

Communications.

For the Church Journal and Messenger.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

LOS ANGELES, January, 1875.

MESSRS. EDITORS: It is several months since I have written to THE CHURCH JOURNAL, from this part of God's goodly heritage. Apologies are poor substitutes for performances at all times, and you will not, therefore, be troubled by any extended list. Be assured, negatively, that it has not been because I have not sympathized with your course on "Ritualism," "Cumminsism," or "De-Kovenism," for often has the impulse been strong to write you a word of Godspeed, touching your treatment of them, and all other "isms," in either direction, from the good "old paths" of Christ and His Church. Let my only apology then be the amount of hard work that has devolved upon me in this parish, leaving but little time for outside correspondence. Your readers may have been the gainers thereby, and so we will drop the matter.

We are well pleased in this section with the action of the General Convention. Particularly did we feel disposed to sing a "Te Deum" over what it did on "Ritualism," and the Illinois question. Our Bishop and the Diocese, Clerical and Lay, are almost an unit on both points. As to "Ritualism," we never had any fears. But I was afraid that the personal worth and talents of Prof. Seymour might crowd the real question at issue in his case out of sight, and that the man would be confirmed, leaving that dreaded and important issue untouched, or quasi endorsed on the wrong side. But gloriously and fearlessly was the question met on its merits, and as gloriously decided.

As to "Ritualism," a heavy blow was struck, and in the right direction. For one, I could have wished that it could have been heavier and more crushing. But compromise is sometimes the best policy, and so we hail the action as a good omen.

Neither "Ritualism" nor "Cumminsism" is popular in this section. We regard both as traitorous to the Church. The Laity especially, as a mass, have no leanings in either direction. And they will apply the corrective whenever needed. My excellent old schoolboy friend and companion, Chief-Justice Waite, who was a member of the General Convention, in a private note to me expresses the same idea, which it would be well for extremists to bear in mind. "The Church!" he says, "I think is getting along nicely. The great body of its membership is conservative, and there is where the votes come from. Talk may be High or Low, but the work is generally about as it should be." There may be an occasional defection to Romanism, and to Cumminsism, but the great heart of the Church is sound to the core, and there, as my friend justly remarks, "is where the votes come from."

We were disappointed at first, that Southern California was given the go-by as to a Missionary Bishopric. But, of course, the North had the greater claim, and as we could have but one division, it was our duty to yield and wait. I do not regret it for one. The next three years will more effectually develop our wants, and show the necessity for additional Episcopal supervision. Meanwhile, we are most heartily willing to remain under Bishop Kip's jurisdiction. Now that he is relieved from the North, he can give a double portion to the South. His long visit of two months last Fall, was very acceptable. He made a most favorable impression everywhere, and added hosts of new friends to the old ones. His detailed account of his work in this section, which will appear in the *Spirit of Missions*, will well repay perusal and study.

To come down to personal matters. The Church is prospering in this city. The congregation has increased many fold, and now fills the church on every pleasant Sunday. Particularly are the evening audiences encouraging. These, as a general thing, are almost failures in California. But we have an average of from 150 to 200, and mostly men. The number of Communicants has nearly doubled since last Easter. We have a good Sunday school, which is constantly on the increase. We have also the largest Protestant congregation in the city, and it is weekly increasing. For all this the writer thanks God, and takes courage for the future.

I intended to have written you about our Christmas services and Sunday-school festival. It is now somewhat too late. But I will mention one thing, which will appear singular to you, in your frozen latitude and belongings. In addition to the evergreen decorations, which were elaborate and beautiful, our chancel-rail and Communion table were profusely ornamented with large bouquets of flowers of every kind, which bloom in the open air, the year round, in Los Angeles. The effect, as you may imagine, was most pleasing. Our services were well attended, and our Christmas Tree festival, on Holy Innocents' evening, a perfect success. On the tree was some golden fruit, being a purse of \$100 in double eagles for the rector.

