

selves Christians." And over those of them, whom I firmly believe to be outside of Christ's Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, my very soul yearns, with the most tender compassion and pity; and for whose spiritual welfare and safety, I would most gladly say and do anything in reason, not inconsistent with that which I very sincerely and humbly believe to be the very truth of God. It may, nevertheless, be just possible, that Dr. Carry will regard me as one of those who need to be "more sympathetic," for no other reason than that we are not of one mind, as to how, when, and where, Christian sympathy is to be exercised, if indeed we are even so much as agreed as to the exact and proper meaning of the thing itself. He speaks of the Church of England as being "under obligation to testify against the position of un-Catholic bodies, and to express the sincerest sympathy towards them as Christians and brethren." I think this is a very hard "obligation," because, I very much doubt whether it is within the range of possibility. "To testify against the position," and "express the sincerest sympathy towards them." How? Is it at the same time, or alternately and periodically? If sympathy be genuine and true, can it be expressed merely towards anything or anybody? Why does Dr. Carry say "towards," and not either for or with? Was either of these little words too strong to be used here? Would not the sentence quoted, be much more consistent with the real circumstances of the case, if it were as follows: "under obligation to testify against the errors, either forming or sustaining the position of non-Catholic bodies; and to both have and show the most tender compassion and pity for such bodies, as erring men."

Dr. Carry says he is "not guilty of half the absurdities I father on him, and he cannot imagine how I could make such charges." Well, I never said he was "guilty," of anything, and I have therefore never charged him with being "guilty of absurdities" nor made any "charges" at all; hence, he decides wisely when he says he "won't discuss them," and I certainly decide the same way as to the "charges." I have indeed endeavoured to show on his part, error in judgment, error of the head, but of the heart never; and he does me no more than justice when he acquits me "of any idea of malicious disparagement." He says the "one baptism" originates and creates the brotherhood. Now this is either absolute error, or it is a sample of that confusion of thought and idea, which inevitably leads to error. As I understand the matter, "the Christian Church," and the "Christian brotherhood," are terms identical. The one comprehends no more than the other. Does the "one baptism" originate and create the church? Certainly not. The one or the other was originated and created at, and not before or after, the occasion of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the great day of Pentecost. And to say that there may be any other or further origination or creation of the church or brotherhood is manifestly absurd. Was not the one or the other complete and perfect, by virtue of this great and special baptism, before even one single person had been baptised with the "one baptism" at all. For the purposes of this question only; has any baptism which has taken place during the interval from that hour till the present, been anything more than an adding to this church, or this brotherhood. Acts ii. 41? Has it anything more to do with the originating or creating of the brotherhood, than have the baptisms which Dr. Carry has administered during the past few years to do with the origin or creation of the congregation which he faithfully serves. In this view of the whole matter (and I have not put forward as mine any other view of it) he is quite correct when he says "the brotherhood is indissoluble in this world. Even excommunication does not abolish it." Of course not. Who says it does? Not I. But if Dr. Carry means to say that the connection of a brother with the brotherhood "is indissoluble, etc.," then I ask him how he interprets the words of our blessed Lord, St. John xv. 2 quoted by me in my first letter, but to which Dr. Carry for some reason best known to himself, has not alluded. Will he now kindly say in what manner or form he thinks the "taking away" has in any case happened or might happen. "Taketh away." Where from and where to? Does not the second part of the text clearly indicate that it is a taking away both before "the hour of death and the day of judgment," and therefore a taking away out of one kingdom into another, even out of the Kingdom of Christ, into the kingdom of Satan, which for purposes of the question at issue, are the only kingdoms throughout the whole world. And here be it remembered, that it does not by any means follow either that all who belong to and remain in the one kingdom shall be saved; or that all who belong to, and remain in the other shall without any exception at all be lost. If the taking away of certain branches of the "True Vine" by Him who is the Divine Husbandman be not a complete severing of the "branch" from the "Vine" as Dr. Carry seems to hold, simply because it is quite true that it may be "restored" again, then it must be held to follow that

when the human husbandman with his pruning knife, severs a branch from the natural vine, it is not severed at all simply because it may be restored again by the act of grafting. But Dr. Carry and every other sane and intelligent being knows very well, that in the case of the natural vine the branch is severed, by the pruning knife, and hence it follows that "every branch" of the "True Vine" which the "Father taketh away" is also completely severed; for if not then the symbol (I speak reverently) is more absolute and extensive than that which is symbolized, which cannot be possible.

