

The Catholic Record

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario. Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, Messrs. Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. G. Broderick and Miss Sarah Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agents for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John's.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line each insertion, advance payment.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, Hamilton, Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the Bishops of 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 Monday morning.

Subscribers when changing their address should notify the office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their paper.

Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid. Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning.

Obituary and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form to insure insertion.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION, Apostolic Delegation, Ottawa, June 18th, 1906.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.

My Dear Sir:—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit.

I sincerely defend Catholic principles and rights, and stand firmly by the teachings and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting the best interests of the country.

Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and it will do more and more, as its wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes.

I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families.

With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success, Yours very sincerely in Christ, DONATUS, Archbishop of Ephesus, Apostolic Delegate.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1906.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.

Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

The matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Blessing you and wishing you success, Believe me to remain, Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa, Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 22, 1906.

"THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE."

A sermon recently appeared in the St. John, N. B., Evening Times, which throws some light upon the position taken by Anglicans and Presbyterians respectively on the "historic episcopate" which Anglicans claim to possess but Presbyterians repudiate as unnecessary and unscriptural.

There are certain passages of Holy Scripture which need the light of the tradition of the Church to make them clear and demonstrative of the truth, while others are perfectly clear in themselves.

The Rev. Mr. Duffy (Episcopalian) shows clearly enough that there were at least three orders divinely instituted for the rule of the Church, the orders of Bishop, priest and deacon. These orders are named in the Greek original of the New Testament, Episcopos, Presbyteros, Diaconos. In Phil. i. 1, the Apostle St. Paul sends his greetings and blessings to all the saints in Christ Jesus with the Bishops and Deacons. And why does he not mention here the priests?

The Rev. P. F. Duffy explains that the word Episcopos always meant a Bishop, and that it means so here, but he offers no explanation why the priests are not mentioned.

Such early Christian writers as St. John Chrysostom, Theophylact, Eusebius and others solve the difficulty by stating that through the Episcopal office existed as distinct when these epistles were written, there was no absolute distinction of name between Bishop and priest until some years later, as the duties of both offices were similar, both being actually priests, but of higher and lower degree, on account of extra powers fulfilled by a Bishop. St. Ignatius, who was of the Apostolic time, wrote to the Trallians and Smyrniens:

"Priests (presbyters) be subject to your Bishops." (Episcopos.)

This saint was martyred in or about A. D. 107, so that he lived in the Apostolic age, and, in giving the usage of the Church in its entirety, while he lived, he certainly gave the usage of the primitive Apostolic Church.

Also the words of Acts xx. 28, "The Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops (episcopos) to rule the Church of God. Hence Episcopos of verse 28 and presbyteros in verse 17 of Acts xx referring to the same persons, might in itself imply that they who were presbyters or priests when sent for by the Apostle to come to see him at Miletus were bishops on their return to Ephesus, having been consecrated by St. Paul; but there is this serious objection to Rev. Mr. Duffy's interpretation, that St. Paul throughout his two epistles to Timothy speaks to him as bishop of the whole Ephesian church, which included territory beyond the city's limits, and there is nothing either in Holy Scripture, tradition or history to show that there, was more than one bishop in

Ephesus, the same Timothy who was consecrated to the office by St. Paul himself, and the time when these words were written was toward the date of St. Paul's martyrdom, say in the year 65 or 66, thirty three years after our Lord's ascension into heaven.

In Acts i. 20 the word episcopos, which is the office of an episcopos, or Bishop, is applied to Judas. This is a quotation from the 110th psalm, verse 8, being applied to him on account of his treachery to our blessed Lord:

"His bishopric let another take."

The office of Judas was that of an Apostle, and it is an Apostle who thus applies the text of the prophet to the traitor.

The Apostolic office is identical with that of Bishops, to whom it has descended by episcopal or Apostolic consecration. The priests who were ordained in every city according to Acts xiv. 23 by Sts. Paul and Barnabas, were subject to the Apostles, and even to Bishops who had been ordained by the Apostles. Thus the three epistles written by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus show that St. Paul gave to these an extensive authority in their respective districts around Ephesus and Crete respectively, and they had the power of ordination, which was never exercised by priests, but only by Apostles and their successors who were the Bishops of the Church. St. Patrick was a Bishop, Catholic and Apostolic, otherwise he would not have had any other authority than an impudent usurpation could have conferred upon him. To have any authority at all, he must have derived his mission from the Bishops of the universal or Catholic and Apostolic Church which was at this time spread throughout the world, and everywhere declared its submission to the Supreme Head of the Church, the Bishop of Rome, and thus he actually claimed it.

