

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

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

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, THOMAS COFFEY.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

London, Saturday, Sept. 12, 1891.

ANOTHER NEW CREED PROPOSED.

Like the Creeds or Confessions of Faith of most of the Protestant Churches, the articles of religion which appear in the Book of Discipline of the Methodist Church are devoted in great measure to attacks on Catholic doctrine, and it is now recognized by Methodists themselves that the most important truths of Christian doctrine are not to be found in them; and it is moreover discovered that, even as they stand, the doctrines which are propounded in them are not in accordance with the Methodist teachings of the present day.

Professor Tillet, of Vanderbilt University, proposes in an article which recently appeared in the Quarterly Review, to remedy this state of affairs by framing a new Confession which will embrace "those doctrines which are held in common by all sections of Methodism." The Confession which he proposes to adopt will be markedly different from that of the Presbyterians, inasmuch as the latter is distinctively Calvinistic, whereas the Methodists generally reject that Calvinistic theory which practically makes God the author of sin, though He punishes the sinner. The new creed will also probably contain the doctrine that Christ died for all men, whereas the Presbyterian Confession, as it stands, restricts the offer of salvation to the elect.

The Professor maintains that as the doctrinal statements made in the Articles were formulated before Methodism came into existence, being selections adopted from those of the Anglican Prayer Book, they do not express fairly the theology of Methodism, and are consequently a dead letter. He proposes, therefore, that the Methodist Ecumenical Council, which is to meet in October in Washington, shall take steps to draw up a creed and a catechism which will give new statements of doctrine, which are "better suited to the wants of this age" than are the creeds which were drawn up centuries ago.

It is, of course, necessary that a body claiming to be the true Church of Christ should have a formula of faith in which its followers agree, as otherwise the purpose for which the Church was instituted by Christ is not carried out. That purpose is plainly indicated by St. Paul to be that "henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive." (Eph. iv., 14). Elsewhere, in his first Epistle to Timothy, the same Apostle styles the "Church of the living God the pillar and ground of truth." (1 Tim. iii., 15). It is certainly irreconcilable with this description of the Church to believe that the Methodist Church, which has hitherto taught a set of doctrines as its articles of religion, should now change them so as to accord better with the opinions and sentiments of a new age. What guarantee have we that the new doctrines which it is proposed to adopt will be any more truthful and certain than those which are to be discarded? The proposal to so change them and the acknowledgment that Methodist teachings differ from the present creed are sufficient evidences that the whole system of Methodism cannot be that pillar and ground of truth of which the Apostle Christ speaks.

We have further evidence of this in the manner in which it is proposed to effect the change of creed. It is not suggested to adopt the new creed with a view of incorporating into it all the truths which have been revealed by God, but merely to express those doctrines which are common to all branches of Methodism. On such a principle, it is evident that the creed will be constructed with a view to comprising within the fold as many varieties of belief as possible.

We are aware that this notion of including within the fold of the Church

as many divers doctrines as possible is in accord with the modern Protestant notion of Catholicity in doctrine, which is supposed to be a mark of the true Church, but it certainly does not accord with the idea of Catholicity conveyed by our Blessed Lord when in His commission to His Apostles He commanded them to teach all nations all things which He had revealed to them. The Catholicity of doctrine which is here implied consists in teaching the entire doctrine of Christ, and it was in this sense that these words were understood by the early Fathers and teachers of the Church. The quality of Catholicity was understood by them to mean that the same doctrines were taught everywhere in the Church and that they would continue to be so taught to the end of time. It implied, therefore, unity of faith as well as the spread of that faith through the whole world. This is something very different from the idea of Catholicity entertained by Professor Tillet and the Methodist press generally.

It is to be remarked that the professor thinks that the new creed will require a volume for its expression; but it seems to be the conviction of the Methodist press that it ought to be of much smaller compass, so as to include within the Church a greater variety of persons holding considerable diversity of belief. It remains to be seen what view the coming council will take of the subject.

THE USE OF PIOUS READING AND SACRED IMAGES.

Archdeacon Farrer says that Bishop Westcott, whom he calls "our greatest living theologian," told him that his devotion to the study of the life of St. John was due to his reading "The Death in the Desert" by Robert Browning. Browning was highly pleased at hearing this; and there is no doubt that the best and loftiest sentiments are often inspired by a single incident of the kind indicated. But is it not true that a picture, or a statue, brings to the mind as vividly as any description in words the event which creates such an impression? This is the use to which Catholics put pictures and images of the saints, and there is no doubt they frequently fulfil their purpose, not only with those who are unable to read a description in a book, but even with the best scholars, who are often accustomed to look at things with the cold, calculating eyes of an investigator who refuses to be moved by mere sentiment. Such persons are often impressed more by a momentary glance at a touching scene illustrative of the heroic virtues of a saint, or of some incident in the life of our Lord, than they would be by reading page after page of description in a book.

