

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 Ogdensburg, 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 full condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

Messrs. L. K. King, E. J. Neven, E. J. Brodick, 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 Newfoundland, Mrs. M. Reynolds, New Liskeard.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION.
Apostolic Delegation.
Ottawa, June 13th, 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 is, in fact, a Catholic paper in the truest sense of the word. It is a paper that is not only a credit to the Catholic press, but also a credit to the Catholic Church.

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 these lines it has done a great deal of good. It is a paper that is not only a credit to the Catholic press, but also a credit to the Catholic Church.

Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address. It will do more and more, as the wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes. Therefore, earnestly recommending it to Catholic families. With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success, Yours very sincerely in Christ, DONATUS, Archbishop of Ephesus, Apostolic Delegate.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

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, and the manner in which it is conducted. It is a paper that is not only a credit to the Catholic press, but also a credit to the Catholic Church.

It is a paper that is not only a credit to the Catholic press, but also a credit to the Catholic Church. It is a paper that is not only a credit to the Catholic press, but also a credit to the Catholic Church.

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
J. D. FALLON, Arch. of Larissa, Agent. Delet.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 2, 1907.

THE PAPACY AND THE CHURCH.

Professor Goldwin Smith, in a letter to the New York Sun, opens with a brief critique upon the Encyclical about Modernism and closes with a display of historical fact-works showing a number of the Popes against whom he has chronic prejudice in no favorable light.

The miraculous things he criticizes, and he confuses the temporal dominion with the spiritual power, until he mistakes the Church for a jumble of confusion rather than a garden of order and beauty. It is impossible to take point by point. The field is too vast, covering as it does several miracles, the names of Dullinger, Lacordaire and others, not to mention the strong-willed St. Hildebrand and Innocent III., nor the Duke of Alva and Jesuitism (sic) and St. Bartholomew and many other stage characters who so often have done service for Professor Smith whenever the Papacy has risen before his imagination. He has read the history of the Church in a peculiar frame of mind. In its earlier chapters he does not see the Papacy at all. It is only at a later date when ecclesiastical activity had moved from east to west, when the nations were forming and the union of Catholicity required the firmness and action of the strong central power, it is only when the Papacy acted that men like Professor Smith over thought there was such a factor. And no matter what these Popes do it is wrong; no matter what is done through the Church the Popes are to blame. Whether Hildebrand attacks the Albigenses or Pius X. condemns Modernism it is all the same: tyranny in both cases, fierce cruelty with the Sovereign Pontiff of the eleventh century and reactionary ignorance in the twentieth century. Even if the Holy Father were willing to take Goldwin Smith into his counsel it would not do; for Goldwin Smith would tell him to resign, that he (the Holy Father) was not at all necessary for the Church, that in fact the Church would be better without the Papacy. This is the argument. "It must be borne in mind," he says, "that not only Popery and Christianity, but Popery and Catholicism are different things." It is as undignified as it is incorrect for a scholar of Professor Smith's reputation to use such language or to treat these subjects with such discourtesy. We object to the term Popery, which is offensive in its origin, its application and its insinuation. What should be borne in mind is that difference of view is a stronger reason for language being temperate as well as definite. If dictionaries are authoritative the term Popery as used by the Professor is incorrect; for it always signifies the same doctrine as Catholicism. It therefore cannot "be borne in mind" that Popery and Catholicism are different things. Catholicism and the Papacy—using a term which is not opprobrious—stand to each other as the body and the head. The body, it is true, is not the head; nor is the head the body. But what is one without the other? The papacy is no more the work of ecclesiastical development or political circumstances than Catholicism itself. Both are of divine institution; but the papacy is first. If the Church is Catholic then it must be one. It is not a confederation of churches nor the aggregation of particulars. What makes the Church Catholic is its unity, and what makes its unity is the papacy. In our conception of Christ's Church the

order is clear, so clear that all the hazy of all the centuries can never confuse it: Christ first, then Peter and his successors, the popes in whom resides all teaching and governing authority. The Pope is not evolved from the internal operations of the church; he is not created or commissioned by the Episcopacy, but is the central unity whence the whole hierarchy takes its rise. The Church was never without the Papacy, and could not do without it. Without this central power there would be no legitimate ecclesiastical authority, no unity, no Catholicity. It is perhaps popular in these times, as it has been for several centuries, to be anti-papal; but it is also bitterly to be regretted, for no greater obstacle stands in the way of uniting Christendom than this prejudiced view of the papacy and its relations with the Church universal.

