

THE MORNING STAR AND CATHOLIC MESSENGER  
PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY  
The New Orleans Catholic Publication Company, at  
No. 124 Carondelet street, between Poydras and  
Lafayette streets.

The Directors of the Company are:  
Most Rev. Archbishop N. J. PERCHE, President.  
JOHN HENDERSON, Vice President.  
Very Rev. G. RAYMOND,  
Very Rev. J. MOYNIHAN,  
Rev. T. J. KENNY,  
Rev. T. J. BRUTE, C. M.,  
Rev. H. GIBSON, C. S. R.,  
JOHN T. GIBSON,  
JOHN McCAFFREY.

All communications to be addressed to the  
Editors of the Morning Star and Catholic Messenger.

Publication Office—No. 124 Carondelet street.

VOLUME V.  
Morning Star and Catholic Messenger.  
NEW ORLEANS, SUNDAY, JULY 21, 1872.

LETTER FROM ROME.

THE POPE'S ANNIVERSARY.

ROME, June 22.—On Saturday last the numbers who went to the Vatican to pay their homage and respect to the Holy Father was 9000. The Society for Catholic Interests issued 7500 tickets, and the remainder were people who were known, and were therefore admitted. At the entrance to the galleries Prince Cambrano read a short address to the Holy Father, to which he replied. He then passed through the double lines of the people, blessing them and giving them his hand to kiss. Nothing could exceed their enthusiasm; and the Holy Father was sensibly affected by it. On Sunday morning the whole of the Roman nobility, with the exception of three families—Doria, Colonna, and Piombino—were received, and an address read by the Marchese Cavalletti, Senator of Rome. The Holy Father made a most beautiful answer in reply, thanking them for their loyalty and devotion. In the afternoon a solemn Te Deum took place in St. Peter's, thanksgiving for the preservation of the life of his Holiness. It would be impossible to describe the effect produced by that splendid ceremony. The whole church was crowded from the high altar to the door, and thousands of voices joined in the prayers that were either recited or sung. The procession from the sacristy was headed by 180 members of the Italian or Foreign Societies carrying torches. Next came the Clergy and Chapter of St. Peter's, and last the celebrant, Mgr. de Merode, who intoned the Te Deum and gave Benediction. When all was over, the Piazza filled with carriages and a countless multitude reminded one forcibly of the days when the Papal functions took place in St. Peter's. On the following day the Cardinals, the Officers of State, the Noble, Palatine, and Swiss Guards presented their homage and congratulations to the Holy Father.

MONSIGNOR HOWARD.

Monsignor Howard has just been named Archbishop of Neo-Casaria in partibus infidelium. He is already Vicar of St. Peter's, which office is generally filled by an Archbishop, and he will act as coadjutor to Cardinal Ciarelli, the present Bishop of Frascati. His nomination has given the greatest satisfaction to all his friends.

THE TRIAL.

The acquittal of the murderers of the Pontifical gendarme is still causing a good deal of excitement. On the trial it was clearly proved that the gendarmes were unarmed, that they gave no provocation whatever, and finally that the murderers, in order to carry out their plan, waited at the corner of the road for more than twenty minutes, until they came out of the house which they had seen enter. It is said that the jury were intimidated, and that all had received threatening letters, informing them that the same fate awaited them if an unfavorable verdict was given. This is certainly not very reassuring for those who serve the Pope, and is a great encouragement to their enemies to repeat the crime they so successfully carried out. As soon as the verdict was given the mob burst out in loud exclamations, and carried the murderers in triumph through the streets, crying out, "Long live Italian Justice!" "Death to the Pope!" In 1844 when Rossi, the Pope's Minister, was assassinated, the same thing took place, and people shuddered with horror at seeing a second murderer carried in triumph and receiving the ovations of the lowest refuse of Italy.

THE FOREIGN DEPUTATIONS.

On Wednesday, the foreign deputations were presented by Monsignor Stonor, Belgium, France, Spain, Germany, England, Ireland and America, were represented on the occasion. Lord R. Kerr presented the address of the Catholic Union of England, and Count de la Poiré that of the League of St. Sebastian.

THE POPE'S LETTER.

The letter of the Holy Father to Cardinal Antonelli is the principal topic of conversation. It is a clear and concise statement of the actual state of things, and will, it is hoped, be an answer to the endless false statements about Rome. The whole anti-Catholic press of Europe, with a persistence which is perfectly wonderful, is every day denying the insults to religion and to her ministers which take place in Rome, and in all probability they will continue doing so; and further add that, as the Holy Father is in the Vatican he cannot know what takes place outside. The letter, however, will prove to the Catholic public that the statements are true, and that the Church is not free so long as she is

under the domination of Italy or any other power.

