

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 404 and 406 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

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

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, Niagara Falls, N. Y.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

London, Saturday, September 9, 1899

CONSECRATION TO THE SACRED HEART.

The appeal of Leo XIII. to the world, entreating it to acknowledge the Christ as its Master and King, must have fallen strangely on the ears of this generation.

Some time ago a man who had written against Christ gave, as he was nearing eternity, utterance to the following words: "Repose now in Thy glory, noble Founder! Thy work is finished. Whatever may be the surprises of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed.

Remarkable and significant words inasmuch as they came from a man who had cast off from him the religion of his childhood, and who, after having tried to feed his soul with the husks of unbelief, declared when death was near, that the religion of Christ could alone satisfy the wants of human nature.

He, as it has been said, came on earth to teach man a model life, to guide him to his destiny, to console him in every sorrow, to leave no want of his nature unsatisfied. He did not preach in stately cathedrals, but on the mountain slopes, in the valleys:—wherever there were souls to save there He placed His pulpit.

AGNOSTIC TEACHING. A sensation was produced in a small church at Ste. Agathe, a summer resort near Montreal, in the Province of Quebec, on Sunday, the 27th ult.

Among other unusual statements uttered by the young divine was his belief that the inspiration of Shakespeare and Browning differed only in a degree from that of Isaiah and Paul. The Bible was simply the literature of the Jewish people, and everything contained therein should be interpreted in the light of this fact.

The wrangling and noise of the world fill our ears with confused murmurs, and we are too much inclined to adapt its standards and to embrace its

principles. The braggart and the man who knows too little to discern that he knows nothing pushes aside the sage and the scholar. All our energies must be devoted to what the world calls success. We too would have our brethren to stand not as idlers but to be in the front ever and always, for we believe that by so doing they can extend God's kingdom on earth.

We wish them, however, to remember the conditions that must accompany the success that has any element of permanency. The heroes of the Church have dominated whole generations not by material force but by a faithful imitation of the virtues of Him who taught in His school the virtues of humility and obedience. When once we grasp the fact that without these success is but failure, we have learned something. In our days of wealth, of childish display, it is consoling to recall the fact that the Saviour, a Toller for bread, ruled by creatures, obscure and contemned, wrought without the assistance of anything the world considers as essential to success, the wonderful transformation called Christianity.

The faithful of London, if we may judge from their frequentation of the sacraments, understand this; and we wish that the fervor manifested by them on last Sunday may abide with them always. The scene in the cathedral must have gladdened the heart of Bishop McEvay and caused him to rejoice that unto his keeping is given such a section of God's Church.

AFTER THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

It is a somewhat remarkable circumstance, coming so soon after the great peace powwow at the Hague, that the Cossacks and British bluejackets came very near having a rupture at Hang-Kow, China, on the Yang-tse-Kiang river a few days ago, and the matter was not settled by the new arbitration tribunal which was agreed upon by the Peace Conference.

A sensation was produced in a small church at Ste. Agathe, a summer resort near Montreal, in the Province of Quebec, on Sunday, the 27th ult. The church, is an Anglican one, and the Rev. H. W. Garth, rector of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Narragansett Pier, preached a discourse on the lines of the Agnostic wing of the United States Episcopalians.

Canadian Anglicans are not prepared to go so far in an Agnostic direction as some of their United States brethren, and the congregation manifested their disapprobation of this teaching in a very decided way. Two of the congregation rose at the conclusion of the discourse, and amid the plaudits of the hearers, protested publicly against the views of the preacher. Nevertheless, the preacher has some adherents, and the incident has been discussed with a good deal of warmth by the Church of England people of the locality.

WAS IT INCENDIARISM?

Our readers may remember that the Rev. F. M. Clendenin, the pastor of St. Peter's Protestant Episcopal Church at Westchester, New York, protested publicly to Bishop Potter in regard to the ordination of Professor Briggs, to the Episcopal ministry. Recently that Church has been burned, and some of the High Church people of the city are very positive in the assertion that the Broad Church people are guilty of having burned the Church or caused it to be burned.

THE PARTING OF THE WAYS.

The Ritualists generally have not taken kindly to the decision of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, adverse to the use of lights in processions and of incense for liturgical purposes; and though the prohibition is extremely moderate, and couched in such terms that it could be easily evaded, many prominent clergymen have declared openly that they will pay no attention to it, even to the extent of professing obedience. The neutral party of peace, which has taken no part in the attack of the Evangelicals upon the High Church, are earnestly begging of the Ritualists to conform to the decision, but the latter point out triumphantly that their decision itself declares that it has no legal or coercive authority, and ask by what principle a non-coercive law should be obeyed.

A SENSATIONAL FABRICATION.

The trial of Captain Dreyfus has been made by some of the press reporters the occasion for misrepresenting the position of the Catholic Church, and especially of the Jesuit Order, toward the accused man. It has been very confidently asserted that the Church and the Jesuits have ranged themselves against Dreyfus because he is a Jew, and that in fact the whole anti-Semitic movement which resulted in several parts of France, and in Algeria, has been directed and engineered by Catholic priests.

