true or proper altar, whereon Christ is again really sacrificed; but it is and may be called an altar, in that sense in which the primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other. Those who, as the Romanists, hold not simply a real, but a corporal presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, can scarcely avoid holding also the notion of a propitiatory sacrifice; and to this notion of a corporal presence is to be traced superstitious reverence for the external circumstances of the elements. Our own Church, admitting the doctrine of a real, though spiritual presence, utterly rejects that corporal presence which, however it may be veiled under obscure or unintelligible terms, is virtually one with the error of transubstantiation. It is expressly declared at the end of the Communion Service, that by the custom of kneeling to receive the elements, "no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."

"The ceremonies," says Bishop Fleetwood, "allowed and practised in the Church, though not enjoined by the rubric, are such as were used in the Church before the canon or the rubric was made; and being reasonable, and easy, and becoming, were not enforced by any new law, but were left in possession of what force they had obtained by custom. He that complies not with these ceremonies, offends against no law, but only against a custom; which yet a prudent man will not like to do, when once it has obtained in general."

With regard to worshipping towards the east, there can be no doubt of its having been a very ancient practice of the Church; for it is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, and by Tertullian. Bishop Stillingfleet, one of the most learned of our divines, considers it to be one of those customs derived from primitive times, and continuing to our own, which there is no need to oppose, but rather to cherish. "And of all customs," he observes, "that of contention and singularity, where there is no plain reason against it, doth least become the Church." I do not, however, consider it to be the intention of our Church, that the officiating minister in reading prayers should turn to the east with his back to the congregation. Bishop Sparrow thinks, that anciently the reading-desk was so placed, that the minister looked to the east away from the people, to whom he is directed to turn in reading the lessons. But the reading-lessons was not known in the early years of the Reformation. It is not mentioned in the Injunction of King Edward VI., or in those of Queen Elizabeth, nor in any canons or visitation Articles before the canon of 1603. The first rule in King Edward's Common Prayer-book orders, that the minister should so turn in reading prayers as that the people may best hear him; and as the reading-desk was then placed in the chancel, at the communion-table, it is clear that he could not have faced the east. It appears, however, from the proceedings of the Savoy Conference, that it was customary at that time for the minister to turn to the people only when he spoke to them, as in the lessons, absolution, and benediction; when he spoke for them to God, it was argued by the bishops, "It is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church did, the reasons of which you may see in Augustine." I approve of the arrangement lately adopted in several churches, by which the clergyman looks to the south while reading prayers, and to the west while reading lessons. With respect to those ordinances of the Church, about which there is a difference of opinion, where the rubric and canons are not clear, the judgment of the bishop should be sought.

A question has risen about placing lights upon the communion-table. On this point I may be entertained as to law in this particular. They were forbidden by the Injunction of King Edward VI. in 1549; but they were in use when the first Liturgy of that monarch received the authority of Parliament, and therefore seem to be sanctioned by the rubric in our present Common Prayer-book. But whether be so or not, they have always been retained in our Chapels Royal, in cathedrals, and in College chapels; and I see no objection to them provided that the candles are not burning except when the church is lighted up for evening service.

I strongly disapprove of the practice, which, as I am informed, has been adopted by a few of the clergy, of decorating the communion-table with flowers; and especially where that decoration is varied from day to day, so as to have some fanciful analogy to the history of the saint who is commemorated. This appears to me to be something worse than frivolous, and to approach very nearly to the honours paid by the Romish Church to departed saints. Such practices as these, which are neither prescribed, nor recommended, nor even noticed by our Church, nor sanctioned by general custom, throw discredit upon those decent ceremonies and expressive forms which are intended to enliven the devotion of those who are engaged in the service of God, and to do honour to his holy name. It is well observed by Bishop Halifax, that there may be too much form in religion, as well as too little. The one leads to enthusiasm, the other degenerates to superstition; the one is Puritanism, the other is Popery; whereas the rational worship of God is equally removed from either of these. In resisting an exaggerated spiritualism, we must be careful not to incur the charge of materializing; and, above all things, we must beware of arbitrarily connecting the gifts of God with ordinances of merely human appointment, and of teaching our people to place the ceremonies which the Church has ordained, however significant and laudable, on the same footing as the sacraments, which have been ordained by the Lord Jesus himself. It is very well to speak of them as precious fragments of an ancient, or perhaps of a primitive ritual; we deny that they are to be considered as anything more than decent and venerable usages, or that we have the slightest evidence of their being perchance divinely authorized portions of the Church's perpetual sacrifices. Ceremonies which cannot be shown to have been appointed by the apostles, with a direction for their continuance, are not of perpetual obligation through the Church, although it may be proved that they were used by the apostles, or may appear highly probable that they were so; as, for example, the appointment of an order of deacons for daily distribution, the anointing of the sick with oil, and some other customs—although they may not lightly be laid aside even by Churches, and not at all by individual members of themselves. This is the doctrine of our own Church, in the preface to her Book of Common Prayer; and in this respect every one, at least every clergyman, is bound by the laws of his own Church. What they enjoin he is to practice; what they forbid he is to abstain from; what they purposely omit he is not to introduce. Prayers for the dead, trine immersion in baptism, the kiss of peace in the eucharist, the mixing of water and wine in the chalice—all these were undoubtedly ancient customs, if not of primitive antiquity; but they are not recognised by our own Church, and they are, therefore, not to be practised by its ministers. "Let no minister of a parish," says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "introduce any ceremonies, rites, or gestures, though with some seeming piety or devotion, which are not commanded of the Church and established by law; and let these also be wisely and usefully explicated to the people, that they may understand the reasons for obedience; let there be no more introduced, lest the people, being burdened unnecessarily, attempt to follow none." You are not to take as your rule and government in this respect the early Church, or the primitive Church, but the Church of England, as she speaks in plain and obvious cases by her rubric and canons, in doubtful and undecided ones by her bishops. This is the language of common sense, as it is also the canon of law, laid down by its ablest interpreters. I earnestly wish that rule were kept in view by all clergymen. We should not then have to complain of unwarrantable omissions and mutilations of the Church's service on the one hand, of unauthorized additions to her ritual on the other. I must confess, that I view the former fault with a complacency than the other. I think that the clergyman who presumes to omit any part of the office, which he has solemnly pledged himself to use wholly and entirely, either through haste or negligence, or (which is still worse) from a dislike to the doctrine which they assert, offends more grievously against the order of the Church than he who, from mistaken zeal for antiquity, revives obsolete practices, or is minute and scrupulous in his attention to the externals of religion. It is my earnest desire that you should omit no part of the solemn service which the Church has appointed to be said, whether in the administration of the sacraments, or in what are commonly termed the occasional offices.

