

are rather bound to acknowledge with gratitude the liberality and confidence which have enabled this society to be the dispenser of a fund hitherto unprecedented in amount. They rejoice in what has been given, not only on account of the increased number of schools and teachers to be thereby provided, but also on account of the extended interest in education betokened by the number and amount of the contributions. But the experience of the past year bids them look beyond the subscription list, to the results of individual zeal and self-devotion; to the humanizing effects of increased intercourse between the educated classes and the children of the poor; above all, to the personal influence of each clergyman in his own school-room, lightening and guiding the labour of the master or mistress by sympathy and advice, and giving to the children a lively sense of that pastoral relation, without which all improvement in systems of education will but end in disappointment.

From this time forward let the affluent classes place sound education within the poor man's reach, in a spirit of free christian benevolence, and their good shall not be frustrated. Let them prove to the son of toil that their object is, not so much to make themselves more safe, as to render him and his children more happy, and the victory will be won. Then even these our times shall not be without their own honour. It shall be their praise to have reared up a godly and pious people, who out of an honest and good heart, keep the apostolic injunction, to "love the brotherhood, fear God, and honour the king." But whatever may be the outward signs and tokens in the world around,—even though disaffection and ungodliness seem to triumph for a while,—your committee are resolved to pursue the tenor of their way; they will not draw back from the work to which they have put their hand; but, in full reliance on the principles for which they contend, are contented to leave the issue in the hands of Him whose servants they are, and with whom faithfulness, not success, is the condition of reward.—*National Society's Report, 1844.*

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, SEPT. 19, 1844.

A correspondent has furnished us with slips from an English periodical, specifying several extravagant acts alleged to have been committed by parochial Clergymen in England, engaged, as we should conclude, in the "progress Rome-ward." In one case a female of unexceptionable religious character is said to have been refused the communion, because she was a Presbyterian; in another, condemnation to have been pronounced upon a woman, and her grave to have been levelled, because she did not confess her sins to the clergyman upon his demand before she died; in another the lifeless body of a child to have been baptized, and a bowl of holy water with the finger of the corpse in it enclosed in the coffin. We had become acquainted with these allegations before, but were unwilling to advert to them, because not only are statements of this kind not to be relied upon, but if they could be substantiated, they would only be the acts of individuals, and should be brought to the notice of their Bishops; if no redress could be obtained there, then they would be a grievance to bring before the public. We are aware of the tendency which manifests itself by occurrences of this kind in the mother-country; but the columns of the Berean we are loath to occupy with charges not vouched for, when there is painful matter enough, amply authenticated, to call for notice and excite prayerful concern for the scriptural character of our beloved mother.

Part of this matter is the spreading scrupulousness which causes Clergymen of the Church of England to refuse Christian burial to the dead who were baptized by non-episcopalians. Several have exposed themselves to proceedings in the ecclesiastical court by their refusals, and have thus given occasion for elaborate judgments, the last of which has recently come to hand and will be of special interest to our clerical readers. It is that in the case of Titchmarsh versus Chapman, delivered 31st of May last, caused by the Clergyman's refusal to perform the funeral rites over a child, on the ground that it had not been baptized within the meaning of the rubric. The legal authority is Sir H. Jenner Fust, the Dean of the Arches, that is, the Judge in the Archbishop's Court. He, in declaring the law, referred so pointedly to former decisions, that it will be natural for us to state these in their connexion with each other.

As far back as the year 1809, Sir John Nicholl, in the case of Kemp v. Wickes, decided that a minister of the Established Church cannot refuse to bury a child baptized by a dissenter. This decision was referred to and adopted by the present Dean of Arches, in passing sentence upon the Rev. Mr. Escott who, a few years ago, refused in a case which excited intense interest, among such of the clergy, on the one hand, as were disposed to adopt the views upon which he had acted, and among dissenters, on the other, who hoped that it would lead to the recognition of their orders by a competent Court of law. Both parties were disappointed. The decision was against the Clergyman; but it

never touched the question, whether the Wesleyan minister, who had baptized the child, was considered by the law as in holy orders or not: it declared that the application of water in the name of the Holy Trinity, even by a person not in holy orders at all, nor a member of the Church of England, was valid, though it might be irregular; that it was not to be repeated; and that it entitled the body to have the burial service of the Established Church read over it. This decision being appealed from, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had to review the case, and the result was the affirmation of the sentence, on the 2nd of July, 1842.

