

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1872.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR. APRIL—1872. Friday, 26—St. Cletus and Marcellinus, PP. MM. Saturday, 27—Anselm, B. C. D. (April 21). Sunday, 28—Fourth after Easter. Monday, 29—St. Peter, M. Tuesday, 30—St. Catherine of Siena, V. MAY—1872. Wednesday, 1—St. Philip and James, Apostles. Thursday, 2—St. Athanasius, B. C. D.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The position of the Gladstone Ministry is very precarious. Their majority in the House of Commons is dwindling away, and *twice* within one week, have they had to put up with an actual defeat. The adverse majority was not large; but in the second instance it occurred on a clause in the Ballot Bill, a Ministerial measure. Whilst the negotiations on the competency of the Geneva conference to entertain the U. States' claims for consequential damages, are still pending, we do not think that the Conservative party will try and force their political opponents to resign; but will prefer to leave the Ministers who, by their loose wording of the Washington Treaty, have got Great Britain into the scrape, to get out of the mess as best they may. It is rumored that, after their Continental trip, and during the course of the coming summer, the Prince and Princess of Wales propose to visit the United States and Canada.

The agricultural laborers of Warwickshire have commenced a strike for advanced wages, which may very probably extend from the centre of the Kingdom to the extremities, and produce grave social consequences. As a rule the farm laborers of England are not well paid; a fact which is the consequence of another fact—to wit—that the culture of the cereals in England is not a pursuit which leaves very high profits to the farmer. If compelled to pay more than he pays already for the labor by him required on his farm, there will be no margin left for farmer's profit at all; and apparently the consequence will be that the inferior lands now under the plough will be first abandoned to grazing purposes; and that gradually Great Britain will, as the process goes on, have to procure its breadstuffs from countries whose soil and climate are naturally more favorable than are its own, to the culture of the cereals, and where in consequence they can be grown cheaper than they can in England. As yet the agricultural strike has been unattended with any of those acts of outrage which have as a rule characterized the proceedings of the Trades Unions; but it is to be feared that if the farmers refuse to accede to the terms proposed by the laborers, this creditable state of things will not last long; but that burning stacks, and smoking barns may again revive the memory of the days of *Siring*. The leader of the movement is apparently a man of the name of Joseph Arche, a person of some intellectual culture, and of much good sense; his influence whilst it last will be exerted for good, to prevent illegal acts; but in all movements of this kind, influence and power at last almost always fall to the lot of the most unprincipled demagogues. Still we will hope that better counsels may prevail; and that without injury to the farmers, and others who have largely invested capital in land, some means may be discovered of raising the physical and moral conditions of the English agricultural laborers.

There have been rumors afloat, during the past week, of the growth of a very hostile feeling in Prussia towards France, provoked by the language of the latter, apparently menacing revenge, and by her active measures to restore the efficiency of her army. These rumors are however now officially contradicted, and for the present at least the peace of Europe is not to be disturbed. The Carlist movement in Spain, if telegraphic messages are to be believed, has resolved itself into a few isolated cases of highway robbery of no political significance. A collision betwixt the Piedmontese troops and the guards of the Sovereign Pontiff, in which

blood was shed, is reported from Rome, but in their items from Italy the telegraphic reports are not very trustworthy.

The dead lock on the matter of the "consequential damages" continues; but still it is hoped and believed that an amicable issue from the difficulty will be discovered. An "if" may be found somewhere, by those who look for it diligently, and as Touchstone tells us there is "much virtue in *If*." At all events it is not likely that two great nations will go to war on a mere punctilio. On its side the U. States government is certain that, even if entertained, its claims for consequential damages will be rejected by the Geneva Arbitrators, and the British government can have no serious apprehensions that damages under that head will ever be awarded; but neither government likes to recede from a position once taken up, or to be the first to yield. Still from the tone of the press, and from the fact that in the money market there is no panic, we have good grounds for anticipating an amicable and honorable solution of the difficulty.

