

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

At No. 210, St. James Street, by J. GILLIES.

G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars. If the Subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts.

To all Subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the Subscription shall be Three Dollars.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, Aug. '71," shows that he has paid up to August '71, and owes his Subscription from that date.

S. M. FITZGERALD & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. ROWELL & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1872.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

OCTOBER—1872.

Friday, 11.—Of the Feria.
Saturday, 12.—Of the Immaculate Conception.
Sunday, 13.—Twenty-first after Pentecost.
Monday, 14.—St. Callistus, P. M.
Tuesday, 15.—St. Theresa, V.
Wednesday, 16.—St. Edward, C. (Oct. 13.)
Thursday, 17.—St. Hedwig, W.

ST. PATRICK'S ORPHANS' BAZAAR.

St. Patrick's Orphans' Bazaar will be held in the Mechanics' Hall, on the 24th inst. A Band will be in attendance. Entrance fee, 10 cts; Season Tickets 25 cts.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

There would appear, if *Our Own Correspondent* of the London *Times* may be relied upon, to be a little cloud on the European political horizon, menacing perhaps a storm. Russia, we are told, officially withdraws her congratulations addressed but the other day to M. Thiers, and expresses her dissatisfaction at the bellicose tone, and hostile attitude of the Radical party in France. What this may signify we cannot discover at present; but we may suspect that Prussia is somehow connected with this new attitude as towards France adopted by the Russian Government.

Among the notable events of the week, we may mention the partial destruction by fire of the famous Escorial, one of the architectural glories of Europe, and a building justly characteristic of Old Catholic Spain. It was erected by Philip II., King of Spain, in fulfilment of a vow by him made before the battle of St. Quentin, so glorious to the Spanish arms.—Partly palace, partly monastery, the Escorial was built to represent a gridiron in commemoration of the martyrdom of St. Lawrence, and in it were contained the priceless literary treasures of Spain. These, including the world-renowned library, have in great part been saved, and it is hoped that the injury done to the vast pile of buildings may be repaired.

Agrarian outrages are again reported from Mayo, Ireland. There has been another great Home Rule meeting in Limerick, at which Mr. Butt delivered a very powerful address.—Some sensation has been created in England by the suicide of Sir James Willes, one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas; it appears that the unhappy man was suffering from an attack of insanity, superinduced by gout.

The Legislature of the Province of Quebec is expected to meet for business about the 9th of next month. On Sunday evening about 8 P.M. a heavy thunder storm passed over the city; and in the course of the night the walls of the St. Patrick's Hall fell down with a loud crash. On Monday next there will be a meeting of the shareholders, when the affairs of the concern will be fully discussed.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Sir,—I, and some of my friends, are much troubled to discover the reason why a correspondent of the *Montreal Witness*, of the 26th of last month, signs himself *A Catholic*. Surely he cannot fancy that by so signing, he can deceive any one, or that the features of the Protestant are hid by the Popish cloak he puts on. His design in writing evidently is to involve in doubt a fundamental dogma of the Catholic Church—the supremacy of St. Peter; and to convict of error a preacher in the Church of the Gesù, who asserted that doctrine; and as an instance of its truth, alluded to the position assumed by St. Peter at the Council of Jerusalem, Acts XV. Now what I want to ask of you is "Can the writer in the *Witness* be a member of the Roman Catholic Church, as he pretends to be? and is the passage from the writings of the great St. John Chrysostom by him quoted, and which I enclose, a fair quotation?"

Yours, A Real Catholic.

The following is the extract above alluded to which is given in the *Witness*, as correct translation of a passage in St. John Chrysostom's 33rd Homily on Acts XV.

"St. Chrysostom, one of the greatest Fathers and Saints of the Church, in his xxxiii Homily remarks as follows:

"This (James) was bishop, as they say, and therefore he speaks last. . . . Men and brethren, he says, hearken unto me. His also is a more

complete oration, as indeed it puts the completion to the matter under discussion. . . . There was no arrogance in the Church. After Peter, Paul speaks, and none silences him; James waits patiently, not starts up. Great the orderliness. No word speaks John here, no word the other Apostles, but held their peace, for James was invested with the chief rule. And he says well, with authority, I judge, &c."

