

The Catholic Record.
Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond
street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
ADVERTISING:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTON, Editor,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
London, Saturday, Jan. 20, 1894.

Official.

The Conferences for the clergy of the London Diocese will be held at St. Peter's Palace, London, on Wednesday, Jan. 31, at 2 p. m.; for the clergy of the counties of Essex and Kent, at The Deanery, Windsor, on Thursday, Feb. 8, commencing at 11 a. m.

NOVEL DOCTRINES IN PRESBYTERIANISM.

Further changes in Presbyterian creed formularies may be anticipated in the near future, if we are to judge by the results of a recent conference which took place at Glasgow, where some remarkable utterances were made by prominent ministers of the Established Church of Scotland.

The Rev. Dr. Hamilton urged that the practice of praying for the dead, which had fallen into disuse in the Church, should be resumed. He argued that "the state of the blessed dead is one of gradual advancement and of arriving more and more into the light and glory of the Lord; and surely it is right that we should pray that they might grow in that state and that the Lord might have mercy on them on the great Judgment Day." Further, "as it is right to pray for the dead, and we might hope to be useful to them by our prayers, we might also hope that the dead pray for us."

We have been so accustomed to hear it mentioned that the Catholic belief, that the saints in heaven pray for us, is injurious to the mediocrity of Christ, that is a genuine surprise to us to find the same doctrine thus openly proclaimed in an assembly of Presbyterian divines. If it be true, as Dr. Hamilton admits, that the saints in heaven thus intercede for us before the throne of grace and mercy, there can be no injury to Christ in our asking them to pray for us. How often have we been told that Christ must be the only mediator between God and man, in accordance with the teaching of the apostle: (1 Tim. ii, 5): "For there is one God, and one mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus?" In vain have Catholics pointed out that the apostle adds: "Who gave Himself a redemption for all, a testimony in due times;" showing that the one mediator of redemption is here spoken of, whereas mediators of intercession are many, as the same apostle constantly calls upon the brethren for their prayers as in Heb. xiii, 18: "Pray for us: for we trust we have a good conscience, being willing to behave ourselves well in all things. And I beseech you the more to do this that I may be restored to you the sooner."

Dr. Hamilton is evidently a convert to the belief that the prayers of the saints in heaven are useful to those who dwell on earth, and are offered up to God for our welfare.

This change of doctrine is the more remarkable as its announcement was well received by the assembled ministers. The Rev. Dr. Cooper of Hamilton expressed gratitude to Dr. Hamilton for his courage in advocating usages which have been long neglected by Presbyterians, especially that of praying for the dead. Rev. Dr. Macleod of Govan also coincided with Dr. Hamilton, asserting that Christians are not only entitled, but are compelled by the necessities of the case to pray for the dead. He said: "Every Christian prays for the resurrection of the dead, and when they do this, what is it but praying for the dead?" Yet he explained that their belief in these matters is "as separate as the poles from the doctrine of intercession of the saints, or the doctrine of Purgatory, both of which, as Protestants, they repudiate."

It may be very true that the doctrine thus advocated of praying for the dead differs from the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, but this mode of reasoning makes it allowable to introduce any absurdity and to advocate any novelty in religion, provided always that the innovation does not agree with the doctrines which have been held by the Christian Church throughout all ages. Thus room is given for the engrafting of the doctrines of annihilation of the wicked, transmigration of souls, Pantheism, and other phantasies upon the new-fangled Christianity; for of all these it may be said that "they are as separate as the poles from the doctrines" of Christianity.

Yet the fact remains that, by some process or other, a theory is being

adopted into Presbyterianism which makes prayers for the dead become allowable; and as regards the other doctrine of "intercession of saints," it would be difficult to show that the theory of Rev. Dr. Hamilton and his confederates is anything different from what the Catholic Church teaches on the same subject. The new Presbyterian belief merely stops short of its legitimate consequence that we may ask the saints to pray for us. But why should we thus stop short? If the saints really pray for those who are on earth, where can be the unlawfulness of our asking them to do so?

