

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XVII.

OCTOBER, 1913.

No. 4.

CURRENT EVENTS.

LUTHER'S INTOLERANCE was scored in a sermon by Geo. W. McDaniel, of Richmond, Va. The *Times-Dispatch* of that city quoted parts of the sermons, which caused our pastor A. L. Crouse, of Charlottesville, Va., to publicly voice his dissent. Defending his statement, Mr. McDaniel wrote in the *Times-Dispatch* of March 16 as follows:—

“Luther was of an intense nature. I would not judge him harshly for his ardent advocacy of the truth as he understood it, but it seems to me that he went beyond the bounds of reason. Myer’s *General History* says: ‘Melancthon often reproved Luther of his vehemence and spoke apologetically for it.’ In his funeral oration over his distinguished leader, he quoted Erasmus: ‘God has given to this last time, on account of the greatness of the disease, a sharp physician.’ Professor Fisher, of Yale, in his *History of the Reformation*, speaks of the ‘intolerant’ course of Luther towards those Protestants who denied his doctrine of consubstantiation. Certain of his opponents held that the Lord’s Supper had a mnemonic significance, that it was a symbol of the atoning death of Christ and a token or pledge of its continual efficacy. In this particular they held the views of Virginia Baptists, and Professor Fisher says Luther was ‘intolerant’ towards them.

“The peasants of Germany went to many extremes, which no one will justify, but they held certain views which are founded upon Scripture. Luther urged that these misguided enthusiasts should be ‘stabbed, crushed, strangled.’ ‘He called upon the Christian authorities with all the more urgency and vehemence to use the sword against the devilish villains.’ See *Life of Luther*, by Julius Koestlin, professor of the University of Halle-Wittenberg.

“It gives me no satisfaction to prove that Martin Luther persecuted. It grieves me to think that he was not always consistent in his attitude towards those of different faiths. But his anathemas against the Jews show conclusively that he had not attained to the state of freedom of conscience. The invectives which he used against them are strong even for sixteenth-century standards. ‘If I had power over them, I would assemble their most prominent men and demand that they prove that we Christians do not worship the one God, under the penalty of having their tongues torn out through the backs of their necks.’ See *Von den Juden und ihren Luegen*, XXVII, 257. He advised that their houses be torn down, that their

books be taken from them, that their public worship be interdicted, that their synagogues be burned, and was sorry that he could not destroy them with hell-fire. See *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. VIII, p. 214.

"His intolerance appeared most clearly not in his attitude toward Catholic doctrine and worship, but in his dealings with other evangelicals who disagreed with him or walked different paths. As time passed, he grew more impatient of dissent, more insistent upon complete agreement. *Century Magazine*, October, 1911.

"Fearing the excesses of the Anabaptists and other radicals, Luther might become as intolerant as any papist. See McGiffert's *Martin Luther and His Work*.

"Conservative and intolerant, he introduced a regime of religious bigotry, for a long time narrow blighting to intellectual and spiritual growth. Our ideals of liberty were not his.

"The persecuting spirit in Germany persisted into the nineteenth century. The organization of a Baptist church in Hamburg as late as 1834 created a sensation. The constant growth of the Baptists exasperated the clergy and the authorities. They decided that Baptists should not be tolerated. Police officers entered their meetings and drove the members into the street amid the jubilant shouts of the populace. Pastor Oncken was arrested, imprisoned, and shamefully treated. He was tried, convicted, fined, and deprived of his property. See *Baptists in Germany*, by Cathcart.

A reply to these statements by Rev. Meuschke, of Richmond, Va., was declined. — Students of history know that Luther's "intolerance" in the sacramentarian controversy consisted in his refusal of church-fellowship to the Reformed, and that his utterances against the peasants, Jews, and Anabaptists were directed against people who were subverting public order. That Luther was no "Jew baiter" can be seen from his remarks on Ps. 14, 7. (IV, 927 f.) He turns vehemently against the usurious practices, the craftiness and cunning intrigues of the Jews, and mercilessly exposes their miserable lies; but, on the other hand, he pleads that Christian love and gentleness be applied in efforts to win them from their errors. (XX, 1821.) As regards the Anabaptists of Luther's days, we have been led to believe that American Baptists deprecate being identified with such iconoclasts, anarchists, chiliasts, and fanatics as Muenzer, Storch, Hut, Rink, Matthys. The American historian of the Baptist Church, Dr. Newman of McMaster University, Toronto, writes in his *History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, p. 37: "The extent to which the Baptist cause has been impeded by the Muenster kingdom

is incalculable. The Baptist name is odious throughout continental Europe to-day because of it. In England and in America the opponents of Baptists long urged their extermination on the ground that they might be expected to reenact the horrors of Muenster."

IN HIS LAST WILL Mr. Morgan, financier and multi-millionaire of New York, had said: "I commit my soul into the hands of my Savior, in full confidence that, having redeemed it and washed it in His most precious blood, He will present it faultless before the throne of my heavenly Father; and I entreat my children to maintain and defend, at all hazard and at any cost of personal sacrifice, the blessed doctrine of the complete atonement for sin through the blood of Jesus Christ, once offered, and through that alone."