"The preacher as the Jesuits may think he knows better how to interpret Scripture than St. Chrysostom. I am bound by the creed of Pope Pius IX. to interpret the Scriptures according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and therefore I conclude that it was St. James and not St. Peter who put the completion to the matter under discussion, and that St. James, and not St. Peter, was invested with the chief rule.

A CATHOLIC.

The above translation from St. Chrysostom is garbled, and corrupted in an anti-Catholic sense; therefore not the work of a real Catholic, and therefore one which no real Catholic would adduce as of any value. We will proceed to point out its errors.

The very first sentence of the 33rd Homily on Act XV. V. 13. from which the writer in the *Witness* quotes, determines the entire question at issue as to the reason why in the Council at Jerusalem, St. James spoke last, and had, so far, the post of honor, assigned to him.

"He—St. James—was bishop of the Church at Jerusalem, and therefore spoke last."

"Episcopos en tes en Hierosolymois Ecclesias outos, dio kai uesteros legei"—Homilia 33.

The "as they say" is an interpolation, in order to throw doubts on the fact of St. James having been the Bishop of Jerusalem, which words are left out: and therefore to ignore or invalidate the reason expressly assigned by St. Chrysostom why he, St. James, was allowed to speak last. The post of honor was assigned to him because the Council was held in his Episcopal City; so the Father expressly tells us.

The great Father and Saint from whom we are quoting—not second hand—then goes on to hold up to the admiration and example of his audience, the order, and modesty of the speakers their mutual forbearance and the absence of all pride, *tuphos* or vain glory. As a striking instance of this he calls attention to the fact that after Peter, Paul spoke, and no one reproved him; that James waited for his turn and did not leap up *ouk apopela*; that John said nothing nor the other Apostles; that they kept silent and were not offended, so pure or free were their minds from all vain glory. Here again the no Popery writer cited in the *Witness* makes an interpolation, making St. Chrysostom give as the reason for the silence of St. John and the other Apostles, that "James was invested with the chief rule." In the original Greek no such words occur in connection with this passage, no such reason is assigned for the silence of St. John and his brethren; but something akin to them may be found in the *previous* sentence, where the fact is alluded to that the place of honor or privilege of speaking the last in the debate was conceded to the Bishop of Jerusalem, because as in the opening of the Homily we are told—the Council was held in his episcopal city—"To him the first place was assigned." By divorcing these words from their context, and poking them in there, where in the original no such words are to be found, the meaning of the entire passage is distorted.

Read with the context, the passage leaves the impression, the very opposite of that which the garbled extract given in the *Witness* is intended to convey. The point upon which St. John Chrysostom insists is, the humility, the absence of vain glory and self assertion that characterized the proceedings of the Council: and as a striking instance of this humility he points to the fact recorded in Acts XV., that, even after Peter had spoken, Paul spoke, and again St. James, and that no one reproved Paul for his presumption in so doing; that neither St. John nor the other Apostles, were offended with St. James. But why should they have been offended? why is it a thing remarkable that Paul and James, without provoking reproaches, spoke after Peter had spoken, if the last named had not been pre-eminent in dignity? Surely, if, as the writer in the *Witness* pretends "St. James and not St. Peter was invested with the chief rule," there was nothing in his being allowed to speak last, and so closing the debate, so very remarkable, as to make it worth while for St. John Chrysostom to appeal to it as a striking instance of modesty and humility, of the absence of vain glory or self assertion from the Council Chamber of the Apostles. On the contrary, on the hypothesis that Peter not James, was by divine appointment invested with the chief rule, but on this hypothesis only, can we see in it anything remarkable, or worth being insisted upon as an instance of apostolic humility. Read with the context, it is therefore clear, that St. John Chrysostom looked upon Peter, not on James, as the Apostle invested with the chief rule; and entitled, had he chosen proudly to insist upon his prerogative to speak last and to close the debate.

That such was the doctrine always held, always expressly taught by St. John Chrysostom, will be manifest from a few citations from that Father's writings, which we give below, and which, did space permit, we might multiply indefinitely. The following will however suffice

to establish our thesis. We content ourselves with giving only the English translation; should the *Witness's Catholic* doubt their accuracy, he can easily convict us of error, since he is so intimate with the writings of the Fathers:—

In the 8th Homily against the Jews, St. Chrysostom speaking of St. Peter's fall, expressly says, that he, St. Peter, by his penitence and tears, so washed away his denial that he was made first of the Apostles—*protos apostolon*, and that to him was committed the rule over the whole earth.

