906.

used with

their own

many as

t in them.

nem sing. is point to

singing by . He tells

most fac-

er had in entirely on

se and ap to stories

ls to the

vantage of

re time to

entions the

roval. He

ay as a fatal

ious train-

e Pastoral

are emulat.

ve for the

and abroad

that Lord

ecome Lord

During his

ne and Lady

o agreeable,

s the entire

nation was

une. When

y Aberdeen

earts of the

e might also

disliked by

many charm-

blin during

bt the same

be restored.

ruth to say erdeen find

of the people

hey were in

of the New

y creditable

te have been

ther Judge

now ranks

st Catholio

ted States.

the Church

preading the

ALMIGHTY

thanksgiving

may, and we

our crosses

these appear bear; Go from us

dim. But

hidden jo

cross. He

ty, their un-readiness and coners of God

elicate atten

trials to en-

make haste

forethough

uring anxiety

ouraging and

of sympathy

than sisterly

Behind all ou

No matter surely care

im for every-lus. Every-ent for some

lly to fit and ven's endless

g and ecstation Let us prac

n earth so as nue its joyous

heaven's high

f our lives on

n His choser

doing us good

e and mercy Sacred Heart

priateness to nicana, " the

Name which is n the Name of l bow, of those

arth and under

every tongue

e Lord Jesus f the Father. rits ceaselessly

e in strains of

ens hope and

pany of the

who is a Cath

ve), said to W.

poration :

tion tender rs. Dinkey, the

Schwab as a

Faith."-Bos-

ada.

the Castle

d-work.

GEORGE IV.'S WIFE

AN UNCROWNED CATHOLIC QUEEN.

Messrs. Longmans and Co., London, have just published a work entitled "Mrs. Fitzh erbert and George IV.," by Mr. W. H. Wilkins, in which, by special permission of the King, is now made public the actual facts connected with the marriage of His Majesty's royal grand uncle to the good Catholic woman whose name forms part of the woman whose name forms part of the title of the work. The story told by Mr. Wilkins is highly interesting, casting as it does much light on the com-plex characteristics of the riotous monarch, who, having first sworn with profound blasphemy that he never would consent to Catholicem meipation would consent to Catalogue in passage yielded to the banded might of the people of Ireland, guided by the genius of O'Connell, and reinforced by the soldierly determination of the Duke of Wellington. It appears that, entrusted by members of Mrs. Fitzberbert's family with the task of preparing her definite biography, Mr. Wilkins applied for permission to break open the famous packet in which she enclosed the documents that she deemed essential to her ultimate justification, and which was deposited at Coutt's Bank, in 1833, under the seals of Lord Albein 1833, under the seals of Lord Albe-marle and Lord Stourton, as her trus tees, and of the Duke of Wellington, who acted as the executor of George IV. His request appears to have led to the removal of the papers to the private archives at Windsr early in the present year, but King Edward allowed him to inspect them, and to copy so much of their contents as was essential to his purpose. Too much essential to his purpose. Too much praise can scarcely be accorded King Edward for his action. When Mrs. Fitzherbert first attracted the attention of George Prince of Wales, she had already been twice married. Mary Ann Smythe had been her maider name, and both her parents came of old North of England Catholic families. He father, a younger son of a baronet, excluded by his faith from any honorable public employment in his native land, had for some time half. some time held a commission in the Austrian army. She herself was born Austrian army. She herselt was both in 1756 in Shropshire. Like most girls of her religion and station, she was educated at an English convent at Paris. Through all viciesitudes of fortune she steadfastly adhered to her hereditary creed.

