

The True Witness AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT No. 105, Fortification Lane, by J. Gillies to whom all Business Letters should be addressed.

G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE.

To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars. If the Subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.

The TRUE WITNESS can be had at the News Depots. Single copies, 5 cts. To all Subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the Subscription shall be Three Dollars.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, Aug. '71," shows that he has paid up to August, '71, and owes his Subscription from that date. S. M. PATRICK & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. Rowell & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1875.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

Friday, 19—Ember Day. The Holy Lance and Nails. Saturday, 20—Ember Day. Of the Fetic. Sunday, 21—Second in Lent. Monday, 22—Chair of St. Peter at Antioch. Tuesday, 23—St. Peter Damian, B. C. D. Wednesday, 24—St. Matthias, Ap. Thursday, 25—Of the Fetic.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

On Monday the journals published a telegram with reference to Spain. Alfonso had arrived in safety at Madrid on the 14th. His army which he had left behind him, does not seem to be in safety. Those sad dogs the Carlists have been pitching into it, inflicting upon it checks, and repulses, and all manner of outrages, so that it has had to fall back; to this it is added that the Carlists in Biscay and Guipuzcoa have been reinforced, and have resumed the offensive, menacing Bilbao. Pampeluna is again besieged and in a worse state than it was before it was relieved by Alfonso. As these reports reach us through anti-Carlist channels, we may safely presume that the losses of the Alfonsists have not been exaggerated. It seems that on his way to Madrid ex-Marshal Basaine showed himself at Santander. His appearance was the signal for a strong hostile manifestation on the part of the French residents, who treated him to a concert of hisses, and at one time seemed inclined to use violence upon him, so that he had to be protected by the police.

In France there has been another Ministerial crisis, but this scarce deserves recording as something new. The Duc de Broglie is spoken of as head of the new administration.

His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin has issued a Pastoral putting the faithful on their guard against two itinerant Yankee revivalists, Moody and Sankey, who have been running the conversion business in Dublin, after having carried on the same dudge in Edinburgh and other parts of the United Kingdom. His Eminence in particular denounces the antiaeternian tendencies of these self-commissioned apostles, who beguile the simple, and encourage self-indulgence on the part of sinners by substituting a mawkish sentimentalism for repentance and a holy life. This warning is timely, and we may perhaps need it here. Who can tell! Perhaps when the Opera Bouffe company shall have exhausted its attractions it may be succeeded by a Gospel Bouffe troupe, with sensational preaching, "No-Popery" costumes, and musical accompaniment on the accordion. The success of Spurgeon in this line has stirred up a host of imitators.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

To the Editor of the True Witness. Pray read a short letter about Pope Benedict IX. that came out in the Witness of Wednesday, the 27th ult. Tell us what you think of it; and explain, if you can, how, if the facts as therein stated be true, all Popes can be infallible? Inquirer.

We have read the letter in question. It purports to be a rejoinder to Father Murphy's lecture on Papal Infallibility. The story of the pontificate of Benedict IX. accords with that given by most historians, not always to be credited, of the events of the eleventh century; and after the expulsion of Benedict from Rome, and his subsequent restoration by the Emperor Conrad in 1058, there was a short interval when there were three claimants to the Papal throne; but this confusion was of short duration, since in 1046 Clement II. was unanimously accepted as legitimate successor to Gregory VI., in whose favor Benedict IX. had resigned his pretensions, two years before, A.D. 1044. In reply to the question put by Inquirer we reply, therefore, that, during that period, i.e., from the resignation of Benedict IX. to the installation of Pope of Clement II., Gregory VI.—of whom Dr. Dollinger in his ecclesiastical history speaks as one who enjoyed the respect of, and was praised by his contemporaries—was the legitimate inheritor of all the privileges attached by Christ to the office of Pope, successor of St. Peter, and was therefore infallible in the sense of the Vatican Council.

But admitting these things to be facts, what then? how do they in any manner affect the truth of the Catholic doctrine, that the Pope, as successor of St. Peter, when addressing the Church as a whole, or defining a question of faith or morals, is, by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, so guided and restrained, as to teach nothing but what is true? From one premise you cannot deduce a conclusion; nor neither from the immorality of a Benedict IX. nor from the vicious life of any other Pope, can you logically conclude against Papal Infallibility—unless you postulate as the major

premise of your syllogism—that no man, who is himself a sinner, can, in virtue of his office or seat, teach the truth. But the falsity of this premise is evident from the words of Christ. Himself as his biographer reported in the 23rd of St. Matt. 2nd, and 3rd verses—

2. "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat."

