

# THE EUCHARIST

## FOURTH TRIENNIAL CHARGE

TO THE CLERGY AND LAITY OF THE DIOCESE OF VERMONT

BY

THE RT. REV. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., LL.D.

DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION, 1907

WITH NOTES AND APPENDICES

NEW IMPRESSION

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

91 AND 93 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

LONDON, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

1907

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
A CHARGE . . . . .	5
APPENDIX A.	
RECORD OF THE INSTITUTION (THE GREEK TEXT AS GIVEN BY WESTCOTT AND HORT) . . . . .	25, 26
APPENDIX B.	
THE MEANING OF ΠΟΙΕΙΝ . . . . .	27
APPENDIX C.	
THE MEANING OF ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΣ . . . . .	31
APPENDIX D.	
THE MEANING OF ΚΑΤΑΓΓΕΛΛΕΙΝ . . . . .	32
APPENDIX E.	
THE MEANING OF ΘΤΣΙΑ ΑΙΝΕΣΕΩΣ . . . . .	33
APPENDIX F.	
THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE CONSECRATION AND THE OBLATION	34
APPENDIX G.	
THE INWARD AND THE OUTWARD PART OF THE SACRAMENT, EACH REAL IN ITS OWN SPHERE . . . . .	35
APPENDIX H.	
THE ARRANGEMENT OF SERVICES . . . . .	40
APPENDIX I.	
FASTING COMMUNION . . . . .	41
APPENDIX K.	
RESERVATION OF THE SACRAMENT . . . . .	45

## A CHARGE, &c.

*My Brethren of the Clergy and of the Laity:*

It has been my endeavour, through various publications put forth from time to time during the last thirteen years,\* to keep before our people the doctrine of the Sacraments set forth in the Prayer Book, as an integral part of the Christian religion. They are not mere symbols of needed gifts, but "effectual signs," conveying to those who rightly use them what they signify;† they are the means ordained by our Lord Jesus Christ for bringing home to us individually, through the agency of His Holy Spirit, the virtue and benefits of His life and death, the renewal, that is, of human nature by the incarnation of the eternal Son of God, and our deliverance from bondage to sin and Satan effected by His victorious sacrifice. In particular I have striven to maintain a true regard for the Eucharist,‡ the Sacrament of our Lord's body and blood, as the chief service of the Christian Church, in which all other devotions find their culmination, the Lord's Service which should mark the Lord's Day, if possible, in every congregation, certainly in every cure where there is a properly ordained priest to consecrate the

\* *The Sacraments* (a tract, 1901). *Notes on the use of the Prayer Book* (1895). *Instructions and Devotions on the Holy Communion* (1901). *Companion to the Prayer Book* (1902). *Extracts from Convention Addresses, 1894-1904*, pp. 21, 22.

† Article xxv.

‡ The word "eucharist" passed from meaning (1) simply thanksgiving, to mean (2) the specially ordained thanksgiving of the Christian Church, the whole service or sacrifice of thanksgiving, and then (3) the consecrated elements themselves.

sacrament, and lead the corporate worship of the people.\* The celebration of the Eucharist is the great central act of Christian worship. Therein according to His institution we shew the Lord's death until His coming again.† Therein we receive spiritual food, Christ's body and blood, which He declared to be meat indeed and drink indeed, for the nourishment of our inner life.‡ Therein

\* See Appendix H, The Arrangement of Services, p. 40.

“The celebrating priest is indeed the necessary organ of the body's action. He is the mouth with which she prays, and the hand by which she offers and blesses in the name of Christ. But the sacrifice is the church's sacrifice. . . . ‘We offer,’ ‘we do sacrifice,’ is the language of the liturgies. ‘No priest,’ says Peter Lombard, ‘says, I offer, but We offer, in the person of the whole church.’” Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 213, comp. 271.

It has been necessary to call attention to the necessity not only of a duly ordained minister, but of the proper *matter* for a valid Eucharist, Bread and Wine—not unfermented grape juice. See *Notes on the use of the Prayer Book*, p. 29, and *The Mountain Echo*, Jan., 1902, where the declaration of the American Bishops at Chicago in 1886, reaffirmed by the Lambeth Conference in 1888, is quoted: “The use of unfermented juice of the grape, or any liquid other than true wine diluted or undiluted, as the element in the administration of the cup in Holy Communion, is unwarranted by the example of our Lord, and is an unauthorized departure from the custom of the Catholic Church.”

† 1 Cor. xi. 26. For the force of *καταγγέλλειν*, see Appendix D, p. 32.

‡ John vi. 55. If the discourse in John vi. does not relate directly to the Eucharist, it is because it expresses the larger idea of which the Eucharist is a particular concrete embodiment, the one leading embodiment which Christ bequeathed to His Church. Sanday, art. “Jesus Christ,” in *Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. II., p. 637.

“Body and blood” stand for the whole man—the outer frame and the inner essence, with which the life was identified. Accordingly, to feed upon Christ's body and blood means to take into oneself His manhood; *i.e.*, its spiritual principle. By the separation of the parts the idea of a violent death is presupposed. The Son of man lived for us and died for us, and communicates to us the effects of His life and death as perfect man. See Westcott, *The Gospel of St. John*, p. 107, comp. his *Revelation of the Father*, p. 40.

by virtue of this reception our fellowship in Christ with God and one with another is renewed and cemented. "Seeing that there is one loaf, we who are many, are one body, for we all partake from the one loaf." \* All this we should contend for as a definite part of the Christian religion. Let us see that we hold and teach the truth in accordance with the analogy of the faith, in due proportion. †

About the importance of this rule of proportion I have thought it desirable at this time to give some warnings, because of certain dangerous tendencies abroad, by which in Vermont we are affected indeed only indirectly, but not less really. There is a danger of the sober and restrained teaching of our best Anglican divines (whether in England or America), based on their study of Holy Scripture and ancient authors, ‡ being largely forsaken for

\* This is the probable translation. 1 Cor. x. 17. So St. Ignatius, Eph. 20:

"Assemble yourselves together . . . in one faith and one Jesus Christ . . . breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote that we should not die but live for ever in Jesus Christ." Light-foot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II., i. p. 545. A similar idea is set forth in the Prayer of Thanksgiving contained in the *Didache*, ix. 4: "As the elements of this bread, scattered on the mountains, were brought together into a single whole, may Thy Church in like manner be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom."

This symbolism of the "one loaf" is lost when separated wafers are used. "Individual Communion cups" are a still further departure from apostolic practice and ideas.

† Rom. xii. 6.

‡ See e.g. Bp. Beveridge, Works, vol. v., p. 229: "From hence ye may all see the excellency of our church, in that it requires nothing to be believed as an article of faith but what the apostles first taught, and what the church of Christ in all ages hath believed to be consonant to the doctrines delivered in their writings: but whatsoever opinion hath no ground or foundation in them, that ours, together with the catholic church, rejecteth as either utterly false, or, at best, not necessary to be believed."

Especially for primitive teaching concerning the Eucharist, I would refer to the 6th discourse in vol. I. of Bp. Seabury's Sermons, in which he

presentations of sacramental and eucharistic doctrine drawn from mediæval and Roman sources. A good deal of exaggerated language is prevalent in doctrinal and devotional books which have a considerable circulation, and are apt to colour the teaching of the younger clergy.\*

Such language brings twofold mischief:†

(1) It tends insensibly, but almost inevitably, to a superstitious regard and use of the sacrament. Both advocates and opponents of certain theories of the Eucharist urge that these opinions logically lead to the practice of reserving the sacrament for purposes of devotion and worship.

(2) On the other hand, by a representation for which they find no authority in Scripture, many are repelled from all sacramental doctrine. The neglect and irreverence that we lament around us in New England are liable to be increased rather than remedied by the propagation of crude and unwarranted theories.

The Eucharist is the central act of Christian worship. It is dis-appeals to the early writers, and first liturgies of the Christian Church, to the testimony of the first Reformers in England, to the first prayer-book of Edward VI, and to the doctrine and practice of the venerable remains of the old apostolical church of Scotland.

\* Reference may be made for the sake of example to a more formal treatise, by the Rev. Dr. A. G. Mortimer, *Catholic Doctrine and Practice*, and to a popular tract, *Discerning the Lord's Body: the Real Presence, some Illustrations and Results*, by the Rev. H. Page Dyer, with a Preface by the Bishop of Fond du Lac.

