

REMITTANCES TO  
ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND AND WALES.

DRAFTS from £1 upwards, payable at sight, free of charge, at the Bank of Ireland, Dublin, and all its branches; Messrs. Henry, Mills & Co., Bankers, Lombard-street, London; the National Bank of Scotland, Glasgow; Messrs. Bowman, Grinnell & Co., Liverpool.

HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,  
St. Sacramento Street.

Montreal, March 1853.

## THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,  
At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

## TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.  
To Country do. . . . \$2 1/2 do.  
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

## THE TRUE WITNESS

AND

## CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 4, 1853.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The one, all absorbing topic of interest continues to be the Eastern question, which, in so far as Turkey is concerned, had been satisfactorily answered by the Sultan's formal declaration of war—a document universally admitted to be most ably and temperately drawn up. Omer Pasha had in consequence, notified the Russian commanders to evacuate the Principalities, on, or before, the 25th ult. In reply, Gortchakoff stated that he had no orders either to commence hostilities or to withdraw from the Principalities: he would therefore neither run, nor fight. And thus matters remain, and will probably remain during the winter; the season for active naval operations in the Black Sea, or a military campaign in the Balkan, having passed away. In the interval, negotiations will still continue.

Hitherto France and Great Britain have cordially agreed to the joint policy required of them by the aggressive designs of Russia in the East: and no doubt, as far as signing Protocols, and drawing up Notes goes, Louis Napoleon will adhere to the course of action he has adopted. But whether he will go so far as to engage France in actual hostilities, or lavish her blood and treasure for the furtherance of what, after all, are chiefly British interests, is a very different question. Already it is rumored that the Emperor of the French will leave Great Britain in the lurch on the Oriental question; and though, there is no foundation for the report, beyond certain ominous expressions in the French press, it is not likely that the nephew of the great Napoleon, will forsake his darling project of consolidating his power, and firmly re-establishing the Napoleonic dynasty, from any feelings of good will towards the "perfidious Albion," or from any desire to secure British naval supremacy in the Mediterranean. If England engages in this war, it is most probable that she will soon find herself without an ally: too happy, if she have not to count both France and Austria amongst the number of her foes.

In England the system of "strikes" is assuming gigantic and threatening proportions. Partial "strikes" of the operatives are responded to by general "strikes" of the mill-owners and manufacturers. The latter, as being able to hold out longer, manage to reduce their refractory workmen to subjection, and thus compel them to accept wages at their pleasure. It is the old feud betwixt labor and capital, in which hitherto the combination has been principally on the side of labor; but masters have found out that they can "strike" as well as men; and that the universal stoppage of their mills is a more decided and efficient measure than the partial "strikes" of their hands. We may expect soon to hear of disturbances in the manufacturing districts, in England, and to hear the old cry raised again "a fair days wages for a fair days work." If it comes to this, Lord help the bloated cotton lords; the operatives have a long outstanding account to settle with them.

In France there are some ugly symptoms, amongst which we may notice the arrest of 200 persons for political offences. Agitation is again reviving in Austrian Italy, so that we may reasonably expect stirring news from the Continent of Europe.

## THE GAVAZZI TRAGEDY.

We have nearly arrived at the close of this melancholy affair, and trust that the ill-feeling which it has engendered may soon die away. The Grand Jury threw out all the Bills laid before them, against Charles Wilson, Esq., and the Officers of the 26th Regiment; they also ignored the Bills presented against all parties charged with the murder of James Walsh, with the exception of those found last week, against Messrs. Heward and Morrison. Mr. Heward, after a trial of two days, has been acquitted; a short report of the proceedings will be found on our fifth page.

No one, we think, after reading the evidence, will doubt of the propriety of the verdict. The question for the Jury to decide was simply one of identity; and whilst, in the evidence of the policemen, who pretended to identify Mr. Heward with the murderer of Walsh, there were discrepancies, and apparent contradictions, most clear and positive testimony was adduced to show that Mr. Heward was not the guilty person. The Jury were therefore bound to bring in a verdict of "Not Guilty."

