

pageant among the trophies of war. Gibbon adds that they were afterwards deposited in the Christian Church of Jerusalem—but they do not appear to have been ever heard of again. B.

CORRESPONDENCE.

(The editors of the Nova Scotia Church Chronicle do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of their correspondents.)

Every communication for insertion should be accompanied with the signature and address of the writer.)

TO THE EDITORS OF THE CHURCH CHRONICLE,

NOVEMBER 9, 1865.

Rev. Sirs,—I have not the time, nor the inclination, nor do I think your readers would thank me, to answer in full that last tremendous epistle of Anti-Synod; who seems to be grievously afflicted with *Cucoethes Scribendi*.

I would simply remark, First, that nothing was farther from the thoughts of the persons referred to in my letter, than the idea that a Synod would interfere with the legitimate authority of our wardens and vestry. His idea was that it would rather tend to the strengthening of this, but at the same time prevent that indirect and improper influence, which, as appeared during the course of the argument in the Council Chamber, a few persons in a parish may exert to the prejudice of their Clergymen in matters over which they have no legitimate control.

Secondly, I would humbly venture to refer our erudite friend to two or three authorities which possibly he may have overlooked.

1. For the existence and character of early Church Synods I would refer to the Speech of Sir Henry Thomson before Convocation, Thursday, Feb. 12, 1863, which is fully reported in the Guardian of that date.

2. For an early example of our Bishop's conduct, I would refer him to S. Cyprian A. D. 259. Speaking to his presbyters, he says "from the beginning of my episcopacy I resolved to do nothing of my own private judgment without your advice and the concurrence of the people." Speaking to the people he says "All things shall be examined, you being present and judging," and again, "*Secundum vestra divina suffragia*," and again, "*Secundum arbitrium quoque vestrum*."

3. For the opinion of our Reformers I would refer him to the *Reformatæ Legem*. That code drawn up by Cranmer, Taylor, Peter Martyr, and other of our reformers enjoined that diocesan synods should be held each year in Lent; and that the decrees of the Bishop's going forth from such synods should be immediately obeyed.

Thirdly. In answer to that terrible outburst of wrath provoked by the audacity of advocating that popish (!) principle "Let the voice of the majority prevail;" I would ask "Anti-Synod" quietly to consider what the Nicene Creed, *c. g.* is, but the utterance of the voice of the majority of the fathers of the church assembled at Nice and Constantinople; what that British legislature for which he is so thankful is, but the expression of the majority of the British representatives assembled in Parliament; what, in a word, any act of the church, or the state is, but the voice of the majority speaking strongly, clearly, and decisively.

Fourthly. Lest my silence with regard to those remarkable deductions of "Anti-Synod" should be misconstrued, I would remark on the 1st (not to go so far as the 3rd) that it conveys the idea that the late decisions of the Privy Council have affected the title of "My Lord," as addressed to the Bishops. Now I beg to say that those decisions have not affected that title in the least; that if by the Queen's authority, or by courtesy our Bishop has ever been addressed as "My Lord," he ought on the same grounds to be so addressed now. The decisions of the Privy Council do not touch the question of "title," they relate solely to the exercise of "coercive jurisdiction." This