The Prince of Wales fell madly in

The Prince of Wales fell mady if love with the beautiful widow, but she rejected all his overtures until he actually attempted suicide in consequence of her refusal to accept his addresses. On the 15th of December, 1785, she was secretly wedded to the Prince at her home in Park street by a Pertextent minister. The decrees of Protestant minister. The decrees the Council of Trent bearing on the subject not having been promulgated in England, the union, though irregular, was not invalid. It is not surprising that something more than rumors he ceremony being in contemplation of the ceremony being in concempation had become current, for reticence was as little an abiding element of the bridegroom's character as veracity. Five days before the event Fox wrote the Prince a long letter, in which he pointed out clearly the dangers of such a step, though, indeed, they were sufficiently obvious. Under the terms of the Act of Sattlement anyone who married a Roman Catholic was barred from the Theorem and Mrs. Fitzbarkers. from the Throne—and Mrs. Fitzherbert was Roman Catholic. By the Royal Mar riage Act of 1872 any matrimonial con tract entered into without the King's consent by a member of the Royal family who had not yet reached the age of twenty-five was declared null — and the Prince was only twenty-three, and certainly had not the King's consent. The witnesses at the marriage ceremony were the bride's Catholic uncle and brother, while the certificate of its having taken place was written by the Prince of Wales and signed by him, his wife, and the others present. This certificate, thanks to the King, is now published for the first time. There is no good reason why we should recount in these columns the story of the dissi pations and general misconduct of the Prince until at last, harrassed by duns and the importunities of his father, George III., he decided to forsake his and marry the unfortunate Caro line of Brunswick, from whom he separated shortly after the birth of their only child, the poor Princess Charlotte of Wales. About this time his Royal Highness, worn out by all kinds of excesses, deeming himself at the point of death, wrote a will, from which the

following passage may be quoted:
By this, my last Will and Testament,
I now bequeath, give, and settle at my
death all my worldly property of every
description. death all my worldly property of every description, denomination, and sort, personal and other, to my Maria Fitzherbert, my wife, the wife of my heart and soul. Although by the laws of this country she could not avail herself publicly of that name, still such she is in the eyes of Heaven, was, is, and ever will be such in mine.

In 1800 the Prince returned to Mrs. Fitzherbert, the validity of whose marriage is said to have been recognized by the Pope, although it is admitted that documentary evidence to this of

fect is not forthcoming.

After his accession to the throne George IV, bestowed little if any at tention on his real wife. For years previously he had practically deserted her for the several favorites who suc-cessively cajoled him by flattering his inordinate and insane vanity. That, despite his follies, he still cherished some sentiment of affection for her is certain. On June 25, 1830, he died. A short while before the end he reseived a letter from Mrs. Fitzherbert couched ases of sincere regard. He seized it with eagerness, read with emotion, and placed it under his pillow, and then apparently forgot all about it." But it was noticed when the body was prepared for burial that round the neck still hung the miniature

unalterable friendship and dearest Mrs. believe me ever to be, my dearest Mrs. Fitzherbert, mort faithfully and devot-

edly yours. EDWARD.
We learn also that the Dukes of Clarence and of Sussex were on the friendliest terms with her. Indeed, when the Duke of Clarence became King, as William the IV., it was only the representations of Wellington that prevented him from acknowledging her prevented him from acknowledging her as his brother's wife, but not his Queen, and Wellington had reason enough to dread a "No Popery" cry. But Mrs. Flizherbert was frequently a guest at the Royal table, and corresponded with Queen Adelaide and the Princess Augusta in letters in which the intracey which ters in which the intimacy which existed is made quite apparent. In 1837 Mrs. Fitzherbert died at Brighton at Mrs. Fitzherbert dead at Brighton at the age of eighty-one; but it is only now after the lapse of sixty-eight years, that full justice has been rendered to her honor by the publication of formal proof that she was an uncrowned Catholic Queen of Great Britis Leaf the total for the formal proof that were credit. is due to King Edward VII.

DAUGHTERS OF THE FAITH

THE WORK OF CATHOLIC WOMEN AGAINST

DIVORCE APPROVED. The formal recognition of the Daugh ters of the Faith by the authorities of the Church was celebrated in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, Sunday afternoon. The society was organized largely to make divorce unpopular. Miss Eliza O Brien Lummis, its founder, obtained for it the sanction of the

Pope.
The celebration was in the form of Solemn Pontifical Vesper, and the church was crowded with wonen, many of whom are well known socially. many of whom are well known socially. Archbishop Farley, who has also endorsed the organization, pontificated. Among the other dignitaries in the sanctuary were Mgr. Lavelle, the pastor of the Cathedral, and Mgr. Mooney, Vicar General of the archdiocese. The sermon was preached by Father O'Rourke of the Jesuits.

O'Rourke of the Jesuits.

