

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

No. 195, Fortification Lane, by J. Gillies to whom all Business Letters should be addressed.

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. FETTERALL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. Fowler & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1875.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

FEBRUARY—1875. Friday, 12—Crown of Thorns Saturday, 13—St. Peter Nolasco, C. (Jan. 31). Sunday, 14—First in Lent. Monday, 15—St. Romanus, Ab. Tuesday, 16—St. Scholastica, V. (Feb. 10). Wednesday, 17—Ember Day. Of the Feria. Thursday, 18—Of the Feria.

REGULATIONS FOR LENT.

All the days in Lent, Sundays excepted, from Ash Wednesday to Holy Saturday inclusive, are days of Fasting and Abstinence.

On the first four days in Lent, as well as every day in Holy Week, the use of flesh meat is prohibited.

The use of flesh meat at every meal is permitted on all the Sundays in Lent, Palm Sunday excepted.

The use of flesh meat is also by special indulgences allowed at the one repast on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays in every week from the first Sunday in Lent, to Palm Sunday.

On all days in the year without any exception on which the use of flesh meat is prohibited, it is perfectly allowable to use animal fat, such as lard, or drippings, in the preparation of food; for frying fish, for instance, eggs, and other Lenten diet; but it is not permitted to eat the meat, or animal fat in its natural condition.

It is permitted—1st. to fry fish, or eggs with fat, or even pork, provided the pork be not eaten; 2nd. to boil pork in soup, to add to it fat or lard; 3rd. to cook pastry in fat, or to use the latter in the preparation of pastry.

It is also permitted on the mornings of fast days—1st. to take some mouthfuls of bread, and a little tea, coffee, chocolate, or other beverage; 2nd. that on the evenings of fast days, they may take soup made with flesh meat, standing over from dinner.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

With the exception of the reported Alfonsist successes over the Carlites, which, however, must be taken with a grain of salt, there is little to report from Europe. The Holy Father has, it is said, written to Don Carlos, pointing out the inexpediency of prolonging the contest. The truth of this report, however, is doubtful.

The Imperial Parliament met on Friday, the 5th inst. In the Speech from the Throne a repeal of exceptional legislation—Coercion Acts, we suppose, were alluded to—for Ireland was recommended.

There have been several sad accidents in Canada during the past week. At Quebec a mass of snow fell from Cape Diamond, crushing a house, and killing eight of the inmates. Here in Montreal the neglect, or incompetence of the authorities to whom is entrusted the charge of watching over the safety of all buildings in the City, nearly led to an equally fatal catastrophe. The walls, or a portion of the walls of the Queen's Hall, St. Catherine Street, destroyed some time ago by fire, have been left standing. In close proximity to these dangerous remains, and overtopped by them, stands Signor Haussmann's Assembly Rooms, in which a large party of dancers were gathered the other evening. It was blowing a fierce gale, and the walls of the burnt Hall being unable to resist the force, came down with a crash on the adjacent Assembly Rooms. By a marvellous providence none of the dancers were killed, but many were severely injured. When we read of such accidents as these, we naturally ask—of what use are the Building Inspection officers?

All is reported quiet at the scene of the State-School disturbances at Carleton Place. According to accounts which we have seen since our last, the party of constables with whom was Gifford who was shot, were provided with a warrant for the apprehension of certain persons therein specified; and did, before proceeding to force their way into the house, produce their warrant. This, if true, materially alters the aspect of the case. As first reported, it did not appear that any warrant was produced, or was even in existence, in which case the resistance of the inmates of the invaded house would have been perfectly justifiable.

A very interesting question of Constitutional Law, which has more than once been the cause of lively discussions in Great Britain, has come up in this country. A. M. Côté, of the Jacques Cartier Bank, is summoned to testify before the Land Swap Committee of our Quebec Legislature. M. Côté declines answering certain questions put to him, and does not obey a summons to appear before the Committee at Quebec. Hereupon the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly issues his warrant to the Sergeant at Arms to arrest M. Côté, whom the latter named, through his attorney, words for a writ of Habeas Corpus, and

contests the competency of a Speaker's warrant to deprive him of his liberty.

