

THE CHURCHMAN

August, 1912.

The Month.

Holy Com-
munion the
Central Service. IN the *Northern Churchman* for May last (its sub-
title is the "Church Chronicle for the Diocese of
North Queensland") there is published the first of
a series of articles on Eucharistic Fundamentals. The intro-
ductory article is stated to be "communicated," and so we
presume it is not to be regarded as official. We notice further
that it is published whilst the Bishop is absent in England, and
we are therefore hopeful that it is issued without approval. The
writer begins by pointing out that if the principle of fasting
communion be carried out and the hour of celebrating the sung
Eucharist be delayed until 11 a.m., there will be few or no
communicants at this Service. He notes further that this, as
a matter of fact, is the case, and records the fact that he had
recently visited three churches in London—St. Matthew's,
Westminster, with 400 people present and only one communi-
cant; St. Cuthbert's, Kensington, 500, with no communicants;
and St. Saviour's, Ealing, 600, with two or three. We, of
course, simply give these statements as the writer's own illustra-
tions, without assuming responsibility for their truth.

The Essence
of a Right
Celebration. The writer then proceeds to take note of the
fact that to many people this seems a perversion
of the fundamental object of the institution of the
Holy Sacrament, contrary to the teaching of Scripture and the
English branch of the Church Catholic, and, in short, is the

expression of an entirely wrong conception of what the Eucharist was intended for. Amongst this class of people we gladly enrol ourselves. The writer then goes on to face the real difficulty of his position, and we venture to quote in full the paragraph in which he does it :

“ The question the writer seeks to answer, then, in this article, is this : Is a celebration of the Holy Eucharist with few or no communicants a right use of the Blessed Sacrament ? Are those of us who condemn such a use of it right or wrong in our disapproval ? The answer to this question must, of course, be guided by the conceptions we have formed on the primary object of the institution. Is it primarily a spiritual meal, or is it primarily, as the Prayer-Book teaches, ‘ a perpetual memory of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ ’ ? The teaching of Scripture and of the whole Church seems to be that the latter is primary—*i.e.*, that what is essential to a right celebration of the Holy Eucharist is what is essential to it as a commemorative Sacrifice, which is offered to God, before it is a communion offered to men. In other words, Sacrifice is primary, communion of the people is secondary. If that be so, then even five hundred communicants can add nothing to the intrinsic efficacy of the Blessed Sacrament. *That* consists wholly and entirely in our Lord’s self-oblation of the perfect Sacrifice of His Body and Blood as they are re-presented in the Holy Mysteries. To say that communion is secondary is, of course, very far from asserting that it is non-essential, and so of minor importance. In any case the priest communicates, not as the substitute for, but as the representative of, the congregation. But seeing that a right communion has, as its essential, reception of the communion fasting, ‘ save in extreme weakness,’ those other communicants present will have made their communions at an earlier celebration, or at some time during the week.”

We have quoted the whole paragraph because

Sacrifice Primary, Communion Secondary.	we wish to call attention to the sentence in which sacrifice is stated to be primary and communion secondary, and we notice that this sentence is some-
--	---

what modified as the writer proceeds. We hear from time to time a demand that the Lord’s own Service on the Lord’s own Day should be made the central act of Christian worship, and we confess we have a good deal of sympathy with the demand. But if the writer here at all represents the ultimate object of those who make the demand—and sometimes ultimate objects slip out in the wilds of the Australian Bush which are kept within bounds at home—we venture to ask our readers to con-

sider the point to which we are moving. First we have the definite reintroduction of the Mass, a definite return to the medieval condition. We cannot believe that the English Church at large wishes to take any such step. Secondly, we do not have the Lord's own Service as the central act of worship on Sunday. The Lord's own Service surely is the service which He instituted in the Upper Room the day before He died. Then all who were present communicated. Our Lord laid an emphasis upon that fact, "Drink ye all of this." Further, "Our Lord's self-oblation of the perfect sacrifice of His Body and Blood" was yet to be made on the hill of Golgotha, and to be made once for all. We take no delight in criticizing the view that another holds of the Holy Communion; we recognize that there is room within the Church of England for variety of teaching, but we are compelled to contend that the medieval doctrine of the Mass, which this writer most dangerously approaches, if he does not actually reach, is neither Scriptural, Catholic, nor Anglican. It is well to take note of that which, in this one case at least, underlies the cry for the Eucharist as the central service, and to be warned.

