

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Whence the Haidas originally came is still an unsolved question. Their own tradition makes them come from the neighbourhood now familiar as Klondyke, but to this tradition little importance can be attached. To a stranger, all the British Columbia Indians suggest by their cast of features a Japanese origin. The present writer took some pains to ascertain whether any connection was traceable between Haida and any of the languages of Eastern Asia. But a Church Missionary Society missionary in Japan, whose knowledge of languages makes him a competent authority, wrote in answer to inquiries: "I find no affinity whatever between Ainu (the aboriginal language of Japan) and Haida. Your language is neither Ainu, Japanese, Korean, nor Chinese, nor do I think it has any connection with Manchurian." J. H. KEEN.

ART. VI.—THE RESERVATION COMPROMISE.

THERE is an impression that some, at least, of the Bishops have resolved upon a compromise in the matter of Reservation. They will, it is said, call for the immediate stoppage of local Reservation, but they will allow clergy to consecrate the elements in church, and carry the consecrated elements at once to a sick person. It is rumoured that this is the intention of the Bishop of London, although as yet there is no public evidence of such intention. Indeed, in certain quarters the rumour is denied with a good deal of heat. It is certainly, however, the position taken up, with limitations, by the Bishop of Salisbury, who has explained in some detail why this concession or compromise appears to him so far permissible that he will not forbid it.¹ The subject is important; for whatever may be said in favour of the compromise, there is this much, at least, against it—that it distinctly violates the directions of the Book of Common Prayer. From this point of view it is just as illegal and just as improper as local reservation. Nor can the consent of the Bishop free a clergyman who practises this form of reservation from the guilt of breaking his ordination vow. That solemn promise, so lightly regarded in some quarters, runs as follows:

"I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the Church of England as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God; and in public prayer and administration of the Sacra-

¹ "Further Considerations on Public Worship: a Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Salisbury." London: Longmans and Co. Chap. iii.

ments I will use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other, except as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

Now, the words of the Bishop of Salisbury in his "Letter," cannot by any ingenuity be stretched to mean an order. His Lordship's language is very carefully guarded, doubtless with the express purpose of leaving upon the shoulders of the clergy such offence as may be committed. The Bishop says :

"I am not desirous to press severely upon those who follow the practice described by Justin Martyr, and at the Easter season or at some other great festival, when there is a press of communicants, at once and immediately make the sick partakers with the whole in a common Eucharist. I of course take for granted that in such cases there is no procession or additional ceremony, and that the service in the chamber is not unduly curtailed.

"I must, however, warn them that, though I do not think this need be condemned under the head of reservation—in which an act of setting aside for a time and in a particular place seems to be implied—yet it is not literally consistent with the direction to *celebrate* for the sick. In a court of law this last point would, in my opinion, be fatal to their defence. A legal criticism would naturally be: 'It may be you do not reserve, and therefore are not contravening the spirit of the 28th Article; but you are not obeying the rubric for the Communion of the Sick. You are using a form of administration of the Sacraments other than that provided in the Prayer-Book.'"¹

From this it is clear that the Bishop himself thinks the use should be exceptional, that he recognises the illegality of the compromise, warns his clergy of it, and lays upon any who adopt it the onus of breaking the law. He will not "press severely" upon them—that is all. Whether, if the Bishop of London makes the same concession, he does it with the same limitations and the same warnings we are unable to say. If he did, then (1) the practice should only be resorted to at Easter or at some other festival when there is a press of communicants; (2) the carrying of the elements to the sick must take place "at once and immediately," so that the elements are not set aside and locally reserved; (3) there would be no procession or additional ceremony, nor yet any deprivation of the sick of the service which they are entitled to; and (4) all would be done with the full consciousness that the act was illegal, that the Bishop could not make it legal, and that the clergyman was breaking his ordination vow.

