



As to those forms and ceremonies which are expressly enjoined in the rubrics or canons, and which, as is said in the 18th Canon, are intended to testify humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgement that the Lord Jesus Christ is the eternal Son of God, the only Saviour of the world, I think that, upon the principles asserted by Bishop Butler, they are clearly reasonable, and that, as being enjoined by the Church, they are obligatory upon its members. Such are the various devotional postures prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and the doing lowly reverence when in time of Divine Service the Lord Jesus is mentioned, as directed by the same canon, which custom, it has been observed, sheweth a reverent regard to the Son of God, above other messengers, though speaking as from God also; and against Infidels, Jews, and Arians, who derogate from the person of Jesus Christ, such ceremonies are useful. Again, whatever may be thought of the synodical authority of the canons of 1640, I can see no very serious objection to the custom therein commended, as having been the ancient custom of the Primitive Church, and of this also for many years in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, of doing obeisance on entering and leaving churches and chapels; not as the canon expressly declares, "with any intention to exhibit any religious worship of the communion table, or the eucharist or church, or anything contained therein, in so doing, or to perform the said gestures in the holy eucharist from any opinion of the corporal presence of the body of Christ upon the holy table or in the mystical elements, but only for the advancement of God's glory, to give him alone that honour and glory which are due unto him, and no otherwise." But that the clergy, although they are at liberty to use this custom, are not obliged to do so, is clear from the conclusion of the canon, which heartily commends, but does not enjoin. "In the practice or omission of this rite," it says, "we desire that the rule of charity prescribed by the apostle be observed, which is, that they who use this rite despise not them who use it not, and they who use it not condemn not those who do it." If those persons who practise these obeisances towards the holy table, do so under a notion of the bodily presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, or if the people are led to suppose them to do so, then I consider the custom to be objectionable, and at variance with the spirit of our Reformed Church. If otherwise, the clergy who observe it are bound to explain it to the people, in the sense in which it is explained by the canon.

The same canon of 1640, declaring the situation of the holy table at the east end of the church, being in its own nature indifferent, and that whereon no reliance is to be placed or scruple made therein, doth not imply that it is or ought to be accounted a true or proper altar, whereon Christ is again really sacrificed; but it is and may be called an altar, in that sense in which the Primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other. Those who, as the Romanists, hold not simply a real, but a corporal presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, can scarcely avoid holding also the notion of a propitiatory sacrifice; and to this notion of a corporal presence is to be traced superstitious reverence for the external circumstances of the elements. Our own Church admitting the doctrine of a real, though spiritual presence, utterly rejects that corporal presence which, however it may be veiled under obscure or unintelligible terms, is virtually one with the error of transubstantiation. It is expressly declared at the end of the Communion Service, that by the custom of kneeling to receive the elements, "no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."

"The ceremonies," says Bishop Fleetwood, "allowed and practised in the Church, though not enjoined by the rubric, are such as were used in the Church before the canon or rubric was made; and being reasonable and easy, and becoming, were not enforced by any new law, but were left in possession of what force they had obtained by custom. He that complies not with these ceremonies, offends against no law, but only against a custom; which yet a prudent man will not like to do, when once it has obtained in general."

With regard to worshipping towards the east, there can be no doubt of its having been a very ancient practice of the Church; for it is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, and by Tertullian. Bishop Stillingfleet, one of the most learned of our divines, considers it to be one of those customs derived from primitive times, and continuing to our own, which there is no need to oppose, but rather to cherish. "And of all customs," he observes, "that of contention and singularity, where there is no plain reason against it, doth least become the Church." I do not, however, consider it to be the intention of our Church, that the officiating minister in reading prayers should turn to the east with his back to the congregation. Bist<sup>o</sup> Sparrow thinks, that anciently the reading-desk was so placed, that the minister looked to the east away from the people, to whom he is directed to turn in reading the lessons. But the reading-desk was not known in the early years of the Reformation. It is not mentioned in the Injunctions of King Edward VI., or in those of Queen Elizabeth, nor in any canons or visitation Articles before the canon of 1603. The first rule in King Edward's Common Prayer-book orders, that the minister should so turn in reading prayers as that the people may best hear him; and as the customary place for reading the prayers was then the chancel, at the communion-table, it is clear that he could not have faced the east. It appears, however, from the proceedings of the Savoy Conference, that it was customary at that time for the minister to turn to the people only when he speaks to them, as in the lessons, absolution, and benediction; when he speaks for them to God, it was argued by the Bishops, "It is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church did, the reasons of which you may see in Augustine." I approve of the arrangement lately adopted in several churches, by which the clergyman looks to the south while reading prayers, and to the west while reading lessons. With respect to those ordinances of the Church, about which there is a difference of opinion, where the rubric and canon are not clear, the judgment of the Bishop should be sought.

