

"through the Apostles, and in honour of so great a Sacrament, that into the mouth of a Christian the Lord's body should enter before any other food; and this custom is observed throughout the world." (Ep. 118, c. 6.) This will suffice to show what was the rule of the Church for the first 400 years. I do not say that these writings are authorities, but they are witnesses of what the Church generally held on this matter.

Bingham enumerates seven councils which were held in different parts of the Church between the end of the fourth century and the end of the seventh, in which Canons were enacted to guard and enforce the Church's rule of fasting Communion. The words of the first of these councils were given in my previous letter, and may serve as a sample of the rest.

The Penitentials of the Anglo-Saxon Church bear witness to the same rule and prescribe penance as for a sin, for any breach of it.

"Whosoever shall eat before he go to Housel, and after that partake of the Housel, let him fast seven days."—Archb. Egbert, A.D. 740.

"Let a man fast according to the decision of the Canon before he go to Housel."—Ibid.

"And we enjoin, that no one unfasting taste of the Housel unless it be for extreme sickness."—Can. in King Edgar's reign, A.D. 960. Anglo-Saxon witness by Rev. J. Baron.

The Sarum Liturgy continued the Use of the Church of England down to the reformation of the Church of office books under Edward VI. Whilst there is no rubric in the Sarum Use that enjoins fasting on the communicants generally, yet the whole tenor of the service seems to imply this. The rubric with respect to a priest who had to celebrate twice in one day, reads thus:—"But when any priest is obliged to celebrate twice in one day, then at the first celebration he ought not to take any portion of the ablutions but to place them in the customary, or at least in some clean vessel until the end of the second celebration, and then he should take both the ablutions together." This is sufficient to prove that the Church had a defined rule with respect to fasting Communion from the Apostolic age down to the Reformation.

But Mr. Burritt declaims against traditions and customs, and quotes triumphantly our blessed Lord's rebuke to the Pharisees as recorded in St. Mark vii., in condemnation of such. But the two cases are not parallel. Some of the traditions of the Pharisees may have been wrong, but does it therefore follow that all tradition must be wrong. He might as well reject all Scripture, because some Scriptures are Apocryphal. The Pharisees prayed standing at the corners of the streets; are we not to pray at all? They disfigured their faces when they fasted; are we therefore never to fast? They sounded a trumpet before them when they gave alms; are we therefore never to give alms? But whilst Mr. B. denounces tradition, is he not at the same time a traditionalist himself? Undoubtedly he is. To cite but one instance. He observes (ostensibly at least) the first day of the week as the Lord's Day, instead of the seventh. And on what authority? Certainly not on any Scripture warrant. There is no command in the New Testament to keep holy the seventh, much less to keep holy the first day of the week. He must therefore base his practice on evidence external to the New Testament itself. In short, he must do so on the authority of the Church. Yet this is tradition. And if the authority of the Church is sufficient in the latter case, why not also in regard to receiving the Eucharist fasting. The two cases are alike. No Scripture rule, but Apostolic custom. I am aware that the English Church does not mention this subject in her canons, but that does not justify any one in giving no heed to it. The Church of England is bound by the Canons of the Universal Church, except where she has made a special canon of her own. Being silent on this matter she means her people to abide by that which is the Catholic custom. She says in the 80th canon that it was "far from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they had fallen."

But Mr. B. has recourse to the 89 articles by which he endeavours to bolster up his position. As to his reference to Art. 6, I never said that fasting Communion was necessary to salvation. Again, as to his quotation from Art. 24, I fail to see how fasting Communion can be "repugnant to God's Word," when it is not, directly or indirectly, forbidden therein. And here let me point out that Mr. B. has made an unfair use of this article. Why does he stop short at "so that nothing be ordained against God's Word?" Why not also quote the eleven lines that follow? Because, manifestly against him. Here they are:—"Whosoever through his private judgment willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like,) as he that of-

fendeth against the the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren." The English Church, then, so far from rejecting all tradition, as Mr. B. would try to make it appear, has rather guarded "the traditions" pretty strongly.

If, as has been shown, fasting Communion was, and had been, all along up to the Reformation, a tradition of the Church, and one not repugnant to God's Word; then, fasting Communion was probably one of "the traditions" contemplated in this 34th Article. Art. 20 teaches that it is not lawful to "so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another." How will Mr. B. reconcile his interpretation of St. Mark vii., with 2 Thess. ii., 15:—"Therefore brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle. Again, 2 Thess. iii., 6:—"Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he has received of us." Now this language shows conclusively, first, that there were traditional "customs" in the Apostolic Church, sanctioned and set on foot by the Apostles themselves; and secondly, that every right minded Christian was in duty bound to observe them, even if they did not quite coincide with his private judgment. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God."

