

RESERVATION

By the Rev. C. SYDNEY CARTER, D.D.,
Principal of Clifton Theological College
 (Concluded.)

It is necessary here to say a word about the Latin Prayer Book of 1560. It is boldly claimed that "the official and authoritative character of this Prayer Book is beyond doubt" (Harris, p. 562). It is then argued that because this 1560 Latin Book provides, in its service for the "Communion of the Sick," for some sort of "Reservation" (which we will consider later) therefore "Elizabeth did not regard Reservation of the 1549 type as in any way inconsistent with the 1559 Prayer Book which was authorized by Parliament, nor with the 1552 office for Sick Communion, which was retained unaltered" (p. 564). In fact, it is dogmatically asserted that "the 1552 office for the Communion of the Sick was *officially interpreted* as permitting Reservation of the 1549 type" (p. 562).

Now as we have seen, not only did Cranmer and the leading Reformers, who compiled the 1552 Book, strongly denounce the mediæval practice of Reservation, but in the Service for "Communion of the Sick" no provision for even the temporary type of 1549, or mention of it, was made. It is therefore important to study the actual facts concerning this 1560 Latin Book and its supposed authority to amplify, and even contradict, the rules clearly laid down in the legal statutory Prayer Book of 1559. Now this Latin Prayer Book of 1560 certainly has a peculiar origin and standing, and "its authoritative character," instead of being "beyond doubt," is most questionable. Bishop Anthony Sparrow in his *Rationale of the Prayer Book* (1657) says, "It is a translation of some private pen *not licensed by authority* as I guess" (Preface). Mr. Clay, who edited it in 1847 with the *Liturgical Services of Queen Elizabeth*, declares "that it came forth with the express sanction of Elizabeth's Letters Patent," but he adds that this was done by a "stretch of her prerogative," and that instead of it being, as the "Letters Patent" assert, *convenientem* or agreeable with the 1559 Book, "it was almost an independent publication" (xxi and xxiii). Research, however, has revealed that these asserted "Letters Patent" *do not exist*, and that there is no trace of them in the Public Records and that in addition they are irregularly drawn up. (Franeý, *Reservation of the Sacrament*, p. 53, 1899). But even if they were genuinely Elizabeth's "Letters Patent," this Latin Prayer Book was only issued on her *sole personal* authority which could not override the exclusive authority of the Statutory 1559 Prayer Book. Any attempt therefore to "use any other rite, ceremony or order of celebrating the Lord's Supper," which was not "mentioned and set forth" in the 1559 Book

was clearly illegal and liable to the severe penalties prescribed by the Act of Uniformity 1559.

Now the pious purpose for which Elizabeth requested Walter Haddon to prepare a Latin translation of the Prayer Book was the same as that stated in the First Edwardine Act of Uniformity—"It was for the furthering and encouraging of learning in the tongues in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford," to which Elizabeth added, in her Letters Patent, the Public Schools of Eton and Winchester. It was, in fact, the laudable desire that the dons and students, who knew Latin, should say their Morning and Evening Prayers in their own Colleges Churches and Chapels in that language. The Book was not to apply to ordinary parish churches, and although the whole Prayer Book with its Occasional Offices was translated into Latin, obviously there would be few young students or Fellows who would during their Term time want to use the Service for Communion of the Sick!, and Chancellor Wordsworth is probably correct in concluding that it is a question whether Walter Haddon's *Communio Infirmorum* Appendix was ever used (*Prayer Book Dictionary*, 404). This may account in some measure for the "liberties" which were taken by the translator with this particular Service. But in any case Haddon, rather strangely, *did not take the 1559 Prayer Book as his model*. Instead he turned to a professed translation of the 1549 Book made in 1551 by a Scotch Professor at Leipzig named Aless. It certainly was a very free "translation," since in the *Visitation of the Sick* Haddon deliberately alters the rubric about the desire of the sick person for Unction, to the permission to say a certain Psalm!! But Dr. Haddon does not even make an exact translation of Aless's faulty *Latin Prayer Book*. He makes careless or deliberate alterations which in important cases make it a compilation very much *sui generis*, and certainly not "in harmony" with the authorized Elizabethan Prayer Book. This is very conspicuous in his translation of the Service for "Communion of the Sick." Dr. Harris declares that on account of the provision in this Latin Service for Sick Communion, the 1559 Prayer Book office was "officially interpreted as permitting Reservation of the 1549 type." But if we study this Latin service carefully, we soon discover that it did *not* authorize Reservation "of the 1549 type." According to that Book, if there was a Celebration of Holy Communion in Church, "the priest was to reserve as much of the elements as shall serve the sick person and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any)," and then the same day he is, as soon as convenient, "after the open Communion ended," to "go and minister the same first of all to those who are appointed to communicate with the sick (if there be any) and last of all with the sick person himself." He is, before ministering the reserved sacrament, to say the General Confession, Absolution and Comfortable Words. Now this Order did not require the priest himself to communicate a second time, and thus he need not be fasting. It was a clear case of so-called "Reservation," scarcely differing from that practised in Justin Martyr's day. But the corresponding rubric in Haddon's Latin Prayer Book *differed materially from this*. Like the 1549 rubric it orders the priest from the