The eagerness with which in certain quarters the report, first set in circulation by the London Daily Telegraph, that the relations of France and Germany were very critical, has been repudiated, tends to confirm it, or rather to give reasons for believing that, even though exaggerated, it is by no means destitute of foundation. We are not astonished therefore that the North German Gazette of the 20th, whilst denying the report, admits that a late speech by M. Thiers had caused much uneasiness in Germany, and that the details of the French war budget were such as to dictate caution to the German government. The article concludes by more than hinting that in consequence, the occupation of France by German troops may be prolonged.

The definition of the General Council of the Vatican concerning Papal Infallibility has been officially published by Mgr. the Archbishop of Paris; in consequence many of the liberal journals of that City are in an excited condition, and clamor for civil proceedings against the Prelate and the Catholic clergy.

In our Canadian Parliament there have been some rather lively passages at arms betwixt the members, but as yet no important business has been transacted. In front of the town the ice has broken up and is moving slowly away, without doing any damage. We are thus relieved this year from the fear of an inundation. The City mortality for the last week was 145.

THE COMING BATTLE.—The Paris correspondent of the London Times states the question fully and fairly:—

"The two great forces in Europe, are not Catholicism and Protestantism, but Catholicism and the Revolution."

It is by these Powers, not by Catholicism and any other phase of Christianity, that the battle has to be fought. Protestantism, considered as a positive religious system is effete, and no one dreams of taking it into account.

But what is the Revolution? this great antagonistic to Catholicism? In the religious order it implies the denial of God, or Atheism; in the political order, the negation of authority or anarchy; in the social order it means Communism. The triumph of these will be the result of the defeat of Catholicism in the great battle now waging in Europe, and of which the dull thunder has already reached our ears from across the broad Atlantic. It is the Times that states the conditions of the fight: "the two great forces in Europe are, not Catholicism and Protestantism, but Catholicism and the Revolution."

Never were truer words published in the Times; would that all who read would ponder them; and would it be if Conservative journals would bear in mind that every blow dealt at Catholicism, is a blow at those institutions of which they profess to be defenders; that every loss to the Catholic Church, is so much gain to the Revolution of which they profess to be the opponents.

By force of arms, and at the point of the bayonet, after a short war unjustly waged against him, unjust because undertaken without the shadow of a pretext, and in direct violation of the most solemn Treaties—the Sovereign Pontiff, has been deposed and robbed of his dominions. Is it possible that outside of the lunatic asylum there is any one so insane as not to perceive that the stability of every throne in Europe is thereby menaced; that the principle that might alone constitutes right, has been thereby formally adopted as the basis of the European international Code? The property of the Religious Orders has by a dishonest and despotic government been confiscated, and the inmates of the convents have been driven from their quiet homes by a licentious soldiery; is there any one such a fool as to believe that thereby the rights of property have been secured? Or that when their turn comes, as come it will, the Communists will not profit by the lesson set them by the robber government of Italy? What is good law for nuns and monks, is good law for proprietors of every description, and for all manner of capitalists. Confiscation is a

game that others besides the accomplices of Victor Emmanuel can, and will play at.

It is in a word the Revolution, not Protestantism as it is commonly understood, that has gained, by recent events in Europe. It has gained because the attack upon the sovereignty of the Pope justifies an attack upon every sovereignty, upon every political authority in the world; it has gained, because the forced confiscation of the property of the nuns and monks if justifiable in their case, justifies, and sets up a precedent, for the confiscation of the property of every landholder, of every merchant, of every capitalist of Europe. The principle that all ecclesiastical property belongs to the nation, is capable of being applied to all property, of every description. It too is national; and when the day of their triumph arrives, will be nationalised, i.e. confiscated, by the Communists—as has been the ecclesiastical property by the robber government of Italy. The latter is but fighting the battle of the Commune, or as the Times puts it, of the Revolution.

