

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXI

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 12, 1899.

NO. 1,086.

## The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, August 12, 1899.

### THE JESUITS.

We are waiting to hear the names of the "creatures of the Jesuits" who have been appointed to the Catholic University in place of the "true men of science." Perhaps the editor has seen the error of his ways and is elaborating an apology for his unmanly and calumniating remarks.

Perrin tells us that he scrutinized the Jesuits of Hindostan with malignant temper, but that their virtue annihilated his prejudices, a knowledge of them convinced him they were men of prayer and of heroic self-abnegation.

Robert Louis Stevenson regretted that the Fathers who ministered to the converted savages were supplanted by land thieves.

Senator West, speaking recently on the Indian question, before the United States Senate, said the only gleam of light radiated from the Jesuit schools. "I do not speak," he said, "with any denominational prejudice in favor of the Jesuits. I was taught to abhor the whole society. I was raised in that good old Church which looked upon the Jesuit as very much akin to the devil; but I say that out of eleven tribes I saw—and I say this as a Protestant—where they had Protestant missionaries they had not made a solitary advance in civilization—not one: and yet where there are Jesuit missions, you find farms, civilization; the relations of husband and wife, parent and child scrupulously observed. One ounce of experience is worth a ton of theory—and this I saw and know."

Our brother editor has so far nothing but theory, based on the vagaries of an overheated imagination or a disordered liver. Some day, however, he may see that accuracy is the badge of scholarship, and truth an indispensable virtue for a Christian, and write sanely on things Catholic.

### THE WAR.

The American soldiers in Luzon are making for themselves a record of which barbarians might well feel ashamed. Women and children are butchered, and churches are desecrated and made the camping grounds for bands of conscienceless blackguards.

And this is war for Humanity! Even Kitchener's campaign in the Soudan pales into insignificance when contrasted with the deeds of the soldiers in the far East. To harry and to kill and to burn and to place blasphemous and obscene hands upon things enshrined in the faith and veneration of millions of their countrymen, are very dubious signs of an enlightened civilization.

The Americans who are not deluded by the claptrap of brainless editors will endorse every word of Mr. Benham's speech at Chicago: "I never had greater respect for mankind, or more confidence in humanity, than I have to day, for I see the Philippines maintaining against awful odds their struggle for liberty." He tells how the President deserted the policy of Henry Jefferson and Lincoln and declares that, under pressure of the cabal, he surrendered "the honor of the nation to the contractor and laid his executive power in the balance in favor of rapine and slaughter. Our conduct in this war has proved true every statement made by the Spaniards in regard to our real designs in the war for Cuba. We have out-heroded Herod: we have destroyed more lives in the Philippines in a few months than did the Castilian despots in their long and detestable tyranny."

### CATHOLIC MEXICO.

Mr. F. R. Guernsey, Mexico correspondent of the Boston Herald, has just published much-needed information for the benefit of our separated brethren. He is unostentatious in his eulogy of the priests who minister to the spiritual wants of the Mexicans. He cannot understand why men of culture should busy themselves with the poor and degraded and deny themselves the comforts of life:

"Sincere? Of course they are. Nobody plays that part in life for show, or in the hope of winning the applause

of men. When I see them walking in the rain, wearing coarse garments, their faces alight with the sunshine of an invisible heaven, I am sure that most of us are pretty poor specimens, and do not merit heaven in its remotest environs."

"I have no reason," he says, "to defend the Catholics, not being of their communion, and rarely entering their churches, but so many good and noble women have I seen among them in this country; so sweet are the Catholic women, so charming the homes of the Catholic people of Mexico, that when any one attacks them, I am ready to tell the truth about them. It is a cheap and silly weapon, this of slander; it is never employed by man or woman with the love of God in their hearts."

### PROGRESS OF THE CHURCH IN THE EAST.

A letter to the New York Freeman's Journal from its able and always interesting Roman correspondent, *Vox Urbis*, gives the interesting intelligence that the mission undertaken three months ago by the two Dominican Fathers Rhetore and De France among the Nestorians of Asia Minor, has had wonderful success. Fifty thousand Nestorians have declared their adherence to the Catholic Church; and, in addition, thirty thousand Armenians of the Gregorian Church have also recently embraced Catholicism. This intelligence has been communicated officially to the Holy Father by Mgr. Altmayr. This return of eighty thousand Schismatics to the one fold will be a great consolation to the Pope, who has devoted so much of his energy toward reconciling the Oriental Schismatics to the faith, and it holds out the hope that this great fact may soon be followed by still more extensive triumphs of the Catholic Church in the East.

