

the apostolic and Scriptural custom of anointing the sick, whensoever any devout person may desire it." The form for such administration is given in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., ordering the oil to be blessed by a bishop.

We have before us Parker and Co's reprint (1887) of 'The First Prayer Book, as Issued by the Authority of the Parliament of the Second Year of King Edward VI.' At page 140, it says 'If the sick person desire to be anointed, then shall the priest' (that is, the Anglican clergyman) 'anoint him upon the forehead or breast only, making the sign of the cross, saying thus' (then follows the formula of anointing, pp. 140-1). In the Second Prayer Book (1552—also reprinted by Parker and Co.) there was no direction either to place bread and wine on the table, or even to bless or consecrate them. And the religion-menders of the day actually omitted and even protested against all consecrations, as we learn from Bucer and Willock. Extreme Unction was also jettisoned. It was contemptuously referred to by the innovators of the time as 'greasing', and the holy oils were devoted to the lubrication of cart-wheels and other profane uses. The re-introduction of the ceremony of anointing is a welcome return to old beliefs and practices that were rejected in the days when men that were dressed in a little brief authority set out to mend and tinker the Church of the Living God.

The Causes of Modern Anticlericalism in France

(By His Grace the Archbishop of Wellington.)

French contemporary anticlericalism has a motley variety of causes. Some, of course, are too unfit to be openly acknowledged. To substantiate this, alas! there is no need to dive into the mysteries of the 'lodges' and those 'workshops' wherein are elaborated all the persecuting laws which a too docile Parliament readily enacts. It is sufficient to read the daily parliamentary reports, to occasionally peruse the newspapers, the pamphlets, or books of the Jacobin party. A low craving for power, an unbidden desire thinly disguised to prey on the fat official quarry of honors, sinecures, and posts, an unquenchable thirst for material enjoyments, a complete and absolute indifference for whatever has no bearing on the next re-election; and the hope that by persistently flaunting the 'clerical spectre' one may be the everlasting great man, the everlasting elected member of his province—such are the noble sentiments ever seething in the hearts of the bulk of modern French terrorists, which dictate their parliamentary votes and leak out of the phraseology of their speeches. No wonder that, apart from their wish to keep a good electoral spring-board—tremplin electoral—and from their determination to grasp in one way or another the 'milliard' of the religious Orders, they deemed themselves honor-bound to proscribe the monks and nuns. No wonder they stand up as the personal enemies of the Church; of her dogmas and her morality. Their conception of life is the very opposite of what is suggested and commanded by Catholicism; they don't want 'revealed morality'; for have they not 'independent morality'—independent especially of what they brand as vulgar prejudices? In many respects anticlericalism is an insurrection of all the muddiness and filthiness of human nature against whatever implies order, abnegation, idealism, unselfishness, the voluntary sacrifice and subordination of the individual to something above him.

Yet anticlericalism has causes, or pretexts, of a somewhat more elevated order. It is wont to plead political and social reasons, some of which are rather specious. It charges the Catholic Church—it were fairer to say 'some Catholics'—with being the natural ally of what goes by the name of the 'parties of reaction.' It charges her with being the born foe of the regime which France for the last twenty-five years has freely assumed, and of the 'democratic' reforms which she has striven to carry out. It charges her with irremediably identifying her cause with fallen monarchies, and with the aristocratic interests which fallen regimes are held to represent. Now, such sweeping and absolute

