

stance to maintain those who have gone to the frontier and to the heathen. Shall we do this by putting more faith and zeal and self-sacrifice into our present method, or shall we endeavor to do better by adopting the apportionment plan?

WOMAN'S AUXILIARY TO THE BOARD OF MISSIONS,
DIOCESE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

The Woman's Auxiliary is an invaluable helper in all departments of Missionary work.

The report following is incomplete as some Parishes have not sent their statement. It includes the work reported from May 1, 1902, to May 1, 1903:

INDIAN HOPE.

Gifts of money	\$4,115 70
Value of boxes	2,850 42
Total	\$6,966 12

DOMESTIC COMMITTEE.

Value of 142 boxes	\$11,684 19
Cash received	5,829 13
Sent to New York	2,521 50
Gifts not received	549 42
Total	20,584 24

FOREIGN COMMITTEE.

Gifts of money	5,299 23
----------------------	----------

FREEDMEN'S COMMITTEE.

Value of boxes	\$2,656 83
Cash received	2,176 80
Cash reported	824 00
Total	5,657 63

DIOCESAN COMMITTEE.

Money received	\$1,596 88
Money reported	395 19
Value of boxes	1,371 69
Total	3,363 76

JUNIOR DEPARTMENT.

Value of boxes	\$2,000 00
Money sent	2,021 58
Total	\$4,021 58
United offering	4,772 19

SUMMARY.

Total gifts of money	\$30,101 62
Total value of boxes	20,563 13
Grand total	\$50,664 75

Adding \$1,741.24 previously given for the United Offering, to the sum reported above, the amount now on hand is \$6,513.33.

The United Offering is presented once in three years at the time of the General Convention. The amount of the last one, made in San Francisco in 1901, was \$106,560.34, all for Mission work. Of this \$16,516.10 was from this Diocese. The next Offering will be made in Boston in 1904, and will all be for the training, sending and support of women workers in the Mission field.

THE MISSIONARY COUNCIL.

Those who were so fortunate as to be present at the Missionary Council, which was held in Philadelphia last October, need no testimony as to the great value of such a series of meetings. It is hoped that the next Council, which will be held in Washington on the 27th, 28th, and 29th of October, will be of equal interest and value.

SHALL THE NAME OF THIS CHURCH BE CHANGED
AT THIS TIME?

In the General Convention of 1901 a petition having been presented for a change of the name of the Church, it was

Resolved, That a Joint Committee be appointed, consisting of five Bishops, five Presbyters and five laymen, to take the whole subject of a

change of name of this Church into consideration, to ascertain as far as possible the mind of Church people in general concerning it, and to make report at the next General Convention, with such suggestions as may commend themselves to their judgment.

The Joint Committee appointed under this resolution has sent a letter to every Bishop of this Church, asking that "at the next meeting of the Convention or Convocation of each Diocese or Missionary District, said Convention or Convocation be requested to inform this Committee whether it does or does not desire that the name of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America shall be changed at this time, and if it does so desire, what name it wishes substituted therefor."

It is the duty of this Convention to answer this request.

Shall the name of this Church be changed so that it shall no longer be the Protestant Episcopal Church?

It is evident that the burden of proof rests upon those who desire a change of name. If no convincing reasons can be given for destroying the title by which this Church has been known in this country and throughout the world ever since it was formally organized and became a part of the visible Church, then it should remain as it is. I do not say "as it ever shall be." That question is not before us. We are asked whether we desire a change of name *at this time*.

I have read carefully every article and argument upon this question that has come within my reach, and have not found in them sufficient reason for changing the name of the Church to which it is our privilege to belong. On the contrary, I have become more fully convinced that a change at this time would be detrimental to our growth, and to the promotion of the unity of the Church.

It seems evident that dislike of the word Protestant has much to do with the demand for a change of name. But why should it be disliked? It is said that it expresses opposition instead of affirmation; that it is negative. So are nine of the Ten Commandments. So is the first vow of the Baptismal Covenant. The Holy Scriptures abound with instances of

coupling opposition to error with adhesion to the truth. Abhorrence of evil is coextensive with cleaving to that which is good.

The attitude of mind expressed by the word Protestant, is antagonism to false doctrine and wrong practice. It signified that when it was first used in 1529, when a minority of the Diet of Spiers, in Germany, protested against two measures which had been proposed, and appealed from the judgment of the Diet to the Supreme authority of a General Council of the Universal Church.

