

temporal wants, neither will he add to his spiritual wretchedness by seeking vain consolations, or by adding sin to sin. The poor-spirited, and the poor in spirit, differ as widely as light and darkness. The poor-spirited man, when in trouble, desponds, flies to false comforts, takes to drinking or gambling to drive away care, and sometimes rushes out of life uncalled, into the presence of God. Surely the soldier is poor-spirited who forsakes his post. This is not the spirit of a soldier of the cross, or of one poor in spirit. The poor-spirited are often exceedingly proud, afraid to have their poverty known, they hide and cloak it as long as possible, they refuse aid, they are offended at being thought poor. And so in religion: men are ashamed to own, even to God, that they are so vile and worthless as they are: they scorn to be saved by grace, to receive eternal life as a gift, to pray for mercy, salvation, grace, with the importunity of a perishing hezgar; they are half, or more than half, offended with the minister, who, though from the kindest of motives, is faithful enough not to flatter, but to look them honestly in the face, and say, "You are poor and miserable, helpless and destitute, vile, worthless, and undone sinners. Let not then the world confound together characters so different as those of the poor-spirited and the poor in spirit."—*Rev. John Hambleton, M. A. Islington.*

THE SERVICES OF THE LAITY.

I am conscious also, that I did not press as I ought to have done upon professors, how much it was their duty, as they received the knowledge of the things of God themselves, and had ability, to begin to work together with their minister.

I ought to have told them plainly, and constantly, how little good, in comparison, could be done by one man, as a teacher of the truth; or by his conversation, or visiting the poor, the ignorant, or the afflicted—that this ought to be regarded, as it was in the churches planted by the apostles, as the common and indispensable duty of every man professing godliness; that they be diligent among their neighbours in those works and labours of love;—that the minister is to be considered as the officer, indeed, who gives the word of command, and takes the lead in all good works; but that all the people of God, like soldiers under him, must fight against the common enemy,—must take pains in diffusing light and knowledge, showing all compassion towards those that are ignorant and out of the way, and endeavouring to bring them to the knowledge of the truth. I should have shown them, that, on many accounts, private Christians are fitted to exhort, and instruct, and reprove those of their own age and condition;—as this is an affecting proof of love for them, is more likely to stir them up to seek for knowledge when they see others besides the preacher are acquainted with Divine things, even men who have no better education than themselves; whereas the greater part excuse their ignorance, supposing the poor, and all who work for their bread, have no time to gain knowledge. The very few who have love and zeal thus to come forth, to help in promoting the salvation of souls, find that God blesses them for their good-will to their fellow-creatures, and with such sacrifices He is well pleased.—*Venn.*

If Subscribers, who have not preserved the whole file of the Berean, could part with any of the numbers 8, 30, 31, 33, they could serve us to complete sets, and our Publisher would pay for them, if sent to him.

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, MAY 29, 1845.

In the course of discussions which took place, last year, on the question whether the mode of celebrating the Fête Dieu annually pursued by the Roman Catholics in this city and Montreal is consistent with the regard due to the religious feelings of Protestants, a periodical in the interests of the Church of Rome stated that, if that mode inconvenienced the Protestants, no doubt the Rulers of that Church would alter it. Last year a very respectful representation was transmitted to the ecclesiastical authority of the Roman Church at Montreal, stating how much the Protestant portion of the community was inconvenienced by that celebration. We endeavoured to set forth the same fact, convinced that we were speaking the mind of the greater portion of our Protestant fellow-citizens. Now when we adverted to the approaching festival, in our last number, we really entertained a hope that, in accordance with the expectation held out as above, the inconvenience would be obviated this and succeeding years; and on Sunday we were exceedingly mortified to find that such was not the case. The whole of Fabrique and St. John's Streets (the only part of the town which came under our observation) was gaudily ornamented with trees, flags, and pictures; and at a quarter past ten, just as great numbers of Protestants had to be on their way to their respective places of worship, and when children were dismissed from their Sunday Schools, the usual procession passed through that much frequented thoroughfare, accompanied by a military band of music playing an exhilarating tune. If this celebration is held to be worship to God, we have no right to make the least objection to it as an infringement upon our rights, provided it were confined to the Roman Catholic places of worship; but to have it fill the public streets with its trappings, noise, and distraction on the Lord's day, is what we must designate as violence done to the religious privileges of all that portion of the population who do not recognise in this festival any worship to God,

