

blessing with a right administration—we with a right reception—of the ordinance.* They extend the blessing wherever the commission is accredited. We restrict it under an accredited commission to where the ordinance is honoured. With them therefore the grace under a legitimate ministry is universal. With us it is discriminating. We deny not the extent of the privilege, only its promiscuous application.

There is also a great want of precision in adding Scripture testimony to this argument. How many grave theological errors have arisen from pressing Scripture terms beside and beyond their proper use and application! Much false reasoning and unsatisfactory conclusion from this cause obscure the present point at issue. When the full baptismal privileges are claimed indiscriminately and without reserve for unconscious infants, the different character of the persons, whom the Apostle invests with these high prerogatives, seems to be put out of sight. They were intelligent and gifted members of the Church, who had maintained a credible profession of some standing. The recent date of the several churches forbids the supposition, that they had been baptized in infancy. They must have been the adult believers, according to the records of the Acts, baptized upon the profession of their faith.

Not but that infants, even in the first ages of the Church, were fully interested in their Baptismal inheritance. We must otherwise suppose them either to have been circumcised, and so brought again under the Judaical yoke; or,—what is no less improbable,—that they were, without any moral ground, excommunicated from the covenant of grace, into which they had been formerly admitted—their privileges under the Gospel being thus made in one most important point less than they had been under the law. As it is but “one Baptism,” we cannot suppose it to be different to the adult and to the infant, where the need, the capacity, and the interest, is virtually the same. Yet the two cases must be brought to some identity or parallelism, in order that what is clearly predicated of the one, may be scripturally applied to the other. The adult was evidently invested (as we have seen) with baptismal privilege upon his sincere profession of repentance and faith, and so far only as it was sincere, can we conceive of any attendant blessing. Upon the same ground only can we suppose the infant investiture—not when the ordinance has been a profane mockery or an empty form; but when it has been a true Sacramental covenanting and dedication to God. The promiscuous indiscriminate appropriation of privilege to every baptized child, presents no relative parallelism to the Scriptural application, and therefore cannot fairly be admitted a satisfactory demonstration. We do not therefore—as Dr. Pusey insinuates—boldly contradict the Scripture, by denying the privilege of the baptism into death.† We only investigate the precise application of the term, and within the limits of the application when discovered, we predicate as decidedly as himself.

We observe the same want of precise accuracy in the use made of our Primary Church authorities. We have already adverted to our Baptismal Services as pressed beyond measure, and with very doubtful application in this argument.†† How often do we hear of Hooker's high estimate of Sacramental grace, while his own express limitation, which in fact furnishes the key to his whole statement, is left unnoticed! When he speaks of “Baptism as a seal perhaps to the grace of election”§§ (a sentence expressed indeed with modest hesitation, but obviously giving his preponderating judgment) he clearly intends his exhibition of privilege to be limited to the sphere of God's election—that is—of the spiritual Church of God. His known and declared judgment of “the Perpetuity of Faith in God's elect” is sufficient confirmation of this view. A mind of his profound and accurate thinking could never have included in his system dogmas so manifestly inconsistent with each other—as those of universal regeneration necessarily involving the Defectibility of grace) and the Perpetuity of the Divine principle. Evidently therefore the universal grace of Baptism derives no warranted support from this revered name.—Rev. C. Bridges, M. A. Vicar of Old Newton.

The Berean.

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, JAN. 2, 1845.

In entering upon a new year, it is a part of Christian wisdom, to take a serious view of time, its changes, its uncertainties, its present opportunities, and the use which we are making of them to the great end, our preparation for eternity. We have inserted, both on this page and on our fourth, pieces which have a tendency to guide the minds of our readers, old and young, in that direction; and the Editor will be permitted to be brief in expressing

* Bishop Mant's Tracts place the whole ground of Baptismal blessing upon the legitimate administration. No reference is traceable throughout the whole statement to the necessity of a right reception. The statements of most other standard writers on the same side are more discriminating. See note, p. 35.