Many saints have attested that from contemplating the crucifix they have learned the intensity of Christ's love for mankind, and to love Him in return. St. Thomas, the Angelic Doctor, also learned while kneeling before the same image of Christ crucified, the significance of the mystery of man's redemption, and he was enabled thus to impart to the world his admirable explanations thereon which are found in his Theological Summa. If Bishop Westcott was led by the reading of a poem, which describes graphically the life led by St. John the Baptist, to love the character of that saint, and to study his life, the use of the crucifix as a means of leading us to a more intimate knowledge of the mysteries of the life of Christ is certainly not to be condemned after the manner which Protestants have hitherto denounced Catholics for employing it for this purpose; and what we say of the crucifix is equally applicable to images of the saints.

The use of such images dates from the first ages of the Church. The Apostle Emperor Julian made it one of his objections against Christianity that the Christians adored the cross, erected figures of Christ on their houses, and made use of the sign of the cross; and Origen attests that Celsus, who wrote against Christianity at a still earlier period, made a similar objection, just as Protestants do against Catholics at the present day. The accusation of giving divine honors to the cross, which was implied by these enemies of Christianity, was, of course, as false then as it is to-day; but it would never have been urged if the Christians of the period were not accustomed to the use of the sign of the cross, and to make pictures and images of the cross, or of Christ crucified, just as Catholics do now. A conspicuous fresco of the Crucifixion, which may be seen to this day over the principal stairway of the Palace of the Caesars in Rome, is further evidence of the fact

This fresco is said by antiquarians to have been made in the reign of Constantine the Great; but we have besides the testimony of the historian and Bishop Eusebius, the contemporary of Constantine, that this Emperor caused beautiful silver images of Christ crucified, the Blessed Virgin and other saints to be placed in the churches which he erected in Rome and elsewhere.

In the Catacombs similar pictures and images are to be seen constantly, which were made during the first three centuries when the early Christians were obliged to celebrate the divine mysteries in those secret places of refuge, to escape heathen persecution. These are to be found in the cemeteries of Sts. Callixtus, Agnes, Priscilla, Pretextatus, etc., and many of them date certainly as far back as the reign of Diocletian, and even earlier. One of these representations on glass, which men learned in such researches declare to be earlier than the persecutions of Decius, A. D. 250, shows the Blessed Virgin seated on a throne, and holding the Infant Jesus. Both figures are depicted with the nimbus or aureole above and around their heads, a symbol whereby the early Christians signified their veneration for Jesus and His Mother.

We had occasion some time ago to refute some false statements made by Professor MacVicar of Montreal in reference to the use of sacred images, which he maintained to be forbidden by the commandments of God as delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai. We showed then that God had commanded such images to be made under the Old Law, and that therefore they were not forbidden, except when they were made for gods, to be adored and served. Two golden Cherubim were by God's command placed upon the ark of the Covenant, towards which the Israelites were required to show the greatest reverence and respect. (Ex. xxv., 18, 19). Thus, when the people were guilty of taking to themselves that which was forbidden them by the law, and were punished by God for so doing, "Joshua rent his garments, and fell flat on the ground before the ark of the Lord until the evening, both he and all the ancients of Israel," and thus they prayed together to God that they might not be delivered into the hands of the Amorrites. (Jos. vii., 6, 7.) David also had this ark borne with great reverence and religious ceremony and sacrifices from the houses of Abinadab and Obbedon, until it was brought to the city and "set in its place in the midst of the tabernacle." (2 Ki. vi.). All this was done in obedience to the command of God. (Ps. cxviii., 5; 1 Par. xxviii., 2.) If, as many Protestants pretend, such religious reverence be superstitious and idolatrous, it must be said that God commanded superstitious and idolatrous rites to be observed, which is absurd.

The practice of the Jews, which must be regarded as a correct interpretation of the law, proves, therefore, that the commandment of God was not intended to forbid the making of images, unless for idolatrous purposes; and the Catholic use of such images is altogether free from any imputation of idolatry and superstition. The same is clear from the raising of the brazen serpent in the desert, as described in the twenty-first chapter of the book of Numbers. This brazen serpent was a symbol of Christ's crucifixion, as He declares in St. John iii., 14. Surely if it was lawful and beneficial for the Jews to reverence a symbol which represented Christ's future crucifixion, indirectly, it cannot be unlawful and superstitious for Christians to represent the same crucifixion clearly by means of the crucifix, after the event.

