

## THE MONTH.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury opened a Court on the 12th in Lambeth Palace, for the hearing of the suit, "Read and others v. the Lord Bishop of Lincoln." The *Record* says:

The only business transacted was the reception of a formal notice from the Bishop of Lincoln that he protested against the constitution and jurisdiction of the Court, on the ground that, in accordance with the practice of the Primitive Church, his trial ought to take place before the Metropolitan and the whole body of Bishops of the Province. As our readers are aware, the judge in the present Court is the Archbishop alone. The other Bishops present were merely invited by him to attend as assessors, in order to give him the benefit of their opinion and advice, and they will have no authoritative voice whatever in the proceedings, nor any participation in the judgment which will be pronounced. It was arranged that the Vicar-General of the Province should receive the formal protest of the defendant on Tuesday next, and should attend whenever required for conducting the formalities connected with the suit. The Court itself was then adjourned to March 12.

The Dean of Llandaff, in the Temple Church, on the 10th, made a reference to the Bishop of Lincoln's case.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Vaughan said:

Can it be worthy of a Christian leader, on the one side or the other, to attach the importance of a fundamental principle either to the having or to the not having of a certain adjunct or accessory to the celebration of a sacrament of which the virtue (if it have a virtue) cannot depend upon anything confessedly extraneous or adventitious? The argument is, and it ought to be, two-sided. If not vital, why attack it? is one side of it. If not vital, why fight for it? is the other. St. Paul, perhaps, would have said, "If it hurts, if it wounds, if it irritates, if it offends, better die twenty deaths than introduce, or, after introducing, maintain it. In these things, he who does is the aggressor rather than he who lets alone or bids you let alone. But we care not to bandy such trivialities as the question, which of two unwise persons is the less wise. . . . Let not one's own judgment, one's own taste, one's own liking or disliking, one's own habit and custom, one's own idea of liberty, or one's own interpretation of an ambiguous point of law make one insensible to the terrible danger, to the real wickedness of throwing into confusion, perhaps of absolutely upsetting, the order of things as established under the good hand of God in this realm and Church of England.

In relation to the proposals for compromise, says the *Record* of the 8th, an informal conference was held at the Jerusalem Chamber. The Dean of Peterborough proposed a resolution with a view of bringing influence to bear upon the Bishop of Lincoln and the promoters in the interests of peace. The *Guardian* says:

There was a good attendance of lay and clerical members of all sections of the Church, and a very good feeling was manifested. It seemed that nothing could be done without concessions on both sides, but the extreme wings proved irreconcilable, and no agreement was arrived at.

At the Jubilee meeting of the Church Educational Institute in Sheffield, Archdeacon Blakeney presiding, the Archbishop of York gave an admirable address on Education and the Bible. The Institute is carrying on its work, it appears, with increasing success.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, in a *Times* letter, regard "with much concern" the publication of the London edition of the *New York Herald* on a Sunday.

There has been a good deal of correspondence, as was expected, about Mr. O'Brien's "martyrdom."

<sup>1</sup> "Laicus," in a large type *Times* letter, says: "Let all good Churchmen lay to heart the solemn and touching words of Dr. Vaughan, and remember who are the real aggressors in this case."