

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 show 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. Howell & Co., 40 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1872.

ECCLÉSIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MARCH.—1872.

Friday, 29.—Good Friday.
Saturday, 30.—Holy Saturday.
Sunday, 31.—Easter Sunday.

APRIL.—1872.

Monday, 1.—Of the Octave.
Tuesday, 2.—Of the Octave.
Wednesday, 3.—Of the Octave.
Thursday, 4.—Of the Octave.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

It was announced by Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, on the 21st inst., that an active correspondence had been going on between the Imperial and the Canadian authorities, in regard to the provisions of the Treaty of Washington, in so far as the Dominion was affected by any arrangements therein contained. Mr. Gladstone, however, declined to lay the correspondence before the House, as it was not complete. St. Patrick's Day was generally observed throughout Ireland, and passed over without any disturbances. In New York the Irish had a very grand Procession, and the Day, so dear to Irish hearts was celebrated with becoming pomp.

There is little of interest from the Continent of Europe to report. M. Thiers still holds on to office, though it is scarce to be expected that his tenure can be prolonged. It is felt by all that the actual is only a provisional government. The position of the Sovereign Pontiff remains unaltered.

A disgraceful outbreak, in which the *Young Britons*, an anti-Catholic or Protestant Society in Toronto, took the lead, occurred on the evening of Monday, 18th inst., at Toronto. From a report of their proceedings, as given in the *Globe* of the 19th, we learn that the rioters turned out in force in the evening, and marched through the streets with loud cries of "Down with the Pope," and, in the words of the *Globe*, "with other cries still more offensive to the Roman Catholic population." As they went along, they smashed the windows of the residences of those obnoxious to them; and in spite of the resistance of the Police, forced their way to the Christian Brothers' Schools, where they howled, hurled stones through the windows, and naturally caused serious alarm to the inmates. The Police however turned out in force, and the *Young Britons* were finally dispersed, not however without some hard fighting.

"It is," says the *Globe*, "an outrage upon decency and common sense that such things should be done in the name of religion and patriotism;" and in this verdict we believe that the majority of our Protestant fellow-citizens will concur. We do not, as in analogous circumstances would the *Montreal Witness*, hold Protestants generally, or their church organizations, responsible for the "outrage;" for we recognize that in all communities there are bad men who are easily excited to wrong doing; amongst Catholics, as well as amongst Protestants. Both should however unite in discouraging violence, no matter by whom, or on what pretence of religion or patriotism committed.

So when a Mr. Muraire was pelted in a Volunteer Camp of Catholics, on which he had obtruded himself, and was ejected therefrom with violence, we condemned, and do condemn, the act; in spite of the fact that he, by thrusting himself where his presence was certainly not required, and where as a religious controversialist, if not illegal, it was at all events highly improper—had in a degree provoked the violence complained of; whereas in Toronto, no provocation of any kind had been offered by the Catholics, to the *Young Britons*. Taking the ground however that violence is anti-Christian, and, in the case of Mr. Muraire was unnecessary to effect the legitimate object of putting him, and his wares out of the Camp, we, as Catholics, condemn alike the action of the *Young Britons*, and of the Volunteers who pelted said Mr. Muraire with potatoes, and beef-bones. In so doing we do but feebly repeat the earnest and oft reiterated injunctions of the Catholic Church.

Would to God that from these facts, Catholics and Protestants would learn the lesson, not of mutual recrimination, but of mutual forbearance; recognising that—though the Church is spotless—as amongst the members of the respective communions, there are faults on both sides. The *Young Britons* form an avowedly Protestant Society; their bond of union is hostility to the Catholic Church; and their rallying cry is "Down with the Pope." Would it be just when condemning them were we to include all Protestants, and their several church organisations, in the same condemnation? No! were we so to judge them, they would justly protest against our bigotry. Well then! we implore of them to deal out to Catholics, with the same measure as that with which they would that they should be dealt out unto. Remember the *Young Britons*; and do not, because provoked by the covert taunts and insults of itinerant tract peddlars like Mr. Muraire, or the obscene Murphy, Catholics also sometimes resort with violence, leap to the conclusion that all Catholics approve of, or above all that their Church sanctions, such modes of procedure. No! She condemns them; and to all her children she ever repeats the words of Him Who founded her—"Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; pray for them who despitefully use you."

