

magnifying certain doctrines to the neglect or denial of others. The notion that it is the mission of different denominations to bear witness to particular phases of Divine truth, might be well enough if the people to whom this witness is borne were brought under the influence of all the witnesses. But to subject one Christian to the teaching of Divine sovereignty, and another to the insistence upon human freedom, cultivates two different types of character, neither of which is according to the truth. The idea of a "witness-bearing Church"—that is, a body of Christians with a special Divine commission to bear testimony against other bodies of Christians—while it is pleaded of denominationalism, is in fact one of the worst fruits of the system. The effect of the system upon the sacraments is no less to be deplored. It obscures the true meaning of these holy ordinances by contracting the Table of the Lord to the close communion of a party in this Church, and by making baptism the badge of a sect; so that one says, "I was baptised an Episcopalian," and another, "I was baptised a Presbyterian," and another, "I was baptised a Baptist." The effect of denominationalism upon the ministry is no less deplorable. It too often degrades the servant and ambassador of Christ into the hired man of a voluntary association, and suspends his reputation and influence upon his success in making proselytes from other "societies." That minister must be a strong man, who, in adjusting his work to such conditions, does not lose somewhat of the spirit of his high commission, and shrivel his own mind to the dimensions of a *Gossip*.\*

These evils are greatly aggravated by their complication with social distinctions and family pride. Denominational lines, in such communities as we have described, are very apt to follow the lines of class distinctions, and to deepen them with "the Gospel plough." Religious societies become social clubs, and get rid of the question about seating the poor man in vile raiment by making it practically certain that he will not come into the same assembly with the man in goodly apparel and a gold ring. "The Salvation Army," or any other outside effort, is good enough for him. And so we look with complacency upon the spasmodic movements of zeal without knowledge, and even patronize them from a distance, as a salve to our conscience, not perceiving that the plea for their necessity, and indeed fact of their existence, is a standing reproach to the Church. What wonder, if in this state of things one half of our settled ministers in all denominations are unsettled in their minds, and waiting for "a call"? What wonder if the doors of vacant churches are besieged by an army of candidates, composed not only of young men who are openly looking for their first charge, but largely of old soldiers, some of whom by unworthy devices conceal the fact of their candidacy? Surely if we need a civil-service reform in the State, there is no less need of a pastoral-service reform in the Church. And this reform, to be effective, must begin at the denominationalism which fills the land with feeble churches and half-supported ministers, and wastes in sectarian rivalries what ought to go to the evangelizing of the world.

To be Continued.

### THE ARCHBISHOP'S JUDGMENT.

COURT OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

(Before His Grace the LORD ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY, with the BISHOPS of LONDON, HEREFORD, ROCHESTER, OXFORD, and SALISBURY, and the VICAR-GENERAL, SIR J. PARKER DEANE, Q.C., sitting as assessors.)

(2) The mere reasonableness of the conditions, however, or even proofs of expediency would establish nothing as to legality, unless it can be shown that usage has also adequately affirmed it. This appears to the Court to be the case. The practice of congregations on such a point is not likely to be much on record, and in most country churches the fewness of the communicants after the bulk of the congregation had withdrawn would at once make

\* *Gossip* is an ecclesiastical term—a corruption of *Godsid*. It was first applied to sponsors in baptism, and its development into its present popular use is not without historic significance. See Brewster's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable.