DIPLOMATIC CONGRATULATIONS.

During the week the whole of the diplomatic corps accredited to the Holy See have presented the congratulations of their Sovereigns to the Pope.

THE ITALIAN DEPUTATION.

Yesterday the Chapter of St. John Lateran presented their felicitations to the Holy Father on the anniversary of his coronation. His Holiness, accompanied by some Cardinals and the members of his Court, went to the Sala Ducale, which was crowded by the deputations from the various towns of Italy. About 260 dioceses were represented, and Signor Acquaderri, of Bologna, President of all the Italian Young Men's Societies of Italy, read a magnificent address of congratulation. The Holy Father's answer was received, and frequently interrupted by the most enthusiastic acclamations. It is always a most touching and beautiful thing to hear the Holy Father, as an Italian, speaking to Italians.—London Tablet.

MISCELLANEOUS IRISH NEWS.

DEATH OF THE REV. PETER CONWAY, P. P., HEADFORD.

This announcement will be received with profound sorrow through the land. The good, generous and warm-hearted "Father Peter" is no more. In his death the poor have lost one of their best, most tried and uncompromising friends, and religion a faithful and zealous priest. He died on Saturday last, at three o'clock, of typhus fever, brought on, it is said, by the nervous excitement to which he has recently been subjected. The zealous, hard-working priest is now at rest, and far removed from the insolence of office. He is gone to receive the reward promised to those who have loved the poor for Christ's sake, who were loyal to their trusts and faithful to the end. In human breast there did not beat a more generous or sympathetic heart than in that of Father Conway. Few men in our time have given more practical proof of their zeal for the welfare of the poor than he. In famine and pestilence he was among them to give them help and comfort; their joys and sorrows were his; their enemies and oppressors were his also; and if, occasionally, his zeal exceeded that which some call the strict lines of prudence in advocating the claims of his poor parishioners, the excess arose from the depth and intensity of his sympathy, as well as from his determination to stand by and do battle for the needy and the friendless. His "want of prudence" was the excess of his honesty and his sincerity. He felt that he was amply rewarded for all his toil and self-sacrifice by having secured the affections of his people, his influence over whom was potent but gentle, because he lived in their affections and in their "heart of hearts." No sacrifice was too great for him to make for his flock. This was well illustrated by his taking two long and weary journeys across the Atlantic to raise money among the Irish race in America to build the noble parochial church of Headford, which will long be regarded as a monument of as good and holy a priest and as patriotic an Irishman as ever breathed. But Father Conway needs no such monument, for his name will live in the love of the people from generation to generation, as that of one who was always the fearless asserter of their rights, the reprover of the wrong-doer, the generous benefactor of the needy, the destitute, and the afflicted; as one who stood between the oppressor and the oppressed, and who had closed his honored life in the service of God and of the flock confided to his charge. His death throws a terrible additional interest round the now famous "Judgment." We understand from the day of its delivery Father Conway drooped. In one of our recent issues we quoted some of the epithets which Judge Keogh was not ashamed to heap on the good priest, the devoted and self-sacrificing friend of his flock and of the people of Ireland. There are some men of whom nothing is to be dreaded but their praise, and whose enmity is the best testimony of the character of those they assail. Father Conway's funeral, which took place on the 24th of June, was immense. The procession left St. Mary's at eleven o'clock. The coffin containing the remains was borne on the shoulders of the people, and was followed and preceded by thousands. No living could exceed the sorrow of poor and rich at the loss of the good priest. The church was densely crowded when the funeral arrived here, and some difficulty was found in getting the remains to the choir. After the High Mass, at which the Archbishop of Tuam presided, the remains were buried within the church, amidst the wailings and lamentations of the people.—Dublin Freeman.

[From the Southwestern Presbyterian.]  
INFALLIBILITY AS A FISH STORY.

The question before us is a very simple one. Our neighbors of the CATHOLIC MESSENGER have challenged us to discuss the dogma of Papal Infallibility. This notion seems to be a serious one to them, at all events, it is the corner-stone of the Papacy, and if it is true, we are more than willing to know it. But we confess that their discourses only seem to make the matter more and more improbable.

