

70. In Joel iii. 3 it says: "And they have cast lots for my people, and have given a boy for an harlot, and sold a girl for wine, that they might drink."

71. Jonah. When he prayed unto the Lord out of the fish's belly. Jonah ii. 9: "Salvation is of the Lord."

72. Ninevah, is probably meant. Jonah iv. 11: "Ninevah that great city, wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left."

73. Ox and an ass. Deuteronomy xxii. 10: "Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together."

74. a. Jael, the wife of Heber. Judges v. 24: "Blessed shall she be above women."

b. The Blessed Virgin Mary. St. Luke i. 28: "Blessed art thou among women."

[Note.—Other names have been given, but the above two are generally taken as the two examples.—J. D. B.]

75. a. Jeremiah. Jer. xx. 2: "Then Pashur smote Jeremiah, and put him in the stocks."

b. Paul and Silas. Acts xvi. 19-24: "They caught Paul and Silas"—"And made their feet fast in the stocks."

76. a. Pharaoh. Genesis xli. 1 to 24.

b. Nebuchadnezzar. Daniel ii.

77. Saul himself. I. Samuel ix. 2: "Not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he, he was higher than any of the people."

78. His great-grandfather was Boaz. Ruth iv. 21. "Boaz begat Obed. His great-grandmother was Ruth. Ruth iv. 13: "So Boaz took Ruth, and she was his wife."

79. a. Moses means *drawn*. Exodus ii. 10: "She called his name Moses, and she said, because I drew him out of the water."

b. The daughter of Pharaoh. Exodus ii. 10: "He became her son."

c. Egypt. Same chapter: "Pharaoh was King of Egypt."

80. Amram was her father's name, and Jochebed was her mother's name. Numbers xvi. 59: "And the name of Amram's wife was Jochebed, and she bore unto Amram Moses and Aaron, and Miriam their sister."

81. Issachar. Jacob, his father called him so. Genesis xlix. 14. "Issachar sit a strong ass couching."

82. At the age of 969 years. Genesis v. 27. "And all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred sixty and nine years."

83. Moses. Exodus iv. 10. "And Moses said unto the Lord . . . but I am slow of speech."

84. Samson. Judges xvi. 9. "And he broke the withs."

85. a. He covered Job with sore boils. Job ii. 7. "Satan . . . smote Job with sore boils."

b. Job scraped himself with a potsherd. Job ii. 8. "And he took him a potsherd to scrape himself."

86. St. John the Apostle. Revelation i. 9. "I John . . . was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ."

87. St. Peter. Peter ii. 17. "Honour all men; Love the Brotherhood."

88. a. Jubal. Genesis iv. 21. "Jubal; he was the father of all such as handle the harp and the organ."

b. His brother's name was Jubal. Genesis iv. 20 & 21: "Adah bare Jubal . . . his brother's name was Jubal."

89. a. At Melita. Acts xxviii. 1: "They knew that the Island was called Melita." It was the Island now known as Malta.

b. "He healed the Father of Publius of fever and dysentery. Acts xxviii. 8: "And healed him." He also healed many others "which had diseases in the island. Acts xxviii. 9. He likewise shook off the viper into the fire. Acts xxviii. 3 to 6.

90. a. Bernice.

b. In the Acts in connection with her brother Agrippa when visiting Festus—before whom Paul made his defence. (See Acts xxv and xxvi.)

91. St. Stephen. Acts vii.: "stoned Stephen."

92. King Solomon, the Son of David. Ecclesiastes i. 1.: "The words of . . . Son of David, King in Jerusalem"—and Ecclesiastes i. 9: "All the rivers run into the sea."

93. In Genesis xxiii. 3 verse to end. Abraham buying "the field of Ephron, which was in Machpelah, which was before Mamre," for "Four hundred shekels of silver." "And the field and the cave that is therein were made sure (the deed) unto Abraham. (Postscript).

(To be Continued).

Correspondence.

REV. MR. ANCIENT AND THE
"WESLEYAN."

To the Editors of the Church Guardian.]

SIRS,—I am sorry to find that the *Wesleyan* thinks I speak of the views of my "early guides" with lightness. Meanness would be a more correct term, for it makes me sad to think that the Church, by whose ministry I was converted; by whose teaching and sacraments I have been instructed and fed; and by which the piety of tens of thousands has been and is being nourished, should have been misrepresented, and that I should have held, at any period of my life, such unworthy views of her. But what will your readers think when they are told that those views "are still maintained by thousands of intelligent men who believe that with a large proportion of Episcopalians, forms are more than faith, and moral acts, though as independent of the heart as the rose and golden fruits are of the spruce bush to which we tie them at Christmas-tide, more than scriptural conversion."

