

## The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 404 and 406 Richmond street, London, Ontario.  
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,  
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."  
THOMAS COFFEY,  
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,  
KESSELS, LUKE KING, JOHN NICH, P. J. NEVES and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.  
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space 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.  
Advance must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Jan. 11, 1906.

## THE EPIPHANY.

The feast of the Epiphany, which was celebrated on Monday, the 6th inst., is in commemoration of the visit made by wise men of the East to the crib of our Lord at Bethlehem a few days after His birth, to pay homage to Him. They came to Jerusalem making enquiries: "Where is He that is born King of the Jews: for we have seen His star in the East, and we are come to adore Him?"

The wise men are called in the original Greek of the New Testament *Magi*, and in the Latin Magi, this being the name by which the Eastern nations called their men learned in astronomy and other sciences. These wise men of the East were evidently aware by some means of the general expectation prevalent at that period that a Saviour and Ruler would arise in Judea whose spiritual kingdom would extend over the whole world, and when they beheld the miraculous star, which indicated the birth of Christ, they were enabled to interpret its significance correctly, and therefore came to Judea to consult the wise men and doctors of the law at Jerusalem as to where the new-born Saviour should be found.

The scribes and chief priests were able to tell from the Old Testament that the expected Messiah should be born in Bethlehem, for the fifth chapter of the prophecy of Micah has this in reference to His coming: "And Thou Bethlehem Ephrata art a little one among the thousands of Juda: out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be the Ruler in Israel; and His going forth is from the beginning, from the days of eternity."

The wise men were accordingly directed to Bethlehem, but before their departure King Herod, who feared a competition for the throne, desired them when they should have discovered the expected King, to return to give him information, so that he also might go to adore Him.

The wise men or magi, being directed by the miraculous star which had guided them before, reached Bethlehem, and entering the humble abode where Christ was, adored Him and offered gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh. When they had rendered their homage they returned to their own country, without passing through Jerusalem, as they were warned by a vision from God of Herod's evil designs, and they would not, therefore, give him the information desired.

Herod was very angry when he found himself over-reached, and as he had no specific information of the truth, he gave orders that all the male children of Bethlehem of two years of age and under should be massacred, so that the new-born King should be among the number. Joseph was warned, however, by an angel, to remove into Egypt to escape the designs of Herod, and he remained there with our Lord and the Blessed Virgin till after the death of Herod and of those who sought to kill our Lord. The Holy Family then returned to Judea and dwelt in Nazareth.

The word Epiphany signifies manifestation. It is applied to this festival, because the birth of Christ was manifested to the Gentiles through the wise men. Who these men were precisely, and from what country they came, is not recorded in Holy Scripture, but there is testimony from the early fathers of the Church that three kings were the leaders of the Eastern visitors. This is stated by Sts. Cyprian, Basil, Chrysostom, and others. The Venerable Bede gives their names as Gaspar, Melchior, and Fuscus. Another authority states that the three Magi became afterwards preachers of the Gospel and were put to a martyr's death, but the name Baltasar is given in this account instead of Fuscus. The difference of name does not affect the credibility of this tradition, as it is frequently the case that the same person is known by different names in different countries, just as the Baltasar of Scripture, the last of the Chaldean kings, is called

Labunetos by Herodotus, and Nabonnedos by Berossus as quoted by Josephus (against Apollon). The tomb of these three martyrs is said to have been moved from Constantinople to Milan by the Empress Helena, and to have been again transferred to the Cathedral of Cologne, where it remains at the present day.

The Epiphany is regarded as one of the most important festivals, because it denotes the acceptance of the gospel by the Gentiles. It is celebrated annually in Rome by a public entertainment in the College of the Propaganda, in which short addresses to our Lord are made in fifty or sixty different languages, by students, each of whom speaks in his native tongue. This is to indicate the universality of the Church, which is the special mystery of the festival. Mass is also celebrated in some Roman Church during the Octave of the Epiphany in all the Eastern liturgies used in the Catholic Church.

## THE RENAISSANCE.

The Renaissance, mentioned by Mr. Goulay in a recent number of the *Canadian Magazine*, proves that the Church was not a barrier to intellectual advancement, but the fostering mother of everything that could tend to enlighten and develop the human mind. It was an epoch of discovery, of invention, of progress, when men and women seeking Truth for its own sake, indefatigably always, though at times the quest was difficult, realized the truth of the honoured maxim "that the world holds nothing more precious or more beautiful than a cultivated intellect."

