

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
BINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
BY THE PROPRIETOR,
JOHN GILLIES,
AT NO. 195 FORTIFICATION LANE.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:
To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars.
To all City Subscribers whose papers are delivered
by carriers, Two Dollars and a half.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, June 9 1876.

ECCLESIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JUNE, 1876.

Friday, 9.—Of the Octave. Ember Day. Fast.
Saturday, 10.—Of the Octave. Ember Day. Fast.
Sunday, 11.—Trinity Sunday.
Monday, 12.—St. John of St. Facunda, Confessor.
Tuesday, 13.—St. Anthony of Padua, Confessor.
Wednesday, 14.—St. Basil, Bishop, Confessor, and
Doctor of the Church.
Thursday, 15.—Corpus Christi. Holyday of Obligation.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

It is officially announced that the ex-Sultan Abdul Aziz committed suicide on Sunday morning, by opening the veins of his arm with a pair of scissors. The Times correspondent at Paris says:—"The physicians of the British and other embassies at Constantinople testify that the late Sultan committed suicide by cutting the arteries of both arms with a pair of scissors. He died at the Toheragar Palace at ten o'clock on Sunday morning, and was buried in the tomb of Mahomed the Second on Sunday evening. One telegram received in Paris asserts that the Sultan stabbed himself with a dagger in the region of the heart. It is generally remarked in Paris as strange that Abdul Aziz, who had always shown himself so feeble, should have suddenly displayed so much energy, and, at the same time, that his death was of so little importance to any one that it seemed repugnant to attribute it to assassination.

The Standard's Vienna Correspondent says a letter from Constantinople asserts that Vice Admiral Drummond, commanding the British fleet in the Mediterranean, has undertaken an inspection of the fortifications of the Dardanelles at the request of the Porte. The Governments of Austria, Russia and France have instructed their representatives at Belgrade to counsel the new Cabinet to exercise moderation. A Herald special telegram from London says the Prince and Princess of Roumania and Prince Milan of Serbia, which latter State refused to pay the last two instalments of tribute claimed by the Porte propose to issue a joint declaration of independence, owing to the irregular accession of the Sultan to the throne. The Prince of Montenegro is only awaiting the action of the other Slavonic provinces. In Serbia the schools and colleges are being closed. Further despatches from Berlin to the Times state that the declaration of the Official Gazette that the insurgents are determined to immediately fall upon the Turks with the whole Serbian race, must be considered as authentic. M. Wesselsitzki, the Russian agent in Herzegovina, having published an address, handing the military and diplomatic direction of the insurgent affairs over to the Prince of Montenegro. The Serbian troops are ranged on the frontier and ready to act at a moment's notice. The Central staff has gone to Alixants near the Turkish camp at Nish. The principal Serbian force, however, is stationed at Losnitza, where pontoon bridges are being constructed preparatory to crossing the Drina into Bosnia. Various fortified camps have been established along the frontier. The Russian General Tserinayoff, who has assumed command of the Serbian forces, in his official capacity, handed the Serbian Government \$25,000 as a donation from the Slavonic sections of Russia. Bulgaria is also being set on fire by hosts of well armed volunteers which are arriving from Russia. The recent reform firman of Abdul Aziz has been specially withdrawn in some places. Special envoys have been sent to Morocco and Tunis to ask for assistance. A crisis is unavoidable unless Russia retracts. Russia is unprepared for the present contingency and is slow to decide. There is a feeling in Berlin that we are on the eve of momentous changes, and every hour may bring important news. The Berlin Telegraphic Agency asserts that England had concluded an alliance with Turkey, and guaranteed the latter's integrity. The Russian Telegraphic Agency declares that the new Sultan will be recognized on all hands without protest as soon as his accession is officially announced. The Porte is drawing up a very liberal constitution in seven clauses, which will soon be promulgated. The correspondent of the Times says:—"The Ministerial North German Gazette gives us to understand that, owing to the antagonism between Russia and England, all Europe is plunged into a most critical condition.