MODERNISM.

Every papal document attracts more or less the attention of non-Catholics. The last encyclical, so far from being an exception, has already aroused friends and foes, subjects and aliens, to a pitch of enthusiasm on the one part and hatred on the other. One reason for the feeling manifested is that the Encyclical bears directly upon the intellectual order—a thing which has not been done we know not when. There was no necessity for it. Men for generations had been thinking, of course, but their field of thought did not even border on the domain of the supernatural. A time came when there and there a teacher, Catholic in heart and name, began to investigate matters of faith with the mere appliances of reason. No further notice was taken of it than to call the individual's attention to the danger of such teaching. For just as every operation has a term towards which it is directed and to which it invariably tends, so was this teaching fast rushing to a term which meant the death-wound of faith and the oblivion of the supernatural. What was the Church to do? And by the Church we mean the Pope. What was he to do? Was he to be hypnotized by the pretended progress of modern civilization so as not to see the danger of death to the Church, or seeing it was to admit without protest its desolating advance? To this the modernist replies: "By all means the Church ought to live. And it is because we wish it to live, free henceforth from the reactionary and conservative spirit of the past. Not only is it an anachronism but it is folly to wish to maintain in modern society an organism decrepit with twenty centuries—an organism which was adapted for a society totally different from the demands of the present time. The Church should be transformed: for better a transformed Church than a dead Church. There is no other remedy for the anemia of which it is dying than a large transfusion of new blood borrowed from its healthy neighbor in whose social life it ought to participate under penalty of contradicting its divine calling." Such is modernism in tendency, language and substance. All its disciples may not have the same boldness or the consciousness disregard for revealed religion; for some are radical and others moderate. The latter see only the brilliant side by which the imagination is charmed with the vision of a Church scientifically reformed. But the Church would have to pay for this transformation at the price of abandoning its supernatural character, its gospel, its dogma, its divine origin, in a word, at the price of its own life. Some of these visionaries wished to remain in the Church, to continue to be Catholics, but they were to be modern Catholics. Modern Catholicism! This adjective and this noun stand well together when there is kept due relation which authority and experience define and explain; but in the minds of the new school the epithet absorbs and suppresses the substantive. In the Church there are always modern ideas whose expressions in work and practice make for religious life and the good order of society. Modern Catholicism, on the other hand, in theory, sacrifice the substance to the accident, the noun to the adjective, and extinguishes Catholicism in its essence under the pretext of modernizing it. In practice it suppresses from Catholicism all that might shock the modern spirit, whilst it positively inoculates Catholicism with all the modern spirit possible. Past, present and future are the purposes towards which its errors aim in its pride. The past is finished; it must be laid aside and forgotten. Its bearings on the present are meaningless, reactionary and untimely. The present is the only age of progress, evolution and civilization. The future—when evolution will be complete—liberalism universal and naturalism all-prevailing—this future will realize and materialize the triumph of modern Catholicism. These are the errors against which the Encyclical is directed—errors which were

not up in the air, but which were in many of the schools, glided by all the rhetoric of sophistry, but now laid bare by the Voice of Truth and the Supreme Authority of the Church. As this by no means closes the subject we hope to return to it anon.

EQUALITY.

