

In addition to this, the Synod unanimously adopted a resolution suggesting the formation of a Church of England Diocesan Temperance Society. In pursuance of this, a public meeting was held the same evening in the Church of Holy Trinity, which was presided over by the Premier of the Province, the Hon. Mr. Norquay, and which I had the honor of addressing. A committee was appointed to draft a constitution, and next Thursday a public meeting will be held to adopt it, and set the Society in working order. I have been appointed Secretary, *pro tem*, and as there is no temperance organization in the North-West, the Church has secured the honor, and will reap the rich rewards, of first occupying this important field of work and influence. You see that the Church here is intensely vigorous. She has, most fortunately, an admirable Bishop. She has, I can easily see, a united, zealous and able clergy—men of high education, polished manners, and immense vitality. They are all proud of their Church and their Bishop, and while in Ontario are dreaming, they are up and at work. Thank God, I know nothing of those dreadful terms,—"High Church" and "Low Church." There is but one Church here—a Church without a division, or a rent, and you see the wonderful results.

The Dioceses of Huron, Niagara, Toronto, and Ontario will do well to study the progress of the young giant of Prince Rupert's Land, and wake up from the slumber into which they have fallen. They really do not know how sound asleep they are, and they never will know until they compare their perfunctory, and therefore feeble, movements with the stalwart labor and noble zeal of the young athlete of the of the great west of Canada.

I have said but a little of what I have to say; but I must no longer trespass on your space. You will hear from me again soon.

Yours, &c.,

WM. LEGGO.

Winnipeg, Nov. 26, 1880.

## Correspondence.

All Letters will appear with the names of the writers in full, and we do not hold ourselves responsible for their opinions.

### PARADISE.

DEAR SIR,—I think the greatest difficulty to the right understanding of the text; viz: St. Luke xxiii. 47, lies in the translation or rather the non-translation of the word Paradise: it occurs three times in the New Testament, the first, in the *dative supra*, the second time, in the accusative 2nd Cor. xii. 4, the third time, in the genitive Rev. ii. 7, the words are merely Grecianized Hebrew although Liddell & Scott in their Greek lexicon, note the word as being of Persian origin. I wonder at what time it was adopted as Hebrew, see it occurs just as many times in the Old Testament as in the New; in Neh. 15, 8, it appears in the absolute singular in which verses it is translated, forest: being used interchangeably with year; in the song of Solomon iv. 13, it occurs again in the absolute singular and is translated orchard; in Ecclesiastes ii. 5, it appears under the form of the absolute plural and is rendered gardens; while in the same verse it is translated orchards, the garden or orchard of Eden; hence we perceive the word Paradise is translated a garden an orchard and a forest. I would remark it may refer to the garden in which the Lord was buried and if so the notifying of his place of burial was the last prophecy our Lord uttered on earth. If the thief was buried in the same garden, the Lord referred to his place of burial; and not as some suppose to his everlasting felicity.

Yours &c., respectfully.

WM. MANSON.

Walkertown, Nov. 29th, 1880.

SIR,—The Rev. W. J. Mackenzie having taken a paragraph in my letter on the meaning of the word Paradise, as his thesis, in a communication which appears in your last impression, I may perhaps be permitted to offer a few additional remarks on the subject.

After a brief preamble Mr. Mackenzie thus enters upon his argument:—"Our Saviour, when on the cross, said that He should be in Paradise that day. He did not intimate that He should be anywhere else between His death and His resurrection."—Admitted: but then recurs the question, where or what is Paradise?

He goes on to remark that the "sepulchre" in which the body of Christ was laid "was not Paradise," a truism which I suppose no one will attempt to controvert.—He adds, however, that if His disembodied soul or spirit only went into a "prison," such prison could not properly be called Paradise.

Now, the passage to which he here refers, 1 St. Peter iii. 19, is susceptible of various interpretations.