It is an interesting fact that these two elements, of protest against a wrong action by a portion of the Church and an appeal to the authority of a General Council of the whole Church, were equally prominent in the first use of this word. It shows that the Reforming Churches were agreed in their recognition of the authority of the Church as a whole. On the one hand they protested negatively against papal usurpations and innovations, and on the other they protested positively their adhesion and submission to the judgment of the Church Universal. Considering the remoteness of the possibility of getting the case of the Reforming Churches before a General Council, and the atrocious persecutions with which all the Reformers were assailed, it is not strange that the element of appeal to the voice of the whole Church which the word Protestant at first contained, was overshadowed by the other element of protest against the cruelties and crimes and perversions of truth of the Church of Rome; and so the word Protestant soon came to be applied to the Reformers in all countries of Europe, and the word became a symbol of unity among them.

It is not probable that the principles of the Reformation had taken strong hold of the common people of England at the close of the reign of Edward VI., in 1553.

It is certain that the accession of Queen Mary, and the restoration of the old ceremonies of the Church were generally welcomed. But a deep revulsion of feeling soon came when heretics were tortured and burned to death for their

religious opinions, and when Queen Mary died the whole Romish establishment was swept out of England with almost universal execration. Under Queen Elizabeth there was peace, but across the Channel, during her reign, there was bitter persecution throughout the Netherlands, and within six years, not including the multitudes who perished of exposure, and sickness and starvation, and the many thousands who were killed in battle, or murdered after their surrender, the Duke of Alva, as the agent of Philip II., boasted that he had sent to death by the sword, the cord and the flames, eighteen thousand Protestant heretics.

Then came the awful Massacre of St. Bartholomew, when almost the whole community of Huguenots were assassinated in a night, for the same crime. England, too, was threatened with a rekindling of the fires of Smithfield; and during the preparation of the great Armada the whole English people were awaiting an invasion which, should its purpose succeed, would mean for them loss of life and faith and freedom; and the whole English nation became intensely Protestant. Even then it was not thought best to change the name of the Church of England, but it was thought well to define the character of its religion; and so it was described by the English Parliament as "The Protestant religion established by law."

It was in accordance with this designation that, in 1783, Dr. Berkeley, son of the Bishop of Boyne, wrote to the Primus of the Scotch Bishops, Bishop Kilgour, that "the glory of communicating a Protestant Episcopacy to the United and Independent States of America seems reserved for the Scotch Bishops." And in reply Bishop Kilgour expressed his "heartly concurrence in the proposal for introducing Protestant Episcopacy into America." These are the words of the Primus of the Episcopal Church in Scotland.

Thus far it would seem hard to find anything in the history of the word Protestant of which anyone in our Communion should be ashamed. And we shall see that the founders of our own Church were not ashamed of it.

It is true that the word has come to be often misapplied.

But the same is true of many words whose use should still be retained. It is true emphatically of the word Catholic, which is wrongly applied by the great majority of those who use it. On the one hand, the word Protestant has been claimed by some to whom it does not belong, and on the other, a studious effort has been made in some quarters, to bring about its general application to various forms of unbelief; and this has extended so far that if some other name had been adopted in 1789, and we were now considering whether it would be well to change the title by which we had ever since been called, it might well be doubted whether it would be wise to take our present name. But such hypotheses are idle. This is our name; and to me, it seems a better name than any substitute for it that has been proposed.

As describing this Church, the word Protestant still means our protest against the erroneous teaching and practice of the Church of Rome. It does not imply that we fail to recognize the body of the Faith which she holds in common with us; nor that we are unwilling to acknowledge that there is much which is admirable in her organization, and sagacious in her administration. There are many respects in which we might well follow her example and learn from her. But we should not, therefore, become blind to her perversions of the truth; her "blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits." She is no nearer to conformity with the teaching of the New Testament than she was two hundred years ago. In all that time she has not receded from one particular of her tyrannous pretensions.

If there were no longer anything in the Roman Catholic Church to justify our protest against her errors, I know not how we as a Church, or as individuals, could justify our continuing in separation from her. But the reasons which were given by the Upper to the Lower House of Convocation in 1689 why "the express mention of the Protestant religion should be inserted in the Address" are as applicable now as they were then. They are as follows:

"The express mention of the Protestant Religion should be inserted in the Address:

"First. Because it is the known denomination of the common doctrine of the Western part of Christendom, in opposition to the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome.

"Second. Because the leaving this out may have ill consequences, and be liable to strange constructions both at home and abroad, among Protestants as well as Papists."

