

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 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. PATTENBELL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo.  
ROWELL & Co., 40 Park Row, are our only authorized  
Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1872.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MARCH—1872.  
Friday, 22—Seven Dolours, B. V. M.  
Saturday, 23—Of the Feriis.  
Sunday, 24—PALM SUNDAY.  
Monday, 25—Of the Feriis.  
Tuesday, 26—Of the Feriis.  
Wednesday, 27—Of the Feriis.  
Thursday, 28—Holy Thursday.

BEWARE OF THE CITY CARS.—If it be  
true, as stated in the *Witness*, that these carry  
persons sick with small-pox, we warn all who  
read these lines, never to travel in the City  
Cars.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The telegram reports, that on St. Patrick  
Day, it was proposed to make a great political  
demonstration in Ireland, having for its object  
an amnesty for the prisoners still undergoing  
punishment for offences connected with Fenian-  
ism. A great Home Rule meeting has been  
held in the Rotundo, Dublin, at which Mr.  
Butt made a very strong speech, hinting at  
ulterior measures, should the result of the next  
general election not be favorable towards pro-  
curing from the Imperial Parliament the desired  
political changes.

The British Government has received from  
France official notice of the abrogation of the  
Commercial Treaty. The excitement on the  
Alabama claims question has much subsided;  
no apprehensions seem to be entertained that  
serious consequences will ensue. The claimant  
in the Tichborne case, now in jail, awaiting his  
trial on a charge of perjury, is generally believed  
to be Arthur Orton, and will, it is said, soon  
be indicted on a charge of murder by him com-  
mitted in Australia. Detectives from that  
country, with a warrant for his arrest, are, it is  
said, actually on their way to England.

Marshall Bazaine is to be brought to trial  
before a Court Martial for surrendering Metz  
and the army under his command to the Ger-  
mans. The fortifications around Paris are to  
be repaired and put in a state of thorough  
efficiency. The situation at Rome remains un-  
changed; no importance is to be attached to  
the rumors that the Sovereign Pontiff is about  
to leave his capital, though no doubt his stay  
there is rendered very irksome by the presence  
of the licentious foreign mercenaries of the  
sub-Alpine King. The funeral of Mazzini,  
the suborner of assassins, and the apostle of  
the dagger, was celebrated in Rome on Thurs-  
day last. The *carnivale* of the revolution, and  
criminal population turned out in great force to  
do honor to one of their own stamp.

Winter still reigns in Montreal, and the  
death-rate from small-pox rises higher and  
higher every week. Its chief ravages are  
amongst the French Canadians.

St. Patrick's Day was duly celebrated in  
Ireland and everything passed off quietly. The  
reply of the U. States Government to Lord  
Granville's note has been discussed in the  
British Cabinet, and the impression thereby  
produced is said to be favourable. Another  
French priest a Rev. M. Junque is reported  
as having gone over to the anti-Catholics. The  
Archbishop of Cologne has formally excom-  
municated four of the Professors of Bonn  
University for refusing to submit to the decrees  
of the Council of the Vatican.

The assassin of Lord Mayo, late Governor  
General of India, has suffered the penalty of  
his crime. On the scaffold he disclaimed the  
imputation of having acted as the agent of  
others, and avowed himself to be the sole  
designer as well as sole perpetrator of the  
crime.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.—The temptations  
to deliver lectures upon this subject are, to  
Protestant ministers, many and great. Such  
lectures offer a fine opportunity for denouncing  
the "Man of Sin;" and when delivered before  
"Young Men's Associations," the lecturer is  
not bound over to keep the truth, or to adhere

to historical facts; since he is well assured  
that the ignorance of his audience on these  
matters is as profound as his own contempt for  
veracity and logic. Under such circumstances,  
he makes his own history; invents his facts, and  
draws what conclusions he pleases. And so  
when the hour is passed, lecturer and audience  
separate well pleased with one another.

