

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.
TERMS :
To Town Subscribers . . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. . . . \$2½ do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 13, 1854.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The secession of Lord Palmerston—its causes, and probable results, upon the Aberdeen cabinet in particular, and the politics of Europe in general—occupy the public attention to the exclusion almost of all other topics. The *Times* strives very hard, and very ineffectually, to persuade the public that the cause of the noble Lord's retirement was the too democratic tendencies of some of the clauses in the new Reform Bill, that is to be: but the general impression, not only throughout England, but on the Continent as well, is, that the true cause of his resignation of office is to be found in his disapproval of the vacillating policy of his colleagues on the Eastern Question. Lord Palmerston's successor has not yet been found, though many persons have been named, and, if we may believe public report, have been requested to accept the vacant office. The days of the present government, are, to all appearances, numbered; and the next change will, in all probability, be the instalment of a Palmerstonian ministry in the high places of Downing street.

The *Nation*, and Irish liberal press generally, seem to look upon the resignation of Lord Palmerston as a good omen, for the success of the "Tenant Right Bills, and the triumph of Irish policy. In the present distracted state of the Irish party, we fear that Irish influence will be but little felt in the approaching session of Parliament. The members of that party are unfortunately more occupied at the present moment with their own unhappy squabbles, than with the interests of their common country: destitute of all organisation, neither their numbers, nor the talents of their members, will avail them in a battle field, where, to be victorious, unanimity in action, and singleness of purpose, are essentially requisite. The Irish party have men in abundance; men of undoubted talent, and undoubted honesty, but they sadly want a man to concentrate, and direct their, at present misapplied, energies, to the attainment of one common object. At the commencement of 1854, the prospects in the world of Irish politics are anything but encouraging, and sadly belie the glorious promises held out by the apparent triumph of the cause of Catholicity, and Irish nationality, at the last general election. The report of the escape of the gallant Smith O'Brien, though still current, is not fully confirmed, but we hope it may be true; for we are certain, that Smith O'Brien, if at liberty, is so, without any imputation on his honor as a gentleman, and that no one will so much as dare to suspect him of any violation of his parole. We hope that we may soon have the pleasure of announcing his safe arrival in America.

From the Continent of Europe the last mail brings no news of any importance. The persecution at Baden still continues: France is quiet; and from the seat of war in the East, the tidings are still of the same uncertain, unsatisfactory nature. The partial successes of the Turks on the Danube have been more than counterbalanced by the destruction of their squadron at Sinope, and a series of disasters in Asia. The result of the still pending negotiations cannot be known before the latter end of the month.

The last discovery of gold in the vicinity of Geelong seems to have completely eclipsed all the other wonders of the Australian El Dorado; and reads more like a tale of Eastern romance, than sober reality. A writer in the *Geelong Advertiser* testifies to having seen "ninety pounds of gold washed out of one tubful of stuff." Of the value of property, some idea may be formed from the following quotations from the *Catholic Tribune* of Melbourne for the month of September. Suburban lots are selling at from £6,000 to £7,000 per acre; and land at some distance from town is sold as high as £700 per acre. Well may the Melbourne papers which record these things exclaim—"The Arabian Nights would read tamely as compared with the true story of our Gold Fields."

Great distress was caused in Griffintown last week by the rise of the waters far above their usual level. A special meeting of the City Council was summoned to take into consideration this distress, and to devise, if possible, means for its relief. Unfortunately, party spirit ran high, and without so much as enquiring into the merits of the case, or the wants of the sufferers, a majority of the members present retired from the Council, and thus effectually prevented the Corporation from rendering any assistance to the poor Irish in Griffintown. This conduct, as may well be imagined, caused much angry feeling in town; and a meeting, hastily called, but numerously attended, was held on Monday evening last, to give expression to public opinion upon the conduct of those members of the Corporation, who by their hasty withdrawal, had so offensively declared their disregard for the sufferings of their Irish fellow citizens. The Resolutions adopted were temperate, and contained nothing calculated to cause a breach betwixt the French and Irish Catholics of this city; between whom a good understanding should always prevail, seeing how intimately they are united by their common interests.