It will be noted in the paragraph already quoted, fasting communion is regarded as essential.

A little later in the article the writer speaks of it as "so clearly amongst those things held *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*." It is hardly necessary to argue the point here, but surely not one of the three essentials of Catholicity can be applied to the practice.

We have called attention, more than once, in these Notes to the indications that are apparent in the ecclesiastical sphere of real and earnest desires for greater unity. The recent combination of certain branches of the Methodist Church and the present movements in the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland are cases in point. But the tendency is visible in other spheres than that of

The Congress
of
Universities
of the Empire.

ecclesiastical organization. The Congress of Universities of the Empire just held in London is a proof that in academic circles, too, the need is being felt for closer contact and more effective co-operation. We say "contact" and "co-operation" advisedly, because we feel most strongly that each one of the Universities, both British and Colonial, must be left to do its own most suitable work in its own particular way. But, while admitting this to the full, we feel that much more may well be done than has hitherto been effected, in the interchange of ideas, and in such co-ordination of work as may facilitate the passage of students from one University to another. Politicians are devising ways for linking up the various parts of the British Empire into an organized whole. They may do well while they discuss fleets and tariffs to remember the great benefit that may accrue to the Empire from the closer union and co-operation of its great academic bodies.

The True Function of Universities. The proceedings of the Conference will doubtless be published in due course, and will be read with keen interest by all who have these problems at heart. It may suffice at present to call attention to two speeches of especial importance for Christian citizens of a professedly Christian Empire. Lord Rosebery, in his characteristically brilliant and thoughtful inaugural address, laid emphasis on the fact that the highest function of Universities is to produce, not merely men of learning, but men of sterling character. It is quite true that a University should be a home of learning and research, where the brilliant scholar may find his most congenial sphere. But the great majority of students leave their *alma mater* to undertake practical work in the outer world—in spheres where learning may count for something, but character counts for everything. Believing as we do that he who has the mind of Christ, and whose life is one of loyal service to the word of Christ, alone has the secret of true excellence in character and life, we urge all who in any way, directly or indirectly, are able to strengthen the Christian influences brought

to bear on University students, to redouble their efforts, in the sure conviction that this is not the least of the ways in which the world may be won for Christ.

The other speech of special importance from the **The Problem of the East.** Christian point of view was that of Sir Frederick Lugard, Chancellor of the University of Hongkong. It was largely concerned with the problem raised by the impact of Western culture on Eastern minds. The problem is an old one for the Missionary, and now it is becoming a real one for the educationalist. Here, too, we have, for our part, no doubt whatever that Christianity, and Christianity alone, holds the key to the only possible solution. Western learning means for the Eastern student the uprooting of old beliefs, the breaking adrift from old moorings. If the older religious sanctions be gone and there are no others to replace them, it is not too much to say that he is as one "having no hope and without God in the world." The void created by the loss of an older faith must be filled by the presence of one that is better, if the last state of that man is not to be worse than the first. The problem is one that concerns the East in general, and China in particular. We venture to assert that what is true of the British Empire is true of the world at large. It is only under the sway of Christ that it can find its true welfare, and in the setting up of His kingdom the winning of the Universities for Him may play no slight and unimportant part.

Evangelicals and the Universities. We have, advisedly, devoted considerable space to this question of the place of Christianity in University life. What we have had to say concerns all Christian men. We turn now to say more particularly an emphatic word in the same context to our own friends and brethren of the Evangelical School in the Church of England. The members of that school have taken a great and praiseworthy part in the evangelizing work of the Church; they were pioneers in social reform before Christian Socialism was born or

thought of. But they have, on the whole, been singularly and conspicuously neglectful of higher education, especially that of the Universities. In view of the requirements of the Archbishops that in and after 1917 men who are ordained to the ministry of the Church of England must be graduates, the question of the position and influence of Evangelicalism in both the older and newer Universities assumes new and striking importance. If our Evangelical friends do not during the next five years take up this question of the education of the clergy in a vigorous and practical way, they will lose one of the greatest opportunities ever presented to them. They will find that the training of ordinands has passed entirely into hands other than theirs, and they will only have themselves to blame if the clergy as a whole stand for doctrines and practices alien to those of the Reformed Church of England.

