

ARCHBISHOP LYNCH'S CONTROVERSIAL WORK.—XIV.

His Grace gives the best of all reasons as far as mere assertion goes—why Catholics "hold so strongly to tradition." It is, he says, "because the Holy Scripture orders them to do so" (p. 24). His attempts to prove this are, however, utter failures. Let us look for a moment at the passages which he quotes—two in number—both from 2 Thessalonians. The first is chap. ii. v. 15, where the Apostle says, "Stand fast, and hold the traditions you have learned, whether by word or our epistle." The second is chap. iii. v. 6, where he says, "not according to the tradition they have received of us." These traditions were doctrines which the Apostle had taught the Thessalonian converts, and commands he had given them "by word of mouth," and in writing. They were, therefore, very different from what the Church of Rome calls tradition. In 1 Cor. xi. 23, Paul says, "For I have received of the Lord Jesus that which also I delivered unto you." In the same epistle, chap. xi. v. 3, he says, "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received." In these passages, the word rendered "delivered," is in the original, a part of the verb from which the noun rendered "tradition" is derived. The traditions spoken of in them are of the very same nature as those spoken of in the passages quoted by His Grace. Protestants, therefore, receive tradition properly so called. The Apostles can now no longer speak to us by the living voice, but in their writings they "deliver" to us that which they have "received of the Lord Jesus." It would be well if His Grace's Church were to reject all traditions, except those in the apostolic writings.

The Archbishop tries to "turn the tables" on the Protestants. He says (p. 25) that they themselves "believe in many traditions." These, according to him, lack only 998 of 1,000. Let us notice just two of them. (1) The keeping of the first day of the week as the Sabbath. Protestants keep it as such, because they believe that they have Scriptural authority for so doing. (2) "The eating of blood though forbidden in the first Council of Jerusalem." His Grace must mean the *not* eating of blood. Many refrain from using blood as an article of food, because they believe that they ought not to do so. No one, however, eats it because he believes that he ought to do so. The clause "though forbidden in the first Council of Jerusalem," is, therefore, here a very ridiculous one. Protestants who refrain from eating blood, do so, either because they believe that Scripture forbids it, or that it is hurtful to health. Of tradition they make no account whatever.

His Grace further says (same page), "All that Christ and His apostles said and did have not been recorded; were they the world would not contain all the books that should be written," (John xxi. 25). For "have" and "they," read "has" and "it." Had the Holy Spirit seen it to be needful for our salvation that we should know more of what they said and did, more would have been recorded. To supplement the Old and New Testaments by tradition, is virtually to say that the Spirit of God is not infinitely wise.

On page 26, the Archbishop asks, "Was not the Virgin Mary a mere ordinary woman?" Either of these adjectives is sufficient. In reply, he says, "By no means; she was not an ordinary woman of whom the Scripture says, 'that all nations shall call her blessed' (Luke i. 48)." His Grace does not quote Scripture here very correctly. The passage referred to gives Mary's own words regarding herself. She does not say "all nations," but "all generations." She also says, "From henceforth all generations," etc.; that is, from the time when the Holy Ghost should come on her. She would be called blessed, not on account of anything in herself, but only on account of being the mother of the promised Messiah. According to his Grace's reasoning, certain strange doctrines can be proved, of which the following are specimens. The children of the virtuous woman "arise up and call her blessed" (Prov. xxxi. 28). Therefore, she is not a "mere ordinary woman." The Holy Spirit says, "Blessed is the people that know the joyful sound" (Ps. lxxiii. 15). Therefore, every one belonging to it is more than "a mere ordinary creature." Christ says, "Blessed are the poor in spirit," etc. (Matt. v. 3-11); and again, "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed" (John xx. 29). Therefore, they are more than "mere ordinary creatures."

"She alone is called, and is in reality, the mother of Jesus Christ the Son of God (Luke i. 43)," [page 26]. This utterly demolishes those heretics—if such there be—who believe that Christ had more mothers than one. Of course, the Virgin Mary was not the mother of the Son of God. She was the mother only of the body of Him who was both the Son of God and the Son of Man.

"She was no ordinary woman to whom an archangel was sent from heaven and addressed in the most honorable title of full of grace, whom the Son of God obeyed and loved above all other women, as every good son will love his own mother," [page 26]. Had composition, your Grace. You cannot say, "to whom an archangel.... addressed." You should say, "and whom he addressed," etc. Is not "loving and obeying" the natural order? It does not sound strange to speak of Christ's *loving* his mother more than any other woman, but it does to speak of His *obeying* her more than any other. Was there any other to whom He was by the law of God bound to be subject? It was absolutely necessary that Christ as our Redeemer should be "made of a woman." Of course, then, He was bound to love her more than any other woman and to obey her. The original of the word rendered "full of grace," does not express moral character, but honor bestowed on one. The Protestant translation, "highly favored," is the correct one. In the 30th verse, it is said, "Thou hast found favor with God." This is the same as the expression so often used in the Old Testament, "To find grace in one's eyes or sight." Here, the word rendered "favor" is the noun from which the one in the 28th verse, rendered in the Vulgate "full of grace," is formed. In Eph. i. 6, a word having the same origin as the latter is correctly rendered in the Protestant version "made accepted."

"In fine, God's mother is no ordinary woman." Here, his Grace sums up the arguments which he has already brought forward to prove that the Virgin Mary was "no mere ordinary woman." But if nothing be added to nothing the whole is nothing, and it is so in this case. God has His being of Himself, and therefore He never had a mother.