No one but the Pope ever claimed to be head of the universal Church, and indeed such a claim would have been ridiculous to the extreme, since no universal authority was given to any one if not to St. Peter, and such authority was never conceded by the whole Church to any other. Hence a non-Roman Church could not be anything else than an acephalous monster. An acephalous Church would be a body in which there would be no authority to teach Christ's doctrine, and it would soon wander away from the faith once delivered to the Saints. We can see this plainly from the recent acts of the Anglican Church, which keeps together only by owning no authority. Almost every Bishop and every cleric teaches a doctrine and uses a discipline and a liturgy which suits his own fancy. Did St. Patrick institute such a Church as this? If he did so the Church of Ireland was only a Babel of confusion. But he did not do this. He established a Church which held communion with the Churches of the world, all of which were in communion with the Pope and recognized the Pope's headship before and after St. Patrick's mission.

The Rev. Mr. Duffy, in order to make it appear that St. Patrick instituted a different Church from the universal Church of that day, declares that St. Patrick received his mission from St. Germanus, a French Bishop. It is true he was consecrated by St. Germanus, but this great Bishop held his office from the Pope and consecrated Patrick by authority derived from the Pope.

If the case had been otherwise, St. Patrick would have been a usurper when assuming to establish a novel Church in Ireland. His Church was Catholic and Apostolic because he taught the faith which was at that very time the faith of the whole Roman Empire and beyond the boundaries of that Empire.

St. Patrick studied for the priesthood in Rome at the school of St. John of Lateran, under the very eye of St. Celestine the Pope, and it was this Pope who authorized him to follow his inclination to go on his mission to Ireland and sent with him several Lateran students to assist him. He was consecrated by Bishop Germanus, according to his best historians. He refused to accompany the French missionaries who wished him to go to England to help root out the Pelagian heresy, as his heart was set upon the conversion of Ireland.

But it is true, as Rev. Mr. Duffy asserts so positively, that the French at this time constituted an independent Church, Catholic and Apostolic? There is not the least foundation for such a statement. St. Patrick went to Ireland in 432. The great Council of Ephesus was called to meet in 431, with the purpose of condemning the errors of Nestorius. The Bishops of the East and the West were present in force and the faith of Nice was re-asserted in the clearest terms.

The errors of Nestorius were condemned by an almost unanimous vote of the Bishops of the East and West, including those of France, though the

Eastern Bishops felt more concern than the Western in suppressing the heresy emanating from the patriarchate of Constantinople, and were more numerous than the Westerns at the Council. But in 430, the year before the Council of Ephesus was held, two French Bishops, Hilary and Prosper of Aquitaine, came to Rome on behalf of the French church to inform Pope Celestine I of the ravages made in France by the semi-pelagian heresy.

The Pope blamed in strong terms any who were tardy in suppressing this heresy. He said in a letter addressed to all the Bishops of France:

"No one has the right to teach in your dioceses without your permission. To you the deposit of faith is committed, and how can the faith be maintained if you allow false teachers to spread their errors? If there are priests who have taught these false doctrines, you must all the more earnestly insist on their preaching the true Catholic faith."

In this style he continues his somewhat lengthy letter, which shows that the Church of France was Roman as well as Catholic and Apostolic, and, as Rev. Mr. Duffy admits, that the Irish Church, established by a Bishop who was consecrated in France, was Catholic and Apostolic, for that very reason it was also Roman, and unless this had been the case it would have been neither Catholic nor Apostolic. For this same reason, the Anglican Church has not these attributes, nor any other which refuses obedience to the divinely appointed head of the Church.

The Rev. Mr. Duffy lays great stress upon the fact that in aftertimes there arose a difference between the English and Irish Churches. This is true, but it occurred owing to the fact of broken communication between these two countries and the European continent, especially France and Italy; and it took some time before this division was healed, as the astronomical calculation of the time of the vernal equinox was not so accurately known fourteen centuries ago as it is to-day. There were, therefore, variations in the keeping of Easter which do not exist now, and which are not variations in faith.

