

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1899.

NO. 1,096

## PROTESTANTS AND THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

At St. Thomas Church, Waterloo, Liverpool, Father McLaughlin, an experienced missionary, speaking recently of the wide extent to which the mystery of the Incarnation is virtually denied amongst numbers who pass as Christians, and of the hazy idea of revelation which naturally springs from that denial, said: For many years past I have thought—and recent events have forced the opinion still more strongly upon me—that one great reason why so many of those belonging to non-Catholic denominations have such loose and ill-defined ideas of the doctrines of Christ's revelation is because they have such vague, ill-defined ideas of Christ Himself—i. e., of His divine nature, His divine personality and His divine attributes. It is also my conviction that the under-current of disbelief in the Incarnation is much wider and deeper than is generally supposed; at all events than staunch and earnest Protestants are willing to admit. Not being apparent on the surface, its full extent is not adequately realized. Anyone, however, who is conversant with the signs of the times can easily perceive that the faith of many of our separated brethren in this great fundamental mystery is not of the right kind; has not the right ring to it. They are supposed to receive it as an essential item of belief, but if inquiry is made the supposition will be found unwarrantable. From time to time they hear Him called God, and occasionally they join in prayers in which He is evoked as God, but all the while they seem to have a secret feeling that that name is given to Him more by a sort of pious courtesy than as a title which He has any strict right to claim. While they look upon Him as one who had something to do with redemption and justification, and often use the phrase "the Lord Jesus," yet they appear to forget or to ignore the fact that He is their Creator, is their Preserver, and is one day to be their Judge. This view of Him does not come home to them; it is part of their nominal creed, but it does not seem to have a place in their practical one. While their language in His regard is religiously respectful according to their ideas, yet it betrays a secret want of orthodox belief. They speak of Him, it is true, as One who stands on a very high level, yet, after all a human one. They fail to realize Him as a Being of infinite power, infinite knowledge, infinite wisdom and of essential truthfulness. Is not this the case? Do they not treat Him as if He was bound to be satisfied with whatever they choose to offer Him in the way of faith, worship and works; as if they and not He had the power to lay down the law as to what they ought to believe and what they ought to perform; as if they could take the work of salvation into their own hands and find their way to heaven without His helping guidance and on conditions almost entirely of their own making? I am not now—as it remembered—speaking of agnostics; they hold a theory which has placed them beyond the range of Christian Revelation altogether. The scope of my remarks does not touch their position. I have nothing to do with them. Neither, on the other hand, am I referring to those sections of the Church of England in which the mystery of the Incarnation is believed with full and firm faith. No, I am speaking of people—and I am sorry to say they are an increasing crowd—who are ostensibly members of one or other of those Christian communions which have sprung from the "Reformation"—people who loudly and with emphasis profess Christianity, yet in reality do not believe in the divinity of that Christ who is Christianity's Author. That there are such—and that their numbers are steadily growing—no one who mixes much either with the masses or the classes can for a moment have the slightest doubt. I am only one of many who have had very favorable opportunities of testing the fact by personal experience. Over and again in conversing with persons—some of the Church of England, others nominally belonging to some of the other non-Catholic denominations—I have said: "Am I not then to take it for granted that you believe that Jesus Christ is God?" The answer came with an amount of hesitation which of itself was sufficient to indicate the absence of explicit faith. It was clear the genuine belief which my question implied was not there. The following is a sample of such answer: "I believe that He was a very wise and a very holy man, and a worker of great miracles, but I can't say I believe He was God in the strict sense of the word." This answer represents the belief, or, rather, I should say, the vague (religious) attitude of mind of thousands outside the Catholic Church who call themselves Christians. That Christ was singularly good and singularly great; that He was a prophet, a special messenger of heaven; that He was a pre-eminent philanthropic, sympathetic, self-sacrificing Benefactor of the human race; that the mantle of His surpassing sanctity and transcendent merits may be in some mysterious way thrown over people to shield them from the wrath of the Most High and protect them against the assaults of the evil

