

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname).—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1899.

NO. 1,039.

VOLUME XXI.

The Catholic Record.

London, Saturday, February 4, 1899.

"CAMILLE."

We were amazed at seeing in the advertising columns of the Church Progress a very complimentary reference to the drama of "Camille." The talented editor must have been absent from the city when that issue was put in press, for he never would have permitted any commendation of such a degrading and salacious production.

SHOULD BE BOYCOTTED.

The mutoscope pictures of the Holy Father are receiving much attention across the border. They may be a credit to American enterprise, but they should be boycotted by every Catholic. We have the picture of Christ's Vicar enshrined in our heart of hearts, and we need no money-making device to increase our love for him. It is a sad commentary in an age that, to use a phrase of Ruskin's, if it could make a railway to hell, would invest in the concern to any amount and stop churchbuilding all over the country for fear of diminishing the dividends.

AN EPISCOPAL BISHOP ON SALOONS.

The Church Temperance Society of New York held a meeting recently at which Hon. Mr. Choate and Bishop Potter (Episcopal) were the principal speakers.

Bishop Potter came out boldly in favor of the saloon as a social necessity. It will be a shock to good people all over the country to see a Church dignitary bolstering up what they have been trying to pull down. According to the Bishop, saloon keepers are benefactors of the poor man, because they supply a "social necessity," bred by the recreative instinct of humanity. Here is a chance for every philanthropist! When the prize-ring heroes are tired of their ignoble business they may stone for the past and shine as models of Christian charity by starting a gin mill for the workman!

The Bishop, we surmise, did not know what he was talking about. Were he a minister of the Church which preaches the Gospel to the poor he would have had a more strengthening message for these who are garbed in the livery of poverty and who are drawn into the whirlpool of intemperance by the saloons which he essays to defend. Were he to wend his way to any tenement district he would find homes that have been wrecked by the saloon and women who have walked hand in hand with Sorrow since their marriage day. He would find a great many things which would shock his aesthetic temperament and perhaps alter his views on the saloon.

The saloon-keeper is in the business for money, and will deal out his goods to any applicant who can pay for them. Many of them will take the last farthing from a husband and give never a thought to starving wife and children. It is the most pitiable business for any human being. It is lucrative, but the average man will rather be content with little than be enriched by money that is moistened with the tears of the victims of the saloon-keeper.

The saloon is, as Archbishop Ireland says, responsible for the awful intemperance which desolates the land, and which is the physical and moral plague of our time. Let us waste no words on the possible or ideal saloon. The saloon as it exists to day trades and fattens upon intemperance, and at its door must be laid all the dire evils which accompany or follow from intemperance. The Catholic Church is the enemy of the saloon: her Bishops recommend those engaged in the business to obtain a more decent way of gaining a livelihood; and she believes them to be not the poor man's club but places where the poor man guzzles away his brains and reputation and manhood, not out of "recreative instinct" but through weakness of human nature.

The New York Sun describes Bishop Potter's speech as ignorant and inconsiderate talk. They do not pretend to go to a drinking place because it is the "poor man's club," for they know it is nothing of the sort, and that if they attempted to use it as such they would be hustled out by the keeper to make room for other customers. The

poor man goes there to buy drink, to gratify his bibulous rather than his recreative instinct.

The Hon. Mr. Choate uttered no dissenting word. He was probably thinking of Windsor Castle or that speech of Patrick's Day of 1893 which was a public insult to every Irishman in the United States. He was thinking, perhaps, of how well he outwitted those who opposed his appointment. Well we think he may be pardoned a slight chuckle of gratification. The "fighting race" does very well at Santiago or Manila, but need not apply at Washington.

NOTES BY THE WAY.

We oftentimes wonder at the talk about our unity and good-fellowship. It may not be based on fact, but that, especially at mutual admiration gatherings and patriotic celebrations, matters little if we can be deluded into the belief that we are a band of brethren. We speak only of unity along social and commercial lines. It may exist, but we have little evidence of it. Some of those who have come into possession of this world's goods hedge themselves around with the greatness of the dollar, and draw the line between themselves and their poorer brethren. They get the idea that the poor cannot possibly have any refinement of manner, and can, therefore, be but treated with condescension. They frequent the company of those who have wealth: they esteem it a great honor to be looked upon favorably by Protestants, and they become in time parasites on the tree of society, and acquire the "please-don't-wake-the-baby-air" of those who abhor controversy and permit calumny to pass unrebuked. Their sons and daughters grow up wedded to parental ideas, given to extravagance and destitute at times of anything that is useful either for themselves or for others. This, you will say, is an extreme case. But you must not misunderstand us.