It had been pointed out by Rev. Hageman, of Fall River, Mass., that this dying statement of Mr. Morgan embodies "the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone." Mgr. Cassidy, a Roman rector of Fall River, who had previously criticised Mr. Morgan's faith as out of harmony with his vast wealth, became so incensed at the idea of Morgan's holding the Lutheran faith that he violently attacked Luther and his doctrine of justification in the *Fall River Evening News* of May 26. We quote the pertinent passage as a sample of Rome's tactics in polemics:—

"Luther, having destroyed (?) the infallible authority of the Church, made himself an infallible authority. On the 5th of March, 1522, he wrote to the prince elector of Saxony: 'I have not received my Gospel from men, but from heaven, through our Lord Jesus Christ, so that I desire to be called henceforth an evangelist.' (De Wette, 2, 139.) Luther calls himself: 'By the grace of God Ecclesiastes of Wittenberg, who not only has his doctrine from heaven, but is one who has more power in his little finger than a thousand popes; kings, princes, and doctors.' 'Whosoever teaches differently from what I have taught, or whosoever condemns, he condemns God and must remain a child of hell.' (*Saemtliche Werke*, 28, 246.)

"How does that strike my non-Lutheran Protestant friends? At another time Luther says: 'I will not have my doctrine judged by any one, not even by angels. For as I am convinced of it, I shall be through it your and the angels' judge, so that he who refuses my doctrine may not be saved.' (*Saemtliche Werke*, 28, 144.)

"And now let us learn the doctrine of Luther. 'Faith alone,' Luther teaches, 'works justification; and a man is saved and his sins are forgiven by confidently believing.' He writes to Melanch-

thon, his colaborer and friend: 'Be a sinner and sin boldly; but more boldly still believe and rejoice in Christ, who is the Conqueror of sin, death, and the world. Sin is our lot here below. This life is not the abode of justice. It is sufficient that by the riches of God's glory we acknowledge the Lamb who takes away the sins of the world; sin cannot deprive us of Him, even if in the same day we were to commit a thousand adulteries or a thousand murders.' (De Wette, 2, 37.) In one of his sermons he exclaims: 'Provided one has faith, adultery is no sin.' (*Saemtliche Werke*, 21, 284 sq.)

"Sin boldly! Rob, murder, violate, debauch! Provided one has faith, it is no sin. Such is the doctrine of Luther — justification by faith alone — in all its nakedness, and such is the doctrine that we do not hesitate to term hideous, monstrous, soul-appalling. Is there here any mention of faith (which) leads to good works? I deny it. 'Be a sinner that the blood of the Lamb many cleanse you!' Do evil, not good. Is there here any mention of penance, of regret, sorrow, of reparation? None. 'Justified by faith alone,' screams Luther, while up from the apostolic ages, making the centuries resound with its echoings, thunders the voice of Christ's disciple, St. James: 'Thou believest that there is one God. Thou dost well; the devils also believe and tremble,' James 2, 19.

"'Sin boldly, that the blood of the Lamb may cleanse you,' preaches Luther in the sixteenth century, and 'my soul, washed and redeemed in the precious blood, He will present faultless,' writes the dying Dives in the twentieth, both in union and harmonious declaration of the same doctrine. However sinfully we may have lived, how unrepentantly we may have died, it matters not, 'we are saved by the blessed doctrine of the complete atonement for sin, through the blood of Jesus Christ, once offered, and through that alone.' Oh, ye fair-minded students! Oh, ye learned and ready of speech! Oh, ye who labor and sweat and toil, see you not the hideousness of such a teaching?

"Brother may betray brother, and wife be false to husband, and son shed the blood of parent, and each plunder the other — it is all right. Get you not a glimpse of the monstrousness of the position taken by this dying Dives? The masters of finance may water stock; they may corner commodities of life; they may manipulate the great enterprises of the land; they may sequester the great natural stores laid away in the earth for the use of all; the captains of industry may hire men and women as they hire the beasts of the field; they may melt and spin and weave the blood and body of the worker into the substance and fiber of the manufactured product; on the sweat,

the toil, the hunger, the want, the wretchedness of labor they may fatten and grow great and rich and powerful; yet dying and bequeathing their (ill-gotten) gains, standing on the brink of eternity, they turn and look out backward on the homes they have made desolate, the land made desert by their injustices, and strewn with the bodies of the men and women whom they have murdered, and then turn in sacrilegious Satanic confidence and say, 'It is nothing. I have believed. I am made clean.'

"And the man with the hoe, yea, and the pick and the crowbar and the dynamite stick, raises his head from his toil-bent position and says: 'What's that? Justified by faith alone? Sin boldly, rob, plunder, ravage, murder, — never mind as long as I believe? By heavens, that's a great doctrine. The world is surely ours if we can get it, and dying I'll be redeemed and spotless made in the precious blood of my Savior.' And the pickax descends no longer into the earth, but into the brain of some weaker brother. 'It's no harm to murder if I believe.' And the sledge-hammer falls no longer on the hard rock, but on the iron bolts of the rich man's vaults. 'It's no harm to rob if I believe.' And the dynamite is planted no longer in the tunnel, the cave, or the mine, but under the city or town cottages of the fewer rich. 'It is no harm to lay waste if I believe.' And sabotage and syndicalism and pauperism measure forces with capitalism and industrialism and grow-richism, each down and up in turn, each robbing, each murdering, each plundering until, both weltering in each other's life-blood, the human family expires in chaos — all washed clean in the Savior's blood — because both believed and were therefore forever justified! Such a doctrine, we repeat, is not only hideous, it borders on the Satanic."

