

introduce into the service of the Church any hymn or anthem not ordered by the rubric, or because it was illegal to introduce it in the particular place in which it was sung, or because of something in the words themselves rendering them unsuitable. It was not contended that it was illegal to use a hymn or an anthem in all places where it was not ordered; and in the next place, to pronounce that it was an unlawful addition to the service, it must be shown that it was unlawful at that particular place. By the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth it was permitted that at the beginning or end of the Common Prayer, either morning or evening, there might be sung a hymn, or such like song, in the best sort of melody or music. It was not alleged that the hymn was so sung as to interfere with the communicants at the time of the reception or with the words of the administration, and on the point of usage instances were before the Courts showing that such a usage had been ample, widely diffused and continuous. The Court therefore found that there was no ground to declare such singing to be illegal, but the contrary. Moreover, there had been no evidence to show that the service was let or hindered by the singing, or that it interposed to the delay of the reception. They must next inquire whether the anthem was suitable. In form it was, the two verses which composed it being taken out of the Bible. Seeing that there was no evidence to show that Bishop Ridley or any one else objected to the choir singing the anthem on any doctrinal ground, there was no reason for believing that the words had any association with Romish preachers or practices which the Church of England repudiated. The Court had not to consider expediency, but legality, and the use of the words could only be condemned on the ground that at that place their use was illegal, which could not be maintained. The Court considered the singing of the anthem by the choir was not an illegal addition to the service.

The next point was the use of lighted candles during the Communion Service when such candles were not required for the purpose of giving light. The responsive plea in regard to that was that throughout the celebration there were two lighted candles on the Holy table, and that such lights were lawful. What was charged and admitted was that two candles in candlesticks were alight from the commencement to the end of the service. In regard to this matter, the court thought that while they ought to give full weight to previous decisions, the judgment in this case ought to be based upon the view which the court took upon the whole of the evidence before them. Having examined from an historical point of view the cases that had been brought forward, in which the use of lights had been made the subject of litigation, and quoted the decisions of certain judges who held that the lighting of candles was not contrary to the Act of Uniformity, the Archbishop proceeded to consider the extent to which lights had been used in the English Church, arriving at the conclusion that between the years 1680 and 1750 the use of lights had been about equally balanced. On a full review of the whole subject, the Court did not find sufficient warranty for declaring that the law had been broken where two lighted candles, when not wanted for the purpose of giving light, stood upon the table during service.

The next charge with which the Court had to deal was that while pronouncing the Absolution the Bishop of Lincoln conspicuously and ceremonially having both hands elevated, and looking towards the congregation, made with his hands the sign of the cross, and that again, in like manner, while pronouncing the Benediction during the same service the Bishop made the sign of the cross. It was alleged that these were unlawful additions to and variations from the order of service as prescribed and appointed. In the answers made to these alle-

gations, it was stated that the Bishop did raise his right hand and make the sign of the cross during the Absolution, at the same time looking towards the congregation, and also that while pronouncing the blessing he made the sign of the cross with his hand. The point to be inquired into was whether the ceremony, was lawful, although not prescribed in the Prayer Book. It certainly could not be supported by the Canon relating to the sign of the cross in baptism. There were two cases in which the sign of the cross came under the consideration of the Court—first, in giving Absolution; and, next, in the case of Benediction and there was no justification for the use of crossing in either case. The court, therefore, found that there was no justification either in direction or usage for making the sign of the cross in giving the final Benediction; that the action was a distinct ceremony, not 'retained,' since it had not previously existed; and that therefore it was a ceremony additional to the ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England. This ceremony was also an innovation which must be discontinued.

