

the Consecrated Elements, especially when new bread is used, or when communicants take it between their fingers instead of receiving it in the palms of their hands. And surely such a desire is praiseworthy, for it cannot be superstitious to desire to guard with all becoming reverence so holy a thing as the Consecrated Element.

But, nevertheless, the use of wafers seems to me to be departing somewhat dangerously, at least, from a more important particular of the original Institution than the use of leavened or unleavened bread, to destroy a very significant and beautiful symbolism of the Holy Sacrament much insisted on by St. Paul, and, moreover, to be a departure from true Catholic practice.

A letter from the respected Bishop of Grahamstown has lately appeared in the *Church Times*, which so well expresses my own opinion on the subject that I think I cannot do better than quote it at length, and thus fortify my opinion by his:

"I notice the remarks of your correspondent in your last issue, and your own note upon my reference to 1 Cor. x, 16, 17, in connection with the use of wafers in Holy Communion.

I do not question the legality of such use, nor its convenience and possible expediency under certain special circumstances, as, for instance, at a mission station where suitable bread cannot be obtained.

"But I earnestly commend the preparation of a special loaf, or bread, as the more excellent way in ordinary cases. I submit that (a) *Symbolically* St. Paul's reference to the significance of the "one bread," or "loaf," as pointing to the constitution of many into "one bread and body," through communion in that "one bread," would be inappropriate and without force in application to a multitude of wafers. Mr. Bailg Gould states truly, in a note on p. 207 of his interesting work "Our Inheritance":—"A point was made about all being partakers of one loaf." See Ignat. ad Philad. iv., "One loaf is broken to all; one cup distributed to all." Ad Eph. xx., "With one undivided mind, breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality." (b) *Historically*, the use of wafers is not in accordance with original and primitive usage. They appear to have been introduced about the eleventh or twelfth century. At the Institution, our Lord took "the loaf," or "the bread," to break for distribution. A designation for the Holy Eucharist was "the breaking of the bread." The Council of Toledo, as quoted by the same author, in 693, condemns priests for "cutting off round slices from their common house bread," and the Council insists that "only a whole loaf must be used."

The history of the change to the use of wafer bread in the West, for in the Eastern Church it has never been adopted, seems to be as follows: Though our Lord used unleavened bread at the Institution it was only because that was the bread being used at the Passover, and so the early Christians, both among the Jews and the Gentiles, used the bread that was in ordinary use, that is always leavened. Epiphanius, writing in 368, and describing the peculiarities of the Ebionites, says that "they celebrate the mysteries in imitation of the saints in the Church at Azymes [*i.e.* unleavened cakes], and the other part of the mystery in water only." In the 7th century, "universal use, as it appeared, of leaven, led a writer to assume, as a necessary consequence, that our Lord instituted the Sacrament in leavened bread, and thence to argue that it could not have been instituted on the day of the Passover" (Scudamore, "Notitia Eucharistica," p. 755, quoting John Philoponus). It would seem, however, that the bread for this purpose was made specially, round in shape like a *bum*, and of a size that could easily be broken, yet great importance was attached to its being a whole loaf or cake that was offered. A Canon of the Council of Toledo, in 693, shows that it was obligatory at that time to offer *whole* loaves. The number of

communicants, however, unfortunately, in the Middle Ages, became very few, and this would seem to have been one reason for these loaves being reduced in size, and at length becoming like the present wafer. Honorius of Autun, in 1130, says, "Because from people not communicating it was unnecessary that so large a loaf should be made, it was settled that it should be made like a "denarius," or penny.

With regard to the law and practice of our own branch of the Church, the rubric that guides us is as follows (it is to be found at the end of the Office for Holy Communion):

To take away all occasion of dissension and superstition, which any person hath or might have concerning the Bread and Wine, it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten; but the best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten."

This rubric was inserted in 1552. It will be evident that this rubric was intended "to take away all those scruples which over-conscientious people made about the bread and wine, some deeming it *essential* to have leavened, others *unleavened*," Whately, p. 310. The previous Reformed Prayer Book had ordered that the bread should be "unleavened and round, as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and something larger and thicker than it was, so that it might be aptly divided in divers pieces." When, therefore, this was changed, and the present proviso inserted, "it shall suffice," &c., it must evidently have been meant to *give a choice*, to justify the use of common bread, when there was an *ad-guate* reason for employing it," (Scudamore, p. 750). Bishop Cosin who had much to do with the last revision of the Prayer Book in 1662, says, "Though there was no necessity, yet there was liberty still reserved for the using wafer bread, which was used in divers churches of the kingdom, and Westminster [Abbey] for one, till the seventeenth of K. Charles." In 1559 certain Injunctions took away this liberty and ordered, "for the more reverence to be given to these Holy Mysteries, being the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, that the same sacramental bread be made and formed plain, without any figure thereupon, of the same fineness and fashion round, though somewhat bigger in compass and thickness as the usual bread and wafer."