Luther's claim to authority as a teacher of God's Word is the common claim of every Christian who proves his belief from the Scriptures. The infallibility of the Scriptures becomes the infallibility of the teachers of Scripture. They can challenge the world as Isaiah did: "To the Law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them"; or Christ: "The Scripture cannot be broken"; or Paul: "Though an angel from heaven preached other gospel to you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed!" — Luther's utterance: "*Pecca fortiter!*" in a letter to Melancthon of July 19, 1521, we have reproduced in its context in THEOL. QUART., Vol. XII, p. 117. Luther replies to a maudlin complaint about his sins which Melancthon had made to him. Luther, in his rugged, heroic way, tells his friend: "If you are a preacher of grace, do not preach a fictitious,

but true grace. If grace is of the true sort, you will also have to bear true, not fictitious, sins. God does not save those who only acknowledge themselves sinners in a feigned manner. Be a sinner, then, and sin boldly, but let your trust be still greater and rejoice in Christ, who is the Victor over sin, death, and the world. We must sin as long as we are in this world; the present life is not an abode of righteousness; however, we look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, says Peter. We are satisfied by the richness of God's glory to have come to the knowledge of the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world. No sin shall wrest us from Him, were we even in one day to commit fornication and manslaughter a thousand times over again. Do you think the price paltry and the payment small that has been made for us by so great a Lamb?" This statement of Luther on the unlimited grace of God's pardon for sin Mgr. Cassidy construes into a free pass to commit sin and go to heaven nevertheless. Does Mgr. Cassidy know that the argument of Luther is the same as that of Paul in Rom. 5, 20, and that Mgr. Cassidy's cavil is the same as that to which Paul replied Rom. 6, 1 ff.?

THE PLENARY, OR VERBAL, INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE was publicly defended in a letter to the editor of the *Sunday World-Herald* of Omaha, Nebr., December 22, 1912. It reads as follows:—

The first editorial in last Sunday's *World-Herald*, under the headline "Reformed Theology," contains the following statement: "It can hardly be said that any one entertains that belief ('verbal inspiration') now, but the conclusions arrived at by the church scholars, who call their work 'the higher criticism,' have been generally accepted in place of the old beliefs." Permit me to offer figures which tell a different story. The Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America, the largest of the four general Lutheran organizations, making a gain of 115 per cent. in the past twenty years according to the statistics of Dr. Carroll, adheres to-day as ever before strictly to the doctrine of "verbal inspiration" in agreement with 2 Tim. 3, 16, and most emphatically rejects what is called "higher criticism." And this church-body comprises 2,771 ministers, 3,481 congregations and 743,500 communicants. Now I read in to-day's paper that the average circulation of the *World-Herald* for the month of October was 55,804. Would the writer of the editorial referred to have the courage to say, especially when soliciting advertisements, that "hardly any one" reads the *World-Herald*? But I am glad and thankful to say that all the believers of the "verbal

inspiration" are not to be found only in the Lutheran body with which I have the blessed privilege to be affiliated. No, there are many hundred thousands outside of the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference who have not bowed their knees to "higher criticism."

During the past three or four years two Christian laymen have caused to be sent broadcast gratuitously five little volumes of about 130 pages, called *The Fundamentals*, to more than 275,000 pastors, evangelists, etc., of whom more than 25,000 replied with letters of appreciation. These *Fundamentals* are a testimony in behalf of "verbal inspiration" and against "higher criticism." Thus I read, Vol. V, p. 75: "Of course, the writers were inspired." "The Holy Ghost spake by the mouth of David" (Acts 1, 16). "The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel" (Ezek. 1, 3). But the writings as well as the writers were inspired, because "all Scripture is God-breathed." God, who "breathed into man the breath of life and he became a living soul," has also breathed into His book the breath of life, so that it is "the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever."

In Vol. V, chap. 3, the author of "The Bible and Modern Criticism" concludes thus: "Let us, then, by repudiating this modern criticism, show our condemnation of it. What does it offer us? Nothing. What does it take away? Everything. Do we have any use for it? No! It neither helps us in life nor comforts us in death; it will not judge us in the world to come. For our Biblical faith we need neither the encomiums of men nor the approbation of a few poor sinners. We will not attempt to improve the Scriptures and adapt them to our liking, but we will believe them. We will not criticise them, but we will ourselves be directed by them. We will not exercise authority over them, but we will obey them. We will trust Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. His Word shall make us free." (p. 89 f.)

I cannot refrain from calling attention also to the personal testimony of Dr. Howard A. Kelly, the eminent surgeon of Baltimore, whose published works have caused him to be reckoned with the most eminent of all authorities in his own field, which testimony makes up the seventh chapter of the first volume of *Fundamentals*. This is what he has to say: "I was once profoundly disturbed in the traditional faith in which I have been brought up — that of a Protestant Episcopalian — by inroads which were made upon the book of Genesis by the higher critics. . . . One day it occurred to me to see what the book had to say about itself. . . . I now believe the Bible to be the inspired work of God, inspired in a sense utterly different from that of any merely human book."

Another evidence to show that the writer of the editorial referred to is mistaken, as aforesaid, is the cry of the few against preachers who would feed their flocks with the product of "higher criticism," and for just such ministers who still dare believe in "verbal inspiration."

The writer of the editorial referred to also speaks of a great change in doctrines. Suppose he would read what the *Christian Herald* of December 18 has to say editorially about Dr. Eliot's "Unsound Doctrine."

