

in our working day world. Though the Reformation Party has had possession of this land ever since the first permanent English colony was planted at Jamestown, in 1607, one nevertheless discovers from the last census, that, in 1890, this party had not only failed to take religious possession of the United States, but had left forty-two out of sixty-two millions of the people outside of any ecclesiastical organization. The advocate of the Reformation has indulged in high play, and has lost. Feeling the emptiness of the situation, multitudes are turning away from the personal recognition of all religion; whilst others, with better thought, finding religion to be an inextinguishable craving of the soul, are anxiously asking: "To whom shall we go for the words of eternal life?" In this great crisis the Catholic Church appears, fresh, fair and strong, after the conflict of the ages, "her brow and breast made beautiful with scars," offering the wavering world Salvation through Christ, the one Mediator between God and Man. Many turn away with scoffing on the lip, but with a dread premonition in the heart, the dark foreboding that plagues the souls of those who sin against light; while, on the other hand, others are giving themselves to inquiry as never before, and are becoming convinced of the justice of the Catholic claim. To day the study of the Fathers, the Schoolmen and the Councils is being prosecuted anew, with the facilities that have been placed within reach by the labors of the last half century, rendering it comparatively easy to obtain the benefit of knowledge bearing upon the claims of the Catholic Church. Therefore, the authority of the Church is becoming apparent to intelligent seekers after truth, whose minds are not hardened into confirmed hostility to Catholic thought. I do not, however, propose to offer any apology for entering the Catholic Church. Standing in the midst of modern religious systems tottering to their fall like columns in the Temple of Karnak, no defense need be offered for accepting a firm and unshaken Catholic Faith. I shall not enter upon argument, or seek to detail reasons for rendering allegiance to Rome, but will speak in a general way on one branch of the general subject, namely, The Position of the Holy Scriptures in the Teaching System of the Catholic Church.

In what I have to say, I trust that I may be understood as desiring to express my views with all due respect for opinions of non-Catholics, and that I may transgress no rules of charity in any allusion to the views of those with whom I was so long and pleasantly associated and whose happiness and welfare will always remain, as in the past, subjects of affectionate solicitude and regard.

For some years I have stood with men who sought to vindicate the Sacred Scriptures and rescue them from a defense which is generally regarded as a dishonor; and since, moreover, it has been charged that those who go over from the Protestant to the Catholic fold gain no advantage in respect to the condition of Biblical Criticism, I shall try to meet the charge. Let me proceed, therefore, to suggest that, in my judgment, the Roman Catholic Church is entitled to the profound respect and confidence of all classes of non-Catholics who honestly and reverently adhere, as of old, to Holy Scripture; and for the reason that this Church holds, without compromise, to the Bible as the plenarily inspired Word of God. The Church of Rome stands before English-speaking people, and Protestants everywhere, as the unique and solitary defender of the Bible in its integrity and entirety. No other body maintains this uncompromising attitude. The attack upon the Bible is shown by Mr. Mallock in the November Nineteenth Century, as coming from Protestant critics, who seek to save the Scriptures by reducing them to the level of other so-called Sacred Books of the East. The opposite position of the Roman Church is shown by the Encyclical of Leo XIII. Providentissimus Deus, 1893, which leaves no doubt. Quoting the Council of Trent, the Holy Father says that the Books of the Old and New Testament, "whole and entire," "contain revelation without error," the Holy Ghost having inspired men to write "in apt words and with infallible truth." The Encyclical, therefore, declares that "it follows that those who maintain that an error is possible in any genuine passage of the sacred writings, either pervert the Catholic notion of inspiration or make God the Author of such error." Leo XIII. disposes of the "Higher Criticism" in the following manner: "There has arisen, to the great detriment of religion, an inept method, dignified by the name of 'Higher Criticism,' which pretends to judge of the origin, integrity and authority of each Book from internal indications alone. It is clear, on the other hand, that in historical questions, such as the origin and the handing down of writings, the witness of history is of primary importance, and that historical investigation should be made with the utmost care, and that in this matter internal evidence is seldom of great value, except as confirmation. To look upon it in any other light will be to open the door to many evil consequences. It will make the enemies of religion much more bold and confident in attacking and mangling the Sacred Books; and this vaunted 'Higher Criticism' will resolve itself into the reflection of the bias and the prejudice of the critics. It will not throw on the Scripture the light that is sought, or

prove of any advantage to doctrine; it will only give rise to disagreement and dissension, those sure notes of error which the critics in question so plentifully exhibit in their own persons, and seeing that most of them are tainted with false philosophy and rationalism, it must lead to the elimination from the Sacred Writings of all prophecy and miracle, and of everything else that is outside the natural order."

