

which Roman canon law forbids being translated from Latin for public use into any other language, so that it has become necessary to employ the mechanical signal of a bell at certain points of the rite, to warn the congregation of that which they cannot, for the most part, learn from the words of the celebrant.

It may be freely admitted that no great harm was meant or worked by this system when it first began, which was after the inroad of the barbarians into the Roman empire, when the new Christian converts were found to be speaking a great variety of dialects, none of which had any literature, and all liable to incessant changes, whereas Latin was more or less generally understood. The fault was in not meeting the change of circumstances, when Latin dropped out of popular use and the new languages of Europe took final shape; and it is only too plain that the motive at work then was the desire to keep more power in the hands of the clergy.

Nor is the Roman case like that of the modern Jews, who use Hebrew still in their public devotions, as being the original sacred language in which their religion was Divinely revealed, and as being further a bond of tribal union to a scattered race. The most ancient Christian records are in Greek; the Epistle of St. Paul to the Roman Church itself is in Greek; and the *Kyrie Eleison*, with other Greek words, still embedded in the Missal, attest that the Mass of the Roman Church was once said in Greek too. Accordingly, the Latin translation, now held as sacred, must have been made with the intention of obeying St. Paul's precept, when Greek began to fall into disuse in Rome, and the bulk of the Christian people began to speak Latin.

No doubt this disobedience to Holy Scripture is of far less heinousness than the preceding examples, but still it is disobedience, and shows how Rome prefers her own will to God's will.

Nor is the usage without serious practical mischief. In the first place, it has made the act of the congregation at Mass largely mechanical and unintelligent, especially where, as the rule is in all Roman Catholic countries, the great bulk of those present are totally unlettered. Next, even for those somewhat better instructed, it has resulted in the very general employment of private and unofficial books of devotion, which are used at Mass, instead of the Missal itself, so that there is no attempt of the congregation to join directly in the lay portions of the office; and these books are usually far below the level of the Missal in tone and doctrine, so that the people are never lifted up to the ancient standard. Lastly, the unknown tongue puts an ignorant congregation wholly at the mercy of an infidel celebrant, who can substitute any other matter he pleases for the words he is supposed to be reciting.

DISCOURAGEMENT OF THE BIBLE.

XXXV. Besides these plain revolts against the clear letter of Holy Scripture and of the historical tradition of the Catholic Church, there are other respects in which the whole *spirit* of these two witnesses to the Faith is departed from, albeit there is not such express violation of the letter. First of these may be set the *discouragement* and slight put upon Holy Scripture by the Roman Church, not merely indirectly, by raising unwritten ecclesiastical traditions to equal rank with the Divine oracles (Conc. Trid., sess. iv.; Conc. Vatic. sess. iii. cap. 2), but directly, by restricting and disallowing the free circulation of the Scriptures in the vernacular. As this fact is often called in question, it may as well be here set down that the fourth Rule of the Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books, approved by Pius IV., and still in force, runs as follows:—"Since it is manifest by experience that if the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue be suffered to be read everywhere without distinction, more evil than good arises, let the judgment of the bishop or inquisitor be abided by in this respect; so that, after consulting with the parish priest or the confessor, they may grant permission to read translations of the Scriptures, made by Catholic writers, to those whom they

understand to be able to receive no harm, but an increase of faith and piety, from such reading; which faculty let them have in writing. But whosoever shall presume to read these Bibles, or have them in possession without such faculty, shall not be capable of receiving absolution of their sins, unless they have first given up the Bibles to the Ordinary. Booksellers who shall sell or in any other way furnish Bibles in the vulgar tongue, to any one not possessed of the licence aforesaid, shall forfeit the price of the books, which is to be applied by the bishop to pious uses, and shall be otherwise punished at the pleasure of the said bishop, according to the degree of the offence. Moreover, Regulars may not read or purchase the same without licence had from their superiors."

So far, then, we see that permission to read the Bible is not a thing of course, but an exceptional favour, made difficult, to obtain, and likely at once to be refused in every case where any man wanted honestly to know what God's revelation says upon some point of popular religion which might perplex him. But this is not all; for Clement VIII., glossing this rule, declares that the order and custom of the Holy Inquisition have taken away from Bishops and Superiors all power to grant any such licences.

Here are some of the 101 Propositions of Quesnel, condemned by the Bull "Unigenitus" of Clement XI. in 1713, as "false, scandalous, pernicious, seditious, impious, blasphemous, and heretical":—

"79. It is useful and necessary at all times, in all places, and for all kinds of people, to study and learn the spirit, holiness, and mysteries of the Sacred Scripture.

"80. The reading of Holy Scripture is for all.
"82. The Lord's Day ought to be hallowed by Christians with pious reading, and above all of Holy Scripture. It is dangerous to attempt dissuading Christians from this reading.

"84. To take the New Testament out of the hands of Christians, or to keep it shut against them, by taking away the means of understanding it, is to close Christ's mouth against them.

"85. To forbid Christians the reading of Holy Scripture, especially of the Gospels, is to forbid the use of light to the children of light, and make them undergo a sort of excommunication."

