

Ireland as by law established, and especially to the Articles of Religion as set forth by the Archbishop and Bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God 1562, according to the computation of the Church of England, for the avoiding the diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion, or some one of them, and against the act or statute made in the Parliament holden at Westminster, in the 13th year of the reign of her late Majesty Elizabeth, Queen of England, entitled 'An Act for the Ministers of the Church to be of sound religion;' and whereas the said George Anthony Denison was duly served with a copy of the said articles, and was duly required by writing under our hand to appear and to make answer to the said articles; and whereas we, rightly and duly proceeding in the said cause or proceeding, with the assistance of three assessors nominated by us—to wit, the Right Honourable Stephen Lushington, Doctor of Laws, Judge of her Majesty's High Court of Admiralty of England, and who has practised as an advocate for five years and upwards in the Court of the Archbishop of the said province of Canterbury; the Very Reverend George Henry Sacheverell Johnson, Master of Arts, Dean of the Cathedral Church of Wells; and the Reverend Charles Abel Heurtley, Doctor in Divinity, the Lady Margaret's Professor in Theology in the University of Oxford—having heard, seen, and understood, and fully and maturely discussed the merits and circumstances, and diligently searched into and considered of the whole proceedings had and done therein, and observed all and singular the matters and things that by law ought to be observed, and having heard witnesses examined in proof of the said articles, and heard advocates and proctors on both sides thereon, did, on Tuesday, the 12th day of August, 1856, pronounce, decree, and declare that the eight first articles filed against the said Archdeacon were proved, so far as is by law necessary; that the 9th, 10th, 11th, 13th, and 14th of the articles filed in the said cause or proceeding on behalf of the said Reverend Joseph Ditcher were proved, and that the charges therein made were established, so far as is hereinafter mentioned; and that whereas it is pleaded in the said 9th article, filed in the said proceedings, that the said Archdeacon, in a sermon preached by him in the Cathedral Church of Wells, on or about Sunday the 7th of Aug. 1853, did adversely maintain and affirm doctrines directly contrary and repugnant to the Twenty-fifth, Twenty-eighth, Twenty-ninth, and Thirtieth of the Articles of Religion referred to in the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth, chapter 12, or some one of them, and amongst other things did therein adversely maintain and affirm 'That the Body and Blood of Christ being really present after an immaterial and spiritual manner in the consecrated bread and wine, are therein and thereby given to all, and are received by all who come to the Lord's table;' and 'That all who come to the Lord's table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are given; and that by all who come to the Lord's table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are received;' we the said Archbishop with the assistance and unanimous concurrence of our said assessors, did determine that the doctrine in the said passages was directly contrary and repugnant to the Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth of the said Articles of Religion mentioned in the aforesaid statute of Queen Elizabeth, and that the construction put upon the said Articles of Religion by the Venerable the Archdeacon of Taunton, viz., that the Body and Blood of Christ become so joined to, and become so present in, the consecrated elements by the act of consecration, that the unworthy receivers receive in the elements the Body and Blood of Christ, is not the true or an admissible construction of the said Articles of Religion; that such doctrine is directly contrary and repugnant to the Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth Articles, and that the true and legal exposition of the said Articles is, that the Body and Blood of Christ are taken and received by the worthy receivers only, who in taking and receiving the same by faith do spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, while the wicked and unworthy, by eating the bread and drinking the wine without faith, do not in anywise eat, take, or receive the Body and Blood of Christ, being void of faith, whereby only the Body and Blood of Christ can be eaten, taken and received; and whereas it is pleaded in the said 11th of the articles filed in the said proceeding that divers printed copies of the said sermon or discourse in the 10th article mentioned as written and printed, or caused to be printed, by the said Archdeacon Denison, were by his order and direction sold and distributed some time in the years 1853 and 1854, within the said diocese of

Bath and Wells; and whereas the said sermon or discourse contains the following, among other passages:—'That the Body and Blood of Christ being really present after an immaterial and spiritual manner in the consecrated bread and wine, are therein and thereby given to all, and are received by all who come to the Lord's table;' and 'That to all who come to the Lord's table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are given; and that by all who come to the Lord's table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are received;' we the said Archbishop, with the assistance of our said assessors, did determine that the passages aforesaid contain a repetition of the erroneous doctrine charged in the 9th article filed in the said proceeding, and that such doctrine is directly contrary and repugnant to the Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth of the Articles of Religion mentioned in the aforesaid statute of Queen Elizabeth.

