

# The Bazaar.

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. 21.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 1846.

[WHOLE NUMBER 125.]

**THE SAVIOUR'S INQUIRY.**  
And dost thou love me more than all  
Thy friends and pleasures rare?  
And canst thou leave them at my call,  
My love through life to share?

Then fling a faithless world away,  
A world of sin and strife:—  
From darkness raised, O hail the day  
That shines to give thee life!

Rev. Dr. Colter.

## PRIMITIVE EXTENT OF DIOCESES.

Italy is the only part of the West certainly known to have been thus favoured. Italy is distinguished from all the rest of the western church by the smallness of its dioceses. The kingdom of Naples, containing about 30,000 square miles, has 151; leaving to each an area of something less than 195 miles. Let no suspicion of popery touch this settlement. It can be proved that the policy of the Church of Rome has been to diminish the number of bishoprics, and that it has actually gone on for ages consolidating dioceses within the papal territories, while without they have been reluctantly increased as a measure of reformation at the urgent instance of the secular powers. Rome, too, loves money, and would have Episcopal work done quick and cheap.

But the very suspicion of popery is easily avoided. Go back to the sixth century. Count and measure the Italian dioceses before the era of the beast. The data are full and accurate; and from these Bingham establishes the fact that within 50 miles square around Rome, (2500 square miles,) there were 20 dioceses, Rome itself included: leaving to each district a surface of 125 square miles. The 18 dioceses of the province of Umbria were even less, averaging 100 miles to each. All these have been consolidated by the Pope, by threes and fours, and proportionately reduced in number.

Here, then, we have a standard by which the state of New York is divisible into from 370 to 450 dioceses, and that standard furnished by the only part of Europe which was unquestionably converted and settled on a Christian basis by an apostolic ministry.

No doubt this district was then one of the most populous in the world: but no disproportion in population would account for such a difference in superficial extent. It would require the whole population of the globe to be brought into the state of New York, to make an adjustment on that ground. Besides, we are to remember that as Rome was not built, so neither was it Christianized in a day; and it must have been long, very long, before the infant church bore the same proportion to its population that our church bears to the population of the state, and no inconsiderable while before it even bore the same proportion to superficial extent of country that we Episcopalians now bear to our young territory.

But if the neighbourhood of Rome had alone presented this standard of Episcopal jurisdiction, we might suspect it, however early, of popery by anticipation; or set it aside as an anomalous state of things, growing out of the unique position of the environs of the capital of the world.

It is not so, however. Turn where we will, as soon as we come upon the footsteps of an Apostle, we discover the same state of things. If there be a feature of external discipline in the Church, surely stamped with the character of apostolicity, it is this.

I will trouble you with only one instance, but it shall be of the most unexceptionable kind, linking itself inseparably with one of the plain testimonies of Scripture to Episcopacy.

There is no part of the Church of which the condition at an early date is better ascertained than that in the district of Asia Minor, known as Proconsular Asia. There is none in which apostolic presence and influence is more clearly ascertained. There is none which, like that, can bring the direct divine sanction for its constitution. There were the seven churches to which the Lord himself sent special messages by the mouth of John. The churches of which one was ruled by the beloved disciple until long after the probable departure of his fellow apostles, and another, down to the very middle of the second century by his pupil Polycarp; the churches which Ignatius visited, and to which he wrote.

Now these seven churches, together with Magnesia and Tralles, to which also, as independent dioceses, epistles are addressed by the martyr: Antioch, all lay within a portion of Asia Proconsular and Lydia, one hundred and five miles square. Nine dioceses in an area of eleven thousand and twenty-five square miles is an arrangement not in perfect agreement with the premisses, but as yet incomplete legislation of our General Convention, assigning a minimum of eight thousand. It would place thirty seven dioceses, instead of one, in the state of New York.

But is this all? Does Asia Minor give a standard of apostolic episcopacy so wide as that found in Italy? Far from it. There were, indeed, nine dioceses, known to have been such in the first century of the Christian era within that area; but there were, also, within the same area, twenty-three others, known to have existed by the records of the church; in all, thirty-two. This gives an average of three hundred and forty-five square miles, or one hundred and thirty-two dioceses within the area of the state of New York. The country thus divided, was in part mountainous, and by no means thickly peopled, over its whole surface, although it included several large cities, and many very fertile and populous districts. It is by no means certain that we know all the dioceses it once contained; and this, with the difference in population, may account for the difference of the standard here found, and that in Italy.

