

"Beware of false prophets, who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."—Matt. 7, 15.

The false prophets, of whom our Lord warns us to-day, are the sects, the sects, the sects, who approach us in the clothing of sheep, of hypocritical dissimulation, who obtrude themselves as well-meaning friends, but in reality have in view only the destruction of our soul. To associate with persons, is clearly to dedicate our soul to perdition. Truly, it was necessary for our Saviour to warn for reason and the experience of convince us, that whatever our company is, such also are we. Or it is possible to associate every day with outcast, without becoming gradually accustomed to his faults, to love them by degrees, to adopt them finally, to become a reprobate oneself? It is so natural with our innate propensity to imitate and our inherited inclination to evil, that it is scarcely necessary for the devil to lend a helping hand.

Put a few grains of salt into a glass of sweetened water, and what happens? Will the salty fluid become sweet, or rather, will not the sweet water become salty? Among a hundred sound apples, place only one which is decayed; will the latter again come fresh, or will it bring corruption to all the good ones? Place a diseased sheep among a flock of healthy ones, will the sick sheep become well, or will the whole flock become infected? See how nature teaches us by the most impressive examples, what will certainly be our portion in the spiritual life, if, despising the admonition of Redeemer, we associate with the prophets in sheep's clothing. We fare, as says the wise man: "He toucheth pitch shall be defiled with, and he that hath fellowship with proud, shall put on pride." Eccl. 1. In the saddest manner, we experience the warning sentence of our royal psalmist: "With the perverse thou wilt be perverted." Ps. 17. Justly, therefore, does St. Paul say: "Know you not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" 1 Cor. 5. Oh! what profound truth is in this saying! Oh, what mischief and destruction will not be caused by one villain (one Lucifer sufficed to tempt millions of good and holy angels devils. One impious domestic is able of ruining a whole family, immoral child is able to infect a school and to poison the hearts of the children. So great is the power of bad example, so deplorable our weakness and inclination to evil.

But if this is the case, what do those expect who blindly confide in themselves to all persons without knowing them, to whom it is immaterial whom they associate and have in course, be they good Christians, scandal givers and seducers? They persevere on the good road, remain faithful to God, or will not devil triumph over them and set them with the chains of hell? What then will be the fate of those children, whose parents, forget their office of guardian angels, careless and unconcerned where children run about, what kind of companions they have, what they see hear? Would it not be a miracle such poor children, through the love of their parents, were not led in the early years to the way of hell by vice seduction? And those poor victims, companions and servants whom there are many, what will become of them if unscrupulous parents, imagine, as is so often the case, have fulfilled their whole duty by ing their board and wages, without however, troubling themselves as to their morals, their behavior and their conduct, permitting them loose acquaintances, nightly rambles, intercourse with evil companions? Do masters and mistresses still claim to have a conscience? Do they still believe in the fearful words of the apostle: "If any man have not care of his house, he hath denied the Lord, and is worse than an infidel?" 1 Tim. 5. Ah, yes, how many sins will be prevented, how many souls saved from perdition, if Christian masters regard to their subjects, were to the place of God instead of Satan! But for this reason our Lord has said in His gospel: "Many called, but few are chosen." Matt. 22. With their own souls will have to answer, whom Heaven has entrusted with the souls of others, their terrible indifference they themselves to be lost.

O parents and superiors, do, for all in your power, prevent your children and your subjects destruction of evil association. It is for the unreasonable and uneducated; be conscientious as such must one day render a severe account. But I beseech you, in the sacred name of Jesus: "Beware of false prophets, the seducers, flee from them, from pestilence and cholera, shun as poisonous serpents. To perish is certainly sad, but it is far more terrible to lose one's soul and to eternally in hell. Be warned, therefore, and despite not the proffered grace, which says to you: "My sinners shall entice thee, consent to them. If they shall say, Come, my son, walk not thou with them." Prov. 1, 10, 11 and 15. Amen.

Impure blood is an enemy to health and leads to serious disease. Hood's Sarsaparilla conquers this enemy and danger.

There are a number of varieties of Holloway's Corn Cure will remove everything from the foot. Call on your druggist and get a bottle at once.

POPULAR PROTESTANT CONTROVERSY.

Sacred Heart Review. To understand fully the bearing of the following paper by Rev. Mr. Starbuck one should read his last week's article on the same subject.