In conclusion, let me quote from Spurgeon's *Clew of the Maze*: "We have measured the boasters who are the apostles of 'modern thought,' and we are slow to admit that the truth of the Gospel was purposely involved in obscurity, that their vast intellects might in due time develop it. Under their management our churches are famishing, and religion is falling into contempt; and yet we must daily wait at the posts of their doors, while their changeful oracles reveal to us the progressive theology. Bah! We will go on feeding men with the bread of heaven, while these pretenders are proving that sawdust is the true stuffing for the human doll."

(REV.) HERMAN HALLERBERG.

ON THE READING OF THE BIBLE BY THE CATHOLIC LAITY Revs. E. H. Schmidt and O. W. Wismar have had occasion to speak in the *Times-Democrat* of New Orleans under date of December 27, 1912, as follows:—

"For various reasons we feel ourselves compelled to answer the last letter from the Society of the Holy Spirit.

"In our last letter we referred the reader to the Council of Toulouse, 1229, which forbade laymen the possession of the Old and New Testaments, the suppression of vernacular translations being especially commended; to the Synod of Tarragona, 1234, ordering vernacular translations to be brought to the bishop to be burned; to the edict of Berthold, Archbishop of Mainz, 1485, against the printing of religious books in German; to the bitter experiences of Wyclif and Tyndale; to the action by the Council of Trent on the reading of the Bible by the laity, etc., and we asked to be enlightened on these various historical incidents; for we thought they showed that Rome has been hostile to Bible reading by the laity, and that, as far as the Roman hierarchy was concerned, the Bible never would have been placed in the people's hands, neither before Luther's days nor after.

"Now, the above references are very conveniently called 'supposedly historical' and 'loose' by our opponents, and they challenge

us to quote a provision from the proceedings of the Council of Trent which forbids the reading of the Holy Scriptures by the laity.

"Surely, the Society of the Holy Spirit will be the only one who found that charge in our letter. We said no such thing as our opponents charge. We simply asked for 'enlightenment on the action of the Council of Trent in this question of the reading of the Bible by the laity,' which, we trust, is quite a different thing. In the second place, it must strike the reader as strange that the Society of the Holy Spirit selected just this particular reference. We naturally would have expected a challenge on all the references. Or possibly they could have given us enlightenment on one of the references at least, instead of using another quotation from a Protestant historian, which, by the way, we had not asked for.

"What of the Council of Trent? What wonderful things did it provide regarding the reading of the Bible by the laity? This matter was taken up in its fourth session, April 18, 1546, the year of Luther's death. When the great and important question of the translation of the Bible into the vernacular came up, Bishop Acqui, of Piedmont, and Cardinal Pacheco advocated its prohibition. But why did not the council unanimously vote their way? Because, as Cardinal Madruzzi maintained, a prohibition would produce the worst impression in Germany. Madruzzi at least knew expediency. The many members of 'this great Catholic council' argued to and fro, back and forward and back again, but, sad to say, they could come to no agreement on this simple question. So, finally, they left this question to the Pope, and his decision we quoted in our last letter. Will our opponents claim that the Council of Trent did anything to promote Bible reading by the laity?

"The Pope and Bible reading by the laity! It would make a strange story indeed! But the reader can get an idea of this subject by reading the following interesting advice given to Pope Julius III (who, as papal legate, had been present at the opening of the Council of Trent) by the cardinals, on his election to the pontifical throne in 1550:

"Of all the counsels that we can offer Your Holiness, we have kept the most necessary to the last. We must open our eyes well, and exercise all possible force in the matter, *viz.*, to permit the reading of the Gospel as little as possible, especially in the common tongue, in all those countries under your jurisdiction. This is the book which, more than any other, has raised against us the disturbances and tempests by which we are almost lost. Therefore, it is necessary to withdraw the Bible from the sight of the people, but with

great caution, in order not to raise tumults.' (Document in National Library at Paris, Fol. B, No. 1088, Vol. 2, p. 650.)

"Here is a quotation from the mouths of cardinals. Will the Society of the Holy Spirit admit the testimony?

"We could continue this story of the Pope and Bible reading by the laity, but we deem this sufficient."

The reference to the Document in the National Library at Paris, which was reproduced also in the current volume of THEOL. QUART., p. 53, requires a modification. The quotation is from a writing of Petor Paul Vergerius, who had quit the Roman Church and espoused the evangelical cause. The writing is a bold satire from beginning to end, as a reference to Salig, *Gesch. d. Augsb. Conf.*, II, 1165—8, will show. Gerhard refers to this satirical statement—however, without indicating that he considers it satirical—in *Confessio Catholica*, p. 405 a, and in his *Loci*, I, 37, and II, 384. Some Protestants, overlooking the evident scope and character of Vergerio's writing, have declared the above quotation a "forgery." Rev. Dallmann points out that it has been so regarded by Gibbings in his *Taxes of the Apostolic Penitentiary* and by Le Lieure in his *Protestant Treasury*, and that doubt is cast on it by Gibson in his *Pre-servative*.