According to some writers, the Renaissance dates from the fall of Constantinople, in 1453. "This, however," says Dr. Nerius "is a mistake. It dates at least from the eleventh century, and there is abundance of evidence that the progress between that and the Reformation was quite as real and as important as any that has taken place since."

These ages have no interest for the ordinary reader. He is accustomed to regard them as epochs of ignorance and intellectual serfdom, and so firmly fixed in his mind is this belief that it requires a persistent iteration of facts to convince him that they, centuries ago, cleared the ground for our civilization, laid its foundation, and bequeathed to future generations the forces wherewith to fashion and to perfect it.

Who does not know of St. Horositha, abbot of the convent of Gaudesheim, who, though living in the tenth century, composed plays that were, according to her contemporaries, not without merit.

The Irish monks and scholars did much in this century to encourage intellectual pursuits. Germany could boast of a love for letters, and in no age, says Meiners, did it possess more learned and virtuous churchmen. The illustrious Gerbet, afterwards Pope Sylvester, saw clearly the defects of the age, and judged wisely that the most efficient means of correcting them was the protection of scholars and the fostering of learning. Before this period, however, no brilliant intellectual feats signified the onward march of humanity, and the reason is evident. Society was in a state of transition and transformation. The barbaric element from the fastnesses of the North was passing through the alembic of religion, and when, purged of its grossness, it came forth, it was as a new born babe, dowered indeed with infinite possibilities, but helpless and inarticulate.

But as it waxed strong its voice rang out, not indeed in oratoric phrase or in the rhythmic flow of poetic language, but in the uncultured speech of one but beginning to understand aright the riddles of the world, and yet it gave token of a strength and beauty that would come with the confidence of maturity and perfect development.

We cannot expect much from men who sat down to table with the sword at their side and feared at each sound that the invader was at the door. But when they turned from war to peace they threw off the casque and the corselet and sat in scholar's gown at the feet of great professors. We are told that Albertus Magnus was forced to lecture in the public square, so great was the crowd that came to hear him.

Students sat in the streets on litter of hay or straw discussing their themes or listening to their masters. All ranks of society took an interest in student doings, and when a public debate was held peasant and noble, priest and prelate thronged to witness the literary tournament, to applaud each

clever thrust and parry, and to shout applause when a well-fashioned syllogism put an end to the dispute. The Church, by ordering that each church should have a master to instruct the poor gratuitously, placed education within reach of all classes.

The discovery of printing in 1440, and the fall of Constantinople, which sent scores of refugees versed in all the refinements of attic culture, into Europe, gave a new impetus to the cause of learning. Some of them were installed as professors in the universities. It must not be thought, however, that they were the creators of the great sources of enlightenment. Paris, Oxford and Ferrara, counting their students by thousands, and having their methods and masters of world fame, were in existence long before the tenth century. Salamanca founded in 1209, Cambridge in 1280, Louvain in 1425, Vienna in 1365, Prague in 1358, were firmly rooted in the affections of the intellectual world. But they fired men's minds with an enthusiasm for classical study and imparted a grace and suppleness to the vernacular. The cold and exact formalities of the schools gave way to the polished epigram and the well-rounded period.

The truly wise still clung to the traditions of the past, but the lovers the novel embraced the new teaching with an ardor that played many a prank with their common sense. We wish not to underrate the labors of the refugees from Constantinople, but the facts warrant us in saying that they added no new element to a civilization already existent and flourishing. The age of Leo X., in which the Renaissance attained its greatest splendour, was prolific of poet-tasters, of stylists, but of no world master. Words and not ideas were sought, and any wielder of a style bedecked in antique frippery was lauded as a genius. The Madonnas and Transfigurations of Raphael, the Last Judgement and Moses of Michael Angelo are the real glory of the age. The Renaissance, however, in unearthing the mines of thought of past ages, and in opening up thereby new vistas of intellectual beauty, in protecting the scholars and encouraging mental activity, was a great factor in the cause of education; and if abuses did signalize its progress it was simply because men, lured away by the voice of fanciful speculation, and the study of naturalism, refused to use its advantages in a judicious manner. Then came the Reformation, which, say our critics, emancipated the human intellect and sent it onwards and upwards into the serene regions of truth. We have no hesitation in saying that thought has developed since the days of the Renaissance, but we cannot describe its cause to Luther or to his disciples.

The argument "*post hoc, ergo propter hoc*" is a clumsy controversial weapon. But we do say that the principles of the Reformation were inimical to the advancement of literature, and if its adherents have written their name "not in water" on the honor-roll of the world it was not on account of their Protestantism but because Catholic legend and thought dominated their intelligence and gave a warmth and beauty to their utterances.

