The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XVII. LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1895. NO. 859.

The Lenten Hours.

From dreary winter, with its frost and snow,
And ice-bound streams, and forests dull and bare;
From clouded skies and sunless, bitter air;
From cruel winds that oftimes fiercely blow,
And spreading meadows where no flowers show,
To days when skylarks sing without a care;
When heaven is bright, and all the earth is fair
With light and bloom, the Lenten hours go.

And once they led through anguish long and dread,
Through cruel suffering and prayers and tears,
From hopes undimmed and coward doubts and fears,
To that blest hour when, from His rock-hewn bed,
Where Cæsar's soldiers watched with tireless care,
Christ rose a victor, and men ransomed were.

—Magdalen Rock in Ave Maria.

CONCERNING CHURCH UNITY.

Important Paper by an English Clergyman on a Subject now Attracting Wide Attention in This Country as Well as in England.

(Rev. George Angus in London Tablet.)

It is, to myself at least, always refreshing to read the speeches and letters of Lord Halifax, the President of the English Church Union. A former president of that large and influential society, the Hon. Colin Lindsay, who worked for some years on Anglican lines, became a member of a still larger and more influential society of which the Pope is Head. I remember what searching of hearts his secession caused, and how the Chaplain-General of another Church of England association invoked the prayers of all and sundry in the hope that "N. Y." (for so Mr. Lindsay's indentity was, scarcely successfully, concealed) might be preserved to the "Church of his baptism." One Anglican, then as now, a beneficed clergyman, treated this pious attempt to control a would-be wanderer with some contempt. To the request made for prayers he replied, "I shall do no such thing; I shall pray that 'N. Y.' may do the will of God," which "N. Y." did. That history may repeat itself must be our earnest desire.

The utterances of Lord Halifax stand out in strong and pleasing contrast to the controversial language made use of by other High Churchmen. Carping criticisms on petty details are absent. His Lordship does not sneer at the "Italian Mission," a nickname invented by his Spiritual Chief at Lambeth; he does not speak of the "Romish Schism," nor inveigh against "Half Communion;" he does not pronounce the Rosary to be an unedifying form of prayer, nor find fault with the position given by Catholics to Mary and the saints in the economy of grace. He is far from considering the Pope to be an arrogant usurper, or a pernicious pretender. He recognizes the Roman See as the Central Authority in Christendom. He yearns for reunion with that See. He would not, I feel convinced, agree with the writer in the January *Church Quarterly* (p. 311, foot-note) who informs us that those for whom that learned periodical speaks "are deliberately opposed to Rome on various grounds, theological, historical, and last, but not least, moral." What Lord Halifax chiefly desiderates, if I understand him rightly, is that the Roman Communion should recognize the Church of England as a part, or branch, of the Church, unfortunately *de facto* separated from the Mother Church, the rest of the West; should acknowledge Anglican orders as valid, and allow that Anglicanism possesses everything, essential at least, which (he would maintain) Rome has in completeness as her heritage. And the reason he wishes this is that he considers the Roman and the English Churches to be not two Churches, but one Church, as he not long ago wrote to the *Times* (I quote from memory) that the quarrel between England and Rome was a dispute not between two Churches, but between two portions of the same Church. In others words,

ROME AND ENGLAND ARE REALLY ONE.

As to this let us examine the position. England and Rome are really one, though outwardly and accidentally two. But can this be seriously maintained? Here are two bodies which have no intercourse, no social dealings, no inter communion, no consulting or arranging, no ordering or obeying, no mutual support—can this be union? Under such conditions how can the two be one? If the Church were an Invisible body, according to the usual Protestant and Evangelical view, something might be said for this theory, but can there be union between two societies not visibly united? Evidently Rome and Canterbury are two bodies: if they were one (as they once were) they would possess

ONENESS OF GOVERNMENT.

To illustrate this let us look at mundane matters. Americans are our kith and kin. They speak our language. They recognize great Britain as the Mother Country. But can America and Great Britain be, in any sense, called one Kingdom? No. Americans have a different form of Government—a flag, and coinage, and laws, and institutions, and army, and navy, of their own.