This, then, is the attitude of Rome toward the "Higher Criticism." Further, Leo XIII. says: "It is absolutely wrong and forbidden, either to narrow inspiration to certain parts of Holy Scripture, or to admit that the Sacred Writer has erred. For," he continues, "the system of those who in order to rid themselves of these difficulties, do not hesitate to concede that Divine Inspiration regards the things of faith and morals, and nothing beyond, because (as they wrongly think) in a question of truth or falsehood of a passage we should consider not so much what God has said as the reason and purpose which He had in mind in saying it—this system cannot be tolerated." Further it is observed: "All the books which the Church receives as Sacred and Canonical, are written wholly and entirely with all their parts, at the dictation of the Holy Ghost; and so far is it from being possible that any error can co-exist with inspiration, that inspiration not only is essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it as absolutely and necessarily as it is impossible that God Himself, the Supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true." "Tala," he concludes, "is the ancient and unchanging faith of the Church solemnly defined in the Councils of Florence and of Trent, and finally confirmed and more expressly formulated by the Council of the Vatican."

The Catholic Church will stand by these decisions forever. Yet legitimate criticism is welcomed in Catholic schools, and the study of Holy Scripture is encouraged by the Encyclical, which presents the most powerful motive for entering upon the work, beginning with "the study of the Oriental languages and the art of criticism." It is recognized that there is a vast field for study, and that much is to be learned in respect to interpretation. It is said that "not infrequently interpretations have been placed on certain passages of Scripture (not belonging to the rule of faith and morals) which have been rectified by more careful investigations." This result has never been gained by the denial of inspiration, or the elimination of books or parts of books. The "Higher Criticism" now attacks entire books, and efforts are made to explain away the words of our Blessed Lord in His references to Old Testament characters and events. We are told, by way of illustration, that the Church sees various subjects in a new light, notably that of astronomy; that serious and now recognized mistakes have been made in interpretation, and that we may essay new interpretations of particular sayings of Christ. The case of Galilee is adduced. It is doubtless true that after Christianity actually prevailed, the Emperor Julian confessed, "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean!" and, in this connection, we are told that the Church "now confesses," "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean!" The Church, however, as Mr. Mallock may see from the Encyclical of 1893, makes no confession of the kind, indeed no confession at all; but, on the contrary, rejects the position assigned.

Says the Encyclical, "Nothing can be proved either by physical science or archaeology which can really contradict Scripture." The declaration of St. Augustine is approved, where he says of the Scientist: "Whatever they assert in their treatise which is contrary to these Scriptures of ours, that is to the Catholic faith, we must either prove it as well as we can to be entirely false, or at all events we must without the smallest hesitation believe it to be so." On this platform, the Catholic Church stands to-day. Of course there is a human and a Divine side of the Church, and the human can err. In the case of Galilee the mistake was not *ex cathedra*. The Church did not err. She has never changed her method of dealing with Science. If Galileo conquered anything it was not the Church. He did not hold the views falsely attributed to him, and his argument from tides and magnetism is now declared "all moonshine." A slight examination shows that his hypothesis was pure hypothesis, while an important part is rejected to-day. The weight of argument lay with Ptolemy. On the evidence submitted, the Congregation was right, and the case of Galileo affords no ground for the encouragement of "Higher Criticism." There are, nevertheless, those who tell us that our Blessed Lord took Old Testament narratives, for instance those of Jonah and the Flood, and used them as He used the parables and the story of the Prodigal Son. The critic, however, fails, in his zeal, to recognize the fact that for eighteen centuries the Church has accepted the parables as parables, while, on the other hand, she has accepted the Old Testament illustrations as facts, and as standing in the rank of facts, and the illustrations drawn from the fact of "the lily of the field." The whole Christian world has always understood our Lord in these cases, as drawing upon inspired history. Of this there was never any doubt, yet if He had made no reference to the Old Testament these passages in the elder writings might perhaps have stood differently in relation to faith and morals. But the use made of them by the Saviour opens up considerations re-