A friend has kindly sent us the biennial address or report by the President of the International Association of Machinists, with the request for an expression of opinion upon some of the president's remarks. One portion of the address begins with an act of faith in evolution "as a law of growth and as a universal law." Starting with the idea that men's desire for equality is all-pervading, the president finds: "That moral equality, or religious equality, if you please, found its expression in the Reformation." This Reformation, he further claims, brought about, sometimes by slow stages, in others by revolution, that political equality which though incomplete tends to develop social and industrial equality. In expressing our opinion, we think the shoemaker ought to stick to his last. A president of a large association ought before giving his own private opinion or belief discuss the affairs of his society. Let us suppose a Catholic in the same position, who would start with an act of faith in the Church and the infallibility of the Pope, stating that the rights, duties and objects of the machinists' craft clearly come under that article of the creed, what would be thought of the man? Forthwith it would be heralded from the upper lakes to the gulf that he was handing the association over to Rome. There would be a storm which would either depose the man himself or split the society in two. There is less to excuse the present president for going out of his way to offend the Catholic members and others as well, who have no sympathy with evolution or the absurd arguments based upon it. It may be that with several of his associates the president was regarded at the time of that speech as a paragon of learning, whose knowledge of history, theology and economy, displayed itself with more rashness of statement than correctness of reasoning. Others differ from him, and we amongst the number. Not only was it bad taste for him to talk the way he did, not only was it offensive to his Catholic hearers and readers, not only was it irreligious in its tendency—it is false and unsound in theory and history. It is simply because this officer of an important association parades his private views in the public function and utterance of his society that we presume to call him to account. Equality is a glib term. It is music to the ear which is weary of the uninterrupted sound of work. It is joy to the heart pressed down by the crushing cares of multiplied demands and limited supplies. Equality, like liberty, is made to do service everywhere—religion, politics, industry, the church, the state, society, are the successive fields of its combats, if not of its triumphs. Equality suffers more from its pretended friends than its candid foes. In claiming universal equality its champions frustrate their own ends; and create a condition in which inequality is more obstinate and more causative of distress than ever. All are not equal in the goods of soul and body. One has five talents, another has two, and a third only one. There are different kinds of labor for which some are adapted, and others not at all. One man might make a very good leader, whose influence would sway a multitude, or who, being president of an association, could govern it and make it an instrument for good; another would by his first word create disorder and dismember what he had been appointed to conserve. We admit equality in a certain sense, we demand it as an inherent right whose protection is one of the inviolable duties of society, and one of the safest guarantees of society's stability. We are equal before the law. Its sanction should not weigh more heavily upon one than upon another; nor should the law be applied with any other spirit to the least as well as the greatest. Amongst the foundation stones of society, justice lies perhaps deepest. But we must be careful about equality according to justice; for justice may be distributive, in which case the equality is proportional rather than arithmetic. Let us pass on. When the president speaks in the same breath of the moral equality and the religious equality as one and the same thing, he is talking nonsense. Morality is not the same as religion—nor do we understand what is intended by moral equality when identified with religious equality. Whilst religion includes morality it is more extensive in meaning and far more exalted in purpose—including as it does the worship of, and other duties towards, God. But the objectionable feature in the President's address is that he attributes to the Reformation (so-called) the expression of religious equality. Besides being offensive to Catholics, this statement has no foundation. If rebellion means equality, and if destruction of the temple means levelling, then the remark may go for what it is worth; though we think the speaker might have started at the first chapter of that history. The first battle for equality of that kind took place in heaven, when Lucifer strove to make himself as God. It is historically unfair to attribute love of equality to the leaders of the sixteenth century. So far as rights are concerned the Catholic Church is the true exponent and the stoutest defender of equality the world has ever had. When our Blessed Lord, in founding His Church, broke down the barrier of Israelitic birth and threw open the gates of salvation to the Gentile world, He proclaimed to all time and to all nations the equality of man. In His Kingdom there was neither bond nor free, neither Greek nor barbarian, neither Jew nor Gentile, and this equality exists in the Church: the same sacraments are open to all, and the highest position may be attained by the least child of the Church. Nor can it be claimed that "submission to the Master of the House" (using the President's phrase) is a mark of religion preceding the sixteenth century, and that from that time it ceased to be demanded or practised. Submission was required from the beginning, and will be unto the end. It will be written of the religious man in the head of the book that he comes not to do his own will but the will of Him who sends him. How can any Christian, at all pretending to be a disciple of Him who was obedient unto death, reject "submission unto the Master of the House?" How can Society subsist without a hierarchy? Nothing so secures us in our rights and guards the stability necessary for contentment on the one hand and real progress on the other. We cannot follow this gentleman's address any further. He refers to history, ancient and modern. But as his references are indefinite in themselves and irrelevant to present questions, and as we are not teaching history, we allow this part of the address to pass. Enough has been said by us to stand as a protest against such principles as the President announced in a mixed Society, that they cannot be maintained by Catholics nor can they be supported by logic or history.

DEATH OF FATHER BARRY.

The sad announcement was made in St. Peter's Cathedral, London, last Sunday, that Rev. Father Barry, of the Cathedral staff, had died on the previous day. The young priest was a native of this city, son of Mr. and Mrs. Garret Barry of King street. Father Barry and the members of his family were highly esteemed in this city, and a very large circle of friends will feel keen regret that the young priest has been cut off in the beginning of a career which promised to realize to the fullest all that was hoped for by his Bishop, his fellow-workers in the ministry and his relatives and friends. But God decreed that he should be taken unto Himself. Father Barry made his course of studies in Sandwich College and the Grand Seminary, Montreal. He was a diligent student and was endowed with talents of a high order. He was ordained a few years ago, and was appointed assistant at Sarnia, later being called to supplement the Cathedral staff. He had been in delicate health for the past two or three years, and the end came on Saturday last. The funeral took place from St. Mary's church, and was one of the largest seen in London for many years. Peace to the soul of the gentle and kindly and lovable Father Barry.

