

THE NINTH SUNDAY AFTER
TRINITY.

“THE mammon of unrighteousness,” as one of the idols men are tempted to fall down and worship, is to form an important element among the various means and instrumentalities which are to shape the Christian’s course in his pathway towards the heavenly world; and, according to the use that is made of it, will materially affect the final result. Although it is most accurately described as “unrighteous,” yet there is such a use to be made of it as will ultimately secure a refuge among the everlasting habitations of the holy ones; as, on the other hand, there is another mode of employing it, that of using it chiefly for ourselves, which will infallibly secure a final home in the place where weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth will be the eternal occupation of its inmates. “In all wealth, a principle of evil is implied; for in a perfect state of society—in a realized kingdom of God upon earth—there would be no such thing as property belonging to one man more than another. In the moment of the Church’s first love, when that kingdom was for an instant realized, all that believed were together, and had all things common; and this existence of property has ever been so strongly felt as a witness for the selfishness of man, that in all ideas of a perfect commonwealth—which, if perfect, must of course be a Church as well as a State—from Plato’s down to the Socialist’s, this of the communion of goods has been made a necessary condition, so that though the possessor of the wealth, or those who transmitted it to him, may have fairly acquired it, yet it is not less this unrighteous mammon witnessing in its very existence as one man’s and not every man’s, for the corruption and fall and selfishness of man—for the absence of that highest love, which would have made each man feel that whatever was his, was also every one’s beside, and rendered it impossible that a *mine* and *thine* should ever have existed.” But it must nevertheless not be forgotten that any premature attempt to realize a fancied state of perfection, any attempt made except by the voluntary adhesion of the entire community, has been one of the most fruitful sources of the worst evils ever known in the history of the world.

There is no state for man on this side the grave exempt from trial. The most remarkable instance of trial in the case of a whole people was that of the Israelites after leaving the iron bondage of Egypt; and the history of it is written for the admonition of the people of God in every subsequent age. Every gift of Providence and grace was bestowed upon them or promised them, even while its immediate connection with their present history was for a time at least in part withheld. So that whether in a redundancy of gift and privilege, or in holding its bestowment before the eye of faith, as something to be attained in the future, a state of probation indicating results corresponding with the course of life chosen, was secured in ways as extraordinary as they were manifold.

THE NATURE OF A CHRISTIAN
MISSION.

“THE atrocious crime of being a young man” is too soon and too easily rectified. The young Bishop of Colombo is guilty of the crime just at present; but, in connection therewith, he has manifested a courage and a discretion which are not often combined. In a sermon which he recently preached in St. Paul’s Cathedral, he gave a forcible and an eloquent plea for a recognition of the true object of a Christian mission, and of the functions of a Christian missionary. The Bishop argued that the object of a mission is not simply to convert the heathen, but to found a spiritual kingdom in their midst; and the function of the missionary is to edify, to build them up as members of Christ’s Church. This aspect of the subject is often left out of sight by the supporters of missions, and the morbid craving for results not only involves the danger of leading the missionary to give his exclusive attention to the more exciting part of his work, to the neglect of the equally necessary task of keeping a watch over his people, but it occasions spiritual injury to the converts, who need all the prayers and all the efforts of the Church for their growth in Godliness. In thus boldly vindicating the position which he is well known to have taken in his own Diocese, and which has brought upon him some animadversion from those who, although in the Church, are not of the Church—holding “views” which are alien to her principles—Bishop Coplestone has acted both wisely and courageously, and we trust that the Lambeth Conference has laid some stress upon the important principle which has been thus forcibly advocated from the cathedral pulpit. The Bishop is evidently a believer in that old-fashioned Book, called the Bible, and is not afraid to go back to apostolic precept, and better still to apostolic practice; and in his reference not only to the inspired words, but also to what he effectively termed “the Inspired Acts of the Apostles,” he occupied a position which is absolutely impregnable.

THE PAN-ANGLICAN SYNOD.

A GREAT deal of disappointment is expressed at the absence of any public report of the proceedings of the Lambeth Conference; and that so little is known about them. At the conclusion of the Conference, a Pastoral was issued by the assembled Bishops, which we are glad to insert in another part of this issue. It will be found to contain something of a more definite character than that issued in 1867, and altogether more satisfactory. In reference to the secrecy of the proceedings, it is alleged that the disadvantages which would have attended publicity far outweighed any gain which the gratification of curiosity would produce. It would appear that a much greater amount of agreement existed among the hundred Bishops who were assembled this year than existed in the Council which met in 1867. A tolerably complete account of the proceedings of the Conference of 1867 has just been published. We purpose giving, as we have

space, the opening address of the Archbishop of Canterbury on that occasion, and also some of the speeches made during the discussions that took place, which are still of general interest.

THE NEED OF INSTRUCTION IN
CHURCH PRINCIPLES.

THE most cursory glance at the present constitution of the Church in Canada will be sufficient to perceive that there exists a lamentable ignorance of the essential principles and doctrines of our holy religion. As one of the causes of this state of things, may be mentioned the *breadth* of opinion that is permitted to be entertained in our branch of the Catholic Church. But then, several mistakes are apt to be made in regard to the kind and extent of this *breadth* that is permissible. Because a number of different opinions are allowed to be entertained on some subjects, it does not therefore follow that the Church holds no definite doctrine at all; and that all her statements may be received or not, just according to the whim or caprice of the individual. On the contrary, it is very necessary in the present day, for both clergy and laity to bear in mind that there are fundamental truths, a reception and diffusion of which form the very essence of our Church’s right to form a part of Christ’s kingdom on earth. Nor is it alone such dogmas as those of the Trinity in Unity, the Incarnation, the *influences* of the Divine Spirit, the general judgment, and immortal blessedness or endless misery beyond the grave, that the Church strenuously insists upon as the main subjects of her teaching. That Christ established a Church on earth, that this Church is Christ’s Church, the body of Christ, that it will continue to the end of the present dispensation of things, in historical and visible continuity, that none can lawfully minister the word and sacraments but such as are commissioned to do so by Christ Himself through the legitimate authorities of the Church, and that her ministry has a Divine authority to perform the sacred functions of the ministerial office, are as definitely laid down and insisted upon by the Church herself as any other branches of her teaching.

Now, we find amongst us, men, professedly of some education, who take a certain position in society, and who are, furthermore, looked upon as authorities in many important matters, dissenting *in toto* from some of the above-named essential doctrines of our Church. These men, in expressing their own peculiar views upon these subjects, necessarily carry with them a certain number of admirers. And this not from decided conviction, but because such views are set forth by those who in other matters are considered authorities. This fact, in many respects is productive of some trouble, until time has been afforded for furnishing the remedy. It certainly does not follow, because a man is thoroughly conversant with one subject, that he should be considered an infallible authority in all. A man may be perfectly *au fait* in common or in civil law, still it does not necessarily follow that he is a correct interpreter of the Law of God.