

ground of ecclesiastical polity. It was strengthened by differences on other topics, especially the rites and ceremonies of public worship, which, having been introduced by the Church for the use of her congregations, encountered bitter, persevering, and relentless opposition from those who ranged themselves under the banners of nonconformity.

To those who are acquainted with the ecclesiastical history of these kingdoms in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this state of things must be well known. And you, my brethren, need to be only reminded, by the way, of the struggles between the Church and the puritanical party in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; of the discussions at the Hampton Court conference in the reign of King James I.; and of the substitution of the directory for the Book of Common Prayer, together with the overthrow of Episcopacy and of the monarchy withal, during the disastrous period of the rebellion and usurpation at and after the reign of King Charles the Martyr, under the tyranny of that "solemn league and covenant," which, originating with the Presbyterians of Scotland, bound all its adherents in a band to exterminate, as well in England and Ireland as in that country, the Episcopal polity and the Liturgical form of prayer; in a word, "the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government" of the Church. Upon the revival, however, of the Church, together with the monarchy, on the restoration of King Charles the Second by the blessing of Divine Providence, an attempt was made to reconcile these religious differences, by a royal commission to certain Episcopal and Presbyterian divines, authorising and requiring them to advise upon and review the Book of Common Prayer, to consult upon the several objections and exceptions which should be raised against the same, and to make such reasonable alterations, corrections, and amendments therein as should be agreed upon to be needful and expedient "for giving satisfaction to tender consciences, and for the restoring and continuance of peace and unity in the Church." The ensuing examination, however, commonly known by the name of the "Savoy Conference," from the place of meeting, was of small effect. Objections were alleged by the Presbyterians, and answered by the Episcopal divines; but few alterations were agreed upon, and, with some not material corrections, the Book of Common Prayer remained as it was, and thus was made part of the new Act for the uniformity of public prayers, which, after a brief interval, was enacted severally in England and in Ireland, and which, as we all know, both as being the law of the Church and realm, and by our own voluntary and solemn undertaking, is the rule of our ministrations.

Meanwhile an account of the proceedings between the Bishops and their assistants on the one hand, and the Presbyterian divines on the other, was published in 1661. A copy of it now lies before me, in a pamphlet, entitled, *The Grand Debate between the most Reverend the Bishops and the Presbyterian Divines, as also in Dr. Cardwell's History of Conferences*.—From that account I would now lay before you the principal objections and answers on the topics, on which alterations were proposed and rejected. These things appear to me important, not merely as interesting occurrences in our ecclesiastical history, but still more in their relation to our professional engagements and conduct; and as affording cautions to ourselves, that we strictly observe our fidelity to the Church, and that we do not, by any inconsiderate or ill-adviced deviations from our plain line of duty, so far forfeit our allegiance to her, and take part with her opponents. To those, who have not contemplated the subject under this point of view, it may be matter of surprise, that of certain irregularities now prevailing among some ministers of the Church, especially, if I mistake not, among those who have been most prominent in reproaching their brethren for other alleged offences, the most striking are in accordance with the objections, which at the Savoy Conference were advanced by the Presbyterian divines, and negatived on the part of the Church by the Bishops and their assistants.

3. Following the example of the primitive Catholic Church in her mode of worship as well as in her constitution, the Reformed English Church had provided a Liturgical form for her people; a form, defined in all particulars, and not open to any innovation, whether by diminution or addition; and concerning "the prescript form of divine service," it had been her judgment in her Canons, that "that form of Liturgy or divine service, and no other, shall be used in any Church of this realm, but that which is established by the law, and comprised in the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the sacraments." But the Puritanical party, who had striven out a new and anti-Catholic project of ecclesiastical polity, struck out a similar project of Christian worship, whereby, during the usurpation, the Church's Book of Common Prayer had been superseded. The repetition of such an attempt would have been no manifestly ineffectual; so that they were content to limit their objections to particular portions of divine service, to some of which I will now specifically advert.

