Morning Star and Catholic Messenger.
PUBLISHED EVERY SUNDAY MORNING.

REV. A. J. RYAN,
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF.

NEW ORLEANS, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1872.

OUR CLUB RATES
FOR PAPERS SENT BY MAIL TO ONE ADDRESS.

One Copy (one year)	$ 3 00
Five Copies "	12 50
Ten Copies "	22 50
Twenty Copies "	40 00

No orders will receive attention unless accompanied by the cash.

Agents for the Star.

LOUISIANA.
B. LEBAUX, Franklin.
Jas. DOUGLASS, Baton Rouge.
W. BURKE and CARR, Natchitoches, La.

TEXAS.
J. D. SAWYER, corner Market and Twenty-Second streets, Galveston.
J. Z. LATENDECKER, Laredo.

GEORGIA.
J. J. O'CONNELL, Savannah.
GEORGE NELSON, Macon, Ga.

SOUTH CAROLINA.
STEPHEN MOLONY, Charleston.

CALENDAR OF THE WEEK.

Sunday	Sept. 29	St. Michael, Archangel.
Monday	Sept. 30	St. Jerome, Confessor and Doctor of the Church.
Tuesday	Oct. 1	St. Remigius, Bishop and Confes.
Wednesday	Oct. 2	The Holy Guardian Angels.
Thursday	Oct. 3	Votive of the Blessed Sacrament.
Friday	Oct. 4	St. Francis of Assisi, Confessor.
Saturday	Oct. 5	SS. Placidus and Comp., Martyrs.

His Grace, Most Rev. Archbishop Perche, reached the city last Monday, after an extended visitation of the parishes in the Teche country. We are pained to learn that he is suffering so much from an affection of the leg that he cannot even say Mass. He hopes, however, that a few days of necessary rest will enable him to complete his Episcopal visitation.

FAIR FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE MOUNT CARMEL ORPHAN ASYLUM.—Preparations are being made to render this fair one of the most attractive and successful ever held in this city. Many ladies and gentlemen of acknowledged talent have already kindly consented to entertain and amuse the audiences which will assemble on the several nights. The Fair will be held in Lyceum Hall, commencing Nov. 9 and continuing fourteen nights.

NEW ORLEANS CATHOLIC TOTAL ABSTINENCE ASSOCIATION.—The special meeting of this Association held last Sunday evening, was attended with beneficial results. As its continued prosperity and steady growth gives evidence that this Association is destined to be one of the solid and flourishing societies of the city, and not one of those which, springing into existence in the fulness of its strength, perished slowly and surely, it attracts notice and wins advocates. It having been found impossible, on account of business engagements, to secure the attendance of a member at the Convention to be held at Cleveland, O., on the 10th prox., the Association has resolved to request Maj. O'Driscoll, of Washington, to represent it. The Major, as Secretary of the Union, is devoted heart and soul to the cause and gives all his time and energies to the advancement of its interests, and no more appropriate selection we think, could have been made. The next regular meeting of the Association will be held at the Star Hall, 124 Carondelet streets, Sunday evening, Oct. 13th, at 6½ o'clock. As this is no secret association, gentlemen interested in the cause are invited to attend.

YOUNG MEN'S CATHOLIC LITERARY ASSOCIATION, ST. THERESA'S PARISH.—At the request of many friends the entertainment given by this Society on the 16th inst., was repeated last Thursday evening to a very numerous audience. The performance was smoothly rendered—being, in our opinion, a marked improvement upon the previous one. We were happy to see so correct a conception, and so able an acting of the part entrusted to him, as was shown by young Master Thos. Toole (a volunteer) in the character of "Robert, Count of Lusigny," in the play of "The Crusader's Vow." His endeavors were loudly and repeatedly applauded. "The Persecuted Dutchman" was received with every evidence of approbation. The sad mishaps, the ludicrous situations and the admirably rendered Teutonic dialect of "The Original John Schmidt," furnished subjects for many a hearty laugh. Judging from the audience present the sum realized must have been considerable. Of this we are pleased; for it will encourage the young gentlemen of the Y. M. C. L. A. to give in the future many and improved representations of the Catholic Drama.

