

The Berean.

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

VOLUME III.—No. 20.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 1846.

[WHOLE NUMBER 124.]

BATTLE-SONG.

EPHES. VI.
Sons of Zion, hold your way,
Meet the host without dismay;
Yield not up a willing prey;
But face your deadly foe!
Jesus Christ is near at hand,
Cheering on his little band,
Passing to the promised land,
Then on to glory go.

Struggling with the battle-tide,
Though thy wounds are gaping wide,
Dead and dying side by side,
Yet soon the thought of flight;
By the God of heaven led,
Smiling from her glory-bed,
Victory shall crown thy head,
Thy rest in worlds of light.

Warrior, let the written word,
Furnished by thy risen Lord,
Be thy ever faithful sword.
To wield in flood or field;
Righteousness upon thy breast,
And thy helmet—hope of rest—
When by Satan sorely pressed,
Take faith to be thy shield.

Rev. S. C. E. Neville.

COLONIAL BISHOPS.

THIRD REPORT OF THE "COLONIAL BISHOPS' COMMITTEE."

The Committee appointed to arrange measures in concert with Her Majesty's Government, for the erection and endowment of additional bishoprics in the colonies and dependencies of Great Britain, cannot commence their third Report without an expression of joy and thankfulness at the progress which, by God's blessing, has been made in the great work since the time when it was committed to their care.

During the past year the important colony of New Brunswick, and the Island of Ceylon, were constituted independent dioceses, by the erection of bishops' sees at Fredericton and Colombo; and the Committee are happy in being enabled to state that Her Majesty the Queen has given her Royal consent to the immediate subdivision of the diocese of Australia into three distinct bishoprics, by the establishment of one see at Morpeth, for the northern division of New South Wales, and of another at Melbourne, for the district of Port Phillip.

These new sees, which could not have been constituted but for a generous sacrifice of private interests on the part of the Bishop of Australia, will derive a considerable portion of their endowment from the Colonial Bishops' Fund.

Thus, then, within the space of five years, which have elapsed since the Declaration of Archbishops and Bishops, was signed at Lambeth, nine new bishoprics have been created. Of these, two—namely Gibraltar and Fredericton—derive their endowments almost exclusively from the funds placed at the disposal of the Episcopal Trustees; and four others—namely, New Zealand, Tasmania, Melbourne, and Morpeth, receive important assistance from the same source. The remaining three, namely, Antigua, Grenada, and Colombo, have been endowed by means of a different distribution of the funds at the disposal of the Imperial or Colonial Government for Ecclesiastical purposes.

The foregoing summary will show that of the original design, as set forth in the Declaration of Archbishops and Bishops, great part has been already accomplished; and the Committee have much satisfaction in reporting, that no less a sum than 15,000L. has been contributed towards the endowment of a bishopric (not originally contemplated) within the British possessions in the Chinese Seas.

Of this Endowment Fund, the sum of 5,000L. has been most liberally given by two individuals (over and above their donation of an equal sum for the erection of a College); 6,000L. was raised by congregational collections in the Diocese of London, under the authority of the Bishop's Pastoral Letter; a grant of 2,300L. was voted by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and about an equal amount has been remitted to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, by individual contributors; but a considerable additional sum will yet be required, and a Special Committee has been named to collect such further funds as may be necessary to make a permanent provision for the see.

Of the colonies still remaining without Episcopal superintendence, the Cape of Good Hope and South Australia have been mentioned in preceding Reports as presenting the strongest claims; and it would have been the duty of the Committee on the present occasion to renew the appeal on their behalf, had it not pleased God to put into the heart of an individual member of the Church, by an exercise of almost unexampled liberality to guarantee adequate endowments for a bishopric in each of these colonies.

It is well known that the Lord Bishop of Calcutta is using the most strenuous efforts to obtain a subdivision of his own enormous diocese, by the erection of a bishopric at Agra, for the north-western provinces. Such an arrangement is imperatively required for the welfare and extension of the Church of England in Northern India; while the recent wonderful spread of Christianity in the southern provinces of Tanjore and Tinnevely must, ere long, force attention to the importance of sending forth a chief pastor for the special oversight of those infant Churches.