But if this error in the computation of Easter was of such grave consequence as Rev. Mr. Duffy would make it appear, why does not his church follow the inexact computations of the second to the fourth century computations, instead of the date which is used by the Catholic Church of to-day?

But the alleged non-Roman character of the Church of Ireland could not give a non-Roman character to the Church of England before the Reformation, so there is little to be gained by arguing it to be so. The English (Catholic) Church before Reformation times was Roman, whether we take for its beginning the Church as established by St. Augustine, in the end of the seventh century, or that established by Fulgentius and Damianus in 183. In both instances the missionaries came from Rome, acting under the authority of the Popes, as may be clearly seen from the writings of Venerable Bede.

It will be seen from this review of Rev. Mr. Duffy's sermon, that this gentleman, while right in his thesis on the Apostolicity of the three sacred orders of the hierarchy, makes a serious error in maintaining that St. Patrick planted any but the Catholic faith in Ireland. We might add many other proofs to those we have given on this point, but our article would become too lengthy if we were to continue.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF HALIFAX.

We print in another part of this issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD a report of the ceremonies attending the consecration of His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. McCarthy, Archbishop of Halifax.

As was to be expected, the occasion was one of very great interest for the Catholics not only of the Archdiocese of Halifax, but of the Maritime Provinces, and, indeed, of the Dominion at large.

It brought together the representative of our Holy Father, Mgr. Sbarretti, and a large number of most distinguished Archbishops, Bishops, priests and laity from Canada and the great republic.

The new Archbishop has taken upon himself the performance of great and onerous duties the guidance and guardianship of the Church of God in a most important section of the Dominion. He follows a line of noble Prelates who have shed lustre on the sacred office of the episcopate. The most Rev. Dr. McCarthy begins his great work fortified by the confidence, the esteem and the love of the priests and the people over whom he has been placed. His blameless life as a priest of Holy Church, his indomitable energy, and his rare talents and scholarly attainments, give us assurance that his administration will bear fruit most pleasing to the Divine Heart of Our Lord. May his years be many! May his happiness be great in the knowledge that the love of his priests and people surrounds him! The publisher of the CATHOLIC

RECORD begs His Grace to accept his sincere congratulations.

THE CHURCH AND THE VERNACULAR.

CONTINUED.

Our English Catholic versions may not have that polish of language or that grammatical construction which others possess, but, to quote the words of an old song, "such empty phantom we freely grant them." However, there is one thing we do possess, and one thing we always shall possess, and that is, that, guided by the light of Divine Tradition, and living under the watchful eye of the Infallible Church of Christ, we shall always possess the word of God in all its purity.

Almighty God, by the prophet Isaiah, lays down the covenant He makes with Jesus Christ, and His Church, in these beautiful terms: "There shall come a Redeemer to Sion, and to them that return from iniquity in Jacob, saith the Lord. This is my covenant with them saith the Lord. My spirit is in thee and my words that I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever." Here we have it promised by God that the spirit of the Lord should never depart from the Redeemer nor from His posterity, and also that the words put into His mouth, and revealed by Him to his seed, should never depart from His mouth, nor from the mouth of His seed from henceforth and forever. Now the seed or posterity of the Redeemer are His followers, His Church. Consequently God has pledged His word that the Holy Ghost shall remain with the Church of Christ, and that the true doctrine of revealed truths shall never cease to be held and taught by her, for the words of God "shall never depart out of her mouth." And Christ Himself, speaking to His Apostles, said: "I will ask the Father and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you forever, the Spirit of Truth." And a little later He adds: "But when He the Spirit of Truth is come, He will teach you all Truth." And when the Holy Ghost did descend upon the Apostles, He did not come in the shape of pens, ink or bibles, but in form of fiery tongues, thereby symbolizing their mission to the world, that it should be with living tongues that the knowledge, love and mercy of God should be made known to the race of man. "Whatsoever I have heard of my Father," said Christ to His Apostles, "I have made known to you. . . . Go therefore to teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, behold I am with you all days till the end of time. . . . He that heareth you, heareth Me, and he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me." Here Christ asserts that He has entrusted to His Church, whatsoever He had heard of the Father, all the words which the Father had put into His mouth, that is the whole body of Divine Revelation, the written and unwritten word of God. And He plainly says that the sole teacher and interpreter of that Revelation is the Church, that her office as teacher and interpreter is perpetual and universal; that He, the Way, the Truth and the Life, the Eternal Wisdom of the Father would be with her teaching and safeguarding that divine deposit till the end of time; that He has set His seal upon the teachings of the Church, and that those who would hear and obey her, would hear and obey Him; while those who would despise her, would despise Him and the Father who sent Him, and that they should be treated as the heathen and the publican, that is, as worshippers of the devil and as people abandoned by God and given up to a reprobate sense.