They send an ambassador or minister, to us: we send one to them. In no way do we form One Kingdom, because we are not under one and the same Government. Now, surely, in matters ecclesiastical, Rome and Canterbury are in a like position. Two distinct bodies, separate from, and (of necessity) opposing one another. When they enjoy oneness of spiritual government, as they did once, then, and not till then, can they be again one society, one spiritual kingdom.

I say "as they did once," so let us look at the oneness of government existing in

PRE REFORMATION TIMES.

Now, no doubt, it is the fashion for some Anglicans to say: "The Church of England never was Papal: never Roman Catholic: always independent of Rome," and so on. Historians, however, and other common-sense people do not agree with this newest and most startling of Anglican assertions; nor, I think, does Lord Halifax. Quite recently, the *Spectator* pooh-poohed Archbishop Benson's contention that the Church of England was "never Roman Catholic," by asking him if he had received his Pall from Rome (a grimly sarcastic question, the only Pall His Grace possesses being that emblazoned as the historic arms of the See of Canterbury,) as all English Archbishops had done from Augustine to Pole? The *Church Times* puts the Pall question aside as a matter of no importance, by urging that the Holy See had, by undue influence, almost forced the Archbishops to apply for the Pall (which argument hardly holds good with the filial language used by the same Archbishops towards Rome), and says that some Popes extorted money for the Palls, when sent from, or received at, the Eternal City. Not being an Archbishop, and never having received a Pall, I do not know whether fees are demanded in such ecclesiastical transactions, but supposing that they are, and granting that some Popes may have been greedy or grasping in such matters, I cannot see that this is more incongruous than the practice, common to Anglicans and Catholics, of asking and giving fees for baptisms, or churchings, or marriages, or funerals; anyhow it does not interfere with the fact that, rightly or wrongly, the pre-Reformation Bishops recognized the government of the Pope, and acknowledged him as their Chief Pastor and Supreme Spiritual Head, although it is not for a moment contended that they liked or approved, everything done by the Pope in these capacities. We may not always be bound to approve the action of Rome, although we are bound to obey; just as in civil things, people may not approve of the judgment of the Supreme Tribunal, the House of Lords, but they must conform to the rulings of the same. Again, let it be noticed that the Pre-Reformation Church recognized the Headship and Authority of Rome not merely as

DE BENE ESSE, BUT DE ESSE.

In other words, not merely as a wise, providential ecclesiastical arrangement, but as Divinely appointed by the Saviour, as the Fathers of Chalcedon expressed it. And, further, the Pope was recognized to be, in virtue of the Divine Commission, not only supreme head, judge, and ruler, but also the God-appointed Teacher of the Church; and, moreover, in the capacity of Teacher (though not necessarily as judge or ruler), so assisted by the Holy Spirit, when teaching, that he is unable to lead his disciples astray. Indeed, if he could lead us astray, he would not be of much use; and his appointment as Teacher could hardly, with reverence, be referred to Almighty God. Now, many proofs might be quoted to show that the Pre-Reformation Church taught this doctrine, but two may suffice. About one hundred years before the time of Cranmer, was held the Council of Florence, which, certainly, the then Church of England accepted, as the present Church of England says she accepts Ephesus and Chalcedon. And what does Florence tell us? Nothing less than this: "That the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles; that he is the true Vicar of Christ; that he is the Head of the whole Church, the Father and Teacher of all Christians, and that to him was given, in the person of Blessed Peter, full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the Universal Church. . . ." Does the Church of England hold this as of faith, now? So, some years afterwards, let us hear the Pre-Reformation Church again. When Elizabeth succeeded and began to carry out the work commenced by her father and her brother (Dr. Littledale's *Tiger Club*) the Catholic Convocation of Canterbury spoke for the last time, and said that: "To Peter the Apostle and his lawful successors in the Apostolic See, as being the Vicars of Christ, has been given the supreme power of feeding and governing the Church of Christ multitude. . . ." Will the present Convocation of Canterbury (which, we are told, is in continuity,) say as much now, and if not what hope can there be of the restoration of those spiritual relationships between England and Rome, which Lord Halifax and some of his friends long for?

