

# The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 454 and 456 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.50 per annum.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line each insertion, except measurement.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHBRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LUKK, KING, JOHN NICH, and P. J. NEVEN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Arrangements must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, March 3, 1894.

## THE EARLY BRITISH CHURCH.

If, by persistent assertion, fictions could be turned into historical truths, the whole history of Christianity would be entirely changed. We have frequently had occasion to call the attention of our readers to the persistent efforts which have been made during recent years to misrepresent the early as well as recent history of religion in the British Isles, the purpose being to give a new coloring to the status of the Church of England in its relations to Christianity.

A new effort of this kind is now being made by the Rev. Dr. Baum, editor of the American Protestant Episcopal Church Review of New York, who is now engaged in giving a series of lectures in Montreal on "the history of the Christian Church."

The evident purpose of these lectures is to obscure the actual facts having relation to the early character of the Christian religion, and especially to keep in the dark the part taken by the Popes in the ruling of the Church throughout the world.

We are informed through the columns of the Montreal Witness, that it was the intention of Bishop Bond of that city to preside at the first of Dr. Baum's lectures and to introduce the lecturer. Owing to the Bishop's unavoidable absence, this office devolved upon the Rev. Dr. Norton, rector.

Of course, it would not be fair to hold these gentlemen responsible for all Dr. Baum's assertions, which it would be impossible for them to foresee. Yet the fact that the lecture was delivered under their auspices, and that these assertions were allowed to pass without correction, makes it appear that they are in sympathy with this endeavor to conceal the truths of history.

Dr. Baum gives the following extravagant account of the origin of Christianity:

"There were three branches of the Early Church. The first was the Greek Church, which was closely followed by the organization of the Anglican Church, and at a later period by the Roman Church."

The next statement is one which we are obliged to regard as an error of the reporter: "These branches continue their historical continuity until the day of Pentecost." The whole lecture contains so many preposterous statements that we are prepared for almost any assertion from the gentleman who delivered it. Yet we are not prepared to believe that he made this one, so devoid of meaning. We may presume, therefore, that it should be corrected to read, "almost from the day of Pentecost," a sense which accords fairly well with the rest of the lecture.

Concerning the first establishment of the Church in England Mr. Baum has this to say:

"Christianity came into Britain before Gaul, and, therefore, did not come from the missionaries of Gaul. Most of the evidence of the planting of Christianity in Britain is circumstantial, yet much of it is as clear as the light of day. In the old Church of St. Joseph of Glastonbury, the story is preserved how that St. Joseph of Arimathea set sail in a ship trading to the ports of Britain, and landed in Cornwall. After establishing the Church at Glastonbury, he worked through Wales, and thus Christianity spread North of the Roman walls of Hadrian and Agricola."

We must here remark that, as Catholics, we have no special interest in proving that the establishment of the Church in Britain is of later date than that assigned to the event by Rev. Mr. Baum, except so far as the interests of truth concerns.

Whether or not the Church in Britain was established by St. Joseph of Arimathea, it is certain that at this early date the Church throughout the world was one, in subjection to one head, St. Peter, or his immediate successors, in union with the Apostles, one of whom, St. John, lived down to the end of the first century, or the beginning of the second.

The purpose of Dr. Baum in giving a fabulous antiquity to the date of the establishment of the Church in England is clear from the whole scope of

his lecture, and especially from the extract we have quoted above, wherein he makes the Church of Christ consist of three distinct, and, he wishes us to understand, independent branches, the Greek first, the Anglican second, and the Roman last!

There is something original in this theory of Dr. Baum, and though we have from time to time had something to say on the origin of the British Church, it may be advisable to say a word on the novel aspects of the doctor's theory. Our first observation must be that, in historical matters, novelties are very apt to be gross blunders, and they are generally so, unless when some extraordinary and new light is thrown upon the subject through the recent discovery of authentic documents which give facts which have hitherto been quite unknown.