In the course of last year, the Rev. W. H. Chapman was cited to appear in the Court of Arches, for having refused to bury a child baptized by an Independent minister. The defence set up in this case was, that the application of water and invocation of the Trinity were performed by a schismatic and heretic, consequently by a person *ipso facto* excommunicated; so that, even were the baptism to be considered valid and not to be reiterated, yet the baptized person could claim no benefit from it, until he had, by himself or his sponsors, sought admission to the privileges of the Church—which in the case before the Court had not been done.

The learned Judge expressed his regret, that the former decision, affirmed as it was by the highest Court, had not been sufficient to obviate any farther resistance to what had then been declared to be the law on such questions. He could perceive no distinction between the two cases. The very ground of defence taken seems to have proved suicidal in the opinion of the Judge. If the baptism was not to be repeated, "admission" to the privileges of the Church could only have been sought by applying for the rite of Confirmation. If that rite was obtained, what was confirmed by it? It must be something which was valid so far as it went, bringing the candidate to the communion-rail upon the same terms as others who had received the most regular baptism. Now the same baptism which would have been counted valid, if the child had lived and come forward as a candidate for Confirmation, must be counted sufficient to entitle the child, dying in infancy, to burial at the hands of the Church minister.

Quoting the words of defendant's Counsel, "God forbid that I should say this child was not a Christian," the Dean of the Arches said, "The question, as it appears to me, is not, whether this child was admitted into the Church of England, but whether it was admitted into the Church of Christ?" In dealing with the allegation, that a schismatic and heretic was *ipso facto* excommunicated by the terms of the 12th Canon which runs thus, "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that it is lawful for any sort of Ministers and Laypersons, or of either of them, to join together, and make rules, orders, or constitutions, in Causes Ecclesiastical, without the king's authority, and shall submit themselves to be ruled and governed by them; let them be excommunicated *ipso facto*," the Dean referred to the Toleration Acts 1st William and Mary, and 53rd George III, avowing his opinion that any incapacity which may have existed under the operation of that Canon, is removed by those laws of more recent enactment, of which he was bound to take judicial cognizance. Sentences of excommunication may indeed be pronounced, and they may be followed with imprisonment (it does not appear, for what class of offences) not exceeding six months; but no other civil penalty or incapacity whatever shall be incurred by the excommunicated person. Consequently the act of baptism, performed even by a person excommunicated by a sentence, could not be of less validity in the eye of the law than that of a person not excommunicated; still less could the child upon whom the act was performed, be thought to have incurred the guilt of heresy.

In referring to the rubric, the Dean of the Arches seems to have laid the principal stress upon the word "sufficiently" which is found in the office for private baptism, immediately after the thanksgiving to be used upon the application of water and invocation of the Trinity. We do not find that he affirmed that in the case before him all was "well done and according unto due order," as the formulary has it after the inquiries into the manner in which the rite was administered; nor did he advert to the possibility of the child having been brought to be "received into the Church," according to the formulary; but he decided that the child was "sufficiently baptized" and could not with propriety have been "baptized again," if it had lived; and therefore it was entitled to have the funeral service of the Church performed over its dead body.

After giving this condensed view of a case which has resulted in censure upon a Clergyman, it is but justice to mention that, in the course of his remarks, the learned Judge adverted with severity to the bitter spirit of intolerance displayed by the adverse party; it appears, the Clergyman stated his scruples to the father, and inquired why he had not the child interred in the dissenting burial-place; the father said it was on account of the high fees charged there; upon which the Clergyman offered, but in vain, to pay the fees for him. We will add the remark that, while we entirely dissent from the view which excited the Clergyman's scruples in this case, we think the position of the Clergy at home is a most undesirable one, when the law compels them to perform special religious services at the mere convenience of those who ordinarily decline their ministrations. And as we suppose that the same laws are not in force in the Colonies, we should be glad, if some friend who can give information on the subject which our clerical readers could rely upon, would enable us to do so in our columns. We neither wish nor fear that our brethren in this Diocese would use their liberty to the violation of the spirit of charity; but we could wish them to be assured that the law is as tender towards their scruples as it is towards those of Christians dissenting from the Church.