In Germany as in Italy, the battle has fairly begun, and the two antagonistic forces—Catholicism, and the Revolution headed by Bismarck—are locked in deadly embrace. And here we find a striking instance of the truth of the Times' definition of the terms of the combat. Bismarck has hitherto been the man of the Conservative party, and noted for his opposition to the democratic party in Germany. But the necessities of the strife in which he now finds himself engaged force him to seek other allies, and to contract new engagements. His friends and supporters are now the very men from whom *liberty* he has been estranged; and by an infallible instinct of the exigencies of his position as leader of the anti-Catholic forces, he finds himself compelled to take his stand at the head of the partizans of the Revolution.

The Russian Government is pursuing the same course of policy as towards the Western Powers, parties to the Treaty of Paris, as that which, with the applause of the Protestant and Liberal world, Victor Emmanuel has lately pursued as towards Rome and the Sovereign Pontiff. Bound by solemn Treaty, to respect the independence of the latter, no sooner did Victor Emmanuel find himself in a position to violate his pledged faith, and solemn engagements, than, without even the shadow of a pretext, he commenced hostilities against the Pope; attacked, and, after a short struggle, succeeded in making himself master of, Rome, and the States whose integrity he had bound himself to respect, and cause others to respect. This violation of faith, this deliberate treachery was, and is still applauded by the Liberal world, and no where more loudly than in England.

Profiting by the hint, Russia is imitating the bad faith of the Piedmontese Government. The former perceives that, left without an ally in Europe, Great Britain is physically unable to resent an insult, or to compel the observance of the terms of that Treaty of Paris, which, at the cost of so much blood and treasure Great Britain and France, conjointly, won on the ever memorable heights of the Malakoff, and the Redan; and so with the same cynical contempt for honor, for pledged faith, and right, that Victor Emmanuel displayed when he let loose his mercenary hordes on Rome, Russia to-day announces to the world her intention of tearing to pieces the Treaty of Paris, of violating every one of its essential provisions, and of doing every thing which by that Treaty she had pledged herself not to do. Sebastopol is, in defiance of express stipulations to the contrary, to be re-built, fortified, and refitted as a naval and military arsenal. The Black Sea is again to swarm with Russian men-of-war, and its coasts will again be covered with forts armed with the heaviest of ordnance. And this is all that we have to show for the blood so lavishly shed at the Alma, at Balaclava, on the heights of Inkerman, and before the terrible Redan! How have the mighty fallen!

But what can Great Britain say? We do not say do? for she can do nothing. What can she say? Were she to appeal to the sanctity of Treaties, to the laws of nations, and the principles of eternal justice, with what a laugh of scorn would her remonstrances be met by Russian statesmen. No doubt their opinions would be clothed, not veiled, in the elegancies of diplomatic conventionalities; but in substance they might be expressed in some such terms as these—"You are pretty fellows indeed, to prate about the sanctity of Treaties, about the laws of nations, about honor, good faith, respect for pledged word, and eternal justice!—you who looked on and applauded whilst all these were in Italy violated, and trampled under foot by your precious Victor Emmanuel!"

This cynical contempt for right, this exaltation of might, so characteristic of the present age—the necessary result of the spread of Liberalism, of the waning political influence of the Catholic Church, and one of the popular errors denounced in the famous *Syllabus*, is, we have no doubt, destined to work much trouble in Europe, and indeed throughout the

world. The words honor, faith, and right have lost their significance, and nations and individuals acknowledge no limits to their respective "mights" but the "mights" of others. Communities manage their affairs with no more scruples than does a Fisk, or than a Gould manages his. Indeed, as compared with Victor Emmanuel, we look upon the last named as men of scrupulous honor, and as high bred gentlemen. At all events the principle, or rule of action in both public and private life has been laid down, and accepted by the Liberal world—that no one is bound to observe a contract which it is profitable to him to break, and which he can break with impunity.

WAS ST. PETER EVER IN ROME?

Objection. "The only evidence that can be adduced from the New Testament for St. Peter's having been at Rome is, that he seems to have written his first Epistle from Babylon." (I. Pet. v. 13.)