These remarks were suggested to us by the  
perusal in the *Montreal Gazette* of a report of  
a lecture delivered the other day by a Protest-  
ant minister of this city, the Rev. Mr. Baldwin,  
in connection with the "Cathedral Young  
Men's Association;" that these remarks are ap-  
propriate we propose to show, by quoting from  
the lecture, as reported, one or two passages;  
and contrasting them with the facts as recorded  
by ecclesiastical historians, whose testimony  
cannot be impugned as that of witnesses pre-  
judiced in favor of Papal claims.

The Rev. Mr. Baldwin started with the as-  
sertions that, "in the early days of the Romish  
Church no ecclesiastic held supreme author-  
ity;" and it "was explained that the Papacy  
was founded on a Canon passed by the Council  
of Sardica in the year 343." In other words,  
the Primacy, or Supremacy of the Pope, was  
unknown to the early Christian Church, and  
was based upon a decree of the Council of Sar-  
dica in the fourth century. This we think is  
the fair interpretation of the lecturer's words.

To these bold assertions, made in reliance  
upon the profound ignorance of his audience,  
we oppose the testimony of the Protestant  
Neander; and of another writer, of whom one  
would think that, as the great opponent of  
Papal claims, even the Rev. Mr. Baldwin, and  
his audience must have heard; we mean the  
now notorious Dr. Dollinger. The question at  
issue is, not as to the validity of the claims of  
the Bishop of Rome; but as to their antiquity.  
Were they known to, and admitted by the ear-  
liest of the Christian writers, whose works we  
possess, and long before the Council of Sar-  
dica? To the discussion of this purely histor-  
ical question, we limit ourselves; and as our  
witnesses we call into Court—first Neander, the  
Protestant historian.

Having in the preceding paragraph, spoken  
of the very early tendency in the Christian  
Church to transfer to Rome the secular capital  
of the Empire, a spiritual supremacy as the  
*cathedra Petri*—he, Neander, goes on to say:

"In Cyprian we find this transference already  
complete. In proof of our assertion we will adduce  
not only the passage in his—St. Cyprian's—book  
*De Unitate Ecclesie*, where the reading is disputed,  
but an uncontroverted passage Ep. 55, ad Cornel.  
where he styles the Roman Church the '*Petri Cathedra*,  
*ecclesia principalis*, *unde unitas sacerdotialis*  
*coorta est*.'"—*Vol. i., p. 293, Bohm's Edition.*

Now from this it is clear that in the third  
century, and therefore long before the Council  
of Sardica, the supremacy of Rome as the  
*cathedra Petri*, as the source of sacerdotal  
unity in the Christian Church, was generally  
recognised in the most explicit terms; and that  
that superiority, or headship was founded not  
upon any canon or decree of councils, but upon  
the universal belief, well or ill-founded is not  
here the question;—that Christ had conferred  
upon St. Peter certain prerogatives of feeding,  
ruling, and governing the whole church; and  
that these prerogatives, had been transmitted  
from St. Peter to his successors as Bishops of  
Rome. That St. Cyprian may at times in  
practice not have approved himself always quite  
consistent with his theories, even if established,  
is only a proof that the best of men are liable  
to error; but the fact is admitted by Neander  
that, as early as the time of St. Cyprian, that  
is to say in the third century, the "transference"  
to Rome, the *cathedra Petri*, of the high pre-  
rogatives in the spiritual or ecclesiastical order  
that had been attached in the secular order to  
Rome, the City of the Cæsars, was "already  
complete."