To the Editor of the Berean.

Sir,—When the question is asked, what are the best means to be employed in effecting a revival of religion, it may with humility and self-abasement be replied, "What could have been done more to the Lord's vineyard, that he has not done in it?" We have the precious gift of his Son who died for us, the written word and preached gospel: why are they not found sufficient means for turning men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God? Death and judgment are set before us, and we are called to flee from the wrath to come and lay hold on eternal life; the lake which burneth with fire to deter, and the pleasures at God's right hand to invite, furnish motives which might be thought sufficient to affect us with power, and to bring us to a lively concern for the salvation of our souls.

The Psalmist, full of concern for the souls of men, "offers up his prayer to God: 'So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.'" If we made this our prayer for ourselves and for souls around us, we might, in an unperceived and noiseless manner, be helpful towards an effectual revival. We might find ministers preach more earnestly and affectionately, visit from house to house more assiduously, warn the careless with more importunity, comfort the afflicted more spiritually, build up the converted to a more steadfast and consistent deportment. So also we should find their congregations hanging upon the preachers' lips for instruction, those in the bondage of sin groaning for deliverance, the dry bones staking, the contrite shedding the silent tear, and the adopted child responding Abba, Father! to the love which calls him to be separate from the world and walk as with "feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace."

Should our state seem but as that of the dying embers, yet in answer to united and individual prayer, in faith asking for the outpouring of God's Holy Spirit, it might please Him to kindle up a flame, increasing gifts and diligence among those who are Ambassadors for Christ, and a hungering and thirsting for the bread and water of life among those to whom they are sent, and showing in a wide-spreading revival of religion, "that His hand is not shortened that it cannot save, neither His ear heavy that it cannot hear" when Zion prays for increase and beauty.

I am yours, faithfully,

A LAYMAN OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

EXTRACT FROM AN AFFECTIONATE APPEAL TO ALL WHO LOVE THE LORD JESUS CHRIST IN SINCERITY.

By the Ven. Archdeacon JEFFREYS, of Bombay.

Strange to say, there are Christian professors (and those not a few) who, in answer to these appeals, by the mercies of Christ, by a bleeding Saviour's love, not to destroy the souls for whom Christ died, will plead their CHRISTIAN LIBERTY! What! the liberty of sanctioning the use of that accursed instrument of Satan, through the means of which, it has been proved, from the best returns the nation can obtain, that more than five hundred (nearly six hundred) die weekly the death of the drunkard, and if we are to believe the Word of God, that drunkards shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven, perish in the flames of everlasting fire! I will here borrow an illustration, which may perhaps at first sight seem overstrained and inapplicable to the case in hand, but I entreat you to follow it patiently to the end, and see how it applies. Suppose the providence of God had so ordered it that six hundred souls must be wrecked every passing week on the coast of England, and that this could not possibly cease so long as the Christian continued to use intoxicating drink; suppose the providence of God, which can do all things, had established such a connexion between these things, that they could not be separated; that so long as the professed follower of Christ countenanced the use of the drunkard's drink, these wrecks must needs continue, and these six hundred souls must go down every week to a watery grave; suppose the experience of nearly two centuries had proved this,—would he cant and whine about his *Christian liberty* then? Could he calmly look on from the shore, and see the stranded vessel in the breakers, with six hundred of his fellow-creatures clinging to the rigging,—would he hear their shrieks and cries for help, and see them, one after another, washed out of the shrouds by the foaming surge, and sink to rise no more?—could he see this scene every week, and still plead his

