

or ritual, nor a ministry, to which they have not been accustomed or to which they conscientiously object, will be imposed upon any congregation; and no arrangements with regard to these matters will knowingly be made . . . which would either offend the conscientious convictions of persons directly concerned, or which would hinder the development of complete unity within the united Church or imperil its progress towards union with other Churches."

When a pledge in such terms has been given and received, any distrust is a sad reflection on the honour of the one who entertains it and on the sincerity of the pledge he himself has given! The pledge has received the approval of Lambeth. If its operation will need "watching," that need will be far more on the part of the non-Anglican sections, for Anglicans will constitute fully one half of the total membership of the united Church.

Ultimately the whole Union rests, as it should, on the spiritual qualities of faith, hope, and love. As Evangelicals we could ask for nothing else.

If at bottom the opposition to the Scheme is due to the fear that its provisions may form a basis for further attempts to achieve Reunion at Home then we may well declare our joyful acceptance of any such desirable development. Only the spiritual unpreparedness of the Home Churches would make it premature. May we catch the spiritual fervour of South Indian Christians and humbly accept from their hands the key to the door of Christian Reunion!

On Non-Communicating Attendance.

BY THE REV. E. HIRST, M.A., A.R.C.M.

"HOW things have changed!" was the remark made by one who had returned to his home town after an absence of forty years. Many landmarks had disappeared. New areas had been built. Modern buildings had replaced the old. However, the man remarked that the old Church remained the same, with its usual worship and witness.

This is not the case in every Church of the land. The services to which our parents and grandparents were accustomed have been greatly changed. Some of the changes have been made for the sake of brevity whilst not altering the character of the services. Others have been so drastic as to render the services unintelligible to those accustomed to the use of the Book of Common Prayer. The customary service of Morning Prayer, often attended by whole families, or at least by a large part of the family, and which is specially suited to the needs of family worship, has disappeared for what is termed a "Sung Eucharist," or a "High Mass." These services are in line with neither New Testament examples, Early Church tradition, nor the teaching of the Church of England. They are not suited to the English character, which is another consideration. Such services have often been thrust upon unwilling congregations by self-willed

incumbents who have neither studied the generality of their people, nor their wishes in the matter. That congregations resent these changes is clear from the arguments put forward by these clergy in support of the alterations. Most of these arguments will not bear investigation in the light of the New Testament, Early Church History, and the teaching of the Church of England in her Articles and Book of Common Prayer, for these standards do not accept a service in which worshippers will not be communicants, as the Sung Eucharist or the High Mass clearly presume.

“WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURE?”

It is clear that all who were present at the Institution of the Lord's Supper received the bread and wine at the Lord's hands. “Take, eat; this is My body”; “Drink ye all of it.” The order of the Greek is remarkable, which Dr. Moffatt emphasises in his translation. “Take and eat this, it means My body”; “Drink of it, all of you: this means My blood.” Reception of the elements was distinctly Christ's intention for His followers. It His worth noting how St. Mark stresses this, for of the Cup he adds, “and they all drank of it.” Moreover, if we are to understand Christ's words recorded in St. John vi. as anticipatory of the Holy Communion, reception is absolutely essential to the rite: “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves.” St. Paul, one of our primary witnesses to the Institution of the Lord's Supper, whose authority cannot be questioned, for he claims that his knowledge was due to a direct communication from the Lord (I Cor. xi. 23). adds to Christ's command to eat and drink: “This do in remembrance of Me”; “This do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me.” The Apostle stresses the essential connection between the commemoration and the Communion, a connection broken by non-communication at a Sung Eucharist or a High Mass. “As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come.” Whilst the last quotation is apparently a commentary on the Institution, it is possible that it forms part of Christ's own words at the Institution. That Christ clearly intended reception of the Elements is further emphasised by St. Paul. “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a *communion* of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a *communion* of the body of Christ? Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body; *for we all partake of the one bread.*” The necessity of reception is stressed by St. Paul's comparison between the Lord's Table and the heathen altar: “Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils.” The Apostle is even more emphatic when he condemns the abuses of the Lord's Supper prevalent in Corinth. He contrasts what was actually happening in their assemblies with what ought to happen. Their conduct was such as compelled him to say: “This makes it impossible for you to eat the Lord's Supper when you hold your gatherings” (Moffatt). As Professor Lias has said: “It is not merely that the conduct of the Corinthian Christian was inconsistent with taking part in the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, but that it was in no sense a supper of Christ's institution of which they partook.” The plain

words of Scripture are definitely against non-communicating attendance at the Holy Communion. To join in the commemoration—to proclaim the Lord's Death—involves reception of the elements with faith. To be present without communicating is plainly beside the purpose of the Sacrament ; it fulfils no duty ; it has no promise of a blessing.

