

inferior, not from the superior metal—it is a debased compound after all. And the same must be said of that Church in which it is admitted that Protestantism, with all its lowness of standard, its coldness of feeling, its selfishness of principle, is so thoroughly mixed, kneaded and incorporated, rises to its surface in episcopal manifestations, and penetrates its mass. The bright grains of Catholic truth or feelings which sparkle amidst the viler elements, only excite shame to see them so thrown away and disgraced; they do not stamp upon the motley heap the note of standard purity.

The conduct of the bishops \* in the Anglican Church, seems therefore to offer us one very clear criterion for deciding on its actual Protestantism. But in ancient times, we fancy that there could have been very little difficulty in deciding such a question. There are churches existing which the Anglicans admit to form collectively the Church Catholic. There are on the other side certain congregations of Christians commonly known as the Reformed or Protestant Churches. We wish to know to which the Anglican belongs. This question would, in olden times, have been put—"with which are you in communion?" It is the Spanish and Italian proverb realized; "tell me with whom you go, and I will tell you who you are." Yes, with which body of Christians is the Church of England in active communion? This surely is the vital question. Now as to the best means of resolving it.

\* We have lately noticed repeated censures especially in some Catholic periodicals, on the application of ecclesiastical terms, as "Church," or "Bishop," to the Anglican establishment; as though their use implied a recognition of the rights usually attached to such things or persons. Such a view we deem quite exaggerated. The term "Establishment" does not comprehend as much as the word "Church," namely the members as well as the rulers. And as the legal title of certain persons in the country is that of "bishop," it would be needlessly uncourteous, as well as extremely inconvenient, to use a periphrasis every time one wanted to designate the persons usually known by the title. The constant recurrence of such phrases would render a book or article unreadable, besides the certainty of its being flung away in disgust by many who otherwise would have been readers. Things get names and persons get titles, and one gives them in social good-breeding without thereby pledging oneself to any judgment on their propriety. One may talk of king George I. or king William, and speak of the "Reformation," and believe it to be exactly the contrary. Now if, from fear of appearing to acknowledge the truth and rightfulness of things belonging to Anglicanism, we refuse to employ terms applicable strictly only to the Catholic Church: if, in other words, we banish every word indicative of ecclesiastical authority or rank (for rectors, curates, clergymen, deacons, all would go with bishops), we really must invent a new system of terminology for treating of such matters, and that at the risk of not being read. The same must be said of a hundred other terms, if we refuse to employ the word "Church," for doctrine, faith, communion, confirmation: and many other expressions in current use, must be rejected as well, when speaking of those to whom we do not allow the prerogatives of a church; or we must encumber them every time with the elegant qualifications of "pseudo," or "so-called," which we wish to spare our readers and ourselves. But, in truth, we do not find in the writings of the fathers this difficulty in applying similar terms to those in whom they did not believe that they could be literally and properly fulfilled. We do not feel ourselves called on to refuse a courtesy which they granted.

The communion between churches, does not imply that all their members are in active intercourse, nor that the communion itself should be carried on by daily, nor by even frequent acts of recognition. Anciently, the chief pastor of each was charged with this duty; he was the organ, the instrument of such relationship. The patriarchs communicated with each other; and so long as they did so, the whole of their provinces were considered as partaking in the privilege. In like manner the archbishops were supposed to take charge of a similar duty for their jurisdictions. If Carthage kept communion with Rome, its suffragans were on the same terms. When therefore a metropolitan acts in this matter, he virtually represents the Church. And if that Church, that is its bishops, do not protest against his act, they virtually approve of it, and become parties to it. Now, within these few months, the archbishop of Canterbury, who, in certain letters commendatory issued by him to Dr. Alexander, styles himself "Primate of all England and Metropolitan," has clearly entered into certain relations with the greatest Protestant Power of the continent, upon a matter ecclesiastical, in the strictest sense of the word, namely, the appointment of a bishop at Jerusalem.

