

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 23, 1852.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

England seems destined to have her social troubles, as well as the Continental nations. Considerable agitation, which, according to the *Times*, is fast assuming formidable proportions, at present prevails in the manufacturing districts of the North of England. The last day of the year was celebrated by a gigantic "strike" of a great body of the engineers, mechanics, and millwrights. "On the first of January 1852," says the *Times*, "the greater number of those enormous industrial establishments in Lancashire, which have been the pride of Englishmen, and the astonishment of the world, will, for a time, be closed, in consequence of the suicidal folly of the associated mechanics. The great London firms have publicly announced their resolution to throw in their lot with their provincial brethren. Whatever may be the ultimate result on the manufacturing industry of the community, the first consequence will be an unexampled amount of distress amongst the mechanics themselves."

The masters have to calculate how long the operative can bear the strain of penury and starvation; the operative asks himself how soon the master will yield when he sees his forges dim, his sheds unoccupied, his orders rejected, and his fortunes verging towards bankruptcy and ruin. It is a fearful calculation on either side."

The Kafir war is costing annually the sum of £1,350,000, being four times more than the sum expended during that same period of time, in England, on art, science, and public education; such at least is the calculation of the *Edinburgh Advertiser*.

There has been a rather amusing passage at arms, at Tuam, unhappily notorious at present for the exploits of the Jumpers, betwixt the Rev. Mr. Bourke, Dean of Clonmel, and a Rev. Mr. Foley, an Apostate Priest, who, it seems, had challenged the Rev. gentleman above mentioned, to a public controversy. The reply of the Dean, was a contemptuous and sarcastic refusal of the challenge:—

"In thus refusing you an opportunity to exhibit your fancied dexterity in polemical gladiatorialship, permit me," says the Rev. Mr. Bourke, "to offer you a word of advice. You have gained something in this world by your change of religion; you have got a nice wife, with, it is said, no trifling share of the shiners; these enable you to live more comfortably and luxuriously, than was, I believe, your wont. For these animal enjoyments your structure of body and character of mind seem to fit you much better than for intellectual exercises, which require literary cultivation, and refined and deep erudition. Take counsel from me, therefore, and confine yourself to them. But if, notwithstanding this useful and well meant advice, you are still bent on exhibiting as a polemical gladiator, for the entertainment of fools and fanatics, you must search out and find a more befitting antagonist."

The *Tablet* gives a translation of those parts of the decrees of the Synod of Thurles which relate to the Godless Colleges.

The *Tablet* gives a list of the number of conversions during the past year, from which it appears that 34 clergymen—including amongst the number the names of Manning, Wilberforce, and the most eminent scholars and divines of the Anglican Establishment—and 37 laity have been received into the bosom of our holy mother, during the year 1851. Deo Gratias.

We copy the following, as containing the latest details of the result of the Presidential election:—

Yes	7,439,216
No	677,557
Total number of votes	8,116,773

PROTESTANT HISTORY.

In our last we pointed out the errors in quoting from Catholic divines, into which an *Irishman* had been betrayed by trusting too implicitly to the good faith, and honesty of Protestant controversial writers; to-day we intend to examine his logic, his history, and his chronology, and will show, that whilst in many instances his statements of facts, or his premises, are false, so also, that the inferences he would thence fain deduce are—even if the premises were true—unsound.

We have already shown that Bellarmine, a zealous supporter of, and a writer who yields to none in respect for, the Chair of Peter, asserts infallibility of such Papal decisions, *only*, as are propounded to the *Universal Church*, "*que tota Ecclesia prescribitur*;" we do not consider that we are called upon to be more *Ultra-Montane* than Bellarmine, and, therefore, with Bellarmine admit, that in other cases, it is not absurd to say the Pope may err. Now, the thesis of *Irishman*, if indeed he have a thesis, is, that the Pope, *loquens ex Cathedra*, addressing the *Universal Church*, and deciding upon questions of faith and morals, is not infallible; he argues that Popes may err, under the circumstances above specified—Firstly, because some Popes have been bad men, and have led wicked and immoral lives;—Secondly, because some Prelates of the Catholic Church—men eminent for their sanctity, have, at different epochs in the Church's history, separated themselves from the Pope;—Thirdly, because Popes have erred in their decisions, upon questions of faith and morals, by them propounded to the *Universal Church*. Now, we frankly admit that, if *Irishman* could prove from history, that Popes have erred—speaking *ex Cathedra*—we should be obliged to admit the logical sequence—that Popes are not infallible,

