

sons for visible separation, and other good men were driven out from its communion. They took the doctrine of the Church with them, and their standards, government and practice were in nowise altered. They worshipped in no chapels or meeting-houses, repudiated the name "Dissenter," and were recognized in Protestant Christendom as a Church of Christ and part of the Church universal. But while good men went forth from the Church of Scotland in spite of their adherence to the Church's catholicity, other good men for the sake of that doctrine remained in the midst of what they acknowledged to be wrong. The bitterness of separation wore away in time, unions took the place of divisions, and finally none refused to her sister communions a place in the catholic Church. Once only in the closing year of last century did the Church of Scotland cut herself off from communion with any other section of the Church of Christ for the purpose of excluding from her pulpits evangelical ministers of the Church of England. It was a great mistake and will never be repeated.

Episcopalians may decry our orders and exclude us from their pulpits, but for the setting forth of gospel truth ours are open to them. The Baptists may refuse our members a seat at the Lord's Table; they shall nevertheless if they choose partake in our communion. The Methodists are dissenters, from the Church of England standpoint, and, according to our views of truth, are one-sided in doctrine; but our Presbyterian Church knows no dissenters, and, spite of differences, calls them brethren. Nay, inasmuch as the Protestant Ecumenical Council has not yet sat in judgment on the Greek and Roman and other apostate Churches, we still receive their baptism in the name of the Trinity, even though Presbyterians have ever held that no baptism is valid but that administered by an ordained pastor of the Church. We believe neither in Pope nor bishop, hold anti-pedo-baptism and congregational government to be unscriptural, reject Arminianism, Ritualism and Latitudinarianism, but we have for all that strong faith in the holy catholic Church.

I have already indicated that the idea which Presbyterians formed of the Church was no mere definition for the mind, but a ruling principle that manifested itself in their relations with Christendom and with the world at large. Presbyterian Churches were local only in name and in matters of government. They recognized their true position as sections of the one visible Church, and strove for that Church's unity. Thus we find Zwingle and Oecolampadius, the Swiss reformers, tenderly and earnestly pleading for union with Luther and Melancthon; and John a Lasco of Poland, not long after, using his utmost endeavors to combine the Reformed and Lutheran confessions in that country. When the Heidelberg Catechism was published in 1562 as an exposition of the views held by the Reformed Church in Germany, it was at once translated into many languages and adopted by other Presbyterian Churches of Europe. The Dutch Synod of Dort was in intention, if not in fact, a Protestant Ecumenical Council, an invitation to assist in its deliberations being extended to theologians of all the Reformed Churches. Switzerland was for a long time the visible centre of Presbyterian union. The Reformed in Germany and the Netherlands, in Scotland and France, in Bohemia, Hungary and Poland, in Italy and in Spain, held communication with the Swiss Churches and with one another in the land of Zwingle and the adopted country of Calvin. And yet not one of them was an offshoot from Geneva. Even Cyrillus Lucaris, the patriarch of Constantinople, who presented to Charles I. of England the famous Alexandrian MS. of the Scriptures, visited that centre of religious interest, and was preparing to carry Presbyterian doctrine and principles into the Greek Church in Turkey, when Mohammedan suspicions cut short his life. The relations of the Scottish Church were principally with Switzerland, France and Holland. The connection of John Knox with Geneva, I need not dwell upon. Many other Scottish ministers were on terms of intimacy with their Swiss brethren. As for France, it was ever a home for the wandering Scot. "Fidele comme un Ecossais" had passed into a proverb there. Knox preached in the Huguenot churches, and Welch, his son-in-law, became a French pastor. Andrew Melville taught theology at Sedan, and Boyd and Cameron were professors in Saumur. In the early part of the seventeenth century, fourteen Scotch ministers had their names on the Synod roll of the French Church. Holland was a refuge for the distressed in Covenanting times, and, with its Presbytery of banished Scot-

tish ministers, did much for the maintenance of religious ordinances in Scotland, by educating and ordaining young men who were not afraid of the persecutor's sword. Calderwood, Livingstone and Brown were honored names in the Church of the Low Countries. But the sympathies of Scottish Presbyterianism were wider still. Collections amounting to large sums—in one case over 100,000 pounds Scots—were made from 1604 onwards for the persecuted Churches of Switzerland, France, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, and the Reformed in Denmark, and fasts were appointed in connection with the distressed state of the Churches in France, Bohemia and Holland. The French Church also, in the midst of its own trials, aided many refugees from Spain and other countries, ransomed numerous captives carried into slavery by African pirates, helped the Piedmontese with money, of which it sorely stood in need itself, and interceded with their persecutor and with the French king on their behalf. This Church must also be added to those which strove for Protestant union; for, in 1603, we find it corresponding with the Churches of Germany and Switzerland, Holland, England and Scotland, with a view to a conference in which the Lutherans might be induced to join the brotherhood of the Reformed. The Church of England belonged to this brotherhood till the days of Laud and his unfortunate king, but when the Commonwealth came, the sympathies of all save the one little Episcopal Church of the Moravian Brethren were transferred to the men of the Westminster Assembly and their successors. The Westminster Assembly itself conceived the design of uniting all the Churches of Protestant Christendom, as Calvin had thought of attempting long before. They all believed in the Holy Catholic Church.

(To be continued.)

ARCHBISHOP LYNCIP'S CONTROVERSIAL WORK.—VII.