3. "All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye, after their works; for they say and do not."

Nothing can be plainer than this distinction. Although the Scribes and Pharisees were violators of the law themselves, yet because they sat in Moses' seat, therefore Christ commanded His hearers to observe and do all that they commanded. And so St. Augustine, commenting this passage of the Gospel *Serm. 137*, well defines the duty of the Christian layman in analogous circumstances—"Latus enim qui vult bene vivere cum attendit clericum malum, quid sibi dicit? Dominus dicit: *quae dicunt, facite; quae faciunt, facere nolite*. Ambulem viam Domini, non sequar istius mores. Audiam ab illo, non verba ipsius, sed Dei." There is therefore no necessary connection betwixt holy living, and infallibility as a teacher; since it was not because they were just men—for they were notoriously unjust; but solely because they sat in Moses' seat, that Our Lord commanded His hearers to do and observe all that the Scribes and Pharisees taught; for surely unless, because of their office, the Scribes and Pharisees taught truth and nothing but the truth, Our Lord would never have so commanded His disciples. The major premise therefore, that without which from the isolated fact of a Pope's vicious life, it is impossible to conclude as to his fallibility as a teacher, falls to the ground.

The true lesson to be learnt from the fact of a Pope like Benedict IX. is this—Not Papal fallibility, but the danger of the intrusion of the civil or secular power in things ecclesiastical and spiritual. To this vicious intrusion, to this interference on the part of Caesar, are attributable all the evils and corruptions with which the Church can be reproached. Gallicanism or Caesarism, to use the modern name for this interference, has been from the beginning, the curse or canker-worm of the Church; and never was this more manifest than in the persons of some of the Popes whom Caesarism by means of threats, and blandishments, of bribes and violence, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, succeeded in thrusting into the Chair of Peter. In the case of Benedict IX. this was very conspicuous. He was the son of a Count Alberich, one of those Counts of Tusculum, who had conceived the hopes of making the Papal dignity hereditary, in their family. In this hope they were encouraged by their having so often succeeded, aided by the Emperor of course, in forcing sons of their house upon the reluctant people of Rome. The state of the Church in those days is depicted by the Protestant historian Gibbon—

"The Vatican and the Lateran were stained with blood; and the most powerful senators, the marquises of Tuscany, and the Counts of Tusculum held the Apostolic See in a long and disgraceful servitude. The Roman Pontiffs of the ninth and tenth centuries were insulted, imprisoned and murdered by their tyrants."—c. 48.

In very similar terms speaks Dr. Dollinger:—"The Roman Church was at this period borne down with the depths of misery and degradation; the greater part of its lands, its possessions and revenues was in the hands of strangers (as they are *se-igns*); there were no apparent means of averting the ruin which threatened the Church of the Apostles."—Vol. III., p. 145.

But in this extremity God raised up one who, ascending the Pontifical throne under the title of Gregory VII. averted the impending ruin, vindicated the rights of the Church against Caesar, and so restored her purity, humbled the Emperor, and repulsed the encroachments of the civil power on the spiritual domain. His first great object was as Gibbon tells us "for ever to abolish the right of usurpation of the Emperors, and the Roman people," in the election of the Pope; and succeeding in this, he earned for himself a name to be honored to the latest generation by all friends of religious freedom. Within a quarter of a century of the death of a Benedict IX. a Gregory sat upon the throne of Peter! Catholics should therefore never despair, even when, humbly speaking the ruin of their Church seems inevitable. Things went worse with her in the days of the Counts of Tusculum, than they do, to-day; and her prospects were more gloomy from a human stand point in the beginning of the eleventh century, than they are at the close of the nineteenth.

