

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

N. B.—If any one has a good thought, or a Christian sentiment, or has facts, or deductions from facts, useful to the Church, and to Churchmen, we would solicit their statement in brief and concise letters in this department.

Unfermented Wine.

SIR,—Your Montreal correspondent does lay to heart resolution two of the Lambeth Conference in 1888: so much so that he has refused to consecrate, where unfermented wine is used. All the same, he maintains his right to follow the precedent of *Athanasius contra mundum*, and "lays to heart" with profound regret the ruling of the Pan-Anglican Conference.

18th May, 1892.

"L. S. T."

PASSOVER WINE.

Recipe of a Jewish Rabbi.

"Boil old Malaga or Muscatel raisins in water, in the proportion of one pound of the former to one quart of the latter, gently down to one pint; strain off the wine, and bottle."—Extract from *Clergyman's Magazine*, March, 1883, by Norman Kerr, M.D., F.L.S.

THE WINE USED BY THE LORD AND HIS DISCIPLES IN THE ORIGINAL INSTITUTION OF THE SACRAMENT.

It is generally, if not universally, admitted by even the most strenuous advocates for the use of intoxicating wine as a communion wine, that the Lord took the Passover cup when He administered the Last Supper; therefore the question as to the quality of the wine used at the Passover at the time the Lord was on earth, becomes a very important one.

In a recent work (1879) written by a Jewish Rabbi, the Rev. E. M. Myers, entitled "The Jews, their Customs and Ceremonies, with a full account of all their Religious Observances from the Cradle to the Grave," we read that among the strictly orthodox Jews, "During the entire festival (of the Passover) no leavened food nor fermented liquors are permitted to be used, in accordance with Scriptural injunctions" (Ex. xii. 15, 19, 20; Deut. xvii. 3, 4). This we think settles the question so far as the orthodox Jews are concerned; and their customs, without much question, represent those prevailing at the time of our Lord's advent.

The editor of the *London Methodist Times* lately witnessed the celebration of the Jewish Passover in that city, and at the close of the service said to the rabbi: "May I ask with what kind of wine you have celebrated the Passover this evening?" The answer promptly given was:

"With a non-intoxicating wine. Jews never use fermented wine in their synagogue services, and must not use it on the Passover, either for synagogue or home purposes. Fermented liquor of any kind comes under the category of 'leaven,' which is proscribed in so many well-known places in the Old Testament. The wine which is used by the Jews during the week of Passover is supplied to the community by those licensed by the chief rabbi's board, and by those only. Each bottle is sealed in the presence of a representative of the ecclesiastical authorities. The bottle standing yonder on the side-board from which the wine used to-night was taken was thus sealed. I may also mention that poor Jews who cannot afford to buy this wine make an unfermented wine of their own, which is nothing else but an infusion of Valencia or Muscatel raisins. I have recently read the passage in Matthew in which the Paschal Supper is described. There can be no doubt whatever that the wine used upon that occasion was unfermented. Jesus, as an observant Jew, would not only not have drunk fermented wine on Passover, but would not have celebrated the Passover in any house from which everything fermented had not been removed. I may mention that the wine I use in the service at the synagogue is an infusion of raisins. You will allow me, perhaps, to express my surprise that Christians, who profess to be followers of Jesus of Nazareth, can take what He could not possibly have taken as a Jew—intoxicating wine—at so sacred a service as the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

Superannuation Fund.

SIR,—I have watched anxiously for some response to the Bishop of Algoma's appeal on behalf of a fund for the Superannuation of the Clergy of his diocese, and so far, beyond its eliciting some expressions of sympathy and regret, with perhaps a little surprise that such a fund was not already in existence, no practical steps have seemingly been taken to form even a beginning for the same. Need we wonder that there should be a more than ordinary difficulty

