

all our happiness. This divine teaching is peculiarly promised under the gospel dispensation: *all thy children shall be taught of the Lord.* Isa. liv. 13. It is the superior excellence of the new beyond the old covenant, that God has promised that all truly interested in it, from the least to the greatest, shall have divine illumination. *They shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest.* Jer. xxxi. 34.—Heb. viii. 11. It is true that spiritual blessings come by hearing, but only as God in his sovereign love gives the increase. It is true that there are different degrees of knowledge, and that due means must be used to increase our knowledge. (1 John ii. 21.) yet it is perfectly clear that Christians in general have a teaching beyond and superior to man's teaching; seeing St. John says to all, *ye need not that any man teach you: but, as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him,* 1 John ii. 27.

Nothing can be more important than such promises. Amidst the countless varieties of opinions, formed even by those who study the sacred records,—amidst the multitude of religious controversies of every kind,—amidst the bustle and distractions of the various occupations of life, pressing on our immediate attention for our necessary maintenance, or for our continual welfare, O how great the necessity and the value of an infallible teacher!

'Yes,' urge the Romanists: 'and such a teacher we present you in our Church; a human, yet an abiding and an infallible guide.' Alas! all pretences to a human guide of this character are disproved, not only as God has never promised such a teacher, but as those by whom the claim has been advanced, whether they be popes or councils, have maintained and promulgated perfectly opposite opinions. Even teachers rendered infallible under a divine inspiration, and generally allowed to be such, could not wholly prevent different opinions respecting important truths. We see this in the apostolic age. The apostles were living, they were the authors of the Christian books, they were divinely inspired, yet even in their days there was a *Diotrephes*, there were *evil men and seducers*, there were *false teachers*. There was no want of light and evidence as to truth, but the want of a sanctified heart to receive it, so that, even apostolical authority could not prevent heresy. If they could not, how vain must be the hopes of uninspired teachers, whose pretences to infallibility are rendered perfectly nugatory by the interminable disputes where it is lodged.

The actual state of man sufficiently accounts for this tendency to different opinions. Man is a fallen creature, with many sinful dispositions, full of pride and vanity, seeking distinction and self-elevation. Christianity meets and opposes every sin. While men's deeds are evil, they will try in all ways to change a standard which thwarts every corruption, or to make that very standard a means of earthly and individual glory. These things necessarily produce great differences, and show the need and importance of a teaching beyond man's, which shall change the inner man, renew the heart, and dispose our minds to attend to, and duly receive and comprehend, spiritual and eternal things.

Besides the corruption of the heart, let it never be forgotten that there is a malignant spirit who worketh in the children of disobedience. He is the great deceiver. He first led Eve into fatal error, and the apostolic caution is of great importance, *I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity which is in Christ.*

The distinction of the whole human race into two classes, the *righteous and the wicked*, illustrates this subject. Dr. Buchanan, preaching at Cambridge, and speaking of the present as an era of light, which he proves by the efforts now making to spread the gospel, says: 'It is of vast consequence to the purity and perpetuity of our church, that those students who are preparing to enter it, should have just views on this subject. There is one fact which ought frequently to be illustrated to them, as being the foundation on which they are to form a judgment on this and other parts of the divine dispensation. It is the following:—'It is an undoubted truth; constantly asserted by Scripture, and demonstrated by experience, that there ever have been two descriptions of persons in the church. They are denominated by our Saviour, the *children of light and the children of this world*, and again, the *children of the wicked one and the children of the kingdom.* Mat. xiii. 38. These different terms originate entirely from our receiving that illumination which God, who cannot lie, has promised to give to them that ask him. For if a man supplicate the Father of lights for his good and perfect gift, with a humble and believing spirit, he will soon be sensible of the effect on his own mind. Another consequence will be this; he will learn, for the first time, what is meant by the reproach of the world.—Sermons, p. 57.

Here then is the true and the only infallible Teacher, the Holy Spirit, who guides into all truth. For ever blessed be God, that he has promised such a Teacher, and given us the cheering, consoling, and delightful hope that he will instruct us.—Selected by an Absent Friend.

To be continued.

THE SURPLICE IN PREACHING.