It is not pretended that any such new documents have been discovered by Rev. Mr. Baum, or any one else; hence we have only the already well-known facts to guide us in the matter under consideration, and the facts are that there is no evidence of even a probable character to show that either St. Paul or St. Joseph of Arimathea preached the gospel in Britain, though fantastic writers there are who assert that one or the other or both these great saints took part in the work.

We have the testimony of Tertullian that in his day, the beginning of the third century, numerous Christians were to be found in every public situation, the army included; and there is every likelihood that among the Roman soldiers in Britain there were numbers of Christians during the second, and some during the first century. It is probable even that a few Britons were Christians even in the first century, but it is historically certain that when King Lucius, in or about the year 183, sent his letter to Pope Eleutherius asking for missionaries to establish Christianity, there was not in Britain any known Christian Church. The establishment of the British Church must therefore be attributed to this period, and not to the fanciful period which Dr. Baum has fixed upon: just as the practical discovery of America is to be attributed to Christopher Columbus, even though it may be true that in the eleventh or even in the sixth or fifth century this continent had already been visited by venturesome mariners. The British Church was therefore established by missionaries from Rome, who derived their authority from the Pope and recognized that authority fully; Dr. Baum's theory of an independent British Church, earlier than that of Rome, is, therefore, a mere fancy.

The doctor adds, "No councils were held until the year 314. The first was held in the South of France, at which were three Bishops of Britain, which the Roman Church does not seek to deny."

This is very true. But why should the Roman (Catholic) Church seek to deny this? The fact does not prove that the British Church was an independent National Church, such as that set up by Act of Parliament in the sixteenth century. The British Bishops by assisting at the Council of Arles showed that they were part of the Universal Church, and in signing the decrees of that Council which recognize the universality of the Pope's authority. It is besides evident from the writings of the Fathers, and from the Acts of the General Council of Nice, held only a few years after that of Arles, which was merely a Western Council, that the Pope's authority was recognized equally in the East as in the West. Dr. Baum's figment of a Greek Independent Church is therefore just as unfounded as that of an independent National Church of England existing at the same period.

The next statement of the lecturer is said to have been to the effect that the Council of Constantinople, held in A. D. 325, framed and promulgated the Nicene Creed. We are willing to suppose that this is also a typographical error, and that the statement actually made was that the Council of Nice was held in that year, which is the truth.

We cannot conclude this article without a short reference to another of Dr. Baum's statements to the effect that "no evidence can be adduced to show that Peter ever had been in Rome."

"St. Paul had labored with that Church," and it is unfair to suppose that Paul had followed Peter.

In this statement Dr. Baum ignores the truth. There is much more evidence of this than there is of the supposed fact on which he builds his theory of an independent Church of England. Dionysius of Corinth tells us that Peter founded the Church in Corinth and in Rome. Irenaeus, Eusebius (the father of Church history),

Origen, to say nothing of scores of later Fathers of the Church, all attest the same, making a chain of unbroken testimony to this well-known fact in ecclesiastical history. So indubitable is this testimony that the learned Anglican divines Cave, Pearson, Ussher, Young and Blondel, admit it is an undeniable fact, and no ecclesiastical writer of any note pretends to deny it. Dr. Baum has the assent of a few modern ministers whose zeal exceeds their discretion, in denying a fact so well established as this is.

## FATHER KNEIPP AND HIS COLD WATER CURE.

The report that Milwaukee is going to have an hospital conducted according to the methods of Father Kneipp has awakened much interest and not a little curiosity.

Father Kneipp's name is now famous. But a short time ago the parish of Worshofen, in which the good Father exercises the ministry, was unknown, and to-day it is as familiar as the names of the great continental cities. Persons of all ranks and conditions come daily to benefit by the treatment, and the most wonderful cures are effected. When Father Kneipp first ventured to use his cold water for the alleviation of the infirmities of human nature he was derided by the medical fraternity as a senseless enthusiast, and efforts strong and vigorous were made to make him cease his "medical mummery."