Yes! Let us remember that if the Papal throne was disgraced by a Benedict IX. it was because, in his days there obtained an accursed system of Caesarism or Gallicanism, such as that, which modern Liberalism is seeking to impose upon us again to-day; and for resisting which Pius IX. the worthy successor of a Gregory VII. is a prisoner in the Vatican. Now, as in the days of which Dr. Dollinger speaks—the Church is despoiled of her land and possessions; the swine have broken in upon her wayward, and the wild boar has trodden down her pleasant places under foot. Shall we therefore despair? No. God has not left us desolate. In His own time He will raise up again for us a deliverer as He did of old in the person of a Gregory VII. and again shall the enemies of His Church be confounded. Let us but be true to ourselves; and to the great principle for which a Gregory so nobly fought and so nobly died—to wit, that the civil power has no rightful authority over the Church; that in the appointment of her priests, of her Bishops, and of her Pope, neither King nor Caesar, has any right to meddle.

We have already answered the question as to the infallibility of Sixtus V. impugned on the grounds that the first edition of the *Sistine Bible* was so full of typographical errors; that one of his successors called it in and replaced it by a revised and corrected edition. Catholics do not attribute any infallibility as a proof reader to the Pope, and a thousand typographical errors in the first edition of the *Sistine Bible*, would not touch the question, to wit—Is, or is not the Pope, because he sits in Peter's seat, and when a Catholic

defining a question of faith and morals, so guided so restrained by the Holy Ghost as to be an infallible teacher? What have the oversights of proof-readers, or the carelessness of type-setters, to do with this question?

DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

On the 11th instant, the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie brought forward his motion of which he had given previous notice, for the granting of a conditional amnesty to Riel and Lépine, unconditional to all others implicated in the North West disturbances. In a long and powerful speech Mr. Mackenzie defended the course which he and his colleagues had pursued in this very complicated, and exciting business. Mr. M. Bowel warmly censured the action of the actual Government, as he also censured that of its predecessor. Sir J. A. Macdonald defended the policy of the Government of which he had been the head, and stoutly denied that it had given any promise of an amnesty in the case of those who had taken part in the shooting of Scott. The Hon. Mr. Blake followed; and after recess the debate was resumed by M. Mousseau, who spoke strongly, and at length, in favor of a complete and immediate amnesty. Other speakers followed. Mr. Devlin delivered his maiden address, which was well received, in support of the Ministerial motion—which, after an animated debate, was finally carried by a large majority—the numbers being 126 to 50.

Thus a long agitated and very difficult question has been disposed of at last. Let us be thankful.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

The proposed amendments to the City (Montreal) Charter were discussed in Committee on Saturday, 13th inst. Amongst other important decisions arrived at by the Committee was one to the effect that the clause requiring a seat for three years in the Council as a qualification for the Mayoralty, was struck out. A lively debate ensued on the question of exempting places of worship and charitable institutions from taxation. It was by some of the members pointed out that such exemptions were general throughout the Province of Ontario, where all charitable, educational, and literary institutions enjoy immunity from taxation. By others it was urged that, if the proposal to exempt these institutions in Montreal from taxation were carried, it would diminish the civic revenue by about \$61,000; finally a motion by the Hon. Mr. Angers to the effect that churches, presbyteries, Bishops' palaces and establishments occupied for charitable purposes, was put and carried by a majority of two; the vote being 5 for, 3 against it.

ROWDYISM.

We will not pause to enquire how much of exaggeration there may be in the accounts given by some of our City contemporaries of disturbances caused by persons called, or calling themselves Catholics, in a Protestant church on Craig Street, on the occasion of the delivery of a series of anti-Catholic lectures. Exaggeration there may be; but we fear that some blackguards have given cause for the indignation, very natural indignation, expressed by our Protestant fellow-citizens; and as Catholics we cannot too strongly protest against such outrages upon the legal rights of our fellow-subjects—no matter what their creed. In so doing we presume to speak, not only in the name of our lay co-religionists, but of the entire body of the Catholic Clergy, who hold in abhorrence all illegal acts, all appeals to physical force.

We may be told that the language of the lecturer is very insulting, very scurrilous, very provocative of violence. As to the truth or falsity of this plea we will not pause to enquire; but granting for the sake of argument that it is true, it offers not a shadow of excuse for the conduct complained of in the *Witness* and other Protestant papers. No man is compelled to go and listen to the lecturer; indeed no Catholic can go to his lectures without sin; but if he of his own free will, and in violation of the precepts of the Church, will persist in his attendance upon such lectures, he is bound to refrain from giving any sensible expression of his indignation. It must be remembered that in their own churches Protestants are as much at home, as much masters, as we are in our places of worship, in which most assuredly we would not tolerate hissing, shouting, stone throwing, or disorderly conduct of any kind.

