

One, the One in Three? What but the love of God—the love of God to man? And therefore, when the Church has finished her annual review and commemoration of all these manifestations of the Divine regard and compassion, she brings forward the estimate of the Beloved Disciple upon the subject, in the sweetest of all the wonderful loving tones in which he has edified and instructed the Christian Church. St. John shows that God's own love for mankind is the source and spring of all love towards Him, and that all true love towards Him is shown in part by the evidence of its practical outward manifestation in the exercise of charity.

The portion selected for the Gospel, containing the historical parable of the rich man and Lazarus, besides revealing somewhat of the state of the departed, places in the most awful light the sin of being without Christian love, and the utter incompatibility of such a condition with a life that will entitle men to the blissful reward of a heavenly inheritance. In teaching this truth the Lord likewise reveals the fact of the intermediate state between the death and resurrection of the body. He also imparts a truth in reference to that state which is of the utmost consequence to us in life. He shows that when once the soul is separated from the body its final and eternal destiny, for weal or for woe, is irrevocably fixed. Although when the Saviour uttered this parable the Last Judgment was far distant in the future, yet he unequivocally showed that the souls of these two men, who had probably been known to his audience in life, but had now departed from their bodies, were as living and as conscious as they had ever been, and that their condition was already that of those upon whom a preliminary judgment had been passed. An unalterable award of happiness had been given to the one; an irrevocable award of misery had been given to the other.

The parable serves many other purposes than those here mentioned. It explains the Lord's conduct after His resurrection, in showing Himself not to the Pharisees, not to His enemies, "not to all the people but unto witnesses chosen before of God"—to His own disciples alone. It was a judgment on the rest that no sign should be given them but the sign of the prophet Jonas; and yet it was a mercy also, for they would not have been persuaded, even by one that had risen from the dead. But at the same time it must be admitted that there was a satisfaction of the longing of man's heart that one should return from the world beyond the grave, and give assurance of the reality of its existence. And this was a longing which neither Abraham nor Moses could satisfy, but which Christ provided for when, having died He rose again and appeared unto men, having the keys of death and of the invisible world.

THE FOLKSTONE CASE.

At last the Ridsdale judgment has been given, after much waiting and many surmises as to what it would be. Of course it will not satisfy everybody; and as there has been much excitement upon the subject

throughout the entire Anglican church, we must expect a great variety of comments upon it. We have only space and time this week for a hasty review of the principal points laid down.

The *Purchas* decision has been re-opened, because the Privy Council think that in proceedings which assume a penal form, a tribunal, even of last resort, ought to be slow to exclude any fresh light that may be brought to bear upon the subject; and in the case of Mr. Purchas, the Judicial Committee had not the advantage of an argument by his counsel on the points in question.

The Committee hold that the crucifix ought to be removed. And that for two reasons: It was erected without a faculty, and they think it important to maintain, as to the representation of sacred persons and objects in a church, the liberty established in *Phillipotts v. Boyd*, subject to the power and duty of the Ordinary so to exercise his judicial discretion in granting or refusing faculties as to guard against things likely to be abused for purposes of superstition. And they think also that, under the circumstances of the case, a likelihood and danger existed of the crucifix being made an object of superstitious reverence.

They hold that the use of wafer instead of bread in the administration of the Holy Communion is unlawful. But they allege that it was neither averred nor proved that Mr. Ridsdale actually used anything different from bread, "such as is usual to be eaten," made thin and in a circular shape. And if this was what was used, their Lordships do not think it could be pronounced illegal.

The third important question was as the position of the celebrant; and in this their decision overrules the decision in *Herbert v. Purchas*. They say the celebrant "must in the opinion of their Lordships enable the communicants present, or the bulk of them being properly placed, to see, if they wish it, the breaking of the bread, and the performance of the manual acts mentioned. He must not interpose his body so as intentionally to defeat the object of the rubric and prevent this result." But "beyond this there is no specific direction that during the prayer he is to stand on the west side or that he is to stand on the north side." So that to adjudge the celebrant guilty of a penal offence, it is not enough to show that he has stood on the west side with his back to the people, it must also be proved that the people could not, if they desired to do so, see him break the bread and take the cup into his hand.

On the fourth point, the Eucharistic vestments, the Committee ignore altogether the Rubric on that question. Their judgment maintains "those vestures of the clergy to which the English church is accustomed, and maintains what has now been the known accustomed habit for more than three hundred years."

—The "Empress of India" has been put in thorough repair, and those that have the management of Sunday school excursions cannot do better than avail themselves of the ample accommodation furnished by the vessel for the purpose. See advertisement.

DISABILITIES OF THE CLERGY.

THE case of clergymen removing from one diocese to another, and in consequence losing their status or position in reference to claims they previously had on a surplus Commutation or a Widows' and Orphans' Fund, is one which demands increased attention, although we are not very certain that the question is capable of a very easy solution. The increase in the episcopate, forming as it does, an increase in the number of separate and in many respects independent dioceses, very largely tends to increase the number of cases of hardship arising from the loss of claims—claims which had been acquired perhaps by many years of hard and unrequited labor. We recently called attention to the subject in the columns of the *DOMINION CHURCHMAN* in an article entitled:—"Does the increase of the episcopate necessarily involve the restriction of the clergy?" In reply to this question, it is stated that "the answer must be emphatically in the negative, but if the word *really* were to be established for the word *necessarily*, then the reply would be decidedly in the affirmative." And yet it would almost appear that if the division of all Diocesan Funds is to take place on the division of a diocese, any attempt to preserve intact to a clergyman, on his removing from one diocese to another, the claims upon the church funds, which he may have acquired, would lead to endless complications and to an amount of hardship, of a different kind, however, which no general regulation could ever provide for. For, although, as year after year has passed away, his claims on Diocesan Funds have continued to accumulate, yet the claims he has acquired are not upon the funds of the diocese to which he is removing, but upon those of the diocese upon which he has just turned his back. And to make such a regulation as would recognize his years of service in another diocese, by giving him the same status in that he has newly entered, might be remarkably fair and just so far as himself is concerned, but would meet with a vast amount of dissatisfaction on account of its injustice towards those whose most righteous claims had thereby been deferred, perhaps for some years. It would therefore, appear that if the funds of the church are to be repeatedly divided as we have been continuing to do, there must be, somewhere or other, a considerable amount of injustice or hardship either in the case of the migrating clergyman, or in that of a number of others, to whom his removal has conveyed the unwelcome mandate:—"Go down lower." And consequently, the only remedy for the injustice or the hardship would be to have one central fund in the ecclesiastical province, for each object where length of service is allowed to tell; or, for each clergyman to stay at home in the diocese where he was ordained, and do his work there. Although it is much to be wished that some scheme could be devised to remedy the evil.

The resolution or by-law to be proposed by the Rev. Canon Read, D.D., Niagara Synod, during the present week, is one which