

three times instead of twice, as before, in the *Gloria*, where it is retained.

This might have been thought a sufficient account of the omission, as it has been given by impartial scholars (Burbidge, *Liturgies and Offices*, p. 247).

But it becomes necessary to examine whether there are more serious motives for the changes, since it was on doctrinal motives that the learned counsel rested the force of the charge. Are the words doctrinally unsuitable to be used at that point, and is there evidence beyond the change itself (which might be otherwise accounted for) that they were thought so? It has been argued with apparent force that Bishop Ridley felt so strongly against the *Agnus*, as here used, as positively to forbid it in his injunctions in 1550—the time when it was not only lawful but compulsory by the Prayer Book and the Act of Uniformity. It is hard to believe that a person of Ridley's probity would act so, even if he had not been one of the principal persons in the composition of the Prayer Book the year before (Strype *memorials* ii., i., 184), and if it were not also (as it is) the purpose of this same second item of those injunctions to enjoin (as itself states) that Order "in the time of the Holy Communion" which was "appointed by the Book of Common Prayer" (Visitation Injunctions of Bishop Ridley: *Works*, Parker, Soc. 319). But the fact is that what Ridley forbade is another and different thing. In the Missal (*Sacramental*, Burntisland c. 723), after the consecration and before the communion (before communicating himself), the Priest holding the broken bread in his hands over the chalice said the *Agnus* privately, the two other ministers drawing close to him and joining privately. The Prayer Book, of course, excluded this action on principle, and appointed that "during the communion time," i.e., while the people were communicating, the choir should sing "O Lamb of God" as a hymn. What Ridley forbids is the continuance of the old practice of the priest. He says perfectly clearly, "No Minister is to counterfeit the Popish mass . . . saying the *Agnus* before the communion." In fact he requires that the order of the Book he had just helped to compose and was now enforcing should be observed in this particular, and the anthem "O Lamb of God" be sung by the choir during the Communion. It has been confidently said that one only explanation can be given "why it is deliberately not included in any of the later Prayer Books." The only answer can be (it has been said) because it was associated with the Mass and the Adoration of the Host. That is the only answer that can be given. The same objection would of course be equally against passages which are included. As to this passage the objection had not occurred even to extreme Reformers. On the contrary, in the severe review, point by point, of "the whole canon of the mass . . . after Salisbury use," which Foxe prefixes to his narrative of Queen Mary's reign, the only objection taken to the *Agnus* is that it was said "privately";—Lest the people should be edified," is the sarcastic note (*Acts and Mon.* B. x. N. vi. p. 465, ed. Cattle). But for a positive view of the matter we may refer to the Savoy Conference, and to "the alterations and additions tendered" "as needful" to the Bishops for their "acceptance . . . to be inserted in the several places to which they belong" (*Petition of the Puritan Divines*). These were drawn up mainly by Baxter, and presented by the Puritan or Presbyterian Committee (Reprint Hall's *Reliq. Liturg.* vol. iv.). Among their alterations and additions we find them recommending that after the consecration, and the Minister having declared "This bread and wine being set apart and consecrated . . . are now no common bread and wine, but sacramentally the body and blood of Christ," the Minister should, after a short prayer, "take the Bread and break it in the sight of the people, saying, The Body of Christ was broken for us and offered once for all to sanctify us; behold the sacrificed Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world." (Hall, iv. 70; Calamy's *Life of Baxter*, v. i. App 32; *History of Nonconformity*, 1704, p. 91.) This makes an application of these words, after consecration and before reception, strengthened as it is by the words "Behold" and "Sacrificed," more precise in its form and more predicative by far than if sung as an anthem while people are receiving. Yet there is no doubt of the ideal Protestantism of the great man who applied them in this definite way as innocent and edifying.