In Spain the Bill suppressing the fueros has been introduced into the Senate; it provides that all Spaniards shall be liable to military conscription and taxation alike, with those exceptions: persons in the Basque provinces who supported Alfonso during the late war, are exempted from conscription for ten years, and those who suffered persecution for the Alphonist cause are exempted from payment of taxes for the same term. Gen Quesada has ordered the state of siege in the province of Santander to be extended. Several suspected Carlists have been expelled from Biscay.

An unusual event took place on Sunday at St. John's Catholic Church, St. Louis, Mo., the occasion being the ordination of 17 priests, 10 of whom were students who left Germany because they would not submit to Bismarck's policy towards the Catholic Church.

CONFIRMATION IN QUEBEC.—On Sunday week His Grace the Archbishop of Quebec administered the Sacrament of Confirmation to 259 children in St. Saviour's Church. On last Friday Mgr. Fabre, Coadjutor Bishop of Montreal, confirmed 388 children in St. Roch's Church, Quebec.

FANATICISM.
The utterances of the Rev. Doctor Taylor before the Synod of Montreal and Ottawa, calculated as they were to engender bitter religious strife, have called forth severe comments, not only from the Catholic, but from the Protestant press as well. In a late issue the Montreal Witness, in answer to some strictures on this subject, has a long article headed "Ecclesiastical Peace and Good Will," which, if it does not deal with facts, and fails to point out a single disability or genuine grievance of which the Protestant population in this Province can complain, at all events gives evidence of that concentrated essence of bigotry which cannot fail to gratify its most ignorant and fanatical patrons. It would be difficult for the father of lies, were he himself to undertake the editorial management of the "only religious daily," instead of merely inspiring the writer, to put into an equal number of lines more untruth than is to be found in the article in question. Any intelligent man would be disgusted with the general system of vituperation indulged in by the Daily Witness in dealing with the Catholic Church and its Hierarchy in this Province, for when driven to bay, and pointedly asked to show cause, its only reply is a rebash of the time-honored slanders which pass current with a certain class of its readers. Making an attempt to conjure up a cause, the Witness propounds its complaint as follows:—

"They (the Protestants) are brought face to face with Roman intolerance daily. They see the simple dictum of the Bishop throwing industrious men out of employment because of their religious belief; buyers are forbidden to deal with certain traders because the latter are obnoxious to the hierarchy; honest men are refused the civil right of burial because they belong to certain societies or read the Witness, and any one not an ecclesiastic who reads that unholly paper without special permission is not only excommunicated from the Church, but his fellows are not allowed to communicate with him, or deal with him; Protestant ministers are stoned; converts to Protestantism are assaulted and beaten almost to death; Protestants are forced to pay taxes to support those who in this manner oppress them, and the courts are as a general thing so under ecclesiastical control that redress is impossible. This is the state of affairs in Quebec."