Christian liberty, knowing that it was the cause of this destruction, and the means of drowning his fellow-creatures, six hundred weekly, or more than thirty thousand every year, and that this destruction could not possibly cease so long as he persevered? But what is this supposed case in comparison with the real one now before us, in which the connexion between cause and effect is as certain as any proposition in mathematical science! For it is no more possible for any man who takes the least trouble to inform himself of the facts of the case, to doubt whether the drinking customs of the age (especially the countenance given to the use of intoxicating drink by the sober, and, above all, by the religious) are the cause of all the desolations of intemperance, than it is possible to doubt whether the sun be the source of light and heat; and it is certain that unless all who are respected for piety and virtue in the country will enter their protest against the cause, and shame it out of the Christian caste, it is not possible that the effect should cease! What, then, I say, is the supposed case in comparison with the real one before us? Or what is the drowned mariner's, compared with the drunkard's, grave? It is a mere trifle in comparison; for the six hundred seamen, who would on this supposition go down to a watery grave, need not on that account go down to the lake of everlasting fire.

Christian liberty! The soul of every good man must sicken at hearing this sacred, this venerable term, prostituted to an argument so utterly disgusting. Christian liberty has been beautifully defined to be—"the liberty of doing that which love makes delightful." Shall the Christian then plead for the liberty of doing that which is now known to be, directly or remotely, the cause of one-half of all the disease, two-thirds of all the poverty, and three-fourths of all the crime of England;—the liberty of promoting the use of that which breaks the heart of the wife, starves her children, and by the poisonous example of their father, corrupts their morals, and ruins at once both their bodies and their souls;—the liberty of promoting that which is the cause of by far the greater portion of the tears of the widow and the orphan;—the liberty of using that which keeps thousands away from the ministry of the Gospel, by causing them to absent themselves from the house of God, while they frequent those places where the sound of the Gospel is never heard! The true believer, the lover of Christ, would hate and abhor such a *liberty*; he would rather remain chained to the damp walls of a dungeon to the end of his life, than be such a traitor to his Lord as to sanction and encourage the use of that which is the foulest instrument of hell, the most destructive engine of mischief, that Satan has introduced into our world, since the fall. The Apostle Paul says, "Take heed, lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak; and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died! and again, 'But judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block, or an occasion to fall, in his brother's way.'" Shall the Christian, then, use that liberty by which he multiplies the occasions of temptation abroad upon the face of society, and, in thousands of instances, sets a trap for his brother's soul? When Paul says, "Take heed, lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak, and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died," he takes for granted that the brother so falling is wrong in his judgment, and after all is only led to do that which he believes to be wrong. But what would the Apostle say in the present case, when the *Christian liberty*, now pleaded for, plunges a brother into misery, disease, poverty, guilt and crime, and destroys him, both body and soul, for time and for eternity? Would he not say—"Such mercy as thou hast shown to thy poor neighbour's soul, such mercy will thy Lord show to thine. Take heed lest this liberty of thine carry not thy selfish soul down to the lake of everlasting fire! Oh! how different is the self-denying love of a crucified Saviour, who denied himself, even to the death, for us miserable sinners, that we might not perish, but have everlasting life! How different the test of love left us by St. John, the beloved Apostle, when he tells us, 'We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.'" "He that loveth not his brother, abideth in death: Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.'" "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins;" "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." And let us not here be guilty of the mean, paltry attempt to escape conviction, and evade these commands by saying, that they apply exclusively to our brethren in Christ. It is admitted that this is their primary meaning; but our Lord commands us to love all mankind, to do them good, even our enemies themselves; even as our heavenly Father sendeth rain on the evil and on the good, on the just and on the unjust; and he has, in the parable of the good Samaritan, explained the term,

neighbour, in so wide a sense as to include all who may in any way come within the sphere of our influence, or whom it may be in our power to benefit or to injure by any thing we can do. Let us remember that "God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us;"—that, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his son. Oh! what would have become of us, if God had first waited till we became dutiful children, before he stretched out the arms of his mercy towards us? Are we, then, to wait to settle the question whether a fellow-creature be a brother in Christ, or only a brother of the human family, before we can determine that we owe him any love and mercy to his soul—before we can determine that it is our duty to deny ourselves, in a worthless indulgence, and to protest against those customs which are destroying the souls of thousands of our brethren, and consigning them to everlasting misery? The beloved Apostle says, "Let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." Surely, then, we are required to give some more substantial proof of our love than this!

