

the proper maintenance of the Episcopal office. We heartily congratulate the clergy and laity of the proposed Western Diocese upon the fact that so much has already been accomplished. The erection of this new diocese by the voluntary exertions of the people, and the unfettered choice of a Bishop by the united voice of clergy and laity, will be one of the most interesting events which for many a day has been witnessed in the Anglican Church, and cannot fail to be productive of most important results.

ENGLAND.—The case of Archdeacon Denison has again occupied a large share of public attention. On the 21st of October the Archbishop of Canterbury pronounced sentence, depriving the Archdeacon of all his preferments. A protest was however first delivered and argued by Dr. Phillimore, which involves the question to which we referred last month. It is clear that the Statute of Elizabeth, under which the proceedings were instituted, does not speak of *Thirty-nine Articles*, but describes a certain *printed book* of "Articles, &c.", four and a half inches long, three wide, and containing 37 pages. Now Dr. Lamb's "History of the Thirty-nine Articles" contains a *fac-simile* of the book, which is supposed to be the one referred to, and which exactly corresponds with the description; and this book does not contain the Twenty-ninth Article. That Article, according to Dr. Phillimore, was added by Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1562, but did not receive the royal assent. His argument is that at the time the Statute of Elizabeth passed, there was no *printed book* in existence, containing the twenty-ninth Article. Dr. Bayford, on the other side, showed that the Archdeacon was proceeded against under the 36th canon, as well as under the Statute of Elizabeth, and that canon, it was admitted, contains the twenty-ninth Article. He was also charged with preaching doctrine contrary to the twenty-eighth Article, about which there is no doubt.

Archdeacon Denison has appealed to the Court of Arches, and from thence a second appeal, if needed, will carry it to the final court, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, so that it may take a year or two yet before the question is settled.

We have received a letter from a highly-valued correspondent, in which he speaks of our previ-

ous article on this subject as unsatisfactory. The truth is, we fear to write upon so sacred a subject in the cursory manner which would be suited to this publication. But at the same time we do not hesitate to state our views. We regard it as peculiarly unfortunate that Archdeacon Denison should have raised this controversy. He has endeavoured to express a great mystery in hard and dry words, which could not but be seen to contradict the plain words of the Article. And thus he has brought upon us an apparent authoritative denial of that great and essential doctrine of the Catholic faith, that (as Bishop Cosin expresses it) "upon the words of consecration, the body and blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive it; and all this not after a physical and sensual, but after an heavenly and incomprehensible manner." This doctrine the doctrine of the Church in all ages, the doctrine of the most revered divines of our Anglican community, we have hitherto been allowed to hold and to teach. The judgment of Archbp. Sumner seems to imply that it is repugnant to the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles. That this judgment will be confirmed by the higher courts we entertain no doubt. What the result will be is hidden among the inscrutable designs of God's Providence. A protest has already been started, to which are affixed the signatures of some of the most distinguished among the clergy of England, and to which many more will append their names, appealing from the sentence of his Grace to a free and lawful Synod of the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury and then, if need be, to a free and lawful Synod of all the churches of our communion. That such an appeal will be granted, we do not for a moment imagine, and it appears difficult to conceive how the final result can be anything else, but another lamentable disruption in the body of Christ.

UNITED STATES.—Among the canons enacted by the recent General Convention of the church in the United States is one requiring every bishop to visit each church in his diocese once in three years. The Bishop of Massachusetts has for many years refused to visit the Church of the Advent in Boston, on account of some so-called Tractarian practices which Bishop Southgate, the Rector of the parish, refused to discon-