

the Synod only to the Synod to the Governor with it. The will of the could be "to the Synod within the Synod and this trust and this trust of Mr. the Synod made that the Synod the surplus "had the Synod have they the Synod it into the the Synod the laity to the Synod the clergy, was the Synod laymen with the Synod of Christian the Synod ng the power the Synod trust. The the Synod to the clergy, that the trust the Synod the clergy, and the Synod wful to take the Synod specific pur the Synod to take this the Synod is spoken of the Synod dividing the Synod pective of the Synod in t, the by-law the Synod ndowment the Synod of law of 1874 the Synod \$1,200. The the Synod ne incomes the Synod shall subse the Synod perosity the Synod

could be
 to the clergy,
 can no gener-
 appropriate
 could they be
 in the first
 re not gener-
 at the Synod
 they applied
 and provided
 reasonable,
 say, that the
 ends ? " Who
 charges ? " If
 salary of two
 be thought of
 spect you to
 the salary we
 a fraudu-
 Where was
 appropriating
 sh, two hun-
 income after
 tennance and
 nt giving an
 Synod says, I
 r wives and
 lawful for
 bc, in many
 of wood and
 e Christian
 ashame, and
 tly wrong ?
 Trust, the
 xyman's in-
 t just, they
 ng referred
 :—"It now
 us into the
 justice, in
 oon's fund.

WRIGHT.

great sacrament
instrument
lifted into
ertain that
branches

ays been
rist, then
the body
und part
apostolic
g body in
leg is de-
no means
the body,
ne. The
or a divi-
apostacy
schism is
h. What

is the sin which invalidates the sacrament of regeneration? It must be a sin unto death, for regeneration is the reception of spiritual life. Is schism a sin unto death? I do not think so, for then how would the baptism of an adult be valid if administered by schismatics? He would be in a state of schism after baptism.

And if schismatics are guilty of such apostasy as makes the sacrament of baptism of none effect, then it were futile to even hope to see them ever in a state of salvation.

"For it is impossible for those who were our enlightened" (baptized) "and have tasted the heavenly gift and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away to renew them again unto repentance," Heb. vi. 4, 6 vs.

There is no second "regeneration," there is but "one baptism."

So we come to the conclusion that the cutting away of the branch from the true vine, after having been grafted in by the sacrament of regeneration, can only be brought about by the sin against the Holy Ghost, spiritual lifelessness, may not that be apostasy? Is schism ever represented as being that sin?

Excommunication was of different kinds in the early church, the lesser excommunication or separation was expulsion from the church, and was not for the most deadly sins, the greater excommunication or anathema, or total separation, was entire exclusion from the body of the faithful.

St. Paul did not excommunicate the Corinthian schismatics, but only the man guilty of incest. Yours truly,
W. B.

Copyright © 2004 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Sir,—As good a Catholic, by which I mean a Protestant Catholic, all the more Catholic for being Protestant, all the more Protestant for being Catholic since all sound Protestantism is an appeal to Catholicity, and though the word Protestant has become ambiguous as you say, yet the noun must, I think, mean one who holds the doctrines in the main at least, that the first Protestants did hold. I will, with permission, say a word more on greetings, because, as one of your readers asked for an answer to a certain question, and one should have the courage, I suppose, to say what one thinks. I am in Synod and called to vote. A body of professing Christians, send official greetings, they are dissenters, that is, they think differently from us, if they do not feel differently; they are a separate organisation, they represent a schism by inheritance, for which their forefathers were in a degree, (I am not going into decimals) not wholly responsible, and a schism for which my forefathers were so partially. It is proposed to address them as brethren, and emphasize the brotherhood. I do not object. I propose an amendment in addition, and to this effect, (it was what I said to myself as I read of the first precedent to which my attention has been called, and which shall be nameless, I should have done on the first blush) "and we send this message because time fails to tell you all we wish to say or adequately represent our feelings or our views." My conscience would have been satisfied, because, if schism is a sin, I presume that to approach schismatics with a view to healing schism is a duty. I do not say that I have cut the knot, but certainly have solved nothing. But the Synod is, I should suppose, in no way compromised, and can prepare an address distinctly stating its position, it can suggest a meeting of representatives, to discuss this thing. Logic we believe to be altogether on our side; if the whole end in nothing, we have done our duty, and the time could hardly, I believe, be wasted if we sent men of calm temper on our side. Could we not meet as men, if nothing, higher in organisations for charitable work as a preparation for discussion and to remove the odium theologium, or at least to lessen it. These supposed men believe in the name of the Lord Jesus and love Him, they accept much of His doctrine, and in a sense work in His cause. They do not seem to us to accept the word Christ as representing one appointed with authority, and giving authority through human channels, but seem rather to hold that any volunteer has a right to assume the uniform of the grand army, and that his efforts must be tested by apparent results, and the members wounded, without considering at all the demoralization of the army itself. Distinguishing of course between matters of opinion and matters of faith, I would say, let the two lines of thought be tested side by side. Let us hear and let the world hear in the most distinct manner possible, their side of the question and our own as well.