4. They proposed, then, that "the repetitions and responsals of the clerk and people, and the alternate reading of the psalms and hymns with a confused murmur in the congregation, whereby what is read is less intelligible, and therefore unedifying, may be omitted;" [Grand Debate, p. 3; Cardwell, p. 305.] and that "in regard the Litany is so framed, that the petitions for a great part are uttered only by the people, which we think not to be so consonant to Scripture, which makes the minister the mouth of the people to God in prayer, the particulars thereof may be composed into one solemn prayer, to be offered by the minister unto God for the people." [Grand Debate, p. 4; Cardwell, p. 306.] But the Episcopal divines made answer, that the demand for taking these away was made "upon such reason, as doth in truth enforce the necessity of continuing them as they are, namely, for edification. They would take these away because they do not edify; and upon that very reason they should continue, because they do edify; if not by informing of our reasons and understandings (the prayers and hymns were never made for a catechism), yet by quickening, continuing, and uniting our devotion, which is apt to freeze, or sleep, or bat in a long-continued prayer or form. It is necessary, therefore, for the edifying of us therein, to be often called upon and awakened by frequent *Amens*, to be excited and stirred up by mutual exultations, provocations, petitions, holy contentions, and strivings, which shall most show his own, and stir up others' zeal to the glory of God. For this purpose alternate reading, repetitions, and responsals, are far better than a long, tedious prayer; nor is this our opinion only, but the judgment of former ages, as appears by the practice of ancient Christian Churches, and of the Jews also." [Grand Debate, p. 66; Cardwell, p. 338.]

5. Again, in opposition to the limitation prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, the Puritans pleaded "that the gift of prayer being one special qualification for the work of the ministry, bestowed by Christ in order to the edification of his Church, and to be exercised for the profit and benefit thereof, according to its various and emergent necessities;" they, therefore, desired "that there may be no such imposition of the Liturgy, as that the exercise of that gift be thereby totally excluded in any part of public worship; and further, that considering the great age of some ministers, and the infirmities of others, and the variety of several services of time occurring upon the same day, whereby it may be inexpedient to require every minister at all times to read the whole; it may be left to the discretion of the minister to omit it, as occasion shall require." [Grand Debate, p. 5; Cardwell, p. 306.] But it was remarked, in answer, by the Bishops and Episcopal divines, that "this makes the Liturgy void, if every minister may put in and leave out all at his discretion;" that "the gift or rather spirit of prayer consists in the

inward graces of the spirit, not in *ex tempore* expressions, which any man of natural parts, having a voluble tongue and audacity, may attain to without any special gift;" but that "if there be any such gift as is pretended, it is to be subject to the prophets and to the order of the Church;" and that "the mischief that come by idle, impertinent, ridiculous, sometimes seditious, impious, and blasphemous expressions, under pretence of the gift, to the dishonour of God, and scorn of religion, being far greater than the pretended good of exercising the gift; it is fit that they, who desire such liberty in public devotions, should first give the Church security, that no private opinions should be put into their prayers, as desired in their first proposal, and that nothing contrary to the faith should be uttered before God, or offered up to him in the Church." [Grand Debate, pp. 71, 72; Cardwell, p. 341.] And whereas of late years a custom had been gaining ground of extemporary prayers being used before and after sermons, without any foundation from law or canon, the Bishops and their assistants expressed their "hearty desire, that great care might be taken to suppress those private conceptions, of prayer both before and after sermons, lest private opinions be made the matter of prayer in public, as hath, and will be, if private persons take liberty to make public prayers." [Grand Debate, p. 57; Cardwell, pp. 254, 337.]

6. Again, it was proposed by the Nonconformists, "that there be nothing in the Liturgy which may seem to countenance the observation of Lent as a religious fast; the example of Christ's fasting forty days and nights being no more imitable, nor intended for the imitation of Christians, than any other of his miraculous works were, or than Moses's forty days." [Grand Debate, p. 4; Cardwell, p. 306.] To which the Episcopal divines answered, that this desire, "as an expedient for peace, was in effect to desire, that this our Church may be contentions for peace sake, and to divide from the Church Catholic, who shall oppose themselves against the custom of the churches of God; that the religious observation of Lent was a custom of the churches of God appears by the testimonies of St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome, who says it was *secundum traditionem Apostolorum*: this demand then tends not to peace, but dissension. The fasting forty days may be in imitation of our Saviour, for all that is here said to the contrary; for though we cannot arrive to his perfection, abstaining wholly from meat so long, yet we may fast forty days together, either Cornelius's fast, till noon; or at least Daniel's fast, St. Peter's fast, till three; or at least Daniel's fast, abstaining from meats and drinks of delight, and thus imitate our Lord." [Grand Debate, p. 69; Cardwell, p. 339.]

