

nor thirty, nor twenty; in one hundred and thirty years the whole progress made is this, that in all London and Westminster the number of churches open for daily service has dwindled away to sixteen!

Well may Mr. Bennet complain that "we hear of no increase; still the churches are closed; still damp and chill; still no voice resounds within, and no people bow down; . . . . . they are as they were—Sunday Preaching Houses are not Houses of Prayer."—Sermon on the Fast Day. We have, of course, nothing to add to this statement.

It may be anticipated that other towns are not in a happier condition than the metropolis. Take a single example. Newcastle, with 80,000 inhabitants, is thus described. "There is not a daily service in any one of the eight churches belonging to the Church of England. Only one of the Newcastle clergy endeavors to establish his daily service, and he is even discouraged by his brethren." E. C. April, 1847. The writer adds,—“Alas! alas! how would the pious St. Osmund mourn . . . . the degenerate state of that service for which he so nobly provided while on earth.” No doubt,—but St. Osmund provided for the service of the Mass, and if he came on earth would assist at that divine service, as it is still celebrated by that very “body of zealous and exemplary Roman Catholic Clergy,” whose good works in Newcastle the same writer so candidly and generously lauds.

It appears, then, that the attempt to revive generally the practice of daily congregational prayer, has not only failed, but that there is, at least in many places, less of it than any former period.

Another excellent, though perhaps unseasonable effect of the “Puseyite” Clergy was to promote the decoration of churches, and to introduce a more decent ceremonial. How far they have succeeded we need not say. Stone altars, tables of prothesis, &c., &c., have not, at least hitherto, attained but a precarious existence. A recent example shows how it has fared with other decorations.

It appears that in the month of September, 1846, a certain Essex Churchwarden carried away in a basket, by force, from the parish church, “two small flower glasses, and an oak cross inlaid with pearl,” which had ornamented the communion table. His conduct was described by the English Churchman—No. 194—as “presumptuous and fanatical ignorance,” and it is added, “that the Churchwarden is indictable for theft as well as sacrilege, we have no doubt whatever.” To remove flower glasses and a cross was, therefore, at this period, in the judgement of the English Churchman nothing less than “theft and sacrilege.” We need

not say that our sympathies are entirely with the English Churchman. But, unfortunately, so far from obtaining more security, as time goes on, for these innocent vessels and pious emblems, an eminent and distinguished Anglican Bishop has, within the last few weeks, committed the very same act of “theft and sacrilege.” Having knocked over the flower glasses with his own hand, and in the middle of the service, the Bishop of Exeter next proceeded to institute “criminal proceedings” against the offending clergyman, for “the usage of ornaments, and particularly the Cross, which his Lordship showed had given grave offence to the followers of the Reformed Church!” It appears, then, that “the cessation of the Daily Sacrifice” is not the only “mark of Antichrist” resting upon the Anglican Church,—the Cross, also, which was “to the Jews a stumbling block,” is to “reformed” Christians a “grave offence.”

We will only add, that some of the Bishop’s remarks, in his reported “judgement” are of such a character that we are almost inclined to suspect misrepresentation. The whole circumstance however, is significant and instructive, and serves to show the real state of the Established Church. It is for this reason that we have referred to it.—Impunity in denying a fundamental doctrine of Christianity, and “criminal proceedings” for using flower glasses and a cross; this, surely, is a phenomenon which was never witnessed, and never will be out of the Anglican Church.

With a single additional observation we proceed to our summary.

No doubt there are churches here and there, where all, or nearly all, that “Puseyism” desiderates has been obtained. We do not pause to inquire what that “all” is. If any serious mind can really be satisfied with it, and continue so for any length of time, it can only be from an utter unconsciousness of anything deeper, truer, and holier. But what we wished to observe was this; that even in these cases few as they are, there is no security for the continuance of the system even from month to month. Our proofs are at hand. It is only necessary to mention one.

A church in Clifton appears to have exhibited the “Anglican system,” whatever it may be, in perfection. The Minister dies. In a moment all is undone. “The congregation,” says the English Churchman, “will, it is to be feared, be dispersed or deprived of their privileges—the daily services we suppose, will be stopped, the weekly communion discontinued, and everything reduced to the true Puritan model. Of course, we speak only upon conjecture. . . . . The case of Clifton is particularly lamentable, because the principles of the English Church have long been faithfully preached