

Cath. Church - Apologetics

15

BX
1790

1000048

Thy Kingdom Come

By

William Stephens Kress

Priest of the Obio Apostolate

CATHOLIC INFORMATION BUREAU

SANTA CLARA, CAL.

AEP 7530

THY KINGDOM COME

By

WILLIAM STEPHENS KRESS

PRIEST OF THE OHIO APOSTOLATE



CATHOLIC INFORMATION BUREAU
SANTA CLARA, CAL.

TWENTIETH THOUSAND

THE OHIO APOSTOLATE
6914 Woodland Avenue, S. E.
Cleveland, Ohio

Nihil Obstat.

*EDWARD C. KRAMER, D. D.,
Censor.*

Imprimatur,

✠ *J. P. FARRELLY,
Bishop of Cleveland.*

Cleveland, March 26, 1912

Copyright, 1912, by
WILLIAM STEPHENS KRESS

Deacidified

FOREWORD.

The plain, frank talks of this booklet are addressed to lovers of the Lord, Jesus Christ, whose supreme earthly desire it is to be enrolled among the loyal citizens of His Kingdom. This Kingdom is none other than His Church—a spiritual Kingdom, wherein the followers of the Master are to find the security of divine faith and the joy of participation in the divine life. Of the abundant spiritual helps that, by direction of its highest Ruler, are bestowed upon the citizens of the Kingdom, through the sacraments and other means of grace, and by which the reign of the Spirit is inaugurated and advanced within the souls of the faithful, no mention will be made in these pages; since our sole aim is to meet the questioning of the mind and to point out the way that leads to the secure possession of the truth. That this booklet, with the grace of the Holy Spirit, may fulfil its mission and bring many precious souls into the Kingdom, is the one hope and desire of the author.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CHAPTER I.

Why have more than One Church?..... 1

CHAPTER II.

Is it Possible to bring Catholics and Protestants into
One Body? 4

CHAPTER III.

The Untenable Rule of Protestants 9

CHAPTER IV.

Insufficiency of the Bible14

CHAPTER V.

Christ's Church18

CHAPTER VI.

The Authoritative Teacher24

CHAPTER VII.

How can I be Saved?28

CHAPTER VIII.

The School of God32

CHAPTER IX.

Identity of the Catholic Church with the Gospel Church.37

CHAPTER X.

Doctrinal Development41

CHAPTER XI.

The Deposit of Faith44

CHAPTER XII.

Did the Church founded by Christ grow Corrupt?.....47

CHAPTER XIII.

Is Persecution an Article of the Catholic Creed?.....52

CHAPTER XIV.

Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared55

CHAPTER XV.

The Catholic Church and Intellectual Progress59

CHAPTER I.

WHY HAVE MORE THAN ONE CHURCH?

"And He sent them to preach the Kingdom of God."
Luke 9, 2.

The remark is often made that a kindlier feeling has arisen of late years between Catholics and Protestants. All well-disposed people hail the disappearance of bitterness from the domain of religion. Today men are willing, not only to acknowledge the honesty of those who differ with them, but we love to believe that they have come to that farther stage where they are able to discuss, calmly and dispassionately, the reasons that keep them apart. This is a big advance over the olden times, when prejudice was so violent that reason and charity alike were affected by it. It is a good thing to be able to reason clearly; for when you have fully allowed for all that is praiseworthy in particular doctrines, or the good faith of individuals, the ugly fact still remains that we, who ought to be one in belief and organization, are woe-fully divided. Christ prayed for unity: that we be one as He and the heavenly Father are one. All who would be true disciples of the Lord should strive to bring about this unity.

The most religious and thoughtful of men see much to deplore in the multiplicity of sects; for multiplicity of sects means multiplicity of beliefs, and multiplicity of beliefs implies error. Every one, we trust, realizes the truth of this. When, for instance, the Baptist pronounces the invalidity of the baptism that does not include total immersion, and sets up a wall of separation between himself and other Christian bodies, who maintain the validity of pouring and sprinkling, it is error that sets up that wall. If the truth were known to all about the requirements for the validity of baptism, there would be no cause

Passing of
Bitterness—
Manly
Inquiry

Errors
Separate

2 WHY HAVE MORE THAN ONE CHURCH?

for dispute; both sides to the controversy would then believe alike and there would be, at least, one sect less in the world. All the other differences among the hundreds of Christian denominations arise from the same cause: error.

Error a
Revolt
Against the
Kingdom

Unity follows truth as closely as light does the sun. Truth and unity are a wedded couple; the marriage was made in heaven and is indissoluble. Error may be manifold; but truth is and must remain one. Add 5 and 4: the true answer is 9; the incorrect answers may be many, but the true answer must be one. St. Paul speaks of persevering in the unity of faith. God, who is truth, cannot but wish to be worshipped in truth. He cannot be pleased with error; since, if He is truth, error is a denial, in part, of God Himself. Error cannot be made to fit into the divine plan. God cannot, then, be pleased with a multiplicity of sects and cannot be worshipped rightfully through error, which, in the last analysis, means attempting to serve God through the instrumentality of unbelief. Christ's Church is the Kingdom of Truth. Sectarianism is a revolt against the Kingdom, even though the seceders have no intention of setting up a system of their own, contrary to Christ's. We say in the prayer taught us by the Lord Himself: "*Thy Kingdom come!*" It is Christ's will that truth, and not error, shall reign triumphant and that men shall prove their allegiance to Him through absolute loyalty to the truth.

Believe
All Things

It will not do to close one's eyes to the real differences that exist in the beliefs of rival sects. It has been offered in extenuation by sectaries that these differences are not important; that they do not touch essential matters. In answer to this we need only remind the apologists of sectarianism that where the Scriptures do not distinguish between essential and non-essential beliefs, neither should we. Christ demands that we believe all that He has revealed under penalty of damnation. He does not excuse or condone disbelief in what some are pleased

to call non-essentials. Moreover, the differences to be found among the various Christian bodies include what any intelligent person will admit to be very important divergences. What folly it would be to set up rival churches, if the differences were unimportant. It is surely an essential point whether Christ is God, or mere man; whether the Holy Ghost is a divine person, or only a divine operation; whether baptism is necessary to salvation, or is a mere consecration; whether, or not, there is original sin; whether the Eucharist is Christ's body, or only a piece of blessed bread; whether the Bible is the sole fount of revealed truth, or shares this distinction with the Spoken Word of the Apostles; whether Christ is a real savior and redeemer, or only an example and model for man's imitation; etc. If these divergences do not reach to the very core of religion, religion must be without any solid body of truth. These divergences, and many others besides, exist today among those who style themselves followers of Christ.

May they continue thus, without honest and unceasing effort to extinguish the differences and establish the truth? No. It is certainly not in accord with God's will that error flourish side by side with truth, or that it receive the same honor from His followers. One meets with not a few people who, while admitting the wrongfulness of contradictory beliefs, yet never think it necessary on their part to make a real effort to set matters aright. They seem content to drift along, although forced to acknowledge that Protestantism—as a “cluster of rival religions,” to use a phrase of Newman's—is living out a conscious falsehood. Are they not partners in guilt? Are they not deceiving others by their example and lulling their own conscience into a false security?

They think it sufficient excuse that they were started wrong through no fault of their own, affecting to believe that the mistakes of one period need not be corrected by the fuller knowledge of maturer years. But we were

Find
the
Truth

Change to
the Right
Road

started wrong in many other things, and none of us but would agree to call ourselves very stupid had we not corrected our errors as soon as they were noticed. It is humiliating, no doubt, to confess now that what was one's belief for years was false; hard to break with associations, dear as life itself, that lined and lighted the whole long journey; perhaps to have the door of the parental home closed upon one; to be charged with instability and even apostasy by esteemed friends; but what supreme folly it would be to continue on in the wrong direction, when it is question of the road to heaven. We correct mistakes everywhere else, in history, the sciences, in business, in the daily affairs of life. We are ever ready to learn in secular matters; we should be still more eager for spiritual truth; eager to realize the Master's prayer: "*that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent* (John 17, 3).

CHAPTER II.

IS IT POSSIBLE TO BRING CATHOLICS AND PROTESTANTS INTO ONE BODY?

"That you may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God, for which also you suffer." 2 Thess. 1, 5.

Among the many present-day religious leaders, who admit the wrongfulness of sectarianism, there is a movement for federation; a desire to formulate some basis upon which the divergent sects may act as one body. They have agreed beforehand that anything closer than a mere federation is impracticable; that the prospect of eliminating contradictory doctrines is absolutely hopeless. They desire to create a show of unity where unity is not. But to cover belief and unbelief with the same mantle and call it Christianity is a poor substitute for Christ's Kingdom of Truth.

Not Federation
but Unity

Could you picture to yourself a body of scientific workers coming together and agreeing to let truth and error lie side by side, without a real effort on their part to sift the one from the other? They would be unworthy the name of scientists, if they were content to give error the same right as truth, or if they admitted the hopelessness of discovering the true one among conflicting views. The real scientist will make any sacrifice, however great, in the interest of truth; he does not consider it humiliating, but rather ennobling, to give up his erroneous notions; he desires to progress, to advance in knowledge, not to remain stationary, much less to be a reactionary. He is loyal to truth. He puts us to shame if we are less loyal to spiritual truth; if we are content to be reactionaries in religious research.

Science
Intolerant
of Error

If any maintain that it is not desirable to get into one fold, they should be honest enough to lay aside their name of Christian. Christ's religion is one. If they desire to exploit their own views, or propagate a new religious system, let them candidly put them forward as their own, and not present them as Christ's. With the proper counterfeit brand upon them no one will be in danger of being misled.

Label
Counterfeits

Our souls have been created for truth. Why should we not all become priests of truth? A minister once said to us: "If I knew the Catholic Church to be Christ's Church, I would have none of it." Strange language from one who professed himself a minister and follower of Christ! It was an unblushing admission that he would follow the divine teacher only so long as he was not required to give up his own opinions, however false. It is evident from his words that it was not truth that he was seeking. If we knew his communion were Christ's Church, we, for our part, would wish to join it, no matter what our preconceived notions about it. We do not desire our own, but God's will. We trust that minister has no disciples among the readers of this booklet. We are di-

Priests of
Truth

recting our remarks to lovers of truth, to those who are honestly repeating the petition in the Lord's Prayer: "*Thy Kingdom Come.*"

Salvation
through the
True Faith

There is all the more reason for welcoming God's truth, inasmuch as our future happiness depends upon its acquisition. "*Without faith it is impossible to please God.*" This does not mean any sort of faith, but divine faith alone. How much of our faith is human? how much divine? Divine faith requires, not only the acceptance of Christ as our Savior; but that we believe all that He has revealed. Less than this will forfeit heaven and lead to damnation: "*teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*" (Mt. 28, 20); "*he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned*" (Mk 16, 16). There is an imperative need to correct differences and acquire the oneness of the true faith. Nothing less important than our own salvation is at stake.

Divine Road
of Duty

Let us see if we cannot settle the differences that exist among yourselves, and that lie between you and us. I believe that we can do it. Absolute honesty will be required, it is true, and a great singleness of purpose. Allow no obstacle of any sort to stay your progress, or divert you from the divine road of duty. If required, do something heroic for once. The words that our Lord addressed to St. Peter may apply to you as well: "*Thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee and lead thee whither thou wouldst not*" (Jn 21, 18). It was a martyrdom that Christ foretold. No matter; a martyrdom for Christ's truth will make you worthy of heavenly reward: "*he that taketh not up his cross and followeth Me, is not worthy of Me*" (Mt. 10, 38). Make the prayer of à Kempis (I. 3) your own: "O truth, my God, make me one with Thee in everlasting love!"

A Grave
Responsibility

Do you perhaps think that the reform we propose is too great for your strength, or that the evil of a divided Christendom is too firmly established to yield to any so-

lution? You may not be able to weld the Christian denominations into one; but you can, at least, remedy the evil there where you are responsible for it—in your own church affiliation. You may not even delay investigation, or defer putting your findings into effect, in the hope that the organization, to which you belong, may be induced some day to take action as a corporate body. Fidelity to conscience will brook no delay. We are not responsible for others; but we are responsible to God for our own steps. It is a real reform that we propose to you. The evil of sectarianism exists, and exists in self satisfied complacency. It is an evil, nevertheless, and calls for correction. Various Protestant churchmen and theologians have attempted its solution, but each time have failed of accomplishment. You have not as yet considered the solution proposed by the Mother Church. Turn to her for an earnest hour or two; consider carefully her plan of unification, and if the plan commends itself to your intellect and your conscience, be brave enough to accept it.