We will next call on Dr. Dollinger to testi-  
fy: his evidence to facts—not opinions—when  
given in favor of the Pope, surely cannot be  
impugned as that of a partial witness. We  
quote from his *History of the Church*, Vol. i.,  
c. iii. sect. *The Primacy*:—

There are not wanting, in the first three centuries,  
testimonies and facts, some of which directly attest,  
and others presuppose, the supremacy of the Roman  
Church and of its Bishops. The first testimony is  
that of an apostolic Father, St. Ignatius who, in the  
superscription of his letter to the Romans, gives this  
supremacy to their Church, naming it the *directress*  
*of the testament of love*, that is of all Christian-  
ity. After him, the disciple of another apostolic  
Father, St. Irenæus, declares the same in terms  
clear and precise. . . . Tertullian also, when a  
Montanist, although unwillingly, bore witness to  
the supreme dignity of the bishop of Rome. . . .  
St. Cyprian, therefore, considers the apostle Peter as  
the depository of the Episcopacy, as well as of the  
supremacy. . . . Peter conveyed this high  
prerogative to the Church of Rome; the Episcopal  
throne of this Church is the throne of Peter (*cathedra*  
*locus Petri*); the Church of Rome is the first,  
the principal Church; the bishop of Rome is the suc-  
cessor—the representative of Peter, and therefore  
possesses all the distinctive power, all the authority  
of his predecessor. . . . his Church is the root,  
the mother (*radix et matrix*) of the Catholic Church."  
"St. Cyprian does not speak of this supreme  
power of the Roman Pontiff merely on a passing occa-  
sion; he exhorts him to exercise it."  
"This authority of the Pope was not unknown to the  
Pagans. This is proved not only from the celebrated  
sentence of the Emperor Aurelian, but also by a re-  
mark made by St. Cyprian respecting the persecutor  
Decius."  
"Like all other essential parts of the Constitution  
of the Church, the supremacy was known and ac-

knowledge from the beginning as a divine institu-  
tion, but it required time to unfold its faculties."—  
*Dollinger's History of the Church.*

Our limited space bids us to stop quotations  
to the same effect, which we might multiply  
indefinitely; but we have quoted enough to  
prove—even by the testimony of witnesses  
whom no one can suspect of ultra-montane  
proclivities—our thesis, which is,—not that the  
claims of Papal Supremacy are well founded;  
but the historical fact that these claims were  
asserted; generally known, to Pagans as well  
as to Christians; and acknowledged as a  
"divine institution" forming part of the "*es-  
sential constitution of the Church*," from the  
very earliest ages of Christianity, and were not  
therefore founded on the canons of a Council  
held in the fourth century.

We will pass to another topic. The Rev.  
Mr. Baldwin asserted "that certain bishops"  
—we suppose he meant Popes—"who were in-  
fallible according to this argument, have been  
condemned by synods which the Roman Catho-  
lic Church itself admitted to have been in-  
fallible also."

This again is historically false. The burden  
of proof, however, rests with the Rev. Mr.  
Baldwin; and we challenge him to produce  
one single instance, in which a decree, defini-  
tion, or dogmatic utterance of the Pope, ad-  
dressing the universal Church, *ex cathedra*, on  
question of faith or morals—and it is under  
these conditions alone that the Pope is defined  
to be infallible—has been condemned by any  
synod which the Roman Catholic Church itself  
admitted to be infallible. Again, the question at  
issue is one of historical fact, not of theology,  
or dogma.

Before we conclude we must glance at the  
Reverend lecturer's logic. He complains that  
the Doctrine of Papal infallibility under the  
above prescribed conditions, "has not been  
carried by the triumphs of intellect; it has  
not been found out as the laws by Kepler were  
found out, by the most rigid and stern logic;  
it has not been found out by the power of the  
human mind;" but has been imposed by the  
sheer strength of authority. This is the lec-  
turer's strong point against it.