Celebration in church to "reserve so much of the sacrament as suffices for the sick man." But then it introduces an *entirely new feature*, when it adds: "And soon after the Supper is finished he shall go to the sick man *with some of those present*, and shall first communicate with those who are at the sick man's bedside and with *those who had taken part in the Service in Church*, and lastly with the sick man."

Now this order is more akin to as full an extension as possible, and repetition of the service in church, *in the sick man's room*. The priest himself had to communicate *again* (and one of the main reasons for the 1549 "reservation" was to avoid this necessity) and some of the church congregation were also to do the same, and the friends of the sick person were also to communicate with him. And we should note carefully that there *must be* such "friends" present, as the 1549 qualifying clause—"if there be any"—was omitted from this rubric. This sort of "extended Communion" was clearly not "the 1549 type of Reservation," nor was there any authorization for such a practice in the 1559 Book which Haddon was supposed to be translating into Latin! It conformed neither to the one nor to the other. The same was the case with the order of service when there was a *Celebration* in the sick man's house. In the 1559 office there was merely the Collect, Epistle and Gospel ordered to be said. Haddon has these, but he inserts "The Lord be with you" and the *Sursum Corda* and then adds, "Unto the end as stated above"—"*Usque at finem ut supra dictum est.*" As this apparently refers to the Order of Communion Service in the 1559 Book, this would mean the omission of the Confession, and Absolution, which come *before* the *Sursum Corda* in the 1559 Order—a serious omission both devotionally and liturgically.

It is not surprising that this independent, curious "hotch potch" production met with small favour in the learned world for which it was designed. Most of the Cambridge Colleges refused to use it, describing it as "the Pope's dregs" (p. xxxi, Clay). Accordingly we find that this irregular "royal" Latin Prayer Book was never reprinted. It was obviously altogether too "original" a translation to be acceptable as the equivalent of the 1559 Prayer Book. Dr. Haddon was quietly dropped, and Elizabeth allowed her printer Wolfe the patent and monopoly of issuing in 1572 another Latin Prayer Book which adhered far more closely to the 1559 Book and had therefore no provision in it for any kind of reservation. The rubric in it for the "Communion of the Sick" is an exact translation of that in the 1559 office. Chancellor Wordsworth declares that this, and later Latin Prayer Books, superseded the 1560 Book, although Dr. Harris tries to disparage these later Latin Prayer Books by asserting, *without any evidence*, that they were "for private use alone." He does not, however, explain the insertion of the office for "Communion of the Sick" in a Prayer Book designed only for the use of "private people" desiring to say at home the Common Prayer in Latin!

A further ingenious but rather far-fetched attempt is made to claim Archbishop Parker as favouring the use of Reservation of the 1549 type. In 1561 Parker re-drafted the Edwardine text of the *Reformatio Legum* and in so doing he made a verbal alteration or addition

to chapter 19 on transubstantiation. After the statement that transubstantiation is opposed to Scripture and the true nature of a sacrament, it adds : " Therefore neither do we allow this sacrament to be lifted up on high, nor do we suffer it to be carried through the fields, nor to be reserved (till the morrow), nor to be worshipped." In the Edwardine draft the words "*in crastinum*"—to the morrow—were absent. They were inserted by Parker in 1561 and consequently it is urged that the Archbishop *by this addition* wanted to retain the 1549 practice of " reserving " for the use of a sick person on *the same day*, but no longer. This is a very slender foundation for charging Parker—the Primate—with the deliberate aim of disobeying the clear statement of the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity 1559 which declared that " any other form of *administering* the sacraments " than that carefully prescribed in the 1559 Statutory Book should " from henceforth be utterly void and of none effect " ! It is far more likely that Parker was correcting this passage, by this addition, to make it agree with the well-known and then often-quoted reference to a supposed Second Epistle of Clement of Rome—" Let so many holy loaves be offered upon the altar as may be sufficient for the people. If any remain, let them not be reserved *until the morrow*, but be carefully consumed by the clerks with fear and trembling." But whatever the reason for Parker's addition, we must remember that this *Reformatio Legum* had no real authority since it was never legally authorized, and that in the next year when the Convocation, presided over by Parker, issued the Thirty-eight Articles, this addition of "*in crastinum*" was significantly absent. Even if we grant, what is highly improbable, that Parker had desired that the additional words might be construed as allowing some sort of " extended Communion " for the sick with the reserved elements, he must soon have realized that such a practice was quite ruled out by the Act of Uniformity and by the clear language of Article 28 to which he had assented. Moreover, no specific case of any attempt to practise the 1549 type of Reservation after 1559 has been discovered, even though there were in those days amongst parochial incumbents many secret favourers of the old mediæval practices.

