

The True Witness

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 210, St. James Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:
To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars. If the
Subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the
year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms
shall be Two Dollars and a half.
The True Witness can be had at the News Depots.
Single copies, 5 cts.
To all Subscribers whose papers are delivered by
carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if
not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we con-
tinue sending the paper, the Subscription shall be
Three Dollars.
The figures after each Subscriber's Address
every week shows the date to which he has paid up.
Thus "John Jones, Aug. '71," shows that he has paid
up to August '71, and owes his Subscription from
that date.
S. M. PATTENGILL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo.
BOWELL & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized
Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1872.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.
OCTOBER—1872.
Friday, 25—SS. Chrysostom and Daria, MM.
Saturday, 26—Vigil of SS. Simon and Jude.
Sunday, 27—Twenty-third after Pentecost.
Monday, 28—SS. Simon and Jude, Aps.
Tuesday, 29—Of the Feria.
Wednesday, 30—Of the Feria.
Thursday, 31—Fast. Vigil of All Saints.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

There has again been a sort of Bonapartist
scare in France; and that the government of
M. Thiers thinks there is something in it ap-
pears probable from its action towards Prince
Napoleon, our old acquaintance Plon-Plon, who
has been warned away from French territory.
We should have fancied that France must have
had enough of the Bonapartes, and that the
name of the man of Sedan must stink in their
nostrils. The gallant Plon-Plon protests
against the treatment he has received and is
about to institute legal proceedings to test its
legality.

The insurrection in Spain is said to have
been suppressed; but in Spain, insurrections
whether Carlist or Republican, are as tenacious
of life as cats are popularly held to be. Put
down, crushed, and utterly killed one day, they
start into existence again the next, with as
much vitality as ever.

Affairs remain unchanged in Italy and in the
Pontifical States. Religious liberty is now
fully established, in so far as religious liberty
means the right to commit with impunity mur-
derous assaults on Catholic priests, especially
on Jesuits. P. Curci, a Jesuit, for instance
being expected to visit Pisa, a large body of
Italian Liberals who have "found the Lord"
lay in wait for him, but mistaking another
priest, a Franciscan, for him, they beat the
latter almost to death. Hereupon great exulta-
tion in the liberal camp—"We cannot help,"
says one of their organs, the *Gazzetta del Po-
polo*—"we cannot help congratulating the peo-
ple of Pisa on the attitude they have assumed
towards the Jesuit Curci. It is not to be won-
dered at, if exasperated at the sight of a viper
they stoned it. It is all very well saying that
we are sorry that a Franciscan was beaten and
nearly killed, instead of a Jesuit—we are not.
We are pleased at the energy of the sturdy
Pisans." Who now can doubt of the firm es-
tablishment of Liberal principles in Italy, and
of the progress that the Reformation is making
in that regenerated land. Why—a lot of drunken
Orangemen in the North of Ireland could not
have acted better, or more consistently with
their principles.

The Anglican bishops who assisted at the
meeting of the "Old Catholics" the other day
must have found themselves in rather a tight
place. There they were in all the Apostolic
authority an Act of Parliament can confer;
and yet not one of the "Old Catholic" party
so much as dreamed of applying to these Angli-
can bishops for the perpetuation amongst them of
valid Orders—which was one of the chief
points under consideration. This shows in
what esteem Anglican Orders, and Parliamen-
tary successors to the Apostles, are held even by
the "Old Catholics."

Small-pox has again broken out in Boston
and is raging rather severely. The extreme
modesty, we suppose, of that exemplary man
Tweed, of New York notoriety, has induced him
to withdraw himself altogether from society;
he is too bashful to face the public, and his
numerous friends, many of them connected with
the police, are searching for him in vain. The
chances of Mr. Greely for the Presidency
since the last elections have become beautifully
small; whether he will now retire from the
hopeless contest, or fight it out to the end is
not known. A great demand for Maryland
coal has sprung up in England, and large orders
have been sent over to this side of the Atlan-
tic. It is now pretended that the Emperor of
Germany will, in the matter of the San Juan
boundary question on which he is arbitrator,
as betwixt Great Britain and the U. States,

give award in favor of the former. No reli-
ance however, can as yet be placed on these
rumors.

Our old acquaintance, "Catholic" makes
his appearance again in the columns of the
Witness of the 15th inst. He does not deny
the charge of having given—second hand, we
have no doubt—a garbled quotation from St.
John Chrysostom's 33rd Homily on Acts xv.;
but he complains that the TRUE WITNESS has
not taken up the question that appeared in his
—*Catholic's*—last communication "Who pre-
sided and gave the decision at the Council of
Jerusalem?"