Here the case may rest. When I find a spot on the earth more likely than those now produced to have been laid out into episcopal districts by men guided by the Holy Ghost, and find its standard by episcopal jurisdiction widely differing from that fixed by John in Asia, and in Italy by Paul and Peter, it may become necessary to reconsider the question. Until then I shall remain, as now, convinced that apostolic episcopacy was not on the pattern which unwieldy influences from without, and heedlessness, and other worse faults within, have

set up in the Western church, and seem but too likely to perpetuate in our own offshoot.

It is true, there have been efforts made to support the system of large dioceses. It would be strange if there had not. Much of the assault upon diocesan episcopacy has been directed against this feature of the institution as it existed where best known to the assailers. The temptation to show skill in the defence of a strong cause by maintaining its weakest points has led such advocates as Maurice, for example, to violate, as I believe, historic truth, in order to support the Episcopacy of their own church, instead of assuming the high and safe ground of adhering to the institution simply in its primitive apostolic form. Hooker—the judicious Hooker, is more wise. He waives the question of comparison, leaving others to inquire into the limits of the "restraint," with which he proves that the apostles committed the office of bishops to their successors.

That there was any precise, unvarying measure for those limits—so many square miles, or so many parishes, or so many thousand souls—I am far from affirming. On the contrary, we have proof that even at first the dioceses differed in size and importance, as much as parishes do now. Great as was the difference between the bishop of Rome and the bishop of Eubangium in Jerome's time, there may have been hardly less inequality between the charge of the bishop of Jerusalem or the bishop of Antioch and that of the bishop of some town in Asia Minor or in Italy, in the time of the apostles. Many presbyters and many thousand souls there must have been under each of the former from the very earliest period; and I see no reason to doubt that it was the design of the inspired founders that the churches in those cities, under any imaginable increase, should still remain entrusted each to a single bishop.

No doubt, too, the altered condition of society would warrant a departure from the precise pattern of a primitive diocese. Increased facilities of travel and intercourse by letter and through the press, have altered the relations of distance. Steamboats and rail-roads, daily mails and newspapers, enable a bishop to exercise the same kind of superintendence over a larger surface and a greater number now than in the first century. Let this be taken into due account, and it will appear that the subdivision of New York, need not be by hundreds to reduce it to the primitive standard.

Nevertheless, there will remain ascertainable limits; and those limits will be very far within our present practice. All the facilities of travel and intercourse that exist or may hereafter be created cannot enable one man profitably to exercise the spiritual care and oversight which, according to the scriptures and our ordinal, devolve upon a bishop, beyond a certain extent. Men have not changed if roads have. Their spiritual wants are the same now, as in the days of the apostles. The extension of education, if, on the one hand, it affords advantages to the teacher of religion, on the other, increases the requisitions of ability, zeal, and faithfulness in even larger proportion. Advance in refinement is more than counterbalanced by loss of simplicity and docility. Gainsayers and scoffers, reared in the very bosom of the Church, are more dangerous, if not more numerous than those of the times of Paganism. Worldliness and formality in religion, insincere and insufficient profession, make the pastoral office more difficult than when the fiery love of persecution hemmed in the little band of believers, and kept faith, hope, and love in continual exercise. Souls cost as much even now, as in any previous age. The same wisdom, zeal, and labour must be laid out to win them, though in a different way.

If this be true, a bishop, however rapidly he may be enabled to travel, however extensively to correspond, must have limits to his usefulness, fixed by the nature of his office. I have appealed to the practice of the early church for its construction of the moral and religious question—What these limits are? The answer has been clear. When all reasonable allowance for altered circumstances of society is made, still the spiritual oversight of a bishop on the apostolic plan, must have been far less than would be assigned to one having even the eighth part of our church in this state.

