THE MONTH

Per menses singulos reddens fructum suum,
et folia ligni ad sanitatem gentium.
(Apoc. xxii. 2.)

VOL. CXLI.

JANUARY — JUNE.

1923-

^LONGMANS, GREEN, AND Co.

LONDON, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, MADRAS, AND NEW YORK.

[Editorial Offices, 31 Farm Street, Berkeley Square, London, W. 1.]

greatness of that which you have accomplished against this terrible malady.....If this were your only claim on humanity you would deserve its eternal gratitude. You can therefore understand that medicine and surgery, are eager on this great occasion to offer you the profound homage of their admiration and of their gratitude.

Pasteur, with much emotion, spoke a few words, and then a speech was read for him by his son. He said: "The future will belong to those who have done most for suffering humanity" He urged young men to consider: "What have I done for my education? What have I done for my country?" so that on nearing the grand goal each might be entitled to say: "I have done what I could." One present remarked: "It was a unique spectacle, in which a great man was, in Shakespeare's phrase, 'carried in triumph on the hearts of all.'"

When the end of his life approached, indeed, on the very day of his death, he piously received the Last Sacraments. He turned to his devoted disciples who were near him. "Où en êtes-vous?" he exclaimed. "Que faites vous?" And then he murmured his favourite words, "Il faut travailler." His biographer tells us: "One of his hands lay in that of Madame Pasteur's; the other held a crucifix. In this room, which had something of the simplicity of a monk's cell, on Saturday, September 28, 1895, surrounded by his family and his disciples, he gently passed away."

France gave him a national funeral.

The service in Notre Dame, presided over by Cardinal Richard, was attended by a great multitude of people, Representatives of many universities, wearing the gown and bright-coloured silk hood of their degree, were there; judges in red robes, soldiers in glittering uniforms, ambassadors, princes, and many famous people, assembled to do him honour. The streets were lined by regiments of soldiers But more impressive than this funereal pomp was the profound silence which manifested the grief of a great nation at the passing of a benefactor of the human race.

J. R. CORMACK.

THE FALLACY OF "REUNION"

THE common non-Catholic notion of the Church of Christ is that it exists, indeed, but in a divided state: hence on all sides earnest Christians are striving for "reunion." There are those, of course, who think that perfect identity of belief is not an attainable, nor indeed a desirable, ideal, and that each "Church" contributes some aspect of Truth which is not realized in the rest. But even they aspire to some sort of Federation which shall enable Christianity to present a united front to the non-Christian world. The purport of the following pages is to emphasize the fact that these views are all false, and that unless they are abandoned in favour of the truth no real progress towards unity can be made. And the truth is that *the Church of Christ cannot be, is not and never has been divided, that she alone possesses the whole deposit of revelation, that therefore, there can be no question of reunion with her but only of union, and that that union can only be attained by submission to her ruling and teaching.* It is a pity that this, which is the Catholic standpoint, is not always clearly maintained by Catholics; it is a grievous pity that the issues should be obscured by a disastrously mistaken tactic. Let me say at the outset that I leave altogether alone the question of Anglican good faith and all the more readily, since the fact that Anglicanism is hostile and its mentality anti-Catholic is the gist of my contention. At the same time, to suppose good faith *universal* among our separated brethren is, in view of Church history, an assumption of doubtful wisdom. However, in spite of their utter illogic, it is both reasonable and charitable to credit the great majority with good faith. Personal experience and the testimony of Catholics intimately acquainted with prominent Anglicans go far to confinn this. It is none the less true, *I* am convinced, that anything like compromise is the very reverse of true charity towards them. A letter in the *Catholic Times* of November 11,-1922, puts it very well:

There may be a difference of opinion about Lord Halifax. His Lordship has been for fifty years a member of the English Church—a Protestant Church without apostolic orders, as every

Catholic knows from the infallible teaching of Pope Leo XIII. The members of his Church look upon him as a saint and rejoice to think he has been the means of keeping a great number from becoming Catholics. Why? Because they, like Lord Halifax, would rather follow their own opinion and think they know better than the successor of Peter.

