one word to imply what Rev. Mr. Ross infers from this text, namely, that actual belief must precede baptism in the case of infants.

If these words are to be strictly applied to infants they will not only mean that infants must not be baptized, but also that they cannot be saved at all, for they cannot have that actual belief which Rev. Mr. Ross requires from them, and the text tells us that they who have not that belief shall not be saved but shall be condemned. This consequence the Rev. Mr. Ross expressly repudiates when he asserts that "when an infant is born into this world, its life is pure and spotless . . . and it has no need of Baptism."

Thus the rev. gentleman refutes his own interpretation of the only text which he can quote in favor of the pompous theory which he so confidently propounds, and which he acknowledges to be repudiated by all other Christian congregations in his city, and even by many of his own denomination.

As a matter of fact, which we intend to prove below, his doctrine is a purely modern invention which has no basis in Holy Scripture, and which the whole Christian world to this day repudiates, with the exception of a faction within a Church which is itself but a very small fraction of Christianity.

Assuming Mr. Ross's theory to be true, what mean the promises of Christ that the Church which He built upon a rock shall not be overcome by all the powers of hell? that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it? What means the comparison made by Christ Himself, that His Church or kingdom should be like the mustard seed, the smallest of all seeds, in its beginning, which should grow up to be a tree, "greater than any herbs, so that the birds of the air come and dwell in the branches thereof?" (St. Matt. xiii, 32). What means the prophecy of Isaiah, which even the translators of the Protestant version of the Bible admit to be a prediction of Christ's kingdom or Church:

"And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountain, and shall be exalted above the hill, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go up to it. Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem?" (Is. ii, 2, 3.)

Does the Rev. Mr. Ross's fraction of a Church, never before heard of, which Munzer and Storek invented in Germany in 1523, by ripping and patching the teachings of Luther, alone possess the "faith once delivered to the Saints" by Christ Himself?

To assert that this is the case makes Christ and His Apostles mere buffoons and impostors where they assert that the Church which Christ established must be heard under penalty that they who disobey must be regarded as "the heathen and the publican" because they listen not to the voice of "the Church of the living God which is the pillar and ground of Truth." (St. Matt. xviii, 17, 1 Tim. iii, 15.)

According to the Baptist Year Book for 1872 the total number of Baptists in the United States and British America was then 1,557,449. (Appleton's Cyclopaedia). The number in England, Germany, Switzerland, and other countries might perhaps multiply this by three, but when we consider that the different sects into which these are divided are numerous, such as Tankers or Tumblers, Hook and Eye and Suspender Mennonites, Sabbatarian or Seventh Day Baptists, Particular, General, and Close and Open Communionists, it will be a liberal allowance if we suppose that the Rev. Mr. Ross's sect has one and a half million of adherents. We do not know exactly to which of the many sects of the Baptists he belongs, but allowing again that his peculiar one originated in 1523, he should have, by well known mathematical methods, the total number of Baptists of that sect who have ever lived to be approximately less than fifty seven and a half million, whereas the total number of Christians must have been over twenty six thousand six hundred and nineteen millions since the time of Christ.

It is surely a new example of the frog who would make itself an ox in size, when the Rev. Mr. Ross claims that he and his modern sect have alone been successful in interpreting the teachings of Christ in regard to the baptism of infants.

What, then, is the real meaning of the passage of St. Mark's Gospel which we have had under consideration? The words are addressed by Christ to His Apostles just before His Ascension into heaven, while He is instructing them on the manner in which they are to fulfil their mission. They are synoptical words referring to the whole body of instructions which He had given them while He was with them, and in fact St. John xxi, 15-24, and St. Luke in his Gospel xxi, 28-50, and in the Acts of the Apostles i, 2-8, relate much more which Christ spoke to them on this occasion.

St. Mark informs us in this synoptical discourse, that Christ told His Apostles to "preach the gospel to every creature." He certainly did not mean that this preaching was for infants chiefly but especially for adults, or at least for those who were able to understand.

The belief and the baptism which are next spoken of are also intended for those who are capable of fulfilling what is commanded, and to the extent to which they are capable of receiving it. That is to say adults must fulfil both precepts. As regards children, they must obey only so far as they are capable of obedience, inasmuch as no one can be bound by an impossible precept. But when the children are infants, actual belief is impossible, and it follows that baptism is sufficient in this case.

We have dealt with this part of our subject somewhat lengthily that we might set forth thoroughly the principal thesis of the Rev. Mr. Ross. We must on this account be brief in regard to the proofs that infant baptism is a doctrine handed down from Christ's Apostles, as Christ's own teaching.

1. Rev. Mr. Ross is wrong in his assertion that children are born pure and spotless. "By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned." (Rom. v, 12.)