We may be charged by Protestants with an unwillingness, on our part, to make any compromise in the interest of an united Christendom. They may say: "You, Catholics, are quite willing that there be unity; but it must be on your terms: you are ready to join with Protestants just as soon as the Protestants agree to be Catholics." We can say in answer that, if unity confessedly cannot be found in Protestantism, why then become, or remain, Protestants? The project of any genuine union on that side is an utter impossibility, according to their own admission; on our side it is not only possible, but a necessity. We are governed by different principles. If oneness of faith is a divine requisite, seek it where alone it can be found. Some dream of bringing about Christian unity by dropping out all the doctrines and religious features that are rejected by any of the denominations. If you attempt to do this, your religious program

Close up
the Ranks

would become as empty as a beggar's purse. There would not be a single doctrine or religious practice left. No; the road of compromise is the road of negation, and cannot lead to the Kingdom of Truth. Not one of Christ's revealed truths shall be sacrificed in our holy quest. It is spiritual gain we are looking for; not spiritual loss.

A fairly good idea of where the road of compromise would lead to is given in the forecast of the "Religion of the Future" by Charles W. Eliot, President Emeritus of Harvard College. Dr. Eliot offers as a basis for union the two simple points: "Acceptance of the doctrine of an imminent and loving God, and the precept, Be serviceable to fellowmen." It will be necessary, he maintains, to give up many of our present beliefs; so he rejects the Savior, revelation, the Bible, faith, prayer, the sacraments and even the future life. He speaks of a "burnt heaven and quenched hell." His God is not a being distinct from the universe: all things are God; man is God. He appears to hold that God must be considered the direct author of all our acts, good and bad. We will not desire our own salvation, according to Dr. Eliot, so much as the good of our fellows. He denies to repentance any value whatever, and rejects every sort of mediation, even that of Christ. Religion he describes as "a fluent thing" and as "completely natural in all its doctrine and all its practice." His religion will not be based on authority, nor "bound to any dogma, creed book or institution." A religion without a creed is about as conceivable as a language without words. The trouble with the Eliot religion is that it is just one more of the man-made, counterfeit brands. The people of the future will be satisfied with nothing less, let us hope, than a divine faith, wholly supernatural, based on the absolute authority of God; and their love for their fellows will follow their love for God; and their love for God will not be so tenuous as not to desire the possession of the

Beatific Vision with all the ardor of their spiritual nature. The people of the future will not reject, let us also hope, the Redeemer, who purchased their salvation with His blood.

The Catholic Church has something better to offer you: all of God's truths. She can, moreover, restore the solidarity of Christendom. She holds her own large body, larger than all the Protestant bodies combined, and composed of every existing race, in the unity of faith and in oneness of organization. What principle does she employ to encompass this marvellous result? Would the extension of that same principle cement the Protestant bodies into one, and bring Protestant and Catholic alike into one and the same fold? Yes. We will make that the topic of a special chapter. We hope to show, at the same time, how all religious doubts and anxieties can be swept away at one stroke and how a wonderful peace of mind can be secured. Before taking that up let us examine the Protestant rule of faith.

Christian
Solidarity

CHAPTER III.

THE UNTENABLE RULE OF PROTESTANTS.

"Jesus Christ hath made us a Kingdom, and priests to God and His Father." Apoc. 1, 6.

Builders are a long time preparing the foundation of a modern structure. It may be years before the walls have gained the street level; then the steel frame of the superstructure rises with marvellous rapidity, almost over night, like the web of the spider. You understand the reason for the slow progress of the foundation. If the building did not rest upon a solid base, it would be shortlived and an unsafe habitation from the first year of its completion. We dare not be less careful than these

Lay a Solid
Foundation

10 THE UNTENABLE RULE OF PROTESTANTS.

workers in cement and steel, when we lay the foundation of the mighty edifice of religious truth. Our knowledge must rest upon a solid and immovable rock; not upon the shifting sands of mere human opinion. That will be admitted by all. We invite the closest scrutiny of the Catholic foundation, and we trust that our Protestant readers will extend the same invitation to a careful examination of their intellectual basis, and will help us make it.

God's Word
as the Base

However much Protestant denominations may differ in particular doctrines, they (with the Quakers, or Friends, a possible exception) present a united front on their intellectual basis, or rule of faith. By rule of faith we mean that test by which we know religious truths. They agree that the Bible, subject to the interpretation of individual readers, is the sole fount of religious knowledge. The Bible, they say in effect, is God's Word: now what could form a more solid foundation than it? What better fount from which to drink wisdom? All else shall pass away, but God's Word shall remain forever.

Holy Writ
Sacred to
Catholics

This sounds well, and let us assure our Protestant readers that we are in hearty accord with any praise they choose to bestow upon the Holy Scriptures. To us they are even more sacred than to Protestants; for among us there is no body of men tearing them to tatters under the guise of a higher criticism. When Leo XIII created the Biblical Commission some years ago the New York Sun said: "It is not the Pope, but the great churches of Protestantism, which need to appoint a commission, or commissions, 'for the consideration of all questions connected with Biblical studies.' The time is coming, if, indeed, it has not already, when these churches must take their stand definitely and decidedly on the question whether the Bible is of God, or only of man. As it is now, the Pope is the sole bold, positive and uncompromising champion of the Bible as the Word of God." And the Protestant, Dr. Lorimer, added his testimony: "Only the Pope, only

the Church of Rome, comes to the front as the champion of the Bible against the destructive critics." Should any one attempt such destructive criticism among us, even though he were the foremost scholar in the Church, he would be silenced, or forced out of the Catholic communion; for the Church will tolerate no lowering of God's Word.

Very few Protestant Biblical scholars regard the Scriptures in the same light as the ordinary Protestant layman. There are different stages of unbelief among them; but about all have given up the notion that the Scriptures are inerrant, or that they are inspired in the sense that inspiration was accepted a hundred, or only fifty years ago. To some Protestant scholars the Bible is not even a unique book—the only one of its kind—for they speak of it as one merely of many similar sacred literatures. The unbelief of the leaders of today will, it is to be feared, be the unbelief of the rank and file of the next generation. What then will determine the faith of the Protestant? How can the superstructure stand when the foundation begins to crumble? If the Bible is not errorless, if one must distinguish between the gold and waste that its ore carries, between what is human in it and what divine, what error and what truth: who is going to tell you which is the one, which the other, unless there be some authority outside of the Bible; for the Bible itself makes no such distinctions in its contents.

Once you maintain that the Bible is not a revelation of supernatural truths, that it is not an inspired book, you upset the Protestant rule of faith. Chillingworth says: "The Bible is Protestantism and Protestantism is the Bible." But if the Bible is merely a human production, containing truths and errors interspersed, will you characterize your own Protestantism as the same—a mere human production, teaching errors as well as truths? If the Bible is not inspired, how can any doctrine be established from the Protestant point of view? However, I would not have my Protestant readers follow the lead of

Unrestrained
Biblical
Criticism

Destroys
Foundation

12 THE UNTENABLE RULE OF PROTESTANTS.

their seminary professors; nor to yield one tittle of their belief in God's Word to these rationalistic critics. Do not let friend or foe take the Bible from you; it is a treasure of priceless worth. Believe in its divine inspiration, and believe in its inerrancy. Refuse to admit that less than the whole is God's Word.

Bible not
Sole Fount

When we have said all this in acknowledgment of the divine character of the Scriptures, we must be on our guard, nevertheless, not to give the Bible a place it was not designed to hold by its divine Author. The Lord never claimed for the Scriptures that they contain all of divine revelation; or that they can be interpreted securely by each individual reader. We controvert the Protestant position on their rule of faith. What reasons do Protestants bring to establish the sufficiency of the Scriptures? Will they, do you think, be found convincing?

Inconclusive
Proofs

You have, perhaps, grown familiar with the quotation, "*Search the Scriptures.*" I have seen these words sculptured over the main portal of a stately Protestant church. Many who passed through that door, we venture to say, found in that one line proof sufficient for their belief that they were to look to the Bible, and nowhere else, for religious truths. The Greek word for "search" may be rendered either by the imperative or the indicative mood. The Revised Version has accepted the latter reading: "*Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they that bear witness of Me*" (Jn 5, 39). Whether we accept the one reading or the other, the text proves nothing more than that Christ commended the searching of the Old Testament to find corroboration of His divine mission. In like manner were the Bereans praised for going to the Scriptures, to deduce from them the messiahship of Christ. They sought, not what God had revealed, but Whom He had commissioned to lead them. You may have heard another text, that is often quoted, namely, "*All Scripture*

is given by inspiration and is profitable for instruction." This is a mistaken reading, which was corrected by the Revised Version, and in its corrected form is quite similar to ours: "*All Scripture, inspired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, etc.*" (2 Tim. 3, 16). Reference in the three passages quoted is to the Old Testament. If the contention of the Protestant were true and these texts did prove the all-sufficiency of the Bible, they would prove entirely too much; for then he would be obliged to accept only the Old Testament as his fount of religious knowledge.

As a rule no attempt of any sort is made by better-informed Protestants to prove the sufficiency of the Scriptures, or the right of Private Judgment. The matter is simply taken for granted, as if it were a self-evident fact, which, of course, it is not. The milk of this pre-judgment was drawn in at the mother's breast; it has long since passed into flesh and bone; it is not easily gotten rid of now. Protestant scholars are fearless critics of every other doctrine of Protestantism; but this one they seem afraid to touch. And their timidity in this instance is hardly to be wondered at; for when they ever do subject it to serious examination, it will crumble to pieces like a long buried bone at the first breath of air. Then they will have to admit too, that Protestantism, as such, has no moral right to exist, because founded upon a false assumption.

An Unwarranted Assumption

We have asked tens of thousands of Protestants in public gatherings, where intelligence was not wanting and where ministers were frequently present, to give us one sound argument for the Protestant rule of faith, promising, if they did so, to give up our own religion, and to advise our Catholic hearers to do the same. The challenge remains unaccepted. No argument can be offered.

An Unaccepted Challenge

CHAPTER IV.

INSUFFICIENCY OF THE BIBLE.

“And it came to pass afterwards that He travelled through the cities and towns, preaching and evangelizing the Kingdom of God; and the Twelve with Him.” Luke 8, 1.

Lost Truths

Holy Scripture is an impregnable rock of truth; but it does not contain God's entire revelation; neither is its meaning always open to the reader, so that he can safely follow in all instances his own private judgment. There are many truths that are excluded from the faith of Protestants, because of their faulty rule. Then, again, there are other truths that they hold in very contradiction of their rule, like the rule itself, Sunday observance, etc. The doctrines of Protestantism are constantly shifting, and the house of Protestantism has split up into many parts, each new sect labeling itself a purer form of Christianity. There are grotesque aberrations, like that of the “Gift of Tongues” people; but you cannot convict the holders of them of error on the Protestant principle; for according to that principle they have the same right to their absurdities that others have to their sensible doctrines. What is sensible to the one may be folly to his neighbor.

The Spoken Word

That the Bible does not contain all of divine revelation nor all that we need to know for our spiritual guidance, is taught by the Bible itself. We read in 2 Thess. 2, 14, (15th verse in the Protestant version): *“Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle.”* St. Paul spoke as a Catholic; not as a Protestant. The Protestant would say: “Hold to the Written Word only;” the Catholic says with St. Paul: “Hold both the Spoken and

the Written Word." The Apostles were not told to write; their commission was to preach: "*Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world*" (Mt. 28, 19 and 20). When Christ announced His departure He spoke of the Holy Ghost, who would descend upon the Apostles and teach them all things: "*He will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you*" (Jn 14, 26). He descended upon them on Pentecost Sunday, and strengthened in Him, and enlightened by Him, they went forth upon their great mission of evangelizing the world. Success attended their efforts everywhere: congregations were formed, at the head of which were placed God-fearing men, upon whom the Apostles had laid hands in ordination. These congregations, which together formed but one Church, received their faith through the preaching of the Apostles and those ordained for this work by the Apostles and their successors.

As yet no part of the Gospel had been committed to writing. It was years after Christ's ascension before the first book of the New Testament appeared. Other books and epistles followed. These were written, especially the epistles, when some special need demanded a message from the Apostles. There were abuses to correct, dangers to be pointed out, works of charity to be inaugurated, groups of the faithful to be encouraged, etc. None of the sacred writers of the New Testament gives us a methodical and complete exposition of Christian doctrine. If there is one safe statement it is that these writers did not intend the New Testament to be a simple and complete catechism of the Christian religion. Furthermore, the various writings of the Apostles and Evangelists were not gathered into the officially approved New Testament until late in the fourth century. Upon what authority did the

What did
Christ
Teach?

early Christians receive their religious truths? What truths were the object of their faith? They believed all that was proposed to them by that body of men commissioned by Christ Himself to perform this work. They considered as belonging to divine revelation all that was proposed to them, whether taught by word of mouth, or by letter. With them the test of truth was, not "Is it written?" but "Did Christ teach it?"