Doubtless, this will somewhat surprise them, as I think their experience will coincide with mine when I say that I have yet to find the first—whether he be high, low or broad—to whom this description applies.

The *Wesleyan* next says:—"Mr. Ancient's two-fold attempt to make ourselves appear inconsistent, and to show the Methodist pastors and people of Halifax to be deserving of censure, on the ground of proselytism, results in a double failure. We did not endorse the conduct of those who have advised certain ministers to remain as they were."

Well, perhaps I do not understand English. Here are its own words:—"Methodists, we are happy to inform our neighbor, are not wont to glory over such conquests."

Here is a simple statement of fact (!) And if being happy on account of it does not imply endorsement, will the *Wesleyan* kindly inform me what it does imply? It is true the *Wesleyan* says "sometimes unwisely," but all this can mean is, that while approving the principle there are, in its opinion, exceptional cases—though what their nature is it does not explain—where the rule does not apply, and in which it would be advisable even for these disinterested people, the Methodists, to look after denominational interests.

But the next sentence gives us—perhaps unintentionally—the true position of the *Wesleyan*:—"Nor can we find, after enquiries made in the proper quarters, any reason for using toward either Methodist Ministers or laymen the language of reproach."

Now I assume that those enquiries were honestly made. If so, my statements were found to be true, and, consequently, the conduct they described is hereby endorsed by the *Wesleyan*. Of course this is a complete veering round since the previous article, but it is something to get at its true position, and I hope Churchmen will take note of it.

As for all the rest of the article, in which the Church is represented as being thoroughly Romish, with only an insignificant party of pure men, who are "almost unconsciously succumbing to unhealthy influences," and are dragging "many youth into the vortex of influence where they can render them no help," it is nothing more than so much empty rhetoric.

I will now ask the *Wesleyan* a plain simple question, and I trust it will give me a plain straightforward answer. If this view of the Church is held by so many thousands of Methodists, are not they in conscience bound to do all in their power to win from impending moral ruin as many as they possibly can? And would not the fact of souls being rescued from such a position be a legitimate cause for rejoicing? And if so, I again ask it to reconcile this with the statement:—"Methodists are not wont to glory," &c.

The *Wesleyan* reminds me of the Apostolic injunction to "speak the truth in love." If I have said anything unnecessarily severe I heartily apologise. And I can assure it that "I speak the truth in love" when I say, if the Editor would only do as many of his brethren have done—come into the Church where he could form a judgment of her at first hand, and not from hearsay, he would find an amount of brotherly love, glowing piety—not spasmodic revivalism—

and practical godliness that would surprise him.

Yours, etc.,
W. J. ANCIENT.

MR. BORTHWICK'S QUESTIONS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

DEAR SIRS,—I have been looking over the answers to Mr. Borthwick's Bible Questions, and think that one at least of them is not correct. My referring to your last issue you will see that for answer to question 8, viz.: "Who was the first European convert to Christianity?" "Z." has "Lydia at Philippi, in Macedonia. Acts xvi. 12: xvi. 14. 15 (though Lydia was probably a native of Thyatira; see same chap. ver. 14)." To this Mr. Borthwick has added a note as follows:—"Some have given Cornelius the Centurion of the Augustine band."

Now, to shew that "Z." is wrong one need go no further than his own answer given above. Though Lydia was converted at Philippi, in Europe, yet it is distinctly stated in verse 14, that she was "of the city of Thyatira," in Asia (not probably as "Z." has it) therefore she was not a European convert at all. But even supposing she was a European convert it is a very easy matter to shew that she was not the first. In the 10th chap. of the Acts we read of the conversion of Cornelius at Caesarea. Now it is certain both from his own name, and that of the band to which he belonged; viz., "the Italian band" that he was a European. In all Bibles and other books, where dates are given, the conversion of Cornelius is made to have taken place 10 or 12 years earlier than that of Lydia.

There is also a mistake, I think, in Mr. Borthwick's note quoted above. He says Cornelius was the Centurion of the Augustine band, whereas chapter 10, verse 1, distinctly says he was "of the band called the Italian band." Augustine's band is mentioned in xxvii. 1, but the name of the Centurion of it was Julius. That they were distinct bands seems evident from a remark of Rev. W. Jenks, D.D., in his comprehensive commentary where, under ch. xxvii. he says Julius was "a Centurion of Augustine's band," as Cornelius was of the Italian band.

