

point of the observer. In this case we within the lines of the Church are on the same ground as Mr. Sheraton; you are outside the lines, your point of view is a remarkably bad one for judging Mr. Sheraton. I will take the liberty, therefore, of correcting your sketch. Now let me point out that Mr. Sheraton is under most solemn vows to teach only the Catholic doctrines, and practise only the usages of the English Church, his whole manhood, body, soul, and spirit, is pledged to the work of the priesthood. He has sworn to use diligence in driving away erroneous doctrine, to contend valiantly against such errors as divide the Presbyterian and other sectarian bodies from the Catholic Church. When you compliment him on his "Catholic sentiments" you really mean that he is just as loyal to your Church, or any so-called "Evangelical" Church as he is to the Church at whose altars he has been ordained to serve, that is that Mr. Sheraton does not war with the errors of these bodies but fraternizes with them and holds their sentiments. The patrolman is "in" with the night prowlers, and in the gush of his Catholic sentiments, the watchman's sympathies flow out to those whose unlawful activities he has sworn to arrest! Little wonder such an unfaithful watchman on our ramparts is made the recipient of rewards from a Presbyterian college!

But, thank God! such an event is so rare that I never heard before of its like, nay, I know that there is not another priest of the Church of England who would so accept the wages of unfaithfulness. Your highly imaginative expression, a phrase, no doubt, which is the joint product of your fancy and charity, "Mr. Sheraton is animated by a warm desire for living in unity among Christians," is a very comical not to say farcical reason for making him a D.D. You might have adduced also the equally cogent, relevant, and adequate reason that the honour was conferred in recognition of Mr. Sheraton's warm desire to keep the ten commandments, for surely the first duty of a Christian is to live in unity and peace with his brother Christians!

But to show how little exactitude is seen in your apology, pardon me again pointing out another spot of falsity which is manifested by the light of this fact, that Mr. Sheraton is the paid agent of an organized conspiracy against the unity of the Church of England, and is actively working to disturb the peace of his brother clergy by incessant attacks upon them both individually by name and by cowardly insinuations against such Church institutions as they support. No, sir! if the Church were to come to unity, if its gaping wounds were to heal, Mr. Sheraton would be placed in a position like unto Korah and his company when the earth closed and by unity gave them their quietus.

"But it is possible," you may reply, "that the desire alluded to is for unity among Christians, and Christians only, and that you so-called High-Churchmen are not Christians." Certainly, we have been spoken of as unworthy this name, and Mr. Sheraton's ideas as to the amenities due to his brethren are, to say the least, peculiarly narrow, and his "love of the brethren" in our case so negative that it is clear we are not so recognized. Growing more eloquent as you proceed, your apology goes on to say that "Mr. Sheraton seeks to infuse into his students a spirit of supreme devotion to their Master." I do not care to be critical, but I have all along supposed the undergraduates of a college were not students of a man but of Arts, Theology, or Science. It seems the P. E. D. S. young men are students of Mr. Sheraton, who, no doubt, is a study indeed. But I am puzzled by your phrase, "devotion to their Master." Pray who is he? Not the Master of Masters, the Head of the Church certainly, for if they were supremely devoted to the Head they must necessarily be devoted to the "Body," for they are one. But the P. E. D. S. students are taught that there is no "Body," no visible Church at all, only some impalpable, invisible, visionary conglomeration of infinitely diverse spiritual elements, as attenuated as a comet's tail and as without form and void as chaos itself. The devotion to the Master must therefore mean devotion to Mr. Sheraton and their master. Who that is we shall show in another letter, but he will turn out not to be anything divine or even spiritual, but very human, very carnal. We have exhausted your list of reasons and have shown that they resolve themselves into, 1st. A college career of mediocrity. 2nd. A ministerial life of incapacity and failure. 3rd. A service of antagonism to Catholic truth; and with an active devotion to a bitter party warfare inimical to unity and peace. One reason remains in which is veiled the only moving motive, in our judgment, for a Presbyterian college thus honouring a priest of the Church of England. Mr. Sheraton, you say, "was some years ago appointed editor of the *Evangelical Churchman* and Principal of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School." Mr. Sheraton's course as editor of the *Evangelical Churchman* is run, his crown is not the applause of his brethren in the ministry, not the plaudits of the educated laity, not the "Well done, good and faithful servant" of his conscience or the