A question has arisen about placing lights upon the communion-table. Some doubt may be entertained as to the law in this particular. They were forbidden by the Injunction of King Edward VI. in 1549; but they were in use when the first Liturgy of that monarch received the authority of parliament, and therefore seem to be sanctioned by the rubric in our present Common Prayer book. But whether it be so or not, they have always been retained in our Chapels Royal, in cathedrals, and in college chapels; and I see no objection to them provided that the candles are not burning except when the church is lighted up for evening service.

I strongly disapprove of the practice, which, as I am informed, has been adopted by a few of the clergy, of decorating the communion-table with flowers; and especially where that decoration is varied from day to day, so as to have some fanciful analogy to the history of the saint who is commemorated. This appears to me to be something worse than fruitless, and to approach very nearly to the honours paid by the Romish Church to departed saints. Such practices as these, which are neither prescribed, nor recommended, nor even noticed by our Church, nor sanctioned by general custom, throw discredit upon those decent ceremonies and expressive forms which are intended to enliven the devotion of those who are engaged in the service of God, and to do honour to his holy name. It is well observed by Bishop Halifax, that there may be too much form in religion as well as too little. "The one leads to enthusiasm, the other degenerates to superstition; the one is Puritanism, the other is Popery; whereas the rational worship of God is equally removed from either of these. In resisting an exaggerated spiritualism, we must be careful not to incur the charge of materialism; and, above all things,

we must beware of arbitrarily connecting the gifts of God with ordinances of merely human appointment, and of teaching our people to place the ceremonies which the Church has ordained, however significant and laudable, on the same footing as the sacraments, which have been ordained by the Lord Jesus himself. It is very well to speak of them as precious fragments of an ancient, or perhaps of a primitive ritual; we deny that they are to be considered as anything more than decent and venerable usages, or that we have the slightest evidence of their being perchance divinely authorised portions of the Church's perpetual sacrifices. Ceremonies which cannot be shown to have been appointed by the Apostles, with a direction for their continuance, are not of perpetual obligation through the Church, although it may be proved that they were used by the Apostles, or may appear highly probable that they were so; as, for example, the appointment of an order of deacons for daily distribution, the anointing of the sick with oil and some other customs—although they may not lightly be laid aside even by churches, and not at all by individual members themselves. This is the doctrine of our own Church, in the preface to her Book of Common Prayer; and in this respect every one, at least every clergyman, is bound by the laws of his own Church. What they enjoy he is to practise; what they forbid he is to abstain from; what they purposely omit he is not to introduce. Prayers for the dead, true immersion in baptism, the kiss of peace in the eucharist, the mixing water and wine in the chalice—all these were undoubtedly ancient customs—if not of primitive antiquity; but they are not recognised by our own Church, and they are, therefore, not to be practised by its ministers. "Let no minister of a parish," says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "introduce any ceremonies, rites, or gestures, though with some seeming piety or devotion, which are not commanded of the Church and established by law; and let these also be wisely and usefully explicated to the people, that they may understand the reasons for obedience: let there be no more introduced, lest the people, being burdened unnecessarily, attempt to follow none." You are not to take as your rule and government in this respect the early Church or the primitive Church, but the Church of England, as she speaks in plain and obvious cases by her rubric and canons, in doubtful and undecided ones by her bishops. This is the language of common sense, as it is also, the canon of law, laid down by its ablest interpreters. I earnestly wish that rule were kept in view by all clergymen. We should not then have to complain of unwarrantable omissions and alterations of the Church's service on the one hand, nor of unauthorised additions to her ritual on the other. I must confess that I view the former fault with less complacency than the other. I think that the clergyman who presumes to omit any part of the offices, which he has solemnly pledged himself to use wholly and entirely, either through haste or negligence, or (which is still worse) from a dislike to the doctrines which they assert, offends more grievously against the order of the Church, than he who, from a mistaken zeal for antiquity, revives obsolete practices, or is minute and scrupulous in his attention to the externals of religion. It is my earnest desire that you should omit no part of the solemn service which the Church has appointed to be said, whether in the administration of the sacraments, or in what are commonly termed the occasional offices.

