

surpl[us]es with the full staff of professors and the requirements of an institution worthy of the prestige and position of the Presbyterian Church, and it will scarcely be disputed, had we to begin college work, only one would be established now. What hinders amalgamation? The buildings? We have long been familiar with the objection against female education in nunneries, yet a certain class find a culture there not found in our Protestant schools. The success of the Brantford college shows the need; the Church might do worse than to set apart those college buildings not needed to the overtaking of that want, and be ecclesiastically the gainer thereby, and then the buildings may be retained and made truly useful.

I will venture the assertion that no business consideration will be urged at this juncture for continuing three colleges, and I scarcely think their continuance will be justified on the ground of Church necessity and God's glory.

Shall we say the difficulties are sentimental? The writer does not sneer at sentiment. Man without sentiment is brutish, and sentiment is worthy of respect. But some sentiment must suffer for a general good; the question is, which. Now, which college claims the strongest consideration. I do not know that Montreal College, through its respected Principal, would ask any consideration on that ground, but on the firmer basis of work done. Let its claim be granted; but would the work suffer materially by its removal to Kingston? That question deserves to be fairly put and answered. Knox College has its claim from its early struggles, its historic associations with a movement that must ever form a bright line in history's page, and its students are many and honoured. Yet it is the monument of a division which is now rapidly healing, whilst Queen's comes back to the United Church as the child of the undisrupted Church, none the worse for its treatment at the hand of the section to whose care it fell. Sentiment thus preponderates Queen'sward, and Knox might still be perpetuated at Kingston as the Theological Hall. Old Queen's and Knox—another bond of union, knitting still closer the erewhile disintegrated sections of the now united Church. Is there any real objection in the light of Presbyterianism as it stands related to its work in Canada, and, therefore, to the world, that can hold against this simple proposition? Queen's University is rooted in Kingston; let it be a rallying point. Metropolitan cities are not in experience the best for collegiate work. Let its Theological Faculty be named Knox College; make that University and College, as we then could well afford to, second to none on the continent; and let the buildings at Montreal and Toronto be utilized in some such way as already indicated.

If endowment is not a near future, some of our colleges seem doomed to go. Let us shun the disgrace of failure, and set to work at once to place our college work beyond a peradventure. B.

#### ARCHBISHOP LYNCH'S CONTROVERSIAL WORK.—VII.

On page 28, in answer to the question, "Do Catholics worship images of Christ and his saints?" his Grace says, "No, but they cherish and honor them as representatives and memorials." This is exactly what intelligent heathens say regarding their worship of idols. We shall, however, see by and by that the great mass of Romanists do really worship images. But let us hear what he next says: "All civilized people cherish and honor mementos of their dearest friends, such as busts, pictures and photographs, etc. To dishonor or spit upon the pictures of royalty, or the flag of a nation, would be considered a grievous insult to the sovereign or country." Let us first look for a moment at these two sentences as specimens of English composition. Archbishop Lynch, would your grace tell me how one can "cherish" a bust or picture? I must put a bad mark at your name for that. Next, you say, "pictures and photographs." Now, the word "picture" means a representation of a visible object by lines or colors on a flat surface. A photograph is, therefore, an individual belonging to the class described by the general term "picture." Do any of your flock ever make your Grace a present of fruit and apples? Bad mark No. 2. "Etc." at the end of the first sentence means "and so forth." Therefore you say, "busts, pictures and photographs, and so forth." Strike out the first "and." Bad mark No. 3. In the beginning of the second sentence, you say, "To dis-

honor or spit upon." Spitting on is just one way of dishonoring. Whether does your Grace eat fish or salmon on Friday? Whether was the printer of your little Look paid in cash or gold? Another bad mark for you. "The pictures of royalty" is not a very elegant expression, but I shall let it pass. But let us now look at the reasoning in these sentences. To dishonor whatever belongs to an individual or a society, dishonors the possessor. It is not essential that it be a bust, picture, or flag. For example, a Fenian can show his hatred of the Queen or the Saxon in many ways besides dishonoring the portrait of the former, or the flag of the latter. He can do so as well, for instance, by writing the name "Victoria," or "Saxon," on a piece of board, and then five hundred times kicking it, stabbing it, sending a bullet through it, or throwing a rotten egg or mud at it. When Pat is wearying for a fight at Donnybrook Fair, he sometimes takes off his coat, and carries it in such a way that the tails sweep the ground just as the ah-skirts of ahem ladies' dresses often do. Then he cries out, "Will any gentleman thread on me tail?" Should any one do so, it is in Pat's eyes a grievous insult, and in a moment his shillelah is heard clanking the skull of the offender, unless the latter be on his guard. But let us go on. I pass for the present over the Scripture proofs in favor of the use of images which the Archbishop brings forward. He says (page 28) that "images of Christ crucified and of his blessed mother and saints are erected in churches, on the highways and mountains as an open Bible. Pictures and images tend to raise the mind to think more earnestly on the original or person represented." The words, "in churches, on the highways and mountains," are another piece of faulty composition, but let them pass. If the Romish Church would make the Bible an open one to her people, it would do them infinitely more good than images or pictures can. Facts make as great havoc of the Archbishop's argument about images "raising the mind," as the cannons did of the Sepoys which were blown from them. Scott very truly says that the use of images as aids to devotion "only tends to distract the mind, to interrupt the simple exercise of faith, to excite spurious affections, to deprave the imagination with gross and false notions of heavenly things, and to introduce either absurd superstition or wild enthusiasm." On page 29, reference is made to the statues of "patriots, generals, and poets" which adorn the highways in Protestant countries. No one, however, for a moment, thinks of bowing his head or knee to them or kissing their feet. His Grace next says on the same page, "In the House of Lords and Commons in England, and also in the Parliament of Canada, members bend the knee or bow the head in passing the throne as an act of loyalty and reverence towards the authority or sovereign who sits, or is supposed to sit there." Bad grammar again, your Grace. The words "House of Lords and Commons" mean that the Lords and the Commons form one body. Now, the "House of Lords" and the "House of Commons" are perfectly distinct bodies. "Loyalty and reverence." What distinction can you make between the two in this case? "Authority or sovereign." Would not such an expression as "sovereign, or the representative of royalty," be better? It is only in the chamber of the House of Lords in England where the throne is. I speak now simply with reference to the two Houses of Parliament. It is only in the Senate Chamber at Ottawa where the throne is. Well, it certainly is the duty of the members, when they pass in front of the throne or of the chair, to pay becoming respect to the sovereign, the Governor-General, the Speaker or the chairman, as the case may be. But it would be ridiculous to bow the knee or head to an empty throne or chair, though I have seen it done in the Parliament of Canada. But let us hear what the Archbishop further says on the same page (29). "There is a great difference between the adoration due to God, and the reverence due to His servants." Here he is perfectly orthodox; but I cannot say the same regarding the next sentence, where he says, "It would be a damnable idolatry to adore any but God; but to pay the reverence of bowing to sacred images is not idolatry." Here he means that "sacred images" are servants of God! There is a statue at Rome which formerly was one of Jupiter, and was worshipped as such by the heathens. Well, the Church of Rome changed it into one of Jew Peter, and thus made it "a servant of God" by taking the thunderbolts out of its hand and putting in their place a pair of keys. As such it has been, and still is, truly worshipped. The Arch-

