THE BIRD OF PASSAGE. Away to thy home-stead, thou sweet stranger bird, Away to thy home o'er the sea, For hack thee! the sound of the wild wind is heard, And the yellow leaves fall from the tree.

Away then, away to the bright sunny isles, Where myrtles and lemons entwine, Where Summer hath gilded her bowers with smiles, And Autumn empurples her vine.

There, glad thon may'st flit on the soft zephyr's breast, And sail through the deep azme sky.

There joyously fold thy bright wing and seek rest,
Assured that no snow-storm isnigh.

May safety attend thee, thou sweet stranger bird!
We mourn, though we bid thee depart.
Yes go - for the voice of stern Winter is heard, And surly and cold is his heart.

And oh ' when with us the short Summer is o'er, And Winter his warning has given, May we, too, as fearlessly launch from the shore.

And find our repose in you heaven.

A.

Tennessee, 1837. Episcopal Recorder.

THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY. THE UN-REPENTING.

The primary address to men in general may be stated in the words of the Master describing his own service, " to call sinners to repentance." All have sinned and come short of the glory of God. Whilst they remain unaffected by this melancholy fact, and continue to allow themselves in disobedience, they are living in rebellion against God, and their various acts of insubordination are the fruits and evidences of a carnal mind, which is enmity against God. In reference to all such, however they may differ in the outward expressions of their alien ation and rebelliousness, the work of the ministry consists in labouring to bring them to repentance—in presenting and pressing upon them those considerations which, under God, may discover to them their true spirit and state—awaken them to a proper sight and sense of the wick-edness of their way—the corruption of their hearts-and the ruin in which they have involved theriselves by their departure from duty and God. Till this is done-till a painful conviction of personal guilt, defilement and misery, as a sinner, is produced, leading the individual to ask with sincere solicitude "what must I do to be saved?" nothing is done effectually towards the accomplish ment of the great end of the Ministry. A man may be free from flagrant crimes - he may be, in many respects, a useful member of the community with which he is connected—he may be attentive and kind in social intercourse and domestic companionship; but if he is unconcerned as to the claims of his God, and unaffected by his offences against the Divine Majesty, what can all the civilities and courteness of life avail to his salvation? And yet this inoffensiveness and rectitude in his bearing towards men, especially if connected with a general respectfulness in reference to the institutions of religion, are apt so to throw their engaging influence around his character, as to blind us to his bearing towards God. We hear it said, "why such a person ought to be a professor of religion," and he is even urged to partake of its sacraments. A professor of religion, he and all to whom the word of God comes, ought certainly to be; but first, he should become what he is called on to profess. To make such profession whilst his heart is still unsubmissive to the authority of God and unbroken by a sense of his past sinfulness, would be preposterous. To pres. upon him a participation in the sacraments, as if, by a kind of charm, they were to wor!: his conversion, is miserably to mistake their nature and design, and to persuade him to action premature and incongruous, of ill effect upon himself, and of serious injury to the Church of Christ. What has he to do with the sign of a change which he has not experienced-with the seals of a covenant which he has not truly embraced-or with the badges of a Master whom he is unwilling to serve as that Master requires? To introduce such persons into the visible church is to place them in the absurd and offensive position of the Samaritans who "worshipped the Lord and served their own gods." It is to engage them in a round of heartless ceremony, offensive to Christ, pernicious to their own souls, and detrimental to the cause of religion. No one can calculate the damage which has thus been brought upon the Church, or the fatal delusion which it has exercised on sinners. This is not to work the work of the ministry. This is not turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just. This is not enlisting soldiers for Christ, but persuading those who are yet in rebellion to assume the uniform and mingle in the ranks of his soldiers, much to the injury of their spirit or order-much to the discredit of his service, and greatly to the aid of the foes of man's salvation. Against this sad mistake, my brethren, let us guard, remembering that our business with those who have not worthill lamented their sins and acknowledged their wicked ness, is to seek to bring them to examine and try their ways, that they may turn to the Lord with sincere sorrow for the past and honest purposes of amendment of life. Our message to them is to "repent and turn from iniquity that it prove not their ruin." And we gain nothing in their case until awakened to a perception of the exceeding sinfulness of sin and of their own guilt and wretchedness. they earnestly desire to renounce their rebellion and

THE AWAKENED AND INQUIRING. In reference to those who have been awakened and are anxiously inquiring what they must do to be saved, the work of the ministry is one of deep and most eventful interest. Error here may prove disastrous in the extreme. The mistake of a counsellor. in civil affairs, may lose his client an estate; but by industry another may be obtained. The mistake of a physician may lose his patient his life; but "it is not all of life to live." The mistake of the minister may lose his parishioner his soul! and what then? the loss is remediless.

return to duty and to God.

