

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXII.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MARCH 10, 1900.

NO. 1,116.

The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, March 10, 1900

DEPLORABLE INDIFFERENCE.

During this season Catholics are reminded that the way to heaven is not so broad and easy as some people would have them imagine. There is all the more necessity for this teaching when we consider that the world we know, the men about us who are kind and courteous, recognize no necessity for penance and are yet to all seeming better citizens than many who observe Lent. This natural virtue is apt to lose its brilliancy through contact with the world, but it is nevertheless a source of danger to many of us. We know of men who are thoroughly indifferent to the practices of their faith, on account of constant association with individuals who have no creed, and are, nevertheless, respectable members of the community.

Much harm is done in colleges which are not under Catholic auspices. We do not mean that ought derogatory to Catholicism is mentioned by the professors of these institutions. They are, in the main, too courteous to be guilty of ungentlemanly conduct, and, besides, it would not be business to wound the religious susceptibilities of any pupil. We mean that the indifference that lurks in the atmosphere, that looks out from the text books, and is heard in the words of the pupils, does more harm—silently, it is true, but none the less effectually—to Catholic faith than any amount of reviling. Parents are reminded of this when they confide their children to the care of Protestant institutions. They laugh, of course, as if such a thing could possibly happen that their sons or daughters could become bad Catholics. Well, they ordinarily become worse than that—if they become polished imitators of ungodliness or the most despicable thing of all, the easy-going Catholic who patronizes his Church and has a great respect for all denominations.

During this season we are exhorted to get face to face with our duties as Christians. We are commanded to subdue our lower appetites by mortification so that the voice of God may be heard in our souls. And that voice will tell us that the one thing we have to do with our faith is not to minimize or to conceal it, but to defend it and preach it by a truly Catholic life.

JOTTINGS.

Just now a few editors are, in their comments on the *Mivart* case, playing fantastic tricks before high heaven. They know as much about the head and point of *Mivart's* offending as about the Catholic Church, and yet they must sit down and write reams of rubbish on "scientific advancement and effete dogmatism."

We think that anyone with a desire to be a producer of honest and conscientious work should equip himself with at least some elementary knowledge of the question at issue. He might commence by learning the definitions of science and faith, the attitude of the Church towards intellectual progress, and then he could with some semblance of decency undertake to say something. But he will not do it. The editors who are in quest of sensational news pounce upon Dr. *Mivart's* case and serve it red hot to their readers. Their effusions will abound in references to "Roman hostility to science and will conclude with a display of rhetorical pyrotechnics ancient free discussion and the onward and upward trend of the century to perfect emancipation from priestly power and influence." He will take care to talk intelligently about the markets, and even in the discussion of questions of party politics he will have moments of lunacy; but where Catholicism is concerned he will know nothing and learn nothing. To him, as to others who have been prepared in an anti-Catholic atmosphere, the Church is a barrier to the advancement of humanity. We do not expect the editor to write glowing panegyrics about us; but we have the right to demand fair play—an honest and intelligent exposition of our doctrines.

Even that will be denied us because the average editor is as deeply ignorant of Catholic faith and usage as is the average preacher, and he will con-

tent himself with the traditional fictions, sophisms, calumnies, mockeries, sarcasms and invectives with which Catholics are to be assailed. This blind, unreasoning hatred is what welds all the grotesque parodies on Christianity into unity. "Heresy and scepticism and infidelity and fanaticism may challenge them in vain; but flung upon the gale the faintest whisper of Catholicism and they recognize by instinct the presence of their connatural foe." And the editor must assume the role of prophet, and deplete with facile pen the swaying and toppling down of Catholicism never more to cumber the earth before the dread figure of science. A great many have made the very same prophecy, but they died unfortunately before it came to pass. Back in the days of St. Augustine, some individuals talked pretty much like the modern editor, but they also were disappointed. And if any of the scribbling gentlemen are around when the artist from New Zealand takes his stand on the broken arches of London Bridge, they will find that Catholicism remains not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of youthful life and vigor.