With respect to the habits proper to be worn by the clergy, when ministering in Divine service, no question is made so far as the prayers are concerned; but it is doubted whether a clergyman, when preaching, should wear the surplice or gown. I apprehend that for some time after the Reformation, when a sermon was preached only in the morning at Communion Service, the preacher always wore a surplice: a custom which has been retained in cathedral churches, and college chapels, and in the chapels royal. The Injunction at the end of King Edward's first service-book requires the surplice to be used in all churches and chapels; but the present rubric enacts, that all the ornaments of ministers, at all times of their ministrations, be the same as they were by authority of parliament in the second year of King Edward VI. The gown was probably first worn in the pulpit by the lecturers, who preached when no part of the Communion Service was read. In the King's Injunction of 1633, to the Archbishop, direction is given, that where a lecture is set up in a market-town, it may be read by a company of grave and orthodox divines, and that they ever preach in such seemingly basely as belong to their degree, and not in cloaks. When there is only one officiating clergyman, and the prayer for the Church militant is read, which must be read in the surplice, it seems better that he should preach in the surplice than quit the church after the service for the purpose of changing his habit. But, perhaps, it would be most consonant with the intention of the Church, if the preacher would wear a surplice when preaching after the morning service, and a gown when the sermon is in the evening. Upon the whole, I am hardly prepared to give any positive direction on this point for this particular diocese, although it is certainly desirable that uniformity of practice should prevail in the Church at large.

A more important point than that of the dress of the officiating clergyman, is the manner in which he reads the Common Prayer. No person objects more strongly than I do to a declamatory or rhetorical mode of reading; but I do not understand why those clergymen, who seek to avoid that fault, should pass to the opposite extreme of rapid and monotonous recitation. I am aware, that in the old rubric even the Lessons were directed to be sung in plain tone, as also the Epistle and Gospel; this was wisely altered in 1661. There are certain parts of the service which the rubric still directs to be said or sung; but they are not to be said AND sung, or to be said IF they were sung; and even if they are sung, they should be well sung—they should be sung loudly, audibly, distinctly; and the Lord's Prayer and the Collects are ordered not to be sung, but said. The Fourteenth Canon directs, that the Common Prayer be said or sung distinctly and reverently. Queen Elizabeth's Injunction of 1559 was, that all readers of public prayers be charged to read plainly and distinctly. The writer of the Homily on Common Prayer cites a constitution of Justinian to the same effect, and the like rule is laid down in the Reformatio Legum. The reason why so great a stress was laid on the distinct recitation of the Church service, independent of its obvious necessity, was the general prevalence of an opposite practice amongst the Popish clergy, many of whom, after they had conformed to the Liturgy, read it as they had been accustomed to read the prayers of their breviary. It is much to be regretted, that any of the clergy of our Reformed Church, which justly glories in a form of public prayer so framed that the people may both understand it and bear a part in it, should think it necessary or profitable, or consistent with the Church's intentions, to read it in a hurried and indistinct manner. "It is an absurdity, as well as an iniquity," says Bishop Gibson, "which we justly charge upon the Church of Rome, that her public service is in a tongue unknown to the people; but though our service is in a known tongue, it must be owned, that as reading it without being heard makes it, to all intents and purposes, an unknown tongue, so confused and indistinct reading, with every degree thereof, is a gradual approach to this."

It is a subject, my brethren, of still deeper concern, that any of our body, though but few, should evince a desire and longing to revert, not merely to some of the outward ceremonies, but to the devotional formularies of the Church of Rome; that they should speak disparagingly and disrespectfully of our Liturgy, and prepare men of ardent feelings and warm imaginations for a return to the Roman mass-book, by publishing devotions and homilies, taken from authors of that Church, and embodying not a few of its superstitious and unscriptural doctrines and practices; that

they should recommend or justify, under any qualification, prayers or addresses to saints—which began in poetry and ended in idolatry; intercessions for the dead—which our Church, by her formal discontinuance of them, has implicitly forbidden, and which tend directly to the notion of purgatory; and auricular confession—a practice utterly unknown to the primitive Church, one of the most fearful abuses of that of Rome, and the source of unspeakable abominations. It is a subject of concern, that while they protest in courteous and measured terms against some of the errors of that Church, and speak of them as though they had not been her errors before the Council of Trent, they should abstain from the plain, uncompromising assertion of her unscriptural, or rather her anti-scriptural character, and spend their lamentations on their own national Church, as sitting apart from the mother of Churches, and in bondage to the powers of this world, rather than upon that system of corruption and tyranny, which drove her from communion with Rome, and which is still maintained by Rome inherently, and as far as ever circumstances will permit her to practise it. Again, it is matter of shame and grief to us, and of exultation to our adversaries, that while such men as Hildebrand and Becket are held up to admiration, who, if they were sincere, were yet the authors and abettors of evil, the firebrands of discord and the subverters of civil government, reproach and censure should be cast upon those holy men, to whom, under God, we owe our deliverance from an intolerable yoke—Cramer, and Ridley, and Jewel; as though the occasional errors into which they may have fallen, under circumstances of difficulty, which we are wholly unable to appreciate, were not a thousand times outweighed by their services to the cause of God's truth and of his Church.