If, in this part of the work, the material employed be improper, as "wood, hay, and stubble," it can-not stand the trial to which it will be exposed, but must be burned up, and the labour is worse than pro-

evil effects of such unskilfulness may be experienced | through life. True, the actual destruction of the soul may not ensue, but the individual may be prevented from attaining his rightful measure of usefulness and comfort, and as these form the capacity for the enjoyment of heaven, may thus be deprived of the degree of glory which otherwise he might have gained. Surely this department of the work should be conducted with extreme care, and in studied conformity with the pattern prescribed in our

commission, and every direction be given under the sanction of "thus saith the Lord." This process no minister can manage aright, unless he understands himself the difficulties formed by sin, rendering salvation necessary, and adequately apprehends the remedy provided and the mode of its application. But for sin we should not have needed salvation. Misery presupposes moral cril. The difficulties in which we have become involved by sin are two-

fold, corresponding with the aspect under which sin is to be regarded. Sin, is any transgression of the law of God: as such, it involves us in guilt or liability to punishment. The penalty annexed to such violation is death—eternal death.

Sin is, also, a dreadful disease of our moral nature deranging, defiling, and disabling its powers, and fatal in its tendency, working out the second death. If a sinner is to be saved, both of these evils must be obviated. The guilt of sin must be cancelled, and the disease must be broken and extirunavoidable result. The justice and truth of God priest, and altar. It was at the commemoration of would not admit of the impunity of one, for whose guilt satisfaction had not been rendered—the holi-

sufficiently apparent to every one.

Suppose a person who had violated the laws of his country, to have been condemned and incarcerated to await the execution of the sentence. Suppose him to have contracted then the foul and dangerous fever of the prison, which has prostrated his strength, and is rapidly making its way to his vitals. What would be needed for his relief? If the Executive, in the exercise of clemency, were to transmit to him a reprieve, and the officer who bore it to his cell should throw open the door and hid him go forth and enjoy the cheerful light and refreshing air of liberty, would his relief be effected? As his ear caught the tidings of pardon, his heart would faint within him from a consciousness of the painful disease by which he was disabled and incapacitated ship of all believers in the reconciliation effected by for availing himself of the license just received. the blood of Jesus. The Jews met without a Priest: His exemption from the axe of the executioner could not secure him life and liberty. His unproken and advancing disease would just as certainly consign him to the grave. Suppose that, instead of the officer that pertains to the office of a Priest, in our recontant to the grave. to the grave. Suppose that, instead of the officer from the executive with a reprieve, some physician, in his benevolence, should visit the prison, and touched with compassion for the sufferer should life thus rescued from disease was forfeited by crime; the uncancelled sentence was on him and the stroke of death must still be inflicted by the hand of the executioner. His salvation required both pardon and cure. The sentence or the disease, either remaining, would be fatal. And precisely so it is with a sinner; condemned and corrupted, his guilt must be cancelled and his malady cured, or he cannot be saved .- The Right Rev. J. Johns, D.D., Assistant Bishop of Virginia.

NO ALTAR, NO SACRIFICER IN THE RE-FORMED CHURCH.

From Address to the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ohio, by the Right Rev. C. P. McIlvaine, D.D., Bishop of the Diocese.

Continued from our last number. Now, my brethren, I have not looked without serious consideration upon these things. For several years, I have not consecrated a church, so far as I can remember, in which there was an altar-form structure, instead of a proper table. But this was rather because such a structure did not happen to be in the new churches, than because I was prepared to make any serious objection to it. But the altered condition of things to which I have referred, has placed the subject in a very different light, so that I have been led to inquire into my duty with regard to it as I had not done before. The conclusion to which I have come is this, -that hereafter I must refuse to consecrate any church in which there is an altar-form structure for the Lord's Supper, and in which there is not a proper table, in the usual sense, as the nermanent furniture. I must require, not only that there be not an altar, but that there be a permanent and proper table. Of this determination I takethe present opportunity of giving notice to the

In taking a position which I cannot but suppose will seem, not only new, but over-scrupulous to those whose attention has not been much drawn in that direction, it is due, as well to you, as myself, that I should assign my reasons. This, I now proceed to do. And, my brethren, if I should go more largely into the subject than the justification of the determination just declared would seem to require, I am sure you will not think the time inappropriately employed when you shall see how conclusively the state of the case as to what is right in our Church, in regard to the furniture for the Lord's Supper, expounds her doctrine of the nature of that sacrament. as involving no sacrifice, except as all prayer is sacrifice, and of the minister thereof as being no Priest except as that name is used synonymously with Presbyter or Elder.

