

The Brevon.

THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF MIND, AND SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS WERE SO.—Acts xvii. 11.

No. 46.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1845.

[Vol. I.]

THE JEWS.

They shall be my people, and I will be their God.
JER. xxxii. 38.

Oh happy people! favoured race!
The chosen of the Lord,
To whom He gave his richest grace,
The treasures of his Word!
Such heritage who would not claim,
Who would not boast thy honoured name?

What tho' they bear reproach and scorn,
Outcast and tempest-tossed,
From their own land of promise torn,
They mourn o'er blessings lost:
The Lord will not his covenant break,
His chosen he will not forsake.

Once more they shall his people be,
He, still their gracious Lord,
In all his glorious majesty
Fulfill his faithful word;
Angels shall be their guardian band
To bring them to their promised land.

And in the last, the happy day,
May we with them be found,
With Israel's loud, triumphant lay
Our thankful songs resound:
Hosannah to the incarnate Son,
With Father, Spirit, Three in One.

GS.

EPISCOPAL ADVICE.

The Lord Bishop of Worcester's Charge to the Candidates for Orders, December 21, 1841.

My dear young Friends,—It has been usual for the Bishop, on occasions like the present, to address such pastoral advice to the candidates for orders as he may think best calculated to prepare their minds for the solemn engagements which they are about or soon to undertake; and, in performing this important function of his Episcopal office, to dwell upon the general duties of the clergy, the doctrines which they are bound to teach, and the habits of life which they should endeavour to form. These are important matters, and in common times such as cannot be too frequently pressed upon your attention; but, in times like the present, it appears to me that it is incumbent on the Bishop to be somewhat more particular in his instructions to those who are about to embark in troubled waters, and who will need all the assistance which an experienced pilot can afford them. I have on former occasions, not only in my primary Charge addressed to the whole diocese, but afterwards, when opportunities like the present have occurred of giving advice to my younger brethren in the ministry, deprecated that spirit of innovation which, on the plea of a more punctual observance of the Rubric and a respect for the practices of the primitive Church, was, I felt convinced, calculated to alienate the affections of the laity from the clergy, and thus to give a fatal blow to our beloved Church, which must depend very much, not only for its usefulness but its security, on retaining its hold upon the affections of the people. However necessary it may be to recommend caution and discretion in these matters to the clergy at large, it is more especially so to those who are just entering on the discharge of their sacred calling. It too often happens, that those who have once taken a wrong direction, however much they may afterwards be sensible of the evil consequences resulting from their indiscretion, are deterred by a false shame, and perhaps by a not unnatural indisposition to give way before the prejudices of their people, from retracing their steps, and restoring the intercourse between themselves and their parishioners to that happy state of peace and tranquillity which may be considered as the general character of our Church before a mistaken regard for obsolete forms introduced discord and dissension among us. Those of you who are on the morrow to receive the first orders in the Church cannot have thus committed yourselves; and it may be reasonably hoped that they who have for a short time been ministering as deacons have been too sensible of their subordinate rank in the Church to have ventured to take a decided line on these controverted points, till a longer experience had enabled them to weigh certain evils against most problematical advantages. My advice to you, then, is, that in entering upon your several cures you retain the privilege which you at present possess, of not being committed to a party, and be cautious how you take a course which I am confident you will be anxious to retrace, when you have found that you have lost thereby the affections of your people; but in which a false pride and the feelings naturally belonging to party may induce you notwithstanding to persevere. In reviewing the history of our Church since the Reformation, it is hardly possible to note a time when its prosperity and usefulness was more remarkable than the period immediately preceding the publication of the "Oxford Tracts." An increased degree of zeal, a more entire devotion to their sacred functions, was manifest among the clergy; and not only did the most complete concord exist between them and the laity, but the latter testified their deep veneration for the Church of their forefathers, by contributing most liberally to the erection of churches and the support of Church and Missionary Societies. The service of the Church was then performed in strict accordance with the general directions of the Rubric; and though, on some trifling points, slight variations had been introduced, it was generally understood, that although these variations could not be legally sanctioned without the authority of Convocation, they were made in deference to public opinion, and under the authority derived from the tacit acquiescence of the Bishop. Schools were multiplied, the great truths of the everlasting Gospel were more distinctly and more generally preached