This, it will be seen, is an old, old question, on which the Courts of Judicature and the Courts of Legislature have repeatedly come in collision. The powers even of the Imperial Parliament are not clearly defined. It can of course assert its privileges, and can commit to the Tower; but whether its powers outrun its session?—whether a prisoner by it committed to prison would not be entitled to his liberty upon the dissolution, or even prorogation, of the body committing him? are questions on which much may be said on both sides. It is generally understood that the same powers of enforcing the attendance of witnesses, inherent in the Imperial Parliament, have been by statute conferred upon our Colonial Legislatures; but the Courts of Law, the guardians of our liberties, have always eyed the exercise of these powers, whether at home or abroad, with much jealousy, and with a manifest disposition to restrict them within the narrowest limits. In this case the question will be argued before our Canadian judges, and the arguments of the lawyers will invoke some very important, but very difficult questions of constitutional law.

As to the Land Swap Committee itself and its labors, all we can say is that to the ordinary man they are unintelligible. The entire transaction seems involved in thickest darkness, and we fear that the facts of the case will never fully be made public. Of course this does not increase public uneasiness. Why this reticence, if there is nothing to be ashamed of by the actors in the transaction? As Mrs. Caudle said of the Freemasons: "What do they wear aprons for?"

The Alfonsists are reported as having made their entry into Pamplona, and to be carrying everything before them. From Mexico we have news of the progress of what is vaguely called Protestantism, which, so we are told, "sustained by funds remitted from London and the United States, is making active progress." In other words the revolutionists who control the government imprison the Catholic clergy, banish the Sisters of Charity, and confiscate the property of the Religious Orders. The women with a spirit which the men would do well to imitate, have in large numbers met, and signed a protest to recognize as father or brother, or husband, or relation of any kind—any one who directly or indirectly takes part in the action of Congress driving away the Sisters of Charity.

Latest tidings from Spain are to the effect that the capture of Estella is denied, and that Alfonso, after a short campaign has handed over the command of the army to General Jovelar, and has retired to the security of the capital. It is not likely that the King would abandon his army in the flush of victory. However we shall hear the truth in a few days.

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF NOFOLK, ON THE OCCASION OF MR. GLADSTONE'S RECENT EXPOSURE. By John Henry Newman, D.D., of the Oratory. Messrs. Dawson Bros., Montreal. Price, 50 cents.

From the Messrs. Dawson—who have on hand a large stock of the above named much talked of pamphlet published by the New York Catholic Publication Society—we have received a copy of Dr. Newman's refutation of Mr. Gladstone's late attack on the loyalty of Catholics. How far it is successful as a refutation, is a question on which Catholics may be said to be unable to form an impartial opinion; but by the Protestant press it is admitted to be a success. Mr. Gladstone, remarks the London Times in an elaborate notice "has a difficult task before him if he feels called upon to make a rejoinder;" and in another place the same critic admits that Dr. Newman "undoubtedly convicts Mr. Gladstone of misapprehension of important words in the decrees he quotes." Treating of the style of the Letter, the same paper remarks that Dr. Newman "enjoys the secret of perpetual youth," that "he is the same to-day in his old age, in the Oratory," as he was in the vigor of his manhood" at Littlemore, and still carries, at the College which owes to him one of its wondrous successive developments. We cite these words to show that even in the opinion of Protestant critics, Dr. Newman's Letter is no ordinary production, and is worthy of a careful perusal by all, whether Catholic or Protestant.

It is not, it does not profess to be, written in defence of the truth of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility; but its purport is to show, 1. that the Definition of that doctrine has not in any manner affected the position of Catholics towards their respective civil rulers; 2. that Mr. Gladstone's accusation against the Church of having repudiated ancient history, and against Catholics in particular of making sacrifice of their moral and mental freedom in submitting to her claims, are both unfounded.

