

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITOR: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHRUP, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Theology."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LUKS, KISS, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVEN and Wm. A. SEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, adage measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Feby. 1, 1896.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

The Rev. Morgan Wood, of Detroit, is one among those Protestant clergymen who are horrified at the laxity of the marriage tie which has become so prevalent among Protestants of the present generation. On Sunday the 19th ult. he preached a very strong and well-reasoned sermon against the present marriage and divorce laws in force in the United States. He took the usual ground of most Protestants who maintain that the law of marriage as established by Christ permits absolute divorce in case of the unfaithfulness of husband or wife to the sacred obligations of marriage, but he added that no other cause should be deemed sufficient to authorize either husband or wife to marry again upon separation.

He maintained that there might be other causes for separation in the impossibility for husband and wife to live together peaceably; but there should be no permission for either to marry again except in the case of the death of one or the other, and in case of unfaithfulness, as already mentioned.

He said: "Marriage is more than a civil or legal contract, and no self-respecting man or woman would consent to have that sacred union performed by a justice of the peace. This official has no other interest in the ceremony than the collection of his fee and the observance of a legal expediency. Marriage should be a union of two hearts confiding in each other's lasting love, and of a quality which would uplift and make pure the natural affections."

There is much good sense in Mr. Wood's line of argument, but it will nevertheless fall flat upon the ears of the people who have been addressed. It is the tendency of Protestantism to regard marriage as a mere civil contract, and all the efforts of individual clergymen will no more divert the current of popular Protestant opinion into another channel than would they stem the force of the Falls of Niagara.

This is especially true regarding the congregation ministered to by the Rev. Mr. Wood. It is a congregation more or less intimately connected, as we understand, with the Universalists, and boasts of its being not tied down to any religious creed. It admits of scarcely any special doctrines as belonging to Christianity, and how will Mr. Wood enforce the Christian view of marriage upon it? And if he cannot speak with authority to his own flock, how can he expect to bring to his views the population of the United States, with all their varieties of belief?

Mr. Wood has the reputation of being a gentleman of ability and very devoted to his work of doing good among his flock, and we have no doubt he deserves this reputation; but that is not sufficient to ensure that his doctrinal views be generally accepted. Paganism itself produced philosophers who reasoned out certain truths which they too inculcated with the hope of elevating the social and moral condition of the people, but they failed especially for two reasons: first, the various schools of philosophy contradicted each other on the most important points, and so none of them were believed, good as their intentions were; and, secondly, they had not the divine sanction for their teaching. They were not commissioned by God to teach the certain truth, and all their efforts failed.

The Rev. Mr. Morgan Wood is in the same position. He is a teacher of one of the many sects into which Protestantism is divided, and as all these sects proclaim that each individual is the judge for himself what doctrines he should believe, neither he nor any of his colleagues in the ministry can claim to have the divine authority for their teachings even when they attempt to impress their views upon the general public, and when they make the attempt they are met by other clergymen of contrary views whose claims to be recognized as

teachers are quite as good as their own, and we venture to say that, within his own denomination, Mr. Wood knows of many of his colleagues whose views on the marriage question are entirely at variance with those he has expressed.

We do not mean to assert that Mr. Wood would do violence to his own convictions if a divorced person were to present himself or herself before him to be re-married, but certainly if he were to refuse to comply with the request he would be a singularity among his colleagues, for in the State of Michigan it is well known that every twelfth marriage is followed by a divorce, and all of the divorced persons consider themselves free to marry again, and they have no difficulty in finding Protestant clergymen to celebrate the marriages for them.

There is, we believe, not one of the Protestant sects which at the present moment opposes the marriage of divorced persons so strongly as the Anglicans and Protestant Episcopalians of the United States; yet, even among them, many of the clergy celebrate such marriages, and it is well known that in England the Bishops are hopelessly divided on the question whether or not such marriages ought to be celebrated.