To the first two charges we answer, as will any honest Protestant in the land—Bosh. As to the charge "that honest men are refused the civil right of burial because they belong to certain societies," we say—Positively untrue. The right of civil burial has never been refused to any one; but we should like to know why any Protestant should complain if the Catholic Church refuses to a disobedient member of her communion who has lived and died in enmity with her as a member of a condemned society, the rights of ecclesiastical burial in ground consecrated by her holy rites. On the other hand, the proprietors of the Witness are the only Protestants, we suspect, who can complain, if a Bishop of the Catholic Church forbids his flock to read that journal. We have never heard that the Catholic Hierarchy have sought in any way to interfere with Protestant burials either civil or religious, and certainly no Bishop ever dreamt of controlling the Protestant readers of the Witness—"Protestant Ministers," we are told, "are stoned; and Protestant converts assaulted and beaten almost to death." This is news for us. We considered this a very peaceable community, but the Witness thinks differently. The apostate Chiniquy is the only person whose preaching has been in any way interfered with for a great many years. We only wonder that the vile creature was allowed so much liberty, not to preach the Gospel as he professes to understand it, but to insult every Catholic mother and daughter in his filthy outpouring about the confessional and blasphemously outrage the Holy Sacrament of the altar, as the Witness reported him to have done at Russell Hall and even in the case of this wretch the Catholic priesthood intervened and counselled the people not to manifest their indignation by any violence. Happily that advice was followed, and apart from a few broken panes in a Suburban Chapel no one was assaulted at all not to say beaten almost to death. What the taxes are that Protestants are forced to pay to the Catholic Church we are at a loss to know. The Protestant taxes go to support Protestant Schools in this Catholic Province and we wish we could say the same of Catholic contributions in the Province of New Brunswick. Our courts are stated to be controlled by ecclesiastical influence, this foul slander is in keeping with the balance of the article. We are not prepared now to discuss the propriety of Courts of law interfering between the pastor and parishioner, but the fact is there, patent to all men that the Civil Tribunals of this Province both the Court of Review and the Court of Queen's Bench, have asserted their supremacy in all matters affecting the rights, liberties and privileges of the subject of all denominations over priest as well as layman and this within very few months. Truth however is of no account in the calculations of the Witness. Keep alive bigotry fan the flame of fanaticism, foster a spirit of hatred against Catholicity, lie and slander against the priesthood, represent the Catholic majority as overbearing and instill into the minds of the minority that they are being overridden and oppressed, this is the little game our only religious daily is playing and the Rev. Doctor Taylor et hoc genus omne are its willing coadjutors. In view of these facts we are not surprised that even Protestant journalists feel bound to enter a protest against a system so pregnant with evil results in any community where it is allowed to take root.

SKIRMISHING.

The daily press of this and other cities has brought under public notice a huge New York swindle, advertised in, and commended by the Irish World, and "run" by Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa, the notorious. It is called the "Skirmishing Fund," and has for object the equipment of a band of franc-tireurs, or sharpshooters, to keep blazing away at the British lion until such time as the Grand Army of the Irish Republic will be ready to advance on the enemy. All who love old Ireland, all good men and true who desire to see her as she ought to be, great, glorious and free, are invited to communicate with faithful, chivalrous, bold and daring Rossa, inclosing currency. Remittances are

acknowledged every week, and it is astonishing what a number of workmen and servant-girls—if the published lists can be relied on—allow their pockets to be picked in this manner. These love Ireland not wisely but too well, and fall an easy prey to the sharpers with big-sounding names, who have worn the fetters of the tyrant, as graphically told in the histories of their prison experience, and who are ready to shed the last drop of their blood for the freedom of their oppressed country. The remarks of our contemporaries, bitter and sarcastic as they are, on this latest phase of American Fenianism, meet with our hearty approval, and we deeply regret that between knaves and fools on the other side of the line patriotism is fast becoming a word of reproach.

But this skirmishing business is not monopolized by New York and the United States. Here in our Canadian cities funds for guerilla purposes are in circulation, and filibustering expeditions have already set out, unnoticed by, though certainly not unknown to our friends of the daily press. Your dollar is wanted now to obtain justice for the oppressed Oka Indians, now to bring French Canadians from out the dark night of Popery into the brilliant noon-day of an open Bible, or again to relieve the Protestant minority in this priest-ridden province, from certain disabilities not mentioned, and we venture to assert not mentionable. It is Ald. Clendenning that plays O'Donovan Rossa in one case, C. Chiniquy in other, and Sir A. T. Galt, with great success in another. And whether the skirmishers go on a picnic excursion to Oka, or patrol the streets of Ottawa, as an escort to the apostle of the "Truth as it is in—," or unlawfully assemble in Quebec and demolish public property, they enjoy an immunity from adverse criticism which, considering the keenness of secular journalism in detecting comparatively trifling abuses abroad, is, to say the least, extraordinary. The projected skirmishing of the Fenian Brotherhood which has drawn out such scathing articles, is ridiculous and chimerical—a mere catch-penny, but this active skirmishing of the French Canadian Missionary Society, and Protestant Defence Association is menacing to the peace and prosperity of the country, and calls for the prompt and unqualified denunciation of every honest and patriotic citizen. It is plain that if Protestants, misled by such men as Galt, and excited by Clendenings and Chiniquys, persist in taking the law in their own hands, trouble will ensue, and the Constitution or the skirmishers will have to lie under. What say you gentlemen of the press?

