

is the case. This fact makes it not only right but desirable that the usual dress of the preacher should be the gown, but it cannot make the use of the surplice when occasion calls for it out of place, or invest it with a quasi-Romish character. It is not that the one dress belongs to the desk and the other to the pulpit. On some occasions, as is the case of the Jubilee service in Great St. Mary's on Sunday week, it may be right for the academic gown to be worn by the officiating minister, even when saying prayers; while, on the other hand, when the sermon does not conclude the service, but the preacher has to return to the Lord's table and continue the liturgical service, it seems obviously the right and proper course for the preacher to wear the surplice instead of going through the unmeaning ceremonial of changing the surplice for the gown, and then from the gown back again to surplice. I yield to no man in my attachment to evangelical principles and in my detestation of all the errors and corruptions of Rome, *but I emphatically deny that there is anything unprotestant in the use of the surplice in the pulpit, and any imputation of Ritualism seems to me rather chargeable on those who for mere form's sake would maintain a meaningless and wearisome ceremonial.* Let us take care that in fighting the battle of Protestantism we stand on firm ground, and do not endeavour to take up an altogether untenable position.—I remain, dear Mr. Hollis, very truly yours,

Trinity Vicarage, J. BARTON.
June 6th, 1887.

THE BELL COX CASE.

THE Bishop of Lincoln has published the following: "My dear People,—All of you have, I am sure, been grieved at the imprisonment of Mr. Bell Cox, and you have all been relieved by his release. Distressing as it must be, for an honest man to find himself in a common gaol, yet the special punishment of imprisonment is not the real point which should engage our judgment, however much it may necessarily hold upon our imagination and our feelings. The substitution of deprivation for imprisonment would be no real gain to Church principles. It would indeed be a disastrous change, if a judge who professes to derive his authority solely from an Act of Parliament were allowed to remove priests from their cure of souls.

"The principles on which I would have you now fix your thoughts are such as these. The Church is the body of Christ. The State may assist the Church in the discharge of this her trust, but it is not necessary for the State to do so. The State may or may not be Christian; the Church being Christ's body must be so, and be so forever. So far from assisting the Church in her work for Christ, the State may, as in the days of the Apostles, in the early persecutions, and at other times, hinder and obstruct the Church; forbidding or restraining her in her operations. It then becomes the duty of faithful Christians, particularly of Christ's ministers, to resist, and, it

may be, to suffer for His Name. In England, at the Reformation, it was understood that the State would assist the Church in her high duties; and for several centuries this system of mutual co-operation and support, as it was then conceived, continued to be the accepted constitution of this country. Serious changes were introduced into the relations between Church and State not long before the commencement of the present reign; and now men who do not wish to be regarded as believers in our Blessed Lord may be, and are, members of Parliament and judges, and claim to make and to administer the law by which the discipline and worship of Christ's Church in England is to be regulated. It is, therefore, obviously the duty of those who are alive to the reality of Christ's Kingdom upon earth, and to the sacred nature of the trust which He has committed to His Church, to be on their guard against anything which would withdraw the government of that Spiritual Society of which He is the Head, from the officers to whom he has entrusted it, and place it under the powers of this world. Such is the motive of Mr. Bell Cox, and others, who have felt constrained by conscience to resist what appears at first sight to be the law of this Church and Realm. Their real desire is to maintain the true and legitimate relations between the spiritual and temporal jurisdictions; God's Kingdom in the order of nature, and His Kingdom in the order of grace. And it is to the maintenance, or, where it is needed, to the restoration of such relations that I would now direct your consideration and your prayers.

"At the present time we should desire to know and to do God's Will with a view to obtaining such objects as the following:—That our Church Courts may be presided over by a fully qualified ecclesiastical judge. That any miscarriage of justice, such as, in the opinion of many, took place in the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council with reference to the Ornaments Rubric, may be remedied; so that judgment may be duly given in the diocesan and provincial courts: and Churchmen be content without further appeal: or that, if it please God, some way may be laid open by which, without breaking the existing connection with the State, the Church may be enabled finally to determine all such matters as have been committed to her especial keeping. People sometimes complain that English Churchmen have but little zeal. They can have no true zeal for the Church unless they act upon Church principles; and these, as I have already told you, I believe to be the expression of the Divine Will. It is love and loyalty to our Blessed Lord which makes real Church-people so keen to act and ready to suffer.

"Praying that God may grant us to know and do His Will, I am your affectionate friend and Bishop.

"E. LINCOLN."

The *Church Review* says: We are denounced as subverting all order and stultifying ourselves because we refuse obedience to the Privy Council. The charge is obfuscated in a cloud

of verbiage, in which the Acts of Parliament passed in the reign of Henry VIII. are rammed down our throats, and no reply is left to us. After such rough usage as this our feeble cry of innocence may be unheeded by our valiant opponent who strides on, leaving us, like the man going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, half dead by the way. Nevertheless, we have something to say in reply. In the first place we plead, Not Guilty. We repudiate with abhorrence the charge of lawlessness. We hold that no Churchman has a right to worship according to the fancies of his own luminous imagination. He must worship as "this Church and Realm" commands. He may find many omissions which he would willingly supplement, and many permissions which he would take away. But so long as the Church is "established" he must submit. He may agitate for changes, and if he can persuade Convocation and Parliament to make them, well and good; but if not he can only go on as at present, or join the Liberation Society in the hope that with disestablishment will come the permission he cannot otherwise get. He is not at liberty to form a new "Episcopal Church," for that would be to commit the sin of schism. Now to this *concordat* between Church and State we are most loyal. The book of Common Prayer is not only authorised by Convocation, but it is also a part of the statute law of the Realm. Therefore, when we obey that statute and resist any attempts on the part of the judges of England to read a "not" into the law from motives of expediency, then as loyal and law-abiding citizens we are worthy rather of honour than a dungeon-cell. Dr. Taylor says that the party he claims to represent do obey the Bishops, and would do so without constituting themselves judges of what is legal and what is not. Here we see how extremes meet. It is Romanism pure and simple to submit without questioning to the commands of a Pope, be he ecclesiastical or secular. We readily recognize that Lord Penzance can march us off to gaol if we do not obey him, and we are quite ready to be marched off; but it is not because we are disobedient to the law, only that we decline to allow the law to be altered by unconstitutional authority—the Privy Council to wit—and that altered law to be administered by one who was appointed to his office in the teeth of an agreement made between the Church and the State.

For our own part we are content to repudiate that Convocation at the Reformation period ever had the slightest intention of permitting the civil power to intrude into the spiritual domain. And it is well to remind the public from time to time, that neither are we lawless, nor has the Church ever in her corporate capacity given to kings any further power than "so far as the law of Christ permits."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A quantity of Correspondence and Diocesan News unavoidably left over for want of space.