The fundamental principle of the Reformation, viz., private judgement, allowed its adherents the foolish liberty of accepting or rejecting any doctrine, as caprice or fancy might dictate. Now, in accepting doctrines already believed in, it added no new element to thought, and in rejecting others it produced no new element, for the effect cannot be greater than the cause. Negation begets negation. Again, the issues raised by the revolt of Luther caused minds of intelligence, says Hallam, to be too busy in getting up arguments in favor of the religious tenets they adopted, to think of cultivating poetry, philosophy, or history, or the dignified eloquence that becomes a classic standard. It destroyed, but did not build, and its abiding place in any land betokened that thought advancement was retarded, and that, says Erasmus, "the literary spirit was dead."

Whodoes not know that the Anabaptists thought ignorance the greatest boon of man and that Calvinists condemned art and poetry as diabolical inventions.

Speaking of the Reformation in England Froude points out their peculiar methods of encouraging education. He says: "Missals were chopped in pieces with hatchets, college libraries plundered and burned. The divinity schools were planted with cabbages and the Oxford laundresses dried clothes in the school of art." And if learning died, after all this turmoil and disorder, revive, it was due, says Matthew Arnold, not to men of the Reformation, but of the Renaissance.

## HOW WE GOT THE BIBLE.

There appears in the *Canada Presbyterian* of the 18th ult. the substance of an address delivered at St. Andrew's (London) Sunday school rally during October, 1895, by George William Armstrong, on the subject: "How we got the English Bible."

We cannot be greatly surprised at the amount of ignorance displayed on religious matters by many would-be controversialists as well as the general Protestant public, when they accept without question such statements as are made by Mr. Armstrong in his address. It appears to be the settled purpose of such instructors to misrepresent history whenever the matter has any reference to the Catholic Church, and it is no wonder that when persons who have been instructed by such methods advance in knowledge by means of more extensive study of the proper sources of information, they lose all faith in the teachings with which they have been indoctrinated, and frequently throw aside Christianity itself.

To such teachers as Mr. Armstrong must be attributed in great measure the very general scepticism which prevails to day among Protestants. Thus Mr. Armstrong, after informing his hearers that the Old Testament was originally written in Hebrew, and the New in Greek, says this of the Latin translations:

"The earliest translations were in Latin, and for these (made for the use of the hierarchy and not for the people) we must go back some fifteen hundred years to the sixth century. The first of these, as far as is now known, is Jerome's version called the Roman Psalter. And so from that period to the fourteenth century translations of parts of the scriptures were made. Up to this time we have no record of persecutions on account of the Bible, which can be accounted for because the translations kept the Bible in the hands of the Church, that is the Bishops and priests."

A farrago of greater nonsense than this could scarcely be strung together in one short paragraph; but it has the merit that it is too transparent to deceive those who give the least thought to consider its self-contradictory character. How could "translations" keep the Bible in the hands of Bishops and priests to the exclusion of the laity? It is the natural effect of a translation that it makes a work accessible to all who can read, so that it is evidently false that Jerome's version was issued for the purpose of limiting the knowledge of the Bible to the hierarchy. And here we would further remark that St. Jerome is one among the ancient fathers whom Protestants are fond of quoting, when it suits their purpose, as if he were a Protestant too. We remember hearing a certain Presbyterian divine, who is still a light in his denomination, when he heard Jerome's name mentioned in a conversation, exclaim: "O! Jerome was a staunch Presbyterian." However, as it is easy to repudiate the sayings of individual divines, as being unauthorized, we shall not press this authority in the matter. We can readily appeal to an authority which cannot be questioned, that is, the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, which, in setting forth the Protestant canon of Scripture, professes to base it upon a saying of Jerome, evidently with the view of giving the impression that Jerome's testimony settles the question, and so the canon is stated with the words, "as Homer saith." Hieron being merely another form of the name *Hieronymus*, usually called Jerome in English.

We say, then, that in making St. Jerome a party to the conspiracy to keep the bible out of the hands of the people, Mr. Armstrong betrays his own cause. He makes Protestantism his hypothetical form of primitive Christianity, responsible for keeping the bible from the laity, while trying to throw the whole blame on the Catholic Church.

