

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

WE are not taught to lay aside the consideration of the love of God, and of the love and charity man is called upon to exercise, when the Church brings before us, as she does on this Sunday, the humility which is a characteristic feature of Christianity. For the humility of the Gospel is based on the love of God, and springs from it alone. The tribulation alluded to by St. Peter in the Epistle for the communion office is clearly intended to lead to self-abasement before God; but this can only be a Christian principle when animated by the love of God. Divine Providence brings afflictions upon us in order to produce lowliness of mind, to prostrate the soul, but not to annihilate the powers of man—not even to destroy his ambition in the highest sense of the word; for the humility we are taught to cultivate, fully harmonizes with the loftiest aspirations, the highest aims which created minds can conceive—to know all that can be known of the great God, and as closely as can be done, to approach His transcendent excellencies. Humility, as it respects our fellow-men, will perhaps be best understood when considered in connection with the Apostolic precept to “Honour all men”; and that, because men are made in God’s image. For the virtue is no longer a Christian one than when it originates in just conceptions of the Parent of the Universe; as the basis of all social excellence of a moral nature is in a right state of the heart before God. The virtues severed from that stock will soon, not only languish, but lose their character altogether and decay; being destitute of proper principle, they are neither stable nor permanent. With this understanding, we may admit the force of all that St. Augustine could intend when—perhaps in allusion to the reply made by the great Athenian orator to a question on the subject of eloquence—on being asked what was the first thing in religion, he said, “Humility”; when asked what was the second, he answered, “Humility”; and what was the third, he still returned the same answer, “Humility.”

The Gospel for the day inculcates and elucidates both the duties of charity and humility; and has been admirably selected, doubtless, for the purpose. That the Son of God made man should receive sinners and eat with them was an act of humiliation that could be paralleled by no other event in the history of created intelligences. The parables in which the Lord designed to illustrate the principle which actuated Him might well be expanded to a large extent—so simple are they, yet so forcible. They are so plain, yet so pointed and so deep—so suggestive of the events of everyday life, and yet so free from the slightest tinge of the vulgarity which spoils all modern imitations, so lofty in their aim and so full of the best feelings of humanity that we are brought without surprise to the grand principle which terminates the whole:—“Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.”

THE TORONTO SYNOD.

THE Lord Bishop of Toronto announces his intention of holding a Synod of the Clergy and Lay Representatives of his Diocese, to assemble on the 19th inst. The business that will be done will probably be of the usual formal character, unless some subject not anticipated may happen to arise. It need not however be supposed that its assembling will be of no service in the interests of the Church. The clergy meet together, exchange ideas, sympathise with their friends, learn to cultivate mutual forbearance, and receive fresh stimulus from the progress reported by their Bishop, for the discharge of their parochial duties. So far as the Lay Representatives are concerned, if they happen to have personal friends or acquaintances in the city, they can receive as much benefit in every respect as the clergy: but if they are not so fortunate, the hospitality of Toronto churchmen does not appear, as yet, to have reached far enough to enable them to entertain those who come once a year to sanction the regulations made for promoting the extension of the Church. Some change will surely be made, from the present state of things, in this particular. Other religious bodies understand and practice the thing better than we do.

There are two amendments to the constitution of the Synod, which have to come up for confirmation. The first is to the effect that the Delegates to the Provincial Synod shall hold their office for three years: thus securing a triennial election. As the Provincial Synod usually sits but once in three years, an annual election would seem to be a very unnecessary piece of trouble, involving a very unnecessary amount of excitement. The other amendment is to the effect that the members of free vestries should have communicated three times during the previous year. As we remarked last year, we should imagine the Church to be the only religious body in the world, which allows those who are not members of it to control every one of its operations. It is one of the greatest scandals we know of, and ought to be remedied at once.

Among the notices of motion already received by the Executive Committee, the first in order is one by the Rev. Rural Dean Lett, D.D.: “That the election of Lay Representatives in the several parishes and missions be held on the system of rotation”; that is, we presume, such as exists in the Diocese of Ontario, and which is a decided improvement upon our practice in Toronto.

Clarkson Jones, Esq., will propose a motion relative to a change in the Act respecting the Rectory Lands.

The Rev. V. Clementi proposes to move a resolution forbidding the intrusion of a clergyman into another clergyman’s parish. Probably Mr. Clementi may be aware of some grave cases of the kind to which his motion refers. Certainly one clergyman, ought, as a rule, to be prevented from holding public services in the parish of another without his consent; but we imagined the Bishop’s authority was sufficient to prevent that. In fact, any interference in such a case, would be better left to the Bishop entirely; because

there may be some instances, in a large city especially, when public services may be held in connection with meetings called for the whole Diocese; so that, it would be scarcely wise to lay down too stringent a rule of this kind. We must not forget that the American idea of a parish is that which includes the persons and the residences of those who attend a particular church. Nor is the idea confined to this continent. In England, something like the same principle is found in some newly formed parishes. In Wolverhampton, for instance, formerly one parish, but now divided into some eight or ten, each clergyman confines his public services to his own parish, but privately ministers to the persons or families attending his church, wherever they may happen to reside. And we very strongly incline to think that some regulation of the kind would be the best for us to adopt here. Indeed it appears to be a subject that might very properly be arranged by the Provincial Synod.

The Rev. John Fletcher’s motion for a memorial to be presented to the Provincial Synod, in reference to public services in Parishes and Missions, when there are three or more services, is one which the necessities of this country require. The Bishop’s authority, however, is sufficient to arrange this.

Alderman Boswell proposes that the election of Delegates to the Synod shall be for the period of three years. Those who are fond of excitement will hardly agree to this resolution; nor will the pugnacious. The arrangement would, however, be a decided improvement upon the present one. Either this resolution or Dr. Lett’s ought certainly to be adopted.

Mr. Beck’s resolution will surely be withdrawn. It appears to us to be making far too much of what we imagine is not really intended to amount to anything at all. The facts are these: Certain moneys have been collected by certain persons, for certain purposes. It cannot be denied that the objects for which these moneys have been collected have totally failed. Some pretence or other must be adduced in order to apply the moneys to some use, of a kindred nature to that for which they were collected. Hence the Training College—not forgetting, of course, the ambition of the professors who desire to teach Theology. If Mr. Beck will take our advice, he will let the whole thing alone. It means nothing. It can do no harm. It may serve to prepare for the common school some who cannot read. And we say this because we are informed, upon reliable authority, that two of its first candidates are in precisely that condition. If the Bishop of Toronto, for the time being, will not ordain men from such an institution (and we do not see how his Lordship can possibly do so), we are quite certain that no other bishop on this side of Mexico ever will. We therefore implore Mr. Beck not to hinder the advancement of the Professors of this new institution!

The Chancellor of the Diocese will propose, “That a more systematic registration of Church property and the titles of the same, is necessary in the interest of the Church in this Diocese.” The subject is, no doubt, an