We sincerely trust that, if any prejudice or ill-will against Mr. Heward still lingers in the minds of any of our fellow-citizens, they will carefully and impartially peruse the report of the trial; this, we think, will suffice to disabuse them. Mr. Heward's friends—and

he has many, amongst Catholics as well as Protestants—must rejoice at his acquittal; not that they ever believed him capable of such a cruel and cowardly act, as was the murder of the unfortunate Jas. Walsh. Had there been a fair fight—man to man, face to face, and blow for blow—we doubt not that Mr. Heward would have been as forward in the *mêlée*, and struck as hard, as another; and small blame to him. But that he would run after an unarmed man, and shoot him in the back, like a dastardly poltroon who dares not look a man in the face, is what no one who knows Mr. Heward could easily bring himself to believe. The policemen were apparently in error; and mistook some dirty, cowardly ruffian—most likely some of Gavazzi's Quebec body-guard—for a gentleman, from whom we may differ widely in politics, and in religion, but who, we are very certain, is incapable of doing a sneaking, cowardly, or dishonorable action.

Would to God that we could congratulate ourselves that, with these trials, the animosities, and heartburnings, to which the sad events of the 9th of June have given rise, were at an end; and that the memory of them might be for ever blotted out. This may seem hard; perhaps, after the sad loss of life that has occurred, may appear impossible; yet still, from the quietness with which this trial of the Court of Queen's Bench has passed off, we are willing to believe that much of the old irritation has subsided; that clearer views of the nature, and origin of the disturbances which we all deplore, now obtain; and that honest men, of all parties, upon a careful review of the circumstances attending them, are ready to make great allowances for angry words, and passionate acts, occurring at a period of great and sudden excitement. There was wrong on both sides.—As Catholics, demanding for ourselves, absolute religious freedom, we cannot but condemn the conduct of those, who, setting at defiance, the earnest remonstrances of their clergy, and the repeated warnings of their fellow-countrymen and co-religionists, tumultuously assembled in front of Zion church; who with their shouts interrupted the proceedings, and when bidden to disperse, forcibly resisted the police; for such conduct we offer no defence. At the same time, as Christians, as men, we can find no language too strong to condemn the brutal and cowardly conduct of the ruffians, who, when no one menaced them, when no danger presented itself, rushed after, and fired upon, fleeing, unresisting, and unarmed men; no honest Protestant will ever attempt to palliate such brutality, or to offer any excuse for the wanton shedding of blood which it occasioned. Seeing then that the wrong was not all on one side, it would be well if both Catholics and Protestants would learn to look more leniently one upon the other. God forbid that we should hold all, or even many of, our Protestant fellow-citizens responsible for the acts of a few drunken ruffians from Zion church; on the other hand, we would beg of them not to attribute the rioting and disorderly conduct of some 30 or 40 misguided, and headstrong, individuals, to the Irish Catholics of Montreal, who, both by their clergy, and personally, did their utmost to prevent any tumultuous assemblage in the vicinity of the lecture-room. It is time that the voice of justice and reason should alone be heard.

