

the latter number representing all the members who could be induced, after great exertions, to record their votes against it. You speak of Mr. Crawford's deportment on that trying occasion as "admirable." It undoubtedly was so. But you omit to mention that it was in admirable contrast to his conduct and bearing at a meeting held not long before. The opprobrious term you apply to the resolution first referred to is altogether unwarrantable, especially as you pass over in silence more than one instance in which the term could be very justly used to designate that gentleman's action towards the congregation. I would most gladly have refrained from making such allusions, but as, in dealing with this matter, you have thrown aside the impartial spirit which you claim, I deem it only just to say a word on behalf of those for whom you have nothing but a sentence of condemnation. In my humble judgment they have manifested great consistency in adhering to the principles which have distinguished the Church of the Ascension for the last forty years, and in doing so have exercised, at the same time, no little consideration and forbearance. It is true that there is now no important change in conducting our services on Sunday at eleven and seven o'clock, several objectionable practices having been given up. The ablutions, however, are still performed in the vestry. This, as a religious ceremony, we object to, it being entirely unauthorized by the Church, and an outcome of what we believe to be erroneous doctrine. The evening Communion was introduced by the Rev. Jas. Carmichael, some years ago, in order to accommodate a number of our members, who were prevented by family and household duties from attending early in the day. Mr. Crawford discontinued and refused to restore it, although it had been regularly availed of by 25 to 30 persons—notwithstanding your assertion that "very few ever went there." Mr. Crawford never assigned to us any reason for not complying with our request in this matter, but you inform us that "he does not like evening communions." It certainly must strike your readers as a most remarkable circumstance that a Christian minister should not scruple to avow his dislike of his divine Master's own arrangement. He prefers, it seems, to follow what you term "the instinct of the whole Church" which led to the abandonment of the practice that had been common in the first ages. Surely, however, we cannot be far astray in reverently following our blessed Lord's own example, at least in behalf of those who find it difficult, if not impossible, to partake of His Supper before the evening hour. A "most important concession" as you style it, made by Mr. Crawford, through a newspaper, at the last moment, "under the advice of his Bishop," that his curate "should celebrate in the former manner at certain evening services," is regarded, not without reason, I think, as involving a question of very doubtful morality, namely, whatever a man can rightly do, through another, what he cannot conscientiously do himself. Even should that question be decided in the affirmative, the concession, I fear, came too late to be much appreciated. You state that "the malcontents ask that the morning communion be abandoned." This statement is altogether untrue. No such request was ever made. We have no objection to early communion in itself—but we object to its association with the ritualist's most offensive notion of fasting, to its being made the occasion of introducing advanced ritual, to the use of the eastward position adjudged illegal some years ago by a unanimous decision of the Privy Council—and above all, to the doctrines so utterly repugnant to Holy Scripture and the formularies of our Church, but of which those practices are the acknowledged representatives and teachers. No man having any proper regard for his own reputation and the spiritual welfare of his people, would persist in adopting the practices, were he not, more or less, in sympathy with the doctrines. I cannot but renew the expression of my regret that you should have introduced into your columns any discussion relating to the trouble which has arisen in our church, but, having done so, I am sure you will see it to be no more than an act of simple justice to find room for this reply.

JOHN CARRY.

Hamilton.

your numbers of you should have it to interfere in in this instance, comments are to do full justice this very painful our space, I will, marks as brief as did not ask to be to attempt to did not come the usual course to speak as if im. This is not ched on the sub- able to consider te, so that in the in suspense. In transaction. You Mr. Crawford put ach like to know strange piece of he actual facts of ted in a letter to the congrega- uracy has never on to the follow- "The original king offer of the terms on which ficial document ent the reverend, and yet he is ess he can show, or any of them, rom which the this is simply lify the original all." I will only d, by contraven- offer was made, be in the nature the vestry from." Under these her from mistake ic to a very large is proper course, was quietly to n civil life, this necessary step. taken, we were asures. Accord- lution was very resignation, and e to twenty-six,

Sunday School Lesson.

4th Sunday after Easter. May 4th, 1890.

"THE TRINITY IN UNITY."

There are some things which it is impossible to know all about. I may know and be able to tell what the sun does, but I cannot tell what it is in itself. The sun a picture of God. We know very little of what He is, but know a great deal of what He does.

I.—THE TRUTH IN HEAVEN.

That is, the truth about God as He is in himself. In the Athanasian Creed we have the words, "The

Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped." There is only one God (S. Mark xii. 29). In Isaiah vi. 1-3, there is evidence of the Trinity (Three in one). "Holy, Holy, Holy." One of the Hebrew Names of God was *Elohim*, "The Mighty One." (See Gen. i. 26, first clause.) There are three Persons, but one God.

We cannot understand this, but we believe it. S. Patrick, preaching to the Irish, picked up a shamrock leaf which has three parts and yet is only one leaf; this, he said, was a picture of God.

Every ray of light which comes from the sun is composed of three rays, a red, a yellow, and a blue ray, and yet these three are one.

There are many things that we do not understand, but we believe them. When a seed of corn is put in the ground, it grows up; we cannot understand how, but we believe it. (Repeat baptismal formula.) Here three persons mentioned (S. Matt. xxviii. 19), "Into the Name of, etc." The Baptismal formula is "Into the Name," not the Names; therefore these *Three are One* (1 Cor. xiii. 14; S. Matt. iii. 16, 17).

