

Dominion Churchman.

THE ORGAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA.

DECISIONS REGARDING NEWSPAPERS.

1. Any person who takes a paper regularly from the post-office, whether directed in his name or another's, or whether he has subscribed or not, is responsible for payment.
2. If a person orders his paper discontinued, he must pay all arrears, or the publisher may continue to send it until payment is made, and then collect the whole amount, whether the paper is taken from the office or not.
3. In suits for subscriptions, the suit may be instituted in the place where the paper is published, although the subscriber may reside hundreds of miles away.
4. The courts have decided that refusing to take newspapers or periodicals from the post-office, or removing and leaving them uncollected for, while unpaid, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

The **DOMINION CHURCHMAN** is Two Dollars a Year. If paid strictly, that is promptly in advance, the price will be one dollar; and in no instance will this rule be departed from. Subscribers at a distance can easily see when their subscriptions fall due by looking at the address label on their paper. The Paper is sent until ordered to be stopped. (See above decisions.)

The "*Dominion Churchman*" is the organ of the Church of England in Canada, and is an excellent medium for advertising—being a family paper, and by far the most extensively circulated Church journal in the Dominion.

Frank Wootten, Proprietor, & Publisher.
Address: P. O. Box 2640.
Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. E
west of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN B. HILL, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS for SUNDAYS and HOLY-DAYS.

AUGUST 8th—7th SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.
Morning—1 Chronicles xxi Romans viii to 16.
Evening—1 Chronicles xxii; or 1 Chronicles xxviii. to 31.
Matthew xxi. to 23.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1886.

The Rev. W. H. Wadleigh is the only gentleman travelling authorized to collect subscriptions for the "*Dominion Churchman*."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A quantity of Correspondence and Diocesan News unavoidably left over for want of space.

A WISE, WITTY, SCATHING REBUKE.—It is related that Bishop White once when travelling was seated opposite to a minister who belonged to a school not yet extinct, whose members look down upon all churchmen from a pinnacle of spiritual self-conceit. This inflated personage addressed his venerable travelling companion as follows: "Bishop White, have you any real, vital, personal religion?" To this insufferable impertinence the good Bishop quietly made answer, "None to boast of!" We have never come across a retort at once so wise, so severe, so witty, so absolutely crushing as this lightning flash from Bishop White.

HOW TO ANSWER GAINSAYERS.—No man need hope ever to the rival Ithuriel spear like thrust given by Bishop White as recorded above, but any child can be taught to answer completely a very common sneer of Nonconformists at the sermons of our clergy, a sneer unhappily, which some ill-instructed church people are at times disturbed by and some weak enough to echo. Recently after service in a country church in Ontario, a Baptist who had been at service took exception to the practical conclusion of the rector's sermon, on the ground that he had failed to preach "the Gospel"—a common phrase among the sects. A layman replied, "You forget that we Church people have been taught the Gospel from our childhood. Our clergy, therefore, have no need to be constantly preaching 'the Gospel' to their flocks, whom they know to be so thoroughly instructed therein that they assumed such knowledge of the Gospel in their hearers as perhaps your congregation may need teaching!"

Churchmen and Church women and children should be ready with an answer to such cavillers. When the absence of "Gospel teaching" in a Church sermon is complained of, the reply might well and truly be, that in our service of morning and evening prayer, most especially in the Holy Communion Office, there is more full, true, spiritual, Scriptural, Gospel teaching than was ever preached by a sermon however eloquent, however full of what is called "Gospel," by those who use this word to indicate some partial view of the economy of grace. Sects and parties are all based upon such partial views.

FRUIT FROM THE TREE OF SECULAR KNOWLEDGE.—There is no parallel in history to the avalanche of disgrace which has fallen upon Sir Charles Dilke. This infamous person has for many years, during his whole public life in fact, over twenty years, been a bitter enemy of the Church. His newspaper, the *Weekly Dispatch*, has ever reeked with the foulest abuse of our Bishops and clergy. Upon all in authority, especially upon those in the higher ranks of life, this man has spat out his venom like an enraged rattle snake. Religion he has ridiculed, social order sneered at, revelation scorned. Brilliant in talent, highly educated in a secular sense, full of the world's knowledge and versed in the world's ways as are few men, through all his manhood he has been living the life of a beast. If he had been as brave as he is base he would have turned upon his accusers and said, "I am no Christian, I repudiate your moral code, I refuse submission to laws based on Christianity, I am a law unto myself, I own no God as Law giver." But his courage failed to incite him to make this honest though infamous protest, for conscience made him a coward. The world and the religious public needed the lesson which this revolting case has taught. The truth will dawn upon many minds that the divorce of religion from education is a device of the devil, for the coarsest immorality finds no restraint in secular education.