The worst—because the most dangerous enemies of our religion are those who seek to defend it by unlawful means. The true, the best controversial weapons are a pure and holy life, and the exercise of charity towards all men. If we as Catholics are calumniated, we must live the calumnies down; we cannot crush them by stones, or knock the brains out of them with axe handles.

It is painful, humiliating to have to treat of such a topic as this; but our readers will pardon us for alluding to it, since our object is not to remind them of their duties—for these they have heard from the lips of their clergy—but, to disabuse our Protestant fellow-citizens of the idea which some may entertain, that our Church countenances or winks at acts of violence. For this purpose we have but repeated in our own feeble words what the Church always enjoins in such cases as that under notice, upon all her children.

To our Protestant fellow-citizens and neighbors with whom it is our interest and our duty to cultivate good relations—and all whose legal rights as British subjects we are bound to respect even as we demand respect for our own—we would say—Be not so illogical, so unjust, as to hold us responsible for the acts of a handful of rowdy blackguards, of whom we are heartily ashamed; if indeed, even in name, they belong to our communion; and do us the justice to believe that we will cordially co-operate with you in bringing the blackguards to punishment if possible; and as all events to discontinue for the future all interference with your undoubted legal rights. Trusting then that the Police will do their duty; and confident that the magistrates will do their duty, should any charge of interference with Protestant religious exercises be substantiated before them, by inflicting the extreme penalties allowed by law upon the offenders, we take our leave of a very

unpleasant subject—with this remark proffered in our individual capacity—that if the disturbances are regarded, and if the police, and the servants of the law are not sufficient to repress them, we sincerely hope that the Protestant congregation will take the law into their own hands, and cut and kick their assailants into good behavior. In so doing they will have the sympathies of all true members of the Catholic Church.

THE NEW BRUNSWICK TROUBLES.

The recent disturbances in New Brunswick, growing out of the attempts to enforce a tyrannical school law, and attended with loss of life must needs invoke the attention of the Dominion, and Imperial governments; and without violating provincial rights, the first named, as charged with the task of preserving order throughout the Dominion, may find itself in a position to speak its mind frankly to the authorities of New Brunswick. If it has no legal or constitutional right directly to set aside the school law of that Province, it may refuse its aid to enforce the provisions of that law should further persecution drive the people into rebellion.

It must be remembered that the question at issue in New Brunswick is not as to whether Education shall be enforced by law? but as to whether a particular sort of education to which, as being Catholics, a very large portion of the people are opposed, and are determined never to submit—shall be enforced? Even by the testimony of witnesses who cannot be suspected of partiality towards Catholics, the latter had previous to the passing of the law complained of, succeeded in establishing and maintaining at their own cost an efficient system of education. The object of the Protestant party evidently was not to promote education, but to put down these schools; to crush them, by compelling the Catholics who supported them, to support also the burden of taxation for non-Catholic schools. Thus the *Globe*, certainly not an organ of Rome, says in a recent editorial. (The Italics are our own).

"The occurrences of last week broadened and widened the interest which had been hitherto felt in the New Brunswick School Law. The attitude of all Canadians must now be something more than that of mere spectators. All must feel that the New Brunswick School question is becoming of as much national importance as the Manitoba question, or any other question which has convulsed the whole country. With rioting, the killing of men, the calling of the Dominion militia, the Government of Canada is concerned; and that Government, much as it would desire to ignore our School question, will, we fear, be compelled to deal with it, in order to preserve the public peace and to restore harmony among all classes of the people."