An attempt is also made to prove that Reservation for the Sick must have been practised and tolerated by the Reformers, on the very precarious and slender evidence afforded by an Edwardine Visitation to Saffron Walden church in October 1552—just a month *before* the 1552 Prayer Book came into force. The Commissioners mention amongst the ornaments of the church " a little round box to carry the sacrament in." Such a box or pyx would *at that time* have been lawful for taking the reserved sacrament to a sick person, as allowed by the 1549 rubric ; but Dr. Harris claims it as evidence that " *continuous* Reservation *in one kind* was lawful under the 1549 Book " (556). He also boldly suggests that it would continue under the 1552 Book. The awkward records of the removal by the Commissioners of pyxes, in all the instances known to us does not disturb him, since he asserts that such definite action by the authorities cannot " fairly be regarded as evidence that pyxes were ' illegal ' ornaments." It would be interesting to discover what kind of evidence would have been sufficient

to convince Dr. Harris of the prohibition of any practice which he favoured! But against such purely partisan assertions, Chancellor Wordsworth frankly admits that "in 1552 the Prayer Book dropped all provision for even a limited Reservation" (*Prayer Book Dictionary*, 610); while instead of "continuous Reservation in one kind being lawful under the First Book, Bishop Dowden, deservedly reputed for his careful and exact liturgical scholarship, declares "that Reservation in the Church of England between 1549 and 1552 was in its purpose limited to communicating the sick, in no case was the Sacrament to be kept beyond the day on which it was consecrated" (*Further Studies, etc.*, 249). This is obviously a correct statement when we remember that the 1549 Book only authorizes the reserved sacrament to be taken to the sick as soon as possible *on the day* of a celebration in church; and the Act of Uniformity 1549, under heavy penalties, forbids "any other form or manner of administration of the Sacraments" "than is mentioned and set forth" in that Book (*Gee and Hardy*, 361). Of course, during Mary's reign reservation, and continuous reservation were restored and pyxes consequently returned and were in general use, but "after the death of Mary, pyx and tabernacle were sold or done away with everywhere" (*Prayer Book Dictionary*, 610). As evidence of this we find that Archbishop Grindal in his Visitation Articles in 1576, inquires whether amongst "other relics and monuments of superstition and idolatry" "any pyxes remain undefaced and *undestroyed*"? (*Cardwell Documentary Annals*, I, 399). Yet Dr. Harris declares, *without any evidence*, that in 1560 Reservation of the 1549 type was *explicitly* authorized by the Queen and Archbishop of Canterbury and was in considerable use among the parochial clergy" (584)!

Both Dr. Harris and Professor Kennedy try to make capital out of a natural query raised by Bishop Sparrow in his *Rationale* of the Prayer Book, and they contend that it proves that Reservation for the sick was considered allowable under the 1559 Prayer Book. Sparrow's *Rationale* was published in 1657 and was followed by a second edition in 1661 and one or two later editions. He had noticed that the Service for "Communion of the Sick" in the 1559 Book gave no "directions" as to "*how much* of the Communion Service was to be used in administering to the sick person" (p. 349). In perplexity Sparrow referred to the 1549 Book and there he found clear directions on this point and so he recites the rubric there simply to show "*how much* of the Communion Service shall be used" at the delivering of the Communion to the Sick. This point was all he was concerned with. But he very significantly stops at the words "following in the open Communion" and *adds* "and so proceeding in the Communion Service to the end of the *Consecration* and distribution." This was obviously to show that he knew that Reservation under the 1559 Book was prohibited. But he added an *errata* list at the end of his first edition 1657, and said that these words should be omitted. He evidently felt that *with this addition*, the 1549 rubric was not *accurately* transcribed. But in the next edition of 1661 the words still remained, and they were never removed even in later editions. But the quotation of the 1549 rubric was not in any way intended to give the idea that the 1549 permission