Preaching is a distinct, and in its use, contingent ordinance; it is neither liturgical nor sacramental, nor even actually sacerdotal. Nay, a priest and a preacher are, as to discipline, quite different characters; a preacher in our Church need not be a priest, nor is a priest necessarily a preacher. A sermon is not a substantial portion of any liturgical service, although permitted to be introduced, for example at Communion time, and at the solemnization of matrimony. It is in the service, but not of it. It was a frequent custom in cathedrals, and is now in some parish churches, not to have a sermon at all in the morning, when there was a Communion. The sermon is no more part of the Communion Service than banners are part of the Liturgy,

though allowed to be read. No more are citations or Episcopal Charges parts of the Liturgy, though read at the Communion-table. The case is this. Every clergyman appears in the church in a double capacity:—as a priest, and also as a preacher. As a priest, when ministering prayers, sacraments and all other liturgical ceremonies, he is enjoined to appear in the liturgical garb, superadded to his common dress. As a ministering priest, a clergyman is the representative and voice of the Church, and in the use of the Liturgy he is delivering her written unalterable doctrines, and, therefore, she clothes him with a specific dress for this solemn purpose; but in the pulpit he delivers his sermon as an expounder of the word of God: here he is no longer the voice of the Church, no longer her sacerdotal organ, but he stands in the exercise of his own private judgment, expounding with his own glosses and additions, liable to error, and sometimes actually in error. Here, then, in the pulpit, he divests himself of his liturgical garb, and appears in his ordinary dress, that is, his gown and cassock. This was, in former times, the usual daily dress of a clergyman; and the truth is (though use has given currency to a different notion) he does not for the purpose put on the gown, but puts off the surplice. And here the Bishop's clever hit fails:—'If, says he, the gown were necessary, the churchwardens would have been bound to provide one.' No. The gown is not necessary, but the surplice is positively improper. He might, with the same coolness, have observed, that if a coat and waistcoat were necessary, the churchwardens would be bound to provide them. The real truth is, that the priest would be more in character in the pulpit in his plain clothes, than in his surplice, the gown and cassock having ceased to be his common dress. It is curious that Shakespeare alludes to the usual dress of the priest as distinct from his ministering dress:—'He will wear the surplice of humility over the black gown of his big heart.' The sermon is kept everywhere most distinct from the Sacrament in the Act of Uniformity, in the Articles, in the Canons, and in the Book of Common Prayer. How can that be Liturgy, which is often unwritten and extempore, which is always discretionary, always varying; in which the afternoon preacher may differ from the morning preacher, in which the same preacher may differ from himself.

How then happens it that in cathedrals the preachers wear their surplices? The answer is—because there the surplice is the official dress of all, laics as well as clerics, at Communion Service; and at that time the surplice is as much the ordinary dress, as the gown was in ordinary circumstances.—Rev. C. F. Le Grice.

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1845.

Turning from the important subject of Provincial interest, the Common School Bill, which took up much space in the last two numbers of the *Berean*, to the accounts which have reached us of ecclesiastical affairs in the mother country, our attention is required by two documents which will have great influence, we may anticipate. The first is the letter from His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, printed in our last number, in consequence of which the Lord Bishop of Exeter, by a letter inserted in our number before last, has revoked all his orders for rubrical conformity, stating that he will merge his "own separate endeavours" in that common effort which His Grace has announced his intention to promote, "when the way shall be prepared for a final settlement." The reflection naturally presents itself, what a pity it is that separate endeavours ever were commenced.

It will be remembered that the Bishop of Exeter treated the notion of a common effort as an absurdity, when it was suggested by the Chapter of Exeter Cathedral, in opposition to His Lordship's wishes; yet it is embraced since it has been adopted by the Metropolitan. To clear up this discrepancy, it has to be borne in mind that the former suggestion came at a time when it was hoped that the whole Diocese of Exeter would be made to move in the "advance" at its Diocesan requirement, and so commence a movement of authorization to practices, generally considered as distinctive of the Tractarian party, which might have reached the remotest borders of the Church—while the Archbishop's letter made its appearance after the discovery of a determined spirit of resistance in the Lait, and an aversion to the proposed changes, even in the Clergy, which it was not safe to provoke beyond the strong expressions of reprobation which were heard from all parts of the Diocese of Exeter. We see in that letter a kind and paternal demonstration to facilitate the Bishop of Exeter's retreat from the perilous position to which he had advanced; and we are thankful for the result. If the Bishop's course had succeeded, there can be no doubt but it would have strengthened the Tractarian cause beyond calculation, whereas its failure is a "heavy blow and discouragement" to it, for which we see reason to praise God who watches over that protestant character of the Church which has been acquired at the expense of the blood of many martyrs.