We admit that the bettering of one's condition is praiseworthy; but we do say that to effect it by holding aloof from our brethren, by defiling our minds with ideas which, though prevalent and held in honor in our days, belong to Paganism and not to Christianity, is as blamable as it is idiotic.

How many mothers sacrifice their children on the altar of Fashion. They do not wish to do it, the poor dear mamma who are on the alert for an eligible party, Catholic or otherwise; but the fact remains. If some of those girls were not victims to social humbug they could be of some use in the world instead of frittering away their energies on tea shines and trifles and making much ado about nothing.

What bond of union exists between them and their poorer brethren? Is it not a fact that they scarcely know them, and would not in fact care to know them. If they do know them, they do not help them, and cannot consequently lay claim to the title of neighbor. They potter around in an aimless kind of way; they work sometimes, for they need to have excitement, and take care to have it chronicled so that all the world may read, but the real, practical things are unheeded. We do not speak of pecuniary help, but of that which is the outcome of the right understanding to the commandment to love one another. There is much to be done, but not by those who imagine that life is a light Society Comedy.

Again, look at some of our societies. We cheerfully give our meed of praise to them and to those who guide their destinies, but their most enthusiastic admirers will admit that they are far from attaining all that might be expected from them. We think we understand their difficulties, but, making allowance for all that—for the meagre support which they receive in some localities—we believe that our assertion will be endorsed by a great many all over the country. What is the cause of their non-progressiveness? Does it come from without or from within? Are the members responsible for it? We think that the blame can be attached to the members. The club-rooms become places for smoking and billiard playing. We have no quarrel with innocent amusement, but any amusement indulged in night after night will have, to say the least, a de-

teriorating influence upon the average young man.

We have belief in organization. We need it and we hope to see the day when there will be Catholic societies in every corner of Canada. We hope to see them equipped with every attraction that may appeal to the men, but we hope also that they will be homes of good thoughts and noble resolves, where the spark of enthusiasm will light up apathetic and serf-like natures and move them to make the very best of themselves, to choose their life's work and to cling to it and to recognize the fact that success depends mainly on their own efforts.

Our club-rooms should be not only places for amusement, but for instruction, and for realizing that the success of any society comes only through its unity. When the general good is made subservient to petty personal interests, and when jealousy and clique-making create dissension and discord, the doom of a society is near at hand.

The manly resolve to stand by their colors, to be true to those who are associated with them, is a guarantee of the vitality of an organization.

Above all they should cherish a loyal and submissive spirit to the Church, and guard themselves from being indoctrinated with the false notions that are so easily taken from the daily press: and this is all the more necessary in localities where the intellectual pabulum is the daily newspaper. One can scarcely peruse an issue without finding the grossest absurdities and the vapors of some correspondent or other who tells you that new questions are arising and old dogmas are disappearing. We do not, as some, underrate the influence that is possessed by every glib writer who undertakes "to emancipate man from the slavery of religion." Articles such as these find their way into many households, and distill the poison of indifference into the young and half educated.

We long for the day when a Catholic Truth Society will be in every parish to rebuke calumny and to answer every charge against "The Church" that has been, since the days it received its commission, a militant one.

When any member of a society presumes to play the role of censor of things ecclesiastical he should be shown the door. He is a menace to its stability, for he will create a bad spirit among the members, especially the young section.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF MARRIAGE.

Some Misconception Regarding This Important Matter Corrected by Father Prendergast.

The statement published in a New York paper recently that Miss Virginia Fair had telegraphed her spiritual adviser, the Very Rev. J. J. Prendergast, Vicar General of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, Cal., to secure for her dispensation from Rome to wed William K. Vanderbilt in a Protestant church was denied by Father Prendergast.