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A. McA.—Most of the information you ask for was furnished on our third page last week. The fellow is hardly worth notice. He is not a priest and never was a member of any religious community. He first came to Canada with a companion named Hughes about five years ago, when they were admitted to an educational institution in Ottawa as assistant teachers. But a short time afterwards they were both kicked out for misconduct; Hughes left for parts unknown, and his chum took to lecturing in favor of the Church, using the most insulting and filthy language in reference to Protestants. The late Bishop Guignes, seeing that the Church might well exclaim "save me from my friends," forbade him to lecture on religious subjects, and warned his people against him. Driven from Ottawa, he went to Perth, and thence to Toronto where he was convicted for an unnatural crime and thrown into prison. Finding himself at large again he returns to the stump, this time we perceive as "a brand snatched from the burning." The writer had occasion to meet him frequently, and believes he is insane. In any case don't mind him. It will be interesting though to watch how he will fare with Protestants, and whether they will take him, notwithstanding his antecedents, under the protection, or as a Catholic Bishop did when he ventured to insult them—send him adrift.

EXHIBITION OF CHURCH ORNAMENTS, SACRED VESTMENTS, ETC.

The annual exhibition being by the "Society of the Tabernacle" of sacred vessels, church ornaments, and sacred vestments, etc., will take place at the rooms of the Congregation Notre Dame, St. Jean Baptiste street, Montreal, on the 8th, 9th, and 10th of June, instant, commencing at three p.m. each day. The benediction and consecration of the sacred articles will be performed by his Lordship, the Bishop of Montreal on the first day of the exhibition. All are invited to attend.

The articles distributed are contributed by the members of the Society, who pay an annual fee of fifty cents, and they are destined for gratuitous distribution among poor clergymen and needy parishes, where without the assistance of this society, the Divine services would be performed in a manner unworthy of the Majesty of Our Lord. In looking over the names of the members of this most worthy society, we regret that there are very few of our countrymen inscribed in its ranks; on making this remark we were told that it was not much known among the Englishspeaking Catholics of this country, we regret this, and we hope that our friends will go and see the exhibition, become members of the society, and make known to their friends its useful and eminently praiseworthy objects.

"THE MAYFLOWER."

Some time ago we copied from the columns of the Mayflower, a Protestant journal whose respectability we had never heard impugned, an article on the apostate Chiniquy. The Daily Witness retorted by stating that the Mayflower is a notoriously immoral paper. The Editor of that journal, having seen this charge, has forwarded us a communication which we insert, and to which we beg to call the attention of the Editor of the Witness.

Mr. F. C. Lawlor, No. 11 Papineau Square, is hereby authorized to collect and solicit subscriptions for the True Witness, in this city. As Mr. Lawlor is an old resident of Montreal we bespeak for him from our friends a kindly reception.

It will probably be our duty next week to call the attention of the Hon. Minister of Education for Ontario to the sectarian character of an unsectarian institution—a Collegiate Institute—under his control.

THE OTTAWA UNIVERSITY.
Amongst the many excellent institutions where the Catholic youth of the Dominion are enabled to receive thorough training in the higher branches of education, we believe the Ottawa College occupies an enviable position in the foremost rank. We are fully aware that a number of our English-speaking Catholic friends frequently complain that the education in some of our colleges is too exclusively French. Whether this be true or not of certain institutions in this Province, it certainly is not so as regards the Ottawa University. In another column the curriculum of studies will be found, and we direct to it the attention of our patrons. We have good reason to know that the system of education in this establishment is one that has been adopted after years of mature study and experience, and is particularly adapted to the requirements of the country. Systems that are suitable to older communities are not suitable in Canada, and this the oblate Fathers seem to have thoroughly realized. A good sound practical education is what is wanted here, to fit young men to compete successfully in the struggle which is every day becoming more difficult. The Rev. Father Tabaret, one of the most distinguished scholars in the Dominion is at the head of this institution, and in recommending the Ottawa University to our friends we feel satisfied that we are endorsing an establishment where the morals of the youth will be properly guarded, their physical wants carefully attended to, and an education thorough practical and classical will be imparted.