† Rom. vi. 3, 4, with vii. 1.
 ‡ 1 Cor. xii. 7-13.
 § Gal. iii. 27, with 1-3. ¶ Eph. iv. 5.
 †† See pp. 11, 69. ††† See pp. 12, 14-14.
 ††† Tracts on Baptism, p. 198.
 †††† Chap. v. pp. 81, 82.
 ††††† 11. v. 12. 3. This, as might naturally be expected, was Calvin's judgment. Instit. iv. c. xvi. 21, 22. Bucer also evidently inclines to it. De Vi. et Effic. Baptismi. Scripta Anglicana, p. 597. Sacramentum in solis electis efficient quod figurant is quoted rather loosely from Augustinus. Burgess's Baptismal Regeneration of Elect Infants, pp. 133, 134. Dr. Pusey however doubts the accuracy of the quotation—not being able to discover it, and judging it to be inconsistent with his other statements. Tracts, p. 222. Yet if baptism be the seal of the covenant of grace—(Rom. iv. 11)—its spiritual efficacy would obviously be confined to the limits of this covenant—whatever those limits may be. Wilkins—who of course argues on the restricted application—has some interesting and profitable discussion. De Effic. Bapt. in Infant. vi.—xiv. Compare Usher's Body of Divinity, p. 301.

his deep-felt wishes, that a course of self-examination may lead the readers of this periodical to the cheering result of a good hope that they have improved their opportunities in time, so as to enable them to look forward with joyful anticipation to their passage from time to eternity.

We are not allowed space for extended remarks upon affairs in the Church. Having, however, but recently stated that we do not take a gloomy view of the aspect of things in this Diocese, we will, on the present occasion, add the remark that within the limited period of our personal observation, in Lower Canada, there has been a decided increase of strength to the cause of pure, unadulterated religion in the additions which have been made to our body of Clergy; and we will call upon our readers to be frequent and earnest in prayer that the public and private ministrations of Pastors, that the instruction given in Sunday Schools and other Seminaries of scriptural education,—and that the more private attention to religious training in families may be abundantly blessed to the extension of the spirit of vital godliness through the land, and the hastening of the universal prevalence of the Saviour's rule among all kindreds, tribes, and people!

Taking a survey of the state of affairs in this Province, we rejoice in the indications which have been given, that the Representative of our Sovereign will have with him a working majority in the Legislature, to carry into effect measures of wisdom for the temporal prosperity of the people in this part of Her Majesty's dominions. Persuaded as we are, that the Governor General's intentions are for the public good, and no less so that His Excellency's talents are equal to the important trust which the Sovereign has reposed in him, we pray and hope that he may be spared for a long and successful application of his political integrity and high mental faculties to the guidance of public affairs in British North America.

The articles from the Rev. C. Bridges' pen which we have inserted in our last and in the present numbers, are taken from a work recently published by the author (whose praise is in all the Churches) under the title of *Sacramental Instruction*. He explains the occasion of that work to have been the revision of his well known book on *The Christian Ministry*, for a new edition. The chapter on the Sacrament seemed then to call for enlargement exceeding the prescribed limits, and he found, moreover, that the controversial character which would necessarily attach to a discussion of those erroneous views denominated Sacramental Theology, would not be suitable to the pages of the larger work. Hence the publication of the smaller treatise from which we have extracted.

THE NEW YEAR.

