

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 494 and 496 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

EDITORS: REV. GEORGE B. NORTHGRAVE, Author of "Mistakes of Modern India,"

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey,

Meers, Lake King, John Nigh, P. J. Ryan,

Meers, Lake King, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record.

Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

The Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Its matter and form are both good, and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole.

Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Blessing you, and wishing you success. Believe me, to remain,

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALGONNI, Arch. of Larissa, Apost. Delek.

London, Saturday, Sept. 14, 1901.

RITUALISM AND SOME OTHER MATTERS.

Bishop Whittaker of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Pennsylvania has recently been on a visit to Canada, and in Montreal was interviewed by a representative of the Witness in regard to the attitude of the American Protestant Episcopal Church toward Ritualism, and other matters.

Bishop Whittaker declares that "as a matter of fact there is the utmost freedom of interpretation in that Church, and it would be extremely difficult to secure a conviction before any of the tribunals of the Church in case of a man who had insisted upon a liberal interpretation of the Bible or of the Prayer-Book in regard to aesthetic effects."

"It is felt in our Church," continued the Bishop, "that there should be the utmost liberty in regard both to teaching and ritual, provided, of course, that there shall be nothing to exceed reasonable bounds."

"There is, of course, very elaborate machinery in England for dealing with excessive ritual or in teaching; but we have not got anything like it on this side. In any case we would not think it wise to resort to any extreme measures, for peace is promoted by ignoring such cases so long as there is nothing to scandalize the Church. Besides, the Church has always allowed liberty within her pale, and I think she prospers because she does so."

This is a very euphemistic way of saying that the Protestant Episcopal Church is the refuge of discordant teachings of every degree, from the outspoken Latitudinarianism of Professor Briggs, formerly of Union Presbyterian Theological College of New York, who was ordained to the Protestant Episcopal Ministry by Bishop Potter of New York, up to the highest views on Church authority, and the teachings of antiquity found in the Catholic Church, as maintained by most of the Bishops and clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the West. Thus we have the declaration of Bishop George F. Seymour, of Springfield, Ohio, issued last year, that

"The teaching of the advanced Catholic party of the English Church is, as far as I understand, to be by their publications, in harmony with the formularies of our Church. This party teaches the doctrine of the Real Presence in the sacrament of the altar. It does not hold nor teach the metaphysical explanation of this doctrine enjoined by the Church of Rome, commonly called Transubstantiation."

In regard to the Mass, the same document says:

"Permit me to add a word about the term Mass. It is innocent of all objection save the association with Rome, and that must soon wear away if we persistently appropriate it and use it. Mass is embedded in our common speech already. It is familiar to our ears in Christmas, Candlemas, etc. In the West it must naturalize itself readily because it is a monosyllable, and the West loves to make everything as short as possible."

Considering that the Low Church party regard the Real Presence and the Mass as idolatrous teachings, it will be seen that the liberty of acceptance or rejection of doctrine allowed in the Protestant Episcopal Church on this side of the Atlantic, as well as in its Mother Church of England, do not concern merely matters of slight importance, but are on the most vital matters of the religion of Christ.

Where are the watchmen on the tower walls, who are never to hold their peace when the lambs of the flock

are being pastured on the grass of false doctrine?

Bishop Whittaker's delight at the liberty of belief allowed in the Church is of a piece with the sentiments frequently expressed by prominent clergymen of the Church of England who profess to glory in the dimensions which are at the present moment tearing the vitals of that Church and threatening its very existence.

We must candidly say that we are not believers in the pretended joy of these rev. gentlemen that the Church of England and its American daughter Church allows so much liberty of contradictory doctrines. They are merely putting a good face on a matter which they admit that the Church has no power to control. They are quite aware of the Scriptural teaching that the diversity of degrees and orders in the Church of Christ was instituted by our Lord for the express purpose of saving the lambs of His flock from being nourished on false doctrine, and from being tossed about by the waves of error, like little children, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, as St. Paul teaches in Ephesians iv, 14.

The sentiments of toleration of vital error expressed by Bishop of Whittaker are very divergent from those of St. Paul expressed in two consecutive verses of his epistle to the Galatians, 1, 8, 9.

"But though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you let him be anathema."

Nothing can be clearer than the fact that if there were no other proof than the tolerance of error which the Church of England is compelled to exhibit, this fact of itself shuts off her claim to be the Church of Christ and his Apostles, which could issue mandates in the name and by the authority of the Holy Ghost, as was done by the first Council of the Church held at Jerusalem soon after our Lord's Ascension, when the Apostolic decrees were issued with the clause, "For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things." (Acts xv, 28)

Bishop Whittaker also expressed regret in regard to the decrease in family life in the New England states in consequence of which the descendants of the sturdy Puritans who settled those states in the first instance are steadily declining in numbers, and surely, though somewhat slowly, passing away.