The last election abundantly demonstrated that the feeling of the majority was to sustain the law at all hazards—a feeling that induced many Protestants to support the measure simply because it was *obnoxious to the Catholics, a feeling much stronger than the sincere and honest desire for free education*. For it is a notorious fact that in several Counties which sustained the law there are many districts without schools, or with schools so miserable and inefficient that they are not worthy of the name, whilst no effort is being put forward by the people to remedy this state of things. If the Catholic people had set themselves against all education; if they were avowedly determined to remain in ignorance; if they did not make as many personal sacrifices as Protestants in the interests of education, there would have been some justifiable reason for the way in which it has been sought to compel them to the adoption of this law. But the truth is that before this law was enacted at all, their educational institutions were of the very best kind, and were doing excellent work. They had in the City of St. John the best Common Schools in existence; they had superior schools of a high class; and in other parts of the Province they had educational establishments which were a credit to themselves and reflected honor upon the Province. Further, the class of young men going out from all of these schools were good, honest, industrious citizens, capable and intelligent. So that the Catholic objection to this law—be it reasonable or unreasonable—is not an objection to education itself; and therefore, ought to have been met in a better spirit than it has been.

Such being the case the Dominion Government, if invoked by the provincial authorities of New Brunswick, or in any manner called upon to pay for the expenses arising out of the discontented condition of that Province, will have the right to insist upon certain conditions—prominent amongst these the duty of the said provincial authorities to remove the provoking causes of this discontent. The Protestants of New Brunswick cannot in reason expect to have their whistle, and to make the people of the Dominion, pay for it. They, by their injustice to their Catholic fellow-citizens, without, even as the *Globe* shows, any pretext of zeal for education to urge in defence of their action, have provoked the trouble, and are the real guilty parties in the late homicides; and if they are resolved to persist in the luxury of oppressing Catholics, and of walloping their Romish niggers, in other words if they are determined to have their whistle, they must pay for it—and roundly too.

The duty of Catholics in New Brunswick is clear. Whilst keeping within the limits of the law of the land, it is their duty to oppose, always, and everywhere, by every legal means in their power the odious school law; and to throw every possible obstacle in the way of its working. Then at last the Dominion Government will be obliged to interfere; even as it has interfered in the case of Manitoba.

Bogus Buttan.—Housekeepers going to market should keep their eyes open, or they may chance to have a heasty mixture of corn-meal and tallow palmed upon them for butter. Such was the mischance that befell two ladies the other day when making their purchases in the Bonsecours market. They bought what they understood was butter from a dealer named Lamotte, but on investigation it turned out that the stuff was a heasty mess of which the basis was tallow or grease of some kind. The case was brought up before the Police Magistrate, and the purchase money was at first refused, so we learn from the *Star* of the 3rd inst. We hope that the magistrates will do their duty, and arouse to increased vigilance. The sale of diseased meat is very properly denounced; but no less to be condemned is the selling as butter of a filthy mess composed of grease and flour.

WRITTEN FOR "THE TRUE WITNESS."

SHORT SERMONS FOR SINCERE SOULS.

"THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOUR." By the eighth commandment of that great decalogue which Almighty God from the heights of Mount Sinai gave to the world to be its guide for its moral conduct in all time, we are forbidden to bear false witness against our neighbour. Not indeed that the ten great moral truths or prohibitions contained in that decalogue were unknown to the world before that time. Moses received them graven on tablets of stone from the hands of Almighty God, but those ten great laws written on stone, were already written in the heart of man, and if God gave them to Moses graven on stone it was because he would have an exterior testimony as well as an interior one of his divine will.

By the eighth great moral law, we are forbidden to bear false witness against our neighbour. This prohibition extends not only to the hearing false witness under oath in a court of justice—which is perjury—but also to the bearing false witness in our ordinary conversation which is called calumny. Nor is this all; what we are forbidden to say, we are forbidden to think, hence all rash judgment (whether expressed outwardly in words or conceived inwardly by thoughts) is forbidden by this commandment.

It is well, Christian soul, to bear clearly in mind the distinctions between the different sins against this commandment. The first great sin against it—perjury, as commonly understood, is swearing to what is false in a court of justice. Before God however it is equally as much perjury to affirm anything untrue on oath out of court, as in court; hence habitual swearing may as often be perjury as not. Calumny is distinguished from detraction in as much as, calumny is restricted to the speaking anything untrue against our neighbour whilst detraction includes the speaking anything whether true or false, which is calculated to injure his character. Back-biting may be considered the same as detraction with this difference, that whereas detraction (or the taking away our neighbour's character) may be done either in his presence or behind his back; backbiting as its name imports comprises only the taking away our neighbour's character, when he is not present. The first great sin against this commandment is then the truly heinous sin of perjury, or the affirming on oath against our neighbour's character what is not true. Of this sin the Holy Ghost speaks in the strongest terms of reprobation. Amongst the six things which the Book of Proverbs declares God hates, it enumerates the liar and the false witness. (c. 6) And the same inspired book tells us that "the lying witness shall perish; and in another chapter it declares "the false witness shall not go unpunished."

