

him further than "to mark their disapprobation of such a course of proceeding"—to wit, the kneeling—"by directing that he should pay the costs of the present application," which, after all, I dare say, is no light punishment in England. This ingenious clergyman, who thought to evade the decree of the court against kneeling by bending one knee only, should have remembered the fate of "Peeping Tom," of Coventry, that

"one low churl, compact of thankless earth,  
The fatal by-word of all years to come,"

who, when Lady Godiva was riding by, "clothed on with chastity," risked one eye at an auger hole, and whose

"eyes, before they had their will,  
Were shrivelled into darkness in his head,  
And dropt before him."

But if he had possessed that acquaintance with the scriptures which I have (through the medium, in this instance, of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary) he would, on leaving the presence of this tyrannical court, have hurled at them this parting text: "And he *kneeled down* and cried, with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." Acts, vii, 60.

But we have not yet done with the reverend caviller. In November, 1870, the Privy Council were invoked to punish him for fresh disobedience to the monition, in respect to prostration and elevating the paten and cup. It was alleged and admitted that he had removed the wafer bread from the paten, and elevated the bread, instead of the paten; and it appeared that the upper part of the cup was elevated above the head. The accused claimed that the elevation was accidental and unintentional; but, as he admitted that he had carefully scanned the monition with the determination to yield only a literal obedience to its precise letter, the court held that he must suffer for even a literal violation, on the principle that they that take the sword shall perish by the sword. The accused, also, having met with such bad fortune in his genuflexions, notified his curates that he intended thenceforth to bow without bending the knee, at that part of the prayer of consecration where he had formerly knelt, and so, instead of kneeling, he made a low bow, and remained in that position several seconds. This the court held to be an unlawful prostration of the body. He was amerced in costs, and suspended from office for three months, and thus left with nothing to hold up but his hands, and with full liberty to bow his head if he had any shame left.

In January, 1870, "the office of the judge was promoted"—whatever that may be—"by the bishop of Winchester against the Rev. Richard Hooker Edward Wix, vicar of St. Michael and All Angels, Swanmore, in the Isle of Wight." The vicar was charged with ecclesiastical offences, namely, with having caused two lighted candles to be held on either side of the priest, while reading the gospels,

and with having lighted candles on the communion table, or on a ledge or shelf immediately above it, having the appearance of being affixed to and forming part of it, during the celebration of the holy communion, at times when they were not needed for light; also, with using incense, etc., etc. In respect to the first charge, the vicar admitted and defended the practice, but the court held it unlawful, and "monished" him. In regard to the second charge, Wix becomes a dangerous rival to Mackonochie, in the science of evasion, for, although he admits the lighted candles, yet, he says they were not on the communion table, on the ledge or shelf behind it, but on a separate table, called a re-table, not appearing to form a part of the communion table. I think, on the whole, he is rather superior to Mackonochie, for the latter had to put his candles out just before communion, but Wix defiantly kept his burning by means of the convenient re-table. But, it appearing in evidence that the re-table was placed directly behind the holy table, and had a shelf or ledge, which looked like a mantel-piece over the holy table, the court held that this would not answer, and so Wix and his candles were put out. As to the incense, Wix claimed that the censuring was done only during the interval between morning prayers and communion, accompanied by processions and tinkling of bells, and that the censuring was not within the prohibition of the law, because it was not done during any service. But the court thought there was no sense in this argument; Wix might as well claim that a slice of ham is no part of a sandwich, because it is between two slices of bread; and he was monished against this practice also, and condemned to pay costs, which last probably incensed him most thoroughly. 39 L. J. R. (N. S.) Ec. Cas. 25.

In the same report, at page 28, is found the case of *Elphinstone v. Purchas*, in which the matters of vestments, mixing water with the wine, administering the bread in form of wafers, etc., were gravely and elaborately considered. The defendant did not appear, and so the plaintiff, who was a colonel in the army, had a clear field. After eleven pages of discussion and examination, Dr. Phillimore concludes that Mr. Purchas might wear all the regalia which he was accused of wearing, except "a cope at morning or at evening prayer; also, with patches, called apparel; tippets of a circular form; stoles of any kind whatsoever, whether black, white or colored, and worn in any manner; dalmatics and maniples." The "biretta" or cap appeared to the doctor "as innocent an ornament as a hat or a wig, or as a velvet cap." Processions and incense were pronounced illegal. Blessing the candles was forbidden. So, as to announcing "a mortuary celebration for the repose of a sister," and interpolating a prayer for the rest of her soul. Wafers were not disapproved of, nor was mixing water with wine so long as it was not done at the time of the celebration. Placing on the table a