THE PRACTICE OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

It appears that the Early Church was careful to safeguard the Holy Communion from the eyes of the outside world. Caution made this essential during days of persecution. Yet, even so, the custom of meeting for solemn, regular, and stated administrations of the Holy Communion was a feature of the Church's life. In this, the taking of one loaf, breaking it, and distributing it remained the true catholic ritual. Ignatius emphasises this participation by all : " Ye all individually come together in common, in one faith and in one Jesus Christ, breaking one bread which is the medium of immortality, one antidote that we should not die but live for ever in Jesus Christ " (ad Ephes.). The Didache has a passage of much the same import : " As this bread that is broken was scattered upon the mountains, and gathered together, and became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom : for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever. And let none eat nor drink of your eucharist, but they that are baptised into the name of the Lord ; for as touching this the Lord hath said : Give not that which is holy to dogs " (chap. ix). Similar testimony comes from Justin Martyr : " When we have concluded our prayer, bread is brought and wine and water ; and the president in like manner offers up prayers and thanksgiving with all his strength ; and the people give their assent by saying Amen, and there is a distribution, and a partaking by every one, of the Eucharistic elements ; and to those who are not present they are sent by the hands of the deacons." The Clementine Liturgy is equally clear in its rubric : " Let the bishop communicate, then the presbyters, and the deacons, and subdeacons, and the readers, and the singers, and the ascetics, and of the women and deaconesses, and the virgins, and the widows, afterwards the children, and then all the people in order, with reverence and piety, without disturbance." It is clear that those of the Early Church came to the Eucharist as participants by receiving the elements.

In time, however, certain people did remain without communicating ; yet this was not because of unwillingness, but of inability to communicate. These were the penitents under discipline. Of these, there were four orders, and each order had a different place assigned to it in the Church. The furthest advanced of the penitents were the *Consistentes* (those who stood together), and alone of the penitents, this order was allowed to remain after the rest had been dismissed prior to the Communion proper ; but they were not permitted to partake of the elements with the congregation. Non-communicating members of the Church were in the class of penitents ; so non-communicating attendance was evidently not counted as a privilege, but as a penance, which Cardinal Bona characterised as " a stigma of shame and ban of ex-communication." St. Chrysostom reflects the

same view : " Thou hearest the herald (i.e. the deacon) standing and saying, ' As many as are in penitence, all depart.' As many as do not partake are in penitence. If thou art one of those that are in penitence, thou oughtest not to partake ; for he that partakes not is one of those who are in penitence. Why then does he say, ' Depart ye that are not qualified to pray,' whilst thou hast the effrontery to stand still? But no ! Thou art not of that number. Thou art of the number of those who are qualified to partake and yet art indifferent about it, and regardest the matter as nothing " (quoted from " The Communion of the Laity," Scudamore, pp. 45-6).

The rule of the Early Church which demanded participation in the Holy Communion by reception of the elements, a rule which clearly gave no place to non-communicating attendance, is perhaps best expressed by the ninth canon of the Ante-Nicene Code : " All the faithful who come in and hear the Scriptures, but do not remain at the prayer, and the holy reception, must be suspended, as bringing disorder to the Church." So far from being considered as a privilege, a virtue, or worthy of commendation, non-communicating was regarded as worthy of exclusion from the fellowship of the Church—Ex-communication.

