

How a final decision as to important points of ritual has been obtained; how many perplexing and contradictory rulings even on the part of the highest tribunal there have been; and how much evil has been done by the long struggle between the two opposing parties, are matters, upon which we do not care to dwell. Peace is the supreme interest: and so think those who penned this judgment. Forgetting what is past and irremediable, we look to the future, and are not without hope that the decision of the Privy Council may prove the beginning of a much-needed truce, if only Dr. King's friends do not abuse their victory, and forget that disregard of the opinions of the majority in the Church might bring about differences and divisions worse even than those which the Privy Council has tried to settle."

The *Daily Telegraph* had no leading article on the day following the delivery of the Privy Council; but the following was its comment in "London Day by Day":—"The long-expected judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Bishop of Lincoln will be the occasion for rejoicing among the High Church party, and will cause indirect satisfaction to all who value peace in the Church; but it will certainly not be pleasing to the Evangelicals, or to the Church Association, which promoted the appeal. On every point submitted to them the decision of their lordships is hostile to the view of the appellants. Neither in the singing of the hymn called "Agnus Dei," nor in the eastward position during the opening prayers of the Communion Service, nor in the mixing of water with the wine before the commencement of that service, do they find that any offence against the rubrics of the Church had been committed. With regard to the use of lighted candles on the altar, it must be recollected that the Bishop of Lincoln was not himself responsible for this innovation; he merely officiated at a Church where they were used without protesting against them, and the Privy Council does not consider that such abstention from protest was in itself an ecclesiastical offence. At the same time they decide nothing directly as to the candle question. Nor, of course, do they meddle with those portions of the Archbishop's decision which were adverse to the Bishop, and on which, we believe Bishop King has submitted to the Primate. The importance of the judgment just pronounced cannot be gainsaid, and it is satisfactory that Archbishop Benson's conclusion has been substantially confirmed on all issues. Had the Council decided otherwise, it would have remained to be seen whether High Churchmen would have bowed to the decision of a 'lay tribunal.' Fortunately no such question need now arise."

The *Guardian* says, under the heading, "The End of the Lincoln Case":—"The judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of 'Read v. the Bishop of Lincoln' is a subject for profound and thankful satisfaction. We have never been of those who regard the decisions of the highest lay court on ecclesiastical questions as matters of no moment. In the complicated system which goes by the name of the Established Church they represent one very important element, the assent of the temporal authority to the action of the ecclesiastical authority. What an Act of Parliament is to a vote of Convocation, that a judgment of the Judicial Committee is to a judgment of the spiritual courts. In the one the State pronounces on a legislative act of the Church; in the other the State pronounces on a judicial act of the Church. A judgment of the Privy Council does not decide what the doctrine or ritual of the Church of England is; that is the business of the spiritual courts. But it does decide what the doctrine or ritual of the Church of England as by law established is. If there be any conflict between the two tribunals, if what the spiritual courts have decided to be the doctrine or ritual of the Church of England be decided by the

Privy Council not to be the doctrine or ritual of the Church of England as by law established, then it is for the Church authorities to consider whether the points in dispute are weighty enough to make it their duty to assist at all hazards on their own reading of them. Suppose, for example, that the Judicial Committee ordered a Bishop or Archbishop to give cure of souls to an avowed Unitarian on the ground that belief in our Lord's divinity was not a part of the doctrine of the Church of England as by law established, there would, we may hope, be an entire agreement among Churchmen that for no consideration whatever ought the Bishop or Archbishop to carry out the order. His plain duty would be to disobey and take the consequences. No advantage that could conceivably accrue to the Church from remaining established could be worth the abandonment of an article of the Creed. In regard to points of lesser importance, on the other hand, there would be room for difference of opinion as to what the attitude of the authorities of the Church should be. The position of an established Church is worth some sacrifices, though it is not worth all. It is a just ground of rejoicing, however, when no occasion of conflict arises, and the temporal and spiritual authorities are of one mind. This happily is now the case within the ritual field which is covered by the Lambeth judgment."