October 19, 1885.

ST. ALBAN'S.

SIR,—Being in the neighbourhood of St. Alban's la. y, a dutiful interest much more than an idle curiosity, led me to inspect the beginnings made in what is indeed a noble undertaking. The walls of the See House are nearly completed, and there is every pros-

pect of our Bi-hop having a comfortable residence which will do no discredit to the Diocese of Toronto. Beside it is springing up the chancel of the cathedral that is to be; and I am fain in this letter to convey to fellow churchmen through our province, some of the pleasure which I had in seeing a noble enterprise so well begun. The ground plan of the chancel measures, including the walls, 90 by 39. The foundation wall is five feet thick at bottom, and is narrowed twice as it rises, till the destined limit of three feet is reached. The work thus far is beautifully done, and seems as solid as it should be. The older people can hardly expect to see, even, the chancel completed in their day, as it must be a costly work, and time will be necessary for obtaining funds, which no congregation will feel under pressing obligation to raise. In one sense it is all the better, perhaps, as the foundation will be more consolidated; and it will be safer too, that the spiritual fabric should grow slowly, under the guiding influence of experience and emergent needs, instead of being an ecclesiastical *chateau en Espagne*.

Explain it as we will, the Church's instinct has led her to build cathedrals, and our Bishop deserves the praise and hearty support of his diocese in the work which he has so bravely inaugurated, and which well deserves to be commended as a "venture of faith."

The most commendable feature of his work thus far seems to me to be the absence of any haste to under take too much. The grand churches of our mother land are as much as man's work can be, symbols of eternity; and the venerable cathedrals were built just as the spiritual fabric itself, with no irreverent haste.

"One age would build a chancel, and another a nave, and a third would add a chapel, and a fourth a shrine, and a fifth a spire," so says Newman in a sermon

entitled, "The Gospel Palaces," (sermon xix. vol. vi., of Parochial Sermons), which I earnestly wish all who are interested in St. Alban's would read. In much the same way spoke St. Chrysostom long ago, (11 Actage viii.) encouraging landed proprietors to build churches on their estates. They object "consider how great the expense;" and he replies, "Build for the present a small church; your successor will build a porch; and his successor will make further additions; and so the whole will be ascribed to you." Every English cathedral is a commentary upon this, to say nothing of Cologne, begun in 1248 and finished in 1880, Aug. 15. Those who believe in the permanence of the Church, can be content with the prospect of a completed St. Alban's after the labours of several successive bishops, but whenever completed, the present Bishop will have the honor of being the founder. Let me add a sentence from the sermon referred to: The Christian "can endure to be one of an everlasting company while in this world, as well as in the next. He is content to begin, and break off; to do his part, and no more; to set about what others must accomplish: to sow where others reap."

It requires no imagination to see a dense population around St. Alban's in a few years, and but little to feel assured that this greatest of the Gospel Palaces will be the venerated abode of devotion and the honoured centre of manifold good works.

Yours,
Port Perry, 30th Sept. 1885. JOHN CARRY.

THE PROTESTANT PURGATORY.

