

by upwards of 5,500 members of the Church in the united diocese of Dublin, Glandelagh, and Kildare, and would move that it should be placed amongst the records of the Synod. Dr. Longfield and Dr. Battersby concurred in the opinion that it would be illegal to discuss such a notice, on the ground that the document was not a record of the Synod. At this stage Lord James Butler rose and created some confusion by pointing out that there was not a quorum of members present. The requisite number, however, was soon obtained, and then there was a little further conversation, which was ended by Dr. Longfield pointing out the necessity of business being transacted in a regular way.

—We (*Record*) noted in our last that the Plymouth Ritualists are holding a "Ten Days' Mission." Gavazzi, who is staying there, has written on the subject to the *Western Daily Mercury*. After speaking of his experience, as a Romish priest, of these special Missions, he says:—"I denounce the proceedings of the Ten Days' Mission as intolerably Papist. Is there anything in real Protestantism like the *celebration, the matins, the evensong, the crusade for men only, &c. &c.*? No. It is all foul Popery. The very name of *celebration* means the mass.... Why don't they say frankly, "We are about to Romanize you, come and you shall have plenty of Popish nonsense"? Why do they mask themselves as Protestants, playing a Popish trick at the expense of some *bonâ fide* believer? The trick, however, must be stigmatised, and stopped somewhere, otherwise it will be too late when at the gates of the Vatican.... We can hear with pity the apostasy of those who frankly pass from Protestantism into Romanism; but there can be only disgust and contempt for those who are Romanists at heart, and in their doings conceal their shamefulness under a Protestant mask, and try to legitimatise it under the protection of a clerical gown."

—A novelty in church extension has just been set on foot in Islington by a few gentlemen connected with the Church Sunday Schools of the parish, viz., the establishment of a church solely for children—a want which their experience in the religious teaching of children has for a long time shown them to exist. It was thought by those who have inaugurated the movement in Islington that if a service was originated entirely for children, with a short address suitable for their capacities, they might be induced to attend and take part in it with greater interest than in the ordinary services as conducted in the Established Churches. The vicar of Islington, the Rev. Daniel Wilson, was consulted, and warmly entered into the scheme, offering to lend the Boys' Parochial Schoolroom, Little Cross-street, for the purpose, and there for the last month the services have been held with a success far beyond the expectations of those by whom they were originated. The service commences at half-past six o'clock in the evening, the doors being then shut, and no one admitted, afterwards, and concludes at half-past seven. No infants or adults are admitted, and each child on entering is given a copy of selections which have been made from the Church Evening Service, with suitable hymns. There is a good deal of singing, the prayers being read, and an address or sermon of about twenty minutes' duration delivered by readers who are members of the Diocesan Association of Lay Helpers, acting under the authority of the Bishop of London; while the musical portion of the service is led by a youthful choir, and heartily joined in by the congregation.

—The *Rock* pays the following eloquent tribute to the memory of the late Rev. W. B. Mackenzie:—"Alas! that we should have to use the word "late" in connexion with the name of the most gentle, most unostentatious, and most earnest of God's ministers. William B Mackenzie, of St. James's, Holloway, is lost to earth to make heaven the brighter. From a long, weary weight of suffering, in which, notwithstanding its acuteness, he had many hallowed dreams of the "rest beyond the river," he has ascended to the Father's house, where his suffering is forgotten in the light of his Father's smile, and where all tears are for evermore wiped away. For many months a large congregation and a sympathizing neighbourhood may be said to have been the anxious watchers around his dying bed. "How is Mr. Mackenzie?" was the first question you asked on entering church; you heard it asked in the streets by working men at the corner of the street in which

the church stands; in the omnibus or train by which you went to the City, and in shops where you went to make a purchase. The question now can be answered without any anxiety or uncertainty tingeing it. It is well with him. His painful sufferings are at an end. In the very zenith of his power, when he was never working more earnestly, or loving his work more deeply, he has been summoned to a higher sphere of being and action. Our tears fall because of our own great loss; but they may quickly dry in the thought of his infinite gain.

—Mr. Williams, who has for many years been a travelling lecturer of the Liberation Society, having made a visit to Stalybridge, to lecture on the prospects of religious liberty in England, vainly endeavoured for three-quarters of an hour to get a hearing, and then left the platform amidst cheering and yelling. The meeting afterwards with much enthusiasm passed the following resolution:—"That this meeting is of the opinion that the agents and agitators of the Liberation Society are a perfect nuisance to religion and are unworthy of toleration; that they foster a spirit of infidelity and encourage Romanism; and, further that the Nonconformists have always proved themselves most despotic and intolerant to those who differ from them, and we deem them, therefore, unworthy of our confidence." Every sentence in this resolution was received with great cheering. Three cheers for the "Good old English Constitution," and the singing of "God save the Queen" terminated the meeting about an hour from its commencement.

