

# The Catholic Record.

'Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen.'—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname).—St. Paclian, 4th Century.

VOLUME XXIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1902

1255

## The Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 8, 1902.

### PROGRESS—CHRISTIAN AND OTHERWISE.

It is awfully tiresome all this potter about our progress. We can scarcely pick up a magazine without seeing some allusion, and most of us doubtless are apt to believe that we are a very great people. We are inclined to think, however, that it has but a vague meaning for many who descend upon it. We but state a truism when we say that a country, however conspicuous for its conquests in the realms of commerce and art, may be on the brink of ruin; whereas a nation destitute of material resources, but wedded to truth and justice, and glorying in the honor and purity of its women and men, has reached a high plane of civilization. It is with nations as with individuals. Many a sage out of elbows and contemned blazes a new path for posterity; many a nation thorn-crowned and suffering points the way to a larger hope and liberty. It is wise not to judge the book by its building. There may be a sheen of gold over a country and the country itself be rotten. Moreover, computing progress by dollars and cents, lends itself as easily to the infidel as the Christian. We cannot insist too strongly upon this. For the daily prints that come into every household sounding the praises of progress convey the idea that it means the creation of a millionaire or the production of some intellectual work. And what a good-natured concern the scribes have for the achievements of the past! They take it for granted that the men of other days did nothing and reserve all their plaudits for this swift-moving generation that dotes on wealth and bows down servilely before those who have it. In other days men were wont to be thrilled by the solution of great problems; they thronged to see a great picture, or hung upon the lips of the schoolman or orator; but nowadays we cackle over a new railroad and go into ecstasies over a dinner at \$100 per plate. Even they who should know better—we ourselves become tainted with these notions. We make our fire-side the camping-ground of the gossip of the press and ideas that are erroneous. We permit one of the holy places on earth to be defiled by the world; and it is no wonder that we have weak-fibred men and women who know neither the glory of their faith nor their responsibility towards it, and who to all seeming are no better than they without the fold. Says Cardinal Newman:

"Here is another grave matter against you that you are so well with the Protestants about you. I do not mean to say that you are not bound to cultivate peace with all men, and to do them all the offices of charity in your power. Of course you are, and if they respect, esteem and love you it redounds to your praise and will gain you a reward; but I mean more than this: I mean that you do not respect you but they like you, because they think of you as of themselves, they see no difference between themselves and you."

We have no wish to undervalue the discoveries of the present day. We take of our hat to its inventions and discoveries. Nor are we disposed to hark back to the past save to record our gratitude for its tributes to humanity and our conviction that its services will be more appreciated when sane standards prevail. Nay, more, because we have faith in the age we believe that it will yet throw aside the goggles that catch its present fancy, just as the barbarian, when civilized, dissociates himself from the signs of his former condition. But for the present we have to guard against being misled by the maxims in vogue. When we talk of progress we mean Christian progress: that progress that began with Christ—the progress that refashioned the world—the progress that made authority respected and gave the Christian family and home an abiding safeguard against caprice and passion—the progress, in a word, that tells us about our origin and destiny. All other progress but this is a misnomer. Take away the elements of Christian progress and what remains? Even now, despite our development along the lines of the material, men view the future with alarm. From some quarters voices are raised against the foul and altogether too common crime of infanticide; others bewail the increasing tide of legalized adultery. Representations which pander to the vilest instincts of human nature are not wanting on the stage. A struggle that admits of no pity—a