With respect to the habits proper to be worn by the clergy, when ministering in Divine service, no question is made so far as the prayers are concerned; but it is doubted whether a clergyman, when preaching, should wear the surplice or a gown. I apprehend, that for some time after the Reformation, when a sermon was preached only in the morning at communion service, the preacher always wore a surplice; a custom which has been retained in cathedral churches, and college chapels, and in the chapels royal. The Injunction at the end of King Edward's first Service-book requires the surplice to be used in all churches and chapels; but the present rubric enacts, that all the ornaments of ministers, at all times of their ministration, be the same as they were by authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI. The gown was probably first worn in the pulpit by the lecturers, who preached when no part of the communion service was read. In the King's Injunction in 1633, to the Archbishop, direction is given, that where a lecture is set up in a market-town, it may be read by a company of grave and orthodox divines, and that they ever preach in such seemly habits as belong to their degree, and not in cloaks. When there is only one officiating clergyman, and the prayer for the Church militant is read, which must be read in the surplice, it seems better that he should preach in the surplice than quit the church after the service for the purpose of changing his habit. But, perhaps, it would be most consonant with the intention of the Church, if the preacher would wear a surplice when preaching after the morning service, and a gown when the sermon is in the evening. Upon the whole, I am hardly prepared to give any positive direction on this point for this particular diocese, although it is certainly desirable that uniformity of practice should prevail in the Church at large.

A more important point than that of the dress of the officiating clergyman, is the manner in which he reads the Common Prayer. No person objects more strongly than I do to a declamatory or rhetorical mode of reading; but I do not understand why those clergyman, who seek to avoid that fault, should pass to the opposite extreme of rapid and monotonous recitation. I am aware, that in the old rubric even the lessons were directed to be sung in plain tone, as also the Epistle and Gospel; this was wisely altered in 1661. There are certain parts of the service which the rubric still directs to be said or sung; but they are not to be said and sung, or to be said as if they were sung; and even if they were, few would like to hear reading the litany or prayers was then the chancel, at the communion-table, it is clear that he could not have faced the east. It appears, however, from the proceedings of the Savoy Conference, that it was customary at that time for the minister to turn to the people only when he spoke to them, as in the lessons, absolution, and benediction; when he spoke for them to God, it was argued by the bishops, "It is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church did, the reasons of which you may see in Augustine." I approve of the arrangement lately adopted in several churches, by which the clergyman looks to the south while reading prayers, and to the west while reading lessons. With respect to those ordinances of the Church, about which there is a difference of opinion, where the rubric and canons are not clear, the judgment of the bishop should be sought.

A question has risen about placing lights upon the communion-table. On this point I may be entertained as to law in this particular. They were forbidden by the Injunction of King Edward VI. in 1549; but they were in use when the first Liturgy of that monarch received the authority of Parliament, and therefore seem to be sanctioned by the rubric in our present Common Prayer-book. But whether be so or not, they have always been retained in our Chapels Royal, in cathedrals, and in College chapels; and I see no objection to them provided that the candles are not burning except when the church is lighted up for evening service.

