

H 28, 1903
Piano
ins
\$50
Smith...\$100
& Sons...\$150
\$165
ents will be sold
and are splendid
SOLICITED
IMERS'S
LONDON
T. THOMAS
WINDSOR.

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1903

1276

The Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APR. 4, 1903.

MODELS OF TRANQUILITY.

Last week we heard a speaker advising us not to be unduly aggressive. The speaker was a stranger. His advice was well meant though uncalled for. He may have imagined as he trotted his auditors that they were spilling for a fight. Just how he saw blood in the eyes of our peaceable citizens we are not going to discuss. Some of the prudent ones who retail stories of how quietly and successfully they did things in the days gone by may have been responsible for his delusion. But if we are aggressive we have not noticed it. The only time we break loose vocally is at family gatherings. On all other occasions we are models of tranquility.

EUCHE PARTIES.

A Canadian contemporary waxes eloquent over the success of euche parties held in its city. Organizations have of course their social side, which should be developed. But it seems to us that it is being over-developed in some quarters. The assembling of men and women for the purpose of card playing is, we admit, nothing censurable, but such things, though they may breed friendships and bring people together, are not important factors in the making of Catholic thought and action. And this is exactly what we need. We need that which will minister to the soul and teach us to depend, in this matter of amusement, more upon ourselves and less upon external things.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

Our readers should see to it that the public libraries have trustworthy sources of information about Catholicity. This is a duty we owe to non-Catholics and to ourselves. While we may have reason to rely upon the spirit of fair-play of the authorities we should guard against being victims of misplaced confidence. A little vigilance now may save much regretting in the future.

A HYPOCRITICAL SPECIMEN.

To be so extravagant, says a writer in the Nineteenth Century and After, as to buy more than can possibly be paid for, is certainly cheating, though not perhaps of the same kind as society blames most. And this is done by many without shame or remorse for the ruin it often causes tradespeople. There are those, for instance, who indulge in every kind of extravagance they cannot afford, and at the same time are willing enough to give money which is not theirs, thereby gaining the credit of being charitable. In a few instances they have been heard preaching to working girls on the desirability of dressing quietly and being respectable. It is doubtful if such incongruity and hypocrisy were practised a hundred years ago.

A CULPABLE FOLLY.

Perhaps this kind of person flourishes in this country. We do not know. But we do know that a great many of us spend money foolishly—cumbering our houses with things we do not need and frittering away our substance on frivolities. And we do it because we want to be in the fashion. We have no reason for so doing. We merely follow the crowd—to be one devoid of self-reliance and independent opinion. We herd together after the manner of the ignorant.

ARTISTIC REPRESENTATIONS.

We decorate our homes for instance with pictures bordering on the indecent. Why? Because our neighbors do it or because we have seen a favorable criticism in a magazine. This will, doubtless, be considered an evidence of bad taste by the individual, who though he may not be able to distinguish a meritorious production from a daub, is, thanks to the advice of semi-pagans, forcefully dogmatic on the question of art.

But he may find out that his ecclesiastical superiors, who set their faces against indecent representations, are right. They are not misled by twaddle of art for art's sake. We have no hesitation in saying that the Catholic who tolerates such in his home, instead of beautifying it with what may remind the inmates of their dignity and destiny, is recreant to his responsibility. The custom of excluding the pictures of Our Lord and His blessed Mother and His saints from our parlors—draw-

ing rooms—is a pagan custom. It is in the houses of the poor that we see them, and though oftentimes but poor chromos, are more beautiful in the eyes of a Christian than soul-debasing representations, however artistic.

TREATMENT OF CRIMINALS.

England is slow, says a contemporary. Still, to use a phrase of our friends, "it can get a gait on" when it comes to dealing with criminals. An individual convicted of murder is punished in short order. Public sentiment is sound in this respect. But the process of tracking the law-breaker in the United States is mysterious and time-consuming.

Every big daily sends out detectives to get evidence and reporters to write stories about it. And they are wondrous stories. The rough edges of the crime are cut off and it becomes in the hands of a sentimental scribe but a picturesque incident. The criminal is dubbed a degenerate or something else and so commended to the sympathy of the public. At the trial experts are pitted against experts and the result is much talk and no justice.

For some time past—just to mention a few instances—we have heard of a Capt. Bronnell of the United States army who took part in the murder of Father Augustine in the Philippines. Other military magnates were also under a cloud for injudicious application of the water cure to the natives in these islands. Our contemporaries used some very strenuous language against these gentlemen and called aloud for their punishment. The authorities, however, were busy when the call was made, and so Capt. Bronnell and the votaries of the water cure are still at large. They were tried for the crimes, but adjudged innocent. The trial was, we imagine, but a sop to the voter—something to keep him quiet until after the presidential election.