Even with these limitations there arises the question how

¹ "Further Considerations," pp. 18, 19.

far a Bishop is justified in suggesting to his clergy or condoning on their part an admitted violation of the law and of their ordination pledge. It will hardly be contended that such a course falls naturally and properly within the province of a Bishop. Indeed, the extent to which some prelates regard themselves as entitled to vary the arrangements of the Book of Common Prayer has for some time been a subject calling for the serious attention of Churchmen. Permission to clergy to use, for example, special Epistles and Gospels at services more Roman than Anglican is well calculated to encourage clergy of the extreme order in mangling the Communion Office almost past recognition. But the action of the Bishop of Salisbury is the more curious because he is a stickler for adherence to the Prayer-Book letter. We must take it, then, that the very guarded recognition which he gives to this custom is offered in view of the present distress, and in the hope of making easier the obedience of clergy at present practising local reservation. This, at least, the Bishop is "determined" to prevent, "if God gives me power to do it, even though it involve me in serious trouble."¹

What, however, are the grounds upon which the practice cautiously admitted is used at all? The first argument employed in its favour is an appeal to antiquity. It is claimed to be a simple revival of the practice described by Justin Martyr in the second century. But it must be extremely difficult to rely on this precedent unless we are prepared to do so thoroughly. The reserved elements were not only carried to the sick, but were also sent to the absent, even though such persons were in good health. If the one part of this ancient custom be continued, why not the other? But the appeal to antiquity is, considered by itself, of little significance. Our business is with the law of our own Church. The ancient custom becomes of importance because of an extraordinary interpretation placed by some extreme Anglicans upon the words "except as shall be ordered by lawful authority" in the ordination vow. For it is contended that this use of reservation is a Catholic practice, and, being such, is virtually "ordered by lawful authority"—to wit, by the voice of the Catholic Church. It is an interesting proof of the straits in which defenders of reservation find themselves, that they should think it possible to sustain an allegation of this character. The argument is absurd and futile for two reasons. In the first place, the words of the ordination vow clearly refer to the future, and not to the past. "Except as shall be ordered" could not by any ingenuity apply to what, *ex hypo-*

¹ "Further Considerations," p. 18.

thesi, had already been "ordered" by the custom of the Catholic Church. "Shall" cannot equal "has been." It is impossible to devise any form of words which can give security if individuals may alter tenses and change the future into the past, as may be deemed convenient.¹ But, in the next place, the argument has already been met by our own Church. Article XXXIV. is decisive as to the right of the English Church to change or abolish ceremonies ordained by man; and this right was insisted on most fully at the Reformation.²

Attempts were made at Lambeth to avoid this difficulty by urging that, although the provision for reservation which appeared in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. disappeared from the second and was not reinstated, the practice had not been declared illegal, and, indeed, was still permissible under the Prayer-Book directions. But, again, we can only say that, if the rubrics of the present book are not to be read as making reservation impossible, it is hopeless to ask for agreement in regard to any form of words. The Communion Office and the office for the Communion of the Sick are absolutely incompatible with reservation.

But the question arises how far the present Prayer-Book

¹ The comment of the Archbishop of York at the Lambeth hearing is decisive: "The words are: 'As shall be ordered by lawful authority.' Such words bear upon the face of them a reference to a future time, and not to a far-off past; and, further, to an authority connected with the Church of England itself, and not derived from either ancient usage or from the contemporary customs of other branches of the Catholic Church. To give it such a wide reference as is suggested would be practically to undo a great part of the work of the Reformation" (*Record*, May 4, 1900, p. 434).

² It may be convenient to quote the Lambeth opinions. The Archbishop of Canterbury held: "If it be said that the Church of England has no right to give up so ancient and general a practice, the Church of England has replied, in Article XXXIV., that every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying. In fact, it is impossible to maintain that a Church which made such great changes as were made at the Reformation could not change the mode of administering the Holy Communion to the sick."