XI. We are told that one of the many heads of the hydra was immortal, and could only be overcome by burying it under a stone. I think this blunder which I have just exposed, about the Ten Commandments, must be the immortal head on that hydra of popular misrepresentation against whose poisonous breath we are warned by Dr. Schaaf, Dean Stanley, Professor Harnack, and many other eminent Protestant divines. My last paper in the Review is at least the fifth to the same effect that I have had occasion to write in the last sixteen years, and I am not sure that it is not the sixth or seventh. The rock has not yet come in view under which this blunder can be safely and forever hidden out of sight.

I am afraid that our boast, as Protestants, of depending solely on Scripture for doctrine, and of remaining wholly free of tradition, is easier to make than to prove. Here is a division of the Decalogue concerning which Scripture says not one word, either pro or con. It is only by outside evidence—that is, by tradition—that we even know that it goes back as far as the time of Christ. Even the oral law, which Our Saviour reproaches the Pharisees with so much overvaluing, can not be supposed to have bound on the Jews any obligation of maintaining the Philonian division. This appears by the fact that the Talmudists, those slaves of the oral law, find themselves free to give up the Philonian division for another, differing from both the Christian numbering, agreeing with the Catholic and Lutheran in blending into one commandment the Philonian First and Second; agreeing with the Reformed and Greek in uniting in one all the commandments against coveting; differing from both in numbering as the "First Word" what Christians are accustomed to view as only the introduction. Yet myriads of Protestant laymen, thousands of ministers, numbers of theological teachers, treat our traditional division as if it were an integral part of the Decalogue, and on the strength of it bring an odious and utterly baseless charge against the Roman Catholic Church.

The most humiliating fact is that this false accusation should have been taken up by the magazine of a Presbyterian divinity school. Surely, considering the standing of Presbyterians as Biblical scholars, the emphasis they lay on the Decalogue, the sharpness of opposition which they make between Scripture and tradition, and their pride in maintaining the reputation of having a comprehensive knowledge of everything that concerns the Bible, we should have pronounced it antecedently impossible that the faculty of a grave and learned school of Presbyterian theology (happily not in the United States) could seriously receive into their magazine, without any remark, this singularly ignorant falsehood. As a Biblical scholar of no great note, I blushed at the necessity of calling their attention to such a misrepresentation. Whether they published my letter or not I never knew. I hope so. The other Protestant publications which I have corrected similarly have accepted my corrections without difficulty, and I trust these did so, too. But that any such rectification should have been needed by such a school is something of which every Protestant ought to be ashamed. It is a lasting discredit to Protestant scholarship.

What if the author of this Presbyterian article, who does not appear to be of a malicious or hasty temper, had first encountered a German Lutheran shorter catechism? Here he would have found exactly the same phenomenon. He would have looked in vain for his Second Commandment. On the other hand, he would have found his Tenth split into two. Would he then have accused the Lutherans of suppressing and mutilating the word of God? Assuredly not. Had he never reflected on it before, he would then have reflected that the Bible nowhere signifies where one commandment ends and another begins, and that no variety of numeration makes any change of meaning in the Decalogue. It would then come to his mind as probable that there were at least two ways of numbering the Ten Commandments, and that there might well be more. The fact, apparent at a glance, that only the opening sentence of each longer commandment is given in this compendium would easily explain the rest.

Why are not Roman Catholics entitled to exactly the same favorable presumption, when they do exactly the same thing? It is of no avail to say that they break the Second Commandment (as we number), and that therefore they wish to suppress it. That vehemently polemical Protestant, Doctor Thomas Arnold, explicitly and unwaveringly denies that the Roman Catholic Church is guilty of idolatry. Indeed she can not be if she remains Christian, and modern Protestants do not commonly deny her the Christian name. His explanation of the vehemence with which the charge of idolatry is urged by Protestants is perfectly just. He remarks that the Reformers felt the imperative necessity of finding something to counterbalance the charge of heresy urged against them. There was no doubt that by the doctrinal standards of many centuries they were heretics. They could not easily retort the charge of heresy on the Catholics. This appears in the fact that, so far as I know, with the single exception of Father Forrest, Queen Catherine's confessor, burnt as

a heretic by the brutal Henry the Eighth, for refusing to own the king as Head of the Church of England, no Roman Catholic was ever burnt by a Protestant government on a charge of heresy, as Anabaptists and Unitarians were sometimes burnt.