brutal and selfish contest for pelf and position—goes on at our doors. A generation with small reverence for authority, and whose ideal is not above the dollar—because the dollar stands for everything it cares to have—is round about us. And we talk of progress. Even so the Romans talked whilst the shadow of doom was falling about their walls. And yet they seemed never so prosperous before. They had exhausted the possibilities of ambition. All nations rendered them tribute: poets sang their praises and orators declaimed their glory and progress. And history tells us what happened. The progress that puts God out of the question is the forerunner of disintegration and ruin. The home, therefore, that stands for it is a menace to national stability. We do not mean to say that fathers and mothers take pains to uproot the idea of God from the minds of their children. No—not that. But the parents who, in season and out of season, impress, by example at least, upon their boys and girls that the prizes of the world are alone worth the gaining, are preparing recruits for the army of the indifferentists. They—unconsciously if you like—are helping the anti-Christian propaganda. Of what avail are the calls to action when we are allowed to wander after idols? We have often wondered at our apathy when exhorted to rise to our opportunity, and we have been always inclined to think that it was due to our home-training. We have a weak grasp of the zeal and generosity of our forebears because our eyes are dazzled by the glamour of material prosperity and our hearts deadened by the preachments of foolish parents. But the home that teaches the children to love God, and to certify that love by kindness to all men, is ministering to the vitality and true development of the race. It will be a happy day for this country when children are taught that their chief business is to seek always the kingdom of God and His justice. Then, and then only, shall we have true progress in the material and intellectual order.

We might speak of the benefits of Christian progress in the past, but we should tread on a subject well known to our readers. However, it is well to remember, both for our own comfort and as an antidote to false teaching, that religion is the chief foundation of justice and virtue. So speaks Leo XIII.:

"When the bonds are broken which unite man to God a mere phantom of morality remains, a morality which is purely civil, and as it is termed independent, which abstracting from the eternal mind and the laws of God descends inevitably till it reaches the ultimate conclusion of making a law unto himself. Incapable, in consequence, of rising on the wings of Christian hope to the goods of the world beyond, man will seek a material satisfaction in the comforts and enjoyments of life. There will be excited in him a thirst for pleasure, a desire for riches, even at the cost of justice. There will be enkindled in him every ambition and a feverish and frenzied desire to gratify them even in defiance of law, and he will be swayed by a contempt for right and for public authority as well as by the licentiousness of life, which, when the conditions become general, will mark the real decay of society."

### OUR ATTITUDE TOWARDS NON-CATHOLICS.

On our desk is a letter from an esteemed correspondent who deprecates what he terms our unseemly outbreaks against non-Catholics. We are at all times ready to accept honest criticism, and, if possible, to profit by it. But we think that our correspondent's application of "unseemly" to our remarks is unwarranted. He may be keener-sighted enough to detect it on our columns, but we, with every desire to admit the justice of the criticism, fail to see any evidences of unseemliness. We do not indulge in outbreaks against non-Catholics. We have too much respect for our readers and those without the fold to waste time in fanning the embers of religious bigotry. We are mindful of the rules, we think, of good breeding in this respect; and had our correspondent but glanced over the files of the RECORD, he would have seen that we have always set our face against tactics that savor of scurrility.

But we do rebut charges against the Church. When a divine, as it happens, betimes in Ontario, hold us up to ridicule, we print a column or so just as an antidote. When a bigot in charge of a weekly ridicules the dogmas which we revere, we never allow him to pass unchallenged. In doing this we permit ourselves—and without the slightest scruple—the use of strong

language, because the man who goes out of his way to insult a creed which is regarded by thousands of Canadians as their richest treasure puts himself beyond the pale of polite usage. We have no respect for such human buzzards, and we say so. Yes, we know all about peace and good will. But the only way to have peace, and to prevent our fellow-citizens from obtaining erroneous ideas of what we believe, is to war against the purveyors and revampers of antique falsehoods and fictions. This we do and we make no apology. We intend to do it so long as we are in the business. We should like to please our friends by appearing always in the garments of peace, but the best we can do is to bid them hope to see in another sphere than this a newspaper which may disarm the hostility of the most fastidious critic. It is well to remember that not every man who submits tamely to insult should be credited with patience. Very often it is because he is too indolent or unwilling to endanger his social or political interests—because he is a craven with never a thought of his responsibility as a soldier of Christ—because he is a spineless thing always deprecating the very mention of warfare and talking out of the fullness of his cowardice.

