

applied and largely promoted by him, by his disciples, by his writings, all composed in defence of the Christian religion, for the benefit of souls, and for the guidance of all theologians who were to teach sacred letters according to the scholastic method. Thus as in the darkness of the night while some stars are setting others rise to light the world, so the sons succeed to the Fathers to illumine the Church, and among these St. Anselm shone forth as a most brilliant star.

#### Anselm in the Eyes of his Contemporaries.

In the eyes of the best of his contemporaries Anselm seemed to shine as a luminary of sanctity and learning amid the darkness of the error and iniquity of the age in which he lived. He was in truth a prince of the faith, an ornament of the Church, . . . a glory of the episcopate, a man outranking all the great men of his time, both learned and good and brilliant in speech, a man of splendid intellect whose reputation was such that it has been well written of him that there was no man in the world then who would say: *Anselm is less than I, or like me*—and hence esteemed by Kings, Princes, and Supreme Pontiffs, as well as by his brethren in religion and by the faithful, nay, beloved even by his enemies. While he was still Abbot the great and most powerful Pontiff Gregory VII. wrote him letters breathing esteem and affection and recommending the Catholic Church and himself to his prayers; to him also wrote Urban II. recognising his distinction in religion and learning; in many and most affectionate letters Paschal II. extolled his reverent devotion, strong faith, his pious and persevering zeal, his authority in religion and knowledge which easily induced the Pontiff to accede to his requests and made him not hesitate to call him the most learned and devout of the bishops of England.

And yet Anselm in his own eyes was but a despicable and unknown good-for-nothing, a man of no parts, sinful in his life. Nor did this great modesty and most sincere humility detract in the least from his high thinking, whatever may be said to the contrary by men of depraved life and judgment, of whom the Scripture says that *the animal man understandeth not the things of the spirit of God*. And more wonderful still, greatness of soul and unconquerable constancy, tried in so many ways by troubles, attacks, exiles, were in him blended with such gentle and pleasing manners that he was able to calm the angry passions of his enemies and win the hearts of those who were enraged against him, so that the very men to whom his cause was hostile praised him because he was good.

Thus in him there existed a wonderful harmony between qualities which the world falsely judges to be irreconcilable and contradictory: simplicity and greatness, humility and magnanimity, strength and gentleness, knowledge and piety, so that both in the beginning and throughout the whole course of his religious life he was singularly esteemed by all as a model of sanctity and doctrine.

#### The Character of his Time.

Nor was this double merit of Anselm confined within the walls of his own household or within the limits of the school—it went forth thence as from a military tent into the dust and the glare of the highway. For, as we have already hinted, Anselm fell on difficult days and had to undertake fierce battles in defence of justice and truth. Naturally inclined though he was to a life of contemplation and study, he was obliged to plunge into the most varied and important occupations, even those affecting the government of the Church, and thus to be drawn into the worst turmoils of his agitated age. With his sweet and most gentle temperament he was forced, out of love for sound doctrine and for the sanctity of the Church, to give up a life of peace, the friendship of the great ones of the world, the favors of the powerful, the united affection, which he at first enjoyed, of his very brethren in religion and in the episcopate, to live in daily trials, in troubles of all kinds. Thus, finding England full of hatred and dangers, he was forced to oppose a vigorous resistance to kings and princes, usurpers and tyrants over the Church and the people, against weak or unworthy ministers of the sacred office, against the ignorance and vice of the great and small alike; ever a valiant defender of the faith and morals, of the discipline and liberty, and therefore also of the sanctity and doctrine, of the Church of God, and thus truly worthy of that further encomium of Paschal: *Thanks be to God that in you the authority of the Bishop ever prevails, and that, although set in the midst of barbarians, you are not deterred from announcing the truth either by the violence of tyrants, or the favor of the powerful, neither by the flame of fire or the force of arms; and again: We rejoice because by the grace of God you are neither disturbed by threats nor moved by promises*.