7. Again, it was desired by the puritanical objectors, "that the religious observation of saints' days appointed to be kept as holy days, and the vigils thereof, without any foundation (as we conceive) in Scripture, may be omitted; that, if any be retained, they may be called festival, and not holy days, nor made equal with the Lord's day, nor have any peculiar service appointed for them." [Grand Debate, p. 4; Cardwell, p. 306.] But answer was made by the representatives of the Church, that "the observation of saints' days is not as of divine, but ecclesiastical institution, and, therefore, it is not necessary that they should have any ground in Scripture than all other institutions of the same nature, so that they be agreeable to the Scripture in the general end, for the promoting of piety; and the observation of them was ancient, as appears by the rituals and Liturgies, and by the joint consent of antiquity, and by the ancient translation of the Bible, as the Syriac and Ethiopic, where the lessons appointed for holy days are noted and set down, the former of which was made near the Apostles' times. Besides our Saviour himself kept a feast of the Church's institution, namely, the Feast of the Dedication." (St. John, xii. 22.) The choice end of these days being, not feasting, but the exercise of holy duties, they are fitter called holy days than festivals; and though they be all of like nature, it doth not follow that they are equal." [Grand Debate, p. 70; Cardwell, p. 340.]

8. Again, an objection was made by the Presbyterians, on the ground of the lessons appointed to be read in public worship: "that inasmuch as the Holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation, to furnish us thoroughly unto all good works, and contain in them all things necessary either in doctrine to be believed, or in duty to be practised; whereas divers chapters of the Apocryphal Books are appointed to be read, are charged to be, in both respects, of dubious and uncertain credit: it is therefore desired," they said, "that nothing be read in the Church, for lessons, but the Holy Scriptures in the Old and New Testament." [Grand Debate, p. 6; Cardwell, p. 307.] But they were answered by the Episcopal Commissioners, with reference to the reason, which, it was contended, "would exclude all sermons as well as Apocrypha;" "if so, why so many unnecessary sermons? why any more but reading of Scriptures? If, notwithstanding their sufficiency, sermons be necessary, there is no reason why these apocryphal chapters should not be useful, most of them containing excellent discourses and rules of morality. It is heartily to be wished that sermons were as good. If their fear be that by this mean those books may come to be of equal esteem with the Canon, they may be secured against that by the title which the Church hath put upon them, calling them Apocryphal; and it is the Church's testimony which teacheth us this difference: and to leave them out, were to cross the practice of the Church in former ages." [Grand Debate, p. 76; Cardwell, p. 341.]

9. Again, the Puritans objected to the provision in the Burial of the Dead, where it is said, "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God of his great mercy to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother here departed, we therefore commend his body to the ground, &c., in sure and certain hope of resurrection to eternal life." And they remarked thereon—"These words cannot in truth be said of persons living and dying in open and notorious sins." [Grand Debate, p. 29; Cardwell, p. 333.] But it was answered by the Episcopal divines—"We see not why these words may not be said of any person who we dare not say is damned: and it were a breach of charity to say so, even of those whose repentance we do not see; for whether they do not inwardly and heartily repent, even at the last, who knows? And that God will not even then pardon them upon repentance, who dares say? It is better to be charitable and hope the best, than rashly to condemn." [Grand Debate, p. 145; Cardwell, p. 361.]

10. Again, it was demanded by the Puritans, "Because singing of psalms is a considerable part of public worship, we desire that the version set forth and allowed to be sung in churches may be amended, or that we may have leave to make use of a purer version." [Grand Debate, p. 6; Cardwell, p. 308.] To which the answer of the Bishops and their assistants was an excuse for passing over the objection—"Singing of psalms in metre is no part of the Liturgy, and so no part of our communion." [Grand Debate, p. 80; Cardwell, p. 342.] I notice the question, however, for the purpose of remarking, that, at the time of this last revision of our Liturgy, the singing of psalms in metre was limited to "the version set forth and allowed to be sung in churches;" and that the Nonconformists could not venture on the use of what they esteemed "a purer version," without leave.

11. The dress prescribed by the Clergy during their ministrations, was another point in controversy between the Nonconformists and the Episcopal divines. By the former it was specified as one of

"divers ceremonies, which from the first Reformation had by sundry learned and pious men been judged unwarrantable, that public worship may not be celebrated by any minister that dares not wear a surplice." [Grand Debate, p. 8; Cardwell, p. 310.] By the latter it was answered, "There hath not been so much said not only of the lawfulness, but also of the conveniences of those ceremonies mentioned, that nothing can be added. This, in brief, may here suffice for the surplice, that reason and experience teaches, that decent ornaments and habits preserve reverence and awe; held, therefore, necessary to the solemnity of royal acts, and acts of justice; and why not as well to the solemnity of religious worship? And in particular no habit more suitable than white linen, which resembles purity and beauty, wherein angels have appeared (Rev. xv.); fit for those whom the Scripture calls angels; and this habit was ancient, according to St. Chrysostom." [Grand Debate, p. 108; Cardwell, p. 350.]

