

word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered." Now will our friend say that 'faithful people' are 'composed of the wicked as well as the good'?

But what does God say about His church? He calls it His 'body,' Eph. 1. 22-23. Will 'my critic' dare to criticise God's word and say, the 'body of Christ' is 'composed of the wicked as well as the good'? Would not that be blasphemy? Is it not God's will that His church should be 'a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish'? So he declares in Eph. 5:27. Many other passages of similar import might be given if necessary.

But if the church is to be composed of the 'wicked as well as the good' why did the Saviour give directions for the treatment of a sinning member, and in case of his refusing to hear the church to 'let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican'? Matt. 18:17. Surely He did not mean that 'heathens and publicans' were to be members of the church, or it would be the same as saying 'let him be unto thee as a church member!' I wonder if that would suit 'my critic.' In 1 Cor. 5:13 St. Paul writes to the Corinthian church, 'Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person.' Will Layman dare to say, 'No, let him stay in the church, which is to be composed of the wicked as well as the good'? I was just about to quote the passage in 2 Cor. 6:17-18, but as there are many such why add more? If the church is to be 'composed of the wicked as well as the good' as Layman states, then the whole human family is the church, or at least the same as the church, for all are either 'wicked or good.'

But a word on the parable. Layman, instead of 'grappling' with it himself, applies for help to a renegade

Methodist, 'now a churchman.' Now I may say that since Layman's sneer at my own opinion on the parable, I have also consulted 'learned commentators,' and out of eleven, four took his view and seven took mine. And, strange as it may appear to some, I noticed this peculiarity about the matter, namely, all those four who maintained that the Church is 'composed of the wicked as well as the good' were Episcopalians! Can it be that they find it necessary in view of facts, that is, the actual state of the Church, to take refuge and comfort in this unscriptural view of the meaning of this parable?

Let the church of God be pure. Indeed the true church of God is pure, for it is 'she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, &c.' (Sol. Song 6:10.)

I could wish to say more on this last subject, but my letter is growing long. I unite with Layman, Mr. Editor, in thanking you for your kindness in affording space for these letters. Long as they have been I would have asked for more space had I not been aware of the fact that your readers are now to have the privilege of hearing again from 'Presbyter.' But for this I would have enlarged on several points, whereas I have thought best to confine my remarks almost exclusively to a direct answer to Layman. If in doing so I have written anything which has had the appearance of harshness or severity it has not been from any unkind personal feeling, but simply because I believed the facts of the case demanded it. Truth often cuts with a keen edge. Layman bade me farewell in his last letter to me, but having referred to me so often in his letters to Presbyter, in concluding them he thought well to say, 'Again, Mr. Lawson, Farewell!'

I shall not trifle with Lyman's feelings nor those of your readers! I