As we were not present at the said Council,
we have no personal knowledge of the facts.
We gather these facts as best we may from
history; and here are some of our gleanings
which seem to bear directly upon the question
propounded by *Catholic*, and for which we are
indebted to a historian whose competency,
moral and intellectual, we think that the writer
in the *Witness* will not contest:—

"Our Lord conferred upon His Apostle Peter, the
supreme authority in the Church.
Hence in the enumeration of the Apostles frequent-
ly repeated by the Evangelists, we find that Peter
is always the first named—he is sometimes named
alone, when the others are mentioned in general.
After the ascension of Our Lord it is he who directs
and governs; he leads the assembly in which a
successor to the apostle who had prevaricated is
chosen; after the descent of the Holy Ghost, he
performs the first miracle, and in the name of his
brethren addresses the synedrium; he punishes the
crime of Ananias; he opens the gates of the Church
to the Gentiles, and presides at the first Council at
Jerusalem."

The above given passage is from *A History
of the Church* by a certain Dr. J. J. Dollinger,
Professor of Theology in the University of
Munich, of whom perhaps *Catholic* may have
heard. We copy from the edition published in
1840 by C. Dolman, Bond Street, London, of
a translation by the Rev. Edward Cox of Dr.
Dollinger's History; and the passage occurs,
vol. i., c. 3, sect. iv., pp. 253-4.

Dr. Dollinger—and it is to him that for an
end of the matter, we refer *Catholic*—expressly
tells us that St. Peter presided at the Council
of Jerusalem.—Q. E. D.

The question, "who gave the decision at the
Council of Jerusalem?" is in like manner an-
swered by St. John Chrysostom in his 33
Homily on Acts xv. "Sec," he says, "zai-
ora,—that which it behoved to determine by
law—oper ekryn nomothethymai—that Peter
brought forward—o Petros eisagege." In short,
it was Peter who, when there had been much
disputing, rose up, and laid down the law or
principle, that the Mosaic ceremonial law was
not obligatory upon converts to Christianity,
from amongst the Gentiles—which principle
was subsequently embodied in the letter drawn
up in the name of the Church. After this pre-
nunciation by Peter all disputing was at end.

We trust that *Catholic* will find our answer,
or rather the answer of Dr. Dollinger, satis-
factory. The Homily 33 is far too long to
print in extenso. We have no Greek type, and
it would fill up some eight columns.

In reply to certain queries addressed to us,
we remark that the Catholic Church, speaking
through the Pope, or General Council has
never, in any manner repudiated, and we may
be sure never will "repudiate, or disown the St.
Bartholomew massacre;" for the simple reason
that the Church, that the Pope, having had no
share therein, is no more called upon to repu-
diate, disown or denounce it, than is the
Church of England, than is the present Pro-
testant Archbishop of Canterbury, called upon
to repudiate either the Massacre of Glencoe,
perpetrated by express orders of the supreme
head upon earth of the Anglican Church by
law established; or the still more brutal mas-
sacre of numbers of Catholic men and women
by the means of the infamous conspiracy of
which the last of the Protestant martyrs in
England, Titus Oates, was the mere tool.

On the other hand it is equally true that
Catholic historians, both lay or cleric, when
treating of the subject have often spoken of it
as a brutal and bloody act. There is much
obscurity, even at the present day, as to the
causes that provoked it. That the Huguenots
were meditating a massacre of the Royal Fam-
ily, and of the Catholics generally, as asserted
by the French Court in its representation of
the affair to Foreign Courts and to Rome; that
the attack upon the Huguenots was undertaken
merely in self-defence by the King, but was
carried far beyond his original intentions, may
be true, is very probable from the antecedents
of the Huguenots, but has not as yet been
"proven;" but at all events this we may say,
that it was a hideous crime, and a still more
hideous blunder. As a blunder, it entailed 26
years of civil war upon France, as Sully in his
Memoirs tells us; and as a crime it has, we
say—in spite of the lies of the London *Times*
copied of course by the evangelical press of this
Continent—been strongly denounced by Catho-
lic historians, both lay and cleric, both French
English.