The space at our command does not permit us to follow the illustrious writer through the course of argument by which he proceeds to sustain his thesis; neither is it possible to give an idea of his reasoning by means of extracts; as well might we attempt to make extracts from a proposition in Euclid. Some passages, however, we cannot altogether refrain from. The following for instance is an excellent specimen of the writer's style; he is replying to the allegation of Mr. Gladstone that of late years the Catholic Church has adopted an altogether novel, and hostile attitude as towards the civil power; as if alas! it were a new thing, unexampled in the annals of the Church, for her to find herself in such a position:—

Mr. Gladstone tells us that our Religion has a bearing and behaviour towards the State utterly unlike that of ancient Christianity, so unlike that we may be said to repudiate what Christianity was in its first centuries, so unlike to what it was then, that we have actually forfeited the proud boast of being "Ever one and the same;" unlike, I say, in this, that our action is so antagonistic to the State action, and our claims so menacing to civil peace and prosperity. Indeed! then, I suppose our Lord and His Apostles, that St. Ignatius of Antioch, and St. Polycarp of Smyrna, and St. Cyprian of Carthage, and St. Laurence of Rome, that St. Alexander, and St. Paul of Constantinople, that St. Ambrose of Milan, that Pope Leo, John, Sylvester, Gregory, and Martin, all members of the "quadrivided Church," acted supremely, and laboured successfully, to

cultivate peaceful relations with the government of Rome. They had no doctrines and precepts, no rules of life, no isolation and aggressiveness, which caused them to be considered, in spite of themselves, the enemies of the human race! May I not, without disrespect, submit to Mr. Gladstone that this is very paradoxical? Surely it is our fidelity to the history of our forefathers, and not its repudiation, which Mr. Gladstone dislikes in us. When, indeed, was it in ancient times that the State did not show jealousy of the Church? Was it when Decius and Diocletian slaughtered their thousands who had abjured the religion of Old Rome; or was it when Athanasius was banished to Treves? or when Basil, on the Imperial Prefect's crying out, "Never before did any man make so free with me," answered, "Perhaps you never before fell in with a Bishop?" or when Chrysostom was sent off to Caucasus, to be worried to death by an Empress? Go through the long annals of Church History, century after century, and say, was there ever a time when her Bishops, and notably the Bishop of Rome, were slow to give their testimony in behalf of the moral and revealed law, and to suffer for their obedience to it, or forgot that they had a message to deliver to the world? not the task merely of administering spiritual consolation, or of making the sick-bed easy, or of training up good members of society, and of "serving tables," (though all this was included in their range of duty); but specially and directly to deliver a message to the world, a definite message to high and low, from the world's Maker, whether men would hear, or whether they would forbear? The history surely of the Church in all past times, ancient as well as medieval, is the very embodiment of that tradition of Apostolical independence and freedom of speech which in the eyes of man is her great offence now.

Nay, that independence, I may say, is even one of her Notes or credentials; for where shall we find it except in the Catholic Church? "I spoke of Thy testimonies," says the Psalmist, "even before kings, and I was not ashamed." This verse, I think Dr. Arnold used to say, rose up in judgment against the Anglican Church, in spite of its real excellences. As to the Oriental Churches, every one knows in what bondage they lie, whether they are under the rule of the Czar or of the Sultan. Such is the actual fact that, whereas it is the very mission of Christianity to bear witness to the Creed and Ten Commandments in a world which is averse to them, Rome is now the one faithful representative, and thereby is heir and successor of that free-spoken and unflinching Church of old, whose traditions Mr. Gladstone says the said Rome has repudiated.

