

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION FOR THE CLERGY
Cum Approbatione Superiorum

Vol. LXXX

JANUARY-JUNE, 1929

"Ut Ecclesia aedificationem accipiat."

I Cor. 15: 5.



PHILADELPHIA
American Ecclesiastical Review
1929

exacting practices, regardless of their bearing on our high destiny. We are not entirely indifferent. We know that we ought to cultivate spiritual exercises. But if one exercise is as good as another, why not take the easy one and be comfortable? We take spiritual food, but it does not nourish the soul. "A life of mortification is of little use unless we mortify that in us which most wants mortifying. . . . We have known a youth whose weakness was eating, but whose favorite mortification was keeping silence for five minutes after supper. We have known another who was vain of his hands and his hair, and cultivated and displayed them without any self-restraint, and who practised as a mortification, going without salt on Fridays."²

The Church has her own secrets of practical wisdom. Her traditions have sifted out carefully many practices of spiritual life, countless forms of renunciation, ways of fostering the spiritual sense adapted to the wisdom of a genius as readily as to the simplicity of a child. The watchfulness of those in authority has done much to hinder unreasonable severities and to attach high spiritual dignity to what we may humanly call trifles. A spiritual director who understands the soul that he is guiding is free to suggest substitution of more rigorous for less rigorous spiritual practices or inversely, as may seem to him proper. Hence substitutions in spiritual life when rightly organized his spiritual activity as his director advises, no problem occurs. But what is held in mind at the moment is the freer organization of spiritual life as a whole, a habit of self-discipline fostered, the spiritual uses of relations with others, likes and dislikes, habits of piety, as all of these enter into the composition of supernatural life. We must be on guard against an easy habit of substitution which excuses effort and leaves our natural qualities in control.

This easier way of doing things results sometimes from an inadvertent mistake. The world calls some things small and other things big in ordinary living. Now the wisdom of the saints inverts that scale very often and finds big things small and small things big. They could find immeasurable spiritual

² *Lex Levitarum*, Hedley, p. 30.

value in trifles and trifling value in things that the world calls great. This inversion of values which was effected by Christ in both His teaching and example was nothing short of a profound revolution in all measurements of value. Certainly in His time the poor were socially insignificant, while the learned and powerful were looked upon with awe. And yet Christ elevated His least brethren and robbed the powerful and learned of their deceiving grandeur. A cup of cold water given in the name of Christ took on spiritual majesty, while wealth and ease were shorn of their hitherto unchallenged attraction. The last place at the banquet table takes precedence, when viewed with a discerning spiritual eye.

These lessons in spiritual values are learned in the primary grades in the school of Christ. True interior life frees the soul from the tyranny of social measurements and introduces the divine scale of values set by Christ. Hence the individual soul will be on guard against substitutions and fallacies of valuation which show the subtle working of the traits of human nature as it resists the supremacy of the divine ideal in each life.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF TRUTH AND THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL.

ON 6 January of last year, 1928, Pope Pius XI issued an encyclical on the Promotion of True Religious Unity which has occasioned much adverse criticism outside the Church. The immediate occasion of the Letter was the growing movement of uniting the churches of Christendom under one head, due to the hopeless disintegration in which the sects find themselves. During the past few years the Anglican Church has been prominent in this movement and unofficial approaches have been made to the Holy See to sound out its stand on the question.

It is significant to note that the union of Churches is not with the Episcopalian, not with the Baptist, not with the Presbyterian, but with the Roman Catholic Church. Catholics understand why; many of our separated brethren do not. Even Church history is unknown to them. They are of Protestant

affiliation by accident of birth only, as many Catholics are Catholics because they were born of Catholic parents and have never strengthened their faith with the conviction which comes from study. Not that their faith is weak, but they cannot give an intelligent explanation of the faith that is in them. To them, as to non-Catholics whose want of faith is blameless, the Encyclical of the Holy Father is an enigma. They accept it, but let them be questioned by those outside the Church concerning it, and their attitude is one of apology rather than explanation. Their answers instead of satisfying their hearers only deepen conviction that Catholics in matters of religion have no minds of their own and let the priests think for them. Priests with a reason for the faith that is in them, who from the pulpit and the press defend but do not explain the exclusiveness of the true religion, may stand upon the Rock of Peter and boast that the gates of Hell will never prevail against it; but this manner of defence, while satisfying Catholics, will not help them to explain their position to non-Catholics. It will repel rather than invite investigation by those outside the Church.