and to whom it is a serious interference with the quietness and solemnity of the Lord's day which the law of England designs to secure to them wherever the British sceptre bears sway. We will mention one practical grievance resulting from this celebration, to ourselves and some families who accept from us the service of religious instruction to a class of youth on the Lord's day morning. On the next morning of the Fête Dieu procession, if we should live and be engaged in the same service then, we shall think it prudent not to assemble our class together at all, rather than suffer them to run, right from our endeavour to lead them to spiritual worship, into this attractive contradiction to it and violation of the sacredness of the day. We do not think it a reasonable expectation for us to entertain, that children would not loiter in the street, or run to fall in with the sight to be seen and merry music to be heard on such an occasion, and that the excitement produced by it would not act most fatally against the attentiveness and sobriety of thought which Protestant worship requires, and endeavours to foster. We should raise precisely the same objection to religious observances followed by any other body of professed Christians, if they made themselves liable to the same complaint. For nearly twelve months, the community has enjoyed the comfort of Sabbaths uninterrupted by the attractions of military music and parade—attractions to which on other occasions, such as the cheering celebration of Her Majesty's birth-day last Saturday, we are as well disposed to yield as other men—and it is most painful to have that comfort interrupted on the plea of religious privilege, and with the flippant question, "How does that inconvenience you?"

We therefore renew our protest against the public celebration of the Corpus Christi festival as a grievance and violation of our rights; and we must wish for the time when the voice of the thoughtful and earnest Protestant inhabitants will make itself heard with sufficient influence to assign, to the undisputed rights of their R. Catholic neighbours to worship according to what they conceive to be the truth of God, such bounds as shall place upon a footing of equality with them their Protestant fellow-citizens who have rights as dear to them, and as fully connected with their apprehensions of divine truth.

Our Correspondent Enquirer offers a question which at first sight almost made us fear that, by inserting his communication, we should invite a class of discussions which our readers generally would find neither interesting nor profitable. Suppose the regular descent of the ministry from the Apostles could be demonstrated with a degree of certainty far more satisfactory to the practised ecclesiastical historian than the learned Prelate quoted by Enquirer thinks can be attained, the great bulk of Churchmen, not being skilled in these investigations (as we intimated at the close of our Editorial of the 15th instant,) would not be convinced by the historical proof furnished, but by a confidence in their informant's accuracy and integrity to which they must be won by the discovery of fruits answerable to the high claim of apostolicity which he advances for his ministry. Of primary importance, therefore, is the production of these fruits; and of secondary moment only the argument for the unbroken descent.

Enquirer's communication, however, treats the question in so good a spirit, and furnishes aid so important towards assigning to the point at issue its proper place among opinions held in the Church, that we gladly insert it, though it may seem that he, in common with the Prelate quoted by him, is disposed to fasten upon the probability of irregularities in the dark ages, where others, in the absence of absolute proof, would disregard probabilities and rest assured of an unbroken succession, as long as the interruption cannot be demonstrated. It may be harmless for the one even as the other to follow the bent of his mind, as long as the point at issue is not magnified beyond its due proportion. If, however, the succession be essential, then what authority is to decide what is the "every requisite form" which has to be strictly adhered to, before consecration to the Episcopate can be acknowledged to be perfectly regular? And if we exclude a bias in favour of the fact, we do not know how satisfaction is to be obtained. That numberless irregularities have taken place in the course of eighteen centuries, no one can doubt; that none of them was fatal to the line of succession, may be the conviction of individuals, but cannot be imposed as necessary belief upon others.

The Episcopal Church in the United States has had her power of transmitting an Episcopate not quite sixty years; yet in that short space of time a singular irregularity has taken place in the act of transmission. In the year 1811, Bishop White, assisted by two other Bishops, consecrated Drs. Hobart and Griswold, but omitted to pronounce, in the form prescribed by the Church at the imposition of hands, the words "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The omission caused a good deal of remark, and doubts were thrown out as to the validity of the act altogether. The objections, however, died away; and no doubt is entertained at the present day. Yet, from this incident

which took place on an occasion when all the parties engaged in the service were no doubt scrupulously intent upon the devout and complete performance of every requisite, it may be inferred that greater irregularities took place during the centuries of prevailing ignorance, superstition, and profligacy among the hierarchy of people: to impose, then, upon men the regularity of the succession as a necessary part of their persuasion as Church-members, would be equally vain and presumptuous.