### A DISCUSSION ON LITURGIES AND RITUALISM.

A flutter of excitement appears to have been created in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada by an overture presented by Rev. A. McKay of Lucknow, who protested against the introduction of anything approaching a liturgy into the Presbyterian Church. The two presiding officers who at the time occupied the chair ruled the overture and Mr. McKay's remarks out of order, on the plea that they were discourteous to a sister Church, by which expression the Church of England, which uses a liturgy, is designated.

In reference to this Presbyterian Review remarks that it has no great admiration for a book entitled "Aids to Worship," which was submitted to the General Assembly for the guidance of laymen in conducting occasional services. This book offers a certain ceremonial or ritualistic form which may be conveniently used by laymen when their clergyman is absent, but is objectionable to many Presbyterians because they are opposed to anything which in the remotest degree resembles Catholic usage. Thus the Review says:

"During the present year the Irish Presbyterian Church, the English Presbyterian Church and several other Churches outside the Presbyterian family, have not only tolerated speeches, but passed strong resolutions condemnatory of the Roman Ritualism rampant in the Church of England. And these bodies that there was aught of discourtesy in so doing. But, all the same, we cannot but think the (Canadian) Assembly was right in rejecting both the overtures and the speech."

The Review further informs us that Rev. Mr. McKay's speech and overture were sent to it for publication, but it declines giving them space "not because we do not respect Mr. McKay's position or motives—we sympathize with both—but because his argument is altogether wide of the mark, and does not really deal with the subject in hand at all."

The Canadian Presbyterian body has but recently attained to this respect and reverence to its sister Church of England. Surely when the famous Jane Geddes threw her stool at the head of the Dean of Edinburgh for reading the Anglican service in the Cathedral of that city, and thus inaugurated in Scotland the war against Prelacy, Anglicanism was not regarded as a "sister Church."

The redoubtable virago and her supporters regarded the Anglican service as no less idolatrous than the Mass, and objected strenuously that any

one should "dare to say Mass at their very lugs," but it appears that the Canadian Presbyterians have greatly modified the views of their anti-prelatic sires; and who knows but they may modify them still more after the lapse of a few years, to the extent that the real Mass may no longer be objectionable to them? It is clear that with the changes which are working themselves out, no one can tell what will be the Presbyterian faith in regard to the most important Christian doctrines and practices a century hence; and it would be satisfactory to know that the greatest changes which are taking place are towards a return to the faith of their forefathers, which they have so pertinaciously rejected and vilified for three and a half centuries; though we know that there is also a considerable section of that Church with which the tendency is in an opposite direction, namely, toward total unbelief. There is no doubt that the general tendency of the fundamental Protestant principle is toward unbelief; but there are some minds to which this tendency is an abomination, and thus there is likewise a reaction whereby many are led in the direction of more faith, and we may express the hope that in the contest between the two parties, that of faith may prevail.

The Review agrees with the Rev. Mr. McKay in maintaining the principle that "the Scriptures are the only final authority for the regulation of worship . . . and the Church is not free to prescribe or sanction anything not forbidden in Scripture, but may adopt only what is directly or indirectly commanded therein."

This principle has no ground to stand on, as it is not based either on Holy Scripture or tradition.

There is indeed good reason to regard the books of Moses as containing the whole ritual of the Old Law, for God Himself describes therein in detail the ceremonies which are to be used in public worship, the vestments to be worn by the priests, and even the accessory instruments which must be used in order that those ceremonies may be carried out with decorum.

In the New Testament there are very few details of any liturgical ceremonies left us by Christ Himself. Yet man's essential character is unchanged. He is just as susceptible to good impressions through the senses by means of symbols, as he was three thousand four hundred years ago.

Christ did not Himself establish any elaborate liturgy, but He left on earth a Church to which He gave all power both to arrange the order of worship and to teach mankind, just as He received all power from His Heavenly Father to the same end; for He says: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth," and, "as the Father hath sent Me, so do I send you."

The Review says: "The New Testament certainly affords no encouragement to ritualism or symbolical worship, save in the use of the two universal recognized sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper. On the contrary, it treats the abundant symbolism of the Old Testament as a thing obsolete and effete. But it would not be difficult to construct on the basis of the Lord's Prayer a passable argument for the propriety of a liturgy."

