

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1917.

The Month.

The Food Shortage. WHAT is the remedy for our food shortage? Sunday labour on the land? or a deeper recognition of the over-ruling providence of God? The Archbishop of Canterbury, replying to Mr. Prothero, has written the following letter :—

“ Our inheritance of the English Sunday with its privilege of abstention from all ordinary work is a God-given boon of inestimable value, and I desire to maintain and safeguard it in every reasonable way, but occasions may arise when for the well-being of the people of our land exceptional obligations are laid upon us. As Minister of Agriculture you assure us that such an emergency has now arisen, and that the security of the nation's food supply may largely depend upon the labour which can be devoted to the land in the next few weeks. This being so, we are, I think, following the guidance given in the Gospel if in such a case we make a temporary departure from our rule. I have no hesitation in saying that in the need which these weeks present men and women may with a clear conscience do field work on Sundays. Care would of course be taken to safeguard from compulsion those who would feel such action on their part to be wrong, or whose health would be seriously endangered by the extra strain.”

The Church of England, of which the Archbishop of Canterbury is chief minister, suggests “ in the time of Dearth and Famine ” the use of the following prayer :—

“ O God, heavenly Father, whose gift it is, that the rain doth fall, the earth is fruitful, beasts increase, and fishes do multiply ; Behold, we beseech Thee, the afflictions of Thy people ; and grant that the scarcity and dearth, which we do now most justly suffer for our iniquity, may through Thy goodness be mercifully turned into cheapness and plenty ; for the love of Jesus Christ our Lord, to Whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, now and for ever. *Amen.*”

Which of these two is the more excellent way? It is an amazing omission on the part of the Church, the facts being what they are, that there has been as yet no general call to prayer. We hope sincerely that, even before these lines appear the omission may be repaired.

The Memorial of the Rebellious Thousand, that is **The Rebellious Thousand.** of the thousand clergy who have come out in open rebellion against the decision of the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury on the question of Reservation, has not excited much attention outside certain circles, but it would be a mistake to minimize its significance or its importance. If the signatories mean business, and if the Bishops adhere to their decision, a crisis will be set up which cannot but have momentous results for the Church of England. The Bishop of Oxford who, just now, is much out of favour with the extreme party, says in his *Diocesan Magazine* that the language used by the Memorialists fills him with "something like despair." But he is evidently not afraid, and in the clearest possible terms he "warns" the clergy who signed the Memorial—about 100 of whom are connected with his Diocese—that so far as he is concerned "there will be no change." He continues :—

I shall act in conformity with the intention so expressed by the bishops in general; and I cannot but treat the matter as of serious moment. I renew the regulations which I made two years ago. There is no general permission of reservation. I propose to allow it freely in particular cases where good reason is shown for going beyond the directions of the Prayer Book. I believe I have "lawful authority" so to do. But in no case can it be allowed to reserve the blessed sacrament so as to be accessible for extra-liturgical worship. I make this restriction

(1) because the bishops of the province have decided that it shall be made: and I know that only on this basis is any provincial sanction for reservation obtainable:

(2) because I feel sure that without this restriction the sanction of reservation will imperil seriously our corporate cohesion:

(3) because the extra-liturgical cultus of the blessed sacrament was unknown to the ancient and undivided church and is unknown to the Eastern church. Thus it cannot be called a catholic practice:

(4) because, so far from its being the case that the extra-liturgical cultus, as it developed in the later mediæval Western church, was the logical expression of the doctrine of the Real Presence, it was the outcome of a particular form of eucharistic doctrine which seriously impaired the really catholic doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the holy sacrament.

The Bishop of Oxford is to be commended for his courage, and we hope that other bishops will show the same determination not to surrender to the challenge of the Memorialists.

