

that an episcopal charge ought not, indeed cannot, be the vehicle of regular controversy. The various, the incessant, and, I may add, the daily increasing labours of our office, leave very little leisure for disentangling the subtleties of novel speculation, or penetrating the recesses of abstruse disquisition. Still less could any space, however ample, that could be allotted to these observations, suffice for examining even a small portion of what extends through nearly one hundred Tracts, and has given occasion for almost an equal number of volumes in reply. But the importance of the subject justifies me in thus far offering it to your attention. The error was spreading widely, although now, I trust, since the principles of the writers have been unfolded more distinctly, the thinking part of the public have been put upon their guard; and the young and unwary will be less disposed precipitately to admit propositions, which, it has been well and authoritatively said, "have a tendency to mitigate beyond what charity requires, and to shake the confidence of the less learned members of the Church of England in the scriptural character of her formularies and teaching."—*Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, 1841.*

CHURCHWARDENS' DUTY IN CASES OF INNOVATION.

It has been a great error to suppose that the clergy, and the clergy alone, formed the Church: the Church, I may rather say, are ye; the laity are the Church, and the clergy are nothing more than the ministers of the Church, employed, as their name implies, in ministering to the wants of the people, stewards of the mysteries of Christ, employed under their Divine Master to teach, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and patience, but not as lords over his heritage, not as exercising any power or authority of their own, not as forming a separate class. The intercourse of the clergy with their people, the sympathy which they are bound to have with every member of the body, that sympathy which led the apostle to exclaim—"Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is offended, and I burn not?"—that intercourse will, in general, ensure such a harmony of feeling as shall prove that the parties are identified in sentiment, as well as interest, and that the clergy and people are merely different members of one and the same body. But it is impossible to deny that the case may be otherwise, and that there may be endeavours on the part of the clergy to assume more than has been given, and to claim for themselves and their office a character and privilege which the reformed Church of England has never required. There may be cases in which this may seem to be affected, and where an inclination may be manifest to arrogate for the minister what used to be claimed by the priest, and to claim for the Church of England what she studiously and positively declines. You may hear, for instance, new tones of preaching from the pulpit; you may hear of the Church, where you have been accustomed to hear of Christ; you may hear privileges asserted for ordinances which do not seem to be implied in their services; you may hear that the act of supplication and intercession belongs to the minister, who prays for the people, instead of being, what is signified by the form of our common prayer, a joint and united service, in which the co-operation of both is expected. You may hear all this from the pulpit; and you may be appealed to in your official capacity to provide articles not previously used, such as credences, lecterns, candlesticks, and ornaments for the communion. Or you may be required to collect weekly alms and acknowledgments while the offertory is being read: and you may feel perhaps surprised and offended by the introduction of these novelties, and grieved by the tone in which they are maintained as essential to the service of the Church. I suppose these things as possible, though I do not think they are probable in this diocese; and I hope they will never occur. But, in the event of their occurrence, I must remind you that the laity form the Church, and the laity may find it necessary to make use of you, their representatives, in protesting against any departure from the principles of the Church, or resisting any novel and unauthorised introductions. If, therefore, you perceive that there is a departure in the tone of preaching from the standard of doctrines laid down in the Articles—if the Liturgy is read in a way that defeats the ends of public worship, and contradicts the character of common prayer—if it ceases to be a reasonable service by which all the people may profit, and is perverted into the act of one, who intercedes for others, instead of its being an act of united supplication by all—then I must feel that the laity are wronged and the Church injured, and I must think that you are bound to interfere, in order to vindicate the rights of the laity, and to maintain the integrity of the Church. In order to do this effectually, it must be done discreetly, not with heat and passion, not with clamour and violence, but as becomes the servant of God, with meekness and delicacy, by remonstrances addressed, in the first place, to the minister, who appears to have lost sight of his duty, and, if they fail, then by complaints carried to the proper quarter, to the diocesan himself, and submitted, with proper evidence and proof, to his consideration and decision.—*The Rev. and Worshipful Henry Raikes, Chancellor of the Diocese of Chester.*

NO ALTARS IN THE REFORMED CHURCH.