and such was the impression gradually made on those who had separated from us by such increased zeal and activity on the part of our clergy, that in several dioceses not only Dissenting ministers, but whole congregations of Dissenters, joined our communion. My brethren, I will not contrast this state of things with that which prevails at the present moment in other dioceses, and, I fear, in a small portion even of this diocese; but, as nothing human is perfect, and as in all the transactions of life it must be our lot to decide upon a comparative balance of advantages and disadvantages, I will request you to make the comparison, and then ask yourselves whether the advantages, whatever they may be, which can be derived from a minute regard to ritual observances and the usages of antiquity, may not be purchased at too dear a rate, if purchased at such a price. The limits within which I must necessarily confine myself on an occasion like the present will not admit of my going into the various points which have of late been made the matter of so much unpleasant discussion; but it may be useful to you that I should dwell upon one or two with regard to which you may entertain doubts, and on which you will be compelled to make up your minds when you take possession of your respective curacies. And, first, with regard to the habit which you ought to wear when instructing your people from the pulpit. This is a question which I consider so utterly unimportant that I have never hitherto thought it worth while to express my opinion on the subject. I have myself been present during the celebration of Divine service when the officiating clergyman has thought fit to preach in a surplice, without thinking it necessary to notice such a deviation from the general custom; and though I certainly should have been better pleased if no such innovation had been attempted, still I considered the whole matter as much too insignificant to require my interference. What, however, is in itself insignificant, acquires importance when it is considered as the badge of a party, and when, on this account, it becomes a stumbling block and an offence to others. On this ground I should be disposed to advise you to continue the practice which has so long prevailed of preaching in your academical habit, even though by so doing you deviated from the precise directions of the Rubric. For the sake of those, however, whose consciences are tender on this point I have carefully considered the question, and I have satisfied myself, and I hope that I may satisfy you, that it never has been the custom since the Reformation for the clergy to preach in their surplices. The whole argument upon this point turns upon the sermon being a portion of the Communion Service. If, therefore, we can show that the sermon is not a part of that service, there will remain no longer the slightest ground for an innovation which, though in itself indifferent, will be sure to shock the prejudices and excite the suspicion of your congregation. The 58th Canon, which relates to this matter, is thus headed:—"Ministers reading Divine service and administering the Sacraments to wear surplices;" and it directs that every minister saying the public prayers or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church "shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves; to be provided at the charge of the parish." Now, can it be said that when we are preaching a sermon we are either saying public prayers or administering a sacrament? That we are not doing the former is self-evident, and I will proceed to show that the sermon, thought introduced in the course of the Communion Service, forms no part of the proper Sacramental Service of the Lord's Supper. It is worthy of remark that in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. so little were the Ten Commandments or the sermon considered a part of the Sacramental Service that, after this portion of the service had been concluded, the following Rubric occurred:—"Then so many as shall be partakers of the holy Communion shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side and the women on the other side. All other (that mind not to receive the holy Communion) shall depart out of the quire, except the ministers and clerks." It is clear therefore that at that time, so far from the sermon forming part of the Sacramental Service, a complete interruption occurred after the sermon, during which those who did not mind to receive the holy Communion are directed to retire, and then the proper Sacramental Service commences. This Rubric is indeed not repeated in the second Prayer-book of Edward VI., or in the Prayer-book which we now use; but it is clear that the like interruption of the service was contemplated, for immediately after the Nicene Creed the curate is directed to declare unto the people what holidays or fasting days are to be observed in the week following; and all briefs, citations, and excommunications, are directed to be read; and can these be said to form part of the Sacramental Service? "Then," the Rubric proceeds, "shall follow the sermon," so that you perceive the preaching a sermon is classed with reading briefs, citations, and excommunications, which certainly, in the words of the 58th Canon, can form no part either of Divine service, or of administering the Sacrament, during which ministers are directed to wear a surplice. The inference which I have attempted to draw from the Rubric is further confirmed by the practice adopted at our two Universities. It is well known that in no places is a regard for strict ritual observance more attended to than in our Universities; and yet so little is the sermon considered a part of the Sacramental Service that it is preached in a different place and at a different time from the college chapels; where the Sacraments are administered; and here I cannot but observe,