PASS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE.—Brother Leonidian's card, which we publish on our fifth page, will be read by all friends of education with great pleasure. Some months ago, owing to serious pecuniary complications, it was greatly feared that the Brothers would be obliged to sacrifice the college and turn to other fields of labor,—but owing to the generosity of friends and the rare financial and business qualifications of two of the Brothers—the President, Brother Leonidian, and Brother Authemian—the storm has been weathered, and the College is now once more on a solid footing. The reputation of the professors mentioned in the card as having charge of the several classes is such as, of itself alone, would commend the college to the patronage of our people. Every effort has been made, during the past few months, so to arrange all the details of management that the students will enjoy the comforts of home besides the advantages necessary for a perfect education. We trust that all friends of the Institution will exert their influence in sending students to the Pass, thereby making the coming session, the most successful in the history of the college, and ensuring its existence as one of the best of our Southern Educational Institutions. The session commences on the 1st proximo.

[From the Southwestern Presbyterian.]

FALSIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES.

THE FATHERS.

Our Romish neighbors solemnly assured us, at least four times that Augustine had endorsed the idea of Papal Infallibility, by saying, "Roma locuta causa finita est." They solemnly declared they could prove it and were ready and willing to do so. We have compelled them to acknowledge that Augustine did not say so, and they now excuse themselves by saying, it was a "mistake." We should think so. It was a "mistake" of the sort that, in a court of Justice they would probably style *false witness*.

2. They also asserted that Tertullian endorsed the idea of Papal infallibility "by speaking of Rome as the place whence authority emanates." They are now compelled to acknowledge that in the passage referred to, which we quoted in our last article Tertullian does not claim any more authority for Rome than for Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica or Corinth. This "mistake" is of a kind which would be very damaging to a man's reputation for veracity.

3. They try to evade the charge as to Augustine, by asserting that the language he really used, was precisely similar in meaning to what they call their "paraphase of it." This we denounce as another "mistake," because it involves a suppression of the truth. He used the language in question—"an, or, the Apostolic See has spoken, the case is settled," to report the decision of a particular case which both parties had referred to it. Our neighbors seek to produce the impression that he taught thereby that the Papa of Rome is infallible when pronouncing upon any question of faith and morals. Is it honest to represent a particular opinion, as a general maxim?

4. The attempt to force this construction upon the words of Augustine is also "a mistake," because it involves a suggestion of falsehood, namely, that the reference of a doctrinal question to the so-called Apostolic See of Rome, means that its decisions were regarded as infallible. There were various other Apostolic Sees, and here as was believed, the teaching of their Apostolic founders was preserved and transmitted. These were the centres from which the Missions radiated, and whether they were so or not, at least they ought to have been, the places in which the doctrines of Christianity were best understood. Tertullian refers to them in that view, as we have shown. And Augustine as we have quoted, advises that "mooted questions be referred to the judgment of the Apostolic *churches*." In doing so he plainly admits what Tertullian and others, abundantly teach, that what made it proper for the Carthaginians to refer in this case, to the so-called Apostolic See of Rome, would have made it just as incumbent for the Greeks in a similar case, to refer to the Apostolic See of Corinth or Ephesus. To claim then that by these words, Augustine meant to teach that Rome had the exclusive right to pronounce on such questions, is certainly a "mistake."

5. The claim, that the respectful language Augustine used towards the Papa of Rome, means that he held him infallible, also involves a suggestion of "mistake," viz, that such language could only be used of an infallible person. Augustine had a great personal interest in that decision. He had fought the heresy with all his powers, and the condemnation of Pelagianism was the endorsement of his own orthodoxy. The decision of Innocent was acceptable to him; and when Zozimus under heavy stress of circumstances reiterated the decision, he could afford to dwell less on his prevarications, than on his conclusions.

He accepted and praised the verdict, but is that the same thing as declaring that the man who gave it, is "infallible in deciding all questions of faith and morals?" We think not.