,The true need, I venture to suggest, is that expressed by, Cardinal Newman on one occasion when he wished to make his hearers *anxious about their souls.* If it be replied that the austerity of advanced Anglicans puts most Catholics to shame, the answer is not far to seek. "Even were it so, austerity is no substitute for obedience, which is better than sacrifice." "Behold in the day of your fast your own will is found." The contumacious opponent of St. Gregory at Constantinople was named John the Faster. Again, to quote St. Boniface's epistles, "What profit is there in the treasure of good works if they are wrought outside the Catholic Church."[1] To be "Catholic-minded" is no substitute for the obedience it seems to imply.

By their persistent refusal of obedience to the Vicar of Christ, High Anglicans are risking their eternal salvation. True charity would tell them so frankly and not encourage any delusions about *Ecclesia Anglicana,* or "daughter Churches." The Anglican Church is the daughter not of Rome, but of Elizabeth, a new body formed out of apostates *from* Rome, a *body* that *never was* united with Rome. *Re-union* with Rome is therefore a fallacy.

Its authors, in fact, were often outspokenly exultant at the open breach of continuity! As for example, Dr. Fulke: "With all our heart we abhorre, defye, detest and spit at your stinking greasie anti-christian orders."[2] Again, nearly twenty years before this electioneering tirade, Dr. Pilkington, Elizabeth's Bishop of Durham; is equally explicit: "In Durham I grant the Bishop that now is, and his predecessor, were not of one religion in divers points, nor made Bishops after one fashion. This hath neither cruche nor mitre, never swore against his Prince his allegiance to thé Pope; this hath neither power to christen bells, nor hallow chalices and

1 **"Quid enim prosunt bonorum operum emolumenta si extra Catholicam gerantur Ecclesiam": quoted by Kenelm Digby, *Mores Catholici,* book 2, ch. iii. (1844), Vol. I. p. 126.**

* ***A Retentive to Stay, etc.,* London, 1580, p. 69, quoted in Mgr. A. S. Barnes' *Bishop Bartow and Anglican Orders,* 1922, p. 154.**

super-altars, &c. as the other had, and with gladness praises God that keeps him from such filthiness. . . . God defend all good people from such religion and bishops."[1] In the same year (1561), the chief fabricator of the Elizabethan settlement, Sir William Cecil, the future Lord Burghley, adds to a list of persons indicted at the Essex assizes a number of names and endorses—"Prisoners for Mass."[2] Again, it were impossible to be more explicit, and Cecil, if any man, "kenned the biggin" of the Church of England.

It is not difficult to pile instance on instance; an excellent collection of such authoritative pronouncements may be found in Dom Norbert Birt's Tuie *Line of Cleavage under Elizabeth* (C.T.S.), and the remarkably impious proceedings by which the change was enforced are accurately set forth in the same writer's *The Elizabethan Settlement,* But prejudice is proof against historical fact, denying the plain inference where it is unable to deny the fact itself. People who are history-proof as to the past and fact-proof as to the present are more likely to be "killed with kindness" than to be cured with flattery.

Independent Protestants have no delusions as to the change. Writing in 1871, Ruskin says: "This farmer (Thomas More) . . . is one of the sternest Roman Catholics of his stem time."[3]

Low Churchmen like Bishop Henson, sceptics like Mr. Birrell, hold the same language. The latter's declaration regarding the Holy Sacrifice has become a household word, but I would call attention to another less known yet far-seeing utterance of his, which is very significant in these days of eugenics, birth control, health visitors, and the like:

> There is a sense in which it is quite true, what another Cardinal (Manning) has said about Ultramontanes, Anglicans, and Orthodox Dissenters all being in the same boat. . . . They all have their martyrologies—the bright roll-call of those who have defied Cæsar even unto death, or, at all events, gaol. They all, therefore, put something above the State, and apply tests other than those recognized in our law courts. . . . The Romanist, of course, has to bear the first brunt, and is the most obnoxious to the State; but he must be slow of comprehension and void of imagination who cannot conceive of circumstances arising in this