that if the surplice had ever been worn as the proper habit of a preacher, it would have been adopted in our University pulpits; but here we know that at the present time the gown is always worn, and I believe I may venture to say, that no record exists of the surplice having ever been used on such occasions, and the gown substituted for it; but such a change could not have been effected in a place where old customs are so strictly adhered to as in our Universities without authority, and if effected by authority, some record of it would unquestionably exist at the present day. Again, so far was the sermon from being considered as included in the reading of public prayers or ministering the sacraments, that we know it was frequently preached by some of our most eminent reformers at St. Paul's-cross, and it can hardly be supposed that the surplice was worn on such occasions. The true state of the case I take to be, that you are directed to use the surplice only when reading Divine service or administering the sacraments; you then appear in your proper character of priest or deacon, appointed to minister in holy things; but when you preach you assume the character of a teacher, and as such your proper habit (if, indeed, proper or improper be fit words for a matter so utterly insignificant) is your academical gown, with a hood, denoting your degree at the University. I have thus attempted to prove that it is a mistaken notion to suppose that the surplice is the proper dress for you to wear in the pulpit. If I have not convinced you, I think you must admit that, under the circumstances which I have stated to you, it is at best a doubtful question, and in any doubtful question I feel sure that you would obey the apostle's direction, which ought to have much more authority with you than anything I can say, and "follow after the things which make for peace." Another change which has of late years been attempted in our Church Service is the reading of the prayer for the Church militant, which, if originally intended to form part of the Church Service, had been almost universally discontinued in our parochial churches, and even in many of our cathedrals. Upon this point the Rubrics are certainly inconsistent. In that which immediately precedes that prayer the following words occur:—"And when there is a Communion, the priest shall place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient, after which is done the priest shall say, 'Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth.'" Did this Rubric stand alone, there could be no doubt that the prayer for the Church militant was to be read only when the Sacrament was about to be administered; but another Rubric occurs inconsistent with the above, at the conclusion of the Communion Service, where we read "that upon Sundays and holidays, if there be no Communion, shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion until the end of the general prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth." It is difficult to account for these two contrary Rubrics, which appear to have been inserted at the same time, that is, at the second revision of the Prayer-book in the reign of Edward VI.; but as they do exist, it is not extraordinary that the clergy should have felt themselves at liberty to observe which they pleased, and partly on account of the length of the service, so distressing to those who are in advanced years, partly on account of the awkwardness of being obliged again to exchange the gown for the surplice, this prayer became gradually discontinued. And here I cannot but observe that the disuse of this prayer is of itself a proof that the surplice was not usually worn in the pulpit. Had it been so, there would have been no difficulty in the minister returning from the pulpit to the Communion-table, and reading the prayer as directed by the second Rubric, to which I have referred. It was because he wore a gown, and not a surplice, that this practice was found inconvenient, and therefore was discontinued. The only other point to which I think it necessary to call your especial attention on the present occasion is the use of the Offertory, and the collecting of alms from the congregation on every Lord's day. There is no doubt that, originally, this collection was intended as a substitute for the alms which used to be given at the doors of convents, and as it is still continued in Scotland and the Isle of Man, where no poor-rates exist, we may reasonably conclude that it would never have been discontinued in this country, if the poor had not been otherwise provided for by a rate levied on all the parishioners. The custom then became almost universal that it should only be used at the administration of the Lord's Supper. Attempts, however, have of late years been made by some of the clergy to renew the practice of reading the Offertory and making collections every Sunday, for the purpose of procuring contributions towards the support of our Church Societies; and where this can be done without offence to the congregation, it is impossible to object to a practice which, while it encourages the charitable feelings of the congregation, might, if extensively adopted, materially aid those most valuable institutions. The consent, however, of the congregation is a material element in the propriety of adopting such a practice, for we have no right to force upon a congregation, without their consent, what is not strictly legal, and I have always been intimately convinced, that no collection can be legally made in a church during the reading of the Offertory except for the benefit of the poor residing in the parish and where the church is situated, or under the authority of a Queen's letter. The phrase of the "poor man's box," which occurs in the Rubric, can have reference only to that box which used to be placed in all our churches to receive the alms of the