to minister to the sick person with the reserved Sacrament could be continued under the 1559 Book, and this no doubt was why Sparrow added "proceeding in the Communion Service to the end of the Consecration and distribution." He realized that the Consecration prayer must be used, because the new 1559 rubric presupposed a consecration when it said that "the priest shall first receive the communion himself." The 1549 rubric had merely directed the priest when visiting the sick with the *reserved* sacrament to "minister the same first (*not to himself, but*) to those which are appointed to communicate with the sick, if there be any, etc." We have Sparrow's own admission that any kind of Reservation was illegal under the 1559 Book, for a little before in this same *Rationale* (p. 279) he says, in commenting on the 5th post-Communion rubric, "if any of the bread and wine remain the curate shall have it to his own use"—"That is, if it were *not* consecrated, for if it be consecrated, it is *all* to be spent with fear and reverence by the communicants *in the church*." This was not what the actual 1559 rubric ordered, but it was what Sparrow thought *ought* to be done, and the Caroline Revisers, of whom he was one, took Sparrow's view and added a new rubric ordering this practice. But the statement shows clearly that Sparrow had no thought of "reservation" for the sick, with the surplus bread and wine, as in 1549, or that he regarded the new 1661 rubric—that no consecrated bread and wine were to be carried out of the church—as simply designed to prevent "Puritan irreverence" of taking such surplus to the curate's "own use." But whatever the imagined purpose of this new rubric its actual language that "the consecrated elements remaining over shall at once be reverently consumed and *not carried out of the church*" must, in effect, rule out any possibility of their use for Reservation. Yet Dr. Harris makes the unsupported categorical assertion that "Sparrow declared Reservation to be still lawful" (591).

In this connection it is perhaps worth while to notice an alteration of some significance in 1662 in the 5th and 6th rubrics regarding the disposal of the surplus bread and wine which carried out Sparrow's wishes just referred to. In 1549 a rubric just before the *Sursum Corda* directed "Then shall the minister take so much Bread and Wine, as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion." Bucer in his *Censura* had taken great exception to this rubric as causing superstition, inducing people to think that if any bread and wine of the Communion remain after it is over, there is something wrong in applying it to common use, "as though there were in this bread and wine in itself something divine or holy *outside its actual use in Communion*" (*Censura*, p. 552-3). He held the Lutheran view of the elements (just as we have seen Cosin did) "that they were 'signs' and 'exhibitive tokens,' and have no union whatever with the glorious body and blood of Christ, but of exhibition and testification that by them Our Lord truly communicates Himself to His, to be seen and fed on by faith. They have no other use than that of arousing the mind and certifying the true communication of Christ" (cf. *Censura*, 473). Bucer's objection was evidently accepted, and accordingly in 1552 this rubric was entirely omitted and there was added to the

rubric about the kind of bread to be used—the significant words, “And if any of the bread and wine remain the curate shall have it to his own use.” There is no doubt that this referred both to the consecrated and unconsecrated bread. But this “Lutheran” view of consecrated elements which had been solemnly set apart for a special sacred use was certainly not shared by *all* the Caroline divines, and this explains Sparrow’s comment on this rubric in his *Rationale*. It also gives us the origin of the new 6th rubric in the 1662 Book, which then made a clear distinction between the “consecrated” and “unconsecrated” bread, giving the latter *only* to the “use” of the curate, and ordering the consecrated elements to be reverently consumed and “not carried out of the church.” In Dr. Harris’s comments on this new 1662 rubric we get a glaring example of the *petitio principii* form of argument which is so characteristic of his methods of special pleading and groundless assumptions. Referring to this rubric—“if any of the bread and wine remain of that which was consecrated it shall not be carried out of the church, etc.,” he declares, “It is historically certain that the object of this rubric was not to forbid Reservation” (589). He gives no “historical” proof for this dogmatic assertion, yet on the next page he adds to this mere assumption, and says: “It being granted that down to 1661 Reservation was lawful (and this upon evidence that can hardly be reasonably disputed!) this rubric could only naturally mean at the time, that at the offertory the priest was to place upon the Table so much as he thought sufficient for *all intended Communicants*, whether those were all at the moment in church, or some of them sick at home awaiting Communion” (570). In this way Dr. Harris adds to the rubric the words in italics, because he *wishes them to be there*. With an imaginative interpretation of this sort it is easy to make definite orders mean exactly the reverse of the actual words used!

But we must remember that the basis of these disingenuous methods is the preposterous claim, which is openly advanced throughout Dr. Harris’s thesis, that even though a mediæval practice or ceremony has been deliberately dropped, it is still permissible to use it, unless it is *specifically forbidden in so many words!* He thus contemptuously disregards, without troubling to quote its convincing language, the declared “Opinion” of Archbishops Temple and Maclagan in 1900, based on the careful researches of very competent ecclesiastical lawyers, that “rubrical omission is equivalent to prohibition” (see p. 596). On the other hand, Chancellor Wordsworth regards this official “Hearing” and “Opinion” of the Archbishops on the subject of Reservation, as “the highest English authority” (*Prayer Book Dictionary*, 611). Consequently Dr. Harris declares that the 1549 Prayer Book in spite of its careful and *limited* provision for the Communion of the Sick, allowed “Perpetual Reservation” because it “was not forbidden” (553). In the circumstances it would be almost as reasonable to argue that an English military officer might appear on parade in the dress of an Italian cavalry regiment because such uniform was not actually “forbidden.” Moreover, the principle employed by the Reformers is clearly stated in their Preface—*Of Ceremonies—Why Some be Abolished and Some Retained*. Those that are “abolished”