 The English Translations of the Bible were violently attacked by Romish writers, in the age of the Reformation, because the original word Presbyteros, (whence comes our word Presbyter,) was in no instance rendered Priest. The Reformers answered thus: "The word priest, by popish abuse, is commonly spoken for a sacrificer the same as succeeds in Latin. But the Holy Ghost never calleth the ministers of the word and sagraments of the N. Test. hiereis or saverdotes. Therefore the translators, to make a difference between the ministers of the O. Test, and those of the New, call the one according to the usual acceptation, priests, and the other according to the original derivation, presbyters or elders.

The name of priest according to the original derivation fitless. If the material employed be suitable, yet, from presbyter, we do not refuse; but according to the if it is badly arranged and imperfectly adjusted, the common acceptation for a sacrificer we cannot take it, i

in what I have now said or shall say, there is no that sense, a Priest.
reference intended to any minister, or parish, or any All this illustrates how entirely it was, as perstate of things in this diocese. In carrying out my views of duty in this matter recently, I have designed not the least censure on any person or parish. Nothing of that sort is intended in what I have yet istration of that sacrament; and how little connexto say. In the few cases of altar-form structures in | ion it had, with any sacrifice, as then being offered, churches of Ohio, I have no reason to believe there or, with any altar as then present. has been any object beyond the gratification of a builder's taste. It may therefore seem to some illtimed to adopt the determination of which I have ust notified you. But my opinion is precisely the niterule of this kind, while there is nothing against it their prayers and alms. Our venerable Bishop more difficult to be yielded than a mere matter of architectural fancy; than to wait till erroneous doctrine shall have gained so much strength as to considerable time after the apostolic age." Suicer

ive use?

None can deny that our Lord instituted and administered the Eucharist at a common household tabetrayeth me is with me on the table," we necessatily contemplate the Saviour and the twelve as engaged in an act of communion simply; analogous to that of a household around its family table. Noth-Either remaining, and eternal death is the ing can more perfectly exclude the idea of sacrifice, to enter into Heaven. The endurance of the malady itself must make its subject miserable. A simple illustration, and the truth of this statement will be sufficiently apparent to every one. ficed. Other altar a Jew could not have, than that in the temple around which the blood of the lamb was sprinkled. Other sacrifice there remained none in connection with that feast, when once that lamb had been slain. But there did remain the feast of communion upon that lamb, thus offered once, for all the house of Israel. The lambs were many; the sacrifice, the feast, the type was one. It was the communion of the whole household of the chosen people. They met in families as we meet for our communion in congregations. They met, not at the altar where the sacrifice was offered, but at the table of the family fellowship; as we meet, not at the cross, where Christ our Passover was sacrificed for ciliation to God, was finished when Christ offered up prescribe for his cure, and so minister to him as to intercession within the well, before the mersy seat health. Would it still alone relieve him? No. The elsewhere been offered as a propitiatory sacrifice to God. Christians meet to feed, by fuith, with thanksgiving, spiritually upon a propitiatory sacrifice, long which we draw nigh to God. The Jewish Passover was of two parts, "the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover;" and the feast of the Lord's Passover; the propitiatory offering at the temple, and the eucharistic supper on that offering, in the family dwell- Jewish altars.) But that the primitive churches ing. It was as much commanded that the feast used communion tables, as we do now, of boards and should be in the house, and not at the altar in the wood, not altars, as they do, of stone. Origen was temple, as that the sacrifice should be at the altar in about 200 years after Christ, and he saith that Celthe temple, and not in any private house. Our Passover is of like two parts, the sacrifice and the feast; the offering of the Lamb of God, and the eucharistic supper of the whole household of faith, partaking of that Lamb. In the beginning of the dispensation of the Gospel, the sacrifice of our passover was slain, once for all. Jesus was priest and end of the world, is the Feast of the Lord's Passover, during which each believer, every day, is living by faith, in the secret of his own heart, upon the sacrifice of Christ, as all his life and hope; and the whole household of faith are, at stated periods, assembling together to express and declare in the sacrament of the breaking of bread, their common dependence on, and their common thankfulness for, that one perfect and sufficient oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.