And this might suffice for our purposes in a general view. But I have noticed this topic rather, as affording opportunity for remarking, first, that in our public ministrations at all times and in all places, not only in our consecrated churches, but in any licensed temporary place of worship, the surplice ought to be worn, as the dress of his profession and office, by the ministering Clergyman; and, secondly, for the purpose of stating to you, my Reverend Brethren, collectively, a case which has been submitted to me by more than one of the Clergy of this diocese, and the opinion which I have formed thereupon.

The case is the difficulty experienced, in resuming the service after the sermon, by reason of the requisite change of the dresses, appropriated in practice respectively to the pulpit and the communion table. My solution of the difficulty is comprised in the following suggestions:—First, what is the obligation on a Clergyman to use a dress in the pulpit different from that which he wears during his other ministrations? Secondly, does not the order for his ministrations in general, include his ministrations in the pulpit? and thus would not the surplice be properly worn at any time for the sermon by the parochial Clergy, as it is by those in cathedral churches and college chapels? But, thirdly, at all events, where the circumstances of the case make that dress desirable, does there appear any impropriety in its use?

If indeed, it were at all times worn by the preacher, it might tend to correct an impropriety, not to say an indecency, which is too apt to prevail in our churches, by reason of the change which takes place before the sermon: when the preacher, attended, perhaps, by the other Clergy, if others be present, quits the church for the vestry room, after the Nicene Creed; thus leaving his congregation to carry on a part of the service, admitting psalmody to be such, without their minister; an absolute anomaly, as I apprehend it, in Christian worship, that the people should act without their minister; deprives them of his superintendance during that exercise, and of his example in setting before them the becoming posture and a solemn deportment in celebrating God's praises; and, at length, after an absence of several minutes, during which he has been employing himself in any way but that of common worship with his people in God's house, returns at the close of the psalm to the congregation, and ascends the pulpit in the character of the preacher.

Now all this is, in my judgment, open to much misadversion. And the best mode of correcting it appears to be, for the minister to proceed immediately after the Nicene Creed, to the pulpit, attired as he is, for the Church certainly gives no order or sanction for the change of his attire, and so prepared to take part with his people in the singing, if singing be at that time desirable, or, if not, to proceed at once with his sermon.

But, however this may be, it is evident and incontrovertible, that much awkwardness and inconvenience must be the result of detaining a congregation after the sermon, whilst the minister leaves the church, and returns to a perhaps distant vestry room, in order that he may again attire himself in the dress fitted for prayer: for that he should proceed to the succeeding prayers in any other attire than the surplice, is palpably opposed to the directions of the Church.

The sole mode of obviating this difficulty is for the minister to preach in his surplice. It will be observed, that I assume the resumption and continuance of the communion service after the sermon. I do so for this reason, that, however common may be in practice a deviation from the rule, the rule itself is plain, unequivocal, and imperative, as we find in the first paragraph of the Rubric after the Communion, that "upon the Sundays and other holy days (if there be no communion, until the end of the general prayer "For the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth, together with one or more of these Collects last before rehearsed, concluding with the blessing." This also, be it observed, is the proper, the only proper, because it is the prescribed time, for saying the sentences at the Offertory, and collecting the alms of the congregation. It is only, indeed, by making the collection in connection with the continuance of the service after the sermon, that a religious character is given to the collection. And this is no mean consideration. But the consideration which my general argument induces me to impress upon you, is that the Church directs "the alms for the poor and other devotions of the people to be received," after the sermon, and whilst the Offertory "sentences are in reading," and so "to be reverently brought to the priest, and to be humbly presented by him and placed upon the holy table," and by him commended to God's most merciful acceptance, in conjunction with the prayers which the Church, as hath been already noticed, thereupon orders to be offered unto the divine Majesty.

12. With the hope of satisfying the minds of some of you, my Reverend Brethren, whom I know to take an interest on this topic, and who, on any occasion of "diversity or doubt" relating to your use and practice of the directions of the Book of Common Prayer, are entitled to your diocesan's sentiments, I may have dwelt on the foregoing question somewhat longer than was required by my more immediate purpose of specifying puritanical irregularities. However, I now revert to that purpose with the intention, before I conclude this address, of noting briefly two or three questions affecting our ministrations of the two holy sacraments of our Lord.

In these respects, as in others which have been specified, questions arose in controversy between the Church and her puritanical opponents.