In this matter we must now go, though with different feelings from those with which the appointment was viewed a few months ago. We must premise, therefore, that the impolicy, or indelicacy, or folly of the transaction has nothing to do with our present investigation. It is nothing to us just now, whether the scheme of planting a slip from the supposed "branch of the Catholic Church," called "the United Church of England and Ireland," on Sion's holy mount, was or was not most uncanonical, and a gross attempt at usurpation; nor whether the idea of sending a bishop, to make up a church of chance-travellers, prospective Jewish and Druse converts, and Anglicanised Confession-of-Augsburg men was not chimerical and uncanonical; nor even whether the most dignified and edifying way of exhibiting "the spectacle of a church freed from errors and imperfections—holding a pure faith in the unity of the Spirit," was to send a married bishop, with an infant family prattling round his knee, among the mortified ascetics of the east. Furthermore, it interests us not at this moment to ascertain, which of the two reports be true—whether he has been graciously and respectfully received, or welcomed with hangings in effigy and pelting of stones, except that we hope not the latter, both for the sake of humanity and personal charity towards a man who has let himself and his family be drawn into this miserable plot: and, still more, because we should indeed be sorry and mortified to see so unworthy a transaction reckon among its incidents even the semblance of a martyr's crown; off the ground which Stephen watered with the first Christian blood, profaned by a mockery of his testimony—in favour, too, of Protestant intrusion. But our present purpose is to sift this affair with reference to our inquiry into the Protestantism of Catholicity of the Anglican Church.

From the N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

#### WHY ARE THE CHURCHES CLOSED?

A singular debate occurred recently in the British House of Commons, on the propriety of keeping the churches closed six days in the week. One Hon. Member in his zeal for the welfare of sinners' souls, quoted largely from Horace Smith's beautiful Ode on the same subject. He is reported to have said—

"He thought there was no objection to the opening of Churches to the public; the inspection of the pictures and the sculpture was eminently calculated to produce a devotional feeling. A friend of his, a member of that house, after visiting Westminster Abbey, remarked that Catholicism had erected that magnificent building, and that Protestantism had added the spikes and deformities with which it is now disgraced."

This anecdote conveys a severe reflection, but the Hon. Member furnished another anecdote. He said—

"Dr. Johnson had himself recommended the practice of keeping the Cathedrals open, that individuals might repair thither for the purposes of devotion. When his friend Boswell was in St. Paul's with him on one occasion shortly before he was about to leave this country, Dr. Johnson said to him, 'there is the altar of your God; you are about to leave your native country, approach it and solicit His protection before you leave the land.'—Now comes the general question—why are our Churches closed?"

What! shall the church, the house of prayer, no more,  
Give tacit notice from its fasten'd portals  
That for six days 'tis useless to adore,  
Since God will hold no communings with mortals!

Why are they shut?

Why are our churches shut with zealous care,  
Bolted and barred against our bosom's yearning,  
Save for the few short hours of Sabbath prayer,  
With the bell's tolling steadily returning?  
Why are they shut?

Are there no sinners in the churchless week  
Who wish to sanctify a vow'd repentance?  
Are there no hearts which fain would humbly seek  
The only balm for death's un pitying sentence?

Why are they shut?

Are there no poor, no wrong'd, no heirs of grief,  
No sick, who when their courage falters,  
Long for a moment's respite or relief  
By kneeling at the God of Mercy's altars?

Why are they shut?

Are there no wicked, whom, if tempted in,  
Some qualm of conscience or devout suggestion,  
Might suddenly redeem from future sin?  
O, if there be, how solemn is the question—  
Why are they shut?

"Yes," continued the Hon. Member,—"there are thousands of sinners in the churchless week of England—thousands of the poor, the wronged, the heirs of grief, the sick, and alas! the wicked; to them the opened portals of the church might be the humble means of leading to the refreshing fountain of consolation and conciliation. It is indeed a solemn question—"Why are they shut? Why cannot the British mechanic enjoy a kindred privilege with that of his christian brother, in foreign lands, as saith our poet:—

In foreign climes mechanics leave their tasks  
To breathe a passing prayer in their cathedrals:  
They have their week-day shrines, and no one asks  
When he would kneel to them and count his bead-rolls.

Why are they shut?