one; that He was full of charity, patience and mercy—all this they readily grant; but that He was God, the eternal, all-wise, all-knowing Omnipotent God who created the heavens and earth and contains all things in heaven and earth within Him—that they seem unable to take in; they cannot, at least they do not grasp it. Their faith fails to reach so far; it stops short of His divine nature and of the infinitude of His attributes. Practically this is equivalent to Socinianism or Unitarianism, although those who hold such opinions may not be "quite" conscious of the fact. But to bring home to you the sadly wide extent to which these hazy notions, or rather this virtual denial of the divinity of Christ prevails, it is not necessary to appeal to the personal experience of one man or of many. Every-day life is evidence sufficient. Look at the multitudes in our populous cities, listen to the conversation in society, read the books of the day, note the tone of current literature, examine the teachings and preachings which are poured forth from some of the pulpits of the land—pulpits, too, which are looked upon as Christian—and you will easily realize that large numbers who profess to be members of Christian denominations have not only virtually eliminated from their creed the great mystery of the Incarnation, but seem even to doubt whether there is a personal God. To show that I am not over-stating the case, I shall quote the testimony of one who cannot be accused of prejudice. Mr. W. H. Mallock—himself a member of the Church of England—in a very able and closely reasoned article in the Nineteenth Century Review of last December, recognizes this fact in the fullest extent, and calls particular attention to it: "No one can be conversant with the opinions of the Broad Church school—the school, for instance, of Stanley, Jowett and Pattison—without seeing that, under the veil of a more or less conventional phraseology, its members not only deny any miraculous virtue to the Christian priest, and the sacraments these priests administer, but that they reduce to an allegory, or an obsolete philosophic formula, the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, thus entirely dissolving that edifice which the early Church built up, and that, however they may shrink from stating the matter plainly, they no more believe that Christ was identical with the Creator of the universe than Dr. Arnold (as he said) 'believed in Jupiter.' They speak with much, and no doubt, with sincere unctiousness of the value and authority of Christ as a moral and spiritual teacher; but all definite doctrine with regard to His divine nature they either deny, or what is the same thing practically, they pass over as unimportant. Thus, not to send the reader too far afield for illustrations, a High Church clergyman, in the pages of this Review, was complaining only last month that some of the English clergy, who in outer seeming belong to the same school as himself, are really nothing better than 'Ritualistic pantheists,' whilst the same writer mentioned the more specific fact that the Bishop of Worcester, in personally ordering his clergy to abstain from certain ritualistic practices, has directly commended a volume which flatly denies the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection of the Body and the Ascension of Our Lord. Nor do the differences of opinion thus indicated show any tendency to decrease. On the contrary, they are growing more accentuated. In one out of two churches, whose bells mix their voices, we may find the incumbent following the example of Mark Pattison, and defacing the idea of God to a 'pure transparency,' whilst the incumbent in the other is supplying his astonished flock with holy water, and is inviting them to meditate on the five wounds of the Saviour." It is clear from these remarks that this modern Alarism or partly hidden Unitarianism, or whatever name we are to give it, is not confined to the ranks of the Broad Church party. We know that fact, however, independently of the press. It has extended its ravages much further. It may be cleverly disguised by flourishes of rhetoric; may be kept out of view by ingenious comparisons; and it may be repudiated on the part of those who are accused or suspected of it by denials which at first sight do not appear ambiguous, but it has found a home with many who seem far removed from it and who are supposed to detest it. Look at what is going on all around us. Truth—that truth which Our Lord "was born and came into the world to give testimony to"—is treated as a thing about which there can be two absolutely opposite schools of teaching. And the existence of two such schools, so far from being apologized for, is actually boasted of as a sign of the healthy and vigorous life of the Church which comprehends them. That is, divine truth or Christian revelation is looked upon as something which people may cleave in two, and which being thus cleaved, one half may mean one set of doctrines to one class of men, and the remaining half the opposites or contradictory to another. It is hard to see how genuine faith in the divinity of Christ—as the God of indivisible oneness—can co-exist with an attitude of mind such as this state of things repre-