## "A PROTESTANT'S APPEAL TO THE DEUTER BIBLE."

We trust that we have by this time established satisfactorily—that, in the "cultus sanctorum" which the Catholic Church enjoins, there is no foundation for the charge of idolatry, or giving to creature that which is due to God alone—that the honor which Catholics render to the Saints is merely relative; and that none but a very ignorant, or dishonest, person would ever dream of accusing the Church of tolerating absolute worship to any creature lower exalted—that to invoke the prayers of the Saints in our behalf is no more derogatory to the sole mediocrity of Christ, than to invoke, for the same purpose, the prayers of our sinful fellow creatures—that the belief in the efficacy of the Intercession of the Saints obtained in the earliest ages of Christianity, long ere it "may be said that the corruption of the Church of Rome had commenced"—that the primitive Christians offered sacrifice upon the tombs of the Martyrs, as altars beneath which their sacred relics reposed, and in the belief that the departed prayed for the living, as the living prayed for the departed—that the making, retaining in our temples for religious purposes, and the veneration, of images, pictures, or symbols, of sacred persons or subjects, is in no wise contrary to the law of God as contained in the writings of the Old, or New Testament—and that Protestantism, which decries these practices, as idolatrous, derogatory to Christ's honor, and as an infraction of the Divine command, is at issue upon all these points, with the Christianity of the IV, as well as of the XIX, century, and therefore is not the "Old Religion." Before dismissing this part of Mr. Jenkins' lectures against Catholicity it remains for us to notice one other objection upon which he strongly insists; and to point out the very singular, or rather, inaccurate, notions which he—the lecturer—entertains of the nature of the crime of idolatry. It is perhaps to the mental confusion which prevails amongst most Protestants as to wherein consists the essence of this crime—a confusion which itself proceeds from the very imperfect notions which they entertain of the nature of God, and of that supreme adoration which is due to Him alone—that this continually repeated charge of idolatry against Catholics must be traced.

The great argument, after all, which our author relies upon, as fatal to the worship and Invocation of Saints, may be summed up in the following question:—

How is it—if the Invocation of Saints was meant to hold so prominent a part in the Christian worship as is given it by the Catholic Church—that we find no traces of this practise in the scriptures of the New Testament? and that Christ when He taught His

disciples to pray, made no allusion to such an important subject? "We are commanded," says Mr. Jenkins, "we are taught to pray &c. but always to God, through Christ"—p. 104; whence he concludes to the impropriety of asking the prayers of the Saints, to help us in our infirmities. Rather an illogical conclusion.

If this argument proves anything, it proves too much, and is as conclusive against the form in which the Church offers all her prayers—"per Christum Dominum nostrum"—as it is against the Invocation of the Saints. For, our Lord Himself, when giving to His disciples a model of prayer, destined to last to all ages, did not teach them to pray to "Our Father" through Him; nor is there, throughout His discourse upon that occasion, the slightest allusion to His merits, or the efficacy of His atoning sacrifice. To offer our prayers therefore to the "Father" through Christ, is just as much an infraction of our Lord's injunctions, as to ask the Saints to pray to God for us, through the same Christ. For it must be borne in mind, that, when we ask the Saints to pray for us, it is still through Christ that we pray; for it is only through Christ that the Saints address God; it is only by His Grace, and through His merits, that they are, what they are.

Besides, the whole of this argument is based upon the hypothesis that, in the fragments of the writings of the Apostles, and their companions, which have drifted down to us on the stream of time, is contained the summary of the whole Christian revelation. If this were the case, then indeed, with a show of reason, might Protestants call upon us to show authority in the Bible, for all our practices; but being a mere idle assertion on their part, without even the shadow of a proof, we are fully entitled to treat it with contempt, as an old woman's superstition, until such time at least as they shall have shown, that in the Bible, is contained the whole of God's revelation to man. Having no reason for believing that that revelation is therein contained, we cannot be called upon to establish any of our doctrines from scripture; our reason for believing them is—not "it is written"—but—"so the Church teaches." The Church, and not a book, was the medium appointed by Christ Himself for promulgating amongst all nations—and perpetuating until the end of time—the knowledge of the doctrines which He came on earth to reveal; it is from the Church therefore, and not from any book, that our knowledge of the contents of Christ's revelation is derived.

With a few remarks upon the very defective notions which our author entertains, of the nature of idolatry, and consequently of that worship which is due to God alone, we will dismiss Mr. Jenkins' lecture on the "One Object of Religious Adoration."