charitable for the benefit of the poor of that particular parish. A very curious decision of Sir Lyttleton Powys, in the reign of George I., has been lately published, which sets this matter at rest, for it is therein distinctly stated as the law at that time (and it does not appear that any adverse decision has been since made to reverse it), that no collections can be legally made in churches during the reading of the Offertory, except for the poor of the parish, but by the leave and permission of the Crown. If, therefore, you think fit to restore the use of the Offertory in any of the churches where you may be appointed to serve, you will hear in mind that all the money so collected can only be legally applied to the relief of the poor of the parish. There can be no objection to collections being made for other purposes, in cases where the congregation themselves are consenting parties to them; but, wherever such collections are resisted, it will not be safe for you to persist, while the law upon this subject remains at least so doubtful. I have thus stated my opinion upon some of those points which have been the most fruitful causes of dissension between the clergy and the laity; and in conclusion, I will only refer you to one of the questions which you will be called upon to answer to-morrow. You will be asked, "Will you maintain and set forward as much as lieth in you quietness, peace, and love, among all Christian people, and especially among those that are or shall be committed to your charge?" To this question you will be required solemnly to reply: "I will do so, the Lord being my helper." Be assured that your usefulness in your parishes will very much depend upon your fulfilling the pledge which you will thus give; and if you will go forth to your respective cures anxious to fulfil your sacred duties in the spirit of peace,—not pertinacious about trifles, even if the law be on your side, and still less so, if the law be doubtful,—anxious only to win souls to Christ, and with this view endeavouring to conciliate the affections of your people while you point out to them the way of everlasting life, the Lord will "be your helper." He will bless your ministerial labours with success; and may you hereafter be enabled to appear before his judgment-seat, and say, with well-grounded confidence, "Of those whom Thou hast given me have I lost none."

MEDITATION FOR LENT.

FEBR. 13. 26.—Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.—In the phrase, *hath appeared*, or, *been manifested*, there is probably coched an allusion to the practice of the High Priest, as there certainly is a contrast to it in the word, *once*. It was among the Levitical ordinances, that the high priest should present himself with the blood of a sacrifice before the mercy-seat in the holiest of all; once every year, on the great day of atonement. Now in the chapter before us, we find it stated of Christ, that "by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." And a little lower down, that he "is gone to appear in the presence of God for us." Whence it may be inferred, that St. Paul had an eye to the Saviour's proceeding soon after his immolation, or, as some think, directly from the cross, to present himself as slain in the heavenly sanctuary: without which his sacerdotal performance would not have been perfect; the slaughter of the victim being hardly a more essential part of sacrifice, than its subsequent presentation to the party it was designed to conciliate. Moreover, this excellent sacrifice being once slain and presented, no repetition of it was necessary. It was offered up once for all: wherein it differed from legal expiations, which, having only a typical and not an intrinsic virtue, required to be perpetually renewed. But our High Priest, who was both victim and sacrificer, is free from the imperfection that attached to the Levitical priests and oblations. From his sacrifice a rich and exuberant virtue goes forth for the healing of nations: it exhales a pacificatory fragrance that fills all places and ages; and that is constantly diffusing itself, in all its primitive freshness, throughout earth and heaven.

We observe, yet further, the importance of this great sacrifice being *displayed* to the world. For what was the reason that sin was irremissible without a satisfaction made to Jehovah? Not surely that He, whose nature is love, was actuated by a revengeful passion that thirsted for agonies and blood; for revenge is not assuaged by the infliction of evil on any other than the real offender. So injurious a conception of God must be abhorred by every pious Christian. It has been abundantly shown that the intent of Christ's death was, to make known the unspeakable love of God to undone and helpless sinners; to prevent the disorders that must have ensued in the community of man, had sin appeared to be a trifle in the divine estimation; and to make it conspicuously agreeable with all the perfections of God, to receive his disloyal subjects back into favour. Now these ends would not have been obtained, had the affair of our redemption been privately transacted between the Father and his Son, Jesus Christ, instead of being an overt act divulged and interpreted to mankind. Had Christ not been evidently set forth as the victim, upon whom was laid the chastisement of our peace, the due exercise of faith in his name would have been impossible; no honour would have been bestowed to the law; the exceeding evil of sin would not have been recognised; nor would God have appeared alike glorious for justice as for mercy in pardoning the believer in Jesus. It was therefore essential to the demonstration of the divine excellency, not only that Christ should die, but likewise that his death, with

its intent and circumstances, should obtain the widest notoriety.