The fact that Nonconformist opinion in England
A Methodist is not uniformly sympathetic towards the National
Appreciation. Church gives force and significance to the following words, taken from a recent number of the *Methodist Recorder*. With the simple remark that we welcome most gratefully the warmth and cordiality of the passage, we allow its words to speak for themselves :

“We are quite sure there is something in the spirit and equipment of the Church of England now wanting in the Free Churches. For long years the Church of England has been elaborating its machinery; it has done this with deliberation, with the utmost care, and with a fine statesmanship, admirable in its insight and prevision. It has done very little too much, and nothing with ostentation. Quietly, and considering its ideals rather than the wishes of the many, it has found out ways, taken hints, and set its house in order. We are seeing the result, and we cannot but congratulate the men of God who have had power to discern the times and the seasons. Moreover, workers have been found, and plenty of them. The opportunity for work has been welcomed; it has been all the more readily and heartily welcomed because there was at least a touch of novelty. Never were there so many willing hands and warm hearts, laborious in the Church of England. This has befallen in an hour when we have found our workers bewildered among the infinite variety of calls, running here and there, busy oftentimes about nothing that really matters. There has come among us a mood of resentment upon the multiplicity of demands, and some have withdrawn

themselves, while others are much discouraged. It is here, we believe, the real root of the difference takes its vitality and shows its fruit. God is no respecter of persons or respecter of Churches. Them that honour Him He will honour; and in the Church of England a great development of spiritual vitality has arisen in these last years. It is finding its expression in work—in work peculiarly adapted to the needs of the hour. The Free Churches may look, in the future, to a greater vigour in the Establishment than has been known within the memory of any living man; and we should not be greatly surprised if the vigour be richer and better sustained than any displayed in all its past history. There are enormous resources at its disposal, and there are signs that these resources will be used to their utmost."

The decision of the House of Lords, though
The Thompson expected, has created for the Church a position of
Case. some serious anxiety. However the decision went, it was bound to be so. Some long and careful thinking will have to be done, and we are exceptionally thankful to the Archbishop of Canterbury for the cautious letter which he has addressed to the Church. At a meeting of the Representative Church Council an attempt was made to override the Archbishop's caution—an attempt which happily failed, and which involved those who made it in ignominious defeat. The Bishop of Manchester put the real question, "What is the law of the Church?" and until that question is answered, it is idle, and indeed unwise, to discuss the relationship of the law of the State to the law of the Church, or to suggest that the one is at variance with the other. We have referred to the subject here not because we wish to give a lead, but because we feel that it is unwise to be too dogmatic until we are sure of our way.

Many clerical readers of the CHURCHMAN will
Holidays and probably, when the present issue reaches them, be
Rest. either enjoying their annual holiday, or looking forward to it in the near future. May we commend to their notice a most wise and helpful article in the *London Magazine* for June, entitled, "Forty! the Dangerous Age?" The article is full of sound advice on general matters of health, but the particular to which we wish to call attention is, that for the jaded and weary man the holiday should be essentially a time of rest.

So many men act on the mistaken idea that the man who has spent the preceding ten or eleven months of stress and strain in more or less confined surroundings should spend his holiday month in vigorous athletic pursuits. He passes from one extreme to the other; his tired body is quite unfitted for these new and arduous occupations. The result is that he is even more done up at the end than at the beginning of the holiday, and enters on another year's work jaded and unrefreshed. We are apt to carry the strenuousness and strain of modern life into our holidays too. By all means let us get the good that air and sky, seaside and moorland, can give; but let it be a time of *rest*. It was our Lord who said to His tired servants: "Come ye yourselves apart . . . and rest awhile."