He was very much surprised to learn of the result of family morality as evinced by the large families of the Catholic Province of Quebec.

"Fifteen in family!" he exclaimed in his surprise, when he was informed that this is a frequent occurrence in Quebec—a thing unheard of among the descendants of the New England Puritans.

THE ROCK OF GIBRALTAR.

There has been serious discussions in the Imperial Parliament on naval matters during which the fact was elicited that the new graving docks and other works which have been erected by the British Government at Gibraltar are so far within reach of modern artillery as not to be a safe harbor in a case of a war in which Spain would be hostile to Britain. This, it is said, renders the new works useless, and the committee on defence which has been investigating the defences of the Empire in general has recommended their abandonment, and the erection of new docks on the other or eastern side of the great rock, which will be safe from attack from Spanish territory.

Grave as this condition of affairs is admitted to be, the Government does not exhibit any serious alarm, and it has decided to proceed with and finish the new works, the more especially as it will take several years to erect similar ones on the opposite side of the rock where there is a perfectly safe harbor. It is not supposed that there is immediate danger of any such coalition against England as would be able to destroy an English fleet in the present harbor, and in the meantime the new fortifications and other works are deemed necessary for the time being, and the more secure position can be prepared later on after the completion of the works which are now in an advanced stage.

One proposal which has been offered for the purpose of protecting the present works is to seize and fortify the neutral territory between the British and the Spanish lines; but this would be equivalent to a declaration of war against Spain, which would be an unjust act, and which would

undoubtedly alarm other continental powers, and especially France, who would consider such action as a direct menace against themselves, and would almost undoubtedly lead to a coalition of continental powers to put a stop to such aggressiveness on the part of Britain. It can hardly be supposed that any such action as this will be attempted.

THE CZAR AND FRANCE.

Preparations are being made on a vast scale to honor duly the Czar of Russia on the occasion of his visit to Paris and other cities of France. It is fully expected that the alliance of these two great powers will be cemented more closely than ever by this visit, and the French are taking extraordinary precautions against possible attempts by Anarchists on the Czar's life.

President Loubet is quoted by the Patrie as placing great hope on the Czar's visit as a means of strengthening the friendship between France and Russia. He said:

"I always considered the Franco-Russian alliance exceedingly useful and fruitful to our country. I thought the moment opportune to obtain the Czar's presence at the manoeuvres. We first intended inviting him to the western manoeuvres, which are of greater importance, but the Czar preferred the eastern."

A despatch from Copenhagen says that immediately after the Czar's arrival there on his way to France, the police arrested on the castle grounds two suspected men who spoke Italian and German. The men arrested are said to be Anarchists.

THE SECOND ADVENTISTS' PROPHECIES.

The Second Adventists are not deterred by the awfully bad success which has attended their former dabbling in prophecy from again making alarming predictions in regard to the near approach of the end of the world.

It is the sensation of keeping the people agitated which keeps up this sect, and year after year they have been foretelling the immediate end of things created, and at their annual gatherings, the people have been over and over again wound up to the highest pitch of excitement through being assured that at some fixed hour—which is usually at midnight of some near at hand date—Gabriel's trumpet will sound, and the last day will arrive when "we shall all be summoned to the valley of Jehoshaphat to be judged according to our works."

Scores of times within our memory there have been such prophecies uttered by itinerant preachers and lecturers, and thousands of credulous listeners to their prophecies with ready ears, and have even sold their property, and betaken themselves to high hills or to the house-tops that they might be nearer to heaven when the call should come, but they have been invariably disappointed.

Now the Second Adventist Convention camp has been pitched near Oswego, and the usual prophecies are being uttered. A preacher, by name John S. Wightmore, has announced to the assembly that the present trouble between France and Turkey will inevitably result in a general war in Europe during which the Turkish Empire will be destroyed, and worldwide suffering will result, the end of which will be the "second coming of Christ" as the judge of mankind. He bases his belief in these predictions on Daniel, first and second verses of the 12th chapter.

It is true that both in this passage, and in parts of the New Testament certain signs are given which shall precede the day of judgment, and among these are mentioned in St. Matthew xxiv, and xxv, and St. Luke xxii, great tribulation and distress of nations which shall precede the judgment; but as Christ says of the last day, "But of that day and hour no one knoweth, no, not the Angels of heaven but the Father only," (St. Matt. xxiv., 36). It seems idle for any human being to pretend to know so exactly when the great catastrophe will occur.