Now we admit all this; because it is by  
means of revelation, and not by reason, that we  
must determine the question: because it is a  
question that lies, not in the natural order in  
which alone human reason is competent to ad-  
judicate: but in the supernatural order in which  
human reason is impotent. In the same way  
the doctrine of the Incarnation, or that Christ  
was born of a pure Virgin, "has not been  
carried by the triumphs of intellect;" it was not  
by processes such as Kepler applied to the  
movements of the heavenly bodies, that the  
doctrine of the Trinity was discovered; neither  
was it by the power of the human mind that  
the "resurrection of the body," as asserted in  
the creed which the Rev. Mr. Baldwin is bound  
daily to recite, was found out. These dogmas  
were imposed by the sheer strength of authority,  
as is the doctrine of the Papal infallibility, and  
upon no better grounds. If received at all, the  
first three named are received simply by virtue  
of that "overweening and mysterious power"  
which wields such an influence over the human  
mind," to which the Rev. Mr. Baldwin attri-  
butes the reception by Catholics of the doctrine,  
—that the Pope, as successor of St. Peter, to  
whom Our Lord gave, in the words of the  
Council of Florence, full power, not limited  
but full power, to "feed, rule and govern the  
universal Church," is competent to do that  
which Christ appointed him to do: in other words,  
that he is infallible, when from the Chair of  
Peter he so "feeds, rules, and governs the uni-  
versal Church." The Rev. Mr. Baldwin, as a  
minister of the Anglican denomination of Pro-  
testants should be cautious not to attack the  
principle of authority, as the sole motive for re-  
ceiving any truths in the supernatural order,  
and therefore infinitely beyond the grasp of  
reason, a natural faculty; test he should, at the  
same time, and by the same process, undermine  
the grounds on which alone the professed belief  
of his Protestant congregation in doctrines, such  
as the Incarnation, the Trinity, and the Resur-  
rection of the Body can be securely based. Not  
being accustomed to reason logically, much as  
he may prate about reason, the Rev. Mr.  
Baldwin will perhaps be surprised—if we may  
be permitted to infringe upon a patent of the  
Atty. General—to learn that there are just as  
good grounds for believing that, under the  
prescribed conditions, the Pope is infallible, as  
there are for believing that the Person known  
in history as Christ was born of a pure virgin;  
and he who denies the first named doctrine  
must, if amenable to the laws of logic, speedily  
reject the other also, as resting on no more

A mysterious power indeed, a superhuman  
power certainly, seeing that it is as strong now, when  
the power of the Pope and Church, humanly speak-  
ing, is at its lowest ebb, as it was in the days when  
proud monarchs held the stirrups of God's Vicar  
on earth, and deemed their dignity increased. Such  
a power is not of natural origin. The Pagans would  
have cited it, as demonic, and so most Protestants, if  
logical. The power cannot be denied; the question is,  
is it from God or the devil? Does it come to us  
wafted by airs from heaven, or by blasts from hell?  
That is the question.

Christianity, we reply: and nothing else—  
Christianity, considered as a system of revela-  
tion, of supernatural revelation, whose necessity,  
nay, whose possibility our contemporary, ignor-  
ing the obligations that he owes to it, virtually  
denies. The light by which he is able to de-  
tect the unity of the human race, the common

trustworthy foundation; as justly obnoxious to  
the imputation of not having "been carried by  
the triumph of human intellect;" of not having  
"been found out" as were the laws of Kepler;  
and as not having been discovered "by the power  
of the human mind." The Rev. Mr. Baldwin's  
principle, if adopted,—though the fundamental  
principle of Protestantism,—will, if consistently  
followed, lead him a long way—further perhaps  
than the good simple man reckons for.

The *Northern Journal*, in a well written ar-  
ticle, of the 9th inst., on the Rule of Faith,  
does us the honor of addressing us by name on a  
very important question; to wit, revelation.  
The writer would "fain believe," so he tells  
us, "in God, in the immortal soul of man, in  
the communion of the Divine with the human  
mind; in a revelation that is perpetual and  
personal, and not contained in words, or de-  
pendent upon evidences." He apparently  
scouts the idea of any revelation from without,  
either by living Church, or by dead book;  
but relies only on the inward revelation which  
God makes to every man in particular.

"We would believe that our Father Who art in  
Heaven, comes to every man just in proportion to his  
purity of heart—and his aspiration, and dwells with  
him. And this indwelling of the Divine Spirit in  
the hearts of men is the highest revelation, there is  
no other possible revelation, for a revelation of  
God to any man is a revelation to him alone, to all  
others it is a matter of evidence."—*Northern Journal*, 9th  
inst.