MIXED MARRIAGES.—The subjoined extract from the *Toronto Freeman* of the 21st inst., will enlighten our readers upon a matter which is causing much excitement in Toronto, and with which the name of His Grace the Archbishop of that city is mixed up:—

THE KEITH CHILDREN.—Much has been said in the daily newspapers of the case of "the Keith children."

Mr. David Keith, of this city, was married by a Catholic Priest in Dundee, Scotland, A.D., 1852. The father took care to give the children a Protestant education, but the mother exercising her legitimate influence it seems succeeded better; so the children who have arrived at the years of discretion are all fervent Catholics. The two eldest are of such an age that their faith cannot be tampered with by the father. Consequently he desired to make Protestants of the other five, though much against their will. The third and fourth children are twin boys. These he has sent to Scotland that they may be Presbyterians. The mother finding it was his intention to send also the other three beyond her control, was determined not to yield her maternal rights, so she placed them where she could have access to them as she thought proper.

It seems there is a law passed under Henry VIII. whereby the father is made the sole master of the family. By this law Mr. Keith, it appears, is empowered to ignore altogether the rights of the mother in the rearing of her children; but as Mrs. Keith knows something of the Divine Law, she is determined to obey the law of God before the law of man; so she is resolved rather to suffer imprisonment than to give up the custody of the three children whom she has placed in safe custody.

His Grace the Archbishop has been summoned to prove that he has not conspired with Mrs. Keith to remove the three children. Mrs. Keith has made an affidavit stating that "neither the Archbishop nor Father Jamet counselled her to remove the said children, or had anything to do with their removal."

We think that the courage displayed by Mrs. Keith in defiance of an unjust law which would deprive the mother of her natural rights in the control of her family, is worthy of all praise.

The lesson that all should learn from this sad story of domestic discord is, the danger of "Mixed Marriages." God forbid that we should seem even to speak of them as sinful, since the Church recognises them as valid, and the condition of these who contract them as that of living in Holy Matrimony. But they are dangerous, and as a general rule, are not conducive even to the temporal happiness, either of those who rashly contract them, or of the children the issue thereof. These instead of being, as they should be, as by God they were designed to be, a bond of union, become a source of bitterness, and of domestic strife, as in the case before us.

We know not what precautions Mrs. Keith may have taken before she married her Protestant husband, to assure for their children a Catholic education. If she neglected such precautions then, and before she pledged herself to an alien in faith, she has no one to blame but herself for the present unhappy state in which now she finds herself. By God's law, as well as by man's law, the husband is head of the family, and the wife is subject to him; and the Catholic woman should see well to it, before marriage, that she give not unto herself a Protestant head. Ah! if the mother in this case had but displayed, before marriage, as much courage, as much firmness to restrain her natural affection, and to do violence to her heart, as she displays now, after marriage, when it is too late for courage, because she has voluntarily taken a Protestant for her head—it would have been well for her; well too for the poor children over whom before Courts of Law, the unhappy parents are now wrangling.

WAS PETER EVER IN ROME?

Certain Protestant writers in Kingston, in answer to Father Lange's sermon in that city on Unity, having mooted this question; and as it is at present being discussed in Rome between two Protestant clergymen and two Abbates of the Eternal City, it will not perhaps be without profit to some of our readers to say a few words upon it. In order to treat it the more clearly we will consider—

I. Its history.

II. The authorities on which the Catholic affirmative is founded.

III. The objections urged, as well against those authorities, as against the fact itself.

I. Its history. It is a fact worthy of a certain degree of attention, that Peter's presence in Rome was never denied before the 14th century. At this time we first find doubts cast upon it in the writings of Marsilius of Padua—"Mastro Marsilio di Padova, Grand Master in natural science and astrology, but heretic in many things," as Joannes Villani calls him.) This Marsilius was a fautor of the Louis of Bavaria schism, in the interests of which he raised these doubts. This re-hashing of old controversies since the time of the Reformation is remarkable. Mackintosh tells us, "scarcely any metaphysical controversy agitated amongst recent philosophers was unknown to schoolmen." In other words, for lack of other weapons, the old rusty blunderbusses and arquebuses of the middle ages are deemed good enough "armes de precision" at all times against the Catholic Church.