Seeing, then, that there is no evidence whatever to show that Bishop Ridley or any one else objected to the Choir singing this Anthem at this place upon any doctrinal ground, and seeing that the Act of Parliament which established the Second Book lays down expressly that the First Book was "agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church;" and seeing also that the typical Protestant Representatives at the Savoy desired the restoration at this very place of the words in still stronger form, there is no ground left for believing that the words had then, or have now, any association with those Roman doctrines or practices which the Church of England repudiates.

Under these circumstances, although we might readily agree that the proximity of two other repetitions of the words in the Litany and *Gloria* may make them not the aptest anthem for use here and may suggest their disuse, as apparently it did to the framers of the Second Book, the Court has not to consider expediency but legality. The use of them could only be condemned on the ground that any and every hymn at this place would be illegal, which cannot be maintained in the face of concurrent, continuous, and sanctioned usage. To condemn the singing of that text here as unsound in doctrine would be contrary to the real force of Ridley's injunction, and to other unexceptionable Protestant teaching.

The Court concludes that the singing of it by the choir was not an illegal addition to the service.

7. LIGHTS.—Articles 3 and 13 state:—3. That the Lord Bishop "used and permitted to be used lighted candles on" or apparently on "the Communion Table . . . during" the Communion Service, "as a matter of ceremony and when such lighted candles were not wanted for the purpose of giving light."

13. "That the use of the lighted candles" . . . is an "unlawful addition and variation from the form and order prescribed . . . by the said statutes and of the order of the administration of the Holy Communion . . . and . . . contrary to the said Statutes and to the Rubrics . . . and to the . . . Canons." The Responsive Plea 2 of the Lord Bishop is that "throughout the celebration there were without any objection being raised by him two lighted candles on the Holy Table"; and that "these lights, whether required for purpose of giving light or not, are in his judgment and he submits lawfully." What is here both charged and admitted is that two lights in candlesticks on the Holy Table were alight from before the Communion Service began until after it was over. It is not charged that there was an action of lighting or carrying lights about; but that two lights burning when and where they did while the service was proceeding constituted an unlawful addition to and variation from the form and order prescribed by the acts of Uniformity, Prayer-book, and Canons.

It has to be ascertained

I. Whether two lights so alight have been at any time lawful since the establishment of the Book of Common Prayer; and

II. If so, when, if ever, and by what enactment they were made unlawful.

It has to be premised that there has been an accumulation of illustrative facts in the last few years, and it is held that in cases of this description, "and in proceedings which may come to assume a penal form, a tribunal ought to be slow to exclude any fresh light which may be brought to bear upon the subject." The Court therefore considers (as it has already laid down) that though very great weight ought to be given to any previous decision, yet that in the circumstances of the present case its decision ought to be based upon that view of the law which it is led to take by independent examination of all the evidence now at its command.

I. The first question is, Have the two lights been lawful since the establishment of the Book of Common Prayer? Before the Reign of King Edward VI. many lights were constantly burning in different parts of churches—also in different parts of the service lights were lighted or brought in and carried about according to directions in the service books. The missal contained no directions that there should be two lights on the altar during the celebration. It was not a Rubrical prescription, whatever allusions may be found in the *Consuetudinaria*, or statutes of particular churches. A Canon enjoining the usage is preserved by Lyndwood as having been passed under Stephen Langton in 1222. It is said to have been repeated in 1322, though this date is not without difficulty; but a collation of many instances before the Court shows that, although generally adopted, the usage may perhaps not have been universal, nor the number on the altars strictly uniform, but varying from one to many. Church lists of furniture in use and of Articles considered necessary for celebrating the Eucharist, do not mention Candelabra; they were not as a general rule required to be provided by the parish as articles essential to the service, though incumbents were not unfrequently desired to provide them. In 1547 Injunctions given by Edward VI. ordered that all the other numerous lights in the churches (as having superstitious meanings) should be extinguished, "but only two lights upon the high altar before the sacrament, which for the signification that Christ is the very true light of the world, they" (the ecclesiastical persons rehearsed) "shall suffer to remain still." No act of lighting in service time is prescribed. But it is not disputed that these were alight during the celebration of the Holy Communion, as they are seen in abundant illustration. The light that had been kept before the reserved host was single, *cereus vel lampas*. Thus the same authority which affected the extinction of all the other lights ordered that two should remain in the position described. In

