

Romish doctrine, by laws, articles, confessions, homilies, the oath of allegiance and supremacy, the book of Christian Institution, and many excellent writings; and if, on the other hand, in the same breath, we accustom ourselves to speak slightly and disparagingly of those great and venerable names of the sixteenth century of whom one of the ablest and wisest of modern authorities has said, that "we shall search in vain, either in ancient or modern history, for examples of men more justly entitled to the praise of splendid talents, sound learning, and genuine piety;" or if we learn to designate the blessed Reformation itself as "that great schism" which "shattered" the "sacramentum unitatis," since which era "truth has not dwelt simply and securely in any visible tabernacle;" or if we undervalue our own liturgy, and formularies, and homilies, or put interpretations on our articles at variance with what has been generally received as the intentions of their compilers, and inconsistent with the royal declaration, that "no man . . . shall put his own sense or comment to be the meaning."

And, lastly, I cannot but fear the consequences for the character, the efficiency, and the very truth of our church, if a system of teaching should become extensively popular which dwells upon the external and ritual parts of religious service, while it loses sight of their inner meaning and spiritual life; which defaces the brightest glory of the Church, by forgetting the continual presence of her Lord, seeming in effect to depose him from his rightful pre-eminence; which speaks of the sacraments not as seals and pledges, but as instruments of salvation in a justificatory and causal sense; not as eminent means of grace, inasmuch as "faith is confirmed and grace increased" in them, as our article speaks; not as they "be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace," as our article speaks again, but as if they were the only sources of Divine grace, to the exclusion of any other; the means, the keys of the kingdom; deprecating, as superstitions, an "apprehension of resting in them," and investing them with a saving intrinsic efficacy, not distinguishable, by ordinary understandings, from the opus operatum; which tends to substitute, at least in unholy minds, for the worship in spirit and in truth, the observance of "days and months, and times and years;" for the cheerful obedience of filial love, an aspect of hesitation, and trouble, and doubt; for the freedom of the gospel, a spirit of bondage; for the ways of pleasantness, and the peace which passeth all understanding, the valley of Baca an I a body of death; which works out salvation, indeed, with fear and trembling, but without any foretaste of the rest that remaineth for the people of God, and without joy or peace in believing.—*Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester, 1811.*

TOTAL ABSTINENCE.

The attempt which is sometimes made, to destroy the argument for total abstinence from intoxicating liquors, by a comparison of the use of such liquors, with indulgence in articles of food, fails wholly in the analogy. Food is necessary in itself, and becomes physically injurious only in its perversion or excess. Total abstinence from food, becomes necessarily death, and cannot, therefore, in any case be duty. Intoxicating liquors are not necessary in themselves, but conceded by all, even by those who use them, to be in no degree beneficial as an aliment to the healthful; by most, believed to be actually hurtful in every degree of such an use. Total abstinence from them therefore, so far from being physically injurious, like abstinence from food, is acknowledged by all to be harmless, proved and universally confessed to be healthful in its influence and tendency; and even believed by many, to be indispensable to the maintenance of health. Temperance in the use of food is necessarily therefore, in the nature of the subject, abstinence only from excess; because partial indulgence is indispensable to life. Temperance in the use of intoxicating drinks, is in the nature of the subject, necessarily entire abstinence, because any indulgence is in itself acknowledged to be unnecessary; proved to be hurtful; and the encouragement and allowance of an instrument of disease and death to the healthful physical system. The argument of those who oppose the stand and claims of entire temperance in this connection, must be, therefore, altogether a defensive one, and maintained upon the ground of their personal right to the indulgence which they are unwilling to renounce. It can stand within no other walls of defence, than an avowed and inconceivable love for the indulgence which is defended, though it is conceded to be without physical benefit, and known to be attended with a train of moral evils and miseries in the world, which hide from view, in the comparison, all other sufferings of mankind.—*From "The beloved Physician," a Discourse addressed to Medical Students, by Stephen H. Tyng, D. D. Rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia.*

[We think this a very striking passage. The former part of it seems to us incontrovertible. About the middle, the argument is carried beyond its legitimate conclusions. We should say: "Temperance in the use of intoxicating drinks may, in the nature of the subject, with perfect safety become entire abstinence from conscientious motives, because any indulgence is in itself unnecessary, next to proved to be hurtful, and the encouragement and allowance of an instrument of disease and death to the healthful physical system." The "walls of defence" are somewhat wider than what the latter part of the passage marks out. The simple fear of disoblighing those with whom we live in habits of intercourse, and appearing precise and singular, find room within. How desirable, then, that we should add our influence to help that the use of intoxicating drinks may become as singular, as entire abstinence from them was some time ago.—*Editor.*]

HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY.