I am far from approving of those public controversial discussions, which, by exaggerated statements, sure to be made in the heat of the moment, and admitting of easy refutation, tend to promote rather than check the growth of Popery among us; nor do I think it consistent with truth to deny that the Church of Rome is a branch, however corrupt, of the Church Catholic—or with charity, to speak more strongly in condemnation of its faults, than the sacred interests of true religion require; but I hold it still more inconsistent both with truth and charity to gloss over its deadly errors, and to smooth the way for their establishment. Let us not scruple to say of that Church, not for her condemnation, but in our own vindication and defence, and for a warning to those who are in danger of being deceived by her delusive attractions, that she is in a state of schism, if not apostasy; that she has forsaken the true faith, and defiled herself with superstition and idolatry. And let us speak all the more plainly, seeing that she again employs as her chosen defenders and emissaries, a society of men bound together by a vow to uphold by all methods and at all hazards, not Christianity, but Popery; and who, in accordance with that vow, have framed a society so hideous in its principles, so mischievous in its effects, that it well deserves to be described as having embodied the very "mystery of iniquity." The Church of Rome has added to and defaced the apostolical "form of sound words"—has superseded the apostolical succession—has mutilated and corrupted the apostolical record. That the character of the Church itself is not altered, but that of a few or many of its individual members whose personal graces at once modify and recommend the principles which they embrace. There is scarcely any error of doctrine, however extravagant or fatal, which has not been held by some person of irreproachable conduct. Against such a Church we are bound continually to lift up the voice of solemn reproof; and far from being ashamed of the name of Protestant, we ought to show that a sincere and immovable attachment to the Anglican Church, in its constitution, discipline, authority, privileges, and offices, is perfectly compatible, or rather is itself a practical act of protestation against the errors and corruptions of the Papal Church.

And surely the duty of so protesting is not to be lost sight of, at a time when that Church is openly asserting its pretensions amongst us, and affecting to look for the speedy return of our own reformed Church into its maternal bosom. The doctrines and practices, which rendered necessary our separation from that Church, are still retained by her, unchanged, unmitigated, unqualified; nor are the differences between us, in essential matters, less at the present moment, than they were in the times of Cramer or Jewel, or Taylor or Hooper. We do not assert the absolute perfectness of our own Church; but it is not by retracing any of the steps by which she has been removed from the Church of Rome, that she is to be made more perfect, nor by attempting to remodel her upon the doctrine and discipline, not of the primitive Church, but of the Church of the fourth or fifth centuries. That we are in some respects impeded and trammelled by the nature of our legislative connection with the state may be true, and this is itself one consequence which followed from the abuse of the Papal power before the Reformation; but this imperfection will in no way be remedied by the resumption of exploded principles or practices; and I cannot help suspecting that the desire of reverting to them without impediment, is one motive why some persons are seeking to effect the total separation of the Church from the state. Let us do all that we have at this moment the power to do, as the ministers of that Church; nay, let us do all we are bound to do, and we shall then see what further freedom of action is required. Before we cry out for a reformation of the Church's laws, let us try the effect of those which are in existence, and not complain of the inefficiency of our ordinances till we have carried into them the spirit which is requisite to give them life and efficacy. It will not, I think, be denied that the Church of this country, in point of energy, power, and usefulness, is at this moment progressing; strange that at this very time complaints should be uttered of her wearing the chain of an ignominious thralldom, of her being compelled to mutter in indistinct accents the praises of God, and of her not affording sufficient scope for the indulgence of devotional feelings,—that Church in which the seraphic piety of Hooper, Hall, Taylor, Herbert, Kenn, and Wilson, felt no discouragement. If instead of such lamentations alarming our people, and unsettling the minds of our younger brethren in the ministry, we would admonish, comfort, and encourage one another, be faithful to our dear mother, and use in the spirit of love and diligence all the means and appliances she places in our hands, setting ourselves as a united band of Christian soldiers, with composed and steadfast resolution, to resist the inroads of Popery on the one hand, and of irregular enthusiasm on the other; if we did but realise in our own lives and persons the main precepts and directions which she has given for our guidance, recommending them by our example to the conscience and affections of all men, we should discover that there is much less need than we supposed of alteration; and at all events, we should know for a certainty in what direction that alteration should be attempted.