In precisely the same strain wrote the eight Primates and sixty-eight Bishops of the Lambeth Conference of 1867, one hundred and ninety-eight years after the utterance of the Upper House of Convocation: "Furthermore, we entreat you to guard yourselves and yours against the growing superstitions and additions with which in these latter days the truth of God hath been over laid, as otherwise, so especially, by the pretensions to universal sovereignty over God's heritage, asserted for the See of Rome, and by the practical exaltation of the Blessed Virgin Mary as Mediator in place of her Divine Son, and by the addressing of prayers to her, as intercessor between God and man. Of such beware, we beseech you, knowing that the jealous God giveth not His honor to another."

To the same effect is the "letter to the faithful in Christ Jesus" from the Lambeth Conference of 1878, in which the Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England, commend to the faithful the following: "The fact that a solemn *protest* is raised in so many Churches and Christian communities throughout the world against the usurpations of the See of Rome, and against the novel doctrines promulgated by its authority, is a subject for thankfulness to Almighty God. All sympathy is due from the Anglican Church to the Churches and individuals protesting against these errors, and laboring it may be under special difficulties from the assaults of unbelief, as well as from the pretensions of Rome."

It is not only against the errors of a single branch of the Church that such utterances as these were directed; but against all teaching and practice whose tendency is to undermine the foundations of the Faith that was once delivered to the Saints. And that is the spirit of the word Protestant. It

opposes every manifestation of Antichrist. It stands for the truth as the truth is in Jesus. It is a word of which no one who believes in the Deity of Jesus Christ, and who accepts the infallibility of His promise "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," need ever be ashamed.

By some who advocate a change of name it has been assumed that the title Protestant Episcopal came into use accidentally or surreptitiously, and that no one knows how or under what circumstances it was adopted, and that there was never any deliberate intention of authorizing its permanent use.

It would be hard to invent a theory farther from the truth than this. The selection of the name Protestant Episcopal was no accident, but a well-considered choice. It was adopted because it expressed what was in the minds of the Churchmen of that time, as to the position which the Church occupied, and their conception of her character and purpose. The name Protestant Episcopal had become well known long before it was adopted by the General Convention, as a few citations will show.

In Pennsylvania, May 20, 1778, the "case of the Protestant Episcopal Missionaries of Pennsylvania" was laid before the State authorities.

In Maryland, at a Convention in Chestertown, Kent County, November 9, 1780, "On motion of the Secretary, it was proposed that the Church known in the province as Protestant, be called the Protestant Episcopal Church, and it was adopted."

In 1783, there was adopted a declaration in which the following words occur: "We, the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland (heretofore denominated the Church of England as by law established)."

In Virginia, an act of the General Assembly in 1784, authorized a Convention "to regulate all the religious concerns of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

In South Carolina, at a Convention held July, 1785, the name was officially recognized.

In New York, at a Convention on June 22, 1785, it was "Resolved, That three clerical and three lay delegates be appointed to represent the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York, in the General Convention which is held in Philadelphia."

In New Jersey, at a Convention held in Christ Church, New Brunswick, July 6, 1785, a resolution was adopted "That the next Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this State be held at Burlington."

In view of these facts it would be unwarrantable to claim that the official recognition which was given to the name Protestant Episcopal Church by the General Convention in Philadelphia in 1785, was accidental. There can be no doubt that the members of that Convention acted intelligently in adopting the resolution "that it be recommended to this Church in the States here represented, that their respective Bishops may be called the Rt. Rev. A. B., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in C. D."

Still stronger is the proof that the members of the General Convention of 1789, which finally adopted the Constitution and thereby fixed the name of the Protestant Episcopal Church, were not acting ignorantly nor carelessly in so doing. For there had been nine years during which the name had been winning its way into the knowledge of Churchmen, and into the language of the people and the formularies of the Church. "During these nine years, from 1780, when Maryland deliberately voted to assume the name Protestant Episcopal, to 1789, when the Church in three New England States agreed to the Constitution which incorporated it, it came up for adoption or recognition in six Diocesan Conventions, and in five General Conventions, and it was accepted by them all."*

No Diocese was divided upon the question of its adoption, and only in Connecticut does there appear to have been a single dissenting individual vote. There were several things in the Constitution which Bishop Seabury wished changed, but he

* Acknowledgment is here made to the Rev. John H. Elliott, D. D., for this quotation and for other use made of his pamphlet on this subject.

offered no objection to the name of the Protestant Episcopal Church. There is no reason for doubting that its final adoption by the General Convention and the several dioceses was deliberate, and with full understanding of its significance.