The Committee, before concluding their Report, consider it a duty incumbent upon them to specify those other possessions of the Crown which, from their importance, as well as their distance from any existing see, appear to require resident bishops. They are principally Sierra Leone, Western Australia, the Mauritius, and Prince Rupert's Land.

But it is obvious that a further subdivision will ere long be required in many of the existing dioceses; and even at present, the rapidly increasing population of Canada, taken in connexion with its vast territorial extent, demands for the efficient administration of the Church within that province, an addition of at least two bishops.

Upon the whole, although the Committee do not look forward to an early termination of their labours, they cannot but regard the success which has hitherto been vouchsafed to them as an encouragement to persevere in the good work which they have undertaken, till the Church, by the Divine

blessing, has been fully organized in every dependency of the British Crown.

This important end, however, cannot be attained without a strenuous and united effort on the part of the Church at home; and the Committee feel assured that they shall not call in vain upon the faithful members of that Church to help forward its extension, by their active co-operation and their continual prayers.

W. CANTUAR.
E. EDOR.
JOHN G. ARMAGH.
RICHARD DUBLIN.
C. J. LONDON.
E. DUNELM.
G. ROCHESTER.
J. LINCOLN.

The Abstract of receipts and payments, since 1841 (when the Fund commenced), shews—
Special Donations and Subscriptions £9,196
General do. 51,653
Annual Subscriptions 1,725
Bishops of London and Salisbury's Pastoral Letters 9,399
The Balance in hand is £63,130.

PRIMITIVE EXTENT OF DIOCESES.

MY DEAR SIR,—Our friend Mr. ——— this morning showed me a paragraph of a letter from you, in which you intimated a wish that I would in some way make public the substance of the remarks on the subject of the division of our diocese, which I made in our last Convention. Of what I then said, I have now no distinct recollection, except that as a reason for deliberation, and action on principle, not expediency, I urged the importance of the position of our Church, not only in the estimation of her own members, but in that of disinterested observers in foreign lands.

I fear, my dear sir, that our brethren are not sufficiently aware of this characteristic of the discussion. Too many seem to think the question of division a mere question of dollars and cents, and miles and hours. "Given, a supposed inability to raise more than a certain amount of money, and the evident necessity of providing for at least a certain amount of travel in the discharge of Episcopal functions, what plan of adjustment is most feasible?" seems to be the form in which our ecclesiastical problem presents itself to the minds of not a few in different parts of the diocese.

Surely this is a low, unworthy view of the subject! It is an open attempt to unite the kingdoms of God and Mammon, and introduce the sway of the love of money into the Church which Christ bought with his own blood! Not that they who take this view have such intentions. I doubt not they err unwittingly. But I can as little doubt, that they do err, in putting foremost, in the discussion of so grave a question as that before us, considerations of a merely worldly nature—considerations that tend to debase the minds they occupy, and degrade the cause in which they are brought forward.

The truth is, we are called to decide a question of principle, fraught with most important consequences. Many seem to suppose fundamentals wholly unaffected by the determination whether the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of New York is to remain under the care of one bishop, or to be assigned to two or more.

If Episcopacy itself be not a fundamental, this is evidently true. But then our position as a distinct communion is unjustifiable, and our pretence to be pre-eminently, if not exclusively, primitive and apostolic in our constitution, an empty boast.

If Episcopacy is worth adhering to as a ground of distinction from other Christian denominations, it must be because we find it in the Scriptures, and derive it from the apostles. The possession of a pure, well warranted ministerial commission is one thing. The preservation of that commission, limited to a succession of a particular kind, inseparably connected with a certain division and subordination in the discharge of ministerial duty, is another. We might resolve that for the time to come, our ministers should be all bishops, admitted at once to the highest grade of the ministry. This would not affect the validity of our ministerial commission, nor the certainty of our succession to the apostles. It would throw open the doors to many brethren bearing the Christian name, and break down many a landmark by which we are bounded off into a comparatively narrow compass. Why not do it, then? Because our Episcopacy would then no longer be the Episcopacy of Scripture or the apostolic Church. We should have the ministry, but with an altered character. The commission would be still ours, but we should have changed the functions. The Church would be no longer ruled and fed as she was when men, taught by the Holy Ghost, provided for their wants. We should have departed from their practice, and substituted an invention of our own for the system which the guidance of the spirit led them to adopt. It is on this ground we make the three orders of the ministry a fundamental of our polity. We might give up two, and yet keep intact our inestimable possession, of a ministry sent by Christ as He was sent by the Father, with power and obligation to perpetuate itself, even to the end of the world. But we hold fast to all three, even under the necessity of separation from many of our brethren, because we honestly believe that in so doing we follow the mind of Christ our Lord, and keep his most precious gift as it was given, and apply it to the ends for which it was designed, in the mode designed. We consider the twelve master-builders who laid on the everlasting Rock the foundations of our goodly edifice, as best judges of its plan; and adhere to that plan, as left by them, because they left it, at all hazards, without fear of consequences.