Let us be thankful to Almighty God, that the Church, crippled and fettered as she is thought by some to be, has yet had enough of energy and power to vindicate to herself the religious education of the people; to throw open the doors of her sanctuary to multitudes who were before excluded from it; and to send forth within the last two years six additional bishops to watch over the growth and fruitfulness of her distant offshoots. I embrace this opportunity of cordially thanking the clergy of the diocese, for the prompt and efficient manner in which they carried out my suggestion of a general collection at the offertory on Palm Sunday last, in aid of the Colonial Bishops' Fund. The total amount of that collection—more than 8000*l.*—greatly exceeded my expectations, and will no doubt operate as an encouragement to the clergy to adopt more generally still the mode of proceeding which I recommended; when collections are to be made, for

Church purposes. I shall probably call upon them, in the course of next year, to make another effort in behalf of the Metropolitan Churches Fund. The money already contributed to that fund has secured the erection of 42 additional churches; and where a church is built, schools for the children of the poor are sure to follow. It is to this combined provision for the spiritual and moral wants of the people, that the country must look for the cure of its most dangerous diseases; and I trust that the time is not far distant, when the Legislature of this Christian country will again recognise the duty incumbent upon it, of doing something to preserve and perpetuate its Christianity, by means of the instrument which has been divinely appointed for that purpose; not to supersede the Church's endeavours, and contributions, and sacrifices, but to aid and encourage them, to answer the present demand of instant urgency, and to supply that which the Church herself will not be able to supply till her wealthier members shall have been awakened to a sense of her obligation.

I should say something here on the subject of education, but that the time forbids, and that I spoke on it in a former Charge. I will merely observe on the present occasion, that the efficiency of our parochial system will be most materially increased by regular and periodical inspection. With that object in view, I have appointed clerical inspectors of schools in different parts of the diocese; and I must say, that those clergymen who object to their visiting the schools under their care, and reporting upon them to me as their diocesan, have a very inadequate notion of my duty and their own. Instances, however, of such objection are, I am happy to say, very rare.

I have been informed, that some of the clergy entertain a notion, that they may lawfully publish the banns and solemnise matrimony between two persons, who have already contracted marriage before the Superintendent Registrar under the provisions of the last Marriage Act. I apprehend this to be a mistaken notion. The law has decided the first marriage to be valid, and there can be no second marriage of the same parties. If the solemnisation of matrimony not according to the forms of the Church were not recognised by the law of the land as constituting the validity of marriage, this objection would not apply; but where the law has declared, that either of two modes of solemnisation shall remain valid, parties who have been married according to one of those methods cannot properly have recourse to the second. In what light, as members of the Church, we may regard a marriage, in which there is no intervention of a clergyman, I do not stop to say; but at all events it is a lawful marriage, and we are not to declare, by any act of ours, that parties so married are living in a state of concubinage.—If such a marriage be without spiritual grace, which the Church connects with matrimony when duly solemnised, the parties have deprived themselves of it by their own act, and we are not to remedy it by an irregular procedure of ours. The same principle of course applies to all marriages between Quakers and other Nonconformists, not celebrated in the face of the Church; and yet I suppose no clergyman would think it right to re-marry those parties, after they had lived together for many years as man and wife, upon their being reconciled to the Church.

There are still a few points connected with the orderly performance of Divine service, which as I am frequently consulted upon by the clergy, I will briefly notice before I conclude. I apprehend it is not right to commence Divine service with a psalm or hymn. The psalms and services had better be said than sung, where the congregation are not sufficiently versed in the knowledge of music to take part in it. Where a saint's-day falls upon a Sunday, the collect for the saint's-day, as well as that for the Sunday, should be read, and the Epistle and Gospel for the saint's-day, but the Lesson for the Sunday; this, however is a matter of opinion. The minister should give out the psalms, and all notices that may be lawfully published in church.—Queries for the Ember Weeks should always be used as appointed. The responses at the Communion Service, should be said, not sung, where there is not cathedral service. After the Nicene Creed, the minister should in all cases declare what holy days or fasting days are in the week following appointed to be observed. Baptism ought never to be administered in private houses, except in cases of urgent necessity; and all such baptisms should be duly registered. This I request you to take as my authoritative direction, as well as what follows; that you will not permit any clergyman to officiate as a temporary substitute, not being a personal friend or acquaintance of your own, who shall not have first exhibited to me his letters of orders.

In conclusion, my brethren, let us be careful to bear in mind ourselves, and to teach our people, that the outward means and aids of religion are not religion itself, and are only so far valuable and useful as they contribute to the pleasure of the Father. But the rest of the life of God in the soul, and to keep us within the precincts of his grace. The more careful we are to observe all the external acts of devotion, the more diligently let us cherish in ourselves, and strive to promote in others, those spiritual affections which they are intended to excite. And while we "contend earnestly for the faith," and for all the ordinances of God, let us not forget the "more excellent way;" "put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness;" and pray earnestly, and strive as well as pray, that all hatred and prejudice may be taken away from us, and whatsoever doth hinder us from godly unity; that, as there is but "one body, one Spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all," so we may henceforth be all of one heart and one spirit, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and "with one mind and one mouth glorify God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

#### BISHOP HOADLEY ON BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

(From a Correspondent of the London Church Magazine, for September.)