We need not insist upon this in the case of
the last named, for the works of Drs. England,
and Lingard are accessible, and well known to

all. More to our point are the expressions of
opinion of French clerical historians; and from
amongst these we may quote the P. Daniel, a
Jesuit, whose voluminous *History of France*,
composed nearly two hundred years ago, has
always been looked upon as a standard work.
Of course as a Jesuit, the P. Daniel speaks, not
with the voice of a Gallican, but with that of
an ultra-montane. Now this Jesuit historian
not only speaks of the massacre as a butchery,
une boucherie, but as a crime which, when the
true facts became known, and were coolly ex-
amined, was hated and detested by the whole
world. Here are his words:—

"Enfin quelques jours apres, de nouveaux couriers
furent depêches dans toutes les Provinces, pour
mettre fin a cette boucherie, laquelle, lorsqu'on la
considera depuis de sang froid fut blâmee et detestee
de tout le monde."—*Hist. de France*, par le P. G.
Daniel, S.J., Tom. viii., p. 739.

We quote the P. Daniel, not only because he
shows in what light the St. Bartholomew massacre
has generally been regarded by the extreme ultra-
montanists in the Church; but because his
work was composed for the use of the heir ap-
parent to the French throne, and was dedicated
by its author to Louis XIV. It will thus be
seen that neither French monarchist, nor ultra-
Papist, deems it necessary to defend the hideous
political crime in which a French King was the
agent, if he were not the author of it. We say
political crime designedly, for as such, and not
as a crime committed in the name, or supposed
interests of any creed or religion it is looked
upon by all competent and disinterested judges.
Thus the elder D'Israeli in his *Curiosities of
Literature* commences an essay entitled "*Apo-
logy for the Parisian Massacre*," with these
words:—

"An original document now lying before me, the
autograph letter of Charles the Ninth, will prove
that that unparalleled massacre, called by the world
religions, was, in the French Cabinet, considered
merely as *political*."

So on the medals struck by Charles IX. in
commemoration of the event, and to celebrate
his deliverance from the great danger which he
had escaped—or perhaps feigned that he had
escaped—we read of his triumph, not over
heretics and the enemies of the Church, but
over *rebels* and the enemies of his crown. On
this medal we find the legend, *Virtus in Re-
bellis*; and it was as an act of severe justice
against rebels, conspiring against the King's
life, that the massacre was diplomatically re-
presented to the different Courts of Europe—
to Elizabeth as well as to the Sovereign Pontiff.
The latter believing the statement of facts offi-
cially submitted to him to be true—and it has
not yet been proven that it was not in a
great measure true—congratulated an ally, and
head of a friendly Power, on his escape from a
plot against his life, and his triumph over re-
bels; and thanked God publicly for what he,
the Pope, believed to be the happy deliverance
of the French King and Kingdom from destruc-
tion by a band of conspirators, who it is
now well known, had long meditated the mur-
der of the one, and the dismemberment of the
other. What has religion to do with this? Even
if the Sovereign Pontiff were by means
of lying diplomatic representations deceived as
to facts, what has that to do with the question
of Papal infallibility as defined by the Council
of the Vatican?

WHO IS A CHRISTIAN?—DRAWING THE
LINE.—This is a task that bothers our Pro-
testant brethren. The recently held French
Protestant Synod tried it and failed: the Free
Church of Scotland has fared no better. We
should explain that the line attempted to be
drawn, was a line that should sharply divide
Christian Protestants, from non-Christians. No
easy problem to solve indeed, the reader will
admit; and yet, as the barber who declined
shaving any one below the rank of a baker,
observed to the coal heaver, "we must draw
the line somewhere."

The French Protestant Synod so drew its
line as to include all who believed the truths of
the Gospel, prudently leaving those truths
undetermined; so that in fact its line is no
line at all. The Presbyterian sect, styled the
"Free Church of Scotland," has drawn a
sharper line, but then it is one that excludes
many of the most illustrious worthies of Pro-
testantism: men like Milton, for instance.
The circumstances of the case we find recorded
in the *Witness* of a late date.

The Rev. Mr. Knight is a Protestant
minister of Dundee, in Scotland. He, it appears,
gave great offence to his brethren by preaching,
in the Unitarian chapel in London, of which
the celebrated Protestant divine—the Rev. Mr.
Martineau—is the regular minister. Here-
upon the Rev. Mr. Knight was taken to task
by his Presbytery, who voted that his conduct
was highly censurable; that by preaching from
a Unitarian pulpit he had acknowledged
Unitarians to be a branch of the Christian
Church: that if left to pass uncensured, such
conduct would tend to obliterate all distinction
betwixt Calvinistic saints and Unitarian sin-
ners; and that he, Mr. Knight, should be called
upon to "repudiate the Unitarian body as
forming no part of the Christian Church." Mr.
Knight refused to comply with the re-
quisition.

