

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.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1872.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR. NOVEMBER—1872.

Friday, 15—St. Gertrude, V. Saturday, 16—Of the Immaculate Conception. Sunday, 17—Twenty sixth after Pentecost. Monday, 18—Dedication of the Basilica of St. Peter and Paul.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

With the exception of a report of another intended conspiracy in Spain there is nothing of political importance from Europe to record. The condition of the southern parts of the Italian Peninsula subject to Piedmontese rule is most deplorable.

The Montreal Witness complains that we have done him an injustice by attributing to him an article copied by him from the Independent, and that appeared in his columns of the 12th ult. With what of truth this complaint is urged by our evangelical contemporary; how far we have justly laid ourselves open to the imputation of "misquoting," will be apparent from the article in the TRUE WITNESS complained of, which we give below—

Whether we in an issue of the 1st inst. were guilty of that "misquoting" with which the Witness taxes us; or whether we expressly stated that the article that appeared in his columns was by him copied from the Independent—the readers of the above extracts will be able to judge for themselves.

It is true that, when we wrote, we thought that, without injustice, we might credit the Witness with holding the opinions as to the necessity of commentaries, expressed by the Protestant writer in the journal from which he selected his article; and which he reproduced, for the benefit of his readers, without note or comment, without a line expressing any manner of dissent from the views therein set forth.

However, in justice to the Witness we must add, that he now repudiates the views expressed by the writer in the Independent, whose article without a word of comment, without a hint of dissent from the views therein expressed, he had reproduced in his issue of the 12th ult. In that article the writer expressly asserted:—

"They"—commentaries—"are indispensable to an accurate and thorough understanding of the Scriptures. . . . We might just as well insist on reading our New Testament, only in the original Greek—declining to use an English translation at all—as to forego the help of commentators."

Pushed to the wall, and finding himself unable to defend this position without taking up a line of argument that leads direct to Rome, the Witness thus subsequently disavows the sentiments expressed by the Independent writer:—

"We believe in circulating the Bible without note or comment."

Then why in the name of mischief do you hire and pay preachers to "expound the Word"? What is a sermon but a spoken commentary? and wherein in principle, does a spoken commentary differ from a written commentary? You may tell us that, in spite of what the Independent says, Protestants regard commentaries as "in no way necessary to the right understanding of Scripture so as to become wise unto salvation."

In spite then of the denial of the Witness, we insist upon it, that all Protestants who believe in Christianity believe, and amongst themselves act as if they believed, that "commentaries were" as the writer in the Independent says they are—"indispensable to an accurate and thorough understanding of the

Scriptures," without which we cannot become wise unto salvation. As against Catholics, they of course repudiate commentaries; because the Church, expressly teaches, and acts upon the principle, that the Written Word without a divinely appointed interpreter is not sufficient for salvation; but amongst themselves, all Protestants, all of them at least, who do not scout revelation entirely, use commentaries themselves and force them upon others.

We must really decline continuing the interminable controversy as to "Who presided at the Council of Jerusalem?" which the Protestant correspondent of the Witness who amusingly writes over the signature Catholic seeks to prolong. We decline to continue it because we see no means by which it can be determined or brought to a conclusion.

And besides the controversy is not betwixt the TRUE WITNESS and the correspondent above alluded to of the Witness; but betwixt the latter and Dr. Dollinger; he lauded by the entire Protestant world, as the erudite Dollinger, the accurate Dollinger, the impartial and trustworthy historian, the profound scholar and learned theologian, whose praise is in all the conventicles. He expressly tells us that St. Peter "presided at the Council of Jerusalem;" if the writer in the Witness be better posted up in the matter than is Dr. Dollinger, he should write to that person, pointing out and correcting his error. In short, the question is one which we leave the correspondent of the Witness to settle with Dr. Dollinger.

Only would we observe, that if the latter be an unreliable historian, giving as true that which is false, then the praises lavished upon Dr. Dollinger by the Protestant press are strangely out of place; and henceforward he must be spoken of as the "ignorant Dollinger," the "inaccurate Dollinger," the "dishonest Dollinger," the "falsifier of history." All this must we predicate of him if St. Peter did not preside at the Council of Jerusalem. However it is not for us, but for the friends of Dr. Dollinger to maintain his reputation for intelligence and honesty, one of which qualities, at least, the writer in the Witness denies him.

As a specimen of the reasoning faculties of the Witness' correspondent, and therefore of the uselessness of arguing with him, we select the following. We had stated the fact that, after St. Peter had laid down the law of the case, or principle, that the Jewish ceremonial law was not to be imposed on converts from amongst the Gentiles, "all disputing was at an end;" to which the writer in the Witness replies:—

"After Peter had concluded Barnabas and Paul speak to the same purpose—v. 12. Therefore it is not true that after the pronouncement by Peter all disputing was at an end."

Argal: if A. and B. "speak to the same purpose" as C. there is "disputing." Against such logic as this it would be in vain for us dispute. We abandon the task as hopeless.