It is idle, worse than idle, to contend that the office is not changed by such an enlargement of its duties. In name and style it is not; but we most justly disclaim attention to the name and style when engaged in the proof of the scriptural character of Episcopacy. It is the thing we profess to love and preserve. The thing is different in a diocese of 300 parishes and in one of thirty. The bishop of the former is the overseer of the clergy, not of the church. His intercourse with the flock is indirect, occasional, irregular. As to time, indeed, his periodical visits may be regularly made at stated intervals; but what are they when made? Opportunities for the discharge of such duties as the ordinal implies? Seasons of renewal and refreshing to the pastor and flock, collectively and individually, from the stores of their spiritual father? Occasions of examination into old or new abuses, neglects or oversights, in the affairs of the congregation or the conduct of the people? Eras of the commencement or resuscitation of plans, originating in consultations with the bishop or at his suggestion? This is impossible. Were the bishop all his time in motion, he could barely give each parish one day in the year; and what is a day, a single day, for the accomplishment of these objects?

The bishop, then, of such a diocese as ours, is constrained to confine himself, in a great measure, to the mere routine of functional duty. Ordinations, confirmations, consecrations, and such other public services as can be huddled into immediate connection with these, consume a portion of time, and demand a degree of physical and intellectual energy which few beside our present beloved diocesan would be found able and willing to afford. Even he can now barely accomplish his triennial visitation, and meet the extraordinary demands for occasional service. One less active and robust must of necessity form some plan of concentration, to bring together engagements now multiplied and scattered. The result would be the English system of visitations, in which the clergy are convened at designated points, there receive the bishop's charge, fill up their answers to his printed queries, and disperse to their distant flocks. If this is not saying to the "distracted daily food, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled," I am at a

loss to know how the apostle's rebuke is to be incurred. It must be the result of our present system if carried out. Are we prepared for it?

I will not follow out the system to its full development in a mature hierarchy, with all its gradations of spiritual power and office, as I have already trespassed unpardonably on your patience. It may suffice to remind you that the creation of archdeacons, and subdivision of dioceses into archdeaconries was an invention of the Western Church, subsequent to what Bingham calls "the middle-age convulsions;" and growing out of the enormous limits of the new dioceses then formed among the Gothic nations.

I own I look with extreme anxiety upon the discussion of the question now before us. The crisis has arrived, when we must decide between the primitive simplicity of the church in the very first ages, and the hierarchical character which her ministry assumed after its contaminating alliance with the civil government. Hitherto the providence of God has not imperatively called us to the choice. There were obvious reasons why existing civil boundaries should be assigned our dioceses, in their first establishment. The unparalleled development of our church, which has gained even on the rapidly growing population of our new country, has wholly changed its position. Where feebleness of numbers counterbalanced extent of territory, the members have doubled, quadrupled, decupled, while the surface covered has been greatly enlarged. And this change is still going on. Every ten years doubles our clergy and our parishes in this state. While we are debating, our situation is changing. Silence itself is a decision, and if we do nothing, we settle a question fraught, it may be, yes, it must be, with spiritual advantage or injury to millions of our descendants, and directly or indirectly to the whole church of God on earth. It is of no use to temporize. We cannot, in the slang phrase, "let well enough alone." If the present measure of the diocese is well enough, will it be so next year, with one tenth more parishes? If that increase is endurable, will the addition of another tenth in the year following still continue so? But suppose, because we must divide, sooner or later, we conclude to do it now, shall it be done on what a good brother of ours calls the centripetal principle,—as little as may be, that is, into two, and only two? But on this plan, division of dioceses is to be a periodical business in our country; at least for a long time to come, and the difficulties and dangers of the work to be gone through almost as often as a presidential election. Ten years hence, each half of the diocese will have as many parishes as the whole has now. They will again be too many; or if their greater concentration should prevent the evil being felt as soon, perhaps fifteen years might be suffered to elapse, when 360 parishes, even if spread over no more than 24,000 square miles, would be found to require dividing.

Thus should we be kept constantly in an uneasy, unsettled state, with a wide door open to all the evil passions that can destroy the spiritual prosperity of a religious body, and for the sake of what? Certainly, of no principle! Certainly, not on the score of scriptural truth, apostolic example, or primitive precedent! No: but for the maintenance of an imperfect anomalous form of Episcopacy, forced on us hitherto, by uncontrollable circumstances, and now advocated on grounds of expediency and worldly policy.

