

The Catholic Record

"Christianus nihil nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname).—St. Faclan, 4th Century

VOLUME XXVI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1904

1365

The Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, DEC. 17, 1904.

SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES.

Jack London, whose stories are as cold and pitiless as an arctic winter, is in buoyant mood over the growth of the socialistic movement in the United States. In 1880 the socialists polled 2,068 votes; at the last election they had more than half a million to their credit. The muttering of the discontent is indeed assuming the proportions of an ominous growl. Mr. London tells us that the vote cast for Socialism was the tally of the American citizens who have raised the red banner of revolt against the economic masters of the United States. Their aim to destroy present day society and from the materials to construct a new society which will be run in the interest of the working class, will never, as we pointed out before, be gained on this planet.

But until something is done to check that industrialism, which, as Karl Marx observed, for a profit of 300 per cent, will stop at nothing against the workingman, the cause of Socialism will grow apace.

A DISINTEGRATING FACTOR.

Oratory is not a good diet for any organization. Some talk must be done in the prosecution of business, but it is a wise chairman who knows how to regulate and to limit it. If determined, however, to keep everything in order he can interpose a barrier to the verbosity of those who like to agitate the atmosphere, but if he does not know his business, or, knowing it, shrinks from endangering his re-election by any exercise of authority, the society will be talked to senility and death by the "orator." We have seen portly and well-groomed organizations grow attenuated and out at elbows under such treatment. The silent members or the "workers" can eliminate the "spouter" as a disintegrating factor. But they do not do this as a rule. They seem to be hypnotized into speechlessness and regain their power of utterance only when it is too late, that is when they get indisputable proof that the organization is on the way to the morgue.

THE MODERATE DRINKER.

We suppose that every man who is addicted to liquor plumes himself on being a moderate drinker. The young who patronize the "road house" and the saloon and go homeward in a mellow state are moderate drinkers. The habitue of the club who can do justice to a few rounds of drinks without turning too many hairs in the same category. The drunkard alone is to be reprobated, and whenever we hear of him fouling law and order we thank the Lord for our own rectitude and then have "another one." To our own mind the moderate drinker is the greatest supporter of the rum traffic. We turn from the drunkard with loathing; but the individual who has many reasons to justify his use of the cocktail, and who, despite habitual indulgence, does nothing to put him into the category of the law, arouses no disgust. He treads the primrose path with guarded steps while others who wish to emulate him may take it at a leap. It is not saying too much when we declare that many a man held captive totally or partially by liquor got his first lesson in the art of self-degradation from the moderate drinker. But even he is hard pressed to day for reasons to justify his conduct.

DETRIMENTAL TO HEALTH.

The best workers in cold regions according to Sir John Franklin and Sir John Ross, and in tropical countries according to the Duke of Wellington, are total abstainers. So convinced are men of business that the use of liquor in any measure detracts from usefulness that they invariably employ the teetotaler. A man may suck whiskey and be apparently none the worse for it, but he is the while drawing on his health, and will discover in an emergency that he has little of it to his credit.

There is no kind of achievement you could make in the world, said Carlyle, that is equal to perfect health; and we squander it and plant the seeds which shall yield us a bitter harvest. "Alcohol," we are told, "is no necessity of man," that it is out of place when used for any other purpose than a medical, chemical or artistic purpose; that it is no food; that it is the most insidious destroyer of health, happiness and life. And the rum seller

waxes angry when we advert to his manner of gaining a livelihood.

Referring to a report that insurance companies are about to offer greatly reduced rates to total abstainers Dr. Shady, voicing the sentiment of a score of prominent physicians of New York, spoke as follows: I think it is a good and just plan, and the liberality of insurance companies to non-drinkers will be a profitable arrangement. That reduced rates should be given on the lives of total abstainers can be amply shown. No figures are necessary to tell of the higher percentage of deaths among people addicted to the use of liquors. It is simply a matter of daily observation.

AN ARCHBISHOP'S EDICT.

A reverend pastor informs us that card playing for prizes is prohibited now as a method of carrying on the work of parishes under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop. He hopes that similar edicts will follow in other places. Amen say we.