In one of the Christmas stories which appeared in THE CHURCH JOURNAL, the writer alluded to the stale but over-repeated objection that Jesus could not have been born on the 25th of December, because "Shepherds were then keeping watch over their flocks by night." This assertion made when and where the thermometer is at zero or below, and snow several feet deep upon the ground, seems inconceivable. I remember the effect it had upon my own mind when (then being a Presbyterian) I heard Dr. C., of Albany, N. Y., so positively allude to this in a sermon, which he condescended to preach on a Christmas night. Since I have known better, I have often wondered at the brass of those divines who can keep up the repetition of so silly a reason. I do not pretend to say that our Lord actually was born on the 25th of December (for the mere day matters no more as to its general observation, than does the ever-changing one of Easter), but I do say it is strange that any one who ever read ab at the climate in India, should have the face still to urge the objection. Let me state a fact, which your readers can verify at their leisure. Los Angeles is two degrees north of Bethlehem, and yet *shepherds can be seen watching their flocks by night here on any and every Christmas*. Nor need they excite any pity for so doing. Our climate in Winter is like yours in May. Tropical fruits grow and ripen at all seasons. I am now writing in a room without a fire, and do not need one. On Sundays at church, we require open doors and windows as often as we do fire. Our vegetable men supply us daily with green peas, tomatoes, and even green corn. We perfume the air at all times. Our orange orchards (some of them half a mile square in extent) are in all their glory, the yellow fruit and green leaves making a gorgeous appearance. These are only a few items that can be given about our Winter climate. And still, as stated, we are two degrees north of the birthplace of our Lord. Cannot our left-handed brethren allow that old argument about the shepherds to rest awhile? If any of your readers hear it again repeated, just suggest to the objector a trip to Southern California, and he will be answered.

My pen has run on at such a length that it is time to stop. And so I will subscribe myself, as

Yours, truly, W. H. H.

For the Church Journal and Messenger.

VESTMENTS.

MESSRS. EDITORS: A correspondent in your issue of Jan. 28th, asks "What is the authority for wearing ecclesiastical vestments in our service, and why a clergyman cannot go without them, or add to them, or substitute for the present sort what he pleases." If your correspondent has read with any care Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity (5th Book), Wheatly on the Common Prayer, or any standard dictionary of the Church, he would be relieved of all concern about the appropriateness of "ecclesiastical vestments" or "clerical garments," and why we use them in divine service.

The Church regards herself none the more catholic or divine, and her ministers none the holier for using the surplice. But her authority is "scriptural" and "primitive" upon this as well as upon all other points. Hence we should observe a reasonable continuance of that which is good. A good Churchman will always "prove all things" by the light of history and the holy Scriptures, and he will "hold fast that which is good."

We find that under the law, the Jewish priests were by God's own appointment to wear decent sacred vestments at all times, and at the time of public service they were to have a *white linen Ephod*. (See Ex. xxviii., xxix.)

Under the Christian dispensation which took the place of the Jewish, for the law was only a "shadow of good things to come," among the rites and usages of the Church we find that St. Jerome and Chrysostom both testify that the habit to minister before the Lord was different from that of common life.

Why the surplice or white garment is used in the Church service, is because of its great antiquity, and its appropriateness as an emblem of the light and purity of the Gospel; and as the garments of the Jewish priesthood were *girt tight* about them, to signify the *bondage* of the law, so the *looseness* of the surplices worn by the Christian ministry, signifies the *freedom* of the Gospel. While God does not specially require his ministers to use "clerical garments," He certainly does not forbid them. We use them only for His honor; and while the Church has never thought it becoming for the minister, whether he be Bishop, priest, or deacon, to come before God's presence in the service of the sanctuary without something to remind both minister and people of the reverence due Him, we are firmly persuaded that the service of the Church is more decent and solemn *with* the surplice than *without* it.

Lastly, in our opinion there is nothing that can add to the simplicity, the appropriateness, and the significance of the plain white surplice, and there is nothing that could be well substituted for it, not only because it

is of such long standing, but because it better corresponds with the *linen Ephod* referred to in the Old Testament, than any other "ecclesiastical vestment" or "garment." ***

For the Church Journal and Messenger.

EDITORS OF THE CHURCH JOURNAL: Among "News and Notes," in your issue of February 11, attention is called to a simple method, used by railroad men and iron dealers, of calculating the number of tons of rails to a mile, by multiplying the weight of the rail per yard, in pounds, by eleven and dividing by seven, a rule holding good for rails of any weight. It is added that this "is one of those singular mathematical workings which puzzle us to know how they were ever discovered."