We may, therefore, be pardoned for having a suspicion that the blessings which, if we attach credence to editorials and speeches, are the inalienable heritage of the denizens of the United States, are largely imaginary. But at any rate the law as administered across the border is a source of wonder to us who have the real thing though we may not talk about it unduly.

THE ROYAL DECLARATION AND A PAMPHLET.

London, England, Tablet, March 7th, 1903.
Mr. Edwin de Lisle, with the public spirit which never fails him, has just published a pamphlet upon the burning question of the Royal Declaration. If we could accept Mr. de Lisle's premises we should certainly adopt his conclusions. He postulates as his starting point the definition of that "true Protestant reformed religion established by law," which the Sovereign, at the coronation, swears to maintain. We venture to suggest that the King must be presumed to have some idea which religion it is he so solemnly swears to maintain. And if the definition "the true Protestant reformed religion established by law" is sufficiently precise to secure its maintenance by the Crown, surely the same definitum may suffice when it is a question not of outward maintenance but of inward belief. Mr. de Lisle puts his point thus:

"The fundamental position of the Reformed Church of England and of its supreme Governor, the anointed and crowned King of this realm, is to confess the Catholic faith as summed up in the three Creeds, called the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and at the same time to protest against certain doctrines, rites and ceremonies, which in England are called Roman or Popish, but which the vast majority of Christians, whether they dwell in the old world or in the new, agree to call Catholic and Orthodox. It is therefore unreasonable of English Catholics to expect such a change in the wording of the Declaration as would alter its substance, and make it cease to be a protest, or document essentially Protestant, since the members of the Church by law established, and the State which maintains that establishment, have a right to pledge the Sovereign to that profession of faith, by means negative as well as positive which is the basis of his parliamentary title to the throne. But remember that the sole object of the declaration is to secure the Propagand succession and to exclude a Catholic from the throne. We submit that both these objects would be attained by the amendment proposed by Lord Llandaff which the Royal Declaration would run thus:

"I, A. B., by the grace of God, King of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do unfeignedly believe in the doctrines of the Church as by law established in this realm, and I do reject all doctrines opposed to or inconsistent with the tenets of that Church."

That formula could be used by none but a Protestant, and it would exclude

the possibility of a Catholic Sovereign. If then the avowed objects of the Declaration can be attained without the selection of specific Catholic doctrines for public denunciation by the Sovereign at the most solemn moment of his life, why should it be endured?

Mr. de Lisle, ignoring Lord Llandaff's proposal and forgetful of the definition of Protestantism contained in the Coronation Oath, and believing that no description of the religion by law established in this country can be complete without some repudiation of and protest against Catholic doctrines, suggests an amended form of declaration which would run thus:

"I do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and I do reject the invocation of the Holy Spirit, or the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass as they are now used in the Church of Rome. And I do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever."

So help me God. It is the old Declaration robbed of its grossness, because stripped of its abusive epithets. In this connection let us recall the words we used with all deliberation a year ago. What we object to in the Royal Declaration is the offence, and not the grossness of its expression. It is far better that the present declaration should continue in the present to be what Lord Salisbury has called it—"a stain upon the statute-book"—than that the thing should be rivetted upon our necks for all time by the simple process of removing some of its violence and vulgarity. If any one still hangers for a compromise, and is inclined to doubt the wisdom of the policy pursued both by The Tablet and the Catholic peers, we recommend to his notice this very parallel case. When the London monument was erected to commemorate the great fire, for some years it bore no inscription. Then came the perjures of Titus Oates and the spilling of Catholic blood upon the scaffold. The same Protestant panic which placed the King's Declaration on the statute-book led to the invention of the following inscription which in the year 1681 was carved upon the panels on the base of the monument:

"This pillar was set up in perpetual remembrance of that most dreadful burning of this Protestant city, begun and carried on by the treachery and malice of the Popish faction, in the beginning of September, 1696, in order to the carrying on their horrid plot for extirpating the Protestant religion and old English Liberty, and the introducing of Popery and slavery."

On the north side of the monument these additional words were carved: "Sed furor Populorum qui tam dira patravit nonum restringitur." After a time the saner portion of the nation began to recognize that this cruel calumny against the Catholics was something to be ashamed of. Perhaps even at the time when Pope wrote "The Man of Ross," the more educated part of the community was ready to acquiesce in the substantial truth of the lines—

Where London's column pointing at the skies,
Like a tall bully lifts his head and lies.

