

stantiation indeed, but consubstantiation it carefully avoids condemning.

The articles, as they were fashioned in King Edward's reign, did indeed condemn all kind of "corporeal" or "real presence," and pretended to refute the doctrine in detail by some sham materialist metaphysics. But in Queen Elizabeth's time, in the year 1562, the articles received a material alteration in this very particular. The denial of the corporeal presence strikes equally at the Catholic doctrine of *trans* and at the Lutheran doctrine of *con*. But it was the object of the religion makers, in Elizabeth's reign, to make their religion as roomy and commodious as possible. Moreover, they had a special desire to get rid of the Calvinistic influences that prevailed under Edward the Sixth. Accordingly, they contented themselves with condemning *transubstantiation*, and adopted the jargon that the body, &c. is "verily and indeed taken," but "after a spiritual manner," and "by faith." However, we cannot refrain from setting forth to the admiration of our readers the position in which this doctrine appears to stand. The following passage from Bishop Burnet (Part 3, Book 6), will exhibit the matter in its true light:—

"The differences between these articles, and those set forth by King Edward, are very peculiarly marked in the collections added to my second volume. The most material is the leaving out that express declaration that was made against the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament, which I then thought was done in compliance with the opinion prevalent among the people of the Popish persuasion, who were strangely possessed with the belief of such a presence; but I am convinced by the letters sent me from Zurich, that in this great regard was likewise had to the Lutheran churches, with whom a conjunction was much endeavoured by some: so that perhaps this was one consideration that made it be thought convenient to suppress the definition then made in this matter by the convocation; but it does nowhere appear to me whether these words were suppressed by the consent of the convocation, or whether the Queen ordered it to be done, either by a direct command, or by denying to give her assent to that part of the article."

From this it appears that the Reformed Church, in the reign of Edward, did reject the real presence, formally and verbally; that at a later period the rejection was officially withdrawn—not on any score of truth or falsehood, but for the convenience of admitting error; and thirdly, that the historian does not know whether the rejected matter was left out by order of the Church or by order of the State. Is it possible for anything more clearly to illustrate the private judgment system which the Puseyites worship? Their establishment once condemned what they now publicly teach. It has since—we will suppose—withdrawn its condemnation. What is their reason for attributing more value to the second condemnation than to the first? They can have but two reasons to give. The first is a chronological one; that is, to make it a fixed principle in the-

ology, that an establishment is more likely to be in error between the years of 1547 and 1553, than between the years 1562 and 1843. This is, at all events, a very clear principle, but whether it is deduced from the Scriptures or the Fathers, or the first four Councils, we have not learning enough to determine. The second reason is neither more nor less than that the private judgment of the Puseyite prefers the latter decision to the former. Authority is out of the question. There is the authority of the same body on both sides; and thus it is, that unless the Puseyites adopt our chronological solution of the difficulty, they have no alternative but to base the main doctrine of their religion—the doctrine of the Eucharist—upon their own individual notions, and not upon authority. The case, therefore, between them and the Evangelicals stands thus:—Dr. Pusey's doctrine of consubstantiation, or their anti-Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, is not now condemned by the articles. As matters now stand, therefore, an Anglican may hold the belief in the Real Presence. But the Evangelicals have this advantage over the Puseyites, that the Calvinistic doctrine has never been condemned. The Puseyite remains in the establishment on sufferance, and is allowed to hold his private opinion about the Eucharist against a prior formal condemnation of that opinion. The Evangelical holds an opinion which is equally consistent with the present articles, which has once been expressly sanctioned by the establishment, which has never been condemned, but the opposite of which has been condemned in the most pointed and elaborate manner. Really on this matter we must give our feeble testimony to the despised Evangelical, as holding more stoutly by authority than the mere pretensions of high-flying Puseyite. We shall be very curious to know whether this examination of Dr. Pusey's sermon by the Heretical Board produces any fruit.

Meanwhile, fruit is being produced by other acts in other quarters, but springing from the same root of bitterness. It is singular to see how in these times Church questions are everywhere reviving. Among all classes, Protestant and Catholic—the opinions of the sceptical eighteenth century are passing away; the importance of spiritual things is becoming again recognized; and the infidel notion that the great use of establishment is to offer a protection against fanaticism, and furnish a safeguard to "moderate" religion, is dying out. Everywhere the Churches of western Europe, orthodox and heretical, are beginning to bristle up into a new life; and as they had all sunk down more or less into too abject a submission to civil authority, so now they are all beginning to arouse themselves out of their miserable slumbers. Now, then, comes the trial of strength; and now we are to see in which Church dwell the real elements of vitality. One such contest we have had in Europe, and have seen it brought to a conclusion—the contest between Rome and Berlin—and the military despot of the North has been fain to bow his head to the spiritual Monarch of the South. In Prussia, the Church has proved