The supreme authority of the State in matters of religion as well as in things secular is an essential principle in the Church of England, and on this ground many of the Bishops and clergy maintain that the Church is bound to accept the divorces which have been granted by the courts, and it is difficult to see how others of the clerical body can consistently take the opposite view. Yet within the last few weeks there have been loud protests against the act of a curate in St. George's church, London, who performed the marriage ceremony in a case where one of the contracting parties had been divorced. The curate, however, maintained his right, and there is no authority in the Church to condemn him. The only authority which could put a stop to marriages of this kind in the Church of England is an Act of Parliament; and it is very doubtful whether such an Act could be passed, as divorces are an outgrowth of Protestantism, and Protestantism will continue to maintain them, as a parent loves his or her own children.

If the Rev. Mr. Wood desires to maintain his views on the indissolubility of marriage, to be consistent he should become a member of the Catholic Church, and conform himself to the Catholic belief and practice, whereby divorce is not permitted for any cause, not even for the one cause which Mr. Wood admits as a sufficient justification for it.

THE MAFIA SECRET SOCIETY.

There is a curious ending to the Mafia society in the United States. The Mafia is an Italian secret society affiliated with the other secret associations which have existed so much influence in Italy, and other European countries, and its chief hold over members lies in the fact that its members are under menace of assassination if they dare disobey the orders of their chiefs, and they are likewise bound under obligation to assassinate or otherwise injure those whom the society, that is to say the leaders of the society, mark out for this fate.

It was this association which committed, or which is the same thing, ordered the commission of the murders throughout Louisiana which resulted in the lynching of sixteen Italians by an angry New Orleans mob only a few years ago.

We do not enter upon a discussion here regarding the guilt or innocence of the men who were punished by mob law, but the guilt was not proved against them in the courts, and it may be presumed that even if some were guilty, others who suffered were innocent of the crimes of which they were charged. Mob law made no distinction, and innocent and guilty were alike executed with the usual barbarity with which lynchings are always conducted.

The Italians, as well as those of other nationalities in this country, ought to learn that they should avoid becoming members of secret societies, the chiefs of which make use of them for carrying out their nefarious designs.

It is to be hoped that the Mafia Society is dead in America, and in fact we have not heard that it has done any nefarious deeds since the New Orleans lynchings, but it may be only in hiding till it have a chance again to recommence its work.

The character of this society may be fairly judged from the character of its

American chief, who is said to be Nicolò Toronto, of New York, who has just been arrested as one of the band of ten counterfeiters who have been making a living by flooding the country with "green goods" which they traded off to their country dupes for good United States currency. But the dupes knew what they were doing too, and they hoped to enrich themselves quickly at the expense of the public, and we must not bestow all the blame of such transactions on the principals in the crime. The dupes are about as deep in the mire as are the principals; but at all events it is to be hoped that the unearthing of this green goods conspiracy will contribute towards burying the Mafia Society in America, the chief of which makes manifest his disinterested patriotism by his connection with the counterfeiting gang.

FEAST OF THE PURIFICATION.

The festival of the Purification or Candlemas day, which will be celebrated by the Church on Sunday, the 2nd inst., is instituted in remembrance of the act of obedience of Mary and Joseph, who, to fulfil the law, went from their temporary abode in Bethlehem to the temple of Jerusalem to present our blessed Lord to His Father in heaven, for the law prescribed that forty days after the birth of a first-born male child he should be thus presented to the Lord, and at the same time the mother should make an offering for sacrifice in the temple, either a lamb of a year old, or at least a pigeon or a turtle dove.

As our divine Saviour's parents chose to be reckoned among the poor, their offering was that of the poor, and they brought their pair of doves to the temple accordingly, one for sacrifice, the other as a sin offering, and thus the days of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin were accomplished according to the law of Moses, as well as the Presentation of our Lord in the Temple, both of which events are commemorated on this festival.

Infidels have ridiculed the law of purification which mothers were obliged to observe by the offering of a sacrifice, but this offering was a thanksgiving to God for the preservation of her own and the child's life, and a commendation of herself and her offspring to God's providence, imploring at the same time God's assistance to both during their lives, and the dedication of the child to God was a promise to rear him in the fear of God by a religious training. With the same objects in view the Catholic Church has preserved a form for the blessing of a mother after childbirth, and this rite is also a remembrance of the ceremony of the purification of the Blessed Virgin. The object of this Catholic ceremony is to thank God for His gift of a child, and for having admitted that child to the privileges of a Christian through the holy sacrament of baptism, and to ask His grace to enable the parents to rear him in the fear and love of God.