but may err again, for *ab actu ad posse, valet consequutio*; but there is much virtue in this, if many have tried to prove that Popes have erred when addressing the *Universal Church ex Cathedra*; all have failed—and, as we shall have occasion to show, *Irishman* has no reason to flatter himself that he has been successful where so many have been baffled; we will examine his instances in detail presently.

But, though the conclusion of Papal fallibility would inevitably flow from the premise, that Popes have erred, it by no means follows as a logical sequence, that, because Popes have sinned, or because Bishops have separated themselves from the See of Peter, the Pope is not infallible, when addressing the *Universal Church*, and deciding upon questions of faith and morals; because, in the first place, infallibility does not mean Impeccability, as *Irishman* may satisfy himself by consulting the Dictionary—and because, in the second place, the fact that Bishops have separated themselves from the Pope may just as well be quoted, to prove the fallibility of individual Bishops, when separated from the centre of unity—from the See of Peter—*supra quam fundata est Ecclesia*, as to prove the fallibility of the Popes, from whom the said Bishops separated; the fact of the separation proves, that one, but is of no use in enabling us to determine which, was in the wrong.

Infallibility does not mean Impeccability, we say again; neither does it always follow, that, because a man does what is wrong, he does not know what is right. To see the better course, and still the worse pursue, is an every day occurrence, and proves, rather, the corruption of the will, than the weakness of the intellect; when we hear of a murder, or some other atrocious crime, we do not conclude that the perpetrator was ignorant of the laws of God, or the precepts of morality, but that knowing them, he *willed* to disobey them. The same principle applies to the conduct of the Pope; if he sin, it does not thence follow that he can not, unerringly, distinguish betwixt right and wrong. Thus, as Catholics, we do not argue that it is right to do all that the Pope does, or that Popes have done, but, that whatever the Pope—"*loquens ex Cathedra*" says, that we are to observe and do. Well does our Lord Himself draw this distinction—St. Matthew, xxiii., 2, 3.—"*The Scribes and the Pharisees have sitten on the chair of Moses. All, therefore, whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do; but according to their works do ye not.*" With St. Augustine, therefore, would we address *Irishman*—"Why dost thou call the Apostolic Chair the chair of pestilence? If for the men that sit therein, I ask, did our Lord Jesus Christ on account of the Pharisees, reflect upon the chair wherein they sat? Did He not commend the Chair of Moses, and, preserving the honor of the Chair, reprove them. . . . These points, if you did well consider, you would not, for the men whom you defame, blaspheme the See Apostolic, wherewith you do not hold communion."