And so you Anglo-Saxons—the massive iron hammers of the world—are the very cream of civilization. You have been passed through the purifying alembic of the ages and behold you are the concentrated essence of all that is good and noble and glorious. That is what your admirers say about you, but you, despite your arrogance, have not parted with common sense. Ruskin was your very good friend, and were he alive and in the full strength of his power he would silence and still all this pretty cackling about your prowess and imperialistic mission. He was not even sure you were a Christian. He says you have a religion that is good enough for show, but not for work; that you are in fact the proud possessor of a new brand of infidelity. "We English," he remarks, "have put the matter of God in an entirely new light."

There is a Supreme Ruler—no question about it—only His cannot rule. His orders will not work. He will be quite satisfied with eulphorous and respectful repetition of them. Execution would be too dangerous under existing circumstances, which He certainly never contemplated. This is a very serious accusation, and makes one believe it would be much better for you to give your Bibles to home-dwellers instead of sending them by the shipload to the Chinese who use them largely in the making of fire-crackers. And this is all the more important when you consider that there are thousands of you in the heart of London who are in dire need of the ministrations of the individuals who circumnavigate the globe to make a convert and then circumnavigate it again to tell you about it. You do not seem to notice this because your business of teaching civilization to new-found sullen peoples requires all your time and attention. You have a good many black marks, records of rapine and treachery and cruelty opposite your name in the annals of history, but the laudatory words of the wise and eloquent have caused you to forget them. But the other day you waxed hysterical when you heard how your warriors had been out-generalled and beaten by a lot of despised Dutchmen. Perhaps they were using the "open Bible" at the time, and you were not; but the fact remains that a London mob howled out its grief for very shame of the thing. There was, indeed, just cause for grief for the tears that welled up in the eyes of maid and mother all over England, but there was more cause for shame that a free people should have been driven into a needless and bloody war.

And why did you cry out: "It is not the loss of a battle and the annihilation of an army that begins the fall of a people: a people dies only by the relaxation of its morals, by abandoning its manly habits, by the effacement of its character through the invasion of egotism and scepticism. It dies of its corruption. It does not die of its wounds." You may think that the above quotation is aside the mark, but if you take the trouble to look up past history you will find that it has been

amply verified by more than one nation. In your present frame of mind you mistake the tootings of locomotives for blasts from the horn of civilization. There was a time, however, when you looked higher than the smoke from your factories, and when you had a sense of the supernatural. That was in the days of Merrie England, when you created all the things that have given you a high place among the sons of men.

The "utterly unredeemed villains" who robbed you have not given you anything in return. You have their memory, but no respectable man wants that. Without saying anything more in this strain we wish you to remember that the foundation of your greatness has been laid by your Catholic ancestors. Your charters of liberties, your literature, your halls of learning, have sprung into being under the creating touch of Englishmen who were proud to be loyal children of the Vicar of Christ. Your cathedrals with "their vaulted gates, trellised with close leaves; their window labyrinth of tinted tracery and strong light; their misty manes of multitudinous pinnacle and diademed tower" were not made by men—to use a word of Carlyle's—"who were victims of a horrible, restless doubt, and, still less, a far more horrible cant."

The editor of the *Presbyterian Review* is, we are afraid, a member of that class that learns nothing and forgets nothing. Just at present he is in a very befogged condition about the *Mivart* case. He intimates that the learned scientist would meet in Catholic countries with something far worse than mere condemnation; and so the esteemed editor has not yet done with the nursery tales that were dinned into his ears in the long ago.

If the Paulist Fathers whom he admires would undertake to give missions to Presbyterian editors they would be rewarded with an abundant harvest.

AN ABSURD AND ILLOGICAL CREED.

We referred briefly last week to the remarkable paper on "The Logic of Non-Dogmatic Christianity," which that scholarly Protestant writer, Mr. W. H. Mallock, has in the current issue of the *Fortnightly Review*. There are so many strong points in this article that its full force and value are only to be felt by those who read it in its entirety, and whoever does that will be compelled to admit that Mr. Mallock has made a categorical and comprehensive exposure of the sophistries of the alleged Christianism whose absurd system and statements he refutes.