bishop sees nothing wrong in bowing to "sacred images." But God forbids it, and that is enough. In Exodus xx. 5, He says, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them." The word here rendered "bow down," means in the Hebrew a certain posture of the body which is designed to express reverence. It is the same which is so rendered where Abraham is said to have bowed himself to the children of Heth (Gen. xxiii. 7), and where Joseph relates his dreams (xxxvii. 7, 9). Even though it may mean, as Gesenius says, "falling upon the knees, and then touching the forehead to the ground," we are not at liberty even to merely bow to "sacred images." The passage in Exodus referred to forbids us to pay them any outward form of reverence. The Archbishop says, "We bow every day to our friends in the street, but don't adore them." Bowing to our friends is, however, a very different thing from bowing to "sacred images." I am sure that his Grace never says when he bows to an image of St. Peter, "How d'y'e do, Holy Father? I hope your Holiness is well." His Grace says, "To respect the sacred scriptures because the letters in it represent God's word, to kiss pictures of St. Peter, St. Paul, etc., are acts of reverence to God or to His saints." The letters in the scriptures do not represent God's word. They are God's word—His written language to us. The word "it" in the sentence just quoted should be "them." "Scriptures" is a plural noun. There are pictures of God the Father in which He is represented as an old man. Of course, his Grace would approve of kissing these, for he would regard it as an act of reverence to God. He next says, "Would it be idolatry in a mother to kiss the picture of her darling child whom she knows to be in heaven?" How does she know that it is in heaven? May it not still be in purgatory? She may be guilty of idolatry, for she may love her child more than God, and thus make an idol of it. Her kiss would be one of affection, not of reverence. The Archbishop, therefore, approves of kissing pictures of saints to express reverence for those whom they represent. Well now, a word in your ear, your Grace. Do you ever give the picture of St. Catharine, St. Bridget, St. Genevieve, St. Ursula, or any other lady saint a "wee bit kiss,"—of course not to express affection, but merely reverence? Excuse me for making you blush like a maiden of eighteen. I should have remembered that it is against the rules for Roman Catholic clergymen to kiss lady pictures. They are allowed to do so only to gentlemen ones. I fancy I see you kissing St. Peter. The mother in the case supposed would not kiss her child's foot. Is not kissing the Pope's foot going too far in the way of reverence to the Pope, even admitting that he is a servant of God? Very few of the Popes have been canonized. The Archbishop says, "The Emperor Leo, the image breaker, asked St. Stephen, bishop and martyr, whether he believed that men trampled on Christ by trampling on His image. 'God forbid,' said the martyr." That is to say, "God forbid that I should believe that men trample on Christ by trampling on His image." Och! me darlint, it's nesilf that's shocked that an intelligent and well eddicated clergyman loike your Lordship's Rivirince can't express his idayas better.

But here I must pause, saying regarding my remarks on what his Grace says about image worship, "To be continued." T. F.

Metis, Que.

#### CONVERSION OF ROMISH PRIESTS.

The Treasurer of the Board of French Evangelization acknowledges with thanks the following additional contributions in aid of the ex-priests now studying under the care of the Board:—Rev. T. Fenwick, Metis, \$4; Anonymous, \$1; M. White, Woodstock, Ont., \$2; W. A. M., Malvern, \$5; Geo. Davidson, Berlin, \$10; Rev. J. M. Goodwillie, Camlachie, \$2.

Additional contributions respectfully solicited. These should be forwarded to the Treasurer, Rev. R. H. Warden, 210 St. James Street, Montreal.

#### Births, Marriages and Deaths.

##### BIRTH.

At London, on the 25th inst., the wife of John Cameron, Esq., of a daughter.

##### MEETINGS OF PRESBYTERY.

MONTREAL.—In St. Paul's Church, Montreal, on Tuesday, 2nd April, at 11 a.m.

WHITBY.—At Duffin's Creek, on Tuesday, 16th April, at 11 a.m.

STRATFORD.—In Knox Church, Stratford, on Tuesday, 9th April, at 9:30 a.m.