What ugly epithet, then, could be hurled against the Catholics to pay them off for making us so uncomfortable by branding us as heretics? We could call them idolaters. Idolatry was a more odious charge even than heresy. Moreover, there was evidently a superficial plausibility in the charge. The Teutonic races, in which the Reformation chiefly settled, are by nature almost as averse to imagery as Jews or Arabs. Our mysticism dispenses with the externals of worship almost to nothing. We were then easy to persuade that symbolism, especially the veneration of symbols and images, was idolatry, into which of course no one disputes that, used unintelligently, it may decline. And when Teutonic dislike of images concurred with Celtic intensity and zeal for ecclesiastical regularity, as in the Calvinistic wing of Protestantism, indifference to images easily passed into fiery iconoclasm. The fusion of Celtic and Teutonic Protestantism was complete in Scotland, and it is Scottish Presbyterianism that has most perseveringly rung the changes on the supposed idolatry of the "Papists."

It is nothing strange, therefore, if this worthy Presbyterian accounts the Roman Catholics idolaters. If idolaters, of course he must own that they are not Christians, and, on St. Paul's authority, that they can not enter the kingdom of heaven. These two assumptions are necessary deductions from the first. So far all is contentious and self-consistent. All this, however, does not in the least warrant him in accusing them of trying to keep the second commandment, as we call it, out of sight. He may account them idolaters and pagans, but assuredly they do not so account themselves. They do not believe that they are violating the Decalogue, and, therefore, they have no temptation to keep any part of the Decalogue out of sight. What a curious insanity, to combine in one imaginary and impossible motive Catholic approbation and Protestant disapprobation of images, and then to imagine the Catholic Church is at one and the same time solicitous to enforce and eager to contradict the Decalogue, that she wants her people to obey it and is at the same time so afraid that they will that she will not let them understand what it is! Yet nothing is so drolly impossible but that the magic word "Popery" suffices to convert it into feasibility and fact.

The Council of Trent may be charged by various Protestants with bigotry, narrowness, servilism, and various other unpleasant peculiarities. There are two things of which it can not be accused, by any one who knows anything about it. The Fathers of Trent can not be accused of having commanded anything which they were not firmly persuaded to be agreeable to the Word of God; and they can not be accused of having condemned anything which they were not firmly persuaded to be contrary to the Word of God. Conscientious sincerity is stamped on all the acts of the Council, doctrinal and disciplinary, as is cordially acknowledged by a man so curiously aloof from it in tone of feeling as Mr. Henry C. Lea. When then the Council, on the one hand, enjoins on the faithful never to forget that relics and images are in themselves lifeless and powerless things, and on the other approves a moderate and becoming reverence shown to them for the sake of the glorified originals, the Fathers of the Council are acting in perfectly good conscience towards the Bible, and towards the Decalogue, from the introduction to the Tenth Commandment. Neither they nor their successors have had anything to conceal, or have made any effort to conceal anything.

For convenience I will in the remainder of the paper use the Calvinistic numbering. Is it said that at least the veneration of images departs from the letter of the Second Commandment? I do not dispute it. So, too, we all depart from the letter of the Fourth Commandment in observing the first day for the seventh. The Sabbatarians raise exactly the same reproach against us that we raise against the Catholics and Greeks, and with just as good warrant. Yet no decent and educated Sabbatarian dreams of denying that we really believe ourselves to be acting according to the spirit of the Commandment, in the evangelical liberty accorded us in Our Saviour Christ. He would not expect to find us putting out an expurgated edition of the Decalogue. In token of a bad conscience on our part. Should he fall in with a German Lutheran shorter catechism, he might be at first startled to find no mention of the seventh day. Yet a second glance would assure him that the omission was simply an accident of the periodicalness. He would blame it, but he would not lay it to bad faith.

Now why is it that, whereas we never think (unless we are blackguards) of accusing one another of mutilating and making over the fundamental Scriptures, we are capable of bringing this absolutely incredible charge against the Roman Catholics? It is because, as the Rev. Doctor Carstenstein of Indianapolis has well said, our Protestant Christianity has reached such a height as to drown out the abominable accusations that the different Protestant sects used to fling about against one another, but has not yet risen high enough to drown out the spirit of unscrupulous slanderousness against the Roman Catholics. Courage, however! That consummation is not very far ahead.