This festival is of very ancient observance in the Church, though the exact date when it was instituted cannot be stated. It was ordered to be universally observed in A. D. 541, but there are sermons extant for the feast attributed to St. Methodius A. D. 290, to St. Cyril of Jerusalem A. D. 350, and to others of very early date, showing that the feast was of much earlier date than the sixth century, though it is doubtful whether the sermons were really written by those to whom they have been attributed. They are, nevertheless, of very great antiquity.

There were certain heathen feasts called the Lupercalia and the feast of Ceres, kept at about the same date with the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary and Presentation of our Lord, and as it was with difficulty the populace could be made to give up their public heathenish observances, the feast of the Purification was probably instituted partly with a view to substitute the remembrance of the sacred mystery in the lives of our Lord and the Blessed Virgin for an unholy orgy; the primary object of the institution of the festival was not, however, the mere substitution of a Christian for a heathen festival, but the commemoration of an event in our Lord's life which called for a special observance by Christians.

On this festival it is the practice of the Church to bless candles for the year's use either in the Church or by the people, especially when the sacraments are to be administered in their homes. These candles when lighted are symbolical of the light which Christ brought to mankind by the gospel which he promulgated, and symbolical also of His own personality.

Thus he is described in the Gospel of St. John as "The true light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by Him and the world knew Him not." The appropriateness of this symbol as applicable to the feast of our Lord's Presentation in the temple is further exemplified in the prophetic utterance of the Holy Simeon, who, under inspiration of the Holy Spirit, when he beheld Jesus in the temple on this occasion, took Him into his arms and blessed God and proclaimed Jesus to be:

"A light to the revelation of the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel."

The candles symbolizing our Lord are blessed because it was from the beginning the custom of the Church to bless objects in common use, especially when they were used for devotional purposes. These blessings are authorized by Holy Scripture, for St. Paul says:

"Every creature of God is good and nothing is to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving: For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer."

THE IRISH NATIONAL CONVENTION.

An esteemed correspondent writes to us over the signature "Hittite" objecting to a recent editorial which appeared in our columns in reference to the powers which delegates from the different countries of the world should exercise at the General Irish Convention which it is proposed to hold in Dublin in May, to effect the reunion of Irish Nationalist parties.

We stated that the proposition submitted to the Irish Nationalist Party and accepted by them was that only the Irish delegates from Ireland itself, and probably those from England and Scotland, would have a decisive vote at the Convention. "Hittite" appears to think that this is purely our suggestion, and he argues strongly that Irishmen from Canada, Australia, and Van Diemen's Land or Tasmania and Jamaica, should by all means have representation at the proposed Convention, and a decisive vote on all questions proposed, because "they live under a government of the people and by the people." Those of Van Diemen's Land and Jamaica, he considers, have an extra claim because the best of our race were sent thither under the operation of oppressive laws. He also protests against "closing that Convention against the Irishmen of the greatest Republic on earth, the United States of America."

We fully admit that the Irishmen of all these countries and colonies are in sympathy with those of the mother country, and have testified that sympathy by their contributions sent to Ireland to aid the Irish people to gain their autonomy, but we doubt whether those contributions would have been received if they had been accompanied with the condition that the contributors should have votes in the future government of Ireland, for this is really what "Hittite" demands when he says:

"While I am in favor of Ireland deciding her own fate in National Convention if (Irishmen in) England and Scotland are admitted, I hope representation from every clime will be admitted with a voice and a vote as to the future of the mother country."

"Hittite" is mistaken in supposing that we made any proposition in regard to the admission of Irishmen in England and Scotland with a voice and vote on the decisions of the Convention. Concerning this matter we only mentioned the course which it seems likely will be taken now that it has been determined to hold the Convention if there prove to be any prospect that its purpose of restoring unity to the Parliamentary Party will be thereby attained. There is a reason for the granting of a vote in convention to delegates from England and Scotland, however, which does not exist in reference to Irishmen from the colonies and the United States, and, as we understand the matter, this reason has prevailed with the gentlemen who have in hand the work of calling the convention to extend the right of a decisive vote to delegates who represent all those Irishmen who have now by law a vote in electing members to the Parliament which alone will have the power to grant Home Rule.