DESECRATIONS OF THE MARRIAGE RITE. On Thursday, August 31, Judge Donovan of Detroit showed a disposition to minimize the divorce evil by putting obstacles in the way of those who were seeking for divorce decrees. He refused to grant one decree because it had been the usual practice to let four months pass between the filing of the bill and the final decree, whereas only one month had elapsed in the present case.

THE RITUALISTIC USE OF INCENSE AND LIGHTS. The text of the decision arrived at by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in regard to the use of incense and lights for liturgical purposes, which was announced as being a great victory for the Low Church or Protestant party in the Church of England, proves to be not at all so great a triumph for that party as it was at first reported to be, and as a victory it is scarcely worth all the jubilation which has been wasted over it.

The increasing number of divorces year after year is, unfortunately, not the only evidence of the deterioration of morals which is gradually going on, not only in Michigan, but in many other States. Another manifestation of the total want of respect for the sacredness of the marriage tie, which is gradually growing up among the people, is the frequency with which marriages are now celebrated as one of the attractive features of public shows, the sole purpose of which is to make a pile of money, which in some instances is

to be devoted to very questionable purposes. The Salvation Army may not have been the first organization which thought of making money by advertising public marriages to take place at their gatherings, a small fee being charged at the door; but at all events the army has frequently adopted this course, and has sometimes realized a considerable sum by so doing, part of which has usually been applied towards furnishing the home of the couple married in this way.

The hint thus given has not been lost upon some men in business, and it has occurred a number of times that marriages have taken place in shop windows as an advertising dodge for the proprietors' business. The married couple on such occasions always receive a valuable gift for thus desecrating the sacred rite which has been instituted for the sanctification of those whom "God hath joined together." We are obliged to add with shame that some who call themselves ministers of the Gospel of Christ, have assisted in this desecration by accepting a somewhat larger fee than usual to perform the marriage ceremony.

As a matter of fact, the French officers who are so earnest in endeavoring to convict Dreyfus are by no means in collusion either with the Jesuits or the clergy, and they would resent the interference of the clergy with their prosecution, whether the clergy would be for or against the accused. The Church is not carrying on any campaign against the Jews, but some of the leaders of the anti-Dreyfus campaign are violent enemies of the Christian religion. Among these are Henri Rochefort, Arthur Mayer, and M. Poincaré. The two last named are the managers of papers which are violently anti-Dreyfusard, though they are themselves Jews.

On Thursday, August 31, Judge Donovan of Detroit showed a disposition to minimize the divorce evil by putting obstacles in the way of those who were seeking for divorce decrees. He refused to grant one decree because it had been the usual practice to let four months pass between the filing of the bill and the final decree, whereas only one month had elapsed in the present case. Besides, he thought the case should have been brought up in Toledo, because one of the parties, namely the wife, has taken up her residence there. Detroit, he said, has already too many cases of its own to be dealt with. Notwithstanding the Judge's punctiliousness, he found it necessary under the law to grant three decrees of separation that day, and another case was still on the list for adjudication. He refused to do more in this case than hear the evidence postponing further procedure for a week, because he had made it a rule not to grant more than three divorce decrees on one day. We admire the Judge's wish to keep the divorce list as small as possible; but it is like attempting to stop the Falls of Niagara with a pitchfork, to try to counteract the effects of lax divorce laws by putting small obstacles in the way. The remedy needed to be applied must be something more effectual. Michigan has now more than one divorced couple for every dozen who are joined in matrimony.

Since 1870 the population of the State has doubled, but the number of divorces has trebled, the total number granted in 1898 being 1808. According to recent statistics published there appear to have been among these a few Catholics who obtained divorces in order to legalize the separation of husband and wife, but not for the purpose of being married to other parties, as it is stated that there is no record of any divorced Catholic having remarried any other person than the one from whom he or she had been divorced.

The text of the decision arrived at by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in regard to the use of incense and lights for liturgical purposes, which was announced as being a great victory for the Low Church or Protestant party in the Church of England, proves to be not at all so great a triumph for that party as it was at first reported to be, and as a victory it is scarcely worth all the jubilation which has been wasted over it. We are told, indeed, in the decision that "the two Archbishops" are obliged to come to the conclusion, that the use of incense in the public worship, and as a part of that worship, is not at present enjoyed nor permitted by the law of the Church of England." But this statement is so modified by other declarations of the mandate as to leave the matter as much in doubt as it ever was, and to give a loophole to the Ritualists who are much attached to the use of incense, whereby they may escape the odium of disobedience to the Archbishop's mandate, while making use of it quite as freely as they have hitherto done.