Once more, you will observe that Christ is not said to put away sins, but *sin*. He is not described as atoning for the particular sins of particular individuals, like a surety who pays down an exact numerical equivalent for specific debts; but he expiates the common delinquency of mankind,—removes all legal bars to the remission of it,—by making a moral satisfaction to the governing justice of God, beyond what could have been attained by executing the extreme sentence of the law on the universe of sinners. There resulted from his sacrifice a fuller vindication of the rights of God, and a brighter illustration of the moral excellencies of his government, than could have been attained by making the whole creation a holocaust, to burn for ever in the fire of almighty vengeance.—*Christ Crucified*, by the Rev. J. N. Pearson.

ENGLISH SYNODS.

It may be most reasonably questioned whether the supremacy of the temporal power infers not merely the right of assembling synods, but the exclusive right of calling them. The universal practice of the church for many centuries is opposed to the notion that all synods must be convened either by the Roman pontiff or by the temporal sovereign. The canons required provincial synods to be held twice every year: it is plain that the emperors and kings were not troubled with requests to hold such synods, but that the metropolitans of every province assembled them by their own writ. Such was certainly the case in England, where, as archbishop Wake says, "the provincial synod was held by the sole power of the metropolitan: the king might sometimes approve of, or advise the calling of it; but I believe it will be hard to find out any one instance wherein he required the archbishop by any royal writ to assemble such a council." To these provincial synods the bishops alone were of necessity summoned, and they only had a decisive voice. Their office was to take cognizance of appeals from particular dioceses, to judge bishops and metropolitans, and to enact canons for the province. This latter power, which had frequently been exercised by provincial synods without seeking the permission of the crown, was in the reign of Henry the Eighth relinquished by the clergy so far as related to enacting new canons without the royal consent: a submission which was only consistent with the harmonious co-operation of church and state, and which is in fact enforced by every sovereign in Europe, with or without the consent of the clergy.

But it is a different question, whether provincial synods may not meet simply by the writ of the metropolitan, and proceed, without making new canons, to act on the old canons. It is true that Coke and other lawyers assert that no such synod can meet without the king's writ, basing themselves on the submission of the clergy in the reign of Henry VIII., and on the common law or ancient customs of England evidenced by authentic history; but I doubt not that a constitutional lawyer, less anxious to extend the prerogative of the crown than to give due consideration to justice, and to the genuine voice of history, might be able to prove that the right of the English metropolitans to assemble provincial synods without the royal writ, is still in fact the common law of England.

With regard to the submission of the clergy, in which they declared that "all convocations had been, and ought to have been assembled by the king's writ, and promised in *verbo sacerdotum* never for the future to enact any new canons in their convocations without the king's licence, it appears to me that this submission, and the act which comprises it, relate to convocations only, not to provincial synods, because it is as notorious that the former have always been summoned by the king's writ, as it is that the latter were not so. The whole clergy and the whole parliament of England would scarcely have been so devoid of information or of veracity as to affirm, that provincial synods had always been assembled by the king's writ; it would seem therefore that they must in this submission and act, have only meant to refer to convocations properly so called. In Ireland the clergy made no such submission, and provincial synods have continued to be held by the metropolitans without the king's writ even to the present day.—*Palmer's Treatise on the Church*.

INFLUENCE OF A PHYSICIAN.

Beyond this view of his position, to no man does the responsibility of personal example, and the influence of that example, become greater, or a fact more worthy of grave consideration, than to the physician. He stands in a position of great moral authority to every

* Wake, State of the Church and Clergy, p. 27. See also Kennett, Eccles. Synods p. 201, 202.

† Ibid. p. 107, 108, 111, &c.

‡ Coke, 4 Inst. 322, 323.

§ Act 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19.

¶ Atterbury limits it to parliamentary meetings of the clergy.—On Convocation, p. 82, et. 170. If the term "convocations" were taken to mean any meeting of the clergy, it would be illegal even for a bishop to hold his visitation.

‡ I learned from the late eminent metropolitan, archbishop Magee, that the provincial synod of Dublin has usually been assembled at intervals of 30 or 40 years, to exercise the right; and that he himself held such a synod, which in his opinion even possessed the power of making canons. Bishop Bedel made canons in the Diocesan synod of Kilmore, A.D. 1639, for which see Wilkins's Concilia, t. IV. p. 537. The lord deputy of Ireland, it seems, was unable legally to prevent this or to trouble the bishop.—See *Harriot's Life of Bedel*.