I have one thing more to say on the subject of the "semper eadem." In truth, this fidelity to the ancient Christian system, seen in modern Rome, was the luminous fact which more than any other turned men's minds at Oxford forty years ago to look towards her with reverence, interest, and love. It affected individual minds variously, of course; some it even brought on eventually to conversion, others it only restrained from active opposition to her claims; but no one could read the Fathers, and determine to be their disciple, without feeling that Rome, like a faithful steward, had kept in fullness and in vigour what his own communion had let drop. The Tracts for the Times were founded on a deadly antagonism to what in these last centuries has been called Erastianism or Casuarism. Their writers considered the Church to be a divine creation, "not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ;" the Ark of Salvation, the Oracle of Truth, the Bride of Christ, with a message to all men everywhere, and a claim on their love and obedience; and, in relation to the civil power, the object of that promise of the Jewish prophets, "Behold, I will lift up My hand to the Gentiles, and will set up My standard to the peoples; kings and their queens shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and they shall lick up the dust of thy feet." No Ultramontane (so called) could go beyond these writings in the account which they gave of her from the Prophets, and that high notion is recorded beyond mistake in a thousand passages of their writings.

This is a fine specimen of Dr. Newman's style, and of the force of his appeals to history. His logic is sharp, and the point of his rapier pierces his antagonist's coat of mail. If Dr. Newman lays himself open to adverse criticism, it is in that in some respects, he resembles the illustrious Edmund Burke; that like that great orator his definitions and distinctions are too fine drawn, too subtle for the grosser intellects of his audience; whom therefore he fails to convince—because they do not understand him; because to men of his sharpness of vision, and intellectual calibre, it is no easy matter to bring themselves down to the intellectual level of these whom they address—particularly when these are in great part composed of Protestants of the Exeter Hall type.

We fear too that not only amongst Protestants, but amongst Catholics as well, there are some who will find it difficult to keep up with Dr. Newman. Indeed there are passages, such for instance as those which treat of Conscience, and its authority; which must be read with great caution, and which lend themselves apparently to a non-Catholic interpretation. We have read them carefully but confess that we have failed to catch the writer's full meaning. Of the soundness of his faith, of his sincere Catholicity we have no doubt; but to our imperfectly formed ears some of his propositions are certainly startling, and sound unpleasantly.—But here we feel that we are trenching on the domain of the theologian, and remembering the old adage—ne autor, we in prudence forbear.

Naturally many will take up this Letter curious to know exactly what Dr. Newman believes, and how he himself stands affected towards the question of Papal Infallibility. Many rumors on this matter have been in circulation. We have heard it said that Dr. Newman did not accept the definitions of the Vatican Council; or that if he did accept them, it was only by doing violence to his conscientious convictions, and by renouncing the opinions of his earlier days. Again we have heard it said that he contested the opportuneness of the definition of the doctrine, even if he did not repudiate the truth of the doctrine itself. The Catholic world will be glad to learn from the lips of Dr. Newman himself, that all these rumors are false; that he never called the definition of the doctrine inopportune; that he holds it now de fide; and that as a theological opinion, or belief, he always held it. Dr. Newman was always a believer in Papal Infallibility.

Thus at p. 21, he tells us:— "For myself I did not call it—(the definition of the doctrine)—inopportune, for times and seasons are known to God alone, and persecution may be as opportune, though not so pleasant as peace; nor, in accepting as a dogma what I had ever held as a truth, could I be doing violence to any theological view or conclusion of my own."—p. 21.

"And again, as if anxious to do away with all possibility of misapprehension on this point, he

reverts to the same subject at p. 129; where, quoting from a letter by him written to a friend under date July 27, 1870, he shows what his belief was then with regard to the doctrinal infallibility of the Pope:—

"Ever since I was a Catholic, I have held the Pope's Infallibility as a matter of theological opinion; at least I see nothing in the definition which necessarily contradicts Scripture, Tradition, or History; and the Doctor Ecclesius (as the Pope is styled by the Council of Florence) bids me accept it."—p. 129.