However, we point out this as merely an illustration of the inconsistencies of which the generality of anti-Catholic controversialists are habitually guilty. We fully admit that St. Jerome was not a Protestant, and that his day Protestantism was not even dreamed of as one of the possibilities of the future; but we would remind the *Canada Presbyterian*, which publishes Mr. Armstrong's essay for the instruction of its readers, that St. Jerome lived and wrote two hundred years earlier than the date Mr. Armstrong ascribes to him. He wrote in the fourth century, and it was at the request of Pope Damasus that he undertook the translation of the bible, which is substantially the authorized version of the Catholic Church to this day. It is evident that Mr. Armstrong

desires to make it appear that even at that early date the Catholic Church was conspiring to keep the people in darkness and ignorance; but the essayists and the *Canada Presbyterian* should remember that they are casting this slur on the primitive Christian Church; for it is universally conceded that the Church of the fourth century, just emerging from the persecutions of three hundred years, was identical with the primitive Church which endured these persecutions.

In answer to our query: "How could translations keep the Bible in the hands of Bishops and priests to the exclusion of the laity," Mr. Armstrong evidently means to suggest that Latin was a tongue unknown to the people. He seems not to be aware that it was the language of the people then, and that therefore the best way to make it accessible to the people was to translate it into Latin.

In considering this subject it must always be borne in mind that before the art of printing was invented the condition of the people in regard to literature and literary accomplishments was very different from that existing at the present day. Comparatively few could learn to read at all; but this was a necessary condition at a period when books were necessarily few in number, being all written by hand, at the expense of much labor.

The translation of the Bible into Latin was therefore a move toward making the sacred volume better known; but neither Jerome nor Pope Damasus could expect it to be accessible to all, since there was no possibility of putting literature of any kind within general reach, when it was so difficult to produce it.

There is another misrepresentation of fact in the quotation given above from Mr. Armstrong. He says that Jerome's translation was "the first, as far as is now known." On the contrary, it is known that there was a Latin translation in general use long before Jerome's time, and Jerome constantly speaks of it when he vindicates the changes he made from the current text. This more ancient version was used by St. Augustine, Tertullian, Cyprian and others who wrote before Jerome's version was given to the world. The *Italia*, by which name this more ancient version was called, was made early in the second century, and there are to be found specimens of its reading in the Roman Missal, which is to be found in constant use in every Catholic church in the land. It is hard to say whether gross ignorance in a matter on which he professes to be very learned, or a malicious desire to pervert the truth, predominates in Mr. Armstrong's essay. It contains evidences of both.

Mr. Armstrong states also that there were no persecutions that are known of on account of the Bible before the sixth century, or before Jerome's translation. This is also a misstatement, and so is the cause which he assigns for his statement, namely, that the translations kept the Bible from the people. In the Decian and other persecutions of the first three centuries, the bible was often sought for, to be destroyed or profaned by the Pagan persecutors, and Tertullian and other Christian writers inform us that the Christians who possessed copies suffered death rather than deliver them up.

We have also to remark that Mr. Armstrong shows a vast amount of innocent unconsciousness of the facts of which he treats so learnedly when he confounds the "Roman Psalter" with St. Jerome's version of the Bible. The Psalters merely consisted of the Psalms, with sometimes some additional hymns taken from other parts of Scriptures. If the writer, had said that "Jerome's version is called the Vulgate," he would have been much nearer the truth, for the Latin Vulgate, the version used by the Catholic Church, is chiefly St. Jerome's work.

There are many other misrepresentations of fact in Mr. Armstrong's essay, but we must delay reference to them. We shall therefore now only remark further that we are surprised that our contemporary the *Canada Presbyterian* should lay such a document before its readers for their instruction in matters religious.

The Bible is, as it has always been, a precious book in the eyes of the Catholic Church, which uses it for the edification and instruction of the faithful. It was from the Catholic Church that Protestants got it, unwilling as they are to acknowledge their indebtedness.

It need scarcely be mentioned that Mr. Armstrong makes no allusion to this fact when he pretends to throw light upon how Protestants got the Bible.

## THE SCHOOL QUESTION BEFORE PARLIAMENT.

The long expected sixth session of the seventh Dominion Parliament commenced on Thursday, the 3rd inst., but only a small number of members were present, as it was understood that no real business would be transacted until the 7th January.

A sixth session of Parliament is a thing very unusual in Canada, and it is only because of existing unusual circumstances that it has been called on the present occasion. Our readers are aware that the purpose announced by the Government is to redress the injustice under which the Catholics of Manitoba have been suffering since the passing of the school laws of that Province in 1890—Acts by which Catholic schools have been abolished, the school houses seized by the Government, and Catholic taxes taken for the support of schools which are really Protestant.

It is now nearly six years since the Catholics of Manitoba were deprived of rights which were guaranteed to them under the constitution of the Dominion, and more specifically under the Manitoba Act, and during the whole of this period we have been by turns coaxed and threatened to induce us to give up our claim to a satisfactory settlement.