TO OUR YOUNG MEN.

May we suggest to the young men who are casting around for ways and means to make the winter months less dreary to try the experiment of staying at home a few evenings each week just to make life more pleasant for the mother. She loves you—how much she herself cannot say. She crooned you from her arms, shielded you from danger during the years, and had you educated at the cost sometimes of much self-sacrifice on her part.

Now she is going down into the valley, and a word of love, a thoughtful action will illumine the path before her. Your voice can make sweet music in her soul. Young man, do it before it is too late.

Flowers convey no meaning to the stilled heart. So now show your love for the dear little mother.

JOAN OF ARC'S SPIRIT.

Once again Joan of Arc may save France from her enemies, this time the enemies being, not the English invaders, but those of her own household. Think of the professor of Condorcet College, Paris, going out of his way to cast slurs even grave imputations, on the personal character and virtue of the Maid of Orleans! And this, too, when the vast majority of French people are preparing to honor her as only those who are honored whose virtue has been proved heroic and whose character was superhuman. Joan of Arc was a national character; and, apart entirely from her saintliness, deserves eternal honor from France. But Satanic hatred of the Church blinded Professor Thalamas to her grandeur as a national figure in French history, and he sneered at her purity. To the honor of French manhood, we are told that thousands of boys, students of different colleges, and headed by a delegation from Condorcet College itself, at once rose to their feet and marched through the streets of Paris behind white banners with Jeanne d'Arc's name there in letters of gold and carrying lilies, symbolic of her purity.

The women of Paris, never behind in public spiritedness, covered the statue of the Maid of Orleans, in the Place Rivoli, and her great statue by Dubois, at St. Augustine's Church, with wreaths of flowers.

"Down with Thalamas! rang through the streets of Paris and around the Chamber of Deputies. But Thalamas had fled from the city frightened by the storm he had raised, when he hinted that La Pucelle was not the handmaid of God in His merciful care of the French nation.

All this happened last week, and very many members of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies and Municipal Councillors also took part, glad of an opportunity to voice their opposition to the anti-Christian policy of the Combes' Cabinet.—New York Freeman's Journal.

THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE AT LONDON.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE FIVE.

was couched in words of hearty welcome to the distinguished delegate on his first visit to Windsor, and assured him of the unwavering loyalty of the parishioners. Reference was made to the co-operation and devoted attention by Bishop McEvay. Pontifical Vespers were held in the evening, and Bishop McEvay blessed the bell donated by Mrs. E. C. Walker, of Walkerville. Rev. Father Egan, of London, was master of ceremonies for the day. The visiting priests were: Rev. Fathers Brady, Wallaceburg; McKee, London; Hogan, Strathroy; West, St. Thomas; Ladouceur, Jeanette's Creek; Parent, McGregor; Francis, Chatham; Prud'homme, Big Point; Langlois, Tilbury; Collins, Hays, Chalendar, Sandwich; and Beaudoin, Walkerville. The new church was erected at a cost of \$35,000, and is a handsome structure.

Kind looks, kind words, kind acts, and warm handshakes—these are secondary means of grace when men are in trouble.

VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

(Continued.)

N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

Mr. Jones—"Our American Revised Version has had access to older and more correct manuscripts than ever the Latin Vulgate has had."

Before committing yourself to such a statement, you should be very sure of your ground, because if not true it compels us to place you in a very humiliating position. We will now give the facts, and they will show where they leave your statement.

1. There is no Hebrew copy of the Old Testament older than the tenth century. As St. Jerome began his translation of the Vulgate in the fourth century (380), the Hebrew manuscript from which he translated the Old Testament must, of course, have been made prior to that time, probably long prior to it, for he would naturally seek the oldest and most reliable copy which he could find among the Jews of Palestine, where he made his translation. Now, it follows from these two facts that the oldest manuscript of the Old Testament accessible to the American Revised Version dates only from the tenth century, while the manuscript used by St. Jerome for the Old Testament of the Vulgate dates from the fourth century at least, and very probably much earlier. From this it does not require much arithmetic to see that the manuscript used by St. Jerome was at least 600 years older than that used in making the American Revised Version.