The Douay version will be always held in veneration by English-speaking Catholics, for there is a halo around it that can never be dimmed. It was made by poor exiles in a foreign but friendly land at a time when their brothers at home were laying down their lives for the truths which it contains. We shall always turn to it and hearken to its teachings and its pleadings, as devoted children are wont to listen to the counsel and commands of their aged though less educated parents. Its imperfections will only serve to render it more dear to us, and as Isaac of old recognized the voice of Jacob and the hands of Esau, we shall recognize the voice of the Holy Ghost speaking to us through the Douay Bible, though its language be imperfect and its accents strange.

When a century and a half had rolled by the time the Douay version was made, the English language began to be altered, and a newer and more refined mode of expression was introduced. This necessitated new versions and new revisions. Dr. Nary of Dublin translated the New Testament, which was printed 1718 A. D., and Dr.

Whitham published another translation of it in 1730 A. D. It was the alteration in the language that urged the latter to make a new version, for speaking of the Douay translators he says that they "followed with a nice exactness the Latin text—at the same time always consulting and comparing it with the Greek, as every accurate translator must do, not to mistake the true sense—but what makes that edition seem so obscure at present, and scarce intelligible, is the difference of the English tongue, as it was spoken at the time, and as it is now changed and refined; so that many words and expressions, both in the translation and annotation, by length of time are become obsolete, and no longer in use." Bishop Challoner also, who is the author of many pious books, and who did a great deal to mould and publish Catholic thought in England, and who made the great changes that were being made in the English language, and wishing to give the Scriptures in a more readable form to the people, concluded to make a revision of the Douay Bible. He accordingly set to work, and availing himself of all the best literary materials at hand, published his revision in five volumes in 1750 A. D. which is well nigh universally used by English speaking Catholics to-day.

Now if from the multiplicity of versions and revisions made by Protestants we, elsewhere, concluded that they have never offered to the people the pure word of God, how then can we claim that Catholics possess the Word of God in all its purity, since they too have made several versions and revisions of the Bible? We shall answer this difficulty as briefly as possible. Protestants assert that the Bible alone is necessary, since, according to them, it contains all things necessary to salvation; that it alone contains the true Word of God, and that outside it the true Word of God cannot be found. Such being the case, we would like to ask them, which among their numberless versions and revisions is the true Bible?

In giving the history of the Protestant versions, we saw that every version that was printed was condemned as either untrue or corrupt, and that by Protestants themselves. We saw that the revisions were likewise condemned; we also saw that it was admitted by these very same people, that it is hard to find two editions which agree with each other, that it is even hard to find a chapter in which they read together, and that the "variations exist in spelling and punctuation not only, but in the summaries and text itself." It is not within the purpose of our argument to investigate how or why they arrived at these conclusions, suffice it to say, that divisions amongst themselves, lack of authority in religion, together with their prejudices to the Catholic Church, have been the fruitful source of much that is corrupt in their Bible.

It must be borne in mind that versions and revisions have a different meaning for Protestants than they have for Catholics; for the former they mean changes in the form and substance, that is, changes in language and in the text itself, while for the latter they mean changes in form or language only. That versions and revisions could and should be made in this sense, is not a matter of surprise; in fact it is self evident when we consider the great alterations the English language has undergone since the Douay Bible was first published. And while a revision of our present Catholic Bible is a desideratum, since it lacks that grammatical construction, that elegance of form and refined modern expression on which Protestants lay so much stress, and to which they sacrilegiously ascribe the truth of God's word; yet it is by no means absolutely necessary, for, as we said before, the Church, and not the Bible, is the divinely appointed teacher of mankind.