in filling those empty missions in poor Algoma, and that for the sake of his diocese, as much as on behalf of that band of self-sacrificing, devoted men who minister therein, its Bishop has had to come once more, hat in hand, as it were, to plead their cause—this time, apparently, without the slightest result? And, oh! how it must pain and humiliate, and rasp and jar—day, almost paralyse the mental and spiritual powers of chief pastor and clergy alike that God's people cannot see the position for themselves, and spare them the painful necessity of pleading as mendicants, for what, in other dioceses, where there are no such hardships to be encountered nor self-denials daily endured, this provision for the old age of their clergy is looked upon as one of common humanity and simple justice. It has been said that "there is and ever will be a mystery about how the clergy live to the average layman. How the Israelites managed to get along in the wilderness was a mystery to the nations who opposed their march through the desert. . . . Some suppose that a clergyman can multiply the cruse of oil and the handful of meal by some pious incantation; if not, then how can a man live, much less save for old age or incapacity, who has nothing or next to nothing to live on, and then there is such a strange and bewildering uncertainty as to when he is to receive it." It was Dr. Paxton Hood who remarked, "what being in the world is so utterly helpless as an aged, worn out, poverty stricken minister. He can't steal, being a minister; he can't beg; and no one will hire him as a clerk. . . . Somewhere down East they told their new pastor: 'We hope the Lord will make you humble; we will keep you poor.' The only reason I can see why they are not at once taken to heaven is, that our merciful Father leaves them here to cultivate justice, humanity, and love among the people."

Now, sir, the 29th of June next will be the anniversary of the consecration of Algoma's devoted Bishop. Could any way of making that day, so fraught with benefits to that child of the Canadian Church, be more acceptable to him, whose crowning act of self-sacrifice in cutting himself adrift from all that made life so desirable, and in taking upon himself a burden of responsibility none but a God-given strength and patience could have enabled him to support, than in making it our opportunity to give a practical response to his earnest plea on behalf of his clergy? Let this response take the form of a general thank-offering, which, though made up of many very small individual gifts, may yet, collectively, not only have its significance as marking our gratitude to God for giving Algoma such a Bishop, but be in itself of such a value in hard cash that the superannuation fund for the clergy may have a very substantial foundation stone laid for future building upon in years to come. I humbly offer this as a suggestion to the Churchmen and Churchwomen of our Dominion, and if the energetic secretaries of the several diocesan branches of the Women's Auxiliary would invite these thank-offerings, and co-operate in the work, I venture to hope that henceforth the 29th of June may have a double cause for its joyous celebration in Algoma itself and amongst Algoma's friends. Thanking you, sir, for letting me have my little "say" upon this subject.

SHEVA.

London, Ont., 17th May, 1892.

Divine Didactics.

SIR,—Will the editor of the *CANADIAN CHURCHMAN* kindly allow me to thank him very much for his able article on "Divine Didactics" in the issue of 12th of May. We do not hesitate to say that it has helped us a good deal. We are afraid the sermons of the late Bishop of Pennsylvania (Wm. Bacon Stevens, who preached before the Pan-Anglican Synod in 1878) are not well known in Canada—we are certain they are not. In No. 7 of the vol. published by E. P. Dutton & Co., of New York, that upon the text John xxi. 22, we find the following: "What if science, as at present understood, and the Bible do not agree? Shall we be troubled thereat? I trow not. I rejoice to know that what is termed modern science and the Bible do not agree. I should be sorry if they did. Modern science is changeable—the Bible is unchangeable. The science of to-day is not the science of last year, and will not be the science of the next. The Bible of to-day is the Bible of all the Christian centuries, and will be a thousand years hence just what it was nearly eighteen hundred years ago, when the Canon of Scripture was closed. Mark the changes which have taken place along the whole line of science since the beginning of this nineteenth century. What a catastrophe, then, would it have been had it been proved that the Bible and science as known at the beginning of this century fully agreed! that all the assertions of the Bible could be quadrated with the facts of science as then understood! The great tidal waves of science which have rolled over the world since, would have left the Bible stranded and ruined. And so now, could it be made clear to-day that every truth in the Bible ac-

