5-10-6-5

4. 677

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED RVERY FRIDAY At No. 223, Notre Dame Miret, by

J. GILLIES. G. R. OLERK, Editor. TRRMS:

To all country subscribers, or subscribers recessing their papers through the post, or calling for them as the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not so paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.

To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by car riers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance. but if not paul in advance, then Three Dollars. Sangle copies, price 3d, can be had at this Office; Pickup's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street ; at T. Riddell's, (late from Mr. E. Pickup,) No. 22, Great St. James Street, opposite Mesers. Dawson & Son; and at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lewrence and Cruig Sts.

Also at Mr. Alexander's Bookstore, opposite the Post-Office, Quebec.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 16, 1863.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

Our European fyles for the past week are very barren of interesting matter. No great polity cal changes have occurred on the Continent, and from the manufacturing districts in the North of England the tidings are more cheerful than they bare been of late. It is confidently asserted that the crisis of the Cotton familie has passed end that an improvement in the condition of the operatives may in consequence be expected.

There has been hard fighting on this side of the Atlantic betwirt the two hostile parties, and the results are upon the whole very cheering for the cause of Southern independence. The great Pederal expedition against Vicksburg has been gallantly repulsed by the Confederates, who inflicted great slaughter upon their exemies. The latter have also met with another very serious defeat at Paine's Biuff, Mississippi; but as a set-off, the Yankees claim a victory over the Southerners at Springfield. Since its defeat before the Confederate lines near Fredericksburgh, the army of the Potomac has remained tractive; and whilst on one hand it is asserted that it is about to take up winter quarters, on the other hand there are rumors that it will again. and shortly, resume offensive operations against Richmond.

The strong and well grounded confidence that Protestant journalists place in the ignorance of their readers upon all matters connected with the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church, and of ecclesiastical history outside of the pale of their own little ansignificant sects, is well illustrated by the St. John's Colonial Presbyterian of the 25th ult. This writer takes us to task for asserting that-on all matters of doctrine, wherein Protestant sects differ from Catholics-with the exception of the "Supremacy of the Roman Pontiff"-the Schusmatic Greek Church agrees with Rome; and that wherein the Greeks differ from Rome on other doguatic points, such as on the double procession of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, they differ also, and to the same extent, from the Church of England as by Law E-tablished .-·Our contemporary thus attempts to refute as :-

"The Greek Church encourages the circulation of the Bible is the vernacular language of the people, in which also its own ritual is generally colebrated, and while associating tradition with the written word of God as a Rule of Faith, the Greek Oburch provides that the former must be in accordance with the first occumenical councils, and the Synode held in Constantinople in 592, and 879.

To this we reply, that the Greek Church does not encourage the circulation of the Bible in the rulear tongue amongst the people : because its Rule of Faith is, formally, identical with that of the Catholic Church, as is admitted by our opponent. Not the "Bible alone," but the Bible as interpreted by the Church, and through her Synods, is the Rule of Fanh to the Christians of the East, as it is to those of the West; and on this fundamental point they both differ from all Protestant sects. We thus, from the very words of the Colonial P. cshyterian, establish the truth of the first part of our thesis.

The Latin, as well as the Greek Church of course insists that the tradition, or unwritten word " be in accordance with the decrees of the first Œcumenical Councils;" and if the former does not insist upon the accordance of her traditions with " the Synody held in Constantinonle in 692, sed 879 880," it is because that she, in common with all Protestant sects, does not acknowledge the binding force of the peculiar decrees of either of those Synods. The first, that of 692 - In Trull - was indeed in some respects a continuation of the VI. General Council, whose dogmatic decrees it lest unrouched; but its peculiar work, consisting of certain disculmary Canons. 102 in number, was never recognised by Rome as the work of an Gerumenical Council, and is not at the present day accepted as of the slightest value by any existing Protestant denomination—as may readily be inferred from the fact that, of those Canous the third forbids the second marriage of a simple presbyter, and his marriage with a widow; whilst another, the twelfth, expressly forbids all Bishops from remaining in the married state. For particulars, we phis by the Papal Legates.

refer our contemporary to Geiseler's Compendium of Ecclesiastical History, as a Profesiant. authority upon the subject, which he will be more likely to accept favorably than that of a Catholic historian.