Human Responsibility appears to have originated jointly in God's right to command, and man's power to obey. Had God had no authority, or man no ability, human accountability would be unintelligible. Were God

* The keys that can open and shut the kingdom of heaven, we, with St. Chrysostom, call the knowledge of the Scriptures; with Tertullian, the interpretation of the law; with Eusebius, the Word of God.—*Jevel's Apology.*

to relinquish His prerogative, it would be His own act; but no act of man's can forcibly divest Him of it. Man, therefore, might forfeit his ability, and yet God retain His authority. Accordingly, since God made man upright, and imposed obedience when man was able to obey, man's fall cannot have abrogated obligations imposed before he fell, because no act of his can throw off God's title to his service.

Notwithstanding, then, that Adam involved himself and his posterity in an utter incapacity to yield obedience, the whole race continues liable to the penalty of disobedience,—unless God either resign His claim, or accept in lieu of man's, the meritorious obedience of a Substitute. But, nowhere learning that God has ever relinquished His authority, it follows, that man, unless interested in the imputed righteousness of another, remains exposed to all the consequences of the Fall,—responsible, though powerless. If this abstract theory concerning man's impotent responsibility be true, let a conviction of helplessness lead us to one whose strength is made perfect in weakness, so that, as of old to Israel, He may say to us—"Thou hast destroyed thyself, but in me is thine help found." Hosea, 13, 9.

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, MAY 2, 1844.

In accordance with the purpose which we announced in our last, we now refer to the case in which it seems to us that the Episcopal Church in Scotland has assumed an aspect repulsive to the people in the midst of whom she has established her worship.

Amongst the Episcopal Clergy in Edinburgh is the Rev. D. J. K. Drummond, ordained by an English Bishop, but for a number of years, and up to 1842, canonically subject to the Bishop of Edinburgh, as Pastor of a congregation in his Diocese. The ministrations of that gentleman seem to have been highly appreciated by an affectionate people; and he, in the use of a liberty which he did not know the Church to forbid, had instituted, besides other private means of edification, a weekly prayermeeting which was so well attended that many a time numbers had to go away for want of room. It was held in a hall rented for the purpose by the minister, and was conducted by singing two hymns, giving an exposition of Scripture, and an extempore prayer.

After having performed this service for years with the cognizance of the late Bishop of Edinburgh, on the elevation of his successor to the Episcopate this meeting was declared forbidden by the 28th Canon of the Scottish Episcopal Church in which it is stated that "if any Clergyman shall officiate or preach in any place, publicly, without using the Liturgy at all, he shall, for the first offence, be admonished by the Bishop" &c. &c. A preceding clause, which however is not before us, forbids, as the Bishop expresses himself "mutilations of the Liturgy; this forbids its total omission."

Mr. Drummond represented, that his meeting was a private one, but his Diocesan decided to the contrary, suggesting, however, to Mr. Drummond that he should appeal to the Synod of the Diocese, and thence, if necessary, to the College of Bishops, in order to ascertain which interpretation would be adopted by the highest authority. Mr. Drummond preferred the alternative which was opened to him by a number of the members of his congregation, of renouncing his connexion with the Scottish Episcopal Church, and opening a place of worship of the kind referred to in the short History of that Church inserted in another column. He there officiates now, we presume, as a Clergyman in connexion with the Church of England, adhering to the English Book of Common Prayer in public worship, and using the liberty of private ministrations which the mother church allows her Clergy.

Now this result of the matter is much to be deplored. Without questioning the conscientious zeal of either of the parties between whom the difference of opinion came to light, we are struck with the fact that the meeting which Mr. Drummond found so acceptable with the people, was a most promising opportunity for bringing those under the ministrations of an Episcopalian who would not come under the influence of his ministry at those opportunities of worship where he adhered to the Liturgy. Once convinced, by observation, that the use of forms at our public ministrations does not, as Non-Episcopalians are apt to persuade themselves, necessarily deaden the spirit of devotion in either minister or people, the grand obstacle to their candid examination of our peculiarities of worship was removed; and many might be induced to bear with our forms in public worship and to join the ranks of worshippers in our communion, where they would be brought, we firmly believe, to imbibe a taste for them.

The course which has been pursued, exhibits division. Though Mr. Drummond's ministry may continue to be useful to many souls, its efficiency towards bringing them to

lake refuge, from division in their own communion; under the banners of Episcopacy, must be considered as nearly gone.

