

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 continue 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. PETERSON & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. Rowell & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1873.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

OCTOBER—1873.

Friday, 3—St. Wenceslaus, M.
Saturday, 4—St. Francis of Assisi, C.
Sunday, 5—Eighteenth after Pentecost.
Monday, 6—St. Bruno, C.
Tuesday, 7—St. Mark, C.
Wednesday, 8—St. Bridget, W.
Thursday, 9—SS. Dionysius and Comp., MM.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The restoration of Monarchy in France at no distant date is now confidently predicted, and we hope—we cannot say more at present—we sincerely hope that the prophecy may be fulfilled. There are many and grave difficulties in the way of it no doubt. In the Cities and centres of manufacturing industry the party of the Revolution is strong; but, as on all hands it is now generally admitted that France must be either Royalist or Communist, the party of order comprising all those who hold property are stronger, though certainly not so active or so well organized as are their opponents.

Victor Emmanuel has been on a visit to the Emperor of Germany. The result of their interview is not of course officially known; but there is a moral certainty that an alliance anti-Catholic, and against Royalist France, has been agreed upon betwixt the two persecutors of the Church.

The reports from Spain are most contradictory. One moment we are told that the Carlists are demoralised, and crushed; the next, we read of their victories over their enemies. There is betwixt the Madrid revolutionary Government of Spain, and the British, a very pretty little quarrel as to the giving up to the former of the Spanish iron-clad frigates now in British custody at Gibraltar. It is not likely that there will be any fighting, but we look forward to some very tall talking on both sides. By latest telegrams it seems that the frigates in question have been given up to the Spanish revolutionary government in Madrid. There are so many Spanish Governments at the present moment, that it is necessary to particularise: for besides the legitimate Government of Charles VII., and the Madrid revolutionary Government, there are other revolutionary Governments equally respectable, of which one has been bombarding Alicante. In fact in Spain all is confusion. No change has taken place in the affairs of Italy.

The financial panic in New York is subsiding. The Royal Commission at Ottawa still continues its labors; but public interest in these has much abated, since it is felt that by the evidence of Sir J. A. Macdonald and Sir Hugh Allan all the main facts of the case have been brought out.

The Witness returns to the charge about Pope Honorius, under the caption "More About Infallibility." This caption is bad; there is nothing "More" on that subject advanced therein; we have but the old story, by this time worn threadbare, given over again; to which, in the nature of things, it is impossible for us or for any man to give anything but the old worn answer. We have not the presumption to suppose that we can bring forward either new facts, or new arguments.

The argument of the Witness is this:—

That Pope Honorius erred; therefore he was not infallible, in the sense in which the Council of the Vatican has defined all Popes to be infallible; and that therefore the Council of the Vatican has also erred.

To test the strength of this argument it is necessary to determine the fact whether Pope Honorius erred in the sense and under the conditions, in and under which alone the Council of the Vatican defines the Pope, to be infallible.

The Council of the Vatican defines, and enjoins to be held as of faith, under pain of Anathema, that the Pope, speaking *ex cathedra* and addressing the universal Church on a question of faith and morals is, in virtue of the assistance of the Holy Ghost, infallible, or not liable to error.

The question therefore at issue narrows it-

self to this. Did Pope Honorius, when speaking *ex cathedra*, and addressing the universal Church on the disputed question of the one Will, or two Wills in the one Person Christ, fall into error, or give a decision which subsequent Councils or Popes have revoked, or condemned as erroneous? If he did, then the Infallibility of the Pope as defined by the Council of the Vatican, must be abandoned; if he did not, or if it cannot be proved that he did, then the case of Honorius proves nothing either for or against Papal Infallibility.

But according to all the laws of logic, it is for the assailants of that dogma to prove that Pope Honorius did, when speaking *ex cathedra* and when addressing the universal Church—under which conditions alone Catholics predicate the infallibility of the Pope—give a dogmatic definition which subsequent Councils or Popes have repudiated, or condemned as erroneous. The *onus probandi* rests, we say, with those who cite the case of Pope Honorius as a proof that the Council of the Vatican has erred. It is for them to cite the date, and words, the exact words, of the document in which, speaking *ex cathedra*, in his quality as successor of St. Peter, and addressing the universal Church on the question of the One or Two Wills in Christ, Honorius pronounced a sentence which has been subsequently repudiated or condemned by either Council or Pope.