With respect to the other Constantinopolitan Synod, that of 879 880, the same rejoinder is applicable. Neither by Rome, nor by Protestants of any sect, has it been received as authoritative on matters either of doctrine or of discipline; and again in this respect, where the Catholic differs from the Greek Church, there the former agrees with all existing forms of Protestantism. The Synod of 879-890 was the result of an attempt of the schismatic Photius-the intrasive Patriarch of Constantinople-to procure a reversion of the condemnation pronounced upon him by the General Council of 869-known as the Fourth of Constantinople, and as the Eighth Œcumenical Council. The latter had decided in favor of the claims of Ignatius, whom the Emperor Michael III. had imquitously driven from the Patriarchal throne, to make room for the more plant Photos. This condemnation was confirmed by the Pope, to whom the case had been referred; but after the death of Ignatius, and upon the accession of Basil the Macedonian to the purple, Photius again urged his pretensions, and sought to strengthen his position by the authority of the Synod, to which the Colonial Prestyterian refers us; but as neither Catholics nor Protestants recognise that Synod as a General Council, or attach any value to its decrees, we have another proof of the truth of the thesis -that wherein " the Greeks differ from Catholics, they differ also, and to the same extent, from the Church of England." If, however, we would learn the precise extent

of the dogmatic differences between the Catholic Church and the schismatic Greeks, we may find it clearly defined in the letter of Michael Cerulargus, Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 1053. and addressed to John, Bishop of Trani in Apulia. Next to Photos, Michael Cerularius may be looked upon as the chief agent in the deplorable schism which separated the East from the West : and as no man could have been better acquainted than was the last-named with the differences which led to that schism, so also no one could have been more deeply interested in making out what is called " a good case" against Rome, and in justification of the very serious movement which he contemplated." This letter, of which only a Latin translation now exists, is cited by Geiseler, the Protestant Ecclesiastical historian above quoted; and from it we gather that the main points of difference betweet the Greek and Latin Churches. upon which the schismatic Patriarch insisted, and upon which be attempted to justify his schism, were these. The use of unleavened bread in the Eucharistic Sacrifice by the Western Church, whereas in the East feavened bread was employed.; the Sabbatical fast, or fast on the Saturdays of each week, which the Latins then observed, and which observance the Orientals denounced as savoring of Judaism. The non-observance in the West of the recommendation to abstain from blood, and from the flesh of animals strangled, as articles of food; and the Western custom of not singing Alleluia after Quadregesima. These, with the "filiogue," or assertion of the double Procession of the Third Person of the B. Temity by the Latin Church, were the only differences which the typx-eyed critic, and denouncer of Rom-15h error, could detect in the eleventh centuryan epoch when certainly all that Protestants denounce as idolatry in the Catholic Church was fully developed; and would have been denounced also by the Patriarch of Constantinople, if those idolatries and corruptions which now distinguish Catholic, from Protestant worship and doctrine, had then subsisted betwirt the Latins, and their envenomed enemies — the Greeks. We are justified therefore in concluding that on all points of doctrine -the Real Presence, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints-not raised in the letter of Michael Cerularius, there was at the date of its composinon-A.D. 1053 - perfect agreement betwint

Rome and Constantinople. That such actually was the case, oppears also from the debates at the Council of Florence. when, for a time, the breach betwint the two Communious was closed up. It is therefore false that, as our contemporary pretends, "the 'Mass' of the Greek Church is essentially different from that of the Roman;" for were there any such essential difference to-day, the same essential difference must have been in existence prior to the eleventh century-since the present rituals or Liturgies of both are, by all admitted to be identical with those employed eight hundred years ago; and would have been pointed out, and insisted upon by the promoters of the schism, in justification of the separation of Chareles difering "essentially" from one another on matters relating to footh and worship. The Colonial Presbuterian pretends that though the "Greek Caurch prays for the dead, it knows nothing of a purgatory-nothing of the purgatory of the Roman Church." Is not this something akin to

. It was in the year immediately following the letter of Michael Cerularius that the letter of excummanication was formally haid upon the ultur of St. Scnonsense? - we respectfully ask of our content dead." is it not evident that that Church believes, or that, when its present Liturgy was compiled, it did believe, that the dead were, or might be, in a state intermediate betwirt heaven and hell, and wherein they might be as-isted by the prayers of the faithful upon earth? But if the Greek Church believes, or believed, this-and upon any other hypothesis its custom of praying for the dead is inexplicable—it holds, or certainly once held, all that the "Roman Church" teaches as of faith concerning purgators :-

" Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium entiragiis, putiesimum vero acceptabili Alta is sacrifico, juvari."— Conc. Tril. Sess. 25.