sents. When men who are leaders, religious leaders of other men, tax their ingenuity to the utmost in finding figures of speech to bridge over the chasm that separates the opposing parties in their communion, when they even go so far as to proclaim loudly and publicly their anticipation—an anticipation apparently accompanied with the desire of its fulfilment—that the religion of the future will be neither Catholicity nor Protestantism, but Christianity, i. e., Christianity broad, wide, unlimited—Christianity untrammeled by dogma—Christianity without any definite belief in the Godhead of Him who was its Founder—how conceive that those who give expression to such ideas can truly believe in their inner consciousness that Christ, the original Author of Revelation, had a divine personality, that He was the God of God, Light of Light, the Fountain of everlasting and changeless truth. How can such men reconcile these anomalous views of religion with the Second of Articles, i. e., the Article in which the Godhead of the Redeemer is enunciated in language clear, definite and unequivocal? What wonder then there should be loose notions about the doctrine of Christ's revelation when such loose ideas prevail as to whether He Himself is truly a Divine Person? It is only what under such conditions might be expected—the one is the natural and necessary outcome of the other. But if I am asked to explain whence has come this want of definite faith in the Godhead of the Redeemer, and to trace the lamentable effect to its original cause, I have only to point back to the unhappy epoch in the history of this country when the bond which had bound it to the Rock of Truth was severed, when the permanent indwelling of a divine Teacher in the Church was denied, when altar and sacrifice disappeared. There lies the secret. Once altars were broken, creeds came in for similar treatment, they shared the same fate. Dogma—definite doctrine—then began to dissolve. It passed gradually into a mist which has lasted ever since; the sun of truth has not yet dispelled it; the atmosphere of Protestantism, with the exception already alluded to, has but become darker and darker with passing years. Hence the denial, whether virtual or explicit, of the fundamental doctrine of the Incarnation. And hence, too, as an inevitable consequence of such denial, the antagonistic schools of opinions, the hazy notions of revelation, the doubts, conjectures, divisions, subdivisions, re-subdivisions, contradictions, re-contradictions that rend the land from end to end at present. Doctrines have become enveloped in obscurity because Christ, as God, has passed into a cloud and has vanished from the eyes of many—many who are still called by a name to which they have no just or rational claim.—Christians.

## THE LATTER-DAY LAZARUS.

The Missionary.

Lazarus at the door of the palatial home of Dives, within sight and sound of the sumptuous banquet, and yet famishing from hunger, is truly typical of the many poor souls in our country who are hungering for the Bread of Life.

It is the truth and the whole truth which alone can satisfy the demands of the intellect, while the consolations of religion alone can gratify the cravings of the human heart. It is true there are many who seem to get along for some years with but a fragmentary knowledge, or but a partial practice of religion; but it is while other passions are dominant. Ambition's fires are burning fierce or social pleasures satisfy for the time being, but the time comes when the religious instinct becomes imperative in its demands. The soul must yield an unhesitating submission to the truth, and must manifest to God and His creatures a loving service. In this is complete religious satisfaction.

The religious banquet is spread inside the walls of the Catholic Church, and we are the fortunate ones who enjoy its plenty. Just outside the gate there are not a few who are famishing by the wayside. From their innermost hearts they are craving the certainties of faith. How often is it not said by them, as they watch the devout worshipper, "I would give all I have if I could believe as you do." They seem to be harassed by grievous doubts. They are uncertain of their way, as though groping in the dark. They know not if ever they shall come out on the other side of this terrible maze of uncertainty and tangle of error which besets them on all sides. Little wonder, then, that in their gropings they have become dust-begrimed and covered with the offensive ulcers of sin. They know not of the healing waters of life. As they lie there, Lazarus like, by the door of the Church, craving the crumbs that fall from the table of her children, the hand of pity and sympathy should be extended to them. There is not one true convert who, after being received into the Church, would not willingly give all that he possesses rather than be deprived of the blessings that his religion has brought to him, and there is no one religious soul outside the Catholic Church to-day who would not give his

very heart's blood to possess what we possess in the Holy Communion—that sweet embrace of peace and love.