ALTAR DEDICATION AT PICTON.

On Sunday (May 28th) a beautiful new Altar made by Mr. Michael Gormley of Trenton, and decorated by Mr. Richardson of Napanee for the Rev. John Brennan, P.P. of Picton, was dedicated with all due solemnity. The altar proper is a massive plinth, supported in front on six pillars, and at the back by a colonnade containing five niches for statues. The retreads consists of six arches—three on each side of the tabernacle—above which is a handsome oil painting of St. Gregory, the patron Saint of the Church. Above all this is a handsome entablature supported on eight pillars. The decorations are in Mr. Richardson's best style, and add exceedingly to the beauty of the whole; in fact they have so transformed the church that few would recognize it.

The following is the dedicatory sermon delivered by the Rev. Father Brettargh on the occasion:—

"This is my body which shall be delivered for you; this do for a commemoration of Me."—I Cor. 11-24.

"Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the new testament which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins."—Mat. XXVI. 27.

As we are assembled to-day, my dearly Beloved Brethren, to use for the first time and to dedicate to the service of God this truly beautiful altar, which the zeal of your good Pastor has provided for your church, it would appear a duty incumbent upon me to speak a few words to you on "Altars" and "Sacrifices."

An Altar presupposes a Priest—and both Altar and Priest presuppose a Sacrifice or Victim. A Priest is a Priest (as St. Paul says) because he offers "gifts and sacrifices"; and an Altar is an Altar because "gifts and sacrifices" are offered thereon. Take away the victim the Priest becomes a mere layman; and the altar (however beautiful) a worthless and unmeaning heap of boards. You have your altar and your Priesthood—where is your victim? Your question is already answered in the words of my text. "This is my body, which shall be delivered for you, this do in commemoration of Me." "Drink ye all of this for this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins."

If we look back in the order of time to the days of the patriarchs and to the dispensation of the Old Law, we cannot but be struck by the number and variety of the Sacrifices offered to Almighty God. 1. Abel offered the firstlings of his flocks—and God (the Scripture tells us) was well pleased. 2. Noah's first act on leaving the Ark was to offer a whole burnt offering from the animals around him, and his offering arose (as the Scripture says) as "an odor of sweetness." 3. Abraham after having received a command from God to go out from the bosom of his family and his father's house into a foreign land, erected an altar and invoked God's name. Nay! if God himself had not supplied the victim, this good patriarch had sacrificed his own son. 4. Melchisedech, "a Priest of the Most High," offered bread and wine which he afterwards gave to Abraham and his soldiers on their return victorious over the five kings who had been in league against Sodom. 5. Isaac and Jacob erected altars and offered victims. 6. The holy man Job (that illustrious patriarch, who God declares had no equal) offered sacrifices for each of his children "lest they should have sinned."

And as with the Patriarchs—so also with the Gentiles—everywhere sacrifices. Sacrifices to this idol—sacrifices to that idol—sacrifices to the other. Sacrifices to false Gods it is true—but still everywhere sacrifices. Nor do these Gentile sacrifices—these sacrifices to false Gods—weaken our argument in favour of sacrifice as a necessary act of all adoration and worship. On the contrary they strengthen it; since they establish the universal feeling of mankind in favour of sacrifice as a mode of adoring God. These Gentiles wandering further and further from the civilization of the Patriarchs and the worship of the true God, yet carried along with them that innate feeling learnt from the law of nature and revealed to the Patriarchs, that Sacrifice is the truest and highest expression of worship.