We are of course equally far from imputing unworthy designs to the Bishop of Exeter, and from approving in every respect the opposition which he has met with. Nor would we pronounce upon the motives even of those in whom another "heavy blow and discouragement" has recently been inflicted upon the Tractarian party, as we report to our readers in the condensed statement headed "the Cambridge Round Church Case." The importance which has been attached to Mr. Faulkner's resistance to the Camden Society may be judged of from the circumstance that voluntary subscriptions were sent in from all parts, to refund to him the great expense to which he was put by law-charges; the Bishop of Landaff among others remitted £5. as we perceived not long ago, with a letter expressive of the interest he took in the issue. But while we deal tenderly with men as to their motives, we must use the light we have in judging of the tendency of their doings; and after reading over the judgment recently delivered in the Court of Arches against the Stone Altar and Credence Table in the Round Church, we are afresh moved to devout gratitude for the explicit recognition therein made of features distinguishing our reformed doctrine and worship from those of the Church of Rome, and the discountenance given to innovations which, whether so designed or not, certainly in effect favoured the return of the Church of England to the corruptions in doctrine, and fooleries in worship from which she was delivered by the Reformers.

ECCLESIASTICAL.

CLERGY RESERVES.—The Committee to whom the House of Assembly had referred the Petitions of numerous members of the Church of England in the two Dioceses, respecting the present management of the Clergy Reserves, have presented a report dated 19th February, which has been printed, and is a document of considerable interest to all who are concerned in the eventual proceeds of the endowment made for purposes of public worship and religious instruction, though the members of our Church alone have at this time been petitioning for some measure calculated to secure a portion of it to its proper destination.

The Committee refer to the fact that in the neighbouring republican State of New York, the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church\* and the numerous Dutch population are enabled to make extensive provision for religious worship by the means formerly set apart by the government, which "being scrupulously preserved and respected by succeeding governments, now yield most munificent resources for the support of religion." The ample endowments now enjoyed by our R. catholic fellow-subjects in Lower Canada are in like manner adverted to, and the conclusion arrived at by the Committee is unfavourable to the Imperial Act which places the Clergy Reserves at the disposal of the Government to divide the proceeds, but does not contemplate their transfer to the different religious bodies, in the shares allotted to them, for their own management.

On investigating the allegation that the charges hitherto incurred for inspection and management of the Clergy Reserves have in a great measure consumed the fund which was designed for the religious instruction of the people, the Committee find that

"in addition to a deduction of five per cent. out of all moneys received by the District Agents, and besides the charge of remunerating a large number of Inspectors of Clergy Reserves, who have been appointed to be paid by the day, at a rate not specified in the Returns, the proceeds of these lands are also charged, by an order of the Government made in August, 1841, with forty per cent. for the expense of the Crown Land Department. Up to the time of that return, it appears that in Lower Canada there had been no sales of Clergy Reserves since the 1st of January, 1833, and that since the Union of the Provinces not more than about £1,150 had been received on account of the funds, while £609, or more than one half of the whole amount received, had been charged against it as disbursed for expenses.

"In the first half of the year 1813, the whole moneys collected in Lower Canada seem not to have exceeded £75 16s. 6d., while the disbursements charged against the fund are £431 9s. 2d.

"In Upper Canada, it appears by the same documents that the sales of Reserves had been few for some time previously, though large sums had been received on account of previous sales.

"In the year 1842, the collections amounted to £18,000, and the disbursements to £5,196.

"For the year 1813, the amount collected up to the 1st July, is stated at about £7,000, and the charges at £1,763 11s. 3d., and while so large a sum as that above mentioned has been charged against the fund for disbursements, there appears to have been only a sale of two hundred acres effected during that period, at the price of £90.

"From the information above stated, it appears to your Committee that there is really no proportion or connexion whatever between the service rendered to the fund and the charges which are imposed upon it.