We ventured, in our last number, to give our opinion that the restriction of Mr. Drummond's liberty in this matter was needless. We do not presume to question the correctness of the Bishop's interpretation of the Canon. So far are we from it, that we consider Mr. Drummond's judgment was incorrect in looking upon that interpretation as sufficient, and declining to avail himself of the privilege of appeal. But then the fact becomes the more prominent, that the legislative power in the Scottish Episcopal Church at this day looks with disfavour upon the freedom of devotional exercises implied in the course which Mr. Drummond pursued. She allows her Clergy full liberty at meetings which, from their nature, must remain confined to small numbers out of their congregations: meetings of communicants, meetings of candidates for confirmation, meetings for communicating missionary intelligence. Even a prayer-meeting, precisely of the character of Mr. Drummond's, may be conducted with safety by the Scottish Episcopal Clergyman, as long as it is attended by a small portion only of his congregation, so as to be strictly private in that sense. But if it prove so attractive a means of edification, that the number of attendants increases until the parlour becomes too small, and he must engage a larger room to admit the numbers who throng to avail themselves of this privilege; if this increase should even consist of Non-Episcopalians who come to profit by the ministrations of an Episcopal Clergyman, the Canon comes into force, and compels him to use the un-mutilated formulary for public worship. Bishops in England have not so circumscribed the liberty of their Clergy. They have been known even to decline licensing lecture-rooms for public worship, because their license would bind the Clergyman to use the Liturgy, when they thought it more desirable he should be free to use his discretion. This, we think, is the spirit of the Church of England. It is one among those features of conciliating wisdom which have so strongly attached to her that portion of her Clergy who have been mainly instrumental in elevating the tone of piety within her, most of whom adhere to her forms with inflexible consistency, and with the most edifying effect at those seasons of public worship where all her members, not prevented by necessity, are considered bound to attend, but use the freedom which has been denied Mr. Drummond, according to their discretion at other opportunities of spiritual improvement to their people, and to strangers whom they might wish to enclose in the ark where themselves find edification and safety.

A correspondent who has furnished us with more than one truly Berean contribution already, addresses to us the following inquiry: *To the Editor of the Berean.* Sir,—Having heard doubts expressed as to the import of a term used by you in the Leading Article of your first number, and thinking that an opinion delivered by yourself upon the subject would be acceptable to many of your readers, I am induced to ask the question—What is meant by "a Diocesan Paper"? You say that an attempt was made last autumn to institute "a Diocesan Paper," but without success. Now as the term is altogether new to myself, I should be glad to know first, what would be the characteristic features of such a journal, and secondly, what particular advantages would accrue to the Church from having such a periodical, that are not derived from your own?

I am, &c. &c.
AN INQUIRER.

This question is so natural, that we are almost ashamed to say we have been at a loss how to answer it. Like our inquirer (who seems to be somewhat more fresh from the mother country than ourselves) we do not strictly know what would be the characteristic features of a Diocesan paper, though we are ready enough to state what we meant by it, when we became parties to the application mentioned in our first number, and alluded to by our Correspondent. We and our associates would have been ready to consider the deficiency filled up which we lamented, if a periodical could have been started through measures initiated by the highest ecclesiastical authority in the Diocese. Such a publication would have been Diocesan in our estimation, so far as to stay all further attempts on our part to establish another; and the Editor of the Berean would thus have acquired entire relief from solicitation on the subject.

But the truth is, the Church of England knows nothing of Diocesan papers. We never heard of such a thing in England. Diocesan intelligence seems to be put within the reach of every Editor that chooses to give it circulation; and accordingly it is found in the Times, as in the Morning Chronicle, in the Church Intelligencer, as in the Record, and whatever other periodical antipodes there may be. No official character is imparted to the paper which inserts the intelligence; no responsibility for the views advocated by that periodical is incurred by those from whom the intelligence proceeds.

We have learned to use the term "Diocesan paper" during our residence in the neighbouring republic. But since our Correspondent has led us to look for our authority in adopting it, we find that, even if the meaning it conveys applied to the institutions of our sister Church in the United States, it would not thereby become applicable to the position

of the Church in these Provinces. In the States, every Diocese has its representative body: a convention, composed of Bishop, Clergy, and Lay Delegates. They might, if they chose, adopt a Periodical as their official organ. No such representative body exists at present in the English Episcopal Church, and consequently "the Diocese" can not so act as to make a Periodical become Diocesan.