We are invited to believe that he regarded these men as infallible because he called them "Sancta papa" "beatae memoriae Papa, holy Papa, Papa of blessed memory. What shall we think then of Athanasius, Paulinus, and Augustine himself, whom Jerome addresses as Beatissime Papa,—*most* blessed Papa? Ep. 17, 18, 25, 30, inter Epist August. What shall we think of the clergy of Rome addressing Cyprian bishop of Carthage, as Benedictus, Beatissime Gloriosissimus Papa. Blessed, *most* happy, *most* glorious Papa? Ep. 8, 30. Epist cler Rom ad Cyp.

The fact is, nothing was more common than such compliments, and if it made a man infallible to be addressed so, infallibles must have been as plentiful then, as *colonels* are now-a-days.

Truly! the men who use such quibbling to make out a case, may well say: "It is not *our* infallibility which we are discussing."

But is this all? It is not? When men make "mistakes" *deliberately, systematically* and *for a purpose*, the common word for it is *not* "infallibility," but FRAUD.

FALSIFICATION OF HISTORY.

Romanists say—our statement in reference to Zozimus, "belongs to the category of false assertions. Why if that assertion were true, it would at once, not only end this controversy, but wipe out the Catholic Church itself?"

Thus, so far from its being true that all the parties to this transaction virtually rejected Papal Infallibility, not one of them did so. Not Zozimus for he made no such decision as stated; not Augustine and the other Bishops for they had no such decree to protest against; not even the heretics, themselves, for Pelagius never called in question the finality of the Papal power even when its decision was against him.

We can only say that, whatever be the consequences, the fact remains.

1. They seek to produce the impression that the case brought before Zozimus by the appeal of Celestius, was a different case from that which Innocent had decided against Pelagius, by saying that Celestius "denied having held the condemned propositions of Pelagius." This statement is directly contrary to the testimony of Augustine, who says that while Pelagius was crafty and evasive, Celestius was bold and audacious in asserting the heresy: Says he De Peccat orig., c. 6, after stating the heresy: Huic sensdm suum vobis aperire Pelagius vel timuit, vel erubuit quem discipulum ejus palum sine ullius obscuritatis ambagibus apud sedem Apostolicam profteri nec timuit nec erubuit." This his meaning, which Pelagius either feared or blushed to acknowledge to you—his disciple openly, plainly, without circumlocution neither blushed nor feared to profess at the Apostolic See." So much for the attempt to misrepresent the question to be decided. The case before Zozimus differed, only in being a more aggravated form of the heresy, which was to be condemned.

2. The history of the case is this. In January A. D., 417. Papa Innocent condemned Pelagius and Celestius, and their doctrine denying original sin.

3. In the Spring of that year he died and was succeeded by Zozimus, to whom Celestius appealed, and submitted his Libellus, or confession of faith, which according to Augustine—de pecc orig. c. 2—was much more frank and open than Pelagius, in the denial of original sin." Zozimus caused it to be read, and then writes a letter to the African bishops, blaming them for being so hasty in censuring Pelagius and Celestius—and says—Either within two months let some one come and convict him to his face of holding other opinions than those set down in his books and Confession, or else, after such plain and manifest declarations made by him, let your Holiness know, that there is no doubt remaining." Letter of Zozimus, vol. 10, p. 2347. Benedict edit, Augustine. So much for their denial, that Celestius appealed, and had a new hearing of the heresy.

4. Not very long after, Zozimus wrote another letter to the African bishops, saying that "he had received a letter and Libellus, or statement of doctrine from Pelagius, and also a letter in his behalf from Praylus bishop of Jerusalem. He goes on to say—that "these had been *publicly* read, and their contents are all to *the same tenor, sense and purpose*, with what Celestius had produced before. Oh! brethren would that any of you had been present at the reading of them! What joy there was of the holy men who present? Some could scarce forbear weeping that it should be possible for such men, of such unrebukable faith to be so slandered." Then he inveighs against their accusers, and concludes—"If the father rejoiced at the return of his son that had been dead and was alive again; had been lost and was found, how much greater rejoicing of our faith is this—that *these* men of whom false stories were reported, *Never were dead or lost*. I have sent therefore to your charity copies of the writings which Pelagius sent etc. See letter of Zozimus on p. 2350. Bened edit August. vol. 10. So much for their denial, that Zozimus approved the Pelaganism which Innocent condemned.