I strongly disapprove of the practice, which, as I am informed, has been adopted by a few of the clergy, of decorating the communion-table with flowers; and especially where that decoration is varied from day to day, so as to have some fanciful analogy to the history of the saint who is commemorated. This appears to me to be something worse than frivolous, and to approach very nearly to the honours paid by the Romish Church to departed saints. Such practices as these, which are neither prescribed, nor recommended, nor even noticed by our Church, nor sanctioned by general custom, throw discredit upon those decent ceremonies and expressive forms which are intended to enliven the devotion of those who are engaged in the service of God, and to do honour to his holy name. It is well observed by Bishop Halifax, that there may be too much form in religion, as well as too little. The one leads to enthusiasm, the other degenerates to superstition; the one is Puritanism, the other is Popery; whereas the rational worship of God is equally removed from either of these. In resisting an exaggerated spiritualism, we must be careful not to incur the charge of materializing; and, above all things, we must beware of arbitrarily connecting the gifts of God with ordinances of merely human appointment, and of teaching our people to place the ceremonies which the Church has ordained, however significant and laudable, on the same footing as the sacraments, which have been ordained by the Lord Jesus himself. It is very well to speak of them as precious fragments of an ancient, or perhaps of a primitive ritual; we deny that they are to be considered as anything more than decent and venerable usages, or that we have the slightest evidence of their being perchance divinely authorized portions of the Church's perpetual sacrifices. Ceremonies which cannot be shown to have been appointed by the apostles, with a direction for their continuance, are not of perpetual obligation through the Church, although it may be proved that they were used by the apostles, or may appear highly probable that they were so; as, for example, the appointment of an order of deacons for daily distribution, the anointing of the sick with oil, and some other customs—although they may not lightly be laid aside even by Churches, and not at all by individual members of themselves. This is the doctrine of our own Church, in the preface to her Book of Common Prayer; and in this respect every one, at least every clergyman, is bound by the laws of his own Church. What they enjoin he is to practice; what they forbid he is to abstain from; what they purposely omit he is not to introduce. Prayers for the dead, trine immersion in baptism, the kiss of peace in the eucharist, the mixing of water and wine in the chalice—all these were undoubtedly ancient customs, if not of primitive antiquity; but they are not recognised by our own Church, and they are, therefore, not to be practised by its ministers. "Let no minister of a parish," says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "introduce any ceremonies, rites, or gestures, though with some seeming piety or devotion, which are not commanded of the Church and established by law; and let these also be wisely and usefully explicated to the people, that they may understand the reasons for obedience; let there be no more introduced, lest the people, being burdened unnecessarily, attempt to follow none." You are not to take as your rule and government in this respect the early Church, or the primitive Church, but the Church of England, as she speaks in plain and obvious cases by her rubric and canons, in doubtful and undecided ones by her bishops. This is the language of common sense, as it is also the canon of law, laid down by its ablest interpreters. I earnestly wish that rule were kept in view by all clergymen. We should not then have to complain of unwarrantable omissions and mutilations of the Church's service on the one hand, of unauthorized additions to her ritual on the other. I must confess, that I view the former fault with a complacency than the other. I think that the clergyman who presumes to omit any part of the office, which he has solemnly pledged himself to use wholly and entirely, either through haste or negligence, or (which is still worse) from a dislike to the doctrine which they assert, offends more grievously against the order of the Church than he who, from mistaken zeal for antiquity, revives obsolete practices, or is minute and scrupulous in his attention to the externals of religion. It is my earnest desire that you should omit no part of the solemn service which the Church has appointed to be said, whether in the administration of the sacraments, or in what are commonly termed the occasional offices.

With respect to the habits proper to be worn by the clergy, when ministering in Divine service, no question is made so far as the prayers are concerned; but it is doubted whether a clergyman, when preaching, should wear the surplice or a gown. I apprehend, that for some time after the Reformation, when a sermon was preached only in the morning at communion service, the preacher always wore a surplice; a custom which has been retained in cathedral churches, and college chapels, and in the chapels royal. The Injunction at the end of King Edward's first Service-book requires the surplice to be used in all churches and chapels; but the present rubric enacts, that all the ornaments of ministers, at all times of their ministration, be the same as they were by authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI. The gown was probably first worn in the pulpit by the lecturers, who preached when no part of the communion service was read. In the King's Injunction in 1633, to the Archbishop, direction is given, that where a lecture is set up in a market-town, it may be read by a company of grave and orthodox divines, and that they ever preach in such seemly habits as belong to their degree, and not in cloaks. When there is only one officiating clergyman, and the prayer for the Church militant is read, which must be read in the surplice, it seems better that he should preach in the surplice than quit the church after the service for the purpose of changing his habit. But, perhaps, it would be most consonant with the intention of the Church, if the preacher would wear a surplice when preaching after the morning service, and a gown when the sermon is in the evening. Upon the whole, I am hardly prepared to give any positive direction on this point for this particular diocese, although it is certainly desirable that uniformity of practice should prevail in the Church at large.