We are well aware that our French Canadian brethren cannot be taxed with hostility, or even indifference, towards the Irish. On many and many an occasion their sympathy for the victims of misgovernment at home, cruel penal laws, harsh landlords, and typhus fever, has been manifested in the most liberal and generous manner; and he is an enemy to both French and Irish who shall ever endeavor to cause division betwixt them.

The *Montreal Herald* of yesterday takes the *True Witness* to task for the manner in which it spoke, the other day, of the democratic politics advocated, by Messrs. Mitchell, and Meagher; and attributes the opposition offered to that policy, in the United States, to the influence of Popery. Our cotemporary is right. No true Catholic can be a democrat; no true Catholic can sympathise with the cut-throats, brigands, and demagogues of Continental Europe; and, as the Church always, and everywhere, inculcates the duty of obedience to legitimate authority, in the Civil, as well as in the Spiritual, order, no true Catholic, being a British subject, and therefore owing allegiance to his Sovereign Queen Victoria, can approve of, or sympathise with, the politics of that man, who denounces her, as a "felon," and a "she-tyrant." Such language—when applied to a lady, who, like Queen Victoria, by her virtues adds fresh lustre to her exalted rank, and who sets an example to all, which every wife and mother in England, rich or poor, would do well to follow—is as offensive to the feelings of the true Catholic, and we may add, of the gentleman, as it is contrary to truth. Catholics wear their loyalty in their hearts, and not on their lips; if they do not make so much parade of it as do Protestants, it is because it is deeper seated; and though they may, and must, disapprove of many of the acts of the British government, they are too just to hold Queen Victoria either morally, or legally, responsible for them. They may denounce the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and the "Nuns' Bed-chamber Inspection Bill," but, at the same time, they can, from the bottom of their hearts, exclaim, "God bless Queen Victoria." Why then should the *Herald* blame the *True Witness* for expressing its abhorrence of the politics of the man who could speak of that amiable lady as a "She-Tyrant?"

PROTESTANT RIOTS AT CINCINNATI.—From our American exchanges, we gather further details respecting this melancholy affair. It is certain that the design of the mob was either to kill, or to inflict severe personal injury upon, His Excellency the Nuncio; and that the rabble were exhorted to this brutal conduct by a portion of the Protestant Press. Here, for instance, are some extracts from the *Hochwäiter*, the organ of the German Protestants at Cincinnati, which breathe the very spirit of Protestant democracy. After calling His Excellency a "murderer, a tiger, a hyena, a butcher," and reciting the oft-repeated calumnies of Gavazzi, the writer exhorts the Protestants of Cincinnati not to allow Mgr. Bedini to leave them unscathed; or to let the "Butcher of Bologna safely carry home his unbroken limbs, his body, and his life from the Republic of the Stars," lest "posterity should look upon them with scorn and contempt!"

"Wherever the opportunity for revenge offers itself, it should be taken hold of, and used to the utmost.—Whoever has reason for seeking revenge, he shall exercise it wherever he can. The Sons of Italy are too thinly scattered among us to punish the bloodhound of Bologna. The Yankee possesses neither feelings nor principles. . . . Do not count upon the Irish Patriots; they are grown up in ignorance. . . . Germans you are called for, to revenge a murdered nation is not the duty of any other one. Down with Bedini. . . . We have the just confidence in the German population of Cincinnati . . . that they will not do less against that hyena than the brewers of Barclay's against Haynau. What do we care about the *Wahrheitsfreund's* babbling about American hospitality? Who will suffer the tiger, the hyena, among men? Is there for tigers and hyenas a hospitable roof in the republic of stars? Is there no ball, no dagger, for a monster, whose equal was never on earth? . . . Wherever are gallant men, wherever are men, there must be a conspirator against the life of such a monster,—a conspiracy to the last drop of blood, and to the last breath. He is not more a man who lifts not his hand against such a hyena, against a tiger like Bedini."