The Church of England has seen her foulest foe fall like Lucifer, just in that momentous crisis in her history when he was marshalling other Sons of Belial to make a sacrilegious assault upon her properties. So let all thine enemies perish, so may also wither every hand that touches thy ark, Church of our Fathers and our God!

ROMAN RITUAL AT VARIANCE WITH THE PRAYER BOOK.—In a paper read before the Canterbury Conference the Rev. E. D. Cree said:

"Public worship, according to the opinion of the Prayer book, interde—1. The adoration of the Supreme Being. 2. The edification of man. As the Protestant Dissenters generally have nearly lost the former idea in worship, the Roman Churches have nearly lost the latter. Their worship is almost entirely something done for the people, who look on and commonly know nothing of what is going on in the strange language, but read some good book. Hence the necessity of attracting the attention through the eye, and hence the perpetual motion of their ministry. They must be doing something, and as it cannot always have a meaning, you come to such painful frivolities as this even in the most solemn part of the service, 'Then shall the priest kiss the paten and afterwards put it to his left eye, then to his right eye; then make a cross with it above his head, and so on.' Such ritual cannot edify man, and I am afraid cannot reflect glory to God, and therefore is essentially at variance with the spirit of the Prayer book. Let me add that the Roman ritual wants to express just what we do not—viz., a low materialistic presence of the Redeemer, instead of an intense manifestation of His spiritual presence. In the Eucharist Rome looks backwards and downwards to the earth; we look direct up to the service ever going on in the *sanctum sanctorum* above. Rome goes backwards to Calvary, and would repeat the One Sacrifice

(this I know is contradicted by Roman authorities, but I have the very word in Roman books); we have got beyond that, and want to present the Atoning Blood. Rome lingers still slaying the Lamb at the altar; we in thought go within the veil to adore the Lamb living again and standing. Is it likely that the ritual of the Roman Eucharist can be suitable for our own?"

NON-COMMUNICANTS AT HOLY COMMUNION.—In the paper above quoted we read:

"It may be considered a ritual peculiarity to celebrate in the presence of habitual non-communicants. This fits in with Roman eucharist doctrine, but not with ours. In all the volumes that I have read on the subject, nothing is more to the point than Keble's utterance:—'I have a strong feeling against the foreign custom of encouraging all sorts of persons to "assist" at the Holy Eucharist without communicating. It cannot be without danger of profaneness and irreverence to very many, and it has brought in, or encouraged, or both (at least so I greatly suspect), a notion of quasi-sacramental virtue in such attendance. This I believe to be utterly unauthorised by Scripture and antiquity.' I do not suppose St. Chrysostom was preaching any new doctrine when he said (iii. *Homil. Ep. ad Eph.*), 'Thou hast sung the *Sanctus* with the rest; thou hast declared thyself to be of the number of the worthy by not departing with the unworthy; why stay, and yet not partake of the table?' The spirit of the Prayer-book tallies with the spirit of St. Chrysostom and John Keble. If they were right those who encouraged this practice are wrong, and if the latter are right, then we who do not encourage it are wrong. To conclude, these limitations will prevent differences in the same congregation; all will stand together, all kneel together. Till recently the congregation stood when the service addressed them, and when they used the words of praise, they knelt to pray. Now, by way of exception, some will kneel when exhorted in the 'Ye that do truly;' and when they repeat the 'Glory to God in the highest.' For the former, it should be noted that the people are told to make their confession meekly kneeling; and the rubric says it is to be said by priest and people all kneeling, which surely implies assuming then the attitude of kneeling. For the latter, a rule is given, to stand to sing it in high celebrations, and kneel at low; as at the Offertory to stand at high and kneel at low after putting the offering into the bag. But is it really Catholic to distinguish between high celebrations and low? What makes a high celebration is only more clergy, more music, more congregation. Surely the dignity of the Blessed Sacrament is independent of such things as these. But if this is no real distinction, there is no intelligible rule, and the old-fashioned way of taking it is the most reasonable and devout. What, indeed, is there in that grand outburst of adoration at the completion of our highest act of communion with God, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, to suggest our taking the attitude of penitence and humiliation? It even seems a pity that there should be a diversity in joining in at the 'Therefore with angels.' The custom grows of joining only at the *Sanctus*, but there is nothing in the typography to suggest this; and the oldest musical services begin the choral part at the 'Therefore.' The only important thing here, however, is that all should do alike."

AN EMINENT CONVERT TO PROTESTANTISM.—Monsignor Renier, a Venetian, descended from a former Doge of Venice, a prelate of the Pope's household and a distinguished writer and preacher, on Sunday, abjured the Roman Catholic faith, and entered the Italian Catholic Church, placing himself under the protection of the Anglican Episcopate. Monsignor Renier, who is sixty years of age, made the act of abjuration before the Rev. Mr. Nevin, of the American Church of St. Paul.