OUR BRETHREN AT DETROIT have been compelled to issue a public protest regarding the appropriation of \$200,000 toward the enlargement of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Hospital. Rev. Hertwig writes us:

"Rev. Rud. Meyer and myself were detailed by the Lutheran Pastoral Conference of Detroit and vicinity to go before the Poor Commission of our city and inquire what the intentions of that commission were. We found that they intended lending \$200,000 of the city's money to St. Mary's Hospital. St. Mary's was to build an addition to its present hospital with this money, the city would put its patients into this \$200,000 addition, and the city would also pay for the care of its patients, a certain sum per week. After fifteen years St. Mary's would be expected to buy the addition from the city—at a price not stipulated at the present time. Well, you may imagine what they would pay for it after fifteen long years, when not even the most alert of our citizens would remember that it belonged to us. We found that the Poor Commission of our city was about to virtually *donate* \$200,000 to a Roman Catholic institution, and we emphatically protested. The commission would not listen to our argument, and so we went to court. Before going there, we organized, and most of the other Protestant denominations of the city joined

the fight. We have a Central Committee headed by one of our own ministers, Rev. E. Ruesskamp. The court granted us a temporary injunction enjoining the Poor Commission from going ahead with their plan. Before the hearing came off, however, for a *permanent* injunction, — lo, and behold! — the Catholic authorities of St. Mary's retreated and said, 'We do not want the money. Why? Because some Lutherans of the city are so bigoted as to deprive the poor sick of the city of hospital facilities, just because those facilities are to be supplied in a Roman Catholic institution. We do not want it — it would have been a burden to us anyway.' A clear case of sour grapes!

"When Rev. R. Meyer and I appeared before the Poor Commission on our first visit, we incidentally made a complaint, and also supported it by testimony, to the effect that the priests at St. Mary's Hospital try to proselyte among our patients. This created quite a stir in the press. The chaplain of St. Mary's Hospital then appeared in a public statement, emphatically denying our charges and saying: 'I request and demand of these two reverend gentlemen a public apology, and if this is not forthcoming in due time and in the same place where the slander appeared, they may find themselves entangled in some legal proceedings that may prove both unpleasant and at the same time costly.' We replied immediately in a signed statement, and said among other things: 'We wish to state that we have no apology whatsoever to make for any of our statements made last Tuesday afternoon before the Board of Poor Commissioners, as all of our statements made before said board concerning proselyting at St. Mary's Hospital can be substantiated before any court of justice.' No legal proceedings followed — the father chaplain was trying a bluff, and we called it.

"The press of the city reported very extensively on all these matters, but their reports were tinged with partiality toward their old friends."

THE ANNUAL NATIONAL CALAMITY OF THE PAN-AMERICAN MASS at St. Patrick's Cathedral at Washington is due to happen again on Thanksgiving Day. Last year Pastor Wenchel, of our capital city, furnished us press notices which show to what an appalling extent the leading officials of our national government allow themselves to be used for the glorification of the Roman Church on this occasion. The *Washington Times* of November 28 said: —

"Thanksgiving Day had an especial significance in Washington. Here, at the seat of Government, the Chief Executive, the lawmakers, the interpreters of law, the representatives of every phase of official life, joined hands and hearts in services at St. Patrick's Church.

“Surrounding President Taft, the justices of the Supreme Court, members of Congress, and church dignitaries, sat the diplomatic envoys of foreign nations, large and small. The pan-American mass, *now a fixture on the program of the annual thanksgiving*, was observed with all the solemnity, and yet all the humility of former years, and in accordance with its underlying motive.”

The *Evening Times* of the same date contained the following description:—

“In the sanctuary, on a scarlet throne to the right of the altar, sat the highest Catholic prelate in the land, Cardinal Gibbons. Grouped about his eminence were the Very Rev. James A. Burns, D. D., and Rev. John T. Whelan, chaplains to the cardinal. Mgr. William T. Russell, rector of St. Patrick’s Church, also occupied a seat in the sanctuary. The preparations for the service were even grander than those on the occasion of the three previous pan-American masses of thanksgiving. The decorations within the church were more elegant and impressive. Silk flags of each nation of the pan-American Union were mounted on the pews assigned to the diplomatic representatives, and about the pillars and arches of the auditorium were draped the colors of the Latin-American republics and those of the United States, which predominated. The gorgeous decorations of the altar and the multicolored flags of the various sister republics served to reflect the religious and patriotic sentiments of the gathering. Shortly after 9.30 o’clock the distinguished guests began to arrive, but it was not until a few minutes before 10 o’clock that President Taft, accompanied by Mrs. Taft and his military aid, Maj. Thomas L. Rhoads, reached the church. Mgr. William T. Russell, rector of St. Patrick’s, met them at the sidewalk and escorted them to the pew they were to occupy. The majority of the members of the Diplomatic Corps and other invited guests, including justices of the Supreme Court, senators, and representatives in Congress, officials of the army and navy, and representative citizens of the District, had been seated by that time.

“On scheduled time the solemn procession of altar boys and priests, marching in advance of Cardinal Gibbons, left the rectory and advanced to the main entrance of the church. Hundreds of people had gathered before the edifice, and the services of a squad of policemen under the direction of Captain Hollinberger were required to keep them in check.

“As the procession marched into the church, the orchestra and combined choirs began the processional. Led by the altar boys, the distinguished group of prelates, attired in their magnificent robes,

marched solemnly down the center aisle toward the sanctuary. The priests and dignitaries wore vestments trimmed with gold, and pages bore the trains of the prelates. The congregation remained standing all the while, and as soon as the cardinal and papal delegate, accompanied by their attendants, had taken their positions on either side of the sanctuary, the officers of the mass took their places before the altar."

The "sermon" by Archbishop Keane, of Dubuque, was a panegyric eulogizing American progress, prosperity, wisdom, etc. It politely ("We this morning pray Him to touch the wounded Turk and give him peace in the fastnesses of his desert solitudes."—*Evening Star*) cursed the Turk out of Europe, and blessed "the martyred spirits of the Balkans," who have "pushed back the semi-barbarous Turk from the land he has desecrated." It handed a sop to the administration: "We thank God to-day for the peaceful attitude of our own wise Government during the year that has passed, an attitude which has won larger respect and greater confidence, strengthening the bonds which tie us to our sister republics, and which promises a brighter morrow for the Western Continent."