To the Rubric of the Church, that, in order to the baptism of infants, "the godfathers and godmothers, and the people with the children, must be ready at the font at the prescribed time;" the Nonconformists objected, "Here is no mention of the parents, in whose right the child is baptised, and who are fittest both to dedicate it to God, and to undertake to God and the Church for it. We do not know that any persons (except the parents, or some other appointed by them) have any power to consent for the children, or to enter into covenant. We desire it may be left free to parents, whether they will have surties to undertake for their children in Baptism." [Grand Debate, p. 18; Cardwell, p. 323.] But to this it was answered by the Episcopal divines, "It is an erroneous doctrine, and the ground of many others, and of many of your exceptions, that children have no other right to Baptism than in their parents' right. The Church's primitive practice forbids it to be left to the pleasure of parents whether there shall be other surties or not. It is fit that we should observe carefully the practice of venerable antiquity as they desire." [Grand Debate, p. 130; Cardwell, p. 355.] And "it hath been accounted reasonable, and allowed by the best laws,

that guardians should covenant and contract for their minors to their benefit; by the same right the Church hath appointed surties to undertake for children, when they enter into covenant with God by Baptism; and this general practice of the Church is enough to satisfy those that doubt." [Grand Debate, p. 131; Cardwell, p. 355.] "And so the Rubric was left unaltered, its purport being more clearly and decidedly expressed by the twenty-ninth Canon, which decrees, "No parent shall be urged to be present, nor be admitted to answer as godfather for his own child."

Again, as to the position of the baptismal font, the Puritans desired, that "it may be so placed as all the congregation may best see and hear the whole administration." [Grand Debate, p. 19; Cardwell, p. 324.] and this drew from the Episcopal divines the remark, that "the font usually stands as it did in primitive times, at or near the church door, to signify that Baptism was the entrance into the Church mystical; 'we are all baptised into one body,' 1 Cor. xii. 13 [Grand Debate, p. 131; Cardwell, p. 355]; a remark well worthy of the attention of modern improvers, who seem oftentimes studious to place the font anywhere but in its proper significant position, if, indeed, they admit any font at all."

Again, whereas the Church permitted private Baptism to be administered to infants "upon a great and reasonable cause to be approved by the Curate," but required them to be afterwards brought into the Church to be witnessed by the congregation; the Puritans objected to the form provided for their reception, and signified their desire, that, "where it is evident that any child hath been so baptised, no part of the administration may be reiterated in public under any limitation; and, therefore, we see no need of any Liturgy in that case." [Grand Debate, p. 20; Cardwell, p. 325.] But they were answered, "Nor is anything done in private reiterated in public; but the solemn reception into the congregation, with the prayers for him, and the public declaration before the congregation of the infant, is now made by the godfathers, that the whole congregation may testify against him, if he does not perform it, which the ancients made great use of." [Grand Debate, p. 133; Cardwell, p. 356.] Thus, if private Baptism, in a case "of great cause and necessity," be allowed by the Church to her ministers, it is allowed only on the deliberate condition, that the child so baptised be admitted into the congregation with the public solemnity specially provided for that purpose.

And here I cannot but draw your attention to the absence of all solemnity, which frequently accompanies the ministrations of this holy ordinance of our Lord, notwithstanding the care of the Church for its due celebration, by directing that it be celebrated after previous notice to the Curate, at the font, publicly before the congregation, immediately after the last lesson at morning or at evening prayer. A general and systematic neglect of these provisions, which, I fear, be regarded as too prevalent in our ministrations, whilst it is a palpable violation of the Church's laws, is calculated to bring disrepute on the holy sacrament of Baptism. Nay, I am persuaded, my Reverend Brethren, that more wholesome, more scriptural, and sounder views would commonly prevail concerning it, if it were carefully administered after such manner as the Church prescribes.

For, not to mention other advantages, I will limit myself to one which falls in with the course of the present observations, namely, that the people of the Church would be habituated to connect the idea of regeneration or the new birth with the admission of children into her fold by holy Baptism, when they hear her by her minister taking her Saviour's declaration concerning the necessity of "any one being born again of water and the Holy Spirit," for the foundation of her baptismal service; praying, that "the child now to be baptised may be regenerate;" affirming, that "after he is baptised he is regenerate;" thanking God, that "he has been pleased by baptism to regenerate him."

In truth, every reference in every formulary of the Church, where notice is taken of regeneration, speaks of it as the spiritual grace of holy Baptism. But, as to the baptismal service in particular, both the objections of the puritanical nonconformists, and the defence of the representatives of the Church at the Savoy Conference, manifest its meaning. For whereas to the prayer in Baptism, that this child "may receive remission of sins by spiritual regeneration," the Puritans objected: "This expression seeming inconvenient, we desire it may be changed into this, 'May be regenerate, and receive remission of sins.'" [Grand Debate, p. 20; Cardwell, p. 324.] The Episcopal divines made answer that the prayer was "most proper; for Baptism is our spiritual regeneration." (St. John, iii.) "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, &c. And by this is received remission of sins, (Acts, ii. 3.) 'Repent, and be baptised every one of you, for the remission of sins.'" So the Creed, "One baptism for the remission of sins." [Grand Debate, p. 132; Cardwell, p. 356.] And whereas to the affirmation, "that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant by thy Holy Spirit," the Puritans objected, "We cannot in faith say, that every child that is baptised is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit; at least, it is a disputable point, and therefore we desire it may be otherwise expressed." [Grand Debate, p. 20; Cardwell, p. 325.] The Episcopal divines answered, "Seeing that God's sacraments have their effects, where the receiver doth not *ponere obicem*, put any bar against them, which children cannot do, we may say in faith of every child that is baptised, that it is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit; and the denial of it tends to anapostasy and the contempt of this holy sacrament, as nothing worth nor material, whether it be administered to children or no." [Grand Debate, p. 132; Cardwell, p. 356.]