All wisdom, however, is not locked up in scientific works, and the doctors are now constrained to admit that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in their philosophy. The doctors now go to Worshofen to hear the instructions of the doctor-priest. There is nothing supernatural about the treatment: patients go to Father Kneipp, who receives them kindly, points out the special mode of treatment and dismisses them. A consultation rarely lasts more than two minutes.

The spectacle of the patients going through the daily gymnastics is unique and well worth the trouble and expense of a journey to Worshofen. We advise all wearied of the commonplace to visit Father Kneipp's hospital. When first we saw it we deemed that a strange frenzy had stricken the inhabitants of Worshofen. Imagine a throng of people indulging in the wildest manner of gestures. Some were dancing, others were jumping, and some were endeavoring to discover how many strange and wondrous movements the human arm and leg are capable of accomplishing. We looked at the multitude in amazement, and thought to glean from the expressions of their countenances what kind of amusement they were indulging in. But they were grave and solemn, intent, it seemed, on a serious business. They were seeking lost health through Father Kneipp's cure. The gymnastics are continued for some time, and then the patients become ordinary individuals except that they are always barefooted. Cold water and bare feet, in conjunction with Father Kneipp, work prodigies.

One of the essentials of full dress at Worshofen is bare feet. It is amusing to go to one of the hotels there, and behold all the guests minus shoes and stockings. "I remember," says a writer, "seeing at a concert one evening a violinist in full dress, with the exception of shoes and stockings; but there was no room for astonishment, because in the front row of seats I noticed the Cardinal-Archbishop of Prague and two princesses, daughters of Don Carlos, all barefooted. But after a while the feeling of astonishment wears off, and we should feel disappointed if we did not behold all species of pedal extremities devoid of artificial covering."

And how they waded up and down in the stream! We confess that our equanimity was disturbed at beholding the efforts of some to keep their trousers from falling down into the water.

All the day you will see the patients wading in the streams, going through their aerobic exercises, and if you stop long enough you will see them departing full of strength and vigor and calling down Heaven's choicest blessings on the guileless doctor-priest.

There is no fixed charge for the treatment. Some, doubtless, give large sums of money, and others go away without the expense of a single sou. If Father Kneipp exacted payment he should to-day be many times a millionaire, but the desire of wealth did not prompt him to unfold his scheme to the world. He is actuated by the desire of amelioration of humanity, and the permanent and ever-increasing success of his cure more

than amply recompenses him. The money that he receives is devoted to the relief of the sick and poor. He is simple and unpretentious in his manners, and one cannot help admiring and loving the good old man who does so much good and attaches no importance to it. The Pope has created him a Monsignor, and they say that when the official document came to him he was so unconscious of its contents that it remained unopened until some clerical friends congratulated him on his dignity. He then read it, and with eyes filled with tears avowed himself unworthy of the honor.

We but voice the sentiments of many when we predict for the hospital of Milwaukee a large sphere of usefulness.

## THE McALL MISSION.

A recent issue of the Canada Presbyterian contains an article on the White Fields of France, purporting to be an account of the progress of Presbyterianism there. Rev. Mr. McAll and his wife visited Paris, and the history of how the mission began is told in his following words:

"Here is the history. I was an English pastor; and to none, I am convinced, could the pastoral relation and work be dearer than they were to me. My wife and I had crossed the channel for the first time, on occasion of our brief summer holiday."

He goes on to say that they yearned over the unhappy victims of bloodshed and famine (it was after the war of the Commune in 1870), and they resolved to offer their tracts and "Scripture portions." It was not very substantial nourishment for famishing people, but they doubtless remembered that "man liveth not by bread alone."

"We stood there alone, or rather one like unto the Son of God was surely close beside us—so there under the windows of the great wine-shop forming the angle of the Rue de Belleville and the Boulevard, my wife and I took our stand."