Church, but only the dishonouring, the mocking chaplet of a dignity conferred for treasonable complicity in the designs and hearty sympathy with the policy of the chief historic enemy of the Church of England whose cause he was ordained to defend against those from whom he has stooped to receive the reward of unfaithfulness. The *Evangelical Churchman* was a "Broad Church" ship, modelled after the designs of Robertson and Stanley, and sailed by its Editor under the "Evangelical" flag. The promoters, the passionate zealots who were moving the Toronto diocese into angry commotion over a theological disputation as between "High" and "Low" Church tenets, have for years been proving their fitness to deal with such high questions by keeping up a so-called Evangelical paper rank with Broad Church heresy, and staring in every number with anti-Evangelical teaching! Not the clergy alone, with the exception of a few hot partisans, but every well read layman, both Churchman and dissenter, saw the scandalous incongruity between the title of this paper and its teaching. Every man with even a smattering of theology proper knew that the differences between the High Churchmen, whom Mr. Sheraton's paper so malignantly attacked and slandered, and the honest Evangelical, were very small indeed compared to the wide gulf between the tenets inculcated in the *Evangelical Churchman* and those of Evangelicalism. Of all feuds that between Robertson and the Evangelicals was most bitter, of all antagonisms the semi-scepticism of Stanley is most opposed to Evangelical dogma, yet under Mr. Sheraton's rule, and even yet, the *Evangelical Churchman* taught the doctrines of Robertson and promulgated the half-infidel notions of Stanley! It is no secret, it has been proclaimed from the house-tops by himself, that the head of Queen's College is really a "Broad Churchman." "Birds of a feather flock together, and a fellow-feeling make us wondrous kind," says the proverb. We thus get at the root of the mystery of this degree in Mr. Sheraton and Principal Grant standing to their respective Churches in analogous positions. The Principal of Queen's has "Catholic sentiments" irreconcilable with the Presbyterian polity and dogmas, he is in that Church as a revolutionary force which if not sternly repressed by creed and discipline would rend it into fragments. Such is the relative position of the Principal of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School to the Church of which he is a priest. Mr. Sheraton, like Principal Grant, is a revolutionary force, he is kept down, to his infinite chagrin, by the doctrinal standards of the Prayer Book, but is mining under the very key of the Church's stronghold, and his new degree is given him by his sympathizers and co-workers in order to facilitate his movements in preparing the way for the destruction of the Catholic Church. In another letter I will deal with another aspect of this matter.

CATHOLIC CATECHISM.

No. XXII.

Rubrics before receiving and administration.

1. *The celebrant receiving.* The usage of the Catholic Church generally, East and West, is for the celebrant to receive standing, because his receiving is part of his official action as priest. The Rubric with the 21st canon obliges the celebrant to receive the Communion every time that he celebrates, even if he should do so more than once in the same day. Common sense would indicate that as he is not ministering to others, when communicating himself, that he should not speak audibly in so doing, especially as the devout will naturally be then absorbed in private devotion, which it is out of place to disturb unnecessarily.

2. *The Delivery to Communicants.*

(a). To the bishops, priests, and deacons, actually taking part in the service, not merely present unofficially among the congregation—this is in accordance with the Rubric of 1549, "that they may be ready to help the chief minister:—(b), in order probably refers to the distinction of the sexes, first to the men and then to the women, according to early Catholic usage; (c), into their hands, the change adopted by the Prayer Book of 1549, "into their mouths," arose from the superstitious practice of conveying the sacred elements away secretly; but in 1552 the manner of receiving was again put back to the use of the hands, so that receiving into the mouth is now uncanonical. Certainly common sense is against the receiving of the consecrated bread between the finger and thumb of the hand, thereby not uncommonly resulting in unseemly accident. A very seemly custom is that spoken of by S. Cyril, and happily

practiced now, namely, into the right hand supported by the left hand crossed underneath it.

When he delivereth the bread, and when the minister delivereth the cup to ANY ONE.