The Archbishop of York's words were: "The contention of counsel employed on behalf of Mr. Lee was, first of all, that Reservation, being a laudable custom of the Catholic Church from the earliest times, could not be set aside by the action of any single branch of the Church; that such a proceeding would be *ultra vires*, and therefore null and void. To this contention the sufficient answer was given that the Church in Article XXXIV. claims the right as a national Church 'to abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority,' and that every clergyman of the Church of England has given his assent to this Article" (*Record*, May 4, 1900, pp. 433, 434).

offers countenance to the suggested compromise of carrying the consecrated elements at once from the church to the sick. The Bishop of Salisbury himself admits¹ that "both rubrics are verbally *inconsistent* with it." If "verbally inconsistent with it," need we go further? Surely the compilers of the Prayer-Book made the rubrics "verbally inconsistent" with reservation just because it was their intention to make reservation in any form lie outside the law and custom of the Reformed Church. To suggest that the custom spoken of by Justin Martyr may have escaped the observation of the revisers does not carry us far. We know that in the present Prayer-Book the specific directions of the rubric are that the curate "shall there *celebrate* the Holy Communion"; and the change from the ambiguous word "minister" of the second Prayer-Book to the definite "celebrate" of the present Book makes such an argument worthless.

It is urged, however, that there is some precedent for the practice which the Bishop of Salisbury will permit. He says: "I have heard of a case of the Sacrament being taken to a sick woman directly after a public celebration, at Corfe Castle, fifty years ago, and I am told that the like tradition exists at Pentridge."² But fifty years leave us well within the period when the Oxford Movement was procuring the revival of a good many things no longer permissible in the English Church. The Pentridge "tradition" has no date, and may also be a quite modern instance. In regard to the countenance already given to the practice by certain prelates, we are in possession of the exact facts, which again, however, furnish us only with recent precedents. They were described as follows by Mr. Dibdin at the Lambeth hearing:

"Without communicating with the Bishop of Durham, I have received a letter from him which I know he wishes me to make known here. It is this: 'I have just seen, with great surprise, that Mr. Hansell stated, in his address at Lambeth, that I have authorized reservation in certain cases. I have not done anything of the kind. What I have done is, that I have endeavoured to show how the cases in which reservation is declared to be most necessary may be met *without reservation*. In two cases I have allowed incumbents who have applied to me to adopt the following usage, which I believe to be legal, as it is certainly primitive: *Immediately after the consecration* one of the assistant clergy takes the elements to the sick person, so that the administration to the sick may be coincident with the administration to the congregation. The sick person, in fact, is to be treated as a member

¹ "Further Considerations," p. 17.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 15, 16.

of the congregation. This, I hold, is what Justin Martyr describes. I have further directed that the sick person should be enabled, by the assistance of some friends, to follow the service, so as to be prepared to receive in due time. The usage was to be adopted only in exceptional cases. I stated my view at the York Convocation in May, but the report has not yet been published. Whether the usage is legal or not, it certainly *excludes*—that is the usage that he has allowed—‘reservation, and does not authorize it. There is, indeed, no question on which I feel more strongly, and I cannot understand how my action has been misinterpreted. I insisted strongly in both cases on the fact that *there was no reservation*. It is clear to me that Justin Martyr describes coincident, and not subsequent, administration to the absent.’ That is the whole of his Lordship’s letter.

“I should like to add a word on the same subject with reference to another case that was mentioned here, and which may be misunderstood hereafter, although I know it is well known to your Graces. It is with reference to a statement made as to the practice of the late Archbishop Benson, in a case which we all remember. What was really done was this, and perhaps it is necessary to state it exactly: The Bishop of Winchester was lying ill in this house, and Archbishop Benson, in administering the Holy Communion in the private chapel in this house, at the time of distribution carried the elements from the Holy Table up into the Bishop of Winchester’s sick-room, and administered him there, and then returned to the chapel and finished the service. That, and that only, is what happened.”¹

It is, no doubt, a matter for regret that prelates of the Church should themselves have set an example of doing what is apparently inconsistent with the law they have to administer; but even their example cannot turn wrong into right.

It is clear, then, that the practice which is to be, with certain limitations, permitted, is absolutely without warrant under the present law. It remains to consider how far that which is not lawful may be deemed expedient.

