

The names of two distinguished Canadian clergymen have been very generally mentioned, one of whom, it is probable, will be elected. Their names, however, have not yet been brought before the public by their friends, and we forbear to do so. It is desirable, however, that this should now be done. We fully understand and respect the motives which, so long as the Endowment Fund was not yet secured, enjoined silence on this head; although we believe that few of the subscribers would have been influenced by any consideration of their personal preference for this or that individual. But these motives no longer exist; and it is desirable that the lay-delegates, some of whom reside in remote localities, should have ample time for making themselves acquainted with the merits and qualifications of the respective candidates, in order that they may be able to give an intelligent as well as a conscientious vote, and not appear on the day of election as the mere nominees of their ministers.

ENGLAND.—The English Church papers are still filled with letters and communications respecting the judgment in Archdeacon Denison's case. But the smoke of the action is clearing away, and we are beginning more clearly to discern the position of the various parties. We are much gratified to find that our own views are fully sustained by those of many whom we most highly esteem among our brethren at home.

In the first place it is clearly acknowledged, even by those who most heartily sympathize with Archdeacon Denison, that his present unhappy position is due chiefly to his own rashness and self-reliance. It is a mistake to suppose that his opponents were the aggressors. He began the contest by requiring, as Examining Chaplain to his Bishop, from every candidate for Holy Orders, a certain interpretation of the Articles, which, if not clearly erroneous, was certainly not the only one which has always been considered admissible by our Church. On the other hand, this cannot be taken as a sufficient reason why a high legal tribunal should adopt the same narrow and intolerant course; and proceed to the extreme penalty of deprivation on account of expressions, which, even if erroneous, are to be found in very nearly the same words, in the writings of many distinguished divines of our

communion. And moreover the Archdeacon, if he contradicts the Articles, does so unintentionally; for he declares that although he cannot retract his expressions, he is willing, *ex animo*, to renew his signature to the thirty nine articles. We have always maintained, even while most strongly contending for the Catholic faith in its integrity, that any attempt to narrow the terms of communion would be most injurious and unjust, and we can refer with satisfaction to the motto which stands at the head of our paper, "Unity in things necessary, *liberty in things doubtful*, charity in all things." Where there can even be the shadow of a doubt, let liberty be unrestrained by any vexatious restrictions. And on this account we deplore the Bath judgment; not because we think the Archdeacon right, but because we think the judgment wrong.

With regard to the doctrine involved in the judgment, we must add a few words, because we find that we have not yet been sufficiently explicit. The chief point at issue is the question whether the Body and Blood of Christ are given to those who eat and drink unworthily, as well as to those who eat and drink worthily. To some of our readers the Archdeacon's logic appears unanswerable; they can detect no fallacy. The Church, he says, teaches him that a sacrament consists of two parts, the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace; and that the inward spiritual grace in the Lord's supper is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed given and received. If therefore the Body and Blood of Christ are verily in the bread and wine, they must be given to all who receive that sacrament, even to the unworthy, though it be to their own damnation that they partake of them. Now this is a proposition which our Church certainly means to condemn, while she as certainly means to affirm the real though spiritual presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements. The whole doctrine of the sacraments involves, of course, a great mystery; and as the Church is silent on the subject, we are not going to affirm that any particular way of reconciling the two propositions is the true one. But we would observe that they can be reconciled; and that there is one way of doing so, which is at least admissible, and which has been maintained by some of the most revered among our Anglican divines. May it not be, that while