What would be the effect of dropping the word Protestant at this time from the name of this Church? Upon the Roman Catholic Church probably none whatever. It matters not to her what we call ourselves. The only thing she seeks from us is submission to her authority. It is possible that she might regard dropping the word Protestant as a straw indicating a current of thought moving in that direction, but it is more probable that she would look on in entire indifference.

To many in the Reformed Churches not in communion with us, it would give sorrow of heart, because it would be regarded by them as an abandonment of the distinctive principles for which the word historically stands; and it would be considered as emphasizing whatever causes of division there may be between them and us, and of minimizing those points upon which we confessedly agree; and thus it would seem to them, a note of separation rather than of unity.

By the Old Catholics it might be welcomed as encouraging union between us and them; but this is by no means certain, for their position is a protestant one, and many of them are favorably disposed towards us now. Indeed, the suggestion has been made by some of them that the name "Protestant Catholic" would be better than any other. I can see no benefit likely to ensue from dropping the name Protestant, but there is danger that it might cause a wider breach than ever, between us and our Protestant brethren of other names.

It is said that we owe it to the character of our Church that we should assert our position as a distinctively Catholic body, and that if we should do so, a great many would at once seek admission to our communion. But from whence would they come? Let us not deceive ourselves by supposing that they would come from the Roman Catholic Church, any faster than they are coming now. Let us not imagine that by a change

of name we can make the cross of Christ any less an offense, or more of an attraction, to the unbelieving men and women in the world around us, whom it is our great duty to seek to win to Christ and His Church, rather than to influence those who are already believing, to a change of their ecclesiastical relations.

Supposing our present name Protestant Episcopal should be dropped, what name is to be adopted in its stead? Upon this point there has been much discussion, but nothing like agreement. It seems probable that a majority of those who desire a change would agree in making the word Catholic a part, if not the whole, of the name. But what would be gained by this? Our Church here in America has always been Catholic, has never professed any other than the Catholic faith, has never authorized any service without professing faith and allegiance to the whole Catholic body. But incorporating this word into our title would lead to great confusion in the minds of the greater part of the whole people of this land. Ninety-nine one-hundredths of our newspapers use the word Catholic, whether applied to doctrine, usage or personality, as signifying connection with the Roman Catholic Church. Nineteen-twentieths of the people use the word in the same sense. The number of persons in every State of the Union is very large who would understand our adoption of the name Catholic, as signifying that we had thereby acknowledged a closer relationship to the Roman Catholic Church than had before been admitted, and not a few would look upon it as a long step towards submission to her authority. It is not improbable that such considerations as these would alienate many of our own members. It is certain that it would check, if not turn altogether away, the present drift of believing Christians towards our own Communion. I am sure that for every one person who has remained out of the Protestant Episcopal Church because of its name, Protestant Episcopal, one hundred would be lost to it as the direct consequence of dropping that name, and substituting any other that has been suggested in its place.

For these reasons, and for others which it would tax your time too much to state, I cannot regard any present change of the name of this Church with approval. There is no emergency which demands a change. If there were reason to believe that changing our name would make us better Christians, more earnest, more self-sacrificing, more patient, more considerate of each other's welfare; if the result were likely to be a deepened sense of our responsibility for the evangelization of the world; a great increase of our gifts for the maintenance of the missionary work of the Church; and the consequent extension of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ; if there were reason to believe that it would be a step towards the fulfillment of our Lord's prayer for the unity of His followers. I could contemplate it with satisfaction. But as I cannot find from careful consideration, that it would be likely to promote any one of these results, but rather to hinder them all, I am not in favor of changing the name of this Church at this time.

And now, brethren, beloved in the Lord, I commend you unto the guidance of God in all your deliberations, that all you do may be for the honor of His Name and the welfare of His Church.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL.

1902.

April 30, Wednesday. Evening. In All Saints', Moyamensing, 13 persons were confirmed by the Rt. Rev. Cortlandt Whitehead, D. D., Bishop of Pittsburg.

May 1, Thursday. St. Philip and St. James. A. M. In the Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, the Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D. D., Bishop Coadjutor elect of the Diocese of Pennsylvania, was consecrated to the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God.

P. M. The tower of the Church of the Holy Apostles was dedicated by the Rt. Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D. D.

May 2, Friday. In the Home for Consumptives, Chestnut Hill, 8 persons were confirmed by Bishop Mackay-Smith.