We may next expect that there will be a revision of the Westminster Confession giving to the saints the important part in Christian public worship from which they have hitherto been rigidly excluded.

THE ST. BARTHOLOMEW MASSACRE.

A correspondent of the *Mail*, writing over the signature M. S., endeavors to make it appear that the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, 1572, was approved of by the Pope, and in proof of this states that a large picture of the massacre was painted and hung up in the Vatican, and that "a scroll thereon contained these words: 'The Pontiff approves the murder (coedem) of Coligny.'" He quotes Brizard as saying in 1790, "To this day the French who visit Italy behold this picture, which, though half effaced, still portrays but too faithfully our calamities and the excesses of Rome."

This assertion of the Huguenot Brizard is evidently that of a bitter enemy of the Holy See, and it cannot be relied on. History establishes the fact that the massacre was purely a political ruse of the young king of France, Charles IX., or rather of the Queen-mother, Catherine de Medici, and the Pope had nothing whatsoever to do with it. It is a thing unheard-of and incredible that a Pope should deem it expedient to affix a scroll to a picture approving of the whole event which it portrays, and we do not give any credit to Brizard's statement in the present case. The fact that he asserts that the massacre is one of the "excesses of Rome," is proof sufficient of his partisanship, as he must have been aware that it was a sudden outbreak by which the queen-mother hoped to counteract the rebellion and treason of the Huguenots. This is the view taken by Ranke, White, Soldan, Baun and Coquerel, and numerous documents of the period which have come to light since they wrote confirms their view.

White, though strongly anti-Catholic, admits that

"It must not, however, be supposed that the provocation and insult were all on one side. On the 25th March, 1571, the High Bailiff of Blois sent the Queen-mother a long account of the mischievous doings and profanity of the Huguenots; how they had broken open churches, shattered images and crucifixes, and carried away thirteen young women from the convent of Guiche. Even in Paris, the hotbed of Romish fanaticism, the Huguenots broke the images set up in the streets and in some of the churches. They also held tumultuous meetings in the Pre Aux Clercs which was at last put down." (p. 156.)

Among other events which served to inflame the French Court and populace against the Huguenots was the fact that the latter entered into agreement with several foreign nations for the overthrow of the monarchy and the establishment of a Protestant kingdom. The English, Swiss and Germans promised help for this purpose. Queen Elizabeth agreed by the treaty of Hampton Court to furnish 6,000 men, of whom one half should garrison Havre as a material guarantee till the end of the war. The French people, who had still in their minds the hardships they had endured until they had not very long before succeeded in delivering a large part of France from English rule, could not be expected to bear patiently the efforts of the Huguenots to bring the English back again to the country. The Hampton Court treaty was signed on 20th Sept., 1562.

In 1563 the Duke of Guise, the principal nobleman and the ablest general of the king's party, was murdered by Jean Poltrot de Mere, who acknowledged that he had been paid by Coligny to do the deed. Coligny admitted that Poltrot had offered to do it, and he had not discouraged the murderer, and that as it had been perpetrated, he did not regret it, for, said he, "I esteem it the greatest blessing that could possibly have befallen this kingdom, the Church of God, and especially myself and my house." (White, p. 222.)

The same historian states that "This leaves no doubt that Coligny assented, if he did not consent, to the crime."

On 24th March, 1565, by Coligny's order, the priest of St. Owen "was seized by soldiers, larded like a capon, roasted, and his flesh thrown to the dogs. Friar Violeau was horribly mutilated and then killed, and other priests and Catholic laymen were speared or starved to death, sawed asunder or burnt at a slow fire. In 1567 all the priests of Pluriers were massacred by order of Conde, and in the same year the Huguenots endeavored to seize the person of the king. They did not succeed, but they seized fifty cities of France and openly defied the power of the Government, which they desired to overthrow."