[1] *The Burning of St. Peal's,* Wks. Parker Soc., p. 586.
[2] *Catholic Record Soc. Pabl.,* Vol. I. *p. 52.*
[3] *Tors., VII.*

country, when the State should assert it to be its duty to violate what even Protestants believe to be the moral law of God. Therefore, in opposing Ultramontanism .... care ought to be taken by those who are not prepared to go all lengths with Cæsar, to select their weapons of attack, not from his armoury, but their own.[1]

Writing about the same time, an excellent Catholic scholar, now unjustly neglected, clinches the point:

> How odd it is that people who believe in a personal God and a future state can rebel against the only living authority they have for it! They are like fractious children trying to upset their bread and milk, and still more like a truant boy throwing mud at his mother.[2]

In these days some would have us, out of respect for the zeal and earnestness of High Church folk, to close our eyes to the measureless evils wrought by the Anglican Establishment, the multitude of Catholics to whom its loaves and fishes have been a fatal temptation, even though wilful proselytism has utterly ceased, and view without strong condemnation the barefaced attempt to steal the name and place of the Bride of Christ, after the failure of superhuman efforts, prolonged for centuries, to destroy her! To do this we must in *effect* encourage the notion, impiously false, that the Church is divided, give occasion for the enemy, fore-Christian and after-Christian, to blaspheme, indulge ourselves and the Anglicans in hopes dangerously delusive, and that at the very time when the need is most urgent to insist upon unity and authority.

The Oxford Movement began some ninety years ago, a sufficiently long period to justify a judgment by its results. It has certainly not leavened England with Catholicism and it certainly has kept back great numbers of individuals from the true Church. Indeed, this has been, in practice, its main pursuit. To say, after ninety years' testing, that this movement is one which Catholics should regard with tender solicitude is grievously to mistake its tendencies.

It will not be amiss, perhaps, to refresh our memories with the verdict, very different from that now fashionable, of a number of eminent Catholics regarding High Anglican activities of the past. We are not convinced that the leopard has changed its spots.

[1] ***Obiter Dicta, The Via Media.***
[2] **E. H. Deting, *The Lady of Raven's Combe,* iii.**

The Anglican is essentially a formalist; he is a man of half ideas, half principles; he never dare carry out an argument to its logical conclusion; he says "two and two" but dare not finish the formula by adding the words "make four"; and in this pruning of reason consists his *via media."* [1]

Father Faber was at times very severe:

To see grown-up children, book in hand, playing at Mass .... revelling in Catholic sentiment instead of offering the acceptable sacrifice of hardship and austerity; this is fearful, indeed a sickening development of the peculiar iniquity of the time, a masterpiece of Satan's craft. This is not the way to become Catholic again, it is only a profaner kind of Protestantism than any we have seen hitherto.*

Father Gallwey, in his *Lectures on Ritualism* (1874),' made very plain his fears that intellectual pride and bad faith, the spirit of Arius and Wycliffe, were rife in the movement at that time:

It is precisely because with their whole hearts they reject submission to the Catholic Church that they labour so zealously to introduce as quickly as possible all Catholic doctrine and every Roman rite into the cathedrals and churches of England .... it is by no means unlikely that they may have the melancholy privilege of succeeding in their design .... they are anxious to take away all pretext for secession to Rome?

Father Coleridge fully shared this view:

These leaders will teach, in the face of day, truths on the denial of which their communion was built, and for refusing to deny which hundreds of Catholics have suffered in life and limb. .... But they have no thoughts more foreign to their minds, no desire less congenial to their hearts, than the thought of returning to charity, the thought of placing themselves once more in the obedience of the Church, the desire once more to find themselves happy and rejoicing children of Him whom Our Lord has appointed to be the Chief Shepherd of the Fold.