As the Jews were not allowed to unite the offering and the eating, the priestly sacrifice and the our hearts be called altars, &c. Mark, with your-eucharistic feast, but were commanded to separate selves, therefore, the newness of this point, for them in point of place and time; so we cannot, by any possibility, unite them under the Gospel. The sacrifice for us was offered eighteen hundred years and truth and sound antiquity be regarded.?! ago, " once for all." It cannot be repeated. The feast alone remains-a feast commemorative of a sacrifice, but not a sacrifice of commemoration, except as the offering of prayer and thanksgiving is

when it is spoken of the ministry of the N. Test. But seeing your popish sacrificing power, and blasphonions sacrifice of your mass hath no manner of ground in the holy scriptures, either in the original Greek, or in your own Latin translation, you are driven to seek a silly shadow of it in the abusive acceptation and sounding of the English word priest and priesthood. And therefore you do in great carnest affirm that priest, sacrifice, and altur are dependents and consequents one of another, so that they cannot be separated. If you should say in Latin sacerdos, sacrificium, altare be such consequents we will subscribe to you; but if you will change the word, and say presbyter, sacrificium, altare, every learned man's ears will glow to hear you say they are dependents and consequents inseparable. Therefore we must needs listinguish of the word 'priest' in your corollary; for if you mean thereby sacerdoten, we grant the consequence of sacrifice and altar; but if you mean presbyforum, we deny that God ever joined these three in an inseparable hand; or that presbyter, in that he is presbyter, hath any thing to do with sacrifice or altar, more than senior, or ancient, or elder."-Fulke's Def. of English Translation of the Bible, Park. Soc. Ed., pp. 109,

" Ambiguity, (says Bp. White,) has arisen from the circumstance that the English language applies the same word ' Priest,' to denote two words in the original, hiereys, and presbyteros. Of the latter word it is here affirmed that it never denotes an offerer of sacrifice; and as to the former word, none alleges that it ever stands for a christian minister in the scriptures."—Diss. on the Eucharist.

+ Of course I mean priest in the sense of a sacrificer.

Long after the first institution of the Lord's supper, the Christian Church continued to keep it aloof from any thing expressive of sacrifice, except as it commemorated that of Christ, and was accompanied, change a question of taste into one of principle, and make the having of an altar identical with the hoving of a good conscience.

Let me first go to history. What was the priminlive use?

Says, it is "clearer than mid-day, that altars were not in the primitive church;" (meridiana lucc clarius.) Basnage says, that the writings of men of the apostolic age, such as Clement, Polycarp, luction and the week of the control of the apostolic age, such as Clement, Polycarp, luction and the week of the control of the apostolic age, such as Clement, Polycarp, luction and the week of the control of the apostolic age. Justin, never employed the words, High Priest, Priest, &c., for the christian minister; nor did they ministered the Eucharist at a common household ta- any more use the word altar, to signify the table of the And when he says "the hand of him that the Eucharist." Bingham, our learned and standard author, in Ecclesiastical Antiquities, says that, as late as the time of Athanasius, (4th century,) the churches had "communion tables of wood;" and of the churches of Africa and Egypt, particularly, he says: "There is no question to be made, that about this time, "the allars were only tables of wood." In the year 509, a general decree was made in France, "that no altar should be consecrated, but such as should be made of stone only.'? And Bingham says, "this seems to be the first public act of that nature, that we have upon authentic record, in ancient history. And from the time of this change in the matter of them, the form, or fashion of them changed likewise. For, whereas, before, they were in the form of tables, they now began to be erected more like altars.";