Some suppose that it has no reference whatever to our Saviour's "descent into hell," but that it relates to the inspired preaching of Noah to the sinners of his antediluvian day. Others understand the word *phylake* to mean, as it may mean, a kind of watch-tower where the disembodied spirits watch for the second coming of the Lord. While others, again, interpret it, as I suppose Mr. Mackenzie does, as that portion of Hades inhabited by the devil and his angels, and from which "when the thousand years are expired, he, Satan, shall be loosed." I may here remark, incidentally, with respect to the word "prison," that Zechariah speaks of the "prisoners of hope."

In proof, however, of the correctness of his interpretation, Mr. Mackenzie asserts that "the only place of that name (Paradise) which the New Testament recognizes as the abode of happy souls, is the 'Paradise of God.'" Now, the word Paradise occurs only three times in the New Testament: viz: in the passage which gave rise to these communications; in the passage where St. Paul recounts his vision; and in the Revelation of St. John the Divine.

With respect to the first, I admit that opinions are divided as to the meaning of the word. With regard to the second, it may be remarked that probably two different places and two different times are alluded to by the Apostle; the two different places being the "third heaven," and "Paradise." The "third heaven" is, I suppose, universally understood to mean "the seat of God and of the holy angels into which Christ ascended after His Resurrection;" while Paradise signifies, as I believe, "the blessed state of faithful souls between death and the resurrection;" and it was of this state that St. Paul, in his vision, most likely had a foretaste.

I confess I cannot see the relevancy of Mr. Mackenzie's next quotations, from St. John and St. Luke, to the argument in question. Our dear Lord's prayer was a prayer "for Himself that He might be received into glory, at His ascension, His original glory in heaven;" and it was a prayer for all His disciples, "that they might be eventually partakers of that glory."—"The last words on the cross" were quoted from King David's prayer uttered a thousand years before the birth of Christ, and breathed, perhaps, by many a Christian now.

With regard to the words of comfort addressed by their Master to His disciples before His crucifixion:—those words refer simply to His approaching death, to His subsequent resurrection from the dead, to His appearance on earth during an interval of forty days, and to His ascension to the Heaven of Heavens. The disciples' sadness was occasioned by want of faith in His resurrection from the dead; their joy by the evidence of their sense on that glorious Lord's day; a joy subsequently much enhanced by the fulfilment of the promise of the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter.

What I maintain, then, is, that there is only one passage, in which the word Paradise occurs in the New Testament, that indicates with certainty that Paradise means the "Paradise of God," viz: that in the Revelation; and Mr. Mackenzie has, therefore, failed to induce me to alter my previously expressed opinion that the word Paradise made use of by our blessed Saviour on the cross means the place of the souls of departed saints.

Yours &c.,

VINCENT CLEMENTI.

Peterboro, November 27, 1880.

### THE MARRIAGE QUESTION.

DEAR SIR,—My reason for signing a petition against the Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage Bill, is simply this:—

The Lord God emphatically declared that man and wife "shall be one flesh."—Gen. 2, 24. Our Lord, (St. Matt. 11, 5), reasserts the fact, adding that Moses for the hardness of their hearts he permitted divorce. St. Paul repeats the same on two occasions, for very different reasons, (Eph. 5, and 1 Cor. 6, 16).

In the sight of God, man and wife are no longer two, but one flesh, and hence the relatives of one become the relatives of the other, whatever distinction man, in his wisdom, may make.

Granted that taken from the rest of God's Word, the chapter in Leviticus may have a doubtful meaning, yet taken in connection with the original law of God and its strong re-assertion by Christ, there can be but little doubt as to its prohibiting such connections, although not absolutely necessary to convince Christians.

I also, with Mr. Rainsford, admit that it is the duty of the Church to guide, and therefore follow the teaching of the "majority of the Bishops in the House of Lords," and the unanimous decree of the House of Bishops in the Province of Canada.

Yours, &c.,

H. POLLARD.

Ottawa, Nov., 1880.