W. J. McCLEARY.

## THE CLERGY TRUST.

LETTER No. 5.

SIR,—Under the Award of the Arbitrators dividing the funds and lands between the dioceses of Toronto and Huron, it states that the diocese of Huron should execute a covenant to the Church Society of the diocese of Toronto, that the securities received from the latter, in reference to the Bishop and Archdeacon's fund, should be applied thereto, but it was necessary to pass a by-law confirming the same, because no appropriation could be made of any surplus arising from the Commutation fund otherwise than by law. Nevertheless, if one by law could be repealed, any other could, and the Canon of the Synod of 1876 declared that all by-laws and canons respecting the Commutation fund and the Surplus interest thereof, should be rescinded, and all grants made in pursuance of any such should absolutely cease and determine. How the Huron diocese stands in relation to the Toronto diocese respecting the covenant made concerning the Bishop's and Archdeacon's fund, is another matter for consideration, but it is clear that no arrangement could render null and void the conditions of the Clergy Trust. If wrong was done by rescinding the by-law relating to the Bishop and Archdeacon, wrong was also done to the rest of the clergy, and why the former should continue to receive their annuities, and not the latter, only serves to prove the injustice which has been done. According to the construction put upon the Clergy Trust, it is declared that the Trustees were not bound to divide equally any income arising therefrom, among the claimants, but there is not one word which conveys the idea that it was ever intended the Bishop and Archdeacon to have the lion's share. I have not raised any objection to their having more than Benjamin's portion, but on what ground of equity can it be maintained that they should retain such a goodly portion, and their poorly paid, struggling brethren, be deprived of their little pittance, so necessary and proper for their "maintenance and support?" The only answer I know of that might be given would be that "unto him that hath shall be given, but unto him that hath not even that which he seemeth to have shall be taken away." I have not been able to find any Com-mentator of authority or otherwise, who has ventured to assert that such a declaration has the remotest reference to financial matters. I cannot conceive it possible that any but an Oriental imagination with crude ideas of honesty would so interpret the inspired word of truth. According to the standard of Oriental Christianity, such an interpretation would be inadmissible. The Doctor calls the appropriation a gratuity, and also declares it to be an annuity. The terms are not synonymous, the one denoting continuance or permanency, whilst the other is complete by a single act. The Rector appears greatly exercised over the popular "young man," and not without reason; his grievance, however, is the result of the injustice which he so deplors in these words, "the former administration of the surplus of the Commutation fund, so thoroughly met this evil, that it never seemed to exist." Could my reverend brother bear stronger testimony to the injustice of the legislation of 1876, and yet he asserted that the Synod "resolved in its justice, to throw the surplus into the Mission fund?" His idea about wealthy laymen creating a fund for the benefit of clergymen who have laboured long and well, will scarcely commend itself so as to assume any practical form, when viewed in the light of the administration of a fund which was created by clergymen for the very purpose, and which owing to a want of Christian integrity, has so signally failed in the result. When Dr. Beaumont speaks of "the strongest assurances given by our late excellent Bishop," and the clergy looked in vain for the fulfilment of them, I agree with the correctness of his comment of them, I agree with the loose stone in the arch, or rather as the result demonstrates, the "key" stone was wanting. I will now consider the idea which he propounds as a solution of our financial difficulties, and show that it is purely chimerical.

J. T. WRIGHT.

The Pastorage,  
St. Mary's, Dec. 2nd, 1885.

To be continued.