No wonder, that with such exhortations to violence and murder from the Protestant press, the life of the Nuncio was attempted by the Protestant rabble of Cincinnati. It is in vain for Protestants to deny, or attempt to explain away, the meaning of such language as we have given above. They may add falsehood to brutality, but never will they be able to wipe away the damning facts, that stand on record, written in letters of blood, against them. Yet we should not be surprised; the murder of a Papal Nuncio, by a Protestant mob at Cincinnati, would have been but an appropriate sequel to the burning of a Catholic convent, by another Protestant mob at Boston.

His Grace the Archbishop of Cincinnati, upon hearing of the fatal result of the riots, wherein one man was killed, immediately subscribed the sum of \$10 for the relief of the family of the deceased.—The rioters have been held over to bail in the sums of \$500 each. Tranquillity is restored.

The Sisters of Providence have been presented with £25 by Mr. M. P. J. Cinq-Mars, merchant, McGill Street. It will be remembered that Messrs. Brewster & Mulholland recently lost £200, and offered a reward of £25. Mr. Cinq-Mars found the amount, and having received the reward, devoted it to the funds of the charity referred to; an act which is worthy of all commendation.—*Transcript*.

The *Pilot* and *Herald* are respectfully requested to copy the above.

"A PROTESTANT'S APPEAL TO THE DOUAY BIBLE."

Having shown, by the testimony of Protestant historians, that there are no grounds for accusing the Council of Trent of having introduced any novelties into the faith, or practice of the Catholic Church, it remains for us to point out the differences betwixt the Tridentine decrees, and those propounded by Mr. Jenkins, on the doctrine of Justification. We say, "propounded by Mr. Jenkins," because his is not the doctrine generally held by the Protestant world at the present day; though, to do our author justice, it is the doctrine originally propounded by Luther; but of which, ere his death, Luther himself was ashamed, and which he endeavored partially to retract.—*Hull. Lit. Hist. c. 6.* That doctrine was, that man was justified by faith alone—to the exclusion of holiness of life, and good works, done in the name of Christ, and through the grace of God. In opposition to this, the Church declared that the faith which alone justifies, is the "fides formata," or faith vivified, and working, by charity. A mere intellectual assent to the propositions of Christianity, cannot justify man, in the sight of God.

But, to understand the difference betwixt the Catholic, and Jenkinian systems, it is first of all necessary to understand what is meant by the word "Justification;" for, in the two systems, it has a very different meaning.

To the Catholic, the word "Justification" means the process by which sinful man becomes just; in the same way as by sanctification is meant the process by which he becomes holy; or, as by the words putrefaction, and petrification, are meant the processes by which a body becomes putrid, or acquires the consistency of stone.* In other words, the Church teaches that when a man is justified, he is made just. The word Justification is thus defined by the Council of Trent:—

"Non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio, et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratia et donorum; unde homo, ex injusto, fit justus, et ex inimitico, amicus."—*Sess. VI., c. 7.*

In the same sense, Justification is thus defined by the learned Moehler, in his *Symbolik*:—

"An exaltation from the state of sinfulness to that of grace; that is to say, an annihilation of the union of the will with the sinful Adam (a removal of original sin, and of every other sin committed before justification) and the contraction of fellowship with Christ, the Holy and the Just One—a state which is, in a negative sense, that of remission of sins, and, in a positive sense, that of sanctification. When God declares man to be just, and well pleasing to Him, he really is so;"

or else God would declare a lie, which is impossible.