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Prior to the Reformation, the Western Church had accepted the principle of non-communicating attendance, known as "Hearing Mass." The outstanding work of our English Reformers was the abolition of the Mass and the restoration of the Communion. In this, they reverted to the New Testament standard. Non-communicating attendance at the Holy Communion was not to be permitted, but it is not surprising that without the threat of penalties, the change could not be effected at once. A rubric of the first Prayer Book of 1549 A.D. says : " So many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side and the women on the other. All other (that mind not to receive the said Holy Communion) shall depart out of the quire, except the ministers and clerks." This injunction to non-communicants, telling them to leave, is in keeping with early Liturgies which dismissed catechumens and penitents prior to the Communion proper, for they were not able to receive the elements. Mgr. Duchesne informs us that " The Constantinopolitan ritual . . . has preserved to our own day the ceremony of the dismissal of the catechumens." The obvious break in our service after the prayer for " the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth," would seem to correspond with the dismissal of non-communicants in other Liturgies. This division between the Ante-Communion and the actual Communion is no haphazard thing, for the collects at the close of the service are to be used to round off the Ante-Communion " when there is no Communion." From these directions, non-communicants may evidently be present at the Ante-Communion, but are expected to have departed from the Church before the actual Communion. This conclusion is supported by the rubrics before the third Exhortation and the Invitation. The first of these speaks of " the Communicants being conveniently placed for the receiving of the holy

Sacrament;" and the second speaks of "them that come to receive the holy Communion." It is clear that this part of the Service has no message for non-communicants, and cannot imply, as is sometimes argued, that there may be some persons present who do not propose to receive. Moreover, it should be noted that the prayer of thanksgiving in the 1549, the 1552, and our present Prayer Books presume that all present shall have received the elements. "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank Thee that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy Mysteries . . . and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of thy favour and goodness towards us." "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have duly received these holy mysteries." "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries." Furthermore, all of these Prayer Books we have mentioned, specify that there shall be no communion except there be communicants to partake with the Priest.

It is well known that the Prayer Book of 1549 was wilfully misrepresented by some of the clergy; and in such measure as it did not effect the intended changes, it was a failure. To make sure that only participants were present at the Holy Communion, the 1552 book had these most significant passages in the first Exhortation: "We be come together at this time, dearly beloved brethren, to feed at the Lord's Supper, unto the which in God's behalf I bid you all that are here present, and beseech you for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, that ye will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden of God Himself"; "And whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy Banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you, that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more. Which thing ye shall do, if ye stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate, and be not partakers of the same yourselves." "It is said unto all: Take ye and eat. Take and drink ye all of this: do this in remembrance of Me. With what face then, or with what countenance shall ye hear these words? What will this be else but a neglecting, a despising, and mocking of the Testament of Christ? Wherefore, rather than you should so do, depart you hence and give place to them that be godly disposed." The non-communicants having departed, the service proceeded with the Invitation addressed "to them that come to receive the Holy Communion." The strong terms of this exhortation were necessary in 1552, because the habit of non-communicating attendance had not been entirely overcome; but by the time of the publication of our present book, the warning was not necessary. One of the results of the suppression of the Prayer Book under Cromwell was that by the time of the Restoration it was imagined by some that absence from the Lord's Table was an alternative which people were free to choose." It was natural that the stern words of 1552 should be omitted in 1662, because they were no longer necessary. That the Communion, and the Post-Communion, of our present service is for communicants only is clear from the actual prayers and the rubrics. They all bear the sense of the rubric before the third Exhortation: "At the time of the celebration of the Communion, the Communicants being conveniently placed for the receiving of the holy Sacrament, the

Priest shall say this exhortation." Our contention is supported by The Second Book of Homilies, declared as authoritative in Article xxxv, for the Homily "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ" asserts: "Every one of us must be guests and not gazers, eaters and not lookers. . . Of necessity, we must be ourselves partakers of this table, and not beholders of others." With these facts before us we cannot reasonably understand the meaning of the rubrics and prayers of the Communion office as contemplating the presence of any other than Communicants for the Communion and the Post-Communion.

It is sometimes argued that non-communicants are tolerated at the Coronation Service and at Ordinations, and so non-communicants may be present at other administrations of the Lord's Supper. The only reply that so specious an argument can deserve is that those whom these services concern are definitely communicants at the service, namely the Sovereign and his Consort, and the Ordinands.