A more important point than that of the dress of the officiating clergyman, is the manner in which he reads the Common Prayer. No person objects more strongly than I do to a declamatory or rhetorical mode of reading; but I do not understand why those clergyman, who seek to avoid that fault, should pass to the opposite extreme of rapid and monotonous recitation. I am aware, that in the old rubric even the lessons were directed to be sung in plain tone, as also the Epistle and Gospel; this was wisely altered in 1661. There are certain parts of the service which the rubric still directs to be said or sung; but they are not to be said and sung, or to be said as if they were sung; and even if they were, few would like to hear reading the litany or prayers

---

enemy, few would like to hear reading the litany or prayers was then the chancel, at the communion-table, it is clear that he could not have faced the east. It appears, however, from the proceedings of the Savoy Conference, that it was customary at that time for the minister to turn to the people only when he spoke to them, as in the lessons, absolution, and benediction; when he spoke for them to God, it was argued by the bishops, "It is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church did, the reasons of which you may see in Augustine." I approve of the arrangement lately adopted in several churches, by which the clergyman looks to the south while reading prayers, and to the west while reading lessons. With respect to those ordinances of the Church, about which there is a difference of opinion, where the rubric and canons are not clear, the judgment of the bishop should be sought.

A question has risen about placing lights upon the communion-table. On this point I may be entertained as to law in this particular. They were forbidden by the Injunction of King Edward VI. in 1549; but they were in use when the first Liturgy of that monarch received the authority of Parliament, and therefore seem to be sanctioned by the rubric in our present Common Prayer-book. But whether be so or not, they have always been retained in our Chapels Royal, in cathedrals, and in College chapels; and I see no objection to them provided that the candles are not burning except when the church is lighted up for evening service.

I strongly disapprove of the practice, which, as I am informed, has been adopted by a few of the clergy, of decorating the communion-table with flowers; and especially where that decoration is varied from day to day, so as to have some fanciful analogy to the history of the saint who is commemorated. This appears to me to be something worse than frivolous, and to approach very nearly to the honours paid by the Romish Church to departed saints. Such practices as these, which are neither prescribed, nor recommended, nor even noticed by our Church, nor sanctioned by general custom, throw discredit upon those decent ceremonies and expressive forms which are intended to enliven the devotion of those who are engaged in the service of God, and to do honour to his holy name. It is well observed by Bishop Halifax, that there may be too much form in religion, as well as too little. The one leads to enthusiasm, the other degenerates to superstition; the one is Puritanism, the other is Popery; whereas the rational worship of God is equally removed from either of these. In resisting an exaggerated spiritualism, we must be careful not to incur the charge of materializing; and, above all things, we must beware of arbitrarily connecting the gifts of God with ordinances of merely human appointment, and of teaching our people to place the ceremonies which the Church has ordained, however significant and laudable, on the same footing as the sacraments, which have been ordained by the Lord Jesus himself. It is very well to speak of them as precious fragments of an ancient, or perhaps of a primitive ritual; we deny that they are to be considered as anything more than decent and venerable usages, or that we have the slightest evidence of their being perchance divinely authorized portions of the Church's perpetual sacrifices. Ceremonies which cannot be shown to have been appointed by the apostles, with a direction for their continuance, are not of perpetual obligation through the Church, although it may be proved that they were used by the apostles, or may appear highly probable that they were so; as, for example, the appointment of an order of deacons for daily distribution, the anointing of the sick with oil, and some other customs—although they may not lightly be laid aside even by Churches, and not at all by individual members of themselves. This is the doctrine of our own Church, in the preface to her Book of Common Prayer; and in this respect every one, at least every clergyman, is bound by the laws of his own Church. What they enjoin he is to practice; what they forbid he is to abstain from; what they purposely omit he is not to introduce. Prayers for the dead, trine immersion in baptism, the kiss of peace in the eucharist, the mixing of water and wine in the chalice—all these were undoubtedly ancient customs, if not of primitive antiquity; but they are not recognised by our own Church, and they are, therefore, not to be practised by its ministers. "Let no minister of a parish," says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "introduce any ceremonies, rites, or gestures, though with some seeming piety or devotion, which are not commanded of the Church and established by law; and let these also be wisely and usefully explicated to the people, that they may understand the reasons for obedience; let there be no more introduced, lest the people, being burdened unnecessarily, attempt to follow none." You are not to take as your rule and government in this respect the early Church, or the primitive Church, but the Church of England, as she speaks in plain and obvious cases by her rubric and canons, in doubtful and undecided ones by her bishops. This is the language of common sense, as it is also the canon of law, laid down by its ablest interpreters. I earnestly wish that rule were kept in view by all clergymen. We should not then have to complain of unwarrantable omissions and mutilations of the Church's service on the one hand, of unauthorized additions to her ritual on the other. I must confess, that I view the former fault with a complacency than the other. I think that the clergyman who presumes to omit any part of the office, which he has solemnly pledged himself to use wholly and entirely, either through haste or negligence, or (which is still worse) from a dislike to the doctrine which they assert, offends more grievously against the order of the Church than he who, from mistaken zeal for antiquity, revives obsolete practices, or is minute and scrupulous in his attention to the externals of religion. It is my earnest desire that you should omit no part of the solemn service which the Church has appointed to be said, whether in the administration of the sacraments, or in what are commonly termed the occasional offices.