REV. SIR,—As you are in the habit of publishing extracts from the works of old Divines and others which bear upon the doctrines and discipline of the Church, I beg to hand you one from a prelate author, with whose writings many of your readers may be unacquainted.—I mean Bishop Hoadley, who successively filled the sees of Bangor, Hereford, Salisbury, and Winchester, and whose works excepting his sermon "On the Terms of Acceptance," have become extremely scarce. Hoadley was esteemed a very low Churchman in his day; nay it has been asserted he was "the greatest dissenter that ever wore a mitre."

Would that dissenters and low Churchmen of the present day held opinions at all bordering upon many that might be culled from his writings!

From what I have subjoined, your readers will see that he is sound upon the doctrine of Baptism as held by the Church. I may probably show other instances in which he meets the caveat of the Nonconformist, by compromise, but by grappling with the supposed difficulty.

"BISHOP HOADLEY ON BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

"But I must not forget to say something to this Baptismal Regeneration which you object against.—I am so little acquainted with the art of distinguishing, that I know no difference between a regeneration and a real regeneration. If there be a regeneration, I think it real; and if there be a real regeneration, it is to be ascribed to the Spirit of God. And because it always appeared to me that whoever was received into the Christian Church by God's minister, with prayers directed by the congregation to the Church's [when this wholesome method of the Church's intent be again carried out], and with sufficient security for his good education, and with sufficient according to God's will; I never doubted that God received such in his favour, and heard the prayers of his people, and approved of their baptism; and because I thought they were duly made Christians, I

could not but think the holy spirit of God resided in them, as they were now the temples of God. The Scripture leads us to think this, and consequently, we think that they are regenerated (in the Scripture notion of that word) as they are entered into this new estate; and that, by the Holy Ghost, as they are instituted to all his influences and assistances, purchased by the blood of Christ. We know not of anything in Scripture to induce us to think otherwise; and, therefore, we do not separate what St. Paul hath joined together, the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost (Tit. iii. 5.), in speaking of the whole Christian Church.

"But we can hardly persuade ourselves that you believe as you speak, when you say your reason for not concurring with us in this, is for fear of contributing to the hardness of careless men in the opinion that they are regenerate, and need no further care.—We, on the contrary, think the point now before us a persuasive argument to the greatest care and diligence. For if men were regenerated by the Holy Ghost, and made the temples of God by baptism, how much does it concern them to live as such, not to defile the temple of God, or drive his spirit from them? And in this we flatter ourselves that we imitate St. Paul and the other Apostles, who in their writings have said this very thing, and all the glorious things imaginable of all professed baptised Christians in general; and yet never thought them an encouragement to security, but always insisted on them as the properest arguments to the greatest care and diligence. And it would be worth while to enquire, whether the same objections do not lie against what St. Paul affirms of baptised Christians, as do against what our Church says of them."—*The Reasonableness of Conformity*, in answer to Calamy, &c.

I beg to remain Rev. Sir, yours, &c.

R. L.

### THE CHURCH.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1842.

We have frequently expressed an opinion that any Churchman who attends a Dissenting place of worship, be it Protestant or Roman Catholic, commits the sin of schism. We have also said that such has ever been the opinion of the Catholic Church, and of the greatest divines of the English branch of it, and we shall now proceed by various extracts to show that we were fully warranted in making such a statement.

In the first place we take up our position on the foundation of Holy Scripture. One text out of a great number of the same tendency, will suffice:—*"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned: and avoid them."* (Romans xvi. 17.) Now Dissenters do cause divisions contrary to the doctrine which Churchmen have learned in their Bibles and Prayer-Books, and therefore they ought to be avoided.

The testimonies of the Fathers upon this point are so strong and so abundant, that we should not know where to stop, were we to cite their great authority in consecutive order; we will therefore content ourselves with two quotations from the Martyr Irenæus, who was bishop of Lyons about the year 178, and enjoyed the friendship of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John:

"It is fitting that they of the Church obey the Presbyters, men who derive their succession, as we have shewn, from the Apostles; who, together with the succession of the overseership, received the certain grace of truth, according to the pleasure of the Father. But the rest, who secede from the chief succession, and assemble themselves in any place where they will, should be held suspected as heretics and evil-disposed persons; or schismatics, proud and self-perversers; or hypocrites and bringers of gain and vain-glorious."