The succeeding years, down to the unfortunate date of the slaughter, 24th August, 1572, were marked by similar outrages, and the advisers of the king resolved to end the trouble by the perpetration of a cruel massacre. The massacre was not an act of religion, certainly. Its purpose was to establish the authority of the king, and it was carried out by his soldiers. Many priests endangered their own lives by concealing and protecting the doomed Protestants. Amid the conflicting accounts given of the occurrence, it is hard to say how many were slain in Paris and the country districts, but Lingard, who always endeavors to ascertain the actual facts of history, places the number at about 1,600.

We by no means desire to palliate the enormity of this crime, but it is not just to represent the Huguenots as having given no provocation, and the injustice of attributing the deed to any persecuting spirit on the part of the Pope is still greater. There were horrible excesses on both sides, and we are all aware that such excesses always open in inflaming the passions of men.

The French king sent at once a one-sided account of the occurrence to the Pope. He represented that there had been a plot to destroy himself, together with the whole royal household and the members of the Government, but that it had been defeated by the bravery of the royal troops. A *Te Deum* was sung in Rome, not by the Pope, but by Cardinal Lorraine, the brother of the Duke of Guise, who had been murdered by Coligny's tool, Jean Poltrot. We can readily imagine that the remembrance of this foul deed made the Cardinal all the more ready to believe the story which was told by the king's ambassadors, especially as he knew that on a former occasion an attempt was really made to seize and carry into captivity the king and his household. It is clear, therefore, that the *Te Deum* was an act of thanksgiving, not for the massacre of the Protestants, but for the preservation of the king from those who were supposed to have had a design upon his life; and when the Pope became acquainted with the facts as they actually occurred, he did not hesitate to reprobate the king's conduct. It is not to be supposed, therefore, that he would record his approval of it by affixing a scroll to a picture representing the massacre, painted some years afterwards. The picture itself, by Vazari, was placed in the Vatican, just as other pictures by great artists are placed there, as recording and illustrating an historical event; but we are no more to suppose that it was approved by the Pope than to infer that the Rape of the Sabines was approved of by him, because there is also a picture of that occurrence in the galleries of the Vatican.

Even the historian of the massacre, White, acknowledges that the Government of Charles IX. were desirous of acting with mildness in the distracted state of the country, until they found that Protestantism as it existed in France aimed at their overthrow. It was not until this was proved by facts that the king declared he would tolerate only one religion in the country. This resolution was taken not as carrying out a principle of the Catholic religion, but as a political measure to ensure the permanence of his Government.

The Catholic Church does not approve of persecution for conscience sake, though it has occurred from time to time that Catholics have persecuted; yet it will be found that in most instances when such has been the case they have been goaded to it by atrocities committed against them. On the other hand, we can safely say that in no Catholic country were penal laws ever inflicted which would compare in barbarity with those which were in force in Great Britain down to Catholic Emancipation in 1829. It is useless, however, to recall these

events in a spirit of reviling. They are the acts of ages gone by, and there is no reason to reproach the present generation with them, much less to make them a pretext for persecution at the close of the nineteenth century, when a more tolerant spirit ought to prevail than that which existed one, two, or three centuries ago. It seems to be the desire of the *Mail's* correspondent to renew the hatreds and bickerings of the sixteenth century, and to implant them on the present age. Against doing this we enter an emphatic protest. If our ancestors three centuries ago persecuted each other, that is no reason why we should do so in the present age and in the new world.

IF NOT HYPOCRISY, WHAT?