With respect to the habits proper to be worn by the clergy, when ministering in Divine service, no question is made so far as the prayers are concerned; but it is doubted whether a clergyman, when preaching, should wear the surplice or a gown. I apprehend, that for some time after the Reformation, when a sermon was preached only in the morning at communion service, the preacher always wore a surplice; a custom which has been retained in cathedral churches, and college chapels, and in the chapels royal. The Injunction at the end of King Edward's first Service-book requires the surplice to be used in all churches and chapels; but the present rubric enacts, that all the ornaments of ministers, at all times of their ministration, be the same as they were by authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI. The gown was probably first worn in the pulpit by the lecturers, who preached when no part of the communion service was read. In the King's Injunction in 1633, to the Archbishop, direction is given, that where a lecture is set up in a market-town, it may be read by a company of grave and orthodox divines, and that they ever preach in such seemly habits as belong to their degree, and not in cloaks. When there is only one officiating clergyman, and the prayer for the Church militant is read, which must be read in the surplice, it seems better that he should preach in the surplice than quit the church after the service for the purpose of changing his habit. But, perhaps, it would be most consonant with the intention of the Church, if the preacher would wear a surplice when preaching after the morning service, and a gown when the sermon is in the evening. Upon the whole, I am hardly prepared to give any positive direction on this point for this particular diocese, although it is certainly desirable that uniformity of practice should prevail in the Church at large.

A more important point than that of the dress of the officiating clergyman, is the manner in which he reads the Common Prayer. No person objects more strongly than I do to a declamatory or rhetorical mode of reading; but I do not understand why those clergyman, who seek to avoid that fault, should pass to the opposite extreme of rapid and monotonous recitation. I am aware, that in the old rubric even the lessons were directed to be sung in plain tone, as also the Epistle and Gospel; this was wisely altered in 1661. There are certain parts of the service which the rubric still directs to be said or sung; but they are not to be said and sung, or to be said as if they were sung; and even if they were, few would like to hear reading the litany or prayers

---

cere and immoveable attachment to the Anglican Church, in its constitution, discipline, authority, privileges, and offices, is perfectly compatible, or rather is itself a practical act of protestation against the errors and corruptions of the Papal Church.

And surely the duty of so protesting is not to be lost sight of, at a time when the Church is openly asserting its pretensions amongst us, and affecting to look for the speedy return of our own Reformed Church into its maternal bosom. In errors are not less opposed to the Gospel of truth and holiness now, than they were at the time of the Reformation. The doctrine and practices, which rendered necessary our separation from that Church, are still retained by her, unchanged, unmitigated, unqualified; nor are the differences between us, in essential matters, less at the present moment, than they were in the times of Cranmer or Jewell, of Taylor or Hooper. We do not assert the absolute perfectness of our own Church; but it is not by retracing any of the steps by which she has receded from the Church of Rome, that she is to be made perfect, nor by attempting to remodel her upon the doctrine and discipline, not of the primitive Church, but of the Church of the fourth or fifth centuries. That we are in some respects impeded and trammelled by the nature of our legislative connexion with the State may be true, and this is itself one consequence which followed from the abuse of the Papal power before the Reformation; but this imperfection will in no way be remedied by the resumption of exploded principles or practices; and I cannot help suspecting that the desire of reverting to them with less of impediment, is one motive why some persons are seeking to effect the total separation of the Church from the State. Let us do all that we have at this moment the power to do, as the ministers of that Church; nay, let us but do all we are bound to do, and we shall then see what further freedom of action is required. Before we cry out for a reformation of the Church's laws, let us try the effect of those which are in existence, and not complain of the inefficiency of our ordinances till we have carried into them the spirit which is requisite to give them life and efficacy. It will not, I think, be denied that the Church of this country, in point of energy, power, and usefulness, is at this moment progressing; strange that at this very time complaints should be uttered of her wearing the chain of an ignoble thraldom, of her being compelled to mutter in indistinct accents the praises of God, and of her not affording sufficient scope for the intelligence of devotional feelings,—that Church in which the seraphic piety of Hooper, and Hall, and Taylor, and Herbert, and Kenn, and Wilson, felt no restraint and no discouragement. If instead of such lamentations, alarming our people, and unsettling the minds of our younger brethren in the ministry, we would admonish, comfort, and encourage one another, be faithful to our dear mother, and use in the spirit of love and diligence all the means and appliances she places in our hands, setting ourselves as a united band of Christian soldiers, with composed and steadfast resolution, to resist the inroads of Popery on the one hand, and of false zealous enthusiasm on the other: if we did but realize in our own lives and persons the main precepts and directions which she has given for our guidance, recommending them by our example to the consciences and affections of all men, we should discover that there is much less need than we supposed of alteration; and if, at all events, we should long for a certainty in what direction that alteration should be attempted.