Passionate Pressure. The Bishop of London's excuse that it is dangerous to interfere with the devotional aspirations of the people will not bear examination. The Bishop of Oxford allows, of course, that "it is indeed very painful to resist

any passionate pressure of religious emotion," but, as he so well points out, "passionate pressure" is being brought to bear from other quarters in relation to difficult questions. Obviously, therefore, if it is yielded to in one direction concessions must be made in others, and the result would be—chaos. No one desires to restrain the legitimate expression of the heart's devotion; it should be encouraged in every possible way, but when it oversteps well-defined bounds and ceases to be legitimate, the devotee is bound to conform to recognized standards or seek a home in a more congenial communion. No other course is open, consistent with honour. If, therefore—to take the case before us—a member of the Church of England desires to have access to the Reserved Sacrament for devotional purposes, he comes at once into conflict with the Church's rule, and he must either abandon his idea or join the Church of Rome—the only body in all Christendom where such devotions are allowed. The issue is very simple and very clear, and we hope the Bishops will not allow it to become obscured by temporizing compromises.

The Case for the Reservationists. It is right, in view of all the circumstances, that the case for the Reservationists should be adequately put forward. Those who want to know the real position of the question should read Dr. Darwell Stone's new volume, *The Reserved Sacrament* (Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net). It is a most able production and everything that can be said in support of the practice of Reservation is said clearly and well. But we are bound to add that a careful reader will not be long in discovering from Dr. Darwell Stone's pages that the practice is absolutely out of harmony with the principles of the Church of England as expressed at the Reformation. The historical chapters are very interesting and very full, but it is perfectly clear that the only authority for the practice is to be found in pre-Reformation times. Much stress is laid by the author upon the practice of the thirteenth century, a period we should be inclined to regard as one of the darkest in the history of the English Church. Dr. Darwell Stone examines the Lambeth "Opinions," expressed by Archbishops Temple and Maclagan, which laid it down very clearly that (in Dr. Temple's words) "the Church of England does not at present allow reservation in any form," and against this view he sets the fact that "the

constitution of Archbishop Peecham directing reservation in every parish church, however its operation may have been affected by many enactments in the Church legislation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, has never been expressly repealed." The argument is more ingenious than weighty and cannot be used against the express terms of the Rubric in the Communion Office. In regard to Article XXIX Dr. Darwell Stone admits that "such words are not likely to have been written by those who approved of any method of reserving the Sacrament," but he urges that "so far as the obligatory character of the Articles is concerned, they cannot rightly be interpreted as binding those who receive them to more than that reservation, and the other practices mentioned are not of the essence of the Eucharist." But how does this argument help him? The practice of reservation is not only "not of" but absolutely foreign to "the essence of the Eucharist." Dr. Darwell Stone pleads for reservation for the sick; he contends also for the permission of approach to the place where the Sacrament is reserved; and, while to him personally "there is no spiritual gain in being able to see the Sacrament in addition to knowing it is there," he "does not see any weighty reason against" Exposition of the Sacrament. He seems to be more doubtful about the expediency of Processions of the Sacrament and Benediction, but he holds they need "the most careful consideration from English Churchpeople and from the English episcopate."

But what is Dr. Darwell Stone's attitude on the
 The Doctrinal Question. doctrinal question? We quote from the chapter on Doctrinal Considerations the following passage which gives the key to the whole position:—

"If the Sacrament is reserved there are practical and devotional inferences which follow. There must be a reverent method of reservation. There must be due care about the custody and renewal of the Sacrament. Those who enter the place where the Sacrament is reserved are called to acts of worship. He Who is there present is the divine Lord Who was born of Mary, and baptized and tempted, Who taught and healed and suffered, Who died and rose and ascended, Who is now at the right hand of the Father. All that He can claim of honour, love and adoration is due to Him in His sacramental presence. The worship which the Christian soul pays to Him when the Sacrament is consecrated is paid also as it is reserved. It includes the utmost response of which the soul is capable. If it differs at all from the worship which would be His if He were to manifest His visible presence, the difference is not because of anything in Him but only because the soul might attain to something higher if the sight of the Lord were vouchsafed."