There is one thing however to which we would call attention, as having some bearing on the question of Papal authority; it is this—That which St. Peter laid down as the faith of the Church is recognised as law by the Church, indeed by almost all Christian communities, at the present day. What St. Peter laid down or declared was of faith, amounted simply to this:—That the old ceremonial laws were not binding in conscience on Christians. This law was universal and perpetual, and therefore it behooved St. Peter to propound it.

The judgment of St. James—in so far as peculiar to him—on the other hand, was not of faith, or except as relates to fornication, of morals, but merely local and of temporary obligation—a disciplinary arrangement which has for centuries been abandoned by all Christians. No Christians, except amongst some of the Orientals, at the present day deem themselves in conscience bound to abstain from the flesh of animals that may have been sacrificed to idols, and subsequently exposed for sale on the public market; or from the flesh of animals that have been strangled, or caught in snares; or from blood. These things all Jews held in peculiar abhorrence—see Neander History of the Planting; and therefore as a matter of local and temporary expediency, and for the sake of not giving too rude a shock to the feelings of the converts to Christianity from amongst the Jews—but not as of faith or morals, and therefore of perpetual and universal obligation—St. James proposed to retain for Christian converts from amongst the Gentiles, the same ceremonial restraints in matters of diet as had been previously imposed on the "Proselytes of the Gate." This disciplinary arrangement—"compromise" Neander calls it—peculiarly suited for the religious atmosphere of Jerusalem of which St. James was Bishop—was by the latter proposed on account of his peculiar relations with the Jews, whose feelings he was most anxious not to shock; but this compromise being of purely local and temporary expediency, has long ago been abandoned. Christians of the present day * without religious scruples of any kind, freely eat

* The Greeks renewed the Noschian prohibition of certain foods, blood and strangled animals in 692.

even of the blood of pigs, and other sorts of unclean food. The peculiar legislation, or judgment, therefore of St. James has passed away, as the necessity for it has passed away.* That of St. Peter on the contrary—that the ceremonial Mosaic law is not binding in conscience upon Christians—being universal and perpetual, remains in force to the present day. In short, if he eat blood puddings, or hares, or partridges caught in a snare, the Catholic of the Witness unconsciously gives testimony to the merely local, temporary, and disciplinary nature of the proposals brought forward by St. James, and which as a matter of expediency, not of faith or morals, were accepted as a compromise by the Council; whilst by other circumstances, he no doubt shows his acceptance of the law against ceremonial observances, as laid down by St. Peter.

From this then we argue, that, as the universal and permanent transcends the temporary and local: that as matters of faith transcend these of mere expediency—so the judgment of St. Peter transcends in importance that pronounced by St. James; though no doubt, that of the latter, in view of the feelings of the Jews from amongst whom the first converts to Christianity were made, and with whom, as their Bishop, St. James held peculiarly delicate relations, was at the time of great importance, and admirably adapted to meet the peculiar but purely temporary and local difficulties of the case, and the wants of the Diocese of Jerusalem. These having passed away, the law about abstinence "from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled," v. 29, has also passed away; but the judgment of St. Peter that "we tempt not God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear," v. 10, remains unaltered, unrepealed.

* Indeed, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, c. x. v. 25, St. Paul treats the "amenities" of St. James as of merely local and transient obligation; for he expressly authorizes the Corinthian Christians "to eat whatsoever is sold in the shambles, and asking no question for conscience sake." We quote from the Protestant version.

DEATH OF JOHN FRANCIS MAGUIRE.—The death of this distinguished patriot and Catholic, which it is our sad duty this day to announce to our readers, will cause deep sorrow to the Irish, and indeed to Catholics throughout the world irrespective of national origin; for his labors were profitable to all, and the Church was ever the first object of his affection.

The deceased was but 57 years of age at the time of his death, and it was hoped that he might long have been spared to his countrymen and co-religionists to continue his good works on their behalf; but to God it has seemed otherwise fit, and we must submit.

As an author Mr. Maguire will be long remembered by his works—"Rome and Its Ruler," the "Irish in America," his "Life of Father Matthew," and his memoirs of "The Last Four Popes." These are a rich legacy that he has bequeathed to the Catholic public, and which will make his name familiar in many a household. As a politician, the editor of the Cork Examiner, was ever the champion of the rights of his country, and the zealous vindicator of her good name; amongst journalists none held a higher rank than did Mr. Maguire. As a legislator he was in like manner distinguished for his constant attention, and unwavering fidelity. On the right hand and on the left others might fall away; some, like our well-known "so help me God" Keogh, might prove recreant to plighted faith, and false to the calls of duty; but John Francis Maguire stood ever at his post, indifferent to threats and blandishments—still fighting the battle of his country and of his Church; to the last faithful and true, emphatically an honest man.

