

CALENDAR.

September 3, First Preparatory American Congress, 1771... 6 John Fealy, "The First Preacher upon St. Christopher's Islands," 1029... 7, Twelfth Sunday after Trinity... 8, Insen, Missionary from Ireland to France and Germany, 700... 9, Sebastopol evacuated, 1855

Tunes from the Chant and Tune Book published by the Synod of Toronto, arranged to selection from the Psalm and Hymn Books used by authority in the Diocese of Toronto TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Table with columns for Hymn No., Tune No., Psalm, and Verse. Lists hymns 95, 110, 147, 104, 88, 219, 165 and their corresponding psalms and verses.

Notice to Subscribers.

Subscribers, Mr. A. J. Frie is not in our employ as Agent or Collector... Griffiths being authorized to act in that capacity this City and neighbourhood

Notice.—We should feel extremely obliged if our Correspondents would adopt a good legible hand in writing to us. At the same time, we should like them to forward their contributions as early as possible.

Notice.—All Communications for the "Ontario Episcopal Gazette" should be addressed postpaid to the Editor, Ottawa, C W

Ontario Episcopal Gazette.

THE REV. C. P. EMERY, EDITOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1862

THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD

The Metropolitan has summoned the Provincial Synod for the 19th of this month. There will be a great deal for it to accomplish. The introduction of the Provincial Synod into the Colonies is quite an era of importance in our branch of the Catholic Church. We have a great deal to do in the way of establishing Ecclesiastical Tribunals, inasmuch as we are entirely left to legislate for ourselves. We can no longer apply to England for the settlement of our difficulties. The Court of the Metropolitan is henceforth becomes a matter of the greatest weight that we should proceed with the utmost care in establishing laws, and ordinances for that Court. Were we to be certain of always being blessed with so learned, judicious, impartial, and pious a man as our present Metropolitan, we could leave the whole matter in his hands; but seeing we cannot promise ourselves so great a blessing, it becomes us to provide such limitations that the Metropolitan may know exactly what he has to do when called on to sit in judgment.

Among other grave subjects which will naturally be discussed and settled will be:—

- 1. What is our legal position to the Mother Church?
2. Whether we ought not to drop the title the United Church of England and Ireland, and assume that of the Catholic Church in Canada, or that of the Canadian Catholic Church?
3. Whether it is not desirable that a form of Prayer of Thanksgiving for Harvest be adopted?
4. Whether questions touching adding to, or taking from the Book of Common Prayer, can be allowed?

We most earnestly hope that the Provincial Synod will not allow anything to be said about alterations being made in the Book of Common Prayer. To begin with, we have no objection to alterations of so grave a character; and if we had, there would be no end to the work. We should be always making alterations, as some of our Church Societies, who can never get their bye-laws to suit everybody. It would be a most dangerous experiment for us to touch the Prayer Book. It is quite true that in some cases, where there are three services in a Church, it is desirable to have Even Song said twice. Under these circumstances, which are very few, in fact we doubt whether there be six instances in Canada, why should not the Ordinary permit the Litany to be left out at Matins, and said in the Evening instead of Even Song being repeated?

We hope that some steps will be taken for erecting a suitable home for the widows and orphans of our Clergy. The question commends itself to the most serious consideration of the Provincial Synod. A great deal of trouble and expense would be saved the different Dioceses, and much comfort would accrue to our widow and orphans.

MEMBERS OF THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD

Francis, Lord Bishop of Montreal, and Metropolitan of Canada. George J. Lord, Bishop of Quebec. John, Lord Bishop of Toronto. Boninam, Lord Bishop of Huron. John T. Lord Bishop of Ontario.

MONTREAL DIOCESE
The Very Rev. the Dean of Montreal, Rev. Canon Leach, F. Davidson, Ven. Archdeacon Scott, Rev. F. Davidson, Ven. Archdeacon Bancroft, D. Landry, W. Anderson, G. Slack, J. C. Davidson

QUEBEC DIOCESE
Hon. Geo. Moffatt, Hon. J. S. McLeod, James Armstrong, Esq., J. S. Huntington, Esq., M. P. P. Waterloo, Wm. Barrett, Esq., Major Campbell, Hugh Taylor, Esq., R. A. Young, Esq., Dr. Smallwood, Edward Carter, Esq., Hiram Foster, Esq., Knowlton Brome Co., D. McNaughton, Esq.