This has never been attempted; because, in the first place, no such document exists, or ever existed; and because, in the second place Pope Honorius—and this was his fault—refused to give any ecclesiastical decision whatsoever upon the question which in his days, distracted the Church, but upon which the Christian world looked up to him for a decision.

But was not Pope Honorius condemned by Popes and Councils, together with Theodorius, Sergius and other Monothelites? For the sake of argument we grant all this? But does not this fact of condemnation prove the thesis that the Pope is fallible?

No certainly it does not, unless it can be shown that Honorius was condemned for teaching *ex cathedra*, and under the conditions specified by the Council of the Vatican, some erroneous doctrine. It proves of course that Honorius failed in some duty, that he was guilty of some thing; but it does not prove that he taught as true that which is false, or condemned as false that which is true. It does not follow that because an officer charged with a high and important command is condemned for negligence that therefore he deliberately betrayed his post to the enemy. Admiral Byng was condemned and shot; but it would be false were we to say that he was condemned either as a coward or as a traitor.

But was not Honorius heretical in his views of the Two Wills in Christ? No he was not; he held on this point the doctrine of the Sixth General Council. Why then, and for what was he condemned? Because he did not avail himself of his prerogative as Christ's Vicar, as Supreme Head of the Church to crush the nascent Monothelite error; because by his culpable silence, and inactivity he allowed a heresy to spread, and did not, as he should have done, stamp it out at once.

What proofs are there of this? We can but cite the testimony of historians: and here is that of one who is lauded by the Protestant world as the best, the most learned and the most accurate of ecclesiastical historians; of one who cannot be suspected of ultramontane proclivities, or of a too strong feeling towards the cause of Rome and Papal Infallibility—we allude of course to Dr. Dollinger the foremost man of the "Old Catholics." Here is what he says upon the matter in dispute. We quote, it may be necessary to add, from Dr. Cox's translation from the German of Dr. Dollinger's History of the Church, Vol. II., Section VII., pp. 196 and 197.

Having given a sketch of the outbreak of the Monothelite heresy; of the efforts of a certain party in the Church to bring about a compromise with the Monophysites; of the consequent controversy betwixt Sergius and Sophronius Patriarch of Jerusalem, and the crafty letter from Sergius to Honorius, in which the latter took care to misrepresent the subject matter of the dispute with the orthodox Sophronius,—Dr. Dollinger goes on to say:—
"Honorius suffered himself to be misguided. His answer was almost an echo to the letter of Sergius, and betrayed an extraordinary dogmatical obscurity, and misconception of the subject in dispute. He viewed the opposition of Sophronius as a contest for words which should be left to grammarians, and decreed that no ecclesiastical decision should be pronounced on the question; but when he made the distinction of the two natures, which remained unmixd, and of the two operations peculiar each to its nature, he declared the true doctrine of the Church; he made manifest indeed of an unity of will in Christ, but by that he understood no more than the conformity of the human with the Divine will, and rejected the idea that in Christ, as in sinful man there was a law of the members combating with the spirit."

Therefore, *teste* Dr. Dollinger himself, Honorius was perfectly orthodox; and if he erred, he erred, not on the question of faith, for on this "he declared the true doctrine of the Church;" but in that he allowed himself to be

It is not pretended that the Pope is omniscient.

deceived, by the crafty letter of Sergius, as to the matter actually in dispute betwixt the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Patriarch of Jerusalem. But no one pretends that the Pope cannot err upon matters of fact not included in the original *depositum*; and so cunningly were the letters from Sergius worded, that it was impossible therefrom to make out what he and Sophronius were disputing about. But though on this point Honorius erred, it by no means affected his faith; for as Dollinger admits, on the doctrinal question itself, he declared the true doctrine of the Church." Honorius was not, according to Dollinger's showing, a heretic in the usual acceptation of the word; he did not hold false doctrine.