I say Lord Halifax and some of his friends, which brings us to another point, namely,

HOW MANY AGREE WITH LORD HALIFAX?

How many, in the Church of England, care two straws about the Popes, or understand that, at baptism, they became spiritual subjects of the Holy See? Subjects and children, although, through no fault of their own, through inherited circumstances, disobedient and erring. The Low Church people would ridicule such an idea, the Broad Church, like Gallio, "care for none of these things," and as to the High? Well, what of the *Church Quarterly* writer quoted above? What of the authors of publications like *Methods of Romanism* or *The War in the Roman Camp?* Have such anything in common with Lord Halifax, or he with them? Does any single Anglican Bishop wish to be in communion with Rome? At the Exeter Church Congress, the Bishop of Exeter invited all pious Christians to flee from the Pope, and to become Episcopalians, and just before this Lord Halifax had apologized to a Spanish Papal Bishop, because Spaniards had done what the Bishop of Exeter says all pious people ought to do, and had procured from Anglo-Irish sources, a Reformed Bishop. "Why not acknowledge our orders?" says Lord Halifax; but the great majority of Anglican Bishops and clergy do not want their orders acknowledged (in the Catholic sense,) for the simple reason that they do not believe that such orders (in the Catholic sense) exist, or can exist under the Christian dispensation. I pointed this out in the *Times* (writing under a *nom de querre*) in a recent discussion upon Anglican Ordinations, and asked why are Catholics called upon to assert what the vast majority of Anglicans deny? I also respectfully invited (I am sure Dean Burgon would have forgiven me this little plagiarism) the Archbishop of Canterbury and York to say plainly, whether they ordained, and meant to ordain priests to say Mass and absolve, or not?

But an Anglican writer replied that my challenge could not be taken up, as the Anglican Bishops did not agree as to what they meant, or did not mean, to do, in conferring ordination. And yet good men, members of the English Church Union, contentedly remain in this boneless body, whose chief officers are not agreed as to their teaching, or as to the value and effect of their solemn official ministrations. Under such circumstances how can we look for the realization of the pious and Christian aspirations of the Catholic-minded President of the English Church Union?

EIGHT-AND TWENTY YEARS AGO

I stood, at Cheltenham, upon the same platform with Lord Halifax. We were then in the same communion, and at an English Church Union meeting. At that meeting I behaved very badly, at least so the then Secretary of the English Church Union informed me. I daresay I did, and I hereby crave pardon of all concerned. The times were exciting and exhilarating. We were engaged in Catholicizing the Church of England (as she, somehow, refused to Catholicize us), and this in the teeth of all our Bishops, and most of the clergy and laity. My own Bishop anticipated a "sorrowful separation," and thought we had better go to Rome. When I went, His Lordship said that I had carried out my principles to their logical conclusion, which, at that time of "the parting of friends," was somewhat of a consolation. Two-and-twenty years have gone since I passed from dreams and delusions, and fogs and fancies, to "the joy and peace of believing."

Beau Brummell used to say that one may be amused, but should never be surprised; nevertheless I plead guilty, as did Newman, to having felt, and to feeling, an extreme astonishment that I ever believed the Church of England to be, in any sense, "the Bride of the Lamb." I trust, however, that, in these lines, I have not said anything unbecoming or discourteous to that distinguished and zealous member of the Anglican communion whose name I have so often mentioned; and I hope he will forgive me if I add that I pray, before the inevitable day of departure hence dawns, once again to "walk in the House of God as friends," and to be reunited, in the One Fold, and under the One Shepherd, in that Catholic and Roman Church, which is the queen of saints, the true Jerusalem, and the mother of us all.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL HIGH MASS.

The Rev. Lewis Wattson Tells His Congregation to Invoke the Aid of the Blessed Virgin.

Kingston, N. Y., Feb. 3.—The Rev. Lewis T. Wattson celebrated the Feast of the Purification in St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church to-day with a High Mass this morning and by a sermon to-night, which has caused not a little talk, especially among his parishioners, who are not in perfect accord with his ritualistic tendencies. He took for his text, or theme, the Magnificat, saying that the Virgin Mary, as the mother of God, should be especially venerated. It is time, he said, to lay aside some of the Protestant prejudices on this subject, and, when we pray, to ask Mary to intercede for us with God. At the marriage feast Christ, at His mother's request, turned water into wine, and, taking this as an example, Father Wattson argued that if Christ listened to Mary then, why would He not now when she is Queen of Heaven?