QUEBEC DIOCESE (continued)
H. S. Scott, Esq., Quebec; George Irvine, Esq., Quebec, Right Hon. Lord Aylmer, Melbourne, Hon. Ed. Hale, Quebec, J. B. Forsyth, Esq., Quebec, Wm. Sprague, Esq., Quebec; E. J. Hemming, Esq., Drummondville; B. S. Morris, Esq., Lennoxville, Major H. W. Campbell, Quebec, Wm. Petry, Esq., Quebec; J. Thompson, Esq., Coaticook; Thos. Wood, Esq., New Ireland

QUEBEC DIOCESE (continued)
W. G. Wurtle, Esq., Quebec; Dr. Blath erwick, Quebec; C. N. Montzambert, Esq., R. H. Smith, Esq., Quebec; G. Wood, Esq., Quebec

TORONTO DIOCESE

Ven. Archdeacon of Toronto, Revs. Dr. Beaven, W. S. Darling, E. H. Dewar, Dr. T. B. Fuller, J. J. Geddes, S. Givins, H. T. Holland, T. S. Kennedy, A. Palmer, Dr. J. Short, Provost of Trinity College.

TORONTO DIOCESE (continued)
Hon. G. W. Allan, M. L. C., Hon. Geo. S. Boulton, M. L. C. Judges Bowell, Dr. C. J. Campbell, Esq., R. B. Denison, Esq., J. W. Gamble, Esq., S. B. Harman, Esq., E. G. O'Brien, Esq., Hon. J. Patton, T. C. Street, Esq., M. P. P.

HURON DIOCESE

Ven. Archdeacon Brough, London, Rev. R. M. Boomer, Galt; Rev. E. L. Elwood, Goderich, Rev. R. Flood, Delaware, Rev. J. W. Marsh, London; Rev. W. F. Sandys, Chatham; Rev. J. Smythe, S. Mary's, Blanshard, Rev. J. C. Usher, Bradford. Ven. Archdeacon Hellmuth, London; Rev. W. Bettridge, Woodstock; Rev. S. George Caulfield, S. Thomas, Rev. E. Sullivan, Birt.

ONTARIO DIOCESE
The Very Rev. the Dean of Ontario, Kingston; Rev. J. A. Mulock, Kingston, Ven. the Archdeacon of Ontario, Brockville; Revs. T. S. Lauder, Ottawa; T. H. M. Bartlett, Kingston; Wm. Beardsell, Trenton; R. L. Stephenson, Perth; J. G. Armstrong, West Hawkebury; C. Forest, Metcalf Village; F. R. Tans, Brockville; H. Mulkins, Kingston; Ven. the Archdeacon of Ottawa, Cornwall.

ONTARIO DIOCESE (continued)
T. Kirkpatrick, Esq., Q. C., Kingston; G. P. Baker, Esq., Ottawa; Hon. J. Sha., Smith's Falls; Hon. G. Crawford, Brockville, Hon. J. Hamilton, West Hawkebury; M. L. C.; W. B. Simpson, Esq., Kingston; W. Ellis, Esq., Prescott; R. F. Steele, Esq., Prescott; R. F. Steele, Esq., Brockville; Sheriff T. Corbett, Kingston; Edmund J. Sison, Esq., Belleville; S. G. Chesley, Esq., Cornwall; D. P. Jones, Esq., Gananoque

THE PROPOSED CANONS

The Rev. Dr. Beaven has notified the Secretaries of the Provincial Synod, of his intention to bring before that body, at its meeting on the tenth of this month, the Report of the Committee on Canons, presented to the Diocese of Toronto in 1854.

The Provincial Synod will have a great deal of important work at the coming Session. Adopting Canons will not be the least important. There will be many alterations made in those which Dr. Beaven suggests, and no doubt, there will be several Canons added. In reading over the Canons, there are a few alterations out of many, that strikes us to suggest. In Canon 1, under the head-

