

bed by a few clergy in Canterbury, London and in the university of Cambridge, who were solicited but not compelled to subscribe by the bishops Cranmer and Ridley." It is painful to notice this miserable subterfuge. Because the only records of the subscription, which have been preserved, regard these four places, it is assumed as a fact that no subscriptions took place anywhere else, though it is plain from these very records that the same orders were transmitted to every diocese in the kingdom: and because Cranmer said that he had not compelled any to subscribe, [and said it with truth, for he had not the power to compel, according to law] --it is insinuated that the subscriptions were spontaneous, though the fact is, that all were summoned to subscribe, and were informed that the names of the refusers would be returned to the council, "that further order might be taken with them by the king and his council." There is no doubt that the whole proceeding was arranged after the precedent set by Henry VIII, when he sought to obtain the acknowledgement of his supremacy without the qualifying clause, and rejection of papal supremacy. It was intended, first, to procure the subscriptions of the clergy in every diocese, by virtue of the royal command, and then to confirm the articles by act of parliament, under the pretext that they had already been adopted by the whole body of the clergy. The scheme was defeated by the death of the king, before parliament could be assembled, so that the civil penalties could not lawfully be inflicted on the non-subscribers: but the articles themselves were considered from that time as the authorized creed of the Reformed Church of England and continued to be so under Elizabeth, until they were corrected and improved in the convocation of 1562.

If, then, the reader consider how widely the English church of Edward differed in government, and worship, and doctrine from the church of the first year of his father Henry, he must come to the conclusion, that they could not be one and the same church. As well might you maintain the identity of the present church of England with the present church of Rome; for the difference between them is not greater.

We proceed to the reign of Mary, the successor of Edward, under whose sceptre the new church was swept away, and the old church restored. 1st. The five bishops, so unjustly deprived to make room for reformers under Edward, recovered their sees. On the attainder of Cranmer for treason in the attempt to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne, the archbishopric was considered vacant, and the administration assumed by the chapter of the cathedral. Holgate of York, and Bird of Chester, were deprived, because, having taken the monastic vows, they had nevertheless contracted marriage *de facto*, though they ought not to *de jure*; Taylor, Hooper, Harley, and Ferrar, calling themselves bishops of Lincoln, Worcester, Hereford, and St. David's, were removed, on account of the nullity of their consecration, the defect of their

title, (a patent from the king, with the clause limiting their office to the time of their good behaviour,) and for divers other causes; and Barlowe, of Bath and Wells, with Bush of Bristol, hardly escaped the same fate by a timely resignation. In this manner all the men of the new learning were drawn from the episcopal bench, and their places were speedily filled by others attached to the ancient worship. 2d. In the first year of the queen, an act was passed, repealing all the statutes on religious matters, enacted during the nonage of her late brother; which at once rendered illegal the use of the book of common-prayer, that of the new ordinal, the marriage of priests, communion under both kinds, and every other innovation recently established by authority of parliament; and placed religion on exactly the same footing on which it stood at the demise of Henry VIII. Afterwards, in the first and second of Philip and Mary, another act was passed, repealing in like manner the statutes on religious matters enacted during the reign of Henry, which at once abolished the royal supremacy, and the oath in support of that supremacy, and restored to the pope all that jurisdiction and authority which he had formerly possessed within the realm. Thus religion was now replaced on exactly the same footing on which it had stood before the quarrel of Henry with the apostolic see. The same religious government, the same religious worship, the same religious doctrine prevailed. What then are we to say of the church of England under Mary? Was it the same church with the church under Edward, or the same with the church at the accession of Henry? It is difficult to extort a precise answer from the patrons of the Oxford doctrines, and the reason is evident; if they admit the church under Mary, there is an end to their claim to apostolic succession: The chain is broken. They cannot trace their descent from that church; they cannot by hook or by crook connect themselves with it. Hence they tell us, that under Mary, every rule of polity was violated; that unjustifiable changes were made by the influence of the queen and of Gardiner, and that the church of England was oppressed by a schismatical prelacy and clergy. It may be sufficient to reply that no innovation in matters of doctrine, or worship, or discipline, was introduced by the civil power during Mary's reign. The queen laid no claim to the government of the church: that, like all her predecessors before Henry, she left to the church itself. She employed her authority only to undo what had been done by royal authority in the reign of her father and brother; and the parliament only repealed what had been recently enacted by preceding parliaments. The consequence was, that every innovation of the reformers was cleared away, and the religion of former days became again, without further enactment, part and parcel of the law of the land.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

#### PHYSICAL EDUCATION.

From Dr. Combe's principles of physiology applied to the improvement of physical and mental education.

