

should be given for each member of the Church to give his quota, however small it may be. I feel quite satisfied that these facts have but to be pointed out, and much will be done to rectify the neglect of the past. Overcome the besetting sin of parochialism, realize the importance of the Mission Fund, give the laity a chance, and we need have no fear of having funds enough to carry on a strong, progressive work in the missionary districts of the Diocese of Ontario.

F. DALTON WOODCOCK.

Camden East, Diocese of Ontario.

The Church as Seen in Rural Districts

SIR,—A glance at the condition of our Church in country places in enough to dishearten the most loyal Churchman. In every village or country place may be found flourishing the Methodist and Presbyterian sects, particularly the former. In almost every case their buildings are substantially built, large and free of debt; whilst our own are usually small rough cast buildings, or small brick buildings, very much in debt. And, worst of all, in most cases are the few adherents cold and indifferent. It was, indeed, a painful thing to read, in the annual missionary sermon, our numbers as compared with the above bodies. These are facts most deplorable, and with which our Church, as a whole, must soon have to deal, if we intend to exist at all. And why is it that our Church with her endowments has gone so far behind? Let me point out a few apparent reasons. If we go through our country districts we will find a large number of poor missionaries trying to keep up a little style on a very small stipend, and often side by side with them old rectors drawing largely from the glebes and other funds of the Church, and attending perhaps one or two churches, where it may truly be said that "two or three are gathered together." Could not such parishes as the latter be divided in some way, so that the revenue from these glebes would be applied to many of the missions, and by so doing strengthen the Church in every way, and so reduce the mission grants that the Superannuation Fund might be increased, and a lot of these dead men taken from their parishes and placed where they can rest in peace. It is a difficult matter for the rural dean to report against his brother clergyman, and often for this and other reasons the sad condition into which the Church is falling has been unexposed. For this time let this glaring drawback be sufficient to set us thinking, and let me suggest that a committee be appointed by the Lord Bishop to visit the parishes and missions, in order that they might consult with him as to the re-arranging of parishes and replacing of men when deemed necessary. I should like very much that some of the readers of the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN would discuss this subject, which seems to a country clergyman to be all-important.

COUNTRY PARSON.

Rev. W. Hinde's Paper on Confirmation.

SIR,—In the issue for February 7th of the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN, you give a report of Mr. Hinde's paper on Confirmation, read before the Rural Deanery, Chapter of Elgin, Diocese of Huron. To one or more points in it that might have been more clearly stated, or rather that might have been said with a closer attention to facts, allow me to draw Mr. Hinde's attention. 1st, as to sponsors. If Mr. Hinde is correctly reported he advocates the need of sponsors being communicants, or in preparation for being such. All the remark I would make here is that Mr. Hinde speaks as if no law to that effect was in existence. Among the Canons of 1604 he will find that it is expressly enacted that sponsors shall be communicants. It is true it is a canon very much in disuse, on the ground that the Sacrament of Baptism is *ex necessitate*, and of Divine institution, whereas sponsorship is but an ecclesiastical provision and safeguard. Where the alternative (and it unfortunately too often occurs, but what can one do?) presented is to confer baptism with what sponsors one can get, or none at all, I think few would hesitate as to what they would do. They would give the sacrament. Greater is the gift than the rubrics and canons that simply safeguard the gift. 2ndly, Mr. Hinde "averred it to be his opinion that parents were the most suitable persons to be sponsors." Here Mr. Hinde unwittingly bolsters up a too common error, viz., that sponsors take the place of parents. They do nothing of the kind, except it be that the parents are unbelievers, i.e., unbaptized themselves. Parents are sponsors by the very fact that they are the parents of the candidate. No law or enactment of the Church or any other body, not even the State, can add to their responsibility or take from it. They are sponsors by nature, and this is the answer and explanation one should give to the too often expressed objection: why can not the parents stand for their children? The god-parents required by the Church are but additional securities that the baptized one shall be virtuously and Christianly brought up.

WM. ROSS BROWN, R.D., Dio. Montreal.