An opinion always, ever since he became a Catholic, held as a theological opinion or belief by such a man as Dr. Newman, and for the holding of which he finds valid reasons in the words of the Council of Florence, can scarce deserve to be spoken of in the flippant terms that we find employed by some of the writers in the vulgar Protestant press.

To only one other point brought out by Dr. Newman can we allude; and that is, that the British Government had no reason to be surprised at the definition of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, seeing that it had abundant means of knowing that the Popes have during long centuries claimed this infallibility as one of the peculiar privileges attached to the office of successor to St. Peter; that in 1793 Dr. Troy, the then Archbishop of Dublin, in one of his published Pastorals had expressly said—that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, when teaching the universal Church as their supreme visible head and pastor, was held by "many Catholics;" and that, though others denied this, requiring the assent, express or implied of the Bishops to the Pope's definitions before these were to be accepted as infallible; either opinion might be held by individual Catholics "until the Church shall decide upon this question of the Schools;" p. 16, and that therefore it, the British Government had good reasons for believing that the day when the Church should decide upon the question might arrive; after which it would no longer be permissible for Catholics to hold an opinion contrary to the decision then arrived at.

This quotation given by Dr. Newman from the Pastoral of the Archbishop of Dublin published in the English language in 1793, proves two things.

1st. That more than twenty-five years ago the dogma or doctrine of Papal Infallibility was certainly mentioned in genuine and authorized books, or pamphlets, if an Archbishop's Pastoral be genuine and authorized.

2nd. That the belief in Papal Infallibility as defined by the Council of the Vatican—not necessarily as understood by the vulgar of Protestants—is not an invention of Protestants falsely by them attributed to Catholics.

In concluding our notice of this very remarkable work, we would respectfully suggest that if—as is most probable will be the case—a second edition be called for, greater pains be taken by the proof readers, and the occasional typographical errors which occur be carefully corrected.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF TORONTO ON "THE BIBLE"

On Sunday evening, 31st January, His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto, delivered another of his brilliant and learned discourses in St. Michael's Cathedral, taking as his subject, "The Bible." His Grace, on entering the pulpit, began as follows:

It has been alleged that the Catholic church is constitutionally inimical to the spread of the Holy Scriptures. We have on a former occasion, and I hope satisfactorily, proved this to be untrue. It is moreover alleged that the Catholic church receives amongst her canonical books, some which Protestants call apocryphal and reject as uninspired.—There are many apocryphal books rejected both by Protestants and Catholics. We hope to prove this evening that the books rejected by Protestants rightly received by the Catholic church, and that their writers were inspired by God. We will give first a short sketch of the Bible. It is called Bible from the Greek Bimos, a book; the Old and New Testaments; the Old written before the coming of Christ; the New, since that epoch. The matter of the Old Testament may be briefly divided into the Law, History and the Prophets. The Law is contained in five books written by Moses, who gave with the law the most insuperable proofs of his divine mission and inspiration. Next come the Prophets, announcing the judgments of God on an ungrateful people. Besides, from references of the Sacred Scriptures now extant, we find allusions made to over twenty other books which have perished in the various wars and migrations of the Jews, and especially by the destruction of the temple. We will mention the names: 1. The prophecy of Enoch (Jude i. 14); 2. The book of the wars of the Lord (Jude ii. 14); 3. The book of the just (Jude ii. 15, 16, and 2 Kings i. 18); 4. The book of the words of the days of Solomon (3 Kings xi. 41); 5. The book of the words of the Kings of Israel (3 Kings xiv. 19); 6. The book of Kings (2 Paralip. xxiv. 12); 7. The book of Samuel the Seer (1 Paralip. last chapter, 29); 8. The book of Nathan the Prophet (same place); 9. The book of Gad the Seer (same place); 10. The book of Ahia the Shilonite (2 Paralip. ix. 29); 11. The book of vision of Addo the Seer (same place); 12. The book of Semias the prophet (2 Paralip. xii. 15); 13. John the Son of Hanan (2 Paralip. xx. 34); 14. The discourses of Hozai (2 Paralip. xxiii. 13); 15. The discourses or orations of Oasias King of Juda (2 Paralip. xxvi. 22); 16. The 3,000 parables of Solomon (3 Kings iv. 32); 17. The 6,000 or 1,005 canticles of Solomon (same place); 18. Solomon's discourses on nature (same place, v. 33); 19. The descriptions of Jeremiah (3 Mac. ii. 17); 20. The books of Jason of Cyrene (3 Mac. ii. 24). Besides several others, amongst which may be remarked the book on Government which Samuel wrote and laid up before the Lord (1 Kings x. 25). In the new Testament we have a similar division. In the four Evangelists we have the Law. In the Epistles its explication; and in the Acts, the history of the first year of the church, in the Apocalypse the prophecies relating to the "latter times" of the church.—As there is no question between Protestants and Catholics with regard to the Proto-canonical books, we will confine ourselves entirely to those books called by Protestants Deutero-canonical, or Apocrypha. The inspiration and authenticity of the Scriptures must rest upon the testimony of an infallible church. It must be an infallible authority to decide what is the word of God and what is not. A fallible man cannot, on his own authority, decide with certainty that such is and such is not God's word. The infallible cannot come from a fallible source. If the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the ditch. The canonical books are so called from the Greek canon, which signifies a rule or standard. It