A more subtle argument for non-communicating attendance is that, because the Communion Service is the only place in the Prayer Book which orders a sermon (excepting the Marriage Service), the direction to Godparents in the Baptismal office that they must call upon the children "to hear Sermons" must involve the presence of children at the Eucharist as non-communicants. To show how groundless is such a plea, the facts must be stated. Strictly, the Prayer Book seems to intend that the Holy Communion should come after Morning Prayer; for the Church of England has no prescribed rule of time for the celebration of that Sacrament. The order which still obtains in many parts is Morning Prayer, Litany, Holy Communion. This order finds corroboration in the prescribed teaching of the Church in Passion Week, when the story of the Passion is given from the four Evangelists, in the Second Morning Lessons and the Gospels. The Gospel portions follow on that chosen for the Lesson, not vice versa. This shows that the Church's teaching throughout the year is not confined to the Epistle and Gospel, but to the whole of the Scriptures to be read—Lessons, Epistle, and Gospel. "The Sermon or Homily" follows the prayer for the Church militant. One or these Homilies might well be that "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," which, as we have seen, roundly condemns non-communicating attendance. Moreover, the natural break in our Communion Service follows that part in which the sermon or homily is ordered. The Ante-Communion is quite separate from the rest of the service; a fact recognised by those who use the Ante-Communion only, instead of the whole service, on Good Friday, and acknowledged by the rubrics which give directions for procedure "if there be no Communion," as well as what is to be done "when there is a Communion," and "the time of the celebration." When the direction to Godparents was inserted in the Prayer Book there was also a clause in the Exhortation to the Negligent condemning non-communicating attendance, and also a demand for the withdrawal of those who did not intend to communicate. We have seen that when the clause regarding non-communicants was omitted, the abuse no longer existed; so children could hear the sermon and withdraw from the Church together with non-communicants at the close of the

Ante-Communion, as they were then expected, and still are expected to do.

That the Church of England values and safeguards her Communion Office, none can question; but she has fenced the Lord's Table from abuse and from the prying eyes of the curious and the negligent. The encouragement of, or the insistence upon the presence of non-communicants at a Sung Eucharist or a High Mass, breaks down the safeguards which the Church of England has placed around her ministrations of the Sacrament of our Redemption, and ignores what is her expressed opinion upon non-communicating attendance. That she expects participating recipients, not spectators, at her Communion, is clear from the terms of the Exhortation to be read when people are negligent to come, and from the Exhortation "to them that come to receive the Holy Communion."

Book Reviews

A PREFACE TO PARADISE LOST.

By C. S. Lewis. Pp. viii. and 139. Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. 7/6.

A new book on Milton's masterpiece by such a well-known writer will be welcomed by a large circle of readers. No doubt the circle would have been far larger a generation or so ago when the great poem was probably far more widely read than it is to-day. But in some ways this is not altogether surprising. To read Milton, or for that matter Chaucer, Shakespeare or any of our greatest authors, requires time, not to mention patience and concentration. And with so many novel attractions, literary or otherwise, many to-day are not prepared to make the necessary effort. Yet in spite of this there will be a ready welcome for the volume if only because of the name of the author. Mr. C. S. Lewis by his religious writings alone—which we greatly hope will increase as time goes on—has won a name for himself and attracts the attention of numbers of people who do not normally read religious or theological literature. So we predict a great demand for C. S. Lewis on Milton!

There are several standpoints from which it is possible to study a book like this according to the predilections of the particular reader. We are not concerned here primarily with what Mr. Lewis has to say on point of literary form, though this is not in any way to belittle his achievement in this direction. Much of the book naturally is taken up with a study of Milton's great work from the point of view of epic poetry and to a discussion of the poem as a supreme example of what epic poetry is intended to be.

But in the present case we feel that most of the readers of this Magazine will be far more interested in that part of the book which treats of the contents or subject matter of the poem. And here Mr. Lewis writes emphatically as a Christian and has no hesitation in saying so. Commenting on the statement of a certain professor that it is necessary to clear away certain "theological rubbish" before one can appreciate the "lasting originality in Milton's thought" Mr. Lewis writes: "In order to take no unfair advantage I should warn the reader that I myself am a Christian and that some (by no means all) of the things which the Atheist reader must 'try to feel as if he believed' I actually, in cold prose, do believe. But for the student of Milton my Christianity is an advantage. What would you not give to have a real live Epicurian at your elbow while reading Lucretius?" Here at least the Author is perfectly frank.

We can indeed see the advantage of this standpoint as we follow the writer's treatment of such themes as "Milton and St. Augustine," "The theology of Paradise Lost," "Satan's Followers" and "Adam and Eve"—to quote some of the chapter headings of the last half of the volume. It is very tempting to examine the contents of some of these chapters in some detail but it would take too long. The book is full of good things which we can only indicate by