Charges are False,

nay, calumnious. They are categorically contradicted, not only by the instructions, declarations, and encyclicals of Leo XIII., but also by the exact, impartial, and

complete history of French Catholicism since 1870. None the less, two things are certain, which by shallow and prejudiced minds can be, and are daily, worked up into capital against French Catholics. It is undeniable, on the one hand, that, as a whole, French Catholics did not welcome the advent of the Third Republic with the favor they manifested to other governments—for instance, the Restoration and the Second Empire; and that for too long—as though they had always fared well at the hands of past monarchies—they deemed the cause of the 'throne' and of the 'altar' inseparable. And, on the other hand, the directions of Leo XIII., though they disarmed many hostilities, encouraged many initiatives, and reassured many consciences, were not followed with that unanimity which was highly desirable. Thus were furnished to clever enemies all the pretexts they sought. They had only to recall to their electors (with great exaggeration of course) all the imprudence, all the blunders, all the faults which Catholics committed in past times, when they were the masters; and they upbraided these clerical adversaries of 'modern society,' with the design of restoring the ancient regime. We must admit that, in this regard, all is not false in the charges brought by the anticlericals against French Catholics.

Nor is all false in the charges of the intellectual and moral order alleged against Catholicism by its enemies. The great objection—the classic objection—which has filled no end of articles, books, and speeches—is that Catholicism stands in irremediable and absolute contradiction with 'science', and, as such, it appears (they say) to any candid, unbiassed mind, a form of human thought manifestly exploded. The objection is weak, it cannot startle or stagger anyone who has pondered the celebrated theory of Pascal, on the three orders of realities and cognitions, or anyone who has followed the discussions brought about of late years not only by thinkers, but by contemporary scholars on the criticism of the sciences. In fact, it is not science, as science, that is adduced against religion; it is scientific theories interpreted by a certain philosophy; it is a certain philosophical conception of science—a conception which deep-thinking scholars in our day are unanimous in rejecting.

Yet this objection, which dates from the Encyclopaedists, as Brunetiere clearly shows, has disturbed more than one good and great mind; and we can easily perceive that it still impresses minds not conversant with the march of ideas. Some Catholics in defending the truth have too often used arguments out of date, out of the grooves of contemporary mentality. Besides, orthodoxy has by some been conceived too narrowly, too unbrageously; there was among the timorous excessive fear of free ideas, fear of laicism and laity, fear of bold ideas and initiative; and thus only the negative aspects have been viewed and developed by them in a doctrine eminently positive, a doctrine of life by excellence. This has been a great pity. And we can readily understand that minds, sincere indeed but poorly informed, too interested and prompt to make the Church answerable for the faults of some of the faithful, have concluded the existence of a deep and irremediable opposition between Catholics and modern thought. Such it seems are

The Principal Causes

of contemporary French anticlericalism, or, in other terms, persecution. It has created a party, not perhaps very numerous, but most energetic, admirably and long organised for an electoral campaign, and, at all events, just now well nigh all-powerful. It has the power in hand, and it wields it ungenerously, unscrupulously, and incessantly. Never, perhaps, save during the French Revolution, was the exploitation and oppression of a great country by a minority exercised with equal impudence; never were the true sentiments of a nation held in greater contempt. France, indeed, is not 'clerical' in the strict sense of the word, but still less is she anticlerical. And the proof of this is that, upon a question which might have been able to rally the votes of a certain number of unbelievers who were simply liberals—the question of the separation of Church and State—the ephemeral rulers of France dared not appeal to the people, being certain that such an appeal would have spelled defeat. They resorted to a veritable 'coup d'etat,' to effect that separation, confident that the electors would not interfere with the accomplished fact. For it must not be forgotten that the actual lower house of Parliament had not a quarter of its members elected on a separatist programme; and how much this proportion would have been lessened, had a referendum been put to the nation for a free expression of public opinion!

The 'anticlerical reaction' in France is an artificial thing contrary to the fundamental dispositions and the secret desires of the country. But its authors had to give satisfaction to an all-powerful Freemasonry. They were also too yielding and complacent to an ex-cleric whom the hazard of political life and the will of a clever lawyer (for Waldeck Rousseau was surely no statesman) set up for about three years as President of the

"HASTE makes waste," but there's nae waste ava wi' Cook o' the North Tea. It's genuine.

"DOUBLE drinks are guid for drouth," especially if the drink is genuine Cook o' the North Tea.