Does this Babylon mean Rome? Dr. Brown would wish to say it does not, but he dare not. He contents himself therefore with opposing theories, negative arguments, and the opinions of modern second rate scholars, to the unanimous voice of antiquity. Whilst denying that Babylon meant Rome, Michaelis, the chief supporter of this absurd denial, and Dr. Brown, acknowledge that Eusebius, St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Jerome, and the older Roman Fathers all understood the Babylon of which St. Peter speaks to mean Rome. Michaelis also acknowledges, that they offered reasons why it must mean Rome. Speaking of Eusebius, who quotes Papias, Dr. Brown is cautious. He does not absolutely deny the fact that Eusebius quotes Papias; he merely suggests a doubt. "Eusebius says this (Babylon) meant Rome. He appears to say it on the authorities of Papias, though some learned men deny that he ascribes the tradition to Papias." This is cautious wording in the worthy Bishop.

The "he appears" is strong evidence that the episcopal objector had little faith himself in the "some learned men" who deny the tradition to Papias. With the "Roman divines" he is equally circumspect. St. Jerome and the Roman divines also adopt it—he acknowledges; but then he adds, a learned writer of their communion (Hug.) truly observes etc. Now we object to a single writer however learned, and whether of "their communion" or not, being considered as of more weight than the whole of those Fathers, who living near the times of the Apostles had better opportunities of judging, breathing as they did the very atmosphere of the tradition. And what is Hug's argument?—this "learned writer of their communion?" "The use, he says, of such a metonymy may be very proper in a symbolical book like the Apocalypse, but would only be credible in the subscription of an epistle, if arcana nomina Ecclesiarum (secret names for churches) had existed amongst Christians." But does any one pretend to say that the word Babylon, was used as an arcana nomen (secret name) for the Roman Church? We think not. The power of Rome was regarded by the later Jews in the same sense as that of Babylon by their forefathers (Jer. i. 7.); and hence whatever the people of Israel be understood to symbolise, Babylon represented the antagonistic principle. The Apostles therefore having been accustomed when Jews to look upon Rome as Babylon, may easily be excused for having carried this nomenclature with them into the Christian Church. Hence they used it, not as an arcana nomen Ecclesie, but as a word symbolical of "the world, the flesh, and the devil." It is therefore as much in place in an epistle as in a symbolical book. Either Hug's knowledge of Jewish history was loose, or his logic at fault, when he made this objection.

The Bishop of Ely admits that—"If the tradition be due to Papias, he is doubtless a very early authority (A. D. circa 110.); but Eusebius, he tells us, has given us to understand that he was a person, whose judgment was not to be depended upon, and particularly that he was an enthusiast about the Apocalypse. Hence his interpreting St. Peter by the language of the Apocalypse is "not of much weight." Now this is not handsome of the good Bishop. In the first place, he very coolly takes for granted that our good friend Papias is "interpreting St. Peter by the language of the Apocalypse." We have shown, that he need not of necessity be doing so, since Babylon was already a name for Rome among the later Jews. In the second place, even granting that Eusebius does consider Papias "a person whose judgment was not to be depended on," this proves nothing, since a born fool may be a good witness as to a matter of fact. Having now disposed of the good Bishop, let us look at the testimonies on which this fact of Babylon having meant Rome, is founded.

I. Our adversaries admit 1° that all the old Latin Fathers understood it as such. 2° They even admit that these Fathers gave reasons for so understanding it. II. They grant us that Papias (A. D. 110.) Eusebius, St. Clement of Alexandria and St. Jerome assert it.

III. St. Peter's Epistle itself bears intrinsic evidence to its having been written in Rome, since 1° St. Peter therein warns the Asiatic Christians of the impending persecutions; a knowledge which he could easily have obtained in Rome the centre of Imperial power, but which it would be difficult to suppose attainable in any other of the Babylons, which our modern Papiaphobists have extemporised; 2° Moreover his exhortations to obedience to rulers and governors would point to the conclusion that he was writing under the shade of the imperial wing; 3° Whilst his sending Silvanus, who was St. Paul's companion, to bear the letter, and mentioning St. Mark, whom all allow to have written his gospel at Rome, as saluting, both circumstances point to the same conclusion.