Rule of
Early
Christians

Their answer is ours, or to speak more accurately, the answer we gave then is the answer we give now. The sources from which we obtain the truths of divine revelation are two: Scripture and Divine Tradition, and we place both on an equality. The Church proposes these truths to our belief, and we know from the promises Christ made to her, that she cannot lead us into error. No one will deny that our position today is the same as that of the early Church; yet, strangely enough, there are a great many who say that this position is a false one. One of the foremost Biblical scholars among American Protestants is Charles Augustus Briggs. In an address made before the Church Club of New York City he said: "If we had the entire apostolic inheritance as given in Holy Scripture, clearly defined and agreed to by Christian scholars, we would not then have the entire apostolic inheritance. Many of the Reformers were here mistaken. They thought that they could reform the Church by rejecting everything not to be found in Holy Scripture . . . Biblical criticism has made it certain that you cannot build Christianity on the Holy Scriptures alone. It is necessary also to determine the Christian inheritance in unrecorded apostolic tradition."

Self-
Contradictory

The principle that we must accept nothing but what is in the Bible implies a contradiction. By adopting that principle you violate it; for the most careful search of the Scriptures fails to find that principle itself in the Bible. The principle dies by its own hand. Furthermore, a rule must be within easy reach of all who are to use it. If

only one in 5,000 carpenters possessed a foot rule the craft would find itself rather helpless in its building operations. Up to the invention of printing in 1438, for a period of almost 1,500 years, it is a safe conjecture, not more than one in 5,000 of the earth's inhabitants, could have read the Bible; owing either to their inability to read at all; or to the lack of versions in their own tongue, as in the case of those dwelling far distant from the heart of civilization; or to the scarcity and costliness of copies, which had to be written laboriously by hand.

Let us go to the second part of the proposition we are to prove, namely, the fallacy of Private Judgment. That the Bible, or the Holy Ghost through the Bible, does not enlighten every reader, enabling him to walk securely in the path of divine faith, scarcely needs further proof than the dissensions among these same readers. The Holy Ghost is not the author of contradictions. The Bible is not, as has been stated, a simple document that any child can understand. It is plain from its style and mode of composition that it was not intended as a text-book. It is no exaggeration to say that its meanings have been subjected to more discussion than all the other books in the world put together. Hosts of scholars have spent a lifetime in elucidating its obscure passages, and they are farther from agreement than the common folk. The earnest searcher after truth is dismayed at the array of contradictory opinions held on every vital point by these experts, who have presumably called to their aid every subsidiary study: the original and related languages, comparison of old manuscripts, archæological researches, contemporaneous secular history, etc. And when the learned doctors disagree how can the humble patient hope to grow strong in his faith?

Can you really believe that the merciful Savior would surround the acquisition of His religion with insurmountable obstacles, so that the best disposed among His followers might never really know whether he is a believer

Fallacy of
Private
Judgment

Out of
the Dark

or unbeliever? It surely cannot be that He who declared that without faith it is impossible to please God, would so befog our mind that we can never tell at any one moment whether we are pleasing or displeasing Him. Do not say in excuse that God looks to our intention; that He will be pleased in any event with our good will. Believing in a falsehood is not divine faith. It is divine faith that is required of us. We desire that divine faith, of course. No one wishes to hold error for truth. The very multiplication of sects, with the additional sacrifices that this multiplication calls for, is proof that men are willing to put themselves about for the triumph of truth. The differences will never disappear so long as each man believes that it is both his right and duty to adhere to his own interpretation. There is a better way, a way that can assure us of the possession of truth, upon which we can walk without fear or misgiving, the way on which Christ Himself will meet us and take us by the hand and lead us to our everlasting home.

CHAPTER V.

CHRIST'S CHURCH.

"Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of His love." Col. 1, 13.

Disintegration

The experiment of searching for the truths of divine revelation in the pages of Holy Writ, without the guidance or corrective of a competent Court of Appeal, the experiment of well-nigh 400 years, has demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt the fallacy of Private Judgment. The result of Private Judgment has been sectarianism run wild. The divisions into which the Christian body has been split are almost innumerable, and the pro-

cess of farther disintegration cannot be halted. Efforts at reunion, attempts to patch up differences and bind together discordant groups, have all been shattered upon the same rock of Private Judgment. Private Judgment has visited its baneful effects upon individual beliefs, as well as upon denominational professions of faith. New and strange views are constantly springing up, and their supporters continually quote Scripture in their defense; opponents are combating them with an equal array of Biblical passages; on the other hand cherished old doctrines, from the most important down, are attacked in the name of the selfsame Scripture. The contradictions are disconcerting. Who has the truth? All? No. Is there no voice to put a stop to the unseemly wrangling? Are the sacred words of the Savior to be dragged hither and thither by angry combatants? Are the texts of Scripture to be turned into clubs and snares? Is the honest believer to be left in his perplexing doubts? Are the earnest seekers to grope in the dark forever, and never really to know when they have found the truth? If you say "no" to any of these questions, you will have to surrender the principle of Private Judgment.

Is it not a sensible thing, then, in face of these direful consequences, to pause and ask whether Private Judgment was not an unfortunate substitution for Christ's way by the so-called reformers of the sixteenth century? If it turns out to be a substitution, set up in direct disobedience to Christ's commands, it ought to be rejected, and that promptly. Something more authoritative than our own opinion is needed to satisfy us that we have understood a difficult, or disputed point, correctly. After all, we do not want our religion, but Christ's.

Private Judgment was invoked by Martin Luther to justify his own opinions, when these were branded as false by the Catholic Church, one of whose priests he was. Before his time, and by all Catholics since his time, the Catholic Church, as being the church founded by Christ,

Pause and
Examine

Luther's
Substitute

was looked upon as the authoritative interpreter, as well as official expounder of divine revelation. Is this view correct? Let us see.

The Kingdom

One fact that stands out very plainly in the teachings of the New Testament is the establishment of His Church by our Blessed Lord. His faithful were gathered together into a religious brotherhood. They were His Kingdom, His fold, His brethren, His disciples, His saints, His mystical body, His church. They were to be one in every respect. St. Paul (Eph. 4, 3-6) spoke of them as "*careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. One body and one Spirit; as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all and in us all.*" Says Professor Briggs, in his address before the Church Club of New York City: "The New Testament knows of but one Christian Church. It is impossible to find anywhere in the New Testament . . . or in primitive Christianity, the idea of a national church, distinct and independent of the Universal Church. How can anyone doubt that Jesus and His Apostles instituted one, and one only church, which was to be in organic unity, notwithstanding its worldwide diffusion, among all nations." Dr. Briggs, very illogically, yet characteristically, subjoins the remark that this unity was "not a unity of identity or uniformity, but a unity in variety." There was, it is true, a variety in practices indifferent in themselves, neither morally good nor morally evil, like that of abstaining from certain meats; but had the variety extended to doctrines there would have been an end to unity. The Professor was probably influenced by the status of the denomination to which he belonged and of which the men he addressed were members: the Episcopal church shelters members of the most widely divergent beliefs. The unity of such is only nominal; for truth and error are not one. The Church that Christ founded was far different;

in it error was not permitted to lie down quietly beside truth. You need not be a Biblical scholar to have learned that much from the New Testament.

It is extremely important that you hold a correct notion of the word "Church." From the *Biblical World* of November, 1905, we take this definition: "As most of us are coming to see, a church is not intended to be a theological class, where everybody believes exactly alike, but an organization in which the faith and good impulses of the individual may be strengthened and enlarged by co-operation. We join the church, not to be saved, but to save." This is the definition of *a* church, as the writer inadvertently admits; but not of *the* Church. Another definition was sent us by an anonymous correspondent presumably a minister: "The Church of Scripture means a religious assembly, or congregation, selected or called out of the world by the doctrine of the Gospel, to worship the true God in Christ, according to His Word. All the elect of God, of what nation soever, from the beginning to the end of the world, make but one body, of which Jesus Christ is the head. The Protestant Church, it is true, is made up of several denominations, but they all stand on the one rock, Christ Jesus." The definitions of most Protestants seem to be made to order; they are so arranged as to include, in some fashion or other, the conglomerate of divergent sects that pass under the general name Protestantism. Let us get our notion of the Church from the New Testament. The Church of Scripture is not the non-descript thing made up of a thousand different beliefs, called Christendom today; it is the pillar and ground of truth, one in belief and organization. It is a visible organization, founded by Christ, in which men are trained for heaven; it is the congregation of all those who profess the faith of Christ, who partake of the means of sanctification provided by Him, and who are governed by

Church
and churches

their lawful pastors, under a supreme earthly head, the successor of St. Peter, to whom Christ committed the chief care of His flock, both lambs and sheep (Jn 21, 15-17).

Interior
and Exterior
Order

Not a few Protestants love to think of the Christian religion as purely and exclusively interior. If they can be induced to affiliate with a denomination it is for mutual encouragement, or for social features only; not from any feeling of necessity or duty. While it is true that Christianity is primarily a spiritual force, it is in essential connection with an exterior order: the latter as divine as the former. Christianity stands to the Church much in the same relation as the soul to the body. The soul can exist without the body, but so long as it is in this world it is essentially bound up with the body. When Christ founded His Kingdom it was with obligation of citizenship upon His followers. The Church is the Kingdom of the Son. The Apostles assuredly belonged to an external order; their disciples not less so. St. Paul writes to the Ephesians (2, 19-22): *“Now, therefore, you are no more strangers and foreigners; but you are fellow-citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God. Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building, being framed together, groweth up into an holy temple in the Lord. In whom you also are built together into an habitation of God in the Spirit.”* The sacraments, prayer, worship, ministry, brotherhood are all associated with an exterior order. It must be evident, then, that Christianity is not purely and exclusively interior.

Pastors
and Flock

In Christ's Church a distinction is to be noted between pastors and flock, ministers and them that are ministered to. In many Protestant churches the ministry is made little of, and frequently enough, ministers themselves will lend a hand in marking out every essential distinction between clergy and laity. This may not be far wrong in a ministry that lacks priestly ordination and valid succession from the Apostles. St. Paul's estimate

of real priests was vastly different; he speaks of them as "*dispensers of the mysteries of God*" (1 Cor. 4, 1); to whom is given the "*ministry of the reconciliation*" (2 Cor. 5, 18); "*ambassadors for Christ*" (2 Cor. 5, 20); "*God's co-adjutors*" (1 Cor. 3, 9). "*We are God's co-adjutors*"; he says, "*you are God's husbandry; you are God's building.*" He writes to the Romans (10, 14 and 15): "*How shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they be sent?*" And to Titus (1, 5) he wrote: "*I left thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and shouldest ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee.*" We read in Acts 13, 2: "*And as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them: Separate Me, Saul and Barnabas, for the work whereunto I have taken them. Then they, fasting and praying, and imposing their hands upon them, sent them away.*"

To avoid confusion it is well to keep in mind that distinction in Christ's Church between pastors and flock. As to the former was given, among other things, the commission to teach, we may designate them by the short term of Teaching Church. The Teaching Church, according to its conciliar pronouncements, is the official, or infallible, teacher then, and then only, when her bishops are gathered together in a general council, with the Pope at their head, either in person or through his legates, and define doctrines regarding faith and morals, binding the faithful; or when her chief pastor does the same, acting in his capacity of supreme pontiff; or, finally, when the voice of her bishops, dispersed throughout the universe, but united with the Pope, is unanimous. Bear this in mind and you will understand clearly what is meant when we speak of the church as an official teacher, or of her pronouncements as official, or infallible, teachings. It was the Lord's prayer that His Church be and remain one: "*Holy Father, keep them in Thy name, whom Thou hast given Me; that they may be one, as we also are*" (Jn 17, 11). The Church

The Teaching
Church

could not possibly remain one, unless Christ made some provision for an authoritative teacher and supreme executive head. Anything less than that would necessarily lead to uncertainty and divisions. It was within His power to provide both. His Teaching Church was sent forth with the solemn guarantee that it should represent Him and speak with His voice.

CHAPTER VI.

THE AUTHORITATIVE TEACHER

"And hast made us to our God a Kingdom and Priests, and we shall reign on the earth." Apoc. 5, 10.