are quietly dropped out and not "retained." And surely any attempt to prohibit a large number of practices *by name*, would have been most unsuitable and unedifying in a book of devotion? By implication, this was equally well effected by the clear statement in the 1549 Preface—*Concerning the Service of the Church*, which declared that "the curates shall need none other books for their public service but this book and the Bible." This limiting order was made perfectly clear and definite in *each Act of Uniformity* which forbade under heavy penalties the Ministers to vary, add to, or alter the services, rites and administration of sacraments in any way from what is positively "mentioned and set forth" in the authorized Book of Common Prayer. In connection with this definite order—"It shall not be carried out of the Church"—Bishop Creighton told Mr. Linklater, "I know the attempts made to explain that away, but we must not try to explain away plain words, which have to be read in the light of the previous concession" (*Life and Letters*, 311) i.e. of "the 1549 permission to 'reserve' for the sick person".

As regards Reservation for the purpose of *Adoration* there is unanimous and severe condemnation of such an un-Scriptural custom both by prominent Elizabethan and Caroline Churchmen. Bishops Jewel and Bilson use strong language about it. Jeremy Taylor declares "It is certain they commit an act of idolatry in giving divine honour to a mere creature" (*Works*, VI, 1862, 162-3). Archbishop Bramhall denounces it in similar terms: "We dare not give divine worship to any creature—there is no more adoration due to the sacrament than to the garments which Christ did wear upon earth" (*Works*, I, 21). Bishop Burnet, whose liberal views would allow him to join in fellowship even with those who taught transubstantiation, drew the line at the Adoration of the Reserved Sacrament: "If . . . the adoration of the elements is taught and practised, this we believe is plain idolatry, when an insensible piece of matter, such as bread and wine, has divine honour paid to it, when it is believed to be God, when it is called God and in all respects worshipped with the same adoration that is offered to Almighty God. This we think gross idolatry" (*Articles*, 453).

This may sound to some uncharitable language, but it is merely confirming a little more forcefully the statement of the post-Communion *Black Rubric* which declares that "no Adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received or unto *any* Corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians)." Bishop Creighton was certainly correct in saying that Adoration "is clearly against the mind of the Church of England" (*Life and Letters*, 313).

This question of "Adoration" is really the pivot on which the controversy over Reservation turns, and it is pertinent here to notice the complaint which Dr. Harris makes regarding the decisions of the ecclesiastical Courts. He affirms that our rubrics should be interpreted "with reference to the liturgical tradition of which they form a part, or to the known views and intentions of their authors"

(595). With regard to the latter standard we have already seen that the "known views" of Cranmer and his fellow liturgical scholars, who were "authors" of almost all these rubrics, were definitely opposed to any form of real "Reservation." In fact, even the 1549 experiment of a sort of "extended Communion" for the Sick was ruled out after a three years' trial because they found it led to abuses. The clear evidence which we have in Cranmer's reply to the demands of *The Rebels in the West* in 1549 is really conclusive of the falsity of Dr. Harris's assertion that "continuous Reservation in one kind was lawful under the 1549 Book" (556). For these "Rebels" complained that the mediæval practice (carrying out Archbishop Peckham's Canon for "reserving Christ's body") had been abrogated by the new 1549 Prayer Book. "We will have," they demand, "the Sacrament hang over the high altar and *there to be worshipped*, as it was wont to be"; and they charitably add, "and they which will not consent thereto we will have them die like heretics against the holy Catholic faith"! Cranmer chided them severely with their ignorance of "the holy Catholic faith," telling them that this corrupt practice was not heard of for more than a thousand years until the times of Popes Innocent III and Honorius III. "In the beginning of the Church," he says, "it was utterly forbid to be kept" (*Remains*, 172-3). It was therefore the definite aim of the Reformers and Revisers to frame their rubrics concerning the Sacrament so as to break any previous "liturgical tradition" of reserving, carrying about and worshipping the host, which they denounced as idolatrous and un-Scriptural. They all strongly denied that the Sacrament should be worshipped by adoration of the reserved host hung up in a monstrance or pyx. As Roger Hutchinson said, "The bread and wine are not His flesh really and corporally, but a certificate, a seal, a patent or lease thereof." "Christ's flesh is to be honoured by coming to His Supper and obeying His precept, 'Take, eat, drink of this all,' by receiving of the sacrament, not with kneeling before bread and wine." So, discountenancing all such traditional customs, he prays, "Deliver us from superstition, idolatry and ignorancy with which both we and our forefathers have been snared and fettered in times past" (*Works*, 261). It is impossible, therefore, to conceive that the "authors" of a rubric saying that the consecrated elements are to be consumed and "not taken out of the church" would intend this order to be "interpreted" as still permitting the pre-Reformation abuse of "continuous Reservation" and the worshipping of the reserved host.