Halifax Orange Lodge, No. 1628, has passed by a unanimous vote a resolution declaring that the right of free speech is a cardinal principle of Protestantism, and its suppression the essence of Popery. It is not explained, however, how it comes to pass that it is only ultra-Protestantism, in the form of P. P. Aism and Orangism itself, that attempts to infringe upon individual liberty by binding their members to refuse employment to citizens who exercise their right to civil and religious liberty by following their conscientious convictions, or to vote only for candidates for office of some particular creed. They seem to forget that free speech is not the only right which citizens of a free country hold dear; and in the present case the object of this pretended resolution in vindication of free speech is in reality meant as a denial of the right of a Catholic to hold a civil office equally with his Protestant fellow-citizens. The ostensible purpose of the resolution is to condemn the Grand Orange Lodge of British North America for prohibiting criticism of the acts of Mr. N. Clarke Wallace, the Controller of Customs, but all who know the real history of the matter know that this is really meant to condemn Mr. Wallace for accepting office under a Catholic Premier. It would be hard for any one of common sense to find an excuse for abusing the Pope, in the internecine strife of the Canadian Orange Lodges; but the Halifax Lodge has a cleverness peculiarly its own, and it pronounces Mr. Wallace to be "an Orange Pope . . . controlling the consciences and political aspirations of Orangemen in as great a degree as ever exercised by the Pope of Rome over faithful Papists." The Halifax Lodge would exhibit more good sense if they left the Pope alone while washing their own dirty linens.

A NEW CRAZE.

For the third time during the past year a sect having its headquarters in some part of the United States is in expectation of the immediate coming of our Lord to judge the world, which it is supposed is about to come to an end in a few days. On one of the recent occasions when this exciting thought took possession of a number of devotees, the expectation existed in a congregation of Swedish Lutherans in the West, and on another occasion the excitement was among the Second Adventists of Massachusetts. This time it is among the Second Adventists whose headquarters are at Battle Creek, Michigan.

Concerning the time of the end of the world there are certain indications given by our Blessed Lord, as that there shall be first great tribulation, after which "the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven and the powers of heaven shall be moved . . . and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with great power and majesty." Yet we are told that "of that day and hour no one knoweth, neither the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father alone." (St. Matt. xxiv.) St. Mark's Gospel has: "But of that day or hour no man knoweth, neither the angels in heaven nor the Son, but the Father." (xiii., 32.) Again: "For as lightning cometh out of the East and appeareth even unto the West, so also shall the coming of the Son of Man be," and: "For as in the days before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage even till that day in which Noe entered into the ark, and they knew not till the flood came and took them all away; so also shall the coming of the Son of Man be." (St. Matt. xxiv.)

Of course Christ as God knows and knew all things. Hence the Fathers of the Church, Sts. Jerome, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and others interpret that Christ as God knew the date of the day of judgment, but not by the

virtue of His humanity, nor as God's delegate for the purpose of revealing it.

We infer that it is useless for man to enquire into or to pretend to foretell the exact date of this event. Nevertheless attempts have been made to do this. Some have imagined that the world will last just six thousand years from the date of creation. Jurien, one of Luther's principal followers, fixed upon a year when the end of the world should come. Living to find himself in error as to the date, he fixed upon a second with like result, and finally upon a third year, A. D. 1666, which also passed away without the event foretold, though it was set by him so far in the future that the would-be prophet did not live to find out his third error by personal experience.

In our own generation prophecies concerning the date of the end of the world, among which those by Dr. Cummins, known as "Tribulation Coming," Baxter, and Orr, who claimed the title of "the Angel Gabriel," will be remembered by many. The prophet who created the greatest excitement on this matter on this continent was Joe Miller, founder of the sect of Millerites, which was, we believe, the original of the Second Adventists. Miller had his missionaries travelling over the entire continent preaching his doctrines, and obtained many followers; and though his prophecies were not fulfilled, his followers have fixed upon many other dates since the year 1848, named by him for the final convulsion of nature. As there were numerous converts to Millerism in all parts of this continent, there was great commotion among them as the appointed date drew near, but the day passed without anything extraordinary occurring; and since that time prophecies of similar character have been at a discount. However, while the delusion lasted, many grotesque incidents occurred. Thousands of believers sold their property, and ascended the hills dressed in white garments, to be ready to ascend into heaven or to be transported to the valley of Jehosaphat for judgment, as the case might be, and great was the disappointment when their hopes collapsed.