There is something peculiarly solemn and instructive in the lessons which old Time teaches us, as he “rolls his ceaseless course.” The certainty that the moments once past, however they may have been spent or employed, can never return,—that the present hour which we enjoy is hurrying rapidly away with its various opportunities for good or ill, improved or abused,—and that the future is hastening on with all its momentous interests, is a subject which should kindle within the heart of every thinking man the most anxious enquiry, and awaken the deepest reflection. Yet though every passing day and hour—yes, every fleeting moment that finds us still in the land of the living, the spared monuments of the mercy of that all-gracious Being who alone (though, alas, we often seem to forget it) can “hold our souls in life” through every season, every year in its silent and apparently imperceptible flight, brings with it its own peculiar warning:—how small is the number of those who wisely set themselves to “redeem the time,” and seize the passing moment, as a rich treasure to be turned to everlasting account! Alas! days, months, and years may glide away in quick succession; proclaiming as they hurry along in their headlong career, “Man, think of God!—think of Time! think of Eternity!” But man, misguided mortal! too long in the scene of a world which, like himself, must soon vanish away; too much engrossed with the cares and anxieties—nay the vanities and deceitful pleasures of life, to hear the admonitions or, at least, to heed his warning voice—acts as if he was ignorant of the fact, and had yet to learn the great practical truth, that Time is hurrying on, with all the rapidity of its swift-winged moments; and Eternity! dread! awful! immeasurable Eternity is rapidly approaching; approaching too, not as a matter of mere speculation, or doubtful interest, but of inconceivable moment and importance to every son and daughter of earth, for it brings with it judgment, and our undeliverable doom. What then is the madness, the infatuation of those who, careless or unobservant, neglect or abuse this most precious gift of time; who, mortal, made of clay, inhabiting a poor temporary tabernacle of crumbling materials, and even for this depending upon the will of God, whose breath can dissolve it in a moment,—yet live as thoughtless and unconcerned as if they deemed themselves already the children of immortality; far removed from the ravages of time, beyond the reach of disease and death, and their poor perishing bodies akin to those of the Angelic host. Reader, we hope you are not one of such: for oh! it is a lamentable and, to the conscience in any degree awakened, a heartrending reflection,—when we look back to the years that are past, and call to mind the opportunities and means of grace we have enjoyed, and God's proffered mercy held out to us day by day, month by month, year by year continually,—to find that they are all gone; for ever gone! and we, after all, no nearer the Kingdom of God!

Another of those short periods of our exist-

ence called years, has expired. Twelve months are gone from us, with all their chequered scenes of good and evil, with all their hopes and fears, their joys and sorrows; and we, who by the blessing of God are still permitted to live, enter again upon another year, with all its unknown futurity! But with what reflections should we enter upon it? With solemn enquiries into that which is past, and solemn resolutions to improve for the future. Blessing then God's holy name, and adoring his goodness, for this further extension of his favour—what, reader, have you been doing for His glory, and your own salvation, during the months and days of 1844? As the time advanced in its steady, onward, even, tho' swift and certain course, have you progressed in your Christian walk? have you advanced in “all virtue and godliness?” have you increased in that knowledge which “maketh wise unto salvation?” that intimate acquaintance with God, and his Son Jesus Christ, which is essential to the interests of the soul? Now, at the expiration of another year, when of course you are so much nearer death—nearer the grave—nearer judgment—nearer eternity, than you were this time last year: are you—happy thought, if indeed you are—nearer God—nearer Christ—nearer Heaven?—As there is no standing still—no halting on the road “that leads to life on high”—there is but one other reflection which must naturally follow—and this we leave to the silent workings of your own bosom. Do not, however, think that we exclude ourselves in our observations: we, reader, apply these searching questions to our own heart—to our own conscience; and God enable us all to answer them aright, so that none of us may deceive his own soul!—These enquiries and reflections rise naturally out of the subject: because our safe arrival at the termination of a year should fill our hearts with love and gratitude to that Being by whose providence it is that we survive to see it; while so many amongst us and around us, both old and young (for death, young reader! makes no distinction) have, during its progress, been swept away; some with little warning—and some perhaps with none, to their eternal destiny. The yearly revenue paid to that Tyrant, through fear of whom men are “all their life time subject to bondage,” should teach survivors to regard themselves; to own the sparing hand of God; and at the same time to reflect that, though they have escaped the year that is past, and may escape “this year also”—which Providence only knows—yet a year will come which shall be to them the last; which shall see them laid where we must all one day lie. We have commenced another year, but who of us may live to see the close of it? what reason have you or I, kind reader, to suppose that we may not be among the number of those who shall, during its course, take their departure to the world of spirits? Certain it is that we are drawing nearer the grave every day; and however the world and its busy scenes may, as they too frequently do, banish the unwelcome thought—death, inevitable death, is approaching, fast as the wings of time can bear it on: and may surprise us even sooner than we are aware. As therefore we must all confess how little, how utterly nothing, we have done for God, during the years that are past; but feel, alas! that they are gone for ever, and that repentance is all that amends it is now in our power to make; as we acknowledge the great goodness of God in thus lengthening our days, and giving us still an opportunity of making our peace with Him “before we go hence and are no more seen”—Readers of the Berean! searchers, we trust, of the Word of God—and all such as know the value of precious time, feel the importance of religion, and the happiness of a holy life, and long for the kingdom and glory of God:—let us with one accord resolve, in the name of our Heavenly Father and in the strength of his Spirit—to devote this year to his service more than any year we have yet enjoyed:—and may we all so live “to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom!”