Now this principle obviously applies just in proportion as our Episcopacy resembles that of the Apostles, in deed and truth, not name only. The Church of Rome has elevated certain deacons and priests to a position of higher prerogative and more extensive jurisdiction than that of any primitive bishops, and has placed at their head a bishop claiming to be God's sole vicegerent in the whole earth. Here are the three orders, and a bishop of apostolic succession, and therefore valid commission. But is this apostolic Episcopacy? Is it scriptural? Is it even sufferable in a church governed and fed on the principles of the gospel? No Protestant can admit

an affirmative answer. A valid Episcopacy, a ministry of three orders has lost its claim to respect by its departure from the apostolic pattern. It is corrupted, and become abominable, while it is nevertheless an Episcopacy, and an Episcopacy with the three-ordered ministry.

It is not enough, then, that we have an Episcopacy in the three orders, unless our Episcopacy be the same as that of the Apostles. The same principle on which we are Episcopalians, requires us to be apostolic Episcopalians.

Now the question comes up, may not Episcopacy be materially, if not essentially affected, by the limits assigned to each bishop, for the discharge of his peculiar functions?

The answer to this question depends on the notion entertained of the functions of a bishop. Were he a merely instrumental officer, kept by the church to do certain official acts, which must be done by some one, and for substantial reasons may be done by him only, the limits assigned to a bishop might be determined by his physical ability to go through the correspondent routine of duty, and within the range of that ability it would not be material whether he ordained, confirmed, and consecrated churches, for ten parishes or ten thousand. But, however this may accord with the loose notions of some who perhaps have given little thought to the subject, it is not the view of a bishop's office and ministry taken by our church.

We hold to no *opus operatum* in Episcopal services, no racking against time and space, ordaining by the score, confirming by the hundred, and doing a visitation by the mile square. The solemn office for "the consecration of Bishops," in our ordinal, tells a very different story. There a bishop is commended to Almighty God as one set in the church "to spread abroad the Gospel, the glad tidings of reconciliation"—"to use the authority given him, not to destruction, but to salvation"—"to give to the family of God their portion in due season." He is exhorted, in language of which it is hard to say whether it is more energetic or comprehensive, to "be to the flock of Christ a shepherd; to feed them; to hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind up the broken, bring again the outcast, seek the lost; to be so merciful, as not to be too remiss; so to minister discipline as not to forget mercy;" and to qualify himself for this arduous task, to "give heed unto reading, exhortation, and doctrine; to think upon the things contained in the book of God; to be diligent in them, that the increase coming thereby may be manifest unto all men." He is made to vow, in the presence of God's people, that he will instruct the people committed to his charge; that he will "teach and exhort with wholesome doctrine, and withstand and convince the gainsayers;" that he will "banish and drive away from the church all strange doctrine, contrary to God's word; and both privately and openly encourage and call upon others to do the same;" and that he will "maintain and set forward quietness, love, and peace among all men; and diligently exercise such discipline as by the authority of God's word, and by the order of this church, is committed to him." These are onerous engagements and responsibilities. They are not to be discharged, as I have some where seen it proposed to have the duties of a West Indian plantation chaplain performed, by a cast-iron parson, warranted to wear long and run well. They call for the highest energies our nature can exert, and for their unceasing application, and under bonds the strongest that can be laid on man. The duties of a bishop, as our ordinal exhibits them, are not merely functional; they are literally the "care of the churches;" under which the greatest of the apostles groaned.