5 In view of these facts what is to be thought of their assertion that these bishops did not protest against this decision because they had nothing to protest against? Aug ad Bonif lib. 2, c. 3, 4, tells a very different story. He says they asserted that the question was not met, "that Celestius should be compelled to recite and condemn the errors of his Libellus, lest if he did not do so, many persons of weak judgment might be more ready to think that those doctrines in his Libellus, poisonous to our faith, were approved by the Apostolic See, because that See had said that *that Libellus was Catholic*, rather than think these doctrines corrected by it—the Apostolic See—because he said he would assent to Innocent's letter." So much for their denial, that the Bishops had anything to protest against.

6. In the meantime, the Emperor Honorius issued a decree condemning the errors of Pelagius and Celestius. Wks Aug. 10, 2358. So much for their idea that Zozimus was universally admitted to be infallible.

7. About the same time a general Synod was held at Carthage, in which the Pelagian errors were specified and anathematised. Wks Aug. 10, 2361. So much for their idea that the decision of a bishop of Rome is necessarily final.

8. Finally Zozimus changed front, and issued a sentence of censure. And as says Prosper, in *lib contra* Collatorem, n. 57. Wks Aug. 10, 2365. "He added the strength of his sentences to that of the African bishops," *i. e.*, did not originate—but merely concurred in a decision, which was contrary to his own previous deliberate judgment.

9. But even then, after two Papas had pronounced sentences it is perfectly evident that it was only regarded as a local decision; for at the meeting of the next General Council at Ephesus, Pelagianism was solemnly put on its trial before them, and received its condemnation there.

So it appears, that our neighbors to the contrary notwithstanding—Celestius did appeal from Papa Innocent to Papa Zozimus—that the appeal brought precisely the same heresy before him—that Zozimus entertained the appeal—that he censured the African bishops for rashness in condemning these heretics—that he declared Pelagius and Celestius orthodox—that the African bishops protested against his declaring the Libellus of Celestius Catholic—that he afterwards pronounced these men heretics—and that, after all, it was a question so far from settled by these decisions, that the Council of Ephesus felt it necessary to give sentence on it thirteen years afterward.

Our neighbors have thus asserted at least eight "mistakes" on this single point.

They make a very serious "mistake" when they deny the correctness of our account of this case. Persons so familiar with Augustine, must know that the documents from which we quote are all to be found in the Appendix to vol. 10 of the Benedictine edition of Augustine. To any committee of gentlemen we would be glad to exhibit them. And when it is known that these documents are cited by Giesseler, published by Baronius, and quoted in full by Labbe, we think it will be conceded that it would be hard to find a more barefaced attempt to falsify history than the one we have just exposed.

What next?

COLLEGE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. The Academic year at this College begins Tuesday next, Oct. 1st. It is of the greatest importance that students should be present on the day of opening, as much loss of time is thereby avoided, and a proper classification at once attained. For these reasons and many others too numerous to mention, parents are earnestly requested to see that their children attend punctually on the day mentioned. A card in our educational column gives much necessary information as to the terms of tuition, hours of classes, length of session and division of courses, etc., and to it, or to the Rev. President, we refer those who are not thoroughly acquainted with the superior advantages for the proper education of boys, offered at this College.

St. Zosimus on Infallibility.

In the reply of the *Presbyterian* which we publish to-day, there are several points of fact in which we must differ with it.

1st. The "mistake" or rather overaight of giving a paraphrase of a passage in St. Augustine as a literal quotation, when the the two are identical in meaning is, our neighbor says, one that, in a Court of Justice, they would probably style "false witness." This would depend on the nature of the Court. No doubt, with a Jeffreys, for a judge, it would be so held if it suited the bigoted purposes and malignant hatreds of the Court so to hold it. If a gentleman happened to preside, however, no matter of what denomination, he would treat the charge of false witness a as quibble unworthy of a place in a serious discussion.