It cannot be seriously questioned that the attitude and teaching which we have outlined represents the traditional Anglican view of Reservation with its corollary—Adoration—from the Reformation at least till the rise of the "Tractarian Movement." Even Bishop Gore candidly admits that "I should have thought that there could be no question at all that the *abandonment* of the practice of *Reservation in the XVth century* was with a view to cutting at the roots of a growing cultus which there was a desire to get rid of" (*Reservation*, 73). It is not therefore surprising that the Royal Commission of 1906 included "the Reservation of the Sacrament under conditions which lead to its

Adoration" as one of the practices "which must be promptly made to cease." It would certainly seem that this mediæval practice is both un-Scriptural and unprimitive. There is not a trace of any such teaching in the New Testament. Moreover, as we have seen, it arose as a direct result of the promulgation of the mediæval theory of transubstantiation in 1215; but even then the prolonged "Exposition" of the Reserved wafer for Adoration was not practised until 1539 (p. 74, *Reservation*). Fr. Thurstan, a learned Roman theologian, admits that "In all the Christian literature of the first thousand years no one has apparently yet found a single clear and definite statement that any person visited a church in order to pray before the body of Christ which was kept upon the altar" (*History of Holy Sacrament in Great Britain*, p. 170).

Mr. Freestone in his comprehensive research work, *The Sacrament Reserved*, in citing this statement of Fr. Thurstan's, adds that "It is in the latter part of the 11th century that the rudiments of a *cultus* definitely paid to the reserved Eucharist first appear," and that "the development of any *cultus* of the reserved Eucharist was the direct outcome of the acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation as the orthodox belief" by the Lateran Council of 1216 (*The Sacrament Reserved*, pp. 259 and 266). He adds that in the 13th century "there is yet no trace to be found of any custom in which the presence of Christ is secured in the church out of mass time for purposes of devotion" (p. 264).

But to-day through a policy of drift or *laissez faire* we are faced with a most anomalous position on this important question. It amounts to little less than the comprehension in the one Church of what look very like two contradictory doctrines or religions. The one teaches that Christ dwells in our hearts by faith through His indwelling Spirit. The other teaches the worship of Christ supposed to be localised in a consecrated material symbol. This contradictory teaching was abundantly evident when the Conference on "Reservation" was held at Farnham in 1925. The E.C.U. Declaration of 1922 enunciated a virtual transubstantiation of the elements through consecration, and added that "Christ thus present *is to be adored*." Dr. Darwell Stone endorsed this teaching, when he declared not only that "Anglican priests offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist for the living and the dead," but that "by consecration the bread and wine are changed and become the true body and the true blood of Christ and that Christ thus present in the elements is to be adored." He added that "this Presence *is permanent* and so when the Sacrament is reserved *Adoration is right*." Therefore "a 'Service of Devotions' in which the Reserved Sacrament is a centre for worship is of real spiritual help" (*Faith of an Eng. Catholic*, 51-4). But needless to say there is absolutely nothing in our Articles or Prayer Book to support such dogmatic statements as these. And on historical grounds Bishop Samuel Wilberforce was justified in declaring that "the predicating of a local Presence of the Eternal Priest in the elements was the peculiar distinction between the Reformed and the Unreformed faith" (*Quarterly Review*, July 1866). More recently Bishop Headlam declared that to

fix the moment of consecration "introduces a somewhat mechanical idea into the whole service, because in the Service, we adore Him, but to extend this Adoration to the Reserved Sacrament means introducing a form of Adoration which is inconsistent with the whole idea of the Liturgy" (*Reservation*, 148-9). Canon Storr puts it shortly when he says, "Behind the demand for Reservation lies a view of the Sacrament which is difficult not to regard as materialistic," since "the fact remains that phrases are used such as 'Jesus in His House of bread,' or 'the Prisoner of the Tabernacle,' or 'I will bring your Lord down to you from the altar,' which the ordinary worshipper will interpret as meaning that Christ is there in the wafer" (*Reservation*, p. 9, A.E.G.M.).