We have had him with us for years, but we like to think that he will be supplanted by individuals who will not think that the whole business of Catholics in this country is to pull wires, to play for politicians and to be devoid of courage and self-sacrifice. We have had enough of this kind of patience. We have served, and gone back and forth, and kept quiet and followed the beck of politicians who had their own little axes to grind, and wherein have we been the gainers. Must we continue to mumble the same old platitudes, solacing ourselves while that all things will come right in the end. Or is it a duty of anyone who has any pretensions to a chivalric spirit to see that things come right just now, and to allow no insult to pass unresented?

We are pleased, however, to learn that bigotry is on the wane. We hope, though we are not sanguine about it, that it will be soon a thing of the past. Still, it is consoling to imagine that some day divines will give us fair play and editors will not see in every caprice of an overheated imagination another argument against the Church. Still, for the time being let us be vigilant and loyal, aggressive when necessary and careful always to exhibit our faith in our daily lives.

### THE NON-CATHOLIC MISSION MOVEMENT.

Special to the CATHOLIC RECORD.

The latest convert to the Church from the ranks of Episcopalianism is Mr. John Stuart. He was formerly a minister and had been associated with missionary work in the Episcopal Church. He is a man of about thirty-five years of age and is unmarried. Somewhat over a month ago Mr. Stephen W. Wilson, formerly rector of Grace Episcopal Church in Cleveland, resigned his rectorship, and after a due course of instruction was admitted to a profession of his faith by Rev. Richard O'Sullivan of St. Thomas Aquinas church. Mr. Wilson had been of the party who believed in the validity of Anglican Orders, but when the Holy Father issued his letter in which the historical controversy was reviewed, and declared that it was impossible to recognize the validity of orders received in the Anglican ordination, he turned his face to the old motto, possessing the Apostolic succession. "I believed at one time," said Mr. Wilson in an interview on his conversion, "that the Episcopal Church and the Roman Catholic Church were branches of the Holy Catholic Church. The Bull of the Pope on Anglican Orders turned me from that belief and started me in the direction of the true Church, and during the past few years I have studied the matter with the greatest earnestness, and this change that I have now made is the result of the maturest deliberation." Mr. Wilson leaves his former flock without any ill feeling on either side. He acknowledges their constant kindness to him, and they recognize the sincerity of conviction which has led him to take the decisive step.

These are but a few more of the more prominent converts who are coming as the fruits of the new ritualistic movement. Among the laity there are hundreds in whom the love of the fundamental truths have been strengthened by ritualistic practices and who could not be satisfied with the husks of empty form and ceremony that they were getting. At the mission given in the Cathedral in Chicago by Father Conway there are now one hundred and fifty-six in the class of Inquiry preparing for reception into the Church.

At the opening of the new Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Ignatius in New York the sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Geo. Christian, a gentleman of character, dignity and position among his people. He said in part: "We are

here to emphasize the fact that this Church is a part of the Catholic Church and not a part of the Protestant sect. This is the Church of the worshippers in the Catacombs and through the mists of ages up to today."

How such a Church repudiating Protestantism can affiliate with the sect whose official title is the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is a mystery; and, on the other hand, how such a Church can be identical with the Church of the Catacombs and yet reject the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors is equally mysterious. No wonder the strong common sense of the best of the Ritualists is asserting itself, and one by one in ever increasing numbers they are coming back to the one fold of the Great Shepherd.

### A CLERGYMAN'S MISTAKE.

"Critic" in New York Freeman's Journal. I have just read an article, contributed by the Rev. David Tice to the Christian Advocate (Sept. 11, 1902), entitled, "An Archbishop's Mistake." As the article deals with the position of the Catholic Church in respect of the reading of the Scriptures, some account of it may prove of interest to our readers. The initial paragraph is as follows:

"Archbishop Ryan's article in The Baltimore Tablet in May contains what must be regarded as an astonishing statement, contrary to the well-known history of the Roman Catholic Church. These are his words as published: 'The Church does not hide the Scriptures from the people. She does not and never did forbid the people to read the Word of God. On the contrary, she recommends her children to read the Scriptures.'"