To the Editor of the Berean.

THE PRIMITIVE PERCEPTIONS OF MANKIND.

Sir,—All those perceptions in mankind which cannot be traced to any finite origin, must be of necessity Divine; they must proceed from God alone, and must bespeak the universal and unceasing operation of the Deity, "in whom we live, and move, and have our being." They have been imparted to our minds without the medium of finite agency, and therefore may be justly called, *The primitive perceptions of mankind.*

Possibly not many of these primitive perceptions are coeval with our birth; they may in general be subsequent thereto, and successive in their actual development; but yet, as they must all have been divinely communicated to our minds, they can never be disregarded without incurring the displeasure of that Being who has favoured us with them.

Such primitive perceptions contain no verbal teaching, no logical propositions, no religious doctrine, and without the light of revelation they are mysteries, although living proofs of the Divinity in all mankind. Our own deductions from them, as from any other given data, may be incorrectly drawn, and therefore may be inconclusive; so all human interpretations of the sacred volume, are not, like the Bible itself, infallible and of Divine authority. But as the Holy Scriptures are infallible, so are any perceptions which have proceeded from the same source.

If any creature could be independent of the Deity, were it only for a single day, then might he continue to be independent of the Deity for ever. But the notion of an independent creature would not only involve a contradiction; it would be impious and absurd. This world and the creatures therein could not continue to exist, any more than they could begin to exist, without the agency of God our great Creator. True it is, that in this elemental world of ours, the Deity, in the exercise of his providence, employs finite agency, and then his own Divine agency is only mediate: but however numerous the links of the chain may be, if we succeed in tracing the connexion, we come to that point at last where finite agency terminates, and that of God shows itself. The direct and immediate agency of God is invisible, and all his primitive communications to mankind are unseen. Miraculous interpositions of the Deity, when visible, imply the intervention of some finite agency, as well as that which is Divine; as in the case of the burning bush, and in that of the Urim and Thummim; but in the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the agency of God is immediate and unseen. But although that Holy Being is himself unseen in his gracious operations, yet are they attested by an evidence that gives a full assurance in the human heart. Their divine source is attested by the teaching of the sacred volume. Religious feelings are of the nature of heavenly enjoyment, because they are all divinely inspired; they banish from the human heart guilt, impiety, and ill will; they dissipate the fear of death, and give a rich, a copious foretaste of eternal life; they happily attest the presence of the Deity within us, and make our souls the habitations of the Holy Ghost. Thus saith our blessed Lord,—"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

The Holy Scriptures have attributed even all natural and visible phenomena to God himself; because, although he operates therein by finite agents, yet as all finite things are under his control, which is absolute and irresistible in all its physical relations, it is said that "The help which is done upon the earth he doeth it;"—and that, "He doeth as it pleaseth him in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: no one can resist his hand, or say unto him, what dost thou?" But it must be evident, that the agency of God is more direct in all its operations upon the minds of his intelligent creatures, than in its operations upon material things: in them, is found the breath of life; he has created them in his own image, after his likeness; to them he imparts a knowledge of himself, and in their breasts he has deposited the latent hope of everlasting life: this inextinguishable feeling in human hearts is of itself sufficient to attest the sacred story, which informs us that, "God created man in his own image"; and the truth of the Gospel which declares that "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, has begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead to an inheritance, which is incorruptible and undefiled, and which fadeth not away."

Possibly, in the original condition of mankind, Adam and his wife were well acquainted with the verbal meaning of all primitive perceptions. Adam was accustomed to converse with God himself, and knew his voice, and he understood his holy will, whether it was conveyed by visible and audible instruction, or by the native intuitions of the Deity.