We are told that God is Spirit and dwelleth not in Temples made with hands, but in the humble and contrite heart, and therefore in the face of such crude statements as these it is difficult not to use language which may be, by some, considered offensive or uncharitable, especially when we are told that Our Lord's glorified humanity can be localised in a pyx or monstrance for purposes of adoration. For to quote Canon Storr again, "At the Holy Communion the spiritual Christ feeds us with spiritual food of His body and blood. The whole service—including its central feature, the reception of the bread and wine—is the means through which He does this. But we have no warrant for saying that apart from communion there is any special presence of Christ in common with the elements" (*Reservation*, p. 11). Canon Tait expressed this truth in another way at Farnham when he said, "The use of the consecrated elements is not, I believe, to introduce us to the presence of the Incarnate Lord, but through their reception to enable our spirit the more readily to feed upon Him" (*Reservation*, p. 96).

The projected Revised Prayer Book of 1927-8 proposed to limit Reservation for the Sick only, and ordered that "there should be no service or ceremony in connection with the sacrament so reserved, nor should it be exposed or removed except in order to be received in Communion." But unfortunately we have abundant evidence that with any authorization of Reservation, nothing short of permanent Reservation for Adoration will satisfy a considerable section of extreme Churchmen whose constant doctrinal outlook is "South of the Alps." Once the elements are reserved, with this new theological teaching of Anglican extremists—that "the reserved sacrament is the body of Christ"—it is impossible to prevent the practice of Adoration. In 1917 the Bishop of London, publicly in Convocation, recognized this impossibility, and on this *ground alone*, refused to restrict it for the "sick only."

Archbishop Maclagan in 1900 also realized this result, when he said, "wherever Reservation is practised there arises the danger contemplated by Article 28 of the Holy Sacrament being worshipped as well as reserved" (Archbishop of York's *Opinion*, p. 14).

We fully realize and sympathize with the practical administrative difficulties which many of our diocesan bishops have to contend with over this serious question, especially where they have inherited it as a sort of *damnosa hereditas* from their predecessors, yet it seems quite

clear that the root of the present impasse lies in the implications arising from the Tractarian and mediæval doctrine of the Real Objective Presence of Christ in the elements by virtue of consecration. It can scarcely be seriously questioned, however, that it was the rejection of this doctrine which brought our leading Reformers to the stake. But it has now by some means forced its way back as a doctrine "in the Church of England." Without this doctrine and its logical outcome—the adoration of the reserved elements—it would be comparatively easy to frame a rubric permitting something of the nature of "extended Communion" in cases of sickness.

But even here a further question arises as to its NECESSITY. The late Bishop Watts-Ditchfield, on more than one occasion, made a most important affirmation when he declared that while he was at Bethnal Green he never found any need for Reservation for the Sick. Even in the humblest and untidiest homes he found that seemly and reverent arrangements could always be made in the sick room, so that the sick person need not be deprived of the undoubted benefit of the short form and the Consecration prayer provided in the Service for the "Communion of the Sick." Further the plea of *necessity* on the ground of the priest's convictions or preference for Fasting Communion when neither Holy Scripture nor our Church has any rule enjoining this practice, cannot be regarded as a sufficient one. As Bishop Creighton more than once pointed out in this connection, "It is clear that the Prayer Book contemplates *the good of the sick person*, and provides that he should have the satisfaction of a complete service, including Consecration, in his presence. . . . Reservation in any form upsets this, and substitutes the *convenience* of the priest as the *determining factor*. This is the main point to be considered." "The priest must not consider his own convenience till he is driven by absolute stress to do so." (Creighton, *Life and Letters*, II, 310.) He added that "the separation of the recipient from the act of Consecration is opposed to the spirit of the Prayer Book. I can never feel that the case of *necessity* is made out, but if we sanction it in case of necessity, people are sure to go on. Therefore we will not sanction it in any form" (*Life and Letters*, II, 310). These were wise words and they have proved to be prophetic.

But in cases of Communion for the Sick the one quite uncontroversial provision which our Church has sanctioned for cases of extreme sickness, when physical conditions do not allow of any service, or when there is "lack of company to communicate with the sick person," seems generally to be disregarded. For it is always possible to comfort the sick or dying person with the Scriptural method of "spiritual Communion." It should not be forgotten that this rubric for "spiritual Communion" was merely the expansion of a rubric in the Order for Extreme Unction in the pre-Reformation *Sarum Pontifical*—which ran: "Then (i.e. after the Unction) let the sick man be communicated, unless there be a probable fear of vomiting or other irreverence; in which case let the Priest say to the sick man, 'Brother in this case a true faith sufficeth thee, and a good will. Believe only and thou hast eaten'" (Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, 894-5 (1872)). Dr. Harris