1. For if it be true that any one claiming to be an officer in the Christian Church is infallible, we ought to have some clear and conclusive evidence of the fact, from the lips of Christ, or the utterances of the Apostles, the inspired writers. Claim as much as you please, the opinions of man, the inquiry will continue to present itself, what is the testimony of scripture? We are told in reply to this question:

We may wrangle forever over Bible texts. There is no sect so absurd or impious but has been able to give some specious color to its extravagances by misrepresenting the Bible. Let us then ask what did the Fathers of the Church think on this subject.

For our part we agree on this point, with the opinion expressed, when the matter was discussed in the Vatican Council, by Archbishop Conolly, of Halifax: "I will have nothing—said he—but the indelible word of God, made into a dogma. The opinion of ten thousand theologians do not suffice me." Quirinus, p. 506.

But the investigation of the passages of Scripture which are quoted in the interest of this dogma, such as we have published, from the pen of Archbishop Kenrick, shows that those texts do not prove "Papal supremacy, far less, Papal Infallibility."

2. The champions of infallibility then invoke the testimony of writers of the early centuries of Christianity. We are assured that the Fathers said so.

In reply we present the testimony of such men as Kenrick, Dollinger, and the learned authors of Janus, who agree with Dollinger on this point although they differ on others. These authorities deny that those writers support the idea of Papal infallibility.

The reply to this, "here are a number of quotations from those writers, examine them for yourself, if you are able, and show if they are false; what is said by Kenrick, Dollinger and Janus is only assertion; here are the facts."

We offer a conclusive answer to this reply:

It would not be hard to sift the merits of the citations. For instance, the very first sentence—that a disciple of Paul has so taught—is notoriously a dodge; it is known to every Protestant writer that there is no evidence that the so-called Pastor, "of Hermas," was written by a companion of Paul the Apostle.

But on points like this, we propose to set Protestant testimony aside, and give the clear and decided evidence of eminent authorities in the Roman Church itself. Now, in reply to the claim that the pretended citations from the Fathers are facts, and the denial of them is only assertions. The case is simply this, the CATHOLIC MESSENGER AND STAR, says, that so called citations from the Fathers in support of the idea of infallibility are fact: while such men as Kenrick and Dollinger say, they are not facts. Each one must judge for himself which are the best authorities. These learned writers even go so far as to say, that a commissioned teacher of the Roman Church cannot assert Papal infallibility, without perjuring himself, "For—say they—we have sworn to interpret Scripture according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the Fathers teach no such doctrine."

4. To abate the force of this testimony, we are told that Kenrick has recanted these opinions; and that Dollinger would not recant, has been excommunicated. But there seems to be so little sympathy between Kenrick and our neighbors on this question, that we must hesitate to accept their testimony as to his present opinions. Yet if it is so, the word of God whose authority he so reverently upheld, and the facts of history which he so clearly unfolded at the Vatican Council, they have not recanted.

It is perhaps true that the Pope has declared Dollinger a heretic. It is also true that Dollinger has pronounced the Papacy of the Vatican Council heretical. Scripture, History, Reason and Tradition say that Dollinger is right. THE MORNING STAR AND CATHOLIC MESSENGER says that the Papacy is right. Who is to decide?

5. But Strauss says, has not recanted, nor has he been excommunicated. In a speech in the Council, notable from its eloquent vindication of the Gallican Church, he declared "papal infallibility is against the constitution of the Church, the rights of Bishops and Councils and the immuta-

ble rule of faith, according to the Fathers of the Church." Quirinus, p. 539.

Lord Acton has not recanted nor has he been excommunicated, yet in the North British Review, he has expressed the same opinion. He tells us that it was openly declared by speakers in the Vatican Council, that "many of the authorities quoted in proof of the dogma even by its most esteemed defenders, are mutilated, falsified, interpolated, garbled, spurious, twisted out of their proper meaning."

6. All those arguments which seem so conclusive to the ignorant, and which our contemporary argue, were urged before the Vatican Council. The quotation of Lord Acton shows how they were regarded by many learned and conscientious members of that body. A large portion of the Council most eminent for piety and learning rejected them as worse than worthless, and left the Council. But before departing they addressed a protest to the Pope speaking as follows:

"Your Holiness is aware that there were eighty-eight fathers who, moved by stress of conscience and love for the Holy Church, voted by the words non placet (No), sixty-two others who voted by the words placet juxta modum (modified assent); and finally about seventy who absented themselves from the congregation and abstained from voting. To these are to be added others, who, on account of illness or other weighty reasons, have returned to their dioceses."