The Ritualists who are much attached to the use of incense, whereby they may escape the odium of disobedience to the Archbishop's mandate, while making use of it quite as freely as they have hitherto done. The Archbishops explain, in the

first place, that though the question was brought before them for decision as to two matters—the liturgical use of incense, and the lawfulness of carrying lights in procession in public worship in the Church of England—they do not constitute a court whose decisions are binding, and they have no coercive jurisdiction on the questions at issue, so that "their pronouncement is not a judgment in the legal sense."

And why is not the judgment of the highest authorities in the Church an authoritative pronouncement? The reason is evidently because the supreme authority of the Church is not vested in the Church itself, but in the decrees of Parliament, i. e., King, Lords, and Commons. This complete subjection of the Church to the civil authority is precisely the point against which the Ritualists most vehemently protest; and their protest is based upon the correct principle that the Church derives, not from the State, but from Christ Himself directly, its commission to teach all things whatsoever He commands, and not what the State desires she should teach. But this principle cannot be applied to the Church of England, which was created by the State, and which derives from the State all its authority. It has not, therefore, any authority within itself either to define what must be believed or what discipline is to be followed in matters of liturgy. It must look to the laws which the State has framed for all such matters. Herein, therefore, we see a first reason for which the victory gained by the Low Church party in securing a decision somewhat favorable to their views is of a minimum value. It is a decision which no one is bound to obey or regard with reverence.

But it may be said that it has a certain moral force, inasmuch as it makes manifest what the highest ecclesiastical authorities believe should be the rule of conduct to be followed by the clergy in conducting the public worship, so that they who refuse to conform to the rule laid down put themselves into the position of rebels against the only authority which they themselves admit ought to be obeyed.

To ascertain what force there is in this, let us see what the Archbishops really say on the subject. They state that in the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer there is nothing either enjoining or forbidding the use of incense. From this some draw the inference that what was used in worship before the Prayer Book was compiled may be used still, and the Bishops say that ceremonies which are brief, long in use, and not important, are actually commonly used in the Anglican churches, such as the exclamation "Thanks be to Thee, O God, for thy holy Gospel!" used immediately after the Gospel of the Communion service. But they add that "no Bishop would be wise" in permitting "the introduction of any ceremony which is conspicuous, not sanctioned by long-continued custom of our Church, and of such a nature as to change the general character and aspect of the service."

On these grounds they say that if it could be shown that the use of incense had passed in Apostolic times from the Jewish to the Christian ritual, there would be a strong reason for retaining it, but this they deny to be the case, and conclude that the Church of England ceased to use incense "for greater simplicity of worship," "for conformity with New Testament usage," and "to revive the ways of the primitive Church." Yet they add: "It would always be possible, if some great occasion made it suitable, for the sovereign, with the advice of the primate, to order a great ceremonial in which the use of incense should form a part." Above all things, they recommend to the clergy of the Church, even in regard to this matter, greater toleration of one another. They add that incense may be used even now when it is needed for the purpose of "sweetening" churches.

It is highly probable that in the churches where incense has been used the clergymen will suddenly discover that their churches need "sweetening," and so the use of incense will be continued. At all events it will certainly be the general opinion of the public that the labors of the two Archbishops have resulted in the bringing forth of a very small mouse. In fact the decision has brought out only one truth prominently, and that is the decisive supremacy of the sovereign, that is to say, of the civil authority, in regard to all controversies in the Church of England, whether they regard faith or Church discipline. We may here also remark that the Ritualists put far more stress on the matter of the employment of incense than does the Catholic Church, which they are supposed to be

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.

imitating. The liturgical use of incense is beautifully suggestive of the united prayers of the celebrant and the people ascending to the throne of God, in accordance with the words of David: "Let my prayer be directed, oh God, as incense in thy sight." Nevertheless it is not used in the Catholic Church, except on special occasions and in very solemn Masses. In fact, outside of the Catholic cathedrals there are probably three or four hundred Masses celebrated without incense to one at which incense is used, whereas the Ritualists appear to use it on every possible occasion. At all events, it is well understood by Catholics that its use does not pertain to the essence of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The other matter treated by the two Archbishops is the use of lights in public worship. It was at first stated that they have prohibited their use, but the text of their judgment shows that such is not the case. They disapprove only of the use of lights in processions, so that they do not forbid their use on the table (or "altar") during the Communion service. In fact, instead of the Archbishop's decision favoring Low Church views, it seems to us that, on the whole, the usages of the Ritualists have been sustained; and this, in fact, is the view which certain Ritualistically inclined clergymen, with whom we have recently conversed, take of the matter. Lights have been regarded in all countries as symbolical of joy and triumph, and their use even produces these feelings in man. Hence they are commonly used for illumination purposes on all joyful occasions, as in torch-light processions. Their use is so natural on these occasions that it appears to border on the absurd to prohibit their use for liturgical purposes the more especially as they are peculiarly appropriate to signify the light of Gospel truth which our blessed Lord came on earth to spread, and Christ Himself is symbolized in Scripture (St. Luke II, 32) as "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles. Such a prohibition is an attempt to suppress the voice of nature itself.