The fact of this 1390 years assent to this tradition is of no mean importance, when we consider that none of all those various schisms, whether of the Oriental or Western Church, who broke off from Catholic Unity during these ages, ever bethought themselves of calling it in question, which it was manifestly their interest to do, if they had any hopes of success. Nor do we find, moreover, that those Emperors or rulers, who at all times regarded so jealously the power of the Papacy, ever ventured to question the validity of those title-deeds by virtue of which the Papacy held its spiritual sway. One only conclusion from this fact is admissible—that the testimony of their validity was too strong for even the most biased tribunal.

II. Testimonies on which this tradition rests. Of these there are five classes.

1st. All those early writers who have written concerning St. Peter; of whom might be enumerated St. Clement (Epist. I ad Corinth, c. 5 and 6); Ignatius (in Epist. ad Rom.); Papias, as quoted by Eusebius, (L. II., c. 4); Dionysius, of Corinth; Irenaeus, Caius, St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, Lactantius, Athanasius, &c.

2nd. All those who have given catalogues of the Popes, from Peter downwards, (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Eusebius, Optatus, &c.)

3rd. All those early writers who have affirmed that St. Mark was Peter's interpreter, and that he (St. Mark) wrote his gospel from what he had heard from St. Peter at Rome. (Papias, Clement Alex., Irenaeus, Jerome, &c.)

4th. Innumerable pictures, medals, buildings and tombs to which Caius, Priest of Rome, in the 3rd Century under Pope Zephyrinus referred when he challenged the Cathaphrygian heretics to come and behold the "trophy of the Apostles." Innumerable inscriptions which Eusebius speaks of (B. ii., c. 25) as existing in his time in Rome. Ancient statues of St. Peter and Paul to which the same writer refers (VII. c. 18) as then existing.

5th. All those records of ancient pilgrimages (ad limina Apostolorum) to Rome, of which Gretzer has collected the records.

There is a body of testimonies sufficiently respectable to establish any historical fact; but as our adversaries fearing to meet them, have by an ingenious artifice evaded them, and narrowed the question to the first three centuries of the Christian Era; and as we wish to meet them on their own ground, we will pass over all but those drawn from the first three hundred years.

1st. The first which presents itself is that of St. Clement, who, Tertullian tells us, was made Bishop by St. Peter. This Clement in an epistle to the Corinthians (admitted by all to be genuine) referring to the persecutions in the Roman Church, under Nero, speaks of the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul, holding them up to admiration as noble examples of patience in tribulation.

2nd. We next find St. Ignatius of Antioch on his way to martyrdom in A.D. 107, writing to the Romans these words "I do not command you as Peter and Paul; I am a condemned man." This coupling of Peter and Paul is conclusive, since St. Paul's connection with Rome is scriptural.

3rd. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis (probably a disciple of St. John the Apostle) as quoted by Eusebius, says that St. Mark wrote his gospel from the preaching of St. Peter at Rome, and that the Apostle wrote his first Epistle from the same place calling it Babylon.

4th. St. Dionysius of Corinth in a letter to the Roman Church under the pontificate of Soter (A.D. 161—170) quoted by Eusebius, says that SS. Peter and Paul after planting the faith at Corinth, went into Italy, planted the faith amongst the Romans, and there sealed their testimony with their blood.