The first error we would point out is, in our author's definition of idol. "Now, literally, an idol is an image, and an image an idol."—p. 116. This is incorrect; an image is not necessarily an idol, nor is an idol an image. For, if every image were an idol, then Christ Himself must be an idol, and His worship, idolatry; because—according to St. Paul, Col. i. 15—the Son "is the image of the invisible God." But Christ is not an idol, though the image of God; therefore, an image is not necessarily an idol. Besides, if every image were necessarily an idol, then would every statue, every painting, every representation of every object, whether animate, or inanimate, be an idol; and every sculptor, engraver, or painter, a transgressor of the divine command; which is absurd. An image may be used for idolatrous purposes—that is, worshipped as God, or as a fictitious representation of God, and so become an idol; but, at the same time, and for the very reason for which it becomes an idol, it ceases to be an image, or true representation of its prototype. For the essential difference betwixt an image and an idol, herein consists—that the former is, in some sense at least, a likeness, or true representation, of something which does really exist—whilst the latter is but a lie, a false representation of what is, or a fancied representation of what is not; hence the words usually employed by the sacred writers to denote an idol—"idol"—from the root *alal*—signifying "vain, worthless;" and *sheker*—false, a lie"—Habak, ii. 18. To represent God under the figure of a calf, or a bull, is to make an idol; but to represent Christ in the figure of a man, or of a child, is not to make an idol, but an image, or true representation.

Equally faulty are our author's definitions of idolatry; according to which the Pantheist holds, in their integrity, all the attributes of God, and the Polytheist does not withhold, from the Divine Being, supreme adoration.

"Idolatry does not, necessarily consist in a denial of the existence"—we suppose Mr. Jenkins means, Being—"of the true God"—p. 90; and he instances the Brahmins, who, although they worship, "almost every form of man, of beast, of bird, of reptile, as God." hold "in their integrity" all the attributes of the Supreme Being, and profess doctrines "concerning the divine nature not very dissimilar from those which are entertained by ourselves." Speak for yourself, and your brother Protestants, Mr. Jenkins; Catholics recognise no affinity betwixt their doctrines concerning the divine nature, and those of the gross Pantheists to whom you allude.

That idolatry does not consist in the denial of a God is true, but it necessarily involves the denial of the true God. The Pantheist differs from the Atheist only in this—that one denies God the Creator—the other denies Him as Creator: one denying Creator or First cause—the other creation, or second causes; and thus both, equally, deny the true God, for true God is Creator. The Pantheist Brahmin therefore, does not "hold in their integrity" all the attributes of the Supreme Being—and, as by ignoring God's creative act—by which He made all things, which, though from Him, and by Him, are not Him—he

virtually denies the first chapter of Genesis—he does not hold "doctrines concerning the Divine nature at all analogous to those which Catholics entertain." The Brahmin is an idolater, because he is a Pantheist; and in fact, so far from Pantheism being compatible with a true faith in the being of God, or the "holding in their integrity" all the attributes of the Supreme Being, it is the source from whence flowed all the idolatrous systems which have degraded humanity in former ages, and from whence proceed most of the philosophical, and religious errors of our own.

Our author next attempts to show—that, as the Pantheist holds all the attributes of the Supreme Being "in their integrity," so the Polytheist does not withhold from Him supreme adoration. "Idolatry does not necessarily consist in withholding from the Divine Being, supreme adoration. That such an adoration of the true God is compatible with the commission of the sin of idolatry may be gathered from the history of the children of Israel"—p. 91. And in support of this, we are referred to the seventeenth chapter of the fourth of Kings, where we read that "every nation made gods of their own," and "nevertheless they worshipped the Lord"—v. 29, 32.

In the first place, with all due deference to Mr. Jenkins' knowledge of Scripture, which, as he sets himself up for a master in Israel, should be correct, the people here spoken of were not, as he says—"the children of Israel"—but the strange people, whom the King of Assyria brought from Babylon, from Cutha, Avah, Emath, and Sepharvaim, and placed in the cities of Samaria, "instead of the children of Israel"—v. 24. Mr. Jenkins would do well to read his Bible a little more attentively ere he sets himself up to expound it; such mistakes as these, whilst they make us smile at his ignorance, excite our wonder at his presumption.

