

of eighteen, and now that Judge O'Brien is dead there are three. The newspapers have been suggesting that the place left vacant through the demise of this Catholic judge should be filled by the appointment of a distinguished Catholic lawyer, The MacDermot, Q.C. The Irish Executive, of course, has no intention of adopting such a dangerous suggestion. The statesmanlike policy is to promote loyalty amongst the Catholics by treating them harshly and contemptuously.

**The Legal Title of Catholics.**—The gradual annihilation of the Penal Code (says the *Freeman's Journal*) has reminded a correspondent of a corresponding change in the legal title of Catholics. From the time of the introduction of the Protestant creed into Ireland in the reign of Elizabeth the appellation used by the statutes was 'persons in communion with the Church of Rome.' At the beginning of the Penal Code period, in 1662, in the reign of William III., and for a century afterwards, the Statutes describe Catholics, in hostile and contemptuous phraseology, as 'Papists and Popish people.' In 1793 Catholics attained the title of 'Papists, or persons professing the Popish or Roman Catholic religion,' and by later Statutes they are termed 'Roman Catholics' only. The reproachful epithet of 'Papist,' 'Popish,' 'Romish,' 'Romanist,' etc., writes Mr Scully in 1812, 'was no longer applied to Catholics by any gentleman or scholar.' This series of changes in the legal nomenclature of Catholics is of something more than a mere academic interest. Two years ago Mr Lecky, the member for Dublin University, had an animated controversy with a constituent, a clergyman of the English Established Church, by whom he was fiercely assailed for the offence of designating the members of the Catholic faith in debate in the House of Commons 'Catholics' and not 'Roman Catholics'—a compound epithet which involves a solecism in language.

**The Lord Chancellor and the Magistracy.**—Lord Ashbourne, the Irish Lord Chancellor, seems to have extraordinary notions of judicial procedure (says an exchange). Lord Emly was reported to have said, in addressing a meeting of labourers, that they would not have induced the Local District Council to give them the work on the roads if they had not shown a stern determination. If they had not come there in their numbers, and if they had not come with blackthorns, they would not have succeeded. Lord Emly was stated to have described these words, upon the demand of the Lord Chancellor, for an explanation, as 'an oratorical flourish.' If they had been used they certainly would have been nothing more, and should not have been taken seriously by Lord Ashbourne. But Lord Emly did not admit having uttered them. On the contrary, he is said to have intimated to the Lord Chancellor that the report was inaccurate, though refusing to give any further information. How any man with a judicial mind could, under the circumstances, have penalised Lord Emly—a man of distinction and the son of a Postmaster-General—surpasses understanding. Lord Ashbourne is the same official who restored to the magistracy the Orangeman. Lord Rossmore, who was dismissed from it for a riotous rush through the ranks of the Queen's troops, whilst shouting that his men would cut them up. The Lord Chancellor is likely to have not a little trouble over the removal from the magistracy of Mr. Kendal O'Brien, chairman of the Tipperary District council, for his namesake Mr. William O'Brien, asserts that he has given the National District Councillors of Ireland a lead which will be followed.

## THE CHURCH AND THE SCRIPTURES.

### DISCOURSE BY CARDINAL MORAN.

His Eminence Cardinal Moran, in the course of his second sermon on 'The Church and the Sacred Scriptures,' delivered in St. Mary's Cathedral, Sydney, said:—

It was asserted that up to the period of the so-called Reformation the Bible had been hidden away from the people. Such statements were made in opposition to facts and with the object of stirring up prejudice. Holy Church loves, and has always loved, the Sacred Scriptures, and had ever commended them to her children. Had she not preserved the Scriptures, as the sacred deposit of truth, for 19 centuries? The charge was made against the Church because she did not regard the written word of the Sacred Scriptures as our sole guide to truth and knowledge. Holy Church held that there should be the living voice of authority in the interpretation of the inspired writings, just as Our Lord Himself and His Apostles taught by the living voice. From the earliest times the Fathers and Pontiffs of the Church had exhorted the faithful to read the Scriptures, and to seek them as a pure stream of blessing and consolation. St. Augustine advocated this love of the Sacred Scriptures, and St. John Chrysostom, in his advice, said: 'Let the Divine Scriptures be ever in your hands; their lessons ever in your minds and your hearts.' Perhaps no great Pontiff of those early days so strongly insisted on the reading of the Scriptures as St. Gregory the Great, 'I beseech you,' he said, 'to meditate constantly on the Sacred Scriptures.' So from age to age to our own time the successors of St. Peter had kept the knowledge of the Scriptures before the faithful. At the beginning of the present century they found the great Pontiff Pius the Seventh writing in terms of highest admiration and warmest approval to one of the Italian bishops who had translated the Scriptures into the Italian language. Pope Pius the Seventh declared that no better service could be rendered to religion than to enable the people of a country to read in their own language the Gospels and other portions of the sacred writings. Then, again, they had the Encyclical of the present illustrious Holy Father, Leo the Thirteenth, on the Study of the Scriptures. There was no more beautiful tribute to the Scriptures than this encyclical, and in it the true position of the Church as the guardian and expounder of the Scriptures was clearly set forth. The present illustrious Pontiff a few months ago

crowned his labours in the cause of truth and knowledge by granting a special indulgence to each one who reads every day some part of the Sacred Books.