And the consequence of this obduracy:

Alas! such movements are among the choicest and rarest gifts that God can bestow upon a nation and a generation outside His Church, and on their issue may probably depend the whole

» *Rambler,* Sept., »850, p. 187.
» Quoted in *Truth* (N.Y.), June, 1912, p. 26.
' P. 14. I made further quotations from these Lectures in a paper on Ritualism in the *Catholic Review,* July 9, t9>4·

future of the country in which they appear, and through that of millions of souls.[1]

Another Jesuit convert, one whose memory is held in benediction, gave us an interpretation of that movement which has always convinced me as the true one:

.What happens to most educated men in the course of their lifetime happened to Oxford when Mr. Newman became a Catholic. Oxford looked on and listened, and having listened, turned away and thenceforward has drifted slowly, surely, steadily, in the direction of an ever-growing indifferentism. The memoirs of the late Rector of Lincoln give us a good illustration of the effect on an individual mind of drawing near to the light, and then deliberately turning away.[2]

These are opinions not lightly to be ignored and more in accordance with observable facts than those now some of us hold. With them agree Kenelm Digby, Godfrey Raupert,[3] and Mgr. J. S. Vaughan, who says "they dare not face the facts, and prefer to live in a fool's paradise, thereby running the risk of a dénouement too terrible to contemplate."[4] Even the gentle Oratorian Father Ryder satirized the amazing perversion of history that attempted to represent as Mass-priests the Protestant ministers who tormented our dying martyrs with their pestering blasphemies, the very newest view, Newman said, presented to us as the very oldest!

So far from winning the mass of the nation for Catholicism, Anglicanism has in the opinion of many shrewd observers indirectly aided the *anti-Christian* movement. The author of *Protestant Journalism* cites Montalembert:[5]

As long as they refuse to obey the Pope, the English press permits them to hold any private opinion, however un-Protestant, and English Rationalists acknowledge them' as allies. The latter evidently agree with Montalembert, when he said of High Church Anglicans: "These men, I am convinced, will always prove the worst enemies of the Church, more so than infidels themselves."

I find a good example of this effectual co-operation in the career of Père Hyacinthe:

[1] ***The Return of the King,*** **1883, p. 107.**
[2] **Ft. Richard Clarke, S.J., in The Month, July, 1885.**
[3] ***Back to Rome,*** **p. 14, 1903.**
[4] ***Catholic Review,*** **Jan. 1913, p. 18.**
[5] **P. 51, 1874, from *Memoirs of Coant de Montalembert,* by Mrs. Oliphant, Vol. II. ch. x. p. 35.**

He founded the Catholic Gallican Church of Paris, and with the aid of money supplied him from England, notably by *the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, and Dean Stanley,* he carried on his religious services in a building formerly used as a theatre, which he purchased for the purpose. But despite his assistance, and despite all the efforts used by M, Loyson to court publicity and to push his ideas, the undertaking was constantly on the verge of financial catastrophe.[1]

The Church of England, as represented by Bishop Gore of Oxford, is internally rationalistic and modernist, externally, aesthetic and ritualistic.[2]

The practice of Ritualism has long ceased to be a sign of tendencies towards Catholic belief; witness the case of the Rev. Percy Dearmer. But I wonder whether Catholics who speak of reunion realize that modernism may consist not only with rood screens and riddels, and mediaeval Lenten array, but also with claims to possess the Mass and to reserve the Blessed Sacrament. It is in no spirit of hostility that I refer to the teaching of the Rev. Conrad Noel, a brave man and zealous according to his lights, but *a* man prominent amongst those rationalists who deny the Divinity of our Lord. Posing as a "Catholic," this modernist in his *People s Life of Jesus,* appearing serially in the *Crusader,* abandons the very foundations of Christianity and treats Christ as merely human. Yet he aims at restoring Catholicity by means of his Crusade! Are we to sympathize with *his* efforts?

Greetings sent to Geneva in 1909, or the appearance of the Archbishop of Canterbury in Calvin's pulpit in 1922, the Church Congress at Sheffield last October, the recorded words and deeds of many Anglicans, clearly contradict the strange delusion that as a rule the High Church party is 'really "Catholic-minded." It is as wilful as the most individualistic Protestant: it hates authority.