† Comp. what Mr. Keble says about the doctrine of Transubstantiation, *Eucharistical Adoration*, ch. iv, p. 123 (3d ed.): "Within the Roman obedience it has been a scandal to the simpler sort by 'giving occasion to many superstitions,' it being so exceedingly hard for them to separate it from a base and carnal idea of the Holy Sacrament. Among us, and everywhere in the West apart from Rome, it has proved a still greater scandal; it is the one chief reason of the prejudice which in these later ages has prevailed, and is prevailing (God grant it may not always prevail), against the true and primitive doctrine, which is mistaken for it."

tinctly the worship of the faithful, of the baptized who are living measurably true to their baptismal calling, to the promises made and the grace received in that sacrament. The Eucharist is not intended to be a mission service, for the conversion of unbelievers or of the godless and indifferent. These should rather be excluded from the sacred mysteries in the spiritual appreciation of which they can have little share.\* The glorying in Christ's death, His victorious sacrifice, can have little meaning to those who do not recognize His divine person and representative manhood, or who are practical enemies of His cross, leading self-indulgent lives, unmindful of their baptism into His death.†

The presence at the celebration of the Eucharist of devout persons who for reasons of spiritual prudence are not prepared to receive on every occasion when it is celebrated, or when they can be in church, is an entirely different matter. This may well be defended and encouraged, provided it is recognized that it is only by receiving the body and blood of Christ that the benefits of His sacrifice, commemorated in the Eucharist, are sealed to us.‡ So likewise in the case of children, and especially of those preparing for Confirmation and Communion.

According to our Lord's institution the pleading of the sacrifice is closely connected with the partaking of His sacramental body and blood. The eating and drinking, actual communion, is not a further additional ceremony, as if the sacrifice were pleaded by

\* So Justin Martyr (*Apology*, i. 66): "This food is called among us Eucharist, of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and also has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is living as Christ enjoined."

In days of strict discipline some classes of penitents were altogether excluded from the celebration of the mysteries; others were allowed to be present, but not to partake. These were said to share in the *prayers*, and not in the *sacrifice*. See Bingham, *Eccl. Antiq.* viii. v. 5.

† Phil. iii. 18, Rom. vi. 1-13.

‡ Keble, *Letters of Spiritual Counsel*, cxxviii., clv.

the consecration while the communion is a separate duty or privilege.\* "Take, eat," and "Drink ye all of this," are parts of the record of the institution. The command precedes the declaration "This is My body," "This is My blood." To eat and drink is, as much as to bless and break, included in "Do this for My remembrance."† The eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood, whereby we are made one with Him (our baptismal incorporation into Him being thus renewed), enables us to join in His self-oblation which in the Eucharist we commemorate. Along with Him our head and leader, we offer ourselves, our souls and bodies, a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice to God. This (as St. Augustine continually urges) is the great Christian sacrifice, the oblation of Christ's mystical body to God, to do His will, in unio with Christ's own perfect self-oblation.‡

The central oblation in the Eucharist is nothing material, though it may be presented under a material figure or an outward act.§ Bread and wine have been presented as firstfruits of God's gifts in creation, for which, as well as for His work in redemption, we praise His name. The broken bread and outpoured wine, after the recitation of Christ's words of institution, represent Christ's

\* As in the common Roman Catholic practice, where the Holy Communion may be given out of Mass, and at a separate time, even to persons who have just assisted, or are about to assist, at the celebration of the Mass.

"Popular modern theology has erected a false and mischievous separation between the idea of sacrifice and the idea of communion." Pullan, *The Atonement*, p. 80.

† See Appendix A, p. 25, The Record of the Institution.

" B, p. 27, The meaning of ποιῆν.

" C, p. 31, The meaning of ἀνάμνησις.

‡ "Christ is both the priest who offers and the sacrifice offered. And He designed that there should be a daily sign of this in the sacrifice of the Church, which, being His body, learns to offer herself through Him." *De Civitate Dei*, x. 20; comp. serm. 272 (to the newly baptized).

§ "Passio est enim Domini sacrificium quod offerimus." Cyprian, Ep. lxiii.



body broken and His blood shed in the passion. But it is not the body and blood as such that we offer, either really or symbolically present in the "holy gifts;" \* it is Christ's death viewed as a moral act that we plead; not the mere suffering, but His obedience reaching even to death and perfected in the surrender of His life.† This moral triumph of the Son of man, this victorious sacrifice, we proclaim to one another and to all; ‡ in it we glory before God and make our boast; in this we claim our share. Feeding upon our Lord's humanity perfected through suffering and exalted to the throne of God, we derive from Him the power to follow where He has led the way. Thus the Eucharist becomes a great supplication, chief among Christian prayers, as it is also our great sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.§ This is the pure bloodless sacrifice of

\* The most probable view of the relation of the oblation to the consecration is that which is naturally suggested by our own Prayer of Consecration, *viz.*, that (1) the broken bread and outpoured wine are offered to God as symbols of Christ's body and blood, along with our praise and thanksgiving for His victorious sacrifice, and all that it accomplished for us; and that (2) then the bread and wine so used are returned to us quickened and vivified by the Spirit of God, and made to be the means of conveying to our inner and regenerate being the body and blood of Christ, *i.e.*, a fresh share in the virtue of His sacred humanity. Strictly speaking, we do not offer the body and blood of Christ, but only in a figure. The material offerings of bread and wine are given back to us endowed with spiritual efficacy. See Appendix F, p. 34, The connexion between the oblation and the consecration.

† Phil. ii. 8, comp. Ps. xl. 6-8, Heb. xi. 5-10. "Non mors, sed voluntas placuit sponte morientis." S. Bernard, *Tract. de erroribus Abaelardi*, viii.

‡ See Appendix D, p. 32, The meaning of *καταγγέλλειν*.

§ See Appendix E, p. 33, The meaning of *θυσία αἰνέσεως*.

Comp. the *Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII* (1897): "First we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer

which the Fathers speak, and to which they apply the prophecy of Malachi.\*

The death of the Son of man upon the cross in perfect obedience to His Father was at once a reparation to God for the manifold disobedience of those whom He represented, and a triumph over the power of evil, which in His own person but on our behalf He conquered.† This was the fulfilment of the typical sin-offering and burnt-offering of the Levitical law.‡ But the sacrifice did not consist in the mere death or slaying of the victim; the blood, which symbolized the life which had passed through death, was offered before God. This was the really sacrificial act. And this is fulfilled in our Lord's presenting Himself before God in heaven, alive from the dead and perfected through suffering. At the ascension He performs this priestly act, Himself both priest and victim.§ Our Eucharist depends on this offering, and, like the

the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice." Pp. 18, 19.

"We do readily acknowledge an Eucharistical sacrifice of prayers and praises; we profess a commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross; and in the language of Holy Church, things commemorated are related as if they were then acted; as—'Almighty God who hast given us Thy Son *as this day* to be born of a pure Virgin,' etc.: we acknowledge a representation of that Sacrifice to God the Father: we acknowledge an impetration of the benefit of it: we maintain an application of its virtue; so here is a commemorative, impetrative, applicative Sacrifice." Abp. Bramhall, *Answer to M. de la Milletiere*.

\* Mal. i. 10, 11. For several quotations see Bp. John Wordsworth, *The Holy Communion*, p. 11 note. The primary reference of the prophet is probably to the offerings of the Gentiles *then* acceptable to God.

† Christ offered to the Father *our manhood* perfected in himself. Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 209.

‡ See Willis on *The Worship of the Old Covenant*.

§ It seems to be a matter of little importance, probably not really more than a difference in the use of language, whether Christ's *offering* of Him-

peace-offering, provides the feast upon this sacrifice. Feeding on that which has been offered to God, we are His guests, and are taken up into the life of Him, our head, on whom we feed.

This, which seems to be the general representation of the Eucharist in the Fathers, is, it will be recognized, something very different from and far higher than the popular views inherited largely from the Middle Ages, wherein men are accustomed to look for deliverance from future consequences and penalties of sin for the sake of what Christ has done and suffered, rather than for release from bondage to sin and evil through union with Christ, "knowing Him and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being conformed unto His death."\*

The thought of Christ as our external substitute rather than as our representative and head, is, I am convinced, at the bottom of a great many of our popular misconceptions, and poor, earthly ideas concerning the Eucharist, derived from both Roman and Protestant sources. Instead of glorying in Christ's conquest of sin and Satan, claiming our part therein, and proclaiming the great fact, the good news, to others, we are too generally content to beg God's merciful consideration, on Christ's account, for ourselves and others, while still remaining earthbound slaves of evil. The

self in heaven be regarded as a single act performed at the Ascension, while its virtue is continually called forth and distributed, or whether it be thought of as a continual act. In either case there is a continued intercession on our behalf, involved in the very fact of our Lord's presence before the Father, as our representative, the Lamb as it had been slain. In either case our prayers (offered 'through Christ', 'in His name') and our eucharists depend on His intercession, and on His pleading in heaven the merits of His death on the cross, His obedience unto death. See Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25, 27, viii. 11, 12, ix. 24, 25, x. 12; 1 John ii. 1; Rev. v. 6.

\* Phil. iii. 10. It would be a good exercise for any to read through the Epistle to the Philippians with the object of gaining the writer's view of the purpose and effect of our Lord's passion. The author would venture to refer to the last of his Baldwin Lectures, *Christ's Temptation and Ours*, for a fuller treatment of the victory of the passion.

Eucharist is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving offered by redeemed men; not a pleading for pardon by those who are not reconciled.\* In Christ, united with Him, we have received adoption as sons. He has loosed us from our sins by His blood, *i.e.*, His life laid down for us and communicated to us;† for this our praise is offered to Him who was slain and by His death made those whom He purchased to God out of every nation, a kingdom of priests.‡ His perfect righteousness, in which God delights and in which we glory, is more and more imparted to us His members, who meanwhile, in spite of our manifold actual imperfections, are accepted in Him, as members of God's well-beloved Son.