The Government still adheres to its announced intention to pass a remedial measure, and in the speech from the throne delivered by His Excellency the Governor-General, the following reference was made to this much-discussed question:

"Immediately after the prorogation of Parliament, my Government communicated through the Lieut. Governor of Manitoba, with the Government of that Province, in order to ascertain upon what lines the local authorities of Manitoba would be prepared to promote amendments to the Acts respecting education in schools in that Province, and whether any arrangement was possible with the Manitoba Government which would render action by the Federal Parliament in this connection unnecessary. I regret to say that the advisers of the Lieut. Governor have declined to entertain favorably these suggestions, thereby rendering it necessary for my Government in pursuance of its declared policy, to introduce legislation in regard to this subject. The papers will be laid before you."

We do not desire to see the Province coerced, and we would rejoice to see an honest disposition on the part of the Provincial Government to keep within the limits of a reasonable exercise of its legislative authority. It is the duty of every Province to restrain itself within the limits of its authority, and to observe these conditions on which it has become a Province. We do not ask that force should be used, for we do not imagine for a moment that force will be necessary, but we ask that the proper course of law should be taken to redress grievances the existence of which cannot be denied, as their existence has been declared by the highest Court in the British Empire. We desire therefore that there should be a remedy for these grievances.

We admit that in insisting on our rights we have to meet the hostility of a well-defined and noisy faction in Ontario, a faction which is constantly putting forward the claim that it is sustained by the will of the people of this Province, and we are advised to submit to their dictation.

Even if we were convinced that this were the truth we could not act on such advice. We are quite satisfied of the justice of our demands, and we would maintain them even in the face of a hostile majority. We have the right to maintain the justice of our views, and to endeavor to convince others thereof, even though we stood alone, with the whole voice of Ontario against us, and we are not bound to admit that an Ontario majority, however respectable and predominant, is to direct the counsels of the whole Dominion.

It was because the "Fathers of Confederation" foresaw the possibility that a sectional majority might be carried away by a wave of fanaticism that express provision was made in the British North America Act to leave the ultimate decision on the question of religious education within certain limits, not to any Local Legislature, but to the Dominion Parliament, which it was supposed would be a more steady and fair tribunal for the settlement of such questions than would be any Provincial Legislature.

But it was not a case of mere possibility. The past history of our Provinces showed that there was a strong probability that certain Provinces could and would be from time to time influenced by sectional and religious issues,

and this fact made it peace of the Dominion decision should rest legislative authority.

It was by no means favor to Catholics that was inserted in the Dominion. It could that Catholic influence mount over the Dominion or Parliament, and it was rather by desecration of minority in guarantees were instance of Sir A. T. tecton of minorities freely accepted by C any expectation that means of them secure what strict justice m from the conscious Parliament representation of the people, but interests from oec would be more like legislature to weigh the balance of str decide accordingly.

We have said the expected that Ca should be paramount and it is not, inasmuch not even as many House of Commons as a fair apportionm if they were repres portion to their num tion of the country. the sense of justice o Protestant fellow-ci sates in Parlia a just school bill res olic minority of Ma of which they have cally deprived. greater reason to e desire that their in Quebec shall ed. They may r that with what mea will be measured to if they pronounce t the Protestant major right and proper, that the Catholic m would be justified similar tyranny ov minority.

We have confide very Protestant pr there exists a spiri ice which will lea in Parliament to a the injustice which trated.

We believe that, may gain the upper eral elections which the popular voice of sustain and insist u justice to the Mani

As we go to p turmoil in Gover Ottawa. Every day complications, and ling character and thick and fast i Seven Ministers have sent in tion. Their names ter, Minister of F Minister of Trade a Charles Hibbert T Justice: Mr. Haggan ways; Mr. Dickey, Dr. Montague, Minis Mr. Wood, Controlle

The latest news h effect that the vaca have been filled by isters taking charg named in addition partments having the supplementary ister of Finance, Sir Minister of Justice Militia, Hon. T. M. Trade and Commer gan; Minister of Mr. Ferguson; Mi and Canals, Hon. J.

## THE LATE FATHER CAMPBELL.

The Scranton, Dec. 25, contains reference to the de lamented Archdeacon Rev. Kenneth A. cleryman, died at the residence of Dr. Wyoming avenue. Father Campbell gav three years ago on came to this city a made his home with son. His death was du Father Campbell was Ontario. His age w studies for the priest St. Michael's Colleg Montreal Seminary. thirty years ago, and jubilee as a priest in During his stay in persons in this city. Father Campbell was contact with him, we scholarship, religious ner. He had spent a