The compromise is, no doubt, offered to the extreme clergy in the hope that it will help them to give up local reservation with its accompaniments. It would, it may be thought, meet the difficulty of those who urge that in the homes of the poor it is often impossible to celebrate for the sick. It is a little curious that the difficulty experienced by extreme

¹ “Reservation of the Sacrament: Mr. Dibdin’s Speech at the Recent Hearing,” pp. 89, 90. Bemrose and Sons.

Anglicans is one which Evangelical clergy have not discovered. They can minister to their people in such "slum" parishes as East and South London provide, without coming upon distressing cases which make reservation absolutely essential. Indeed, the habit of the very poor is to render the one room they inhabit as clean and neat as possible when they expect a visit from the clergy. The Archbishop of York made short work of the argument from assumed necessity when at the Lambeth hearing he said: "But it is well known, not only to the Archbishops, but to the Church at large, that there have been, and are at this moment, a very large number of the clergy whose work lies in such parishes as those referred to, and that such difficulties as have been suggested have never really stood in the way of the reverent administration of the Holy Communion to persons qualified to receive it, however humble and disagreeable the surroundings may have been."¹ It will be agreed that the long parochial experience of the Archbishop of York gives a peculiar value to this testimony. But whether those with whom the argument from assumed necessity weighs will accept this compromise is a point upon which at present there is no evidence. So far the treatment of offenders with studied leniency has not been very successful. The recalcitrants are still considerable in number, and there is no diminution in the violence of the language used by them and on their behalf.

But even if the compromise had some success in this direction, has it not certain more or less obvious dangers? It is at least a step towards the local reservation which is at present condemned. Experience tells us that in things of this kind one concession leads to another. Of course, there are always people who laugh at the "thin end of the wedge" argument. They assume that it is so easy to fix absolute limits, to say, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther," and to compel a halt. The whole history of the Romeward movement in the English Church is against their cheerful optimism. Bishops who to-day help to familiarize the Church with what they deem a harmless form of reservation may to-morrow find themselves hard pushed to sustain their prohibition of local reservation. Moreover, the concession will help to familiarize people with the carriage of the reserved elements through the streets. That danger is seen by the Bishop of Salisbury, who points out that "rulers of the Church . . . have to take increased care . . . that no opening be given, through any concessions they may make, for either of these dangerous developments, which are serious invasions of the spirituality

¹ *Record*, May 4, 1900, p. 434.

of the Christian religion."¹ He also takes it for granted that in such cases there is no procession. But clergy who find it consistent with conscience to argue that censuring "a person" and "an altar" is no breach of the promise not to censure "persons or things" may possibly find the resources of their casuistry equal to some evasion of this command also. It is probable that many of the clergy will take no pains to disguise the fact that they are carrying the elements to a sick parishioner, and some, at least, of the evils feared are likely at once to happen.

There remains the fact that the sick member of the English Church is entitled to the privilege of a celebration in his own room, with full enjoyment of that most solemn and moving part, the consecration itself. The Bishop of Salisbury finds that reservation has already led to serious infringement of the rights of the sick:

"It appears to be a somewhat common experience that where the clergy have adopted the plan of communicating with the Sacrament already consecrated, they advise, and often press, and sometimes force, communicants to receive in this way and in no other. In some cases this leads them to the grave and unwarrantable presumption and irregularity of communicating the sick only in one kind."²

May not the practice he permits conduce to an extension of these faults?

On the whole, then, it must be feared that the compromise is as hopeless as it is illegal. It is well meant; but the time is past for temporizing, and further displays of weakness are but likely to increase the distress of the Church.

A. R. BUCKLAND.

ART. VII.—CONTINENTAL CHAPLAINCIES: A NOTE.

MR. LLEWELYN DAVIES has in the columns of the *Times* drawn attention to the curious way in which some Continental chaplains, holding licences from the Bishop of London, regard their duties. The chaplain of whom complaint was made used wafer-bread at his administration of the Holy Communion. There are, as Mr. Llewelyn Davies pointed out, many reasons why the average English Churchman may deplore such a usage. It would, no doubt, be argued on the other side that wafer-bread is so widely employed in our churches here at home that to resent its use in the

¹ "Further Considerations," p. 18

² *Ibid.*, p. 19.