Protestant editors do not yet guard themselves against tumbling into such quagmires of blunder-headedness, but a good many of them at least are very ready to be dragged out of them, even if they soon forget and tumble back again. This slough of unintelligence is not quite so hopeless as the Slough of Despond. I shall not live to see it filled up, but I think that at least our great grandchildren will.

Charles C. Starbuck. Andover, Mass.

FAITH AND REASON. Sermon by Mgr. Vaughan.

Monsignor Vaughan, who is preaching a course of sermons at the pro-cathedral, Kensington, during the month of May, occupied the pulpit on Sunday, and took for his text the words, "When the spirit of truth is come He will teach you all truth." In the course of his sermon he said that one not infrequently hears worldly-minded persons speaking of religion and the religious spirit as though there were some need of apology for it. They, of course, themselves are far too wise and learned to profess any particular creed or to believe in anything supernatural, but they are condescending enough to allow that religion, at least in times past, MAY HAVE SERVED A USEFUL PURPOSE, and that even at this date it may be of some advantage to those who are less instructed, or to persons of an impressionable nature, such as women and children, but they declare that religion is altogether unsuited to the strong and virile mind of man, and to his stern commonsense. That picture he need hardly add is an altogether inadequate one.

RELIGION IS NOT POETRY, not a mere sentiment, not devotional emotions. It is something far more real and earnest, and there was nothing in the world so well established, and so enduring as religion. Nay, it is as everlasting as God Himself, and this was easily shown by analyzing its very idea and essence. Religion is the recognition of essential truths—the recognition in the first place of what God is, and in the second place of what we are, and the comprehension of this reduced to practice in our daily life and conduct. This implies obedience on our part to the law of God. And why do we listen to the voice of God and obey His commandments?—because we recognize the truth. The obedience on our part is merely the external evidence of the inward knowledge that God is God, and that we are what we are. Man's first duty is to obey God's will, and where there is a conflict between man's will and that of his Creator, where there is a desire to follow his own inclination, and to refuse to follow the law of God, he is flying in the face of that great truth, that God is Master, and he is the subject. Man must bow down his mind and his intelligence to a

BELIEF IN WHAT GOD TEACHES, and when he compels his proud reason to acknowledge the superiority of God we call that faith. Unfortunately man through pride of intellect is too often unwilling to yield his own personal judgment—his reason, his intellect. He must have his opinion, his views, and that is the cry of the world at large, or at least to realize that God's sovereignty is universal, and must extend over all things without exception. The Church insists on the subjection of the will, and, therefore, the world is up in arms against her, and calls her a tyrant, and calls Catholics priest-ridden slaves, without pluck or independence. Why do they follow the teaching of the Church, why not exercise their own intelligence and reason? Because the Church says that we are the creatures of God, and that He is our Master, and, therefore, every single gift we possess we must acknowledge as coming from God, and as we must bow down our will by obedience, so we must bow down our mind and our intellect.

OUR PRIDE OF INTELLECT, by exercising faith. This pride is, in the authority of scripture, the root of all evil. There never yet was a single heresy or schism in the Church, but pride was the root of it. Want of humility it is that causes man to throw aside the yoke of Jesus Christ. Those who cry for Liberty! Liberty! do not know what Liberty is. They cannot distinguish it from license. They are unmindful of the warning of St. Peter, who tells them not to make liberty a cloak of formulas. Full liberty of intellect is the full liberty to range through the realms of truth—not the liberty to believe a lie. The intellect is not enslaved until it puts on the fetters of error, until it winds about itself the

CHAINS OF SIN AND HERESY. If liberty consisted in believing what is untrue then God Himself would not possess liberty, because He cannot believe an untruth, and, therefore, the Church is not restricting our liberty when she presses upon us the obligation of accepting certain definite dogmas. To be obedient to truth is no restriction of liberty.