"SINN FEIN."

From the city of Minneapolis, Minn., we have received a report of a meeting held for the purpose of promoting the establishment of a branch of the Sinn Fein Society. The primary object of the association, we believe, is to help the sale of Irish industries. This is an excellent work and we trust it will succeed beyond the highest expectations of those interested. Working along this line the Sinn Fein movement will commend itself to all Irishmen. It would be well, however, we firmly believe, were the members also to give a hearty support to the Irish parliamentary party. One movement is to a certain extent identified with the other, or, if it is not, it should be. If such a course is adopted the Irish people will all the sooner be granted Home Rule for their country, the denial of which places the governing body in England in an unenviable light before the liberty loving people of Europe and America.

A SILVER JUBILEE.

The following editorial article, from The Toronto Globe, will be read with interest not only by the Catholics of Toronto city and the parishes outside its limits, but in many other sections of the country. Those who know the pastor of St. Paul's will appreciate this warm and well deserved appreciation of his noble work in Toronto. May he be vouchsafed a golden jubilee to crown the grand work for faith and country to which he has so unselfishly and so constantly devoted his best energies in the Queen City.

"The people of St. Paul's parish will on Friday and the next few days celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the ordination of their parish priest, Rev. Father Hand. Such incidents are perhaps not so rare as to call for special comment, but Father Hand fills so distinctive a place in the life of the people in the eastern section of Toronto that the celebration which begins to-morrow is an event of no common interest. The address of last night began, 'Reverend and Dear Father,' and it is an spiritual father of his flock that Father Hand has earned their love—a father whose kindness and patient interest faileth never.

The parish priest of St. Paul's combines qualities which are sometimes thought to be inconsistent. The brain of a born financier does not usually accompany mildness and benignity of character. But they are certainly mingled in Father Hand's case. When he came to St. Paul's fifteen years ago there was a debt of \$80,000 on the parish. Times were bad, and the very mention of the word 'subscription' was calculated to chill any gathering of men. But Father Hand has managed to pay off all but \$10,000 of that \$80,000, besides expending \$50,000 in the improvement of the church and other property on Power street. When it is considered that St. Paul's is by no means a well-to-do parish, it may be truly termed a proud record.

It has not been accomplished with much noise or arguing. The priest went on attending to his parish duties, winning the love of his people by the eternal fountain of sympathy that welled in his nature for them in their joys and sorrows, their temptations and their triumphs. For such a churchman the purpose of the people were always open; indeed, as a friend said, it pained the pastor at times to see them give so much of their little store. The return that his gift for finance enabled him to give them was superb management of the funds that came into his hands. The parish is rejoicing these next few days, and it may be said without reference to denominations that we will all rejoice with the parishioners in spirit, if not in deed."

Translated for The Freeman's Journal.
ENCYCICAL ON "THE DOCTRINES OF THE MODERNISTS."
BY HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X.
PIUS X. POPE.

To all the Patriarchs, Princes, Archbishops, Bishops and other Ordinaries who are at peace and in communion with the Apostolic See.

CONTINUED FROM LAST WEEK.

The Modernists arouse justifiable indignation when they accuse the Church of distorting texts, arranging and confusing them in her own way and for her own purpose. In bringing this charge against the Church they are accusing her of doing what their own consciences must accuse them of doing. The result of this distorting of the Sacred Books and of this distributing of them through the ages is that the Scriptures can no longer be attributed to the authors whom they had seen with their own eyes. But that is a matter of little consequence to the Modernists who have no hesitation in flippantly asserting that the books in question, particularly the Pentateuch and the first three Gospels were formed gradually by a series of additions to a narration which originally was extremely brief. Either there were interpolations in the shape of theological allegorical interpretations or simply fabrications by joining together different passages. In a word we must recognize in the Sacred Scripture a vital evolution springing from and corresponding with the evolution of faith.