We may here remark that Flavius Josephus is sometimes quoted to show that the Jews were really forbidden to use images. But it is to be noted that Josephus accuses Solomon of having violated the law by placing images in the temple which he built. (3 Ki. vi., 23, 29; vii., 24, 36.) But God approved of Solomon's work, inasmuch as He promised to make the temple His dwelling-place, if His commands were obeyed in the building thereof. (vi., 12; and we read in 2 Par. vii., 1, 2, that God actually filled the temple with His Majesty. Josephus was, therefore, in error in his accusation against Solomon. The truth is that after the Babylonish captivity the Jewish discipline was made more strict, because it was feared that owing to the evil example which the captive nation witnessed in Babylon, they might be tempted to fall into idolatry; but this was not in consequence of the law as given by God to Moses. Hence the more ancient Jews did not consider that there was any prohibition against the use of images, which were an incentive to piety

and this view is maintained by Philo, who lived long before Josephus.

In answer to the view taken by Josephus, we may very properly apply a remark made by one of the clerical members of the Protestant General Assembly which met recently at Detroit. Speaking of the Anglican claim that the Episcopal consecration from the Apostles, and is therefore superior to the ministry of Non-Conformists, this clergyman said he could not find any such claim provable from Scripture, and he did not care to look for it elsewhere. We may say with at least equal truth that the accusation of Josephus against Solomon is not provable from Scripture, and we do not recognize the authority of Josephus when he takes it upon himself to correct Scripture. Josephus is certainly a highly respectable authority when he testifies to Jewish belief and practice; but he was not infallible, and when his testimony is not reconcilable with that of Holy Writ, the preference must be given to the inspired word of God.

A BITTER CONTROVERSY.

The war between the various factions within the Church of England is being continued in the columns of the Toronto Mail not only with fury unabated, but with a vigor of denunciation and abuse which grows fiercer every day. A recent writer in that journal, who adopts the nom de plume of "Churchman," declares in effect that the whole Church of England is apparently so strongly infected with treason to the teachings of Protestant truth that it may be soon necessary to look to the Church of Ireland—by which he means the Church of the English garrison in Ireland—as the sole preserver of true Protestant Christianity. He asserts that the Church of Ireland is as independent of England as it is of Rome. He adds that the Church of England has given birth to endless sects, of such divers complexion as Ritualism on one hand, and Salvation Armyism on the other, to that extent that an Englishman who is also a Ritualist, writing for the Church Times, lately stated that Irish churchmen are the only churchmen he has met who are worthy of the name.

Churchman's account of the total independence of the Irish Church from that of England is certainly not borne out by the facts of the case. Elizabeth, first, and afterwards James I., established the Irish Episcopal Church on the model of the Church of England, and it was, equally with the Church of England, the creature of Parliament, and the King's supremacy was made its chief doctrine, just as it was in England, and it was only in the garrison towns that it could be forced on the people of Ireland at all; and this was done by force of English bayonets. It is true that the Bishops placed in the Irish dioceses were not those who ruled the dioceses of England, but the Church was practically one with that of England, and even the English Book of Common Prayer was used in the Irish Churches. The two Churches were, therefore, practically one, having the same Head and teaching the same doctrines.

But if Churchman's theory be true, how does it come that in Canada we have never heard of Irish churchmen attending any Church service but that of the English Church? We presume that Churchman himself has always done so; for otherwise he is meddling in matters which do not concern him.

The Book of Common Prayer, according to Lord Macaulay, was composed with the express design to include Englishmen of the most different beliefs within the fold of the Church of England, and it is a well known fact that the doctrinal part of it was left purposely obscure so that almost all members of the Church might find therein such dogmas as would be most pleasing to them; and this accounts for the great variety of sects which so angers Churchman. The doctrines of the so-called Evangelical party in the Church may indeed be found in the prayer-book by those who are Calvinistically inclined; but the Ritualists may also find much which favors their views; and it is for this reason mainly that the Evangelicals or Calvinists have not been able to make their views prevail either in the Anglican synods and convocations, or before the ecclesiastical courts.

The high tone taken by Churchman in denouncing the Ritualists is simply an evidence of intolerance on the part of one who, though loud in proclaiming that liberty of opinion is the birthright of all Protestants, nevertheless denounces those who, in the exercise of that liberty, venture to disagree with him.