"As many as withdraw from the Church, and follow after those who are not of the Church, they are not of the Church; and such as depart from the Church, they depart from the life of God in the soul, and to keep us within the precincts of his grace. The more careful we are to observe all the external acts of devotion, the more diligently let us cherish in ourselves, and strive to promote in others, those spiritual affections which they are intended to excite. And while we "contend earnestly for the faith," and for all the ordinances of God, let us not forget the "more excellent way;" "put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness;" and pray earnestly, and strive as well as pray, that all hatred and prejudice may be taken away from us, and whatsoever doth hinder us from godly unity; that, as there is but "one body, one Spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all," so we may henceforth be all of one heart and one spirit, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and "with one mind and one mouth glorify God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

IX. *Authors of Schism in the Church of England censured.*

Whoever shall hereafter separate themselves from the communion of saints, as it is approved by the Apostles' rules, in the Church of England, and combine themselves together in a new brotherhood, accounting the government of the Church of England, to be profane, and unmet for them to join with in Christian profession, let them be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored but by the Archbishop, after their repentance, and public revocation of such their wicked errors.

X. *Maintainers of Schismatics in the Church of England censured.*

Whoever shall hereafter affirm, that such ministers as refuse to subscribe to the form and manner of God's worship in the Church of England, prescribed in the Communion Book, and their adherents, may truly take upon them the name of another church not established by law, and dare presume to publish it, that their pretended grievances imposed upon it, and upon the members thereof before mentioned, by the Church of England, and the orders and constitutions therein by law established: let them be excommunicated, and not restored until they repent, and publicly revoke such their wicked errors.

XI. *Maintainers of Conventicles censured.*

Whoever shall hereafter affirm or maintain, that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations of the King's born subjects, than such as by the laws of this land are held, and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches; let him be excommunicated and not restored, but by the Archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of such his wicked errors.

The Canons were made in the Convocation of the Clergy in 1563, and confirmed by Act of Parliament in 1572. Though, in many respects, virtually superseded by subsequent Parliamentary enactments, and now no longer enforced, as a whole, by the temporal arm, they are still to be taken as the authoritative opinion of the Church, and as speaking her deliberate opinion. We, therefore, have the Church of England denying, in solemn Convocation, "the name of true and lawful churches" to the assemblies of separatists, and excommunicating all those who maintain (and what greater proof of maintaining can there be than attendance at such forbidden worship?) a contrary doctrine, and persist in such "wicked errors."

BISHOP RIDLEY made his first Visitation of the Diocese of London in 1550, and among the "articles to be enquired of" occurs the following:

"Whether any of the Anabaptists sect, or other, use notoriously any unlawful or private conventicles, wherein they do use doctrine or administration of sacraments, separating themselves from the rest of the parish?"

ARCHBISHOP PARKER, in 1569, in like manner, asks, among his Visitation Articles;

"Whether there be in your quarters any that openly or privily use or frequent any kind of divine service, or common prayer, other than is set forth by the laws of this realm?"

Any that keep any secret conventicles, preachings, lectures, or readings contrary to the laws.

The most superficial reader of English Ecclesiastical History knows perfectly well that our Martyrs and Reformers regarded schism as a heinous sin; but modern Dissenters, and even many modern Churchmen, have so grossly misrepresented the sentiments of those venerable men, that we have thought it necessary to adduce a specimen or two of the language which they habitually used in regard to the separatists of their day.

We will now descend the stream of time, and, from such books as we have at hand, select a few passages, of similar import to those already adduced, merely obfusing by the way that we could fill a large folio volume with selections of a like nature.

Dr. DANIEL FEATLEY, a great opponent of the Arminian Laud, and a dependent of the Calvinistic Archbishop Abbott, thus delivered himself, in a Sermon, before the latter in 1622:

"Of those that feed the flock, some feed not God's flock, but Satan's herd; teaching in Convocatives of Heretics, or Schismatics. Warts and fleas in the ears of the flock, and Pirates have their pilots as well as honest Merchants; let not ye like them; feed not [he is addressing the Clergy] the droves of Satan or Antichrist, but the flock of God."

Can stronger language be applied to Schismatics, or their unscriptural assemblies?

DEAN SHERLOCK writes thus:

Christ has but one body, and those who separate from the body of Christ are no longer of his body; and the ancient Christians did believe schism to separate men from Christ, and to put them out of a state of salvation; it was an acknowledged principle among them, that there was no salvation out of the Church, and that schismatics were out of the Church.

Read what the illustrious BISHOP BELL has said in his accustomed clear and forcible manner:

"We dispute and trample upon the reformation of religion, which, by a miracle of God's mercy, was wrought in this nation in the days of our forefathers, and run to a better reformation.

"We scorn to take it [the Sacrament], and refuse to receive it, unless it be given us by an unhalloved hand in a factious conventicle.

"Schismatical teachers, who, by a specious 'form of godliness,' endeavour to seduce men from their lawful pastors, and to draw them from the communion of the Church, into house meetings and private conventicles.—Read the sixth and seventh verses (2. Tim. iii.), and you will see the Apostle foresaw and described the humour of the age."