There are many Catholics who, Dives-like, see the poor spiritual beggars lying at their very door, and place before them not one iota of instruction to give them knowledge, or stretch not a hand of helping to show them the way into their Father's house. There are many Catholics who may read with admiration the rest of the story of Dives and Lazarus in its special application to their spiritual duty in regard to their less favored neighbors.

## FACTS SOMETIMES 'FORGOTTEN.'

A writer in the London Times, signing himself "Verax," thinks he makes a case against Cardinal Vaughan by pointing to France, Spain and Ireland as presenting conditions not bearing out the Cardinal's claim on behalf of the Catholic Church as illustrated in England when that country was Catholic. The Cardinal had said in a public address, which we noticed in the Freeman's Journal last week, that the degrading poverty of the masses in English cities to-day is one of the results of the robbing of the people by the "reformation" leaders, and that no such poverty and misery were known in England before the "reformation." The Times writer compared England to-day with France, Spain and Ireland, and throwing on the Catholic Church the blame of alleged evils in the latter. But the Cardinal was easily able to sustain his position, which he has briefly restated in reply to "Verax." "When I assert that the Catholic Church with a free hand is well able to promote the happiness of the people, and to raise them from the pagan to the Christian level of thought and action, my statement, I believe, is amply borne out by the history of Christian civilization. I need only appeal to such names as Milan, Hallam, Froude, Lecky, Farrar, Guizot and a host of other witnesses who are above suspicion. But when I claim for the Catholic and Roman Church now the same Divine power and vitality she gave proof of in England during a thousand years of our history, I am confronted with the present state of Ireland, France and Spain.

Of course, France and Spain (particularly the latter) are the favorite "horrid examples" of those who wish to present the Catholic Church in the worst light, either in the domain of "progress" or education, as if that Church were responsible for everything objectionable in those countries, the truth being, as Cardinal Vaughan points out, as follows, that in both the influence of the Church has been counteracted by agencies which have invariably found sympathy and approval in England, among the class represented by the London Times:

"But we are referred to France as proof against the character of the Catholic Church. Has it been forgotten that the Church in France was drowned in a sea of blood a hundred years ago; that, religion, revelation and God Himself were publicly proscribed; that the Church is not free to this day in France; that her Bishops may now meet in synod; that her religious orders are under a ban, and that whatever education the Church gives is under this distress and disadvantage? And yet, in spite of a century of disabilities, Catholic France produces at the present day a great multitude of as noble examples of generosity and devotedness as the world has ever seen.

"Again, we are referred to Spain; but during the century Spain also has been swept by the evil principles of the French Revolution, her religious orders have been again and again suppressed, her seminaries closed, her property confiscated, and for years her episcopate was actually extinguished. The Church in Spain has had to fight with more than one hand tied behind her. Yet look at the Spanish poor, and you will find in them an inbred gentility, a noble bearing, a religious sense and courtesy that you will search for in vain in England. It is only fair to remember that the Catholic Church in Spain and in South America, as in other lands, has had to fulfil her divine mission in chains, weakened on all sides by the State, if not actually enslaved by its laws.

"Verax" seems to suppose that the education of France has been in the hands of the Catholic Church. Has he forgotten that the Infidel state has been the chief educator in France during nearly the whole of this century, and that when Catholic schools have been tolerated they have been of the nature of voluntary and private ventures?"