That there have been bad Popes we admit, although both the number and the vices of the bad Popes have been grossly exaggerated by Protestant writers, who, in their anxiety to "blaspheme the See Apostolic," have generally neglected to give the causes why it happened, that during the middle ages, the Chair of Peter was sometimes filled by immoral occupants; they have not taken care to point out, from whence these scandals arose; for, long before the days of Luther—ever since the Devil seduced Eve—ever since Lucifer fell from his high estate—the spirit of Protestantism—that is of the rebellion of the temporal against the spiritual—of earth against heaven—of the creature against the Creator—has been active, developing itself now under one form, now under another. The same spirit which manifests itself at the present day, under the forms of Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, and Mormonism, manifested itself in the fourth and fifth centuries, under the form of Manicheism, and in the tenth and eleventh centuries, in the contests for supremacy betwixt the Popes and the Emperors. To the brutal interference of laymen, with things ecclesiastical—of civil rulers, with things spiritual—were the disorders which afflicted the Church in the middle ages, owing; in the same way, at all subsequent periods of her history, whenever the unhallowed hands of the laity have been laid upon the Ark of God, disorders, and corruption of morals, and pollution, have been the consequences. Yes, so long as the Emperors, or so long as king, or parliament, or civil rulers, have the slightest influence over the nomination of Bishops, or Popes, so long will they do, their best to fill the Sees, and the Apostolic Chair, with their vile creatures, and, as the Devil is strong, they may sometimes succeed in thrusting bad men into holy places; but as God is stronger than the Devil, even these bad men—wicked Bishops, and immoral Popes—will never be allowed to wound the faith of the Church. Bad as some of the Popes were (and, considering how great, before God sent the blessed Hildebrand, was the influence that the Emperors exercised upon their election, it is wonderful that they were not worse), there is not an instance on record of one of these bad Popes propounding false doctrine, either in faith or morals, to the *Universal Church*; such, and so great was the care that God had of His own, making even the wrath of man to praise Him. Though the Emperors did their best to procure the election of bad Popes, God always took care that His Church should never have false teachers. We reply therefore to *Irishman*, that, in arguing from Peccability to Fallibility, his logic is bad; that the personal characters of the Popes can, in no wise, affect their doctrines; and that the vices of some few amongst them can no more diminish the respect of Catholics for the Chair of Peter, than can the fact that, amongst His ancestors, according to the flesh, our Lord and Saviour numbered a Manasses, as well as a David, diminish their respect for His Divine person, or their faith in His mission.

Certainly *Irishman's* logic is not good, but his history and chronology are much worse; indeed we strongly suspect him of having studied the *Comic History* published by the Apostate Priest's Protection Society, some extracts from which elicited much rapturous applause from the learned editor of the *Montreal Witness*, and a few remarks, not quite so laudatory, in our own columns. We will give a few specimens, for to expose all the absurdities and anachronisms of *Irishman*, would require a moderate sized book, instead of a newspaper.

We will first, pass in review, the instances adduced by *Irishman*, of Popes having decided erroneously, upon questions of faith and morals, when addressing the *Universal Church*, when, only, it is contended—even by Bellarmine—that the Pope is infallible; admitting, that in these instances, his logic is good—for, if a Pope *loquens ex Cathedra*, has erred, another Pope, under similar circumstances, may err again—we shall show that his premises are false, and that, therefore, his conclusions must fall to the ground. The first instance adduced by *Irishman*, is, of course, the old story of Liberius, who is accused of having "subscribed to the Arian heresy." This statement we meet with a flat denial; Liberius did no such thing. Liberius is accused of having signed the first formula of Sirmium, which is not an Arian confession, although, perhaps, some Semi-Arians might have been found willing to accept of it, as a *via media*; because, without asserting the "*Homousion*," it condemned "*those who say that the Son existed from any creation, or substance, and not from God; or, that there was a time when he did not exist.*" Now, we are not going to discuss the question, whether Liberius did, or did not, sign this formula, because it is a question that has nothing to do, with the subject in dispute—the infallibility of the Pope, *loquens ex cathedra*. Liberius was a prisoner in the hands of Constantius, subjected to the most infamous treatment, and therefore, not only, not a free agent, but morally unqualified from speaking to the *Universal Church, ex cathedra*; had he signed fifty thousand Arian creeds, whilst a captive in the hands of the tyrant, or subscribed to the condemnation of fifty thousand Athanasiiuses, it would be to Catholics, in so far as the infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff is concerned, a matter of perfect indifference. Liberius, if he erred at all—which, we, by no means, admit—did not err, in propounding false doctrine to the *Universal Church*, and nobly redeemed the errors of his captivity, by his firm resistance to the formula of Rimini; which, had he signed, an *Irishman* might, perhaps, have truly cited, as an instance of the fallibility of a Pope; as it is, his song of triumph, is premature.