Some of the keenest thrusts which Mr. Mallock in this paper delivers against his opponents are those where by he lays bare in all their absurdities the glaring inconsistencies between modern "Christianism" and the language which they use in defining and attempting to defend them. Foremost among the principles of these new moralisms are their assertions that Jesus Christ was a mere man, extraordinarily gifted, it is true, and wonderfully noble and pure in His character, but still human only; and that His system, consequently, which we call Christianity, is merely a "human reality." Nevertheless, they claim that their system of Christianity, while rejecting all dogma and miracle, admits that there is a great deal of vital truth in Christ's teachings, which we should assimilate by conforming to certain rites and ceremonies instituted by Him. Addressing himself to Mrs. Humphry Ward as one of the high priestesses of this new religion, Mr. Mallock asks:—

"Suppose Socrates (to whom these modern 'Christians' compare Christ) had asked his friends, as he drank the cup of hemlock, to drink on the anniversary of his death a cup of wine to his memory, would Mrs. Ward maintain that for a Greek in subsequent ages the drinking of this cup of wine was essential in any way to the assimilation of the vital truths which animated the Socratic teaching? Would she venture to speak of it as the food of some mystical union? She obviously would not. She would reject such language as an expression of the grossest superstition. Why, then, if Christ was a mere man like Socrates, can our drinking to day a cup of wine in His memory be in any way essential to our following His moral example, or be a vital assimilation of Christ's views of God? How can it be 'the food of any mystical union' with Him any more than it could be the food of some mystical union with Socrates? How in any way can it be more essential to the Christian religion than eating plum pudding at Christmas is essential to Christian good-will,

or than eating goose at Michaelmas is essential to English patriotism?" Another glaring inconsistency between the principles and the language of these neo-Christians is pointed out by Mr. Mallock very strikingly when he says that although they deny that there was anything miraculous about Christ, His Resurrection and Ascension, they nevertheless maintain that He Whom they place in heaven, but merely as a man, will then receive from all His followers "a humble account" of their earthly lives "after the darkness and storm of the great change," which is their grandiloquent way of referring to death. Inquires Mr. Mallock:—

"Why is it more reasonable, less dogmatic and less marvelous to say that all the human race will be judged by an ordinary human being than to say that it will be judged by the Word Who was with God from the beginning? Is there any more evidence for the former assertion than the latter? "As soon," says he again, alluding to these rationalists' rejection of Christ's divinity, "as we deny to Christ any miraculous and superhuman character, the only ground on which we attribute to Him... unique authority disappears. His authority suffers the same kind of change that was suffered by the travels of M. de Rougemont, when it was discovered that he had never been in the regions which he professed to describe. The whole article—which will well repay perusal—is a remarkable one to come from a writer of Mr. Mallock's religious views. Bearing strong, if indirect, testimony to the reasonableness and logical character of true Christianity, its main purpose, of course, is to expose the absurdity and illogicalness of non-dogmatic Christianity, or, to take a phrase from Professor Caird's newly published "Fundamental Ideas of Christianity," to show—which it does very effectively—that such a religious system is "not light, but darkness. It is an unintelligible dogma, a burden and not a help to faith."—Sacred Heart Review.

MADE IN ENGLAND.

"Starling Revelations of Romanism. Heard by One Hundred 'Elderly Females.'"

London Catholic Times.

On Tuesday evening, in connection with St. Mark's Protestant League, a Baptist preacher named Minifie, of Bradford, gave a lecture entitled "Starling Revelations of Romanism" in St. Mark's school, Preston. Notwithstanding the startling title and the admission was free, except some reserved seats at threepence, only about one hundred persons were present, including the members of the choir and committee. The audience was mostly made up of elderly females. It is an old saying that "heresy begets strange bedfellows." The lecturer was a Baptist, the vicar of the parish (St. Mark's) calls baptism an "idiotic superstition," and the chairman (vicar of All Saints) holds that baptism is essential to salvation. However, there was one thing all three held in common, viz., hatred of Rome, and this from flying at each other's throats during that evening.

The following "gems" from the lecture will illustrate what kind of a man Mr. Minifie is: "Romanists left out the second commandment in a great many catechisms. Romanists believed that the Pope could commit no sin, for infallibility meant that! The term Catholic Roman Church was a contradiction in terms! The Church of Jerusalem existed before the Roman Church! The 'Catechism of Catholic Doctrine,' third improved edition printed by Benziger Brothers and having the imprimatur of Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of (sic) New York, states that 'no one could be saved outside the Roman Church.' Article 104, Page 339, 'all non-Catholic died in their sins and are damned.' Romanists believe that Livingstone, Spurgeon, Whitfield, John Wesley and others 'were damned and were now in hell.' Papists said that Cardinal Manning was still in purgatory, and yet had he but bought a four-penny scapular before he died, the Virgin Mary would have got him out the first Saturday after he died! Romanism was the Prime Minister of Satan," etc., etc. Mr. Minifie during the evening put a scapular round his neck amid laughter and jeers from the audience. Sometimes he exhibits pictures, crucifixes, images and wafers breads.