The exhalation from the skin being so constant and extensive, its bad effects, when confined, suggest another rule of conduct, viz., that of frequently changing and airing the clothes, so as to free them from every impurity. It is an excellent plan, for instance, to wear two sets of flannels, each being worn and aired by turns, on alternate days. The effect is at first scarcely perceptible, but in the course of time its advantages and comfort become very manifest, as the writer has amply experienced. For the same reason, a practice common in Italy merits universal adoption. Instead of beds being made up in the morning the moment they are vacated, and while still saturated with the nocturnal exhalations which, before morning, become sensible even to smell in a bed-room, the bed-clothes are thrown over the backs of chairs, the mattresses shaken up, and the window thrown open for the greater part of the day, so as to secure a thorough and cleansing ventilation. This practice, so consonant to reason, imparts a freshness which is peculiarly grateful and conducive to sleep, and its real value may be inferred from the well known fact that the opposite practice, carried to an extreme, as in the dwellings of the poor, where three or four beds are often huddled up with all their impurities in a small room, is a fruitful source of fever and bad health, even where ventilation during the day and nourishment are not deficient. In the abodes of the poor Irish residing in Edinburgh, I have seen bedding for fourteen persons spread over one floor not exceeding twelve feet square, and when morning came, the beds were huddled above one another to make sitting-room during the day, and at night were again laid down, charged with accumulated exhalations. If fever were not to appear in such circumstances, it would be indeed marvellous; and we ought to learn from this, that if the extreme be so injurious, the lesser degree implied in the prevalent practice cannot be wholesome, and ought, therefore, not to be retained when it can be so easily done away with.

When the saline and animal elements left by the perspiration are not duly removed by washing or bathing, they at last obstruct the pores and irritate the skin.— And it is apparently for this reason that, in the eastern and warmer countries, where perspiration is very copious, ablution and bathing have assumed the rank and importance of religious observances. Those who are in the habit of using the flesh-brush daily are at first surprised at the quantity of white dry scurf which it brings off; and those who take a warm bath for half an hour at long intervals cannot fail to have noticed the great amount of impurities which it removed, and the grateful feeling of comfort which its use imparts. The warm, tepid, cold or shower bath as a means of preserving health, ought to be in as common use as a change of apparel, for it is equally a measure of necessary cleanliness. Many, no doubt, neglect this, and enjoy health notwithstanding; but many suffer from its omission; and even

the former would be benefitted by employing it. The perception of this truth is gradually extending, and baths are now to be found in fifty places for one in which they could be obtained twenty years ago. Even yet, however, we are far behind our continental neighbours in this respect. They justly consider the bath as a necessary of life, while we still regard it as a luxury.

When we consider the importance of the exhalation performed by the skin, the extent to which ablution and bathing of every description are neglected in charitable institutions, in seminaries for the young, and even by many persons who consider themselves as patterns of cleanliness is almost incredible. Mr. Stuart, in speaking of North America, states in his remarks, that "the practice of travellers washing at the doors, or in the porticoes or stoops, or at the wells of taverns and hotels once a day, is most prejudicial to health; the ablution of the body, which ought never to be neglected, at least twice a day, in a hot climate, being altogether inconsistent with it. In fact, he adds, "I have found it more difficult in travelling, to procure a liberal supply of water at all times of the day and night in my bed-chamber, than to obtain any other necessary. A supply for washing the hands once a day seems all that is thought requisite." But, bad as this is, I fear that numbers of sensible people may be found much nearer home, who limit their ablutions to the visible parts of their persons, and would even express surprise if told that more than this is necessary to health. Certain it is, that many never wash their bodies at all, unless they happen to be at sea-bathing quarters in summer, or are oppressed with heat, when they will resort to bathing as a means of comfort, but without thinking at all of its efficacy as a means of cleanliness in preserving health.

In many public charities and schools, in like manner, bathing or ablution is never thought of as a proper or practicable thing, except for the sick; and yet, it is obviously of great importance to every one, especially to the young.

On the Continent, the vapour and hot air baths are had recourse to, both as a means of health and in the cure of disease, to an infinitely greater extent than they are in this country. Their use is attended by the very best effects, particularly in chronic ailments, and there can be no question that their action is chiefly on the skin, and through its medium on the nervous system. As a means of determining to the surface, promoting cutaneous exhalation, and equalizing the circulation, they are second to no remedy now in use; and consequently in a variety of affections which the encouragement of these processes is calculated to relieve, they may be employed with every prospect of advantage. The prevalent fear of catching cold, which deters many from using the vapour bath, even more than from warm bathing, is founded on a false analogy between its effects and those of profuse perspiration from exercise or illness. The latter weakens the body, and, by diminishing the power of reaction, renders it sus-