Again in the Homily 3d on Penitence, the same Father speaks of St. Peter as the Coryphous of the Apostles, *koruphe ton apostolon*, the first in the Church, *o protos en to Ecclesia*.

So again, in Homilia, on 2 Timothy c. 3., 1 Peter is spoken of as chief of the company; as the mouthpiece of all the apostles—*stomaton apostolon apanton*; the head of the family; as the chief ruler, and the foundation of the Church.

The same terms, we again find applied to St. Peter, by St. John Chrysostom in his Homily on the parable of the ten talents. Peter is the chief of the choir of the Apostles, the mouthpiece of the disciples, the column or pillar of the Church *o stulos tes Ecclesias*; indeed the great Saint and Doctor heaps up epithet on epithet, piles title upon title, and exhausts the resources of language, in his efforts to express adequately the grandeur of the dignity, and the importance of the office, with which by Christ Himself, St. Peter Prince of the Apostles was invested.

We might fill the page with quotations to the same effect; but these surely are enough to establish our thesis, that St. John Chrysostom held, and taught expressly, the doctrine that, by Christ Himself St. Peter, not St. James "was invested with the chief rule." If then the writer in the *Witness* do indeed feel "himself bound to interpret the Scriptures according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers," he will, unless he can get rid of the quotations from one not the least of those Fathers, by us above given, conclude henceforward, "that St. Peter and not St. James was invested with the chief rule" in the Church.

WHO IS A PROTESTANT? AND WHAT IS PROTESTANTISM?—We certainly wish that Protestants could agree amongst themselves as to what entitles a person to be called a Protestant; and would put out such a definition of Protestantism as should find universal acceptance. This however we can scarce hope for at present, but must still content ourselves with such light as from time to time is thrown upon the subject by Protestant controversies; unless indeed we accept the term Protestant to mean simply any baptized person who is not a Catholic.

This is a good if not an exhaustive definition of the term; though we find another put forward and insisted upon by a large party in the lately held Synod of the Reformed Church of France. After long wrangling, and vainly searching for something positive on which all the members of the Synod could agree, and the holding of which should be deemed sufficient to qualify the holder as a member of the French Protestant Church, the following suggestion—we copy from an editorial report of the proceedings given by the London *Times* of the 3rd July—was made by the Liberal party. There was, as by implication was admitted—no one positive or affirmative principle which all Protestants were prepared to accept; but,—

"there were, indeed, two negative principles on which all were agreed, and which might be considered sufficient to render the Protestants a distinctive body. They protest against Roman Catholicism on the one side and Atheism on the other; but, within these two extremes, it was urged that all forms of belief might find refuge within the Protestant Church."—*Times*, 3rd July.

By this definition, to which 45 out of 106 members of the Synod agreed, any person who is neither a Catholic nor an Atheist is a Protestant, and qualified to be a member of the Protestant Church, no matter whether he be baptized or unbaptized. Every Deist, or one who admits that there is a God, is, provided only that he does not believe what the Catholic Church believes and teaches, *ipso facto* a Protestant. This is a very comprehensive definition; and considering that it emanated from a very considerable body in the Synod of the French Reformed Church it is entitled to a respectful notice.

It was not accepted indeed, 61 to 45 having refused to accept it; and ultimately the test proposed, and agreed to was, that of proclaiming "attachment to the Protestant Reformed Church of France, and revealed truth as contained in the Old and New Testaments." But as it was not determined what were these truths, or wherein they consisted, as still every one is left at liberty to determine these things for himself, even this definition, as the *Times* well remarks, practically excludes no one. "If these," says the *Times*, "are nearly the exact words of the qualification, we may conclude from the proved elasticity of such language amongst ourselves, that the Rationalists are not excluded from further share in the affairs of the Church." Certainly they are not; we all, whether Catholic or Protestant, whether Cal-

vinist or Liberal, profess to believe the truth and all truths contained in the Bible, or in any other book; the only difficulty is—and no small difficulty too—to determine what are those truths? This, *par excellence* the thing to determine, the Synod prudently did not touch, but left to the private judgment of its fellow-Protestants; with the understanding that the real terms of union or church membership should be an "agreement to differ—an idea" the London *Times* adds "not unknown among ourselves."

