

dismantled on its banks, but ships of war shall not enter it; the Commission of the Danube, in which Roumania and Servia shall be represented, is maintained; the removal of the obstacles which the Iron Gates and the cataracts cause to the navigation of the Danube is entrusted to Austro-Hungary. The rectification of the Greek frontier is handed over to Turkey and Greece for settlement between themselves; if they cannot agree they may call upon the Great Powers to act as arbitrators. The Porte engages to apply in Crete the plan of Government of 1868; analogous regulations adopted to local requirements shall be introduced into other parts of Turkey. Perfect liberty of religious belief is accorded in all the provinces; the provinces are each to bear a proportional share of the Turkish public debt; all international arrangements concerning the provinces remain in force. The right of official protection is accorded to the agents of the Powers in Turkey and the Holy Places, with their religious and charitable establishments. The rights conceded to France are expressly reserved, it being understood that the *status quo* with respect to the Holy Places, shall not be seriously affected in any way.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

OF PROBATION IN HADES.

(Continued.)

WE will now turn to 1 St. Pet. iii. 18-20, one of two famous passages which are thought clearly to teach this doctrine; and upon the second, 1 St. Pet. iv. 6, which is similar, although more obscure Mr. Heavel quotes Lange, and notices the approval of Dean Alford. "Holy Scripture nowhere asserts the eternal condemnation of those who have died either as heathen or as not having heard the gospel. It rather implies in many passages that repentance is possible, even beyond the grave, and distinctly declares that the final decision is made, not at the moment of death, but at the last day." Acts xvii. 31, 2 Tim. i. 12-18, 1 St. John iv. 17 are quoted, but I see nothing, there or elsewhere, to support such an assertion, and I do not hesitate to declare my unqualified dissent from such a proposition, notwithstanding the great names of those who maintain it. With regard to the exegesis of these passages, as the second is the most obscure, and both are with relation to the same subject, I shall first examine 1 St. Pet. iii. 18-20. Mr. Heavel notices that various interpretations have been given of both those passages. It is not necessary to examine them all, but only as they stand related to the idea of probation of the *impenitent*. Abp. Leighton refers the passage in Ch. 3, to Noah's preaching by the Holy Spirit. Bishop Horsley, together with Bengel, Luther and others, refer it to those who repented upon Noah's preaching, but who, although they were not saved in the ark, were yet subjects of grace, and to them, as the large multitude of those who had perished under circumstances of doubt, our Lord delivered, or mention is specially made of His delivering to them, the tidings of His peace. The former refers to the Spirit's action by Noah, and does

but indirectly refer to our Saviour, not with regard to His Messiah's life, but with regard to His Divine Personality. When we consider the fact which Bishop Pearson has pointed out, we may well be surprised at the conflicting opinions of really great and good men upon this subject. That most sound Theologian has remarked that Christ's descent into Hades as held in the creed, and as it formed a part of the Catholic faith, was in His human soul, in accomplishment of a part of the Covenant of Redemption, in this respect, that He might undergo the condition of a dead man, as well as that of a living one. But it was as a *righteous* man that He did so; as a perfectly holy man; so as the grave could not retain His body, neither could Hades retain His soul. It is manifest that the "Spirit," referred to in St. Pet. 3, must mean the Holy Spirit, since St. Peter affirms by the same He was "quickened." Hence it is, I think, apparent, as Bishop Pearson says, (art. 2, p. 170) that this passage does not treat of the descent of Christ in His human soul into hell, and if it is held by any that He descended as to His *Deity* peculiarly, it must be something extraneous, and in addition, to the creed of the Catholic Church, and not as a part of the Covenant of Redemption, since, not the work of His human nature, not sustained by the general tenor of Holy Writ, nor by the doctrine of the Catholic and Primitive Church. As Bishop Pearson shows (art. 5, p. 360) the early Fathers used this argument against Apollinaris, who held that Christ had no intellectual soul, but His Divinity was to Him in place thereof, that it was in His *human nature* that He descended into hell. As to the *purpose* or end of His descent, there was no strictly Catholic doctrine held in the primitive Church. The various conjectures, then framed by individuals, without authority of Holy Scripture, were fruitful of evil then as they are now. It is, I think, apparent that their text does not teach that Christ preached in person, either to the righteous, or to the wicked dead, in Hades. It remains but to notice Ch. iv. 6, which I interpret with Archbishop Leighton as referring to the *believing* dead, who, although they appear to the eye of carnal men to be in no better a condition than others, inasmuch as they suffer the same universal penalty, of natural death, and connected with this also the cardinal idea of earthly sorrow; yet are they approved of God, and as such their souls live and are happy before Him. I have paraphrased it thus, and in so doing express not only my own view, but also that of the great and good Archbishop referred to. This rendering too is quite in keeping with the context. These are the only two passages of Holy Writ, having any real semblance of favoring the idea of probation after death or of Christ's preaching either to the righteous or to the wicked, after his suffering and death upon the cross. It may here be added that our Lord in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, denies the *utility* of any one from the dead preaching to men living here upon earth; and of the converse, (*i.e.* of the living Christ preaching to men departed) the objection that this would make God's