Forgetting the exaltation of our regenerate condition, that in St. Paul's language we have been made to sit with Christ in heavenly places,§ we are tempted to think of Him as coming down again to earth; if not again to suffer, yet mystically to die again in the consecration of the sacrament of His body and blood,|| and to be amongst us by an external presence on the altars of our churches, to receive our worship, to hear our prayers, and bestow His benediction; as if He had not declared, It is expedient for you that, as regards any such external or sensible presence, I go away, in order that when ascended I may by My Spirit come to be with you in a closer fashion, not alongside of you or before your eyes, but within your very being.¶ "Christ in you, the hope of glory," is the Christian's joy and boast.\*\* Every one

\* Heb. xii. 22-24, Rev. v. 9-14.

† See the Note on The idea of Christ's Blood in the New Testament in Westcott's *Epistles of St. John*, p. 34.

‡ Rev. i. 5, v. 9, Gal. iv. 5.

§ Eph. ii. 6.

|| See J. R. Milne's valuable *Considerations on Eucharistic Worship*, p. 44.

¶ John xvi. 7, xx. 17.

\*\* Col. i. 27.

of the faithful can claim, like St. Ignatius, to be a bearer of God in his heart.\*

Christ comes to dwell in us,† not by any return to this lower world, from which He has ascended; nor by multiplying miniatures of Himself on the altars of Christendom or in the hearts of His people; but by stretching forth His hand, as it were, from the spiritual world in which He reigns “at God’s right hand,” to take hold of us and lift us up to share His life. Our earthly parents dwell in us by imparting to us their nature, with many of their own characteristics stamped upon it. But our life is separated from theirs. From Christ, as the second Adam, we derive our renewed moral and spiritual life, but not as something once received and then held in separation from Him. Our spiritual life is a continual gift depending on our union with Him. By continually imparting to us, through sacramental instrumentalities, the virtue of His renewed manhood, He, while abiding in His glorified condition, dwells in us. The glorified Head controls increasingly all the members of His mystical body, which gradually grows to its perfection, reproducing more and more the likeness of the Lord.

The eucharistic presence can be no more real, as it is no less spiritual, than the presence of Christ within us by virtue of our baptism. In the sacrament of initiation we are baptized into Him, we put on Christ, we are made one body with Him;‡ all this by no unreal figure of speech, though the language, of course, is that of allegory, earthly relationships being used to symbolize the closeness of the fellowship into which we are gathered with Christ. In the sacrament of His body and blood we feed on Him; our union with Him is continually strengthened as we draw into ourselves the virtue of His sacred humanity, that He may increasingly

\* Θεοφόρος. See Lightfoot’s note on Ignatius to the Ephesians, *ad init.*

† Eph. iii. 17.

‡ Gal. iii. 27, 1 Cor. xii. 13.

dwell in us and we in Him. This twofold aspect of the divine connexion is illustrated, as Bishop Westcott points out, by the two great images of the "body" and the "temple." "We abide in Him since we are His members: He abides in us since we are His temple," says St. Augustine.\* This mutual indwelling involves, let us always remember (as does the very idea of feeding), spiritual activity on our part, and not mere passive reception of His gifts of grace.† "Feed on Him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving." Food cannot be of a higher order than the life which it nourishes. We do not come as children of nature to receive spiritual food, but as members of Christ. We must come in the strength of our regenerate life.‡ Hence the necessity of examining ourselves, not only concerning what we have done, but as to where we stand, whether we be in the faith, true to our baptismal covenant.§

Here I must plead for most earnest care in the preparation of candidates for Baptism. Very little, I fear, is often made of this, far less than of preparation for Confirmation or for first Commu-

\* Hom. on S. John xxvii. 6.

† "To *eat* and to *drink* is to take into oneself by a voluntary act that which is without, and then to assimilate it and make it part of oneself. It is, as it were, faith regarded in its converse action. Faith throws the believer upon and into its object; this spiritual eating and drinking brings the object of faith into the believer." Westcott on John vi. 53. This consideration explains and justifies the disuse of Infant Communion.

‡ So Hooker begins his great discussion of the eucharist (*Eccles. Pol. V. lxxvii.*): "The grace which we have by the holy eucharist doth not begin but continue life. No man therefore receiveth this sacrament before baptism, because no dead thing is capable of nourishment. That which groweth must of necessity first live." Comp. *Bible Teachings* by R. M. Benson, p. 121. "Those who are not baptized, as also those that do not approach the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood in the power of their baptismal life, have not got the capacity of receiving that which is given to them in this holy ordinance. Just so, a person without the sense of smell cannot partake of the fragrance of a flower which he may hold in his hand."

§ 1 Cor. xi. 28, 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

nion. Yet it is Baptism which marks the great change from darkness to light, from nature to grace.\* Being regenerate in Baptism, we receive the gift of the Spirit in Confirmation, and are prepared to feed upon Christ in Holy Communion. In the case of an adult, or of any of sufficient age to answer for themselves, or to appreciate the meaning of the sacred washing, the preparation for receiving this sacrament, in repentance and prayer and instruction, ought to be most real and thorough.

There is a difference between Baptism and the Eucharist, which is plainly recognized in our Catechism. In Baptism the change (if we use the word) is effected directly on the person. There are in this sacrament but two things to be considered:

(1) the outward visible sign—water, wherein the person is baptized In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;

(2) the inward spiritual grace—the death of the person unto sin, and his new birth unto righteousness.

In the Lord's Supper there are three things to be considered:

(1) the outward visible sign—the bread and wine;

(2) the inward part or thing signified—the body and blood of Christ;

(3) the spiritual grace, or the benefits—the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are strengthened and refreshed by the bread and wine.

In Baptism the person is consecrated; in Holy Communion the bread and wine are consecrated. The spiritual food is provided by consecration before it is given to the communicant. But the presence of our Lord is as spiritual in the Eucharist as in Baptism; it is as real in Baptism as in the Eucharist. Whatever term we use of the sacramental presence in connexion with the elements

\* See Matt. xxviii. 19, John iii. 5, Acts xxii. 16, Rom. vi. 3, 4, Gal. iii. 27, Col. ii. 12, Tit. iii. 5, 1 Pet. iii. 21.

in Holy Communion, we ought to be prepared to use of the presence of Christ in the baptized.\*

The relation between Baptism and the Sacrament of our Lord's body and blood shows that we should think of the Eucharist as a central mystery in a supernatural world or system into which we have been admitted, rather than as a miracle in the lower world of nature.† In this connexion it is noteworthy how few are the references in the New Testament Scriptures to the Eucharist compared with those, direct and indirect, to Baptism. Baptism marks the great change—the self-surrender on our part, the gift of renewal on God's. Holy Communion is on God's part the nourishment and refreshment of the spiritual life imparted to us in Baptism; on our part there is the renewed self-oblation of ourselves, our souls and bodies, in union with Christ's perfect sacrifice which we plead. Great as is the gift and the mystery of the Eucharist, it is (I must repeat) but the continuation and renewal of the baptismal gift and mystery. Accordingly, in Scripture the initial gift is emphasized as that whereon all rests. The case is the same with the creed. We profess our belief in "One baptism for the remission of sins." This is the foundation of all else in the sacramental system, and stands as the representative of all.‡

The declaration of the Council of Trent that whole Christ, His body, soul and divinity, is present in each particle of the consecrated bread and wine, is misleading, if not, strictly speaking,

\* *Bible Teachings*, R. M. Benson, pp. 61, 122, 253.

† *Ibid.*, Note xxiii, "Miracles and Mysteries."

‡ Here I would call attention (as in the Lenten pastoral of 1905) to the directions of the Prayer Book concerning the public administration of Holy Baptism whenever this is possible. It is a sad mistake, as well as a disregard of plain rules, to administer Baptism in private. The reverent administration of the sacrament in the presence of the full congregation has a most beneficial effect. It will help as much as anything to a right understanding and appreciation of the sacrament of our Lord's body and blood.



inaccurate.\* If Christ dwells in us, it is, of course, His divine person which animates us, but not by, in any sense, imprisoning Himself within us. Rather He unites us, by making us to share in His renewed and glorified manhood, to His glorious person at the right hand of God.† We see the special appropriateness of the prayer to the exalted Saviour in the *Gloria in excelsis* at the end of our Communion service.

Beside "the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ" and the spiritual feeding of His people, there is no third purpose for which the Sacrament of our Lord's body and blood was ordained, or for which we may (because we have His sanction) legitimately use it.‡ Reservation of the consecrated ele-

\* Sess. xiii. canons 1, 3. For the earlier sources of this teaching, see Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 266, n. The Catechism of the Council of Trent goes even further, and bids pastors "explain that in this sacrament are contained not only the true body of Christ, and whatsoever appertains to the character of a true body, *such as bones and nerves*, but also Christ whole and entire." Part ii, chap. iv, qu. 31.