And, whereas it is pleaded in the 14th of the said articles filed in the said proceeding that divers printed copies of a sermon or discourse in the 12th article mentioned as written and printed, or caused to be printed by the said Archdeacon, were by his order and direction sold and distributed in the years 1853 and 1854 within the said diocese of Bath and Wells; and whereas the said sermon or discourse contains the following among other passages:—'That to all who come to the Lord's table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are given; and that by all who come to the Lord's table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are received;' and 'It is not true that the consecrated bread and wine are changed in their natural substances for they remain in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored. It is true that worship is due to the real though invisible and supernatural presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, under the form of bread and wine.' We, the said Archbishop, with the assistance of our said assessors, did determine that the doctrine in the said passages are directly contrary and repugnant to the Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth of the said Articles of Religion mentioned in the aforesaid statute of Queen Elizabeth. And whereas we, the said Archbishop, thereupon allowed time to the said Archdeacon to revoke his error, until Wednesday, the first day of October then ensuing and now last past, with intimation that if no such revocation as is required by the statute of Elizabeth as aforesaid should be made and delivered into the Registry of Bath and Wells by that time, we would, in obedience to the statute, pronounce sentence in the said cause or proceeding, which was therefore adjourned to this day, Tuesday, the 21st day of October instant, and from thence has been further adjourned to this day. And whereas the said Venerable George Anthony Denison, notwithstanding the premises, hath not made or delivered any such revocation as aforesaid, but doth still persist in and hath not revoked his said error, and the said proctor, by his proctor, earnestly praying sentence to be given, and the proctor of the said George Anthony Denison praying justice without waiving his protests; therefore we, the said John Bird, the Archbishop aforesaid, having first called upon the name of Christ, and setting God alone before our eyes, have, with the assistance of the said Right Hon. Stephen Lushington, the Very Rev. George Henry Sacheverell Johnson, Dean of Wells, and Rev. Charles Abel Heurtley, our aforesaid assessors, and of the Right Rev. Thomas Carr, a Bishop of the Church of England, and rector of St. Peter and St. Paul's in the city of Bath, in the county of Somerset, and Diocese of Bath and Wells; and the Rev. Charles Otway Mayne, clerk prebendary of the Cathedral Church of Wells aforesaid; and the Rev. John Thomas, Doctor of Civil Law, sitting with us in the said cause, with whom we have fully communicated on this behalf, and having maturely deliberated upon the proceeding had therein, and the offence proved, exacting by law deprivation of ecclesiastical promotion, have thought fit to pronounce, and do accordingly pronounce, decree, and declare, that the said Venerable George Anthony Denison, by reason of the premises, ought by law to be deprived of his ecclesiastical promotions, and especially of the said Archdeaconry of Taunton, and of the said vicarage and parish church of East Brent in the county of Somerset, diocese of Bath and Wells, and province of Canterbury, and all profits and benefits of the said archdeaconry, and of the said vicarage and parish church, and of any from all and singular the fruits, tithes, rents, salaries, and other ecclesiastical dues, rights, and emoluments whatsoever, belonging and appertaining to the said archdeaconry, and to the said vicarage and parish church, and we do deprive him thereof accordingly by this our definite sentence

or final decree, which we read and promulgate by these presents."

*Dr. Bayford.*—I am requested on behalf of my client, the Rev. Joseph Ditcher, to state that it is his intention to waive the costs.

*Mr. Bathurst.*—I have now to assert an appeal on behalf of Archdeacon Denison.

*Mr. Burchell.*—I have to pray your Grace to limit the time in which the appeal shall be prosecuted.

*Dr. Lushington* (after consulting the Archbishop) named the 5th of December.

The proceedings then terminated.

The Gazette of last night announces that the Queen has been pleased to appoint the Rev. Henry Colterhill, M. A., to be ordained and consecrated Bishop of Grahamstown, in the colony of the Cape of Good Hope, in the Room of the Right Rev. John Armstrong, deceased.

The following letter to the Rural Deans of his diocese, from the Bishop of Oxford, concerning the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels to be used on the next two Sundays, has been put into our hands, and we publish it at once, following that many of the clergy will rejoice to have any Episcopal direction on a matter left in some measure doubtful in the rubric:—

"Cuddesden Palace, Nov. 4, 1856.

"REV. AND DEAR SIR—As there is some uncertainty as to which collect, epistle, and gospel should be read for the next two Sundays, the Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth Sundays after Trinity (the collect, epistle, and gospel for the Twenty-fifth being this year appointed to be read on the Twenty-seventh Sunday after Trinity), and as it is desirable that we should maintain uniformity on this matter, I request you to convey to the clergy of your rural deanery the expression of my wish that they should, on the Twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, read the collect, epistle, and gospel for the Fifth, and on the Twenty-sixth that for the Sixth Sunday after Epiphany, since by thus taking the number of services necessary to supply the deficiency of the present year from the last of those unused after Epiphany, they will employ those which will be the last to be repeated in their regular course, and thus adhere most closely to the principle laid down in the rubric.—I am, Rev. and dear Sir, your faithful friend and brother,

"S. Oxon."

Full accounts are given of the collision at King's Langley, which we have briefly mentioned elsewhere. It appears that the coal train had run past one of the newly invented train telegraph signal posts on its way to London, when from some cause or other, the engine "shot a bolt from its eccentric," and was brought to a stand; the stopping-signal being immediately put on at the signal post referred to, so as to protect the coal train from any other approaching train on the up line. Hambro, the driver of the coal train, at once descended beneath his engine to rectify the damage, and while in this position, the fireman of the coal train discovered the passenger train coming up at great speed, and succeeded in drawing the driver out before the collision took place. Lawson, the driver of the passenger train, seems not to have seen the signal, and with his fireman, seeing that it was impossible to stop, having first the engine into reversing gear, and put down the breaks, jumped off and succeeded in saving their limbs. In an instant after the passenger train rushed in upon the rear of the coal train, causing the engine and several of the carriages to fly into the air, crashing one upon the other, and creating the greatest consternation to the whole, and various injuries to many of the unfortunate passengers. Fortunately two surgeons were in the train and uninjured. Their attention was immediately directed to the most severe cases, amongst which were those of Lord Byron, who, with Lady Byron, was in a first class compartment, and Mr. Jaques, civil engineer of Queen street, Derby. The noble lord, attended by Lady Byron, was at once removed to a neighboring residence, and Mr. Jaques to the Railway Hotel, Boxmoor Station. There were eighteen ladies and gentlemen who were injured, and who gave their names to the officers of the company, but there appeared to be a general repugnance to doing so, on the ground that they did not wish them published. Lord Byron was sufficiently recovered yesterday morning to return to town.—Standard.

ITALY—The Times publishes the following telegraphic despatch from its Vienna correspondent, dated Monday, at noon:

"The Austrians have evacuated Forli, Faenza, and Thola. The Austrian occupation of the Papal States is now confined to the towns of Bologna and Ancona."