specting His Divine Nature and the Incarnation, in the very highest sense involving Faith; for our Lord either knew or did not know that He was quoting what many call allegories. If He knew that these illustrations were fanciful and unhistorical, He neverthe less knew that the ages to follow would misunderstand Him and accept them as historical, which is seen to be the case. On the other hand, if He did not know them to be the unhistorical things which critics declare them to be, the student is justified in denying that perfection of Incarnation by which the Divine Logos was made flesh. This destroys the idea of His trustworthiness in general. In any event, whoever denies the historical character of the Old Testament in all its parts charges substantially that our Blessed Lord, at the outset, temerously allowed the Church to misunderstand His allusions and thus permitted the Church to mislead the world in all these centuries, never having once, even in an indirect way, suggested the possibility of any other than the universally accepted interpretation; leaving for the hostile critic, in our late day, from his throne of judgment, to reveal and pronounce upon the error, and joyfully proclaim the egregious blunder. Thereby the critic declares that he knows more of the mind and nature of Christ than the whole Church in all these eighteen hundred years, during which the truth was concealed.

In this connection a scholar should not allow his mind to become befogged. The issue is not simply one of science or simply interpretation. Heremennities may be involved, but primarily, it is the Mystery of the Incarnation that criticism puts on trial. The case is dogmatic. It means a revision of the Incarnation to accommodate a revision of the Bible. This the Holy Catholic Church will never approve. It is not in the slightest degree probable that she will allow her children to believe that our Blessed Lord was ignorant of the real character of the Sacred Writings, or that, with a full knowledge of those writings He stooped in the most solemn connections, to the trivialities and literary accommodations of the ordinary Eastern teacher, deliberately sending forth to all ages fiction as fact, suffusing the centuries of the life and thought of the Catholic Church with allegory and legend, leaving as an unfinished world to wake from its long Oriental dream and realize that human thought, throughout the ages, has been simply the subject of illusion, the victim of what at least, approximately, approaches too closely the nature of a world-encircling jest. All this may be in keeping with what Leo XIII. fellaciously styles "the inept method dignified by the name of 'Higher Criticism,'" but it cannot be seriously entertained. It is ineluctable: Socialism.

But while the Church thus carefully protects the Word of God, and holds a position from which in the ages to come there can be no retreat, it may nevertheless be supposed by some that the authorities are unfavorable to the circulation and use of the Bible. This is quite untrue. The memorable Encyclical from which I have quoted shows in the most conclusive manner that it is the duty and privilege of Catholic scholars to study the Bible thoroughly in the original tongues; while the Papal Brief of Dec. 13, 1898, shows that it is equally the duty of the laity to read the Bible in vernacular languages, special favors being granted to the faithful who read the Scriptures not less than fifteen minutes each day. If any one inclines to say that this is something entirely new, let him honestly inquire into the history of the case: since, from the days before the invention of printing, when the Bible was chained to pillars in churches for the free use of all comers down to the present day, the Catholic Church, while restrictive on certain occasions, has always encouraged the proper use of the Sacred Word among all classes, though no invitation is given to the ignorant and the unlearned to expound it to their own destruction. As an example, take the letter of Pope Pius VI., addressed, in 1778, to the Archbishop of Florence, thanking him for sending out an edition of the Bible in the Italian tongue for the free use of the people. He tells the translator: "You judge exceedingly well, that the reading of the Holy Scriptures; for these are the most abundant sources which should be left open to every one, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are so widely disseminated in these corrupt times. This you have seasonably effected, as you declare, by publishing the Sacred Writings in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity." He adds: "You have not swerved either from the laws of the Congregations of the Index, or from the Constitution published on this subject by Benedict XIV." It may indeed be said that the Catholic Church requires the faithful to read the Scriptures in an authorized version. For English readers that of Duany is generally recommended. Protestantism, however, expects its adherents to use the version of King James, though it has never been shown that this version is the more correct. Indeed the revised version contains several thousands of amendments to that now in use, while a certain denomination will not be reconciled to any version save that which favors its own creed.