Then came the "pan-American prayer," read by the rector of St. Patrick's, Mgr. Russell. The loving Roman Church made the representatives of the twenty-one governments on the Western hemisphere hear and feel with what affectionate solicitude she is concerned about all of them, and how readily these governments should find their center of unity in her.—Following the mass came a luncheon at the rectory, of which the *Washington Post* of November 29 noted the principal incidents:—

"Mgr. Russell, host of the occasion, Cardinal Gibbons, Attorney-General Wickersham, and Senor Calvo, Minister from Costa Rica and dean of the South and Central American diplomats, were the speakers. Toasts were drunk standing to the President, to Cardinal Gibbons, and to the presidents of the South and Central American republics. The luncheon in every respect was typical of the close relations existing between the nations of the Western hemisphere. The tables and walls were beautifully decorated. Souvenir medals were given out bearing on the reverse sides relief maps of the Western hemisphere, with 'Friendship' written across it. On the menu cards were the flags of all the twenty-one nations of the Western hemisphere, and on each flag was a letter of the motto: 'And on earth peace to men.'

"Mgr. Russell, in opening the speaking, said that *he knew there would be no misunderstanding, and that no offense could be taken when he introduced Cardinal Gibbons as 'our cardinal.'*

"Enthusiastic applause greeted Cardinal Gibbons as he arose. The cardinal spoke of the qualities which he said rendered President Taft particularly fitted for the office of President. He mentioned the President's judicial temperament, his 'fine discrimination, which enables him to choose the right man for the right position,' and mentioned the selection of Chief Justice White as an example of his appointments. He also spoke of the President's 'sweetness of disposition, which showed no bitterness even in the face of defeat.' 'His administration has been marked by a reign of peace and wonderful prosperity,' he continued, 'which is the greatest possibly in the history of the United States. The test of an administration is the condition of the people of the country.' Speaking of the Philippines, he said that the President is the best man in the United States or in the islands to speak on both sides of the question of what is to be done. 'Happy for the United States and thrice happy for the Philippines,' he declared, 'if the administration of affairs in the islands in the future shall be in hands as capable as those of President Taft.'"

The President being absent from the luncheon, Secretary of the Treasury MacVeagh responded to the Cardinal's toast. It was a perceptibly lame effort to discount the political significance of the event. The President desires to "make us and our foreign neighbors recognize each other as brothers. Therefore the President approves heartily of any effort such as this."

All these things were set forth in the papers with a liberal use of bold-face type and striking photographic views, "our cardinal" usually appearing in the place of prominence. An artistic souvenir postal card shows President and Mrs. Taft as they leave St. Patrick's Church, escorted by Mgr. Russell, beaming with his happiest smile. Said one of the Washington reporters: "The service has always attracted national attention because of the prominence of members of the congregation, the President having been an attendant each year, and various members of the Diplomatic Corps, Roman Catholic members of the Supreme Court, of the Senate and House of Representatives, and officers of the army and navy being present also."

The service has not only "attracted attention," but it is causing ever greater sorrow in the nation at every repetition. Should not our pastors in their Thanksgiving Day sermons take cognizance of what is being done in the name of God, and in the name of all of us, at Washington by our Government? Thanksgiving has long been felt to be a sad misnomer for the last Thursday in November.

THE VALENTINE INCIDENT is officially closed, but as the offense remains, we think it not inopportune to quote the opinion of *The Outlook* of October 5, 1912, to which Pastor Hallerberg of Fremont, Nebr., called our attention some time ago:—

“The decision of President Taft with regard to the wearing of religious insignia or ecclesiastical dress in Government Indian schools can hardly be wholly satisfactory to anybody. Devout Catholics who believe it is a function of government to teach religion will not be satisfied, because the President decides that no teachers will hereafter be engaged in such schools who wear ecclesiastical garb; devout Protestants will not be satisfied, because fifty-one teachers formerly connected with Catholic schools now wearing ecclesiastical dress in the Government schools are permitted to continue the practice; the great body of American citizens, without regard to religious creed, who believe in the complete separation of Church and State, will not be satisfied with the President’s explanation of what is sectarian and what is not sectarian in Government administration. We briefly review the controversy which has resulted in the decision made public last week by the President. In recent years the Federal Government has taken over from various religious bodies Indian mission schools, and has made these schools Government or public schools by harmonious arrangement with the various churches concerned. Complaint having been made to the Indian Commissioner that sectarian practices were still permitted in some of these Government public schools, the Commissioner, last January, issued the following order:

“In Government schools all insignia of any denomination must be removed from all public rooms, and members of any denomination wearing distinctive garb should leave such garb off while engaged at lay duties as Government employees. If any case exists where such an employee cannot conscientiously do this, he will be given a reasonable time, not to extend, however, beyond the opening of the next school-year after the date of this order, to make arrangement for employment elsewhere than in Federal schools.’