Upon the settlement of the Reformation in this country, in the reign of Edward VI., one of the first points to which the attention of our Reformers was directed was the removal of the Romish altars, and the substitution of tables in their place: a step which of course peculiarly offended the prejudices and excited the indignation of the Romanists. On the accession of Queen Mary, one of the first acts of the Romanists was to remove the tables and re-erect the altars. And when Queen Elizabeth came to the throne, one of the first steps taken towards the restoration of the Reformation was, that the altars were made to give way to tables. Can there be

* Protest of certain Tutors at Oxford to the Editor of "Tracts for the Times."

a more manifest proof than these simple facts, that the one agrees better with the doctrine of our reformed Church, the other with the doctrine of our Church before it was reformed?

This is no mere matter of words, or names, or taste. There is a great and most important difference between the two things. An altar is that on which a sacrifice is offered up to God, and a sacrifice implies a sacrificing priest to offer it, and mediate between God and the people; and it is far worse than irrational to say, that a change of our tables into altars is not made for the purpose of instilling this doctrine into the minds of the people, and will not have that effect. A table is obviously unsuitable for such a purpose, and therefore our Church, when prescribing tables to be used by us, in that very direction, necessarily, though only by inference, (and an inference which I care not to press,) condemns altars and the doctrine that flows from them. For though an altar might be called a table, (Mal. i. 12,) from the circumstance that men were permitted to partake of the sacrifices offered, it by no means follows that a table is a suitable and proper place on which to offer up a material sacrifice to God; and it is the consciousness of its unsuitableness that induces the Romanists and Tractarians to change it for an altar. Nor, on the other hand, is an altar suitable where a sacrifice would be displeasing to God, and where all that takes place, besides the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, is a feast upon the symbols of a sacrifice offered once for all upon the cross, in which, to the faithful recipient, the real but spiritual presence of him who is thus represented is mercifully vouchsafed.—*From "Altars prohibited by the Church of England" by the Rev. William Goode.*

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1844.

We offer a few remarks upon another of the "Truths" contained in the Declaration which we inserted in our last Editorial. It is there stated "that persons are not regenerated by baptism." In looking at the piece, we cannot tell whether the error here protested against does not lie just in the particle *by*, so that the objection might not lie equally against the assertion that persons are regenerated in baptism. We fear, that a declaration in this condensed form is not calculated to point out with precision either the error excepted against, or the truth insisted upon. If, avoiding the word *regenerated*, the declaration maintained that persons are not *spiritually renewed* by baptism, it would probably be much more to the purpose.

The use of the word *regenerate*, in our baptismal formulary, has raised many objections to the Church of England, and caused perplexity to conscientious members, when they have thought that the Church pronounced upon that as having taken place in the ordinance which is commonly designated by the term "a change of heart," and of which we look for evidence in vain among the greater part of baptized children, not only during their years before discretion, but in the course of their maturer days, and with many to the hour of their deaths. Now objection is disarmed, and perplexities are removed, when once it is perceived that the Church does not deny (as an American writer* shows that her authors, even while holding various theories, do not deny) "the necessity of a new moral creation in the soul, effected by the Holy Spirit, and having no necessary connection with the act of baptismal washing." We may peaceably discuss the question, what good the child receives in baptism, if once we are united on this subject, that the Church does not teach, that in the sacrament of baptism there is necessarily conveyed that saving change, that being born again, not only of water, but also of the Spirit, of which our Saviour declares, in the 3rd chapter of St. John's gospel, that without it, a man cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

The use of the word *regenerate* in our baptismal service does not imply any such teaching. When it is used in prayer that God would confer the highest privileges upon the child about to be baptized, no objection can reasonably be raised; we "open our mouth wide," and look that God may "fill it." But when after the administration of the rite, we render thanks to God for the benefit now conferred upon the child, it becomes a question of intense interest, whether we presume an *opus operatum* to have taken place which, once performed, may make the recipient of the benefit easy on the inquiry so solemnly proposed by our Lord to Nicodemus: has he passed that vital change which is to fit him for the kingdom of heaven? This is the question we answer in the negative. The adoption of the word *regeneration* in our formulary does not assert that the infant has passed that change. It is, indeed, presumed that the benefit is bestowed in the case of adults who are baptized, and with regard to whom the Church expects every clergyman to satisfy himself whether they are prepared for the ordinance by repentance and faith; and accordingly the

* Rev. Dr. Clark, Walk about Zion.

formulary for adult baptism does not, at the close of the Exhortation, describe the act as a "charitable work" on the part of the Church. But in case of infant baptism, she declares that she performs only a "charitable work," praying and longing for all the blessings of the gospel-covenant, and throughout using the language of undoubting confidence that God is willing to bestow the highest spiritual privileges upon the unconscious infant. He pronounces, after the application of water, that the infant is *regenerate*, but not that he is *renewed*, making the same distinction that St. Paul makes in one of the only two passages in Scripture where the word *regeneration* is used, (Tit. 3, 5) in which he connects our salvation with "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." With regard to the infant, the Church, after having rendered thanks for his regeneration, prays, for a thing yet to be granted, that he "may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin;" whereas, in marked distinction, she prays, at the corresponding place, for the adult, that he "being now born again, and made an heir of everlasting salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, may continue God's servant, and attain his promises."