But this was under the natural law—before God had revealed his will to man in any systematic and connected form. Under the Mosaic law—when God revealed his will, in the minutest particulars—we are overwhelmed with sacrifices—holocausts—expiatory—pacific. The blood of oxen, of sheep, of goats, of doves; offerings of oil, of wine, of incense, of wax, of fruits, of grain, of cakes; everything offered to God to acknowledge him the Great Lord and master; and to render him propitious to man. The scape goat, carrying out into the wilderness all the sins of the people, was a sacrifice. The loaves of propitiation placed by the officiating priest of the week every Sabbath upon the golden table (these loaves one for each tribe) were weekly sacrifices offered to God by the twelve tribes of Israel. The seven candles which burnt perpetually in the golden candelstick with seven branches—the incense burnt on the altar of perfumes—both were sacrifices.

And yet, beautiful and highly expressive of devotion as these Jewish sacrifices undoubtedly were, they (of themselves) had not, could not have any virtue. It was "not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." (Heb. X, 4) In themselves, they had no intrinsic merit and could rank no expiation. They were undoubtedly apt expressions of adoration—emphatic declarations of the sovereign power of God—humble acknowledgments that He was the sole Creator and Lord of all things; and as such must have been very powerful and very acceptable before God. But of themselves they had

no intrinsic merit and could make no expiation. It was only when offered in faith in the Redeemer to come—it was only through the cross and death of Jesus Christ, that they could become acceptable to God in atonement for sin. And then indeed they were all powerful, through the blood shed on Calvary the blood of bulls and of goats became of infinite value; the incense burnt on the altar—the candles burnt on the candelstick with seven branches—became a sacrifice of doubly sweet odor. Through the victim of Calvary the Jewish Priesthood became a true Priesthood—the Jewish altar a true altar—not a mere senseless structure of stone or of wood. These Jewish sacrifices (then) as offered in adoration to God were absolute sacrifices—as offered in atonement for sin, they were only commemorative. As the first they were pleasing to God according to the dispositions of the offerer; as the second they were infinitely pleasing because offered through the death and passion of his divine Son an infinite victim.

"But," you will say, "this is all very true as far as the Sacrifices of the Old Law are concerned, but we have no proof that Sacrifices exist under the New."

What? No proof? Then what, I ask, do those words of Jesus Christ mean? "This is my body which shall be delivered for you," or stronger still in the Protestant text, "which is now delivered for you?" What means those words? "Do this in commemoration of Me?" What means those words? "which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins?" Do these words mean nothing? or if they mean anything at all do they not plainly mean, that Christ's body was delivered by Christ for us, i.e., a sacrifice for us; and that whenever done (as He commanded) in commemoration of Him, or his death, it was a renewal of that sacrifice, which he offered. That as the Sacrifices of the Old Law were commemorative of the future Sacrifice of the Cross, and as such received their efficacy, so the Sacrifice of the Catholic Church commonly called the Mass, were to be commemorative of that same to receive their tremendous efficacy? For look at the passage and its context and the occasion. Jesus Christ is seated at supper. He has already set out on his journey to the Cross for this his last supper is perfectly connected within the order of events, and cannot be disjoined from his death. Taking bread at that last supper and giving it to his disciples he says, "This is my body which is delivered for you." Taking wine he says, "this is my blood which is shed for many unto remission of sin." Is not this sacrifice? a body delivered for men—blood shed for many—unto the remission of sin. He is using the very phraseology of the Sacrifices I delivered for you—shed for many. This is the language of the altar (and as such well understood by his Jewish hearers)—this is the language of the Priesthood—this is the language of Sacrifice. And after using this language of the Sacrifices—what does he add? "Do this in commemoration of Me." Here again more language of the altar, Do this—do what I have done, what has he done? delivered his body for us—i.e., offered his body a sacrifice soon to be immolated on the cross. Do this then he says, offer this body of mine as a commemoration—(that is in after years); and as the Jewish sacrifices have hitherto been commemorations of Me and my death in all past time; so let your Sacrifices be commemorative of me and my death for all ages to come. Do you call this no proof of Sacrifice? You admit that the death on Calvary was a sacrifice—the shedding of blood for the remission of sins; you admit, that the words at the Last Supper his talking of shedding his blood are nothing but the merest nonsense unless taken in connection with the death on the Cross—for how was his blood shed except on the Cross? I would admit that at that last supper he said, "Do this in commemoration of Me," i.e., shed this blood as I have shed it. How then can you deny, that we have a Sacrifice? Either we "do this," or we do not "do this." If we do not do this then we are recreant to Jesus Christ—then are we disobedient and disloyal to Him, who was the Son of God;—then are we rebels and traitors to the Christian religion. If we do "do this," then we do what he did; and as he offered sacrifice so also do we;—and our sacrifice is a true sacrifice as his was; and our priesthood is a true priesthood as his was; and our altar is a true altar, not a mere heap of boards.