"Your Committee, therefore, for the considerations stated, beg leave respectfully to suggest to Your Honourable House to adopt an Address to Her Most Gracious Majesty, beseeching Her Majesty to recommend to

\*The document calls it, oddly enough, "the Church of England."

the Imperial Parliament to amend the said Act, passed in the fourth year of Her Majesty's reign, so as to place at the disposal of the Church of England their share of the said Reserves in Upper and Lower Canada, to be controlled and managed by the respective Incorporated Church Societies of the Dioceses of Toronto and Quebec, and to entrust to other denominations entitled to a share of the Clergy Reserves Fund, the same advantages, should they so desire.

In presenting to our readers this authentic statement of the success with which the proceeds of these lands have hitherto been disbursed for charges of management, we cannot suppress reference to a certain mathematical process called the *method of exhaustions*: the beauty of it is to bring a given quantity to as good as nothing, by taking away continually a certain part from every remainder that may come to light. We should imagine that the plan for managing the Clergy Reserves must have been devised by a mathematician well acquainted with that process.

THE CAMBRIDGE ROUND CHURCH CASE.

Intense anxiety has for some time been felt as to the issue of an appeal to the Court of Arches, by which the Rev. R. R. Faulkner, minister of the above church, opposed the introduction of a *stone altar and credence table* into the chancel of the same, in the course of extensive alterations, repairs, and restorations which had been entered upon three years ago. The church is one of those three (we believe) existing in England which were built after the model of the church over the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, an interesting specimen of ancient church architecture which it was sought to restore to the builder's original design, according to a plan adopted by minister and churchwardens, under the superintendence and with the assistance of the Cambridge Camden Society. This association has for its object the promotion of church architecture, but has excited great mistrust by the romanizing tendency of its publications and labours. In the course of its aid towards the restoration of the Round Church it had accepted an offer, made by some individual, of a stone structure which was on the one part represented as a *Communion table*, within the meaning of the rubric in the book of Common Prayer, but was by the minister objected to as being an *Altar*, and consequently utterly unauthorized by the Church since the reformation. This table or altar is described by Sir H. Jenner Fust, the Judge of the Arches' Court, as weighing about *two tons*; it consisted of a slab, supported by three upright slabs, resting upon a lower one which was imbedded in mortar or concrete, about an inch below the floor of the chancel; and this structure was also made to adhere to the east wall of the chancel. A smaller structure, under the name of credence-table, was added, which the Judge declared to be intimately connected with the other, neither required nor sanctioned by any law, canon, or constitution, and which must fall if the larger be condemned. The question, therefore, to be decided was, whether the structure before described was a Communion table within the meaning of the rubric and canons of the Church of England?

The learned Judge went into an elaborate investigation of the meaning of the word "table" in this connexion. He clearly showed that the substitution of this word for the one previously in use, namely, "altar," arose from the connexion of the latter with the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, and with the eucharist as a sacrifice. In the Church of Rome, the rubric requires the altar to be made of stone and immovable; a practice which dates from the beginning of the sixth century, until which time, none but wooden tables were used for the celebration of the Lord's supper in the Christian Church. To this primitive practice, the Church of England returned at the time of the reformation, specially providing thereby a safeguard against the notion of a sacrifice in the eucharist, and the doctrine of transubstantiation. The following is Sir H. Jenner Fust's argument from historical documents, commencing at the year 1550 when Bishop Ridley of London issued an injunction to this effect:—

"Whereas some of us use the Lord's board after the form of a table, and some as an altar, whereby dissension is perceived to arise among the unlearned, therefore, wishing a godly unity to be observed in all our dioceses, and for that the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions of the Popish mass, and to the right use of the Lord's Supper, we exhort the curates, churchwardens and quest men here present to erect and set up the Lord's board after the form of an honest table, decently covered, in such place of the choir or chancel as shall be thought most meet by their discretion, so that the ministers with the communicants may have their place separated from the rest of the people; and to take down and abolish all other by-altars or tables." These injunctions were of course confined in the first instance to the diocese of London and in the form of an exhortation. But there was an Order in Council issued to Bishop Ridley, strictly charging and commanding him, for avoiding *strife and contention*, to take down altars and place communion-tables in their stead:—

"We especially charge and command you, for the avoiding of all *strife and contention* about the standing or taking away of the said altars, to give order throughout all your diocese, that with all diligence all the altars in every church or chapel be taken down, and instead of them a table be set up in some convenient part of the chancel; to serve for the ministration of the blessed Communion; and it

appears from Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, that on the 19th November, 1550, letters were sent to every Bishop throughout England to 'pluck down altars.' This 'plucking down and removing of altars,' and the substitution of 'honest tables' in their place, was for the avowed purpose of 'moving and turning the simple from the old superstitious of the Popish mass.' The change intended, therefore, must have been something more than nominal; it must have been substantial. If a change of name only had been intended, there could have been no necessity for removing the altars, since they could have served the office of tables. The alterations, therefore, in the short reign of Edward VI. are very important for the consideration of the Court. In the short reign of Mary, which followed, one of her first acts was the repeal of all the statutes passed in that of Edward VI. respecting religion, and things reverted to the same state as they were at the end of Henry VIII.'s reign; altars were to be re-erected in the churches, and penalties were imposed upon those who, of their own accord, pulled down or destroyed them, and mass was again celebrated. But in the year 1558 Queen Elizabeth ascended the throne, and when she repealed the statutes of Queen Mary, the statutes of Edward VI. were revived. In 1559 orders were issued by Queen Elizabeth for substituting the communion of the sacrament for the high mass, and for placing tables in the churches to the same effect as those issued by Edward VI.—Whereas her Majesty understandeth that in many and sundry parts of the realm the altars of the churches be removed, and tables placed for the administration of the holy sacrament according to the form of the law therefore provided; and in some places the altars be not yet removed, upon opinion conceived of some other order to be taken by Her Majesty's visitors, in the order whereof, saving for uniformity, there seemeth no matter of great moment so that the sacrament be duly and reverently administered, yet for the observation of the one uniformity through the whole realm, and for the better imitation of the law in that behalf, it is ordered that no altar be taken down but by oversight of the curate of the church and the churchwardens, or one of them at the least; and that the holy table in every church be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stood, and there commonly covered, as thereto belongeth, and as shall be appointed by the visitors, and so to stand, saving when the communion of the sacrament is to be distributed, at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the chancel as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministration; and the communicants also more conveniently and in more number communicate with the minister, and after the communion done, from time to time, the same holy table to be placed where it stood before." From this order it is manifest that the tables here meant were something very different from the altars, and that they were moveable; for the direction that it was to be placed where it stood before could not apply to an immovable stone altar. In 1561 it appears that Queen Elizabeth issued advertisements directing amongst other things that parishes should provide "a decent table standing on a frame" for the communion; an expression applicable rather to a wooden table than one made of stone."

The argument goes into further details, to show that no alteration has since been made in the law which so decidedly repudiates the "altar" and insists upon an "honest table," and, alluding to a model standing on the table before the court, of the stone structure erected in the Round Church, the Judge asks:

"Looking to the meaning and interpretation of the word 'table' itself, what would be the ordinary construction which a person would naturally put upon the word? Would he consider that it was an article similar to that represented by the model now on the table of the court? would that be the natural and proper sense which he would attach to the word?"

He arrives at the conclusion that

"No one would suppose the term 'table' to mean an article formed of slabs of stone, fixed, and imbedded in mortar and concrete."

The objection, that according to the rubric "the ornaments of the church and of the minister" ought to be the same as those in use in the second year of Edward VI., at which time stone altars had not been removed, is disposed of by Sir H. Jenner by declaring that "the altar was not considered as an ornament, but as a parcel of the building itself." His opinion seems to be that if altars could be shown to be authorized, it could not be under this rubric which refers only to ornaments.

But his decision is against the "structure" altogether, and with it against the "credence-table." The appeal was from a judgment in favour of both, given by the Chancellor of the diocese of Ely, which judgment is thus reversed by the Court of Arches, and the Churchwardens (opponents to the Rev. Mr. Faulkner) are condemned in the costs of the proceedings of the appeal.

JERUSALEM.—The third annual letter of the Bishop of Jerusalem gives a gratifying account of what has been done since his arrival in the Holy City. He mentions that 37 baptisms are recorded in the register, of which 26 have been confirmed. Nine individuals have been ordained Deacons, and five Priests, (four of them Israelites) who have gone forth as heralds of mercy to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation. At the last ordination on Sunday the 1st Sept. three candidates were ordained for the Missionary Stations of Hebron, Beyrout and Bagdad. Upon that interesting occasion there were fifty seven communicants who received the consecrated elements; the usual number at the regular monthly celebration is from 40 to 50.