

Quod Semper, quod
Absque, quod ab Omnibus
Creditum est teneamus

Her Foundations are upon the HOLY BILLS.



In necessariis Unitas,
In dubiis Libertas,
In omnibus Caritas.

THE CHURCHMAN'S FRIEND,

FOR THE DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION RELATIVE TO THE

United Church of England and Ireland Her Doctrine and Her Ordinances.

EDITED BY CLERGYMEN.

VOL. II.—No. 5.]

WINDSOR, C. W., FEB., 1857.

[Published Monthly.]

Church News.

ENGLAND.—The new Bishops of London and Durham have been enthroned. The vacant Bishoprick of Ripon has been filled up by the appointment of the Rev. Robert Bickersteth, Rector of St. Giles' in the Fields, and Canon of Salisbury. Mr. Bickersteth, who at the early age of forty and after having been only fifteen years in holy orders, has been raised to the Episcopate, is known as a popular preacher of the "Evangelical school," and as an earnest and benevolent clergyman. His selection by Lord Palmerston will not increase the confidence of churchmen in the Premier's judgment, especially when it is remembered that the vacant diocese contained such a man as Dr. Hook. Another proof is thus afforded that a minister who depends upon mere popularity for his tenure of office, is no fit dispenser of the Church's patronage.

The Court of Arches has dismissed the appeal of Archdeacon Denison, and it appears even to be a controverted point whether there is any appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Every step which is taken in this unfortunate affair convinces us more and more, that there is no tribunal which, under our existing Constitution of Church and State, has power to define the Church's doctrine.

The following letter, which we take from a

late number of the Guardian, appears to us to be remarkably judicious and sensible, and to mark out the right view which is to be taken by sound churchmen:

Sir—The calm but earnest discussion which is going on in your columns cannot fail to promote the cause of truth. I am glad to observe that your correspondents are beginning to turn their attention away from the mere technicalities of this particular case, to the simple ground of the Church's doctrine. May I request your permission to propose the following queries, which, if answered as I imagine they ought to be answered, might save a good deal of needless controversy.

Is it not probable that the awfully mysterious words of Holy Scripture—"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body"—may be all that we are intended to know, and all that we are capable of knowing about the doctrine?

Is it not a fact that the Church Universal has never attempted to define anything further on the subject?

With regard to the Roman dogma, that the wicked eat sacramentally, but not spiritually; and the English dogma, that the wicked "press the sacrament with their teeth," but are not "partakers of Christ;" are they not mere vague and inadequate, though not necessarily false, paraphrases, which add neither force nor meaning to the tremendous words of Scripture?

Is it not true that the great teacher of the Church, St. Augustin, contradicts himself, or at least speaks vaguely on the subject; showing