This, though virtually a renunciation of  
Christianity considered as a supernatural re-  
velation, is the only position that can consist-  
ently be occupied by those who deny the ex-  
istence of an infallible Church, as the medium  
by which the contents of that revelation are  
transmitted to us. It is, in consequence, a  
position occupied by many Protestants of high  
intellectual acquirements, by numbers whose  
natural virtues enforce our respect. But, we  
repeat it, it is a position that no one can occu-  
py, and consistently call himself a Christian.

And he who occupies this position is bound  
to explain how it is that such contradictory views  
of God, and of man, and of the duties of the  
latter, do obtain, even at the present day, if, one  
and the same God have revealed Himself to all  
alike. Since such contradictory views do ac-  
tually obtain, even amongst those who hold the  
position occupied by the writer in the *Northern  
Journal*—of two things one. Either God con-  
tradicts Himself in his several "personal" re-  
velations; or this inner revelation is a very un-  
trustworthy guide to follow.

And if we contrast the modern, with the  
more ancient world, as it was before the days  
of Christ, the same difficulty presents itself in  
a still stronger light. For if God to-day reveal  
Himself to each individual in particular; and  
if He be indeed the common Father of us all,  
and not a mere capricious ruler, then from all  
time must He have done the same thing, and  
have revealed Himself inwardly to every indi-  
vidual member of the human race. How then  
is it that, ever since the Christian era, when as  
we pretend, a special revelation, *ab extra*, was  
made, and only since then, the ideas of man as  
to his duties have undergone such a thorough  
radical change? The doctrine of progress will  
not explain this; for progress necessarily implies  
tradition from man to man, and the question is—  
How is it, if God reveal Himself inwardly to  
every one, as our contemporary assumes is the  
case; and if such revelation be the "highest," say  
the "only revelation possible," that men to-day  
entertain views of their duties, so very differ-  
ent from those that obtained two thousand  
years ago, amongst the best and wisest men of  
the ancient world? Does God reveal Himself  
differently to-day from what He did twenty  
centuries ago?

To illustrate our meaning let us simply take  
the case of slavery, in the agitation for the  
abolition of which, many of those who to-day  
occupy the position of our contemporary, have  
taken a prominently active, if not always a  
very prudent part. To what is it due that  
their ideas of the system of slavery are so dif-  
ferent from those of antiquity? that they re-  
gard it as the abomination of all abominations,  
as a sin against God and against man? Whilst  
to the men of the days of Augustus it pre-  
sented itself as the proper organisation of so-  
ciety, as indispensable to order? Whence  
comes it that moderns speak of the slave, of the  
negro, great as is the apparent physical differ-  
ence betwixt the negro and the white man, as a  
"man and a brother?" whilst the actual sen-  
timent of the pagan world towards its slaves,  
even white slaves, is well expressed by the  
words which the Roman satirist puts in the  
mouth of the delicate Roman matron?

"O demens! ita servus homo est?" Juvenal, *Sat. 6.*  
Betwixt the modern "*man and brother*,"  
and the pagan "*ita servus homo est*?" how  
wide is the gulf! What then has bridged it  
over?

Christianity, we reply: and nothing else—  
Christianity, considered as a system of revela-  
tion, of supernatural revelation, whose necessity,  
nay, whose possibility our contemporary, ignor-  
ing the obligations that he owes to it, virtually  
denies. The light by which he is able to de-  
tect the unity of the human race, the common

brotherhood of all men, no matter of what  
color, or of what condition, is not the light of  
human reason; for that light the ancients had,  
and yet they saw it not. Neither is it the  
light of that particular revelation which our  
contemporary assumes that God makes to every  
man; for if God do indeed so reveal Himself,  
how came it that before the days of Christ the  
best and wisest of pagan antiquity did not see  
it?—that even men like Cato esteemed slaves  
but as the beasts of the field, to be sold off like  
cattle, when they began to get old and infirm?  
No: the light which has dawned upon the  
human race is the light of the Son of Right-  
eousness, whose rays now illuminate the entire  
world, and make plainly visible to the dulc-  
est eyes, truths which before its appearance above  
the horizon were, if not imperceptible, at least  
obscure to the keenest sighted of mortals.