Is such a care not essentially affected by the extent of limits in which it is to be exercised? Will it, can it, be discharged alike effectively by the same man placed over a hundred congregations, or over ten? Are there not limits beyond which it cannot be at all discharged? And from the nature of the case, must not those limits be far within the range of physical ability to go through the routine of functional duty?

Thank God, our ordinal has established the spiritual character of the Episcopal office, rather than the ecclesiastical. Whatever anomalies may exist or arise in practice, tending to reduce a bishop in our church to a mere official, the voice of the church herself condemns them. She teaches that his charge, as a bishop, is eminently a cure of souls; that as a bishop, he is set over the whole flock, to watch over their souls, as one who must give account; that as a bishop, he is not merely to furnish pastors, and see that the flocks be fed, but himself to feed them, giving each his portion of meat in due season.

Yet this character may be destroyed, by the enlargement of his diocese. It is the tendency of such enlargement to destroy it. Beyond a given limit, every addition to the number of parishes, every enlargement of the extent of territory, assigned to a bishop, must tend to falsify the description of his office in the ordinal, and to nullify the vows he took on admission to that office.

This lesson is taught by the whole history of the church, if I read it right, that just in proportion as the boundaries of dioceses were enlarged, in just the same proportion the discipline of the church grew lax, her children ignorant, her clergy worldly, her bishops proud, dissentious and ambitious; the pastors became lords; princes rose up among the lords, and a tyrant set himself over all, ruling with a rod of iron the starveling flock which went unfed.

I can hardly think the fact will be questioned, that the boundaries have been enlarged. There are few now, corresponding in extent or number of souls with those of the first ages of the church. Here and there one, like the bishopric of Sodor and Man, in England, remains to prove by its blessed pre-eminence in Christian peaceableness, godliness, and spiritual thrift, the excellence of the system of apostolic Episcopacy, in its purity. The names of a Barrow, a Wilson, a Heldestey, and a Ward, burning and shining lights conspicuous in the galaxy of worthies that adorn our mother church, shew what kind of bishops have thought their labours well bestowed and fully engaged in a diocese of thirteen parishes and a hundred and sixty square miles. The spirit of innovation, and the process of mischievous lay-lapping in church affairs, recently led to an attempt to abolish this diocese, by annexation to a neighbouring see. The Church of England rose in arms against it, as one man. From every quarter, the voice of indignant remonstrance against the destruction of its best

diocese was heard. The ministry were forced to recede, and one of my latest English periodicals informs me that Sodor and Man is still to remain a monument of primitive apostolic Episcopacy; a specimen of what the church might be, had she wisdom enough and grace enough to make the sacrifices necessary for a return to the old paths, in which the fathers trod.

Such a return her reformers would have been glad to make had it been in their power, and they did do something towards it. Six new dioceses were actually erected in England under the auspices of Cranmer, and a temporary provision for the wants of the church at the same time made by the appointment of six-and-twenty suffragan bishops. The venerable martyr, it is well known, regarded this as only the beginning of well-doing; but the love of money interfered and crushed his plans in the bud. The funds with which Cranmer would have had new bishoprics endowed, became the spoil of rapacious courtiers; the inconvenience attending the system of suffragan Episcopacy were soon felt; and while the temporary provision was silently abandoned, worldly men and worldly views effectually shut out all hope of extensive permanent improvement.

And yet the dioceses which the reformers were thus anxious to have reduced were in extent of surface about one twenty-fifth of the size of the diocese of New York. England proper contains 50,200 square miles, and is divided into twenty-seven bishoprics. New York containing about 45,500 square miles is left under one.

But the dioceses of England are no fair representatives of the primitive apostolic Episcopacy. The present ecclesiastical distribution of that country is of irregular growth subsequent to the Anglo-Saxon invasion. It has been settled by circumstances not on principle, and under the baneful influences predominant more or less throughout the whole west since the sixth century, the date of Austin's mission. We know very little of the original British church. Yet the providence of God has preserved to us enough of information to assure us that its bishoprics were on a scale very different from that of their Saxon substitutes. Seven, at least, are recorded to have existed in the principality of Wales, comprising a surface of 8,125 square miles of mountainous country never capable of sustaining a dense population.