The Rev. David Tice considers this statement "astounding." Truth, however, is indeed often stranger than fiction. The fiction industriously propagated by a certain class of our separated brethren is that Catholics are forbidden to read the Scriptures; the truth is, that they are encouraged to do so. Mr. Tice nevertheless is determined, as he says, to "furnish the proof at once from his (the Archbishop's) own Church" that Catholics are forbidden to read the Scriptures. The proof consists of quotations from the Council of Toulouise (1229), the Council of Trent, Cardinal Bellarmine, Gregory XVI., Pius IX., and of references to the Council of Constance (1415) and the University of Copenhagen (1418).

The statement of the Archbishop is threefold:

1. The Church does not hide the Scriptures from the people.
2. She does not and never did forbid the people to read the Word of God.
3. On the contrary, she recommends her children to read the Scriptures.

If No. 3 can be satisfactorily proved, it will follow that "The Church does not hide the Scriptures from the people" (No. 1), and that "She does not . . . forbid her children to read the Scriptures" (part of No. 2). The assertion that the Church "never did forbid the people to read the Word of God" will then be answered.

First, then, let us see if it be true that "the Church recommends her children to read the Scriptures." Mr. Tice must be aware of the fact that the Catholic laity have a number of translations of the Bible into English, such as the Douay version, the same version revised by Dr. Challoner, the excellent translation of Bishop Kenrick and that Catholic laymen who, therefore, presumably read these translations. He, perhaps, is aware that the Bible is also translated for the use of Catholic laymen into the other tongues of civilization; and that translations into Middle English and German were made before those of Wyclif and Luther. If Catholics are forbidden to read the Scriptures, it surely must seem strange to Mr. Mr. Tice that the prohibition has met and is meeting so much opposition from authorized Catholic publishers and even from an Archbishop of the Church.

Should he not, in simple prudence, ask himself whether his view of the prohibition is evading the law and acting contrary to the spirit of the Church? One little fact should dispel such a notion. When Archbishop Martini, of Florence, had translated the Bible into Italian, Pope Pius VI. wrote to him in the following laudatory terms:

"At a time when a vast number of bad books, which most grossly attack the Catholic religion, are circulated among the unlearned, to the great detriment of souls, you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures. For these are the most abundant sources which ought to be left open to every one, to draw from their purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are so widely disseminated in these corrupt times. This you have seasonably effected, as you declare, by the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity; especially when you show and set forth that you have added explanatory notes, which, being extracted from the Holy Fathers, preclude every possible danger of abuse. Thus you have not swerved either from the laws of the Congregation of the Index, or from the Constitution published on this subject by Benedict XIV., the immortal Pope, our predecessor in the Pontificate, and formerly when we held a place near his person, our excellent master in ecclesiastical learning; circumstances which we mention as honorable to us. We therefore applaud your eminent learning, joined with your extraordinary piety, and we return to you our due acknowledgment for the

books you have transmitted to us, and which, when convenient, we will read over. In the meantime, as a token of our Pontifical benevolence, receive our Apostolical benediction, which to you, beloved son, we very affectionately impart. Given at Rome, on the Calends of April, 1778, the fourth year of our Pontificate."

Can anything be conceived as warmer approbation than this? Could any more thorough reply be made to the fiction that Catholics are forbidden to read the Scriptures? The commendation is not laudatory and perfunctory, but warm and energetic; and the Pope declares that the translator has judged "exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures." He further declares that in translating the Bible into Italian, the learned Archbishop Martini had not "swerved either from the laws of the Congregation of the Index, or from the Constitution published on this subject by Benedict XIV."