ing of the Queen's supremacy, we would suggest that the word "supremacy" be inserted before the word "power." In Canon 1, under the heading "Of Divine Service," etc. We would ask, is it right to legislate under the title of the English Church? It is quite evident that we are an independent branch of the Catholic Church, quite as much as the Church of the United States, and that we have no legal connection with the Church of England. We ought to legislate for the "Canadian Church." In Canon 2, we read that the Bishop shall order Prayers to be said "in such place of every Church" as he shall see fit. This ought to be erased, inasmuch as it may breed confusion. There is no danger but what our Churches will always be so built as to admit of a proper arrangement in saying prayer. In Canon 3 respecting the Order of Prayer to be used in Colleges, there is an important omission in not ordering that prayer be said daily in College Chapels. In Canon 4, under the heading "Ministers, their ordination," etc. We find that the Deacon must be of full age of 22. We think that careful consideration will lead our Bishops to see the importance of ordaining Deacons at an earlier age than 23. In Canon 5, the term Archbishop is used. It is intended to apply to the Metropolitan. In Canon 6, the Minister that omits to recite the Book of Common Prayer, is to be suspended at once. We think this too harsh and would suggest that he be first warned. In Canon 18, no reference is made to the use of a later's hood of decent stuff, while we consider an omission. We sincerely trust that the Canons of the Church will receive that consideration which they claim and will be made so practical that they may be put into use, and not be laid on our shelves as a sort of literary curiosity.

THE METROPOLITAN

Lawyers inform us that the Church in Canada has no legal connection with the Church at home. We have also been assured that the Metropolitan's patent affords no legal rights apart from Canadian legislation. Under such circumstances, we must acknowledge that we cannot understand what is meant by the Metropolitan's acts being subject to the general superintendance and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury. If we have no legal connection with England, it is quite evident that our Metropolitan is entirely independent of the Archbishop of Canterbury, unless we adopt a law putting him in subordination to Canterbury. Past experience plainly shows us that the establishment of a Pope was both dangerous and destructive to the spread of the Gospel, and we are now presented with the picture of a falling Pope. Let us take care not to establish another Pope in the person of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Good Catholics will never tolerate such a state of things. Let us act in a manly, straightforward manner, and do our work, as a vigorous branch of the Church.

Two important questions will arise at the coming Provincial Synod, touching the election of the Metropolitan, and the office being confined to one See. We trust that they will receive the gravest consideration. What ever conclusion may be arrived at, tending to the election of Metropolitan, it will never do for us in this Nineteenth century, to betraying experiments, this plan of proceeding we leave to those who are ever fond of novelty, at variance with the Catholic Church. Meanwhile, of course, is the See that must ever retain the office of Metropolitan. It is central for all the Canadian Dioceses. To be changing from one Diocese to the other will entail a host of difficulties, misunderstandings, and heartburnings. Besides this, expenses will be incurred and the status of the Church will be unsettled. The mode of electing the Metropolitan, will meet all difficulties, if we are content to follow the good old way of leaving the election in proper hands.

THE BICENTENARY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

The question is asked by many—Why did the late Synod of Ontario Diocese pass a resolution for Sunday the 24th of August, being St. Bartholomew's Day, to be observed as the Bicentenary of the Book of Common Prayer? Our answer is this that we were appointed for specially bringing before our people, the consideration of the great privilege they enjoy in possessing so admirable a medium of public worship, as the Book of Common Prayer, and for pointing out to them the history of the same. We will recount, for the sake of our brethren, some of the important items brought up on that day.

It was shown from reason, and from the common sense of man, that we should naturally expect that a common form would be required as the medium of invoking God in public worship, chiefly for the avoidance of familiarity and unpreparedness in addressing the Deity, and to enable the Church, at large, to join in the worship, and so to avoid the error of those who commission their Ministers to pray for them, and the equal error of those, who, having a form do not expect their people to join in it, but merely to kneel and gaze on, whilst the Clergy are going through all manner of antics, more becoming the stage, than the Altar of God.

In the next place it was proved that, the Old and New Testament afford several instances of Forms of Common Prayer, not only permitted, but enjoined by Almighty God. And that there never was an age of the Church of God before or after the Advent of Christ, without a Form of Common Prayer.

A threefold proof, showing the necessity of a common prayer, was then adduced—1. Those who have discarded the use thereof, have, sooner or later, fallen into the worst phases of infidelity. 2. Those who have a form of prayer without its being common, that is to say ordered so that all people may join in it, have fallen into a merely formal worship. Such is the case with the Romanists. 3. Thousands both among the Dissenters, and the Roman Church, who have rejected a common form, are fast hastening to adopt the same.