But if it had been proposed early in the eighteenth century to erase the calumny, can we doubt that the suggestion would have been met with an offer to modify the more offensive phrases? We can imagine an explaining that his task was not to make a new inscription, but only to modify the old one, so that, for instance, in future the passer-by might be told that the city was burned, not "by the treachery and malice of the Popish faction," but "by the activity and energy of the Catholic party." Happily no such miserable modification was attempted, until at last all men knew it for a lie, and Protestantism grew ashamed of it, and in 1831 utterly erased it. We have but patience, the King's declaration, having its origin in the same perjures of Titus Oates, shall sooner or later go the same road.

HOLY WEEK.

A Meditation by Cardinal Newman.
"IT IS CONSUMED."

1. It is over now, O Lord, as with Thy sufferings, so with our humiliations. We have followed Thee from Thy fasting in the wilderness till Thy death on the Cross. For forty days we have professed to do penance. The time has been long and it has been short; but whether long or short, it is now over. It is over, and we feel a pleasure that it is over; it is a relief and a release. We thank Thee that it is over. We thank Thee for the time of sorrow, but we thank Thee more as we look forward to the time of festivity. Pardon our shortcomings in Lent and reward us in Easter.

2. We have, indeed, done very little for Thee, O Lord. We recollect well our listlessness and weariness; our indisposition to mortify ourselves when we had no plea of health to stand in the way; our indisposition to pray and to meditate—our disorder of mind—our discontent, our peevishness. Yet some of us, perhaps, have done something for Thee. Look on us as a whole, O Lord, look on us as a community, and let

what some have done well plead for us all.

3. O Lord, the end is come. We are conscious of our languor and lukewarmness; we do not deserve to rejoice in Easter, yet we cannot help doing so. We feel more of pleasure, we rejoice in Thee more than our past humiliation warrants us in doing; yet may that very joy be its own warrant. O be indulgent to us, for the merits of Thy own all-powerful Passion, and for the merits of Thy saints. Accept us as Thy little flock, in the day of small things, in a fallen country, in an age when faith and love are scarce. Pity us and spare us and give us peace.

O my own Saviour, now in the tomb but soon to arise. Thou hast paid the price; it is done—consummation est—it is secured. O fulfil Thy resurrection in us, and as Thou hast purchased us, claim us, take possession of us, make us Thine.

WHY I AM A CHRISTIAN.

II.
Rev. E. A. Higgins, S. J.

THE WITNESSES.

The lecturer resumed the subject begun the preceding Sunday, namely the evidences of Christianity. The infidelity which we encounter on every side, said the speaker, challenges our faith and forces us, for our own sake as well as for the sake of fair-minded inquirers, to review and understand the reasons of our belief. Why am I a Christian? I answer briefly, for the very same reasons which produced conviction and begot faith in the souls of those who heard the preaching of Jesus, saw His life, witnessed His works, beheld Him put to death on Calvary and rejoiced with the astonished disciples in the triumph of the risen Saviour. I am a Christian for the same reasons as Peter and James and John; for the same reasons as Paul and Stephen; or, I am a Christian for the same reasons that induced the five thousand to embrace the Christian Faith on the day of Pentecost, converted by the preaching of Peter, who was appealed to the death and resurrection of Jesus in their own city. What made them all Christians? What did they believe Christ to be? "The Son of the living God;" "The way, the Truth and the Life;" "The Resurrection and the Life." In other words they became disciples of Christ and of His apostles, because they believed that Christ, the Author and Finisher of the Christian Faith, was God. On what evidence did they believe His divinity? On the evidence of His words and His works, of His Life and Death and Resurrection, of which they were themselves eye witnesses, or which they learnt from trustworthy witnesses.

Now we are Christians for precisely the same reasons. We believe that Christ is the "Son of God," that He is true God as well as true man, that He is literally God Incarnate, and that the Religion He founded must be the one, only true Religion, and that the Church He established must be a divine institution. On what grounds do we believe in the divinity of Christ? We are convinced of it by the character of His words and works, by the facts of His Birth, Life, Teaching, Death and Resurrection. True, we are farther removed from the evidence of Christ's earthly career than were the first Christians, the converts of the apostles. We are farther off in time, but the light of evidence is no weaker for us than it was for them. True, we are not ourselves eye witnesses of the facts, but we have them from the witnesses whom Christ left in the world to give testimony of Him. Who are these witnesses? They are the Church and the Gospels, or, to speak more correctly, there is but one sufficient witness, which is the Church who has in her possession the precious treasure of the Gospels. On that Christ was and all that He did, is the Church. She was instituted to be His witness and bear His name before all nations. He made her the pillar and ground of truth. Christ put into her care the whole deposit of divine revelation, of which she was to be the guardian and interpreter. He made her a living organic body, whose every life and soul was to be the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, dwelling in her to teach her all truth and preserve her from every error.