is, therefore, a catalogue of books declared to be inspired by a competent authority. But as we have said that authority to be competent must be infallible, we hold that the Catholic church alone is the infallible authority, and competent Judge of what books are inspired and what not. Christ has said: "Hear the church;" and His Apostles: "He that hears you hears me;" and: "I will send the Paraclete the spirit of truth;" and: "to teach you all truth;" [John xvi. 13]. Now on what authority do Protestants rest their canon of Scripture? Not on an infallible authority; they deny such authority on earth; but upon the authority of such men as Cranmer and his associates in the proclamation of the canon of Scripture in opposition to the canon of the Catholic church existing for about 1500 years. It was late for them, after so many centuries, to tell the world, that the Church of Christ had a wrong canon, and that the whole Christian world had been deceived. All the other Protestant denominations which sprung from them or arose about the same time, adopted their canon.

We will represent the faith and teaching of the church, as in other matters, by quoting on this point also the decree of the Council of Trent (Sess. iv.): "And the Holy Synod has thought meet that a list of the sacred books should be set down in this decree, lest a doubt should arise in any one's mind which are the books received by this synod. They are set down here below: Of the Old Testament, the five books of Moses, to wit: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Josue, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two of Paralipomenon, the first book of Esdras, and the second, which is entitled Nehemias; Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, the Davidical Psalter, consisting of 150 Psalms; the Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, the Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, Isaias, Jeremias, with Baruch, Ezechiel and Daniel; the twelve minor prophets, to wit: Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Ajacius, Lacharias, Malachias; two books of the Machabees, the first and the second. Of the New Testament, the four Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; the Acts of the Apostles written by Luke the Evangelist; fourteen Epistles of Paul the Apostle, namely to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, two to Timothy, to Titus, to Philemon, to the Hebrews; two of Peter the Apostle, one of the Apostle James, one of Jude the Apostle, and the Apocalypse of John the Apostle. But if any one receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books, entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic church and as they are contained in the old Latin vulgate edition. . . . let him be anathema."

It will be noticed here that this decree confirms the tradition of the church, which always held these books to be inspired. St. Paul says (2 Thess. ii. 14): "Therefore, brethren, stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistles." And here we may remark that the Protestants have no real proof of the canonicity of Scripture, except from tradition. Away then completely goes the assertion that the Bible alone is the rule of faith. The Bible nowhere gives the canon of Scripture or decides that this book is really Scripture and that that is not. It says all Scripture divinely inspired is good. (2 Tim. iii. 16); "All Scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice." But it does not tell us what this Scripture is or what books are divinely inspired. We will therefore have to cite tradition, after having cited, as above, the church as the infallible Judge of what is and what is not God's word. We will then avail ourselves of the tradition of both the Latin and Greek churches.