† A similar error is frequently made with reference to the Incarnation, in supposing that when the Son of God became man on earth He *left* heaven. The opening lines of the hymn, of which *O Salutaris Hostia* begins the concluding stanzas, would serve to correct the mistake: "Verbum super-nu prodians, Nec Patris linquens dexteram."

‡ The uses to which the consecrated elements were commonly put in early ages seem to show conclusively that there was not the same conception of the sacrament which later gained general acceptance in the Western Church. If it had been believed that "the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, are contained truly, really, and substantially in the sacrament," could it have been a sanctioned or tolerated custom, not merely to carry the sacrament on the person for protection, or send it to others as a token of Christian affection and fellowship, but to bury it with the dead or in an altar, or to sign documents with a pen dipped in the wine? See *Catholic Dictionary* (Addis and Arnold), p. 716. Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, ch. xvii., sec. viii. and ix. Green, *The XXXIX Articles*, p. 235. Jewel, Works, ii. p. 554. (Parker Soc. ed.)

ments "as a centre of prayer," to secure our Lord's perpetual presence, that we may visit Him enshrined in the sacrament in a tabernacle or monstrance, is altogether without authority from Scripture or from the primitive church.\* Such a practice is based upon the assumption (unwarranted for any such superstructure) that the presence of Christ is by virtue of the consecration permanently connected for any purpose with the sacramental elements, whereas it is only guaranteed for the purposes for which He instituted the sacrament.†

Reservation of the sacrament for the purpose of distribution to the sick, or to persons otherwise unavoidably prevented from attending the public service, has the sanction of the earliest ages.‡

\* "It is only in times comparatively modern that the most Holy Sacrament has been publicly exposed for the veneration of the faithful." Probably in the 14th century the sacrament was exposed on Corpus Christi Day [the observance of which only dates from the previous century]. In the 16th century it became common to expose the sacrament at other times. The devotion of the Forty Hours worship of the exposed sacrament was due to a Capuchin of Milan, who died 1556. In 1592 Clement VIII provided for the perpetual public adoration of the sacrament on the altars of the different churches in Rome, the forty hours in one church succeeding to the forty hours in another. *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 331.

Thiers in his *Traité de l'exposition du saint sacrement de l'autel* (1673) says: "The custom of Benediction appears to me somewhat novel, for I have found no Ritual or Ceremonial older than about 100 years which mentions it." *Ibid.*, p. 76.

† Gore, *Body of Christ*, pp. 131 sq. "The presence is controlled by the purpose. And in a matter where the evidence of the senses is denied us, our only right to be confident that the presence abides with us depends on our remaining under the shelter of the purpose."

Thorndike lays stress on the consecration "in order to communion." See *Laws of the Church*, III., xxxi. 9, and *Reformation of the Church of England, etc.*, xxvi. 5; xlii. 1, 2.

‡ Justin Martyr (A.D. 140), *Apology*, i. 65: "Distribution is made to each of his share of the elements which have been blessed, and to those who are not present it is sent by the ministry of the deacons." Comp. Tertullian,

Those to whom the consecrated elements were sent were not only spiritually united with their brethren by partaking of the same spiritual food; they had a pledge of this fellowship by partaking of the sacramental elements consecrated at the public Communion.\* To emphasize this, as well as for considerations of spiritual convenience, it would in my judgment be very desirable to revive among ourselves, with proper safeguards, the authoritative permission to reserve the sacrament for communion of the sick.† But until such a practice is authorized, we are, it seems to me, bound (save in extraordinary cases for which no rule has been or can be framed) to administer the sacrament to the sick, or in private, according to the form prescribed in the Prayer-book,‡ just as we are bound to follow the prescribed order for public worship and ministration. We were admitted to holy orders (or received as priests of the American Church) on this condition (with others) that we solemnly engaged to conform to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.§ And, however desirable a restoration of reservation for the sick may be, it will be impossible to gain the

*De Orat.*, 19; *Ad uxor.*, ii. 3; Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, vi. 44. On subsequent practice in the East and the West, see Wordsworth, *The Holy Comm.*, pp. 116, 117.

\* It was with this idea that in old times portions of the elements (called the *fermentum*), consecrated at the bishop's Eucharist, were sent to other churches under his care. See Frere, *Principles of Religious Ceremonial*, pp. 54, 64.

† Whether with the restrictions of the English Prayer Book of 1549, only on days when there was a public Communion in the church, or (to meet the needs of large populations and of sudden calls) as a more general custom.

‡ Not only is there a prescribed Order for Administration to the sick but in the concluding rubric the Church takes the responsibility of a person being unable under certain circumstances to receive sacramentally, and of his being obliged to be content with a spiritual communion.

§ Article viii. of the Constitution.

Church's permission for it, while reservation for purposes of adoration is practised and widely advocated.\*

\* "Christian worship may be, nay must be, meant to involve spiritual effort. It is God's intention that we should be spiritually lifted up to realize that Christ's presence with us is a presence in the Church, as the life of the body, not amongst Christians as in an outward shrine; and that nearness to Him, or remoteness from Him, is a matter of faith and holiness, and not of place." Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 141. Comp. Waggett, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 19.

Concerning what is called "Eucharistic Adoration," Mozley, in his valuable lecture on "The Holy Eucharist" (in his posthumous volume of *Lectures and other Theological papers*), helpfully distinguishes between (1) the adoration of Christ in the whole act of partaking of the sacrament, and (2) the adoration of Christ as contained in some sense in that which is received; and shows that the former is that advocated by the Fathers generally and defended by Anglican divines, *e.g.*, Thorndike: "The celebration of the Eucharist is a competent occasion for executing that worship which is always due to our Lord Christ incarnate." *Laws of the Church*, III., xxxi., § 1-6. Abp. Bramhall: "We deny not a venerable respect unto the consecrate elements, not only as love-tokens sent us by our best Friend, but as the instruments ordained by our Saviour to convey to us the merits of His Passion. For the Person of Christ, God forbid that we should deny Him divine worship at any time, and especially in the use of this holy sacrament; we believe with St. Austin [in Ps. xcvi. 9] that 'no man eats of that Flesh but first he adores;' but that which offends us is this, that you teach and require all men to adore the very sacrament with divine honour." *Answer to the epistle of M. De la Milletière*, I., ii. Compare Bp. Andrewes, *Response to Bellarmine* (p. 267, Anglo-Cath. Lib.), where he makes the same distinction, and goes on to condemn devotional practices connected with the reserved sacrament. "Nam *circumgestare* hoc vestrum *praecepto* Christi contrarium, nec ei usquam Scriptura favet. Contrarium et *institutum*. Institutum enim tum *Sacrificii*, ut *absumi*; tum *Sacramenti*, ut *accipi*, *manducari*, non recondi et circumferri. Extra Sacramenti finem, extra praecepti vim, usus haud ullus. Fiat, quod fieri voluit Christus cum dixit, *Hoc facite*; nihil reliqui fiet, quod monstret sacerdos, quod adoret populus, de pyxide."

Duchesne (*Christian Worship*, p. 62) makes the astounding statement that after the eucharistic prayer proper is completed by the invocation, "The mystery is consummated. At the call of His disciples Christ has be-

It has been my endeavour to state what I believe to be the Anglican, the Primitive, and the truly Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist. This has been done, of course, briefly, and with the hope of strengthening a true regard of the sacrament even more than of controverting errors. In a matter of this kind, where we at any rate are free from detailed definitions, no set of opinions can be or ought to be forced upon others.\* A considerable latitude of opinion and emphasis, in one direction or another, must be allowed within the limits of what has been authoritatively enjoined or repudiated. Two things are important: first, that we should all reverently and diligently seek the truth, not being content with traditional prejudices or unexamined partisan statements; and, second, that the clergy should carefully avoid official teaching or practices for which there is no authoritative warrant, and which seem to commit the Church, in whose name we minister, to a position which she has not sanctioned. Above all, let us cherish and spread, in ourselves and others, a devout *use* of the blessed sacrament, praying that we may so reverence the sacred mysteries of our Lord's body and blood, that we may ever perceive within ourselves the fruits of His redemption.

come present in their midst. He has taken up His abode on the sacred altar under the mystic veils of the consecrated elements. *The prayers are resumed, but directed now to the present, although invisible God.*" There is absolutely no foundation in the authorities to which he refers at the head of this chapter for any change in the direction of the prayers after consecration. They are still addressed to the Father through Christ.

\* It is with reference to Eucharistic controversies that Dr. Bigg writes :

"It is always dangerous to confuse the provinces of opinion and knowledge. Even in our own minds it is a moral duty to avoid this error. If there is anything about which we are not certain, we ought not to pretend that it is otherwise ; for this is intellectual dishonesty. The next degree of aberration is to persuade yourself that what is uncertain is certain ; and this is superstition. The third and worst is to bind these false certainties by penalties of any kind on the consciences of other men ; this is tyranny," *Wayside Sketches in Ecclesiastical History*, p. 178.

# APPENDIX A.

## RECORD OF THE INSTITUTION.

(The Greek text as given by Westcott and Hort.)

*S. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 23-25.*

(The earliest document, written A.D. 57  
or (Harnack) 53.)

ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου,  
ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν,  
ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο  
ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν  
τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν·  
τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.  
ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων  
τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι·  
τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὅσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

1. It is clear from a comparison of the different accounts that we have no guarantee for the actual words spoken by our Lord. But amid the variations the sense is clear.
2. S. Paul's version, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood," forbids our pressing the simple and literal force of "is" in "This is my body," "This is my blood."
3. The "new covenant" clearly refers to Ex. xxiv. 8, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you." That blood was sprinkled on the people and pledged them to obedience to the law, and on these terms assured them of God's favour; this blood which the disciples are to drink will enable them to keep the higher law of Christ, by making them to share His life.

S. *Luke* xxii. 17-20.

δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν  
λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτοὺς·  
λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν  
ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου  
ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.  
καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν  
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων  
τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου [τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον·  
τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.  
καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λέγων  
τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου,  
τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον].

The omission of the words in brackets (19b and 20) belongs to the oldest form of the Western text. Internal evidence is strongly in favour of the shorter form. The temptation to expand was much stronger than to contract. The double mention of the cup in the longer form raises real difficulties of the kind which suggest interpolation. At the same time the longer text of the great body of MSS., introducing a second cup, and filling out the account mainly from S. Paul, is evidence of the common belief and practice of the Christian Church early in the 2d century.

See Sanday, art. "Jesus Christ" in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. II, p. 636.

The ordinary reading, including the passage here placed in brackets, is defended by Pullan, *The Atonement*, pp. 108, 109.



*S. Mark xiv. 22-24.*

ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν

λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν  
λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.

καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς,  
καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς  
τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης  
τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν·

ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω

ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου

ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πῖω καινὸν

ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

εὐχαριστήσας used by Paul and Luke of the bread,  
by Mark and Matthew of the cup.

εὐλογήσας used by Mark and Matthew of the bread.

S. Paul (1 Cor. x. 16) speaks of τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας.

A similar variation is found in the accounts of the multiplication of the loaves.

εὐλόγησεν in Matt. xiv. 19, Mk. vi. 41, Lk. ix. 16,

εὐχαριστήσας in John vi. 11.

The two words are practically synonymous, the blessing being in the form of a thanksgiving. 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4. See Swete, St. Mark, p. 127.

We give thanks for good, and speak the word of good, praying that God's earthborn gifts of the bread and wine offered by us may in their use become to us the heavenly food of the body and blood of Christ.

*S. Matthew xxvi. 26-29.*

ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν

λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν

καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν

λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.

καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων

πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες,

τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης

τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν·

λέγω δε ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἅπ' ἄρτι

ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου

ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω

μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ

τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

Putting together the several accounts we get as the fullest form :

Take, eat,

this is my body which is [given] for you.

Do this in remembrance of me.

Drink ye all of it,

for this is { my blood of the covenant  
                          { the new covenant in my blood

which is shed { for many  
                          { for you

for remission of sins.

Do this, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

## APPENDIX B.

### THE MEANING OF ΠΟΙΕΙΝ.

τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25 [Luke xxii, 19].

"The proposal to give these words a sacrificial meaning, and translate them, 'Offer this, Sacrifice this, Offer this sacrifice,' cannot be maintained.

It has against it

- (1) the ordinary meaning of ποιεῖν in N. T., in LXX, and in Greek literature generally ;
- (2) the authority of all the *Greek Fathers*, who knew their own language, knew the N. T. and the LXX, and understood the words as having the ordinary meaning, 'Perform this action';
- (3) the authority of the *Early Liturgies*, which do not use ποιεῖν, or *facere*, when the bread and wine are offered, but προσφέρειν or *offerre*, although the words of institution precede the oblation, and thus suggest ποιεῖν, or *facere* ;
- (4) the authority of a large majority of commentators, ancient and modern, of the most various schools, who either make no comment, as if the ordinary meaning were too obvious to need stating; or give the ordinary meaning without mentioning any other as worthy of consideration ; or expressly reject the sacrificial meaning ;
- (5) the testimony of the LXX, in which the various and frequent Hebrew words which mean 'offer' or 'sacrifice' are translated not by ποιεῖν, but by προσφέρειν or ἀναφέρειν, or the like ;
- (6) the fact that here and in 1 Cor. xi. 24 the writer might easily have made the sacrificial meaning clear by using προσφέρειν or ἀναφέρειν."

Plummer on St. Luke xxii. 19.

ποιεῖν is used some 550 times in N. T., never in the sense of sacrifice. The nearest approach to this is in Matt. xxvi. 18, Heb. xi. 28,

ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα. With this compare ποιεῖν ἑορτήν (Acts xviii. 21), δαίπνον (Mk. vi. 21, &c.), δόχην (Lk. v. 29), γάμους (Mt. xxii. 2).

In Mt. xxvi. 18 ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα must mean "keep, celebrate the paschal feast," not "sacrifice the paschal lamb," which could not have been done in a private room. So it is constantly used in LXX, e.g., Ex. xii. 48, Num. ix. 2, 2 Kgs. xxiii. 21. Accordingly it is paralleled by φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα in Mk. xiv. 14, Lk. xxii. 11.

τοῦτο ποιεῖτε occurs about 20 times in N. T. (11 times in St. John's Gospel), and everywhere in the simple sense of "Do this," e.g., John v. 16, 19, vii. 4. So in classical and LXX Greek. τοῦτο never refers to an object, always to an action, αὐτό usually refers to an object.

For a contrast between ποιεῖν and sacrificial words, see Heb. vii. 27.

"ποιεῖν θυσίαν can be rendered 'offer sacrifice,' not because ποιεῖν means 'offer,' but because it means 'make,' and to 'make' a sacrifice is to offer it." Abbott, p. 9.

"When ποιεῖν seems to have a sacrificial sense, it is only as the crystal appears rose-tinted when a rose is placed beside it, as e.g., Heb. vii. 27." So Ex. x. 25, Levit. xv. 30, 2 Kgs. xvii. 32. "Here (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25) it is as Ex. xii. 28, οὕτως ἐποίησαν." Dr. Kay, *Commentary on the two epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, p. 48. Kay quotes the R. C. Estius as saying, "Non quod verbum facite sit idem quod sacrificare quomodo nonnulli illud interpretati sunt plane praeter mentem Scripturae."

Justin Martyr joins ποιεῖν with ἄρτον and ποτήριον (not with an action). *Dialogue with Trypho*, 70: "It is evident that in this prophecy (Isa. xxxiii. 16) allusion is made to the bread which our Christ gave us ποιεῖν in remembrance of his being flesh . . . and to the cup which he gave us ποιεῖν in remembrance of his own blood, with giving of thanks." This might be translated "offer"; but might it not be translated "break" (of the bread) and "drink" (of the cup)? The word is evidently a remembrance of the phrase in St. Paul's account of the institution. Casaubon understands the word as equivalent to εὐλογεῖν καὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, benedictione et gratiarum actione consecrare in sacramentum corporis Christi. See Kaye's Justin Martyr (3d ed.), page 94.

So in ch. 41: τύπος τοῦ ἁγίου τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους . . . παρέδωκε ποιεῖν.

Ch. 117: "These sacrifices alone (prayers and thanksgivings—*εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαρισταὶ*) Christians received ποιεῖν, to make or offer."

Bp. Gore, while urging all that can be said on the other side, thus concludes his note on the use of ποιεῖν, "On the whole there is not sufficient evidence to entitle us to say that ποιεῖν bears the sacrificial sense in the New Testament." *The Body of Christ*, p. 315.

The fullest examination of the use of the word is to be found in Dr. T. K. Abbott's essay, "*Do this in remembrance of me*": *Should it be, "Offer this"*?

If the moral character of Christ's victorious sacrifice be realized, that it is His *obedience* unto death which we plead before God and for which we offer our glad thanksgiving, the dispute as to the exact force of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε will be seen to be of comparatively small importance.

1. "Offer this" would be an almost needed meaning if it were the Body (and Blood) as an external gift which was offered. This meaning it seems hardly possible to attach to the words in the face of all the contrary evidence as given above.
2. To make the verb equal merely "Eat this," "Drink this," is impossible; for the second sentence would then mean, "Drink this [expressed by one word] in remembrance of me as often as ye drink it" [expressed by another word]. This translation also makes τοῦτο refer to the Bread and the Wine (τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα, τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, τὸ αἷμα).
3. "Perform this whole rite or ceremony" would be a perfectly legitimate translation, and fits in with the more spiritual idea of *what* it is which is pleaded. It is a *past act* regarded in its moral aspect. This is not offered but commemorated. It is rejoiced in before God, and told, proclaimed, one to another, while its virtue is called forth and applied. It is pleaded by prayer and supplication—in a solemn and appointed ordinance, not merely by word as at the end of any prayer.

The whole sacramental ceremony is a memorial before God. This seems to be exactly what our Prayer of Consecration says.

We celebrate and make the memorial which Christ commanded, by means of the holy gifts which we offer, which represent the broken Body and the outpoured Blood, having in remembrance Christ's blessed Passion and precious Death, His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension. See Bp. Seabury, *Sermons*, vol. I, p. 147.