We freely admit that the Jewish liturgy has passed away. According to St. Paul it was a figure of the mysteries of the New Law, and it would not be suitable to the fulfillment of the work of Redemption. But Christ used symbolism to a much greater extent than the Review would have us believe. It admits that there was a certain simple symbolical ritual in the institution of the sacraments, and in the command for the use of the Lord's Prayer, and it even says, in continuation of the above extract:

"It is now certain since the discovery of the 'Teaching of the Apostles' that this prayer, at least, was used liturgically from the beginning of the second century, and probably from the middle of the first, though free prayer was allowed and encouraged as well."

What was it but symbolical ceremonial when Jesus stretched forth His hand to touch the lepers whom He healed from their disease? When He made clay of His spittle, and used it to anoint the eyes of the man born blind for the purpose of giving him sight? The Apostles of Jesus also constantly used certain ceremonies, some of which were undoubtedly learned from our Blessed Lord, and others of their own appointment, to preserve proper respect in the divine service and the administration of the sacraments, and St. Paul meant, that these should be observed when he wrote to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv. 40), "But let all

things be done decently and according to order."

The Review admits that Christ used a moderate amount of ceremonial in instituting the sacraments, and it cannot be denied that the Apostles used certain ceremonies also, some of which were of divine institution received from our Lord, and others were instituted by themselves for the respectful administration of the divine mysteries, such as the imposition of hands in invoking the Holy Ghost to come upon those who had previously been baptized, and in ordaining priests, the order for which is called in the Greek original "the imposition of hands." It is, therefore, within the province of the Church of God to institute such a ritual or ceremonial as she deems advisable to ensure respect for the sacraments and the divine worship, and those who cry out against "Roman ritualism" disobey the command of Christ to "hear the Church," under penalty of being regarded as "the heathen and the publican."

When Presbyterianism and other sects were established these rites existed, being authoritatively ordered by the Church, as it came down to us from the Apostolic age, and the rebellious spirit of the Reformation had no justification in rejecting them.

### A WARNING.

Under the above title, the Milford (Conn.) Citizen thus defends the Rev. Silliman Blagden from the attacks of an A. P. A. paper of Washington, which recently poured forth a torrent of vituperation on the Reverend S. Blagden because of his able defence of certain Catholic teachings and practices, and especially of the veneration due to relics of the saints:—

### A WARNING.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

There is a certain, comparatively little known, paper, in Washington; a sympathizer with, and champion of, that un-American and despicable band of abusers of the Holy Catholic Church, known as the "A. P. A." and also a sympathizer with Ingersoll, in that it recently advocated his election as President of Yale University—which has a sure sign that he is doing "the good work" of the Rev. Silliman Blagden, the advocate of Christian Unity. Because, forsooth, he champions the cause of sound and orthodox religion, and rallies to the defence of the Catholic Church, when blasphemy is uttered by the emissaries of the devil.

That the Rev. Blagden arouses the venomous slanders and libel of these wicked men is a sure sign that he is doing "the good work," and pleasing our Heavenly Father; for who ever pleases God, must necessarily displease the devil, and his clients, children, and followers.

Therefore the Rev. Blagden can rest assured, that the prophecy of Holy Writ, respecting his reward in the world to come, for patiently bearing persecution, will surely be fulfilled in his case, provided he remains faithful unto the end. But the Rev. Blagden having once been a lawyer, thinks that our outrageous abuse of one's name should always be blithely and lightly rebuffed, just as parents punish children, when they justly deserve correction, for the good of the children; therefore we are authorized to state that he hereby gives this above mentioned paper, due warning to retract, apologize, and make restitution, for the uncalculated and libelous wrong done him; and to stop at once, all discourteous and disrespectful use of his name; or he, the Rev. Blagden, will take the proper legal steps to enforce obedience to this necessary demand, for good behavior. The Rev. Blagden has not only the high esteem and respect of the Catholic clergy, but he has also the commendation and blessing of some of our prelates; as witness the following autograph letter from His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, respecting a previous outrageous attack upon the Rev. Blagden:

Cardinal's Residence,  
40 North Charles Street, Baltimore, May 10, 1899.

Rev. Silliman Blagden:  
My Dear Sir:—In reference to the hostile criticism pronounced against you, I do not think you should be much disturbed by those who impugn the soundness of your judgment in discussing the views you have expressed. It is much easier to assail a writer than to refute his arguments.

Faithfully yours in Christ,  
J. Card. Gibbons.

And that the Rev. Blagden has the good will of the High Church clergy of the Episcopal Church, note the following from the Brooklyn Standard Union, of May 29:  
AN INTERESTING AND SELF-EXPLANATORY LETTER.

FROM THE REV. PERCY T. FENN, AN EPISCOPALIAN CLERGYMAN, TO THE REV. SILLIMAN BLAGDEN.