He said that when Pope Leo died his present successor took for his motto "Restore all things to Christ." That, he said, was the object of the Daughters of the Faith, and he asked what more noble end could they have selected in these days of materialism when the marriage tie is held so lightly and secular education is sweeping the and secular education is sweeping the land? The object of thes; wo nen was to strive to be in the world, but not of

to strive to be in the world, but hot of the world; to partake of its joys, but not to forget the grief of Calvary. The speaker went on to tell what true greatness was, asserting that it did not come from wealth or power or mental attainments; but from the soul itself. He criticised severely the standard of character set up by Society, and asserted that a person's morals or past life had nothing to do with the popularity that he or she might attain. He declared that men and women did not look carefully into the antecedents of their hosters upon social occasions and

failed to study carefully her character. "Isn't it," he asked, "the woman whose hand guides the swift automowhose hand guides the swift antomo-bile down the avenue or holds the reins at horse shows who is sought in society rather than the woman whose hand rocks the cradle? And yet the hand that rocks the cradle sways the world."

HENRY III. AND THE CHURCH.

PREJUDICE ON THE WANE.

Sacred Heart Review. The story of the Reformation in England, as told by the non Catholic historian, has of late years undergone a remarkable change. Party-pleading and prejudice have given away before the spirit of criticism; and Church history has come to deal rather with statements of fact than with perpetuation of those fictions which, for generations, have served as the source of many an honest soul's pride in the reputed origin of England's reformed churches, and as the nourishment of hatred and misunderstanding of Rome.

Historians are now in accord as to the University of the clergy, or the episcopacy even, was more defiant than that of the laity. The saintly Bishop Grosseteste of Lincoln qualified the exactions made in his diocese as "university of the clergy, or the episcopacy even, was more defiant than that of the laity. The saintly Bishop Hatronians are now in accord as to the Historians are now in accord as to the manner in which the great religious upheaval of the sixteenth century was brought about. Its instigators, poli-tical and ecclesiastical, find to day few apologists. As a consequence there has been thrown into relief the question as to the nature of the change made by the Reformers. It is continued that the Acts of Supremacy of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth were merely the formal assertions of a long effective principle; assertions of a long enecutive putters that these sovereigns proclaimed, in a definite way, an independence of the Roman Church which many of their redecessors had asserted. To subpredecessors had asserted. To sub-stantiate these claims there is pointed out the proud list of English monarchs who had refused to Rome the tribute it exacted, refused to recognize its Legates, disdained to listen to its counsel, and spurned its very commands. Nor are the instances of such a spirit of in dependence at all rare. Their very frequency has proven a pitfall to par-tisan history-writers, Catholic as well as Protestant.

FAILING TO DISTINGUISH between "Rome," as symbolizing a system of authoritative religious teach ing, and "Rome" standing for the dominant political power of the Middle Ages, the Catholic has been tempted to minimize the defiant spirit of English kings and clergy with regard to Papal interference in the political and eccles-iastical affairs of England; while the Anglican has read, in the accumulation of such instances, the pre-reformation repudiation by English Crown and Crozier of all that the word Rome

stands for. AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION.

The difficulty is not a trivial one, nor is the confusion of the two "Romes" round the neck still hung the miniature of Mrs. Fitzherbert which she had given him in the days of their young love. Both before and after the death of George IV., all the members of the Royal family treated Mrs. Fitzherbert with full respect. Mr. Wilkins quotes a letter from the Duke of Kent, tather of Queen Victoria, which concludes as follows: Pray accept the assurance of my greater part may live. Anything that would aid one to the realization of such

AN ADMIRABLE WORK.

AN ADMIRABLE WORK.

There has been published recently a book which, better than anything yet written in English tells the story of how England was faithful in her loyalty to the Popes, her spiritual rulers, at a time when these same Popes, as feudal masters, made her feel the heavy bur dens of vassalage. It is entitled "Henry the Third and the Church," from the pen of A bhot Gasquet O. S. B., a his pen of Abbot Gasquet, O. S. B., a his torian already well known through his works on the Reformation in England. His latest volume is marked by those qualities which have won for the author recognition as a historian of high rank; and constitutes a further claim to his recognition by Catholics as one of the foremost defenders of their Church which has so long suffered from the misrepresentations of so called history. Abbot Gasquet deals with the long reign of Henry III., king o! England during fifty six years of the fateful thirteenth century (1216 1272), and, as his sub title suggests, h's work is a study of the ecclesias ical policy of that conarch and of the relations between England and Rome during his much d'sturbed reign. ENGLAND AND IRELAND FIEFS OF THE

