

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

TRUE freedom is that which results from the service of Christ as distinguished from the slavery of the world, the flesh, and the devil. It is true that in the service of Christ there is obedience to rule; there are restrictions upon action, upon inclination, upon speech. In the service of Christ there are obligations to work, to self-discipline, to sacrifice self to others, to all the details of the code of Christian duty. But these obligations and restrictions prescribe for him just what his own heaven-sent nature would wish him to be and to do. These things are entirely acceptable to the new man in the Christian, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. And, therefore, whatever a Christian may be outwardly, he is inwardly an emancipated man. In obeying Christ's law, he acts according to that which he recognizes as the highest law of his life. He obeys law—the law of his God; and has no inclination to disobey it. Obedience is not to him a yoke; disobedience would be to him a torture. In a state of sin he had often done the things he would not, because he was in a state of real slavery; and with the ultimate result he was always dissatisfied. But now his inclinations are in accordance with his highest duty, that which frees him is itself a law; and the ultimate results of his obedience are in the highest degree satisfactory. "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and death." The Christian is a servant of God; but then, as he would not for all the world be anything else, this service is perfect freedom. True freedom consists in the power of acting without hindrance according to the highest law of our being. A mere animal impatience of restraint, such as we find among the so-called Protestants of Italy and France, is not true freedom. Human liberty does not consist in the indulgence of our lower instincts at the cost of our higher ones. To do wrong does not really assert our liberty; it degrades and enslaves us. It is doubtless necessary that we should have the power of doing wrong in order to do right freely; but we forfeit our freedom none the less if we do anything but what is right. A false notion of liberty is the worst enemy of true liberty. Our highest liberty is secured by our free and complete obedience to every detail that we know of God's eternal law. And moreover, as the Church to-day specially directs our attention to the results of our conduct, we may ponder with satisfaction and profit the conclusion arrived at by the Apostle Paul:—"The wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord."

THE LATE DEAN STANLEY.

AS announced in our last issue, the death of the Very Rev. Arthur Penrhyn Stanley would take the Anglican communion by surprise. He has for a number of years occupied a prominent position as Dean of Westminster, as one of the broadest Churchmen outside the Empire of Germany; as an elegant and accomplished writer; and as a confidential friend of Royalty, partly in consequence of having married the Lady Augusta Bruce, who had been a favourite maid of honour to the Queen. He was son of the late Bishop of Norwich, who himself was an excessively broad Churchman. At Rugby he is believed to have been Tom Brown's "Little Arthur." Afterwards he entered Balliol College, Oxford. His university course was a

good one, and in 1851, he was appointed a Canon of Canterbury Cathedral. In 1858, he was transferred to a canonry in Christ Church, Oxford, and became examining chaplain to Dr. Tait, then Bishop of London. In 1846, he published his "Stories and Essays of the Apostolic Age," which contained the germs, at least, of that excessive breadth of Churchmanship (if Churchmanship it can be called), which he retained to the close of life. His "Historical Memorials of Canterbury Cathedral" will long be read with interest. He made the best use possible of the vast mass of archaeological lore accessible to him in connection with the most magnificent cathedral in Britain. On the promotion of Dean Trench to the Archbishopric of Dublin, Dr. Stanley was made Dean of Westminster. In 1862, he was guardian to the Prince of Wales on his tour to Egypt and Palestine. The Dean's course, in reference to the Abbey, was most erratic, and it is difficult to say where he would draw the line, if he would draw a line at all, in commemorating remarkable men in England's proudest fane, the Abbey of Westminster. The Queen is said to have been most anxious to have the Dean elevated to the Episcopate, but devoted as Disraeli was to Her Majesty, he dared not place in so important a position a man who was generally supposed to have believed in scarcely a single dogma of Christianity—however rich his scholarship, however varied his accomplishments, or however intimate with Royalty. As an illustration of the fact we have so often stated, that *extremes are very apt to meet*, it is remarkable that a man who believed in so little, had a sister whom he highly esteemed, and who, as a Romanist, was prepared to believe almost anything.

