

The Bishop of Western New York (Dr. Coxe) has expressed himself as willing to have a Coadjutor Bishop appointed whenever his Diocesan Council shall see fit.

The Bishop of Mississippi (Dr. Thompson) appeals for \$10,000 to aid him in his work.

The Rev. R. G. Hamilton has written a rather strong letter regarding the translation of Bishop Barker to Olympia.

The Bishop of Iowa (Dr. Perry) has cancelled all his engagements for January owing to a throat trouble.

Owing to ill-health and worry from over-work, the Rev. H. E. Bowers has been compelled to give up St. Bartholomew's, Buffalo. Mr. Bowers did a grand work in the eastern part of the city and was a most rising preacher. It is hoped—after a rest—that the rev. gentleman will take a parish in a less severe climate.

PREFERMENTS.

Deacons.—Mr. Henry Easter, Mr. Colin S. Bassett, Mr. Russell K. Smith, by the Bishop of Tennessee.

Mr. H. R. Carson, by the Bishop of Louisiana.

Priests.—Rev. Frederic I. Collins, Rev. Austin F. Morgan, by the Bishop of Indiana.

Rev. Philip W. Fauntleroy, Rev. Leslie F. Potter, by the Bishop of Missouri.

Rev. W. C. Shaw, rector of the Cathedral, Spokane, Wash.

Rev. W. A. Querry, rector (*pro tem.*) St. Luke's, Atlanta, Ga.

Rev. A. Houghton, assistant Trinity Church, Pottsville, Pa.

Rev. A. T. Urban, rector of Dunmore, Pa.

Rev. C. W. Hodder, rector of Trinity, Lincoln, Ill.

Rev. N. Perkins, Secretary Am. Ch. Building Fund Commission.

Rev. J. Wayne, rector of Petersburg, Ill.

PERSONALS.

All letters for the Bishop of Olympia (Dr. Barker) should be addressed—for the present—to "Church Missions House," N. Y. City.

The Venerable E. L. Sanford, Archdeacon of the Southern Platte and rector of Nebraska City, has resigned.

Correspondence.

All letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

N. B.—If any one has a good thought, or a Christian sentiment, or has facts, or deductions from facts, useful to the Church, and to Churchmen, we would solicit their statement in brief and concise letters in this department.

The Hymn "O! Paradise."

SIR,—I have read with much appreciation several of the letters in your recent issues on above subject. I have always considered the hymn in question a blot on our hymn books. It is a morbid, mawkish, twaddling production, false in sentiment, shaky in its theology, and beneath contempt as a poetical effusion.

PRIEST OF NOVA SCOTIA.

The Athanasian Creed.

SIR,—The Athanasian Creed caused much perplexity (1689.) Most of the commissioners were equally unwilling to give up the doctrinal clauses and to retain the damnatory clauses. Burnet, Fowler and Tillotson were desirous to strike this famous symbol out of the Liturgy altogether. Burnet brought forward one argument which to himself probably did not appear to have much weight, but which was admirably calculated to perplex his opponents, Beveridge and Scott. The Council of Ephesus had always been revered by Anglican divines as a synod which had truly represented the whole body of the faithful, and which had been divinely guided in the way of truth. The voice of that council was the voice of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, not yet corrupted by superstition, or rent asunder by schism. During more than twelve centuries the world had not seen an ecclesiastical assembly which had an equal claim to the respect of believers. The Council of Ephesus had, in the plainest terms and under the most terrible penalties, forbidden Christians to frame or to impose on their brethren any Creed other than the Creed settled by the Nicene Fathers. It should seem, therefore, that, if the Council of Ephesus was really under the direction of the Holy Spirit, whoever uses the Athanasian Creed must, in the very act of uttering an anathema against his neighbours, bring down an anathema on his own head. In spite of the authority of the Ephesian Fathers, the majority of the commissioners determined to leave

the Athanasian Creed in the Prayer-Book, but they proposed to add a rubric drawn up by Stillington, which declared that the damnatory clauses were to be understood to apply only to such as obstinately denied the substance of the Christian Faith. Orthodox believers were, therefore, permitted to hope that the heretic who had honestly and humbly sought for truth, would not be evelastingly punished for having failed to find it.—*Macaulay's History of England*, vol. 3, pp. 374-5.