HOLY SEE

Henry III. came to the throne of England in 1216, succeeding John Lackland who, three years before, had made surrender of self and kingdom to Innocent III., the mightiest of medieval Popes. England and Ireland had therebeen made flefs of the Holy See and subject t) tribute of a thousand marks a year. It was to this burden that Henry succeeded; and the story of his reign is the story of a half century of effort on his part and on the part of his over-lords, Popes Honorius III., Gregory IX., shrewd Innocent IV., and Alexander IV. to make the best of the bargain entered into by their predecessors. The feeble and vacillating Henry, a mere boy at his accession and, for the greater part of his reign, a selfseeker rather than a promoter of the good of his people, and at odds with his clergy and barons, was no match the Popes and the Papal Legates. England became the
FINANCIAL MAINSTAY OF THE PAPACY

in its crusading expeditions and quar-rels with the Empire. To the monies thus taken from English coffers there was added the burden of supporting the Italians who were intruded into nearly every profitable benefice, not already plundered by the king, until on the eve of the Council of Lyons (1245) it was the plaint of the English nobles that the toreigners, who neither knew their sheep nor were known by them, were receiving annually a revenue greater than the sum their king had to spend on the government of his realm. Intol-erable as were these exactions to the people of England, there were yet to be borne the most exasperating methods of levying the odious tribute, particularly

HENRY HAD VIRTUALLY PAWNED his kingdom to the Pope, and impose upon his subjects the urjust burden of paying the pledge money. There flocked into England in the train of the Papal officials, and in some cases with their encouragement, a number of foreign money lenders who turned to their personal profit the inability of the unfortunate English to pay the Papal taxes. So exorbitant were the nands of these unscrupulous usurers, the "merchants of the lord pope" as an accient chronicler calls them, both Henry III. and Innocent IV., neither be it said responsible for the evil. had to take severe measures to r strain their rapacity.

THE BURDENS OF VASSALAGE.

Many were the appeals which were directed to the Popes by the clergy and people of England for relief from their burdens of vassalage. Appeals unheeded provoked protest, and protest often took the form of absolute refusal to pay the taxes. In this regard the attitude of the clergy, of the of the common people, directed rather against their king than against their Pope, found echo in the war-cry of Simon of Montfort, son of the likenamed crusader, and by many considered as saintly. Civil war added share to the burden of the times. added its not unpopular rebellion failed of its immediate purpose, though it prepared for the day when England would have its free Parliament. HOW THE POPES ACTED.

This persistent appeal and protest was not unavailing. The Popes dealt most paternally with their overburdened vassals, and, sensitive to the stigma of avarice which their exactions proof avarice which their exactions provoked, endeavored to make clear to them, what tc-day is so evident, that the money they demanded was not for personal or local needs, but for use in fighting battles in the common cause of Europe at a time when the only bond of unity between Western nations was their common support of the Papacy, the bulwark of defense against foes who bulwark of defense against foes either threatened invasion from without or labored for internal disruption. But England could not understand then that her own interests were bound up in the interests of European unity for which the Popes were striving; that her future place and power among the nations was to be, in no small measure, the reward of her ill borne sacrifices for the Papacy. Her voice of protest was not to be silenced. In such conditions as these it is small

yonder that hard words were spoken of wonder that hard words were spoken of the Popes, and to them: words of in-dependence, nufflial, and in cases dis-respectful. Small wonder, too, that petty historians, who would subserve rather the cause of

SECT THAN THAT OF TRUTH, have vaunted these words as proofs of England's independence of Rome three centuries before the days of Henry VIII. Independence indeed there was, but it was a discriminating independ ence. For, while England denounced ence. For, while England denounced in no uncertain terms the exactions of their Roman overlords, England never questioned the spiritual authority of the spiritual spiritu

the undeniable provocation to confuse the two "Romes," the English of the hirteenth century knew how to dis tinguish; and in their most violent denunciations of the papal feudal

policy they NEVER LOST SIGHT OF THE SPIRITUAL

FATHERHOOD of those whom in temporals they felt t be their oppressors. It remained for the historiographers of the new church of the sixteenth century to introduce the confusion which would give color their claim to previous ecclesiastiil independence. Abbot Gasquet's book, besides offer-

ing a most interesting picture of England of the thirteenth century, viewed from the standpoint of the relations of Church and State, serves effectually to slience these who would read into the coclesiastical policy of Henry III. and his kingdom the prelude to the policy to which a later Henry committed his unwilling people. Yet the book is neither controversial nor a work of neither controversial nor a work of apologetics. The author, in every page, seems to be mindful of the promise he made in his masterly "Introduction," that he would set forth the facts pertaining to the ecclesiastical policy of Henry "as far as possible in the language of the old chroniclers, and of the latters and other documents of the reign," and offer these to the of the reign," and offer these to the reader as the materials for forming a judgment as to their significance. persual of the well documented volume REVEALS THE FIDELITY AND THOROUGH-