And so, full of honors, if not of years, the good soldier has passed away from earth, leaving to us an example which we will all do well to follow. For his eternal rest from every Catholic hearts the fervent prayer will ascend to heaven. Requiescat in pace.

RECEPTION INTO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.—From our Quebec exchanges we learn that on Monday, 4th inst., Joseph Fuller, Esq., of Portland, was received into the Church by the Very Reverend Grand Vicar Cazeau of Quebec. William Kelly, Esq., of Belleville, and Madame Pierre Chauveau acted as sponsors on this joyful occasion.

A GOOD MOVE.—One of those loafers who of late have infested our streets—and robbed the credulous public by selling "pill boxes" has been hauled up before the Recorder, and fined \$2. This we hope will have the effect of putting a stop to the nefarious practice of public gambling.

Hashish, opium, alcohol, and tobacco are peculiar poisons which appear to concentrate their action upon the brain, and are powerful causes of nervous disorders in the perversion of the blood. An individual habituated in the use of any of these, is a machine set in destructive motion, which, if not already too much destroyed, may be repaired under the potent influence of Fells's Compound Syrup of Hypophosphites, since the disturbances disappear as the condition of the blood improves.

WRITTEN FOR THE TRUE WITNESS. SHORT SERMONS FOR SINCERE SOULS. No. XVII.

"Exhort servants to be obedient to their masters not defrauding, but in all things showing good fidelity."—(Titus 2.)

The third duty of servants is fidelity. This is an essential and necessary part of their service, and one to which they should pay particular attention, in as much as it is a fundamental part of Christian servitude. The Apostle, after having enjoined Titus to exhort servants to practice an exact and prompt obedience towards their masters, and never to contradict in anything, continues to point out their duty of fidelity—never to deceive their masters either by word or deed; never to do them any injury either in their character or in their goods; and in all things to have a strict account of all things confided to their care: not defrauding but in all things showing good fidelity. The master confides in his Christian servant, giving into his hands all his goods and chattels, placing them under his charge and surveillance. How great then is your responsibility, Christian servant! How great an injury that servant inflicts, who is a traitor to this trust! Robbery is at all times forbidden, and to all men, and every one who is guilty of it, is guilty of sin; but in a servant it is doubly grievous because committed by one who, having become one of the family by virtue of his servitude, and having had his master's goods put in his possession and confided to his care, has abused his trust, and has received his pay for duties which he did not perform. He has reaped when he had not sowed.

In what, then, Christian servant, does this fidelity consist, which is the fundamental duty of your servitude? It consists in this.—You are to have a zealous care—such a care as you would wish exercised in your own case—over the goods and chattels of your master.—You are bound to see that no damage is done them—that the goods in your charge do not deteriorate; and where they are things that fructify, you are bound to see that through no fault or omission of your's they cease to do so. You sin, Christian servant, whenever you take from your master any of his goods, be they great or small, without his knowledge and permission. You sin grievously whenever, by repeated small thefts, the value of the things stolen becomes considerable. You sin whenever you allow others to steal from your master, or whenever you do not take steps to prevent others from stealing from him. You sin in using his goods wastefully—you sin when in buying, you charge your master more than you gave—you sin when in buying you give the seller less than the price; and you sin in giving to others, even the poor, the goods or victuals of your master. And finally, Christian servant, you sin whenever you presume to take from your master under the flimsy pretext of compensation for services badly paid.

What! you ask, are we not allowed compensation for extraordinary services? Our master exacts a thousand duties which we are not bound to perform, and may we not pay ourselves for them? Our master has engaged us at a low salary—are we not allowed to compensate ourselves? Every work deserves its pay.

Christian servant! let not the false maxims of a dishonest world pervert your minds. You have a right to exact the salary which was promised you, and for which you engaged, but more you cannot exact. Remember—the contract between you and your master, the entered into on earth, was witnessed in heaven. You may defraud man, but you cannot defraud Almighty God. If through an idea, true or false, that your pay is disproportionate to your work, you compensate yourself, as you call it, by taking your master's good, you are guilty of a true robbery—(Innocent XI. prep. 37)—because you appropriate what is another's and without his consent. Do you want a proof of this? I will give it, and my proof shall be from the word of God. A certain householder, you will remember (Matt. 20), went out early in the morning to hire labourers into his vineyard, and agreed with them for a penny a day. And going out at the third hour he did likewise, and again at the sixth and eleventh hours, he engaged those whom he found idle in the market place, and sent them into his vineyard. And when evening was come, the lord of the vineyard said to his steward: "Call the labourers and pay them their hire." When, therefore, they were come that came about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny. But when the first, also came, they thought that they should receive more: and they also received every man a penny. And receiving, they murmured against the master of the house, saying: "These last have worked but one hour and thou hast made them equal to us that have borne the burden of the day and the heats thereof." But he answering, said: "Friend I do thee no wrong. Didst thou not agree with me for a penny? Take what is thine and go thy way." Behold here then, Christian servant, your answer: "Friend, thy master does