And now there remains but the question: "Did the Church ever forbid the people to read the word of God?" The question might be answered in the same way as an American would answer this question: "Did the United States ever forbid its people the right of trial by jury?" In both cases the reply might very well be "No." And yet, in some particular instances, the United States did and does forbid the use of the prerogative of trial by jury, namely, where martial law has been proclaimed in some particular locality. In the same way the Church did forbid the people to read the Scriptures in 1229, and in the vulgar tongue. Why? Because the frightful excesses of the Abbigensian heresy were filling France with a menace to all existing institutions of Church and State—excesses based on wanton and inept interpretations of the texts of Scripture. Mr. Tice quotes the prohibition of this Council, but does not seem to perceive that it proves a thesis the very opposite to his. For, in effect, the prohibition is the first known to Church history. People were allowed universally to read the Scriptures in any tongue they pleased, just as a citizen of the United States may assert at any time his right to trial by jury.

In a particular locality of France, the right universally used was found shameful and abusive, and was suspended for fully abused, and was suspended for that jurisdiction and for that time. But would martial law in the coal regions of Pennsylvania be correctly interpreted as a denial, by the United States, of the constitutional right of trial by jury? Mr. Tice quotes a long letter by Gregory XVI. assailing the work of the Bible societies, and containing extracts from similar pronouncements of Pius VII. and Pius VIII. But surely this is the reverse of the issue. The history of translations of the Bible by our separated brethren shows that the sacred text has not, in many instances, been correctly rendered; party spirit, the desire to elevate into great prominence certain erroneous interpretations, etc., have combined to produce travesties of the venerable text of the Scriptures. Against any unauthorized version of Catholic law surely a right to protest; and I presume that Mr. Tice would not be diligent in encouraging his flock to read the Douay version of the Bible, and might be heard from in protest against the reading of that Catholic version in the public schools. Would such action of his be fairly described as a prohibition of the Bible to his flock, or to their children?

The position of the Church on the whole question might be summarized as follows:

- I. Catholics are encouraged to read the sacred Scriptures.
- II. In some authorized version.
- III. With due reverence for the inspired text, with humility, with a desire to profit spiritually.

To return to the Bible societies, it would be surprising, indeed, if the Church did not protest against the industry of men whose avowed object was to pervert the faith of simple Catholics by translations which omitted some of the Sacred Books, and corrupted the text of the others. Luther added the word "alone" to the text of St. Paul (Rom., iii., 28): "We account a man to be justified by faith," making it read, "We account a man to be justified by faith alone."

Was this reverent? Was it not tricky? "Tudalizing" (smearing), "consecrate" by "charm," "priest" by "senior," "church" by "congregation," "sacraments" by "ceremonies," "ceremonies" by "witchcraft," and all this because he so hated "popery."

Beza was a master at corrupting the text; in changing punctuation, and thus trying to alter the meaning; in substituting a wrong word for the one in the Sacred Text, and so on; he frankly confesses his purpose of dealing in a spirit of sectarian apologetics. The story of the obloquy heaped by the Reformers on one another's versions is as interesting as it is instructive. A Catholic may well be pardoned if, without taking trouble to scrutinize the infinite possibilities of error offered by the many Protestant versions of the Bible, he prefers to follow them general to his children. And the Church may very well adopt a similar attitude toward her children.

It remains now to say that the references given by Mr. Tice to his "authorities" are so poorly set forth, that it is well impossible to hunt up his sources. His quotation from the "Council of Trent" he doubtless meant to ascribe to a very different thing—the "Congregation of the Index." He is similarly unfortunate in his attempts to help his readers to look up the author-

ities referred to. Thus, "Mosheim's Eccles. Hist., vol. iii., p. 299" is no real reference, since the edition is not given. I have, however, read Mosheim's treatment of the Abbigensian troubles, and I have failed to find anything bearing on Mr. Tice's quotations from the Council of Toulouise, in which connection he refers to Mosheim. In the same connection he refers to Basnage, giving tome, book, chapter, and even page, but not giving the one important thing, namely, its edition. I have also looked for the quotation from Bellarmine, and could not find the original as referred to by Mr. Tice, who minutely gives us volume, chapter, and page, but fails to add the edition. I "saw" Bellarmine ("see Bellarmine" says Mr. Tice); but I couldn't find the quotation, as the only edition I had at hand is the edition of Ferrer, Paris, 1878. I am inclined to doubt that Mr. Tice had any edition, whatsoever, of Bellarmine.