ECCLESIASTICAL.

BISHOPRIC OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—The Rev. Prebendary Medley, Vicar of St. Thomas', in the city and diocese of Exeter, has been appointed Bishop over the diocese about to be constituted in the Province of New Brunswick.

DIOCESE OF NOVA SCOTIA.—On Tuesday the 19th November the Corner Stone of another New Church at Rossway, near Gulliver's Hole, in the Parish of Digby, was laid with religious ceremonies by the Rector, the Rev. Wm. Bullock, assisted by the Rev. Wm. Snyder, the Rev. N. Hill, and the Rev. Edwd. Nicholl. Although the day was cold and the wind high, a large concourse from all the neighbouring country attended, to take part in the services of the day.—*Hullfax Times*.

MISSIONARY BISHOPRIC OF WEST AFRICA.—The Rev. Alexander Glennie, who was elected by the General Convention of the P. E. Church in the United States to occupy this interesting post, has declined the appointment. We do not find that the Canons provide for the election of any other in his room, until the General Convention shall meet again.

THE REV. MR. WARD, OXFORD.—On Saturday the 30th of November, this gentleman was summoned before the Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellors, and Proctors, when the question was put to him whether he avowed himself the author of a work published with his name, entitled *The Ideal of a Christian Church*; and further, whether he was prepared to abide by certain interpretations of the Articles contained in it?—He requested two days' time to consider of his answer, which having been granted him, he retired.

LAW CASE.

On the 2nd of November last, the Judge in the Court of Arches pronounced sentence in the case of the Rev. W. H. Henslowe, Perpetual Curate of Wormegay in the Diocese of Norwich, for refusing to bury the corpse of a parishioner who had been baptized by a minister of the Primitive Methodists. The Judge (Sir H. Jenner Fust) declared, that he had no discretion to diminish or increase the punishment, which he pronounced to be suspension from the ministry for the space of three months, and payment of costs. Mr. Henslowe solemnly protested against this judgment, and appealed “to the great council of the realm and to the Convocation;” but the Judge said, “If you mean to appeal, you must

appeal to Her Majesty in Council.” In this case, the judgment rested upon the 68th canon, and Sir H. Jenner expressed himself to the effect that “it would be wise on the part of Clergymen to recollect that, in every case of this kind, an opposition made to a claim, by a large body of persons in the country, of a legal right, should it prove unsuccessful, only afforded an additional triumph to persons who were seeking the downfall of the Established Church.”

An opinion adverse to this judgment we find to be held by the Lord Bishop of Exeter, who pronounced an elaborate judgment in the case of the Rev. Walter Blunt, Curate of Helston, against whom charges were preferred by one of the Churchwardens, which led to the appointment of a Commission of inquiry, by the Bishop, and afterwards to his pronouncing a judgment which occupies a whole page of a London paper, and from which it may be conceived that it is no easy matter to bring within limits, suited for our publication, that which will be of importance or interest to our readers. The judgment is dated 23rd October last.

Mr. Blunt was complained of for preaching in his surplice instead of the usual robe, a black gown. The Bishop decides that he was right; the sermon is part of the communion-service, and the Rubric and Canons recognise no change of vestment. On going into authorities, however, his Lordship finds that the surplice is not the right vestment neither. The rubric at the commencement of the order for Morning and Evening Prayer says that such ornaments of the ministers at all times of their ministrations shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament, in the 2nd year of Edward VI; now these ornaments were “a white albe plain, with a vestment or cope.” At a subsequent period of King Edward's reign, these vestments were done away with, and a surplice substituted; the whole of these changes however were swept away by Queen Mary; and on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, the later simplifications of King Edward's reign were passed by, and the ornaments were re-established as ordered in his 2nd year. Again, the use of the surplice was restored by the 55th Canon of the year 1603; but that Canon, we are told by his Lordship, cannot control the Act of Uniformity passed after the Restoration, in 1662, by which the Book of Common Prayer, with its rubrics, was re-established (after the disorders attending the rebellion) in the form in which they now stand.