This, comparatively, modern use of the form of an altar, instead of that of a table, is strongly asserted by Bishop Jewel, in his Defence of his Apology for the Church of England, against the Jesuit Harding. "As for the altars," he says, "which the Donatists broke down, (in the churches of the 4th century) they were certainly tables of wood, such as we have, and not heaps of stones, such as ye have. St. Augustine saith, the Donatists, in their ury, broke down the altar-boards. His words be fury, broke down the altar-boards. His words he these: Lignis ejusdem altaris effractis. Likewise saith Athanasius of the like fury of the Arians; Subsellia, thronum, mensam lignenm et tabulas ecclesiæ et extera quæ proterunt, foris eluta, combusserunt. They carried forth and burnt the seats, the pulpit, the wooden board, the church tables, &c. Touching your stone altars Beatus Rhenanus saith, In nostris Basilicis, Ararum super addititia structura novitatem præ se fert; in our churches, the building up of altars, added to the you, Artirollus, waller you This word advers we will out newly brought into the church of God, and that our newly brought into the church of God, and that our communion tables are old and ancient, and have been used from the beginning. We have such altars as Christ, his apostles, and St. Augustine, Optetus, and other catholic and holy Fathers, had and used.

Bishop Babington, in his notes on Exodus, published in 1601, says, "The alters used in popery are not warranted by this example, (i.e. of the Jewish altars.) But that the primitive churches sus objected it as a fault to Christians, Quod nec imagines, nec templa, nec aras haberent : that they had neither images, nor temples, nor altars. Arni-bius, after him, saith the same of the heathens: Accusant nos quod nec templa habeamus nec aras, nec imagines.—Gerson saith that Sylvester first caused stone altars to be made. Upon this occasion, al for standing and continuance, wooden tables having been before used; but, I say, in some places, not in all. St. Augustine saith that in his time, in Africa, they were made of wood. For the Donatists, saith he, break in sunder the altar boards. Again the dea-con's duty was to remove the altar. Chrysostom calleth it the holy board. St. Augustine, the table of the Lord. Athanasius, Mensam ligneam, the table of wood. Yet was this communion-table called an altar, not that it was so, but only by allusion, metaphorically, as Christ is called an altar, or selves, therefore, the newness of this point, for stone altars, in comparison of our ancient use of communion tables, and let Popery and his parts fall

The learned Perkins, one of the greater lights at Cambridge, in the latter part of the 16th century, says: "About the year 400, the use of altars began, but not for sacrifice, but for the honour and memory of the martyrs.", I

It would be easy to show that the use of alters

originated, contemporaneously, with that inordinate veneration for the relies of saints and martyrs, which was very soon matured into that idolatrous adoration. which is now one of the grievous crimes of the Church of Rome. It is little to the credit of altars, in the christian church, to look back to the various growths of astonishing superstition, which grew up, in company with their use. Mosheim, speaking of the 4th century, says: " An enormous rain of different superstitions were gradually substituted in the place of true religion, and genuine piety. This odious revolution was owing to a variety of causes. A ridiculous precipitation in receiving new opinions; a preposterous desire of imitating the Pagan rites, and of blending them with the christian worship, and that idle propensity, which the generality of mankind have, towards a gaudy and estentatious religion, all contributed to establish the reign of superstition upon the ruins of Christianity. • • The virtues that had formerly

. Diss. on the Eucharist.

† Basnag. Ann. 100, v. xii, Mede, with all his learning, could find none of the fathers using "altur," for the "table" earlier than Tertullian. A.D. 200. Bingham's Antiquities, b, vii, c, vi. § 15, Defence of Apol. P. i. ch. iii, div. 3.

been ascribed to the heathen temples, to their lus-

Bishop Babington's works, Ed. 1632, p. 307.

V Perkin's works, II; p. 553,

But here I wish it to be distinctly understood that | figuratively a sacrifice, and each communicant is, in trations, to the statues of their gods and heroes, were now attributed to christian churches, to water consecrated by certain forms of prayer, and to the images of holy men. The worship of the martyrs, was modelled, by degrees, according to the religious services that were paid to the gods, before the coming of Christ."

To such heights of superstition and imposture, had the veneration of relics arrived, in the latter part of the 4th century, that the 5th Council of Carthage was obliged to resist its more odious extravagances. The following extracts, from the 14th canon of that Council, will show in what connexion altars arose in the Church. "It is decreed that the altars, which are set up every where, in the fields, or in the ways, as monuments of martyrs, in which no hodies or relics of martyrs are proved to be buried; be overthrown by the Bishops of those places, if it may be. But, if, on account of tunults of the people, that cannot be done, yet let the people be admonished that they frequent not those places, &c. And let no memorial of martyrs be allowed and accepted, except the body, or some undoubted relics be there, or that some original of their habitation or suffering, be there delivered, from a most faithful beginning. As for those altars, that are set up, in every place by dreams, and vain revelations of any men, let them by all means be disallowed."