The next consideration was, the Book of Common Prayer must be agreeable to God's Holy Word, and to be so, it must be true in doctrine and practice. That used by the United Church of England and Ireland was proved to be so. The History of the Book of Common Prayer, as used by the United Church of England and Ireland, was then briefly considered. It was proved that, all the prayers were either, word for word, taken from Scriptures, or else founded on certain portions of the same. It was further shown, how those prayers had been collected from sources of the highest antiquity. How that they were derived, with few exceptions, from the Greek Church, and not the Roman. How the Book of Common Prayer was composed first in 1534, and underwent its last revision in 1662.

The Book of Common Prayer comes down to us as a basket full of choice gifts sprinkled with the blood of Martyrs; and whilst the true-hearted Catholic says, "Let not a word be added, or taken away, the Presbyterian calls it the bulwark of Protestantism; and the Roman Priest denounces it, as being the inducement in the way of Churchmen apostatizing in his falling, if not fallen Church. So mote it be.

A DIALOGUE ON THE MEANING OF THE WORD EVANGELICAL. (To the Editor of the O. R. G.) The Calvinists have confounded Christianity with Calvinism, and inasmuch that they are not able to give any man credit for the possession of Christian piety, nor any Christian Minister credit for being of "the right sort," unless he talks about religion in a Calvinistic subtileth. Several years ago the following dialogue took place between an eminent Evangelical Minister and myself, and which I have sent you for the purpose of setting forth the meaning of the word Evangelical, among what are called Evangelicals, and men of "the right sort."

Q.—Now, my dear sir, will you ask, if you please, whether truly Evangelical? A.—Not exactly so. I must allow, although I think well of you as a Christian.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

THE CHURCH IN CANADA

The members of the United Church of England and Ireland again finds, both from the Scriptures and from the primitive practice of the Church, that there is no command or law, by which power is given to any one Bishop to lead it over God's heritage; nor is there left with any one Bishop, above the rest, the sacred depository of truth. Again, the Churchman traces from the conduct of the holy Apostles themselves, that to their united counsel was committed the Ark of the New Covenant, and that for four hundred years the Christian faith was so preserved—all parts of the world acknowledging "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one hope of their calling one God and Father of all."

In the language of Dr. Newman, already alluded to, "the Church of Rome was, at first, a Catholic, and subsequently became a Papal Church." If then the Word of God and the primitive practice of the Church are altogether adverse to the claims of Rome to be considered as the mistress of all churches, we cannot be wrong in refusing to acknowledge her claims, and as Englishmen we must continue to be Protestant until Rome abandons her unfounded pretensions. In the 139th Canon the Church of England declares that "whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the sacred Synod of this Nation, in the name of Christ, and by the King's authority assembl'd, is not the true Church of England by representation, let him be excommunicated and not restored until he repent and publicly revoke that—his wicked error."

The Calvinists have confounded Christianity with Calvinism, and inasmuch that they are not able to give any man credit for the possession of Christian piety, nor any Christian Minister credit for being of "the right sort," unless he talks about religion in a Calvinistic subtileth. Several years ago the following dialogue took place between an eminent Evangelical Minister and myself, and which I have sent you for the purpose of setting forth the meaning of the word Evangelical, among what are called Evangelicals, and men of "the right sort."

A DIALOGUE ON THE MEANING OF THE WORD EVANGELICAL.

(To the Editor of the O. R. G.) The Calvinists have confounded Christianity with Calvinism, and inasmuch that they are not able to give any man credit for the possession of Christian piety, nor any Christian Minister credit for being of "the right sort," unless he talks about religion in a Calvinistic subtileth. Several years ago the following dialogue took place between an eminent Evangelical Minister and myself, and which I have sent you for the purpose of setting forth the meaning of the word Evangelical, among what are called Evangelicals, and men of "the right sort."

Q.—Now, my dear sir, will you ask, if you please, whether truly Evangelical? A.—Not exactly so. I must allow, although I think well of you as a Christian.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

THE CHURCH IN CANADA

The members of the United Church of England and Ireland again finds, both from the Scriptures and from the primitive practice of the Church, that there is no command or law, by which power is given to any one Bishop to lead it over God's heritage; nor is there left with any one Bishop, above the rest, the sacred depository of truth. Again, the Churchman traces from the conduct of the holy Apostles themselves, that to their united counsel was committed the Ark of the New Covenant, and that for four hundred years the Christian faith was so preserved—all parts of the world acknowledging "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one hope of their calling one God and Father of all."