It may be well for me to quote some commentators on this point. Bishop Woodworth says: "We may observe that the Gospel made its first conquest over heathenism in a large city, Caesarea, named from the Roman Cæsar, the military stronghold and naval arsenal of the Roman Power. And it made that conquest over a soldier called Cornelius, one of the noblest Roman names borne by the Scipios and Cællii—and the mother of the Gracchi was Cornelia—and associated with the greatest victories of the Roman arms, and an officer of the Italian band, not of a cohort raised in Syria, but of native Roman blood. This Roman soldier was 'the antesignanus, or standard-bearer to us, who were heathens.'" Dr. Jenks says, "Peter is the first man employed to admit uncircumcised Gentiles into the Christian church, and Cornelius, a Roman Centurion or Colonel, is the first that with his family and friends is so admitted."

Scott says, "hitherto none had been admitted by baptism into the Christian Church, but Jews, Samaritans and Proselytes; who were all circumcised persons, and who afterwards observed the ceremonial law; but the time was now come when the Gentiles were to be openly made partakers of all the privileges of God's people, without being proselyted to Judaism either before or after their conversion to Christianity. The character of the person whom God was pleased to select, as the first fruits of this harvest from the Gentiles, was suited (as much as anything could be) to abate the prejudice of the Jewish converts against the alteration. Cornelius was a centurion or commander of 100 men, in the Italian band or cohort of Roman soldiers which attended the Governor, who now generally resided at Caesarea."

Burkitt says, "This chap. (x) acquaints us with the just evertures which the Apostles made to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. According to Christ's command, they began at Jerusalem, and preached to the Jews throughout India, Samaria, and Galilee; but now the time was come for beating down and laying flat the partition betwixt Jew and Gentile, which accordingly is done in this chapter, by St. Peter's preaching to Cornelius, who was the first fruits of the Gentile conversion and christianity."

For answer to question 15, "What

wise king says 'Beauty is vain'?" I had the same as "Z." viz. Solomon, but this Mr. Borthwick says is wrong, and that Lemuel is the correct answer. Now, may I ask who was King Lemuel, or where do we learn that he was "wise king"? On this point Bishop Wordsworth remarks, "There is good reason to believe, with all the ancient and many modern expositors, that Lemuel the King is King Solomon himself, who might well be called Lemuel, as being dedicated from his infancy to God, by whom he was called Jedidiah, 'beloved of the Lord.'"

Several more of my answers have been marked wrong which I still think are correct—but we will come to them by and by.

I hope you will give this a place in your valuable paper, and oblige,
Yours etc.,
A STUDENT.

THE TITLE "REVEREND."

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

DEAR SIRS,—In the CHURCH GUARDIAN of the 12th inst. is an interesting paper, "The Bishop of Lincoln and the Wesleyans." A similar case occurred some time ago in the refusal of a clergyman to allow the word "Reverend" to be inscribed on the tomb of a Methodist. It seems to be the determination of that body, now improperly called "Wesleyans," to assume the title of "Reverend," and of "parson" also, as we not unfrequently read of a marriage—or their substitute for that holy rite—as being performed at the "Methodist parsonage." Even their theological students allow themselves to be so designated, if they do not arrogate the title. As in these days of only reviving Church principles, the assumption of that title by Methodists, and all sects and schisms is acquiesced in by large numbers who are not yet brought under the influence of the revival, allow me to suggest the propriety of our adopting another style and title, either instead of, or in addition to, that, that is, the title of Parish Priest—P. P. I observe all the sound Church papers—*Church Times*, *Guardian*, *John Bull*—in their reports of meetings of the clergy, rarely use the prefix "Reverend." I see also the like omission in the notice of a marriage in your issue of the 12th inst., where the officiating clergyman is Clarence W. McCully, Deacon-in-charge. I trust shortly that gentleman will substitute P. P. for his present description. As none of the sects acknowledge a Priesthood, I presume they will not be bold enough to copy us to this extent, so that the faithful will know whether they are reading of an ordained Priest or of one who has tried to get into the fold in some other way.