The following story is worth repeating: His (Mr. Minifie's) "learned friend," Dr. Gratton Guinness, on his visit to Rome went into the hall of the Inquisition, and gazing upon all the cruel instruments of torture around him addressed a "cowled monk" as follows: "If you had the power to-day to put all this machinery of three hundred years ago in motion would you do so?"

"Don't you know," replied the "cowled monk," that Rome never changes?"

A friend of his (Mr. Minifie's), a Mr. Jefford, Protestant missionary in Madras, had told him that the Romanist priests there had tried to poison his

water! Mr. Minifie didn't say whether Mr. Jefford prosecuted the priest, or not for their crime, and Protestant audiences never ask awkward questions; they swallow every statement unhesitatingly.

HIS CATHOLIC AUTHORITIES.

Mr. Minifie, holding up some books, said he had quoted purely from Catholic authorities giving the author, chapter, page, edition, printer, etc., and what more could Romanists ask? A well-known Catholic journalist sitting at the reporters' table and close to the lecturer asked permission to examine the books. Mr. Minifie replied: "They are for the lecturer's use only." However, the Catholic journalist still pressing to see the "Catholic authorities," Mr. Minifie, visibly disconcerted, handed one of the booklets, and to his amazement the reporter found the author to be the notorious ex-convict, Widdows, who was convicted at the Old Bailey by Lord Justice Smith of a most revolting crime and sentenced to ten years' penal servitude! The other books were those of Slattery, Bordon, Ailscock, Chiquy and Protestant literature. At the close of the lecture the vicar of All Saints said there could be no doubt that Mr. Minifie had proved up to the hilt all his charges against Rome! We may add that it was Mr. Minifie who introduced Slattery to Bradford audiences as a "Protestant minister of good standing" when he lectured in that city along with "Sister Mary Elizabeth." In his lecture in Preston Mr. Minifie spoke of "some priests who had more coat than character." Possibly he was referring to his old acquaintance, Slattery, who has fallen foul of his worthy nephew, who acted as his secretary. When a certain class of people fall out, another class of people come by their own.

THE INADEQUACY OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

The development and activity of what has come to be called the Higher Criticism have forced upon the attention of thinking men the radical and far-reaching difference between the Catholic principle of authority and Protestant principle of private judgment as the rule by which the revealed truth and will of God can come to us with that degree of certainty necessary to make them the law of our lives, and not a mere subject of academic discussion or philosophical speculation.

He who wills the end wills the means to it. He who, while willing the end, fails to will and provide the means, sins against the law of supreme wisdom and gives evidence of intellectual imbecility. The infinitely wise Being willed that man should know His will and know certain supernatural truths that could not come to him by the light of reason alone. In fact, He gave man his reason that he might be capable of receiving the knowledge of that will, and those truths as the guide of his conduct in this mortal phase of his existence. It is this gift of reason, his capacity to receive a divine communication, as from intelligence to intelligence, that distinguishes man from his fellow-brutes. Reason then is an essential condition of revelation, and is pre-supposed by it. God gave man reason that He might communicate with him intellectually; He made him fit to speak to before he spoke to him.

Willing that man should know the end for which he was created, and the means to that end, the Creator made a revelation to him. He made it not directly and immediately to each individually, as he spoke to Adam, but mediately, through chosen men, who were commissioned to proclaim it to all men as they came and go in the course of time.

We need not here discuss why the Creator selected this mediate manner of communicating His will to mankind, instead of directly to each person. It is enough that He did select it. And the fact is sufficient evidence that in view of the whole range of the divine purpose in regard to man, it was the wisest and best.

The immediate end of revelation is that man should know with certainty the things revealed, for to know without certainty is not to know.