Seeing them enter sad and disconcerted,  
To quit those cheering fanes with looks of gladness—  
How often have my thoughts to ours reverted!  
How oft have I exclaimed in tones of sadness,  
Why are they shut?"

This desire to have the Protestant churches open during the week is another symptom of the tendencies of Anglican Protestantism

towards at least the discipline, if not the faith of the church. Except in this light, we think the proposition foolish enough. If carried out it would serve only to increase the wages of the sextons, not the number of worshippers. A few old women, and some very young ones, might be found in each parish, who would go to the church to pray, whenever they had nothing else to do, but there the thing would end. As children say of a fine coat, "a Sunday-go-to-meeting-coat," so is Protestantism a "Sunday-go-to-meeting" religion. With wife and family, and a Bible displayed as ostentatiously as a Pharisee's phylactery, it loves to march through the streets on "Sabbaths," with sanctified visage and measured pace, morning, afternoon and night, to "divine service;" but that done, it rests from its labors for an entire week. The true religious spirit which consecrates of every day a portion to devotional purposes, and which attends a man every where, in his closet, as well as in the world, is unknown to Protestantism.—Yet of the Catholic whom it may observe on a "Sabbath" with the open brow and cheerful smile, which bespeak a mind at peace with itself and its Creator, it will snuffle out with upturned nose and eyes; "Behold the Sabbath breaker—thank God, I am holier than he." Yet the "Papist" does every day in the week, what the Pharisee does on one only.

*Persecution in the olden Time.*—The following curious document, for which we are indebted to a valued correspondent, is a specimen of what was done in the good old times:—

A special release granted by the Crown, 24th June, 1634, to Sir Edward Cary, Knight, with a grant to Thomas Risdon, Esq., and Christopher Maynard, Gent.

WOLSELEY.

Sir Edward Cary, of Marldom Knight., was convicted in Law, on the 16th of March, (1629,) of being a recusant. In virtue of a writ from the Crown office, an inquisition was taken 1st October, 1630 in the parish of St. Thomas the Apostle, by John Davye, Esq., High Sheriff of Devon, by which it was certified that the said Sir Edward Cary was seized of and in

| The whole Manor of St. Mary Church, of the clear value of (per annum)  |  | £  | s  | d |
|--|--|----|----|---|
| The Manor of Coffinswell,  |  | 3  | 6  | 8 |
| The Manor of Northlewe,  |  | 5  | 0  | 0 |
| The Manor of Ashwater,   |  | 10 | 0  | 0 |
| The Manor of Bradford,   |  | 5  | 0  | 0 |
| The Manor of Abbotsesham,  |  | 5  | 0  | 0 |
| The Manor of Stockley als Meath  |  | 2  | 6  | 8 |
| The Manor of Goodley,  |  | 4  | 7  | 1 |
| Of a Messuage and Tenement, and 90 acres, called Estkinber,            |  | 0  | 10 | 0 |
| Of a Messuage and Tenement, and 44 acres, called Middlelake,           |  | 0  | 10 | 0 |
| Ditto, and 91 acres, called Monch-house                                |  | 0  | 13 | 4 |
| Ditto, and 53 acres, Dobles Thorne,                                    |  | 0  | 10 | 0 |
| Ditto, and 55 acres, Goston or Gason,                                  |  | 0  | 6  | 8 |
| Ditto, and 70 acres, Yeo in Allington,                                 |  | 3  | 6  | 8 |
| Ditto, and 53 acres, in Cockington,                                    |  | 0  | 9  | 0 |
| A third part of a Cottage in Bedyford,                                 |  | 5  | 0  | 0 |
| 6 acres in Aishenage or Alverdiscott,                                  |  | 0  | 5  | 9 |
| 27 acres in Westland, Cherybere, and Dalton,                           |  | 0  | 10 | 0 |
| 37 acres in Parvacoit, Thorne-don, and Peworihy                        |  | 1  | 13 | 4 |
| 12 acres in Instowe and Brade-worihy,                                  |  | 0  | 9  | 0 |
| 120 acres in Westweeke and Bondehouse, in Lamerton and Broadwoodwiger, |  | 5  | 0  | 0 |

As Sir Edward Cary had not paid since his conviction the penalty of 120 per month