Of course, if the case of Liberius was cited as the first, that of Honorius, is cited as the second instance of Papal fallibility. "Why did the sixth general council depose Honorius?" asks *Irishman*, with the air of a man who has discovered a mare's nest. We cannot say why the sixth general council deposed Honorius, but we can give a very good reason why it did not—because death had deposed Honorius nearly half a century before the meeting of the sixth general council, Honorius having departed this life, A.D. 638, whilst the council was held A.D. 680.—This reason ought to satisfy, even an *Irishman*, to whom we recommend a little more attention to Chronology, before again writing upon Ecclesiastical History. Honorius never propounded any false doctrine, to the *Universal Church*; he was blamed for writing to Sergius, in ambiguous terms, and for not having taken effectual measures to suppress the Monothelite heresy; but, we defy *Irishman*, to prove, that Honorius, *loquens ex cathedra*, taught false doctrine, or, that he himself, held the opinions of Sergius, with regard to the *One will in Christ*.

Thirdly, *Irishman* cites Pope Vigilius, as having shown himself to be fallible, *loquens ex cathedra*, because he, in a private letter to the Empress Theodora, the lovely, but licentious and heretical wife of Justinian, "anathematized all that said, that there were two natures in Christ." To this, we answer—Firstly: that a letter from a Pope to an Empress, is not a *dictum ex cathedra*—is not a decision addressed to the *Universal Church*. Secondly: that Pope Vigilius never wrote to the Empress, a letter, in which he "anathematized all that said there were two natures in Christ." The letter, to which *Irishman* alludes, was written—if written by Vigilius at all—during the lifetime of Pope Sylvester, and when, consequently, Vigilius was no more Pope, than *Irishman* is a sound authority upon Catholic doctrine. To make this clear, we must, even at the risk of being tedious, enter a little, into the details of the reign of Justinian, and we will take the Protestant view of the conduct of Vigilius, because, not even the Protestant version of the conduct of that Pope, can, in aught, affect the question of Papal infallibility.

Vigilius, the deacon, accompanied Pope Agapetus to Constantinople, and is said to have intrigued with Theodora, and subsequently, with Belisarius, in order to procure his elevation to the Papal See; and to have promised, in return, to restore Anthymius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who had been deposed for heresy. Agapetus was succeeded by Sylvester, during whose lifetime, the intrigues of Vigilius were continued; to the Empress, herself a Eutychian, he promised the condemnation of the decrees of the council of Chalcedon; to Antonina, the haughty, but corrupt wife of Belisarius, he is said to have promised large sums of money; in the meantime, the Roman General was closely besieged in Rome, by the Goths; the Pope Sylvester, was accused of conspiring with the Gothic Monarch, for the surrender of the city—he was dragged before the General; letters, said to be in his hand-writing, were produced; his protestations of innocence, and his demands for a fair hearing, were alike, unheeded—condemned, and carried into exile, Vigilius, through the influence of Belisarius, and the intrigues of Antonina, was proclaimed his

successor, but, did not, on that account, become so really, neither had he, the simoniacal usurper, the slightest claim to the veneration of the faithful, or his decrees to be considered the decrees of the Pope, until the death of Sylvester, which took place, in A.D. 538. "*Facinus omni execratione dignum*," says Baronius, speaking of this transaction; "Antonina served the passions of the Empress; and Theodora lavished her treasures, in the vain hope," says Gibbon, "of obtaining a Pontiff hostile, or indifferent, to the council of Chalcedon."

Vain hope, indeed! for mark the sequel. No sooner had Vigilius, by the death of Sylvester, become really Pope, than the conduct of the man entirely altered. Vigilius, the Pope, frustrated every hope which Vigilius, the Deacon, had held out. If the Deacon had promised to restore Anthymius—the Pope excommunicated him; if the Deacon had promised to reverse the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon—the Pope confirmed them, and condemned the Eutychians; if the Deacon was the favorite of Theodora, and encouraged her in her errors—the Pope was the victim of her fury, the denouncer of her heresy, and the fearless vindicator of the doctrines of the Catholic Church, in spite of the cruel persecutions, and long years of exile, and imprisonment, to which he was subjected in consequence. Such, thanks to the care which God has over His Church, was the difference betwixt the conduct of, Vigilius, the Deacon, and Vigilius, the Pope. It is unnecessary to go into the details of the famous controversy of the "Three Chapters;" what we have stated, we defy *Irishman* to refute, and is sufficient to show how little grounds, the conduct of Vigilius affords, for the argument of our opponent, that the Pope, *loquens ex cathedra*, is fallible, because Popes, so speaking—so addressing the *Universal Church*, have erred. We will now pass on to *Irishman's* third and last argument; we shall find, that he has not been more lucky here, than in his quotations, or in his previous history, chronology and logic.