Since that time nothing certainly has occurred to change our views, but, on the other hand, many things, and those of the gravest character, have taken place, which settle us in our determination. We therefore declare that we renew and confirm our votes already given.

Confirming then our votes by this writing, we have decided to absent ourselves from the public session to be held on the 15th instant. For that filial piety and reverence which but a brief time since, brought us to your Holiness's feet, do not suffer us on a question so closely concerning the person of your Holiness, to say non placet, to your face.

And furthermore the votes to be given in the solemn session would be only a repetition of the votes already elicited in the general congregation. See the original Latin in Quirinus.

7. With these facts before us, we may well admire the sublime courage of those who have undertaken to demonstrate that the Bishop of Rome is infallible. Their zeal is worthy of a better cause.

8. Incidentally we called attention to the fact that no reply has yet been made to our answer to the assertion, that "the authority of the Bishop of Rome is greater than that of the Bible." Our contemporary explains our saying, "The simple fact in relation to this is, that we have published an answer to every one of its articles." In reply to this simple fact, we must mention another simple fact, namely, that the article mentioned was one of our articles, and that no answer to it has yet appeared.

9. We noticed in our last number our neighbor's complaint of soporific, want of courtesy and fairness in their opponents. We invite attention to the illustration of those qualities in their article which we publish to-day. We do not greatly object to it. We want them to exhibit themselves in our columns with perfect frankness and naturalness, and according to their own ideas of fairness and courtesy. The spirit and temper of the advocates of Papal infallibility are more instructive than their arguments.

Infallibility.

Our neighbor complains again that we have not replied to a certain one of its articles, and in courtesy we wish to dispose of this before proceeding with the main subject. Our former explanation was misprinted. Instead of saying that we had published an answer to every one of its articles, we wrote that we had published "an answer to every one of our articles," that is, one answer, and that we could not be expected to publish two. And our proposition is still open; let the Presbyterian readvance the argument to which it refers, and do so within the limits of a legitimate single response, and we will publish it.

On the merits, our neighbor comes back to the old demand that people must confine their researches into the meaning of the Bible to the critical examination of the language of the Bible itself. Now this looks to us very unreasonable in cases where a prolonged, patient, honest and prayerful research has totally failed to produce anything like unanimity among sincere enquirers. Take this very doctrine of Papal Infallibility, for instance. Here the question has been before the public for

centuries, certainly ever since Protestantism has been in existence. As our neighbor itself confesses, the subject is a most important one, going so far as to say: "If it is true we are more than willing to know it." This little expression has warmed our heart towards our neighbor, and we propose just now never to scold it again. But what is the result of all this examination of Bible texts? The editors of the Presbyterian, and millions of other intelligent Protestants, cannot find in the Bible any promise of infallibility to either Church or Pope. On the other hand, many more millions of Christians find the text of the Scripture quite plain and unequivocal in its gift of that prerogative.

Now, what is to be done? If the Pope or even the Church is infallible, certainly it ought to be known. It is a most vital point, just as important as to know whether the Bible itself is really inspired.

Can the Presbyterian say positively that the two hundred millions of Catholics are wrong in their understanding of the text which says that the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Church. Surely it would be as impolite in the editors of that paper to say that the interpretation given to that text by the editors of this paper is wrong as it would be for us to say that theirs is wrong, so far as it is a mere question of private judgment. We have not a particle of right to say that our individual construction of any text is certainly right whenever another equally intelligent and sincere man differs with us in opinion, no matter how much we may have prayed over it, for he may have prayed as much and as earnestly. To hold different from this is to be what people generally call hide-bound or bigoted.

Here, then, appears to be a hitch. One camp says: "It is clear from the Bible that the Pope is infallible;" the other camp says: "It is not clear; we do not see it." Must it rest so forever? May we not look around for some outside facts, some historical knowledge which will, perhaps, cast a light upon the difficulty? Suppose, for instance, that the whole early Church held without hesitation to the Catholic view of the text, suppose that we had the writings of innumerable Christians, contemporary with the Apostles, all asserting that infallibility in the Church and in the Pope was conceded by everybody; suppose that all the early Fathers, without an exception, had stated the fact in as precise and unequivocal language as possible; that councils of the whole Church had been held every ten years during the first ages of Christianity and that each, and every one had distinctly reaffirmed this doctrine; that the acts of many Councils had been partly set aside by the Pope, sometimes wholly annulled, sometimes added to, and never recognized by anybody as valid until confirmed by him; that all this control on his part was universally submitted to and adopted by the whole Church; that the Popes themselves from the very first had expressly and formally claimed infallibility; that the Eastern Bishops, so jealous of Rome had never disputed it but always acceded to it; that the wildest heretics of the Early ages had never thought of questioning this interpretation of the Scripture, but always professed perfect readiness to abide by the decision of the Popes; suppose that not a shadow of doubt could remain that the whole body of Christians during the lifetime of the apostles and for centuries afterwards, held without a single exception, to this understanding of the text bearing on this subject, would not these facts have an important influence in settling the doubt arising from the conflicting opinions of the two great schools above referred to?