From this it will be seen—that the Church inculcates the necessity of an intrinsic justice, of becoming really just, ere one can be said to be really justified, or made just—and that by Justification, she means, not merely a relative change of the sinner to the Just One, but an actual change in the sinner himself; a change which is absolutely necessary; ere the God of truth can pronounce man, just. The Church knows nothing of a merely imputed justice, or of an unjust justified man. Her doctrine is—and it does sound very much like common sense—that, to be just before God, man must be just; and that if he is not just, he has not been justified, or made just:—

"Non modo reputamur, sed vere justi nominamur, et sumus."—*Conc. Trid. Sess. vi., c. 7.*

The Church likewise asserts the Free-will of man; and, whilst she teaches that, without Christ, man can have no merit, or do any really good work, meritorious of supernatural reward, she also teaches that the Grace, which God—for His dear Son's sake, freely, and without any merit on man's part—offers to all, is forced upon none; that man is free to accept, or to reject, it; and that, throughout, he must co-operate with the Grace offered; and thus, in the language of the Apostle—work out his salvation in fear and trembling. If he does so, he is said to merit the reward propounded—Heaven, and Life Everlasting; if he does not, he merits Hell, and eternal death. That man can merit at all is, however, the free gift of God:—

"Cujus tanta est erga omnes homines bonitas, ut eorum velit esse merita quae sunt ipsius dona."—*Conc. Trid. Sess. VI., c. 16.*

Thus, in the process of the adult man's justification, we have, according to the Catholic system, two factors, God and man—and recognise two operations—the Divine, and the human; so that, in the words of Moehler, "it constitutes one Theandric work;" God, of His free bounty, and without any merit whatsoever on man's part, gives to him the power to merit; leaving him however free to use, or abuse that perfectly unmerited gift. If man make a right use of it, if he heartily co-operate with the Grace so freely given, he becomes a fellow-worker with the Giver; and is then said to merit the reward which God has of His great goodness propounded as the recompense of that co-operation. If man reject the proffered Grace, or fail to use it, the fault is his own entirely; and his damnation is the merited, and inevitable result of his own abuse of God's best gifts, and not of any irresistible, and irreversible decree. It is thus that man can either merit, or demerit; for of course, if he cannot merit, then neither can he demerit; and thus, if we deny the possibility of merit, on man's part—as defined by the Council of Trent—so also do we deny the possibility of any demerit; and thus the reprobation of the sinner, instead of being a striking instance of God's justice, becomes a melancholy display of His capricious cruelty; and the Just One is degraded to the level of a tyrant—as He was by Calvin, by whom God was represented as an odious monster, a loathsome compound of caprice, and cruelty, unworthy of any honest man's love, or obedience. The truth is that Calvin's God was

* "Quid est justificatio? Justum facere. Quomodo mortificare, mortuum facere; vivificare, vivum facere."—*St. Aug. Serm. 292, Cont. Don.*

† "Sine voluntate tua non erit in te justitia Dei. Voluntas quidem non est nisi tua, justitia non est nisi Dei. Esse potest justitia sine voluntate tua, sed in te esse non potest prae voluntate tua. . . . Sine te fecit te Deus. Qui ergo fecit te sine te, non te justificat sine te."—*St. Aug. Serm. 169.*

only the devil under another name; an omnipotent and infinitely malicious devil.

Having now stated the Catholic doctrine, and shown how, and in what sense, man may merit, it is but fair that we should state the Protestant doctrine, as propounded by Mr. Jenkins; who, whilst professing Arminianism, and whilst the hired preacher of a Wesleyan congregation, was all along preaching the rankest Calvinism; though his intelligent audience do not seem to have been conscious of it.

It is well known, to all who have studied the question, that the views of Arminius on the relations of God to man, and those of Calvin, are perfectly irreconcilable with one another; the former asserting the Catholic doctrine of Free will, which the latter denied. At the Synod of Dort, A.D. 1618, the followers of Arminius, whose tenets the Wesleyans profess, to hold, were condemned as heretics, deprived of all ecclesiastical preferments, and banished the country. On many points, their tenets, as laid down by Simon-Episcopus, their most celebrated theologian, approximate so closely to Catholic doctrine, that it requires a nice metaphysical eye to detect the difference; but they offer no resemblance whatever to those of the Calvinists; of which, as we said before, they are the direct contradictory. It was therefore, for some time, incomprehensible to us, how, whilst professing Arminianism, Mr. Jenkins could have been allowed to preach ultra-Calvinism from a Wesleyan pulpit; until we remembered that Protestants are generally as ignorant of their own religious systems, as they always are of that of Catholics.