The Parisians must have been intensely amused, but Mr. McAll must be commended for his charming ingenueness. Fancy St. Paul and wife taking their stand in Athens and distributing tracts about the unknown God. Rev. McAll will soon discover that Presbyterianism, with its fallible creed, is powerless to stem the tide of Rationalism that is sweeping over France. He may learn, however, some points on Higher Criticism—a science in which our Gallic neighbors are past-masters; and we venture to predict that ere long the conclusion that France will ever turn an un-mindful ear to his admonitions will be forced upon him. The Canada Presbyterian writes enthusiastically over his success and promises us statistics.

## KING HUMBERT AND CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE.

"Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown," especially a crown won by spoliation. King Humbert of Italy is to-day one of the most insignificant and at the same time one of the most conspicuous characters of Europe. He is without ability save perchance a little dose of the bull-dog persistence of his father. His admirers give him the credit of being a statesman, but his official acts—and we appeal to any impartial and critical observer of his reign—scarcely warrant it. Intrigue and treachery are his favorite instruments of state craft. All his endeavors converge to one end—the retaining of the affection of the Italians, on which unstable foundation his throne is erected. He has heaped insult upon insult on the Vatican, and that won him the plaudits of thousands to whom the doctrine of liberty conveyed the idea of unbridled licence. But now, with his people wavering in their allegiance and with a depleted treasury, he ventures on a bold stroke of policy to show presumably that he is the Humbert of old, having nothing dearer than the interest of his people. He has issued a decree declaring a religious marriage to be an immoral concubinage. We append the decree in all its simplicity:

Humbert I.

By the grace of God and will of the nation, king of Italy. Considering the royal decree of the 1st December, 1872, approving the rules for discipline in the army; on the proposition of the Minister of War we have decreed and do decree—

With equal firmness and severity the commandants in the army should take care to repress the first cases of concubinage resulting from improper unions which are too often the cause of scandals and disorders and of violence. The religious marriage which is only a modified concubinage ought to be considered in itself as a grave crime deserving punishment where it is officially discovered.

Given at Monza, the royal residence. HUMBERT.

The decree is indeed worthy of him from whom it emanates. He has been

urged to formulate this infamous document by the Masons, who are not distinguished for their zeal in the cause of purity and who once declared that they will reform even the commandments of God and substitute for them the commandments of the devil.

King Humbert may learn before long that he has gained for himself the unenviable notoriety of being the man who offered the most enormous insult of the century to womanhood. A woman may live in concubinage publicly with a man and be surrounded by the protection of the law, but if the marriage is celebrated in conformity with the law of the Catholic Church she is considered as living in concubinage and punished for it by the immoral Government of Italy. What a farce and travesty of reason and of decency is this! What scorn can be meted out to the man who denounces lawful marriage as adulterous? How can honest women ever look upon his face again without feeling the hot blush of shame and indignation? How can their offspring, relegated to the ranks of nameless beings by the decree, ever give him again their unfaltering loyalty.

King Humbert has seen the dread handwriting on the wall, and his craven soul has bade farewell to reason and stumbles onward to anarchy and the disruption of social order.

## CALUMNIES BY ROMANCERS.

A romance published in the London Graphic, by Rider Haggard, last year, under the title "Montezuma's Daughter," whereof the scene was partly in Spain and partly in Mexico during the last days of the Aztec monarchy, has recently been the subject of some discussion in the columns of that journal and the Pall Mall Gazette.

It is well known to readers of Mr. Haggard's emanations that he deals largely in the marvellous, and no one imagines that the wonderful events generally described by him are real occurrences. Unlike Sir Walter Scott, who has usually ferreted out at least some quaint old ballad, or some tradition on which to base the most extravagant stories that he knew so well how to adorn and tell, Rider Haggard does not, as a rule, give any proof that the details he relates have any origin, however dim, in reality.

In the romance alluded to, however, he departs from his usual course, and gives a kind of proof that the story he tells is founded upon, or at least had a parallel in, actual life.