cords with the received facts of science, what would become of the Bible fifty years hence, when science will have moved on with even more rapid strides, and left behind more wrecks of theories and more stranded speculations? In the meanwhile, the Bible stand, still in the solitary grandeur of its own perfection. It waits, as the ages roll on, for confirmation and acceptance. It was said by one of old, 'God is patient, because He is eternal,' and the Bible, as the book of the God of truth, has this attribute of its divine Author. Its strength is to sit still. It goes not out hastily to meet a half-formed science and embrace it as an ally, lest it should turn into a foe. It calmly tarries in the consciousness of its own truth as the advances of science come nearer and nearer; and every advance of true science does bring it nearer to the Bible. The opposition to that Bible comes only from a class whose utterances St. Paul has justly characterized as 'the profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science falsely so called.' True science, like the wise men of the East, brings to the holy Jesus its magian gifts, and bows adoringly at His feet. Science, falsely 'so called,' like Herod, asks hypocritically of the same wise men, 'Where is the new-born Jesus? but asks not to worship, but to destroy; not to crown Him king, but to massacre with a sword.'

After all, what have these questions between religion and science really to do with your salvation? They are questions which cannot be settled, because science is not settled; and science will not be settled, so long as there is an undiscovered fact in nature, or an inquiring mind in man. The one thing for you to do is to follow Jesus. All other questions will adjust themselves; but unless you follow Him, you must be forever lost. Ought we not to be very grateful that God has seen fit to give us Bishops who make a study of the Word from a wide point of view—we must often suffer were it not for our Bishops. There are, however, a good many who seem to ignore the writings of Bishops unless they just agree with their peculiar ideas.

C. A. FRENCH.

Confirmation by a Priest.

SIR,—In your last paper the question is asked, "Is Confirmation by a Priest ever allowed in the Roman Church?" Here is the answer by Dr. Mullock, late Roman Catholic Bishop of Newfoundland: "Dr. O'Donnell was at first only Prefect Apostolic, that is, a priest exercising Episcopal jurisdiction, and generally having, like the Prefect Apostolic of St. Peter's, the right of giving Confirmation, which, as we see by the practice of the Greek Catholic Church, is not essentially an Episcopal Sacrament, if I may call it so." I called the attention of the Bishop of Toronto to this six or seven years ago.

It has been the practice to re-confirm the Irish Roman Catholic converts received into the Church in Ireland. Some of the English clergy ventured to censure the proceeding, which called forth Dr. Stopford, the late Archdeacon of Meath, who furnished able arguments drawn from Canon law, ancient and modern, Roman and English, in favor of the course which the Irish prelates pursued. Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, was in the habit of administering Confirmation to converts from Romanism, but on different grounds from those of Dr. Stopford. Bishop Hopkins says that what passes for Confirmation in the Romish Church, is not such, in fact, because it wants the genteel form of the *laying on of hands*.

Bingham, in his "Scholastic History of Lay Baptism," undertakes to show the necessity of supplying the defects of heretical and schismatical baptism by Confirmation, of imposition of hands and prayer, upon men's reconciliation and returning to the Catholic Church, in proof of which he says:—"That imposition of hands was thought so necessary for heretics upon their return, that even those who had received it before in their heretical baptism, received it again when they were reconciled to the Church."

Two of your correspondents have written on the "Primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury," and "What is to be the Future of the Church in Canada?" In the year 1634, an Order in Council was made by Charles I. at the instance of Archbishop Laud, which, while it secured a somewhat indefinite spiritual supervision of the plantations and factories established by English merchants, did more to prevent the full development of the Church's system and the establishment of Episcopacy in the Western World, than any ordinance which meets us in the pages of our ecclesiastical history. I refer to the order by which members of the Church of England in the Colonies, and in foreign parts, were placed under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. This system prevailed to this very day where jurisdiction has not been given to some regularly commissioned bishop. The Church of England congregation of the French Island of St. Pierre, distant only seven miles from Newfoundland, is subject to the episcopal order of the Bishop of London, and the clergyman officiating there holds his license direct from that dignitary.