Father Wattson said a woman living in Detroit had told him of a holy woman living there to whom many mothers brought their children to be healed of bodily infirmities, instead of going to a doctor. If this holy woman's prayers were so potent, he said how much more so would be those of Mary? In addressing the Virgin, Father Wattson advocated the use of the expression: "Hail, Mary, Queen of Heaven, Blessed art thou among women. O Holy Mary, pray for us."

The continuation of the hearing in the matter of the charges against Father Wattson will be concluded in Newburg on Friday. This was announced by Father Wattson this morning, when he asked the congregation to pray that the Bishop may be guided rightly in his judgment.

SPIRITUALISM.

Lecture at Holy Angels Church by Rev. Father Effinger, S. J.

Chicago New World.

The subject of Father Effinger's lecture at Holy Angels church last Sunday evening was "Spiritualism." He spoke in part as follows:

One of the most pleasing revelations of the supernatural to man is the world of spirits; and one of the loveliest features of these spirits is their kindly ministration unto man. More lovely their daily offices to you, my friends, who dwell in this temple of the Holy Angels. You believe therefore in spirits. For angels are spirits. He hath made the spirits angels, i. e., messengers. So soon as a spirit is given a message to convey, he becomes an angel, a messenger. Abraham receives the three guests into his tent, and they are angels; Tobias finds a youthful companion girded for the journey, and when his offices of charity are over, he refuses the gifts proffered, and forthwith ascends the skies.

The doctrines of the Church concerning the existence and nature of the spirit world are clearly defined. The Vatican Council (Constitio Dei Filius, C. I.) repeating and confirming the IV. Lateran Council, declares, "The true God alone . . . . . at once from the beginning of time created out of nothing the two creatures, the *spiritual* and the corporal, to wit, the angeli and the numdare." In the fourth and fifth canons anathema is pronounced against those who deny that the angels were created by God.

Before the tribunal of the Church it would therefore be heretical to say with the Sadduces of old, or the materialists of the day that there are no angels at all; heretical to maintain with the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, that they are mere outward manifestations of the energy of God; heretical to hold with certain spiritualists of the day, that the angels are nothing distinct from the departed souls of men; heretical in fine to claim with the materialists that they are only forces of matter.

The definitions of the councils go so far and no further on this head; but the universal belief of the Church extends to many collateral points which are of divine faith. For instance, the Church believes that the angels are a much higher order of beings than man, and are altogether incorporeal, purely spiritual; that they are far superior to man in the power and width of their intellects. "Nature's infinite book of secrecy, in which we can read a little, is spread open before them; they scan the future of natural phenomenon with greater accuracy than we know the past; they read in the pages of the elements and in the volumes of time." But future actions that depend on the free will of man, the Church says, angels good or bad, cannot forsee. Prophecy belongs to God alone. And the Church further teaches by many of her Fathers, that by the mercy of God, man is destined to replace the vast host of fallen angels. What wonder, therefore, that the angels come down from heaven and fight side by side with the souls of struggling men? What wonder that these angels flit above the flames of purgatory, bringing consolation to their loving charges, thence flying to earth to ask the prayers of the living? What wonder that Lucifer and his cohorts, in the bitterness of despair, should seek to wreak their vengeance on the souls of men? The Fathers tell us that legions of destroying spirits fill the air between earth and sky. The least of them able to make sad havoc in this world; the lowest able to craze men with frightful apparitions. Woe were man, were not God above it all; woe, if the natural powers of these angels were not checked by His fatherly hand. Woe is man if (like the spiritualists of the present day) he allows himself to be enticed by those fascinating charms in spiritualistic seances in wonderful exhibitions of powers that surpass the ken of human knowledge and the powers of nature!

