

to accept any particular list of sacred books, and the Church's statement simply amounts to this—that, as a matter of fact, all necessary faith is in her authorized list. (Of course this is strongly affirmed by their opponents to be the very case of the Church's marriage laws.) Assuredly, then, these positions of our Church respecting the Scriptures and the teaching office of her Ministry, are in the highest degree cautious, charitable, and liberal. Thus as her members, enjoying every privilege of her communion, we may deny the obligation of the Lord's Day, the necessity of her Episcopal Ministry, the need of a Priest to celebrate the Eucharist, or to bless our Marriages, the blessing of Baptism to our infants, the obligation of her restrictions in marriage, and, perhaps, drop out, I know not what, books or portions of Holy Scripture. In practice, however, she steadfastly maintains these and many more such beliefs and observances, requiring an outward conformity, but not imposing them on the conscience as necessary conditions of salvation. There can be no liberty greater than this, consistently with the order of a religious society.

6. But this great philosophical and spiritual liberty is diminished by the Puritan interpretation of her words, by which they are made to mean, that Christians in her communion are forbidden to believe anything *more* or anything *else* than the Scriptures contain, which has given rise to the formula, "Scripture is the sole rule of faith and practice," which is still further narrowed, as in my text from the *Gazette*, by making every man's individual judgment the sole interpreter. And hence, our public worship has been cavilled at for three centuries, because everything we do is not prescribed in Scripture. As if reason and religious instinct were not anterior to Scripture, and also intended by the Creator to guide us in His worship as well as the Scriptures! But Churchmen can afford to brush aside as lightly as thistle-down such irrational trifles, and hold firmly to the liberty wherewith we are made free in the house of our spiritual mother. Her words, however taken, can mean no more than that we are to teach nothing *against* Holy Scripture, or anything as ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY, but what it contains. Outside these limitations the freedom of her faith is unrestricted. And therefore the popular misconception of her Rule of Faith is a monstrous perversion. Let me re-state this point briefly before I leave it.

The Church says:—

Nothing is to be enforced as necessary to salvation but what the Scripture certainly contains.

The Sects say:—

Nothing at all is to be believed or done but what the Scriptures enjoin.

Who does not see how infinitely these propositions differ? and consequently the fallacy of saying the Scriptures are the "sole" rule of Faith, unless we restrict the meaning of "Faith" to things necessary to salvation?

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Celebrant Communicating Himself.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR—I have for several years been deeply concerned to know the mind of our Church in ordering that the minister, intending, no doubt, the celebrant, whether Bishop or priest, shall always first receive in both kinds, and then proceed to administer to the people. The Rubric is clear enough, but what I desire to know, is the *reason* for that express direction, or the end and object to be obtained by it. I trust there will be found some among your readers who will be both able and willing to give me the much desired information. I fear much my present, but rather unsettled conclusion, is very different from the great majority of my brethren in the Ministry, as it might also be to the mind of the Church. Yet it cannot be called a personal croquet, for I can cite both the Rev. Canon Carter, of Oxford, and the Rev. Berdmore Compton, of All Saints, Mar-

garet street, London, as strongly influencing my present opinion.

The Rubric in question is held to lay down a rule which must not be broken. If the same minister celebrates oftener than once in the day, whether in the Church or with a sick person, he must first receive himself. Now, if this receiving of the minister is his *communicating himself*, he is forced to do what has been long held to be against the express custom of the Church, to receive the Sacrament more than once in the day. Is there, then, another possible view by which the minister might keep the rule, and yet not infringe the custom of only receiving once a-day?

The possible other view is the one which has of late pressed itself strongly upon my mind. It is that the celebrant receives in both kinds at every celebration as the officiating priest, and that his prior reception is in some way necessary to the completion of the sacrifice in which the Sacrament is perfected. It is the idea that the priest receives officially *what* he then receives, and not personally, and hence it will follow that a celebrant can no more administer the Holy Sacrament to himself than he can pronounce his own Absolution upon hearing his own confession. In connection with this view, we should notice that the minister is not directed to *kneel* when he receives in both kinds, nor is he directed to say the words of Administration to himself. So far as both these customs are concerned, they are without direction, and are as much like *innovations* and *mere formalism* as any other custom for which there is no Rubric.