We come now to the Archbishop's arguments from scripture in favor of the use of images in religious worship. He says on page 28, "God Himself ordered images to be made (Num. xxi. 8). 'And the Lord said to Moses, make a brazen serpent and set it up for a sign; whosoever being struck shall look on it shall live.'" It was to be made, not for a help to devotion, but a means of cure for the serpent-bitten Israelites. True, it was a type of Christ (John iii. 14, 15). But the Hebrew words *al nes*, rendered in the Vulgate "for a sign," do not mean that, but "on a pole," as in our version. The preposition *al* is used in such expressions as "on the head," "on a throne," and "on a bed." In Numbers xxvi. 10, where it is said that certain persons "became a sign," literally "were for a sign," we find in the original not *al nes*, but *l'nes*. The first end which the brazen serpent was meant to serve was that of a means of cure. As such, it was a type of Christ. Its power to heal was wholly owing to the appointment of God, as was the power of the sprinkled blood to keep away the destroying angel from the homes of the Israelites, and of bathing seven times in the Jordan to cleanse Naaman's leprosy. When it ceased to be a means of cure, its value was at an end. It was then only *Nehushtan*, "a piece of brass" (2 Kings xviii. 4). Hence, Hezekiah did only what was right when he broke it in pieces, because the children of Israel burned incense to it. His doing so would have been a great sin, if the brazen serpent had, of itself, been a sign. But let us now look at the manner in which it was to be used. There was no command to bow the head or the knee to it, burn lights or incense before it, or embrace or kiss it. The only thing to be done was simply to look at it. Only a part of the Israelites were commanded to do so—those who were suffering from the bites of the fiery serpents. There was only one brazen serpent. The Israelites neither had copies of it hanging in their tents, nor did they carry them on their bodies. There is, therefore, not even one point in which the use of the brazen serpent by the Israelites, as God commanded, and the use of images by the Romish Church, agree. There is, however, a very close one between the use of the brazen serpent by the Jews in the days of Hezekiah, and the latter.

It is a wonder that some church has not the brazen serpent among its relics. Though Hezekiah—bad Romanist that he was—broke it in pieces, angels could have put them together again as easily as they carried the Virgin's house to Loretto, and Pilate's stairway to

Rome. It would have been nothing wonderful if the whole serpent had been in two or three churches, and pieces of it in several others.

The Archbishop next says (same page), "God also ordered cherubims to be made and placed around the ark of the covenant." One would naturally suppose from this that there were at least *four* cherubim—one at each side of the ark. There were, however, only *two*. "Moses made two cherubim of gold" (Exodus xxxvii. 7). How could two cherubim be placed around the ark? Could two Orange Young Britons surround his Grace? Further, the cherubim were not placed *around* the ark, but on it. "On the two ends of the mercy-seat" (7). "The cherubim spread out their wings on high, and covered with their wings over the mercy-seat, with their faces one to another: even to the mercy-seat-ward were the faces of the cherubim" (9). Yet, his Grace says that they were placed *around* the ark!! Is this interpretation of Scripture according to "the unanimous consent of the fathers"? I fear that the R. C. Archbishop of Toronto studies his Breviary more than he does his Bible. I fear that his "open Bible" is chiefly "sacred images." We have seen that he calls them a sort of open Bible. But let us see what proof in favor of image worship the cherubim are. What this form was, we are not told. We have reason to believe that they did not represent "anything in the heavens above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth." There were only two of them, as has already been stated. None saw them but the High Priest, and he only for a short time one day in the year, when he went into the Holy of Holies. We have no proof that he had then to do any act of reverence whatever to them. If the Archbishop's Church were to use images as the Old Testament Church used the cherubim, she would have only two images, and these would be kept in a room into which only the Pope would go, and that for a little while one day in the year, and then he would only look at them.

These are the only arguments from Scripture in favor of image-worship which the "learned prelate" brings forward. Truly, they need to be examined through a piece of smoked glass, so great is the brightness which streams from them.

In the days of Origen the Christians were accustomed to shut their eyes in prayer. Images could not therefore have been helps to them.

To use an Irish mode of speaking, there is in the undivided Romish Church a very great variety of opinion regarding the degree of honor which should be given to "sacred images." Some, of whom St. Thomas Aquinas is one, maintain that the very same honor should be given to them which is due to those whom they represent. Others do not go so far, but they differ among themselves.

In many places, lights are kept constantly burning before the image of the Virgin, yea, sometimes, incense is offered to it. These things are relics—of heathenism. What would his Grace think of a mother's keeping a light constantly burning before the picture of her dead child, yea, sometimes, burning incense before it? Many images are believed by Romanists to act as human beings. For example, they move their eyes, shed tears, sweat, give sight to the blind, speech to the dumb, and life to the dead. What great wonders have been wrought by the Bambino or Holy Doll at Rome!

I cannot see how any man who knows the difference between his head and his heels, can believe that such pictures as the following—which are very common among Roman Catholics—are aids to devotion: God the Father is represented as an old man with a triangle around His head, though we are expressly forbidden to make representations of Him. He and the Son are represented as putting a crown on the head of the Virgin, who stands on a half-moon and a snake. In a picture of the Annunciation, she is represented as arrayed in a rich dress, kneeling before a richly-carved desk. She does not appear to be in humble circumstances. If the picture referred to be a true representation of the scene, then she acted very meanly, yea, in fact, was guilty of falsehood, when she afterwards offered to the Lord a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons, for she could well have afforded a lamb, and, therefore, she was not free from sin. In "The Sacred Heart of Jesus," His heart is represented on His garments, surrounded by a wreath of thorns. Blood is dropping from it. At the top is a cross, at the bottom of which are flames. In "The Sacred Heart of Mary," her heart is also represented on her