SIR,—Your correspondent "J. R." in your issue of the 1st October, writes under the heading, "The Protestant Purgatory." He says that "every one knows that Purgatory is supposed to be a place where spirits, separate from the body, dwell : a heaven to the good, a hell to the wicked." Where does he get such a definition ? The very word "Purgatory" conveys the idea of "purging," or a place of purification, and his sense of the word would make eternity itself a Purgatory, for is there not a heaven for the Lord's people,—a hell for those who are not in Christ. Now I, as a Protestant and a member of the Church of England, thoroughly believe that the souls of those who have fallen asleep in Jesus are in the Paradise of God, and that the souls of the wicked dead are in a place of misery. So to me says the Word of God. Where does the Church of England teach to the contrary ? "J. R." quotes the words, "for they rest from their labours," applied to the dead who die in the Lord, as proving that the souls of such are in slumber. Surely not, but they are in that rest which is in Paradise. Standing this day by the grave of one who fell asleep within a few days, I heard the clergyman read or repeat from our beautiful order for the burial of the dead, these words : "Almighty God, with Whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with Whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity." There, as I contend, is the teaching of the Church of England. Our Lord in Luke 16, by means of the beautiful parable of the rich man and Lazarus, gives a clear and distinct teaching as to the state of the soul after separation from the body. The dead and was carried by the angels into

Abraham's bosom; the rich man also died and was buried, and in hell, (the Revised Version says "Hades"), he lift up his eyes being in torment." And that this does not refer to the state after the final judgment, is made clear by the fact that the rich man wished to have Lazarus sent to his father's house to testify to his brethren, "lest they also come into this place of torment." St. Paul, in 2d Corinthians, 5, speaks of the willingness "rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord," and in Philippians 1, 23, he says: "for I am in a strait between two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better." See 2d Samuel, 12, 23; Ecc., 12, 7, and Rev. vi, 9, 10 and 11. I must pass by your correspondent's reference to argument as to "pictures," merely saying that when we wish to know what are the doctrines, or tenets, or principles of a communion we go to creeds and formularies.

I am, etc.,
HERBERT S. McDONALD.

LAY HELP.

SIR,—In many of the country districts where the clergyman has three or four stations, he is unable to hold more than one service in each place on Sunday, consequently the Church people frequently attend the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, of course contributing to their funds and sometimes becoming proselytes. It has occurred to me that it would be worth while seeking lay help, which would both increase the Church funds and keep the congregation together. Now, if some person near each, or the principal station, could be found to hold a service either in the morning or evening, while the clergyman officiates elsewhere, it would, I believe, prove a boon the congregation would appreciate. There are educated and capable men to be found who would gladly render this assistance for the good of the cause. I, for one, in this district would hold myself ready when called upon. The question is too delicate for me to moot through any other medium until it has been fully discussed in your columns.

I remain, dear sir,
Yours respectfully
J. A. MACPHERSON, L.L.D. & Co.

THE PROTESTANT PURGATORY.

SIR.—Whatever "J. R.'s" theories may be as to the present condition of the disembodied spirits, "Another J. R." evidently misinterprets the word of the holy patriarch Job (xix. 26), which, whether in the version of James I. or in the revised edition, are not spoken of the *soul* but of the *body*. The patriarch is arguing solely for the resurrection of that flesh, which shall reappear whether destroyed by worms as the older version has it, or in any other way. "After my skin hath been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God, Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold not another," is the reading which the revisers accepted as the best. But in the margin they read, "And after my skin hath been destroyed, this shall be, even from my flesh" &c., or "And though after my skin, this body be destroyed, yet from my flesh," &c. Job's meaning is clear if we refer to verses 20, 25 in the same chapter. In the first, he notes the gradual destruction of his skin by the disease with which he had been visited, "the hand of God hath touched me." Yet even this eating away of his flesh was not sufficient to prevent the persecution he endured from his friends, "Why do ye persecute me as God, and are not satisfied with my flesh." But, he triumphantly adds, torment me as ye will, there comes for me the complete vindication of my righteousness. For, although you think this destruction of my flesh a punishment from God for some unrighteousness on my side, ye shall see the day when I shall again stand in my lot, re-clothed in this flesh, face to face with my God. For I know that my Victor, my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand up at the last upon the earth, "on my side, and then shall I see Him for myself with mine own eyes, and in my proper flesh, that which shall be after the general resurrection, "when this corruptible shall put on incorruption." Surely "Another J. R." cannot be ignorant of the use of the word *ek* in Peek to signify "in," a classical use which approved itself to be the translator of the version put forth in the reign of James I. and is more than tacitly acknowledged by the revisers of 1885, whose marginal suggestion of "without" for "from my flesh" is merely an admission of the bare possibility of an interpretation that should convey the idea that Job, like some of the Sadducees of ancient and modern times, denied the "resurrection of the body," the flesh, which we profess to believe whenever we recite the Apostles' Creed, or, as in the Nicene, sing our belief in the "resurrection of the dead."

ED. RANSFORD.