In connection with this question, Canon Carter says in his pamphlet on "The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist," p. 43, "The priest then receives, and by so doing completes the sacrifice, for his receiving is the pledge that the sacrifice is accepted of God, because he eats as the representative of the people in the Presence of God." The Rev. Berdmore Compton, in "The Catholic Sacrifice," p. 71, says, "And now for the second department of the Catholic Sacrifice. How is it disposed of after oblation? First, for the outward and visible, the Sacramental part thereof. What is done with the Bread and Wine after it is offered by the human priest on behalf of the Catholic Church? The Bread, which has replaced the animal of the peace-offering, as well as its leavened and unleavened cakes (for the motive of good works is now absorbed in the good works themselves offered for thanksgiving for the glory of God)—the bread-offering, when brought to the Lord's Table, not now adapted for fire, is not consumed there by the fire of the Lord. One small part, with a little of the wine, is consumed by the Christian Priest, the deputy and representative of the Great High Priest." Again, in "Ritual conformity," p. 38, we read, "Then shall the minister first receive the Communion," etc. "This Rubric, with Canon XXI, obliges the celebrant to receive the Communion every time that he celebrates, even if he shall do so more than once in the same day. He does so as a part of the sacrificial action which is not complete unless a portion of the Sacrament is consumed by the offering priest. For this reason he communicates himself, standing, as distinct from the congregation, and completing the essentials of the sacrifice in his priestly character."

It seems clear from these extracts that in the opinion of the writers, the priest receives *as a priest*, not *as a communicant*—that his reception is necessary to the completion of the sacrifice; and lastly, that what he then receives is not such as he afterwards proceeds to administer to the people. And in this way the question is forced upon my mind, "can a celebrant validly communicate himself?" I trust you will find it possible in full and just consideration of your avowed principles, to give this a place in your columns, and that some of your learned readers will find it congenial to their minds to help me to find out the mind of our Church as contained in the said Rubric.

Yours in Christ,

JOHN LOCKWARD.

St. Martin's, N. B., All Hallows Eve, 1883.

Honor Thy Mother.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

DEAR SIR,—One of your contemporaries has lately been giving some good advice to children about manners, not slamming doors, etc.; and then follows something which certainly *seems* unscriptural. He proposes the *mother* as *chief* confidant of the family. I remember when going to Sunday School we used to learn the Commandments given through Moses to the Israelites. One ran, "Honor thy father," &c., but we suppose that law has been repealed, and that in the 19th century the ladies are wiser and better counsellors. We shall have next a new revision of the Testament, I suppose, reading, "Husbands obey your wives and be in subjection." Calmness and dignity are very pretty qualities in their way, but they would not excuse the inversion of elementary doctrine.

Yours truly, &c.,

ANYBODY.

Montreal Missionary Meetings.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian.

SIR,—The correspondent of the *Dominion Churchman* for the Diocese of Montreal has communicated a paragraph on the Diocesan meetings, which demands, for the honour of the Church generally, some attention. He expressed himself to the effect, "Diocesan Missionary Meetings have, in the opinion of many, outlived their usefulness. That the clergy composing deputations have, as a rule, been satisfied with using for speeches on such occasions, the 'fag end of sermons, or dry statistics that had long done duty.' Now, this is very hard on his brethren in the Ministry, and is, moreover, unjust. It is casting unnecessarily a slur on all the deputations that have been sanctioned in the past by the Bishop. But let me ask this critic, what would he substitute for this agency that has 'outlived its usefulness'? Can he tell us how these meetings can be improved? Why is he not present at the meeting where these deputations are made up? And considering that the Deputations have positive instructions to keep to the matter for which they are sent out, namely, the increase and sustentation of the Diocesan Mission work, will he tell us how they can do this without going over the statistics? These statistics, confined as they are to our own diocese, cannot, from the nature of the case, vary much, and the appeals made to support the work seems to me, must take the form of what may seem to a cleric to be the 'fag end of a sermon,' whatever that may mean. Can a good sermon have a fag end? The end of a sermon is supposed to be its most energizing part, breathing the whole spirit of the instruction given, and having in it all the energy and spirit of the instructor. Let us hear from this, our critic, for surely he can tell us what our meetings ought to be. And, certainly, if they can be improved, and where they can be improved, no one would be more willing to learn than a member of

ONE OF THE DEPUTATIONS.

Thanksgiving Service.

KINGSTON, Oct. 15th, 1883.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—On Thursday evening, Oct. 11th, a thanksgiving service was held in St. Paul's, and as has become the yearly custom in this Parish, the church was decorated with the wealth of colors and material which Autumn so abundantly affords. Would that an attempted description could give the readers of the GUARDIAN some idea of the beautiful appearance presented by the sacred edifice upon that occasion! Although "the pine, and the box, and the fir-tree" conspire at the winter festival to beautify the Houses of God all over the land, and to tell more plainly even than words the story of Christmas joy, yet at the harvest time there is at hand such a variety of Nature's best things that, in skilful hands, effects can be produced which far surpass the wreaths of Christ-