5th. St. Irenaeus, (Bishop of Lyons, A.D. 178, and disciple of Polycarp who was himself a disciple of St. John the Apostle,) speaks of the Roman Church as "the greatest and most ancient church; known to all; founded and established by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul." He adds—"The blessed

Apostles having founded and arranged the church, delivered its bishopric and administration to Linus. To him succeeded Anacleus; after him Clement; to him Evaristus, and to Evaristus, Alexander. The sixth from the Apostles was Sixtus; after him Telesphorus; next Hyginus, then Pius, after whom came Anicetus; Soter succeeded Anicetus, and now the bishopric is held by Eleutherius the twelfth from the Apostles."

6th. Caius, a priest of Rome, under Zephyrinus, who governed the church during the first seventeen years of the third century, says in a work quoted by Eusebius, but now lost; "I can show you the trophies of the apostles; for whether we go to the Vatican or the Ostian way, we shall meet with the trophies of the founders of this church."

7th. Tertullian, who died A.D. 216, in his great work on Prescriptions says—"If you are near Italy you have Rome, whence we also (the African church) derive our origin. How happy is this church on which the Apostles poured forth their whole doctrine with their blood; where Peter by his martyrdom is made like the Lord; where Paul is crowned with a wreath like that of John."

Again, "Let us see * * * what the Romans proclaim in our ears, they to whom Peter and Paul left the Gospel sealed with their blood."—(Lib. iv. ad Marcion.)

Again he throws down a challenge to the heretics of those times, which our opponents of to-day dare not take up, to "unfold the series of their bishops, coming down from the beginning in succession, so that the first bishop was appointed and preceded by any one of the apostles or apostolic men in communion with the apostles. For in this way the apostolic churches exhibit their origin * * * as the Church of Rome relates that Clement was ordained by Peter."

8th. Clement of Alexandria (Died A.D. 222) tells us that St. Mark wrote his gospel at the request of the Romans, who wished to have a written record of what they had heard from St. Peter.

9th. Origen (A.D. 255) who visited Rome under the Pontificate of Zephyrinus says that St. Peter having preached to the Jews in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia and Asia, towards the end of his life (epi telei) came to Rome, and was crucified with his head downwards.

10th. St. Cyprian (Bishop of Carthage, A.D. 248, put to death for the faith A.D. 258) speaking of certain local schismatics who had appealed to Pope Cornelius, says—"They venture to set sail and carry letters from schismatical and profane men to the chair of Peter, and to the principal church whence sacerdotal unity has arisen."—(Epist. 59, ad Cornel.) And in another letter (52 ad Antonianum) he speaks of the election of Cornelius, "when the place of Fabian, that is the place of Peter, and the rank of the priestly chair were vacant."

Such are the testimonies narrowed down to the first three centuries, on which the episcopate of Peter rests. In our next, we will meet objections.

SACERDOS.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

SIR,—Last week, looking over the *Montreal Gazette*, I noticed an account of a lecture on "Papal Infallibility," delivered by a Rev. Mr. Baldwin who, though styled a Canon, is certainly no great gun.

His Canonship begins by informing his enlightened audience, that "the opinions held by the leading Catholics of ancient times show that in the early days of the Romish Church no ecclesiastical held supreme authority."

Protestants admit that the Church was without "spot or wrinkle" during the first three centuries of her existence. Now, let us see what really were the opinions of some of the leading Catholics during that time; and let us begin with St. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, who was sent into Gaul in the year 157.

In his book against heresies he says: "In this church, which he calls the greatest church, the most ancient, the most conspicuous founded by Peter and Paul, every church, that is the faithful from every side, must meet, or agree, together—propter potorem principalem, on account of its principality or headship."

Here this "leading Catholic" asserts, not only the necessity for all the faithful of the whole world to profess the faith the Roman Church teaches, but moreover gives the reason for this necessity, namely the *potorem principalem* which the Roman Church possesses.

St. Cyprian, another leading Catholic, was ordained bishop in the year 248. He speaks of Rome as "the See of Peter and the principal church, whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise . . . whose faith has been commended by the apostle, to whom faithlessness can have no access." Certainly St. Cyprian believed in the "supreme authority" of the Roman See, otherwise he would scarcely call it the chief,—*principalem Ecclesiam*, whence has come the *unity of the priesthood*; proving not a mere honorary primacy, but a primacy of jurisdiction.