NESS with which Abbot Gasquet set about keeping his promise. The most criti-cal reader will find it difficult to disgree with what the author, in his attroduction, offers as the verdict which he considers most consistent with the fact; which he calmly presents the succeeding chapters. Abbot quet's appreciation is worth quot-

in its entirety:

(I.) The Pope, by the act of King
m, had obtained a position of paraint importance in this country. hat a suzerain was to a feudatory tate, that the Pope of Rome was to land. The country was the fief of ignate. The country was the left of the local of Holy See; and the name of fendal reriord, possessed by the Pope, was no erro empty title, but represented a wer which was acted upon and insted upon again and again in spite of pposition. (2.) This opposition was ally as strong, if not indeed stronger, in the part of the Bishops and clergy it was on the side of the laity. That there was grave discontent inst the Roman officials can not be

oubted for one moment. In fact, it ould hardly have been deeper, and s manifested by ecclesiastics, if possiut it was a discerning discontent, and was absolutely confined to opposition the pecuniary policy of the papal ficials in their constant demands made upon the revenues of the English churches and to the appointment of foreigners to English benefices. (5.) Throughout the agitation—and it was considerable and extending over a long period of time—not cnly was there no attack made upon the

SPIRITUAL SUPREMACY OF THE POPE out that supremacy over the Church Universal was assumed in document emanating from England, and this spiritual supremacy was con-

and this spiritual supremacy was constantly asserted to have been established by Christ Himself."

About Gasquet's book, of interest to readers in general, will be particularly helpful to the lover of English history, and to the student of pre-Reformation times it will be indispensable. Numerous references to ancient chronicles and documents, together with a complete index, make of it an ideal student's book; while its material make up is a source of pleasure to those who have so often to deplore the flimsy form in which Catholic writings are fated to appear, Pablishers, MacMillan & Co., New York.

RELIGIOUS UNITY.

The desire for Church unity displayed by the various Protestant sects is nat-ural. It was what brought about the recent inter Church Conference of the Federation of Churches the membership of which was composed of the represen-tatives of thirty beliefs. The comments of well known Protestant ministers indicate that great things are expected of this attempt at unifying the various sects. The Rev. Dr. Greer, Episcopal Coadjutor Bishop of New York, in speak ing of these hopes, takes a very rosy view of the future. We quote from an interview with him which appears in the New York Herald:

"While, as I have said, it is not Church unity, but still very far from it, it may have the effect of putting such a new spirit into all Christian bodies as to create in them a stronger desire for unity and so in time bring about that end "I believe in the solidarity of the human race. All men are growing nearer together and in the course of

centuries it may be that there will be a union of religions. "Whether or not there will be a union of the Roman Catholic and Protestant faiths depends largely upon the develop-ments of the future. There certainly

will be no union as long as the two Churches are constituted as they are at present." Bishop Greer in stating that there will be no union between the Catholic Church and the various Protestant

Churches so long as "the two churches are contituted as they are" would seem to imply the possibility of the Catholic Church modifying her teachings with a view of restoring the unity that existed throughout Christendon before Protestantism made its appearance. If tution such a compromise would be pos-sible. But as she has not been summoned into existence by man she cannot prove false to the commission her Divine Founder intrusted to her. Consequenty there cannot be a reunited Christendom on the terms Bishop Greer hints at.

In the meantime the attempt the Pro-

unalterable friendship and esteem and an important distinction is certainly those same Roman pontiffs. Despite EVILS IN FORTUNE TELLING THOROUGHLY EXPOUNDED

> IOLY SCRIPTURE CONDEMNS THE HEATH EN PRA TICE IN THE STRONGE T

5 ERMS. Can we lawfully presume to foretell vents that will depend upon the free tions of our fellow men ?

Even that can be done to some ex-ent by thoughtful and observant minds, not indeed with absolute cer ainty, but with such ordinary iner minds, not make the provided in the provided i victim of his passions, and that the constant reading of Ingersell and other infidels will obscure the light of faith, almost as surely as he who touches p'tch shall be defiled.