Now, in view of this, what *ignis fatuus* seduces you to say that the American Revised Version had access to older manuscripts than the Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome had? The man, author or preacher who led you into your ridiculous blunder deserves a stern rebuke; and we could not find it in our heart to blame you if you took him by the ear and led him to some remote place where his homing would not disturb your neighbors, and gave him a strenuous whipping. In this way you might inspire him with a proper sense of historical perspective.

2. Let us now consider the oldest Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. The oldest known to exist go back only to the fourth century. The two recognized as the most ancient are the manuscript known as the Vatican and the Alexandrian. The former is in the celebrated Vatican library, the latter in St. Petersburg, the property of the Emperor of Russia. The German critic, Hug, places the Vatican Codex in the first part of the fourth century, and Tischendorf refers it to the fourth century, and remarks that "it scarcely differs in age from the Codex Sinaiticus. This latter copy was found by Tischendorf in the convent on Mount Sinai, in 1829. He referred it to the middle of the fourth century, that is, about the year 350. These two manuscripts are the most ancient that the translators of the American Revised Version could have had access to.

Now, St. Jerome was born about the year 335, or between 339 and 340, and consequently was as ancient as the most ancient extant manuscripts of the New Testament, and six hundred years more ancient than the existing Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament. He made his translation of the Gospels about the year 380, and he states distinctly that he used old Greek manuscripts, that is, manuscripts that were old in his time. Now, he would not call manuscripts made in his own lifetime old. Therefore he referred to manuscripts made earlier than the oldest copies now in existence.

And yet you tell us—on what authority we cannot guess—that the American Revised Version had access to older manuscripts than St. Jerome had. We would suggest that while you give your misinformant his well deserved punitive reward you give him a few extra lashes on the score of his New Testament manuscript misinformation.

Mr. Jones—"You say Jerome's copy is more faithful to the originals." If by "Jerome's Copy" you mean the manuscripts from which the greatest Biblical scholar of the fourth century made his Vulgate translation, we said it on the principle recognized by all that the more ancient the copy or transcription the more reliable, because freer from the errors incident to transcription, and the manuscripts used by St. Jerome were more ancient than any within the reach of modern translators. A few lines about the originals need only to have your facts in their proper, chronological order. To invent them is as dangerous as inventing your gun and placing the muzzle to your own nose before firing.

2. If by "Jerome's copy" you mean the Vulgate, we say it is more faithful to the originals, for several reasons. First, because St. Jerome is universally recognized as a sincere, honest, saintly man, and a scholar well versed in the Hebrew and Greek languages, from which he translated, and that his translation was made from more ancient manuscripts than any that were ever

accessible to English translators. Secondly, all modern Protestant versions approach nearer to the Vulgate than their predecessors. The American Revised is an illustration of this fact. It comes nearer to the Vulgate of St. Jerome than all previous Protestant versions, and in this fact we believe consists its superiority over them, for it is superior.

To these reasons for believing the Vulgate of St. Jerome more faithful to the originals, we add the opinions of some Protestant scholars, showing that they coincide with our own.

Grotius is universally recognized as one of the great scholars and publicists of his day. He died in 1645. A writer in the International Cyclopedia says of him: "To the talents of a most able statesman, Grotius united deep and extensive learning. He was a profound and enlightened theologian—perhaps the best exegete of his day, and distinguished scholar, an acute philosopher, a judicious historian and a splendid jurist. Altogether, he was what Menage called him, 'a monster of erudition.'" Such a Protestant authority ought to have weight with you. Grotius in the preface to his Annotations to the Old Testament, says of the Vulgate: "It contains nothing but sound doctrine. It was his esteem for it, he tells us, that induced him to make the Vulgate the basis of his notes on the Old Testament. He certainly considered it more faithful to the originals than any other version."

Paul Fagius, appointed by Cranmer to teach Hebrew in Cambridge, thought so highly of the Vulgate that he treated those as half-learned and impudent fellows who spoke slightly of it.