Let us be thankful to Almighty God, that the Church, crippled and fettered as she is thought by some to be, has yet had enough of energy and power to vindicate to herself the religious education of the people; to throw open the doors of her sanctuary to multitudes, who were before excluded from it; and to send forth within the last two years six additional bishops to watch over the growth and fruitfulness of her distant offshoots. I embrace this opportunity of cordially thanking the clergy of the diocese, for the prompt and efficient manner in which they carried out my suggestion for the annual collection at the offertory on Palm Sunday last, in aid of the Colonial Bishoprics' fund. The total amount of that collection—more than 8,000*l.*—greatly exceeded my expectations, and will no doubt operate as an encouragement to the clergy to adopt more generally still the mode of proceeding which I recommended, when collections are made in church for Church purposes. I shall probably call upon them, in the course of next year, to make another effort in behalf of the Metropolis Churches Fund. The money already contributed to that fund has secured the erection of forty-two additional churches; and where a church is built, schools for the children of the poor are sure to follow. It is to this combined provision for the spiritual and moral wants of the people, that the country must look for the cure of its most dangerous diseases; and I trust that the time is not far distant, when the Legislature of this Christian country will again recognise the duty incumbent upon it, of doing something to preserve and perpetuate its Christianity, by means of the instrument which has been divinely appointed for that purpose; not to supersede the Church's endeavours, and contributions, and sacrifices, but to aid and encourage them, to answer the present demand of instant urgency, and to supply that which the Church herself will not be able to supply, till her wealthier members shall have been fully awakened to a sense of their obligation.

I should say something here on the subject of education, but that the time forbids, and that I spoke on it in a former Charge. I will merely observe on the present occasion, that the efficiency of our parochial system will be most materially increased by regular and periodical inspection. With that object in view, I have appointed clerical Inspectors of schools in different parts of the diocese; and I must say, that those clergymen who object to their visiting the schools under their care, and reporting upon them to me as their diocesan, have a very inadequate notion of my duty and their own. Instances, however, of such objection, are, I am happy to say, very rare.

I have been informed, that some of the clergy entertain a notion, that they may lawfully publish the banns and solemnize matrimony between two persons, who have already contracted marriage before the Superintendent Registrar under the provisions of the last Marriage Act. I apprehend this to be a mistaken notion. The law has decided the first marriage to be valid, and there can be no second marriage of the same parties. If the solemnization of matrimony not according to the forms of the Church were not recognised by the law of the land as constituting the validity of marriage, this objection would not apply; but where the law has declared, that either of two modes of solemnization shall remain valid, parties who have been married according to one of those methods, cannot properly have recourse to the second. In what light, as members of the Church, we may regard a marriage, in which there is no intervention of a clergyman, I do not stop to say; but at all events it is a lawful marriage, and we are not to declare by any act of ours, that parties so married are living in a state of concubinage. If such a marriage be without spiritual grace, which the Church connects with matrimony when duly solemnized, the parties have deprived themselves of it by their own act, and we are not to remedy it by an irregular procedure of ours. The same principle of course applies to all marriages between Quakers and other Nonconformists, not celebrated in the face of the Church; and yet I suppose no clergyman would think it right to re-marry those parties, after they had lived together for many years as man and wife, upon their being reconciled to the Church.

There are still a few points connected with the orderly performance of Divine service, which, as I ed a Society so hideous in its principles, so mischievous in its effects, that it well deserves to be described as having embodied the very "mystery of iniquity." The Church of Rome has added to and defaced the apostolical "form of sound words" —has superseded the apostolical succession—has mutilated and corrupted the apostolical record. The character of the Church itself is not altered by that of a few or many of its individual members, whose personal graces at once modify and recommend the principles which they embrace. There is scarcely any error of doctrine, however extravagant or fatal, which has not been held by some persons of irreproachable conduct. Against such a Church we are bound continually to lift up the voice of solemn remonstrance; and far from being ashamed of the name of Protestant, we ought to show, that a sincere and immoveable attachment to the Anglican Church, in its constitution, discipline, authority, privileges, and offices, is perfectly compatible, or rather is itself a practical act of protestation against the errors and corruptions of the Papal Church.