But it may be well to notice first a few of the more usual objections made against the canon as pronounced by the Council of Trent. It is said that those books to which objection is made in the old Testament were excluded from the canon of the Jews, and that Esdras and the great council did not admit books that we admit. We agree that Esdras and the great council did not. The Jews were divided into two classes, the Hebrew Jews as they were called, because they used the Hebrew language in their liturgy, though they spoke Chaldaic; and the Hellenic Jews, or Jews of the dispersion. These used the Greek language and read the Scriptures of the Septuagint, a great authority among the Jews. This version is so called from its 70 (or rather 72) translators, the most learned men of the Jewish religion, selected for their learning and piety for the purpose of translating the old Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. It was quoted by Christ and His Apostles. It was used in the very early times of the church and from it was made the Latin translation used in the church before St. Jerome's version. It is still the version used in the Greek church, and its canon accords perfectly with ours. In this version were and are all the books now called deuterocanonical or apocryphal by the Protestants. Besides the books of Nehemias and Malchay were not written in the time of Esdras, whence the absence of these two books will be easily understood. Protestants again do not admit the infallibility of the Jewish church, and hence deny that of Esdras' canon also. Besides the Jewish church did not pronounce apocryphal or uninspired, those books which Protestants do. We know on the contrary that they were held in high esteem by the Jews. Josephus Flavus a great authority, quotes from the book of Ecclesiasticus, apocryphal according to the Protestants, in his apology against Apollon. The Rabbis also cited occasionally those books. For instance Maimonides quotes the book of Wisdom. They are therefore by no means formally rejected by the Jews. It is not against their inspiration that they were not in the canon of the Jewish church. Protestant divines say that they have rejected as apocryphal all the books and parts of books of which there was any doubt in the church. They have not kept to this doctrine. They have admitted many books of which very serious doubts were entertained at some time or other, even by persons of the Protestant faith. For instance doubts have been held and quite recently of the divinity of the Epistle to the Hebrews (left out altogether in the edition of the Bible printed in England in 1579), the Epistle of St. James, (Epistle of Straw, Luther), the Epistle of Jude, the second of St. Peter, the second and third of St. John, and the apocryphal, all of which are at present in the Protestant canon and to be found in their Bible. Our business this evening is not with those, but with those books which are rejected by Protestant Bibles. Those books and parts of books, received by the Catholic Church but denied by Protestants of the present day, are: 1. Tobias; 2. Judith; 3. Part of Esther; 4. Wisdom; 5. Ecclesiasticus; 6. Baruch with the epistle of Jeremias; 7. Parts of Daniel; the song of the three children, the Idol, Ball, and the Dragon, and the story of Susannah, 8. Machabees, 1 and 2. They condemn also the prayer of Manasses and the 3 and 4 of Esdras. In this we perfectly agree with them, since the last mentioned books have never formed any part of the canon of the Catholic Church.

We will first proceed to substantiate our canon of inspired books in full, as it is given in the Council of Trent given above. And here I must repeat the only way Catholics and Protestants have of deciding this point, is from tradition; Scripture is silent.—We may say here, too, that the Protestants do not reject as pernicious those books which they call Apocrypha, but say (Art. 6): "The other books (as Hieron said) the church doth read for example of life and the instruction of manners; but yet doth not apply them, to establish any doctrine." The decree of the Council, as well as the canon published by Eugenius IV. in 1448 at the council of

Basle, confirm the canon of the Council of Trent.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.

The Council of Trent, in its 25th session, declared that the books of the Bible were to be read in the Vulgate edition.