The Teacher

To the Teaching Church were given certain specific duties, together with corresponding powers. Among these was the command to instruct: *"And Jesus coming, spoke to them, saying: All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world"* (Mt. 28, 18-20). Again: *"You shall be witnesses unto Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth"* (Acts 1, 8). This Commission to carry the Gospel to the farthest ends of the earth and through the countless successions of generations down to the close of time was not, of course, a personal charge restricted to the eleven Apostles; but was given to the office of Christ's ministry, as is apparent from the nature of the commission itself. Note well the power He grants: *"As the Father hath sent me, I also send you"* (Jn 20, 21). The Father sent Him to reconcile the sinner with the offended deity and *"to have all men come to the knowledge of the*

truth" (1 Tim. 2, 4). As empowered Himself by the Father, so He now empowers his priesthood, that the work for which He came may go on and all men may be reached with the saving gospel; that the ignorant may be enlightened and every inquiring mind set at rest.

We have an adage "many heads many minds." In the Kingdom there is to be one mind alone, the Divine Mind. There are to be no disputes, no anxious perplexities, no separation into antagonistic bands in Christ's Church. There is a standard of right and wrong, of truth and error, in that spiritual kingdom, and this standard is proclaimed to great and small, high and low, by the divine Church: "*If he will not hear the Church . . . let him be to thee as the heathen and publican*" (Mt. 18, 17). If the Church were not an infallible arbiter, a divine teacher in questions of conduct and belief, it would be manifestly improper to excommunicate members and publicly brand them as heretics, or unbelieving Gentiles, and as sinners or outlaws. Being what it is St. Paul (1 Tim. 3 15) could speak of it as "*the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.*"

One Mind

All shall know that these teachers sent by Him, so long as they voice the teachings of His Church, are not mere human and frail instruments, liable to error, but are divinely protected; are, in fact, His authorized personal representatives, as we learn from Luke 10, 16: "*He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you despiseth Me; and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me.*" After this will you judge it a light thing to accept or reject at will what is taught you by the priests of Christ's Church? Will you continue to maintain that it is within your right to construct your own belief or moral code out of the conflicting interpretations of Holy Writ?

Ambassadors
of Christ

One
Sheepfold

The support of sectarianism, helping to scatter Christ's sheep into alien folds, is reprobated by the divine Pastor. No individual is free to separate himself from the fold, or to remain outside of it; in other words to hold aloof from Christ's Church, or to affiliate with another. Says the Lord (Jn 10, 16): "*Other sheep I have that are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.*" We are far from realizing that at the present moment; but who is to blame for the disruption of Christendom into a thousand dissenting bodies? Are you going to contribute your part to the healing of the divisions? St. Paul's exhortation is addressed to us as well as to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 1, 10): "*I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you.*" St. Paul insists upon the putting away of all that could bring disunion among Christians (Rom. 15, 5 and 6): "*The God of patience and of comfort grant you to be of one mind one towards another, according to Jesus Christ: that with one mind and with one mouth, you may glorify God and the Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ.*"

The Peace
of Christ

The embracing of the truth must result in unity; for it is only through the creeping in of errors that doctrinal divisions arise. This is an ugly admission, but true. Christ points out the remedy; He has endowed His Church with the precious heritage of the truth, (Jn 14, 16 ff): "*And I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you forever. The Spirit of truth. . . . He will teach you all things.*" The Holy Ghost was not promised to every individual reader of the Scriptures; for in that event there could be no doctrinal differences among them. He was promised to the Teaching Church—the official and infallible guide. What a boon it is to be assured of the possession of truth, to be able to rest in absolute security! This is what the early Christians enjoyed; this is what Christ willed His follow-

ers to have in every age: in the Words of St. Paul (Phil. 4, 7) "*the peace of God, which surpasseth all understanding.*" We, as well as the Philippians, are to enjoy that peace of God, through membership with that selfsame Church that gave them such security of mind and comfort of heart. The Lord said (Mt. 16, 18): "*Thou art Peter (Rock) and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" Neither the violence of her external enemies, nor the secret machinations of internal foes, were ever to force or lead this Church into apostasy. She was to be Christ's faithful witness before every generation until time is no more. This is the one Church that cannot go astray, to go out from which is spiritual suicide.

Which is that Church? The one among the many that reaches back to Pentecost. None of the Protestant churches was in existence before Martin Luther. "Yours," they tell us, "is the Mother Church; yours was the true Church at one time." A valuable admission; for if it was true at one time, it was true always: Christ's Church once, Christ's Church for ever. That is the true Church which is conscious of its mission as an authoritative teacher and infallible guide. The fact that any church disclaims infallibility, and by so doing characterizes itself as liable to error, that of itself rules it out of court. What value does it possess? It is not the Church to which Christ promised His divine protection. As there is only one church that reaches back to Pentecost, that is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus being the chief corner stone; so there is, too, one only church that claims infallibility and authority in teaching; and this, it hardly needs to be added, is the Catholic Church. When you have joined this Church you have entered the fold of the divine Pastor: here you will hear His voice and be taught by the divine Spirit; here the

The Mother
Church

citadel of your faith will not be conquered by the "gates of hell"; and the promise of the Prophet will include you: "*They shall be My people, and I will be their God in truth and in justice*" (Zach. 8, 8).

CHAPTER VII.

HOW CAN I BE SAVED?

"Walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto His Kingdom and glory." 1 Thess. 2, 12.

A Sharp
Questioner

Our final blessedness is a matter of too much importance to be dismissed lightly. Study your way carefully. An earnest inquirer once put the question: "What must I do to save my soul?" You would agree, we are confident, with our answer: First of all have faith in the Lord, Jesus Christ; believe in Him and believe all that He has revealed to man: then keep all of His commandments. "But how am I to know what Christ has revealed and what He wishes me to do?" persisted the questioner. "His followers," he said, "are not at all agreed upon what He taught, or what He requires of us in the matter of conduct; they are split up into hundreds of sects that give each other the lie. Each sect claims to give His teachings in their original purity; if they are telling the truth, then Christ contradicted Himself, teaching one thing to be true and not true, another necessary to salvation and not necessary. Was Christ uncertain in His teachings? did He really contradict Himself? or are the churches misrepresenting Him? If they misrepresent Him, are they not false guides?" Christ, being God, possessed infinite knowledge: He could not be uncertain in His teachings, nor could He ever contradict Himself. The fault does not lie with Him; but with the erroneous teachings that are given out as His.

We learned in a previous chapter that Christ organized His followers into a society, which He called His Church. This Church was to continue His work after His departure. To this Church, as we have seen, He made certain promises, like that of divine guidance in its teaching office and of His continued protection to the end of time. Were these promises fulfilled? Undoubtedly. Christ was not one to make a promise and break it. The future stood revealed to His eyes, and He possessed the power to guard and protect, to curb and guide. To say that He could not keep His Church from apostasy, though He willed it and promised it, is to charge Him with weakness and is equivalent to denying His divinity. We know, then, that there is one Church existing today that is the true mouthpiece of Christ, the bearer of His glad tidings of truth and grace; since it is His very Church, by Him established and by Him divinely protected. Find that Church and you have found the religion of Christ: then you will know both what to believe and what to do, in order to save your soul.

Did Christ
Keep His
Word?

When searching for the true Church make sure that no unworthy or insufficient motive shall influence you. Seeking, in a friendly discussion with a society woman, to reach a common basis for argument, I was surprised to hear her disclaim belief in the Bible, in the divinity of Christ and finally in the personality of God. Knowing that she was a member of a Protestant church, I asked her why she joined that church. She admitted unblushingly that she joined it for the sake of getting into society. "I believed I would meet some of the nicest people of the city there," was the sum total of her creed. There are not many church people with the utter lack of faith of this woman; but there are many, very many, who choose their church for a like reason. Others are led to a church by companions, by the prospect of entertainment. They select a church in lieu of a social club. Some churches have been dubbed "ladies' clubs." The

Strange
Avowals

remark that "our clergyman is a very entertaining speaker and we have many sociable gatherings," may remove the last obstacle to a decision. Another argues the matter out at his desk: "I could improve my business by throwing in my lot with the most popular church of the town; a large congregation worships there, and I may gain new customers." Some join a church because it is easy and makes no exacting demands. "No confession, nor fasting, nor early masses in our church," may be the inducement held out to a Catholic. Others pick a church because there is little to believe. Perhaps it boasts of having no creed, as if such a thing were possible. It may be inviting accessions from other denominations on the plea of "roominess": "With us you can believe about anything you please; there are no heresy trials in our church." Merely to mention these motives is sufficient to condemn them. No sensible person will maintain seriously that the way to find Christ's Church is to learn where the fashionable people worship, where one can be amused, where there is little to do and less to believe, or where one can improve his business outlook. And yet are there not many who are actuated by one or other of these motives in seeking church-membership?

The Sword

A less unworthy, yet wholly insufficient motive is that of the man or woman who says "I belong to this particular church because my parents belonged to it before me." That reason for one's faith would be a very good one, indeed, if, upon investigation, the religion of one's parents was found to be the true religion. If it were found not to be that, son and daughter must forsake the church of their parents, no matter what the cost. Christ Jesus says: *"I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's enemies shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy*

of Me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me, is not worthy of Me. And he that taketh not up his cross, and followeth Me is not worthy of Me" (Mt. 10, 35-38). At other times the Savior was called the prince of peace; but on this occasion He says: "*I came, not to send peace, but the sword*" (Mt. 10, 34).

Still another motive might be mentioned. Some unfortunate people are induced to unite with a church by gifts of clothes, or food, or money, or special schooling, or assistance of one kind or another. This is a favorite method for gaining recruits from the ranks of the poor, practiced among certain wealthy proselytizing bodies. Deeds of charity are commendable, except when they are made to ensnare souls; then they are damnable. That consciences are violated is proved by the fact that the victims of the proselytizers return to their old faith as soon as the gifts cease, or when they are brought face to face with death. We despise the man who shows himself so weak as to sell his birthright for a mess of pottage; but more despicable and more guilty by far are the men and women who contribute to his temptation.

We have been discussing counterfeit motives; a word or two will suffice to point out the genuine motive for church affiliation. We know that among the rival denominations there is one true Church—the one divinely founded and divinely protected. That Church is in existence this very year, as it has existed during every year since the first Christian Pentecost. Become a member of that Church and do so for no other reason than that you are called to the Kingdom of the Son. Though you know that you are wrong, will you say: "I will stay, nevertheless, just where I am. I know we are in error, but we do not choose to get out of it." To do that is to refuse to be honest with yourself and honest with your God. The local environment of that Church may not be at-

"Soupers"
and Soul-
Snatchers

Be Honest
with Yourself

tractive to you, whose acquaintances and associations have been elsewhere and different; but you join the Church, not for social comfort, but to be close to Christ, and through that communion to gain the salvation of your soul.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SCHOOL OF GOD.

"To you it is given to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God." Luke 8, 10.

America's Boast

The European visitor is struck by the grandeur and almost countless number of our school buildings. The American people are fond of knowledge. No other nation approaches us in the amount of money expended year by year for the support and development of our halls of learning. It is our ambition to give every child in the country an education. We can boast, not only of our extensive primary education, but also of our superior secondary schools, which are scattered generously over every part of the country. Our rich men are eager to surpass each other in munificent donations to equip libraries and endow universities and technical schools. We have come to look upon illiteracy, not merely as a misfortune, but as a veritable disgrace. The daughters and sons of our best families deem it an honor to teach the young. We would have the best teachers that can be found. If we chose a motto for our children it would be, "Nothing too good for them!" Knowledge is power; they shall dominate the world by their intellect, if we can bring it about. We are not going to count the cost, either, in working out that purpose. We want strong men physically, but we want them still stronger mentally. Let us add another requisite: we want them

strongest of all morally. Is it not true? The Scripture says: "*Justice exalteth a nation.*" Amid a world-wide weakening of moral restraint we would become a God-fearing, high-minded, pure and just people.

Without religion there can be no advance in morality. All churches are laboring, each in its own way, for the advancement of morality; but, unfortunately, they weaken their preaching of Christian morals by presenting a divided front. We are all agreed that the child shall be taught the truth in every one of its school branches; there is not a parent who would not grow indignant, if his boy or girl were taught to spell or figure incorrectly, or do anything else erroneously. Is it not strange, then, that the same persons who find error in secular matters quite intolerable, find error in religion a matter of little moment and doubt in religion a matter of course? Where there are differences, as was remarked before, there is error, and error should be made to yield to truth. Why are Americans so wide awake and courageous in the one pursuit and hesitating and timid in the other?