Still another, also a "leading Catholic," St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, speaking against the Nestorian heresy, says: "That this is so, I will produce, as an ample witness the most holy Celestine, the Archbishop of the whole world, and the father and patriarch of the great Rome, who himself thrice exhorted you by letters to desist from that mad blasphemy and you obeyed him not. . . . All by divine right bow the head to Peter, and the princes of the world obey him as they would our Lord Jesus Christ. We also who are members, ought to adhere to our Head, the Roman Pontiff and Apostolic See."

St. Jerome writes to Pope Damasus: "I am following no other than Christ, united to the communion of your Holiness, that is to the Chair of Peter; I know that the Church is founded upon this rock. Whosoever eateth the Lamb out of this House is a profane man. Whosoever is not in the Ark shall perish by the flood. He that gathereth not with you scattereth."

In the year 395, St. Augustin was consecrated bishop of Hippo, and certain reformers call him "the greatest of the Fathers, and the worthiest divine Church of God ever had since the Apostles' time." Speaking of the two African Councils—Milevi and Carthage—whose decisions had been sent to Rome to be confirmed by Pope Innocent I., he says: "The decisions of the two Councils having been sent to the Apostolic See, the rescripts have come thence. The cause is finished; would to God that the error may also have an end." So much for some of the "leading Catholics of ancient times."

Now let us turn to the Councils at which, the Revd. Canon must admit, many, yes, very many leading Catholics were present. The first eight general councils, all hold in the East, and composed chiefly of Greek bishops, distinctly recognized the primacy of the Roman See.

In June, A.D. 325 was opened the Council of Nicaea, which drew up the Nicene Creed. The reigning Pope, St. Sylvester, not being able to attend, owing to his great age, *Osius*, with two deputed priests, Vitus and Vincent, presided in his name. Now, will the learned Canon tell us why Osius presided in the Pope's name if "in the early days of the Romish Church no ecclesiastical held supreme authority?"

Among the decrees passed was one fixing the day upon which Easter should be kept, and after Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, had spoken, the Emperor Constantine arose and observed this point had been already determined by the Bishop of Rome, and that his determination had been followed by the bishops of Italy, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Germany, Africa, Greece and Egypt. Why should Constantine cite particularly the Bishop of Rome, and why should all the bishops of Italy, and those other countries abide by his decision? The conclusion seems clear enough; but then, perhaps these were not "leading Catholics" in the Canon's estimation.

Again we ask, why did the fathers of this general Council, which has ever been held by the Church in the greatest veneration, compose and send a synodical epistle to St. Sylvester, whom the style they blessed Pope of Rome, requesting him to confirm their decrees by his apostolical authority if they did not recognize a "supreme authority." Surely, had they not believed the Pope possessed, by reason of his being Pope, a power not inherent in themselves, never would they have begged him to confirm their work. A. D. 431, was held the third general Council at Ephesus, at which assisted Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem. Let us hear him: "It was, says he, the duty of John, the most reverend bishop of Antioch, considering this holy, great and general Synod, to come without delay and clear himself of those things which are laid to his charge, before the *Apostolic See of Rome*, which is with us here; and to show obedience, and to do honor to the *Apostolic Holy Roman Church of God*, by which the Church of Antioch must be directed and judged, as custom derived from the *Apostolic rule and tradition particularly requires*."

The fathers present at this Council listened approvingly to these words pronounced by the legate of Pope St. Celestine: "St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, and head and column of the faith, and foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the Kingdom from our Lord Jesus: to him was given the power of binding and loosing sin; who to this time and always, lives in his successors and exercises judgment (judicium)."

Again let us see the conduct of other "leading Catholics," besides those mentioned above: St. Polycarp of Smyrna betook himself to the Bishop of Rome on the Easter question. The Montanists of Phrygia went to Rome to try to gain its bishop. The presbyters of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria complain of his doctrines to the bishop of Rome; and Fortunatus and Felix, deposed by St. Cyprian, have recourse to the same authority.

Pope St. Victor threatened to excommunicate