Let us pass on now to the 41st page. Here his Grace tells us why Romanists do not eat flesh on Fridays. It is "because Christ predicted that when He would be taken away from His disciples they would fast (Matt. ix. 15). So Friday being the day on which He died, it is meet that His followers should mortify themselves by abstaining from the most nutritious food. Since He suffered death for our sins on a Friday we should mortify the flesh for them also on that day." According to his Grace, refraining from eating flesh on Friday is fasting. Elsewhere he says "Fasting subdues the flesh and brings it under subjection, and takes away the stimulant of revolt" (Rom. viii. 13), [page 41]. The Romanist may stuff himself with other kinds of food, but as long as he does not eat the flesh of beast or bird, he fasts! He is allowed to eat on Fridays, bread, "the halesome parritch, chief of Scotia's food," any kind of fish, potatoes fried in animal grease though he must not eat the grease by itself, butter, eggs which with ume and heat would have become chickens, and, I believe also, a certain kind of water-fowl, because it feeds on fish. He is allowed to drink soup made of flesh, though he must not eat the flesh. On this food, one can fast on Fridays comfortably and with benefit to the body. To multitudes of Romanists, it would be a much more painful thing to refrain from whiskey and tobacco on Fridays than it is to refrain from flesh. His Grace says on page 40, that "Catholics fast to imitate Christ the true model of all Christians." Such fasting as I have just described is not an *imitation*, but a *burlesque*, of Christ's fasting.

"It is a custom dated back to the earliest days of the world, that on the anniversary of the father's death children fasted," (page 41). The Romanist, however, —as "an Irish gentleman" would say—observes the *anniversary* of Christ's death every week.

"Did not Christ say, 'It is not that which goeth into the mouth that defileth a man?'" (page 41). There is his Grace's answer to this Protestant objection, which blows it into hundreds of thousands of millions of atoms so small that they cannot be seen even by the most powerful microscope. "That is true. It was not the apple that defiled the soul of Adam but his disobedience in eating it." It is not at all likely that the fruit which Adam ate contrary to the command of God, was what the French call an "earth apple"

(*pomme de terre*), and his Grace's countrymen a "pratue" or "murphy," but how does his Grace know that it was an apple? Are the Fathers unanimous on this point? If they be, that, of course, settles the question.

"Catholics frequently make the sign of the cross because with St. Paul they glory in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ (Gal. vi. 14)," (page 42). The truth is that the great mass of Romanists glory only in two pieces of wood crossing each other at right angles. Of the full meaning of the Apostle's words which his Grace here quotes, they are, in fact, as ignorant as any wild Kaffir.

"Some Christians have a prejudice against the symbol of salvation, but without valid reason. A weathercock symbolizes change," (page 43). The Christians of whom his Grace here speaks, are, of course, neither Pagans, Mahometans, nor Jews. They are, therefore, Protestants. Now, his Grace when he calls them Christians, acts against the teachings of his Church, for she most distinctly says that they are not Christians. They have a good reason for being opposed to the use of the sign of the cross, as Hezekiah had for destroying the brazen serpent. He destroyed it, because it was, in itself, of no value, and was made an idol. The sign of the cross is, in itself, of no value, and we know that it is largely used for superstitious purposes. What connection there is between the cross and a weathercock it is very difficult to see. The cock—which is a very common ornament on the steeples of Roman Catholic Churches—refers to an event in the life of "the first Pope," which is anything but creditable to him. As it is easily turned about by the wind, it is used as a figure of a changeable person. Of course, as the Church of Rome boasts that she never changes, a weathercock is never put on a Popish Church as a symbol of change. As such, it would, of course, be a most unsuitable ornament.

Subjects of next paper, "Archbishop Lynch on Baptism, Confirmation, and the Confession."

Melis, Que.

T. F.

THE INDIAN MISSION AT LITTLE SASKATCHEWAN.

BY REV. GEORGE PATTERSON, D.D.

MR. EDITOR,—Having had the opportunity of visiting the mission of our Church among the Indians at Okanase, in the North West Territory, under the charge of the Rev. George Flett, I feel it my duty to bear my testimony to the efficiency of the work carried on there, and perhaps a short account of what I saw may serve to deepen the interests of the friends of our Foreign Missions in that portion of our work.

After travelling through prairie almost treeless, one is delighted to come upon such a beautiful piece of scenery as he beholds on approaching the scene of our mission. On turning the elbow of Little Saskatchewan River, he beholds a rich river valley, a low meadow with the river curling through it, while the banks rise somewhat abruptly to the height of one or two hundred feet, on the one side well wooded, on the other covered with copse or small trees. About six miles up is the Indian reserve. The white tents of the Indians were on the low flat by the river. But the missionary's dwelling, a small log cabin, stands on the rising ground. As I drew near the missionary's house, my attention was attracted to some dusky little faces at the door of a little log building standing near. I soon learned that this was the Indian School. I was invited in and heard them in their concluding exercises. They sang some well-known hymns, such as "Joyfully, joyfully onward we move." The school is taught by Mr. Cunningham, one of the students of the Manitoba College. The number in attendance is very irregular, owing largely to the circumstances of the Indians, their necessities for food often taking them away to considerable distances. In this way at certain seasons there may be between forty and fifty in attendance, at other times not more than a dozen. The school is supported by Government, which requires an average attendance of twenty-five. This is rather high to expect in the present circumstances of the Indians, and sometimes works very unfairly to the teacher, who, after having laboured faithfully finds his average reduced in consequence of the Indians being absent from absolute necessity. It is not to be expected that Indian children should give the continuous attention that is expected of white children in schools. Hence the order is to have a short session of school in