Likewise, it may be said that the Catholic Church claims the right, and recognizes the duty of fixing the interpretation of Holy Scripture. I am glad to know that this is also true, and that

the obligation is possible of performance. Thus in all lands where the Bible is read it may be understood by all substantially in the one and same sense. Among Catholics the Bible forms no Babel. It speaks with no uncertain sound. It tells of one Faith, not of many.

Finally it may be suggested that the Catholic Church does not hold to "the Bible only," but supplements teaching with Catholic tradition. The Encyclical, Providentissimus Deus, quoting the Vatican decree, says that the Church "is herself a great and perpetual motive of credibility and an unassailable testimony to her own divine mission." It is also declared that the Council of Trent, "following the examples of the orthodox fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, as well as those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession."

The value of tradition is generally recognized and allowed in many most important relations. In connection with our American Constitution we hear about the "traditions of the fathers." Religionists in general, when no controversy is in hand, do not hesitate to employ tradition, even though the word may not be used. Christianity, like the American Government, has its traditions. The Church is their guardian. These traditions are really unwritten Scripture. They include things referred to by St. John, where he says that the world could not contain books that might be written. Protestants themselves, and Episcopalians in particular, form an example and are forced to use traditions, unconsciously using many that were too firmly fixed to be displaced even by the Reformation. While the Catholic Church accepts and defends the Bible without compromise, she does not treasure the Bible at the expense of her own authority, any more than the banker holds his inferior to the money in his vault.

There are two authoritative sources of guidance, the written and spoken Word, and no one should fancy that the Living Voice is inferior. The Catholic Church is a voice that spoke with unquestioned authority before the New Testament existed, even as the Jewish Church authoritatively preceded the Old Testament. Indeed, we should not forget that generations of divinely instructed and God-fearing men lived before the first words of Genesis were recorded. The Apostles were not commissioned by our Lord to go and write books, but to give oral teaching. The Scriptures do not say that Christianity was founded upon the Bible, but rather that the Bible was based on a living and authoritative Christianity. It is the Church, not the Bible, that is declared to be "the pillar and ground of Truth." The Church was fully organized, speaking with an infallible authority, before the first line of the New Testament was written. The Church has never lost her authoritative position, and in every age the traditions of the Church have been recognized and obeyed. The Church does not fear to submit her dogmas, discipline and general practices to the test of Scripture, since Scripture and Tradition agree. The Bible was composed by Churchmen, who wrote, guided by divine inspiration. The Bible is a Book of the Church, which fixed the canon, and authenticated the contents, thus giving it authority. If that authority were withdrawn, if the Church should declare the Bible not to be the Word of God, the world would refuse to honor it. The Church having authenticated the Bible, holds a true position toward the Bible. This is what renders it safe in the midst of a hostile world. The Church stands behind the Book, and cannot allow it to fall. The Bible might perish, but the Church would remain. We are indeed familiar with the declaration, "The Bible only is the religion of Protestants." This is the famous saying of Chillingworth, but it does not form a notable declaration when taken in accordance with its context. If its author could return to-day and hear himself quoted, he would be profoundly surprised and would repudiate the shibboleth. He teaches a Protestantism quite different from the Protestantism of our day. He understood the value of tradition, and says: "It is upon the authority of universal tradition that we would have them believe Scripture," having subscribed to St. Augustine's declaration, "We would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholic Church doth move us." Having gone thus far, Chillingworth declares the assertion, "Scriptures alone to judge all controversy in faith" is "a plain falsehood," affirming that "Universal Tradition is the rule to judge all controversies by." Again he says, "Neither doth being written make the Word of God the more fallible, nor being unwritten make it less infallible," while "the true Church shall always both maintain and teach all necessary truth;" and "we grant and must grant, for it is the essence of the Church to be so." Here we have an essential principle. The old Protestant war cry is repudiated by its alleged author; while many critics are discovering that the position of Hooker is untenable, where he teaches that tra-

dition is a fundamental error of Rome. The fact is also pointed out that, finding their Scripture authority gone, a class of Protestants are inventing a doctrine of tradition akin to that of Rome. It is clear as charged, that the failure of Protestant religionists to maintain the integrity of the Bible is dissolving the entire intellectual basis of the Reformation. The cry now is, "The Bible only when we agree with it." The old form falls on the ear. The Bible has fallen down from its high place, where it had been enthroned superior to the Church of Christ, which formed the Canon of Scripture and clothed it with authority. This is one inevitable result of venerating the Book at the expense of the Church, for which is greater, the Temple or the Builder? On the principle of private judgment, the Book alone could not stand. It must be ever so. An infallible book calls for an infallible interpreter. The human cannot comprehend the Divine. The Catholic Church alone can interpret and protect the Book. Under her care it can never lose its authority in the eyes of her children. Protestantism is an anachronism, a carnation of prejudice, and stands dazed before the twentieth century with its gates ajar.