We do not dispute "Hittite's" statement that the Legislative Union of Ireland with Great Britain was brought about by bribery and fraud, but it exists, and we cannot ignore the fact. However, if there is any objection to the proposal to give the delegates from Great Britain a vote in the convention, it should be communicated to those who will decide the matter.

Our opinions will not decide it one way or the other. We can do no more than advocate to the best of our ability the just cause of Ireland, and this we will continue to do whatever may be the final decision on this point, which seems to be, after all, a matter of minor importance. The important point is that only Irishmen at home, or those who will be directly affected by the granting of Home Rule, shall decide on the policy by which it may be gained. Those who live abroad can have no further right to interfere than to give their aid and counsel.

INCENSE.

Some friends in Montreal who are members of the Church of England have called our attention to an article on "Incense" which appeared in the *Evangelical Churchman* of Toronto, in its issue of 16th January.

The purpose of the article is stated in the concluding paragraph in the following words, which it pretends to have proved beyond cavil:

"The practice of incense-burning is thus unwarranted by Scripture or by the book of Common Prayer, and has been plainly declared by the highest legal authority to be contrary to the law of the Church of England. It is not derived from primitive and Apostolic practice. It came in from heathenism. It is now simply an imitation of Roman usage."

The question whether or not the use of incense is permitted by law in the Church of England is a matter which does not concern us, for we are far from conceding that the usages of the Church of England are of universal or even local authority over the Church of Christ. The editor of the *Churchman*, however, gives as his proof of this part of his thesis the judgment of the English courts which in the suit of Martin vs. Mackonochie and other cases pronounced the use of incense illegal, and ordered its discontinuance during the Communion service.

Thus the *Churchman* admits that the devotions and usages of the Church of England are completely subject to the dictation of Acts of a Parliament of nondescript belief, the majority passing those Acts being frequently made up in great part not only of non-Conformists and Catholics, but even of Unitarians, Jews and Infidels.

Usually, churchmen endeavor to hide the disgraceful fact that the Church is the slave of the State, but the *Evangelical Churchman* glories in its shame.

The *Evangelical Churchman* is the organ of the Low Church party as distinct from Ritualists—a party which professes to fraternize and be almost identical with Methodism and Presbyterianism, but neither of these sects has fallen so low as to admit such subservience as this to the State. The Westminster Confession distinctly states that "The Lord Jesus hath appointed a Government in the hand of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate;" but the Low Church organ dares not make such a declaration of Church independence.

But our contemporary asserts that the use of incense comes from Paganism. We have only to read its article through to see the refutation of this, for it admits that incense was a feature of Jewish worship, under the Mosaic dispensation, which was of Divine institution. In the face of this admission it quotes approvingly Archbishop Grindal, who describes censers as "monuments of idolatry," which are to be "utterly defaced, broken, and destroyed."

We have seldom seen compressed in so short an article so much arrant nonsense and inconsistency.

But we are told further by the writer that the Mosaic ritual has been abolished. This is true as far as regards its binding force; but there is nothing to prevent the Christian Church from adopting ceremonies and rites which God approved under the Old Law, when she finds them conducive to Christian devotion; and this is what the Christian Church has done regarding incense.

The use of incense is not a question of faith, but, as implied in the words of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith already quoted, it is in the hands of the divinely-appointed government of the Church to use it or not as it deems advisable. That government permits its use under circumstances wherein it contributes to the solemnity of public worship. Private individuals should conform themselves to the usage of the Church, even if it were true, as the *Churchman* says, that the usage were not primitive or apostolic.

The *Churchman* quotes Dean Hook as saying its use was unknown until

the time of Gregory the Great. As we have shown this does not matter much, inasmuch as the Church had authority at any time to use it for devotion's sake. It was symbolical of prayer ascending to the throne of God, under the Old Law, and under the laws of the Church the same symbolism is preserved, as is evident from the prayer applied when it is used, taken from Psalm 140: "Let my prayer be directed as incense in thy sight." (P. Bible Ps. 141.)