With the Church and her doctrines and belief as our guide, let us pass in review briefly the practices and aims of modern spiritualism. Be it the secret power of the hypnotist, giving him a complete or almost complete command of the free will of another, or be it the apparition of absent friends or relatives at a crisis of great danger, or at the moment of death, or be it the converse with invisible spirits, all of which gave spiritualism its fascinating attractions.

In many ages phenomena have appeared from time to time which have been looked upon as marvelous by some, impostures by others and by still others as necromancy, or divination. Passing by all former representations of others ages and peoples, let me confine my remarks to Mesmerism, Hypnotism, and Spiritualism, as exhibited in our modern days of civilization and culture.

Mesmerism was so called from Mesmer, a graduate from the medical school of Vienna about the year 1760. His graduating thesis was the influence of the planets on the cure of diseases; the sun, moon, etc., he said acted on the body of man by means of a subtle fluid called animal magnetism. At this time a Jesuit cured many diseases, rheumatic and others by the application of "steel tractors." Mesmer, seeing the anology between his own theories and the practice of the Jesuit, tried the effect of the magnet. He created quite a stir in the scientific world. Others soon followed in his footsteps, and as is always the case, abuses and malpractices came up. Finally Dr. Burdin of Paris offered a prize of 3,000 francs to any one who could read a given writing without the aid of his eyes or in the dark. The prize was never awarded.

Hypnotism: The term was first applied by Dr. James Braid, a Manchester surgeon, to designate that artificial nervous condition resembling sleep into which he found the subject of Mesmerism to be thrown.

Let me now proceed to investigate the claims and practices of Spiritualism proper.

Spiritualism is the power to converse with, and have dealings with departed souls. Many and marvellous are the deeds done by them. Some, nay most of those, must be ascribed to the clever deceptions and elaborate skill of the conjurer. Herman says that he performed all his apparitions of ghost and goblins, of yawning graveyards, etc., by the sole means of the lime light and mirrors.

But I am concerned at present with that aspect of spiritualism which pretends to inculcate *religion*. I shall take for granted that spiritualism is not a mere imposture. No one can read the report of the Dialectic Society on the evidence submitted to it, or De Morgan's "From Matter to Spirit," without coming to the conclusion that physical effects are produced, which are not and cannot be due to any natural forces and which prove without doubt the presence of superhuman and invisible intelligence, through whose agency they are visibly affected.

The facts are indisputable; their origin, beyond a doubt, is some preternatural agency. The question that I shall undertake to solve is as to the character of this agency.

The general drift of spiritualist teaching is well expressed in the evidence of the Countess de Pomar before the Dialectical Society. She herself was a successful medium, and gives the following summary of the doctrines taught her by the spirits:

"All the spirits with whom I have had communication have invariably told me that they do grow in knowledge and goodness, and this through being re-incarnated; that they return to this earth many times, as many as are necessary for enabling them to grow to perfection. This quite accords with my own deep conviction. If I be asked how long it would take a spirit to rise through the various degrees until it is fitted for leaving this sphere, I could not answer, except to say, there will be time enough in eternity for the due perfection of all, however imperfect may be their natures to-day, and in this hope and conviction I rest content, quite certain that such a thing as eternal punishment is altogether contrary to the great law of God which is written on all His works, the law of eternal progress. The sin we have committed, or are inclined to commit, we shall suffer for until we have thoroughly purged it out of our nature; the wrong we have done we shall expiate, and we shall not come out free until we have paid the uttermost farthing; but we shall pay it, and go gladly on our way when we have left it far behind us, "always stretching forward towards the mark," perfect happiness awaiting us as we get further on in our long journey, happiness which will really be our own, because we shall have worked for and earned it, and have grown up to understand and yearn after it. Our happiness will be to be all good, all wise, all pure, perfect as our Father is perfect. Can any single life on earth perfect us sufficiently even to comprehend such perfection? And yet the standard was given!"