His Grace concluded his judgment, the delivery of which occupied four hours, in the following words: 'A Court constituted as is the present, having wider duties towards all parties concerned than those of other judges, duties inalienable from that position which makes its members judges, consider itself bound further to observe briefly in relation to this cause that although religious people whose religious feelings really suffer might rightly feel constrained to come forward as witnesses in such a case, yet 't is not decent for religious persons to hire witnesses to intrude on the worship of others for purposes of appeal. In expressing this opinion the Court has no intention of criticising the statements themselves which were in this case given in evidence. The Court has not only felt deeply the incongruity of minute questionings and disputations in great and sacred subjects, but desires to express its sense that time and attention are diverted thereby from the Church's real contest with evil and building up of good, both by those who give and by those who take offence unadvisedly in such matters. The Apostolic judgment as to other matters of ritual has a proper reference to these—namely, that things which may necessarily be ruled to be lawful do not for that reason become expedient. Public worship is one of the divine institutions, which are the heritage of the Church for the fraternal union of mankind. The Church, therefore, has a right to ask that her congregations may not be divided, either by needless pursuance or by exaggerated suspicion of practices not in themselves illegal. Either spirit is in painful contrast to the deep and wide desire which prevails for mutual understanding. The clergy are the natural promoters and fosterers of the divine instinct to follow after things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.' We have given judgment on each article as the several points have been considered. We give no costs."

**THE THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.**

The whole Advent season is one peculiarly suggestive of thought upon the deep things of God. Present grace, a life of probation, Divinely appointed means and agencies, as well as the Judgment to come press themselves upon the attention. The great subject of the Christian ministry this coming week opens a wide field for consideration, and the more so from the absolute demoralization of opinion consequent upon the running wild of private judgment. To a vast number of minds where Protestantism has had its full swing, the visible Church or kingdom of the Saviour of the world is ex-

tingent, and the authority of the Christian ministry is submerged under pretensions of popular talents and the gift of utterance, which would appear to engross all conceptions of the commission to preach the Gospel, to feed the lambs and sheep, and to become fore runners of the Great and final Coming of the Son of Man; more portentous in all its bearings than that of St. John Baptist. Herein is found the lurking poison which corrupts the prevalent Christian conscience, which makes Christian worship itself a matter of convenience or pleasure, and which relegates the most indispensable ordinances to the life of the soul, to the category of matters of individual choice. The voices 'thus saith the Lord,' or 'Speak Lord Thy servant heareth,' are not those which are the subjects of intensest concern. The demand is not for the faithful dealing with the soul, but chiefest for the pleasing catering to 'an intellect and the gratification of the hour. The general devout use of the Ember Collects in private as well as public—if such could be effected would be in itself a powerful corrective, definite views of the authority of the Christian ministry as based upon positive Scripture statements practically unapprehended by a large proportion of the members of the Catholic Church of England, and entirely ignored by others—a review of the historical and unequivocal testimonies proving divine authority and earthly jurisdiction; a recognition that in a real sense secondary only to the inspired Apostles—the Apostolic ministry embodies the messengers of God to His servants, and that through them He embraces His children in the Church's fold and feeds them with heavenly manna—until attended by this ministry He takes each one into His own Everlasting arms; legitimate enforcement of these vital aspects and their reception would revive the obscured and unalterable claims of and blessings to be derived from 'the stewards of the mysteries of God.'

The Church of England does not obscure these essential features of a God given ministry in its formularies, but the atmosphere is so impregnated with counter and noxious influences that assertion is needful, if the witness for Christ is to be kept alive and prevail. The Gospel system is simple and perfect, but its factors are so interwoven and interlocked that perversion of one feature carries with it consequences affecting most distant points of faith and practice. View the Christian minister as a tool to voice the prevailing opinions of his people, and there is no place for the soul-guarding witness of reproof; rebuke with all long suffering and doctrine; deny him the esteem which is Divinely stamped upon his sacred office, and there will follow that niggardly support which makes his condition a by-word; disperse the Apostolic Episcopate and there springs up the clash and strife of tongues which now greet the ears of the multitude from opposing teachers—which is approaching the climax of confusion in women preachers. In this line comes to thought a reference made by a great Presbyterian Divine of Ontario, who lately spoke of an esteemed Romish Priest, as a 'father of the Universal Church.' Could an expression from a critical mind be more misleading to such as comprehend not the Church in its Scriptural acceptance; and its Ministry in its rightful position and administration.

The rainbow that plays in the adverse sunlight seems for a moment a vast, stable arch that spans the earth and reaches to the clouds. We look again and it is gone. Thus it is with all earthly things.

We want additional subscribers in Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Toronto, Ottawa, London Hamilton. Liberal commission will be allowed to qualified Canvasser—lady or gentleman—in every one or more of these cities.