Divided
We Fall

The Catholic system bears a striking resemblance to the management of the secular school. Enter a building devoted to secular knowledge. You may find a dozen rooms, which for convenience of reference, are numbered from 1 to 12. You may pass through all of them; you cannot help noticing the uniformity of teaching. The teacher of Room 2 does not tell her children that Seattle is in Wyoming, nor that 5 is contained 6 times in 25; Room 5 has not placed Seattle in Oregon, nor found only four fives in 25. If you were to express satisfaction at the pupils learning the same answers, you would be told that truth is catholic, or universal. Now enter the big school of American Christianity. There are many rooms; but they are designated by names instead of numbers. One room, the largest, is labeled Catholic, another Lutheran, another Protestant Episcopal, another Methodist, an-

A Comparison

other Presbyterian, and so on. Pass from one to the other, and you will surely be struck by the diversity of answers given to the same questions in the different rooms. Try them on the question of baptism, for example. When you have collected the divergent answers you may ask in amazement: Is truth single or multiplex? Is there a Baptist truth and a Lutheran truth and a Methodist truth, or is not truth in religious matters as catholic as in secular matters? To be sure all truth is one and universal. What if two or ten persons say they are honest in their differences? Without impeaching their honesty you would have to answer: the fact still remains that one or nine of you are in error and you are not permitted to remain in error. How long would you put up with a teacher who would say to your children: "You have given me five different answers to my question as to how many times 5 is contained in 25; but because I see that you are in good faith you may each of you keep your own answer."

Value of a
Good Teacher

You have an objection in your mind, and we will state it for you: "The two things are quite dissimilar; the one set of truths can be demonstrated quite easily; so easily, in fact, that there can be no excuse for ignorance; the other set of truths, on the contrary, cannot be demonstrated like a mathematical problem or geographical statement; hence we cannot acquire certitude." Now, that would be very true, if we had to arrive at our answers unaided, or if the teachers were no more competent than ourselves; for it is certain (your differences are the proof) that religious truths are so difficult of demonstration that we cannot learn them without a teacher. Freely admitting that the study of religion has its perplexing difficulties, if only the teacher is complete master of it, the pupil walks with secure step. Christ left us a teacher of superlative worth in His Church.

The school teacher, looking for an appointment, presents her certificate to prove her competency to teach; the Catholic Church presents the New Testament as one of her certificates, to prove both her competency and authority. You do not wish, probably, to search out all that the gospels and epistles say of the Church; so let us recall a few of the texts already quoted. We will put them into a convenient form: "This is to certify that the Church has authority to continue My mission, both as to instructing mankind in the truths of faith and as to the forgiveness of sins (Mt. 28, 18-20; Jn 20, 21). He that will hear this teacher will hear Me (Lk. 10, 16); he that will not hear the bearer of this certificate shall have no part with Me and shall be no follower of Mine (Mt. 18, 17). I pledge My word that this teacher shall be protected against error now and forever (Jn 14, 26; Mt. 16, 18). Signed, Jesus Christ."

Her Credentials

Can you ask for a better certificate than this? Was ever a school teacher so well dowered as the Church, so competent as she to teach? If pupils will place the most implicit reliance upon a good teacher, why should we not yield a still greater obedience to Christ's Church? The best teacher may err; but Christ's Church, our religious teacher, is infallible. To a woman in far away Iceland, who complained that it perplexed her to know just what to believe, we answered: "That matter is very simple, just listen to the Teacher." "That seems too easy," was her response. But why should Christ wish to make it impossible for His children to learn His religion? Would not His goodness purposely make it easy? He surely cannot wish us to spend a lifetime in a vain and unsatisfactory attempt to find out what He requires us under penalty of damnation to know and believe from childhood on. Too easy! In our secular schools we are striving by all kinds of devices to make learning constantly less difficult. Why are you non-Catholics so timid about adopting the only effective me-

Gain Security

dium for gaining Christian truth? You know that the medium introduced in the sixteenth century has failed completely to establish unity of faith, or to give you any reasonable assurance that the doctrines you hold are true. You would not dream of giving your child a dozen text-books and telling him to stay at home from school and master their contents, without the aid of a teacher. If you attempted to do this, the state would interfere and would tell you that you are neglecting your child criminally. Yet you would learn a much more difficult matter, a supernatural religion, without a teacher; and learn it from a book that was never meant to be a text-book, despite the fact that what you treat as your text-book tells you plainly that a divinely equipped teacher has been appointed to lead you securely into the truth. Why will you not place yourselves under this teacher, when your real aim in religion is to require the fullness of Christian truth?

Priest-ridden?

Some persons criticise this religious teacher, the Catholic Church, when she proscribes certain books and expels from her communion those who persist in teaching doctrines contrary to hers. The school teacher will not tolerate two tables of arithmetic, nor two or three kinds of spelling. No one would think of calling the teacher a tyrant for doing so, nor say she is too narrow, or that she is depriving her pupils of free thought. No one would dub these pupils teacher-ridden, as certain grown-ups are styled priest-ridden.

Proclaim
the School
of God

The School of God has an advantage over the secular school. If some modern Cræsus could find an infallible teacher for his favorite university, he would undoubtedly offer a king's ransom for his services. Any Board of Education would be charged with inexcusable neglect, if it could secure a teacher with the certificate of the Catholic Church, and failed to do so. But a teacher of that sort is not available for secular schools. No earthly authority is competent to bestow a certificate

guaranteeing absolute inerrancy. God, on the contrary, can give inerrancy; and as immeasurably more depends upon the acquisition of religious than of secular knowledge, we can reasonably expect Him to use His power for our benefit. He promised to give it, and He has given it. America is ambitious. We would like to lead the world in secular education; why not lead it in what is better still—in religious truth? Proclaim the School of God. Help us spread it to the uttermost parts of the earth, and bring back unity to a divided Christendom. The solution of our differences lies alone in the School of God. God's way is not man's way. God's way leads to the unity of the truth.

CHAPTER IX.

IDENTITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH WITH THE GOSPEL CHURCH.

"Whose Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, and all kings shall serve Him, and shall obey Him." Dan. 7, 27.

So far we have seen that the Blessed Savior Himself, foreseeing the danger of schisms and divisions among His followers, created a magistral chair, from which all might learn religious truths. This was His Teaching Church, which He endowed with infallibility. Of this there can be no doubt; for the Scripture passages are too plain to admit of dispute. No one would think of denying that the test of orthodoxy among the early Christians was obedience to the Teaching Church. Whenever a dispute arose among them on any point of doctrine, the dispute was referred to a council or to the successor of St. Peter at Rome, for settlement. If the defeated disputants continued to hold their condemned opinions, they were cut off from the body of the faithful

Attitude of the
Church toward
the Sects

and were no longer considered as belonging to Christ's Church, or the Catholic—meaning universal—Church, as they put it. No well-informed Protestant would think of asserting that his principle of private interpretation was recognized by the early Christians. They did not call those who were cut off fellow-Christians, but heretics; their ministers were not invited to joint pastoral unions; there were no union services for the members of the Church and the sects; the former strove for no federation with the latter, and they were never guilty of the faithless remark that one religion is as good as another. They believed their own religion true and their Church divine; because they accepted both as they came from the hand of the God-man.

The Charge
of Innovations

While the Protestant, we believe, will agree with all that has been said so far regarding the early Church, he begins to see things quite differently, when it is question of the Church of today. The Church was pure then, he will say; but in the lapse of time it became corrupt both as to its members and its teachings. New doctrines and strange practices crept in, until it could no longer be called the same church. In proof of his assertion he may instance the gradual extension of papal power, the exaggerated cult of Mary and the saints, the celibacy of the clergy, the introduction of auricular confession, of purgatory, indulgences, the mass, of five new sacraments; of candles, incense, ashes, palms, holy water, rosaries, novenas and the other practices that the Catholics of today set much store by. He will say that upon the simplicity of the Gospel teaching and Gospel worship have been grafted foreign dogmas and pagan ceremonies, so that the evangelical organization is not at all recognizable in the present-day Catholic Church. At a period, he will continue, when the people began to study the Bible, they saw how far the Catholic Church had got away from its primitive constitution, and under the leadership of Luther they

undertook to restore it to its original state. As a consequence, he declares, that he comes nearer to the Church, as it left Christ's hands, in Protestantism than we do in Catholicism.

But against this assumption—for assumption it surely must be—we have the divine assurance that the Church, founded by the Savior, should never fail; that not even the powers of hell should accomplish its downfall. The continued assistance of the Holy Ghost was promised, and by the same divine authority, every one is declared anathema who will not hear the Church. Whom shall we trust, Christ or the Protestant apologist? For more than half the period from the foundation of the Church down to the present time, we are informed by the latter, it was non-existent on earth; it had failed lamentably in the mission for the fulfillment of which it had been expressly founded; the gates of hell, despite Christ's solemn assurance to the contrary, had prevailed against it; the Holy Ghost was powerless to save it, and it was turned by corrupt and designing men into the Synagogue of Satan. Then, we are told, great and God-fearing men and women, like Martin Luther, Calvin and Wesley, rose up and accomplished what the Savior and the Divine Spirit had failed in: they purified the Church from the doctrinal corruptions that the Godhead was powerless to keep out and which Christ had so distinctly promised to keep out. Can you believe that? We Catholics cling to Christ; we prefer His Word to that of Luther, or Calvin, or Henry VIII, or Wesley, or Campbell, or Dowie, or Mother Eddy, or Pastor Russell, or any other self-constituted founder of a new sect.

Christ
versus
Luther

We once heard a minister answer the question, "Where was Protestantism before the sixteenth century?" with the counter question, "Where was your face before it was washed." The ancient repartee met with applause from a portion of his listeners; yet the answer is more smart than satisfactory. The faces of Protestantism—for every denomination in Protestantism has a face of its

A Smart
Answer

own—are not the face of Catholicism, clean or dirty. Fancy the surprise of a mother if a hundred boys rushed into her presence and sought to convince her that they were all her own little boy after he got his face washed. Cardinal Newman, who had been a prominent Anglican divine and was noted for his superior learning and his unflinching devotion to truth, while still an Anglican minister wrote: “Whatever history teaches, whatever it admits, whatever it exaggerates or extenuates, whatever it says or unsays, at least the Christianity of history is not Protestantism. If ever there were a safe truth, it is this. And Protestantism has ever felt it so. Hence it tries to dispense with historical Christianity altogether and to form a Christianity from the Bible alone.” (Development of Christian Doctrines, p. 7.) “To be deep in history,” he adds, “is to cease to be a Protestant.”

Was the
Identity Lost?

“But is it not true, after all is said,” asks a puzzled inquirer, “that there have been many and great changes, not only in your disciplinary rules and modes of devotions, which might be passed over, but even in your doctrinal definitions?” Our inquirer makes a wise distinction between discipline and ritualistic ceremonial, on the one hand, and the doctrinal content on the other. The former are but the garments of religion, which may change with the seasons, or vary in different localities, without hurt to the body; or we might properly say, to the better health and better setting off of the body: while the latter, the doctrines, constitute the body itself of religion, and must remain identical with themselves, if religion is to suffer no change. There have been apparent changes, we will admit and in some instances these variations seem considerable; but in each case a fair inquiry, we are confident, will reveal not doctrinal change, but doctrinal development.

Identity
of Babe
and Man

Identity is acknowledged between the babe and the grown up man; yet they are farther apart than the Catholic Church of today is from the Apostolic Church. If

you have not seen a young man since his childhood days, you will not recognize him now by anything you can remember of the babe of twenty years before. Yet his identity can be established to your entire satisfaction; and then you begin to realize how all that the young man now possesses: strength, agility, skill, understanding, etc., were all contained in the child in an undeveloped state. The identity is complete and was preserved despite the fact that the addition to the child's bulk came from without, through the assimilation of food, whereas the growth of doctrine in the Catholic Church was wholly from within, by the process of a progressive unfolding of the original deposit of faith.

CHAPTER X.

DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT.

"So is the Kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the earth." Mk 4, 26.

To some Protestants the idea of any development whatsoever, in matters of doctrine, is abhorrent; yet progress, not only in the subjective penetration of religious truths, but in the unfolding of the doctrines themselves, was inevitable. They argue that all should have remained in its original simplicity. They forget that, though most things may have their simple side, they have their complex side as well, and that, when the simplest fact is examined in its relation to other objects, at once a wide field is opened to our investigation. It seems a simple process to a child to take down the receiver of a telephone and converse with some person a mile or two distant. The child believes that the sound of its voice is carried through, or along the wire to its destination; but to explain that seemingly simple process to its

Simplicity
as a Test

maturer mind, in after years, will necessitate a knowledge of the nature of sound, of the transmissions of its waves, of the properties of electricity, of the intricacies of the switchboard, of the manufacture of copper wire, of the conversion of the latent heat of coal into a current of electricity, and a dozen other related subjects. William H. Mallock, in "Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption," pp. 244 and 245, makes this very truthful reflection: "The adoption of simplicity as a test of religious truth is a result of the grossest ignorance. Those who argue thus, argue in effect that, because religion undoubtedly has a simple side, therefore it has no side that is not simple. . . . It ceases to be simple the moment we begin explaining it; it is infinitely complex in its relation to other things." Mallock's testimony is that of a non-Catholic.