—Grants of money have been made to the society for building and enlarging churches and chapels; towards building churches at Dudleston-heath, Ellesmere, Salop; Fewcot, Stoke Lyne, Oxon; Kenly, Coulsden, Surrey; Middleton St. Lawrence, near Darlington; and Skelmergh, Kendal. Re-building the church at Downham, near Brentwood. Enlarging or otherwise increasing the accommodation in the churches at Bere Ferris, South Devon; Bishop's Itchington, Leamington; Corwen; Crowan, Cornwall; Crewell, Odiham, Hants; Llanishen, Cardiff; Lugwardine, Hereford; Pattishall, Northants; Prittlewell, Southend; Stretford, Leominster; Swanscombe, Kent; Tolland, Somerset; and Warminster Christ Church, Wilts. Under urgent circumstances the grant formerly made towards building the church at Lynmouth, Lynton, near Barnstaple, was increased. The society likewise accepted the trust of sums of money as repair funds for the churches at Low Marple, St. Martin's Cheshire; Rowledge St. James, Hants, and Thurstonland St. Thomas, near Huddersfield.

THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH.—The question of the representation of the laity in the Church courts has been considered by the Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Primus reported that the diocesan synods were unanimous in their opinion that the laity should be admitted to additional powers and functions, over and above those which they at present possessed. All agreed in confirming to the laity the power to speak, and in giving them a power to vote in the councils of the Church; but their power of voting on questions affecting doctrine, discipline, or worship was proposed to be limited in all but one synod, and all asked, or implied the request, that a general synod might be convened for the purpose of carrying out the object. A memorial had been received signed by the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, Lord Clinton, the Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorne, the Earl of Kinnoult, Lord Forbes, and Lord R. C. N. Hamilton, deprecating any organic changes in the Canons, and expressing their satisfaction with the present constitution of the Church and synods. The Bishop of Brechin moved, "That the Bishops are not prepared to call a general synod on the lay question." The Primus moved as an amendment, "That in consideration of the unanimous request on the part of the diocesan synods that the Bishops should convene a general synod, with the view of admitting the faithful laity to additional powers and functions in the councils of the Church, the Bishops do proceed to convene said general synod at as early a period as they may consider it desirable for the interests of the Church." On a division, the motion of the Bishop of Brechin was carried, there voting for it the Bishops of Brechin, Aberdeen, and Glasgow, and for the amendment the Primus and the Bishop of St. Andrew's.

ENGLISH PREFER

Carter, Rev. J. J.; Hon. Canon of Ch. Ch., Oxon.
Campbell-Colquhoun, Rev. J. E.; C. of Southwold, Suffolk.
Dyson, Rev. W. H.; V. of Stillingbourne, Kent.
Egerton, Rev. C.; R. of Weston Longueville, Norfolk.
Fellowes, Rev. S.; P. C. of Fulham St. Mary, Norfolk.
Holland, Rev. S.; V. of St. John's Bury St. Edmund's.
Hookey, Rev. G. S.; V. of John, Burgess Hill, Sussex.
Hoskin, Rev. T. R.; V. of Holy Trinity, Runcorn.
Langhorne, Rev. W. H.; P. C. of St. Luke's, Homerton.
Little, Rev. G. S. L.; V. of Henley, Salop.
Newbolt, Rev. W. C. E.; V. of Dymoke, Tewkesbury.
Patey, Rev. M.; V. Hamworthy, Devon.
Ridgway, Rev. J.; Hon. Canon of Ch. Ch., Oxford.
Richardson, Rev. T.; V. of St. Benet's, Stepney.
Robinson, Rev. C. E. R.; V. of St. John's, Torquay.
Smith, Rev. G. P.; V. of Trinity Milton next Gravesend.
Steward, Rev. A. H.; R. of Ashby Parva, Leicester.
Walrod, Rev. F. F.; V. of Throwley, Kent.
Wright, Rev. H. W.; V. of St. Paul's, Cheltenham.

MARTIN vs. MACKONOCHE.

On Friday 18th ult., Mr. Mackonochie appeared before the council for cross-examination. Dr. Stephens, Mr. Archibald, and Mr. R. Shaw were the counsel. The defendant stated that he had given directions that the monition should be obeyed, and that all his curates had heard the judgment delivered. He had told them not to bend the knee in the consecration prayer. They discussed the Order in Council, and the directions for complying with it. The object was to see how far they could obey the law of the Church without disobeying the law of the State. Mr. Mackonochie added that he elevated the wafer, but not the paten.

In reply to Mr. Archibald's further questions, the defendant said the bell was rung during the saying of the words of consecration; it continued for a minute or so. He had no "fixed level" for elevating the wafer, but there was no occasion to elevate it above the head. The elevation took place before the prayer of consecration was finished. The cup was elevated in the same way, but afterwards. There was no gesture made at the time of elevating, and no bowing; but after the consecration he bowed so that the forehead as nearly as possible touched the table.