"I received a dispatch from Miss Fair," he said. "The real purport of the telegram was not of any importance, and has not been divulged by me, because it was personal. I sent a dispatch in reply, but in neither one was there any reference, direct or indirect, to Rome, or a Roman Cardinal, or an Archbishop, Bishop or priest, or Protestant or Catholic, to Church or State, to dispensation or marriage. Consequently all statements connecting my name with events or matters real or imagined, in high life in New York are without a shadow of foundation."

Father Prendergast then explained briefly the Catholic doctrine of marriage. He said:

"The whole matter of marriage may be summed up under three heads: "First, The Church recognizes as a true, genuine, permanent marriage the union of two persons not Christians, if they are legally married.

"Second: The Church recognizes as true, genuine, permanent and binding until death the marriage contracted between Protestants (that is, persons baptized of any and all denominations).

"Third: The Church requires Catholics to be married in all cases, without exception, by the ministers of the Church in accordance with the prescription of the Church. When, however, one is a baptized Protestant and the other a baptized Catholic, the marriage, however contracted, is a true and real marriage in the eyes of the Church, binding as long as the parties, although the Catholic in contrast, it otherwise than before the ministers of the Church is held to be

guilty of a serious offense against the Church discipline—that is to say, there is a fault personal to the Catholic in the case; but inasmuch as the other party to the marriage is not a Catholic, the fault of the Catholic does not affect the stability and indissolubility of the contract.

"With regard to where both are Catholics the Church insists that they shall be married before a minister of the gospel, their pastor, and in accordance with the laws of the Church under a penalty of ecclesiastical annulment of the marriage. So that such a marriage is not to have more than legal force, and consequently upon the dissolution of the civil tie the parties to the marriage are allowed to contract again. Notwithstanding this clear statement, there are very often troublesome complications which require most perfect familiarity with both civil and ecclesiastical law to unravel."—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

ANGLICAN ORDERS.

Notable Lecture by Rev. D. J. Dougherty, D. D.

Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

Rev. D. J. Dougherty, D. D., of the Seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, lectured before a large audience at the Catholic Club on Sunday evening, on the subject of Anglican orders. He said that the train of events which led up to the pronouncement of Leo XIII. in which these orders were declared invalid were too well known to require rehearsal. The hope of High Churchmen since the time of the Oxford movement had rested on the validity of these orders. The essential defects were in the form and in the intention, and among the Catholic doctrines and terms involved in the issue were "altar," "sacrifice," "the Real Presence," "priesthood" and "holy orders." The priest's duty is to offer sacrifice. It is his essential power and duty, and there is no priesthood without sacrifice.

The Reformers of the sixteenth century began by repudiating the divine institution of the priesthood. They declared that priests were no more than laymen, that no supernatural power was given by ordination or consecration, and they had as a consequence to abolish the sacrifice of the Mass and the doctrine of the Real Presence. The Mass, they declared, was a superstition and idolatry and detracted from the sacrifice of Calvary. The theories which the Continental reformers had evolved were introduced into England with the avowed intention of rooting out the very doctrines which modern Ritualists strive so strenuously to introduce into their Church's creed. Macaulay says that Cranmer was ready to go as far as any Swiss reformer, and held that all jurisdiction, spiritual as well as temporal, was derived from the King. During the reign of Henry VIII. the Catholic rite of ordination was retained, but under Edward VI. it was expressly stated in the commissions of the bishops that they only possessed jurisdiction as long as the King saw fit.

REPUUDIATING SACRIFICE.

Shrines, chapels and altars were destroyed and altar-stones were profaned by being turned into hearth stones. The reason given for destroying the altars was that as long as they remained the people would dream of sacrifice. With the denial of the doctrine of the Real Presence came a loss of respect for churches, until it was necessary for the King to issue proclamation to prevent extreme disrespect. Bishop Hooper refused to wear episcopal robes, and one year after Henry VIII.'s death the land was deluged with words against the Real Presence and the sacrifice of the Mass, in which were used blasphemous expressions that would strike one with horror. These publications were not only not checked, but numbers of them were dedicated to the King.

The English Church did not hide its light under a bushel. Article 29 denies the Real Presence. Article 31 calls Masses dangerous deceits. The pulling down of the altars was the repudiation of sacrifice, and, according to the reformers, priests and Bishops were mere dispensers of the word, and ordination a mere election.