We have to nice one term in our Correspondent's letter which we think does not correctly represent the intention of our remark on the mind of the Church of England. When he gives it as his showing that the Church "ordered the matter to her own taste within her own pale," we doubt whether he quotes our words; or meaning at all events would be more clearly expressed by saying that the Church of England "ordered the matter according to her own apprehensions of the truth, within her own pale." Our belief is, that our reformers felt it to be great gain that they were not compelled to break away from the orderly succession to the ministry which had all along obtained; they believed it to be in accordance with primitive usage, and loved to retain it. Whether all the links of transmission by outward rite grasp each other so as to terminate without break in the imposition of hands; the apostles, was no inquiry of theirs; they had more important matter to search out and to inculcate.

We are of opinion that there exists no repugnance in men generally, to believe the fact of an unbroken succession on the simple ground that it is not disproved,—as long as claims are not founded upon it which threaten to place it above purity of doctrine. As there prevails a bias in favour of a regular transmission of authority, so the sense of men is favourable to the supervision of a given number of inferior officers by a superior, consequently to the establishment of an Episcopate over Presbyters. The fear that Bishops will grasp for power, will be arbitrary and luxurious, an sacrifice truth to the increase of their authority, that perhaps chiefly sets the minds of men against Episcopacy. It must be confessed that the history of the Church of Rome shows too much reason for such apprehensions. But in proportion as the Protestant Church makes men acquainted with an Episcopate exercised in submission to the word of God, in self-denial, laboriousness, condescension, and earnest contending for the faith once delivered to the saints, Episcopacy commends itself to the intelligence, the integrity, the respectability of every social body where it is presented under otherwise equal circumstances. Many years ago, before the revolutionary war, a report having reached Boston that a Bishop for New England was appointed by the British government, a man, with pale-ness on his countenance, exclaimed: "Then I am a dead man!" "Why so?" "As soon as the Bishop lands, I shall shoot him, to rid the country of such a calamity; and then I must be hanged." Such was once the dread of Episcopal influence in Massachusetts, where now the second Bishop is peacefully supervising a flourishing and extending Church, respected and confided in, because his aim, as was that of his predecessor, is mainly to go about doing good. Men loved to believe Bishop Griswold's Episcopate (we abstain from naming his living successor) to have descended to him in direct succession from the apostles, because the fruits of it bespoke that origin. And such, we believe, will ever be the most powerful argument for an apostolic succession.

FROM THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY'S LATE CHARGE, AS REPORTED IN THE TIMES.

It would be almost needless for him to say that the immediate objects in which the existing differences in the church had of late most conspicuously manifested themselves,—were certain isolated diversities in the celebration of divine service. Into a detailed examination of these points he did not intend to enter, because such a discussion, unless full and accurate, would be worse than useless. It did not appear to him that any effort should be made to do away with the possibility of these diversities, by the only legislative power which could rightly interfere, and to call on the conjoint authority of the Church in its synodical assemblies, and of the state, through the Crown and parliament, in order to clear up everything less doubtful, and to enforce the observance of whatever might be approved. He did not mean to say that it would not be well, under other circumstances, and in a different spirit, that the attention of the Church should be directed in the most authoritative manner to the points which gave occasion to the difference, as he believed that much good might be done, and much evil prevented, by any measure by which its system could be adapted to the changes which time makes in the fabric of society, and its energies be directed, not by the mere voluntary efforts of individuals, but by lawful and full recognition of the privileges and the more earnest discharge of the duties which rightfully devolve upon it both at home and abroad. Rather than look to legislative enactments for a remedy to their

present distractions, he would trust to a return to that moderation and sobriety of feeling in the community at large which would surely result from a patient, quiet, and conciliatory course on the part of the clergy—a course which would make it manifest that the spiritual guides of the people had really at heart before all other things, the spiritual good of those committed to them, and that they recognize the gospel of salvation in its purity and in its fullness as the one only means by which this was to be compassed and secured. Of course by what he said he implied the opinion that the obligation on the conscience of the clergy of the letter of the rubric in every minute particular was not so stringent as it had been sometimes said to be, but that some modified influence might be allowed to long-established custom, to inconvenience, amounting in some cases to necessity, and to the feelings of those for whose edification all pastoral ministrations were designed. Two different classes of persons were united in preserving to the utmost extent the stringency of this obligation—the one aiming at a complete uniformity in the exact observance of existing laws; the other seeking to work out a new and further reformation by proving the necessity of change. The subject should be well considered before adhesion was given to either of these parties, lest changes should be introduced which were not desired, or the church destroyed while seeking to uphold it.

