

covetousness! Psalm cxix. 86. Not to put self first! 1 Cor. x. 24. If Lot's heart had been perfect before God, he would have allowed God to "choose his inheritance for him," instead, he got his wish but, found sorrow, Ps. cvi. 15. On the other hand those who leave the choice to God, "their path is as the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day," Prov. iv. 18,

With smiles of peace, and looks of love,
Light in our dwellings we may make,
Bid kind good humour brighten there,
And still do all for Jesus' sake.

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

THE TOWER OF BABEL.

SIR,—They, viz. the Church, were all of one language, and one speech. But having left her 'first love'—a scheme, instead of moulding the soft clay into bricks, was adopted—whereby to 'reach unto heaven.' But this being contrary to true wisdom, the Lord did there confound their language, which resulted in 'divisions'—as a judgment upon the folly and presumption, and these divisions, now known as 'denominations,' continue until the present day.

But 'divisions' are not in accordance with the mind of the Founder of the Church. Therefore, in the very next chapter to that which narrates the cause and origin of the 'scattering,' we find the commencement of the true plan of union, in the call of Abraham, namely, leave all and follow him, the Father of the Faithful, in whose line was to arise the Saviour, to restore unity again according to the Master Builder's plan, as laid down in the iv. ch. of Ephesians, and never to be corrupted or dissolved.

A. C. F.

Sandwich, March 20, 1885.

REV. HUGH JOHNSTON'S SERMON.

SIR.—In looking over the Rev. Hugh Johnston's sermon, preached at the "Metropolitan Church" on the 16th inst., I find the following:—The Romish system is a thing of development and the growth of long centuries. In St. Patrick's Day priests and archbishops married. Now no priest can marry. It was forbidden in the days of Hildebrand. St. Patrick did not teach the doctrine of transubstantiation, that came in the 18th century. Nor did he teach Auricular confession to the priest, that was also added by Innocent III. Nor did he teach the doctrine of infallibility, a dogma that has been added in our day. When England accepted the new faith, Ireland did not.

Would not Mr. Johnston have been more historically correct if he had said when England rejected the new faith Ireland did not? Mr. Johnston has himself shown in the paragraph I have quoted, that, transubstantiation, auricular confession, and infallibility, were new dogmas, all of which, with many others, the Church of England rejected at the Reformation. If the faith were new it would be worthless. The faith that was once, and once for all delivered to the saints we are bound "to keep" not to change it, or give it up, in order to accept a new faith in its stead. It was only the new dogmas that the Church of Rome, in the course of ages, by her process of development had added to the ancient faith which the Church of England rejected at the Reformation. The ancient faith is always the same, and ever will be. Mr. Johnston by such careless and crude statements, without perhaps intending it, is playing into the hands of Rome. The Church of Rome broadly teaches that she, and she alone has the faith once delivered to the saints, and that the Protestant faith is a new one, and Mr. Johnston, if he does not teach the same thing, fully admits the fact. "When England accepted the new faith, Ireland did not."

WM. LOGAN.

CONVERSION.

SIR.—In my last letter on this subject, I tried to show that the verb "to convert" is not used in the New Testament in a technical sense, and spoke of the verb in its popular religious meaning as an endeavour to read a narrow technical meaning into it. "Layman" has taken exception to what I said in stating my position. We are told (St. Luke i. 16,) that the angel said to Zacharias of St. John Baptist, (who was beheaded before Pentecost). "And many

of the children of Israel shall be converted to the Lord, their Lord," and if the following verse (the 17th,) be compared with Mal. iv. 6, it will be seen that the Old Testament, to turn—to convert of the New Testament. On looking up 2 Peter ii. 21, 22; Gal. iv. 9, we find this same verb used of what we should call a sad perversion. It seems to me (I state my opinion with diffidence) that the verb "to convert" is used in the way in which it is used in general conversation, as when we speak of a convert to Mormonism, or the Church of Christ, or Plymouthism, or from sin. We now turn to the three passages quoted by "Layman" in his letter contained in your issue of the 5th March.

1st. St. Matt. xiii. 14, 15 verses. This passage is a quotation of our Lord's, from Is. vi. 9, 10, and is cited by St. Paul, Acts xxiii. 26, and St. John, in John xii. 40, all from LXX. version. After carefully reading it and its context in Isaiah I have come to this conclusion, the prophet is commanded to tell the Jews that criminal wilful spiritual blindness and deafness prevented them from acting upon the continual call to "conversion" the "Turn ye" of the prophets, and our Lord simply quotes it to show that the Jews, even in His day, were still blind and deaf spiritual; as indeed they were and unconverted after Pentecost.

2nd. St. Matt. xviii. 3. "Except ye be converted and become as little children ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." If there be one place more than another in which this word is used in its ordinary sense of "to be turned, and not in any technical sense it is here." St. Mark tells us the disciples had been disputing as to "who should be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven," and having come to our Lord with the question he gives them a divine lesson, (see St. Matt. xviii. 1 to 6 versé,) having set a child in the midst, he tells them simply that they should "turn from their self-seeking ambition and regain the relative blamelessness of children, the temper most suiting the children of the Kingdom of Heaven," viz., the Holy Church, (the 8rd verse must be qualified by the 4th.)

3rd. St. Luke xxiii. 31 to 34 verses, inclusive. I see no reason for reading into the word "converted" here a technical meaning—our Lord in this short conversation tells St. Peter, "Satan has desired to have you (this word you is plural referred to all the apostles,) I have prayed for thee, (this thee, is an individualising pronoun, indicating St. Peter himself as about being in the most dangerous position,) and then follows the prophecy of his denial and fall, what inference would any ordinary man draw from this, other than that the "conversion" referred to was the recovery from the fall?