### EARLY TRANSLATIONS OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

Some enemies of the Church have been bold enough to state that there were no translations of the Sacred Scriptures till modern times. This was untrue. As early as the fourth century St. Jerome was ordered by the reigning Pope to present an accurate version of the Bible. This Doctor of the Church, most learned in Greek and Hebrew, produced what is known as the Latin Vulgate. At the present day the most learned and most painstaking investigators, non-Catholic as well as Catholic, recognise as authentic the text of the Latin Vulgate, which was the work of St. Jerome. The last edition of the Bible published in England had no less than four thousand corrections to bring it in conformity with the Latin Vulgate. Every discovery of ancient monuments and ancient manuscripts served to support the accuracy of the Latin Vulgate. Then, as to the Bible not having been known till the Reformation, there was the fact that in 1450 the Sacred Book was printed, and there were no fewer than 100 editions within 50 years, and this at a time when there was no whisper of the Reformation. History tells us that one of the first uses of the printing press was to supply copies of the Sacred Scriptures. Not only was the Bible printed in the Latin language, but in Germany, in the year 1483 (the year Luther was born), several editions, beautifully illustrated, were issued in Germany. Between that time and the close of the century, no fewer than 24 editions were published. There was no hiding away of the Bible. The reading of the Sacred Scriptures was commended by the Catholic pastors, and besides the German publications, there were six other translations in the Low-Dutch and other dialects. There was no prohibition. The one anxiety of the Church at the time was to prevent corrupt translations, which could not fail to become poisoned sources to the ignorant and the unwary. Holy Church never ceased to incite her learned sons to illustrate the Sacred Scriptures and to set them before the world in the most noble and most attractive form. Many of those who had assailed Holy Church in connection with the Scriptures claimed that the Bible is the one source from which we derive knowledge of the Divine power and love—our sole source of light, and strength, and grace, and spiritual happiness. As he had said on the previous Sunday, the Catholic Church, the Church of Christ, relies not upon the written word alone, but upon the living voice of Divine authority which Our Lord gave to His Church as a blessed heritage for all time. The 'Reformers' of the sixteenth century followed in the footsteps of preceding heretics in declaring that, from the Scriptures, and the Scriptures alone, do we derive knowledge of Divine Truth. The Reformers, who used the Scriptures to suit their own ends, added that the Bible should be interpreted by individual reason. In other words, those who had cast off their allegiance to the Catholic Church held that no teaching or exposition was needed. Each individual was free to interpret as he thought fit. This theory of private judgment had led to the establishment of some 700 Protestant sects, each of which appealed to the Bible to justify its existence. Luther himself deplored the number of false teachers the Reformation had brought forth—the number of men who distorted the Scriptures and profaned the word of God. He called them 'the cohorts of Satan,' and described their presence as a curse on the earth. Yet it was Luther and the Reformers in England who led on the horde of false teachers. One of the distinctive features of the source of Divine Truth was that it should be accessible to all. As the Gospel tells us, 'the poor have the Gospel preached to them.'

### THERE MUST BE A LIVING VOICE.

The written word would not be accessible to all. There must be the living voice—the voice of the teacher, the voice of the preacher. In the time of our Lord and for years afterwards the new Gospel was taught. The sacred text was written only as necessity arose. For centuries afterwards it was not possible to have more than a few written copies of the Scriptures. But the pastors of the Church never failed to impart the lessons of truth and wisdom which had been bequeathed to the Church by our Saviour Himself. The second feature of the source of Divine Truth and Knowledge was that it must be intelligible to all. With the principle of private judgment in force this was impossible. Many things in the Scriptures were difficult to understand. Take, for instance, the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles, in which we are told that our Lord, before ascending to Heaven, explained to the Apostles prophecies they had not understood. St. Luke tells us how our Lord, conversing with the Apostles before His ascension, said: 'These are the words which I spoke to you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning Me. Then He opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures.' And in the second epistle of St. Peter, referring to the life of our Saviour, he speaks of 'certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and the unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction. You, therefore, brethren, knowing these things before take heed, lest being set aside by the error of the unwise, you fall from your own steadfastness.' In the same epistle St. Peter tells us that 'no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation. For prophecy came not by the will of man at any time; but the holy men of God spoke inspired by the Holy Ghost.' Here we find it set forth that the Scriptures to be intelligible to all need the authorised interpretation of those appointed by our Lord to teach and explain the Scriptures. The authority of Holy Church had settled such points as the observance of the Sabbath on Sunday instead of Saturday, and the manner of Baptism. This was the living voice of authority, for nowhere in the Sacred Scriptures was it laid down that the Sabbath day should be Sunday. The spirit which inspired the Sacred Scriptures gives us through Holy Church the genuine interpretation.