dealings in the course of creation to be retrogressive, (which is contrary to all known facts) is both pertinent and valid. Thus, I consider, that enough evidence has been brought to show that Holy Scripture does not countenance the theory of a probation in Hades. The doctrinal issue arising out of such a theory I shall discuss hereafter. S.

Diocesan Intelligence.

NOVA SCOTIA.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

The missionary at Loinsburg, C.B., acknowledges with thanks the following further donations to the new church in answer to his appeal: Rev. P. H. Brown, St. Margaret's, J. Forbes, Esq., Halifax; Anonymous, do; Miss De Wolfe, Kentville; Miss Pyke, do., \$1.00 each.

HALIFAX.—Entertainments of the Pic-nic order take place this week in connection with Trinity Church, and Bishop's Chapel.

DIGBY.—The Rector, Rev. J. Ambrose, has gone to England to seek aid in completing the new church here.

WINDSOR.—Our worthy Rector, Rev. P. Maynard took his D. D. degree at the last session: no man in the Diocese is better entitled to it.

PUGWASH.—July 11th, A deputation of the parishioners waited upon the Rev. D. C. Moore, (late Rector of St. George's parish) and presented him with an address numerously refined by persons of all classes and creeds, expressive of love and esteem and regret at his removal. Mr. Moore replied, regretting that the climate was so unsuited to the health of his wife as to render removal compulsory, reciprocating all good wishes and praying God's blessing on the place and people.

FREDERICTON.

MEETING OF SYNOD.—The Diocesan Synod of Fredericton met this morning in the school room of St. John's Church. The chair was taken by the Rev. G. M. Armstrong, Ecclesiastical Commissary of the Diocese, during the absence of His Lordship, the Bishop. The usual prayers to be used by the Synod during its session were said by the Commissary. The Secretary, the Rev. F. Partridge, Rector of Rothesay, called the roll of the clerical and lay members of the Synod, when a large number of gentlemen answered to their names. Of the clergy, all were present save five or six, and of ninety-nine lay delegates, sixty were present.

The Secretary read the following letter which had been addressed to the Synod, by His Lordship, Bishop Medley:—

To the Clergy and Lay Members of the Synod of the Diocese:—My dear Brethren, I greatly regret to be absent at the meeting of the Synod, where I have so often enjoyed your kind co-operation and support. Having been requested by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury to be present at the Lambeth Conference, which is to be held early in July, my absence is unavoidable. I shall, however, be very thankful to return to my work as soon as circumstances will permit. I have to inform you with much regret, that our Metropolitan, the Most Rev. Ashton Oxenden, has signified to me his desire to resign his See, and the office of Metropolitan in August next. This will render a double election necessary, the election of a Bishop to the Diocese of Montreal, and the election of a Metropolitan by the Bishops of the Province, according to the express provisions of a canon passed in 1877, and printed in the journal. According to the constitution of our Diocesan Synod, page 6, section 14, it is provided that, in the absence of the Bishop, his commissary shall preside. As the Synod will probably meet in the school room of St. Marks, which has been kindly offered us by the Rector, and it is not unlikely that his church will be open to us for some of our services, I have thought it only an act of due