Archbishop Parker, in a correspondence with the Secretary of State between 1569 and 1570, says: "*It shall suffice*, I expound where either there wanteth such fine bread, or superstitions be feared in the wafer bread, they may have the Communion in usual bread; which is rather a toleration in these two necessities than a plain ordering, as it is in the Injunction. This I say to show you the ground which hath moved me and others to have it in the wafer bread. A matter not greatly material, but only obeying the Queen's Highness; and for that the most part of her subjects disliketh the common bread for the Sacraments." Bishop Andrewes, who died in 1626, used it himself, and assumes its use in his notes to the Prayer Book. Archbishop Laud, on the other hand, often regarded as one of the most extreme of the Bishops since the Reformation in doctrine and practice, said, in 1644, "For wafers, I never either gave or received the Communion but in ordinary bread. At Westminster, I knew it was sometimes used; but as a thing indifferent." It may be noticed that the Calvinists of Geneva, the most ultra of anti-Romanists, continued the use of wafer bread.

To sum up, then, it is evident, I think, that whether we consider it doctrinally or with reference to the laws of our Church, the use of wafers in the Holy Communion is a matter of entire indifference. It ought not to be made a matter of scruple of the conscience on the one side or the other. But those who desire to introduce wafer bread may well earnestly consider before doing so these weighty words of Mr. Scudamore in his "Notitia Eucharistica,"

"looking at the long and general disease of wafer bread, we are morally bound on deciding which kind we ourselves will use, to give unusual weight to every alleged consideration of expedience and charity."

To those who are anxious to follow, as nearly as possible, catholic and primitive custom in this matter, the best course, where it is possible, is undoubtedly to have a special small cake, sufficient for the number of communicants, baked specially—"of the best and finest wheat bread that conveniently can be gotten." The old practice that we have seen in some churches of breaking up the bread into small fragments before it is brought to the church is most undoubtedly wrong, destroying the symbolism of the "one loaf" even more than wafers, and is anything but reverent.

I would very earnestly commend what I have here written on this subject to the consideration of all faithful Church people. If it is thought by some but a small matter upon which to say so much, we must remember that nothing is really a small matter which causes offence through being misunderstood. My one object has been to endeavor to clear away that misunderstanding, and to show that it really is not a matter for which anyone need take offence, as no principle is involved in it. And, at the same time, I would very earnestly advise any who may desire, for some reasons, the adoption of wafers, to pause before they commit themselves to what does cause offence, however unreasonable, to many, for the sake of a practice which cannot be a matter of principle, which our Church clearly leaves open, and which is, to say the least, of very doubtful catholic authority.

HOW TO FILL A VACANT PARISH.

When parishes are vacant, and are looking most earnestly for a rector to supply and terminate the vacancy, may I indicate what seems to me their best and wisest way of proceeding.

Let the vestry of such a parish, from observation of the clergymen whom they know, or from inquiry among their friends, and in consultation with the Bishop, make up their minds who would be the suitable person for them to invite to the rectorship. Then at a regularly summoned vestry meeting let them adopt a resolution that he be so invited, and then instruct their secretary to send this invitation, and to embody in it a clear statement of the amount of salary that is offered, and when and how often the same will be paid. If the clergyman accept the invitation, and the vestry and parish gather about him, to stay up his hands and to cheer him in his work, one may hopefully look for growth and strength there. Loyal and helpful parishioners are wonderful forces for making a dull preacher animated, and for changing a cold and distant minister into a bright and warm hearted pastor. If he do not accept, let another suitable clergyman be fixed upon, and the invitation as before be promptly sent to him. It may be that three or four or more clergymen may each say "No, thank you," to the same call. No matter; this is surely their prerogative, and their reasons for declining must be presumed to be wise and good. The parish is not at all to feel itself slighted or injured because of the declination, and ought cheerily to go right on to call the next best man. Keep vigorously and promptly and cheerfully at this one work of writing, say I to all vacant parishes, until your pastor is secured.

May I frankly add—speaking from my knowledge of how clergymen of the best sort feel, and from my experience in these matters,—that one of the most unwise and improper courses to be pursued is for the vacant parish to ask any clergyman to come and officiate for