Numerous ridiculous theories on this matter have been invented by various would-be prophets; but all have been equally futile.

The Lutheran pastor and theologian Jurien appears to have been the first among moderns who ventured upon foretelling the exact date of the day of judgment. He fixed upon two dates successively, namely 1680 and 1689 and lived long enough to find that his prophecies were futile. He then fixed upon a third date 1715, before the arrival of which he died.

About forty five or fifty years ago

one Miller created a great sensation in America by fixing upon a date for the end of the world, and he quoted many texts of Scripture in support of his theory, but the date passed and the expected catastrophe did not occur. We may safely presume that the day fixed by Mr. Wightmore will also pass by in an equally uneventful manner. Miller's followers were known by the name "Millerites."

CATHOLIC YOUNG MEN.

Now that numbers of our Catholic young men are returning to centres of education—McGill (Montreal), Toronto and Kingston Universities, etc.—the question arises what provision is made for the spiritual care of those "strangers in a strange city," exposed as they are to all sorts of temptations. In this respect it is to be feared that non-Catholics realize their duty towards their young people far more and more practically than do we of the "Household of the Faith." Besides, there is the social side of the question. Do heads of Catholic families in those cities take any care of their young co-religionists? Have we anything to correspond with the rooms of the Young Men's Christian Association and such like in those cities? It is a serious matter, and one that should receive attention. At Ottawa of course all the aids of religion are at hand, but even there it is a question if the young men receive that social attention so necessary to youth.

ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT MCKINLEY.

The Anarchical societies have again horrified the world by the perpetration of another dreadful crime to be added to the long list of atrocities for which these enemies of mankind are responsible.

President McKinley was shot twice on Friday afternoon of Sept. 6, at 4 o'clock, in the Temple of Music at the Pan-American Exposition by an Anarchist who on being arrested gave his name as Fred Nieman, a blacksmith of Detroit. It is said, however, that the assassin is a Pole whose real name is Leon Czolgoz. He is a member of an Anarchist society with head quarters in Chicago.

The shooting took place at a reception to the President to which the general public had been invited. Nieman or Czolgoz was in the line of those presented. His right hand was wrapped in a handkerchief in which was concealed a 32 calibre Derringer revolver. Just as the President turned to the right to receive Nieman, the latter thrust out his hands and brought the hidden revolver close to the President's stomach and pulled the trigger. The first bullet went too high for the assassin's purpose, and he immediately fired a second.

On the first bullet entering his body, the President bent forward, and then sank back so that the second shot penetrated the abdomen below the navel.

The first wound inflicted was superficial and not very serious. The second is serious, but may not prove fatal. The President was doing well at last report, and good hope is entertained of his recovery.

The would-be murderer was immediately seized by S. R. Ireland, a U. S. secret service man, and Detective Gallagher, also by a negro who stood next to the murderer in the line which was being presented in order to the President.

On his arrest the assassin gave no further explanation of his deed than that he is an Anarchist and done his duty.

Cries of "Murderer! Assassin! Lynch him!" were uttered by the populace as soon as the situation was understood.

The police and the soldiers, however, surrounded the culprit and prevented his summary execution by lynching.

President McKinley is the third President of the United States, whose assassination has been attempted. President Lincoln was shot in Ford's Theatre, Washington, by John Wilkes Booth on April 4th, 1865. He lived only nine hours. The assassin escaped, but was found hidden in a barn in Virginia. He refused to surrender, and was shot by one of his pursuers. President Garfield was shot on July 2nd, 1881, in the Ladies' waiting-room of the Baltimore and Potomac Railway at Washington, by Charles Galtou. He died on Sept. 19th of the same year. Guiteau was hanged for the crime.

It is stated that Nieman, alias Czolgoz, was selected by lot at a meeting of his Chicago Anarchical lodge to kill the President, and in consequence of information received by the police,

five members of that lodge have been arrested.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE CHURCH.

CONCLUDED.

In reply to our correspondent, "Would-be Reformer," in our issue of Sept. 6 we treated at some length of the chief reason on account of which the Catholic Church has deemed it advisable that the public offices of the Church should be said in the universal language of the Church, which is Latin, and we may here add that it is appropriate that the universal Church should have as far as possible a universal language for the purpose of preserving everywhere the same faith expressed in the same words.

Nevertheless, as this is a matter of Church discipline and not of divine law, we have already said that there is not the necessity of absolute uniformity in language, and as a matter of fact there is not absolute uniformity.