2d. Our neighbor, itself, makes the most remarkable mistake, that has ever come under our observation, in its allusion to the passage from Tertullian. It says that we acknowledged "that in the passage referred to, * * * Tertullian does not claim any more authority for Rome than for Ephesus, Philippi, Thessalonica or Corinth." It is needless to say that there is not a shadow of such admission in our article. With that article printed alongside its own, how our respected neighbor could find any such language in it is a matter of astonishment. It is calculated to give one fearful suspicions of "suthin' warm" and too much of it at that. What we did say was simply to congratulate our learned neighbor on its having finally found a passage which it had solemnly pronounced a forgery and to express our astonishment at its singular suppression of the portion of that passage which we had quoted.

3d. Our neighbor still holds to its wonderful discovery of "*an* Apostolic See." Can historical infatuation go farther than to suppose that questions were referred to any other See than Rome for solution? That it would be proper, for instance, for "the Greeks, in a similar case, to refer to the See of Corinth or Ephesus?" Why every Council that was held at Ephesus or in any other See founded by an Apostle always referred its own action to Rome for approval or rejection. It was to Rome that the Eastern Bishops and Patriarchs appealed whenever "questions" arose. St. Athanasius appealed to Rome against Arianism, St. Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople did the same against Eutychianism. The errors of Pelagius were brought before the tribunal of Rome, even from Jerusalem, as well as from Carthage. Nestorius, an Eastern Bishop was excommunicated and deposed at Rome by Pope Celestin. When the Council of Ephesus met, the Pope required it to adopt his decrees on the Nestorian heresy. He ordered his legates not to argue but to pass sentence according to what he had already decided; "*Ut quæ a nobis antea statuta sunt, exequantur.*" To this the Fathers answered "From the earliest ages it has always been held as beyond doubt that * * * * Peter, who received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, always lives in his Successors and pronounces judgment by their lips;" "*qui ad hoc usque tempus, et semper, in suis successoribus vivit et judicium exercet.*" They afterwards wrote to the Pope asking his confirmation of the synodical decrees, stating that they had followed his instructions scrupulously. They did not ask the Bishop of Ephesus to do so, though that was a See of Apostolic foundation and their Council was held within its walls.

4th. Our neighbor says that our object in calling attention to the fact that the word "Papa" or Pope was used so early as the days of St. Augustine was to show that this implied infallibility. This is an error. We said nothing of the sort neither did we imply it. Thousands of people speak constantly of the Pope without meaning thereby that he is infallible. It merely shows, incidentally, that the title "Pope" which is now so hateful to the Protestants, was in common use in those days. Though then applied to various high dignitaries it has long since become peculiar to the Bishop of Rome.

Our neighbor has the courage to speak of St. Jerome as using complimentary titles in addressing other dignitaries besides the Bishop of Rome. Will our neighbor find an instance of his having written to any other in the same strain as the following, in which he addressed Pope Damasus? He says: "*Beatitudinae tuae, i. e. Cathedrae Petri Communioni consortior; supra illam Petram ædificatam ecclesiam scio. Discerne, si placet; non timebo tres hypostases dicere, si jubebis.*" "I hold fast by thy Holiness, that is the communion of the Chair of Peter; upon that I know the Church to be built. Decree, if you please; I will not fear to proclaim three hypostases, if you so order." Is this mere complimentary language.

5th. But the chief error of our neighbor's article is in the historical account which it gives of the dealings of Pope Zosimus with Pelagianism. The immediate predecessor of Zosimus was St. Innocent. That Pope explicitly condemned certain heresies which were publicly attributed to Pelagius, and the *Presbyterian* contends that Pope Zosimus at one time sustained those heresies, though he was afterwards forced to condemn them. The reasons which our neighbor gives for this statement are eight in number, and, strange to say, its errors are just eight also.