## APPENDIX C.

### THE MEANING OF ANAMNΗΣΙΣ.

*eis tēn émēn anámnysein*, 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25 [Luke xxii. 19], to remind yourselves and others of the redemption which I have won by My death.

The Eucharist is to be a constant calling to mind of Him who redeemed man from the bondage of sin, as the Passover was an annual calling to mind of redemption from the bondage of Egypt. Ex. xii. 26, 27, xiii. 8, 14.

The only other passage in N. T. where the word occurs is Heb. x. 3, *én autáis [θυσίαις] anámnyseis áμαρτιῶν κατ' éniαυτόν*. This was a calling to mind of sins whereby men are put in remembrance of them by a divine institution. Comp. Num. v. 15 (where the verb is used). Westcott says that the Jewish sacrifices had an *anámnēsin áμαρτιῶν*, they were instituted to keep fresh the thought of responsibility, while the Eucharist is instituted *eis tēn émēn anámnysein*, to bring to men's minds the recollection of the redemption which Christ has accomplished.

The verb *αναμνήσκω* is found in the active, 1 Cor. iv. 17, 2 Tim. i. 6, of recalling to the minds of men; in the passive or middle, Mark xi. 21, xiv. 72, 2 Cor. vii. 15, Heb. x. 32, of men being reminded or remembering.

So it is used in Wisd. xvi. 6 of reminding men.

Num. x. 10, Levit. xxiv. 7, are the only instances of the use of the noun in LXX (beside the titles of Pss. xxxvii. and lxix.); in these it is apparently used of a reminding of Almighty God. (But Abbott understands them differently, pp. 27-30.)

The *anámnēseis áμαρτιῶν* in Heb. x. 3 was a solemn remembrance *before God*.

*μνημόσυνον* is the regular word for a sacrificial memorial before God in LXX (*e.g.*, Ex. xxiii. 29, xxx. 16, Lev. ii. 2, 9, 16, vi. 15, comp. Acts x. 4), and this word is constantly used in the liturgies of the eucharistic memorial made before God, but apparently *anámnēseis* is understood in them of our remembering.

## APPENDIX D.

## THE MEANING OF ΚΑΤΑΓΓΕΛΛΕΙΝ.

1 Cor. xi. 26, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ. "Ye hand down from one to another the announcement of the Lord's death till He come." This corresponds with the commemoration at the Jewish annual passover in response to the question, What mean ye by this service? Ex. xii. 26. See Evans in the Speaker's Commentary, and Abbott, p. 46.

The verb occurs in sixteen other passages in N. T. (always used by St. Paul or St. Luke), and in every instance it clearly means to proclaim or to announce to men.

In this same epistle, ii. 1, ix. 14; elsewhere by St. Paul, Rom. i. 8, Phil. i. 17, 18, Col. i. 28, Acts xiii. 38, xvii. 3, 23; by St. Luke, Acts iii. 24, iv. 2, xiii. 5, xv. 36, xvi. 17, 21, xvii. 13, xxvi. 23.

It is used in the same sense in the liturgies, being joined with ὁμολόγειν (ἀνάστασιν) and ἀπεκδέχεσθαι (παρουσίαν).



## APPENDIX E.

### THE MEANING OF ΘΥΣΙΑ ΑΙΝΕΣΕΩΣ.

Heb. xiii. 15, δι' αὐτοῦ ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως διὰ παντός τῷ θεῷ, τοῦτ' ἔστιν καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ.

Whatever *may* have been the application of the *θύσια αἰνέσεως* in the O. T. to the material oblation made as an expression of thanksgiving, here the *τοῦτέστι* distinctly explains it as consisting in the *words* of thanksgiving which are the utterance (*καρπὸν*) of the heart's thankfulness. So in Hos. xiv. 2 (from which the phrase is taken) the lips (uttering praise) take the place of the animal sacrifices.

When the phrase is taken into the liturgies it refers primarily to the words of Thanksgiving which accompany the breaking of the bread, especially the long Thanksgiving commemorating God's dealings with man in Creation as well as Redemption.

In the Roman rite "*hoc sacrificium laudis pro se suisque omnibus*" apparently is applied to *the whole act*, as itself a great *εὐχαριστία*, remembering, subjectively and before God, Christ's victorious sacrifice.

"Eastern liturgies and early Roman sacramentaries alike testify that the so-called preface is an integral part of the Eucharistic offering. And from this it follows that the Eucharistic offering does not consist in the alleged mysterious offering of Christ's Body and Blood by the priest alone, or by Christ Himself through the priest, but is first and foremost the Church's own offering of praise and thanksgiving, 'the fruit of the lips giving praise to God,' the common offering of both priest and people." J. R. Milne, *The Doctrine and Practice of the Eucharist*, p. 99.

## APPENDIX F.

THE CONNEXION BETWEEN THE CONSECRATION  
AND THE OBLATION.

It is not merely that in the ancient liturgies the invocation follows the repetition of our Lord's words of institution (asking that they, historically recited, may be made effectual), and follows also the verbal pleading of our Lord's death, represented in the broken bread and outpoured wine. In reply to the urging of this order and its significance, it might be said that while *we* must *utter* different words of prayer one after another, *God hears* the prayer as a whole, and that for spiritual effect the words of institution and the invocation may be regarded as simultaneous.

But there is the further fact, that the *purpose* of the invocation of the Holy Spirit is constantly stated to be this, that He may make the bread and wine to be the body and blood of Christ for our spiritual food, but not that we may have the body and blood of Christ to offer. See Brightman's *Eastern Liturgies*.

With the common Eastern prayers for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the elements (already used for making the appointed memorial), that they may be made for us the spiritual food of Christ's body and blood, we may compare the prayer of the present Latin rite, that the elements may be carried to the heavenly altar, that so whoever shall partake of the body and blood of Christ may be filled with heavenly benediction and grace. The gifts to be so accepted can hardly be already the body and blood of Christ, for God is immediately before begged to accept them even as He vouchsafed to accept the gifts of Abel and the sacrifice of Abraham and that of Melchizedek. See the Western rites in Hammond's *Liturgies*, p. 338.

In the Eastern prayer the Spirit of God is asked to come down; in the Western prayer it is asked that the gifts may be carried up. In either case the effect looked for is the same, that, having been accepted by God, the sacred gifts may be endowed with spiritual virtue to apply to His people the benefits of the sacrifice they are pleading. See Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 197, and Seabury's Sermons, vol. I, pp. 159, 160.

## APPENDIX G.

THE INWARD AND THE OUTWARD PART OF THE  
SACRAMENT EACH REAL IN ITS OWN SPHERE.

The late Robert Isaac Wilberforce, whose writings have done much, directly and indirectly, to mould the theological thought of the last generation, assumes "that the outward and inward parts in the Holy Eucharist are really united by the act of consecration, *so that to receive one is to receive the other*,"\* and affirms that to deny this (the inference, as well as the reality of the consecration) is to "reject that which is a cardinal feature of the Catholic Faith." Such a denial, he contends, must be due either to the *Zwinglian* theory that "the Holy Eucharist was nothing in truth but an *occasion*, in which the faith of men obtained for them those blessings which are always equally accessible to the believer," no gift of grace being bestowed in sacraments, the effect of which depended entirely upon the *recipient's* state of mind;† or upon the *Calvinistic* theory that the sacraments were merely *seals and pledges* of gifts of grace which God was pleased to effect independently of them, all depending on the intention of the *Bestower*, who, according to Calvin, limited his good will to "the elect."

Is this position sound? May not the outward and the inward parts of the Eucharist be really linked together, but for a spiritual purpose, and so that only a spiritual power can lay hold of or be affected by the inward part? This spiritual power is what the Anglican formularies call "faith;"‡ it is the action of the regenerate person living true to his regenerate life and putting its powers into

\* *Sermons on the Holy Communion*, "The Consecration of the Holy Eucharist."

† "Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent." First part of the Homily concerning the Sacrament.

‡ See Waggett, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 29.

exercise (however feebly). The communicant by virtue of the Christ nature in him (by Baptism) perceives and feeds upon the Christ nature presented to him (in the Eucharist). By "the Christ nature" is meant that share in His sacred manhood which is communicated to us as we are baptized into Christ and made members of His Body. The wicked, those who are not abiding in Christ, like those who have not been admitted into union with Him, do not and cannot receive the inward part of the Eucharist. There is not that in them to which it corresponds.\* They do not merely fail to receive the blessing of the sacrament, but they are incapable of receiving its inner part. They receive the symbols and what *should* be the means of conveying it. *Thus* they are guilty of sacrilege, not by actually receiving the Lord's Body to their hurt, but by coming in contact with the outward sign, and not in and through it discerning the Lord's Body. This is to be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord—*i.e.*, guilty of an offence respecting the Body and Blood of the Lord.

So St. Augustine says, "He who abides not in Christ, and has not Christ abiding in him, without a doubt neither eats His flesh nor drinks His blood, but rather eats and drinks to his judgment the sacrament of so great a thing." Tract xxvi. in Joan. vi.