We think that in this matter, which is the cause of much uneasiness in the Church, a right use of terms would obviate a good deal of irritation. It has become current, to designate the views which the signers of the Declaration probably meant to disclaim, as "baptismal regeneration." Now this designation, though it is pretty generally understood what error is meant by it, gives to those who would fasten the error upon the Church, the advantage of assuming the attitude, at once, of defenders of our Church-formularies. You deny, it is said, what the baptismal service declares. This is specious, and creates suspicion against men who in reality are among the most attached to the doctrines set forth in our standards. But if the erroneous doctrine were designated as that of "spiritual renovation by baptism," the opposers of it would have on their side numbers who, by the use of the current phraseology, are called to arms as if an attack was made upon a breast-work of our fortress. Upon the same ground, it would be wise, in our pulpit ministrations and private instructions, to use sparingly the term *regenerate* which, as the pious and learned Bishop of Chester expresses it, is "neither accurately defined in Scripture, nor restricted to one sense in the language of divines." We should avoid, thus, on the one hand, the fatal error of countenancing the churchman's reposing in his baptismal privileges, as if they pronounced the work done, while, on the other, the fervency of our baptismal service would urge us to impress upon him the benefit he has received by the visible sign and seal of the divine promises; and we should arrive at the conclusion to which an ardent view of baptismal privileges led the sainted Bishop Ryder when he saw in them "not only an external admission into the visible church, not only a covenanted title to the pardon and grace of God, but even a degree of spiritual aid vouchsafed and ready to offer itself to our acceptance or rejection: *At the dawn of reason, I would recommend a reference to these privileges in our discourses.*"

If a high view of baptismal benefit led parents generally to a solicitude that their children "crucify the old man," "utterly abolish the whole body of sin," "follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and be made like unto Him," we should be little disposed to contend with them upon a difference of opinion as to the amount of spiritual aid vouchsafed to the acceptance or rejection of their offspring when baptized as infants. We should then look for a solicitude in selecting sponsors of undoubted piety, and for a solemnity and prayerfulness in parents and sponsors when they bring a child to baptism, the absence of which, in many cases, is a grief and harrowing up of the mind to sound-hearted, conscientious parochial Clergymen, and a stumbling-block in the way of many affectionate churchmen.

We noticed, on a former occasion and in another part of our columns, the application which was made by Protestants to the ecclesiastical authority of the Church of Rome at Montreal for such a change in the manner of celebrating the Fete Dieu as would relieve Protestants of the consequences, to be born of having the stillness of the Lord's day broken in upon. We are sorry, not only that the application has not produced the desired effect, but also that Roman Catholic Editors do not perceive the bearing which this matter has upon the rights of the Protestant subject, rights which, at all events, are as much to be regarded as those of his Roman Catholic neighbour. We recur to the subject simply for the purpose of correcting errors into which a cotemporary (Le Canadien) seems to have fallen in treating of it. In the first place, he considers that the right of celebrating the

* Primary Charge.

Fete Dieu by a public procession with martial music on the Lord's day is secured to the Church of Rome by the Articles of Capitulation by which this Province was ceded to the British crown. Now these Articles certainly do secure to R. Catholics the exercise of their religion, but subject to the laws of England. But if any law clearly belongs to the mother-country, it is that for observing the sacredness of the Lord's day. That day is in law reckoned as no day for transaction of business; in religion it is a day above all for the exercise of charity and due regard to each other's happiness. No Protestant community in England would be held warranted in keeping a religious meeting in such a way on the sabbath as to interfere with the quietness of the streets and public places: such a meeting would be put down by the strong arm of the law. That the Protestant conqueror, when he signed the Articles of Capitulation, should have entered into engagements which would for ever subject him to an intolerant refusal of his claim to an undisturbed sabbath in the country which he has taken by his military prowess, is a strange interpretation of the liberal concession really contained in them. We hope we are not too presumptuous, if we plead for equal privileges with other religious persuasions in this country, for the persuasion of the Sovereign to whose dominions it belongs.