1st. Celestius was a disciple of Pelagius and it was in his favor principally that Zosimus is accused of sustaining the Pelagian heresy. Now we said, in a former article, that Celestius denied holding the Pelagian heresies. This our neighbor says is not so, and that is its error. When Pope Zosimus asked Celestius distinctly, "Do you condemn all that they have published under your name?" Celestius answered in language which St. Augustine records for us. "I condemn it according to the sentence of *your predecessor Innocent.*" And not only does St. Augustine say so, but the very Council of Carthage, upon the supposed antagonism of which to Zosimus the *Presbyterian* relies so much, says so also and very distinctly, in its letter to the Pope. They say that for persons of limited intelligence it would not be sufficient for Celestius to have said that he *was in accord with the letter of Innocent*, but he ought," etc. Therefore, though he certainly elsewhere affirmed the very same errors in different language, yet the Pope was inclined to treat him with clemency because of his professions of submissiveness. As St. Augustine says in a passage already cited by us, Celestius puts these affirmations of error in that part of his libellus where he admitted that he might be in error and asked to be corrected if wrong. For this reason, as St. Augustine continues, and the Council of Carthage also say, Zosimus called his libellus Catholic because his errors were from ignorance, according to his statement, while his will was to accept the truth as soon as he should be instructed. A man is judged by his intentions, and, according to that crafty heretic, his intention was perfectly Catholic. Therefore, both St. Augustine is right in saying he held the errors of Pelagius, and we were right in saying that he *denied* holding them.

2d. Our learned neighbor asserts very quietly in its Nos. 2 and 3, and without the shadow of proof, that Celestius *appealed* to Zosimus from the decision of Innocent. The fact is that Celestius had appealed several years before to Pope Innocent and his appeal was still pending. As we have seen above he expressly proclaimed himself to condemn everything that Pope Innocent had condemned. *He certainly, therefore, could not be understood as appealing from his decree.*

3. The error of our neighbor's No. 4 is in implying that the letter of Zosimus, from which it quotes, makes any reference to the doctrines of Pelagius in its eulogium. There is not a solitary word to that effect. On the contrary, the whole pleasure expressed in that letter is based on the clearly expressed belief that Pelagius and Celestius had been basely slandered by a couple of vile men, that they had never held the doctrines imputed to them and condemned by Innocent, and that they were always perfectly willing to condemn every thing that had been so condemned and that consequently they had never been "dead or lost." That Zosimus made no reference to the condemned doctrines in his congratulation is evident from the language of St. Augustine. He says: "What letter, in fine, of the holy Pope Zosimus, what conversation can be brought forward, where he taught that it is to be believed that man is born without original sin? *Nusquam prorsus hoc dixit, nusquam omnino conscripsit.* Never truly did he say it, never, by any means, did he write it."

4. The fact that the Bishops wanted the Pope to do something more than he had done does not show that they protested against any decision that he had made on an article of faith. They simply wanted him to make Celestius go farther than he had gone and declare what were the errors he was willing to condemn. To construe this into a protest against some solemn decision of a point of faith is remarkably weak logic.

5. "*In the meantime*" says our candid neighbor, "the Emperor Honorius issued a decree condemning the errors of Pelagius and Celestius." This is a very gross historical blunder. It was *not* "in the meantime" in the sense of the *Presbyterian*, for that journal goes on to say that finally Pope Zozimus changed front and condemned the heresy. There is not a particle of evidence on the page of St. Augustine's works cited by our neighbor to show that the Emperor's decree antedated the decree of the Pope. On the contrary, there is no doubt that the Imperial decree followed the Pope's and was obtained at his instance.

6. The general synod referred to in No. 7, was *not* held about the same time but is the month of May, A. D. 418, while the decree of Zosimus was of earlier date the same year.

7. It is, therefore, wrong to intimate, as is done in No. 8, that on account of these things Pope Zosimus condemned Pelagianism. Prosper says, indeed, that "he added the strength of his sentence to that of the African Bishops." But the Council which he approved was that held the year before, viz: in 417. It is a pity, too, that our neighbor saw fit to mutilate the sentence of Prosper by leaving out the latter part of it. The whole sentence reads thus: "Pope Zosimus added the strength of his sentence to the decrees of the African Council, *and armed the right hands of all the Bishops with the sword of Peter for the decapitation of the impious.*"

And why not give also another passage from the same author on the same page, as follows "The most sacred See of Blessed Peter thus speaks to the universal world by the mouth of Pope Zosimus. * * * The African Bishops, writing back to the same Pope * * * say, what you have laid down, saying * * * we understand in this sense that whoever extol the freedom of the human will without regard to the aid of God, you, as though pursuing them, *cut them off with the drawn sword of truth.*"

Does this show that the African Bishops were inclined to rebellion against the Pope, or that Prosper could have thought so?