Such a position does not in the least deny the *Reality* of our Lord's presence. It is *real*, while at the same time spiritual. It is *objective*, if the ambiguous term is to be used; that is, it exists independently of our subjective perception or appreciation of it.† But it need not be so linked with the outward elements that when they are taken physically, it is received spiritually. Such a doctrine seems to imply that there is a physical union between the two parts of the sacrament, and that the inward part is not only spiritually but physically received by the communicant. Then there naturally, inevitably, follow all those consequences, which are contemplated in the *cautelae* of the Roman missal, and also those uses of the

\* Comp. John iii. 3. "Our natural powers cannot realize that which is essentially spiritual. A new vision is required for the objects of a new order." Westcott.

† The risen Lord was manifested only to disciples. But His risen body was not a creation of their imagination.

sacrament apart from Communion which obtain widely and have become popular in the Roman Church, such as reservation for worship and exposition and benediction.

All this follows from a doctrine of Transubstantiation, which need not be grossly material, but which makes the inward and the outward parts of the sacrament really *one thing*, whatever may be the preposition (*sub, trans, con, in*) used to denote the relation of the inward to the outward part. The inward is practically thought of as linked to the outward part, as the soul of man is linked to his body; whereas the truer analogy is the union of our higher regenerate being (what St. Paul ordinarily speaks of as "the spirit") with the natural framework of man's being, material and immaterial.

It is sometimes said that the Anglican doctrine of the Real Presence carries with it all the consequences of the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, only differing from it in verbal or philosophical definition. But it seems to be any *such* theory of actual identification which is repudiated in the Anglican formularies, and declared to "have given occasion to many superstitions." (Art. 28.)

If the inward part of the Eucharist is in any literal sense the Body and Blood of Christ, only "present after the manner of a spirit," the consequences of Transubstantiation seem to be involved. But if His Body and Blood stand for the sacred manhood of Christ, the spiritual reality which was communicated to us as we were made members of His Body in Baptism, represented now under the terms Body and Blood, which set forth different purposes or aspects of the gift, and which the bread and wine symbolize; then there is no localizing of Christ, no possibility of injury to His glorified humanity by external accident or outrage. Grievous irreverence there may be in treating lightly the signs of so sacred a gift. But the inner reality of the sacrament exists only in the spiritual sphere.

Language of the Fathers, such as seems to *identify* the Body and Blood of Christ with the bread and wine, is evidently often figurative and rhetorical. For instance, St. Chrysostom speaks of Christ having given us "Not only to see Him, but even to touch and eat Him, and fix our teeth in his flesh" (Hom. xlv. on John vi. 52); of the communicant touching Christ's flesh with his tongue (Hom. xxvii. on

1 Cor. xi. 27,; of our seeing "the Lord sacrificed, and laid upon the altar, and the priest standing and praying over the victim, and all the worshippers empurpled with that precious blood" (*De Sacerdotio*, III, 4).

As Mr. Stephens, the translator of the last-mentioned book in the Nicene and Ante-Nicene Fathers, says, No controversy had then arisen about the Sacrament, and therefore "writers could freely use expressions which in later times would have been liable to objection or misconstruction." One might compare George Herbert's language: "The Country Parson . . . especially at Communion-times, is in great confusion, as being not only to receive God, but to break and administer Him." *Country Parson*, ch. xxii.

In these and many such passages Chrysostom and others speak in the same sort of rhetorical language which Hooker (about whose meaning there could be no doubt) employed when he wrote: "The very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security [amid many difficult questions that may be asked] that these mysteries do as nails fasten us to His very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force, and virtue, even the blood of His gored side, in the wounds of our Redeemer we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without, our hunger is satisfied and our thirst for ever quenched." *Eccl. Pol.*, V. lxvii. 12.

With this passage from Hooker may be quoted the less familiar words of Bp. Seabury :

"We may see in what sense the consecrated or eucharistised bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ. They are so sacramentally, or by representation—changed in their qualities, not in their substance. They continue bread and wine in their nature; they become the body and blood of Christ in signification and mystery—bread and wine to our senses; the body and blood of Christ to our understanding and faith—bread and wine in themselves: the life-giving body and blood of Christ in power and virtue; that is, by the appointment of Christ, and through the operation of the Holy Ghost; and the faithful receive in them the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice and death to all intents and purposes." *Sermons*, vol. I., p. 157.

The real meaning of the term "Spiritual" as applied to the presence of our Lord is not "after the manner of a spirit," but "for a

spiritual purpose."\* His Body and Blood are spiritual food, nourishing not our physical or our intellectual, but our spiritual nature. Nor are they spiritual food in the immaterial sense only, so that a man by his natural being having a spiritual principle, an immaterial soul, could receive them, or a devil, as distinct from an animal; but they are spiritual food in the *moral* sense, as being the nourishment of our spiritual faculties on their moral side.

It is in this sense that with scarcely an exception the ancient liturgies pray that the Holy Spirit may sanctify the elements that they may become *to us*, or for our hallowing and nourishment, the Body and Blood of Christ. So the Roman missal (nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat).

It is the converse of this prayer which we use when we ask "that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine . . . may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood." The baldness of the Scottish prayer, "that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son," is without precedent. See Dowden, *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, pp. 15, 216, Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 135.

\*"Any thing or process, whether material or no, is, according to the New Testament use of the word, 'spiritual' in which the Holy Spirit, or generally spiritual purpose, effectively manifests itself, and which it effectively controls." Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 126.

## APPENDIX H.

## THE ARRANGEMENT OF SERVICES.

It is a question of real difficulty to decide on the best arrangement and order of Sunday morning services, with reference especially to the celebration of Holy Communion. Several considerations have to be weighed.

1. We desire on the one hand to give the Eucharist a prominent place, as the Lord's service which should characterize the Lord's Day.

2. On the other hand, we recognize that many in our Sunday forenoon congregations are unprepared for constant participation in this highest act of Christian worship. Some are not baptized. Some are very little instructed in the faith. We cannot encourage or practically oblige such persons to be constantly present at the celebration of the holy mysteries without receiving; nor can we drive them away from the Sunday forenoon service, which is their chief opportunity for joining in Christian worship and for receiving Christian instruction.

3. We desire to make it possible, at any rate, that communicants who desire to observe the old rule may receive fasting.

4. A broad distinction between an early celebration of the Eucharist *for communion*, and a later one *for worship*, at which persons are not expected to receive, is altogether contrary to the principles of eucharistic worship as laid down in this Charge, and to the best traditions of the Church.

5. It is certainly not the intention of the Prayer-book that Morning Prayer should be systematically omitted or slighted.

In large city churches, where there is a staff of clergymen, and several services can be held at different hours, these difficulties are lessened, not altogether removed. In country churches the problem is distinctly perplexing. I can only urge that due weight may be given to *all* the considerations involved.



## APPENDIX I.

## FASTING COMMUNION.

Closely connected with the problem of the best Arrangement of Services is the question of Fasting Communion. Bp. Jeremy Taylor well expresses the general mind of the Christian Church with reference to this practice. "Let us receive the consecrated elements with all devotion and humility of body and spirit; and do this honour to it, that it be the first food we eat and the first beverage we drink that day, unless it be in the case of sickness or other great necessity; and that your body and soul both be prepared to its reception with abstinence from secular pleasures, that you may better have attended fastings and preparatory prayers." (*Holy Living*, ch. IV. x. 9.)

1. That fasting reception is a pious and reverent custom recommended by the practice of the Church from very early times is undisputed. (See St. Augustine's Letter to Januarius, liv.)

2. But the horror felt and expressed in the early Church at the idea of Communion after food seems to have been associated with the fear of a surfeit. They had not in view a very light repast. (See Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 22, comp. St. Chrysostom, Hom. xxvii. on 1 Cor. xi.)

3. The custom cannot be regarded as obligatory upon us by reason of ancient canons not formally repealed.

4. Nor should it in my judgment be allowed to interfere with (1) regularity in receiving the sacrament, though a desire to observe the custom might legitimately affect to some extent the frequency of reception; nor (2) with health—as distinct from mere inconvenience or discomfort; nor (3) with the right fulfilment of duties or ministry.

5. With these cautions I would urge the observance of the custom or rule, wherever it is practicable; and knowing that actually it is not practicable in many cases (as with persons living on a farm,

where much work must be done early, and at a distance from the church, where the service which these persons can attend often cannot be held before 10.30), I would recommend (though conscious that this will be regarded with scorn by some who hold rigorously to the rule) that the rule may be observed by taking only a very light refreshment, what is really necessary, before Communion. (Wordsworth, *The Holy Communion*, p. 159, Note.)

It seems to me worth while to quote *in extenso* a declaration on this subject unanimously adopted by the Bishops of the Northern province in England in 1899. Bp. Westcott, it was stated in the House, "spent very great thought and care upon the drawing up of this document."

"Our attention has been called to the teaching of various manuals of instruction and devotion which are widely circulated among members of our Church, and to special pastoral directions, in which fasting reception is made one of the things 'required of them who come to the Lord's Supper,' though it is not included in the requirements set out in the Catechism, and nowhere enjoined in the Prayer-book or in any authoritative document of our Church.