It appears, then, that in the judgment of the Bishop of Exeter the gown is quite inadmissible; the use of the surplice has been connived at, because the proper vestments have not been provided by the parish; but the proper vestments are the Albe, with a Vestment or Cope; and if the Churchwardens of Helston shall provide the latter, he will enjoy the minister, “be he who he may,” to use them. “But until these ornaments are provided by the parishioners, it is the duty of the Minister to use the garment actually provided by them for him, which is the surplice.”

We believe that this is the state of the case as the Bishop of Exeter views it. It does not seem quite clear to us that, if the churchwardens do not provide the proper vestments, it is the Minister's duty to use the wrong one which they do provide: for, if the Canon of 1603, which allows the surplice, “cannot control” the Act of 1662 which restores the use of Albe and Vestment or Cope, we do not see that the remission of churchwardens to obey the Act restores to vigour the requirement of the Canon. At all events, instead of having the Clergyman's duty cleared up by the researches to which modern innovations give rise, the difficulties seem, at this rate, to be only thickening around us.

Mr. Blunt was complained of for having omitted prayer before and after sermon. The Bishop admits this to be a very unusual course, but upon referring to the rubric which follows the Nicene Creed, he decides that no prayer is prescribed for use either before or after sermon, so that Mr. Blunt's course was in strict conformity with the law, and not open to censure. The Bishop himself, in his search for authorities on this subject, to his surprise discovered “Directions of King George I. to the Archbishops and Bishops for preserving the unity in the Church” the sixth of which expressly calls upon these Churchwardens to prohibit the very practice, a departure from which was made matter of complaint against Mr. Blunt. The question remains whether the “Bidding Prayer” prescribed by the 35th Canon is not to be used before sermon, there being a direction to that effect from King George I. whose prohibition seems levelled against Collects which the Clergy were accustomed to choose at discretion. His Lordship inclined to the opinion that the rubric which recognises no prayer in the pulpit supersedes the Canon; but he left that matter for further consideration if parties should continue to object to the practice adopted, properly, as the Bishop thought, by Mr. Blunt.

Two of the charges against Mr. Blunt referred to his substituting extempore dissertations, as they were denominated by the complainant, for sermons (in the morning, we conclude) and extempore lectures on one of the lessons in the evening. Denying the applicability of the term “dissertation,” the Bishop did not censure Mr. Blunt for lecturing extempore, because His Lordship had never expressed to him his wishes in that respect; but he called upon him, at the close of the judgment “especially to avoid all extempore addresses from the pulpit; a practice, not safe to any man, but most hazardous to a fervid and zealous mind like his.” As regards the evening service, the rubric requires no sermon at it; but only catechising of the children which, Mr. Blunt alleged, he could not perform “there being no middle aisle” in the Helston church; he substituted a lecture, bearing more or less upon some portion of the Catechism. The Bishop considered this an incorrect proceeding, which “ought not to have been hazarded lightly;” but “not a matter requiring grave animadversion.”

Mr. Blunt required all persons to remain in church on Sacrament Sundays, until the conclusion of the exhortation, declaring that he would never give the communion to any one who should leave the church before that part of the service. The Bishop admitted this to have been the most mischievous in its effects, he most irregular in its progress, and the least justifiable, of all the particulars stated against

him. It appears that the Bishop had given him directions to encourage the people not to depart until after the exhortation; but Mr. Blunt went the much greater length stated above. Great vehemence and excitement on his part seems also to have been proved, greatly to the disturbance of “that state of quietude and composure which alone befits so solemn an occasion.” The Bishop blamed Mr. Blunt here “for rashness of an ordinary kind, and with little or no excuse,” referring to the character of a minister as of one whose office it is “not to strive, but to be gentle unto all men,” &c.

It was charged against Mr. Blunt, that he had refused to read the Lord's Prayer with, and to administer the Holy Communion, to a man who had been baptized by a R. catholic priest, and refused to be conditionally re-baptized. The Bishop decided that a minister could not pray with a person who is not a member of the Church, though it was his duty to pray for him and in his presence. So likewise as regards the Communion. The question then arose, was this person a member of the Church? The Bishop considered that he was not, and therefore sanctioned Mr. Blunt's decision. It may be remarked, here, that the insufficiency of the person's baptism seems to have been questioned by Mr. Blunt, on the ground that it was administered “in the Roman schism in England or Ireland.”