Pope Leo XII., in an Encyclical dated May 3rd, 1824, addresses the Latin bishops thus:—"We also, venerable brothers, in conformity with our apostolic duty, exhort you to turn away your flocks from these *poisonous pastures* [of vernacular Bibles]. Reprove, intreat, be instant in season and out of season, in all patience and doctrine, that the faithful committed to you (*adhering strictly to the rules of our Congregation of the Index*) be persuaded that if the Sacred Scriptures be everywhere indiscriminately published, more evil than advantage will arise thence, because of the rashness of men."

NOTE.—The writer has known a bonfire to be made of Anglican Bibles and Testaments by Roman Catholic clergymen at a mission in Kingstown, Dublin. If these persons knew how trifling is the difference, apart from mere style, between the Anglican version and the Douai version, what are we to think of their reverence for God's Holy Word? If they did not know it, what are we to think of their professional education, and their own anxiety to learn the truth of the matter? Imagine the like done by Anglican clergymen to Douai Bibles and Testaments.

Pius IX., in the Papal Syllabus of Errors, groups *Bible Societies* along with Socialism, Communism, and Secret Societies, as *pests*, which have alike been often reproved by him with the severest terms in various Encyclicals.

Here, in England, where it is impracticable to forbid the Bible to such as wish to procure it, these rules are not insisted on, but it is almost an unknown book, save in Germany, to the Continental Roman Catholic. Nor are there any such Bible readings with explanations given by the clergy in church as to make amends for the restriction. An explanation of the Gospel at Mass may be given, but is not obligatory, and there is nothing whatever analogous to the Anglican system of public Lessons; for the Breviary Lessons are not only in Latin, but are part of an office which is never said in any parish church whatever, namely, the Nocturns or Night Hours.

These plain facts must be set against such titular

approvals of vernacular Bibles as the Brief of Pius VI., for example, prefixed to Archbishop Martini's Italian version in 1778, which is the only solid argument cited by Roman controversialists in defence. The phrase "poisonous pastures" in the Encyclical of Leo XII., must mean one of two things, either that *all* vernacular translations are poisonous, or that such as are made by non-Romans are incorrect, corrupt, and misleading. In the latter case, obviously the duty of the Church is to provide trustworthy versions as the only sure antidote; but although there have been many translations of the Bible made by Roman Catholics into various European languages, there is, at this moment, speaking under correction, *none formally recognized and sanctioned for general use except the Douai Version*, and that for obvious reasons. All others are mere private ventures, for the most part, and certainly are not encouraged by authority; nor does the great college *De Propaganda Fide*, at Rome, whose polyglot press is one of the boasts of the local Church, do anything to supply the deficiency.

Diocesan Intelligence.

QUEBEC.

From Our Own Correspondent.

LENNOXVILLE.—At the Easter Monday vestry meeting the following resolution was unanimously carried:—"that the sincere thanks of the vestry be tendered to Mr. H. J. Petry for the valuable assistance rendered by him during the past year, in conducting the musical service of the church."

Young Mr. Petry is an undergraduate of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, and son of the Rev. Henry James Petry, B.A., Coll. Reg. Oxon, incumbent of Danville, Troutbrook, and Lorne, P. Q.

MONTREAL.

From Our Own Correspondent.

From our country missions the reports we hear of Easter Sunday, followed by its Easter Monday vestry meetings, have a tone that indicates progress in some respects, and harmony generally. Where the ways and means could be found (no small consideration), there we observe the Queen of Feasts has been more marked than in the past, and with more favour than perhaps would have been looked for a few years ago.

There has just come a report of the vestry meeting of the parish of Belford—a rising manufacturing town, and which gives the name to the deanery constituted in those parts. There the Sunday services were very impressive, and the floral offerings and decorations very tasteful. Special music and special singers characterized the musical portions of the service. The Easter vestry meeting was a happy affair. The rector, Rev. H. W. Nye, congratulated the vestry on the unbroken peace and harmony which had prevailed during the year, and on the quiet, but steady progress which had been made in the various departments of Church work. He spoke with special commendation of the successful work of the Sunday school, the Ladies Aid Society, and the juvenile Bee-Hive. The following is a summary of the statistics given to the meeting:—Baptisms: adults, ten; infants, eleven; Confirmed, twenty-one; Burials, 5; number of communicants, seventy-two; Sunday services, 135; week-day services, eighteen. The stipend of the rector has been regularly and fully paid. This is worthy of note, as it is not as common or general as it might be. Our country clergy, if they could tell untrammelled the manner in which they are paid, and how far short of the \$600 per annum many of them are, and of the privations they have to undergo in consequence, a picture that would not be at all creditable to the intelligence and wealth that our Church is generally credited with, would be presented. Of course all this is well known, because in many cases, personal experience has taught it, by the clergy; but the laity don't know it. They get hints of it now and again in pastorals and in missionary speeches, but they don't believe it, and never will until it is brought home to them in plainer language than it has yet been, as a rule. But how is this to be done? The Synod fixes \$600 as a minimum, and yet for instance we have the parish of Philipsburgh offering \$500, and claiming on this ground to elect their own minister. Have they a right? Is this supporting, in the spirit, or according to the terms of the canon, their own clergyman? Most assuredly not. Doubtless to such a parish as this, the bishop referred in last Synod address, when he said that he did not find that in all cases the terms laid down in