This is all that the "Roman Church" asserts dogmatically on the subject: that there is a purgatory, and that the souls of the faithful therein detained are assisted by the prayers of the faithful, and especially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar. This too is, and ever has been, the doctrine of the Greek Courch on the same subtect, as is evident in that it " prays for the dead" -for whom it would not pray if it did not beheve that they might be aided by those prayers, and were therefore neither in the full enjoyment of heaven and its perfect happiness, nor in the torments of hell from which there is no redemption. There have been differences of opinion between the Eastern and Western Fathers as to the precise conditions of purgatory-some holding to fire, others to darkness; but the Western the subject, and in her prayers for the dead she invokes for them a place both of light, and of refreshment. There is therefore absolutely not the slightest difference betwixt the doctrinal teachings of the Greek and Western Churches uppo the subject of Porgatory.

So too with regard to the use of images, and the invocation of the B. Mother of God, and other Saints regning with Corist. It is true that the Greek Church objects to images in relief, but admits and encourages the use amongst its votaries of pictures or images upon a plane surface. This involves however no essential difference, or difference of principle; for if to treat with outward marks of respect as image "in relief or embossed work" be idolatry, to treat an image painted on a plane surface, with similar marks of respect, must be no less an outrage upon the divine majesty, and an infraction of the divine commands. There is however one important admission, inadvertently made by our contemporary upon the subject of the invocation and honoring of Saints, to which he will, we trust, permit us respectfully to direct his attention. He says :--

"Though the Greek Church 'venerates' the Virgin Mary, it knows nothing of the Mariolatry of the Ro man Church, and would be utterly astounded to hear of that great dogmatic novelty, the doctrine of the immaculate Couception.

The above entract shows that, when it suits their purpose, Protestants can discriminate, can see an essential difference betwirt dulia and Latria; between that honor, or religious " veneration" which may innocently be paid to the Saints s creatures, and that which is due to God the Creator alone, and which if tendered to any creature, however exalted, would be idolatry .--Under ordinary circumstances, Protestants profess to be unable to see the difference; they hrand the distinction betwirt dulia and latria upon which the Catholic controversialist insists. as casuistry, hair-splitting, and, to sum up all in one word, as " Jezuzery;" but when by recognising the essential difference betweet the higher and lower kinds of worship, signified respectively by the terms latria and dulin, they can magnifu schism at the expense of the Church, their mental eyes become so keen, their metaphysical faculties are so sharpened, that they can detect a difference where none exists. The "veneration" which the Greeks pay to the B. Virgin is, in kind. precisely the same as that which the Catholic Church offers to the same object—that is to say the higher form of dulia, or hyperdulia, which differs from latria not indegree, but in kind .-But we let this pass; we are satisfied, perfectly satisfied, with the admission made by our Presbyterian contemporary, to the effect that it is possible to give religious veneration to a creature without falling into the sm of idolatry; and that the cultus sanctorum, or worship of the Saints by no means necessarily involves that highest form of worship due to God alone, and distinguished by the term latria. Henceforth, we may expect from our Protestant contemporaries more rational treatment of the important question—whether it be possible to venerate the Saints without being guilty of idolatry? - and the entire question at issue, betwirt us and them on the subject of saint worship will thus be parrowed to the discussion of the question of fact-Does the homage, worship, or " veneration" which the Catholic Church pays to the Saints exceed its legiumate bounds 7 and is it in short as innocent as that which the Greeks " who know nothing of the Mariolatry of the Roman Church," pay to the B. Virgin ? If our contemporary will condescend to define " the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception"-as he understands it - we shall perhaps have it in our power to show to him either, that he is grossly ignorant of its signification, or that

it is by no means a "dogmatic novelty," or one

which would in any degree astound those ac-

quanted with Oriental patristic literature.