This Church was complete in every part and fully equipped for her work, and was successfully accomplishing her mission before one word of the New Testament was written. She was therefore in her jurisdiction on the existence of the gospels. On the contrary, the gospels were to derive from her testimony all their authority as the inspired word of God. For this reason St. Augustine exclaimed: "I would not receive the Gospels except on the word of the Church, but from the mouth of written Gospel, but from the mouth of Christ, did the Church receive her mission, her power, her jurisdiction, her sacraments. When the gospels were written they were no novelties to the Church. All that they contained was already in her intellect and in her heart. Those records or memoirs were only the written expression of truth, fully known to her and freely preached by her since the day of Pentecost. She welcomed them and cherished them as a most precious treasure, and reverence intended to be a powerful aid in spreading the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ in the hearts of men. If, instead, they had been written, the Church would have been the same

divine institution as now, built on a rock, which the gates of hell should assail in vain. In other words, the mission of Christ, the power to teach, to legislate, to administer the sacraments, to bear the tidings of redemption to mankind, was given to the Church and not to a book, and the promise of a divine and permanent assistance in bearing witness to Jesus Christ and making Him known, was given to the Church, not to any collection of writings. How futile then for infidels to quibble about the dates of New Testament records, and to pick flaws in the simple narrative of the evangelists! How can their carping criticism affect the question of Christ's divinity? Why not address themselves directly to the living issue? There is one competent and sufficient witness to the divinity of Christ, to His life, teaching, death and resurrection, to His words and His works. This witness is the Church which He founded to be His witness and to continue His work. She is a living witness, a permanent witness, a competent witness. She is Christ's own handiwork, and she displays His attributes in her own life and career. She fills the world with her presence. No man who pretends to be half educated can ignore her presence and her history. She is not of today or yesterday. She has been the greatest power in the world since before Constantine. The Roman Empire in its proudest days had to take account of her, and after ten bloody persecutions was forced to come to terms with her. Here, then, is the witness that infidelity must dispose of before it can shake our belief in the reality of Christ's divinity. True, she bears in her hands the Gospel records, and she vouches for their truth and accuracy. She herself stands in need of no voucher. She needs no certificate or letters patent to accredit her. Her Gospels give her not one jot or tittle of authority, they only record her institution and her commission. She needs no authority beyond what she received from Christ. Like all sovereign powers in the world—our own government for instance—she accredits herself. Men have but to look at her. See what she is, what she has been and what she has done, to recognize her divine origin. This is the witness that infidelity must deal with; and all its puerile talk about the myths and fables of the Gospel is but the period of history, not of myth, and any one who cannot trace the history of the Church back to Pentecost and the Resurrection, to Calvary and Nazareth and Bethlehem, must be wilfully blind.

This is the position which Catholics assume on the question of competent and reliable testimony to the life and death, the words and works of Jesus. The Gospel records derive their authority from her. They simply confirm what she teaches about the divinity of Christ.

However, to meet the assaults which infidelity make on the Gospel as history, we are willing for argument's sake to regard them merely in the light of history, and examine their accuracy and truthfulness as we would consider the trustworthiness of any other historical document. As the accusations of the Jews against Jesus were not consistent, so the attack of infidels on the Gospels are contradictory and they might be left to refute one another.

The latest school of infidelity professes to see in the Gospel only a myth or fable, useful perhaps to those who can read the enigma. This theory is the most childish and groundless of all the speculations that skepticism has ventured to put forth. Was the age of Augustus and of Tiberius an age of myths? Were Herod and Pilate, Annas and Calphas, mythical personages? Are not the names of the Christian society, the Church, and its rapid spread and its first persecution under Nero, historical facts? Listen to Niebuhr, the German historian, a man of some authority in questions of history: "Whoever does not hold Christ's earthly life with all its miracles, to be strictly historical does not know what history is."

Are the Gospels, then, authentic history? and are they true? What is meant by authentic? Let us define what is meant by authentic. A work is said to be authentic when it belongs to the author whose name it bears. How can the authenticity of any work be proved? Chiefly by the testimony of other writers who are themselves competent and reliable witnesses. Now, I think no sane man can glance at the proofs of the Gospels' authenticity without being perfectly convinced. There is an unbroken chain of evidence, going back to the age of the Apostles, and attributing the four Gospels to the writers whose names they bear. There is a line of writers without interruption who bear witness to the belief and tradition of this age, and prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Gospels were known in the first century and were universally believed to be the work of the four evangelists.