Neither did he, speaking *ex cathedra* and addressing the Universal Church, teach false doctrine, or give an unorthodox decision; for as Dollinger again tells us—"he decreed that no ecclesiastical decision should be pronounced on the question." Therefore if Dollinger be the accurate, learned and honest historian that the "Old Catholics" and other Protestants assert him to be, Honorius did not, when speaking *ex cathedra* and addressing the universal Church on a question of faith and morals, approve himself fallible, and thereby give a practical refutation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility.

Why then was Honorius condemned? if he neither held himself, nor taught others false doctrine. Because of his negligence and inactivity; because he did not give any dogmatic decision at all on the question of the one or two wills. Again we call Dollinger to court.

"Without therefore declaring for Monothelitism he—Honorius—seemed to favor it, and to approach to it by his unsupported interpretation of those texts so decisive for the cause of the two wills:—'Father let this chalice pass from me: yet not my will, but thine be done;' which words he said were uttered by Our Redeemer only to teach us to conform our will to the will of God. From this inconsiderate letter of Honorius, matter was drawn in later times both for his condemnation and exculpation. Pope John IV. in his apology of Honorius addressed to the Emperor Constantine, and the Holy Maximus Martyr pleaded his cause on this ground, that by asserting an unity of will in Christ he wished only to oppose the idea of a twofold will in Christ of the flesh and of the spirit. Leo II. in his brief to the bishops of Spain and to the Emperor Constantine places the error of Honorius in his inactivity by which he gave support to the heresy, and caused confusion in the Church; but the sixth Council condemned him because he followed the advice of Sergius and thus strengthened his errors. Such was this affair—although we are fully authorized to suppose that Honorius thought much more correctly than he had expressed himself."

Therefore if Dollinger be a reliable historian Honorius was condemned for following the insidious counsels of Sergius to refrain from giving what he ought to have given at once a final or conclusive decision on the question, and which as Pope it was in his power to have given; and because of his inactivity in allowing a heresy to spread, instead of stamping it out at once, in virtue of the power committed to him as Christ's Vicar on earth. Now, and this is worthy of note—why, if the Pope was not believed to have authority to put down error in whatsoever part of the Church it might make its appearance; if he was not looked upon by all Christians in the seventh century, as he is by all Catholics in the nineteenth—as one having authority to teach the whole Church; as the Supreme Pastor to whom was committed the charge of the entire fold; whose voice all were bound to hear and to obey—why, we say, should Honorius, Bishop of Rome, in particular have been held guilty in that he did not authoritatively interfere betwixt the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Patriarch of Jerusalem? The condemnation of Honorius by implication asserts that it was his duty, and that therefore he had the right in virtue of his special prerogative as successor of St. Peter, so to interfere; and if he was held culpable because he did not at once interfere to stamp out the nascent heresy, but by allowing it to spread encouraged it, and confused the Church, was it not because it was also held that he had full authority to crush in its inception, and to determine the true faith? Surely no one would condemn another for not doing that which he was incompetent, and had no authority to do. From the fact—to use an illustration we have already employed—from the fact that Byng was condemned for not having forced on an action with the French fleet off Minorca, we conclude that in the opinion of those who condemned him, he as Admiral had the right and the power to have done so; so also, and by the same process of reasoning we conclude from the condemnation of Pope Honorius for not having at once condemned and stamped out the Monothelite heresy, that, in the opinion of those who condemned him, he as Pope had the right and the power so to deal with it. In a word though the condemnation of Pope Honorius affords no argument against Papal Infallibility, it affords conclusive evidence that in the seventh century it was the belief of the entire Church, of the East as well as of the West, of the Greeks as well as of the Latins, that the

The advice of Sergius to Honorius was to decide nothing on the disputed question. "He then suggested to the Pope that it would be most expedient that mention should not be made either of one or two wills and operations in Christ."—Dollinger's History, Vol. II., p. 196.