It is not for us to defend the Ritualists from the charge of inconsistency in maintaining that the Church has authority to decide controversies of faith, and yet refusing to yield to the authority of the only Church which possesses a continuous Apostolic succession; but the Low Churchmen are not a whit more consistent than their adversaries. And not only do High and Low Churchmen find in the Articles and Liturgy such doctrines as they wish to see there, but Erastians and Latitudinarians are equally successful.

The virulence of Churchman in the airing of his views may be judged from his application of the following texts of Scripture to Bishop Hamilton, of Niagara diocese, and to other Anglican clergy who are not of his own way of thinking. Of Bishop Hamilton he says that he is "personally a very lovable man," but that "he is cordially hated (for his Ritualism) all over the diocese."

The following are the passages of Scripture which he says are "applicable to pert priests and Ritualistic Bishops," Bishop Hamilton and Rev. Mackleur being especially named:

Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying,

This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me.

But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

My people hath been lost sheep; their shepherds have caused them to go astray, they have turned them away from the mountains; they have gone from mountain to hill, they have forgotten their resting place.

All that found them have devoured them; and their adversaries said, we offend not because they have sinned against the Lord, the habitation of justice, even the Lord, the hope of their fathers.

Let them alone; they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.

Churchman's chief failing is evidently not an overflowing charity for those who disagree with him in opinion.

THE TREVES PILGRIMAGE.

The Presbyterian Review is to be added to the list of religious journals which delight in misrepresenting the strong faith which has led devout Catholic pilgrims to Treves by hundreds of thousands to recall the memory of our Redemption by looking reverentially upon the sacred "coat without seam, woven from the top throughout," which is spoken of in Holy Scripture as having been worn by our Blessed Lord before His crucifixion.

The Review says: "The reign of superstition is not over;" and "the whole exhibition promises to be the most gigantic triumph of fraud and superstition that the present generation has yet seen."

And wherein are found the fraud and superstition? The Review may well be considered a fraud for asserting as it does, without show of reason, that "spurious the relic undoubtedly is;" but there is certainly no fraud on the part of the saintly Bishop of Treves and his predecessors who have retained the relic in their possession for nearly sixteen hundred years, preserving it with the greatest care.

Bishop Korum, in his beautiful pastoral in which he announced his intention to accede to the wish which innumerable devout Catholics had expressed, that the relic should be placed on exhibition, said:

"Truth demands of us that we confide in the venerable and constant tradition of our diocese that we never accuse our ancestors of credulity or of fraud unless there be very grave reasons for doing so. Such reasons have never been put forward. How could I venture to think that my predecessors in the See of St. Eusebius had been wanting in the necessary care and vigilance for a cause so eminently important and holy, that is, in examining the authenticity of such a relic, and that in spite of the solemn decrees of the Church; how could I presume that they had kept silence or connived at what they knew to be a fraud?"

Some of the most illustrious and holy Bishops of Treves were those who lived when this sacred relic attracted most attention, and on consideration of these facts, and the attested identity with the relic committed to the Church by St. Helena, Bishop Korum states that though he has no wish to force the relic upon any one, he is fully convinced that it is genuine, after having last year instituted a rigid enquiry into the evidences, which lasted for several days before many competent judges. In the presence of such evidence, joined with the constant tradition of the Church, the fraud and dishonesty are on the part of those who, like the Review, are so ready to make

charges of dishonesty against witnesses whose reputation neither the tongue of ignorance nor of malice can stain.

There are extant copies of the Holy Scripture which certainly belong to the fourth and fifth centuries. There is one of the New Testament preserved with great care in the British Museum. Another, the most highly valued of all by scholars, is in the Vatican Library, and another is in the keeping of the Czar at St. Petersburg.

It will be time enough for Presbyterians to hurl accusations of fraud and superstition against those who venerate the relics of our Lord when people shall have forgotten the general jubilation of the Christian world, Protestant and Catholic alike, which the discovery of the Sinaitic manuscript of the whole Bible was hailed when it was unexpectedly found, the discovery being made complete in 1859, by the finding of the final portions in a monastery on Mount Sinai. Dr. Tischendorf, the discoverer, was considered a public benefactor; still there are plenty of persons who will say that the Presbyterians encouraged both fraud and superstition on that occasion.