In all such forecasts there is dis-cerned by the human mind the con nection between causes and their tural effects. It is an exertion of our reasoning powers, both honorable and often very useful for the prudent direction of future conduct.

Who can know future events independently of their sonnection with past or present causes ?

God alone can do so. We may guess at such matters, but to know them is impossible to us. For to know is to grasp the truth presented to our faculties. But that which does not exist. and has no necessary connection with anything known to us, is in no way pre-sented to our faculties. God could put it into our mind, if He chose to do so; and He has done so in very special occasions, in the case of His Prophets. For prophecy consists in foretelling with certainty events which cannot be known at the time by any one but God; as when Jacob on his death bed fore-told the time of Christ's temporal birth, saying: "The scepter shall

told the time of Christ's temporar birth, saying: "The scepter shall not be taken from Judah, nor a ruler from his thigh, till He come that is to be sent, and He shall be the expectation of nations."

How does God know the future?

He knows, of course, all He has determined to do. As He is all perfect He does not change His mind, like fickle man. He has determined like fickle man. He has determined from eternity all that He will accomplish in time. And He knows what all His creatures do, or have done, or will ever do. He knows even what every one of them would do in given cases which may never come to pass. Why does He know all this? Because an infinite intellect must know all truth, else it would not be infinite; but God is in every way infinitely perfect. A finite intellect cannot know for certain any future event, except by calculation from known causes which must neces sarily produce that event in the course But free acts are not produced of tim necessarily, therefore no finite mind can know for certain the free acts that will happen in future. After all these considerations we are prepared to take up the matter of fortune telling, put at

the head of this paper.

Can any creature foretell the fortune

of any man?
The word "fortune" comes from the which is not learned by calculation from known causes but happens unore een; we also call it "accident," luck," bap." Of course, nothing happens without a cause, and this cause is known by the omniscient God. When we are asked why it happened, we say, "God only knows." Just so common sense makes all sensible men, in all countries and in allages, under stand that God knows all things, that omniscience is a Divine attribute. God, therefore, could foretell the fortune of any being. Now He alone for the fortune of the fortune for the fortune fortune, foretell that which cannot be fore seen by calculation from present causes. This requires an intellect independent of time; but God's intellect alone is independent of

ARROGATING DIVINE POWER What is the evil done by the fortune

teller? He pretends to do what God alone can do; he arrogates to himself a Divine power; he usurps a prerogative of God. Those who consult a fortune teller give to a wretched mertal an honor that belongs to God alone. Therefore Holy Scripture condemns this heathen practice in the strongest terms ever employed. It goes farther, and it shows us that this manner of insulting God has drawn on the wretches guilty of it the severest temporal chastisement ecorded in the sacred pages.

This chastisement was the extermin

ation of the various nations that action of the various nations that occupied the promised land before the chosed people of Israel came into its possession. No man, nor woman, nor child, was to be spared; the Jewish people was to be the minister of God's punishment upon those guilty races that it might thus be better under stood, from the bloody task on which it was employed, how much the Lord detested the abominations they were avenging. Here is the passage from Deuteronomy which teaches the ter-rible lesson: God spoke thus to His people: "When the u art come into the land which the Lord thy God shall give thee, beware lest thou have a mind to initiate the abominations of these nations. Neither let there be found among you anyone * * * that consulteth soothsayers or observe dreams and omens : neither let their be any wizard, nor charmer, nor any one abhorreth all these things, and for these abominations He will destroy them at thy coming." (Deut. xviii.; them at thy coming." (Deut. xviii.; 911.) When King Saul consulted the witch of Endor to have his fortune told, he was punished by the defeat of his army on the following day, where he perished, together with his son Jonathan. (I. Kings xxvi., 4.)

Is not fortune telling mere impostrue? ture ?

It is, often is, and thus the person con-It is, often is, and thus the person consulting the fortune teller is guilty both of folly and sin—folly because he allows himself to be duped, and pays money for being duped; of sin for giving to a fellow man or woman the honor that belongs to God alone. Those guilty of this gross sin of supersition cannot reasonably plead that Those guilty of this gross sin of super-stition cannot reasonably plead that they do not believe what is told them. Why do they consult if this were the case? True, they do not generally a tach full cre'ence to the answers re-ceived, but they believe them in part,

but that, as far as they hope to be helped at all, they ask for his assistance from the evil spirit? And it is indeed the devil or one of his imps that is the oracle consulted.