"Verax" "forgot" those things because it was convenient for him to forget them. He was equally forgetful of the situation of the Catholic Church in Ireland, of which Cardinal Vaughan thus reminds him:

"She was stripped of her possessions, reduced to poverty, deprived of the right to educate, the land taken from Catholics and given to Protestants, fettered and persecuted in every possible way by England for centuries. And yet, even so, she has main-

tained a peasantry that is singularly pure and chaste, and in ordinary times freer from crime than that of England; while, in spite of every disadvantage, she has preserved a high standard of virtue, faith and piety among her keenly intelligent and sympathetic poor. Let any one contrast the intellectual, moral and religious condition of the poor of Ireland with that of the low classes in our great towns, and then say, if he please, that the cause of their respective conditions is to be found in the respective religions of the two countries."

The contrast here suggested, if illustrated with judicial statistics easily obtainable, would be anything but pleasant reading for the constituents of the London Times.—New York Freeman's Journal.

## LEO XIII. AND THE NATIONS.

A Sovereign in Spite of His Isolation.

On the occasion of the patronal feast of the Pope last month, the London Daily Telegraph printed a long biographical memoir of His Holiness from the pen of Father Coupe, S. J., and devoted a leading article to the consideration of Pope Leo XIII's influence and position. Father Coupe says, among other things:

The Pope is alone in the Vatican, without a friend among the Governments of the world, without territory, without treasure, without an army, without power, without a voice in the senate of nations, a prisoner in his own palace, begirt by the troops of a hostile King. His visible sovereignty is, indeed, gone. Nevertheless, his invisible sovereignty was, perhaps, never stronger than to-day. The universal Church, which he rules as supreme bishop, not only lives, she grows and flourishes. While the outlines of other ecclesiastical establishments, born but yesterday as compared with her, are day by day growing dimmer and less distinguishable, she stands out as distinct as ever, clear cut as Mount Blanc seen at night against a background of lightning-lit cloud. She is, perhaps, less powerful than heretofore among the less progressive nations of the world, but she grows lustier than ever among the nations to whom the whole earth seems as a future inheritance. Her strength has waxed in the politically disturbed South American republics; it waxes daily, in spite of much hostility, in England and the United States, in Germany and the colonies. The

SUN OF LEO XIII.'S EXISTENCE is sloping towards the horizon, but no one can deny that, with all the forces of the world against him, he has fought the fight well, and drawn tighter the bonds of respect and love and obedience which knit the Roman Church into one harmonious whole, its unity never more absolute, its purity never more apparent, its authority never more loyally recognized.

But anxious as Leo XIII. has ever shown himself to cultivate peace and amity with foreign sovereigns, there is one tremendous exception, with the kingdom of Italy, as such, he will have no friendship. There he utters an unflinching "non possumus." The Pope demands, and in conscience must demand, such a position as shall subject him to no power which can trammel his action, and shall leave him in possession of true and real freedom for the due governance of the Church. In the first year of his pontificate the Pope set down his foot with unmistakable decision, and never for a moment has he withdrawn it: "In the first place, that we may assert to the best of our power the rights and liberty of this Holy See, we shall never cease to contend for the obedience due to our authority, for the removal of the obstacles which hinder the full liberty of our ministry, and for our restoration to that condition in which the counsels of the divine Wisdom first placed the Roman Bishops. We are not moved."

TO DEMAND THIS RESTORATION by ambition or the desire of dominion, but by our office and by the religious oaths which bind us, and because this principle is necessary to preserve the full liberty of the spiritual power, and because it is clear that the cause of the public good and the safety of society are involved. Hence we cannot omit—because of our office, by which we are bound to defend the rights of holy church—to renew and confirm by these our letters all the declarations and protests which Pius IX. published and reiterated against the occupation of his civil principality and against the violation of the rights of the Roman Church."

It will perhaps be objected that the Pope's freedom of action is sufficiently safeguarded by the Italian law of guarantees. But the law of guarantees may at any time become a party cry. The law of guarantees may be unmade by the same power that made it, just as it has again and again been violated by the same power that promised to observe it. Certainly the wholesale spoliations in Rome, the seizure of foreign mission property abroad, the brutal insults offered to the dead body of Pius IX., and the repeated indignities heaped upon the present Pontiff afford no hope that the Italian Government would not repeal the law

of guarantees to-morrow if it dared. As regards the trustworthiness of that Government, Leo XIII. is as likely to be well informed as any foreign journalist.