There can and will be no compromise when it is a question of revealed Truth, as the Holy Father has pointed out. While granting that no papal document was ever so widely read by non-Catholics as the recent Encyclical, nevertheless it was not an open letter to the world. It was written "To our Venerable Brethren, Patriarchs, Primate, Archbishops, Bishops and to All Ordinaries in Peace and Communion with the Apostolic See," to Catholic Bishops the world over who knew and believed the Truths therein exposed before the Holy Father every penned his Encyclical. Its purpose is clearly explained in the sixth paragraph. "In the consciousness of our Apostolic office let not the flock of the Lord be led astray by error." The "error" is definitely pointed out in the second sentence of the second paragraph in the document. [ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, April 1928, p. 392]. "Convinced that rarely do men lack all sense of religion, they [those outside the Church seeking church unity],¹ seem to draw from this, reason to hope that without great difficulty it may come about that all peoples, no matter how different their religions, will stand fraternally to-

¹ Words in parenthesis are the writer's.

gether in the profession of a few doctrines which will serve as a kind of common foundation for the spiritual life." The Holy Father continues, "We invoke your zeal, Venerable Brethren, to ward off this evil; for we are convinced that by means of your writings and your words, the principles and reasons We shall expound will more quickly reach the people, and they will come to understand them better so that they will know how to judge, and how to conduct themselves in relation to, the efforts made to coalesce in one body through some sort of pact all who call themselves Christians." Therein is contained the purpose of the Encyclical, written to the Bishops that they might instruct their people, the Catholic people, "how to conduct themselves in relation to the efforts to coalesce in one body through some sort of pact all who call themselves Christians." These efforts are made by whom? By non-Catholics seeking some sort of pact of Church unity. Hence it is clear the Holy Father was not addressing himself to non-Catholics, but to Catholics, and that he fashioned his diction accordingly, bidding them to hold fast the faith that is in them without any compromise.

Now the same truth must be presented to non-Catholics, and in just as uncompromising a manner. But because they are non-Catholics, that presentation must be preceded by a preparation which will dispose them for its acceptance. This should not be done with a challenging "I am right and you are wrong" attitude, if we are to look for any measure of harvest; but with the charity of the Holy Father which invites and welcomes without sacrificing principle. "Let them return to the common father of them all; he has forgotten the unjust wrongs inflicted against the Holy See, and will receive them lovingly." It is one thing to instruct our own people, "No compromise". It is quite another thing to present it to non-Catholics with tact that will assure conviction that one religion is not as good as another, without assailing error in any religion, and thus holding the good will and graces of those not in the fold. This can be attained only by getting them to understand the *Catholic viewpoint of Truth*. Once they are brought to understand the principle in back of "No compromise," the Church's stand on the exclusiveness of the true religion, as laid down in the Encyclical, will occasion admiration

on their part and contribute in no little measure to the validity of her claims. There were a few Protestant journals that sensed this Catholic viewpoint and in no uncertain terms praised the Holy Father for His stand, though not agreeing with him on the validity of his claims. Notably among them was the *Presbyterian*. It commented upon the Encyclical as being "only what might have been expected, so it seems to us. What is more, its contents are substantially what they ought to be—provided the historic position of the Roman Catholic Church is valid." Agreeing with the Pope that Church unity cannot be attained by compromising on matters of faith, it continues, "We regret the Pope's wrong assumptions, but we admire his loyalty to principle, his unwillingness to sacrifice what he regards as divinely revealed truth for the sake of unity of organization. Would that many of our advocates of a pan-Protestantism had more of the same loyalty to what they regard as truth, less of a disposition to sacrifice what they, too, regard as divinely revealed truth for the same unity of organization."

If we can get our separated brethren to think with a *Catholic mind* on this question, to look at it in an unbiased manner from a Catholic viewpoint, we can prescind for the time being from the validity of her claims, and much can be accomplished toward effecting Church unity. To get them to do this is only to convince them that Truth is one, and necessarily must always be exclusive of error, and never variable. This can be done outside the domain of religion entirely, thus lending no occasion of being charged with intolerance and narrow-mindedness. The presentation can be made without any "Rock of Peter" defiance, without any "gates of Hell shall not prevail" challenge. It can be made inviting and convincing that further inquiry is worth while.