His Lordship, after some further remarks on this subject, proceeded to speak of the articles of the church. In alluding to this subject at his last triennial visitation, he laid down the rule that subscription to the articles was to be made in the plain sense, quoting the words of Waterman, who says that the church requires subscription to her own interpretation of Scripture, and the subscriber is bound, in virtue of that subscription, to that, and that only; and he, on that occasion, concluded by saying that we are not at liberty to evade it by nice and subtle distinctions, but are bound to receive and subscribe it in the sense which we believe to have been intended by the church. He did not, on reconsideration, see any occasion to alter what he then said; nor would it have appeared necessary to add anything to it, but for the extraordinary views which had of late been propounded in some quarters with so much confidence as seemed to make it not unsuitable to say that while he did not question the belief of parties who maintained such opinions, or that they were justified in conscience in doing so, the adoption of such a theory was a moral phenomenon which he was unable to comprehend, and that the views themselves deserved the most distinct and unqualified condemnation.

MISSIONARY SEIGN COMMITTEE.—We mentioned, some months ago, the extraordinary case of the Rev. Jacob Samuel's bringing a suit for damages against the Missionary Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, on the ground that they had not completed his appointment as their missionary to the East:—the action has come on before Lord Cuninghame, and been dismissed with costs, against Mr. Samuel.

To the Editor of the Berean.

SIR,—I have been gratified by the remarks of your correspondent "E." (in your number of the 17th ult.) under the head "Abrahamic descent and Apostolic succession compared;" as well as by the Editorial observations which were elicited by those remarks. And whilst the interest with which I read them was not diminished, the spirit of enquiry was enhanced, by the ambiguity which seems to shade a rather important element in the theory to which they refer;—the theory being that of a Ministry regularly ordained by Bishops duly consecrated in an unbroken chain from the Apostles,—and the important element being the element of the fact: for it struck me as being highly essential to the theory, that the fact on which its truth and reality depend, should be susceptible of being substantiated beyond the shadow of a doubt.

Your correspondent intimates, that, "to have derived the ministry of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments through an unbroken succession of ministers episcopally ordained, must ever be considered a source of unmixed satisfaction to the believer's mind;" to which he subjoins the remark, that "to attach to the fact an importance beyond this (of satisfaction,) as if it rendered the Christian sacraments necessarily effective, is to fall into a course of pride and self-sufficiency." &c. &c. and again, that, "an attempt to magnify it beyond its proper position, must be regarded as a token of spiritual apostasy." In whatever light these views may be regarded, it appears to have been his design rather to expose the danger into which the holding of the theory might lead, than to prove the fact which is essential to every practical consideration of the theory. Consistently, therefore, with this design, he pursues the comparison which he wished to draw, but leaves the question of the fact aside.

You, likewise, have already shewn, how the evils of division and the desirableness of union in the one scale, with the dangers of priestly dominion and impurity of doctrine in the other, popular feeling nevertheless preponderates in favour of a regular transmission of ministerial authority; but that the Church of England, whilst ordering the matter to her own taste within her own pale, has not pronounced upon the order which others have preferred, nor enjoined upon her members those views which make the uninterrupted descent of ministerial authority from the Apostles, through the line of Bishops, essential to the being of a church.

But as the fact of such an unbroken succession is very frequently assumed, and the validity of orders hinged precariously upon it,

it might furnish interesting matter for consideration, were any one of your correspondents, more equal to the task than I am, to turn his mind to the investigation of the assumed fact, and of the jeopardy in which the whole question of Ministry is placed, when suspended from the clouds of doubt and obscurity which enshroud the subject.