We do not mean to say that this outside proof to which we can refer is as full and complete in each of the kinds specified as

Morning Star and Catholic Messenger

THE MORNING STAR has been started with the approval of the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese, to supply an admitted want in New Orleans, and is mainly devoted to the interests of the Catholic Church. It will not interfere in politics except wherein they interfere with Catholic rights, but will expose iniquity in high places, without regard to persons or parties. Next to the spiritual rights of all men, it will especially champion the temporal rights of the poor.

Approval of the Most Rev. Archbishop.  
We approve of the aforesaid undertaking, and commend it to the Catholics of our Diocese.  
J. M. ARCHBISHOP OF NEW ORLEANS.  
December 12, 1867.

Forms—By Carrier, 64; By Mail, 82—in Advance

NUMBER 25.

here supposed, but we say that in each kind,—the writings of the Fathers, the history of the Councils, the action of the Popes, the submission of Bishops nationally jealous, the testimony of heretics and enemies—there is enough simply to convince a sincere inquirer that all the early ages of the Church, including the earliest, held that the texts of the Bible conferred infallibility upon the Church and even upon the Pope. Ought not such a state of facts, if true, to have great weight in settling a doubt upon the point, and if so, ought it not to be enquired into and brought forward?

"Yes," you will say, "but even then I am not bound to adopt the interpretation of the Early Church, universal as it may have been, if totally contrary to reason and common sense! Reason and common sense! Why, what can show more forcibly the reasonableness and even necessity of the doctrine of infallibility, than the doubts existing on this very question? You say that sincere inquirers will not differ on essential points, but what can be more vital, more fundamental, than a question which strikes at the root of all other questions, at the very interpretation of every revelation? If men can honestly and sincerely differ on this question, they can do so on any other. Yet we see the vast and solemn division of opinions and consciences existing here in the very foundation of the Christian fabric. Is it not reasonable that Christ should have given an infallible means of solving such doubts?"

"But" you say, "how is it that this question of the Papal Infallibility has never been settled dogmatically before, and now the Church is eighteen centuries old?" Answer. Because it was never found necessary to do so before. All Catholics, without exception, held that infallibility was in the Church somewhere; its exact location in the Pope, independent of the Council was not a matter of great practical importance in the working of the Church as things had been heretofore. Finally circumstances have changed so as to give the point more practical prominence and it has been settled. This is the history of all other dogmas." Though always existing as truths and always believed, often centuries elapsed before a necessity arose for their definition as articles of faith, and no doubt the history of the future will be just like that of the past in that regard.

As to the remainder of our neighbor's reply we dispose of it in two remarks. 1st. Kenrick and Dollinger do not deny our facts. They, or one of them simply denied that those facts proved what we claim. They never dreamed of denying their correctness as quotations. 2d. It is rather unseemly levity in our neighbor, in discussing a serious matter to jest as it does insisting that Dollinger is good Catholic authority. On one side we have Dollinger and a few Freeman Catholics; on the other the Pope, all the Bishops and all the Faithful. The Pope has excommunicated Dollinger yet the Presbyterian wants to know which is right, when the question is simply which is Catholic.

Catholic Militant Union of the Cross—Council of New Orleans.

BULLETIN.

NEW ORLEANS, July 20, 1872.

The following appointments have been made. Auxiliary Section of the Church of St. Augustin: President, Miss Clara Matorreau; Vice President, Miss L. Conas; Secretary, Mrs. F. Deblanc; Treasurer, Mrs. Beccel.

Auxiliary Section of the Church of St. Mary of the Assumption: Secretary, Mrs. Josephine Sauerwald.

It is necessary that the place of residence and postoffice address of each officer be made known to the Council, in order to ensure the speedy transmission of communications to the Sections. Officers will please forward the desired information to the undersigned.

THOMAS LAYTON, M. D., Secretary.  
Lock Box 108, Postoffice.