8. As to the ultimate adoption and promulgation of this and other edicts of the Pope by the Council of Ephesus and other Councils, it is idle to argue thence that such edicts were not previously binding. The Council did thus because they were so instructed to do by the Popes, and they have never once rejected such edicts or such instructions. On the other hand, their decrees have never the slightest weight until approved by the Pope, while in point of fact he often suppresses them or adds to them.

So our neighbor is wrong. Celestius did *not* appeal from Innocent—Zosimus did *not* entertain any such appeal—he *did not* sanction the heresies of Pelagius, but was induced to believe him innocent of any such doctrines—he did *not* pronounce *the doctrines* of Pelagius orthodox, and the African Bishops did not protest against any such decision.

CHARITY SERMON BY FATHER FINN.—Next Sunday evening, Oct. 6th, Rev. Father Finn, whose reputation for eloquence is well established in this city, will deliver a charity sermon in St. Patrick's Church, for the purpose of raising funds to assist the poor visited by the Conference of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, established in that parish. Our readers know, or should know, that one of the fundamental rules of this Society, which exists throughout the world, numbering hundreds of thousands of members, exacts domiciliary visits and as thorough an acquaintance with the circumstances of the poor as can be obtained, before relief is granted. This rule, which is strictly adhered to, renders it improbable, not to say impossible, for unworthy persons to obtain relief. Thus the principal objection of those who often refuse to give charity, because the applicant may be a drunkard, a sluggard, or an imposter, is removed. We need hardly add that no distinction on account of religion, race or color is made in the distribution of alms by the Society. Taking all the facts into consideration, we hope that the attendance at St. Patrick's Church, next Sunday evening, will be such as to show that many of our people do not entirely forget the poor and unfortunate. Father Finn has, we understand, chosen for his subject "The Divinity of the Christian Religion."

ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH.—*Annunciation Square.* This being the Feast of St. Michael, the Archangel, the divine services at St. Michael's Church to-day will be of an unusually attractive nature. Solemn High Mass will be celebrated at 10 o'clock A. M., and there will be a sermon by one of our Rev. Fathers, whose eloquence has given him an enviable reputation. We note with much pleasure that Father Tobin, pastor, has, to the delight of his parishioners, secured in the choir the services of our highly respected and well-known friend, H. A. Blake, Esq., whose musical talents and sacred and operatic compositions, have given him a wide-spread reputation. To-day will be sung for the first time in St. Michael's Von Weldon's Mass. We do not hesitate to say that under the direction of Mr. Blake, the choir of St. Michael's will complete with some in our city, of which encomiums have so profusely been given. We promise to those who will attend St. Michael's to-day not only great spiritual benefits, but also an intellectual and musical treat.

SACRED CONCERT AT ST. THERESA'S CHURCH. The programme of the Sacred Concert to be given this evening at St. Theresa's Church, will be found in our advertising columns. The selections have evidently been made with great care, and give evidence of good taste and judgment. The rich and full tones of the splendid new organ, under the skilful touch of Mr. G. Collignon, the leader of the choir at the church of the Immaculate Conception, will be heard to the best advantage, this evening, for the first time. With such excellent artists and amateurs as Mme. Comes, Messrs. Krebs, Metayer, Davis and others, who have kindly volunteered their services, we feel assured that Mr. Collignon will give us such a concert this evening as will long be remembered as the one bright and pleasant spot in this dreary summer. Father Kenny has thoughtfully placed the price of admission at the low figure of 50 cents, so as to enable all lovers of grand and exquisite music to attend. The Concert will commence at 7 o'clock.

Better than a year ago, when "Pere Hyacinth" was about coming to America, John Mitchel, in the *Irish Citizen* had a characteristic notice of some photographs of the "Pere" which a publisher in New York had got out as a speculation. "Having seen this photograph (said John Mitchel), we at a glance can understand Pere Hyacinth's situation. We know what the man is at. He is going for a wife, or for half-a-dozen wives, if practicable." The "Pere's" friends were shocked *fast* then at the idea; but the wretched apostate has verified John Mitchel's prescient judgment by marrying the first of his half-dozen.