But let us hear what a respectable Protestant missionary who spent thirty years in Palestine and Syria thinks of these accusations of superstition which those who have no respect for sacred relics are so ready to make against Catholics. The Rev. W. M. Thompson's "Land and the Book" is found in almost every Protestant house. The author says (p. 328):

"The prompting principle of hero-worship is far too closely intertwined with the inner sanctities of man's moral nature ever to be eradicated. There are spiritual 'high places' where men will ever continue to rear altars and burn incense. It is absurd to ignore their existence—might possibly be sacrilegious utterly to overthrow them. We may moralize, philosophize, and even theologize, as we please, and still men will go on all the same to erect monuments, and build temples and make pilgrimages to the birth-place, the home, and the tomb of prophet, poet and hero. And if kings, nobles and ministers of the gospel crowd to the place where Shakespeare was born, or died, or lies buried, and there weep and pray, and tremble and faint in seraphic ecstasy, should we wonder that the less cultivated and less sophisticated will do the same thing for the sacred prophet and holy seer of antiquity? It is absurd to tolerate, admire, and even participate in the one, and yet condemn the other. Can we surround Plymouth Rock with reverential sanctities, because our forefathers landed there some two hundred years ago and at the same time ridicule the Oriental who approaches Sinai with awe, or makes long pilgrimages to Mecca, or to Jerusalem, Hebron, Beth-lehem, Nazareth, Tiberias, and a score of other places where holy men lived, wrought mighty miracles, and revealed to man the mysteries of God and eternity, and where they often sealed their testimony with their blood? I, at least, cannot be so unjust and ridiculously partial."

Moses was ordered by God to remove the shoes from his feet before the burning bush. It was forbidden the Jews to enter the sanctuary, or to touch the ark of the covenant. Euseius sent his attendant to place his staff on a dead youth, and thus to raise him to life. Handkerchiefs which had touched the body of St. Paul drove away evil spirits and healed the sick, and when the very hem of Christ's garment was touched it had the same effect. Why should not that same garment be regarded with the same reverence now?

The man who derides such sacred relics is evidently wanting in Christian faith, and Mr. Thompson asserts that he who could visit the sacred places of Palestine without reverence "does so simply and only, and in every case because a latent unbelief has transferred the stupendous facts into the category of dreamy myths."

The same principle applies and the same reasoning holds good in regard to the seamless garment which was stained with the precious blood which flowed for man's redemption. He who ridicules those who venerate it must be at heart an unbeliever in the great truths of Christianity, and he would as readily ridicule the sick woman whom Christ commended and rewarded for her faith.

There are other sins besides superstition. Presbyterians were the inventors of the superstition of the wholesale witch-burning which disgraced Scotland and New England; but we have only to look to the flippancy with which sacred things were spoken of by the learned and pious divines who constituted the recent General Assembly at Detroit to see that unbelief is just as rampant as superstition among such sectaries.

The Review says that the Treves exhibition is carried on for purely mercenary purposes. The assertion is without any foundation and one who

has once visited which it is to visit sacred is the statement of the thousand to Treves will with any thou, for whose sea east nearly tw. He was nall, believers might righteousness.

It is for no nurture their that the pilgr taken by the encouraged by and the clei Father himself.

CATHOLIC

THE NEW Y

The New York... a well-m... mon custom... girly girls with... blue as the... things the pos... just the same... and drop, ke... and Mattie a... Lallie, and... Jennie and... Lizzie, and... Lottie and... Fannie, and... Gertie and... Macie, and... Nettie, and... and Flossie... and Minnie... the gods giv... call you by t... girly girls... Girls should... and discourag... All who have... at home and... what is somet... Cat

The Catechi... fortune-tellers... girls go to t... "I just for t... commandment... can't they find... others on the... might lie or... fun." If tha... what they ha... one case, why

In the cur... Mr. C. Kegan... of his religio... when the son... iser, he "los... lost full maturi... entered the o... conversion w... sand instance... of the Cardin... a powerful in... which, earn... found. In... Victoris, is... Thomas a Ke... day by day, c... changed it... put so plainl... of all or d... God or the r... embraced the... after the gre... he says: "I... brimming cu... not know all... that his w... drawn me i... floating on... world. But... I knelt by h... heard the R... I felt that i... was in a ha... to tell him... things in th...

While Jan... poet whose... toward Cath... artist not a... beauty of th... he said: "I... the secret of... mystery of t... the only Ch... heart at h... at his best... Longfellow... have been t... "A boggar... From a lice... Fill up my... For Christ's

The New... gives a rap... to see dang... in the grow... this country... of some cl... toward liqu... potary trut... never had a... and even n... not be elec... of the prej... the most fa... supporters... for the pres... They have... Parisianism... conventions... If it has eve... local cont... Protestant... Catholics se... Protestants... dates on g... merely."

The husk... man has g... purpose of... is a favo... Cl... dutiful su... upon his al