In the case of the Aaronic priesthood, and under that typical dispensation, it was a *sine qua non* that those should be genealogical descent from him who was first "called of God." "Aaron and his sons shall wait on their priest's office; and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death." That institution gave a measure of confidence and comfort to the worshipping Israelite appearing at the door either of the tabernacle of the congregation or of the temple, with his sacrifices and offerings, when a priest was ready to present them, whose mediatory services for him Jehovah had promised to accept. The sacredness of the type was, moreover, guarded by the marked interposition of Heaven on occasions when the office of the priesthood was invaded, or when infractions were perpetrated on the functions which the Aaronite alone was anointed to perform. It was therefore every thing to the Jew to feel assured of the unbroken Aaronic succession, not merely as of Priesthood in the abstract, nor of a body of priests collectively, but of the individual man who ministered for him "in things pertaining to God." Doubtless "the dark ages" of the Jewish Church, in her frequent seasons of captivity or of corruption, witnessed numerous irregularities and violations in her ecclesiastical constitutions; but in the periods of reformation, careful recurrence was had to "the genealogy of the Priests by the house of their fathers;" that they might "stand in the holy place according to the divisions of the families of the fathers of their brethren." And, in the great restoration under Ezra, because certain sought in vain for "their registration among those that were reckoned by genealogy, therefore were they, as polluted, put from the priesthood." The evidence of traceable descent from Aaron was essential to the validity of Aaronic orders; and the mere theory of an unbroken succession was valueless, if unsupported by the clear evidence of fact,—of fact too in regard to every individual claimant of a title to sacerdotal functions. This system, like the city in which it was established, was at unity in itself. It was consistent with its own provisions. Where so much was made to depend on the succession, care was taken to have it as a nail in a sure place.

If, therefore, the theory obtain, that ecclesiastical descent through a line of Bishops duly consecrated in unbroken succession from the Apostles, be essential to the Christian ministry, the enquiry presents itself, whether evidence of the actual fact of such a succession—indispensable under the economy of the Old Testament, is less necessary under the more perfect dispensation of the New? and whether the theory of an ecclesiastical dynasty, is not still as valueless as ever, if unsubstantiated by traceable descent, and by the plain testimony of fact, in relation to every individual who suspends the validity of his orders on such a chain.

It were altogether foreign to the present enquiry to urge the necessity for such a succession, or its analogy with established precedent; since the object of the enquiry is, not the theory of a succession, but the existence of the assumed succession as a fact.

Neither were it pertinent to the investigation to consider what alternative would remain with reference to the transmission or maintenance of ministerial authority, should the assumed one fail; since the enquiry is prompted by the supposed reality of the assumed one, and the desideratum is, not a comparison of differing theories, but the establishment of the alleged one as a reality, demonstrable, beyond the shadow of a doubt, by evidence commensurate with the alarming consequences to the whole question of ministry, should any one link in the chain prove incomplete.

I am, therefore, desirous of enquiring what the degree of positive assurance is, accessible to each Episcopalian—not that ever since the days of the Apostles there have existed such *mens Christiani Ministri*, but of the fact, that the particular Clergyman who ministers for him in the Word and sacraments, did actually receive his orders at the hands of a Bishop, who duly received his Episcopate through an unbroken sequence of Episcopal ancestors, who were themselves in like manner, every one of them successively, ordained and consecrated for eighteen centuries without a single flaw? "For if" (in the words of a living prelate) "a Bishop has not been duly consecrated, or had not been, previously, rightly ordained, his ordinations are null, and so are the ministrations of those ordained by him, and their ordinations of others, and so on without end. The poisonous taint of informality, if it once creep in undetected, will spread the infection of nullity to an indefinite and irremediable extent. And who," he asks, "can undertake to pronounce that during that long period usually designated as the Dark Ages, no such taint ever was introduced? Irregularities could not have been wholly excluded without a perpetual miracle; and that no such miraculous interference existed, we have even historical proof. Amidst the numerous corruptions of doctrine and of practice, and gross superstitions that crept in, during those ages, we find recorded descriptions not only of the profound ignorance and profligacy of life, of many of the Clergy, but also of the grossest irregularities in respect of discipline and form. We read of Bishops consecrated when mere children;—of men officiating who barely knew their letters; of Prelates expelled, and others put in their places, by violence;—of illiterate and profligate laymen and habitual drunkards admitted to Holy Orders; and in short of the prevalence of every kind of disorder, and reckless disregard of the decency which the Apostle enjoins. It is inconceivable that any one, even moderately acquainted with history, can feel a certainty, or any approach to certainty, that amidst all this confusion and corruption, every requisite form, was, in every instance, strictly adhered to, by men,

\* Nu. 3. 10. † Num. xvi. 2 Chr. xxvi. 2 Chr. 31. 17. ‡ 2 Chr. 35. 6. § 1 Tim. 2. 62.