It is time for candid non-Catholics to address themselves to the subject of infallibility, and learn that the notion that it interferes with individual liberty is as true as that the mariner's compass renders the sailor an abject slave. Without instruments and guidance the sailor would be as free as the ancient Sidonian in his ivory galley with purple sails, without even an astrolabe to take the height of the polar star, dead reckoning and guessing his way, gazing with strained, uncertain eye over pathless sea and perilous shore. The freedom that the devout Catholics lose is the freedom to lose his way in storm and night and fog. Mr. Mallock, an independent thinker and outlooker, evidently not caring much if anything for either side, declares, in the article already referred to, that the form of the Christian religion that serves the present intellectual crisis must be "the Christian religion embodied in the Church of Rome, and not in any form of Protestantism." In the judgment of the most disinterested observers, the Roman Church must in the future be the Church of the intellectual classes, even as it was for many centuries before the revolt of Henry VIII. against the Pope. Rome, as "the Champion of Revelation," will offer to the human intellect the "great Apologia." A class of mole-eyed men may fail to see what is taking place, but it is now nevertheless evident that "all those forces of science, which it was once thought would be fatal to her (Rome), are now in a way which constitutes one of the great surprises of history, to group themselves as to afford her a new foundation." On the other hand, with Protestants, it is coming to this, that every source of authority and pledge of permanence is disappearing, while the supernatural events of the Old Testament are less history than the siege of Troy. Glimpses of truth may be found, but where the real Bible begins and where it ends the critic himself cannot tell. His own end, nevertheless, is certain; and it remains, therefore, for the Catholic Church, speaking with authority, to reassure a doubting world, by declaring that all the books of the Old and New Testament, in all their parts, are inspired and together form the infallible Word of God. The Catholic Church is the natural and authorized guardian of Holy Scripture. She offers the solution of the Bible question. Already there is a vague idea abroad, even in Reformation circles, that this is so, and ere long there comes a full conviction that it is Rome to whom the world must look for the settlement not only of the Bible issue, but of all the questions that stand related to Christianity. Protestantism indeed talks of progress, but it does not comprehend the intellectual issues in this crisis and is not abreast the age.

Still a few non-Catholics are becoming more candid in their estimate of the Catholic Church, both as a moral power and as a necessity of our national life, recognizing that if it were taken away society would lose a needed cement and that the Republic itself would be insecure. There is less heat to-day in the discussion of Catholic claims than twenty-five years ago, and we hear fewer of those unfounded charges from men's lips that they do not dare to subscribe with the hand. The Catholic Church is especially adapted to the wants of the American people, in that with needed safeguards it is eminently favorable to real freedom of thought. Its claims are nobly supported by history and philosophy. A man argues the case

against himself when he attempts to ignore the character and standing of Catholicity. The Catholic Church holds the key to the mental, moral and spiritual problems of the age. When rightly understood by the American people, the Church will be found capable of meeting all its varied requirements. Whoever desires a Church must inevitably find it in the Catholic Church. If the Catholics are wrong in their belief, then there is no Catholic Church anywhere. Singularly, the same is true, if Protestants are right in their belief, since they deny that the Roman is the Catholic Church, and do not themselves pretend to be the Catholic Church. In denying the Catholicity of Rome they sign their own death warrant; even as the man proves his own poverty when he proclaims the universe insolvent. On the Protestant theory there is no visible Church, the only body being a mystical body in the air. On this theory, Christianity has failed. The Empire that triumphed over the Roman Empire has perished. This is simply pessimism run mad. Reformation religionism, therefore, offers no moral or intellectual outlook for coming generations, and leaves the world forced at last to choose between Rationalism and the Catholic Church. I believe in the Holy Catholic Church and the Life Everlasting.