In the second place, our cotemporary has fallen into the mistake of thinking that some years ago a military officer was broken for refusing to salute, when the procession of the Fete Dieu passed by in the island of Malta. This is not the fact. The officer was tried by Court Martial and "dismissed His Majesty's service" because he disobeyed the orders he had received from his superior officer. His objections to the nature of the service upon which he was ordered were considered as utterly inadmissible; military discipline required that orders should be obeyed. The case was vigorously discussed in Parliament, as one of flagrant violation of the officer's rights of conscience; and it was dismissed on the ground which, in fact, was expressly laid down in the document by which the sentence of the Court Martial was confirmed, that if religious principles were allowed to be urged by individual officers as a plea for disobedience of orders, the discipline of the army would sustain an injury which might be dangerous to the welfare of the state. We do not admire, we confess, the position thus assigned to military officers; but still the case is very different from what the *Canadien* states. The officer was ordered to fire a salute of artillery, and he had no business, it is argued, to trouble his head about its being ordered in honour of a R. Catholic procession—it was not the Fete Dieu, though, for it took place in August. So on the recent occasion at Montreal, if the military band and guard which we are told were in attendance at the Montreal Cathedral were ordered thither by their commanding officer, military men would no doubt say that they had no choice in the matter, go they must; but that does not say that their commanding officer might not be brought to trial for ordering them on a service which violates their liberty as Protestant christians, and on which he never had the right, though he may have had the power, to order them.

ECCLESIASTICAL.

DEATH OF A CLERGYMAN.—We regret to say that the Rev. G. Mortimer, Rector of Thornhill, C. W. met with a fatal accident on Saturday the 15th of this month. He was thrown from his carriage while driving along Yonge Street, and so severely injured that he survived only about two hours. He was a highly useful and respected clergyman, and brother to the Rev. Thomas Mortimer, Minister of Gray's Inn Lane Chapel, London.

COLONIAL CHURCH SOCIETY.—The eighth Anniversary of this Society was held in London on the 1st of May last, Captain Sir Edward Parry, R. N. presiding. The Report gave an encouraging account of the Society's operations, and described the extensive openings for usefulness presented by the British Colonial possessions, and the places numerously visited by Englishmen in various parts of Europe. The Society's first field of labour was in Western Australia, where it has two Clergymen, and an urgent call for a third. Lay agents had travelled through a considerable portion of Nova Scotia, and Mr. Boyer, late of St. Bees' College, Cumberland, had been sent out to Prince Edward's Island, as a Catechist to assist the Rev. Dr. Jenkins in Charlotte Town. Clergymen and Lay Agents were labouring at the Cape of Good Hope, in the Mediterranean, and at various places on the continent of Europe, where several congregations of English residents have been supplied with the ministrations of the Church through the agency of the Society. The receipts, exclusive of what had been raised in the Colonies, amounted to £3077 5 5. [We notice, in a Prince Edward's Island periodical, the arrival of Mr. Boyer, above referred to, with the remark: "It certainly becomes us to meet this generous conduct on the part of that excellent Society, with a corresponding feeling of gratitude and liberality."—*Edrdd.*]

PROTESTANT ORPHAN SOCIETY, DUBLIN.—At a meeting held at Downpatrick, on the 17th May, for the purpose of forming an Auxiliary to the above Society, the Rev. Thomas Gregg gave the following interesting account of the origin and management of the institution.

A respectable tradesman in his parish died and left a widow and orphan in want. Now, wherever there was a Protestant orphan, some Roman Catholic would find his way to it and take it to some Romish place. After the interment of his parishioner, three tradesmen sat besides the grave of the departed; and said to one another—could they do nothing to save the children of the deceased from Popery. They laid down each a few pence upon the tomb-stone on which they sat, and said they would collect more, and save the children from at least present want. Other tradesmen joined; and such was the origin of the Dublin Protestant Orphan Society. It increased in numbers; it increased upwards; the highest in title and dignity were now its friends and supporters; and, as the Christian religion, which from small beginnings spread itself over the whole earth, so the Society was spreading itself over Ireland,

