

The Breeze.

THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF MIND, AND SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS WERE SO.—ACTS XVII. 11.

No. 21.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 1844.

[Vol. I.]

Poetry.

REFLECTIONS

Suggested by reading an
EPIGRAM upon the Death of CAMPBELL, the Poet.

Campbell! alas is dead; but Rogers lives,
Thus Hope has fled while Memory survives.
London Times.

Has hope then fled and is but memory left?
How sad our lot, of precious hope bereft!
Of hope, that lightens life of half its cares,
That cheers in sorrow, dries the mourner's tears:
That bids us look beyond the cloud of woe,
To that bright realm whence light and bliss do flow.

Alas, what joys arise from memory?
'Tis but a retrospect of misery.
We can but think of crime and sin, and all
That make life miserable! who would recall
Such scenes of wretchedness and grief,
From which sweet hope no longer gives relief?

But blest be God, hope has not left our sphere,
The clouds obscure, anon it bursts more clear,
Its steady ray dispels the shades of night;
And opens Heaven to the believer's sight;
And thus while memory tells of Jesus slain,
Hope bids us strive with Him above to reign.
G.S.

AN EPISCOPAL CHURCH NOT NECESSARILY ROMISH.

From an Address by the Right Rev. William Meade, Bishop of the Prot. Episcopal Church of Virginia, to the Annual Convention held in May last.

[The Bishop introduces the subject of errors prevailing within the Church, and adverts to prejudices which have arisen, or objections which have been put forth against her by those without. After stating how the papacy has all along considered the Episcopate with jealousy, lest it should advance claims to an equality with the Roman see, he describes the nature and extent of protestant episcopal authority in the United States; we commence near the close of that division of his subject.—Ed.]

As the power of the bishops has been of late the subject of more critical and anxious inquiry, it may not be amiss to show, in a few instances, what it is, and what it is not.

The solemn right of ordination is now, and has been, as we believe, since the apostles' days, attached to the Episcopal office. Yet, not only must the bishop remember the apostle's injunction, and lay hands suddenly on no man, but, according to our canons, he cannot ordain any one, however certain of his eminent qualifications, without the consent of a select number of the laity and clergy of the Church, entitled a standing committee, which must also be governed by certain canons. As to the disposal of them after ordination, if they be deacons, he is entrusted with it during the short period of their deaconship, seldom exceeding a year; nor can we conceive an arrangement more beneficial to the deacon, as well as to the diocese. In the exercise of this right, the bishop will of course always seek to consult, as far as possible, not only the qualifications, but the needs and wishes of his young brethren in the ministry. In relation to the presbytery, he has no power to assign stations to them, as is the case with the chief ministers of one of our most respectable denominations; nor can he forbid their removal as is the case with the authorities of another. All this is left with the ministers and people, except so far as they may choose to ask and follow the advice of the bishop. When vacancies occur, or when they are again supplied, it is indeed required that the vestries give notice of the same to the bishop, not that he may dictate or forbid, but be made acquainted with the needs of the parishes, and that they may ask counsel, or he may offer it, as shall seem best to each. I will only add, that the exercise of discipline on offending ministers is a case where, if ever, the high authority of a bishop might be expected to be seen, and yet here the trial is conducted, I believe in all the dioceses, by a jury of presbyters, the bishop presiding, or not, at pleasure. It is his to affirm or reject the sentence. In our diocese, he may diminish, but he cannot increase the penalty. He may pardon him who has been condemned, but cannot punish him who has been acquitted. But, although his power is thus carefully guarded, still, from the nature of his office, and the solemnity of the duties thereof, from the belief of its divine original, from the age and experience usually brought into it, and many other considerations, the influence of a bishop, if deserving, is as great as can be desired by him, or as is safe either for himself or the Church. An office thus understood, and thus guarded, is not one that is likely to lead us into the arms of him who claims all power in the Church of God below.

At the council of Trent, the Pope, by his legates, out of fear lest the independency of dioceses, and the equality of bishops, should interfere with his supremacy, laboured hard at two points: 1st, to prove that bishops were originally the same with presbyters, and that the right of ordination, and any superior authority they possessed, was the gift of the Pope, the representative of Christ, and in whom all power in the Church was vested. 2d, that the right of residence in their dioceses was not theirs, by any divine appointment, but only by the permission of the Pope, who, in order to have them more under his control, preferred to have many of them nearer to him, and liable to his direction, as to all their movements, fearing lest a more distant and permanent residence amongst their people might contribute to the greater independency of bishops. This, however, was resolutely and effectually opposed by many of them, especially the Spanish bishops.—See Jurieu's History of the council of Trent, a work worthy of republication at this time, and which would well repay the publisher.