I have heard, with shame and sorrow, whispers about making bishops too cheap; destroying the respectability and dignity of the Episcopal office: letting loose a mob of bishops upon the church; and cutting down dioceses till they cannot support men of talents, nor command their services. Are these considerations to bring into the legislation of the church of the living God? To weigh with men claiming a commission to serve Jesus of Nazareth, derived through the fishermen of Galilee, and tentmaker of Tarsus? What is the respectability and dignity of the Episcopal office, if not its divine origin and end; and how will these be affected by the multiplication of bishops? Are they not all sent of God? All to save souls? All to preach the word, which is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword? It is a calamity on our communion, to presume that men fit for the Episcopate will stand out for high wages, when called to the service of the church. It is a misconception of the nature of that service to suppose that talent and learning alone are requisite, or that any amount of these will be as fit a preparation for the Episcopacy, as a humble, meek, laborious zeal. It is unfaithfulness to GOD our Saviour, to put worldly estimation, the opinions of the multitude, the changeable breath of popular favour, in counterpoise to a clear knowledge, or even a strong presumption of his will. As such presumption, the Church Catholic teaches men to regard the practice of his first followers. Oh that we might unite in a determination to follow out that practice, in singleness of heart, looking to God for the results! Truly yours,

W. R. WHITTINGHAM.

Seminary, May 10, 1838.

## DANGER OF RE-ACTION FROM EXAGGERATED STATEMENTS.

From the Christian Observer, 1838.

Alluding to the dangers of re-action, especially in religious controversy, we will copy a monitorial passage on this subject from the conclusion of Bishop Burnet's History of his own Times. The bishop's warning is not less applicable now than it was in the year 1708, when it was written.

"I see a spirit," he says, "rising among us, too like that of the Church of Rome, of advancing the clergy beyond their due authority, to an unjust pitch: this rather heightens jealousies and prejudices against us, than advances our real authority: and it will fortify the designs of profane infidels, who desire nothing more than to see the public ministry of the Church first disgraced, and then abolished. The carrying any thing too far does commonly lead men into the other extreme: we are the dispensers of the word and sacraments; and the more faithful and diligent we are in this, the world will pay so much the more respect and submission to us: and our maintaining an argument for more power than we now have, will be of no effect, unless the world sees that we make a good use of the authority that is already in our hands: it is with the clergy as with princes; their only way to keep their prerogative from being uneasy to their subjects, and from being disputed, is

to manage it wholly for their good and advantage; then all will be for it, when they find it is for them: this will prevail more effectually than all the arguments of lawyers, with all the precedents of former times. Therefore let the clergy live and labour well, and they will feel that as much authority will follow that, as they will know how to manage well. And to speak plainly; Dodwell's extravagant notions, which have been too much drunk in by the clergy in my time, have weakened the power of the Church, and soured men's minds more against it than all the books wrote, or attempts made against it, could ever have done." The bishop adds;—"The violences of Archbishop Laud, and his promoting arbitrary power, ruined himself and the Church both. A return of the like practices will bring with it the like dreadful consequences."

To this admonition of Bishop Burnet respecting the danger of re-action from exaggerated statements, we will add a passage from a sermon preached in 1819, before the Prayer-Book and Homily Society, by the present Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India, whose name we cannot mention without informing our readers that his Lordship has just published an admirable volume of sermons, containing the discourses delivered by him during his primary visitation, and which are peculiarly valuable for their clear statements of Scriptural truth and earnest and powerful applications of it to the heart and conscience. They amply confute the sneer of a dissenting journalist, that "Daniel Calcutta is not Daniel Wilson." Whatever of piety, of ability, of eloquence, of faithfulness, is identified with the latter name, will be found in a wider sphere connected with the former. But to our quotation from the discourse of 1819, in relation to the danger of re-action from overcharged statements. "There is nothing," says Bishop Wilson, "of which I am more deeply convinced, than that the security of any Protestant Church, and therefore of our own, is the blessing of God on the simple and commanding doctrine of Christ Jesus. To magnify matters which relate merely to the constitution, and as it were the scaffolding, of the spiritual edifice; to give an overcharged and almost Popish exposition of the sacramental offices; to assume as a matter unquestionable the purity of the doctrine preached by the ministers of religion—from which, after all, the majority of a nation will chiefly judge the tenets of a church, and on which the conversation, education, and salvation of each passing age so much depend—and to hold at a distance, and refuse any intercourse of charity with, Christians of other confessions, in the greatest and most simple of causes—the circulation, for instance, of the Holy Scriptures throughout the world by a variety of societies for that purpose—all this, if any thing of this kind should ever be prevalent in any Protestant church, would, in my judgment, go to loosen its foundations; and in a day of general inquiry and information, and among a free and noble-minded people, would tend eventually to degrade its character, and materially diminish its influence and safety."