Dreusius, for some time professor of Oriental Languages in Oxford, speaks in high terms of the Vulgate, and praises the Council of Trent for the preference which it gave to it above the modern Versions of the Bible. For what is said by these two witnesses we refer you to Richard Simon's Critical History of the Old Testament, vol. 2, chap. 14.

Dr. Dove, in his Persuasion to Recantants, says: "We grant it fit that for uniformity in quotations of places, in schools and pulpits, one Latin text should be used, and we can be contented for the antiquity thereof, to prefer that (the Vulgate) before all other Latin books."

Mollinios, in his work on the New Testament says: "I prefer the Vulgar edition (the Vulgate) before Erasmus's Bucer's, Ballinger's, Brennius's, the Tigurine translation; yea, before John Calvin's and all others."

Theodore Beza, in his Annotations to Luke, says: "I confess that the old Latin text (the Vulgate) seems to have interpreted the holy books with wonderful sincerity and religion. The Vulgar edition I do, for the most part, embrace and prefer to all others." Beza was one of the most famous followers of John Calvin.

Walton, in the prolegomena to his Polyglot, says of the Vulgate: "Although we do not call it divine (that is, an inspired translation as some thought) we yet say that it is highly to be esteemed and not rashly set aside, as well on account of its antiquity and general use throughout the West for a thousand years, as on account of the learning and fidelity of the translator, whom we admit to have been Jerome, in the greater part of the work, the same who is gratefully acknowledged by the most learned Protestant to have deserved well of the Church."

Of course, some Protestants have spoken disparagingly of the Vulgate, but Dr. Samuel Davidson, in his Sacred Hermeneutics, gives the reason and at the same time his own estimate of the Vulgate. He says: "This translation has been highly esteemed by the most competent judges, and we yet say that it is highly to be esteemed and not rashly set aside, as well on account of its antiquity and general use throughout the West for a thousand years, as on account of the learning and fidelity of the translator, whom we admit to have been Jerome, in the greater part of the work, the same who is gratefully acknowledged by the most learned Protestant to have deserved well of the Church."

The judgment of these Protestant Biblical scholars is enough, even if we had no other, to justify our statement that the Vulgate is more faithful to the originals than any modern version.

We might, of course, quote Catholic scholars *ad libitum* but you would look upon them as partisan witnesses. We will, however, quote two for whom you have some regard.

St. Augustin, in his City of God, says: "There was not wanting in these, our days (in fourth century), Jerome, the priest, a man most learned and skillful in all three tongues who, not from the Greek but from the Hebrew, translated the same Scriptures (i. e., the Old Testament). Into Latin, those who learned labor the Jews yet count it gives not only the judgment of the great Bishop of Hippo, but also that of the Jews of the fourth century on the fidelity of the Vulgate to the early manuscripts in the original Hebrew, manuscripts more than six centuries older than any Hebrew manuscript now in existence."

We will now let St. Jerome say a few words in behalf of his own translation: "You (Pope Damasus) constrain me to make a new work of an old, that is, after so many copies of the Scriptures dispersed through the world, should sit as a certain judge which of them agrees with the true Greek. I have restored the New Testament to the truth of the Greek, and have translated the Old ac-

ording to the Hebrew. Truly, I will affirm it confidently, and will produce many witnesses of this work, that I have changed nothing from the truth of the Hebrew."

CONCERNING BRIBERY.

GUILTY VOTE-BUYERS SHOULD MAKE PROMPT RESTITUTION.

On a recent Sunday Bishop Casey, of St. John, N. B., referred to bribery in elections. The Church is too far exalted above temporal things to take any part in politics, said His Lordship. She was as much beyond politics as she is above the state, and the spiritual is above the temporal, as heaven is above the earth, as God is above all. There is no party politics she had no concern; but there is a feature which sometimes applies to these conditions, and of this he would speak. The taking of money was corruption, an immoral act, and even if a man took the money and did not sell his vote the guilt was the same, because the money was obtained by immoral means.