The Battle Creek enthusiasts seem not to have fixed an exact date for the event, but they expect it soon, and it is said they are exchanging their gold watches for silver ones, and their costly for cheap apparel, as they have discovered some passage of scripture which forbids the use of gold and rich attire. Hundreds of converts from the various Protestant denominations, attracted by the novelty of the situation, have joined the Adventists, and have given large contributions towards the propagation of Adventist principles and doctrines.

MAHOMETANISM IN NEW YORK.

It seemed very like a joke when it was announced some months ago that a Moslem had come to America for the purpose of propagating the creed of Islam on this continent, but it is a reality that the effort is being made by Mr. Mahomed Russel Webb, the American who became a convert to that belief, and who has taken up his quarters in New York as the centre of the Mahometan propaganda.

Mr. Webb, it is said, has a very large amount of money at his disposal for the purpose of prosecuting his mission, and he is now publishing a paper entitled the *Moslem World*, which has gained a considerable subscription list, many taking it, no doubt, through curiosity, but many others doing so through the prevalent desire to encourage anything novel, and to adopt the greatest absurdities of creed, apparently, for the sole purpose of disagreeing with other people. It is not surprising that in a country where the superstitious of Hinduism find supporters, assuming the title of Theosophists, etc., there should also be found some willing to adopt those of the camel-driver of Mecca, and it is said that some converts to Moslemism have actually been made; but these have been gained solely from the Protestant sects, whose adherents are disposed to be "carried about with every wind of doctrine."

Mr. Webb himself stated that it is from among the Protestant sects that he has any hope of gaining converts. At all events he and his coadjutors in the missionary field appear to be greatly in earnest, and it is now announced that last week a public lecture was delivered in the city of New York, by one of the propagandists of the new doctrine, in favor of polygamy. If matters go on at this rate, it is not un-

likely that some of the missionaries who are volunteering to go to India to convert the Hindus and Mahometans of that country to Christianity, will find enough work to do in New York to preserve to their various denominations those so-called Christians who are disposed to become Hindus or Mahometans.

The movement inaugurated by Mr. Webb is altogether a new departure in Islamism. Mahomet, indeed, used only the method of persuasion to induce his first followers to acknowledge him as their prophet; for he had not then numbers at his back with which to enforce the acceptance of his doctrines; but as soon as he found himself with a large following he proclaimed that every prophet had a sword which he used to enforce the doctrine with strangers. He achieved many victories over Jews and Pagans, so that at the time of his death his empire extended from Medina east and west over a territory of 3600 square miles. He died by poison administered by a Jewish maiden in a dish of mutton, as she desired by this means to test whether or not he was a true prophet. His death took place in the year 632 of the Christian era, being the tenth year after his ignominious flight from Medina, from which event, under the name of the Hegira, the Mahometans count their years.

The Koran or Alcoran which was written by Mahomet, and which is held by Mahometans to be the divine word, is a model of the Arabic language, but it is full of absurdities and contradictions, as well as repetitions, so that it could only be accepted by a people sunk in the grossest ignorance.

The unity of God, the existence of angels, and a future state of happiness for the good and punishment for the wicked are taught by the Koran: the goodness and wickedness being reckoned from the Moslem point of view. The happiness of the just is thus placed, not only in eating and drinking, but in every species of sensual enjoyment; and it is declared that an unrelenting warfare should be carried on against all unbelievers. Those who die in warring against unbelievers are truly martyrs and are sure of the enjoyment of the Mahometan heaven.

Polygamy and divorce are freely allowed, though with some restrictions as to extent; and of course under this system the condition of women is as degraded as in the territory of the Mormons. Yet it is not very surprising if in those countries which have furnished proselytes to Mormonism, there should be also converts to Mahometanism. No doubt the consideration of this leads Mr. Webb to entertain fair hope of success in his proselytizing mission.

JAPANESE IDEAS OF RELIGION.

It is undeniable that the Japanese are a quick-witted and intelligent people, and it was a thing to be expected that once their attention should be seriously directed towards Christianity, they would find much to repel them in the discord of doctrines offered for their acceptance by the various sects which have established missions among them.