It is according to reason that we should exercise our intelligence to the full in order to discover where the infallible teacher is. If, of course, there is no infallible authority then the whole process is changed. Suppose that there is an infallible authority, and that we believed what Our Lord promised, that He would be with His Church for ever, that the Holy Spirit would abide in it, and that the gates of hell or error should not prevail against it, then the

ONLY RATIONAL POSITION TO TAKE UP having once discovered the true authority, is one of the most complete and

absolute subjection; and that means not merely the surrender of our will but of the greatest faculty of all, the intellect. Instancing the case of Cardinal Manning and Cardinal Newman, he said that they were once members of the Anglican Church, and they exercised their intelligence in order to investigate its claim upon their allegiance, and these great minds found that its claims were hollow, and that there was no basis or foundation in them. Helped by Divine Grace and by the exercise of their reason, they at last discovered that the Catholic Church is the true Church, and having discovered where the infallible authority lay, their whole position in regard to the Church changed. They no longer criticised, no longer passed judgment upon it; they simply acquiesced in what the Church taught. Without giving up private judgment it was impossible for anyone to be received into the true Church. There is no sort of slavery, no surrender of reason, so long as we recognise that the voice we are listening to is the infallible voice of God speaking through the Church, and as Our Lord Himself says, "He that heareth you, heareth Me and he that despiseth you despiseth Me."—London Catholic News, May 14

RELIGION AND DRESS.

The philosophy of clothes attributed to Herr Teufelsdröckh in Thomas Carlyle's Sartor Resartus is something more than a mere jeu d'esprit. There is a real and natural relation between the exterior garb and the character of the man. The soul expresses and manifests itself, not only in the body, but in all the environment, so far as that results from choice and not from necessity. Religion, therefore, so far as it is, as it ought to be, the directing principle, the dominating force, in human life, tends to express itself in dress.

As religion lays hold on eternal verities it has the effect of lifting those who are governed by it out of the sphere of flux and change into the realm of the enduring and the changeless. Therefore those who in a special manner have consecrated themselves to it—those who have "entered religion" as the phrase goes, that is, who live under a religious rule, and follow the evangelical counsels—have a permanent garb, on which fashion exercises no influence. For the same reason, in the lands and periods in which the influence of true religion is most powerful, changes in the style of dress are comparatively slow and infrequent, while the degeneration of manners consequent upon wide-spread irreligion is sure to be accompanied by frequent and rapid changes in "fashions."

Another effect of religion is appropriateness of garb. Religion aims at the restoration of the order broken by the Fall. It teaches each class in society to fulfill its own duties faithfully, to recognize its true position in relation to other classes, to be content with its own lot, be it high or low, and to shun all pretense or affectation of being what it is not. Therefore its natural effect is to lead those whom it influences to choose a dress suitable to their own several stations.

Still another effect of religion is to produce simplicity of attire. This has always been a matter of reiterated precept, at least under the New Covenant. St. Paul, in his inspired instructions to Timothy regarding the government of the Ephesian Church, wrote (II, 9): "In like manner women also in decent apparel, adorning themselves with modesty and sobriety, not with platted hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly attire, but as if they were women professing godliness, with good works." St. Peter also, in his Apostolic letter to the Church of Asia Minor, says that the adorning of the Christian matron should not be "in the outward plaiting of the hair, or the wearing of gold, or the putting on of apparel, but the hidden man of the heart in the incorruptibility of a quiet and meek spirit, which is rich in the sight of God." (St. Peter I, 3, 4.)

The Apostolic tradition in this matter is shown in the simple garb prescribed for even secular priests, and in the customs of those Catholic countries and portions of countries least corrupted by modern Liberalism. In most parts of Latin-America, for example, the women dress, at least when attending Divine worship, with the utmost simplicity. All spiritual writers agree that the Christian maid or matron should dress as simply as her state of life permits. Her ornaments should be few and simple, and these should, by preference, be symbols of her faith. Her dress should be neat and tidy; of plain durable materials if she is poor and in humble station, or of rich materials if she is rich, but all made up in a simple manner.

There are very few countries in the world where so large a proportion of Catholic women pretending to be in earnest in the practice of their religion dress in a shamefully worldly manner as in the United States. It is scandalous for Catholic women in any walk of life to make dress one of the chief objects of their attention and put all the money they can get hold of on their backs and their heads. But the most shameful thing of all is to see women who are members of pious societies daring to approach the Holy Table clad in so heathenish a way. This mode of dressing is not

only un-Christian but extremely vulgar. It is always vulgar when introduced into the church during the solemn Mysteries; and it is almost always vulgar for street-wear, particular in the morning, or at any time except when driving, or in fact all well-bred women recognize over-dressing as the surest sign of vulgarity. Even in this country it is the women of good family and real culture who dress most simply and unobtrusively; and in most parts of the world, whatever the common people may do, any Catholic woman of high rank would consider it a disgrace to go to Mass in anything but the simplest possible costume.