In the language of Dr. Newman, already alluded to, "the Church of Rome was, at first, a Catholic, and subsequently became a Papal Church." If then the Word of God and the primitive practice of the Church are altogether adverse to the claims of Rome to be considered as the mistress of all churches, we cannot be wrong in refusing to acknowledge her claims, and as Englishmen we must continue to be Protestant until Rome abandons her unfounded pretensions. In the 139th Canon the Church of England declares that "whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the sacred Synod of this Nation, in the name of Christ, and by the King's authority assembl'd, is not the true Church of England by representation, let him be excommunicated and not restored until he repent and publicly revoke that—his wicked error."

The Calvinists have confounded Christianity with Calvinism, and inasmuch that they are not able to give any man credit for the possession of Christian piety, nor any Christian Minister credit for being of "the right sort," unless he talks about religion in a Calvinistic subtileth. Several years ago the following dialogue took place between an eminent Evangelical Minister and myself, and which I have sent you for the purpose of setting forth the meaning of the word Evangelical, among what are called Evangelicals, and men of "the right sort."

A DIALOGUE ON THE MEANING OF THE WORD EVANGELICAL.

(To the Editor of the O. R. G.) The Calvinists have confounded Christianity with Calvinism, and inasmuch that they are not able to give any man credit for the possession of Christian piety, nor any Christian Minister credit for being of "the right sort," unless he talks about religion in a Calvinistic subtileth. Several years ago the following dialogue took place between an eminent Evangelical Minister and myself, and which I have sent you for the purpose of setting forth the meaning of the word Evangelical, among what are called Evangelicals, and men of "the right sort."

Q.—Now, my dear sir, will you ask, if you please, whether truly Evangelical? A.—Not exactly so. I must allow, although I think well of you as a Christian.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

THE CHURCH IN CANADA

The members of the United Church of England and Ireland again finds, both from the Scriptures and from the primitive practice of the Church, that there is no command or law, by which power is given to any one Bishop to lead it over God's heritage; nor is there left with any one Bishop, above the rest, the sacred depository of truth. Again, the Churchman traces from the conduct of the holy Apostles themselves, that to their united counsel was committed the Ark of the New Covenant, and that for four hundred years the Christian faith was so preserved—all parts of the world acknowledging "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one hope of their calling one God and Father of all."

In the language of Dr. Newman, already alluded to, "the Church of Rome was, at first, a Catholic, and subsequently became a Papal Church." If then the Word of God and the primitive practice of the Church are altogether adverse to the claims of Rome to be considered as the mistress of all churches, we cannot be wrong in refusing to acknowledge her claims, and as Englishmen we must continue to be Protestant until Rome abandons her unfounded pretensions. In the 139th Canon the Church of England declares that "whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the sacred Synod of this Nation, in the name of Christ, and by the King's authority assembl'd, is not the true Church of England by representation, let him be excommunicated and not restored until he repent and publicly revoke that—his wicked error."

The Calvinists have confounded Christianity with Calvinism, and inasmuch that they are not able to give any man credit for the possession of Christian piety, nor any Christian Minister credit for being of "the right sort," unless he talks about religion in a Calvinistic subtileth. Several years ago the following dialogue took place between an eminent Evangelical Minister and myself, and which I have sent you for the purpose of setting forth the meaning of the word Evangelical, among what are called Evangelicals, and men of "the right sort."

A DIALOGUE ON THE MEANING OF THE WORD EVANGELICAL.

(To the Editor of the O. R. G.) The Calvinists have confounded Christianity with Calvinism, and inasmuch that they are not able to give any man credit for the possession of Christian piety, nor any Christian Minister credit for being of "the right sort," unless he talks about religion in a Calvinistic subtileth. Several years ago the following dialogue took place between an eminent Evangelical Minister and myself, and which I have sent you for the purpose of setting forth the meaning of the word Evangelical, among what are called Evangelicals, and men of "the right sort."

Q.—Now, my dear sir, will you ask, if you please, whether truly Evangelical? A.—Not exactly so. I must allow, although I think well of you as a Christian.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.

Q.—Then do you believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which is personal, absolute, and unconditioned, and indivisible in its most results? A.—Well then my dear friend, it first is really the Evangelical belief, then are we not Evangelical? And here the argument must close.