I used the word "recovery" not as implying apostasy, but in the sense it is often used, as regaining ones feet after a stumble, and "Layman" acknowledges St. Peter's fall, nothing surely but an extraordinary ingenuity could have imagined any other meaning in this connection. If "Layman" will kindly take his Greek Testament and in every place where he finds the verb in any of its tenses and forms, read his technical sense into it, I think he may yet become a "convert" to another way of looking at this question. I believe a more broad and Catholic one. And yet far be it from me, to say his conclusions are "bold assumptions" or "foolish opinions having no foundation," for if he writes more on this subject I shall read, with every attention, all he has to say on it,

Yours truly,

W. B.

SIR.—In the letters on Conversion which have appeared in your paper, notice has not been taken (so far as I have observed) of one striking fact, viz., that the very incorrect and misleading phrase, "Be converted" of the A. V. entirely disappears in the Revised Version. I call it incorrect, because as "W. B." has well pointed out, the verb of the original is in the middle voice—"To turn one's self," not to be turned by some one else. And I call it misleading, because I conceive this false rendering has contributed greatly to that popular confounding of Conversion with regeneration (in which latter the subject is indeed passive), and has given that *opus opo ratum* character to what "Layman" calls popular modern conversion.

The expression, "Be converted" is used seven times in the N. T. Four of these (viz., St. Matt. xiii. 15; St. Mark iv. 12; St. Jno. xii. 40; Acts xviii. 27,) are quotations of one and the same text Isaiah vi. 10. In the Revised Version the word in all these four is rendered "turn" or "turn again." The three remaining texts are; St. Matt. xviii. 3, "Except ye be converted," in R. V. "Except ye turn"; St. Luke xxii. 32, "When thou art converted," in R. V. "When once thou hast turned again"; Acts iii. 19, "Repent and be converted," in R. V. "And turn again."

G. J. L.

ERRORS OF W. B. ON CONVERSION.

SIR.—In my last letter, in the sixteenth and seventeenth lines of the fourth paragraph, where "resolution" is substituted for "revolution" and "involved" is put in place of "revolved."

LAYMAN.

ALGOMA.

SIR.—Will you kindly grant me space to gratefully acknowledge the reception, this week, of an extra number of papers and periodicals, &c., from my numerous friends in England and Canada. It would be impossible for me, with my Lenten work, to do this to each individual sender. Their kind notes will be preserved, and, (D. V.), in due order responded to, if I am spared. The S. S. Superintendent, for whom an appeal was made in "The Banner of Faith," some months ago, has now had a supply sent, which last at least two or three years, and therefore, unless I hear to the contrary, if any further materials for S. S. work are sent, I shall appropriate them to other schools which I know are equally in want. Many of your readers have responded to the appeal, hence it is, I wish to mention the matter in DOMINION CHURCHMAN. You generously printed a letter of mine some months ago, in which I gave a long list of the papers sent through me; since then, and partly owing to what you did, I have received many additional papers and magazines. This week has brought me "Illustrated London News," "Graphic," "Punch," "Moonshine," four copies of "Guardian," "Standard," "St. James Chronicle," "Morning Post," "Living Church," "The Church Evangelist," and these are to come regularly for some time. I have also sent me every week, sometimes more than one copy of, "Longman's Magazine," "Penny Post," "New and Old," "Sunshine," "Gospeller," "Dawn of Day," "The Quiver," "The Argosy," "Sunday at Home," "Family Churchman," "The Young Christian Soldier," and others too numerous to mention. Some unknown friend has sent me a well preserved copy of "Plain Tracts for Holy Seasons," published in 1858, another has sent me an excellent copy of the "Prayer Book, Interleaved," whilst some one else sent me a good copy of "The Church Catechism, explained by way of question and answer, and confirmed by Scripture proofs," by John Lewis, Minister of Margate, Kent, which has the date in it of 1810. This, my son has gladly accepted, for use in his young men's Bible class. Sufficiently nice pictures, with stamped out frames, ready to hang up, have been sent, as will enable me to give one to each head of a family who attends St. Mary's Church, Aspdin, and who is a regular communicant, and thus do some thing to adorn and cheer their bush homes. I have also had a large number of Easter cards sent me, ample to give one to every child attending my Sunday School at St. George's, Lancelot, and St. Mary's, Aspdin.

Our Almighty Father has indeed dealt very graciously with me. Perhaps it may give some of your readers extra pleasure, when I state, that I give away on an average, about twenty-five copies of Church of England Temperance Chronicle every week. When I was paying a pastoral visit yesterday, the good woman of the house received her mail whilst I was present, she showed it to me with no little pride, saying "I never hunger for reading now, sir." May God's holy name be praised, for I am certain that nothing but good can accrue, when so much sound literature is scattered broadcast amongst them. When I state that a "sack" has to be taken every week for my mail, as can be seen at our post office. I am sure, all my friends will not be surprised to hear, that the constant tension upon my nervous system, has, at last, told even upon my hardy frame, and it is becoming an absolute necessity that I should seek a change for a time, or give the work up altogether. I cannot sufficiently thank those who have so liberally and generously aided me, nor you for so freely admitting me to the pages of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN, for upwards of nine years. I can but leave you in the hands of Him for Whose Glory you have all so readily joined me, in what can be called, without egotism, I think, a good work. I am, etc.,

WILLIAM CROMPTON,
Priest.

Aspdin, P.O., Muskoka, Canada.
March 31st, 1885.

An English missionary was invited to the house of a German professor and deputy. After dinner the host apologised to the missionary for the *decollate* dresses of the ladies. "Don't mention it," said the missionary, "I have lived for ten years among the savages of Africa, and am quite accustomed to such sights."