Mr. Tice concludes by asking a question very easy to answer, namely: "To what country or people the Roman Church has given the 'open Bible?'" Even a moderately well-read man should unhesitatingly answer, "To every country and people." Mr. Tice joins to this another question: "Did the people of Mexico, or Cuba, or the Philippines receive the Bible from what source?" The answer to such a bewilderingly foolish question is: "Why, of course, and didn't you know that already?"

### A KENTUCKY LETTER.

The Missionary.

The following is a copy of the letter:

What started me to reading The Missionary was listening to Priest Drury talk about his religion. Till I heard him I thought one religion was about as good as another, unless perhaps I thought most any sort was a little better than the Catholic. I knew there was some big difference between the Catholic Church and all the others, but I had no idea what it was. "Well, sir," the way priest Drury treated the Catholic Church back to the beginning, and made it look so plausible that his Church taught all that was good and condemned all that was bad, was a revelation to me, and I said to myself, says I, "Cy, none of the other churches can set up such a claim as that." Then when the fellows piled the questions into the box, and priest Drury took them out, and answered every one of them fair and square, and showed that the charges against his Church were false and that he had Scripture for his doctrine, I was satisfied that the interesting things to learn about the Catholic Church that I had never heard of would fill several books; so that's why I took to reading your paper.

"It was down at Sargo, on the Henderson Road. Horton's Hall was full. People from all around Sargo were there, and from Birks City and West, and from over in Henri Jones-Brown's district. They wanted to hear priest Drury answer questions. Mose Green was there. He had spent three days searching the Scriptures for hard ones. Mose thought maybe the priest did not know much about the Scriptures. Lots of the folks there that night had never heard a priest talk about his religion before. Mose was one of them. Along about the time the priest was finishing up Mose's Scripture questions, and Mose was beginning to look like he had lost the trail, old Dick Stout handed up a question. He wanted to know why Catholics had so many crosses on their churches.

"Well, sir, the priest took that as a text, and gave a talk that made me see things in a new light. He said the Cross was the banner of Christianity. He talked about an army marching under the flag, and told how a regiment or brigade that would refuse to carry the flag would be called traitors. Then he told how Christians had always marched under the Cross banner, and that the sixteenth century, when Luther and some other fellows refused to carry the Cross and tore it down from the churches, he made it all mighty plain how those sixteenth century fellows were traitors to the principles and the cause that the Cross represents, and how their followers to this day have been misled, and are still bushwhacking about the world without a banner.

"But when he told why the Cross was selected as the banner of Christianity and described how the Saviour suffered and died on the Cross, I'll tell you, Ben, I began to feel like I ought to be trying to get into ranks under that banner. I never felt that way before. I did not know till then how lonesome it is to be without a flag. Ben, the next time Priest Drury comes to the Green River country go to hear him."

CYRUS HAWKINS.

### England's Shame.

"The Irish people are the only people in the world who enjoy neither the possession of the soil on which, nor the government under which, they live. There is no people in the world that does not control one or the other. The Irish own neither their soil nor their government. They have demanded the control of both. We think they have demanded it for seven centuries. They are demanding it now more vigorously, more vehemently and more successfully than ever before. The English Government are determined that they shall control neither their land nor their government. That is the issue. On the one hand the demand of the Irish people that they shall control both their government and their soil and on the other hand the determination of the English Government that they shall control neither."—Bourk Cockran.