B. F. De Costa.

MRS. HOWARD GOULD'S SISTER A MISSIONARY.

San Francisco, November 17.—Ella M. Clemmons, sister of Mrs. Howard Gould, has decided to devote her life to teaching the doctrines of the Catholic Church to the Chinese, and as soon as she can lease a house in Chinatown suited to her purpose, she intends to open a Catholic Chinese mission.

This she will conduct independent of any order and she will maintain it herself.

Ella Clemmons became a convert to the Catholic faith less than two years ago. Shortly after her conversion she decided to give up her pleasant life and give her entire time to the promotion of the faith she had adopted. In looking around for some line of work she became interested in the Chinese, and saw in Chinatown a wide field for Christian endeavor.

There is no Catholic Chinese mission in this city, and the idea of founding one seemed to the young woman the right thing for her to do, so she began the study of the Chinese language, and for seventeen months she has labored to perfect herself.

She has learned enough of the language to enable her to carry on the kindergarten method, and she hopes in another year to be able to speak fluently.

She has already established two classes of Chinese, and these she teaches during the day and in the evening.

"I shall call the mission 'Christ's Studio,'" she said, "and I hope I shall find a place so that I can open it before many weeks go by. I am going to call my line of teaching the kindergarten Bible study."

"I shall furnish the mission nicely, just as though it were my own home, and any one who desires may join any of the various classes I shall carry on. My great hope is that the mission may open the way to my working among the Chinese women. My heart aches for these poor creatures, and I want them to enjoy the truth and the beauty of my religion."

Ella M. Clemmons is a young woman and very beautiful, like her sister, Mrs. Gould, and it will be a surprise to her many friends on both sides of the continent to know that she has taken up the work of Christianizing the Chinese.

CATARRH

of the Head, Throat, Lungs, etc. . . . The latest book on the subject, will help you to pass the winter safely. Will be sent Free Mail this and your address to DR. SPROULE, 7 to 13 Doane St. Boston

"IRELAND IN PICTURES."

A YEAR'S SUBSCRIPTION TO THE CATHOLIC RECORD AND THIS BEAUTIFUL WORK OF ART FOR 86.00.

The gem of the ocean. The scenic treasure of the world. IRELAND IN PICTURES is the book form, the most beautiful historic art work ever published. Containing four hundred magnificent photographic views of everything of interest in the four provinces, with written sketches by Hon. Jas. F. Finnerly of Chicago. This charming work IRELAND IN PICTURES is now ready. It is an interesting, instructive and educational photographic panorama of Ireland as it is. Produced at a cost of over \$5,000. The size of this grand work is 11x14 inches. This anniversary edition is printed on fine art paper and contains views of the cities, towns and villages, rivers, loughs and streams, mountains, hills and vales, cathedrals, chapels and churches, vine-covered abbeys, antiquated shrines, crumbling monasteries, and round towers. Celtic crosses and cemeteries, monuments to Irish heroes, battle fields, evocative scenes and rural landscapes. Every home should contain this book. No library is complete without it. Send for it and be entertained, educated, instructed, and pleased. Bound in fine grained cloth, embossed gold stamped title and back, gilt edges, silk top bands, elaborately indexed with colored map of Ireland.

This beautiful book is sold in the United States at \$6.00. On receipt of this amount we will forward it to any address—charges for carriage prepaid—and also give credit for one year's subscription to the CATHOLIC RECORD. Address: Thos. Coffey, CATHOLIC RECORD Office, London, Ont.

SITUATION WANTED. A SITUATION WANTED AS HOUSEKEEPER for one or more elderly gentlemen by a competent middle-aged woman. Address: "Housekeeper," CATHOLIC RECORD Office, London, Ont.



Good for Itching Backs

MOTHERS! Mothers! A hot bath with CUTICURA SOAP, when followed by a single application of CUTICURA Ointment, the great skin cure and purifier of emollients, will afford the most grateful and comforting relief in the severest forms of itching, burning, and scaly skin and scalp humors, rashes, and irritations, and point to a speedy, permanent, and economical cure when all other remedies fail and even the best physicians fail.

Sold throughout the world. POTTER, DRUG AND CHEM. CO., Prop., Boston. How to Cure Itching Humors, free.