Common sense reads this plainly as compelling the administration both of words and consecrated elements, to each communicant individually.

Moreover, in this carefully worded direction the Reformers evidently had in view: 1st, The Catholic doctrine that by the grace of God, Christ tasted death for every man. The opposite and quite uncanonical practice of saying the words only once to each group of communicants as they knelt before the altar is opposed to the plain direction of the Rubric and of canon 21, and inconsistent with the individualizing love of Christ and His Church for souls. The large number of communicants is no excuse for this practice. The remedy for that difficulty is to divide the number by more frequent celebrations.

Rubric after Communion.

The covering of the consecrated unconsumed elements is again limited to a cloth of fair linen, the same word *pulcher* is here also the equivalent of fair, as in the case of the altar cloth. This is called in the Western Church the *corporal*, in the Eastern Church the *veil*, which must be of linen, doubtless symbolizing the reverence paid to our Lord's natural body at the sepulchre. Common sense would see in the careful retention of this custom by the Revisers of 1661, a strong belief that a special sanctity belongs to the elements by virtue of their consecration. Compare the 6th Rubric at the end of the Office.

Rubric before the Blessing.

"Let them depart" implies that the congregation are not to be dismissed by the minister at an earlier part of the service, nor should the people depart until the priest has consumed the remainder of the consecrated elements; for if they do, common sense shows that the priest would have no other communicant to call to him, to assist him in reverent consuming.

Rubrics at end of Office.

1. *If there be no Communion, and when there is no Communion in preceding Rubric, are explained by (2) making an insufficiency of communicants a bar to a full Celebration; and by (3) specifying the minimum number of communicants necessary. 4 names the "least" frequency with which the Holy Communion is to be celebrated where there are many priests and deacons, and does not bar a greater frequency. 5. Common sense understands these terms, "it shall suffice," in the same manner as does the Scottish Liturgy of 1637 and Bishop Cosin; namely, Scottish Liturgy says, "Though it be lawful to have wafer bread, it shall suffice that the bread shall be such as is usual, yet the best and purest wheat bread that can be gotten." Bishop Cosin says, in his Comment on the Prayer Book of 1604: "It is not here commanded that no unleavened or wafer bread be used, but it is only said that the other bread shall suffice, so that though there was no necessity, yet there was a liberty still reserved of using wafer bread, which was continued in divers churches of the kingdom (and Westminster for one) till the 17th of King Charles. . . . Calvin thought fit to continue it, and so it is at this day."*

On this vexed question, let hear the interpretations of the Rubric in Archbishop Parker's time, by Bishop Andrews, by the custom of Westminster Abbey, the royal chapels, &c., &c., viz., "That for peace and quietness, where wafers were objected to, the best and purest wheat bread that may conveniently be gotten, be used."

6 Is against reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, and bears witness to the opinion of the Revisers of 1661, in respect of the effects of consecration. 7 Is a relic of the primitive custom of the offering of the elements in successive order by the people, for the use of the celebrations. 8. A minimum number of three communions per year is necessary in the eyes of ecclesiastical law, to make a man a communicant.

The Black letter Rubric is the priest's best defence against the accusations so readily made in some quarters, of superstition in the use of reverent acts and postures.

(To be continued.)

THE
Mountain
missions
Mountain
ton and

KINGS
6th June

SYND
the weel

MISSIO

888-12, 1

12-84; 1

tanguish

80-00; 8

Orillia

16-50;

16-05,

22-45,

church,

28-20;

Scarbor

Penetan

Thankg

9-00; S

Saints'

1-50, St

St. Pau

Special

ionary

WIDC

Carleto

Cannin

assessn

84-67;

7-00; F

ments u

Rev. Jo

1-07.

Georgi

Divi

Bolton

1-25,

Toront

Shanty

Banda

North

Lake's

Mono,

Dysar

Georg

7-58;

Palgra

Cross

Churc

1-00;

ALG

All

in thi

five p

St.

21st,

churc

on of

St.

matio

twent

Th

the s

An

butio

St. J

sendi

room

June

To

Th

May,

follo

5th I

1.

ficien

possi

cent

two

case