The father is God (Eph. i. 1, 17).

The Son is God (S. John i. 1, 14; xx. 28; Rom. ix. 5).

The Holy Ghost is God. A Person separate from Father and Son (S. John xiv. 16; performs personal acts (S. John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 8, 13); a Divine Person (Acts v. 3, 4).

"The Father is God, the son is God and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet they are not three gods, but one God."—*Athanasian Creed*.

II.—THE TRUTH ON EARTH.

That is what God does for us.

(i.) "God the Father Who had made me, etc." There are three great things God hath done: First, *creation*. God made all things by His Son (S. John i. 1, 3). The Holy Ghost also co-operated with the Father and the Son in the work of creation (Gen. i. 2; Job xxxiii. 4; Ps. xxxiii. 6).

(ii.) "God the Son Who redeemed me, etc." Second great work, *redemption*. Men forsook God, and became servants of sin. God the Son became man (incarnate) and redeemed (bought back) "all mankind." The Father gave the Son (S. John iii. 16). "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost" (S. Luke i. 35; S. Matt. i. 20). Men were slave to Satan, and Jesus bought them back (1 S. Pet. i. 18, 19).

(iii.) "God the Holy Ghost who sanctifieth me, etc." Sanctify, i.e. "to make holy." Here too, both Father and Son co-operate with the Holy Ghost, "Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son" (*Nicene Creed*). Our Lord says, "Whom I will send," "Which proceedeth from the father" (S. John xv. 26), "The elect," i.e. "the chosen." As Israel of old were God's chosen people (1s Pet. ii. 9).

Consequent duty:—

Because He created us we should be *thankful*.

Because He redeemed us we should be *obedient*.

Because He sanctifieth us we should be *obedient*.

Family Reading.

Devotional Notes on the Sermon on the Mount.

15—THE OLD AND THE NEW.

S. Matt. v. 17, 18: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law till all things be accomplished."

Christ came into the world to establish a new order of things, to set up the kingdom of heaven. That a vast change was involved in this work was plainly implied in that requirement: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The world to which He came was not in a condition to receive Him or His word. What then was His relation to the existing system? What was His relation to the law under which the Israelite was then living? What was His relation to that law as it was then understood? These are the questions which He assumes, and which He now proceeds to answer.

He declares first of all, plainly, that He does not come to destroy the law or the prophets. An innovator might be suspected of being a revolu-

tionist, of proposing to break with the past. With ordinary reformers there is always something of this danger. But the Lord Jesus knew that the order of things which He found in Israel was divine; and He knew how far the original purpose of God had been fulfilled, and how far it had been departed from. It was impossible that He should destroy or overthrow that which was divine. If He ever seemed to do so, it was because those who so judged did not understand the divine plan or its realization by Christ.

He was about to teach them many things which would seem not merely innovating, but destructive; and they would desire to know what His view was of those things which He seemed to be putting away. Here is His answer: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil." We need not trouble ourselves with the controversies which have been raised with respect to the exact reference in these words. The law and the prophets would represent to the hearers of Jesus the whole system of divine revelation under which they lived, and that system embodied in their sacred books. Our Lord seems to say that He recognized this system as divine, as the beginning and outline of a divine plan which had to be completed. If He looked at the moral law, He recognized its beauty, but also its incompleteness. If He considered the types of the Hebrew economy, He saw that they contained meanings which were not yet fully brought out. If the prophecies were studied they would be seen to point forward to events which had not yet taken place.

Of every part of the preparatory system of Judaism our Lord could say that He had not come to destroy it. He could not destroy a thing which was of God. But He had come to transform it, to bring out its full meaning, to show how much more was intended by all its parts than met the eye of the beholder. What was the meaning of the law? Not merely the forbidding of certain outward acts. Those indeed were forbidden; but even the law itself declared its spirituality; for the same code which said, "Thou shalt not steal," said also, "Thou shalt not covet."

And so with every part of the divine order of things under which they lived. The change that would pass upon their outward form might seem like a destruction of them, but it would really be their development, their completion, their fulfilment. The acorn seems to perish when it lies in the ground and rots; but it has not really perished, it has passed into the noble tree which has its roots in that small germ. The acorn has not been destroyed, it has been fulfilled. And so every part of God's word, given with such clearness as was possible considering the men to whom, and the circumstances amid which it was given, will emerge into yet clearer light and receive greater fulness of meaning in the life and work of Him who was the end of the law and the prophets.

By way of emphasizing the thought thus expressed, our Lord adds the strong expression: "For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no way pass away from the law till all things be accomplished." We may remember here another place in which our Lord says that heaven and earth shall pass away, but that his words shall not pass away. There is a sense, as is implied in the passage now before us, in which heaven and earth will never pass away; and there is another sense in which they are continually passing away; but whichever sense we take we shall be reminded of the permanence of the word of God.

This word, in whatever form it may come to us, cannot pass away, because it is of God. The utterances of God must be true and eternal. They may be partial because we cannot take in the whole; but in this case they will form a starting point for ampler instruction hereafter. They may be dark and obscure because those who receive them have not sufficient inward illumination to make them capable of comprehending them; but they will become clearer and clearer to those who accept them in faith and make them the guide of their life.

No slightest portion of them is without meaning. The Jewish Rabbi might understand language like this in an external and unspiritual sense. He might see mystical meaning in the jot and the