A man might say he might as well have a share of the money as not, but to this argument Bishop Casey answered "No; a man cannot sell his vote, he has no right to do so; the vote is a sacred privilege and not only that but, all things being equal, it is a duty and he should exercise his franchise, but to take money for it is an immoral act, and some sound theologians hold it as an unjust act, and that restitution must be made."

Then arose the question as to whom restitution must be made—certainly not to the man who paid the money, because it was evident what he would do with it. He received it from a fund to buy voters like sheep, and if they did not take it, he would do so himself and put it in his pocket. The restitution rather must be made through some charity, "though certainly not to my charities," said His Lordship, "because I do not want such money."

CATHOLIC NOTE.

Archbishop Bruchet of Montreal in his latest pastoral letter asks the rectors of his diocese to "abstain from publishing in the newspapers the musical programme which they will present on grand feasts. It is necessary, when it is a question of something so grand as religious worship that everything that resembles the concert or outward show be done away with."

Let us not count too much what we do for others or try to measure the extent of our devotion; the calculation casts a coolness into the soul and this coolness communicates itself to all our actions.

AN INTERESTING COLLEGE DEBATE.

INTER-COLLEGIATE DEBATE WON BY REPRESENTATIVES OF TORONTO UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF OTTAWA LAST WEEK.

In one of the most interesting and closely contested debates ever held in Ottawa, Toronto University on Friday evening, December 3rd, defeated the representatives of the University of Ottawa in a debate on the subject of the desirability of a republic.

The subject of the debate was a republic in modern times. It was represented by James J. Torney and R. J. Byrne, and the opposing side was represented by Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore.

The first speaker was Mr. Torney, of the Toronto University, who opened the debate in a most able manner in which he expounded his views on the subject of a republic in modern times. He was followed by Mr. Fenwick, who in a most able manner expounded his views on the subject of a republic in modern times. He was followed by Mr. Moore, who in a most able manner expounded his views on the subject of a republic in modern times.

The debate was a most interesting one, and was well attended by the students of both universities. The Toronto University team won the debate by a majority of one vote.

The Toronto University team was represented by James J. Torney and R. J. Byrne, and the Ottawa team was represented by Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore.

It was a pronounced success. Judging by your list of names you have seen that an English and a French D-bling Society, but in our day there was but one—few men all the students were members. The championship of a D-bling Society in the early days of the D-bling Society was a most productive of splendid results. In point of fact, and speaking to the student body, the D-bling Society was a most productive of splendid results. In point of fact, and speaking to the student body, the D-bling Society was a most productive of splendid results.

The D-bling Society was a most productive of splendid results. In point of fact, and speaking to the student body, the D-bling Society was a most productive of splendid results. In point of fact, and speaking to the student body, the D-bling Society was a most productive of splendid results. In point of fact, and speaking to the student body, the D-bling Society was a most productive of splendid results.

A little nonsense now and then, is relished by the best of men."

It was a most interesting and well attended debate. The Toronto University team won the debate by a majority of one vote.

The Toronto University team was represented by James J. Torney and R. J. Byrne, and the Ottawa team was represented by Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore.

The Toronto University team was represented by James J. Torney and R. J. Byrne, and the Ottawa team was represented by Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore.

The Toronto University team was represented by James J. Torney and R. J. Byrne, and the Ottawa team was represented by Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore.

The Toronto University team was represented by James J. Torney and R. J. Byrne, and the Ottawa team was represented by Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore.

The Toronto University team was represented by James J. Torney and R. J. Byrne, and the Ottawa team was represented by Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore.

The Toronto University team was represented by James J. Torney and R. J. Byrne, and the Ottawa team was represented by Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore.

The Toronto University team was represented by James J. Torney and R. J. Byrne, and the Ottawa team was represented by Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore.

The Toronto University team was represented by James J. Torney and R. J. Byrne, and the Ottawa team was represented by Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore. The judges were Sir Samuel Fenwick, Chancellor of the University of Ottawa, and Mr. J. D. Moore, and J. D. Moore.