2dly. It may be asked, is there not something in the doctrine of the Church as to the divine appointment of the ministry—the duty of adhering to a certain order in the ministry—the power of the priest's office in absolution and the sacraments—are there not some very strong expressions in the offices of baptism and the Lord's Supper, about regeneration and partaking of the Lord's body, which savour very much of Romanism, and which may have been the means of conducting back some of our ministers and people to the false doctrines of Rome, which expressions are not to be found in other churches that have shewn no such tendency? To this I reply, that from a careful examination and comparison of the standards of our own and other reformed churches, I am persuaded that there is nothing either in the language or real meaning of our own church on these points, which is more justly liable to the imputation of sympathy with Rome, than may be seen in other churches of the Reformation, perhaps without any exception, while in some of them are to be found passages even more liable to be misunderstood, than those complained of in our own; and that if these objectionable passages in our own standards be the cause of this return to Romish doctrine, there can be no reason why the same effect might not be produced by similar passages in others. Here, however, let me at once declare, that I do not for a moment impute to any of these confessions, in their strongest passages, a countenance to those doctrines, which, by a Jesuitical interpretation, have been ascribed to our own Protestant articles, and might be charged in like manner on them.

From a comparison of different parts of their more enlarged explanations, and a consideration of the circumstances under which they were formed, it is clear that their meaning was altogether different from that of Romish standards. It must be remembered that the churches on the Continent, like that of England and Scotland, in drawing up their confessions, were beset on the one side by the Romanists, who charged them with making nought of the ministry, and church, and sacraments, and on the other, by some wild sects, who actually did deny the necessity of any ministry, and poured contempt upon the sacraments, and sought to spiritualize every thing, and with whom the Romanists endeavoured to confound the whole body of Protestants. Thus situated, is it at all to be wondered at that they should have selected the strongest expressions which truth would allow, to condemn the fanatics, and to silence the calumnies of the Romanists? And when we remember that the very passages now most objected to, were Scriptural passages, though figuratively used, if, thereby, they could, in any degree, without the sacrifice of truth, gratify even those under the partial influence of old established error, who would blame them? Such, I doubt not, was the influence operating on the minds of the Reformers, in all the churches; in the choice of certain terms, both Scriptural and of ancient use. Under other circumstances, they might have been omitted or modified without any change of doctrine. Thus in England, when the Puritans objected to some few of them, there were those among the bishops and clergy who were willing to have omitted, or modified them, believing that nought of the true doctrine of the Reformers or of the Bible would be lost thereby, and but for the unreasonableness of the opposite party, it would have been done.

It is not my purpose to exhibit, in this place, the proofs of that striking similarity in the language of the confessions of the Reformed churches on the points in question. That, I have thrown into an appendix, for your careful consideration. I only remark, that so great, however, was the agreement of our own and the Continental Reformers on the point alluded to, that we ought not to be surprised at the similarity of their language, as exhibited in the appendix.

That the articles of our Church, and our public offices, do not agree with the doctrines of Rome, is evident also from the notorious fact, that some of the Oxford divines do not hesitate to condemn our Reformation as having cast away much of the more precious of the Church of Rome, while one of them, the chief leader, has, in a tract, which suddenly terminated the series, and shocked all Protestant Christendom by its insincerity, vainly attempted to strain them to a Romish interpretation.

3dly. Let me further remark, that some passages in our Prayer-book, which seem, by their sound, to be relics of Rome, and are so understood by many, when rightly interpreted by history, will appear to be solemn protests against Romish abuses. For instance, in the rubric to the communion service, it is forbidden that any of the bread and wine shall be taken out of the Church, but directed that all be consumed therein. To some, this seems like a superstitious regard to the elements, as if they had undergone an actual change, whereas, the design of the Church was to condemn the practice of the Romish Church, who carried it out of the temple to the sick, and elevated it in the streets for adoration, and used it for other superstitious purposes. So, also, in the preface to the confirmation service, it is declared that none shall be confirmed, but such as can say the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, and can answer to certain questions in the Church catechism, etc. Now, this seems much like the doctrine of the Church of Rome, which requires little, if any piety in order to come to the ordinances of religion, whereas, it was actually designed to forbid any to come, as they had hitherto come in the Romish Church, mere children in years, size, and knowledge. A certain amount of knowledge must be had, the Church now declares, and then proceeds to state other qualifications of heart in the course of the service.