As we have seen, the law of supreme wisdom requires that the means of medium to an end must be adequate to that end. The end being knowledge with certainty, what attributes should the chosen medium possess to be adequate to the end? He is said to be a wise man who, in constructing an instrument to do a certain work, so constructs it that it will accomplish the work perfectly when the conditions are placed. To fall in this argues lack of sense to understand what is necessary to do the work, or lack of ability or power to construct the instrument to do it.

The work to be done in the case under consideration is to bring to the knowledge of man with certainty the truths and will of God in so far as it has pleased Him to reveal them, and so present them that the receiving mind will apprehend them in the sense of the divine revealer; for in so far as revelation is received in any other sense it is not received at all. Observe, we do not say that the chosen instrument, to be

perfect, must bring the revealed truths to the mind in such a way that man can comprehend them; for many of those truths are in their nature incomprehensible to the finite intellect, and are for that reason called mysteries. Take, for instance, the mystery of the Holy Trinity, that "there is one God in three divine persons." Understanding clearly the meaning of the dogmatic proposition to which the assent of faith is required, but we do not comprehend or take in that infinite reality announced by the proposition. Faith requires us to believe the proposition is true, but it does not require us to comprehend or see the truth it announces in its intrinsic nature, as God alone can see it, because He is it. We believe it because He sees it and reveals it to us. The merit and firmness of an act of faith depend not on seeing the intrinsic nature of a revealed truth, in knowing that it is, and knowing it on the highest possible motive of credibility, the divine veracity.

The instrument, then, by which revealed truth comes to us must, to be perfect, present the revealed truth in the sense it is revealed, and in such a way that the mind can have no reasonable grounds for refusing assent. Only an infallible instrument fills the conditions. To say that God, in establishing an instrument through which to speak to mankind, would establish one which, through incapacity or evil motive, could present as His word what is not His word, or in such a manner as would justify a reasonable refusal of assent, is equivalent to denying His infinite wisdom and goodness, or His justice.

Either He established no means of knowing His will or He established an adequate, perfect means; an instrumentality worthy of Him, and so stamped with His approbation and authority that to reject it would be to reject Him.

No one familiar with the contradictory doctrines—whose name is legion—presented by private judgment as the word of God, can seriously and understandingly believe private judgment to be the instrument designed by God to make known His truth and will to man.

The way of authority alone remains. When God sent Moses and the Prophets they went with authority. When He sent His eternal Son He came with authority; He was the authority. When at his departure He established His Church and said: "Go teach all nations whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you to the end of the world, He sent her with authority, and she set out with it, and journeys on through the ages with it. She proceeds not as the philosophers, who propose problems for speculation and discussion, but as her divine Founder who "taught as one having authority."

In the last resort there is but the alternative of accepting the truths of revealed religion on authority or rejecting revelation altogether. The latter is the drift of the so-called Higher Criticism, and of those scientists who mistake their own imaginings for the voice of true science.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

CONVERSION OF THE MARQUISE LANZA.

An American Girl who Married an Italian Nobleman.
The New York press announces the reception into the Catholic fold of the Marquise Lanza di Mercato Bianco. This information will occasion surprise, for it was generally believed that the Marquise did not favor the Catholic faith. In one of her novels—for she is an authoress—she makes a hero of a priest who becomes an apostate.

Miss Clara Hammond was the maiden daughter of the late Dr. William A. Hammond, once surgeon general of the United States. She was married in 1877 to the Marquis Manfredi Lanza di Mercato Bianco, a member of one of the oldest noble families of Italy. He was estranged from his father and in 1871 came to this country from Sicily. He battled with fortune for a time with indifferent success, and finally obtained employment in a silk house. He rose to the position of confidential clerk, and eventually made his way into society like that to which he had been accustomed at home. He died in 1895 in Washington.

In his boyhood the Marquis had been a page to the Queen of Italy. He entered the army before he was twenty-one, and so distinguished himself that he won honorable mention. His two sons are now in the army of the United States, one in the Philippines and the other in Puerto Rico. Both of them have been wounded and both have been commended for bravery. The sons, in accordance with the marriage contract, were brought up in the Catholic faith.
Cardinal Rampolla, a cousin of the late Marquis, has sent to the Marquise a rosary of garnets and pearls mounted in gold. It has been specially blessed by the Pope.

Sorrow is the sister of Joy, and they walk the world together closer than many think.—Father Ryan.