“This action of the Indian Commissioner, Mr. Robert G. Valentine, is supported by two important legal precedents. The Court of Appeals of the State of New York, in the cases of *O’Connor versus Hendrick*, decided that the wearing of ecclesiastical garb in the public schools of the State was sectarian enough to justify the exclusion of such garb; and the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in a similar controversy, has upheld the constitutionality of a law excluding ecclesiastical garb from the public schools. It should be remembered that it is possible to teach by means of symbols as well

as by words. But on the complaint of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions the President revoked Commissioner Valentine's order, and, after a hearing, has now approved the decision of Secretary Fisher, of the Department of the Interior, to make the revocation permanent. The argument of Secretary Fisher and of the President may be substantially condensed as follows: There is nothing in the Federal Constitution or Federal statutes to compel the President to exclude sectarian garb from the Indian schools; therefore, in permitting it, he is violating no law. There are only fifty-one teachers wearing such garb in the Indian schools; the Government ought not to permit this number to grow, and in so far as we can, we will take action to prevent its growing; it is true that the Indian schools are public schools and ought not to be sectarianized; the situation is a difficult and delicate one,—but we think the simplest thing to do is to let the teachers now wearing ecclesiastical garb remain, as, after all, there are only fifty-one, and let the practice, even if it is not altogether in harmony with American institutions, die of its own accord. We think Commissioner Valentine was right, and that the President is wrong. It would be much better to turn all Indian schools over to private management, letting the Catholic Indians go to Catholic schools and the Protestant Indians to Protestant schools, than to involve the public school system of the United States in any kind of a controversy over what we hope is the irrevocably established policy of a complete separation of Church and State in this country."

"*APROPOS OF THE AGITATION* for the placing of Catholic books in public libraries a recent issue of *America* offers the following eminently practical advice:

If Catholic voters insist, as they should, that the works of our standard authors be placed in public libraries, Catholics, to be consistent, must see that these books do not remain uncalled for and unread. Otherwise librarians may with some justice object to buying books for which there is no demand. It is quite likely that the taste of Catholic patrons of public libraries is now no better than that of the common run of readers. If there were added to the annual list of books taken out the names of those who read them, it would be found in all probability that Catholics are not particularly eager to peruse works written by authors of our faith, and are no fonder of books of permanent value nowadays than are their Protestant neighbors. The well-puffed novel of the hour, as is well known, is the one book constantly clamored for to-day by most library patrons, irrespective of religion, race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

“Yet, if Catholics are to take with credit that place in the civic, social, and professional life of this land to which our numbers entitle us, we must have in our ranks more men and women who are well read and thoroughly educated. They must be Catholics who not only love their Church and reflect its holiness from their lives, but they must be Catholics who possess such a sound knowledge of the Church’s teaching, such a clear understanding of her attitude toward questions of the day, and such cultivated, well-stored minds withal, that in public life more of our laymen may be worthy representatives of the Mother of Saints and Sages, and in their social intercourse with their non-Catholic neighbors may be better equipped for dispelling the ignorance and correcting the misrepresentations of Catholicity that are still so common in this country.

“For the attainment of these desirable ends, our public libraries, which the money of Catholics helps to build and support, should provide the means. Let Catholics frequent the library’s reading-room. Let them repeatedly ask for such reviews as *America*, the *Tablet*, the *Catholic World*, the *Month*, the *Ave Maria*, the *Dublin Review*, the *Catholic Quarterly*, *Studies*, and their diocesan weekly. If there is a manifest demand for these periodicals, they will doubtless be procured. Let Catholics observe the leading articles and book notices in these reviews, and then apply at the librarian’s desk for new books and old that they observe are of special interest or importance to Catholics. A gentle, but unwearied insistence in this matter will, doubtless, work wonders. In most instances, however, the library authorities will probably be glad to secure at once any good book that is sure to be widely circulated. Catholics, then, of course, owe it to themselves and to the obliging librarian to see that these works are taken out and read.”

The above editorial in the *New World* (Catholic) of March 6 requires no comment.

IT IS MORE THAN A YEAR AGO (June 23, 1912) that Dr. E. G. Sihler wrote us from Rome, Italy, the account which we reserved from issue to issue for lack of space, and which we are glad to offer now, because its freshness has in no way suffered by the delay. —

THEN AND NOW. — If one is not hopelessly dull or endowed with a consciousness hedged in by yesterday and to-morrow, — if one is capable of taking a historical perspective of things and mankind at all, Rome, above all other places, can foster and deepen that sense.

For the American who is professionally devoted to the acquisition and transmission of some great segments of the culture of the past,

or who has come here again and again,—for him there is another matter. He is indeed apt to feel supremely ephemeral and evanescent when he moves among the silent witnesses of the ages. But on the other hand, there is something crushing and overwhelming in the contemplation, nay, in the mere enumeration of what we may call the work and the works of European history and civilization so impressively brought together and preserved in this place.—The Roman empire first, into which, with consummate policy, was dovetailed a quasi-spiritual, hierarchial system of domination, in many ways more far-reaching than Proconsul, Procurator, or Civil Law: whether under secular or spiritual edicts, *here* was the seat of government and the source of its power. Merely to understand the very sequence and coherence of these two empires is something, is quite an adequate reward for travel, expense, and sojourn.—Painful indeed is it to listen to Roman guides jabbering their formulary explanations in English to so many men and women of our own country. What these guides say is the veriest trash of men nomenclature, particularly when they deal with the ever recurrent themes of Greek mythology and Greek legends: that this is Ariadne forsaken by Theseus, that the other scene is a procession of Bacchus attended by Silenus or some Satyrs; that this mosaic probably was once in the *triclinium* of some wealthy Roman, etc.