In the Greek original, man is *anthropos*, which means a human being of any age or sex. *Pantes*, "all" have sinned has the same meaning: "all persons" or "people." Therefore, children are included.

"Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." (Ps. li, 5, Prof. version)

Here original sin is clearly stated to have passed upon mankind. "As by the offence of one unto all men to condemnation, so also by the justice of One unto all men to justification of life. For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners, . . . by the obedience of One many shall be made just."

Also: "For if by one man's offence, death reigned through one, much more they who receive abundance of grace, etc., shall reign in life through One, Jesus Christ." (Rom. v, 17-19.)

Hence even little children have sinned in Adam, and therefore Baptism, the sacrament whereby we are justified, is for them.

2. This is confirmed by Christ, who said to Nicodemus (St. John, iii, 5) "unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Here baptism is meant; and it must be received by all, for where we find "unless a man" the Greek original has "can he be," which signifies "unless any one." This means man, woman, or child, and therefore all are in need of baptism.

All in Samaria, "from the least to the greatest, followed Simon the magician until Philip preached Christ there." Then "they were baptized both men and women." (Acts viii, 12.)

No exception is made, as surely would have been the case if children were not to be baptized. It would have been necessary, if Mr. Ross be right, to have given warning of such a case, lest some one should take these words in their full and natural sense, children being included, and thus Rev. Mr. Ross's sin would have been committed.

We find also that St. Paul baptized the household of Stephanus in Corinth. (1 Cor ii, 26.)

At Phillippi, Lydia and her household were baptized, and also the keeper of the prison in which St. Paul was confined, together with all his household. (Acts, xvi, 15, 33.)

These and many other reasons which we cannot adduce at present show beyond doubt that infant baptism was used by the Apostles. We may add, however, one testimony in regard to the manner in which the Christian Church interpreted Christ's words from the beginning. Thus speaks St. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, who wrote about the year 170, and who was the disciple of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John the Evangelist:

"He (Christ) came to save all men who through Him are born again into God's kingdom, boys, young men, old men, and infants. This settles the what the Apostles taught."

The Toronto Nov. 15th gives teachers to relate it may be reproduced own words. Undoubtedly stories to pupils, one whereby children for themselves their thoughts in the story in question not to have been unus of the Toronto reason that it was insulting to Catholic vilify the teaching Catholic Church. The title of "Idol," is enough. It is, of course, a pity. It is well known set up images; yet this is a story of the Church of Rome, an ancient and child was two ago, and was supposed to represent Nero" in his motto. This statue had been set up people, and we honored by "foes who think that may have eternal death for themselves. "Kissing the image" is meant of homage paid to believed "to be or afflicted." It is a story of money; by the gifts be chased of rare jewels diamonds and pearls of the statue. Does the ed Teacher expect that the Catholic honors the memory whose crimes or penance? If so the ignorance of journal.

again into God's kingdom, boys, young men, old men, and infants. This settles the what the Apostles taught."

A MYTH FROM THE TORONTO PRESS.

The Toronto Nov. 15th gives teachers to relate it may be reproduced own words. Undoubtedly stories to pupils, one whereby children for themselves their thoughts in the story in question not to have been unus of the Toronto reason that it was insulting to Catholic vilify the teaching Catholic Church. The title of "Idol," is enough. It is, of course, a pity. It is well known set up images; yet this is a story of the Church of Rome, an ancient and child was two ago, and was supposed to represent Nero" in his motto. This statue had been set up people, and we honored by "foes who think that may have eternal death for themselves. "Kissing the image" is meant of homage paid to believed "to be or afflicted." It is a story of money; by the gifts be chased of rare jewels diamonds and pearls of the statue. Does the ed Teacher expect that the Catholic honors the memory whose crimes or penance? If so the ignorance of journal.

There is a Virgin and her Church of St. more an idol the covenant with him which God under the Old always treated the utmost reverence 1-15.) This ark gold, and a golden ark, which is a symbol of the golden ark with the Roman status of Mary order to show for Jesus and His.

The Catholic use of statues Saints because of their original the necessity of by imitating their works. Among pay special honor of God because special honor; of the Holy Ghost; "He that is things to me, and "Behold, I actions shall be Luke i, 48-49.)

Among the s dian Teachers lies, and we will resent s representation or flings into such falsehood mythical story.

LABORE

Every now im preacher boring classes. The complain founded upon Catholic church and there is a fact.

In religion every other wants a dedication pin his His rule of f as invariable o-or leave theo interpretation intellect; and Protestant appeal to his.

Among Cat The old Church Faith, whole trusted to be Christ. She "Go, teach heareth you despiseth you that despiseth sent Me."

Fortified w teaches with confidence o