The story is that a certain Englishman who had reached Spain at the period alluded to had become cognizant of the punishment of a nun at Seville by being walled up alive in the convent for a serious violation of her vows. Mr. Haggard then relates in a footnote that he had himself seen in a museum in Mexico the bodies of a woman and an infant, found walled up in a religious house of that city, and that marks upon the skeletons showed that they had been so immured while living.

It is clear enough whence Mr. Haggard derived his idea of such a transaction. The writer has certainly an originality for the conception of horrors, but this invention is not purely his own. Readers of English literature are all well acquainted with Sir Walter Scott's description of the monastery of St. Cuthbert where was the "Vault of Penitence" which

"Excluding air and light,  
Was by the prelate Seixhelm made,  
A place of burial for such dead  
As, having died in mortal sin,  
Might not be laid the Church within."  
Twas now a place of punishment;  
Whence if so loud a shriek were sent  
As reached the upper air,  
The heavens blessed themselves and said  
The spirits of the sinful dead  
Benighted their torments there."

In this "Vault of Penitence" we are told that Constance de Beverley was immured,

"Whom the Church numbered with the dead  
For broken vows and convent fled."  
This legend of the Scottish poet is acknowledged by the annotator to be mythical in all its parts. Thus among the inquisitors who passed sentence on Constance, was "Tynemouth's haughty prioress;" yet it is admitted that at the date of the story, the beginning of the sixteenth century, there was certainly no nunnery at Tynemouth, though there had been one there eight hundred years before. Hence the annotator says: "The nunnery at Holy Island is altogether fictitious." The same writer asserts, indeed, that the immuring,

"On those the wall was to enclose  
Alive within the tomb"

Was customary as they "were subjected to the same penalty as the Roman vestals in a similar case."

He continues by giving the details of the manner in which this was done: "A small niche, sufficient to enclose their bodies was made in the massive wall of the convent; a slender pitance of food and water was deposited

in it, and the awful words 'vade in pace' ('go in peace,') were the signal for immuring the criminal. It is not likely that in later times this punishment was often resorted to; but among the ruins of the Abbey of Coldingham were some years ago discovered the remains of a female skeleton, which from the shape of the niche and position of the figure seemed to be that of an immured nun."

It is evident from this that the whole story of immured nuns is but the make-up of a vivid imagination; and Mr. Haggard's story is no less so than that of Sir Walter Scott, from which the idea was borrowed.

Mr. Haggard is evidently a plagiarist of this immuring tale, and his fiction of the skeleton at Mexico is made on the same frame with that of Sir Walter Scott's female skeleton at Coldingham. In both cases the position of the figure is made to do service in proving that the skeleton was that of a nun. In Sir Walter Scott's case the "shape of the niche" is made to give testimony, but in Mr. Haggard's the circumstances are slightly varied. The niche which in the former case tells such a tale, is replaced in Rider Haggard's story with the marks of the rope which bound the victim previously to her being immured.

The story of Rider Haggard was called into question by Mr. James Britten, Secretary to the Catholic Truth Society, who wrote to the editor of the Graphic stating that the assertions concerning the immuring of nuns are extremely offensive to Catholics as well as untrue, and that he was surprised at the managers of a paper with so many Catholic readers that they should publish such a misleading account of Catholic life and practice.

In reply, Mr. Haggard disclaimed any intention of writing what might offend Catholics, but he insisted that the same time on the historical truth of his statement, and referred to some allusions made by other writers to this practice, and especially to what he had himself seen in Mexico.

In republishing this story in book form in December last, Mr. Haggard retains the offensive passages, the footnote to which thus appears:

"Least such cruelty should seem impossible and unprecedented, the writer may mention that in the museum of the city of Mexico he has seen the desiccated body of a young woman which was found immured in the walls of a religious building. With it is the body of an infant. Although the exact cause of her execution remains a matter of conjecture, there can be no doubt as to the manner of her death: for, in addition to other evidences, the marks of the rope with which her limbs were bound in life are still distinctly visible. Such, in those days, were the mercies of religion."