porary. If the Greek Church "prays fug the to make our readers acquainted with the real hasten to redeem that promise, having received entirety in our limited space. We may preface the story, with this expression of our opinion, formed after an attentive and impartial study of all its facts-that the Aylwards were murdered; judicially murdered indeed, and with all due forms of law; but, none the less foully and most brutalty murdered.

husband about 26 years of age, the wife some three years younger, and with three young children - were both of irreproachable character, and remarkable for their attachment to one another, their industry, the heatness of their little house, and their amiability of disposition .-Some three years ago they settled on a lot of 50 acres, given by Government as a Free Grant, to encourage the colonisation of the back townships of the County of Hastings; and shortly after their sitting down upon their newly acquired lot, they were followed by a Scotchman of the name of Munro, who with his family, including a young man of about twenty years of age. availed hunself of the liberal terms proffered by Church has never pronounced doginatically upon | Government to new-comers. The Aylwards and the Mugroes, were neighbors, and lived harmomously together for some time; but during the spring of the second year great ravages were committed upon the Aylward's young wheat crop he Munroe's lowls; and though the aggriered party often quietly and in a most friendly manner remonstrated upon the subject with Manro, begging him to keep his fowls out of his neighbor's crops, poor Aylward could get no satisfaction, and his complaints were treated with marked indifference. Under these circumstances the latter concluded that he had the right to protect his little property from destruction, and to shoot any animals he might thenceforward find committing depredations thereupon. Indeed ms wheat crop was in imminent danger of total destruction from the ravages committed upon it by Munroe's fawls

We now come to the facts which led more uninediately to the death of the elder Munro, as detailed by the Solicitor General upon the rual, and elicited in evidence.

One day towards the end of May 1862 Munro together with his son, who be it rememhered was about twenty years of age, came over to Aylward's house, and accused the latter of having stolen one of his hens. This charge Aylward denied; but it was reiterated again and again in a very offensive manner by Munco. who was greatly excited, and declared he would not leave the premises until he got his hen. In vam-Aylward assured him that he had not got his hen, though he admitted that he might have shot one in his wheat-field, where perhaps Munro might find it; and again and again he begged the latter to leave his house in peace. The Munroes retused to go, and confident in their superior force. ince they were two to one, the elder declared that " he would remain as long as he pleased. Augry words then passed between them, when at last Munro suggested to Aylward that the fowls might at that very moment be in the wheat-field of the latter, destroying his crops. and that he had better go and shoot them again. but that he should carry none away with him .-Arlward turned back into his house, at the door of which he had been standing throughout the aftercation; and taking down his gun, proceeded towards the wheat-field followed by his two antagonists, the Munroes. According to the statement of the younger of these-who though an interested party was the only evidence against Arlward on the subsequent trial-the latter turned round, bringing his weapon presented towards the elder Munro. The latter seized hold of the gun, and a firree struggle ensued for the mastership; but Munro being a much larger and stronger min than was Aylward, forced his opponent back towards the house. In the struggle a pistol-so the younger Munro swore on the trial, though no evidence of the existence of such a weapon was ever producedtell from the person of Aylward ; the elder Munro called to his son to pick it up, and whilst doing so, the witness deposed that Aylward fired his gun at him, and lodged its contents-slugsm his back. The younger Munro added, that he then got up, and looking round saw Mrs. Aylward standing where he last saw her husband struggling with his father; that he then can home as fast as he could, where shortly he was remined by his father, the elder Munro, bleeding profusely from two wounds - one in his head, and the other in his right arm. The wounded man lingered for about twelve or thirteen days: he had no medical attendance, but was treated by a quack calling bimself an " Indian Herb Loctor;" and in consequence, apparently, of neglect or improper treatment died of exhaustion and loss of blood. So far, however strong the presumptions against the Aylwards, there was no

THE AYLWARDS. Till our last we promised evidence to show that they, or either of them. had inflicted the wounds; and Munro, when near facts of this case, which has excited a profound his end he was appealed to to have the persons interest throughout the Province. To-day we who wounded him arrested-refused to do so. saying, "No! I don't want them arrested, I am full and correct particulars from our esteemed as much to blame as they are." On his death correspondent Sursfield, the substance of which bed, he clearly remembered that he was the sole we hasten to lay before our readers; since from aggressor; and that what the unfortunate its length it is impossible to give the letter in its Aylwards had done, they did in self-defence, and against superior physical force which they had no other means of repelling. This delect of evidence was supplied in the following manner.

