

tion, applause and thanks from that august body in conclave assembled. I shall myself rejoice, and your readers will rejoice also, when having passed the financial step, I ascend to intellectual and moral results. These alone give stability and permanence to a seat of true learning. Again I say. AU REVOIR.

INCONSISTENCY.

Sir,—In reading your city contemporary to day, I am extremely struck with the inconsistency of the school of thought represented by it. It says, "The five points of Ritualism are eastward position, altar lights, vestments, water bread and mixed chalice. Paul does not mention them, nor yet Peter, nor John. If tomorrow they all vanish from the earth, the Gospel of Jesus Christ would be as complete, as effectual, and as gracious as ever it was." To read this one would imagine your contemporary, had a most profound contempt for all outward show. But a few pages on, referring to Christ Church, Leamington, it says, "In this church, the Protestant, blackgown with bands, is consistently with the Protestant Church, and the spiritual doctrines of grace in use." Evidently your contemporary considers the black gown an outward sign of Protestantism, and of the scriptural doctrines of grace. If the Low Churchman has a sign of his belief, in the shape of a vestment, why should not the High Churchman have one? Why is the black the peculiar colour of the Protestant Church? A friend asks, "Why should not a white silk vestment be worn at the altar, if a black silk one can be worn in the pulpit."

Yours,
CHARLES GRANT.

HURON.

Sir,—Your excellent and pacific editorial of last week lament the Church of this diocese, has already borne fruit. The laity were much impressed with its earnest Christian tone; some of them have been at work issuing a form of petition addressed to the Bishop showing why a special Synod should be called and sending it throughout the diocese for signatures. The feeling is strong in its favor, and those who wish for peace speak highly of it. It helps the Bishop in his difficult position, who is said to be in favor of peace. There are a few whose selfish interests are served by strife, and who like "Iago," professing devotion to his Lordship, know he will be more or less dependent upon them by a state of discord and variance being continued. May God frustrate their knavish tricks. Everyone who loves the Church and her Head, and influenced by good will to the Bishop, will assist heartily as unto the Lord, in bringing to a close contentions, which never should have been commenced, and never would but for the misapprehension of their true character, caused by debasing and intriguing measures. The hour is coming when the diocese will say, in review of this terrible calamity—"An enemy did this."

OBSERVER.

THE SYNOD GREETINGS.

Sir,—1. The series of sharp animadversions on my defence of the word "fraternal" in re Synod Greetings, the last being Mr. W. J. McCleary's, has pressed upon me the reflection—Never be too sure. I thought I was in the company of good Catholics and learned theologians, when I walked humbly in the steps of Augustine, and Hooker, and Liddon; but Messrs. Cole, Seward and McCleary, choose to think differently. I am far from censuring them for their opinion about lay-baptism. They have "the last of our great patristic scholars." Waterland on their side; but it is a matter of fact that Western Christendom, ever since the time of Cyprian, has been on the other side, and from the moment I became fully aware of that fact, I felt that as a Catholic Churchman, I should submit my individual logic, which was on the side of my censurers, to the settled judgment and practice of the Church, and I did so. In one word, the validity of lay-baptism is now the law of the Church of England, by which our practice must be governed, though our opinions are free.

2. I am sure that all your correspondents are substantially agreed as to the Synod Greetings. We have Catholic claims which we should never allow to be put in the back ground, and we have a providential position which we should never compromise. This has been recognized not only by the Ultramontane De Maistre, but by the Hibbert Lecturer, who says, "The Church of England has held, and still holds, a middle and a mediating place in Christendom." On this very ground [we are at once under obligation to testify against the position of unCatholic bodies, and to express the sincerest sympathy towards them as Christians and brethren. And for this sympathy how very large a basis is there! Take almost any Trinitarian Protestant Sect, what a large mass of Catholic truth do you find there. Even the besetting

heresy of Protestantism, the Nestorian heresy, has never had such a naked and desperate development as in "the worship of the Sacred Heart," the favorite Cult of the present Roman Church, in the face of her ancient hierarchy, rites and continuous descent. If Protestant Sectarianism is a principle fatal to the Church's organized life, the historic Roman Church has largely injured that life by papalism and her amazing corruptions in belief and worship.