What one feels is this, that the vast majority of American visitors, particularly the droves of Cook's "tourists," driven forward like sheep,—that these are essentially *unprepared*; that their mind has never been widened by serious reading; that Greek and Latin are to them things of which they are soundly ignorant.

The almost universal elimination of Greek from American education: the very positive narrowing of American culture and taste, we feel it here when we look into the gaping physiognomies of so many of our countrymen and countrywomen, and we know that the late president of Harvard undid more than he knew. A chemist and Greek! It was a fatal combination for sound learning in America.

But to return: Whether the Vatican or Naples contain the greater treasures of Greek sculpture, is probably still a debatable question. But again, we are in these collections too deeply impressed by the cultural reach and comprehension even of these accidental remnants. To name but two items: there is an (imaginary) portrait bust of Bias of Priene, one of the canonic Seven Wise Men of Greece. On the pedestal, or, better, the lower part of the *Herma*, is inscribed in somewhat scribbled Greek characters the apophthegm: "*Most men are bad.*" There is also a *Herma* of another one of the venerable

band of Heptasophis (but the head is gone), Kleobulos of Rhodes; here, too, there is a Greek saying ascribed to him: "*Measure is best.*" The libraries of the Roman aristocracy most likely were thus adorned. Thence, too, originally came the busts of other Greek men noted in thought and letters. For the deeper we delve into Roman letters and Roman civilization, the more do we see how (with the exception of law and jurisprudence) Greece furnished themes, models, and standards. Of course, it was only the concern of an *elite*.—Here, too, in the Vatican Museum, we notice, among the objects best preserved, huge bathtubs. Nowhere in the world is there to be seen any object, intended for mere utility, more ponderous, more impressive, or, we may say, more costly. One is of alabaster, two others are of granite. They are so large that, if filled to their full capacity, a large man could float in them or even paddle to and fro a little—clearly intended for a villa where the supply of water did not permit the elaborate *tepidaria* or *frigidaria* described by Pliny. For the Roman senators were the princes of the Mediterranean world.

Another observation: But all this, with Pompeii thrown in, weighs vastly less in the scales of true historical valuation than their literature. Mommsen has uttered the phrase of the "*Truemmerfeld der antiken Ueberlieferung*," i. e., that the tradition of antiquity is a mere plain covered with broken fragments more or less accidentally preserved. The most precious parts of literature *are* really preserved; these furnish a fairly true image, nay, they constitute largely the most enduring element, of that civilization. Only here there is toil and labor, whereas any one may sit down before the Laocoon, or before the Apollo Belvedere, or the Hera Ludovisi, and admire them, and carry away photographs or engravings. An American asked me whether the Greeks (in their civilization) were earlier than the Romans! This was in the Capitoline Museum. I make no comment.—I must not digress here to Hadrian and his Antinous so frequently and fully preserved in Italy; but when one realizes that the tomb of the former served, into modern times, as a veritable stronghold of the popes, and that in 1527 Clement VII as ally of France made his last stand in that fortress, impotent though he was to prevent the sack of Rome, or when we realize that for many centuries the Flavian amphitheater furnished brick and stone for medieval Roman building, we begin to weigh things truly.

Few tours are lovelier than riding from Frascati (below Tusculum) to Genzano, skirting the Alban Lake in its deep pocket of a volcanic crater, and on the smaller emerald of Nemi, idyl of that landscape, beyond which rises Monte Cavo, and the cradle of the

Latin race. At Genzans: now donkeys and sordid dwellings, and copper vessels filled at the town fountain and carried away on the heads of Italian women. Far away, on a slope looking to the southwest, lies *Civita Lavinia*. We think of the mythical ancestry of **Romulus** and of the latter part of the national epic so largely ordained and determined by the dynastic interests of Augustus.

Townward again, fast and almost straight northwardly, by the Appian in the main, most noted highway of history, there is a monumental ruin on the slopes of the Alban Hills; the natives call it the tomb of the Horatian triplets. Maybe. The measure of identification with the classic past, an identification so deeply characteristic of the Renaissance movement in Italy, is familiar to the student of history. At this distance of time and amid the more critical habits of our own, the whole movement appears as permeated with a certain *naiveté*. Much of it was an artificial repristination, particularly in the painted ceilings of Olympian scenes decorating villas of the Roman aristocracy.

Now a united Italy rules again; but it is significant how the modern state essays to rival with, nay, to outdo, the world-rulers of the past in the splendor of some of their most recent structures. When one calmly contemplates the vast and ponderous and composite national monument to Victor Emmanuel, between Capitol and Piazza Venezia, visible from many points of the periphery of Rome, then, for the foreigner, the following train of reflection will arise: It is indeed true that, since Honorius and Alaric (410 A. D.), and afterwards, Italy was neither truly *one* nor was it truly autonomous, until 1870. But, taking the period from 1859 to 1870, it was largely the policy of Napoleon III, first, and of Bismarck, later, which gave to Italy these precious things. The unity and freedom of the Italians was quite distinctly a *parergon* in the constructive statesmanship of France and Germany.

The other matter is the new palace of Justice (Department of Justice) of the Government, a highly detailed form of Renaissance. Among the marble figures adorning one of the two fronts is Cicero in the act of pleading. This structure, too, is a monumental one. It is so vast that, if one looks from Monte Pincio across to the right bank of the Tiber, the perfect and vast dome of St. Peter's alone asserts itself as ever in that famous sky-line, but the new building of Justice indeed seems to dwarf or crowd out everything else.

E. G. SILLER.