It was deposed on the trial-that the Ayiwards had themselves acknowledged before several persons in the village, to having inflicted the wounds of the effects of which Munro died-The Aylwards, an Irish Catholic couple-the that Mrs. Aylward had given an explanation to the effect that, seeing her husband struggling with Munro for the gun, she seized a scythe that was in the house, and running to her husband's assistance struck Munro with it on the head and on the arm. It was further deposed that she-Mrs. Aylward-also made use of very violent language when speaking of the transaction, saying that it was her design to "cut off his head !" and that when ste heard, that Munro was suffering from his wounds she made an ejaculation to the effect that she hoped "that God would increase his pains," and again expressed a regret that she had not killed "old Buldy at once" as she intended to do. But as all this hearsay evidence, or tittle-tattle as to what a nervous, and excited woman said, after the event had occurred, could by no means affect the moral or legal value of the act preceding, we only wander why the jury were such idiots as to listen to it.

> It was also deposed that, about the middle of May. Aylward had had his scythe sharpened ! and that, four or five days before the sad event took place, he had taken it off from the snaith. or handle, telling his wife to use it, if ever he should require help; but as it also appeared that Aylward's scythe never had been attached to a smath, or handle, it is also evident that the Crown witnesses were not only perjured, but very clumsy perjurers to boot. Another effort was made by one of these gentry to institute malice against the accused, by the retailing of a cock and a bull story about Mrs. Aviward hav ing told somebody that "she intended to finish old Munro by inducing him to cross their fence. and that she would then retire towards her ownhouse, and that her husband should thereupour shoot him, and she could be a witness for her tiusband to swear that Munro had followed her with intent to take improper liberties with her." Again we wonder why such irrelevant twaddle, which had nothing whatever to do with the questions, " Did the Aylwards inflict the fatal wounds upon the deceased Munro? and if so, under what circumstances and provocation?" -- was ever submitted to a Jury. And yet, such as we have detailed it was the entire case for the pro-

The accused were zealously and eloquentie defended by James O'Reilly, E-q. of Kingston. He pointed out that the only positive evidence against the prisoners was that of the younger Munro, who as an interested party was a very incompetent witness: that, by the admission of this witness, there could have been no malicious intent upon the part of the Aylwards, seeing that when the two Manroes taxed him in his own house with theft, and grossly insulted him, he repeatedly begged and prayed of them " to leave in peace." That all the evidence tended to show that, relying on their great superiority, of strength, the Munroes had come over to the prisoner's house with the express intent of picking a quarrel with him, and of assaulting him : that the story about the pistol lacked confirmation, seeing that if true, the pistol was in the rounger Munro's possession, and might have been produced in Court, which it was not : and that, admitting that Mrs. As Iward did inflict the fatalwounds, she did no more than was her right, before God and man, to do-when her husband was on his own ground violently assaulted by one so greatly his superior in strength and size as was Munro: As to the subsequent violent language of Mrs. Aylward, he insisted that no attention should be paid to it; as, even if correctly reported, it was but the raving of a greatly excited and nervous female, agitated by the tragic events of the day, by the brutal assault upon her hu-band, and by the active part which she in consequence had taken therein, whilst in an extremely delicate state of health, and nursing her third child. As to her husband, it was not so much as insimuted that he struck the blow, or that he inflicted the wounds which fed to Munro's death. This, and much more, dat Mr. O'Reilly ably and eloquently urge in his client's behalf.

The judge having charged the jusy, the latter after an absence of three hours came into Court with a verdict of Guilty, coupled with a strong recommendation to mercy. The sentence of death was at once passed upon them; and by way we suppose of adding insult to injury, and making the monstrous and most unjust sentence doubly offensive to Catholics, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception was selected as the day for the consummation of the judicial iniquity.

In the meantime active exertions were made