The traces of this evolution, they say, are so apparent that one could almost write the history of it. They actually do write this history with such an air of self-assurance that one would suppose that they had seen with their own eyes the authors at work expanding the Holy Scriptures down through the ages. Textual criticism is their great stronghold. For the purpose of substantiating their history of the Sacred text they strive to show that such a fact or such a work is not in its right place and indulge in criticisms of a similar character.

They seem in fact to have established certain standards of their own worship which they serve their purpose to which all narrations and discourses must conform. Sitting in judgment they determine whether a thing is or is not out of place.

How little fitted are they for this species of criticism. Listening to their talk about the Sacred Books in which they have discovered so many defects one would suppose that no one before them had even skimmed the pages of Scriptures and that there had been a great number of Doctors of the Church infinitely their superiors in genius, erudition and sanctity, who in the true meaning of the expression had made a profound study of the Scriptures. These Doctors, so far from finding imperfections in them, were ever more profoundly grateful to God the more they studied them for having designed to speak to mankind in this manner. But unfortunately these great Doctors of the Church were not assisted in their studies by such aids as are at the command of the Modernists, namely, as their rule and guide a philosophy derived from agnosticism

and a criterion consisting of themselves.

WHY MODERNISTS HAVE FOLLOWERS.

We believe we have made a sufficiently clear exposition of the historical method employed by the Modernists. The philosopher leads the way followed by the historian and then in due order comes internal and textual criticism. As it is characteristic of the first cause to transmit its virtue to everything derived from it, it is quite evident that we are here dealing not with a haphazard criticism, but with a criticism entirely based on the doctrines of agnosticism, immanence and evolution. Therefore whoever adopts and employs this system of criticism thereby gives in his adhesion to all the errors embodied in it and consequently arranges himself in opposition to the Catholic faith. This being the case one cannot help being greatly surprised at certain Catholics attaching so much importance to this system of criticism. There are two reasons for this. On the one hand there is the close alliance existing between the historians and critics of this school—an alliance which ignores all differences of nationality or religion; on the other hand there is the limitless effrontery of these men. Let one of them but open his mouth and the rest assent in chorus, proclaiming that science has made another step forward in its onward march. If anyone is so unskilful as to criticize their new fangled doctrine, however monstrous they may be, he immediately becomes the object of their united attack. Refuse to accept their doctrines and you will be denounced as an ignorant; accept and defend them and you will be lauded to the skies. Misled by all this, many persons are won over who would shrink back in horror if they only realized what they are doing. Thanks to the insolent and domineering spirit of some of the thoughtlessness and the impudence of others, there has been created a moral atmosphere impregnated with pestilential germs that are spreading everywhere propagating contagion in all directions.

MODERNISTIC APOLOGETICS.

Let us now turn our attention to the apologetics of the Modernists. The Modernist apologist is dependent on the philosopher in two ways. First indirectly inasmuch as his theme is history, which, as we have seen, is dictated by the philosopher; secondly, he is dependent upon the philosopher directly inasmuch as he borrows his laws from him. Hence the statement constantly employed by Modernists that the new apologetics must be fed from psychological and historical resources. The Modernist apologist then, begin their task by informing rationalists that, though they defend religion they will not make use of the data furnished by the Sacred Books nor will they quote histories now in use in the Church which were written according to the old methods, but they will have recourse to real history compiled in the light of modern principles and in conformity with rigorously modern methods. In using this language they are not employing the argument *ad hominem*. Not at all. They speak in this way because they are convinced that this modern apologetics is the only true history. There is no occasion for uneasiness. The rationalists know them to be honest and sincere.

Have not the rationalists known them sufficiently well to fight side by side with them under the same flag? Have they not, by way of a reward, received from the rationalists high praise? Praise which would inspire a true Catholic with a feeling of horror is very acceptable to the Modernist who regards as an ample offset to the reprimands of the Church.

THE PART AGNOSTICISM PLAYS.

But let us see what method the Modernist employs in his apologetics. He aims at making the non-believer attain that experience of the Catholic religion, which, according to the principles of the Modernists, is the only true basis of faith. Two ways present themselves to him, namely, the objective and the subjective way. The first of these ways proceeds from agnosticism. It tries to show that of all religions the Catholic religion is especially endowed with such vitality that every psychologist and historian of good faith is forced to recognize that some unknown element lies concealed in its history. With this object in view it is necessary to prove that the Catholic religion as it exists to-day was founded by Christ, that is to say, it is the progressive development of the germ He brought into the world.