And if we look to the Fathers of the Church speaking of this sin, we shall find it no less strongly denounced. St. Isidore argues that the false witness outrages three persons; God whose name he outrages by his false oath; the person before whom he witnesses, whom he outrages by the lie; and the innocent person whose character he destroys. In similar terms St. Thomas (2. 2. q. 70) declares perjury mortal on three counts. First on account of the oath; second on account of the injustice, and third on account of the untruth.

This crime of perjury has been called "the head of all impiety;" that as the head towers above the rest of the body, so this crime towers above all others impieties or dishonourings of God. And if we study its character we shall see that it is so. The highest attribute of God is not his power, or wisdom, or bounty, or mercy, but his truth; that he is true to himself, that he cannot contradict himself; that within him there is no contending of principles; no combat; all is peace. His power, mercy and goodness concern him only in his acts towards his creatures; his truth concerns him also in his acts towards himself; hence his attribute of Truth is his highest attribute; it concerns Himself. Now the slightest untruth directly attacks this highest attribute of God, his truth; it flies in the face of this attribute; it sets itself up against this truth; untruth seeks to sit upon the throne of truth—the throne of God, who is Truth. But if untruth attacks the throne of Truth, perjury attacks it in a double manner; it attacks it in its property of untruth, and it attacks it by seeking to bring Truth down from its throne in heaven to bear witness to a lie. Is not this to detract from truth? Is not this to make God a slave to untruth? Is not this to turn God into a creature and that the most base of creatures, a liar?

Do not tell me that this crime of perjury is only written on the second table of the law and cannot therefore be a great crime. It is written on both tables of the law, for it is forbidden by the second commandment as much as by the eighth; it is as much forbidden by the commandment "thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain" as by the commandment "thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." Nay, it is forbidden by the very first words of the decalogue, "I am the Lord thy God." For what does Almighty God mean by this declaration? God is, truth. If he is God then, he is truth. In affirming therefore that he is God, he affirms that he is truth; and in affirming that he is truth, he declares against all untruth, which is the opposite to truth. Perjury therefore which is untruth affirmed on the authority of God, is evidently included in the very first words of the first table of the Law.

The Apostle St. Paul reminds us that when Almighty God made promise to Abraham he swore by Himself, because he had no greater by whom he might swear. And he swore by Himself, he tells us; that by two immutable things—Himself and His word, we might have an infallible assurance. In swearing by Himself, Almighty God further showed to men that he, as the God of truth was the highest witness that could be sought in the cause of truth, and that He is unchangeable truth so the testimony which man would bear should also ever be unchangeable truth. Hence an oath taken to God in the cause of truth is one of the highest acts of homage and adoration, of which a Christian is capable, and when taken in the presence of men and with the solemnity of a court of justice it owes to God an additional homage. By an oath properly taken, man acknowledges Almighty God to be the supreme and Almighty God—he acknowledges Him to be truth unchangeable and eternal;—he acknowledges Him to be the protector and preserver of truth;—and the avenger of truth; he acknowledges Him to be the all-seeing, the all-knowing witness before whom are great acts of adoration and almighty power because offered to the highest attribute of God—his truth; and because offered before man, and when justice the most important of human institutions is at stake.

But the perjury reverses all this; he acknowledges God to be the supreme and Almighty God, and yet he makes the oath to be truth, yet he makes untruth God. Acknowledging God to be the rewarder of truth and the avenger of untruth, he yet, with a diabolical resolution, throws away all the rewards of truth and brags at the punishments of untruth. The true witness lays his testimony bravely at the feet of the eternal throne, saying as the God of truth, the eternal truth, that he will do nothing but what he belongs to. But the perjured witness enters heaven with the lie in his hands, and penetrating to the eternal Presence, places that lie upon the feet of the Godhead with brazen and counten-