AT THE PAPAL JUBILEE, on Feb. 16 1893, 80,000 people, mostly pilgrims of various nationalities, assembled in St. Peter's. When the enthusiastic cries of this vast multitude, "Viva il Papa Re!" thundered through the mighty basilica, surely some suspicion must have crept into the minds of the Italian ministers that it is suicidal folly to maintain in Rome a rival sovereignty with a power whose spiritual rule radiates beyond the Peninsula, beyond the Adriatic, beyond the Mediterranean, into the more distant provinces East and West. For Italy to persevere in her hostility to the Holy See means certain ruin. With a disinclined people on one side and bankruptcy on the other, she can hardly last long. But the remedy is in her own hands, and both justice and expediency are clamoring for its application—the restoration of the Pope to his temporal power.

## "EX NUN" SHEPHERD.

Witty Massachusetts Seribler Describes Her Reception at Taunton, That State.

Massachusetts is one of the New England States—a fact to be borne in mind when reading the following report, taken from the Taunton Herald, of the reception accorded to Margaret F. Shepherd, the bogus ex-nun, on occasion of her recent visit to that town:

"For some time past placards have been posted in front of Old Fellows Hall, on which were pictured the idealized features of a devout female clad in convent garb. In big, black letters the posters announced that Margaret F. Shepherd, the alleged ex-nun, would speak in the hall for the benefit of the yearning public.

"When the doors were thrown open and the hall was flooded with light, Monday evening, there was a jamb at the entrance. This was not unexpected, however, as the jamb has been there ever since the doors were hung on the hinges, for the architect of the building deemed it advisable to have jamba on all the doors, for he was an experienced man, and knowing that his fellow-craftsmen invariably built their doors with jamba on 'em, he was careful not to omit them from the doors of Old Fellows' Hall. Hence, when the Shepherd seribler began, the vast audience—consisting of, at least, several hundred chairs and nearly ten people—was not startled by the jamb at the door.

"Margaret, according to her posters, was born Sister Madeleine Adelaide. Why her parents conferred upon her the strange and sanctimonious name of Sister Madeleine Adelaide is not known. Heretofore the public was under the impression that Sister Madeleine Adelaide was the alleged title she bore in the convent. The public was laboring under a wrong impression. She was born that way, for her posters say Margaret Shepherd, nee Sister Madeleine Adelaide. 'Nee' is the past participle of the French verb 'naître,' to be born. Hence, she must have been afflicted with the title at birth and did not happen in later life.

"It is said that the audience was a most enthusiastic one, notably the chair part, which remained throughout without the least interruption. "But the jamb at the door did not pay the gas bill!"

## LAYMAN IN CHURCH WORK.

Boston Pilot.

The Augustinian Fathers of Lawrence, Mass., offered some time ago through their parish calendar, which represents the work of the Churches of St. Mary, the Immaculate Conception, St. Lawrence, and St. Augustine's, Andover, a prize of \$10, for the best answer to the question, "How can laymen best help their clergy in parochial work?" Out of many answers received and published in the latest issue of the Calendar, this which was quoted, received the prize:

A young man writes: That in his opinion, the first thing required of the layman is to be a practical Catholic himself—that in this he will find incentive to active co-operation in all parish movements. His greatest strength will be in receiving frequently the sacraments of the Church, and his work will be, first, to lend his assistance cheerfully to all work planned and conducted under the auspices of the Church; second, to always have the good word for what is thus undertaken, and, lastly, to labor by good counsel among his less fortunate brethren.

It is better to be generous than selfish, better to be true than false, better to be brave than a coward. Blessed beyond all earthly blessedness is that man who in tempestuous darkness of the soul has dared to hold fast to these venerable land-marks.

Every real and searching effort at self-improvement is of itself a lesson of profound humility.