L. S. T. hopes this extract may be interesting.

The Athanasian Creed.

SIR,—Mr. Blomfield, in your issue of "the 3rd inst.", makes a glaring assertion when he says: "The damnatory clauses only, which are put in our mouths by the officiating clergyman, are what we laymen, as a rule, object to." Does he mean to say that it is the fault of the clergyman that the Athanasian Creed is in the Book of Common Prayer? Is it not there by the Church's authority? Is it not read by the Church's authority? The clergyman has no option. Simmer down these damnatory(?) clauses and see where come the anathemas: Who-soever wishes for salvation must hold the Catholic Faith; and the Catholic Faith is this, that we worship one God (in Trinity.) Is not this the belief of the whole Christian world? In order to salvation must not a man "live righteously, soberly and godly in this present world"? Is not this the teaching of our Blessed Lord, who declares: "Unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." Did our Blessed Lord pronounce a curse? I trow not. He simply declared a truth, and which will one day be the state of those who live without God.

AN OFFICIATING PRIEST.

JAN. 8, 1895.

The Minatory Clauses of the A. C.

SIR,—These clauses have in past times, as well as present, occasioned much uneasiness in some of the best minds in the Church. Chillingworth, Clarke, Tillotson, Secker are mentioned as being disgusted by them. These names may be added to those great divines of modern date, referred to by some of your correspondents, to whom they have been objectionable. Such being the case, it is not surprising that the repetition of the damnatory clauses of the Creed, explain them as you may, should be distasteful to many earnest laymen of the Church—offensive not merely because such expressions are disturbing, occurring in the course of divine worship and praise, but more especially because, not clearly understanding the meaning of its explanations and distinctions, they are in the dark as to what opinions and persons they are compelled to condemn. For to repeat intelligently all this long, elaborate and scholastic Creed, one must be acquainted with the heresies which afflicted the Church from its foundation to the death of Athanasius and to the close of the fourth century. The manner in vogue in the Church of reciting this Creed renders it still more unpalatable to many of the laity. Says one of your correspondents: "The damnatory clauses, which are put into our mouth by the officiating clergyman, are what we object to." For repeating this confession verse about by the priest and people, the rubric is not responsible. Nay, I hold that the direction of the Prayer Book, that it be "sung or said by the minister and people," is not fulfilled by the clergyman reciting one half of it and the congregation the other half. Moreover, to my mind, it is a plainly improper and undignified mode of saying a solemn confession of faith, to repeat it as we do, every golden word of which should be pronounced earnestly and understandingly by every worshipper present, with one mind and one voice. Permit me further to remark that some of your estimable correspondents, in their anxiety to uphold our Church's use of the Creed, appear to lay too much stress upon its ancient and general adoption by Western Christendom into its sacred offices. The fact is that until the Reformation it was the Creed of the priesthood and of monks only, and no more the common property of the people than it is at this day in the Church of Rome. Only since the Reformation, and in the English Church alone, has it been used congregationally and recited by the clergy and people "in the vulgar tongue," and for what portion of this space of 350 years it has not been so recited, but said only by the parson and clerk, I know not. While then I have myself no quarrel with the Creed, but think it "a treasure of inestimable price" which the Church cannot afford to part with, I could wish that the minatory clauses were eliminated for the sake of so many earnest laymen of the Church—the fruits of the Catholic revival, which may God increase and multiply a thousand fold. I should also like to see—what might be more easily effected—a change in the mode of reciting the Creed, more agreeable to the rubric, more solemn and impressive, and more closely following the example of the first

congregation of worshippers who "lifted up their voices with one accord to God."

THEO.

