

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

NOTES FROM SCOTLAND.

KINROSS AND LOCHLEVEN.

To the Canadian visiting Scotland, nothing offers greater attractions or excites astonishment and curiosity quicker than the number and grandeur of the ancient ruins, with their interesting memorabilia. Many of these were once wrested from the arch-foes of religious liberty, after a long reign of fires and persecutions, and thus deeply ingrained into the nation's blood and memory, their history has been transmitted from sire to son by historian and poet, but chiefly, perhaps, by the fireside tale. Hence we find everywhere an aged patriarch whose memory is fraught with these legends or grandfatherly stories, willing to steal "fire from the fountain of the past to glorify the present." Specially interesting and instructive to one who by birth, early education, and reading can fully sympathize with these lovers of mountain-top liberty is the retreat to one of these rural homes for a night's lodging.

It is only when we handle the horrible instruments of torture, and actually behold the dark sepulchres and hideous underground dungeons in which our martyr ancestors daily suffered fraud, contempt, and abuse, that the mind rises to a true appreciation of their self-sacrifice, soul-endurance, and faithfulness to the truth. Thrust into these foul vaults, numbers of those heaven-sustained saints lived years a living death, yet not exempted by even the "privilege of death and burial" from pains and wrongs. Allow me a single illustration of these allusions. In Surling cemetery, which in natural and artistic beauty seems perfect, inclosed in a glass case, are beautifully carved life-size figures of two sisters, and an angel standing beside them. On the statue is the following inscription: "Through faith Margaret Wilson, a youthful maiden, chose rather to depart and be with Christ than to disown His only cause and covenant, to own Erastian usurpation, and to conform to Prelacy enforced by cruel laws. Bound to a stake within flood mark."

"Margaret, virgin martyr of the ocean wave, with her like-minded sister Agnes."

What intensity and reality of feeling and association is created by a walk among the tombs of such heroes as the Erskines, Campbells, Bruces, Burns, Chalmers, Livingstone, Duff, or over such fields as Bannockburn, Surling, Flodden, Auldearn, Culloden. Our school-days' history has, like a prophecy, become real, and boyhood's dreams have become real life. Such seems the advantage of actually inspecting any object of study.

But there are other objects and scenes of primitive grandeur equally demanding survey and a particular description. Such, for example, are the wooded mountain, bosky dell, enlivened by the running stream which sings a song of undying love. How delightful to roam among unpeopled glens and mountainous retirement—regions consecrated to oldest time. Here the mighty works of the Creator stand in solitary magnificence as they came from his hand, unmingled and untarnished by the puny works of man, the greatest of which would here sink into utter insignificance. It is here the conviction forces itself upon us that the Maker of all is reigning in terrible majesty, where all around we find

"The shadowy glen, the sweeping strath,
The deep ravine, the rugged path;
By dizzy crag and waterfall,
Untrod and unapproached by all
Save him whose heart may seldom quail
In peril's hour—the hardy Gael."

Nor can we overlook the lochs of Scotland, usually surrounded by high mountain ranges or cliffs, which under the skillful hand of the forester are beautiful with fir, birch, larch or plane. They are mostly approachable only by coach, unless you adopt the natural means of progression, through devious vale oft interspersed with sweet rural farms, the seats of pastoral love and innocence; or spiry dome, "around whose hallowed walls our fathers slumber;" or here and yonder gay beauteous villas bosomed in the woods, "like constellations in the starry sky." In perfect silence, Nature here blazons abroad her own glories.

The steep slopes on either side being streaked with blooming heather and the vivid green of patches of ferns, the crevices of the rocks adorned by beds of beautiful mosses and lichens, while above, beneath, and around you, rabbits disport themselves among the

brackens on the green sward, truly here is blissful solitude, uninterrupted joy.

These perennial attractions divide attention pretty equally with hydropathic institutions and the seaside. To one or other, according to means, leisure, and taste, there is a constant and ever-increasing flow of tourists. Had we such society at home as resort hither, how quickly would our inland lakes and rivers become popular. Not more wild, unfruitful and unpoetic is the appearance of Muskoka than that presented only a few years ago by the highlands of Scotland, now the most charming scenery in Britain.

The physical geography of Loch Leven differs widely from that of any other. It is quite inferior in magnitude, rural elegance, and scenery, being only three miles long and one in width, and almost destitute of plantation; yet it is a noble sheet of water, variegated with several well-wooded islands, and lying in the embrace of verdant hills. It derives its celebrity from the castle situated on one of the islands. The tower of this very ancient structure, probably built before the ninth century, is in good preservation. Loch Leven Island is also invested with considerable interest. On this island was a Culdee Hermitage, which for centuries of darkness and violence kept alive the lamp of a civilizing religion. Close by is the birth-place of Bruce the poet, and numerous are the anecdotes narrated of daring and successful exploits by Wallace.

Lochleven was a royal demesne, a suite of apartments having been reserved for the sovereign's use on particular occasions, such as hawking and fishing. Queen Mary, soon after her retirement from France, made this her occasional residence. Here at her own request she had an interview with John Knox. Shortly afterwards a conspiracy was formed which contemplated the imprisonment of the Queen for life in this grim fortress, but the plot was discovered. However, almost immediately after this she was one evening hurried from her capital city, Edinburgh, and next morning found her a miserable captive within its walls. Here she had to sign a formal resignation of her crown.