Texarkana, Tex.,  
St. James' Rectory, May 16, 1899.

My Dear Rev. Brother:—

Your kind letter has just reached me, and I hasten to acknowledge it. It is so refreshing to hear from you occasionally. I congratulate you for what you have lately done to express your disapproval of the ordination of Dr. Briggs. It is a great pity that some of our ecclesiastical machinery could not have been put in motion to present such a sacrilegious farce.

My friend, Dr. Clendenin, is a brave man, and he is supported by a large body of the clergy; but alas! the evil has been done. What are we coming to when we deliver the Church into the hands of the unenlightened Philistines? New York is full of them. In our Church we have Haber Newton, McConnell, Huntington, and many others. Never mind, the promise standeth fast forever: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

May God bless you abundantly in all your good work for Him and His people. I fear, however, that you are doing more than your strength will permit. Do spare yourself as much as you can. You will be glad to know that the Spirit of God is moving mightily

among us in this part of Texas. I had the honor of presenting a class of fifty-three persons for confirmation a few weeks ago. This was the largest class ever confirmed in this diocese. It was an inspiring sight, and it made me feel like singing a perpetual doxology.

Dallas.

Alexander Charles Garrett, D. D., L. L. D., Bishop.

The Bishop visited St. James' Church, Texarkana, on Low Sunday, and confirmed a class of fifty-three persons, prepared and presented by the rector, Percy T. Fenn, D. D., Ph. D. On Easter Day the rector received from his parishioners an offering of \$125, in recognition of the esteem in which they hold him.

Do let me hear from you from time to time, and if ever you come in this direction, be sure to pay me a visit. We always keep a spare room for the visiting clergy, and we will give you a princely welcome if you should design to honor us.

Praying the good Lord to bless you with all the blessings of His grace, and with much love, and all good wishes, believe me to be

Ever yours most sincerely,  
Percy T. Fenn.

Rev. Silliman Blagden.

### THE DEAD AGNOSTIC

It is a Question Whether Ingersoll Had a Clear Idea of What He Believed.

For some years before his death Robert G. Ingersoll had been falling away from public attention. He was growing old, and took a less conspicuous part in politics and other public affairs. This is a busy world, society lives fast and requires variety and novelty in its stimulants. The idol of today is apt to be relegated to the lumber garret to-morrow. It requires a great man to attract general public attention by his ability, a greater, in good or evil, to hold it long and a still greater to hold it permanently and pass his name down to posterity as a landmark in the rapid current of time.

After his lecture on Moses, and one or two others, the public became familiar with Ingersoll's whole range of thought on philosophy and theology. It was a narrow range, and his subsequent lectures and magazine articles were a repetition of Moses, ghosts, etc. Passing events gave occasion for variety in the way of digression, but on the whole Ingersoll's lectures for the last few years were a repetition of the first two or three that brought him to public notice. Had it not been for his great oratorical powers, his wit that amused and his gift of story-telling—so dear to an American audience—he would years ago have suffered the fate of forgotten actors, poets and novelists.

He was not an original thinker, nor a profound thinker on the thoughts of others. There are artists in Rome and other art centers of Europe who confine themselves to making copies of the masterpieces of great painters. By reason of their vividness and freshness these copies are preferred by superficial picture-buyers by age and dust somewhat dimmed by the original. To the great masters, the orator of agnosticism was to the infidel and atheistic writers of the eighteenth century. Their writings were his storehouse of argument and misinformation. His wit and rhetoric clothed their arguments in more modern dress and made them more attractive to the superficial by their freshness and piquancy. But the new paint added no element of strength to the originals.

It is a question whether Ingersoll ever had a clear idea of what he believed. His lectures and writings are almost exclusively devoted to telling what he did not believe. Instead of seeking something positive and permanent to hold to, he was forever fretting to find defects in what others held as positive and permanent.

His trend of mind was to destroy rather than to construct. To destroy one needs not to know the nature or constituents of the thing one destroys. The child with a match can destroy a palace, but cannot build a hut where the palace stood. A man can destroy a watch without knowing its intricate machinery, but without such knowledge he cannot construct it. Because of this mental trend, it is a question whether Ingersoll comprehended any system of philosophy as a whole, even that of agnosticism—if it can be called that—a system—which he professed. His mental eye saw systems of philosophy and systems of religion as one sees objects in a broken or distorted state. He lacked that faculty by which systems and things are seen in their totality and in their due and proper relation to the universal whole.