This case is amusing as the exact counter-
part of a case which the other day occurred in
Scotland, and greatly exercised the High
Church Anglicans. One of the dignitaries of
that sect, it seems, presumed to officiate in a
Presbyterian pulpit, just as Mr. Knight, a
Presbyterian minister, presumed to preach in
a Unitarian chapel. "Sacrilège!" cried out
the Anglicans; "the Presbyterians having no
bishops as we have, have no Orders, and there-
fore no Sacraments, or means of grace; they
are therefore without the pale of the Church
Catholic, and are abandoned to the un-
covenanted mercies of God; with such men it
is sacrilege for one of us to hold spiritual com-
munion; they are not members of the Christ-
ian Church."

So too the Presbyterians, when their turn
comes round, following the lead of their brother
sectaries, the Anglicans, rail as bitterly against
one of their ministers for preaching in a Uni-
tarian chapel, as did the Episcopalians against
one of their bishops for having officiated in a
Presbyterian place of worship. The Catholic
looks laughing on, and marvels why such dif-
ference should be, 'twixt Tweedle-Dum and
Tweedle-Dee."

The best of the joke is, that the line as drawn
by the Presbyterian synod, beyond which no man
is to be reckoned a Christian, excludes Eng-
land's great poet, Milton, from the community
of Christians. Milton was a Unitarian, and his
peculiar Christology crops out in every line
almost of his immortal epic. With Milton,
Christ was not God, but only "one greater
man," who, as is shown in the *Paradise Re-
gained*, "restored us" after a fashion very dif-
ferent from that put forth in the plan of salva-
tion by the Westminster Confession of Faith.
Milton then was a Unitarian, and therefore
according to the finding of the Scotch Presby-
tery above alluded to, no Christian. So also
with many others; indeed of Protestants, the
most illustrious for their attainments have, for
the most part, been Unitarians. More than
doubts have been entertained of the orthodoxy
of Locke, of Sir Isaac Newton, and indeed of
William the Deliverer.

The line therefore as drawn by the Scotch
Presbyterian sect, is no line at all, and will
may be sure not be generally accepted by Pro-
testants; it is too exclusive. The French Pro-
testant line included anybody and everybody;
for everybody professes to believe the truths of
the Gospel, and to reject only what he in his
private judgment deems to be its untruths or
errors. Thus the French line takes in every
body.

Meantime we leave it to our Protestant
friends to give, if they can, a definition of the
word Christian, which shall include men like
Milton the great epic poet of Protestant Eng-
land, and shall exclude the Unitarians.

THE PROTESTANT BISHOP OF LINCOLN AND
THE DOLLINGERITES.—The London *Times*
criticizes rather severely the letter wherein the
above named official of the government church in
England, announced his acceptance of the
invitation of the Dollingerites, to assist at the
gathering at Cologne of the last named sectaries.
In what character will Dr. Wordsworth—the
Protestant official in question—appear at the
meeting? This is the problem which it ex-
ercises all the ingenuity of the *Times* to solve.

As an Anglican, Dr. Wordsworth is pledged
to the 39 Articles, and all doctrines of the
Anglican church enacted by Parliament. As
professing to hold all doctrines of the Roman
Catholic Church, with the exception of the de-
crees of the Council of the Vatican; as accept-
ing the entire confession of faith spoken of by
Protestants, as the "Creed of Pius IV."—the
Dollingerites cannot accept the Parliamentary
39 Articles of the Anglican sect, or look upon
those who adhere to them, in any other light
than that of heretics.

Here then is the difficulty. Will Dr.
Wordsworth throw overboard his 39 Articles?
Or will the Dollingerites renounce their profes-
sion of adherence to the several articles of faith
set forth in the Bull of Pius IV? And if
neither the Anglican bishop nor the Dollinger-
ites will consent to make the sacrifice—the one
of the 39 Articles—the others of the Romish
Confession of Faith—how can there be any
spiritual communion betwixt them?

At first sight there seems, here to be a dead
lock; but in practise the difficulty will be
solved in this manner. Separated from the
Catholic Church, the Dollingerites will abandon,
one by one, all the doctrines on the retention of
which they now pride themselves, as distin-
guishing them from ordinary Protestants.
Having already discarded one vital article of
the Roman Catholic Faith, to which faith they
still absurdly profess to cling—the article for
instance wherein they pledge themselves to
yield true obedience to the Roman Pontiff as
successor of the Prince of the Apostles—they
very soon get rid of all the other distinctive
doctrines of the Catholic Church; and so assume
their legitimate place as one of the many sects
of Protestantism to which they naturally be-
long, and to which the Church of England as
by Law Established belongs also.