Even these, however, were neither primitive in origin, nor wholly conformable to the primitive model. The growth of Christianity in Britain was slow. We know that it had obtained no permanent settlement until toward the close of the second century; and we can then connect it with operations which materially altered the character of Episcopacy in the west of Europe. A band of zealous missionaries were then spreading the gospel in every direction from the valley of the Rhone, whither they had brought it from Asia Minor. They itinerated in large districts and, like our present missionary bishops, took charge of regions which they never dreamed of retaining as undivided bishoprics. In some cases, nevertheless, this was the result; and in the majority the subdivision was slow, irregular, and never brought down to the primitive standard of diocesan jurisdiction. Still that standard was not wholly disregarded; and an inspection of the ecclesiastical map of France curiously illustrates the gradual change of diocesan Episcopacy. The 110 dioceses into which France proper is divided, are of exceedingly unequal extent, comprising from 16 parishes to 1385, and covering from 8 square miles to 2500. Yet their inequality is not without discernible laws. There are three clusters of small dioceses, almost uniform in size, (at least all below a certain standard) from which as the rest recede in distance they visibly increase in size. Ask history for the explanation of this arrangement, and she will tell you that these are the three spots first christianized in France, and that the lapse of centuries intervened before their general influence had communicated itself to the more remote and larger bishoprics. Nismes in Languedoc, Lyons and Vienne in the Lyonnais, and Arles and Aix and Marseilles in Provence, are the earliest domain of the gospel in Gaul, and round them cluster the small dioceses. The provinces of Aix and Arles for example, including the exempt dioceses of Avignon, Carpentras, Carailon and Vaison, cover an area of about 5760 square miles. In this there are 15 dioceses, leaving to each 384 square miles, and ten of those dioceses average only 38 parishes each. The average of parishes throughout all France proper is indeed only 285 to a diocese; but as there have been great changes in the number and limits of the bishoprics in the Gallican Church, I do not insist on the general average. The particular district just instanced is as near as may be on the original footing. It is known that since the fifth century its ecclesiastical division has remained nearly or quite unaltered.

On this scale the diocese of New York would by superficial measurement divide into 119 bishoprics; by number of parishes it would constitute rather more than 8.

Does this seem startling? We have not yet got back to the apostolic churches, nor ascertained the standard of their Episcopacy. The earliest of the Gallic dioceses can be traced up only to the end of the second century. Let us go where apostles planted the church and fixed the character of its ministry and the bounds of its Episcopacy.

To be concluded in our next.

THE LATE REVEREND SYDNEY SMITH'S SERMONS.

Sydney Smith paid no attention to theological study; he was not a diligent reader of the word of God, as is evinced by his strange blunders in reference and quotation; he had no doctrinal system, except that of having none; he had no taste for writing sermons;—we mean discourses for the pulpit, embodying Christian doctrines and precepts, as distinguished from mere essays upon human life and manners;—no understanding of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as the power of God unto salvation; or if he understood it as a matter of theory, he was apparently skeptical in regard to it. Every thing approaching to true religion in the heart, and evinced in the life, he scoffed at as rant and fanaticism; and, whether from distaste, or from a consciousness that divinity was not within the range of his attainments, he evidently eschewed it; so that wherever we find any remark in his discourses of a more than

usually doctrinal character—the doctrine being sound—we strongly suspect that it is borrowed."

[The above is from the London Christian Observer; several quotations from Smith and from Barrow, placed side by side, follow as specimens of Mr. Smith's plagiarism; and the Reviewer closes thus:]