And surely the duty of so protesting is not to be lost sight of, at a time when the Church is openly asserting its pretensions amongst us, and affecting to look for the speedy return of our own Reformed Church into its maternal bosom. In errors are not less opposed to the Gospel of truth and holiness now, than they were at the time of the Reformation. The doctrine and practices, which rendered necessary our separation from that Church, are still retained by her, unchanged, unmitigated, unqualified; nor are the differences between us, in essential matters, less at the present moment, than they were in the times of Cranmer or Jewell, of Taylor or Hooper. We do not assert the absolute perfectness of our own Church; but it is not by retracing any of the steps by which she has receded from the Church of Rome, that she is to be made perfect, nor by attempting to remodel her upon the doctrine and discipline, not of the primitive Church, but of the Church of the fourth or fifth centuries. That we are in some respects impeded and trammelled by the nature of our legislative connexion with the State may be true, and this is itself one consequence which followed from the abuse of the Papal power before the Reformation; but this imperfection will in no way be remedied by the resumption of exploded principles or practices; and I cannot help suspecting that the desire of reverting to them with less of impediment, is one motive why some persons are seeking to effect the total separation of the Church from the State. Let us do all that we have at this moment the power to do, as the ministers of that Church; nay, let us but do all we are bound to do, and we shall then see what further freedom of action is required. Before we cry out for a reformation of the Church's laws, let us try the effect of those which are in existence, and not complain of the inefficiency of our ordinances till we have carried into them the spirit which is requisite to give them life and efficacy. It will not, I think, be denied that the Church of this country, in point of energy, power, and usefulness, is at this moment progressing; strange that at this very time complaints should be uttered of her wearing the chain of an ignoble thraldom, of her being compelled to mutter in indistinct accents the praises of God, and of her not affording sufficient scope for the intelligence of devotional feelings,—that Church in which the seraphic piety of Hooper, and Hall, and Taylor, and Herbert, and Kenn, and Wilson, felt no restraint and no discouragement. If instead of such lamentations, alarming our people, and unsettling the minds of our younger brethren in the ministry, we would admonish, comfort, and encourage one another, be faithful to our dear mother, and use in the spirit of love and diligence all the means and appliances she places in our hands, setting ourselves as a united band of Christian soldiers, with composed and steadfast resolution, to resist the inroads of Popery on the one hand, and of false zealous enthusiasm on the other: if we did but realize in our own lives and persons the main precepts and directions which she has given for our guidance, recommending them by our example to the consciences and affections of all men, we should discover that there is much less need than we supposed of alteration; and if, at all events, we should long for a certainty in what direction that alteration should be attempted.

Let us be thankful to Almighty God, that the Church, crippled and fettered as she is thought by some to be, has yet had enough of energy and power to vindicate to herself the religious education of the people; to throw open the doors of her sanctuary to multitudes, who were before excluded from it; and to send forth within the last two years six additional bishops to watch over the growth and fruitfulness of her distant offshoots. I embrace this opportunity of cordially thanking the clergy of the diocese, for the prompt and efficient manner in which they carried out my suggestion for the annual collection at the offertory on Palm Sunday last, in aid of the Colonial Bishoprics' fund. The total amount of that collection—more than 8,000*l.*—greatly exceeded my expectations, and will no doubt operate as an encouragement to the clergy to adopt more generally still the mode of proceeding which I recommended, when collections are made in church for Church purposes. I shall probably call upon them, in the course of next year, to make another effort in behalf of the Metropolis Churches Fund. The money already contributed to that fund has secured the erection of forty-two additional churches; and where a church is built, schools for the children of the poor are sure to follow. It is to this combined provision for the spiritual and moral wants of the people, that the country must look for the cure of its most dangerous diseases; and I trust that the time is not far distant, when the Legislature of this Christian country will again recognise the duty incumbent upon it, of doing something to preserve and perpetuate its Christianity, by means of the instrument which has been divinely appointed for that purpose; not to supersede the Church's endeavours, and contributions, and sacrifices, but to aid and encourage them, to answer the present demand of instant urgency, and to supply that which the Church herself will not be able to supply, till her wealthier members shall have been fully awakened to a sense of their obligation.

I should say something here on the subject of education, but that the time forbids, and that I spoke on it in a former Charge. I will merely observe on the present occasion, that the efficiency of our parochial system will be most materially increased by regular and periodical inspection. With that object in view, I have appointed clerical Inspectors of schools in different parts of the diocese; and I must say, that those clergymen who object to their visiting the schools under their care, and reporting upon them to me as their diocesan, have a very inadequate notion of my duty and their own. Instances, however, of such objection, are, I am happy to say, very rare.

I have been informed, that some of the clergy entertain a notion, that they may lawfully publish the banns and solemnize matrimony between two persons, who have already contracted marriage before the Superintendent Registrar under the provisions of the last Marriage Act. I apprehend this to be a mistaken notion. The law has decided the first marriage to be valid, and there can be no second marriage of the same parties. If the solemnization of matrimony not according to the forms of the Church were not recognised by the law of the land as constituting the validity of marriage, this objection would not apply; but where the law has declared, that either of two modes of solemnization shall remain valid, parties who have been married according to one of those methods, cannot properly have recourse to the second. In what light, as members of the Church, we may regard a marriage, in which there is no intervention of a clergyman, I do not stop to say; but at all events it is a lawful marriage, and we are not to declare by any act of ours, that parties so married are living in a state of concubinage. If such a marriage be without spiritual grace, which the Church connects with matrimony when duly solemnized, the parties have deprived themselves of it by their own act, and we are not to remedy it by an irregular procedure of ours. The same principle of course applies to all marriages between Quakers and other Nonconformists, not celebrated in the face of the Church; and yet I suppose no clergyman would think it right to re-marry those parties, after they had lived together for many years as man and wife, upon their being reconciled to the Church.