P.S.—Allow me in this communication to make mention of my satisfaction with the table of appropriate hymns, published from week to week in your paper and compiled by the organist of St. Luke's Cathedral, Halifax, N.S. They are very happily selected, all of them, and any of your clerical readers or choir masters who have used them (and I hope they are not few) must feel grateful to Mr. F. Gatward. The list saves one time and trouble.

W.R.B.

Rev. Mr. Whatham and American Bishops.

SIR,—I read with interest the letters by Rev. Mr. Whatham, and am glad to find one of our hard-working missionaries is succeeding after his exodus. The first portion of his letter is excellent, but I feel bound to object to his strictures on his people and Bishops.

I fear he is quite unnecessarily raising difficulties, impairing his usefulness and getting out of touch with his people. This portion of his letter makes us laymen sigh in despair of our clergy ever showing common-sense. Mr. W. sees what his people need and is able to understand their difficulties—why need he thwart them unnecessarily and try to limit his congregation to a small, narrow, exclusive set of Pharisees? Mr. W. may make up his mind that neither in the States nor in Canada will he find a parish where his congregation will not object to sermons reflecting on other Christians who do not agree with him, and to his calling them vile names, schismatics, etc. And he will find the majority of congregations resent the assertion of the priest's power in absolution and the necessity of weekly communion. Mr. W. says that, with a few noble exceptions, the American Bishops in quarrels of this kind between clergy and people, as a rule side with the latter. If that is the case, it explains one cause of the success of the Church in the States; and as to nobility, perhaps the Bishops are right and Mr. W. ignobly and arrogantly wrong. Why is it that the theological training at Trinity was a failure in the past? Because the young clergy used the language which Mr. W. thinks so desirable, chilled and disheartened the people, until at last Wycliffe was established. We hear a great deal of General Booth now; he succeeded by his earnest, practical help of the poor—not by dogmatic teaching. So far from that, he has done his best to avoid anything of the kind; and I cannot but regret that the late Archbishop of Canterbury failed in his endeavours to keep him and his army in the Church. But if Mr. W. wishes to gain a like ascendancy, let him also first gain the confidence of his people. To return for a moment to another portion of Mr. W.'s letter—a subject which I greatly regret is now written and spoken about so flippantly. I mean the doctrine of the Real Presence. I wonder if people like Mr. W. ever reflect on what his father and grandfathers must have thought on this and kindred subjects. They were Christians and Church people, but would be shocked at the language so commonly used. Were they wrong? Perhaps; but perhaps not. Mr. W. repeats the language of his theological professor, and thinks he is right; while the gentleman who holds a similar position in the next seminary will say he is wrong. The winds of doctrine constantly vary, and there is only one thing certain, and that is, if Mr. W. is spared as long as I hope he will be, he will find his opinions antiquated and erroneous.

WM. D. PATTERSON.

Huron College and the Thamesford Concert.

SIR,—Your issue of Feb. 14th has a communication signed "Layman, Thamesford," and entitled "Huron College Concert Club misunderstanding at Thamesford." It arises out of matters altogether local, and, from the local character of its subject matter, as well as from its remarks about Huron College, it is unworthy of a place in a respectable Church paper. Its attack on Huron College is all the more obnoxious because the writer had not the manliness to sign his name. His name might have rendered a reply unnecessary. His letter appears Feb. 14th. The concert it criticizes occurred Dec. 14th. Indignation two months old, on so trivial a matter, is well nigh stale. What he says about the concert is mostly false. He refers to "the College Choral Club, who gave the concert," etc. There is no such club in, or connected with, Huron College, though the term was used for convenience on the bills; and neither the alleged club nor any Huron College men "gave" the concert referred to. It was arranged, advertised and managed by parties absolutely unconnected with the college. They invited some students to assist and provide a chairman, and that was the only connection of the college with the concert. Kind friends of the college in the parish of Thamesford proposed the concert and were assisted by a lady in London. They were not connected with the college, but desired to do something for it in this way, and, though the net proceeds were small, a splendid programme was