Hereupon the Rev. Father Thurston wrote to the Pall Mall Gazette a letter which appeared in that journal of the 22nd of January, completely exploding the story. He had written to a friend in Mexico requesting an investigation of the whole matter, and in reply was told by the gentleman that he had called upon Senor Agreda, the director of the museum, who said that there is no foundation whatsoever for Mr. Haggard's identification of the desiccated body with that of an immured nun. The body which is represented as being that of a nun is nothing more nor less than a body taken out of the common cemetery when, not long ago, the cemetery was done away with. The object of placing it in the museum was to illustrate a phenomenon which is very common in Mexico, the remarkable preservation of bodies under the influence of the Mexican climate.

The whole occurrence goes to show the matter-of-course manner in which many English writers tell tales of Catholic usages, which have not a word of truth in them, but which are nevertheless willingly propagated by the press, while the contradiction is suppressed as far as it is possible to do this by unfair treatment of Catholics who put the truth of the case before the public.

Thus the Pall Mall Gazette, in order not to give the contradiction of the story the same circulation as the story itself, though publishing Father Thurston's letter, left it out of its special extra edition published on the same date; whereas Mr. Haggard's repetition of his calumny was published in every edition. The purpose of all this is evidently to perpetuate the fiction, and like Victor Hugo's Lucretia Borgia, Sir Walter Scott's Marmion, and Mr. Rider Haggard's Montezuma's Daughter, it will be quoted for generations as proof positive of this unmitigated calumny; and it will be believed by those who have been indoctrinated from youth with anti-Catholic prejudices.

He who patiently bears trials for God's sake will soon arrive at great perfection.

## ANOTHER SCHOOL G.

A strong protest has been made by the Catholics of Besenmer against the introduction of Dickens' "Child's History" into the schools as a text-book.

It is not to be denied much to be admired in the writer of fiction, yet the works of fiction also must be judged by the interests of morality, eliminated before they are placed in the hands of indiscriminately read, even independently of the lie spirit which he frequents in them.

It is true that in some as in Barnaby Rudge, I a spirit of fair-play in the rights of the minority as human beings, yet are indubitable evidence many of the anti-Catholic with which was imbued infancy, and these prejudices constantly in his "Child's History," making it as he used as a text-book even where there are But to introduce it with Catholic children, and which is sustained by Catholics equally with an outrage which cannot because it is from beginning against Catholic practices. It is no wonder that the Catholics of I objected to its use.

commission, in spite of representations that a is being done to them resolved to retain the book to substitute any other.

It is not our purpose this "Child's History" Yet we shall point out falsehoods retailed in ing it unfit to be used.

On one page the writer it was from Rome that was brought into England ancient Britons and Thus: "It was in the Roman ships that the first brought to Britain Christian religion was Saxons by Augustine Rome." Further, we a accordance with the "twice had he (Alfred) been taken to Rome, nobles were in the ha journeys which they religious."

Apart from the sneer against the Saxon pious journeys to the lic unity, it is admitted full remarks that English Christianity from Rome ful in acknowledging the Roman See in reli be understood in no ot an acknowledgment of the Pope over all C when the conversion spoken of the novelist a historian) states t converted by one Pat St. Patrick) long a Pope existed, consider had nothing to do w with the Pope."

It is needless to s which thus perverts to be a school text- are many passages w false like this, but We may instance the pretends to give th Catholic St. Dunstan

"The villain Dunstan villian, Odo, cause Elgiva, to be wayla and to be hacked swords and to be ban and lamed and left to

So far the school Besenmer have refus Catholics who have the retention of this I are many Protestan United States and Ca their wonder that C fully satisfied to let educated under a s mits such a state of t

Altogether indepe condition of affairs, tain that they are liberty of educating religiously; and eve testant clergy ther admit this right. Th Bishop of Chester, New Year's pastoral, his dioceses, said o secular system of present the undognm pampered, the dogm starved. That the p who is a Wesleyan, olic, or Churchman,