There are still a few points connected with the orderly performance of Divine service, which, as I

After the Nicene Creed, the minister should in all cases declare what holy days or fasting days are in the week following appointed to be observed. Baptisms ought never to be administered in private houses, except in cases of urgent necessity; and all such baptisms should be duly registered. This I request you to take as my authoritative direction, as well as what follows: that you will not permit any clergyman to officiate as a temporary substitute, not being a personal friend or acquaintance of your own, who shall not have first exhibited to me his letters of orders.

In conclusion, Reverend Brethren, let us be careful to bear in mind ourselves, and to teach our people, that the outward means and aids of religion are not religion itself, and are so far valuable and useful as they contribute to form Christ within us, to establish the life of God in the soul, and to keep us within the precincts of his grace. The more careful we are to observe all the external acts of devotion, the more diligently let us cherish in ourselves, and strive to promote in others, those spiritual affections which they are intended to excite. And while we "contend earnestly for the faith," and for all the ordinances of God, let us not forget the "more excellent way;" to "put on charity, which is the very bond of perfectness," and pray earnestly, and strive as well as pray, that all hatred and prejudice may be taken away from us, and whatsoever doth hinder us from godly union; that, as there is but "one body, and one Spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all;" so we may henceforth be all of one heart and one spirit, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and "with one mind and one mouth glorify God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

TOTAL WRECK OF A FIRST-CLASS STEAMER.

BRISTOL, OCT. 15.—A letter was received this morning at the Commercial rooms here stating that the new iron ste. Brigand had been lost on Wednesday on the Scilly islands. This news created considerable excitement in the mercantile world, and more particularly so from the fact of the Brigand having been built to trade between Bristol and Liverpool, calling at Wexford, in which trade she had been employed for the last two years, having left the station only a fortnight since for the purpose of proceeding from London to St. Petersburgh, for which port she was intended to sail from the St. Katharine's dock on Thursday next.

The Brigand was one of the largest and most beautiful iron steamers ever yet built being 600 tons burthen, and 200 horse-power, and was remarkable for the beauty of her workmanship, the splendid fittings of her saloon, and her extraordinary speed. She cost in building £32,000.—The rumour to which we have alluded above was unfortunately too soon confirmed by the arrival of the Cornish steamer Herald, Sampson Hawes, commander, from Hayle, bringing the crew of the unfortunate steamer, 27 in number, and confirming the statement of her total wreck on the Bishop rock, a portion of the Scilly Isles.

It appears that the Brigand having taken it upwards of 200 tons of coals, and a large quantity of patent fuel for her consumption on the voyage to St. Petersburgh, sailed from Liverpool for London at 2 o'clock on Monday afternoon, and proceeded safely on her voyage until 5 o'clock on Wednesday morning, when they saw the St. Agnes' light, which from the refraction of light, the weather being very hazy, they conceived to be at a considerable distance—they were then steaming at 12 knots an hour; suddenly the man on the look out at the bow sang out "Breakers a-head!" which they saw, but too late, unfortunately, for the rate at which they were going was such that they could not stop her; and, although they put the helm hard a-port, to endeavour to shave the rock, the vessel immediately afterwards struck most violently, and two plates of the bluff of her brow were driven in. She rebounded from the rock, but in an instant afterwards she struck again, broadside on, the force of which blow may be in some measure conceived from the fact, that it actually drove a great portion of her paddle-wheel through her side into the engine-room. The vessel was built in four compartments, the plan adopted in iron ships, or she would have gone down instantly, two of her compartments being now burst, and the water rushing into them at a most fearful rate. By the two shocks four and a half plates were destroyed, and four angle irons were gone in the engine room. The two compartments aft being, however, still water tight, she continued to float, and every exertion was used by her commander, Capt. Hunt, for upwards of an hour to save her, when the crew took to the boats, and shortly afterwards she went down, about seven miles from the rock, in about 45 fathoms of water. The mate attributes the loss to the strong current setting then upon the rock, and to the haze having deceived them as to the distance of the St. Agnes light. The men connected with the engineering department say they were at work below in the engine room, when suddenly they felt a tremendous shock, accompanied with a report like the roar of cannon, and almost simultaneously a second shock and the water rushed in in a fearful manner. They immediately ran on deck, and found that the vessel had struck the rock as before described. One of them was then ordered by the captain to assist the carpenter in endeavouring to stop the leak, for which purpose he went down into the engine-room, where they were still trying to work the engines, but the paddle-wheel being driven in had torn the injection pipes, so that they would not work, but at slow motion;