13. In the office also of the Holy Communion, there were certain objections which caused debate between the ministers of the Church and their sectarian opponents. The priest at the commencement of the service, and in other parts of it, was directed to "stand at the north side of the Lord's table," and at certain periods to "turn himself to the people."—Against this the Puritans excepted, "the minister's turning himself to the people is most convenient throughout the whole ministration." [Grand Debate, p. 16; Cardwell, p. 320.] But the exception was met by the counter-positon, explanatory of the rule. "The minister's turning to the people is not most convenient throughout the whole ministration; when he speaks to them, as in lessons, absolution, and benedictions, it is convenient that he turn to them; when he speaks for them to God, it is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church ever did!" [Grand Debate, p. 125; Cardwell, p. 355.]

And again, in the distribution of the bread and wine, where the Rubric directed, "then shall the minister first receive the communion in both kinds, &c., and after deliver it to the people in their hands, kneeling; and when he delivereth the bread, he shall say, The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." &c. To this the Nonconformists excepted, "We desire that at the distribution of the bread and wine to the communicants...the minister be not required to deliver the bread and wine into every particular communicant's hand, and to repeat the words to each one in the singular number, but that it may suffice to speak them to divers jointly." [Grand Debate, p. 17; Cardwell, p. 321.] But what was the Churchmen's answer? "It is most requisite, that the minister deliver the bread and wine into every particular communicant's hand, and repeat the words in the singular number; for so much as it is the propriety of sacraments to make particular obligation to each believer; and it is our visible profession, that by the grace of God Christ tasted death for every man." [Grand Debate, p. 110; Cardwell, p. 354.] Thus the Puritans distinctly put forward the direction in the Rubric, as one concerning the meaning of which

there was no room for doubt; and thus the Churchmen admitted the direction, as one the meaning of which was unquestionable, at the same time affirming its fitness, stating the reasons of it, and arguing for its propriety.

At the same time there is a remarkable circumstance belonging to this objection and its consequences. For, whereas the Puritans objected to the Rubric as it then stood, the Episcopal divines introduced into it indeed a small verbal alteration, but the alteration was such as to make, if possible, even more stringent the usage to which the Puritans objected. For the former Rubric, before the delivery of the bread, had directed, "when he delivereth the bread, he shall say," and before the delivery of the cup had directed, "the minister that delivereth the cup shall say," without specifying to whom; but the altered Rubric directed the delivery of each to every particular communicant, "when he delivereth the bread to any one, he shall say," and "the minister that delivereth the cup to any one shall say." Thus the objection of the Puritans was more pointedly rebutted: the sense of the Church was, if possible, more deliberately and positively affirmed; and the wilfulness of any of her sons, who might afterwards adopt the Puritanical objection, and deviate from their prescribed line of duty and conformity, was declared to be more exceedingly wilful.

14. After this manner, my Reverend Brethren, several questions relating to the provisions of the Church, which had occupied the minds and pens of the Episcopal and Presbyterian divines in the 17th century, were brought to a point and decided at the Savoy Conference. Objections advanced on the foregoing particulars were answered, and a decision was made by the succeeding "Act for the uniformity of public prayer," in favour of the course which the Church had previously followed, and in which it was then determined for her in future to persevere. This decision, my brethren, is the rule of our conduct, as the Church's ministers. And if we deviate from that rule, it appears from the foregoing specification that we are so far not only forfeiting our pledge of ministerial obedience, but we are ranking ourselves with the opponents of the Church's judgment and authority, however our professional stipulations, and our confidential position in the ministry of the Church, may mask to the public eye the uncomely features of our dissent and non-conformity.