In the middle of the sixteenth century St. Francis Xavier, accompanied by a few missionaries, preached the Catholic Faith to the people of that Empire of Islands, and succeeded in establishing during his lifetime a flourishing church, which became still more prosperous under the ministrations of the zealous Jesuit fathers, who continued his work, and this prosperity lasted until at a later period the jealousy of the Japanese against foreigners and their customs was turned against the missionaries who were laboring in that fruitful field to spread the glad tidings of our Redemption by the blood of Christ.

The Shinto priests urged the extermination of Christianity; and the Government, fearing that foreign influences might finally prevail to the destruction of the reigning dynasty if it continued to spread as it had begun, lent a ready ear to their representations, and the proposed extermination was determined on.

The Dutch traders at Jeddo, being Lutherans, were not only willing that the Catholic Christians should be destroyed, but they encouraged the Government to carry out their intention, and lent their cannon to aid in the

work. After it was supposed that Christians were exterminated, Dutch were the only foreigners permitted to trade with Japan, and preliminary ceremony to their allowed to land at Jeddo, they were obliged to trample on the crucifix, signify their repudiation of Christianity.

Owing to the adoption of liberal policy by the Japanese authorities during the last half of the century, this general exclusion is now in force. Missionaries are not even to the interior; and as this state of things was established by a number of zealous Catholics, at once renewed the work begun by St. Francis Xavier. Churches built in several seaport towns, the astonishment of the mission, as soon as this was the case, Japanese descendants of the Catholics of the country prided themselves to ascertain whether Christian religion thus introduced the same with that which he handed down from their forefathers.

Finding that this was the case, they enrolled themselves as members of the congregations thus established. This was especially the case at aki, and there is now a flourishing Japanese Catholic Church numbering nearly sixty thousand souls.

In the meantime several Protestant denominations, mostly British and American, have also established missions. These include Presbyterian and Methodist of several kinds, Baptists, Unitarians, and others.

The various Presbyterian and Methodist organizations have recently making strenuous efforts to unite different bodies under the respective titles of the Presbyterian or Methodist Church of Japan, as the case may be, and there has been a fair prospect that these efforts would prove successful.

But of late the Japanese direct to have taken another direction, unexpectedly, towards which the converts of all these denominations seem to be tending, which formation of an independent Japanese Church arising out of a general repudiation of the control of the British and American missionaries.

The newspapers of Japan say as yet there has not appeared any Christianity which the Japanese accept, and that Japan must be a religion of its own. It is unpatriotic to receive a religion from a foreign country.

The native Protestant Church probably do not go quite so far as Pagans, but they too believe they should form an independent Japanese Church; and as the movement originated with the Unitarians, probable that in such a church established, Unitarian or Free Church principles will hold sway, especially as Latitudinarianism seems to be most acceptable form in which Japanese can be induced to Christianity, and it is already widely spread among them.

The Rev. Mr. Hiraiwa, a Minister of the Canadian mission, said to be at the head of the movement; and the Japanese foreign missionaries that, as they among themselves so much distrust the Japanese must decide for themselves the form of religion which suits them.

The missionaries are not with the turn affairs have taken, it is hard to see how they can maintain that they have the right to make a creed to please themselves, as had the founders of churches which the missionaries sent.

IF.

The Chicago *Evening Post* accurately what it calls "Ecclesiastical moonshine from a meeting of Bishops." The following specimen of moonshine, which is similar to much of the same manufactured in Canada:

"If the Pope interfering political affairs of our country himself a meddling busy-body, nothing but a foreign Italian braggart and nuisance. If the hood takes children out of the school against their will to send to parochial schools and excommunicates of our households in secret from the servants we until we have to talk in under our own roof, then we right to oppose its methods."

The Post comments as follows:

"If the world were to stop at night we should all tumble Ewigkelt. If the moon were green cheese it would rain sk. If the Rev. Dr. Townsend, or more, were but to fire his cook converse with his wife through horn."