Implied
Doctrines
Given
Express
Definition

The body of revealed truth was given once for all and came to a close with the death of the Apostles. However, as time went on the terms of Christian belief were expressed more and more clearly and definitions finally reached that scientific accuracy that left no farther room for misunderstanding. Bound up in the doctrines explicitly believed were others, hidden at first to the casual observer, but soon drawn out one by one and proclaimed in their own right. With the increase of knowledge distinctions could be drawn more sharply, clearing the atmosphere of religion still further from any remaining mistiness. Philosophy became the handmaid of theology and enriched the latter with a fund of explanations, illustrations and proofs; placing within its grasp effective tools of argument for use against opponents. The restless human mind was active in searching for information in every field of the knowable: the rocks were made to tell an interesting story, surpassed only by that of the stars and planets; the beginnings of history were pushed far beyond the records of the earliest scribes; newly formulated laws of nature; the facts and fancies of evolution; a countless array of discoveries and theories clam-

ored for recognition. The Christian Church needed to meet the new sciences and examine their conclusions—to accept the true and reject the false; at times, to confess their help in overthrowing some faulty interpretation of theologians, and at all times grateful for the additional light thrown upon the sacred truths. It needed to speak to the scientific world in its own tongue and make its doctrines intelligible to the thought of the day. The same restatement of Christian doctrine has become necessary again and again in the face of the accumulated findings, true and false, of the prolific family of Biblical sciences. In the executive department of the Church's activity we find what we must have expected to see: that the powers intrusted to its officers came gradually to assume a fixed mode of procedure—the mode that proved itself in practice the best adapted to the purpose of these powers. In all this there is development, but not change. It has been charged, too, that the Catholic Church ceased to be the true Church when she borrowed terms and modes of thought from Greek philosophy and many of the details of law and government from the jurisprudence of pagan Rome. Some Protestant writers, in consequence, speak of the Catholic Church as a paganized Christianity. They overlook the fact that whatever was taken from pagan sources added nothing substantial to revealed truth.

The unprejudiced investigator will be able to account for all apparent doctrinal changes in the Catholic Church. A new dogma does not mean a new doctrine; it means nothing more than that the official seal has been placed by competent authority upon an old doctrine. Thus the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, promulgated by papal decree in 1854, and that of Papal Infallibility, defined in the Vatican Council in 1870, add nothing new to our Christian belief, except that in future no one may deny either article without forfeiting membership in the Catholic Church. Once we admit the divine

A New Dogma
Not a New
Doctrine

character of the Church, the official pronouncements of this Church itself will be the surest guarantee that there has been no deviation from the primitive faith. Says Mallock, in the book mentioned above, pp. 161 and 162: "It is only now, when the rains and floods of criticism descend and beat on the whole doctrinal edifice, washing away the sands on which Protestant thought rested it, that the true functions of an articulate and infallible Church, of a Church always the same and yet always developing, become apparent. It is only now, when men find themselves planted by modern knowledge in a world unknown to the theologians and apologists of the past, that, desiring still to retain the heritage of their ancient faith, they realize the full necessity for the guidance of a living teacher, whose authority is not indeed opposed to that of science, but is independent of it, and though not contradicting anything which science demonstrates, is able to assure us of the truth of events and things which scientific evidence alone could not even render probable." There has been no deviation from the doctrinal deposit delivered to the Church by the Apostles.

CHAPTER XI.

THE DEPOSIT OF FAITH.

"My Kingdom is not of this world." Jn 18, 36.

Neither Add
nor Take
Away

The contention that nothing must be added to the deposit of faith, made complete before the death of the last Apostle, is most true: "*All things whatsoever I have heard of My Father, I have made known to you*" (Jn 15, 15), are the words of the Savior Himself. Hence St. Paul (Gal. 1, 8), could say: "*Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.*" On the

other hand, nothing must be taken away from the received truths, for the reason that they are divine and, therefore, absolute and eternal. In one of the earliest Christian writings, that called the Epistle of Barnabas, dating from the second century, we read: "This is the rule of true enlightenment: Keep what thou hast received, neither adding thereunto, nor taking anything away."

It is the fashion among a certain class of "advanced thinkers" to take a stand just the opposite to that mentioned two chapters back. They blame the Catholic Church for its unyielding conservatism; for clinging obstinately to what they are pleased to call outgrown views; for its lack of progress and accommodation to the spirit of the age. Their favorite characterization of the Church is "obscurantist" and "reactionary." A sermon title, like that of "The Outgrown Christ," is fully in line with the teaching of these innovators. When they speak of progress in religious doctrine they understand something quite different from us. With them it is not progress at all, but alteration; not development, but retrogression from truth to error. "Therefore," says St. Vincent of Lerins (in his famous *Commonitory*, n. 23), "whatever has been sown by the fidelity of the Fathers in this husbandry of God's Church, the same ought to be cultivated and taken care of by the industry of their children, the same ought to flourish and ripen, the same ought to advance and go forward to perfection. For it is right that those ancient doctrines of heavenly philosophy should, as time goes on, be cared for, smoothed, polished; but not that they should be changed, not that they should be maimed, not that they should be mutilated. They may receive proof, illustration, definiteness; but they must retain withal their completeness, their integrity, their characteristic properties."

St. Vincent recognized the great danger to true faith in the quest after novelties; for he continues: "For if once this license of impious fraud be admitted, I dread to

Stem the
Flood

say in how great danger religion will be of being utterly destroyed and annihilated. For if any one part of Catholic truth be given up, another, and another, and another will thenceforward be given up as a matter of course, and the several individual portions having been rejected, what will follow in the end but the rejection of the whole?"

The Real
Innovators

Though most, or all Protestants, charge the Catholic Church with having gotten away from primitive Christian teaching, a little self-examination must reveal to them that in contrast with the old historic Church they are the innovators. It is they who reject the primacy of Peter and his successors, so clearly taught in the Scriptures; it is they who refuse to go for pardon to Christ's ministers, as appointed by Christ Himself; it is they who have degraded marriage from a sacred union to a mere civil contract; it is they who have introduced that prolific fountain of discord, Private Judgment, and set at nought the authority of Christ's Church; it is they who are tearing out chapters and entire books from Holy Writ; it is they who have banished the Real Presence from their churches; it is they who have broken with the Apostolic succession; it is they who talk lightly of original sin, of eternal punishment, of divine faith; who are bending ever more deeply before the storm of modern rationalism, which threatens to rob them of the last vestige of supernatural religion. Not in the Catholic Church, but in the non-Catholic sects, are to be found deviations from the faith built upon Christ and His Apostles.

CHAPTER XII.

DID THE CHURCH FOUNDED BY CHRIST GROW CORRUPT?

“The God of Heaven will set up a Kingdom that shall never be destroyed, and His Kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people, and it shall break in pieces, and shall consume all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand forever.”
Dan. 2, 44.

There has been no deviation from the doctrinal deposit; but has there been no lapse from the moral standards? The Church, in its official capacity as an authoritative teacher, has never proclaimed, nor ever countenanced, immoral principles, or immoral practices. There is one thing upon which all Protestants are agreed, that before Protestantism arose, the Christian world was sunk in hopeless degradation, and that the Reformation effected a wonderful advance in morality, enlightenment and general well-being. They are so certain of this that they are surprised that anyone can be found simple enough to call it in question. When they see the qualifying “so-called” added to “Reformation,” they ascribe the addition to gross ignorance, or downright bigotry. It never occurs to them that an unprejudiced inquiry on their part might reveal a story different altogether from that they had been made familiar with from childhood. It is good advice to hear both sides before rendering judgment. Have you read anything on the Catholic side?

Hear Both
Sides

That the nations of Europe were far below our present civilization in the fifteenth century cannot be doubted. But then the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were still worse, and the eighteenth little better.

Ebb and
Tide

It was the nineteenth century that witnessed a marked advance. Will the twentieth century continue the improvement? We hope so. The thirteenth was better than the two centuries that succeeded it; it has been called, in fact, by one well-known writer, the greatest of all the centuries. The twelfth and eleventh were far superior to the tenth century. In truth, every century in the history of Christendom was better than the tenth. There has been a fluctuation forward and backward, and, it may be only a coincidence, but the advance always occurred when the papacy was strongest. The papacy was weakest in the tenth century. Churchmen, as well as laymen, were carried up and down in this play of the centuries. But through it all the Church, as the Appointed Teacher, pursued her even course, warning against errors and condemning the evil lives, whether of Popes or princes, of priests or soldiers, of rich or poor. The passions of her kings, or the greed of many of her priests, or the unholy ambitions of some of her bishops, or the threats of unruly mobs could never coerce her into declaring wrong right, or falsehood truth. That is matter of record to him that takes the pains to read. That alone should be sufficient to establish her divine character. A human institution would necessarily be affected by its surroundings. Notice how Protestantism yielded to the pressure of the men and women, who tired of their wedded spouses and desired to marry others and, for their benefit, introduced the un-Christian practice of divorce. Some of us may live long enough to see most Protestant churches abandon eternal punishment and other like unpopular doctrines. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, has been unyielding, standing firmly for the faith that was delivered to the Apostles. Nations flourished and individuals became saints, when they followed the Church's teachings, and both retrograded and civilization was lowered, when they got away from her authority.

There are evil persons in every communion; but there is a difference of policy among Catholics and Protestants in dealing with them. Protestants try to keep at least certain sinners out of their churches altogether; Catholics try to keep them in and convert them. The former is the easier, but the latter the more Christian way. While the Catholic way conforms to the Gospel, there is no denying the fact that it has its disadvantages, from a worldly point of view; for the vicious bring a certain amount of odium upon the Church that carries them, in the eyes of the many, who do not discriminate.

The Wheat
and the
Cockle

Protestants generally, we believe, would make no objection to our policy, if they were convinced that we are making an honest effort to convert sinners. They have a notion that we connive at certain failings, and secretly encourage others. Some few among the most uninformed have a notion, for example, that the confessor condones wrong-doing by pronouncing forgiveness without due repentance. This, of course, is a mistake, and an inexcusable one, in these days of easy enlightenment. We are not influenced, it is true, by popular clamor; nor do we permit ourselves to be carried away by some fad of the hour, like that which pronounces all drinking, or the guarded sale of drink, deadly sin. Neither will we denounce card playing and dancing as intrinsically wrong; for that would be untrue and create false consciences. On the other hand we cannot be cajoled into the admission that certain sins of married folks are ever permissible; or that the state can sever the nuptial bond in any real and valid Christian marriage; or that the same state can absolve some rich bankrupt from the duty of restitution; or that the same state can absolve parents from the duty of bringing up their children in the fear, knowledge and love of the Lord. Sin, that is sin, is never permitted or condoned in the Catholic Church. More, undoubtedly, might be done than we are doing for the salvation of souls; for the opportunities of a wise and self-

Not Moved
by Popular
Clamor

sacrificing' zeal are simply limitless. Yet we can declare confidently that the average priest accomplishes much more in this respect than any Protestant minister. We say this, not in a boastful vein, but as voicing our belief in the greater efficacy of the means at the priest's disposal.

Indulgences
not a License
to Commit Sin

When the Protestant speaks of the Church being hopelessly corrupt at Luther's time, he includes in that phrase something more than the corruption of individual members. He has a notion that the Church itself, in an authoritative way, taught evil and officially fostered immoral practices: so that it might truthfully be said that the Church made her members corrupt. This is a serious charge: can it be proved? We have not the least hesitation in answering, No. Some persons, whose knowledge is less than their assurance, loudly inform us that the Church sold indulgences; that for the payment of money one could secure the pardon of past sins and permission to commit future ones. This would be a damning indictment, if true; but it is not true. An indulgence is not a license to do wrong; neither is it a pardon for past sins. It has nothing to do with sin except to extinguish temporal punishment, an effect of sin, and that only after the sins have otherwise been pardoned. The granting of indulgences is as old as the Church itself. Were indulgences ever sold? Not with the sanction of the Church. Pope Leo X authorized the Dominican friar, Tetzl, to grant an indulgence under the usual conditions of penance and contrition, to which was added that of a contribution according to the means of the donor, towards the building of the world cathedral of new St. Peter's at Rome—a commendable charity. The indulgence was neither bought nor sold.