3. The only real question is, how may we best express the sympathy which is undoubtedly due, without any of our Catholic claims and position? Good churchmen may naturally enough differ here, because practical decisions are often much harder than theoretical ones; as the sects themselves painfully find when they attempt to work out their theory of imaginary unity. One thing is very clear, against Mr. McCleary, (no pun intended), that we were not understood to be making any surrender. I remember the kind and discreet words of Principal Grant, spoken with a tender pathos which, I confess touched me very deeply: "This means much, but I am aware it does not mean everything." I won't spoil the words by any comment, but they express exactly my own feeling. The words of Mr. Justice Rose too were very much to be commended. And surely, sir, it is not for us, English Churchmen, who occupy such an isolated position in Christendom, the sense of which once drove so many weak men to Rome, proudly to keep at arm's length any of the baptized who would approach us under the sense of awakened brotherly feeling.

Rather should we thankfully hail so hopeful an action and pray for its perfection in unity, meanwhile declaring with all humility our obligation to maintain those treasures of Catholic faith, order and unity which God has providentially continued in the English Church, for no deserts of ours, but for the benefit of Christendom and the world. If our "mediating" position is to be of any use in the purposes of God, we must use it.

4. I am not guilty of half the "absurdities" that Mr. McCleary fathers on me. Acquitting him of any idea of malicious disparagement, I cannot imagine how he could make such charges. I won't discuss them. But I must hold that as there is but "one baptism," the brotherhood it originates is indissoluble in this world. Even excommunication does not abolish it, as Mr. McCleary seems to hold, but interrupts the manifestation of it; as the fact of absolution and restored communion shows. And so Keble:

"No distance breaks the tie of blood;
"Brothers are brothers evermore."

Without approving Mr. McCleary's vehement language, I allow that he has some ground for saying, "To say that the other great sacrament of the Church is the very bond of brotherhood would be much nearer the truth." But "distingus;" bond is an equivocal word. It means that which creates an obligation and also that which actually does bind. In the first sense, Baptism is the great bond of brotherhood, because it creates it; in the second sense the other sacrament is the great bond of brotherhood, because it maintains, continues and expresses it. So in our earthly life, a common paternity is the indissoluble bond of brotherhood; but a common life under the same roof and around the same table is the security and expression of it. Mr. McC. is so jealous for the unity of the Church, that he holds me "incorrect" in saying that schism "breaks it up." I should have said it seems, "the abandonment of the true brotherhood." Well, when three brothers out of six forsake the father's house in anger, they don't, according to this, break up the family, they only abandon it! So when a schisma, "rent," is made in a garment, it is the piece torn away that suffers, and not the garment! Not so thought St. Chrysostom, who says that it is the revolt of one to schism. "I grieve, and weep, and wail, and am cut to the very heart, as though deprived of one of my own members." Alas, in vain do we thus defend the unity of the Church. The Church's unity as well as her sanctity is actually violated, and there remains for us but an ideal not yet realized. I am not surprised at Mr. McCleary's alarm. The same feeling led later ages, as Dr. Swainson has shewn, to drop out of St. James' Liturgy *pauison ta schismata ton ekklesion*, "put an end to the schisms of the churches." Mr. McCleary vainly "fears" that I believe that everything that certain wise men "have on every occasion spoken or written is of necessity wise." I don't, and much less do I believe in the wisdom of unwise men. But as I am very sure that some of your readers will not think J. H. Newman in his Anglican days unworthy of notice, I beg to refer them for the present subject to his "Sermons on Subjects for the day," No. xxiv, where they will perhaps be surprised as well as edified; also I refer the Newman's worthy antagonist, W. A. Butler, Sermons, 1st series, No. xxiv. The digesting of these two sermons might not make your readers stronger churchmen, but it would be very likely to make some of them more sympathetic.

Yours,
JOHN CARRY.