Litlington's *capella portatilis* "an enumeration of what was held necessary for the celebration of low mass"—21 articles—candlesticks are not named (*Dr. W. Legg, Soc. Antiq.* 1890). Nor yet in the lists of Queen Mary's time of what parishioners were again bound to find and keep in the church, though in these and the older parish lists a paschal candlestick is almost always mentioned. What amount of authority from parliament, if any, accompanied the Injunctions as made by the Crown in pursuance of the Proclamation Act, is not material. The injunctions themselves and the compliance with them may be regarded simply as evidence that the lighted lights were not then contrary to law. Cranmer in his visitations, which were legal proceedings, and had the authority of a Court, enquired whether the one class of lights, and ceremonies connected with them under several items, had been put away, and the two lights upon the altar retained. The inventories of church goods in various countries have been appealed to as showing that in 1552 candlesticks were left in many churches, but this evidence is of doubtful force, since the goods therein named were intended to be seized for the use of the King, and were so seized shortly after. But inasmuch as they were seized together with not only disused objects, but with church bells, the lead of roofs, valuable English Bibles, organs, &c., the seizing is no evidence on the other hand that they were illegal.

(To be Continued.)

Home & Foreign Church News

FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENTS.

MONTREAL.

MONTREAL.—The directors of the St. Margaret's Nursery, Kensington Avenue, Cote St. Antoine, gave an "At Home" on Friday, Feb. 20, with the object of bringing before the public of Montreal the work of the institution. The beautiful, airy house has a large hall or play-room down-stairs and a good sized nursery up-stairs, besides many smaller ones. The babies old enough to sit up were all gathered in the play-room and behaved very well, being rather pleased and diverted by seeing so many strangers. When the coffee and cakes, which had been liberally provided, were brought in, the children were allowed each a little piece of cake. The fact that they are children of disgrace cannot rob them of the halo of babyhood, or of the light that lighteth every man coming into the world. It is pleasant to see such Christian women as Miss Humphreys and Sister Elizabeth caring for "the least of these," whose humanity links them not to us only, and especially encouraging to note the hearty appearance of most of the infants who have been for some time under their care.

The Rev. James Barclay, the president of the institution, said a few words to the friends assembled, expressing a wish that the work might be better known, and so better supported.

The treasurer, Mr. Darling, spoke of the care that was taken that the mothers should be in safe hands after leaving the Home. Some were sent to their friends and situations were sought for others. In some cases situations were found where the woman could keep the child with her, otherwise the child was kept in the nursery. One great aim of the institution was to foster the mother's love for the child, and make her wish to keep it. The few weeks spent in the Home generally effected this. Last year a hundred and fifty infants were received into the Nursery, of whom only thirty-eight died. This death-rate of 25½ per cent. is lower than that of any similar Institution, except one in Boston, which was built specially for the purpose, whereas the drainage of the present building was imperfect, and the work of repairing had been hampered by a lack of funds. Mr. G. Lamothe once stated that as Chief of Police he had sent eight hundred and fifty infants to the Grey Nunnery and not one of them had lived for six months. The record of St. Margaret's Nursery in saving about 75 per cent. of such children should appeal to the Christian public. The work was being greatly curtailed for lack of funds, and might soon have to stop altogether if not more liberally supported.

The Rev. Mr. French said that the friends of the Nursery should insist on other people coming to see it, as the work only needed to be known to be supported. Not a single objection could be made to it.

Mr. Darling rose again to say that the institution had never needed to take a woman in twice. The speakers emphasized the good that could be done to the mothers and the almost certain death or degradation of the unfortunate children if not thus cared for. This was the only Protestant institution of the kind in the city. Sister Elizabeth conducted the visitors over the building, glad to exhibit the twenty-six babies, some of whom appeared to be very fine specimens. There have been as many as fifty-five