However, the use of incense was much earlier than the date of Gregory the Great, as it is mentioned in the Apostolic canons, and by Tertullian; and there is, besides, no doubt that the vision of God described by St. John the Evangelist in the Apocalypse or Revelation is a description of the Apostolic Christian worship: including the altar, the Lamb offered in sacrifice, the seven golden candlesticks, the souls of the martyrs which were seen under the altar, represented by the relics of the saints which are still placed under the altar in the Catholic Church, and the golden censer with which an angel offered before the altar "much incense of the prayers of the saints," which "ascended before God from the hand of the Angel."

There is, therefore, scriptural authority for the use of incense, as well as the authority of primitive usage.

It is right to mention that our Protestant Montreal correspondents express in strong terms their disgust at the article of the *Evangelical Churchman* as well as another article which appears as correspondence in the same issue, wherein a silly effort is made to prove that Catholics regard the Blessed Virgin as "Saviour."

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE Orangemen of the city of London, in solemn meeting assembled, and presided over by Mr. Essery, have passed resolutions expressing their views on questions affecting Venezuela, Armenia and Manitoba. In this connection it may be claimed for them that they were discussing timely topics, and their pronouncement may have some influence in bringing about a settlement of these troublesome disputes. The brethren, however, omitted to make any reference to Britain's flying squadron, which is now perambulating the ocean challenging the world to tread on its coat-tail.

A PIOUS reference was made in the resolution to an open bible and the solid vote. In this regard we cannot give them credit for dealing in fresh topics. They were very decided in their determination that there should be an open bible, but we think we would not be far astray were we to venture the assertion that they are just as firmly determined not to open it themselves.

THE meeting was a regular old-time Twelfth-of-July-Croquet-he-down-no-surrender-equal-rights-for-all-but-"Papists" meeting. Nor could it well be otherwise when Mr. Essery occupied the chair. It was also a patriotic gathering. Bro. Caleb B. Simpson's resolution resolved:

"That we rejoice in the fact that we are Britons, the subjects of Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria, the model monarch of the world."

The resolution would have been more complete had he added after the word "world,"

"We also rejoice in the fact that we have arms and legs and seven senses."

At the next meeting we hope the members will map out a course of action in case the rumor proves true that Russia and Turkey have made a treaty offensive and defensive.

THE Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have by a large majority approved of a code of rules under which the schools conducted by the Christian Brothers will be admitted as National schools, under certain stipulated conditions. The Church of England members of the Board and the Catholics agreed to the terms, but the Presbyterian and Methodist members voted almost unanimously against them, because religious emblems were not forbidden. The Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Irish Church also took up the matter at a special meeting, and by a majority of twenty to four formulated a protest against the new rules, on the plea that sufficient safeguards have not been proposed for small minorities. The majority maintain their position, however, and a reply to the protest of the Church Committee has been published over the signature of the Archbishop of Dublin and other members of the Board, wherein they assert that the new rules

are an honest culties which b Christian Broth schools under co

In reference to the Christian Education made mention of Col. In version to Chr Endeavorers' been interview in New York from his lectur said, "I do not the Christian affected me. I sense, and I orthodox savag ers were made church at Kala pleased with it no belief is req no difference w in God or not, the Bible. I dreds of chur Church all ov confirms our s issue that conv ity as that of church would self-gratulation deavorers. A turer has no Church. He tion for its t thing which chur Christian Church.

ANOTHER of thoughtless Catholic Church of the indiss curred a few city, and we a correspond Miss Mabel time Mrs. Fer ried to Coun Catholic ch ments th divorced from living, and not inconsis by the Cath cannot be a case entirely the wife of the Catholic inasmuch as divorced man when he ma with Miss quite in ac view of Wright as cause the C divorce of really man Count Zic Wright's The laws of either in t Wright ha Mr. Yznaga

APPROPOS issued to p of Manitoba Messrs. C therefore store the Province, to the W critiscising graphy w way's pet numerous inaccurate statement twenty y so now. used as a or were i or for us Wade w ter in his Catholic in educa

"If e at Quee and fou the Quee asked a officer la the raid ers?" They w life imp But who freeboot berg, th success English lic wera patican Pilot.

"Is Libera from v to the return agnost always the beg