Bearing on the same subject is an account of a disgraceful scene which two "Reverend gentlemen" enacted in a Presbyterian church in Boston, as reported in the papers. These reverends are also called "clergymen." Now, as a clergyman is a clerk in Holy Orders, and as the sects do not acknowledge the validity of such orders, their ministers have no right to be styled clergymen. Further, a clergyman is a gentleman, and the perpetrators of that disgraceful so-called exposure of Freemasonry certainly was not the act of gentlemen.

Yours, faithfully,
PHILECCESTIA.

February 20, 1880.

DIOCESAN CONFERENCES.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

DEAR SIRS,—I believe the advantages of holding conferences such as I suggested last week would be manifold. In the first place, the meeting of so many of the clergy and more intelligent of the laity at the different centres, I would suggest such places as Digby, Windsor, Truro, Charlottetown, and, when railway accommodation permits, Sydney, would have a very beneficial effect upon Church life and work in the surrounding districts. For I assume that the opportunity of holding missionary and other meetings, as well as special services, would be fully utilized. In the next place the subjects discussed, which I presume would take a wide range, could hardly fail to have a broadening, mellowing effect upon the minds of many, at least, of those present. Nor would those benefits be confined to those who attended the conference, as I doubt not the Editors of the GUARDIAN would take care that all the papers read, as well as the remarks of the principle speakers, should

find a place in the columns of that paper, and thus give their readers the next best thing to being present. It appears to me that it would be wise to take up, at each conference, two or three classes of subjects, say one paper of each class. Let one class be of wide range, including such questions as:—The nature and tendency of modern Biblical criticism; The effect of recent scientific discoveries upon dogmatic theology, etc. The next class might deal with such topics as Sunday schools, parochial work and machinery, temperance reform, and the connection between sanitary reform and morality; while last, though by no means last, comes the question of how best to develop the higher spiritual life both in the individual and in the Church.

Now it is not to be expected that those and similar questions can be discussed without parties rubbing against each other; but I think that is one of the strong reasons for advocating such discussions, as all parties would be gainers by the process.

I hope to bring my remarks to a close next week, and trust the subject will then be taken up by more able pens than mine, and most thoroughly ventilated.

I am, etc.,
Vox.

DEAN STANLEY.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

DEAR SIRS,—I think it would do good if you could publish the enclosed from the *London Guardian*:—

"Dean Stanley, by his so called *liberalism*, who appears to mean 'liberal to error and careless of truth,' wins the ear of multitudes; and when his opinions on the unfortunate Colenso (once Bishop) are so widely published, as part of the proceedings at the annual meeting of our venerable S. P. C., it would be well for your readers to see the accuracy (if) of the man who thinks the poor excommunicate Mathematician, 'a propagator of the gospel,' 'not among the least efficient,' and was important enough to tell the meeting that 'long after they were all dead and buried,' Colenso would be so remembered."

One would imagine that gentlemanly—if no higher motive—would restrain a "Stanley" from taking advantage of the fact that his Denary is a *peculiar* (and under no episcopal rules—that in fact he is a successor of the "mitred Abbott," of Westminster and owes fealty to no ecclesiastical superior) to use language and to make statements which would render him liable, as an ordinary cleric to episcopal rebuke, if not to severe treatment."

• ANGLICANUS.

SUNDAY LETTER.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

DEAR SIRS,—Your correspondent, who signs himself "A Reader," excites himself, quite unnecessarily, about the blunder Mr. Bliss has made in his "Clerical Guide" on the above subject. A greater fraud than this publication of Mr. Bliss has never been foisted on the Canadian public. It is full of errors, of which this of the "Sunday Letter" is only one sample. If "A Reader" wants to find out the truth in this matter, he need make no calculations, but simply turn to the "Table of Moveable Feasts" in his Prayer Book, and he will find the "Sunday Letter (or Letters)." For 1880 they are D C, so that D will be the letter till the 29th February, and C for the rest of the year. The S. P. C. K. Almanac will shew him the same thing.

Yours, truly,
E. W. BEAVEN.

Breckville, Ont.

S. P. G. MEETING.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

DEAR SIRS,—To a great extent I agree with your article on the late meeting of the S. P. G., but we should recollect that zeal for the truth as it is in Jesus instigated the action of the Standing Committee and others, &c. While rudeness is never justifiable, assuredly Dean Stanley got no more than (if as much as) he deserved, for his unblushing effrontery in championing Colenso, and insulting such a body of faithful and earnest members of the Church. It would be different if he were a *working* member of the Society. All honor, I say, to the man who said his words should not be heeded more than idle wind.

"STAND LIKE THE ANVIL."