THE MILES PLATTING CASE.

THE *Guardian* quotes from the *Manchester Guardian* an article on the case of the Rev. S. F. Green, which contains a number of sensible remarks. The following are portions of it:—"There must of course be some method of dealing with persistent recusancy; but to send a clergyman to prison because he refuses to obey the mandates of the ecclesiastical courts is to challenge all that is generous in public feeling. Our own view is, that Mr. Green has followed an entirely mistaken course, and the Church should undoubtedly possess the power of vindicating its authority in such cases. But this could be done without issuing processes for committal to a prison cell. . . . It can hardly be necessary that we should state that we regard with the deepest regret the aggressive action of bodies like the Church Association. Our view is that under the Protestant system no church can fairly claim to be national which does not rest upon a comprehensive bases. That the Church of England possesses this latter quality of comprehension is one of the special boasts of her members. For the last three hundred years she has borne this character of a grand compromise, embracing within her fold men of widely divergent views. This has been her strength, and any rude attempts to narrow her terms of communion must be resisted if she is to hold her place as a national institution. This is what the leaders of the Church Association appear to have forgotten. They are magnanimous enough to allow that considerable play must still be permitted to the various schools of thought. They have made no attempt to oust Dean Stanley from Westminster Abbey, and they are prepared to wink at a good deal of ritual which they nevertheless consider an unmistakable mark

of the beast. With the irregularities of their Evangelical brethren they, of course, do not at all concern themselves. Daily prayer and much besides which is clearly enjoined by the rubrics, is neglected, but that is a matter which the English Church Union, if so minded, is left to attend to. But in all this illegality the line must be drawn somewhere, and they claim the right of deciding which offenders shall be left alone, and which brought to justice. This is a pretension against which, in the interests of the Church, an emphatic protest must be entered. Where a clergyman, in opposition to the wishes of his congregation, introduces observances of an extreme type, aggrieved parishioners, we hope, will always be forthcoming to resist the autocratic spirit which has so marked a tendency to develop in these times; but, as in the Miles Platting case, where minister and people are at one in desiring a high ritual, it is—not to put the point too strongly—most unfair, considering what the Church is, for a foreign body to intrude and dictate the fashion of Divine Service. The intervention of the Church Association was in this instance most unjust, and so far, Mr. Green has our entire sympathy. We cannot honestly say, however, that there is much to approve in his later proceedings. . . . The Church, like every other organization, has her tribunals for deciding controverted questions of this nature, and Mr. Green, if he still resolved to retain his place in the ministry, was bound by his engagements, to accept, whether under protest or not, the decisions of those tribunals. We hear much of his suffering for conscience sake—and we desire to speak of him with the utmost respect—but the point at which conscience should have come into active play was when he made the discovery that he could not admit the soundness of his Bishop's advice or of Lord Penzance's monition. His retirement into lay communion would have been a sacrifice to conscience which every Englishman would have understood and appreciated; the course he has actually followed, on the other hand, cannot by many be distinguished from perverse wilfulness. Notwithstanding all this, however, we shall be glad if his friends succeed in obtaining his release, and we hope his will be the last experience of the kind among the clergy of the Church."

CHURCH THOUGHTS BY A LAYMAN.

No. 34.

TRINITY COLLEGE.

THE appointment of a distinguished graduate of Cambridge, one who has won higher honours than any previous settler in the Dominion, is an event upon which the College, the Church, and the country are equally to be congratulated. There are birds to whom light is unwelcome, they find their prey better in the twilight shadows. There are nominal Churchmen whose ambition is checked by a learned clergy, they will be mortified at Trinity College securing so distinguished a Provost. One illiterate agitator who damages a pseudo rival institution by his zeal in its interests has circulated the story that a Provost had been fixed upon, the head of a Canadian public school of highest renown, when the Bishops of Ontario and Toronto left here ostensibly to find a Provost in England.

This layman, at a recent meeting of the friends of the apology for a College in the Toronto Diocese