"What might a man, gifted as Sydney Smith was, have been as a preacher of Christ's holy gospel, had he understood and felt it in its real character; had it been the joy of his heart; and had he determined, by God's grace, not to know anything among men save Jesus Christ, and him crucified; setting forth his salvation as the only remedy for the sins and the sorrows of a guilty world? There might have been peculiarity of manner; he might have been as original as an evangelical instructor, as he was as a political satirist;—every man has his gift—and it is not necessary or desirable to drill all the ministers of Christ into a platoon uniformity of topics or style; but the characteristics of the Gospel are unchangeable; its essential features must ever be kept in distinct prominence; and never must the preacher overlook man's desolate and degraded condition by reason of the fall; the work of the Holy and undivided Trinity in his recovery; the Father giving his Son as a ransom for lost mankind; the Son undertaking and completing the mighty task; the Holy Spirit enlightening, regenerating, and purifying the soul; justification by faith, which receives the Redeemer, as made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; and the heavenly graces divinely implanted in the heart of the believer, and evinced, as the necessary fruits of faith, in a holy and spiritual life. Such was not the character of Sydney Smith's preaching; he did not recognize such principles, or look for such effects; and he would have scoffed at any man as a fanatic who should set forth the Gospel after this fashion. But if it be anything, it is this: if it is not a cunningly devised fable, it is 'the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth.' There is no middle course consistent with Scripture, or the documents of the Anglican confession; and those who declare that they believe themselves moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon them the office of a Gospel minister, and upon that declaration are admitted thereto, but when admitted become mere lecturers in good morals and good manners, abuse their trust, and are answerable for 'the blood of souls.' Whether Sydney Smith seriously considered his responsibility in this awful light, and acted upon it, was a question between him and his God; but his published sermons are before the world, and we dare not assert that they bear evidence that such were his views; or that he had duly weighed the solemn declaration of St. Paul, 'Woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel.'

ADVISE TO NEWLY ORDAINED CLERGYMEN.

"Make up your minds deliberately, if you mean to be faithful, to lead a life wherein hardy and venturesome faith will be daily tested by calls to unflinching self-denial. Your own wish is to win souls to Christ; not to produce a certain general decency and amendment in the face of society around you, but as God's instrument, and through the power of Christ's name, to work in living souls the mighty marvel of their true conversion. How painful soever be the thoughts which it excites, never lose sight of this truth, that your ministry has failed as to every soul entrusted to you, who is not under it converted to the Lord, or built up in his holy faith. And such a work must be full of toil and self-denial. The strong man armed will not allow you to spoil his house, and be free the while from molestation. And he is ever ready with his assaults and craft; unless you slumber he will not seem to sleep. Reckon, then, first on opposition. And then secondly, remember that in all this you will have a real work to do. Let this thought be always with you. Go out to visit in your parish not because you ought to spend so much time in visiting your people, but because they have souls; and you have committed to you (feeble as you are,) the task of saving them, in Christ's strength, from everlasting burnings. Be real with them, strike as one that would make a dent upon their shield of hardness, yea, and smite through it to their heart of hearts. When you preach be real. Set your people before you in their numbers, their wants, their dangers, their capacities; choose a subject, not to show yourself off, but to benefit them; and then speak straight to them, as you would beg your life, or counsel your son, or call your dearest friend from a burning house—in plain, strong, earnest words. Let your sermon be your own, made up of truths learned on your knees from your Bible in self-examination, amongst your people. And to make them such as this, spare no pains or trouble. Deal much in the great truths which the blessed God has taught us of himself; beware of always tarrying amongst the graves and corruption of our fallen, tempted state, but rise up to God and Christ and the Holy Ghost, and bear your flock with you there. To lead them for themselves indeed, through the Spirit, to believe in the person of the Eternal Son, and so to stand before the Father, accepted in the Beloved—this is life Eternal.—The Right Rev. S. Wilberforce, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford.

THE SINLESS HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

The holy Jesus had no sin, and consequently none of the imperfections which sin has brought upon us. His will was in harmony with God's will. "I delight," says he "to do thy will, O my God!" and he did it with all his heart, always and perfectly. And accordingly we read of him, in the Psalms, that "he spake the truth in his heart; his tongue and his heart always went together; he had clean hands;" not once defiled with any sinful pollution, "and a pure heart;" not one evil thought had ever arisen in it: nay "his mind had never been lifted up unto vanity;" not one vain thought had ever passed through his mind. Judge then how perfectly immaculate he must have been; for who is there amongst us, that has not had a thousand, yea ten thousand vain and wandering thoughts? Who does not find them passing through his mind against his will, and intruding into his hours of devotion, from which he hoped he had shut them out, and haunting him even at the Lord's table? But Christ's pure and spotless mind never admitted one vain thought. He was the very image of God; in