Let us take the truth that two and two make four. Whether new schools of mathematics arose or not, they must all be based on that elementary truth, else chaos would result. Now we will suppose that such a condition should arise. One school teaches that the sum of two and two make five, another, six; still another, seven. We remain with the old school which teaches two and two make four. We respect, we number among our friends those who believe differently. But we can never sanc-

tion their error. The schools multiply till there are almost as many answers to what two and two do make as there are people. Then in a hopeless division of beliefs, occasioned by the captious diction, "It does not matter what school you belong to; one is as good as another," some leader in these schools says, "Let us get unity on this matter; we are getting further apart every day." And so they come to us of the school of two and two make four, and say, "You were the first school, and all of us desire unity, but some of these schools will demand that you yield a little. Surely for the sake of peace and unity you will grant some compromise, since we are so broadminded on our part as to be willing to yield a little."

Now what must be our stand? We have a *consciousness of possessing truth*. We *know* that we are right and they are wrong. We reply, "We respect you as individuals. We count you among our closest friends. Some of you have married into our families. But we do not hold as you do that contradictory terms can both be true. We cannot grant that two plus two make five, six, seven, etc. We cannot concede that one school of mathematics is as good as another when each is teaching different answers, one contradictory to the other. We have a consciousness of possessing the truth that two and two make four, and we cannot yield one iota on that point. We cannot even compromise on four and one-eighth for an answer. We believe anyone belonging to a school teaching that the sum of two plus two is five, and who holds at the same time that schools teaching the sum makes six, seven, etc, are just as good, is making an admission that he does not possess truth.

It will likewise be evident that, should anyone of these schools holding different and contradictory answers, give a series of lectures open especially to those believing two and two make four, not one of us would attend. Why? Because we have again the consciousness of possessing truth. We should smile charitably at their invitation to us. We should not want to be put down as narrow-minded. We know we should be criticized because our school bade us not to attend. Possessing truth, and conscious that we alone have it, we should not criticize the heads of our school for making such a prohibition. We would realize the ruling to be wise, and

calculated to protect us against error. Should our school forbid us to read books teaching that schools holding the sum to be equal to five, six, seven, etc., is each one as good as the other, we would see the wisdom of the prohibition. It would not be restraint or the taking away of our liberty of thought; rather a bulwark for protecting the truth we have. At the same time, we could understand why those of other schools would regard ours as tyrannical, because they have *not our viewpoint* as to the exclusiveness of truth. Now on the other hand when we hold lectures and invite them to our school, we do so in charity, praying that they may be convinced and *share with us the consciousness we have of possessing truth* that two and two make four.

Having demonstrated by some such example as the above the exclusiveness of truth, that contradictory things at the same time cannot be true, that truth can never be variable, we can pass to the truth in the field of religion.

Something more important than a sum of figures is the salvation of an immortal soul. Something more than human certitude does the Catholic believe he possesses as to the creed and actions necessary to save that soul. He believes that Christ came to give testimony of the truth; that He founded a Church and commissioned her to "teach all nations whatsoever *I have commanded you.*" that He never taught that it does not matter what you believe, just so you lead a good life; but on the contrary threatened with eternal punishment those who did not believe, "Preach the gospel to every creature, and he that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved, and he that *believeth not* shall be condemned" Mark, 15-16. The Catholic believes in regard to his religion that he possesses the whole revealed truth, and that any religion teaching doctrines contrary to his Church must necessarily be false, just as the members of the school of two and two make four believe that any school teaching an answer contradictory to this, is in error. It is not narrow-mindedness on their part. It is not intolerance when they refuse to listen to lectures given in schools teaching that two and two make five. They know these schools are in error. When they invite members of these schools to theirs to listen to a preachment that two and two make four, it is only that they may share with them the consciousness they

have of possessing truth that two and two are four, and can never be anything else.

Now in the field of religion Truth must equally be as exclusive of error. The Catholic holds there are three Persons in God; the Unitarian, one. Both cannot be right, unless three and one mean the same thing, but any sane man will deny this. The Catholic Church teaches that Christ is really present in the Eucharist; the Lutheran denies that Presence. One says, "Yes," the other, "No". Both cannot be right, unless "Yes" and "No" are identical in meaning. The Catholic Church teaches that Christ instituted seven sacraments; another Church says only two, still another three, etc. The Catholic sees here a contradiction. Only one can be right, because truth is one. So we might multiply examples, showing how the sects are all teaching doctrines, one contradicting the other, one diametrically opposed to the other, and all mutually exclusive of each other, just as four, five, six, etc., are mutually exclusive of each other, and yet most of them teaching that fallacy of fallacies in regard to the salvation of the human soul, "that one religion is as good as another," a fallacy they would not think of admitting in the field of mathematics.