Concessions to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in other than the Latin language are very rarely granted, but when they are so granted, it is usually because the liturgy used is equally, or almost equally ancient with the Latin liturgy of the Western Church, and thus the main object of the Church is attained, namely, the preservation of the unity of faith; and even as a testimony to this unity of faith, this limited variety of language is useful, inasmuch as it is an object lesson which shows that amid all the changes of language in different countries, the unity of faith has been preserved. For this reason, besides the Latin tongue, Mass is offered in divers Eastern countries in Greek, Syriac, Chaldeic, Slavonic, Wallachian, Armenian, Coptic, and Ethiopic. About one tenth of the dioceses of the world use these languages.

There is another advantage in the use of a universal language in the Mass, at least, and this advantage is very striking on the American continents where there are so many people of diverse nationalities who have come to settle here as immigrants. These people at once feel at home in the exercise of their religion, because on their arrival in the country they find that the great act of worship in the Catholic Church is the same as that to which they have been accustomed in their own land. It is in a great measure owing to this that we seldom hear of these foreign nationalities creating schisms in the Church in America, on the ground of nationality, or if such schisms do sometimes occur, as has been the case, they are confined to narrow limits, and usually last but a short time. Thus we have Germans, French, Italians, Poles, Spaniards, Bohemians, Galicians, and even Asiatics, such as Syrians and Armenians, who at once recognize the Catholic Church in America as teaching the same faith which they learned in childhood in their own country—the faith of the universal Church of Christ.

The case is very different with German Protestants who settle in this country. These at once discover that their religion is here regarded as an exotic plant, and they set about erecting Lutheran or Calvinistic Churches, which differ both in faith and form of worship from all the Churches they find existing in the country of their adoption.

Catholic priests also, who visit any of the countries of Europe, Asia, or Africa, find themselves at once at home in any Catholic Church in which they present themselves to be allowed to offer up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. They have only to show their documents which prove that they are Catholic priests in good standing in their own diocese, and at once they are given all the privileges attached to their sacred office. They may celebrate or assist at Mass, preach, administer sacraments, or fulfil any sacerdotal function, just as if they were at home, the only limit being that they must know the language of the country in order that they may be able to instruct others.

It is easy to understand that these privileges cannot exist with the variety of sects which have sprung out of Protestantism, so that in the sects of Protestantism, which are independent and distinct local organizations, it is natural that each should have its own language, but it is also natural and appropriate that the universal Church should use a universal language.

We should add also that the passages of Holy Scripture which are frequently quoted by Protestants to prove that "an unknown tongue" should not be used in the Church liturgy, have no reference to the liturgy. The 14th

chapter of St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians is usually quoted for this purpose, from verse 2 to 39. But the tongues here spoken of refer to the miraculous gift of speaking in many tongues, which was frequently given by God to the early Christian converts, as it was given to the Apostles at Pentecost. (Acts ii, 4 etc.) The Protestant translators of the Bible have introduced many times throughout this chapter the word "unknown" in order to make it appear that the use of Latin in the services of the Church is forbidden in Scripture; but when the chapter is read with the knowledge that this word is not used by St. Paul, but is an interpolation by the Protestant translators, it will be seen that there is no condemnation here of the usage of the Catholic Church.

The revised version of the New Testament issued in 1884 rejects the word "unknown" which was introduced by the translators of the King James' version, and the comparison of the two versions will show what a change was made in the sense by the interpolation.

The Latin of the Catholic liturgy, however, is not an unknown tongue, as the Latin language is still studied by learned men of all countries; and, further, the liturgy is carefully translated in many Catholic prayer books so that the people may become thoroughly acquainted with it, and for the most part Catholics actually familiarize themselves with it, so far as it is necessary for them to understand it. Also, the prayer books which do not actually give the translation of the Mass, give appropriate prayers which may be recited by the people who assist at Mass, and thus the object of public worship is attained.

The sacrifice is offered by the priest only, for the people, and God understands the prayer thus offered. It is not, however, essential that the people should understand every word; but it suffices that the people assisting should offer appropriate prayers in union with the intention of the priest. They may, therefore, recite the prayers given in their prayer-books for the different parts of the Mass, or such other prayers as their devotion may suggest. It is clear, at all events, that the Church has good reasons for its general use of the Latin language, and it is not lawful for any priest to celebrate the Mass in other manner than that which the Church has approved.

Our correspondent complains also that too many sermons are delivered in Catholic churches on the honor due to the Blessed Virgin Mary, and to St. Joseph, the foster father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

As a proof of this he states that a friend of his heard in one church, on two successive Sundays, sermons on these two subjects, instead of explanations of the beautiful gospels which have been selected by the Church to be read at Mass on the Sundays of the year.