4thly. The question, however, still recurs, if there is this sameness of doctrine and language in the different churches of the Reformation, whence the difference in this respect, that a so much greater tendency to Romanistic doctrines has, at different periods, been seen in ministers and members of the Episcopal Church, than in the others? Every effect must have its cause or causes, and how is this to be accounted for?

Whoever will, either in civil or ecclesiastical writers, read the history of the English Church, and of those on the Continent, and of Scotland, as well as those which, at a later period, separated from the English Church, and are not properly called churches of the Reformation, cannot fail to see various causes thereof; and that, for a long time, the very opponents of the Church, who wished many changes in her discipline, and worship, and usages, did not upbraid her with the false doctrines of Rome, as to the church, ministry, and sacraments, as some now do. Various circumstances in her political as well as religious history, which were, unfortunately, but too much blended together, contributed to the fact which is acknowledged. The Protestant Episcopal Church of England, though certainly a separation from the Romish Church, by renouncing her authority and communion, was not a separation from the Old English Church, but a reformation of the same from the corruptions which had come over it during the lapse of ages, and chiefly from its connexion with Rome. Though the event was prepared for by others, yet the Reformation is considered as commencing in the reign of Henry the Eighth. It was carried on under his son, the pious Edward the Sixth, and, after a temporary suspension under Mary, was nearly completed by Elizabeth. From peculiar circumstances, the Government obtained a greater ascendancy in the conduct of the Reformation in England, than in the churches of the Continent, and has ever since retained too much control in its affairs. From this circumstance, it necessarily followed that her religion was much influenced by that of the Royal family, whose patronage and power was very great. It accordingly varied with their principles and propensities. Under the reign of Edward, Popery was utterly renounced. Under Mary, there was a return to it. Elizabeth restored the Protestant Church. But it must be plain that, under such a state of things, many of the ministers and the people would continue much the same in sentiment, though under different establishments. Wherefore, we find that in the time of Elizabeth, only 177 out of 3,100 of the ministers who were possessed of the livings under her sister, the bigoted Mary, refused to sign the articles, and hold their places. With a view to the interest of their Church, they subscribed those very articles for which a Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley had been burned at the stake, only a few years before. Afterwards, indeed, most of them having failed of their object, were forced to withdraw, and their places were supplied by those of a different character. Although there was a steady improvement in the Church, yet when Charles the First, influenced by a Popish consort, and misled by Archbishop Laud, favoured a semi-Romanism, many of those who still secretly inclined to it, were encouraged to hope for another change, until the body of the nation, apprehensive both for civil and religious liberty, rose up in rebellion, beheaded their sovereign, and soon rushed into an opposite extreme. Again, under the second James, himself a Papist, the influence of the throne was so evidently in favour of the Romish Faith, that numbers took courage, and dared to hope the re-establishment of their Church, until another revolution occurred, which ended in the flight of their King, and the abdication of his throne. What will be the issue of the third attempt to fasten at least a modification of Romanism on the Church of England, remains yet to be seen. That good Providence which, in former times, watched over it so carefully, and preserved it so wonderfully, will, we trust, bring good also out of the present evil.

There is another circumstance in the history of the English Church, which contributed not a little to the events we have mentioned, and which deserves to be considered. Although the articles and prayers of the Church, drawn up by the early reformers, were, by the good providence of God, preserved unharmed amid all the changes and revolutions of the kingdom, even as the holy Bible was kept in its integrity during ages of darkness and corruption; although the soundness of her doctrines was never impeached, for they were substantially the same with those of other Reformed Churches, yet, at an early period, there were those in the English Church, who thought many changes of a lesser nature, as to ceremonies, vestments, etc., ought to be made, to distinguish her more decidedly from the Church of Rome; who also complained that reformation in discipline, both as to clergy and laity, and correction of certain abuses in the establishment, were not carried on as speedily as they should be. As to some of these things, such eminent continental reformers as Bucer and Peter Martyr thought them over scrupulous, and urged, not without effect, in some instances, a compliance, warning against separation on account of them. The controversy, however, proceeded, and became more and more violent on both sides, until complete alienation, and, at length, separation took place. Then commenced the effort on the one side to put down dissent by the strong arm of authority, and on the other to pull down the establishment, and as each had power and opportunity, they exercised the same in a manner which it must grieve every good Christian to read or think of. Each party, of course, sought excuses to justify their conduct. The dissenters charged the churchmen with Romanism and loose living, and the church-

men charged the dissenters with hypocrisy, fanaticism and anarchy; and by their mutual crimination actually contributed, in some degree, to produce in each other the evils alleged. It must be conceded by the impartial, that there were many of equal piety on either side, some thinking it wrong any longer to endure such abuses as existed in the establishment, and also many lesser things which seemed susceptible of easy correction, while others, notwithstanding acknowledged imperfections, saw so much that was admirable in it, and such dangers attending the proposed changes, that they felt bound to uphold it, and therefore continued to adorn and bless the same by their zeal and piety.