Owing to this inability to grasp philosophical systems in their totality and as a whole, Ingersoll had no philosophical system. He took a principle from one system and another principle from another system, and failed to see that these two principles are contradictory of each other. Many instances of this indiscriminate selection of principles are to be found in his lectures. If there is anything he insisted on and reiterated more than another it is liberty, freedom of thought, freedom of will. No one has spoken more eloquently on this subject than he. But he did not see that another principle of his destroyed utterly liberty, freedom of thought and of will. We quote from his lecture on "The Gods" this doctrine of his that makes liberty of

thought or action an impossibility: "In the phenomena of mind we find the same endless chain of efficient causes, the same mechanical necessity. Every thought must have had an efficient cause. Every motive, every desire, every fear, hope and dream must have been necessarily produced. The facts and forces governing thought are as absolute as those governing the motions of the planets. A poem is produced by the forces of nature, and is as necessarily and naturally produced as mountains and seas. Every mental operation is the necessary result of certain facts and conditions."

This doctrine, uttered so dogmatically, is of course the death of all liberty. And yet he who proclaimed it believed himself to be a champion of liberty of thought and condemned Christianity as an enemy of free thought. "Christianity," he said, "certainly has not been the advocate of free thought; and what is free thought, and what is freedom worth if the mind be enslaved?" This is an instance where Ingersoll took a doctrine from a system of philosophy that advocates free thought and then took a contrary doctrine from another system that denies the possibility of free thought or freedom of any kind. How the same mind could hold these two essentially antagonistic doctrines at the same time as true is a very interesting psychological question.

Such inconsistencies are enough to show why Ingersoll, in the role of a philosophical teacher, was ceasing to be a man of interest to the general public. He was equally inconsistent in his opposition to Christianity. He did not understand it as a whole. He may be that he was not conscious of his many inconsistencies, just as a man who is color blind is not conscious of the fact and persists in calling a red object blue, because, by reason of his defective vision, he cannot see it otherwise. There is such a thing as intellectual color blindness. His antipathy to Christianity did not arise from his intellectual perceptions, but from his imagination, emotions and sentiment. These had been wounded to an insufferable degree by a false presentation of Christianity in his early youth. Puritan extremism that gave a false philosophy of life and a false idea of the beneficent Creator, gave his young imagination and emotional nature a shock that it never recovered from, a shock that left no alternative but despair or revolt, and he chose the latter. The Christianity he hated was not true Christianity as it is, but the Christianity that had been burned and scalded into his consciousness and memory. His feverish animosity to the Christianity of his imagination—the only Christianity he knew—was the result of pain from the wound that had cicatrized his very soul. This animosity grew with his growth and increased until it became the monomania of his life. This monomania accounts for much that he has said that will not stand the cold test of calm reason and common sense. Instead of being a curb his intellect became the slave of his emotions and his imagination, which accounts for its fitfulness and inconsistencies and for its perverted vision of truth and facts.

What of his responsibility for the evil he has done? God alone knows, for He alone knows whether the early shock to his faculties left him that liberty of soul which is essential to accountability. He alone knows how far he was free, and therefore how far he was responsible, and will judge him with infinite justice. It is because no man has or can have all the data to the problem of another man's life, and because no man can put himself in another man's place, that God has said "I judge not." He has reserved judgment to Himself, because His knowledge is infinite and therefore adequate. God alone knows whether Ingersoll's intellectual color blindness was great enough to free him from responsibility.

—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

### ART IN THE HOUSE OF GOD.

Ave Maria.

Mr. F. Hopkinson Smith, who has been visiting the old cathedrals of Holland, built during the Middle Ages; and he is not exhilarated, over post-Reformation developments. He laments because the uplift of a cross is gone, because the haze of swinging censers no longer blurs the vistas, nor the soft light of many tapers illumines their gloom. "There remain only staring white walls, rigid, naked columns, and hard, stiff backed benches, typical of sectarianism. We quote from his article in Scribner's:

I have always believed that duty and beauty should go hand in hand in our churches. To me there is nothing too rich in tone, too luxurious in color, too exquisite in line, for the house of God. Nothing that the brush of the painter can make glorious, the chisel or the sculptor's beauty, or the square of the architect's ennobled, can be out of place in the one building that we dedicate to the Creator of all beauty. I have always thanked God for His goodness in giving as much thought to the flowers that cover the hillsides as He did to the dull earth that lies beneath; as much care to the matchings of purples and gold in the sunset as to the black crags that are outlined against them. With these feelings in my heart, I have never understood that form of worship which contents itself with a bare barn filled with seats of pine, a square box of a pulpit, a lone pitcher of ice water, and a popular edition of the hymns.