

faithfully observed by all whom it concerns, although in some cases this can only be done at the cost of some little sacrifice of customs hitherto observed and perhaps highly valued. It is hard to observe that any of these can be so important as to justify the rejection of a judgment pronounced by our chief pastor, in a spiritual court, and full of promise for the peace of the Church.—*Southern Churchman.*

PROFESSOR SHUTTLEWORTH, lecturing at Poplar, London, on General Booth's scheme, said that he sympathised with the object the General had in view. It was a bold scheme, well thought out in detail, but much inspired by the views of Robert Owen, to whom justice had never been done, and by modern Socialistic opinions. It was valuable as recognising, as St. James had done long ago, the need of the salvation of the body as well as of the soul. It had, however, great defects. It would create a charmed circle which must be good for those inside; but what of those outside? Again, it would attract men to the towns, as the Chief Constable of Warwickshire said it was already doing; while he (the lecturer) did not see how the men were to be made to work. Nor was there any adequate provision for the wives and children of men who might be in the labor colony. The rev. gentleman concluded by saying that he did not believe in a beneficent despotism, and he profoundly distrusted the emotional pietisms of the Army, which did not really reach the people and would be followed by a great reaction. The General could get his money and might try his hand, but he warned them not to give, as so many were doing, to this flashy and sensational scheme, money hitherto devoted to the more permanent work of the Church.

A letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to 'General' Booth, of the Salvation Army, we print below. He takes the opportunity of criticizing some of the religious as well as economic aspects of his scheme:—

My Dear Sir—Circumstances with which you are acquainted will have explained some delay on my part. I must now reply to your last letter. And, first, let me assure you that you are mistaken if you suppose that the Church envies you the origination of your scheme, or views it with the least disfavor as emanating from an organization external to her own. What the Church desires is that the effective remedy for the suffering of the poor and outcast shall be found, whoever finds it. And if your scheme is the right one, or the best, honor will be given where honor is due. For myself, I can scarcely doubt that the means required for the experiment will be provided, and it will be tried by you with all the force that energy, courage, and faith can bring to the working out of large conceptions. I have now studied your vast scheme with such thought and knowledge as I am able to bring to bear on it. There are two points of view. It would be out of the question to slur over the religious principle of the scheme. You rightly place this in the forefront as the fountain of energy in your officers, and the motive power of recovery for the lost. Our experience does not convince me that the characteristic modes of the Salvation Army are capable of producing lasting moral effects in a whole class or district. And, speaking as a Christian, and not only as a student, I cannot understand the ignoring of those institutions of our Master, Christ, which were intended and, under whatever disadvantages, do widely and deeply serve as the Christian pledges of conduct and bonds of union. It is not only the rough convert, but the officer with his grave responsibilities who is restrained. I say no more on this subject than that your methods of engaging people to moral or religious conduct are very different from those. Naturally (your

methods lie at the very heart of your scheme, so that together they work or fail to work. Secondly, as to the economic principle of your scheme. Its centrality and universality and the dominion to be exercised over it appears to me to amass difficulties for the future. Wants are so various, individual, local, generic, that local operations or specialized Societies appear to possess great advantages in dealing with them. Of such there are numbers earnestly at work, with a host of agents and volunteers. It seems to me a sign of weakness that you ignore them so completely as to produce—unintentionally, no doubt—the impression that in districts where such organization has been long and vigorously at work, your own are the only helpers and rescuers. I do not doubt that these local bodies and various associations now need much co-ordination—that co-operation would economize labor and intensify result. But labor vast and loving is going out by many channels, in many functions, and for many objects; and that the effect of it is large, steady, and increasing is certain. You deserve gratitude, as for many other reasons, so for this, that your large picture and large ideal exhibit so forcibly the need of intercommunication and collaboration. You will not have written in vain if you cause both the devoted helpers and the hitherto inattentive spectators of misery to see that immediate measures ought to be taken to link many energies together, and far more adequate means supplied to find a footing for the willing a new start for those who have lost ground, a shelter for the helpless, stamina for the weak, a motive for the self-despairing and self-despising. These works are seriously and soberly going on, and yours is a call, even to those who least agree with some of your methods, for immense extension and for wise alliance. Believe me to remain, with much respect, your faithful servant,
EDW. CANTUAR.
—*southern Churchman.*

ATTENDANCE AT THE HOLY COMMUNION EVERY SUNDAY REGARDED IN THE LIGHT OF A FEW FACTS.