We have read this passage with regret. The doctrine of the Presence in the Sacramental Elements has surely never been advanced with greater boldness by any responsible English Churchman. It may be the doctrine of the Roman Church or of the Greek Church, but assuredly we fail to recognize it as in any way answering to the authoritative doctrine of the English Church.

We have received the following letter :—

**In Arrest of
Judgment.**

SIR,—I venture as a member of the House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury to address you in arrest of the severe judgment on that body contained in your March number at p. 133.

I read the paragraph with attention from the commonplace meiosis with which it begins to the mouth-filling but meaningless "Sacrosanct" at the conclusion, and I began to think you did not like the House of Laymen. But I also came to the conclusion that you had been so absorbed in what Mrs. Malaprop used to call "a nice derangement of epitaphs" as to pay only scant attention to facts. Otherwise you would hardly have placed in the concluding lines that which in fact shows that the ineptitude which fills you with despair is quite possibly a quality of another character.

The House of Laymen is a "so-called representative body": granted—in the sense that its members are selected by other persons. "The general body of Churchmen are studying the report for themselves, and the more they study it the clearer they become that the scheme proposed, amended though it may need to be in some of its details, will effect a most salutary reform in the government of the Church of England." How, sir, do you know this? Is it collected from any deliberate and expressed opinion of the general body of Churchmen, or is it only a guess on your part founded upon the twofold assumption that in the first place the general body of Churchmen have given and are giving to the Report that close attention which you yourself have given it and which it undoubtedly merits, and in the second place that their attention has produced in their minds results identical with those produced in your own?

Now I venture to doubt the first of these two assumptions, and if the first is illegitimate the second has no grounds. The general body of Churchmen are (I adopt your own grammar) at the present time much occupied with other things than the government of the Church: thousands of younger Churchmen and of those who in ordinary times would be counted almost middle-aged are in distant parts of the world making it possible by the goodness of God that such questions should even be considered by their elders at home: even those elders are loyally giving their minds and bodies to urgent National Service. Under these conditions is it accurate to say that "the general body of Churchmen are studying the Report for themselves"?

But, sir, though such facts must be known to you, you still think that the "so-called 'representative' bodies" ought to give light and leading on the matter to the Church. Is that their duty as 'representatives': is not that duty already performed by the Committee who produced the Report? Leading is not merely going in front, it is going in front and getting men to follow. And the functions of a representative body are, just in so far as it is representative, to inform the leaders how far "the general body of Churchmen," for instance, are prepared to follow. I suggest that the House of Laymen has properly fulfilled its duty in this respect by adopting a resolu-

tion which indicated that the general body of Churchmen had not yet made up their mind on the Report.

For these reasons I suggest that the House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury is not justly obnoxious to the criticisms of your paragraph.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

A MEMBER.

We gladly print this letter, as we claim no infallibility for our remarks whether of the "commonplace" or the "mouth-filling" variety; nor have we any special claim to a grammar that can justly be called "our own." We are open to be convinced on all points, but "A Member" convinces us on none. His letter evades—very cleverly, we grant him—the real point of the Note he sets out to criticize, which was that the House of Laymen having had a session last November when the Report was explained to members ought to have been in a position at the February session to do more than merely "receive" the Report. After three months deliberation most ordinary men would be in a position to say Aye or Nay whether they approved the main principles of the Report. The House of Laymen, however, with traditional ineptitude, could not bring itself to so momentous a decision. The phrase "the general body of Churchmen" was used in contradistinction to the House of Laymen, members of which seem to be a class apart. Our statement that Churchmen, of the general body, are studying the Report for themselves was based upon facts within our knowledge, and in the great majority of cases—there have been some exceptions—such study has led to the conclusion, as we said last month, that if the scheme of the Archbishops' Committee, with suitable amendments, were carried out, it would "effect a most salutary reform in the government of the Church of England." If "A Member" will make inquiries on his own account, and keep a steady eye upon all sections of the Church press, not excluding the Diocesan magazines, he will find that the study of this question is going forward much more quickly than he thinks.