Perhaps it would be of interest to your readers to explain how this rule would naturally suggest itself to men frequently making such calculations, and to whom "time is money." It serves, also, to illustrate how the plodding analysis of one age becomes the plain every-day fact of the next.

The number of yards of rails in a mile of track is 3520; let the weight per yard be 30 lbs., then $3520 \times 30 = 105,600$ lbs. $\div 2240$ (the number of pounds in gross ton) $= 47\frac{1}{2}$ tons. Or suppose the weight per yard 40 lbs.; then $3520 \times 40 = 140,800$ lbs. $\div 2240 = 62\frac{1}{2}$ tons. It will be noticed that the numbers 3520 and 2240 in this problem are constant, and that the weight per yard alone is variable. Now as it will make no difference with the result if we divide 3520 by 2240 first, and multiply by 30, 40, or any other weight per yard afterwards (thus $\frac{3520}{2240} \times 30 = 47\frac{1}{2}$), let us take these two constant quantities and find what their constant quotient is, reduced to its lowest terms: $\frac{3520}{2240} = 1\frac{1}{2}$, or what is its equivalent, $\frac{3}{2}$. Now substituting $\frac{3}{2}$ for $\frac{3520}{2240}$, we have $\frac{3}{2} \times 30 = 47\frac{1}{2}$ tons; or $\frac{3}{2} \times 40 = 62\frac{1}{2}$ tons, and so on for any other weight per yard.

Thus by frequent use, this calculation, originally, no doubt, worked out in detail whenever used, has been "simplified down" to multiplying weight per yard by 11 and dividing by 7.

Of course, to find the number of tons per mile in a single line of uniform size, as a single telegraph wire, we would multiply the weight per yard, in pounds, by 11 and divide by 14.

New Britain, Feb. 20th, 1875.

A READER.

For the Church Journal and Messenger.

MESSRS. EDITORS: Your editorials on the Ministry, in your issues of Jan. 7th and 14th have deservedly attracted the attention of such editors as those conducting the *Evening Post*. Of course the clergy felt and recognized their force. In your issue of the 21st are two articles by the clergy, of which your news editor says "They need no comment." But he adds "One can hardly refrain from thinking of St. John the Baptist, who preached the truth though he did lose his head by it." Now, sir, the clergyman who has "failed" in the honorable sense your editorial indicates, is unlike the Baptist in several respects. He has a family depending upon him. He is not "cast into prison"; he is not "beheaded"; he has his personal liberty, but is deprived of the means of supporting his family, whereas if he were in prison he could reconcile himself to the necessity of throwing them upon the charity of others, and if he were beheaded he would have no responsibility whatever concerning the widow and orphans. It seems to me, sir, that many a clergyman of to-day suffers in the flesh more than the Baptist suffered. For all that, let him preach the truth rather than "prophecy smooth things." But when, like the Baptist, he preaches the truth, or according to the light of the age, he resigns his parish, and is marked as a failure, and after corresponding in every direction, and having others to assist him in this, he finds that the ranks of the ministry are crowded, when after six months of effort, without a salary, he thinks it time to do something for a support, and to do this consistently and satisfactorily, he must make a business of it, and so is led to conclude that, like St. Paul, he will thereafter earn his own living, and does enter upon secular pursuits, *does he violate his vows?* That he has regard for those vows, is evidenced by the fact that he has dared to "preach the truth," and it will not do for any one to say he intentionally slights his vows. *Does he unintentionally violate his vows?* X.

Our correspondent answers himself. A man must earn and eat his own bread. If the Church has no place nor work for a clergyman, we fail to see where he has a choice. Any honest industry is his to choose.—[Eds. CHURCH JOURNAL.]

The Bishop of Durham having been unable through illness to deliver his charge at the visitation in September last, it has just been circulated among the clergy. He refers to the ritualistic school as a new one, whose primary object it has been to discover and inveigh against faults in the Church of which they are members, to set at open defiance her authority, and to prize and copy the teaching of ritual of the idolatrous Church of Rome,