frequently emphasizes the importance of the *Viaticum* for the dying as a traditional custom from quite early times. He quotes a Canon of the Council of Nicea urging this as "most necessary." Apart from the fact that we have no scriptural warrant or injunction for the "absolute necessity" of such death-bed communion or "Viaticum," this Nicene canon is dealing with cases of dying "excommunicate" penitents. The 1549 Prayer Book, therefore, makes no mention of the *Viaticum* or of any special provision for it. With the Reformers the *Viaticum* as such, silently disappears, and Dr. Harris is not able to give any definite contemporary evidence to its observance at this time. In fact, it is difficult to find any reference to it in Reformation literature. Dr. Harris claims, however, that because for many centuries it had been the traditional practice to administer this *Viaticum* with the Reserved Sacrament in one kind only, therefore the Revisers of 1549 "intended to permit or at least tolerate the giving of the *Viaticum* in the traditional way" (p. 557). His only supposed support for this conclusion is the statement of the 1552 Act of Uniformity that the 1549 Book "was agreeable to the Word of God and the *Primitive Church*." But, as Dr. Harris himself shows, in the *early Primitive Church* the sacrament was administered to the dying in *both kinds* (p. 547) and not by the method of *Reservation*. So that an appeal to the usage of the "primitive Church" in this respect does not necessarily support his contention, especially in view of the general attitude of the Reformers to *Reservation*.

He makes a further claim that this Nicene regulation regarding the *Viaticum* can claim the approval of the "Church and State" on account of a clause in the Act of Supremacy of 1559. This clause includes the "First Four General Councils" as one of the standards for "adjudging heresy." Obviously this test was intended to safeguard the Catholic Faith concerning the Holy Trinity which was so carefully defined by those Councils. There is nothing to show that it was intended as a necessary endorsement by the Elizabethan "Church and State" of an isolated statement of the Nicene Council concerning the importance of a particular use of the Holy Communion as a *Viaticum* for the special cases of excommunicate penitents.

As regards primitive usage we do well to remember the evidence which Mr. Freestone has collected on this subject, since he finds that cases of private sick communion are lacking in the first age of the Church, and that it "must remain doubtful whether in the Apostolic times any provision was made at the Eucharist for those who were absent for sickness or for any other cause, from the Liturgy" (*Sacrament Reserved*, pp. 16 and 24). He also adds that "there is no evidence of any general practice of *Reservation* for the Sick in the first six centuries and that evidence of a satisfactory kind for the official *Reservation* of the Sacrament is extraordinarily scanty" (*ibid.* 106).

Now that we have reviewed the whole subject of *Reservation* from the liturgical and historical sides, it does not seem possible to doubt the accuracy of the declared "Opinion" of the two Archbishops given in May 1900. It is surely worth repeating them.

Archbishop Temple declared that "The Book of Common Prayer contains no order, and provides no opportunity for a practice of

Reservation. But this is not all. The language of the 28th Article cannot be taken otherwise than as condemning the practice altogether. . . . All four (of its) prohibitions must be taken together, and all of them in connection with the doctrine of Transubstantiation emphatically repudiated just before. By 'worshipping' is meant any external act of devotion, and this is the chief object of prohibition. The authorities of the Church knew well that external gestures are the very stronghold of superstitious doctrines, and they forbade on this account all worshipping of, i.e. all external acts of devotion to the consecrated elements, because, if retained, they would retain in themselves the doctrine which it was necessary to root out of people's minds. And lifting up and carrying about are forbidden, as giving opportunities for worshipping, and for the same reason was Reservation forbidden. The reason for the prohibition is clear. These practices led to gross abuse which the Church of England felt bound to stop. And even the administration direct from the Church during the service is shown to come under the same head, for it gives an opening to the same abuse." "The administration of the Holy Communion to those who are too ill to understand fully what they are doing is certainly not to be desired under any circumstances. The Holy Communion is not to be treated as if it worked like a magical charm without any co-operation on the part of the recipient" (p. 10).

The Archbishop of York's "Opinion" was similar: "In the absence of any provision for Reservation, the phrase 'shall not be carried out of the Church' must evidently cover the whole of the remaining consecrated bread and wine. It appears therefore evident that the administration of the Holy Communion by reservation is no part whatever of the form contained in the Book of Common Prayer" (p. 13). Regarding Article 28 the Archbishop says (p. 15), "It is a matter of common notoriety, apart from the admissions of Mr. Lee, that wherever this reservation is practised *there follow inevitably* acts of adoration offered to the Holy Sacrament as supposed to embody the actual presence of our blessed Lord." "I can come to no other decision than that the practice of reservation has no sanction from the Church of England at the present time; that it was deliberately abandoned at the time of the Reformation; and that it is not lawful for any individual clergyman to resume such a practice in ministering to the souls committed to his charge."

There can surely be little question that, on the final appeal to the teaching of the New Testament, our Church is amply supported in this position.