

dently cut short discussion. Men whose opinions are degenerating into prejudices cannot afford to be tolerant."

THE THIRD SUNDAY AFTER THE EPIPHANY.

AS will be already sufficiently understood from the remarks we have made on the services for the last two Sundays, the Epiphany, or Manifestation of Christ in the full meaning of the term, includes a great deal more than is suggested by the affecting incidents from which the first day of this season is named—the circumstance that is of His manifestation to the chosen sages of the Eastern world, who were permitted to gaze on the infant Jesus in all the lowliness of His humiliation as a man. But we must remember that the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles means his manifestation to the human race; and besides the manifestation of his glorious Person, both in His Godhead and in His humanity, it is most important for us to know what else is included in the manifestation of Christ. In these Sundays between Epiphany and Septuagesima the services of the Church furnish us with the most important aspects under which the Redeemer of the world is shown forth to the human race. In the Gospel for the first Sunday after the Epiphany we find set forth the gradual increase of wisdom and knowledge, as far as these depend upon experience, in the human soul of our blessed Lord, as shown in St. Luke's narrative of His dispute with the Jewish doctors in the temple at the age of twelve. This was a manifestation of His true humanity in soul as well as in body. In the Gospel for the following Sunday St. John tells how at the beginning of miracles which Jesus wrought in Cana of Galilee He "manifested forth His glory," so that "His disciples believed on Him." And if we consider the purpose of St. John in writing his gospel we shall at once perceive what alone he could mean by the statement that He manifested forth His glory. He seems throughout most anxious to show that the life of Jesus of Nazareth can only be really understood—that His human character indeed can only be fully justified, when men recognize in Him a Divine Person, Who altogether transcends the ordinary conditions of human existence. And the miracle in Cana was pre-eminently an occasion when this glory, coming out from Christ's Divine and Eternal Person, shrouded under a veil of flesh, poured forth its illuminations in the words and acts of Jesus of Nazareth. The glory then St. John speaks of, in connection with the miracle, is the Divine glory. It is the beauty and effulgence of His Divine attributes shown forth in forms which bring them within the range of human sense; and when St. John says that our Lord manifested this he implies that, like the sun behind the clouds on a dark day, it had all along been giving a portion of light, the source of which the men who enjoyed it did not recognize; and that the miracle at Cana was as the rolling away of a cloud from the face of the sun.

The more we can combine the teaching the Church brings before us in the Sundays after the Epiphany the more we shall understand her purpose in presenting us with the principles involved in the various manifestations of Christ. On this third Sunday we have the infirmities, the dangers and necessities of human nature prominently adduced, and a commemoration of the Epiphany of Christ as the Divine Healer of our infirmities as well as the Divine Guardian of those who "shall come from the east and west and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven;" while extending our sympathies and our doing good beyond the narrow limits embracing only those who might claim our good offices on the ground of friendship, is strikingly enforced in the Epistle for the day. Christ's all-embracing sympathies could take in the most loathsome heir of mortality as well as the alien who might be the furthest removed from the commonwealth of Israel. He manifested His loving kindness by touching one whom no one else would approach, and by healing the Gentile slave of a Gentile centurion. Thus the glory of the Good Physician was shown forth in two remarkable instances, immediately after he had made His mission openly known to the people. Nor may we, especially in both these instances, lose sight of the fact that the miracles of Christ are physical and symbolic representations of His redemptive action as the Divine Saviour of mankind; and it would appear that their form is carefully selected and adapted to express this action. By healing the leper He proclaimed His power and His mission to heal the leprous disease which had made the soul of man bring forth the loathsome fruits of sin; and by His miracle of healing extended to the palsied He clothed with a visible form His plenary power to cure spiritual diseases which show the weakness, the deadly torpor of the soul.

DUNNETT vs. FORNERI.

THE Bill filed in the Court of Chancery states that the plaintiff has, for many years, been a member of the Church of England in Canada, and of the congregation and vestry of Christ's Church, Belleville; That the defendant is a regularly licensed and ordained Clergyman of the said Church of England, and the Incumbent or Minister of Christ's Church, Belleville; That the temporalities of Christ's Church are managed by Churchwardens, who, from subscriptions and collections they hold in trust for the purpose, provide, among other things, the salary of the incumbent and the bread and wine for the communion, celebrated according to the Book of Common Prayer; That the plaintiff as a regular contributor to these funds, and as a member of the congregation, is entitled to share in the administration of the Holy Communion; That the plaintiff had been a regular attendant of the Lord's Supper, which had been administered to him by the defendant; That in 1875, the plaintiff was elected a member of Synod, the yearly meeting of which he attended; That the constitution of

the Synod requires its members to be communicants; That by the rubrics of the Church every member is required to communicate three times a year; That on Christmas Day, 1875, the Churchwardens provided the bread and wine for the Lord's Supper at the charge of the congregation; That the plaintiff attended Divine Service on that day, but the defendant refused to administer to him the Holy Communion; That March 11, 1876, the defendant again refused in a similar way; That the defendant at these Services did suspend the plaintiff from his just rights, on the frivolous charge that the plaintiff had not contributed to the support of the Church according to his means; that the defendant thereby usurped authority not conferred upon him; That the defendant by reading a libelous paper before the congregation, declared to be the ecclesiastical sentence against the plaintiff, during Divine Service, has sought to damage his reputation; That the defendant endeavored to deprive the plaintiff of his office as member of the Synod; That the plaintiff claims that, as a contributor to the funds, he is entitled to partake of the Lord's Supper; The plaintiff claims that the defendant is a Trustee for the plaintiff as to his right in receiving the Holy Communion. The plaintiff prays that the defendant may be restrained from refusing the Holy Communion to him, and from causing a forfeiture of his office as member of the Synod, and from damaging the plaintiff—and for costs—and for further relief.

The defendant admits the 1, 2, 3, and 7th paragraphs of the bill; he says the plaintiff was never confirmed, and, therefore, was not entitled to receive the Holy Communion; the defendant also states that he has a right to use his discretion and judgment in admitting members of the Church to receive the Holy Communion; that so acting honestly, truly, and justly, according to the rubrics of the Church, he refused to admit the plaintiff to the Holy Communion—not considering that he was entitled to be a partaker thereof. The defendant further states that the plaintiff has acted openly in violation of the regulations of the Church, that he is a depraver of the Book of Common Prayer; that he is a schismatic, and has maliciously contended with the members of the said Church, and has refused to be reconciled to them. The defendant also submits that the Court has no jurisdiction in this matter.

Vice-Chancellor Roudfoot said the most important question in the case is that of the jurisdiction of the Court to interfere at all in the matter. Rights of the kind alluded to may be the subject of adjudication in the courts in England where the Church is by law established. But the decisions in such cases are not precedents where the Church is not established. By the Imperial Act of 1791, one-seventh of the Crown Lands was reserved for the "Protestant Clergy." Disputes arose on the subject, the Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland claimed to be alone entitled to share. In 1840, the Sections of the Act of 1791 relating to any further reservations of Crown lands for the clergy were repealed.