Our modern perception of great moral truths,  
such as the evils of negro slavery, and the bro-  
therhood of the human race, are then due,  
neither to the light of reason, nor to some per-  
sonal revelation which, of late years, God  
has made to every one in particular. Human  
reason, alone, can not prove the common origin,  
or brotherhood of the white and negro races.  
A Darwin would only insist that both have  
been gradually developed from one common  
protoplasm; the negroes being the more im-  
perfectly developed; the whites being some few  
degrees higher raised than is the negro, above  
the stage of apes, and other quadrumanous  
mammals, through which stages both have  
passed. And this discovery, the last triumph of  
human reason, would justify rather than con-  
demn slavery; since there is no one who de-  
nies the right of the white man to reduce to  
servitude the ape; and since man, the black  
man, according to Darwinianism, differs from  
the ape in degree only, and not in kind.

We will not discuss the changes which, since  
the Christian era, have taken place in the re-  
lations of the sexes to one another; for we are  
sure that our contemporary will admit that the  
moral standard that obtains in any modern  
Christian community, though often deplorably  
low, is higher than that which obtained in the  
most polished, and best cultivated circles of  
pagan antiquity. Modern so called civilisation  
has many ugly spots on its surface; but had as  
it is, an hour's stroll through the deserted  
streets of Pompeii would show that it is better  
at its worst, than was the civilisation of the  
pre-Christian world at its best. This change  
for the better, we, in default of any other cause  
assignable, attribute to that which our con-  
temporary assumes to be impossible; to wit, Chris-  
tianity considered as a supernatural revelation  
from God to man, through Christ; and perpetu-  
ated and diffused amongst all nations by  
means of a Catholic Church by Christ Himself  
appointed to that work, and supernaturally as-  
sisted in the performance thereof.

RELIGION AND POLITICS.—The wriggings,  
the twistings, and the turnings-of-his-back-  
upon-himself, of our contemporary the *Witness*  
upon the question whether ministers of religion  
should meddle with politics? are awful to be-  
hold; as with desperate energy the man tries  
to be upon both sides of the fence at one and  
the same time. The controversial feat which  
our acrobatic contemporary proposes to accom-  
plish is this:—To show that it would be an in-  
fringement upon the civil liberties of the Pro-  
testant minister, were the State to deny him the  
same freedom of speech and action on all polit-  
ical matters that it accords to other citizens;  
but that it is quite the proper thing for the  
State to step in, and to visit with the severest  
pains and penalties, the Catholic priest who  
should indulge in like liberties. It must be  
confessed that the feat which the *Witness* thus  
proposes to itself is an arduous one; and the  
spectator must certainly look on with no little  
anxiety at the rash man, as he recklessly bounds  
into the air, presently to come down heavily,  
not to say loutishly to his mother earth.

He starts with the proposition that "clergymen"  
that is to say Protestant clergymen,  
"like other citizens cannot be denied their civil  
rights;" and of course, amongst these rights is  
that of freely expressing their opinions upon every  
political subject, and of doing their best by ar-  
gument, and moral suasion to make converts to  
those opinions; subject of course to those pains  
and penalties only, which await all citizens in  
common, who provoke to violence, and physical  
force. In short a Protestant clergyman forfeits  
none of his rights of citizenship, and puts on  
no new responsibilities as towards the State,  
when he dons the black coat and white choker,  
and dons himself reverend. The theory is  
correct.

But if correct in the case of the Protestant  
minister, why not equally so in the case of the  
Catholic priest? Why should not the latter be  
allowed the same freedom of political speech  
and action, as is the Protestant clergyman, and  
be subject to no legal pains and penalties but  
what the other is subject to? Ordination may,  
or may not, confer a special grace. Catholics  
believe that it does: Protestants insist that it  
does not: but whether or no, the latter cannot