Luther on
the Reformation

Did not the Reformers reform Christendom in the sixteenth century, and restore the purity of the Apostolic Church? We will let the leaders in the revolt against the Kingdom of Christ tell their own story. They, assuredly, are unbiased witnesses. Luther declared: "I hold that

those who have become Evangelicals have become worse than they were before they received the Gospel. Unfortunately, it is our daily experience that those, who live under the Gospel, are more spiteful, more passionate, more greedy, avaricious and quarrelsome, than ever they were under the papacy" (Hauspostill, Walch's ed. of Luther's works, v. 13, pp. 2193, 2195). Many Protestants cherish the notion that what they are pleased to call the Reformation was really a change for the better. The ones most intimately concerned with that movement tell a different story. To quote Luther again: "Now our Evangelicals are becoming seven times worse than they were before; for after we have learned the Gospel we steal, lie, cheat, eat and drink and give way to every vice. Verily, if we have cast out one evil spirit, seven others, worse than the first, have now entered in and taken possession of us, as is to be seen in princes, nobles, gentry, citizens and peasants, who behave without shame, disregarding God and His threats" (Ausleg. des V Buches Moses, Walch, v. 3, p. 2727).

I might quote Melancthon, Calvin, Henry VIII, Bishop Barlow and others among the so-called reformers, who wrote in the same strain. Martin Bucer said of his followers: "A good number of them only received the preaching of the Gospel, in order that they might be able to plunder the goods of the churches." Erasmus, an eyewitness and accounted by some the most learned man of the time, writes: "The triumph of the Lutherans is the death of good learning. Wealth and wives are their real object. For the rest, their Gospel supplies them with all they want—that is, permission to live as they like" (Ep. 506, quoted by W. S. Lily in *Christianity and Modern Civilization*, p. 163).

It is far from our purpose to cover up, or excuse the shortcomings of Catholics of whatever age or place; but we contend that if reformation of morals was the purpose of Luther and his associates, they should have remained

Other
Witnesses

Reform
from
Within

within the Church, since it was Christ's own Church; should have used her means of grace; and should have begun the reform upon themselves. To set up a church and a religion counter to that of Christ's was the wrong way, assuredly, to undertake a reformation. It is true that individuals, and even entire nations, became corrupt at different times, and that there was much corruption in Luther's day; but allow us to add to this confession the significant fact that Catholics never became morally corrupt, except when they disobeyed their spiritual Mother. They needed reformation: to be reformed from disobedient to obedient children. The Mother needed no reformation, for she remains ever the Bride of Christ. To induce her children to leave her was a wrong start toward reform. St. Paul, when he wished to correct the morals of the Corinthians, did not set up a church of his own. What is usually spoken of as the Counter-reformation, that effected toward the middle of the sixteenth century by the Council of Trent, by the Popes of that period, St. Charles Borromeo, Loyola, Teresa, and many other good men and women, was a real reformation, because undertaken from within.

CHAPTER XIII.

IS PERSECUTION AN ARTICLE OF THE CATHOLIC CREED?

"And Jesus went about . . . preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom." Mt. 4, 23.

Let us be Fair

Not a few dismiss the claims of the Catholic Church upon their spiritual allegiance with the remark that the church that could countenance a war of destruction upon the unoffending Cathari of southern France and the Waldenses of northern Italy, that could use the terrible weapon of the Inquisition to enforce religious uniformity

and view with approval the burning of heretics and the casting of their families, through confiscations, into helpless poverty, can not possibly be the Church of the gentle Nazarine. They turn from it with abhorrence. We have no desire to champion persecution; yet let us be as just in our condemnations as we are in our praises. The Cathari of southern France and the Waldenses of northern Italy were not unoffending sectaries and the Spanish Inquisition was more a state than a religious tribunal, aiming rather to save the monarchy from destruction than to benefit the Church. It is only fair, too, to judge events by their own age. Life was held cheap in mediæval days, and the penalties of the law were savagely inhuman in all of its departments. In England life was forfeited for stealing a sheep and men were maimed for trivial offenses. The spirit of the times was that of a rude, warlike people, accustomed to bloodshed and not yet fully reclaimed from barbarism. Moreover, the cruelties, that we complain of, mark but a passing phase in the history of Christendom. Whatever part mediæval churchmen had in punishing heretics their aims were remedial, and not vindictive; we may disagree sharply with the methods employed, yet it would not be logical on that account to turn away from the Church and reject her legitimate claims. A return to penal laws as the guardian of religious uniformity is at present impossible.

Protestants should not reject the claims of the Catholic Church on the grounds that some of her churchmen and princes have persecuted; for their co-religionists, from the sixteenth century down to the present, have been far more intolerant than Catholics. It is a mistaken notion, held by many, that religious tolerance was born of the Reformation. W. S. Lilly tells us in "Renaissance Types," p. 302: "Nothing can be farther from the truth than to regard Luther, personally, as a champion of liberty, a prophet of toleration, an apostle of freedom of conscience. . . . The immediate effect of his revolution was as disastrous

Protestant
Intolerance

to spiritual freedom as to intellectual cultivation." Before the sixteenth century religious tolerance was unknown to European statecraft, except in papal Rome, where Judaism was permitted to exist, from the fall of the Roman Empire down to the present. And after that the first sincere attempt to establish religious liberty was made, and voluntarily made, by the Catholic founders of the colony of Maryland. Not only did the early Reformers persecute, but they urged others, particularly princes, to persecute, and to pursue dissenting Protestants, as well as Catholics and Jews. The Huguenot minister, Jurieu, says that Geneva, Switzerland, the various principalities of Germany, England, Scotland, Sweden and Denmark had all employed the power of the state to abolish popery and establish the Reformation. Many Protestant synods and assemblies declare tolerance a sin. In England, to make no mention of the atrocities committed upon the Irish, Catholics were hunted like wild beasts, and for 200 years the punishment of death was inflicted on priests for saying mass. It was not until 1910 that English sovereigns were released from an extremely offensive declaration against the faith of their Catholic subjects. "By no artifice of ingenuity," says Macaulay, "can the stigma of persecution, the worst blemish of the English church, be effaced or patched over." "Persecution," says Hallam, "is the deadly original sin of the Reformed churches, which cools every man's honest zeal for their cause in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive" (Constitutional History of England, ch. II.). Protestant persecutions were not confined to the sixteenth century, nor to Europe. The history of nearly every Protestant American colony is stained with the blot of intolerance. To this very day we Catholics are victims of Protestant persecution, which manifests itself chiefly in endless misrepresentations from pulpit and press, as also, to a considerable extent, in political proscription.

CHAPTER XIV.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES COMPARED.

"Hearken, My dearest brethren, hath not God chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the Kingdom, which God hath promised to them that love Him?" Jas. 2, 5.

To many persons a serious obstacle to the acceptance of the Catholic faith is the belief that the Church frowns upon intellectual culture and is opposed to vigorous mental activity; the belief that Catholics must let their priests do all the thinking for them; the belief that their religion is not so much the result of conviction as mere outward form—superstition rather than faith; the belief that Catholicism stands for decadence: political, commercial and social; while Protestantism suggests purity of doctrine, conscience, enlightenment, progress and liberty; the belief that Protestant countries everywhere are in the forefront of civilization. Is it really true that the Catholic Church favors ignorance, and that Catholic countries are less moral and less progressive than those whose people and government are of the Protestant faith? Will facts bear out that assertion, or have we here but another baseless assumption?

A Baseless
Assumption

When instituting a comparison between countries, see that the comparison is fair: take countries of the same race, where possible, of approximately the same latitude, the same size, the same wealth. Compare, for instance, the Protestant and Catholic German states, Prussia with the Archduchy of Austria, Moravia with Bohemia, Holland with Belgium, Scotland with Ireland, England with France, the Protestant and Catholic cantons of Switzer-

A Fair
Comparison

land, Delaware with Rhode Island, Protestant Ontario with Catholic Quebec, Java with Luzon, etc. A comparison between England and Portugal, the United States and Mexico, would be manifestly unfair; as unfair as to compare Liberia with Spain, or India with Bavaria. Have you any idea that when the comparison is fairly and honestly made the Catholic nations are the losers? If there are inequalities, it is the Catholics that have a shade the better of the argument. Statistics could be quoted in proof.

Illegitimacy

Comparisons are odious, and it is only reluctantly we take up the charge that Catholic countries are less moral than those where Protestantism predominates. We will be brief. Examine the figures bearing on illegitimacy. During the ten years ending with 1905 the averages of births out of wedlock were 3.80% in the Catholic Rhein provinces and 2.64% in Catholic Westphalia, against 10.17% in Protestant Pomerania and 10.44% in Protestant Saxony. The rate for the Empire was 8.77%; in the Catholic cities of Treves, however, it was only 3%, Coblenz 2.9%, Aachen 2.5%, Muenster, the lowest of all, 2.2%; against Protestant Berlin with 15.61%. In all comparisons of statistics the rate of such births is lowest in Ireland, in spite of the handicap of its Northern Protestant section, which is ten times that of the Southern. Scotland had three times as many illegitimate births as Ireland some years ago. It may be remarked, in connection with this distasteful subject, that the crime of infanticide is rare in Catholic countries. It is not at all uncommon even among the married non-Catholic women of the United States. The per centum of illegitimacy was highest several decades ago in Austria and Bavaria, where legal marriage was made difficult, in fact impossible, to many citizens, because of the requirement of a certain amount of wealth altogether out of their reach, together with other restrictions. Many were married secretly, and though their marriages were valid in their own eyes and in the eyes of the Church, before the law their children were branded

as illegitimate. A large proportion of the so-called illegitimate children of Mexico are the offspring of parents validly married by the priest, but who failed to present themselves before the civil officials for legal registration.

Examine the figures for suicides. Few countries gather denominational statistics, as does Prussia and none strives harder for accuracy. Between 1891 and 1900 there were in Prussia 93 suicides for every million of Catholics; 247 for every million of Protestants. In Bavaria there were 93 to 210; in Alsace Lorraine 98 to 234. Examine the figures for divorce and the contrast will be still more glaring. In Prussia there were 9.6 divorces for every 1,000 Catholic marriages; to 26.7 for every 1,000 Protestant marriages. For every 1,000 mixed marriages the proportion ran up to 40 divorces. We gather no denominational statistics in the United States; but we know that it is a very rare thing for a Catholic to apply for a divorce; when he does, it is nearly always for its legal effects, not for the purpose of contracting a new marriage relation. The record of our country on the divorce question is extremely bad. In the census period of 1900, according to a report published by The Cleveland Leader, Jan. 2, 1910, there was one divorce to each 100,000 of population in Austria, 2 in England, 3 in Italy, 4 in Wales, 6 in Norway, 8 in Sweden and Bavaria, 10 in Holland, 11 in Bulgaria, Belgium and Hungary, 12 in New Zealand, 13 in Servia, 15 in Germany, 17 in Denmark, 20 in Roumania, 23 in France, 32 in Switzerland, 73 in the United States. There were only two nations that surpassed us: heathen Japan with 215 and Mohammedan Algeria with 288. In 1906 the proportion for the United States had risen to 86. In Ireland there was one divorce to 4,438 marriages. John Barrett, of Pan-American fame, declared in 1910 that more divorces are granted in one week in Chicago than in all the Latin American cities put together in a year. If you will compare the relative fecundity of Catholic and Protestant marriages, the balance of hon-

Suicides
and
Divorces

esty will be on the Catholic side. In Prussia, from 1876 to 1895 there were 4.1 children for every Protestant to 5.0 for every Catholic family; in Bavaria 4.0 to 4.9—a difference of almost 20%. The contrast is far more marked in the United States, where Protestantism is powerless to check the sins that lie back of "race-suicide." The record for France may be fully as bad as that for our native American population; but France has ceased to be a Catholic nation. The average number of babies for American mothers in 1909 was said to be 21 to 1,000; for Spanish mothers 123 to 1,000; for Italian mothers 175 to 1,000.

Other Vices

Drunkenness seems to be the vice of Northern peoples generally, irrespective of their religious affiliations. Yet no one would say that the Protestant Scots, English, Scandinavians, Germans, Canadians and Americans are less addicted to alcoholic excess than their Catholic neighbors. A comparison, by no means injurious to Catholics, might be instituted between them and Protestants on the score of private and commercial honesty, respect for law and works of benevolence; but enough has been said to show that Catholics need fear no investigation, if only the inquiry be conducted with fairness and impartiality. Faults will be found, no doubt, which exist, however, not because of, but in spite of, their Catholic faith.

The Test
of Wealth

In the judgment of some persons material prosperity marks the possession of the true faith. Protestant countries, they contend, lead all others in material well-being, and hence Protestantism must be true and all other religions false. We might dismiss the matter with the simple remark that the Church of Christ was not founded for the purpose of making its adherents wealthy: "*My Kingdom is not of this world.*" St. Paul wrote to the Romans (14, 17): "*For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but justice and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.*" A people may have plenty of gold and silver, and yet be far from God. It was the Savior who said: "*a rich man shall hardly enter into the Kingdom of heaven*" (Mt.