Here the lecturer traced the history of the Gospels back from Eusebius in the fourth century, through Origen, Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Papias, Clement of Rome, and Barnabas, all of whom in their works, or the fragments of their works still extant, mention the Gospels by name or quote from them, giving an aggregate of 1,493 texts from the four Gospels. Add to this the testimony of translators reaching back to the end of the first century and you have a chain of evidence, every link perfect, which even the infidel Renan admits that the four Gospels are authentic and belong

to the first century. Then the lecturer adduced the evidence of their truthfulness and sincerity. The evangelists were competent witnesses, well informed and deeply concerned to know the facts they undertook to relate. As to their sincerity, transparent candor, and the reliability of the Gospels. No historical work that we possess, such as Cassar's Commentaries or the Annals of Tacitus, can offer half the evidence of veracity that the Gospels offer.

If the Gospel history is not accepted as reliable, then there is no trustworthy history in the world. The infidel who says that such a history is a fable or a myth, must be too feeble of intellect to know the difference between fact and fiction. To call the Gospel a myth on the ground that all supernatural religion is impossible, is a shallow assumption worthy of an irrational Atheist.

But the Gospel is something more to Christians than a mere historical record. It contains the inspired Word of God. It enshrines the Wisdom and the Truth of God, for our instruction and guidance in holy living. It was placed in the keeping of the Church, and by her treasured as a priceless blessing, the most precious portion of the sacred deposit of Revelation committed to her care.

In the pages of that record we shall study the character of Saviour and learn from His words and works the reasons why we are Christians. This shall be the subject of the next lecture.

NON-CATHOLIC MISSION IN A METHODIST TOWN.

It would be difficult to find a less promising field for a non-Catholic mission than Evanston, Ill. The city is sacred to Methodism. It was founded by Methodists, and is the seat of the famous Northwestern University, the fourth largest in the country, and the most important school that the followers of John Wesley have founded anywhere. The institution owns one-third of the city, and has given all the Protestant churches the properties upon which they are built. The town is overwhelmingly Protestant in sentiment and influence. Until the last few years the Catholic Church was scarcely known to exist there. That Catholic missionaries should invade such a stronghold professedly to convert Protestants was unquestionably a bold undertaking. A short while ago it could not be attempted at all, and even today it was not without the most anxious misgivings that the pastor announced the mission. His friends told him that it must fail. The non-Catholic population was too well satisfied with itself and did not wish to be disturbed.

A week's mission to Catholics was given. Then the anxious day for opening the non-Catholic series of instructions came. The rule forbidding Catholics who were not accompanied by Protestants was strictly enforced. On the first night of the mission, which seats about seven hundred, was more than half filled. The second night saw almost all the seats occupied. On the third night chairs were in the aisles. On the fourth night standing-room only. The number kept increasing until, on the last night, many returned unable even to look into the church. About one thousand persons, one-half Protestant, heeded the closing lecture. All classes of the business man, the lawyer, and the university professor. There was not at any time the slightest manifestation of ill-feeling. On the contrary, the greatest good-will prevailed. Men of education heard, perhaps for the first time, what may be said in defence of Catholic teaching. So great was the interest aroused that two preachers to prominent churches felt called upon to warn their people against the dangers and seductions of popery.

A large class of assured converts and inquirers was left to the resident clergy, and letters received from different sources indicate that many have been aroused, though for one reason or another they cannot undertake further investigation for the present.

The pastor says that if the missionaries, Fathers McConry and Kennedy, ever return to Evanston his greatest difficulty will be not to get an audience but to procure room.—The Missionary.

LEAGUE OF THE SACRED HEART

General Intention for April, 1903.

For April the general intention is attendance at Mass. This is peculiarly appropriate in the penitential season when all who can possibly do so should try to hear Mass daily. Says the Messenger of the Sacred Heart: "Some careless Catholics fail to hear Mass on Sundays, but although they may offer a variety of reasons for failing to fulfil such a sacred obligation, they never think of questioning the reasonableness of the obligation itself. The Mass is so august, even to their dull, spiritual comprehension, that they must recognize the propriety of requiring every member of the Church to assist at it frequently and on solemnly appointed days like Sundays and holy days of precept."—Catholic Columbian.

TO
CALIFORNIA

Montana, Colorado
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00

Eastern Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00

Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00

Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00

Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00

Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00

Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00

Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00

Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00

Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00
Flyer at 10.00