We will bring down the admonition to a later date, by quoting a passage from the Episcopal charges of another living prelate—the unweariedly diligent, exemplary, and much honoured Bishop of Winchester, who remarked in his primary charge at Llandaff in 1827—"That spell is past, by which the very name of a clergyman, in common acceptance, carried with it associations of a sacred character, and stamped its bearer as a holy man, to whom respect was paid, if not on his own account, for his very order's sake. . . . Do I wish to recall those days of almost superstitious reverence for the priesthood, when the dominion of the clergy over the minds of men deserved less to be considered as the legitimate ascendancy of high talent and extraordinary piety, than as the offspring of a monopoly of learning in an age of darkness—the despotism of exclusive knowledge over ignorance and its associate, error? No, my reverend brethren; happily for ourselves, as well as the world in general, whatever be the character we enjoy, it cannot be acquired by hereditary charter, or put on at pleasure, as belonging to the habit of our profession. Respect must be deserved before it can be won; and as, generally speaking, it will be rarely long withheld when it is fairly due, so it will seldom be long conferred contrary to desert, however high the office or sacred the functions of him who challenges it."

## THE STREAM OF LIFE.

Life bears us on like the stream of a mighty river. Our boat, at first, glides swiftly down the narrow channel through the playful murmurings of the little brook, and winding along its grassy borders. The trees shed their blossoms over our young heads; and the flowers on the brink seem to offer themselves to our young hands; we are in hope, and we grasp eagerly at the beauties around us; but the stream hurries us on, and still our hands are empty.

Our course in youth and manhood is along a wilder and deeper flood, and amid objects more striking and magnificent. We are animated by the moving picture of enjoyment and industry before us, we are excited by short-lived success, or depressed and rendered miserable by some short-lived disappointment. But our energy and our dependence are both in vain. The stream bears us on, and our joys and griefs are left behind us; we may be shipwrecked, but we cannot anchor; our voyage may be hastened, but cannot be delayed; whether rough or smooth, the river hastens towards its home—the roaring of the waves is beneath our keel, and the land lessens from our eyes, the floods are lifted up around us, and we take our last leave of earth and its inhabitants; and of our further voyage there is no witness but the infinite and the Eternal.

And do we still take so much thought for the future days, when the days which have gone by have so strangely and uniformly deceived us? Can we still set our hearts upon the creatures of God, when we find by sad experience, that the Creator only is permanent? Or shall we not rather lay aside every sin which does most easily beset us, and think of ourselves henceforth as wayfaring persons only, who have no abiding inheritance but in the hope of a better world, and to whom even the world would be worse than hopeless, if it were not for our Lord Jesus Christ, and the interest which we have obtained in his abiding mercies?—Bishop Heber's farewell Sermon at Hodnet.

## ADVERSITY.

(Cunningham's Morning Thoughts.)