singing difficult and dispense with the occasion for it. Exceptional instances would prove nothing, but of the instances before the Court several in their very nature imply widely diffused and continuous usage in behalf of which no small amount of authoritative sanction can be alleged. The 'first metrical Communion Hymn written for and adopted' in the Church after the Reformation is the "Thanksgiving after the receiving of the Lord's Supper," printed first in the incomplete Psalter of 1561 and in the complete Psalter of 1562 (Sternhold and Hopkins.) This Book is described in the Title as 'Very meet to be used of all sorts of people privately.' It is also stated on the title page to be 'Perused and allowed according to the order appointed in the Queen's Majesty's Injunctions, 1560'; that is, legally licensed for printing by 'the Archbishops, the Bishop of London, the Chancellors of both Universities, the Bishop being Ordinary, and the Archdeacon also of the place' 'of printing,' or by two of them, 'the Ordinary to be always one.' 'Perused and allowed' is the term used in the Injunctions (li) where the License is to issue from this body. It is not used of 'the Privy Council' or of 'Her Majesty by express words in writing.' It is held by accurate critics that the result of 'this tentative measure satisfied' the authorities that it was right 'to raise the book from the position of a private manual into a public and authorised book for use in public worship.' The licence had been for seven years, but within five years of its granting, as early as 1566 (Bodleian Lib.) the authorisation is 'Set forth and allowed to be sung in all churches of all the people together before and after the Morning and Evening Prayers and also before and after Sermons and moreover in private houses.' In the next year (1567) the authorisation and license were granted for ten years. At the expiration of that term the mere License for printing was 'cum privilegio Regie Majestatis,' whilst the authorisation for singing remained as before. The sanction for singing in all churches is believed (Strype *Mem.*, B. I. xi, 11, xxii.) to rest on the proviso 2 and 3 Ed. VI. I, 7, and refers to the singing allowed in the late Injunctions of Q. Elizabeth and somewhat extends their effect. 'The Book itself bears on its face the object of use in public worship.' (see throughout Julian, *Dictionary of Hymnology* 'Old Version' and 'Appendix.') It was constantly printed in the small folio, small quarto, and the same other varying sizes as the prayer-books, and in 1637 was published by the University of Cambridge (and by the Royal Printers ever after) in one volume with the prayer-book. In 1641 the Committee appointed by the Lords 'touching' considerations upon the Common Prayer Book, suggested the amending of 'The Singing Psalms' and that 'lawful authority should be added unto them,' meaning doubtless parliamentary authority. No fresh authorisation was ever given, although the book may be said to have been in use universally in churches. The suggestion itself may be said to recognise this. It is not necessary further to discuss the authorisation. Its operative authority, whatever it was, applied equally with the other hymns and versions, to the "Thanksgiving after the receiving of the Lord's Supper," and there is no reason to doubt that it was sung according to its heading after the Reception. As the people then (and much later) sate to sing (Shepherd on C. P. B. i. 306), its length, 124 lines, suited it for singing during long intervals—a point which will receive further illustration. Bishop Lewis Bailly's (of Bangor) *Practice of Piety*, one of the most popular manuals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, published in 1610—1612, dedicated to Prince Charles, reached its sixtieth edition in 1743. It prescribes "After receiving of the Holy Communion, two sorts of duties: First, such as we are to perform in the Churches . . . jointly with the congregation," and of these "First, public thanksgiving both by Prayers and singing of Psalms. . . Thus far of the duties to be practised in the Church." (pp. 348, 355.) In 1622 George Wither's *Hymns and Songs of the Church* was licensed by King James I., "worthy and profitable to be inserted in every English Psalm Book in metre." After its reprinting in 1632, it was licensed by Charles I. (Miller, *Our Hymns*, p. 30.) It provides a hymn of 200 lines to meet, as it states, the custom among us "that during the time of administering the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is some Psalm or Hymn sung, the better to keep the thoughts of the communicants from wandering." Indirect but effective evidence of the generality of the practice appears in such a manual as Bishop Wentenhall's 'Method and Order for Private Devotions' ('Enter into thy Closet'), five editions of which range from 1656 to 1684. It suggests the time 'while the Communion is administering to others, . . . especially if there be no Psalm-singing,' as 'suited for ejaculations and meditations. In 1696 appeared the version and in 1708 the supplement of Tate and Brady, similarly containing what were advertised as "The usual Hymns . . . for the Holy Sacrament" (two of them more appropriate to the service before, and two after the Consecration), designed to take the place, as it gradually did, of

