

KETTLE HALL,  
OXFORD

July 16.

My dear Westcott,

I have read your paper over carefully and am now better able to express an opinion about it. I quite agree with it, and indeed I have no amendment to propose. In some parts I think I should <sup>(if someone had occurred to me)</sup> not have used the exact language that you use. But, after very careful reading, I think that you best express your own meaning in your own words.

But I think that the paper ought



KETTER HALL,  
OXFORD.

To have careful reading - more careful than, judging from the general habit of the Commissioners, I think is likely to get.

Looking over the paper again I feel that I still desiderate in the first clause some qualification of the competence of the lay judges. It would be enough if the Church had not in her own courts sufficient machinery for the interpretation - if the Church courts misinterpret, the appeal should lie against the whole

system which administers them and not against the delinquent whom they have misled. I think that the compact of Church & State should be viewed as one between the Church, as a body, and the State, & not between the particular incumbents & the State. But this does not affect your main point. The words I have written on the proof are not meant as corrections.

Yours ever  
William Stubbs