15. The foregoing observations have been offered to your minds, my Reverend Brethren, as suggested by a particular occurrence in our Ecclesiastical History, and as affecting us in the regular discharge of our ministerial commission. It was in my mind to submit two or three other matters to your consideration: thus I would fain have prompted you to lament and deprecate with me the prevalence of other emanations of the same innovating and disorderly spirit, indicated by the facts, that whilst there generally exists an habitual omission, not only of the daily morning and evening prayers of the Church, but of her provisions for those days also which she has appointed to be kept holy, particularly for those which she has dedicated to a commemoration of events in her blessed Saviour's life and ministry, an arbitrary will-worship has grown up in many of our congregations, which the Church directs not, nor approves; that in many is found a substitution of voluntary prayer meetings, for the regular Church services; of extemporaneous unauthorised effusions, for her solemn Liturgy; that in others a curtailment or modification of her prescript form of divine worship has been introduced to make way for a longer sermon; that to a great extent there has been ingrafted on her devotional provisions, not only strange versions of the psalms, but hymns of private composition; and that in numerous instances has been adopted the use of unconsecrated and unlicensed dwelling-houses, or the substitution of the vestry-room for the body of the church, as places of public worship. I would fain also have led you to consider, how far any projects for religious improvement, independent of the Church's governors, ought to be instituted or countenanced by her ministers and people; and especially how far periodical meetings of Clergymen of the second and third orders in the metropolis, from the several dioceses of the country, without Episcopal sanction, superintendance, and control; under the presidency of a presbyter; for the offering of open, unauthorised prayers, and for the public discussion of stated theological subjects; be agreeable to the constitution, the discipline, the good order, and the welfare of the National Church. This allusion to the subject may, however, suffice to direct your minds to reflection upon it; and may lead you to apprehend, that your presence at such meetings is hardly likely to receive your diocesan's approval, if, indeed, it does not encounter his positive discouragement.

But I have occupied you, I fear, already much too long. I will add only my admonition and prayer, that forbearing all rash attempts at visionary improvement, on the side of either Romanism or Puritanism, we may by God's grace cling to the substantial blessings of our actual ecclesiastical provisions; and continue to testify our hearty and humble thankfulness to Almighty God for these his mercies, by an undeviating attachment to the polity, the Liturgy, and the doctrine of the Church, AS SHE IS.

With reference to the observations in the foregoing Charge, on the mode of administering the Holy Communion, proposed by the Presbyterians and rejected by the Bishops and their assistants at the Savoy Conference, I will beg the attention of my Clergy, and of the reader generally, to a small volume entitled, *Communio Fidei, an Historical Inquiry into the Mode of distributing the Holy Communion, prescribed by the United Church of England and Ireland*. By the Rev. JOHN CLARKE CROFTWATHE, M.A., &c. For diligence and accuracy of research, for clearness of arrangement, and for its unanswerable strength of argument, this little tract cannot be too highly prized by those, who feel "a godly jealousy" for the due administration of the Church's ordinances. Should another edition of the tract be called for, as I heartily hope it may be, I would take the liberty of submitting to the learned author the convenience of adding an English translation of the Latin quotations, for the benefit of some readers, whom I happen to know to have been somewhat baffled by this omission in their perusal of the tract, in the argument of which they feel a deep interest. I add, what also I know to be the fact, that persons such as these have been subjected to great distress of mind, and were actually driven from the Lord's Table at which they were wont to communicate; and compelled to seek repose elsewhere, by the unlawful mode of distributing the bread and the cup, condemned in the foregoing Charge, as well as in the *Communio Fidei*. R. D. C. and D. June 21st, 1842.

THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, AUGUST 19, 1842.

THE CHARGE of the Right Rev. Dr. Mant, the Lord Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore, embraces so many subjects of vital importance both in a scriptural and ecclesiastical point of view, that in some inconvenience, we have felt it our duty to insert it entire. Let not its length deter any sincere member of the Church from approaching the perusal of it. Let not those of our communion, in this age of excitement and enquiry and intellectual irritation, incur the opprobrious charge of not knowing why they are members of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, and of not being able to enumerate the marks by which she is distinguished from "Romish superstition" on the one hand, and "Protestant latitudinarianism" on the other. It is no slight gratification and encouragement to us in our humble but arduous vocation, that we have put forth no views but what have received the sanction of those illustrious divines, whose grave monuments have lately rendered our columns so valuable and so interesting.

Few in Canada, perhaps not six persons, have read the Oxford Tracts; but the errors which they contain,—amidst many great, though neglected, truths,—have probably gained a more general circulation; and, therefore, it is well for every one to follow Bishop Mant through his examination of these celebrated publica-

tions, so that he may be able to steer a safe and scriptural path amidst the conflicting religious opinions now occupying so great a share of the world's attention. Dissent, at present, is the enemy from which the Church in Canada has most to fear; but the sky is not without its signs, that Popery,—taking advantage of our divisions, and of the countless absurdities and heresies which have disgraced the otherwise glorious name of Protestantism,—is about making a grand effort for regaining her lost, and, we pray, her irrecoverable, supremacy.