The much-needed reform in this particular should be led by the socialists, and should begin with the head-dress. The general Catholic custom is for women when going to church to cover their heads, not with a gaudy hat, even though that is worn on other occasions, but with a simple drapery, like a light shawl or mantilla. It would probably take several generations of persistent effort to introduce this beautiful custom here; but our women can at least make an effort to imitate their sisters elsewhere by dressing with the simplicity appropriate to the children of the humble and modest Virgin of Nazareth.—Church Progress.

EASY QUICK WORK OF SNOWY WHITE CLOTHES. SURPRISE SOAP. CHILD'S PLAY OF WASH DAY.

CARLING'S GOLD MEDAL ALE, PORTER & LAGER. These Brands are exclusively used in the House of Commons.

ESTABLISHED 1848. State University 1866. Created a Catholic University by Pope Leo XIII. 1868. TERMS: \$160 PER YEAR. Catholic University of Ottawa, Canada. Under the Direction of the Oblate Fathers of Mary Immaculate. Degrees in Arts, Philosophy and Theology. Preparatory Classical Course for Junior Students. COMPLETE COMMERCIAL COURSE. Private Rooms for Senior Students. Fully Equipped Laboratories. Practical Business Department. Send for Calendar. 1907-10. REV. J. M. MCGUINN, O. M. I., Rector.

THE EMPLOYMENT OF LEISURE. Church Progress. Leisure is one of the most precious possessions; but woe to that man who, possessing it, does not employ it rightly! Leisure does not mean idleness; it means time for reflection, for study, for self-improvement; for sitting at the feet of Nature and of Art; for drinking of the celestial fountains of truth and grace; for cultivating the pure affections of the fireside or the cloister or the pastorate; for mutually improving converse with our equals; for free and loving service to our masters and dependents, and to the great and good, and to God's poor; and especially for handing on whatever knowledge and wisdom and skill we possess, however much or little it be, to those who are to come after us, beginning with our bodily, intellectual or spiritual children, if such we possess.

To the Sweet Girl Graduates. Remember that your life, at any rate for the next few years, will be passed in a non-Catholic atmosphere, and live up to the high standard of your religion. Let the world see that a Catholic woman may be bright and clever and attractive and play her part gracefully in society, and at the same time be absolutely uncompromising where her religious principles are concerned. You need not go about with a Puritanical expression and dowdy gown, as is the mistaken custom of some pious souls. Catholics should be as well dressed as any one else. There is no reason why they should hide themselves in the background, and every gift of mind and person should be developed to its farthest extent for the greatest glory of God.

The chief characteristic of the nineteenth century is not so much heresy as intellectual self-sufficiency—the self-sufficiency of those who believe that they know that God is not to be known. If the legislator cannot be known, then certainly the law cannot. The whole moral world then falls back into chaos; the earth is without form and void, and darkness rests on the face of the deep. For this there is no cure but the sanctification and rectification of the intelligence by the presence of the Illuminator, who enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world.—Cardinal Manning.

Fagged Out.—None but those who have become fagged out, know what a depressed miserable feeling it is. All strength is gone, and despondency has taken hold of the sufferers. They feel as though there is nothing to live for. There, however, is a cure—one box of Parlee's Vegetable Pills will do wonders in restoring health and strength. Mandrake and Dandelion are two of the articles entering into the composition of Parlee's Pills.

Mr. Thomas Ballard, Syracuse, N. Y., writes: "I have been afflicted for nearly a year with that most-to-be-dreaded disease, Dyspepsia, and at times worn out with pain and want of sleep, and after trying almost everything recommended, I tried one box of Parlee's Vegetable Pills. I am now nearly well, and believe they will cure me. I would not be without them for any money."

All druggists, 50c. and \$1.00. SCOTT & BOWNE, Chemists, Toronto.

Windsor Salt. Purest and Best for Table and Dairy. No adulteration. Never cakes.