OBJECTION.

But, you will say your sacrifice is only a mystic sacrifice.

I know not, I care not, whether it is mystic or non-mystic. It is the same sacrifice which Christ offered, nothing more nothing less. Do this—he said—what is this, whatever he did he told his priest to do, what ever sacrifice he offered—he told us to offer. Whatever power he had to offer sacrifice that same power he gave to us; whatever that "this" was this is.

But does not Jesus Christ command us to adore "in spirit and in truth?" "God" (said he to the Samaritan woman), "is a Spirit and they that adore Him must adore Him in Spirit and in Truth." Does not this do away with sacrifices?

What! is it impossible then to adore God in spirit and truth by sacrifices? Can Sacrifices and Spirit and Truth never go together? Did not Abel adore "in spirit and truth," when he offered that sacrifice with which God was well pleased? Did not Noah worship "in spirit and in truth," when he offered that holocaust which smelt as an odor of sweetness before God? Did not Abraham adore God "in spirit and in truth," when he prepared wood and the sacrificial knife where withal to sacrifice his own son? Did not Melchisedech that "Priest of the Most High," adore "in spirit and in truth," when he offered bread and wine? Did not that holy man Job—who had no compeer—adore "in spirit and in truth," when he offered sacrifice for his children "lest they should have sinned?"

My brethren! I know of only one other text of Scripture (viz, search the Scriptures) which has been as often dishonestly quoted as these words of Our Divine Saviour to the Samaritan woman, "adore in spirit and in truth." I know of none, which shew more evidently the dishonesty of the practice of quoting isolated passages from Scripture without reference to the context or to the occasion on which they were used.

The Samaritan woman acknowledged Our Saviour as a prophet; and as such, she sought from him a decision on the much disputed question, which divided the Jews and Samaritans. Our fathers (she says) worshipped on this "mountain (Gerizim); but you say, Jerusalem is the "place where men must adore;" now the words worshipped and adore here evidently mean sacrifice, since although both Samaritans and Jews adored God daily at home, as a matter of fact they sacrificed only (the one) on mount Gerizim, the other at Jerusalem. Her question then must in substance have been whether is Gerizim or Jerusalem the right place for sacrifice? And what is our Lord's reply? Does he correct her idea of sacrifice? Does he tell her that henceforth all sacrifices have to be abolished? No! he tells her that the hour cometh, when neither Gerizim nor Jerusalem shall be the proper place for sacrifice. To interpret his words otherwise is to accuse Him of a cruel enigmatical answer to the woman, who had given him water to drink! Is to accuse Him of giving a stone when asked for a loaf; is to accuse the Saviour of the world of seeking this poor woman's damnation by allowing her to take an erroneous idea from his words, rather than give her that light which he came to spread. No! my brethren, for one would rather believe with the Catholic church of all ages, that he takes her own words out of her mouth, and using them, as she understood them, tells her plainly, that the time will come, when another sacrifice superior in spirit and in truth to both those of Gerizim and Jerusalem will be used