furnished and a most enjoyable time spent. "Layman" proceeds thus: "As a member of the dear old Church of England, I am very sorry to learn that the funds of the diocesan college are so low as to be obliged to accept two dollars and fifty cents." The college is not diocesan, and I venture to assert that "Layman" knows very little about the general funds of the college, and absolutely nothing about the particular fund to which this sum was given—nor have we any notice that his sorrow has yet expressed itself by a subscription. He seems to question the honesty of the management by going into the figures. The following is a statement from the lady who acted as treasurer: Total receipts, \$16.25 (not \$19.90, as he states); printing bills and tickets, \$4.75; Town Hall, Thamesford, \$2; organ, do., \$1; bus from London, \$6; net balance, \$2.50; total, \$16.25. "Layman" speaks of "one of the colleges of the Church laughed at and become a by-word among dissenters for having to resort to such paltry means for gathering money"; and, further, speaks of "the seeming down-grade progress of Huron College." This language is unfounded and malicious. Not only had Huron College nothing to do with this concert, but the college is well known, by those who know anything about it, to be making very positive and healthy progress. "Layman" represents Principal Miller as saying "he would not allow the money to be paid into the College Fund," and that "they could buy a clock for the college." I need hardly add that Principal Miller said nothing of the kind. He was not consulted about the concert, and could not be other than thankful—and has openly expressed his thanks—for the kind gift to the fund in question.

T. G. A. WRIGHT.

London, Feb. 16th, 1895.

"Fads and Questionable Teaching."

SIR,—The very absolute letter of the Rev. G. O. Mackenzie, in your issue of 7th inst., under the above heading, has led me to look into some authorities on the proper meaning of Kephias. I have not seen the numbers of the *Teachers' Assistant* which your correspondent criticizes, but I assume that the passage referred to in No. 3, page 25, is St. John i. 42.

Upon this verse I find as follows: (1) In the Revised Version it reads thus: "Thou art Simon the son of John: thou shalt be called Cephas (which is by interpretation Peter)."

[In the margin "That is Rock or Stone."]

2. In Bagster's *Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge*, Cephas is said to mean Rock or Stone.

3. In Rev. Dr. Bloomfield's *Lexicon to the Greek Testament*, the only English equivalent to the Greek Petros is Rock, referring specially to St. John i. 42.

4. In Bishop Walsham How's *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, published by the S.P.C.K., the following is part of his note on verse 42: "'Cephas' is the Jewish word, as 'Peter' is the Greek, for 'Rock' or 'Stone,' and the name is given prophetically, partly in respect of Peter's character as bold and determined, and partly in respect of his being a foundation stone of the Church of Christ."

The footnote at the bottom of the page contains some further interesting information on this subject—as also does the learned Bishop's note on the kindred passage in St. Matthew (chapter xvi. 18).

See also notes in Stock's "Lessons on the Life of our Lord," vol. i., page 184.

5. Archdeacon Farrar, in his "Life of Christ" (chapter x.), explains it thus: "Thou art Simon, the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Kephias, that is, 'Thou art Simon, the son of the dove; hereafter thou shalt be as the rock in which the dove hides,'" and again (chapter xxxv.), "His confession made him a rock, on which the faith of many was founded." See also in Bishop Barry's *Teachers' Prayer Book*, his note on the Gospel for St. Peter's Day. I submit that in the face of such various authorities, and many others to the same effect might be cited, it will not do to characterize the explanation given in the *Teachers' Assistant* as "a fad, or as conveying questionable teaching." On the contrary, it would appear that Rock is not only an allowable, but the more generally approved translation of Kephias or Petros; and further, that St. Peter himself is the Rock meant by our Lord in St. Matthew xvi. 18. A careful perusal and consideration of Bishop How's notes on the two passages in St. Matthew and St. John above referred to, and of Stock, Vol. I., lesson 50, pp. 182, 184, and Archdeacon Farrar's book, chapter 35, will, or ought to, dispel your correspondent's apprehension as to Roman claims. Except for Mr. Mackenzie's singular reference to them, it would have appeared almost superfluous to remark that the expressions in II. Samuel xxii. 32, and I. Corinthians x. 4, have really no bearing whatever upon the point in question.

S. G. WOOD.

Toronto, February 14th, 1895.

Is your digestion weakened by la grippe? Use K.D.C.