The following extract from a communication of J. K. Bauddy, M. D., to the editor of the *Globe Democrat*, St. Louis, Mo., throws further light on the religious teaching of Spiritualism:

"Judge Portis tells us that spiritualism teaches and demonstrates by actual experiment the great truth that there is no death; that what is called death is only another birth into a higher, better and more progressive form of life; that we will continue to be ourselves, neither angels nor devils, and will there rejoin our loved ones who have gone before us, and that those who have gone through that change can and do communicate with those still on earth, and tell them their experiences, of the nature and character of their homes, as well as many other things of interest and of great importance to them. These and much more in the line of the true, the beautiful and the good, and how to think, act and live here to insure good positions; these are among the teachings of spiritualism."

Let us consider these words and attempt to analyze these thoughts of the Judge. "Spiritualism teaches and demonstrates by actual experiment the great truth that there is no death." If by death he meant (and this is the universal meaning of the word) separation of the soul from the body, spiritualism indeed teaches a great error and perpetrates a monstrous fraud. After reading and commenting on several other extracts, Father Effinger concluded as follows:

There is a beautiful painting called "The Game of Life," in a mortuary chapel, which, to judge from its grim architecture of guled pilasters with heads of sphinxes grinning from the capitals and its writhing corbels mounting towards the ceiling, must be in the hold of some gloomy castle of the Middle Ages, away from the light of day and the gaze of men, the great game is played by the living among the dead. The chess-board is placed on the end of the sarcophagus which stands in the middle of the ancestral vault. The pieces are all allegoric figures of virtues and vices, the colors being red and white. The two players are entirely taken up with the game. On the right as you look on the picture, sits a lordly man, a French nobleman, in manhood's prime. The game has evidently been going against him. A few red pawns is all that he has taken from the enemy, while the critical position of the few white-robed virtues on his side shows you that if his next move is false, all is lost. Bent forward over the fatal board, his head resting on his right hand, his whole soul concentrated in the motionless face, his whole intellect centered in the open earnest eye, he is studying his last move. He thinks of nothing else now. He is utterly unconscious of the terrible change that has come over his adversary; he does not see how those fleshless features now burn beneath the black hood; he does not even see the fierce glare of the demon's eye, fixed as a serpent's on its unconsious prey. He sat down to play with Satan in the guise of Mephistophles; but were he to look up now and see the veritable fiend, he would leap to his feet and cry to heaven for help. But he has not the faintest idea of the appalling transformation of his adversary, no, nor a thought of the dark cloud that rests on the brow of his majestic angel, who has been standing between them all the while. The angel has given his last saving counsel and now stands a figure of indescribable anxiety, waiting for the last move, before he shall turn aside and weep for a lost soul. This is not a mere painting. The color of the canvas vanishes before mine eyes. The great game of life rises up before me in living reality. Satan is in our midst in all the fascinating forms of spiritualism. Oh! many are enticed to sit down with him, hear the charming news of the spirit world, his manners are so winning, his voice so sweet.

It seems as if anti Christ, the man of sin, who with the help of Satan will work great wonders and signs, and claim for himself divine honors, has come into the world. He needs but infidelity to enlist in his ranks, in order to array the powers of hell and of the world in the most universal persecution against the Church. But "of that day and that hour no man knoweth." He who directs his Church, may make the evil spirits of the seances, even as he made Balaam, the son of Bear, utter words of blessing instead of curses. Or he may allow ungrateful peoples to become the guilty victims of Spiritualistic Demon-worship; and while the Church springs again from the ashes of her ruins in Asia and Africa, suffer the western world to go its way of Paganism. But even then the end may not be. One saint of God may overthrow the empire of spiritualism. When the East lay buried in the darkness of spiritualism, fakirs and the rest ruled with absolute sway over India. One man was sent of God, and overthrew that empire of Satan—and that man's name was Xavier. When the northern island of the European continent was the grove of Druid demon-worship, one man was sent from God, and he expelled the spirits of darkness under the light of the gospel truth, and his name was Patrick.

Lent, with all its graces, with all its opportunities to lay up treasure beyond the reach of thief, or moth, with all its sympathies with the sufferings of the Redeemer, with all its calls to the faithful to arise from the death of sin and sloth to the life of virtue and diligence in the service of God. Lent is here. While all the Church is mortified, who would shrink from mortification? While heavenly riches abound, who would remain poor? Hail, Lent, that is a preparation for Easter!—Catholic Review.