It remains for us to examine, in the last place, *Irishman's* argument against the infallibility of the Pope, *loquens ex Cathedra*, deduced from the premise that some Bishops, of recognised sanctity, have separated from the See of Rome. Were the facts as stated by *Irishman*, his argument would be naught, for, as we have shown above, it does not follow as a necessary consequence, that because a Bishop separates from the Pope, that the latter is in the wrong. But absurd as is the argument, the facts adduced by *Irishman* are far more ludicrous, and tend to confirm us in the opinion, that the honest man has been studying some *Comic History* of the Lower Empire. "Why," again asks *Irishman*, "did Ignatius of Constantinople, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyprian, Firmilian, and the Bishops of Asia, separate from the Pope on the question of Easter?" We have here certainly a queer jumble of names, from Firmilian in the third, to Ignatius of Constantinople in the ninth, century; but where did *Irishman* discover that any one of these Bishops separated "from the Pope on the question of Easter?" St. Cyprian, supported, as some say, by Firmilian, though the letter of the latter to the former is apocryphal, and is by some attributed to a Donatist, at the end of the fourth century, had a dispute with Pope Stephen, not respecting Easter, for that dispute raged during the Pontificate of Victor, at the end of the second century—but, respecting the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, in which disputes, both Firmilian and St. Cyprian, were undoubtedly in the wrong, but neither separated from the Pope. About the time of observing Easter, we never heard that they differed with the See of Rome at all. What St. Cyprian's sentiments towards the Chair of Peter really were, we may gather from the facts that—in his contests with the presbyter Novatus, and the deacon Felicissimus, and again, when he was accused of apostasy, because, at the breaking out of the Decian persecution, he withdrew, for a while, from the fury of his foes—it was to Rome that he appealed, it was to Rome that he thought it necessary to write, in vindication of his conduct.

The absurdity of making St. Chrysostom, and Ignatius of Constantinople, separatists from the Pope, is still more glaring, for the attachment of both these Prelates to the Holy See, and the good offices of the Popes—Innocent I., and Nicholas I., in their behalf, when banished and persecuted by the Emperors, are matters of history, such as we have been accustomed to read; though, perhaps overlooked in the *Comic History of Irishman*. The Easter question was definitively settled by the Council of Nice, A. D. 325; now St. Chrysostom succeeded Nectarius in the See of Constantinople, A. D. 398; he soon became odious to the court, because of the energy with which he repressed its vices, and declaimed against—not the time of observing Easter, but the manner of spending Good Friday, and Holy Saturday, in the sports of the circus. Banished by the Emperor Arcadius—recalled in a few days by general acclamation—again exiled through the intrigues of Eudoxia—his Chair filled by another—St. Chrysostom, appealed to the Pope, who decided in his favor, though he was unable to overcome the animosity of the Empress. Nor did the exertions of the Pope, in favor of the deposed, and exiled St. Chrysostom, cease with the life of the latter; "it was the firmness of the Roman Pontiffs," says Gibbon, "that disposed the Prelates of the East to restore the honors of his venerated name;" and yet *Irishman* tells us that St. Chrysostom separated from the Pope on the question of Easter; he is a funny chap.

We will examine another of *Irishman's* instances, and then conclude; Ignatius of Constantinople, we are informed, also separated from the Pope on the question of Easter. Let us see. Ignatius, son of the Emperor Michael Rhangabé, succeeded Meletius in 846, but having incurred the enmity of the all-powerful Caesar Bardas, to whom the holy Bishop refused Communion on the Feast of the Epiphany,