Duties of Archdeacons.

SIR,—I notice in your contemporary a letter signed "Deb," on subject of Archdeacons, as being information as to what are the duties of these Church dignitaries. This, in the present day, especially in Canada, would be hard to define, for it seems to be but an empty title. The early Church had her work for them to do, in overlooking the local organization, under the Bishop, and were termed "*Oculus Episcopi*" or the "eye of the Bishop." Situated as the Church in Canada is, with its extensive dioceses, beyond the power of any Bishop to supervise and direct the parochial working, that is so essential to our progress and extension—now instead of an empty title as that of Archdeacon, why could they not become, as of old, a living active force in the Church, and under our Bishops' authority visiting parishes periodically, and reporting the state of the Church and her needs, thus greatly assisting and relieving our Bishops of the detail work that now does not and can not receive their undivided attention. I am satisfied that some systematic parochial visitation is a necessity if we are to progress—and next to a Bishop such visits by Archdeacons would have a most beneficial result, especially if known as the "*eye of the Bishop*," and how many local difficulties between people and pastors might be thus better adjusted than by the commissions now so generally appointed in some dioceses, which rarely end satisfactorily. As was well said on this subject in the Synod of Huron, by Mr. Jenkins of Petrolia, "a little of a Bishop went much further than a great deal of commission." The cost of these commissions and deputations would pay the travelling expenses of one or two Archdeacons—but some dioceses such as Huron have an endowment belonging to this office, that has in this diocese been drawn for the last twenty-eight years by the senior Archdeacon, amounting to some four hundred dollars a year, and for no actual services rendered to the Church; this would cover the expenses of travelling of two such officials in this large diocese, and the fund be well spent and be of vast benefit. This is a question entirely for our Bishops, to utilize the work of the Archdeacons, as proposed, but commenced in one of our dioceses, others would follow, and thus a mere inactive dignitary would become a working power in the Church's work—and for a time at least, perhaps, do away with the necessity of "more Bishops," as it would leave them free from anxiety as to parochial supervisions. The diocese of the State of Massachusetts, U.S., two years since, appointed a committee to consider the sub-division of that diocese; it was not deemed practicable at that time, but this committee recommended the appointment of four Archdeacons with four divisions for their respective fields of work. By recent reports this work is progressing most favourably. Why should not this also work well in our large Canadian dioceses? Yours etc.,

LAYMAN.

The New Birth in Baptism.

SIR,—Thousands of good Christians, from early training and other causes, have held the "Faith" adulterated with error. Sad indeed it would be were any of us to try to detract from the sanctity of such persons on account of such error—they being unconscious of it. Now A. B. Thom and others evidently forget that sincerity is no test of truth. "L. S. T." in your issue of Jan. 3rd, asserts that "by multitudes of the very salt of the earth, regeneration and conversion have long been used as synonymous terms." To this may be replied—Even so many holy persons, during ever so long a period of time, cannot avail to change truth into error or error into truth. "Hear the Church," the pillar and ground of the truth, is the loving command of our Divine Master. The Holy Church throughout all the world has ever taught from the beginning that the grafting into Christ is done by the Holy Spirit in baptism—that the growth in Christ, beginning in baptism, is continuous among all except the impenitent, by that growth, much or little. A graft in a tree does not necessarily produce fruit; neither does one grafted into Christ necessarily produce the fruits of righteousness—too often, alas, fails to do so. I pointed out, Dec. 13th last, the reason why regeneration and conversion are termed synonymous, by many in the Church and out of it, in these last days. A mode of entrance into their fictitious Church of Christ on earth was a necessity; it could not be Baptism—hence the error. Are they synonymous in Scripture? No. Are they synonymous in the Prayer Book? No. St. Paul was converted, but not regenerated till he was baptized. Simon Magus was regenerated in baptism, but not converted. So now, the adult approaching Holy Baptism, in penitence and faith, is converted before he is regenerated. Being regenerated in baptism, he is a living member