Saint Paul, writing to Timothy, says that the Church is the "pillar and ground of the truth," but we must not understand this to mean that the Church of itself and independently of Christ is the "pillar and ground of the truth," no, but it is such in virtue of its union with Christ, who is truth itself, and who promised to be with her all days till the end of time, and that the "Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth would abide with her forever, and teach her all truth." Hence we can argue a priori that if the church, to which was solemnly promised and actually given the plenitude of truth, were to translate or approve a translation of the Sacred Scriptures, which God has especially committed to her care, that translation, at least as far as the truth is concerned, should be the most perfect the world could receive. And this is actually the case, for the Latin Vulgate has been praised for its correctness by Protestants of every denomination, while our English Catholic version has found many learned Protestant admirers, and was praised by no less an authority than Bacon. English Protestant scholars, having set aside their religious prejudices, have in the

newest revisions of their Bible come nearer to the Catholic translation. However, even if the Protestant Bible were in all things like our Catholic version, they could not argue to an identity of belief, for until they interpret the Scriptures according to the mind of the Catholic Church and in submission to her authority, there can be no identity of faith, no union, and the gulf that has separated them from the Church for more than three centuries would still continue to exist.

UNION TRUE OR DECEITFUL.

A letter which appears in the Montreal Witness of 12th Sept. from the Rev. James B. Freeman, Methodist Minister, of London, Ont., uses the critic's knife very sharply in regard to the principles which have been laid down by the union committees of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches, in the union agreement which was reached last summer by the assembled committees who undertook to make a compact which, after being duly discussed and voted on by the Presbyteries, Conferences, and Congregational assemblies or unions of the three bodies, should be finally voted upon by their General Assemblies, or by whatever body is used by each to signify their respective supreme ruling authorities, and should then become the law for the three bodies concerned.

We ourselves believed, from the time when this proposed union was floated in the atmosphere, that it was impossible for such a union to be effected unless by the yielding of doctrines, on the part of two at least of the negotiating bodies, on points which are believed or admitted to be, part of God's actual revelation to each denomination. And now that a basis of union has been decided upon, the Rev. Mr. Freeman openly declares that this is exactly what has been done. The negotiations are still going on; but from indications which have risen to the surface, we cannot but draw the inference that the parties to the agreement arrived at so far are becoming more and more conscious that all three must give up certain doctrines which they have hitherto held to be the immutable teaching of Jesus to His Church, of which Christ said to His Apostles: "Teach all nations, all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo! I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." (St. Matt. xxviii. 20.)

Will these denominations hesitate now that they have ascertained that they are on the brink of the abyss of total unbelief in God's truth?

From the frying pan to the fire it is but a short step, and it certainly appears that this step is about to be taken. Let it be once generally understood, after the three bodies above referred to have taken the fatal step, and it will soon be reasoned very plausibly; have we not already made our abjuration of doctrines taught by God, or which at least our denomination insisted to be taught by God? And what is there to prevent us now from abjuring other such doctrines when it becomes convenient to do this once more?

Here is the view taken by Rev. Mr. Freeman on this matter:

"On the whole, we maintain the integrity of our doctrinal standards, and when we think of the other Confessions, this report (of the combined delegations) is certainly a great gain for the Arminian system: Indeed, when we recall the Westminster Confession, as we have studied it up, we wonder how the Presbyterian brethren ever assented to this report. The groundwork and superstructure of that magnificent system is built up around articles three, ten and seventeen of the Confession, viz.: on 'God's Eternal Decrees, Effectual Calling, and the perseverance of the Saints.' Of all these great doctrines, the backbone of the Confession, there is scarcely a vestige in the report."

"The only trace of the great doctrine of predestination is found in Art. 6, and that under the compassionate title of the Grace of God. In this article the evident intention of the joint committee was to give a simple statement of the two systems, Arminian and Calvinistic, without any attempt at reconciliation. And in this they have succeeded most admirably. They have placed the two systems together in two sentences. The first is a beautiful and satisfactory statement of Arminian theology. The second records the Calvinistic position, but it is couched in such mild terms, omitting all reference to reprobation, and so capable of being interpreted that the chosen people are those who will accept Christ, that even the Arminian cannot reasonably object to it. But apart from this report, we do not believe that the Presbyterian ministers themselves have any desire to perpetuate the bald system of predestination as contained in the old Confession of Faith."

The Rev. Mr. Freeman then explains that he is of the conviction, from other sources already known, that the Presbyterian ministers would sooner or later recast or eliminate the harsh statements of the Confession.

We do not ourselves doubt this. Independently of what certain stalwart