There were similar Societies now in Cork, Kilkenny, Limerick, and Tipperary. The work which had begun with three tradesmen sitting upon a tombstone in St. Catherine's church-yard, had travelled South, and West, and North; and with the blessing of God would spread beyond its present bounds. It commenced in 1828, since which it had been spreading, so that now it had 322 children under its care. The Society paid £3 10s. a year, for the care and keeping of each of the children, at the houses of farmers in the country, education and clothing not included. He once asked a farmer's wife, how she could support a child so well, and at so cheap a rate? She said, in the first place, you pay us like men (that is, said Mr. Gregg, on the day) then, we have more milk and bacon than we want, and what better market could we take it to than to you; we don't feel it going out, and we have the comfort of it, coming in all of a lump, and a blessing on it also; we only wish you would send us more to keep. It was unnecessary for him to say that the farmers and their wives with whom the orphans were entrusted must be Protestants—they must send the orphan children, as well as their own, to school—not to a national school.* They would not send orphans to a family, where the father had not every day family prayer, and reading of the Scriptures, where the family did not begin, spend, and end the day with God, and bring up the children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

A sum of thirty shillings a year was allowed for clothing. Six pounds were set apart as an apprentice fee for every child, as soon as his name was placed upon the Society's book—a sum which would amount to about eight pounds at the time he had to be apprenticed. The children of parents of every Protestant denomination were admitted. They called the farmers at whose houses they lived their uncles, and the farmers' wives their aunts; and they were placed under the superintendence of the Protestant Clergy, so that to the name of every child on the Society's list there was affixed the name of the Clergyman who watched over it with pastoral care.

* [The schools called *national* in Ireland, are regulated by government: as the Bible is excluded from them, Protestants do not in general avail themselves of the secular advantages offered by them, though they are taxed for them.—*Editor.*]

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION held its Anniversary in London on the 2nd of May. We are sorry to perceive that this Society has been agitated by the question, whether it ought to furnish the Church Catechism any longer through its Depository, and the decision is, that it will discontinue the publication and sale of all denominational catechisms. It is to be feared that the origin and result of this agitation will materially interfere with the co-operation of members of the Church of England in the labours of the Society.

SOCIETIAN ENDOWMENT BILL, alias Dissenters' Chapel Bill.—Under the appellation which we put second at the head of this article, a bill has been introduced into the British Parliament with the sanction, we grieve to say, of Her Majesty's government, which has met with universal reprobation on the part of all orthodox Protestant denominations, manifested by petitions and by public meetings remarkable for union of sentiment. The bill professes to "regulate suits relating to meeting-houses and other property held for religious purposes by persons dissenting from the Church of England." In point of fact, it chiefly secures to the Societian denomination, which denies the divinity of our Saviour, the possession of all those meeting-houses and funds which, having originally been devoted to Trinitarian purposes, they have in the course of years appropriated to themselves. A meeting was held on the 29th of May numerously and respectfully attended, and addressed by leading men of the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Independent communions, all of whom united in reprobating the intended bill, and deciding upon petitions against its passing. It is not the least astonishing circumstance connected with this measure, that it has the sanction of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, of which the *Dublin Freeman's Journal* boasts as a proof that they are the "true friends of freedom of conscience?"

We are informed that TRINITY CHAPEL is closed for about three weeks, on account of painters being employed in it, and that public worship will, with divine permission, be held by the incumbent in the Free Chapel, St. John's Suburbs, on the Lord's days intervening, at the usual hour in the morning.

THE LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL.—We understand that accounts have been received from His Lordship, dated on the 2nd of this month, at Michipicoton, a post belonging to the Hudson's Bay Company, on the North East corner of Lake Superior; more than half the distance to the Red River settlement; and we should judge from an inspection of the map.

THE ENGLISH MAIL will be closed this evening; paid letters till 7 o'clock, unpaid till 9, P. M.

* We send this number to several Clergymen of whose disposition to promote the circulation of the Berean we have received advice, and who will be so kind as to use this and succeeding ones as Specimens, without supposing that any demand will be made upon them. We purpose writing more fully on the subject in the next number.

To CORRESPONDENTS: Received letters from Sherrington;—Sorel, attended to;—Rev. R. the parcel never arrived;—A. Constant Reader, too late for this number;—Extract from Hunt;—Mr. Bryson;—letter from Islington; hope for breathing-time between this and next mail.

We beg to acknowledge the following subscriptions, received on account of the Berean, since our last publication:—
From Mrs. Henry Smart, 12 months; Rev. W. J. D. Waddilove, two copies; Dep. Com. General Robinson, 12 months; Dr. Racey, 12 months; Mr. Colley, 12 months.