Still more severely is the truly evangelical and incomparable BISHOP BEVERIDGE:

"As for schism, they certainly hazard their salvation at a strange rate, who separate themselves from such a Church as ours is, wherein the apostolical succession, the root of all Christian communion, has been so entirely preserved and the Word and Sacraments are so effectually administered; and all to go to such assemblies and meetings as are not so warranted by the law of God. I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. (Matt. xxvii. 20.) For it is manifest, that this promise was made only to the apostles and their successors to the end of the world. Whereas in the private meetings, where their teachers have no apostolical or episcopal imposition of hands, they have no ground to pretend the apostles, nor by consequence any right to the Spirit which our Lord here promiseth; without which, although they preach their hearts out, I do not see what spiritual advantage can accrue to their hearers by it. And therefore, whatsoever they may think it, for my own part, I would not be willing out of this promise of the Spirit for all the apostles, as knowing, that not only myself, but the whole Catholic Church, is highly concerned in it: it being by virtue of this promise, that the Church is continually acted, guided, and assisted by the Spirit of God, and so the ordinary means of grace are made effectual to salvation, which otherwise would be of no force or efficacy at all. And therefore, to speak modestly, they must needs run a very great hazard who cut themselves off from ours, and by consequence from the Catholic Church, and so render themselves incapable of receiving any benefit from this promise, or from the means of grace which they cut themselves off from."

"So long as you do so, [i. e. hold constant communion with the Church] you are certainly in the ready way to heaven; whereas, if you leave the Church, and run into corners and separate congregations, you expose yourselves at least to a very great uncertainty about your salvation."

Bennet's *Abridgement of the London Causes*, which is a summary of the arguments of the greatest Church Divines of his day against the Dissenters, we meet with this pithy and conclusive argument:

"To be in communion with the Church is to be a member of it; and to be a member of two separate and opposite Churches, is to be as contrary to ourselves as those separate Churches are to one another; and whoever communicates with both those Churches, on one side or other, communicates in a Schism. So that if Schism be a very great sin, and that which will damn us as soon as Adultery or Murder, then it must needs be unlawful and dangerous to communicate with Schismatics."

We will conclude our quotations with the emphatic words of BISHOP JOLLY, who not long since was gathered to his happy rest, but whose name and virtues will for ever shed lustre upon the Scottish Episcopal Church:

"It appears that the sin of schism is so great and heinous in the sight of God, how careful should every Christian be that he fall not into it! The communion that our Saviour gave to the pastors of the Church empowers them to teach the people their duty in an authoritative manner, and to bless them in the name of God; to offer up their prayers to God, and to administer the Holy Sacraments. But if we see any person usurping any part of the sacred office, teaching though he be not sent, or pretending to administer the Sacraments, and to bless, as a priest or minister of God, though he be not called, how can we imagine that it is lawful for us to be taught, or blessed, or to offer up our prayers, or to receive the Sacraments, and to be in communion with him, who is an invader of the priesthood, or how can we be in communion with these invaders, by our presence at their ministrations, without being partakers of their crime? And we are equally obliged to abstain, though the person officiating has received valid ordination, if he is at that time exercising his orders in opposition to the Rightful Bishop of the Diocese, with whom all good Christians, who love the order and peace of Christ's Church, must ever live in communion."

"OUR BEING SCHISMATICS, THAT WE CAN BE IN THE RELIGIOUS ASSEMBLIES OF THEM THAT ARE SO? The Apostle bids us mark and avoid them. How then can we, with safety to our souls, contradict so plain a command? It is true, indeed, the common way is to discharge and condemn these conclusions, by calling them uncharitable; but surely uncharitable they cannot be, if they are true, if they are clear deductions from Scripture, and the universal belief and practice of the first and purest ages of Christianity."

The Rev. Alexander Williams, the excellent Rector of Cornwall, has been the subject of our Ecclésiastical Intelligence...

lands attached to it—the proportions of cleared land on each "Glebe" whether by or without the assistance of the Farm Buildings—the repairs required to fences or otherwise...

Nov. 13. The station has been served every Sunday at 3, P.M., and the increasing congregation bears testimony to the benefit of concentrating effort in one promising spot...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

red there, but the vacancy in the office of the Accountant should remain at the disposal of the Governor, the appointment to be filled up by that of the junior, the other officers being promoted by you...

Canadian Ecclesiastical Intelligence. Collections in aid of the funds of the Society made in the several Churches of the Diocese, in compliance with the Lord Bishop's Circular...

Proceedings of the Cornwall Parochial Association in connection with the Church Society of the Diocese of Toronto. In placing before our readers the proceedings of the meeting held in St. Peter's Church, on Saturday last...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

THE MONITOR OF MONDAY publishes an account of the commercial operations of Tabriz in 1840, from which it appears that this city has now become the emporium of the whole trade of Persia with Europe...