Sternhold and Hopkins. It was authorised by Orders in Council to be used in all churches. The above evidence is not evidence of exceptional cases, but it is evidence of provision made by authority from time to time of hymns to be used in this place. It may further be observed in illustration of the subject (although as has been said, records of such a matter are naturally meagre), that Wesley in 1782 mentions with approval the playing of "low, soft, solemn" music "while we were administering" at Macclesfield Parish Church, as also the "solemn music at the post-communion" at Exeter Cathedral (*Journal*, Mar. 29, Aug. 18.) Not only do many persons remember the singing of a hymn or verses of a hymn, while the Communion was being received, as not uncommon, and as an assistance to devotion and edification, but there are parish churches in which the tradition still is kept on greater festivals or when there are many communicants. The custom is also to some degree attested by the Common Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, which, closely following our own, has in several places inserted in the rubrics directions for the doing of things which were commonly done, though not expressed to be done. After the consecration prayer and before the reception it directs "Here shall be sung a Hymn or part of a Hymn."

So far then as the singing of a Hymn or Anthem at this place is concerned, if only they be suitable and not in themselves exceptionable, the Court finds no ground to declare such singing illegal, but the contrary.

Before enquiring whether the Anthem charged was suitable or not, we should, under this head, enquire whether the service was let or hindered by the singing of it. The charge states that it was sung "immediately after the prayer of consecration," so that there was no let or hindrance at that point. The charge states, and the plea admits that it was "before the reception of the elements. . . . A doubt arose as to 'reception' by whom? If it means that the celebrant did not receive the elements after the usual brief interval for his private devotion, nor proceed to administer them to the other clergy, and then to others in order, but waited until the end of the anthem before receiving, this would constitute an insertion in, or addition to, the service, which would not be lawful. It would be in contradiction even to the line of the defence, which pleads that the singing ordered in the communion time in the original rubric is not unlawful though no longer enjoined. But no evidence was adduced by the promoters to show that the service was interrupted. The learned counsel for the defence stated their conviction that although begun to be sung before the reception by the congregation, it was not interposed so as to delay the reception by the celebrant. No witness was called to establish the contrary, and if there were a doubt the defendant would be entitled to the benefit of it.

3. We must now enquire whether the anthem charged in this case was a suitable one. In form it was. The two clauses which compose it are "taken out of the Bible," and so are nearer to the original conditions that any metrical version or hymn can be.

The objection, however, rather took in argument the form that this particular Hymn or Anthem having been ordered in King Edward's First Book to be sung by the choir at this particular place, and having been omitted from the later books, ought on that account not to be sung here. Since the Court finds that other hymns have been constantly and may lawfully be sung, it is necessary to enquire whether any other reasonable account of the omission of this one hymn is to be found in the construction of the service, or whether it was presumably omitted on account of its inappropriateness or positive unsuitableness. It was not one of the "ceremonies abolished," but was "one of those retained" under the Preface which gave the reasons for the abolition of some and the retention of others; and the mere reprinting of the same Preface in subsequent books from which the Anthem was left out, would be no proof that it was abolished for the reasons there given. It was asserted in the arguments that it was omitted on account of its meaning or doctrine in association with the Eucharist; but no proof was advanced of this assertion beyond the omission itself. On the other hand, there is an explanation arising from the very construction of the service, which has satisfied competent critics not concerning themselves with doctrine. This particular anthem had been sung a first time just before the Communion Service in the end of the Litany. In King Edward's Second Book the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which also contained it, had been removed from its former place and set after the Consecration with only the Lord's Prayer and one other Prayer between. If the *Agnus* had been left in after the Consecration it would there have been sung a second time, and then a third time almost immediately in the *Gloria*. It was natural to change this; and it is also worthy of note that in the same recension in which it was taken away from that place the words are repeated with variation