The *Standard* of the day following the judgment says:—"In the course which they have now adopted the Privy Council have precedent on their side as much as if they had followed the ruling in the Purchas case. At the beginning of his judgment yesterday the Lord Chancellor referred to the Ridsdale case, in which he said that 'the contention of the appellants—namely, that the Privy Council was bound to uphold the previous decisions of the court—had been discussed at length,' with the result that it was refuted as untenable. The judgment which the Privy Council then had more immediately before them was the judgment in this very same Purchas case, and it was stated by the then Lord Chancellor, almost in the words of Lord Halsbury, that it was their Lordships' opinion that 'they should be slow to reject any fresh light which might be brought to bear upon the subject,' and that 'although very great weight ought to be given to the decision in 'Hebbert v. Purchas,' yet they ought in the present case to hold themselves at liberty to examine the reasons on which that decision was arrived at, and if they should find themselves forced to dissent from these reasons, to decide upon their own view of the law.' This is exactly what Lord Halsbury says now. And what was the consequence of the Privy Council adopting this course in 1877? Why, that the judgment in the Purchas case, delivered only six years before, was virtually reversed, their lordships arriving at a conclusion which it is difficult to distinguish from Dr. Benson's—namely, that there was nothing illegal in the eastward position, that is to say, in the clergyman's standing on the west side of the table, and facing the east, unless by doing so he prevented the people from seeing the acts of consecration. As it is totally impossible for all the people in a large church to witness these acts, all that can be meant by the words in the rubric is that there shall be no intentional, deliberate, and avoidable concealment of them, and on this point the Lambeth judgment and the Folkestone judgment, in the case of Mr. Ridsdale, seem to be substantially at one. Such is the end, for the present, of this memorable dispute."

The *Globe* says:—"Now that the Archbishop's decision has virtually been adopted by the Judicial Committee, it is most sincerely to be hoped that we shall hear no more of these unhappy cases. Judgments delivered, one by a spiritual court and one by a temporal court, on the same case, are found to coincide, and those Churchmen who would not have submitted to the judgment of the Privy Council alone, violate no principle by submitting to that of the Archbishop,

and *vice versa*. Surely under these conditions there can be no necessity whatever for again undertaking such proceedings, which are a grave scandal to the country and a serious danger to the peace of the Church. It is to be hoped that all schools of thought will concur in a loyal acceptance of the decision, and that while Low Churchmen will refrain from reproaching High Churchmen with illegalities which are shown to be non-existent, the latter will not utilise unduly the advantage they have gained. Certain ceremonies may be lawful, but they are not always expedient; and to press startling innovations in ritual upon congregations to whom they are not only strange, but repulsive, is to impede most seriously the work of the Church."

THE FAMILY CHURCHMAN.—Following close upon the Lincoln judgment comes the inevitable avalanche of newspaper correspondence and Press opinions which will show how the decision is likely to be received. It will be seen from the specimen "opinions" which we publish to-day that the tone of comment, with a few necessary exceptions, is favourable; and the earliest comments from the pens of laymen and clergy are so far satisfactory that they counsel prudence in the use of victory, and recommend cheerful compliance rather than dogged resignation on the part of those whom we suppose we must call the vanquished. Four letters which appeared in the *Standard* almost on the morrow of the judgment may be taken as typical. "A Layman" points out in a few words the position assumed by the Primate. "It is worthy of notice," he writes, "that in the first instance the Archbishop declined jurisdiction, but having been obliged to entertain the suit by the Privy Council, he delivered a judgment so exhaustive and able, that it has now become an historic document, and will cause Archbishop Benson to be remembered long after he has passed away." But it is rather of its reception than of the judgment itself we now speak. The Rev. George Huntingdon, writing from Terby rectory, says: "If we act on such counsels of prudence, leaving to others the liberty we claim for ourselves, with loyal deference to our rulers, we shall have secured for ourselves and for future generations a dignified, noble, understandable ritual, as entirely unlike that of Rome as it is distinctively Anglican. It is a great opportunity. Do let us make the best of it." "An Aged Clergyman" expresses himself in much the same terms, though unable to resist a passing complaint as to the toleration of the mixed chalice; but perhaps the most significant letter is from a former member of the E.C.U., with whose claim for mutual forbearance we fancy most readers of the *Family Churchman* will sympathise. "If," he urges, "the clergy knew the irritating effect some of the many 'fads,' etc., have upon the members of their congregations, they would hesitate before adopting them, sometimes only for the purpose of pleasing over-zealous Ritualists, who scarcely give a thought to the ultimate results of their actions. Some consideration is surely due to old and moderate members of the Church." If the suggestions of these representative writers be carried out, the judgment may prove the real Eirenicon many of us have so long been looking for.

THE WOMAN'S AUXILIARY.

The second triennial meeting of the Woman's Auxiliary to the Board of Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada, will be held in Montreal, September 14th, 15th and 16th, and it is hoped that a large attendance will be present, not only of delegates but members of the W. A. interested in the work. The opening service for the Provincial Synod with Holy Communion, takes place on the morning of Wednesday, the 14th, at eleven o'clock in Christ Church Cathedral, at which it is expected that members and delegates to the Woman's Auxiliary will be present to take part. A special service for the W. A. will be held in the Cathe-