Port Perry, 16 Oct., 1885.

THE STATE OF THE SOUL AFTER DEATH.

Sir,—Your correspondent J. R., "Brockville," in his article "Protestant Purgatory," in DOMINION CHURCHMAN, October 1, has not, if I am any judge, made out a very clear case. Indeed, what he says on the subject is far from being the Church's utterance, and this is what we are to be anxious about. Purgatory, as represented by her, and which is undoubtedly the true explanation, is as Dr. Staunton says, "a supposed place of temporary punishment, where the souls of the departed are purged by fire, previous to their admittance to heaven; the pains of which are held to be expiatory, and are proportioned in degree and duration to the demerits of the sufferer." We know that the Church is very explicit in her denunciation of this very erroneous and corrupt doctrine of the Church of Rome. In article 22, the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, is declared to be a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God. As to what your correspondent says about Protestants, (he evidently means ultra-Protestants) adopting the Romish theory, I cannot understand. Most true is it that the body and spirit must be re-united at the resurrection, as our Lord exemplified, and plainly taught, but I deny that there is nothing in His teaching and that of His Apostles, to prove that there is no intermediate state whatever.

That there is an intermediate state into which the soul passes at death, it would seem, there can be no doubt of. No one would be guilty of the absurdity of affirming that the soul of the departed goes directly to heaven, the final abode of the righteous. Else what is to be done with the doctrines of the Resurrection. As J. R. aptly and truly says, "if the spirit alone can enjoy all the happiness of the blest, what need to resurrect the body at all? In my flesh shall I see God." Yet after this, he goes on to assert that Protestants, (he does not define which of the numerous bodies) accept the Romish doctrine of purgatory. As to the other doctrine of the "invocation of Saints," condemned alike by the Church, I think that it is far more generally received and acted upon by ignorant unreflecting Protestants, so called.

The intervening time between death and the resurrection, we know little about. Almost nothing is said in Revelations concerning it. It may be passed (as J. R. says), in a sort of slumber. That it is a period of rest; rest from the labours and toils of this life is plainly revealed, see Rev. xiv. 13, and quoted by your correspondent. This is pretty much all that we know about it. I contend, therefore, that in accepting the doctrine of an intermediate state, one is far from endorsing the Romish teaching on Purgatory. It is simply accepting the only reasonable and Scriptural theory that can be found for this somewhat obscure question. The human mind will, if possible, have some solution of the mysteries which surround it. And the fact that the Romish doctrine of purgatory does not answer the demand, makes nothing against the more Scriptural doctrine of simply an intermediate state.

You will understand, that there is not the slightest wish or desire to do your correspondent any injustice, I am ready to acknowledge that his meaning might have been mistaken, yet it cannot be denied, he writes very ambiguously. If, as is possible, he holds to the doctrine of the Church, versus those who have adopted opinions different to her teaching, there is no danger and no occasion for animadversion, but, on the contrary, if the purpose was to overthrow the faith of some and drive them to the adoption of theories and doctrines subversive of what has always been held by the Church, the voice of warning should be heard.

Here and there in his communication, it is true, the assertion of truth is made, but so obscurely, it is difficult to comprehend what the writer is aiming at.

Nothing, indeed, is truer than that which is stated in one place, viz: that our Church teaches Catholic truth as revealed in the Word of God, and none other. Also that purgatory is an Italian exotic. Grafted upon the pure root of Christ's holy church in Britain, and for a while (with other things), choking her spiritual life. Well! does he close with the admonition, "Let Churchmen take warning from the errors of others who have no ancient and reliable guide, let them fully realize that the Church is Christ's lamp to their feet that they stumble not, &c." So would we be ever admonishing our brethren to take heed how they hasten to any false doctrine, however specious and attractive, but constantly adhere to the faith once delivered to saints.

SENEX.

There is a good deal of religion in this world that is like a life preserver—only put on at the moment of immediate danger, and then half the time put on hind side before.

—God does not want our praises; but the disposition to praise Him is essential to our happiness, and therefore required.