true and strong, and the gates of hell have not prevailed against it. A second struggle has been carried on for some years in Scotland, between a "Reformed" Church and a less despotic state of England. What has been the issue of that conflict? Why, the Kirk, with every right upon its side, has gone to pieces in the contest. In England there are symptoms much fainter and less decided, of such another contest, of which the end is not so certain. We confess we should not be very sanguine about the result; because in England we consider all parties in the establishment as having far too much worldly prudence, and far too great a readiness to compromise, for us to have much reason to suppose that on this side of the Tweed any great sacrifices would be made for principle. If the history of the past did not teach us this, we should certainly imagine we saw, in a document recently published by the *Morning Herald*, the small beginning of a great crack in the Law Church.

It appears that the bishop of London, in his late charge, has issued certain orders to the clergy of his diocese, touching the due observance of certain disused Protestant rubrics. These orders were found, it is said, unpalatable to the majority of the clergy, and "universally to the laity." The anti-Puseyite clergy attributed them to the influence of Puseyite advisors, and declare that on that account they "feel that to be coerced into the use of such injunctions is deeply humiliating." The majority have "declined to comply," and the Bishop has met their uncomplying spirit with a high hand. "At the confirmations which are taking place, he intimates to the clergy present, that their attendance is required in the vestry, & there in language which admits of no discussion or appeal, issues his commands. His decisiveness of manner precludes all hopes of objection being heard, and the clergy retire in mortified silence." But they are silent for the time only. Their pride is wounded, and their anger roused, and they resolve to appeal to the Prime Minister to relieve them from the tyranny of their own Bishop! Most certainly this is a very pretty quarrel, and the notion it displays as to the reality of Episcopal authority, is positively charming. These recalcitrating parsons actually address a letter to the editor of the *Morning Herald*, in which, having not so much as gone through the preliminary of making a formal remonstrance to their diocesan, they put into him, very modestly, "whether it is becoming on his part thus to force upon the clergy, many of whom are equally gifted with himself, the adoption of the obsolete practices which their judgment deliberately repudiates." And they tell him pretty plainly, that if he continues in this course, he will be deemed to be of a self-willed and dogmatic spirit, and will never afterwards be venerated with that love and affection which the clergy should entertain towards their spiritual father in Christ."

If the father tells his children to do anything they don't like, the children won't love him any more, and will agree to set

him down for a very obstinate arbitrary old hunk. Nice children after the spirit! We wonder whether these are the lessons of filial obedience they inculcate upon their children after the flesh. After all for a dispute between a bishop of London and "the majority" of the persons in his diocese, this seems to us to be almost without a parallel. Ample materials here for a schism if there was any superfluity of honest adherence to principle on either side. But to make matters worse we are told by these "spiritual children," that they "know that the suggested alterations, injurious as they are, are but the precursors to others still more pernicious." And so they set themselves to work to agitate against their bishop "to send up petitions to her Majesty," and make pathetic appeals to the Prime Minister! How long will it be before these obedient parsons discover the soundness of the lesson inculcated into them by the Irish Presbyterian Professor of Church History, now on a sympathising visit to the "disruptors" in Edinburgh—the lesson namely, "that it is their duty to go and do likewise;" and that forasmuch as "semi-Popery has been taught openly for years, and not a single minister has ever yet been deposed for the heresy, Episcopal Government is a folly rather too expensive." Of a truth, they seem apt pupils for such a lesson.—*Tablet*.

INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH.—The Editor of *Gli Annali delle Scienze Religiose* observes, in reference to the temperance movement by Father Mathew: "What the Catholic Church at the present day accomplishes for the social improvement of nations by the mere efforts of a poor Capuchin friar, the most celebrated writers on political economy—the most profound Ministers of State—and the most august legislators have been unable to effect. Such is the glory of Catholicism considered in its relations to this economical and social science, which invincibly demonstrates that the prosperity of nations is intimately united with and powerfully sustained by its doctrines and institutions."—*Cath. Herald*.

SWITZERLAND.

The Pope's Nuncio has laid a note before the Vorort, complaining of the circulation in Switzerland of a false bull of His Holiness. The Vorort immediately assembled, and came to the following resolutions:—1. The Vorort will express to the Pope's Nuncio its lively regret at the fact communicated by his Excellency. 2. The cantons shall be called upon to use their utmost endeavours to stop the circulation of the false pontifical bull, and to bring the offenders to punishment. 3. The canton of Berne, whence this false bull has been spread through the country, shall be especially desired to search diligently for the authors. The executive council of Lucerne has also addressed a letter to the authorities of Berne, recommending them to take such precautionary measures as may prevent a repetition of such a scandalous proceeding.—*New Zurich Gazette*.