In point of fact, however, the attempts, in our sister Church, at giving a Diocesan character to Periodicals has not been productive of any advantage that ought to dispose us to make trial of the like in the British Provinces. We purpose giving in our next some curious details on the subject, out of the means of information which reach us from the United States; but in the mean time we will state the conclusion at which we have arrived that, by whatever title a paper in the British Episcopal Church might come to be styled Diocesan, the effect of it would be to add responsibilities to those confessedly numerous and weighty enough which are already sustained by the Episcopate; and to throw a Diocese into the peril of division between individual Churchmen and the constituted authority, in a matter which never needed to have become the occasion of difference between them. An Editor might satisfy many, but cannot please all. If his enterprise is like that of the Berean, his failure affects none but himself; if his labours claim a higher sanction, he cannot be unsuccessful without, to that extent, involving in his failure interests which had better remain entirely exempt from such hazards.

SHORT HISTORY OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

The progress of the Reformation in Scotland was very unlike that in the sister country. In England, a constellation of pious Bishops, earnestly labouring for the recovery of pure doctrine and scriptural freedom, was countenanced by a succession of Sovereigns, with the interruption, only, caused by Queen Mary's short & persecuting reign. So far from the Episcopate being found a grievance, the eminent services and bitter sufferings of men who held it and took the lead in the blessed work of spiritual emancipation, endeared the institution of it to a people who would not have felt satisfied not to see the places so nobly vacated by a Cranmer, a Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper, filled up again by others to whom they might look as their leaders on any future call to an earnest contending, even to losses, prisons, and death, for the faith once delivered to the saints.

In Scotland, the Episcopal office was superseded at the Reformation, by the creation of Superintendents who were to exercise Episcopal functions, but were not set apart to that office by consecration at the hands of Bishops. To this deficiency a remedy was sought to be applied in the year 1610, when three Scotch Superintendents were set apart for the Episcopal order by the laying on of the hands of three English Bishops. The Episcopal form of government was thus imposed upon the Church of Scotland, but the public mind not being gained over to the change, it was abolished in the year 1638, when those troubles commenced which terminated in the overthrow of both Monarchy and Episcopacy in England. On the restoration of the Monarchy, the attempt at introducing Episcopacy in Scotland was renewed. In the year 1661 four Presbyterian ministers (one of them the heavenly-minded Leighton) were consecrated to the Episcopate over the Church in Scotland, by English Bishops, and Episcopal government was legally established. It continued so till the Revolution in 1688, when the Presbyterian form of Church government was established in Scotland, thus taking from the Bishops then in office in that country all the power, rank, and emolument which they had held by virtue of their connexion with the State. Their Episcopal character, of course, could not be taken away from them by Act of Parliament; and as a portion of the Clergy and Laity remained attached to them, they continued to exercise their spiritual authority, and transmitted it to others, through whom it has descended to those now holding the Episcopal office in that Church.

The attempts at establishing Episcopacy in Scotland having been prosecuted with much violence and cruelty, it is not to be thought strange that the hearts of men were alienated from it rather than inclined in its favour, so that none but a very small portion of the people adhered to the Episcopal Church on its legal abolition. Its depression was further increased and prolonged by the adherence of its members generally to the exiled family of the Stuarts. It was not till the death of Charles Edward Stuart, in the year 1788, that public prayers were offered up in the Scottish Episcopal places of worship, for the reigning family. If they are to be blamed for their long adherence to the Stuarts, it may, however, be expected of them that their loyalty will be equally steadfast towards the house of Hanover to which they have now transferred it. The government duly appreciated the alteration of their sentiments as subjects of the crown, and repealed, in 1792, the several statutes by which till then Scotch Episcopalianism had been subject to many disabilities.

It may be remarked, here, that besides the congregations of Episcopalianism which were canonically under the supervision of the Non-juring Bishops, several were formed by Clergymen of the Church of England, who did not feel themselves withheld from offering up the prayers of their Church for the reigning family; and members of their congregations had the advantage of exemption from the effect of those penal statutes just referred to, and they adhered wholly to the English Form of Common Prayer, from which that adopted by the Scotch Episcopal Church differs in some particulars.

At the present day the Scotch Episcopal Church is divided into the six Dioceses of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dunkeld, Brechin, Aberdeen, and Moray. Each of these has its Bishop; the number of Presbyters with cure of souls is about eighty. The reported baptisms in the year 1839 were 2405, and the communicants 12,028. The numbers have been steadily increasing for several years, chiefly through a growing attention to the wants of English and Irish Episcopalianism who in former

years, on taking up their residence in Scotland, used more commonly to merge in the Presbyterian congregations, but are now sought out and brought under the ministrations of the Episcopal clergy.