In the second place, the people spoken of in the text were Polytheists; and therefore, as giving to the strange gods whom they served, as well as to the Lord God of Israel, divine worship—they did withhold from the Divine Being that which was His due. They worshipped Jehovah it is true; but still only as a local God—the God of Samaria, by whom they trusted to be delivered from the plague of the fleas; just as they served their false deities with supreme worship in the hopes of receiving other favors from them. That this was so, is clear from the context—where we read—"That the men of Babylon made Soothsayers"—hooths in which the women prostituted themselves in honor of their gods—that others "made Nergel"—an idol of the Oubites, supposed by some to be the same as Anerges, or the planet Mars—that others "made Nebalaz and Timothae"—the one a dog-headed idol, the other the Lord of Darkness—and that the men of Sepharvaim burnt their children in fire, to Adramelech and Ananias, the gods of Sepharvaim—v. 30, 31. In every one of these acts, there was a withholding from the Lord God of Israel that supreme adoration which is His due—because, by them, supreme adoration was given to other and false gods. If Mr. Jenkins fails to perceive this, it is because his notions as to what constitutes divine worship, or supreme adoration, are confused, as his quotations from Scripture are inaccurate.

In opposition to Mr. Jenkins' definitions, we assert that all idolatry—whether it be the idolatry of the Pantheist, or of the Polytheist—necessarily involves the denial of the true God, as the One, Absolute, Infinite, and Necessary, Being, the Creator and Sustainer of all things. Where there is the true knowledge of God as Creator—where His Supreme attributes are "held in their integrity"—there it is impossible for idolatry, or the slightest tendency towards idolatry, to exist: for all idolatry necessarily presupposes, and proceeds from, the want of faith in the true God. Men who possess this faith can never lapse into idolatry, no matter by what external acts, or with what warmth of expression, they may show their reverence for God's creatures. So long as they recognise them as merely creature, they can never give to them that which is due to Creator; and the honor which they exhibit towards them can never even approximate towards Divine, honor, or worship. Worship is essentially an internal act; and though it ever strives to express itself by the external, the latter does not of itself constitute worship. The creature who kneels, or bows his head, before his earthly sovereign—the child who, on his knees, reverently asks a father's blessing—is not, therefore, an idolater, though honoring creature with the same outward marks of respect as those with which he accompanies the Divine worship which he renders to the Lord his God. For it is ever the internal act, that determines the value of the external: it is the inward intention, and not the angle formed by the dorsal column with the horizon,\* that is the measure of devotion, and distinguishes the honor which, for the sake of Creator, creature renders to creature, from that which creature renders to Creator, for His own sake. Would Protestants but bear this simple truth in mind, they would not be so prone to tax their fellow creatures with idolatry.

And here we must conclude our notice of Mr. Jenkins' attempt to fasten the charge of idolatry upon Papists. If we have treated the subject somewhat at length, our excuse is, that there are many well meaning, but ill-informed, Protestants who—

from the warm expressions sometimes, but always in a restricted sense, employed by Catholic writers, and from the ceremonies, and outward acts, by which the

\* Protestants generally argue as if the difference betwixt absolute, and relative worship, was only a greater, or slighter, inclination of the head. Thus with them—taking an angle of 90 degrees with the horizon, as the normal, or no-religious-reverence at all condition of the human body—an acute angle of the body with the horizon, but of more than 45 degrees is the worship of *dulia*—of 45 degrees, *hyperdulia*—and of less than 45 degrees, the worship of *latria*, or Divine worship. In other words, with Protestants, devotion varies inversely as the angle formed at the point of junction of the humeral vertebrae, with the os sacrum.