Pope's authority, extended not only over his own diocese, not only over the Latin churches, but over all Christendom; that all Bishops, all Patriarchs were subject to him in the sense of being bound to abide by his doctrinal decisions; in other words that the Pope was the Supreme Head on earth of the Church of Christ. For other Bishops it sufficed that they themselves held and taught true doctrine, in their respective dioceses; but, as from the condemnation of Honorius is evident, more much more than this was expected from the Pope, from the Bishop of Rome, from him who sat in Peter's seat, to whom in a particular manner had been given the charge of feeding the sheep and of confirming his brethren. Why, in short should more have been expected from the Bishop of Rome than from any other Bishop if to the former more had not been given? If Honorius, as Pope, had not received power and authority to give judgment upon the question agitated betwixt Sergius and Sophronius why was he condemned for refusing to give any "ecclesiastical decision," as Dollinger says? how was it that the effect of his silence, or refusal to act was stigmatised as a giving up of the immaculate to defilement. Evidently by those who condemned him Honorius was held to be entrusted with the preserving immaculate of the entire Church; or in other words to be invested with all that by the Council of the Vatican is attributed to the Pope; for surely Christ could never have committed the task of preserving the faith immaculate, to one who in the discharge of that task was liable to error, to mistake truth for falsehood, or falsehood for error.

We conclude our remarks too lengthy, we fear, with this offer to the Montreal Witness. When he shall produce the date, and very words of the document, wherein, speaking *ex cathedra*, and under the conditions defined by the Council of the Vatican, Pope Honorius decided in favor of the Monothelite heresy, we undertake either to disprove the authenticity of the said document, or to reject the dogma of Papal Infallibility. This is a fair offer.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF HAMILTON.

In our last we mentioned the improvement that had taken place in the health of this good man and worthy Prelate: to-day the sad duty devolves upon us of recording his death, which took place on the 26th ult., and has plunged the Catholics not of his own diocese only, but of all Canada in sincere affliction.

Nor is the sorrow for the loss confined to Catholics. Our Protestant fellow-citizens who knew him, loved and honored him, for who could resist honoring and loving one so honorable, so truly amiable! His death is thus felt to be a national loss; and it is recognised that if the Church has especial cause to lament the death of a wise and virtuous pastor, the Canadian public has to mourn the death of one of its best and noblest citizens.

In our next we shall be able to lay before our readers a full obituary notice of the deceased. In the meantime as illustrating the position which Mgr. Farrell held in public estimation, we copy the following from the Montreal Gazette of the 29th ult.

"A GOOD MAN GONE.—The intelligence which comes from Hamilton of the death of Bishop Farrell will carry sorrow into many a Canadian home, where the late prelate was known and esteemed. Few men have succeeded in acquiring so large and so general a share of public respect. True to his Church—an earnest and simple-minded Roman Catholic gentleman—his constant aim was to spread the spirit of peace and good-will among all sections of the Christian community. There is, perhaps, no city in the world where the spirit of tolerance between Catholic and Protestant is more marked than in Hamilton; and the fact is very largely due to the exertions and quiet, unostentatious example of the deceased Bishop. He was an Irishman, heart and soul, a lover of the dear old Emerald Isle, and an earnest sympathiser with every movement for its advantage. But he held in loathing and contempt the agitators who trade upon Irish patriotism and Irish generosity, and hence American Fenianism had in him an uncompromising foe. The death of such a man is a public calamity, and as the solemn requiem mass is chanted over his bier, every one who knew him will feel that in his death Canada has lost one of the most faithful and useful of her adopted sons."

"THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN N. Y.—The Roman Catholic clergy in the United States are briskly pursuing their cherished scheme of overturning the far-famed public-school system of that country, their latest contrivance being the setting up of what are called Parish schools under teachers of their own church. A large school of this description has been opened in what is called St. Peter's Parish, New York, and on the opening day a very large attendance of Roman Catholic children, thanks to the drumming of the clergy, was got together to the delight of the priests and prelates who assembled in honor of the occasion.

Twenty-five Christian Brothers have arrived from Europe to teach in these Romish schools—an ominous importation. The next move when this machinery is put into working order will be a raid on the public treasury for sectarian school grants. The Romish clergy have always a peculiar knack of directing public money into their own coffers."