DEAR SIR,—It is rather surprising to see that Mr. Rainsford is using your columns to publish the fact of holding a brief for the would-be-husbands-of-deceased-wives-sisters. Perhaps you will kindly allow me space for a brief reply, as I should regret that the mischievous idea should go forward that we all coincide with the views enunciated in Mr. Rainsford's letter. It is stated by Mr. Rainsford that "public opinion has now declared itself in favor of the bill, as removing a most unnecessary restriction." It would have been more correct to say that certain persons who have violated the law—both ecclesiastical and civil—are now endeavoring to get the civil law changed to escape the penalty of their wrong-doing. As to "unnecessary restrictions" let anyone review the growing laxity of the last 20 years in regard to the marriage tie and the sanctity of its relations. Let them take a glance at the condition of things in the neighboring republic and then see if they can honestly assist in bringing in like evils upon ourselves. Mr. Rainsford is not the first who has depreciated what he terms "the dim light of Mosaic Legislation." Dr. Colenso travelled over the same ground years ago, yet with all his efforts people are still unconvinced, and your recent correspondent is not more likely to succeed.

As to the "arguments of the Church's champions being borrowed from the Levitical economy," does Mr. Rainsford forget that in all this discussion the ethical principle has never been lost sight of by the opponents of change? Abrogated as was the ceremonial law, yet, surely, we are scarcely expected to deny the binding obligations of the moral, strengthened and rivetted by the economy which has supplanted the Levitical. The "thorough persuasion of the lawfulness of the marriage," is not a strong argument where "the wish is father to the thought," and the advocates have a personal interest in the doing away with sisters-in-law. We would rather appeal in support of our view to the "*quod semper, quod ubique quod ab omnibus*," but here perhaps Mr. Rainsford would not be inclined to follow us.

Admitting for the sake of argument that which we deny as a fact, that the public require this change in the law, and that it is in obedience to a popular demand, we must remember that it was in obedience to a popular cry that our Blessed Lord was murdered, but the event certainly has not tended to popularize the Jews. But suppose such an unfortunate event as the proposed change in the law. Is the Church bound thereby? Certainly not. Such alteration by the state alone does not bind the Church. She, as has been well said, "is a kingdom with her own laws, which nothing would justify her surrendering at the behest of the state," and no state law can compel us to admit to Holy Communion those whom the Church declares to have violated her law and thereby are living in sin.

As to "placing the Church in a false position," we should assuredly do so by an abandonment of right, whilst to "follow a multitude to do" what we consider to be "evil," would inevitably bring its punishment in the well-merited contempt of every right thinking mind, with the dire consequence of the displeasure of God for the violation of His commands.

Yours faithfully,

H. B. OWEN.

Newmarket, St. Andrew's Day, 1880.

SIR,—In your last issue, the Rev. W. S. Rainsford lifts his voice in favor of widening the area of communal facilities and felicities. Referring to the proposed memorial to the Executive against the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, he says he "deplores such action." Mr. R. is, I am told, a clergyman of that Church which declares that a man may not marry "his wife's sister;" he is such only by having solemnly assented to this item of her teaching among others; and yet when her Bishops and clergy propose to do what in them lies to maintain this rule, he "deplores" such action! Well, this conduct on the part of Bishops may be very deplorable, but it has at least the merit of being consistent with their vows as officers of the Church. The truly deplorable thing is the spectacle of one of her clergymen deploring the maintenance of her teaching. On this question that teaching is not be mistaken; and how any one can be in revolt against it, and yet minister at her altar, surpasses my comprehension.

Mr. R. seems to have a poor opinion of Leviticus. He says:—"The main arguments her (the Church's) champions employed are borrowed from the Levitical economy." Now, one would have this not a bad place to go to for light on the subject. I have always supposed hitherto that Moses was the inspired law-giver of the ancient church; and it puzzles me to understand an inspired law-giver misleading the people on a question of morality. It is true that God's will may not have been fully unfolded to His ancient people; but it was blasphemy to say that in so far as it was made known, it was not in perfect harmony with eternal truth. "Many learned and capable scholars" may "hold the union" "to be permissible." But what is this to a Churchman so long