In framing the new rite, Cranmer and his co-laborers took the ancient Catholic rite as their point of departure. From this they naturally eliminated whatever displeased them—that is, whatever referred to the conveyance by holy orders of sacerdotal power. They struck out the words referring to "sanctification" and "consecration," and also the passage in which the Bishop says: "Receive the power of offering sacrifice to God." They eliminated that portion of the rite where the Bishop hands over to the candidate for the priesthood the sacrificial instruments. The Bishop consecrates the hands of the candidate for the priesthood, because he is to offer sacrifice and to handle the body and blood of Christ. They eliminated that.

Twice does the Bishop use imposition of hands accompanied by a formula of prayer. The first laying on of hands which occurs early in the ordination Mass is conjoined with words replete with the conveyance of sacerdotal power. This laying-on of hands and prayer are essential to priestly ordina-

tion and consequently are found in all rites of the East and West and recognized as valid; in the Latin, the Greek, the Jacobite, the Abyssinian-Coptic. The framers of the Anglican rite cut out of this essential form of words every reference to sacrifice and to real priesthood, and then transferred the mingled remains to the introductory part of the ordination service where they are unaccompanied by the laying-on of hands.

THE ANGLICAN RITE.

Dr. Dougherty then critically examined Anglican ordination rites in themselves and apart from their history. A sacrament is a sign instituted by Christ to give grace to the soul and at the same time make known to the priesthood, and then transferred the mingled remains to the introductory part of the ordination service where they are unaccompanied by the laying-on of hands.

The form of words used in ordaining to the episcopate of the Anglicans could be used for confirming a child, ordaining a deacon or making a parish clerk. It does not define the office or power of a Bishop, and if Anglicans have no Bishops, they can have no priests. The form used for the presbyterate is also indeterminate. It could be used for the consecration of a Bishop or deacon. The words are, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven." Forgiving sins is not offering sacrifice, and we know from the writings of the period that the Reformers did not mean the power of absolving possessed by priests.

Under Charles II. a defining clause was added to the forms for ordaining Bishops and priests. Why was it added if not to meet the objections of Catholics who had taunted the Anglicans with having no Bishops or priests, or to silence the Dissenters who wished their ministers to enjoy the privilege of sitting in the House of Lords equally with Anglican Bishops, since the latter, being Bishops not in deed, but only in name, were in reality no higher in rank than Dissenting preachers, or to remove the scruples of the school of Laud, who with others had traveled on the Continent of Europe and had conceived somewhat truer notions of Catholic priesthood and holy orders? No matter what was the cause of the insertion of this defining clause, its addition leaves room for the suspicion that the Anglican Church itself felt the insufficiency of its ordination. But this action, even if otherwise efficacious, was one hundred and three years too late. The succession was extinct and there was no validly consecrated Bishop in the Anglican Church who could ordain in proper form.

THE MATTER OF INTENTION.

A valid intention is essential to a sacrament. The Church does not judge of the intention in so far as it is internal, but in so far as it manifests itself externally she is bound to take cognizance of it. If the Catholic rite is changed with the manifest purpose of introducing another rite not approved by the Church and of rejecting what the Church does and what, by the institution of Christ, belongs to the nature of the sacrament, then it is clear that not only is the required intention wanting, but that the intention is positively adverse to and destructive of the sacrament. The heretical framers of the Anglican rite not only changed the Catholic form, but its significance. Why cut out sacrifice? Why consecrate missals? Why deny the Real Presence? Can it be possible that they wiped out everything relating to these doctrines without the intention to do so? Here Doctor Dougherty cited utterances of Cranmer, Ridley and Barlow to show that they did not believe in a sacrificing or consecrating priesthood, nor indeed in orders conveying any supernatural power whatever. Barlow said if the King appointed a Bishop without ordination he was as good a Bishop as any other. Is it any wonder modern Ritualists turn away in pain from the founders of their Church, and some even compare the authors of the English Revolution with the fathers of the French Revolution? Bad men do not make good churches, and valid ordination rites could not be made by Cranmer and Ridley, and we cannot believe that they could be so stupid as to make orders to convey a power which they contended did not exist.

SIGNIFICANT EVIDENCE.