What forms does fortune telling

In pagan times the devils spoke as oracles of the false gods; they caused themselves to be adored as gods, for David tells us: "All the gods of the Gentiles are deville." (Ps. 95); and their oracles were their most efficient means to secure votaries. For though the demons do not really know the con-tingent future they can make a very shrewd guess at it, and thus they in-spired great confidence. There were renewned cracles at Delphi and Dodona; there were the oracles of Jupiter Ammon, of Hercules and Mars, and countless other idols. As Christianity spread, the oracle became dumb, because the devils were exercised by the followers of Him Who has conquered the

Among our pagan Indians the medi-cine men and soothsayers are the ministers of satan. In China and other heathen lands fortune telling has other heathen lands fortune telling has for ages taken in part the shape of spirit rapping. In this form it has reappeared in civilized lands. It is now the fashionable form of deviltry here and in England, as well as in some countries on the European continent. To explain the proofs of this statement would require a separate paper. In all would require a separate paper. In all would require a separate paper. In all ages fortune telling has been done by private persons, many of whom make their living by it. Such was the girl whom Sts. Paul and S las met at Phillipi, of whom the Acts parrate, "A certain girl, having a pythonical spirit, met us, who brought to her masters much gain by divining.* * But Paul being grived, turned and said to the spirit: 'I command thee, in the name of Jesus Christ, to go out from her, and he went out the same hour. (xvi., 16-18.) Such soothsayers in our cities to day would post on their doors signs of "second-sight reader," "medium," "clairvoyant," "chiromancer," "palmist," "mesmerist," etc., or the familiar, plain "fortune teller." Names matter little, the nature and grossness of the sin have been sufficiently explained; fortune telling is rank superstition.— Rev. Charles Coppens, S. J., in the True Voice, Omaha, Nebraska.

A MISSIONARY INCIDENT.

In an interesting sketch contributed to Les Missions Catholiques by Arch-bishop Langevin, of St. Boulface, we

bishop Langevin, of St. Boulface, we find the following graphic account of an edifying death among the Indians of the Canadian Farthest North:

"A good old convert, seventy-six years of age fell seriously ill, and received the Last Sacraments with the most admirable dispositions. His whole the serious account his count. family were assembled around his couch.
It is now, 'he said to them when the Viaticum had been administered 'it is now that I understand all that the priests have explained to me about religion. You know that I once adored evil spirits and was a medicine man; I danced the sun dance; I sacrificed victims, and invoked the thunder and and the great Bear against the missionand the great Bear against the mission-aries: I spoke evil. But I didn't un-derstand. To-day I do understand, and I tell you I did wrong. The Great Spirit is good; He has pardoned me. I am happy; I am going to see Him in His grand Paradise. I don't fear to die, and am glad to suffer for Our Lord, Who suffered so much for me."

Who suffered so much for me."

After stating that the old man died a few hours later, in the most edifying dispositions of faith, hope, and love, Mgr. Langevin adds a sentence that throws some light on the hardships of the missionary career: "Such consolations make one forget that one is lost in the bleak and savage Farthers." in the bleak and savage Farthest North, and that one's daily bread is not always forth coming."—Ave Maria

LESSONS OF A DRUG STORE.

"I read any book I lay my hands on," said a young drug clerk to a customer, who had found a copy of an atheist's book on the counter, and who had warned him of the character of the volume. "But are you not afraid of poisoning your mind?" inquired the customer.

your mind?" inquired the customer.

"Not a bit of it," was the reply.

"Then, no doubt, you are not afraid of poisoning your body," continued the customer, "and you taste every drug you lay your hands on?"

"I do not," exclaimed the clerk.

"What!" cried the customer, "you are willing to risk poisoning your mind by destroying its faith in God, but you was

by destroying its faith in God, but you are careful not to poison your body. But exalic acid would probably cause less injury than the reading of that book. The acid would kill the life of that consulteth pythonic spirits, or fortune tellers, or that seeketh the truth from the dead. For the Lord abhorreth all these things, and for these abominations He will destroy Some of them are sure death to what is best in man, worse than the sting of a rattlesnake or dose of strychnine. Read good books or none. And be sure that it would be as sensible to go along those shelves and take a glassful of every drug you have in the stope as it is to read every book. in the store, as it is to read every book that you lay your hands on."—Sta Xavier Calendar, Cin.