George Douglas, brother to the Laird of Lochleven, sought every opportunity to set the captive princess at liberty, but an accomplice betrayed him and he was banished from the island. Success had almost crowned another scheme of George by which he hoped to have the Queen conveyed ashore under the assumed character of a laundress, but disappointment again supervened. At length the Queen of Scots effected her escape from the island by the aid of Willie Douglas, a lad of sixteen years. Willie obtained the keys of the Castle while waiting at the supper table in the capacity of a page, by letting his napkin drop over them as they lay on the table beside the Laird's plate; but some say Willie had the privilege of the keys often, and got them to let out a gentlewoman of the Queen's, but let out herself, disguised in a gentlewoman's apparel, shut the gates, cast the keys into the Loch, and rowed her to the land, where George Douglas received her. Doubtless Mary had a joyous welcome from loyal hearts, as she sprang from the boat on to the "green shore of Kinross." W. K. M.

Sept. 4th, 1878.

ARCHBISHOP LYNCH'S CONTROVERSIAL WORK.—XVII.

An Indulgence, his Grace tells us, "does not mean forgiveness of sins, nor permission to commit sin, nor not to pay one's honest debts, but it means the remission of canonical penances or other temporary punishments due to sin when the guilt of it has already been forgiven by the sacrament of penance. A magistrate often commutes imprisonment into a fine; so in the Catholic Church fasting and other penitential work are sometimes commuted into alms, and other good works" (54). Here, his Grace makes a distinction between committing sin, and refusing to pay one's honest debts. Is not the second only a form of the first? He speaks of the guilt of sin being forgiven by the sacrament of penance. How can penance forgive sin? How can guilt be forgiven? By "temporary punishment," I suppose his Grace means "temporal." A fine is a form of punishment. Is it not then, in the highest degree absurd, to speak of punishing people by making them do good works? More on the last point anon.

"Objection.—Protestants say that when the sin is forgiven there is no temporal punishment due. An-

swer.—They do not hold this in practice" (page 55). As little, your Grace, do they hold it in theory.

"Sin and its punishment alone exclude from the kingdom of heaven" (page 55). How can punishment exclude from the kingdom of heaven? Is not exclusion from it, punishment?

"The Church exercised this power when St. Paul granted an indulgence to the incestuous Corinthian (2 Cor. x.), forgiving, as He says 'in the person of Christ,' the penitent, on account of his extraordinary grief" (page 56). We are not told that this penitent gave Paul any money for his indulgence, or—as his Grace would say—gave alms in place of doing penance. Elsewhere, as we saw a moment ago, the Archbishop says that an indulgence does not mean forgiveness of sins. Here, he says that Paul forgave sins by an indulgence. He, therefore, completely contradicts himself.

"There must be a just and proper cause for granting these indulgences" (page 56). What more just and proper cause, your Grace, could there be than a few dollars?

"The penitent must perform many acts of reparation" (page 56). These acts, as we have seen, can be commuted into almsgiving, that is giving to the church—the highest kind of almsgiving.

"The sin must always be forgiven by a hearty and true repentance before an indulgence can be gained" (page 56). As I have said before, how can a "hearty and true repentance" forgive sin? What better evidence of his repentance can one give, than by giving a few dollars to the Church? Is not golden sorrow the best kind of sorrow? If one will not give, why should he be forgiven?

We come now to what his Grace says on the subject of Transubstantiation. "Christ changes bread and wine into His own body and blood" (p. 57). "Under the form of bread, Christ has declared that He is whole and entire; body and blood, soul and divinity" (p. 65). "In partaking of the blessed Eucharist, either under the form of bread or under the form of wine, communicants partake of the true body and blood of Christ under each species" (p. 66). If the consecrated bread and wine, are, each, the body and blood, soul and divinity of Christ, then, according to his Grace, He acted foolishly in using both bread and wine when He instituted the Last Supper, for the bread or the wine alone, was quite sufficient. On page 57, the Archbishop says: "He * * can change bread into His body and wine into His blood." This does not harmonize with the statement just reviewed.

The objection, "How could Christ hold His body in His own hands?" seems to Protestants a most powerful one against the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Let us hear how the "learned prelate" disposes of it. "How," he says, "could He multiply loaves and fishes, and grain in the earth, but by His Almighty power? This wonderful action of Christ at His Last Supper far transcends the comprehension of man. But the love of God for His creatures, being infinite, induced Him to do what finite love cannot comprehend. A God who would become man and die on a cross for His creatures would descend to incomprehensible depths to gain their love" (p. 59). Even what is called the "second sight," could not enable one to see what bearing his Grace's words have on the objection quoted.

Your Grace, it was utterly impossible for Christ to hold His body in His own hands. You acknowledge that He, the Son of God, became man. It was absolutely necessary that He should in all essential respects be like His brethren. Now, no creature, even the highest, can be in more than one place at a time. Being everywhere present, is true only of God. The doctrine of Transubstantiation is, therefore, a virtual denial of Christ's humanity. The Christ of your Church, cannot be a Saviour.

The Archbishop gives two reasons why the cup is withheld from the laity (p. 66). 1. "It is not essential." Therefore, when Christ used the cup, He did what was altogether unnecessary. 2. "The command 'Drink ye all of this' was not given to the faithful in general." The commands regarding eating the bread and drinking of the cup, were given to the same persons. If then, the laity have no right to the cup, neither have they any to the bread. If they have a right to the bread, so they have, also, to the cup. I challenge his Grace to answer me. As we have already seen, he says, "A person should wish to perform everything enjoined by our Lord" (p. 44). His Church, however, disobeys his command, "Drink ye all of this cup."