Thus far in our presentation we have not asked our non-Catholic hearers, the seekers after truth, to accept the validity of the Church's claim. Get them to see and admit that truth is one, and exclusive of contradictions, by some such example as used above, and it follows that religions teaching contradictory doctrines cannot be each as good or true as the other, equally pleasing to God, unless it be that God is equally pleased with error as with truth. Admit that God has the right to determine the kind of service His creatures must render to Him, then man-made doctrines and creeds contradictory to His doctrines and precepts must be false. Admit that God through His Divine Son did determine the service man was to render; namely, what man was to believe and do in order to save his soul, and that He founded a Church with a commission to preach those doctrines and morals, and it follows that no one has a right to remain outside that Church. The employee has not the right to determine the kind of service he is to render to his employer. The work he is to do, the

time he is to spend in its performance, are all determined for him by his employer. We are all in the employment of God, in His service. We exist for no other reason. It is not for us to say what kind of service we are to give, what we are to do, or what we are to believe. Our employer, God, has determined that for us, and has entrusted that commission to His Church. We have no other alternative than to believe and act according to the orders of the Divine Employer, revealed and entrusted to His Church. At this point we are ready to demonstrate the claims of the Catholic Church that she alone received that Divine commission.

Some such process of reasoning, instead of repelling, will rather invite to further investigation and bring the seeker of truth to the conviction that the modern fallacy, "one religion is as good as another," has absolutely no *fundamentum in re*, possesses no vestige whatsoever of common sense, and is, without any redeeming qualification, unworthy of the consideration of any sane mind. He will then have grasped the Catholic viewpoint on the exclusiveness of Truth. Though he may not assent to the Church's claims of Divine commission, he will nevertheless understand why she is uncompromising when it is a question of Divine Truth. Like the *Presbyterian*, while not agreeing with the Holy Father's claims, he will nevertheless see that the Encyclical is "only what might have been expected . . . its contents substantially what they ought to be." Though "regretting the Pope's wrong assumptions", he will "admire his loyalty to principle, his unwillingness to sacrifice what he regards as divinely revealed truth for the sake of unity of organization."

Sensing the Catholic mind on the exclusiveness of truth, he is now ready to listen to the Catholic claim to Truth. The slogan, "one religion is as good as another," has been stripped of every vestige of respectability, without a single attack upon any church. The good will of the seeker of truth is still ours. Before him he sees hundreds of different sects, all teaching doctrines that are diametrically opposed to each other. One cannot be as good as another. Truth is one. He finds no church in Protestantism with even a pretence to infallibility. He wants to be sure that he possesses the Truth of Christ. Uncertainty will not satisfy Him. There is too much at

stake, his immortal soul. He finds among the Churches one only that lays claim to infallibility. "One religion is as good as another," condemns Protestantism. It is a profession that it does not possess truth. Not even claiming infallibility, that for him is a confession that Protestantism does not believe with certitude that which it professes. The Catholic Church's claim to infallibility convinces him that Catholics believe with certitude that which they profess. Its claim to infallibility creates at least a presumption in its favor. He is now ready to examine that claim.

WM. J. BURKE, C.S.C.

Notre Dame, Indiana.

THE RECOVERY OF THE BODY OF THE VENERABLE JOHN SOUTHWORTH.

The Only Preserved Body of an English Secular Priest Martyr.

ON 20 December, 1927, it was my happy privilege to bring back to English soil the body of the Venerable John Southworth, who was martyred at Tyburn on 28 June, 1654, and whose remains had been sent to Douai in Flanders by one of the Norfolk family, there to rest for nearly three centuries in the college where he had been nurtured, the college that could claim some three hundred martyrs among the long procession of devoted priests that issued from its walls to work on the English mission.

It was in the preceding July that I first went to Douai and was able to identify the remains as those of our English martyr: it took a month or more to substantiate this identification, and then at last through the mediation of the British Foreign Office the claim of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster that the body should be returned to England was allowed by the French Government.

It will perhaps interest American Catholics to read some account of the discovery of the body: for particulars of the life of the martyr it will be sufficient to refer the reader to Bishop Challoner's *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, where an adequate biography will be found.

The English Secular College was founded at Douai in the north of France by Cardinal Allen in the year 1568. It was a