If any further evidence were wanting to this overwhelming body of testimonies, it would be found in the disputes of our adversaries amongst themselves, and in the ridiculous theories which have been advanced in order to find for this poor evicted Babylon "a local habitation and a name." They had better have left it, where the ancient Fathers had placed it, at least until they had found it a decent resting place. 1° Capellus and others take Babylon to mean Jerusalem. 2° Bar-Hebraeus understands it of the house in Jerusalem where the Apostles were assembled on the day of Pentecost. 3° Others place it on the Tigris and identify it with Seleucia or Ctesiphon. 4° Others take it to be Baboul in the Delta, a little north of Fostat or old Cairo between Upper and Lower Egypt. A tradition to this effect is said to exist in the Coptic Church; whilst a tradition that St. Mark the companion of St. Peter was bishop of Alexandria, is supposed to strengthen this theory. The fifth and last supposition, and the one most relied upon by our adversaries, is that by Babylon was intended the old Babylon of the Assyrians. The value of this assertion will best be learnt from the nature of the arguments by which it is sought to be established. A learned Cambridge scholar (Lightfoot) in a sermon preached at St. Mary's, Cambridge, can only find the following: "it was one of the greatest knots of Jews in the world, and Peter was the minister of the circumcision; and Bosor (2. Pet. II. 15.) speaks Peter in Babylon, it being the Chaldee or Syriac pronunciation of Pethor in Num. XXII. 5. Such are the flimsy arguments which modern Protestant scholars are content to advance against the universal testimony of Christian antiquity. Assuredly they rely greatly upon either the credulity and ignorance, or the bigotry of their co-religionists. SACERDOS.

Education cannot be made purely secular, or as the cant phrase goes "unsectarian," if it be carried beyond the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic. If it be extended beyond these, into the domain of history, geography, or any of the *ologies* it must needs be "sectarian," or complicated with theology and the religious element. This truth, so often insisted upon by Catholics, as an unanswerable argument against "mixed" or "common schools," is strongly urged by the London Times:—

"Mr. Herbert must be assumed to include in his history, geography, geology, logic—not to mention other subjects; and not one of these can be studied without touching upon questions on which mankind are, and will be, for ever divided. What is Scotch history with the words 'Pope, King, Prelate, Government cut out of it? Geography must recognise the existent diversities of religious belief, and their influence on national progress, and character. Geology involves many disputed questions; and Logic raises the whole controversy as to the basis of belief, being as it is only another word for what Dr. Newman has styled the Grammar of Assent."—Times.

There must then needs be, a Catholic History, and a Protestant History; a Catholic Geography and a Protestant Geography—and so on throughout the whole chapter of the sciences. If all these be excluded from common school education, then common school education is not worth the trouble, and the money that it costs. If they are included, and as both cannot be taught as true in the same school—as the one is the contradictory of the other—it is evident that injustice is perpetrated if Catholic History and Catholic Geography be enforced upon Protestant pupils; or if Protestant History and Protestant Geography be thrust down the throats of Catholic pupils. From this dilemma there is no possibility of escape. Common schools must be either worthless, or sectarian.

THE MODEL REPUBLIC.—This is no altogether a nice place to live in, if the following, which we find in the telegraphic reports from the United States, be a fair specimen of the manner in which life and property are there protected. It seems that on the 19th inst., at a place called Talagual, a man who was on his trial for murder was acquitted. Whereupon a relative of the murdered man, by way of expressing his dissent from the finding of the Court, shot the defendant dead, and then served the Judge on the Bench in a similar manner. This provoked an expression of public opinion, in the shape of a free fight, in the course of which seven persons were killed outright, and as many more were wounded.