The action of Pope Julius and Cardinal Pole during Queen Mary's reign in reconciling ministers and bishops of the Anglican to the Mother Church was cited as being that kind of evidence which good lawyers look for, namely, the Court's decision at the time the case was tried. Those who were ordained after Henry VIII. had broken away from the Church were ordained in schism and consequently their ordinations were censurable; hence upon being reconciled they were conditionally

ordained, but those ordained under the form used in Edward VI.'s time were treated as laymen. The test question was "Were you ordained before or within the last eight years?" In two dioceses, one of them London, fourteen were ordained in Queen Mary's time who had received Anglican orders under Edward VI.

Referring to Matthew Parker, the speaker said that Lord Macaulay is the authority for the statement that for over a century the English bishops did not admit the necessity of valid ordination. In answer to the Catholic Bishop Whitaker said: "Keep your orders to yourselves," and his colleague, Mason said: "No man on earth can offer sacrifice." Cardinal Newman said that it was a historical fact that until the rise of the present Ritualistic movement there was no question of the Anglican Church attitude; that there has never in the Anglican Church any belief in the sacrifice of the Mass. The Established Church has clung tenaciously to the patrimony bequeathed to it by Cranmer and Ridley, and herself repudiates a sacrificing priesthood.

An interesting phase of the subject which the speaker touched upon was this. Previous baptism is necessary for the reception of the other sacraments. There was a time when baptism as a sacrament was well nigh lost in the Anglican Church, and by authority it was decided that a minister might teach that baptism conveys no sacramental benefit. We need not be surprised that its administration was careless and lax and that generations of men received and bestowed Anglican orders who had never been baptized. The question, he said in conclusion, is one of vital importance to High Churchmen.

KINGLAKE ON THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

What a charm there is in the contemplation of the various scenes in the life of our Blessed Mother, especially when this contemplation is assisted by a visit to the hallowed scenes of her sojourn here below. The scenes in the life of her Divine Son are inseparably connected with her. We cannot contemplate His life and sufferings without thinking of her; and hence we find many Protestant writers speaking of her in the most beautiful language. In Kinglake's "Eohen," the hero in describing his visit to the Home at Nazareth is made to say:

"The attending Friar served me well—he led me down quietly and all but silently to the Virgin's home. The mystic air was so burnt with the consuming flames of the altar, and so laden with incense that my chest labored strongly and heaved with luscious pain. There—there with beating heart the Virgin knelt and listened! I strove to grasp and hold with my riveted eyes some one of the feigned Madonnas, but of all the heaven-lit faces imagined by men there was none that would abide with me in this very Sanctuary. Impatient of vacancy, I grew madly strong against Nature, and if by some awful spell, some impious rite, I could—Oh! most sweet religion that bade me fear God, and be pious and yet not cease from loving! Religion and gracious Custom commanded me that I fall down loyally, and kiss the rock that blessed Mary pressed. With a half consciousness, with the semblance of a thrilling hope that I was plunging deep, deep into my first knowledge of some most holy mystery, or of some new, rapturous and daring sin, I knelt, and bowed down my face till I met the smooth rock with my lips. One moment—one moment—my heart or some old Pagan demon within me, woke up and fiercely bounded—my bosom was lifted and swung—as though I had touched Her warm robe. One moment—one more, and then—the fever had left me. I rose from my knees. I felt hopelessly sane. The mere world reappeared. My good old monk was there, dangling his keys with listless patience, and as he guided me from the church and talked of the Refectory, and the coming repast, I listened to his words, with some attention and pleasure."

THE ANGELUS.

Our Episcopal friends are beginning to covet our Angelus bell, the reminder of the faithful at morning, noon and eventide, of the mystery of the Incarnation. Writes Bishop Cortland White, of Pittsburg, to the Churchman:

It seems to me too bad that the Roman Catholic body should be the only one that three times a day bears testimony to the multitudes of busy people absorbed in worldly cares that there is another world, and that there are eternal virtues.

We think the Ritualists have adopted the Angelus. Bishop Whitehead would compromise on a noon tide bell, and call it the "Evangelus."—Boston Pilot.

REBUKE.

From the Academy.

A chill, dark, autumnal morning. A breakfast table with an overworked tribe of clamorous children. A worried mother and an irritable father muttering something about "no decent elbow-room." A small child uplifts solemn eyes from his plate and says: "Haden't one of us better die?"