A great many persons are disposed to think that attendance at the Holy communion every Sunday is wholly unnecessary, if not positively wrong. Let us, however, calmly consider a few facts about this service:

1st. It is the only service for public worship which our Lord instituted. St. Luke xxii. ; 19; 20; I. Cor. xi. : 24 25.

2nd. In this service only can we secure the grace which our Lord pledged to give us in this sacrament. St. John vi. : 53.

3rd. The Apostles regarded the Holy Communion as the proper service for the Lord's Day, and always met on Sunday to celebrate it. Acts xx : 7.

4th. The Christians, after the Apostolic age, always celebrated the Holy Communion on the Lord's Day. Justin Martyr (A. D. 130) and Pliny, in a letter to the Emperor Trajan, testify to this fact.

5th. The Church of England and the Episcopal Church in this country evidently expect the Holy Communion to be celebrated every Sunday and Holy day, as for those occasions they have provided separate Collects, Epistles and Gospels, all of which form a part of the Communion service.

A strict regard for the principles upon which the Liturgy is based would make it imperative to finish the office when once it has been begun. There is no good reason for the very recent custom of using the 'Ante Communion' apart from the rest of the Communion Service. The office is only complete when used as a whole. And evidently our Church's purpose is that the entire service should be said every Sunday and Holy day throughout the year.

6th. In the purest ages of the undivided Church, attendance at the Holy Communion every Lord's Day was considered an obligation binding upon every Christian.

The canon of a council held A. D. 300 witnesses to this fact—'Any person living in the city who neglects to attend the Holy Communion for three successive Sundays shall be excommunicated until he repents of his sins.'

Here there is a service instituted by Christ, which, during and from the Apostolic times, the Church has invariably taught should be the characteristic act of worship for the Lord's Day. At this service, in the best ages of Christianity, every Christian has been expected to be present. Do not these facts imply an obligation resting upon you and me?

If we observe the first rather than the seventh, which God commanded, as a day of rest simply because the Church bids us to do so (for there is no scriptural evidence that Christ authorized the change), then certainly when the same Church tells us what is the proper way of observing the Lord's Day, we ought to obey her rule. If she is authority to change the day, has she not equal authority to show us how to observe it? In the light of these facts it is evidently the duty of every Christian person, if he wishes to be consistent and desires to follow implicitly the teaching of the Church, to be present at the Holy Communion every Sunday. * * * * * If we want to be Apostolic in our practice we should keep in mind the fact that without exception every baptized and confirmed persons communicated every Lord's Day.—*Guild of the Holy Cross*

CATECHISING.

One of our clergy on taking charge of a neighbour's class for Confirmation began by asking what the word "Catechism" meant. At once the reply, "What a foolish question," came from the eldest one present, who soon found himself unable to explain it. This wish to be wise without knowledge possibly lies at the root of many loose notions in religion. It leads some to fancy they can sweep the wide circle of Theology without the slow catechetical teaching that is plainly approved by St. Luke. The lack of an accurate grasp of first principles must weaken interest in our doctrines, and lessen the usefulness of our members.

The early Church put the young and the ignorant through a very long course of instruction. Questions were asked on both sides, and the learner was too thoroughly grounded in the faith to easily fall away. But strength beget confidence, and with prosperity came easier modes of admission to full Church membership, and then naturally followed those long dark ages so sadly wanting in definite teaching. Noble efforts were certainly made by saintly souls to meet this neglect, but not until the XVI Century movement was there any important return to primitive practice in this kind of teaching. The impetus then given extended to our Reformers who in a short summary of faith gave an authorized Catechism as a basis of teaching, yet one suggestive enough to admit of hundreds of manuals enlarging it. And so anxious was the Church for her children's training that her clergy were urged most strongly to teach and explain this Catechism in the congregation regardless of station, or age. But her pious intention was not all way complied with, and in unhappy times her rules were forgotten. At length catechising dwindled down to barely learning the short questions and answers, and then new devices crept in. Some made up for this by committing to heart the XXXIX Articles, and an array of Scripture proofs with possibly a few Canons added. Others availed themselves of lax days and were confirmed without knowing a word of their Catechism as such. Often the