We suspect that our friend, "Would-be Reformer," is hypocritical on this point. There is necessarily a great variety in the subjects for sermons by so many priests in so many Churches, and it is quite possible that the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph were the subjects of sermons in some of these on successive Sundays; but the explanation of the great moral lessons inculcated in the gospels are not neglected by the clergy. At the same time we must call our correspondent's attention to the fact that by secretaries the Blessed Virgin and other saints, including St. Joseph, are frequently spoken of with disrespect, and it is necessary at times to pay them special respect, and to indicate the honor due to them according to the words of Scripture: "Glory, and honor, and peace, to every one that worketh good." (Rom. ii, 10)

It might easily happen that sermons should be preached on these two great saints on successive Sundays. Their regular feasts occur within one week, viz., St. Joseph's day on March 19th, and the feast of the Annunciation, which is at the same time the feast of the Incarnation of our Lord, on March 25th. But both these feasts are specially solemnized on certain Sundays, and usually these are successive Sundays, apart from those Sundays on which are celebrated the mysteries of religion specially connected with our redemption, such as Passion, Palm, and Easter Sundays.

This year the feasts of St. Joseph and the Annunciation were solemnized on March 10 and 17 respectively, so that we do not doubt that these were the subjects of sermons preached in many churches on those days. But our correspondent is in error if he

supposes that such subjects are unscriptural or unevangelical.

From St. Matthew's gospel 1, 19-24 we learn that St. Joseph was a "just man" who "did as the Angel of the Lord had commanded him," and from St. Luke 1, 48-50, that God "regarded the humility" of Mary and did for her "great things" on account of which "all generations shall call her blessed." Surely there is in these revelations sufficient ground for preaching on the virtues and dignity of these two great saints.

MR. WALKELY'S UTTERANCES.

The Rev. Mr. Walkely of the Unitarian Church in Ottawa has called down upon himself the animadversion of the Protestant press—secular and religious—on account of an alleged anti-English, anti-Imperialist speech delivered in Boston. Yet the same gentleman, as well as his predecessor in the "Church of our Father," as they style it, has been holding forth week in and week out blasphemously denying the Divinity of Jesus Christ—denying that He is God the Son—and not one of those rappers have attempted to raise a voice in defence of the Saviour of the world.

METHODIST ECUMENICAL CONFERENCE.

It was never expected by any one who knew the inner workings of ecumenical conferences, that the Pan-Methodist Ecumenical Methodist Conference now in session in London, England, would do any practical work. How could Council which has, admittedly, no authority, whether divine or human, rule a Church, make a decree binding on the conscience of any one? So the Ecumenical Conference has already dribbled away in trifling three or four days of the ten during which it is to be in session. The first grave matter discussed was the manner in which the greetings of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London should be received. The greetings of the dignitaries were friendly enough tone, but they carefully gave it to be understood that Methodism is but a schism which the Anglican cannot regard as being part of the Church of God. Both dignitaries wished the Conference to be a pleasant one to all members, but they expressed the hope that Methodism might return to Anglican fold from which it seceded little more than a century ago.

This gave great offence to the members of the Conference, and the letters of two Anglican dignitaries were unanimously voted as not worthy of being received by the Conference. The

was aggravated by the fact that Bishops' letters in reply to the invitations sent were addressed, not to Conference, but to London newspapers.

On Sept. 6 there was a very excited discussion in the Conference on Boer War. The Rev. George Eliot, Detroit bitterly denounced the Boer Government for its determined opposition of the war. The Rev. Cooke of Chattanooga declared hostilities were necessary in order vindicate the principle of equality to British subjects who had shabbily treated under Boer rule.

Rev. E. Hoss of Nashville, Tenn. declared that it would be a plain impertinence for the Conference to the British Government what to do in South Africa. The Rev. Parks of London thought that a manifesto on the occasion would very much out of place. Pro members of the Conference to part in this discussion and no decision was taken on the matter.

Shortly after the opening of the Conference, Bishop Walters, of the Methodist Church of Jersey City, complained that white Americans endeavored to destroy the good entertained in England of the people of America, and of the delegates to the Conference. He stated that "the crimes of people in the Southern States exaggerated in order to create opinion unfavorable to the race. Out of ninety lynch colored people which had taken place in 1900," he said, "only eleven occurred in consequence of assaults upon white women. English portion of the audience the Bishop; but the Southern delegates were greatly offended, and their indignation at the kind given to a colored Bishop. Southerners left the Conference. The discussion on the brought up was very fiery, a language was used both in and defending the colored race