To imagine that Lord Halifax speaks for the Anglican Church is to shut one's eyes. Instead of the old Low, Broad and High Church types, are we not rather confronted to-day, generally speaking, by "all the various indefinite shades of Hegelianism, pseudo-mysticism and positivism, blended with an extraordinary medley of scientific dogmas that have gradually and insistently been imported into the realm of

[1] Ths Month, June, 1895, p. 245: italics mine.
[2] Fr. C. E. Rivers in *The Tablet,* 33rd March, 1913.

Protestant theology"?[1] But even this description is hardly adequate to the extraordinary display at Sheffield.

For practical conclusion, bearing in mind the history of Ambrose Phillips de Lisle, devoted and fervent but for a time misled, and the movement with which he was associated (singularly resembling the present one), we may well adopt the words of the late Father Clarke, S.J.:

> Most Catholics have encountered from time to time Anglicans who have sought to fraternise with us on the common ground of dogmatic belief. They urge us to take part with them against the common foe who is threatening to sweep away all religion whatsoever. .... It seems a little hard to tell these well-intentioned. well-meaning people, acting in good faith, that between us and them there is a great gulf fixed, that they really belong to the ranks of the enemy whom they desire th repel, *that they are, however unwillingly, his allies and friends, -promoting his interest and furthering his cause.* Yet it is no true kindness to put this antagonism in the background, and, though we ought to guard against any uncourteous or offensive rejection of their advances, yet we should never forget the fundamental opposition which exists between our religion and theirs; that we are as Catholics the children of light, while they are as non-Catholics the children of darkness; that as regards principles they are our enemies no less than the open unbeliever, and though we are glad to recognize in them a happy inconsistency, which causes them to profess a dogmatic belief where a dogmatic belief is logically untenable, yet to ally ourselves with them would be no less a treachery to our Faith, than a certain method of involving ourselves in the destruction impending over them.[2]

These grave words are as true now as they were thirty-seven years ago, although Anglicanism has been wonderfully Catholicized in the meantime. For it has not crossed the gulf which yawns between Authority and Private Judgment, between a living infallible Teacher and doctrinal independence.

h. e. g. rope.

[1] Dr. Aveling in *Dublin Review,* Oct. 1905, p. 339.
[2] The Month, Sept. 1885, p. 1.

MYSTICISM, FALSE AND TRUE

FOR some years past mysticism has been in great vogue. According to Miss Underhill this was to be expected and is quite natural. The nineteenth century was a period of great expansion and progress in science, the arts, literature and politics; and after such a period it was to be expected that a period of renewed interest in mysticism would succeed. For mysticism is humanity's finest flower, it is the product at which all the great creative epochs of the race have aimed.

A Catholic holds that true mysticism is not a product of nature but of grace. Nature may indeed furnish the occasion for the manifestation of grace. And so he would prefer to explain the modem interest in mysticism as a revolt of the spiritual nature of man aided by grace against the secularism and materialism of the age. He would consider that the fact that mysticism also flourished in the sixteenth century confirmed his contention. Undoubtedly the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were periods of great expansion, but they were also periods of great religious and moral depravity. But God did not leave Himself without witnesses then; it may be that He does not wish to leave Himself without witnesses now, and on this account has inspired the renewed interest in mysticism.

However this may be, Catholics are always interested in the spiritual life, a term which they prefer to mysticism'. They are interested to see how St. Augustine, Dionysius the Areopagite, Richard of St. Victor, St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, and innumerable other heroes of theirs, are studied and quoted by modem non-Catholic writers on mysticism. Many of these writers display abundant industry and learning. Although they generally give the pre-eminence to great Catholic mystics like St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, yet they class with them, as belonging to the same category, pagan philosophers such as Plato and Plotinus, eastern sages of China and India, and men like Jacob Boehme and XVilliam Blake. They usually show want of insight into Catholic doctrine, and detect similarity of teaching where little or none exists. I will quote one or two instances of what I mean. Professor Rufus M. Jones writes: