

The Church.

"Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

VOLUME XIV., No. 19.]

TORONTO, CANADA, DECEMBER 5, 1850.

[Whole No., DCC.

WEEKLY CALENDAR.

Day	Date	1st Lesson	2nd Lesson
M	Dec. 8	Isalah 5	Acts 8
		" 24	James 1
M	" 9	" 31	Acts 9
		" 32	James 2
T	" 10	" 33	Acts 10
		" 34	James 3
W	" 11	" 35	Acts 11
		" 36	James 4
T	" 12	" 37	Acts 12
		" 38	James 5
F	" 13	" 39	Acts 13
		" 40	1 Peter 1
S	" 14	" 41	Acts 14
		" 42	1 Peter 2
F	" 15	" 25	Acts 15
		" 26	1 Peter 3

ENGLAND.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S VISITATION.

On Saturday morning, November 2nd, the Bishop of London commenced his Visitation in St. Paul's Cathedral. Divine Service commenced at eleven o'clock; and, after the Prayers, a Sermon was preached by the Rev. Henry Mackenzie, Vicar of St. Martins-in-the-Fields.

The names of the Clergy having been called, his Lordship proceeded to deliver the following

CHARGE.

REV. BROTHERN,—On this, the sixth occasion of my calling you together to hear the words of Pastoral admonition and advice, I feel an unwonted degree of anxiety and difficulty in addressing you. Events have recently occurred deeply affecting the character and well-being of that branch of the Universal Church in which it is our privilege to minister, of such a nature that while it is impossible for me to pass them over without notice, it is difficult so to speak of them as not to give offence in some quarters where I would not willingly awaken any feeling of displeasure. But looking to the present position of the Church, and to the uneasiness and disquietude which agitate the minds of many of its most attached and thoughtful members, I feel that I should be wanting in my duty if I did not declare my opinions with great plainness of speech; but, at the same time, I desire to do this in a spirit of gentleness and forbearance, and to say nothing which may serve to increase or perpetuate the unhappy divisions which cripple the energies and impair the usefulness of our Church, and enable our adversaries to assail us with weapons of our own forging. May the Holy Spirit, whose office it is to teach God's faithful people, grant us to have a right judgment in all things, and especially in those which concern the peace of His Church.

GORHAM & THE BISHOP OF EXETER.

I proceed at once to the most important of the questions upon which it will be my duty to touch; that which has arisen out of the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Courts in the case of Mr. Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter. I do not intend to enter at length into the history of those proceedings, nor into a minute examination of the judgment delivered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or, more properly speaking, the report made by them to Her Majesty the Queen. But I feel myself bound to explain to the Clergy of my Diocese the reasons which induced me to withhold my approval of that report; and I am desirous of offering some suggestions as to the measures which should be taken to obviate it, which I would hope may tend to quiet in some measure the minds of those who look upon it as in a high degree injurious, if not absolutely fatal, to the character of the Church, as the keeper and dispenser of God's Truth.

THE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE.

When, in obedience to Her Majesty's commands, I attended the first meeting of the Judicial Committee, I had not read Mr. Gorham's published account of his examination by the Bishop of Exeter, nor was I aware of the extreme opinions which he had avowed. I went into the inquiry with the expectation of finding that he had not transgressed the bounds of that latitude which has been allowed or tolerated ever since the Reformation. Had such proved to be the case, I could have acquiesced in a judgment which, while it recognized that latitude, should have distinctly asserted the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, in the proper sense of the words, to be the doctrine of our Church. But having read, with great attention, Mr. Gorham's publication, I found that it contained assertions wholly irreconcilable, as it appeared to me, with the plain teaching of the Church of England and of the Church Universal in all ages.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have stated that Mr. Gorham's doctrine appears to them to be as follows:—

"That Baptism is a Sacrament generally necessary to salvation, but that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of baptism; that regeneration invariably takes place in baptism; that the grace may be granted before, in, or after baptism; that baptism is an effectual sign of grace, by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it; in them alone it has a wholesome effect, and that without reference to the qualification of the recipient it is not in itself an effectual sign of grace; that infants baptized, dying before actual sin, are certainly saved, but that in no case is regeneration in baptism unconditional."

Had this been a full and accurate account of Mr. Gorham's opinions on the subject of baptism as set forth by himself, and had the reasoning, by which the Judgment of the Judicial Committee is supported been omitted, in part at least, I might have felt less difficulty in assenting to the judgment. It certainly must be admitted that regeneration does not invariably take place in baptism, if such admission be limited to the case of unbelieving or impenitent adults, and that the grace is not so restrained to the rite, but that God may, if it so please Him, grant it separately from the rite, and that it is an effectual sign of grace to them only who worthily receive it; the question being whether all infants are worthy recipients; and, lastly, that in no case is regeneration in baptism unconditional, the question being what are the conditions to be fulfilled.

But Mr. Gorham's assertions are not fully nor adequately represented by the foregoing statement. His real errors, as I consider them to be, are of a more serious nature; being, as far as I can understand his language, not merely of a doubtful tendency with reference to the Church's doctrine, but precisely and dogmatically opposed to that doctrine. These errors are passed over in silence by the Judicial Committee in their elaborate report to the Queen, a silence which is, in one point of view, satisfactory, inasmuch as, if it does not expressly condemn the errors in question, it certainly does not expressly vindicate nor in terms sanction them. "Mr. Gorham," says the Judicial Committee, "maintains that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of baptism, that regeneration invariably

ably takes place in baptism; that the grace may be granted before, in, or after baptism." It is true that Mr. Gorham asserts this in some of his answers; but in others he goes much further, and advances positions from which it follows as a necessary inference, not only that there may be cases in which infants are not regenerated in and by baptism, but that they are in no case so regenerated; that infants, duly baptized, may be regenerated, but that, if they are, it is before baptism, by an act of preventive grace; and that so they come to baptism already regenerated; that forgiveness of sins, the new nature, adoption into the family of God, the being made "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven," are benefits conferred on "worthy recipients,"—"not in baptism, but by an act of preventive grace given by God before baptism,"—so making them worthy recipients of the rite, that baptism is so far an effectual sign of God's grace bestowed beforehand, implanting a new nature, and strengthening and confirming faith in him. Thus, according to Mr. Gorham, the strengthening and confirming of faith is the whole of the spiritual grace bestowed in baptism, even on worthy recipients; faith, forgiveness of sins, regeneration, the new nature, and adoption into the family of God, have been all bestowed upon such, if at all, before baptism.

It did not appear to me possible to reconcile such statements as these with the plain and unequivocal teaching of the Church of England as to the nature of a Sacrament. They seemed to me to be a plain denial of that which the Church asserts, that an infant is made in and by baptism (not before nor after it) a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. If there be any meaning in words, those statements are express contradictions of the truth that in a Sacrament the outward and visible part, or sign, is a means whereby we receive the inward and spiritual grace, as well as a pledge to assure us thereof. If this theory of Mr. Gorham's be true, then is baptism no longer a Sacrament according to the Church's definition, nor can we, with a safe conscience, continue to teach our children that Catechism which yet the Church declares to be to be learned of every one of her members. It appeared to me then, that those assertions of Mr. Gorham, which were passed over by the Judicial Committee, but to which I could not shut my eyes, went to deprive holy baptism of its sacramental character, and utterly to evacuate its peculiar and distinctive grace. I am not now considering, nor was this the question, before the Judicial Committee, whether Mr. Gorham's theory be defensible as being unrepugnant to the teaching of the Church of England; whether it can be reconciled with the deduction which she has drawn, in accordance with the primitive Church of Christ, from the Word of God, the one infallible source of truth? Now, that Baptismal Regeneration, including in that term the remission of original sin and the implanting of a new principle of spiritual life, is indeed the doctrine of our Church, is, to my mind, so plain that I find it difficult to understand how any person can persuade himself of the contrary. I would repeat, with reference to this question, the observation contained in my Charge delivered to the Clergy of this Diocese in 1842:—

"In the interpretation of the Articles which relate more immediately to doctrine, our surest guide is the Liturgy. It may safely be pronounced of any interpretation of an article which cannot be reconciled with the plain language of the Offices for public worship, that it is not the doctrine of the Church. The opinion, for instance, which denies Baptismal Regeneration might possibly, though not without great difficulty, be reconciled with the language of the 27th Article; but by no stretch of ingenuity nor latitude of explanation can it be brought to agree with the plain unqualified language of the Offices for Baptism and Confirmation. A question may properly be raised as to the sense in which the term Regeneration was used in the early Church and by our own Reformers; but that regeneration does actually take place in baptism is most undoubtedly the doctrine of the English Church; and I do not understand how any Clergyman who uses the office for baptism, which he has bound himself to use, and which he cannot alter nor mutilate without a breach of good faith, can deny that, in some sense or other, baptism is indeed the laver of regeneration."

I cannot for a moment admit that the Articles contain the whole doctrine of the Church of England.

"The Book of Articles," says Bishop Pearson, "is not, nor is pretended to be, a complete body of divinity, or a comprehension and explication of all Christian doctrines necessary to be taught, but an enumeration of some truths which, before and since the Reformation, have been denied by some persons who, upon their denial, are thought unfit to have any cure of souls in this Church or realm."

It was argued by Mr. Gorham's counsel that the Book of Common Prayer is to be considered simply as a guide to devotion, not as defining any doctrine; but it appears to me to be a perfectly inadmissible supposition that, in a solemn act of worship, and especially in the celebration of a Sacrament, any point of doctrine should be embodied as a certain and acknowledged truth, about which the Church entertains any doubt. This would surely be nothing short of addressing the Author of Truth in the language of falsehood. On the contrary, the assumption of a doctrine, as true, in a prescribed form of prayer or thanksgiving to God, is, in fact, the most solemn and positive assertion of that doctrine which can possibly be made. Will any one maintain that if the Articles of religion had contained no direct declaration of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, it would not have been expressly and most solemnly asserted by the Church when she directed her members to pray to the "Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, three persons and one God," or that because the special work of the Holy Ghost in the economy of man's salvation, that of renewing him in the inner man, is not in terms asserted in the Articles, it is, therefore, not asserted by our Church when she instructs us to pray that, having been regenerated and made the children of God by adoption and grace, we may be daily renewed by His Holy Spirit?

I do not understand how any Clergyman can doubt whether the Liturgy is binding upon him, in respect to doctrine, when he remembers the solemn declaration which he has made in the face of the Church:—

"I do hereby declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in the book entitled *The Book of Common Prayer*."

Not only you will observe, his consent to use it, but his assent to everything contained in it. Again it is prescribed by the Act of Uniformity, that every lecturer shall openly declare his "assent unto, and approbation of, the said Book of Common Prayer; and to the use of the prayers, &c., therein contained and prescribed,"—words which are quite incompatible with the notion that nothing more is required of the Clergy than to declare their readiness to use the Book of Common Prayer. Dr. Waterland, speaking of the case of Arian subscription, says of Dr. Samuel Clarke:—

"He was sensible that Articles, Creeds, and Liturgies, must all come into account, and all be reconciled (if possible) to his hypothesis. He made no distinction between the truth of this and the use only of that, well knowing that truth and use are coincident in a case of this high moment, and that he could not submit to the use of the prayers but in such a sense as he thought true."

But all doubt as to the bearing of the Book of Common Prayer upon questions of doctrine, at least with regard to the Sacraments, is removed by the express language of the Canons. The 57th Canon distinctly and authoritatively refers to the Book of Common Prayer as declaring what the doctrine of the Church is with respect to the two Sacraments:—

"The doctrine," it says, "both of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper, is so sufficiently set down in the Book of Common Prayer to be used at administration of the said Sacraments, as nothing that can be added unto it that is material and necessary."

This is a direct assertion that the Baptismal and Eucharistic Offices are dogmatic as well as devotional, and were this authoritative declaration wanting, we should protest against the notion that, in the most solemn acts of prayer and thanksgiving to God, our Church should have permitted herself to employ the strongest and the most unqualified words, without intending them to be understood in their natural sense. This Canon, indeed, says no more than had been said by Bishop Ridley, in his *Last Farewell*, written just before his martyrdom:—

infinite goodness and abundant mercy of Almighty God, great substance, great riches of heavenly treasure, great plenty of God's true and sincere Word, the true and wholesome administration of Christ's Holy Sacraments, the whole profession of Christ's religion truly and plainly set forth in baptism, the plain declaration and understanding of the same, taught in the holy Catechism have been learned of all true Christians."

I need not consider the comparative authority of the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer in questions of doctrine. We are bound to admit the truth of both documents. If there be anything which wears the semblance of contradiction or diversity between the two, we may be sure that the framers of the Articles did not intend it; and, with respect to the two Sacraments, the express declaration of the Canons put forth fifty years after the publication of the Articles, is decisive as to the point that they are to be interpreted in accordance with the plain language of the offices in the Book of Common Prayer. If there be any ambiguity or want of precision in the Articles, as to the effect of Baptism, it is, I think, our obvious duty to have recourse to the office for the administration of that Sacrament, for the purpose of ascertaining the Church's mind on so important a point of doctrine. It is not my intention to discuss at length the meaning and force of the 27th Article, nor would I deny that its language is less precise than that in which many other doctrinal questions are stated and determined; but I cannot believe that, if there be anything ambiguous in that language, such ambiguity was intentional, and studiously employed for the purpose of leaving the construction of that Article to the private persuasion of individuals, considering that the purpose for which the Articles were designed was stated to be "the avoiding of diversities," not merely in teaching, but of opinions. Moreover, if there be some obscurity in the language of the 27th Article, when taken by itself (an obscurity which ceases to exist when that part of the Article which relates to the baptism of adults is distinguished from that which concerns infant baptism) there is none when it is read in connexion with the 25th, which declares the Sacraments to be "not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's good will to us, whereby he doth work invisibly in us." Therefore baptism is an effectual sign of grace in us—that is, a sign producing the effect which it represents, and by baptism God doth work invisibly in us. I would refer you also to another of the Articles, which seems to me very clearly to indicate the sense of those who framed them as to the spiritual effects of baptism. I mean the 16th Article, "of sin after baptism." It says:—

"Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is a sin against the Holy Ghost, and therefore unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives."

It appears to me to be an unavoidable inference from this Article that its framers considered the receiving of the Holy Ghost to be uniformly an effect of baptism, where no bar existed on the part of the recipient, and his inference is rendered certain by the language held by Cranmer in 1538. "Because," he says, "infants are born with original sin, they have need of the remission of that sin; and that is so remitted that its guilt is taken away, albeit the corruption of nature, or concupiscentia, remaining in this life,

UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.

RESIDENT SCHOOL HOUSE.
For the week ending December 9th, 1850.

VISITORS.

THE PRINCIPAL.

JAMES C. MORRISON, M.P.P.

CENSOR.

W. WEDD, Esq., M.A., 3rd Classical Master.

F. W. BARRON, M.A., Principal U.C.C.

CONTENTS OF THIS NUMBER.

First Page.	Ecclesiastical Intelligence—Diocese of Toronto, England.
Second Page.	England.
Third Page.	Communication.
Fourth Page.	Editorial—The Church University.
Fifth Page.	Editorial—The Papal Appoint-
ments; Card;	ments; Card; Scobie's Canadian Almanac
Arrival of the Europa.	Arrival of the Europa.
Gore and Wellington Branch of the Church Society.	Gore and Wellington Branch of the Church Society.
Prospectus of the Young Churchman.	Prospectus of the Young Churchman.
Sixth Page.	Poetry:—Hymn for the Young.
Theology of Incarnation.	Theology of Incarnation.
Two Days at Burlington.	Two Days at Burlington.
The Bargain—The Gainer and the Loser.	The Bargain—The Gainer and the Loser.

Ecclesiastical Intelligence.

DIocese OF TORONTO

WIDOWS AND ORPHANS' FUND.

Collections made in the several Churches, Chapels, and Missionary Stations, throughout the Diocese of Toronto, to be applied to the Fund for the support of the Widows and Orphans of the Clergy in this Diocese. *The twentieth Sunday after Trinity—15th October, 1850.*

Previously announced in No. 16	£259 3 9½
Seymour	£0 10 3
Percy	0 4 9
—per Rev. E. C. Bower	0 15 0
Ops	0 4 0
Emily	0 10 0
—per Rev. R. Harding	0 14 0
St. Peter's, the Credit per Rev. J. Magrath	2 7 10
Caledonia	2 0 0
Cayuga	1 5 0
York	0 15 0
—per Rev. B. C. Hill	4 0 0
St. Mary's, Fromesfield	0 8 1
Trinity Church, Sutherland	1 12 6
Sarnia	1 2 0
Butlers	0 2 5
—per Churchwardens	3 5 0
St. Ann's, Adelaide	0 8 0½
Station, 4 Con. South	0 1 5½
Church, 5 Con. Metcalfe	0 2 10
Church at Katesville	0 3 10
—per Rev. A. Mortimer	0 16 2
Christ Church, Tyndinaga	0 11 9
School-house, Shannonville	0 3 3
—per Rev. G. A. Anderson	0 15 0
Merrickville Church, per Rev. E. Morris	0 13 1½
St. Paul's Church, Sydenham,	
Loborough	0 4 10
St. James' Church, Portland	0 4 6¼
Waldron's Scho l-house, Stor-	
ington	0 3 9
Osbornes	0 7 0
M-Farland	0 3 1½
Additional	0 1 9
—per Rev. T. W. Allen	1 5 0
Christ Church, Hamilton per Chrch' wdn.	11 12 8
—per Rev. J. McIntyre	0 2 6
St. Mark's Church, Barriefield	1 6 3
St. James' Church, Pittsburgh	0 5 3
McLean's School-House	0 8 3
Franklin's do	0 7 9
—per Rev. H. Brent	2 7 6
Port Dover, per Rev. F. Evans	1 8 9
Christ Church, Port Stanley, per C. W.	0 10 0
Christ Church Burritt's Rapids, per C. W.	0 11 3
137 Collections amounting to	£290 16 11

BIRCHALL,

Treasurer.

Toronto, Nov. 27, 1850.

TESTIMONIAL.

Previous to his departure from Dundas, where he had for some time been acting in the capacity of Assistant Minister, the Rev. Wm. Logan was presented by the pupils of the Rev. Mm. McMurray, with a handsome copy of "Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible," as a testimony of their "affectionate regard."