19, 23). It is not at all true that Protestant countries are blessed with greater prosperity than Catholic countries. There are rich and poor among both, and the same nations have had alternate periods of prosperity and depression. Belgium is commonly said to be the most prosperous country in Europe; the Catholic states of Germany are on a par with those of the Protestant faith; Quebec is not behind Ontario, nor Cuba behind Jamaica, nor Argentina behind New Zealand, nor the Philippines behind India, nor Mexico behind Egypt. Industrial enterprise, commercial activity, intelligent agriculture, the possession of advantageous sea-ports, of a fertile soil, the prevalence of coal and iron, bear an intimate relation to material prosperity; but have no connection whatever with the truth or falsity of a faith.

CHAPTER XV.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND INTELLECTUAL PROGRESS.

"The desire of wisdom bringeth to the everlasting Kingdom." Wis. 6, 21.

You have heard the phrase "ignorant Irish." Among the earlier Irish immigrants were many, who, if not ignorant, were indeed unable to read and write. But who was to blame for that, the Catholic Church or the Protestant English government? Up to less than a hundred years ago the Catholics in Ireland were not permitted to endow, conduct or teach schools, or even to send their children abroad to be educated. It was a criminal offense, punished with transportation, in any Catholic to act as schoolmaster, or even as tutor in a private family; if he dared return his offense was high treason. Not for many years after 1829, the date of Catholic emancipation, were

British
Brutality

the Irish allowed to use their taxes for schools. There is a different story to tell in Ireland now; no illiterates come from that country to the United States at present. The Irish are more fond of letters than most other peoples and, given an equal opportunity, they will be passed by none.

Patron
of
Learning

Many people talk glibly of ignorant and illiterate Catholics, and it is their own lack of knowledge that closes their eyes to the fact that not all the churches in Christendom combined have contributed in the past, or are contributing today, one-half as much toward mental culture as the Catholic Church. We say "mental culture"; for we wish to lay claim to much more than mere reading and writing. American Catholics saved to the people of the United States some \$42,000,000 in tuition, through their own support of their Christian schools, in 1911. The figures are growing larger year by year. That, over and above their payments to the public schools, is an indication of the value they place upon the souls of their children. They have taken to heart the pleading of the Savior: "*suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come to Me; for the Kingdom of heaven is for such*" (Mt. 19, 14). The Catholic Church reaches back to the day of Pentecost. Among her earliest teachers were a St. Paul, St. Justin Martyr, St. Polycarp, St. Ignatius, the Christian philosopher, Athenagoras, St. Clement, founder of the famous Alexandrian school, his pupil Origen, St. Irenaeus of Lyons, St. Cyprian of Carthage, Lactantius, St. Athanasius, St. Hilary. You have heard, probably, of the golden age of Catholic scholarship, comprising such doctors and saints as Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil the Great, Cyril of Jerusalem, Jerome—the greatest of Biblical masters, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and—greatest of all—Augustine. To these succeeded other distinguished scholars: St. Leo the Great, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Gregory the Great, Venerable Bede, Alcuin, St. Bernard, etc. There was a second golden age, comprising such masters as Albertus Magnus, Alexander of

Hales, St. Raymond of Peñafort, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, Roger Bacon, Raymond Lully; and their precursors William of Champeaux, Abelard, Robert Pulleyne, Peter Lombard, John of Salisbury, Hugh and Richard of St. Victor.

Monastic and cathedral schools rose early in the centuries, and from them evolved most of the great halls of learning, that are still in these modern days carrying out the courses of their Catholic founders. The thirteenth century saw the foundation of the universities of Paris, Salerno, Bologna, Salamanca, Oxford, Toulouse, Seville, Cambridge and others. The fourteenth century witnessed the beginnings of the universities of Rome, Coimbra, Dublin, Prague, Valladolid, Cracow, Erfurt, Heidelberg, Cologne and Ferrara. In the fifteenth century other famous schools took their rise, among them: Ingolstadt, Wuerzburg, Leipzig, Rostock, Freiburg, Greifswalde, Basel, Mainz, Tuebingen in Germany; Turin in Italy; Valencia, Caen, Alcalá in Spain; Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen in Scotland; Louvain in the Netherlands, Bordeaux in France, Presburg in Hungary, Upsala in Sweden, Copenhagen in Denmark. Most of these are still in existence; but it will be well to remember that in their early Catholic days students were not asked to pay fees; for churchmen were forbidden to exact contributions for imparting knowledge. The schools were generously patronized in consequence; Bologna, Paris and Oxford could boast many thousands of pupils. Now, if the Catholic Church really loved darkness, why did she found these great schools?

Catholic
Universities

The Catholic faith proved not only an incentive to the foundation of schools, but also inspired the highest achievements in art. The American visitor to Europe gazes in wonder upon the magnificent cathedrals of Notre Dame in Paris, Canterbury, Durham, Rouen, Salisbury—the most beautiful church in England, York, Amiens, Toledo, Burgos, Rheims, Ely; the Sainte Chapelle in Paris, that

Lofty
Cathedrals

Gothic gem, built by King St. Louis, after his return from the crusade; Westminster Abbey; the cathedrals of Beauvais, Chartres, Granada, Seville, Tours, Brussels, Trondjem, Strassburg, Freiburg, Cologne—all of them begun in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; of ancient St. Mungo's in Glasgow and St. Giles' in Edinburgh, and innumerable lesser churches; of Rome, Milan, Venice, Florence, Pisa, Orvieto and other Italian cities.

Painters

Painters vied with sculptors and other artists in giving expression to the loftiest ideals of religion. To combine in one the tenderness of the mother with the purity of the virgin called forth the matchless madonnas of the masters. The scenes of the Bible were transferred to the walls and windows of church and chapel, and the Bibles themselves and missals were illuminated with inimitable skill. In the history of culture you cannot pass by without mention such builders as Brunelleschi, Giotto and Bramante; such sculptors as Michelangelo and Canova; such painters as Cimabue, Fra Angelico, Filippo Lippi, Botticelli, Ghirlandajo, da Vinci, Raffaele, Correggio, Titian, Tintoretto, Guido Reni, Domenichino, del Sarto, Ribera, Morales, Murillo, Velasquez, Cano, Rembrandt, Rubens, Van Dyke, Duerer, the Holbeins, Overbeck, Munkaczy, Millais. Remove the Catholic masters from the treasured collections, and will there be an art gallery left?

Poets

In the history of culture you cannot ignore the Catholic poets, like Dante, Petrarca, Tasso, Chaucer, Dryden, Pope, Calderon, de Vega, Camoens, Corneille, Racine and countless others, including the authors of the Eddas, the Niebelungen Circle and the Icelandic scalds of the early and late Middle Ages; or Catholic litterateurs of the present generation, like Brunetière, Coppè, Huysmans, Bourget, Rettè, De Luque, Leal, Jorgensen, Brentano, F. M. Weber, Baumgartner, von Hahn-Hahn, Cardinals Wiseman, Newman and Manning, Father Faber, Coventry Patmore, Aubrey de Vere, Wilfrid Ward, Francis Thompson,

John Oliver Hobbs, Lucas Malet, Robert Hugh Benson, Hilaire Belloc, Justin McCarthy, Canon Sheehan, Sir F. C. Bernard, Orestes A. Brownson, Bishop England, the two Spaldings, Father Ryan, Richard Malcolm Johnston, Father John B. Tabb, F. Marion Crawford, Henry Harland, Joel Chandler Harris, Charles Warren Stoddard; or historians, from Eusebius, the father of Church history, to the Lingards, Hurters, Gfroerers, Knopps, Sheas, Cantus, Jannsens, Pastors and Denifes of the present generation.

In the history of culture you cannot ignore the princes of music, whose highest art was usually devoted to the Catholic choir: Guido of Arezzo—father of Plain Chant, Orlando di Lasso, Palestrina, Allegri, Peri—father of the modern opera, Lully—creator of the overture, Picini, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Cherubini, Paganini, von Weber, Rossini, Mercadante, Donizetti, Bellini, Berlioz, Liszt, Verdi, Gounod, Ambroise Thomas, Dvorak, Perosi, Mascagni, Puccini and the unknown authors of the chants of the mass and the liturgy.

Composers

In the history of culture it would be a blunder to ignore the achievements of Catholic scientists: of Galileo, Leverrier, the priests Copernicus, Gassendi, Piazzi, Orioli, Picard, de Vico, Grimaldi, Perry and Secchi in astronomy; of Galvani, Volta, Ampère, Coulomb, Gramme, Lalande, Marconi, Branly in electricity; of Roger Bacon, Albertus Magnus, Valentine, Agricola, Lavoisier, Linacre, Fourier, Haüy, Toricelli, Bernard, Schwann, Abbot Mendel, H. V. Dumas, Chevreul, Becquerel, Professor and Madam Curie, Roentgen and Pasteur in chemistry and allied sciences; of Fallopius, Eustathius, Steno and seven other Catholics, whose names have been given to parts, or structures, of the human body; to Cesalpino, Jussieu, Buffon, Daubenton and Malpighi in the natural sciences; to Gerbert, Cavalieri, Mersenne, Pascal, Cauchy, van Roomen, Descartes, Chasles, Monge, Hermite in the higher mathematics.

Scientists

Among the inventions and discoveries of Catholics we might mention the gamut, the use of stringed instruments, the organ; banking and book-keeping; the hydraulic

Inventions
and
Discoveries

press; clocks, watches, spectacles, the printing press, fire arms; the heliocentric theory, spectrum analysis; algebra, descriptive geometry, acoustics, crystallography, the science of heat; the thermometer, barometer, telescope, opera-glass, microscope, camera-obscura, magic lantern and photography; the mariner's compass, Mercator's projection, the astrolabe, quadrant, log, globe; canals, locks, water-mills; the electric dynamo, the armature, the electric lamp, the storage battery; the steam engine, the gas-motor, flying machines; illuminating gas, balloons, the stethoscope; bacteriology, the X rays, and so on indefinitely. The study of geography was stimulated by Marco Polo—greatest of ancient travelers, Leif Ericson, Christopher Columbus—discoverer of a new world, Magellan—first to circumnavigate the globe, Amerigo Vespucci—who gave his name to our country, Balboa—first to gaze upon the Pacific Ocean, Cortes and Pizarro—conquerors and founders of modern kingdoms, de Soto—discoverer of the Mississippi, which was first explored by Joliet and Marquette; and then there were the Cabots, Champlain, Cartier, de la Salle, Hennepin, Junipero Serra—founder of San Francisco and apostle of California, and a hundred others, whose names are appropriately perpetuated in our mountains, rivers, lakes and cities. Would you conclude from this partial array of fragmentary facts that the Catholic Church is inimical to science? Facts may not be more eloquent than high-sounding words; but they are more convincing.

In any case Christ's religion was given us, not for any earthly advantage primarily, but for spiritual gain and eternal reward. It is undoubtedly true that the principles, proclaimed by the divine Teacher, if followed by mankind, would cure all the ills that present society is suffering from, and give us a foretaste of the Heavenly Kingdom even here on earth; nevertheless, it is the future life we look to for the complete realization of the petition in the Lord's prayer: "*Thy Kingdom Come.*" That Kingdom we can make our own, if we will.

APOSTOLATE PUBLICATIONS

Catholic Religion, Rev. Charles Alfred Martin. A statement of Christian teaching and history, 496 pages, cloth, illustrated, \$1.00. Boston Pilot, Jan. 7, 1911: "No Catholic family should be without this book. It is a new 'Faith of our Fathers,' only more extensive. It touches on every conceivable topic connected with the Catholic Church doctrinally and historically. **The low price of the book is a marvel** and for that reason alone, the **circulation ought to go into the millions**. It is just the thing to give to your Protestant friends."

Cana, Little Chapters on Courtship, Marriage and the Home, Rev. Charles Alfred Martin. 10 cents.

Follow Me, Little Chapters on the Rosary, Rev. Charles Alfred Martin. Illustrated, 10 cents.

For these books address Rev. C. A. Martin, Cor. Oak Hill Ave. and Cleveland St., Youngstown, Ohio.

Questions of Socialists and Their Answers, Rev. William Stephens Kress, 200 pages, paper, 25 cents.

The questions in this book were asked by Socialists, and were asked, not so much to gain information, as to impart it. They bring the reader into direct touch with American Socialists—their aims and methods.

Address The Ohio Apostolate, 6914 Woodland Ave. S. E., Cleveland, Ohio.