The Ecclesiastical organization of the Church is thus described in an official statement published by the Bishops: "The Bishops are supreme administrators of our canon law, each in his own diocese. Collectively, they form a court called the EPISCOPAL SYNOD; of which one of their number, chosen by themselves, with the title of *Primus*, is president. To this court, which meets annually, appeals may be made from the decisions of the several Bishops, and its decisions are final. The supreme legislative authority is vested in the GENERAL SYNOD. This court consists of two chambers,—an upper, in which the Bishops sit alone; a lower, consisting of Deans and Delegates, one of each class being sent from every diocese. Deans, it ought to be mentioned, are, among us, presidents of all diocesan meetings of the Clergy in the Bishop's absence, and are nominated by the Bishop. No canon can be enacted or abrogated without the assent of both these chambers. General Synods are held, not periodically, but only at such times as the Bishops may think expedient; four such Synods have been held in the present century. Our lowest class of Church Courts are the DIOCESAN SYNODS, which meet annually, and consist of the Bishop and instituted Clergy of each diocese. In these, by-laws may be framed for the diocese only, subject to the revision of the next General Synod; and it is in Diocesan Synods that the Bishop sits as judge in all cases of discipline. The other members of the Synod must in such cases hear the evidence, and give their opinions *seriatim*; but the decision of the Bishop is the judgement of the Court, subject to an appeal to the annual Episcopal Synod. The temporalities of each Chapel are managed by a board of Vestrymen or Trustees, with whom is usually lodged the power of electing and presenting the minister."

Societies exist for raising an Episcopal Fund, and also a Fund for general objects in furtherance of the efficiency of the Church. A successful effort has been made for the establishment of a College under the auspices of the Church, and prospects seem favourable to her prosperity if, while holding fast her distinctive principles as an Episcopal church, she maintain consistently her character as a Protestant community, in the spirit of love and meekness proclaiming the pure and unadulterated gospel, that souls may be brought out of darkness into light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

To the Editor of the Berean.

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE BEREANS.

DEAR SIR,—The following remarks which are chiefly extracted from the excellent Commentary of Matthew Henry, may perhaps be acceptable to some of your readers, as being explanatory of the title which you have adopted for your valuable periodical, and as indicating the spirit which many, I doubt not, together with myself rejoice to see actuating you in your undertaking, and which all, as many as have the cause of true religion at heart, earnestly desire to be diffused throughout the world.

"These were more noble than those in Thessalonica." The Jews in the synagogue of Berea were better disposed to receive the gospel than the Jews in the synagogue at Thessalonica: they were not so bigoted and prejudiced against it, nor so peevish and ill-natured, they "were more noble" or as the Greek has it "better bred." They had a freer thought and lay more open to conviction, were willing to hear reason and admit the force of it, and to subscribe to that which appeared to them to be truth, though it was contrary to their former sentiments: this was more noble. "They had a better temper, were not so sour and morose and ill-conditioned towards all that were not of their mind. As they were ready to come into a unity with those that by the power of truth they were brought to concur with, so they continued in charity with those that they saw cause to differ from: this was more noble."

"They received the word with all readiness of mind"—They were willing to hear it, and did not shut their eyes against the truth."

"They searched the scriptures daily whether those things were so." Their readiness of mind to receive the word was not such, as that they took things upon trust, or swallowed them upon an implicit faith: no, but since Paul reasoned out of the Scriptures, and referred them to the Old Testament for the proof of what he said, they had recourse to their Bibles, turned to the places he referred them to, read the context, considered the scope and drift of them, compared them with other places of Scripture, examined whether Paul's inferences from them were natural and genuine, and his arguments from them cogent, and determined accordingly."

Trusting that the perusal of these sound words may have the good effect of reminding some of the true standard around which Protestants are in these times especially called upon to rally; and of the birth-right which every genuine son of the Reformed Church cherishes as the most valuable of all his privileges—the right of searching the Scriptures for himself,

I remain, dear Sir, your's, &c.,
A READER.

To the Editor of the Berean.

SIR,—If you think the following account of an alarming disease, taken from the last number of the *Episcopal Recorder*, worthy of a place in the *Berean*, you will oblige the undersigned by copying it into your columns; and it might be very beneficial to the public if some of the faculty acquainted with the symptoms of the complaint would prescribe a few simple remedies for the same; for, I fancy the disorder has often made its appearance in Quebec; and is still very prevalent.

Your's, &c.,
A. E.

ALARMING COMPLAINT.

There is a disease at this time but too prevalent, an account of which is not to be found in our popular books of medicine; I shall, therefore, endeavour to communicate some particulars respecting it. The disease to which I refer is evidently of the intermitting kind; and in all cases that have fallen under my ne-