Faithful to this original connection, between altars and tombs, with the sacrament of the Lord's body on the top, and dead men's bones within, is the present use of the altar in the church of Rome. The Rhemish Annotators on the New Testament, commenting on Rev. vi. 9, where occurs the vision of the souls under the altar, say, "Christ, as man, (no doubt,) is this altar, under which the souls of all martyrs lie in heaven, expecting their bodies, as Christ, their head, hath his body there already. And for correspondence to their place, or state, in heaven, the Church layeth, commonly, their bodies also, or relics, near, or under the allars, where our Saviour's body is offered in the holy Mass; and hath a special proviso, that no alters be erected, or consecrated, without some part of a saint's body or relies." And this "special proviso," is founded on the assumption that "the relics of the saints add not a little to the sanctity of the sacrament, when they are contained in the altar;" thus fully carrying out the abominable doctrine that we are assisted by the merits of the saints in obtaining justification through the merits of Christ.

Conformed to this tomb-like use of Romish altars, and their monumental origin, is their almost invariable shape. They are in the shape of arks, or chosts, resembling, very closely, in general appearance, those oblong structures of stone, or brick, surmounted with a marble slab, which from time immemorial, have been erected over the dead, as monuments to their memory.

This peculiar, chest-like form of the Romish altar, s wholly unlike any thing under the name of altar, of which we have any account. The alters which Meny autrouse which were atterwards set up, according to that model in the temple at Jerusalem, had no such character. Bingham says that when such structures, for altars, began to be used in the 5th century, "they were built like a tomb, as if it were some monument of a martyr;" and he quotes an eminent authority (Bone,) as saying that specimens of such ancient monuments to martyrs were still found, in his day, in the catacombs of Rome, and other places. t

It is not difficult to trace the steps by which the martyr's tomb came to be so universally the Romish altar. It is well known that, at an early period, Christians took great pleasure in honouring the memory of martyrs, by creeting tombs, as monu-ments, over the place of their burial, and in assembling there for worship, on the anniversary of their death. On these occasions, the martyr's monument served as a table, on which they celebrated the Eucharist.

(To be continued.)

AUTHORITY OF THE FATHERS. From Bishop Jeremy Taylor, on the Liberty of Prophesying.

If I should reckon all the particular reasons against the certainty of this topic, it would be more than needs as to this question, and therefore I will abstain from all disparagement of those worthy personages, who were excellent lights to their several dioceses and cures. And therefore I will not instance that Clemens Alexandrinus taught that Christ felt no hunger or thirst, but eat only to make demonstration of the verity of his human nature; nor that St. Hilary taught that Christ in his suffer-ings had no sorrow; nor that Origen taught the pains of hell not to have eternal duration; nor that St. Cyprian taught Re-baptization; nor that Athenagoras condemned second marriages; nor that St. John Damascen said Christ only prayed in appearance, not really and in truth; I will let them all rest in peace, and their memories in honour. For if I should enquire into the particular probations of this article, I must do to them as I should be forced to do now. If any man should say that the writings of the school-men were excellent argument and authority to determine men's persuasions, I must consider their writings, and observe their defailances. their contradictions, the weakness of their arguments, the mis-allegations of Scripture, their inconsequent deductions, their false opinions, and all the weaknesses of humanity, the failings of their persons; which no good man is willing to do, unless he

* Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. cent. iv. p. 11, § 2. + "The altar which has been erected" (under Tractarian auspices) "at the Kound Church, Cambridge," (and which has been condemned by an ecclesiastical court as illegal) " is a mass of stone work, rising as an erection from the ground, and attached to the fabric of the Church. The only point in which it differs from the tomb-like altars, generally seen in Romish churches, is that it is not closed in front, (though it is on the sides,) the Romish altars being generally closed all tound, the interior being devoted to the reception of relies, without which, there is a very general feeling, among Romanists. that the cucharist cannot be properly celebrated upon them. But this tomb-like form is not reckoned essential to the being of an altar, and occasionally, I believe, a portion of the front is left open, that the relies may be seen, and protected only by a trellis work of brass or other metal."—Goode's Altars Prohibited in the Church of

Bingham's Antiq. b. viii. c. vi. § 15.