Mr. Blunt had refused to bury the corpse of a young man who had been baptized by a Wesleyan minister in London. This was charged against him as being done “in open defiance of the settled law of the land.” His Lordship sharply repelled the assertion that the law of the land was “settled” to that extent. He admitted that it was, so far as that a Clergyman “is bound to bury the corpse of an infant baptized by a layman;” but whether he would be bound to do so if the infant had been baptized “by a heretic or schismatic” was a question, His Lordship said, yet awaiting the decision of the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council. But if that question be there decided against the Clergyman, “the decision will not apply to the case in which Mr. Blunt refused to bury—namely, the case of an adult who, having been baptized a schismatic, lived to years of discretion himself a schismatic, and died without having been made a member of the Church.” Adverting to the doubts which have arisen on this occasion, His Lordship expressed himself to this effect: “I now resolve the doubts by saying, that neither the office for the Visitation of the Sick, nor that for the Burial of the Dead, ought to be used for an adult, who having been baptized in schism, and having lived a schismatic, has never been admitted into the Church.” After several remarks to justify this decision, the Bishop wound up that part of the judgment by these words: “After all, what is there of hardship in the case? Can they who, while they live, repudiate our communion, complain that, when dead, they will not be treated as if they had been within it?”

We pass over several minor matters which brought out no authoritative decision; but it deserves mention that, incidentally, the Bishop introduced an occurrence at Archdeacon Sheepshanks' last Visitation at Helston, on which occasion Mr. Blunt seems to have insisted upon the performance of the service in the order which he considered the rubrical one, contrary to the wishes of the Archdeacon; and was sustained by the Bishop, who states, in a letter to the dignitary just named, that in every instance in which any of his Clergy express a determination to follow strictly the requirements of the Church by reviving usages and observing rubrics which have fallen into desuetude, he would give him permission, if asked, to use the Bishop's name as *ordering* such observance; so that Mr. Blunt had a right to say even to the Archdeacon, he had the Bishop's authority for the course which he insisted upon following.

The place where women were to kneel at Churching, had become a cause of altercation, and the Bishop decided that, if no special cause could be shown to the contrary, they were to kneel at the rails of the Communion table, as Mr. Blunt had required.

The conclusion at which His Lordship arrived, after the investigation of the long list of grievances, is that there has been, on the part of Mr. Blunt, “among minor errors, one most culpable indiscretion; indiscretion which has carried with it its own appropriate and very heavy punishment, by most seriously impairing his usefulness; by robbing him, it may be feared, of much of the confidence and attachment of the best of his people; even of those whose respect he had already begun to acquire by qualifications of no common order, and most otherwise have largely increased; above all, by encouraging, and in some measure justifying, a clamour against him, which has issued in the present distressing investigation.” After several remarks condemnatory of the course which has been pursued against Mr. Blunt, the Bishop concludes with an admonition to Mr. Blunt to be more cautious in future, and with an expression of His Lordship's hope that the parties mainly concerned would mutually forgive, return to the feelings which become the sacred connexion of a pastor with his people, and in future have only the “contest of love, who shall most faithfully serve, and under the divine blessing, most largely advance, the only cause which can long be worth their contending for—glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will towards men.”

It is not in our power today, to accompany this important piece of intelligence with the remarks to which it seems to give occasion; but it is our intention to recur to it in our next number.

DEATH OF DR. ABERCROMBIE.—The Edinburgh papers announce the sudden death of Dr. Abercrombie, of that city. He had been slightly indisposed for some time, but was able to attend his professional duties to the last. On Thursday morning he was found by his servant lying dead in his own room. It was supposed that he was carried off in a fit of apoplexy. Dr. Abercrombie was a man of great eminence in his profession, and was held in the highest respect by his medical brethren. He was a man of refined literary taste; and had a philosophical cast of mind. He is the author of various valuable works: one on the *Intellectual Powers and the Investigation of Truth*; another on the *Philosophy of Moral Feeling*; he wrote on the *Moral Condition of the Lower*