Mr. Archibald then addressed the council, contending that although the articles of monition had not been drawn to meet in express terms that act now confessed, Mr. Mackonochie had ventured to trifle with the law, and had done an illegal thing. The several acts admitted to have been done were within the terms of the monition, and rendered the respondent liable to all the consequences of a breach of the monition. It was well established that in attempting to perform an illegal act a man rendered himself liable to penal consequences. So Mr. Mackonochie, in his attempt to raise the cup to the middle of his head, had, in fact, been guilty of elevation. The same considerations applied in the case of the wafer. The witnesses for the appellant stated that they had seen the wafer on some occasions, and the chalice on others, raised considerably above the head of the celebrant, and on one occasion it was a foot above his head. From the position of the celebrant, standing with his back to the people, it was impossible they could see the chalice unless it was raised considerably above his head. All this showed that, in attempting to keep just within the bounds of the monition, those bounds had been distinctly exceeded. Taking the whole of the evidence together, it was plain that the clergy of St. Alban's had committed a breach of the monition. Mr. Mackonochie said he could distinctly swear that after the 17th of June he did not elevate the chalice or wafer above the head; and, in answer to the Archbishop of York, that the raising of the wafer instead of the paten did not arise in consequence of these proceedings. In reply to Lord Chelmsford, Mr. Mackonochie added that the wafer

was introduced before the first judgment. The council took time to consider its judgment.

Lord Chelmsford in delivering judgment in this case, said that in the monition which followed the appeal to this committee Mr. Mackonochie was commanded to abstain from the elevation of the cup and paten during the administration of the Holy Communion. Their lordships expressed a clear opinion upon the matter and a mere literal compliance with the monition in an evasive manner would not suffice, but it was again alleged that Mr. Mackonochie has not complied with the monition, inasmuch as, first, he knowingly and habitually sanctions the elevation of the paten and cup above the head of the officiating clergyman at the prayer of consecration; and secondly, he knowingly and habitually sanctions kneeling or prostration before the elements during the prayer of consecration. Affidavits filed on behalf of the appellant describe the acts done by the officiating clergyman during the administration of the Holy Communion on seven different Sundays; the practice being that upon the officiating clergyman's reading the solemn words of the prayer of consecration he drops his voice, so as to be nearly inaudible; that a bell begins to toll; that he then elevates, not the paten, but a wafer, and places it on the communion-table; that he then bows his head towards the table, and remains in this position for some seconds; that he then elevates the cup, and, replacing it on the holy table, bows down as before, after which the administration of the elements commences. It appears from the cross-examination of Mr. Mackonochie that, after the institution of proceedings against him, he authorized the practice of elevating the wafer and not the paten, and he confessed that his object on every occasion was merely to comply literally with the law. But he assured their lordships, and they accept his statement, that he had in no way desired to shelter himself behind the difference between the use of the wafer and of the paten, but had treated the elevation of the wafer as equivalent to the elevation of the paten. Again, there can be no doubt that any elevation of any part of the cup above the forehead is an elevation of the cup itself. Now the conclusion to be drawn is that Mr. Mackonochie having determined to yield only the most literal obedience to the precise letter of monition, had resolved that neither he nor his curates should elevate the cup above the forehead during the prayer of consecration, but that, in trying to keep to the degree of elevation intended, the officiating clergyman, no doubt unconsciously and unintentionally, elevated the paten and cup to the extent mentioned in the affidavits. Whatever his intention to obey may have been, the act of elevation to the prohibited degree was witnessed; the secret intention could not be known. The remaining charge to be considered against Mr. Mackonochie is his sanctioning kneeling or prostration before the consecrated elements during the prayer of consecration. Their lordships did not regard the reverential bowing as an act of prostration; but the posture assumed for some seconds by Mr. Mackonochie was not mere bowing, but a humble prostration of the body in reverence and adoration. Their lordships, therefore, consider that the charge against Mr. Mackonochie of having sanctioned prostration before the consecrated elements is fully proved, and express their great regret at the course which Mr. Mackonochie thought himself justified in adopting in his supposed submission to the authority of the monition. He carefully scanned the monition and the Order in Council to see how nearly he could observe the prohibited ceremonies, or, as he expressed it, how far he could obey the law of the church or what he considered to be the law of the State. Mr. Mackonochie must be reminded that the right of the church of England to ordain ceremonies is asserted by the 34th Article of Religion, and that none of the ceremonies which he practises are prescribed by the church. In the attempt to satisfy his conscience, and to shelter himself under the narrowest literal obedience to authority, Mr. Mackonochie has been for a second time in fault. Their lordships therefore declare that Mr. Mackonochie has not complied with the monition in respect of the elevation of the paten or wafer, nor as to abstaining from prostrations before the consecrated elements, and they order that he be suspended for the space of three calendar months from the time of the no-