It must not be supposed that though in a minority the Liberal or Rationalistic party in the French Reformed Church are either numerically, or morally contemptible. Though in a minority in the Synod their representatives are the representatives of a majority of the entire French Protestant body, being representatives of the urban section of the community, out-voted by the rural section. Intellectually the Liberal minority is far superior to the majority. It is true, as the *Times* says, that "its most distinguished members avow and deliberately defend opinions which would here be regarded as a direct negation of Christianity"—for this is the logical result of their consistent Protestantism; nevertheless, as the *Times* admits, their views are "not the views of one or two extreme men, who like a notorious preacher among ourselves, refute themselves by their ignorance and extravagance. They are the deliberate opinions of a large party who maintain them with learning and argumentative powers." They are, the *Times* might have added, the views at which all men capable of reasoning, and who consistently carry out their theological and moral researches on truly Protestant principles must sooner or later arrive; and to which the educated classes of the Protestant community are all hastening in England as in France, in America as in Europe.

DESTRUCTION OF ST. PATRICK'S HALL.

The sad task is imposed on us of recording the total destruction by fire, on the morning of the 2nd inst., of the St. Patrick's Hall, one of the chief ornaments of our city. The loss is great, not merely in a pecuniary point of view, but as involving the destruction of a monument of Irish enterprise; and the most commodious Concert Room and Public Hall in Lower Canada.

The fire was communicated from the premises occupied by Mr. Ronayne's boot and shoe factory, separated only from the St. Patrick's Hall by a narrow alley. Though with their usual zeal and alacrity the Fire Companies were promptly on the ground, and though they braved the destroyer with their well known courage, on which it would be superfluous for us to insist, the flames soon extended themselves to the roof of the St. Patrick's Hall. This took place betwixt two and three o'clock in the morning, at which time a stiff breeze was blowing from East, which afterwards veered to North. This fanned the flames into fury, and it soon became evident that all that could be expected from the Fire Brigade was the confining of the fire to the buildings on which it had already seized. About 3 a.m. the roof of the St. Patrick's Hall fell in with a mighty crash, and soon naught but four bare calcined walls stood to mark the spot where the Irish of Montreal had erected a monument by its beauty and stately proportions worthy of them, of the City of their adoption, and of their native land. With great difficulty the large dry goods store of the Messrs. Morgan was saved; but after the fall of the roof of the Hall the flames were kept under and were prevented from spreading. The total loss of property by this disastrous fire is roughly estimated at about a Quarter of a Million of Dollars. Part of this, but part only, is covered by Insurance in the several offices of this City. The St. Patrick's Hall was insured for only \$55,000; it cost in its erection about \$120,000 so that the loss to the stockholders is great. It will be remembered too that in February, 1869, the roof of the building gave way beneath the unusual load of snow it had to bear, and thus necessitated a very great outlay on the part of the owners of the building.

We are happy to learn that some of the beautiful and costly *Regalia* of our Irish National, Charitable, and Religious Societies were saved; amongst other objects thus rescued uninjured we are glad to see is the gorgeous Banner of the St. Patrick's Benevolent Society, acquired at the cost of \$650. Nevertheless many objects of great price, and acquired at the cost of many sacrifices have doubtless perished in the flames.

It is complained, perhaps with truth, that the hose were in very bad order, and that to this was it in great measure due that, at an early stage the Firemen were unable to get the mastery of the flames. The hose, it is urged were too weak, to resist the strain on them, and imposed by the height to which it was necessary to throw the water. This will of course be enquired into, and promptly remedied. But if substantiated, the defects in the hose complained of do not justify the malignant slander of the

Montreal Witness who, true only to his usual trade, of calumny, lying and slandering again and again insinuates against the Firemen the charge of drunkenness, and neglect of duty. Thus in an article, editorial, on the subject he will not "say that the loss of our most magnificent hall might not have been prevented with present advantages had our firemen managed to keep dryer inside, and made good use of their world renowned agility;" and again in another column, he more expressly charges them, the Firemen, with the same faults:—

"The firemen, we are sorry to say, appeared to pay more respect to an old building in the vicinity, used as a tavern, than to the noble structure named after Ireland's Patron Saint."