Of an alliance, or union betwixt Anglicans as
they are, and Dollingerites as they profess to
be, the *Times* scours the idea as impossible.
It recalls the ridiculous and abortive attempt
made in the beginning of the last century, to
bring about a union betwixt the Anglicans, and
the extreme Gallicans in the days of the Re-
gency, and of whom the notorious Du Pin put
himself forward as the mouth-piece. The
negotiations ended in naught. On the Angli-
can side they were conducted by the Protestant
Archbishop of Canterbury, a Dr. Wake, who
submitted to Du Pin the 39 articles, as a proof
of Anglican orthodoxy. These articles Du
Pin treated, extreme Gallican though he was,
and far less of a Papist at heart than are even
the Dollingerites of the present day, with the
utmost scorn. "If we could suppose"—says
the *Times*—"the Vatican Council addressing
itself to the same task it could hardly have
dealt more stiffly with them, or applied the
scissors more freely." The whole affair ended
in smoke, and brought nothing but ridicule
well earned, on its projectors. "The concep-
tion of this scheme of union," says the *Times*
—"was ridiculous and hardly decorous." It
was attempted to renew the negotiations some
years later by a bad French priest of the name
of Courruyer, who was however promptly dis-
countenanced and condemned by his superiors;
whereupon he escaped to London where he was
made a lion of, like Mr. Loyson for instance in
these our own days—receiving from Oxford the
honor of Doctor of Divinity, and from Caroline,
wife of George II., a more substantial recogni-
tion of his services, in the shape of a pension. But
in spite of the spasmodic efforts to make a sen-
sation out of the matter to the credit of so-called
Anglo-Catholicity, the man and his project of
union sank into oblivion in a short time, and
left no trace behind. So will it be with this
Anglo-Dollingerite movement. "We will
frankly say"—concludes the *Times*, discussing
the abortive Wake-Du Pin negotiations—"that
we expect just so much, but no larger or differ-
ent results from the present enterprise."

In short, the coming together of Anglicans
and Dollingerites at Cologne, is valuable only
as illustrative of the old proverb about "*Birds
of a Feather*;" and as therefore enabling us to
determine how to class the Dollingerites, and
to dispose of their absurd claim to the title of
"*Old Catholics*." They profess to be in faith
to-day, what they were before the Council of
Vatican. "We are," they boast, "what we
were yesterday; it is you, you who accept the
Council of Vatican, who have changed." But
this vaunt is disposed of by the fact that they
invited the Anglican ministers to take part in
the proceedings of the Cologne meeting; hold-
ing out to them, as the cant phrase goes, the
right hand of fellowship, and thus acknowledg-
ing the spiritual kinship betwixt themselves
and men whom two years ago they looked upon
as heretics, and whose Orders they repudiated
and still repudiate with contempt. Here then
is an evident change of position, and a convinc-
ing proof that betwixt the Dollingerites of
1872, and the real "*Old Catholics*" of 1870,
there is a radical and irreconcilable difference.

MAUDLIN PHILANTHROPY.—As an instance
of the maudlin tenderness for rascals that ob-
tains in England, we read of an agitation for
the abolition of flogging at Newgate, as a pun-
ishment for crime; and we are informed that
many letters have appeared in the public jour-
nals urging the discontinuance of the "bar-
barous practice." It strikes us that the crime
for which the lash is inflicted, is the "barbarous
practice;" and that it will be quite time enough
to abolish the floggings, when the garrottings,
when the maiming for life, when beastly as-
saults upon females, and other brutalities for
which the punishment is inflicted, shall have been
abolished. It may be bad taste, but we con-
fess that our sympathies are rather with the
victims of the criminal's brutality, with the
poor woman whose eyes he has punched out,
whose skull he has crushed, whose whole future
earthly existence he has rendered miserable,
than with the howling beast receiving a very
appropriate retribution at the whipping post.
For the prevention of crime by making an ex-
ample of the criminal, as a repressive agent in
short, the lash is the very best instrument that
has yet been discovered. There is nothing of
which the "*roughs*" stand so much in dread;
and its disuse will we may be sure be followed by
an outbreak of brutality on their part. Why
then should it be abolished? If it be abolished,
then must orderly citizens take to carrying dead-
ly weapons in self-defence, and the use of bow-
knives, six-shooters, and other arms easily con-
cealed about the person, will become as common
in England as in the U. States.

From many a den of infamy the fervent
prayers of many a Bill Sykes are no doubt at
this moment being wafted heavenwards that
the agitation of the maudlin philanthropists
may have a happy issue. Alas for the women,
the weak and defenceless, should Bill Sykes'
petitions prevail.

A convict prisoner who lately heroically jumped
into the lake at the prison and saved the life of a
drowning guard, has been released from the Kingston
penitentiary on a free pardon.