## BIBLE WINES.

SIR,—As the subject is getting thread bare, I shall not ask for much space; but I should like to call the attention of those who are interested in the subject, to some Bible testimony as to the intoxicating nature of wine which I have never heard or seen quoted; and which I think may be taken as conclusive evidence. In 1 Esdras 8, verse 10 to 24, they will find "The first wrote, wine is the strongest. Then began the first, who had spoken of the strength of wine; and he said thus: O ye men, how exceeding strong is wine, it causeth all men to err that drink it; it maketh the mind of the king, and of the fatherless child to be all one; of the bondman and of the free-man, of the poor man, and of the rich; it turneth also every thought into jollity and mirth, so that a man remembereth neither sorrow or debt; and it maketh every heart rich, so that a man remembereth neither king nor governor; and it maketh to speak all things by talents; and when they are in their cups, they forget their love both to friends and brethren, and a little after draw out swords; but when they are from the wine, they remember not what they have done. O ye men, is not wine the strongest that enforceth to do this?"

It may, of course, be objected that Esdras is not universally accepted as Scripture, but I believe that few doubt the antiquity of the book.

SPARHAM SHELDRAKE.

## Notes on the Bible Lessons

FOR SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS, ON  
THE INSTITUTE LEAFLETS.

Published under authority of the Sunday School Committee of the Toronto Diocese.

Compiled from Rev. J. Watson's "Lesson on the Miracles and Parables of our Lord" and other writers.

DECEMBER 20th, 1885.

VOL. V. 4th Sunday in Advent. No. 4

### BIBLE LESSON.

"The Healing of the Centurion's Servant."

St. Luke vii. 1, 10; St. Matt. viii. 5, 13.

The scene of our lesson is changed to-day from Cana to Capernaum. Here it was that the nobleman's family lived too. Some Roman troops were quartered at Capernaum, they were generally detested by the Jews who as a conquered nation were only kept down by a strong and cruel rule, naturally therefore they looked upon the Roman soldiers as the instruments of their degradation. And the Romans paid them back in their own coin by in turn holding everything Jewish in supreme contempt. We see an instance to-day how love disarms hate.

(1) *The Centurion of Capernaum.* The Roman officer, commanding the garrison, called a centurion because roundly speaking he usually commanded one hundred men, was an uncommon man. We read in St. Luke vii. 2, that his servant or slave was dear to him; Roman masters were often very cruel to their slaves. Again, he loved the Jews, verse 5, and they loved him, verse 4. He had built them a beautiful synagogue at his own expense. He was no doubt a proselyte like the other good centurion, Cornelius, mentioned in Acts x. 1, 2. The centurion's servant was very ill, St. Matt. in ch. viii. 6, says he was "sick of the palsy, grievously tormented."

(2) *The Centurion's Humility.* St. Matthew tells us he came himself, St. Luke describing the circumstance more minutely, says he did not come in person, but thinking himself unworthy sent some elders of the Jews to plead his request that Jesus would come and heal his servant, or perhaps he first sent and then came in person. Even now-a-days, however, it is common to describe a person as doing himself what he does by others. In both narratives his humility is expressly mentioned. Here was the greatest man in Capernaum asking help from Jesus, the humble carpenter. He remembered the partition wall between Jew and Gentile, very likely had heard the Scribes speak of the great king they expected; but He was to be King of the Jews, the centurion therefore sends the elders thinking that Jesus would be more likely to listen to them than to him a Gentile.

(3) *The Centurion's Faith.* Jesus immediately granted their request, St. Luke vii. 6, and St. Matt. viii. 7, "I will come and heal him," but as He was going, other messengers come with a strange request, St. Luke vii. 6. He begs Jesus not to put Himself to any trouble of coming. His word will be enough, spoken wherever He is. In verse 8, the centurion argues thus; if I, who am a man with superior officers, obey them; and have only to say to my soldiers, do this or that, and they obey me instantly, how much more wilt Thou, who hast none over Thee, but art