At the same time, Bishop Mant is equally strenuous in cautioning his Clergy against the evils of Dissent, and against "confounding self-constituted sects with lawful Churches, and imagining schism and sectarianism to be no sin."

One part of the Charge will perhaps have a particular interest for the Clergy of this Diocese,—we mean that towards the end, in the paragraph marked 11, relating to the use of the Surplice in the pulpit. This was a question very ably contested in our last volume, by two or three correspondents; and we feel bound to say that JOXA and B. C. P. are sustained by the high sanction of Bishop Mant. For our own part we never expressed an opinion upon the point, but we certainly ventured to recommend that Clergymen should not set aside the custom now prevalent, and return to the obsolete, and, as we believe, rubrical, practice, without first consulting their Bishop. "If," says Bishop Terrot, "there be any points which you (the Clergy) see to be generally, and to have been for a long time neglected, you may then lawfully consider whether such neglect by the enacting body does not amount to a virtual repeal; and before attempting to re-introduce any such antiquated and unusual practice, however rubrical," I would advise you not only to study the temper and preparation of the congregation among which you minister, but also officially to consult your Bishop, part of whose weighty duties it is to take upon himself the responsibility in such matters." In this advice, we believe, other Bishops have concurred.

The Charge should be read, from first to last, by every reader of clerical or lay. Every sentence is full of weighty matter: the outline of the "Savoy Conference" is a clear and valuable summary; and the paragraph marked 15, at almost every end, touches upon many points, most seriously affecting the unity of the Church. When our Bishops deliver themselves thus Scripturally, thus learnedly, who can say that "the trumpet gives an uncertain sound?"

We have gathered together a few paragraphs of interest from the journals of the American Church.

"CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS.—At a meeting of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Maine, held on the 19th ult., Mr. Davenport, late pastor of the Congregational Church in Gorham, and Professor Goodwin, of Bowdoin College, and Mr. Frederick Gardner, were received as Candidates for Holy Orders.—N. Y. Churchman, Aug. 13.

"ORDINATION.—On Sunday, Aug. 7th, in Trinity Church, Southwark, Philadelphia, Edward C. Jones and Asaiah Prior, (lately a Presbyterian minister,) were admitted to the Holy Order of the Bishop H. W. Onderdonk."—Episcopal Recorder, August 13.

"SEPARATION.—The Rev. S. W. Wilson, of East Cambridge, together with the [?] of which he was placed, has seceded from the Methodist Episcopal body. It appears that Mr. W. was in the habit, last year, of exchanging pulpits with Unitarian and Universalist ministers, and his church [?] meeting with these denominations in holding conference meetings." At the last session of the M. E. Conference, these irregular proceedings were brought under review; and after due deliberation, the following resolution was transmitted to Mr. Wilson, by the conference, through the secretary: "Resolved, that the course taken by the Rev. S. W. Wilson, in commencing, and exchanging pulpits, with Unitarians, meets with our decided disapprobation, and that he be required to desist from such a course in future." The result was, Mr. W. and the society under his care at once withdrew from the M. E. Church [?], and his language now is, "I stand for the Christian world free, unfettered, and independent." How true it is that "into every form of dissent enters the spirit of schism." And why should it not be so, when dissent is itself the offspring of schism? and when, among the great majority of Dissenters, divisions are justified as necessary stimuli to Christian effort, and to emulous activity in duty?—Boston Witness and Advocate, August 13.

Some of our American Episcopal contemporaries, be it said with all respect and kindness towards them, are not sufficiently guarded and definite in their use of Ecclesiastical terms. Words are the representatives of things; and the use or non-use, for instance, of "Church," with reference with Dissent; and of "Catholic," with reference to Popery; involves questions of the highest importance.

Some of the Quebec and Montreal papers have lately devoted four or five columns to a correspondence that has been carried on between some gentlemen, relative to a dispute arising out of the late Quebec races.

The correspondence we have not read, and feel no interest about it. But it is not to be lamented that so much attention should be paid by the public journals to such subjects? and is it not the duty of the press to discountenance, rather than encourage, amusements, such as horse-racing, which are invariably attended with drunkenness, profligacy, and gambling, and which already have poured an additional flood of vice upon those parts of the Province where they have been established?

Would any sensible parent, approve of his son being addicted to horse-racing? Would any merchant place trust in a clerk, addicted to horse-racing? Would any man, sincerely anxious for his eternal salvation,—addict himself to horse-racing, and its inseparable concomitant, betting, or as it may be more truly and plainly called, gambling?

Let