To be continued.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL DISCIPLINE.

It is not conceived, that, within the narrow compass of a single sheet, any adequate justice can be rendered to a subject, which, strictly speaking, comprises nearly every thing that properly belongs to Sabbath-School Instruction. Nor, even if present circumstances prescribed no limit to these remarks, would the experience and attainments of the writer warrant any hope that he might ever deal with it as its great importance and extent deserve. If, however, this brief notice of it, elicit the efforts of some abler pen, one main design of this imperfect Essay will be served.

"Discipline" expresses a course of action far nobler in its origin and tendency than is suggested to most minds by the modern acceptation of the term; although, like many others having reference to mental culture and moral training, it has come to signify little more than ordinary parlance than the very lowest of means resorted to, to gain those ends.

The kindred word "Education" has in like manner been injuriously circumscribed in popular phraseology, till it indicates little more than the elementary materials employed to cultivate the understanding, and to form the character of man.

The two words have become, in our defective modes of thinking, so associated with the mere mechanism of Scholastic Institutions, that the mention of either most commonly gives birth to recollections at once derogatory and unjust to both.

It is not only in young minds that dry tasks in orthography, grammar, or arithmetic, enforced by the town, the stern voice, or the rod, constitute the prominent features in the view which obtains with regard to Education as well as Discipline. But this is greatly to degrade them from their high original, and to defraud them of their lawful rights as twin-children in the School of Wisdom.

The former (Education) derives itself from a word (*duco*) which means "to lead." The latter (Discipline) from another (*discipulus*) which signifies "disciple." And the precise sense in which each is to be viewed, depends on the particular connection in which they may respectively occur.

"To lead," in reference to learning, would imply every thing that tends to conduct the mind from ignorance to knowledge, and from every shade of ignorance to every antagonist class of knowledge. If from hurtful ignorance to useful knowledge, the leading would so far be a good one: if the reverse, a bad one. But in either and in every case, the Education, properly speaking, would comprise every thing by which the mind was led to think, to approve, to embrace, to abandon, &c.

So also, "disciple," in reference to a code of principles, and a model of character, would include every thing that helps the learner to comprehend and adopt the sentiments, and to copy the pattern which are the objects of discipleship. It would moreover exclude every thing of a contrary tendency, because nothing unfavourable to Discipleship could form a part of discipline.

The code of principles, for instance, might be Military, or Philosophical, or Legal, or Mechanical; and the Discipline be studiously adapted to mould the pupil's character after the model of a Marlborough, a Bacon, an Erskine, or a Watt; but in so far as such ends are aimed at, the Discipline that seeks them must include all available means of attaining them, or be, at least so far, not Discipline at all.

Again, if the code of principles be those of Revelation, and the Model of character that perfect one which Christianity displays, then likewise the Christian Discipline which contemplates the inculcation of the one, and the imitation of the other, must include every accessible auxiliary, and exclude every avoidable hindrance, to that Discipleship which was the object of the command of old to "disciple all nations;" and which is the object of all Christian Teaching now.

But Sunday School instruction is Christian Teaching in a special sphere. Sunday School Discipline, therefore, is Christian Discipline applied throughout the whole range of that special sphere—i. e. in every quarter which is or which may be directly or indirectly reached by the widely expanded circle of Sunday School influences.

Sunday School Discipline, then, is something more than drill, whilst in some sort including it; its instruments something more than implements of coercion, whilst, of its own kind, employing them. It contemplates Discipleship to Christ as a Master and a Model, by means of all the appliances and agencies, direct and indirect, which bear or can be brought to bear on that result. And it is only necessary, in reference to any given particular, whether of sentiment, or of practice, or even of fashion or fancy or caprice, to shew that it may exercise, now or at a future day, some bias or control, favourable or unfavourable, over the principles or habits or manners, or even worldly circumstances, of any one or other of the numerous parties more or less nearly or remotely connected with the

diversified subjects and associations of Sunday School proceedings; when that given particular would instantly be owned by the Christian Disciplinary as belonging to the System which the expression "Sunday School Discipline" describes.