In view of all this, it is only right, Venerable Brothers, that we, after a lapse of eight centuries, should rejoice

like Our Predecessor Paschal, and echoing his words return thanks to God. But at the same time, it is a pleasure for us to be able to exhort you to fix your eyes on this luminary of doctrine and sanctity who, rising here in Italy, shone for over thirty years upon France, for more than fifteen years upon England, and finally upon the whole Church, as a tower of strength and beauty.

(To be continued.)

## HAECKEL AND HIS METHODS

### AN EXPOSURE

By Richard L. Mangan, S.J.

(Concluded.)

But the case against Haeckel does not end here.

In June, 1908, he delivered at Jena a conference called 'The Problem of Man,' in which he exhibited three plates, two of which had already appeared in the Berlin lectures of 1905, designed to prove the affinity between man and the mammals. Against these plates Dr. Arnold Brass, in *The Problem of the Ape*,\* brings serious objections. Without entering into the minute details of the accusations, we may sum them up as follows:—

Plate I. shows the skeletons of man and of four man-apes and bears the title 'Skeletons of Five Man-apes' (anthropomorpha). Plates II. and III. represent the embryos of different mammals (the swine, rabbit, bat, gibbon, man) at various stages of their development, to show that at certain periods the human embryo is scarcely different from that of the others.

According to Dr. Brass, not only has Professor Haeckel falsely represented various evolutionary stages of man, the monkey, and other mammals, but he has taken from the works of Selenka the figure of a macaco, and, by shortening its tail, made a gibbon of it, whilst adding to the original illustration, made by His, of the human embryo! Admirers of Haeckel naturally waited with some anxiety for the answer to these accusations. In the *Berliner Volkszeitung* of December 29, 1908, and in the *Münchener Allgemeinen Zeitung* of January 9, 1909, appeared an article by Haeckel in which he carefully avoids the points at issue and resorts to the most illiberal abuse of his opponent. Of the condemned illustrations he can only say that 'they are pictures destined to make accessible to a wider circle facts which have been long known.' In this way he thinks he has justified his action. Comment is superfluous. But in the answer to an anonymous protest in the *Münchener Allgemeinen Zeitung* of December 19, 1908, Haeckel proffers an apology which has staggered even his admirers:

'A small number of my numerous embryo-pictures (perhaps six or eight per cent.) are really falsified (in the sense of Dr. Brass)—namely, all those figures for which the material possessed by us is so incomplete and insufficient that to make an uninterrupted chain of the evolutive stages, we are forced to fill the gaps by hypotheses, and reconstruct the missing members by comparative syntheses.'

After an undignified attempt to shift part of the blame on to the shoulders of the engravers, as if it was not his duty to check their errors, if any occurred, and to notify the reader, he continues:

'After this compromising confession of "falsification," I might have to consider myself sentenced and annihilated, had I not the consolation of seeing with me in the prisoner's dock hundreds of fellow-culprits, many of them most trustworthy investigators and renowned biologists. The majority of figures, morphological, anatomical, histological, and embryological, circulated and valued in manuals, in reviews, and in works of biology, deserve in the same degree the charge of being falsified. These are all inexact, adapted more or less, schematised, reconstructed.'

We have heard before of splendid audacity, but this example is of the best, for in the first place it is untrue that he has made his arbitrary alterations only on 'schematic figures'; the charge is that he has made them on figures which he has not given out as schematic at all. Secondly, it is untrue that the majority of biologists use only schematic figures in their works. Haeckel is playing fast and loose with the term. A schematic figure has always been understood to mean a figure which expressly brings out certain features in an object and in a form reconstructed according to the conception of the maker. A non-schematic figure represents the object as the author has seen it exist, not as he conceives that it might possibly exist. Serious scientists notify the reader of the fact that a figure is schematic, unless it is obvious, whereas

\* *Das Affenproblem*. Professor Haeckel's latest falsification of embryo-pictures. Leipzig, 1908.

'Oor Sandy wis aye gairnin' aboot his tea till I gied him Cock o' the North. Eh! but he's pleased noo!'

Some prefer 'Hondai Lanka' tea for its delicious flavor, others for its economy. Have you tried it?