According to Mr. Jenkins' system, man is utterly destitute of all Free will; with Luther, he reduces man to the condition of a stone, or stump, in so far as any act of volition is concerned—and by declaring man's nature to be "totally corrupt," denies the existence in man of any faculty even, wherewith to co-operate with Divine Grace, when offered. Of course in such a system, there is no place for either merit, or demerit, on man's part; man ceases to be a morally responsible agent; for, as by nature, "totally corrupt"—he cannot so much as accept the Grace of God when offered to him. This was the old Protestant doctrine, now, thank God, pretty generally exploded, though it is still held by rigid Calvinists.—"That we do no injustice to Mr. Jenkins, will be seen from the following extracts, in which man is represented as, as little responsible for his acts, as the vine branch laden with fruit, is responsible for its rich clusters of grapes:—

"What of merit is there in the branch of the vine laden with its rich clusters of fruits, the branch that derives all its life and nourishment from the roots and the stock; that is pruned by the husbandman; that is warmed by the sun, and fanned by the breeze?"—*p. 226.*

None whatever, certainly; because, and just because, the branch, being an inanimate object, is utterly incapable of any act of volition; it is a machine; and can have no merit, because perfectly irresponsible. Not so however would it be, if the branch were a free and responsible agent; capable of refusing, by the exercise of its will, to be joined to the parent stock; capable also, in virtue of the same free will, of refusing—despite the caresses of the husbandman, the genial rays of the sun, and the refreshing showers—to bear fruit at all; and obliged, ere it could bring forth its rich cluster of grapes, to undergo toil, fatigue, privations, and self-denial; to wrestle, not unaided certainly, but still to wrestle with numerous powerful, and opposing influences. In the former case, no merit is attributable to the vine branch, because, if it bears fruit, it is because it cannot do otherwise; in the latter, merit—in the same sense in which Catholics predicate merit of the good works done by the Christian in connection with Christ—might well be attributed to the vine branch; because "its rich clusters of fruit" would be partly the result of its hearty, unforced, and voluntary co-operation with the husbandman;—all whose labors would have been in vain, had the vine branch not chosen so to co-operate. Thus then we see, from Mr. Jenkins' analogy, that, according to his system—as in that of Luther—man is merely an inanimate, unconscious, irresponsible machine; destitute—as the branch of a tree, as a stock, or stone—of all free will; and irresistibly acted upon by forces from without, with which he cannot co-operate, but to which he can offer no opposition; and who is therefore utterly destitute of all merit, if he bring forth fruit abundantly; and of course equally undeserving of blame, if he bring forth no fruit at all. Man, according to this Protestant theory, is a mere machine, irresponsible, and therefore, only—because irresponsible, because not a free moral agent—incapable of meriting, or demeriting. How Mr. Jenkins can reconcile the eternal torturing of such an irresponsible creature, with God's infinite goodness and justice, we cannot understand. Why should the vine branch be punished, if it bring not forth fruit? The fault must be either in the husbandman, or the vine itself; but it would be ridiculous to attribute it to the mere branch.

Till Mr. Jenkins shall have solved this question, we may well afford to laugh at his attack upon the Tridentine decrees; and at his absurd analogies betwixt man—a free agent—and the inanimate, and irresponsible branch of a tree. Nay, we should not laugh; we should rather mourn that man should dare, so to blaspheme his God, so to malign the noblest work of his Creator. For, of course, if man be but as the branch of a tree, helpless and irresponsible, his fruits, whether good, or evil, are the work of God; and thus—as were Luther and Melancthon—we are driven to the blasphemous assertion, that God is the author of all evil—as much the author of the adultery of David, as of his subsequent repentance; of the treachery of a Judas, as of the confession of St. Peter. Strip man of his Free-will, pronounce, with the Calvinist, his nature to be "totally corrupt," and you have declared man's Creator to be the author of all his sinfulness, and all his abominations.