If these premises be just, they give a scope to the subject under examination which it is not commonly considered to possess; an extent and a variety which are rarely appreciated or understood.

In Christian communities, few, if any, can find exemption from its exactions, and fewer still an escape from its effects.

Not only persons of every grade and of every age, but gifts and graces of every description, with every recurring occasion and facility for using and improving them, are all laid under tribute to this comprehensive System which aims at discipleship to Him who is the Giver, the Preserver, the Pattern, and the Claimant of the whole.

The faithful Sunday School Teacher above all will feel the full force and import of the reasoning by which this Essay has been made to shew the complicated nature and relations of a subject, which if applied to others, is applicable with perhaps peculiar emphasis to him.

But this seems a favourable point at which to yield to the joint suggestion of time and space, for bringing these imperfect observations to a close.

Another Essay by some abler pen may resume and complete a Theme which the writer of this one merely expected to introduce. It only remains for him therefore to pray that grace and guidance may rest on all, who, disciples of the Lord Jesus themselves, are striving to win others also, to the same discipleship, by means of the numerous instrumentalities and opportunities which Sunday School Discipline includes.

OF EPISCOPAL RESIGNATIONS.

CANON XXXII. OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

Whereas, the Resignation of the Episcopal Jurisdiction of a Diocese is to be discountenanced, but circumstances may sometimes create an exigency which would render an adherence to this principle inexpedient; it is hereby declared that the Episcopal Resignation of a Diocese may take place under the following restrictions: that is to say—

SECT. 1. A Bishop desiring to resign, shall declare his desire to do so, with the reasons therefor, in writing, and under his hand and seal, to his Council of Advice, which shall record the said writing, and send a copy of the same forthwith to every Clergyman and every Parish in the Diocese.

SECT. 2. At the next Convention of the said Diocese, held not less than three months after the delivery of the said writing to the Council of Advice, the proposed resignation of his Bishop shall be considered; and if two-thirds of the Clergy present, entitled to vote in the election of a Bishop, and two thirds of the Parishes in union with the said Convention, and entitled to a vote, and at that time represented, each Parish having one vote by its Delegate or Delegates, shall consent to the proposed resignation, the subject shall be referred to the General Convention; but otherwise, the tender of resignation shall be void.

SECT. 3. The writing aforesaid, and the proceedings of the Diocesan Convention consenting to the resignation, shall be laid before the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies at the next General Convention, which shall have cognizance of all matters relating to them; and if a majority of each order of that House, voting by States, shall agree to the measure, the said writing and proceedings shall be laid before the House of Bishops of that Convention; but otherwise, the said writing and proceedings shall be void.

SECT. 4. The said writing and proceedings being laid before the House of Bishops, it shall have cognizance of all matters relating to them; and the Bishop who proposes to resign, may sit and vote as before in that House; and if a majority of the Members present of that House shall agree to the proposed resignation, the presiding Bishop shall declare that it is confirmed; and this declaration shall be entered on the Journal of the House. But if a majority of the Bishops present do not agree to the resignation, all the previous proceedings shall be void.

SECT. 5. If no meeting of the General Convention is expected to be held within one year of the sitting of the Diocesan Convention aforesaid, the President of the Standing Committee of the Diocese shall transmit copies of the said writing and proceedings of the Diocesan Convention to the Standing Committees of all the Dioceses of this Church, and if a majority of them consent to the proposed resignation, the said President shall transmit copies of the said writing and proceedings, and of the consent of the majority of the Standing Committees, to every Bishop of this Church; and if a majority of the Bishops shall notify the senior Bishop of their consent to the proposed resignation, he shall declare, under his hand and seal, that the said resignation is confirmed, and shall transmit the said declaration to the President of the Standing Committee of the Diocese concerned. But if a majority of the Bishops do not notify the senior Bishop of their consent to the measure within six months, all the previous proceedings shall be void.

SECT. 6. A Bishop whose resignation of the Episcopal Jurisdiction of a Diocese has been thus confirmed, shall perform no Episcopal act, except by the request of the Bishop of some Diocese, or of the Convention, or the Standing Committee of a vacant Diocese. And if the said Bishop shall perform any Episcopal act contrary to these provisions, or shall in any wise act contrary to his Christian and