The above is from the Montreal Witness, and gives a convincing proof of the arrogance of Romanists. These misguided men have the audacity to set up, and pay for the education of their own children, out of their own pockets; whilst Protestants follow the more excellent way of taxing Catholics, to pay for the schooling of Protestant children.

But the Witness anticipates that the Roman-

ists having their own schools, and having no use for, no interest in the non-Catholic schools set up by the State, will demand their share of the monies dishonestly taken out of their pockets for non-Catholic school purposes. We know not what course of action these audacious men may take, but we think it highly probable that they will insist that they be no longer taxed, either directly or indirectly for the support of schools of which they make no use.

So Protestants in Lower Canada insist that they pay no tithes or tax of any kind for the support of Romish churches, though these churches are open to them if they see fit to enter. In the simple fact that they do not so see fit, the law of this priest-ridden country seems reason sufficient why Protestants should be exempted from all taxation for Catholic Church purposes. But alas! though in principle the Church question and the School question are identical; though a State School is as much an outrage on civil and religious liberty as can be a State Church—Protestants have two set of principles, two contradictory rules of right and wrong—one for themselves, the other for Romanists. Why not let us have the Voluntary Principle for School as well as for Church? there would then be no chance for Romanists to make a raid on the public treasury. Let every one educate his own children.

THE NEW CATHEDRAL.—A circular from Mgr. the Bishop of Montreal, announcing that the collectors of the annual subscriptions for the rebuilding of the Cathedral are about to commence their round of visits, has just been read from all the pulpits of the Catholic Churches in Montreal. The collectors have been taken from amongst the clergy and laity in equal numbers; and His Lordship expresses the hope that they may be received with the courtesy and liberality to which, from their position and the object of their visits, they are so well entitled. The works are progressing well in spite of the hard times, and the increased cost both of labor and materials; everything is paid for in hard cash; no debt has been contracted, and a sum of \$80,000 has already been contributed. Under these circumstances Mgr. trusts that the Catholics of the diocese will be encouraged to continue their liberality, until such time as a stately edifice, a representation of the great church of St. Peter's at Rome, shall arise to attest to future generations the generosity and religious zeal of the Catholics of the diocese of Montreal.

In his latter days, Mr. Grote, the celebrated historian, retraced many of his old opinions, confessing them to have been but illusions.—Amongst those illusions he enumerated these three:—That democracy would give good and honest government;—That Ireland might be made contented with English rule, and forget the penal laws and the wrongs of centuries, by governing her as England is governed;—And last, and most monstrous illusion of all; that, as the people advanced in intelligence and material prosperity, they would deem it their duty and their privilege to educate their own children, without invoking the assistance of the State. "This," says Mr. Grote, "I find to be the greatest illusion of all."

On the afternoon of Sunday, the 21st ult., there took place a very imposing ceremony.—The Canadian and Irish parishioners of St. Henri des Tanneries, headed by their priest and the Rev. Mr. Salmon, marched in solemn pilgrimage to the new Cathedral. At the Episcopal Palace they were received by Mgr. de Montreal, who, robed in Pontifical garb, proceeded to the Cathedral now building, where a sermon suitable to the occasion was preached by the Rev. Fleck, Rector of St. Mary's College; after which Pontifical Benediction was given, and a handsome collection taken up.

In the Catholic journals of the United States the practicability of organising a pilgrimage to some of the most celebrated of the European shrines, to Rome, and perhaps to the Holy Land, is being warmly discussed. The cost is estimated, so we learn from the Catholic Review, at about \$600 for each person.

Young Gillies, who it will be remembered was amongst the sufferers by the accident on the Exhibition Grounds, is now almost entirely well. This will, we hope, reassure the minds of his friends.

Mr. Arch, the great leader in the Agricultural laborer's movement, is now in Canada, and is making himself acquainted with the resources of the Colony, and the inducements it holds out to emigrants from England.

We are glad to see that the talents of our fellow citizen Marcus Doherty have been recognised by the Government, by whom he has been appointed Judge for the District of Arthabaska.

THE BANK FORGERS.—The notorious agents in the Bank of England forgeries are some in Pentonville some in Holloway gaol. They are to be transported to separate penal settlements.