In the first place we must show what this germ was. The Modernist would do this by means of the following formula: Christ announced the coming of the Kingdom of God which was soon to be established and of which He was to be the Messiah, in other words, the divinely appointed agent and ordainer. Next it must be shown how this germ always immanent and permanent in the Catholic religion has gradually developed in the course of history, adapting itself successively to its environments whilst borrowing from them through the means of vital assimilation, dogmas, ecclesiastical government and forms of worship which served its purpose. In the meantime the germ surmounts all obstacles, vanquishes all enemies, survives all assaults and emerges triumphant from all combats.

But after taking into consideration these obstacles, these attacks, these adversaries and these combats, and after recognizing the vitality and the fecundity of the Church in whose history the laws of evolution have not been interrupted with these still remains the fact that these laws do not explain the whole of the Church's history. The unknown rises up and confronts us.

Such is the line of argument adopted by the Modernists. They never seem to suspect that the determination of the primitive germ is an a priori of agnostic and evolutionist philosophy and that the germ itself has been invented to help their cause.

The new apologist whilst trying to spread the Catholic religion by employing the arguments just quoted admit that in the Catholic religion there

are many things which, from a teleological point of view, are not explicable. With ill concealed satisfaction they declare that the four dogmas are errors and contradictions.

It is true that they immediately declare that these errors are not explicable; but, strange to say, they are also many errors in cred books, in passages referring to science and history. But the Books, they say, have for their object—matter religion and not not science and history.

In their history and science sort of outward covering which to facilitate the spread of religion and morality among masses. The latter underdog science only in the way that presented to them in these consequently if either history or science had been more perfect they have been hurtful rather than full. Moreover they add that cred Books, inasmuch as they are essentially religious, are necessary.

Now life has its own truth and logic which are radically different from rational and logical truth, namely to quite a different order, namely truth of adaptation and purpose both with respect to the material which it exists, as to the spiritual, and with respect to the which it exists. Finally cast all restraints the Modernists as to proclaim that all which is by life is true and legitimate.

BLASPHEMOUS DOCTRINE.

We, Venerable Brothers, there exists but one God and who hold that the Sacred "were written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and have for their author" (Council of the De Revelation, Chap. II.) do all this is equivalent to attributing God Himself what may be serviceable life. With St. A we say: If in an authority you admit but one lie there will remain a single passage in the tures, apparently difficult to or to believe, which on the pernicious rule may not be away as a lie uttered by the willfully and to serve a purpose it will come about, Doctor continues, that every believe and refuse to believe likes or dislikes.

But the Modernists proceed way with a light heart. They that certain arguments adduce Sacred Books, as, for example, which are based on the proph on no rational basis. They less defend these on the gr which are the artifices of life. They do not stop at the are willing to admit, say, that Christ Himself clearly determining the time for t of the Kingdom of God.

say, is not a matter for sur Christ was subject to the law. After all this what is to the dogmas of the Church? T overflow with flagrant cont But that does not matter s from the fact that vital log them, they are not repugn biblical truth. Are we are n with the infinite, and has finite an infinite variety of In short, to maintain ar de theories they do not hesitate that the noblest homage t paid to the infinite is to n object of contradictory pro When they justify even con what is it that they will not

APPLICATION OF IMMAN

The non-believer may be believe not only by obje ments, but also by subjecti

With this object in view t ists have recourse to the immanence. They endeavor to persuade the non-believer th the depths of his nature and his life are the need and ar but for the religion in wh as the religion which the per of life absolutely dem again we cannot help p loring that there are C while rejecting immanence employ it as a method of They do this so imprudent seem to admit that there nature a true and rigor with regard to the super and not merely a capa adaptability for the supe has at all times been em Catholic apologetics. Th it is only the moderate M make this appeal for the Catholic religion.

As for the others, who n be designated as integr would show the non-believe his being the very germ. Himself had in His con which he bequeathed to the Venerable Brothers, is a of the apologetic method of ists. It will be seen that feet harmony with thei Their doctrines as well as not calculated to build destroy. They would not hevers Catholic, nor w take Catholics themselves Nay, more than that, the stroy every form of religio

THE REFORMING M

It remains for us to say about the Modernist as the role of a reformer. We already said shows how t are dominated by a consum make innovations in all th is absolutely nothing in religion upon which this not fasten.

Reform of philosophy, the seminaries: The sch sophy is to be relegated lete systems which go to history of philosophy.

The new apologist whilst trying to spread the Catholic religion by employing the arguments just quoted admit that in the Catholic religion there