When the storm arose, the disciples, alarmed at the raging of the waters, hurried to "the hinder part of the ship," where Jesus was sleeping, roused him from his sleep, and at once began to reproach him with indifference to their safety: "Master," they say, "carest thou not that we perish?" What a picture is this of the weakness of human nature! While the waters of life glide smoothly on, we are not disposed, because not tempted, to question the kindness of Providence; but let the storm arise, and the billows break over our heads, and we are in a moment betrayed into the language of doubt and complaint: "Lord, carest thou not for us? Hast thou forgotten to be gracious? Is thy mercy clean gone for ever?"—Is such thy language, thou poor disquieted servant of a compassionate Redeemer? Then silence thy complaints by the very considerations which put to silence those of David under similar circumstances, "I said this is mine infirmity; but I will remember the years of the right hand of the Most High." Like him call to mind the years that are past: remember the vigilant compassion of the master you have endeavoured to serve: consider the benefit of all those cross winds and tides in the great voyage of human existence.—"What, under God, taught Job to abhor himself, and 'repent in dust and ashes?' Adversity. What brought David in contrition of soul to the mercy seat of God? Adversity. What humbled Ahab and Manasseh, the wicked city of Nineveh, and the haughty sovereign of Babylon? Adversity. In what circumstances did St. Paul make the largest discoveries of the all-sufficiency of the grace of God? In adversity. What was the outward condition of St. John, when he was lifted up into the world of spirits, and saw all its splendour and glories arise before him in mysterious visions? A state of captivity and exile. And in like manner when the disciples were in trouble, the angry waters were soon subdued into a state of quietness and repose. The sleep of the Saviour was but for a moment, and designed only to try the faith of his followers. They no sooner called upon him, than he "arose and rebuked the wind, and there was a great calm." And now that he has divested himself of the infirmities of our nature, he sleeps no more: he that keepeth thee neither slumbereth nor sleepeth. Who can hear the exceeding great and precious promises of his Gospel, and not feel the tempest and tumult of his own heart subside? Who can hear them, and not strive to draw near this compassionate Friend and Master, who is a present help in every time of need?

## THOUGHTS FOR HEADS OF FAMILIES, PARENTS, AND TEACHERS.

The influence which men have upon one another, is a matter suited to lead to very serious reflection. There is no man, however lowly his situation, however small his ability, who has not this influence in some degree. We are so formed, that we are continually liable, more or less, to be moulded and fashioned, for good or evil, by those who are around us: Perhaps there is scarcely a day passes over our heads, or even an hour's intercourse held with our fellow-men, during which we do not receive some impression, either of a profitable or of an injurious kind.

But while, in these shorter and accidental seasons of intercourse, we are liable to desire benefit or damage, one from another, how much more is this the case in that lengthened and continual intercourse which we have with the companions of our lives, with our relations and other friends: above all, with parents and teachers!

The inquiry may be well made by every one: How am I acted upon by the society, of which I am a part: particularly, by the individuals with whom my connexion is most intimate? And, on the other hand: What kind of influence am I myself exerting on those, among whom my days are spent: especially my relatives and dependents; and, most especially, the members of my own family?

A Christian master or mistress, is much concerned in this matter: and, if at all awake to its importance, will surely ask sometimes: What is the impression likely to be made upon the minds of my servants, by my habitual conduct towards them? Do they see in me, from day to day, that which they may safely follow? or that which is too likely to lead them astray? Will they, when the term of their service is expired, carry away with them some measure of Christian knowledge; some conviction of the worth of their souls; some sense of the importance of eternal things which they had not before?

Parents and teachers may well feel still more their deep responsibility, while the inquiry crosses their minds: Am I faithful to the trust reposed in me? Is my influence, over those who look up to me as their guide, really of a salutary nature? Do the children who, in the providence of GOD, are placed under my care, receive from me, both by teaching and example, impressions likely to fit them for usefulness in this life, and for happiness in the life to come? Am I striving to lead them to the Saviour; that He may wash them in his precious blood, and form them after His image, and take them under His protection, to whom I gave them up, in Holy Baptism? Happy if, through Divine grace, they can, with a good conscience, answer these questions in the affirmative: but, if they misuse their influence, or forget their responsibility, they will one day find that such misimprovement, and even such neglect of the power given them, adds not a little to the amount of their guilt.

But, above all, mothers are concerned in this most important matter. Much, undoubtedly, may be done by fathers: far more than is attempted by too many of those to whom that relation belongs. Still, the mother's post is much more responsible. From the constant superintendence which she has over the child during every moment of its earlier days, from her gentle disposition, and from her soothing attention to its wants, she acquires an influence which the father cannot be expected to have. Her watchful care and tender ministrations, in hours of sickness, can never be forgotten. Her words, her looks, the very tone of her voice—all these come back to the mind, after the lapse of many years, and engrave the remembrance of her in characters never to be effaced.