As a set off to these attacks of the *Witness* we have the testimony of both the *Montreal Herald*, and the *Gazette*; of whom the one says in its report, that "the heroic daring of the firemen, and their perseverance in the face of discouragements, and appalling dangers cannot be too highly commended, for had it not been for the persistent efforts by which their lives were often imperilled the destruction of property must have been immense." So also in like manner testifies the *Gazette* to "the brave efforts of the firemen;" and in a special paragraph it thus takes up and deals with the calumnies of its evangelical and mendacious contemporary:—

The conduct of our city fire brigade is of the highest importance as regards the protection of Montreal from disastrous fires. The *Witness* charged them, in effect, with drunkenness at yesterday's fire, after the following fashion: "We do not say that the loss of our most magnificent hall might not have been prevented with present advantages, had our firemen managed to keep dryer inside and made good use of their world renowned agility." During the whole time the writer was present, about two hours, the firemen worked in admirable style, and exhibited no signs whatever of being in the slightest degree under the influence of liquor. Such a charge against a body of men distinguished for their courage, sobriety, and good conduct ought never to have been made except upon the most undoubted evidence. We notice that in a later edition the *Witness* withdraws, somewhat gracefully, the charge.

We would venture to hint to the *Witness* that he will find it safer to be a little more careful in the selection of the objects of his malignant mendacity. Lie, and lie lustily, as heretofore against Bishops, priests, Jesuits, and nuns; but when you abandon such game for Scotch Lords, whom in your holy columns you accuse of murder, you are made publicly to eat your own dirty words, and like an abject coward under the lash of the horsewhip, are forced to acknowledge yourself an unscrupulous and unprincipled liar. So when you accuse a body of men in whose reputation the public generally are interested, you find yourselves confronted by such opponents as the *Herald* and the *Gazette*, who again force your words down your throat, at the risk of choking you. Take our advice most evangelical *Witness*; and if you cannot restrain your tongue from evil speaking, lying, and slandering, at least be more circumspect for the future in your selection of the objects of your evangelical attributes.

THE POSITION DEFINED.—As betwixt Germany the persecutor, and the Church, the position is well defined by the London *Times* which editorially remarks:—

"Strange to say, the real contest lies between the strong 'Man of Blood and Iron' at Berlin, and the feeble old man at the Vatican."

And yet great as seem the odds against the latter—to those at least whose eyes have not been opened so that they may perceive "the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire round about" the Vicar of Christ, as of old the heavenly host kept watch round the prophet of the Lord—II. Kings, vi., 17—we feel no hesitation, no doubts as to the result. We fear not; because we know that they that be with us are more than they that be with them; and we are assured that the feeble old man, a prisoner in his own palace will in the long run approve himself more than a match for the "Man of Blood and Iron," as the *Times* well calls him, who from Berlin issues his tyrannical edicts against the Church. He may thunder as he pleases; Catholics laugh at him and his thunder-bolts, and strong in the promises of the Most High hold him, and his weapons in derision.

The following are the terms in which the *Witness* finds itself compelled to retract its false witness against the Fire Brigade. He eats his leek it is true; but by his grimaces it is plain he does not relish the morsel:—

THE FIRE.—We find that the charge made by our reporter on the conduct of the firemen last night was based upon two facts. There was one fireman found somewhat dazed, and apparently the worse of liquor, and others who were believed to be in the same condition; while the abundance of liquor within reach seemed to give color to the accusation. Certainly many onlookers seem to have been deceived by appearances. A gentleman who was with the firemen from the first, and during the whole night assures us that if any remark should be made on the conduct of the Fire Brigade, it should be in the highest terms of praise for their energy and abstinence. He says, moreover, that there was no occasion to test the height of the stream of water on the roof of St. Patrick's Hall, as the flames were inside the roof before the full Brigade could be got to work. Had the flames been attacked, even with buckets, when first seen, it is generally believed the Hall would have been saved.

It is rumored that Sir John Rose will succeed Mr. King as President of the Bank of Montreal.