"We are very far from desiring to lessen in any degree that devout reverence with which the Sacrament of Holy Communion ought to be approached; or to discourage fasting reception where it is found to provide a salutary self-discipline. We readily acknowledge that a custom which has prevailed from early times throughout the Church generally till the sixteenth century, and which has been advocated as helpful to the spiritual life by many teachers of our own Church, is always likely to find wide acceptance among us. At the same time to describe reception without fasting as a sin is wholly unwarranted by the teaching of Holy Scripture, and is, therefore, inconsistent with the ordination vow. We further hold that there are grave reasons both from the history of the custom and from its essential character against making the practice of fasting reception one of obligation.

"1. The circumstances of the institution of the Holy Eucharist exclude the thought that taking food shortly before disqualifies for reception. The same conclusion follows from St. Paul's treatment of this Sacrament in 1 Cor. xi. Nor is the obligation of fasting

reception supported by any authority of Scripture or by any Apostolic ordinance. The conjecture of Augustine that it was one of the points which St. Paul 'set in order' (1 Cor. xi. 24) rests on no historical foundation.

"The custom of fasting reception would naturally arise when the service was transferred from a late hour in the evening (according to our reckoning) to an early hour in the morning. The cause of this change is not recorded. It may have been made in the Gentile Churches, in which the Jewish reckoning of time was superseded by the Roman, in order to place the service at the beginning of the Roman day as the institution had been at the beginning of the Jewish day. But not to insist on any special explanation of the origin of the change, it is enough to observe that there is no reason for supposing that it was made in order to secure a fast from the beginning of the day to the time of Communion.

"When the custom of fasting reception was once established even in a limited range, it was likely to spread owing to the general tendency of the Oriental mind towards ascetic practices. But the adoption of the custom was ultimately accompanied by serious evils. Infrequent reception and non-communicating attendance, which can not be wholly dissociated from fasting Communion, came to be general; and these customs find no support in the teaching and practice of the primitive Church.

"2. Fasting, again, is a means to an end, and not an end in itself. It is valuable or not according as it fulfils the proposed object. It may be employed to obtain for the communicant the fullest command over his powers of attention and devotion. But it is evident that the fitness of fasting for obtaining this result depends in a large degree upon climate, domestic habits, age, and the like; and exhaustion, as we all know, is itself in most cases fatal to spiritual self-command. And more than this; while the spontaneous combination of prayer and fasting corresponds with a spiritual instinct, it is contrary to the tenor of Apostolic teaching, and indeed of the teaching of the Lord Himself, to make the observance of a period of material abstinence a necessary condition of participating in the highest spiritual service of the Church. The inherent discordance between the custom of fasting reception and its object becomes still more obvious, if fasting

is made obligatory from a fixed hour, when it is remembered that the duration of the fast and its physical effects will necessarily vary in individual cases, and are practically indeterminate. Nor can it be overlooked that the different conditions of town and country parishes introduce serious difficulties in the uniform application of any such rule. It may be added that so far as fasting reception is advocated on the ground of reverence for the Sacrament, the arguments have a wider range. They may be used with equal, and some will think with greater, force in favour of fasting after reception.

“Such considerations show that fasting reception is one of those matters of ecclesiastical discipline which every ‘particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish’ with a view to the spiritual health of its members. And that the English Church since the Reformation has ceased to require fasting before Holy Communion, leaving the matter to individual liberty, appears to be clear from the fact that there is no direction upon the subject in those passages of the Prayer-book in which the requisites of individual preparation are plainly specified, nor in any of our authoritative documents. If it be urged that there was no need to prescribe the observance in 1549, the same cannot be said of 1662. In other words our Church has virtually applied to this matter the principle of St. Paul’s teaching on a similar question: ‘Let not him that eateth set at nought him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth; for God hath received him . . . Let each man be fully persuaded in his own mind.’ (Rom. xiv. 3, 5.)”

*The Guardian*, May 10, 1899, p. 655.

A similar declaration was adopted by the Bishops of the Southern province in 1893. See *Guardian*, May 10, 1893, p. 769.

Comp. Pastoral Letter of our House of Bishops in 1895, *Journal*, p. 386, and Abp. Benson’s charge, *The Seven Gifts*, p. 97.

## APPENDIX K.

## RESERVATION OF THE SACRAMENT.

Reference is continually made to the Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops at the General Convention of 1895, as giving permission for the practice of Reservation. Those who so refer to the Letter can hardly recollect what it actually said.

"The practice of reserving the Sacrament is not sanctioned by the law of this Church, though the Ordinary may, in cases of extreme necessity, authorize the reserved Sacrament to be carried to the sick. We are deeply pained to know that any among us adopt a use of the reserved elements, such as the Article condemns as 'not ordained by Christ.'

"Whatever theological motive, or metaphysical meaning, may be assigned to the rubric in the Communion Office, whatever historical colouring may be given to it, as a study of liturgics, no ingenuity of evasion can turn the plain 'shall not be carried out of the Church', 'shall reverently eat and drink the same', into an authorization of the use of the remaining elements for a service of benediction, or for purposes of adoration. Most earnestly do we appeal to the Clergy to consider the wrong of such disobedience alike to the letter and the spirit of our ecclesiastical law."

The "cases of extreme necessity" were certainly intended by the great body of Bishops who accepted the Letter to refer primarily to such emergencies as the Yellow Fever pestilence at Memphis in 1878, and the earlier visitations of Cholera in Leeds and London, on each of which occasions Reservation of the Sacrament for the sick and dying was allowed by the diocesan.

What has been said on p. 21 of the Charge concerning the actual provision of the American Prayer-book for the Communion of the Sick (even in extreme cases) is sufficient to show the law of our Church on the subject;—a law that (as I have said) might, in my judgment,

well be modified, with proper safeguards. But since supposed English authority for Reservation (inherited by us) is frequently claimed,\* it may be well to add a word about two such claims.

1. The provision for Reservation in the Latin Prayer-book put forth in 1560 under Queen Elizabeth is frequently cited as showing that the practice was not forbidden, and existed side by side with the service for the private celebration of the Sacrament, inserted in the Prayer-book of 1552.

The untrustworthy character of this Latin Prayer-book was fully exposed at the Hearing before the English Archbishops. (See report in *Guardian* for July 30, 1899, p. 1028.)

Moreover, the rubric found in that book (apparently foisted into it without authority, and altogether dropped in the next edition of the Latin Prayer-book published twelve years later) was not a reproduction of the rubric of the Prayer-book of 1549, permitting Reservation for the Communion of a sick person on the same day with the Open Communion in the church; but only a provision that immediately after the public service, as a continuation thereof, the priest might adjourn, with some of the congregation, to the sick man's house, and there give Communion to these persons and to the sick man. *Mox finita coena, una cum aliquot ex his qui intersunt, ibit ad aegrotum et primo communicabit cum illis qui assistunt aegroto et interfuerunt coenae, et postremo cum infirmo.* Liturgical Services. Queen Elizabeth. (Parker Society) p. 404. Comp. Procter and Frere's *New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (1901), pp. 118 sq.

2. The sixth rubric at the end of the present English Order for Holy Communion (the second in our Prayer-book), ordering the reverent consumption of any remaining Bread and Wine that had been consecrated, was doubtless inserted in 1662 in order to guard

\* *E.g.*, in a pamphlet by the Rev. John Wright, advocating *Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the Sick* (Young Churchman Co., 1903), which gives the substance of a larger English treatise on the subject by the Rev. J. W. Kempe. Dr. Wright gives a list which he calls "approximate rather than exhaustive" of churches in 30 different dioceses where Reservation was at that time practised. I have been told that in one Eastern diocese there are now (1907) no less than 15 churches where Reservation is the custom.

against any irreverent use thereof, and was not aimed at the practice of Reservation. But the question is whether Cosin and the other revisers of that date could have drawn the rubric in such terms, which plainly exclude Reservation, if they had known that Reservation was still lawful (as is contended), side by side with the private celebration.

It is true that Thorndike, writing some ten years after the Savoy Conference, in which he took part, and at which this rubric was adopted, seems to take for granted the lawfulness of reserving the Sacrament from one public celebration to another for the purpose of giving communion to the sick. "The Church is to endeavour the celebrating of the Eucharist so frequently that it may be reserved to the next communion. For in the meantime it ought to be so ready for them that pass into the other world, that they need not stay for the consecration of it on purpose for every one." *Reformation of the Church of England better than that of the Council of Trent*, xxxix. 4. But he may mean that this *ought* to be the rule, rather than that it was intended or lawful according to the existing Prayer-book.

Going behind the English book, the 13th canon of the Council of Nicaea is sometimes quoted as if it gave an express order that provision should be made (by Reservation) that there should be no risk of the Church failing in any case to have in readiness the *Viaticum* for any one in danger of death. The canon has no reference to any such question. It is concerned simply with the restoration of penitents to Communion before death. See *Canons of the First Four Councils*, in Greek and English (Parker, 1867), p. 15, and Dr. Bright's *Notes* on the same (Clarendon Press, 1882), p. 43.