Mr. B. denies that the Church of England at the Reformation appealed to Primitive Antiquity. I think the Book of Common Prayer contains sufficient evidence to refute this and to establish that she did so appeal. "Here you have an order of Prayer, and for the reading of Scripture, much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers." (Concerning the service of the Church.) Again, the preface to the Ordinal reads: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, Deacons." The Church does not here assert that Holy Scripture alone makes the threefold order evident. Scripture only gives intimations to that effect. Scripture, then, not by itself, but read in the light of "Ancient Authors" makes it evident. I might produce evidence from other authorized documents of the Church; but this will suffice to prove the ground taken in my former letter, in this particular, as the true and proper one.

Mr. B. has endeavoured to make it appear from 1 Cor. xi., 19-22, that St. Paul styled fasting Communion, "heresy." But I do not see how St. Paul could have meant any such thing. Christ and His Apostles fasted. Fasting, then, in itself, cannot be wrong, much less be called "heresy." How, then, can receiving the Eucharist fasting, be characterized as heresy? Much rather is it an act of reverence to so receive. I may be wrong, but it appears to me that it was the divisions of the Corinthians which St. Paul called "heresies." "I hear that there be divisions among you, and I partly believe it. For there must be heresies among you" (v. 18, 19). They came together "not for the better, but for the worse." They profaned the Lord's Table with their own feasts—some were "drunken." Whereupon St. Paul exclaims, "What? Have ye not houses to eat and drink in?"

I find this astounding statement in Mr. B.'s letter, "Nowhere in the New Testament is that ordinance" (the Holy Communion) "spoken of other than as the 'Supper.'" This is an incorrect statement as may appear from Acts ii., 42: "And they continued steadfastly, in the breaking of bread." And again, Acts xv., 7: "And on the first day of the week when the Disciples came together to break bread."

Let me conclude by citing the counsel given by Biddad to Job—counsel which we should all do well to heed: "Inquire, I pray thee, of the former age and prepare thyself to the search of their fathers (for we are but of yesterday, and know nothing). Shall not they teach thee, and tell thee, and utter words out of their hearts?" (Job viii., 8-10.)

Yours faithfully,

W. P. SWEATMAN.

Pembroke, 9th March, 1880.

EUROPEAN CHAPLAINS.

DEAR SIR,—I send you the following extract from "Mission Life" (published by S. P. G.) which reveals a state of affairs in the case of Continental Chaplains so like the condition of many of our own clergy that I think you may possibly consider it worth insertion in the DOMINION CHURCHMAN. The paper referred to is

in February number, and is a continuation of a former article of great interest and importance.

I remain,

Yours truly,

J. W. BURKE.

Belleville, March 13th, 1880.

It seem the chaplains are exposed to severe trials from the action of committees or trustees who base their power on a claim to own the buildings used for Divine Service, and also to hold the purse strings by which chaplain's salary is paid. The article goes on to say:—

"With regard to the buildings they are in many cases mere hired rooms; in others they are buildings specially erected for the purpose; while some are consecrated churches or chapels; but I believe that in almost every case the tenure of the building is, more or less in the hands of the congregation or committee, who are responsible for the rents or for debts upon the building, and who consequently, in some instances, cannot dissociate from their official position the idea that they are landlords, or owners, and have some sort of proprietary right which gives them a hold over the chaplain and his services. Being not unfrequently commercial men, and holding shares such as docks, railways, or theatres, they perhaps not unnaturally imagine that the Church should be carried on with some view to profit. If the chaplain succeed in drawing good congregations, and thereby securing increased pew rents, he may be allowed to conduct the services as he chooses. If otherwise, well, he had better look out for another place. On this state of things it is needless to comment. An example occurs to the writer where the committee having taken an idea into their heads, and the chaplain declining to see it in the same light, they first threatened to close the Church, and then actually locked the doors in his face, and he had to break them open by the aid of a locksmith in order to perform service in the Church for which he held the Bishop's license. These are fortunately rare and extreme instances; but without going to this length and subjecting themselves to legal process, the committee as at present constituted have, if so disposed, the choice of many ways by which to drive the chaplain out of the place. They may harass him with regard to his services, they may find fault with his views, or with his manner and delivery; they may object to his intoning the service, to his chanting the Psalms, to his using the surplice in preaching, to his making collections for charitable purposes, to his taking a holiday in the summer, to his teaching the catechism, to his reading the Athanasian creed and the Communion service; they may traduce him as a "Ritualist," a "Puseyite," or a "Jesuit in disguise;" persuade the ignorant members of the congregation that he is trying to lead them over to Rome, and that his wish to have baptisms performed in the Church, and to have the bodies of deceased persons brought to the Church, and his insisting on marriages and churchings being performed in the Church, are all so many examples of his sinister designs, and are plainly indicative of "Sacredotalism," and "Ecclesiasticism," and "Sacramentarianism," and *omne quod exiit in ism.*"

Another trial arises from the chaplain's salary being paid by or through these trustees or committees, and is illustrated by the following anecdote:—"In speaking to him these persons do not scruple to inform their pastor that he is their salaried employe, and is dependent on them for his maintenance, and that of his family."

"Who are your masters?" said one of these gentry to a chaplain of high standing, M. A. Oxon, and of distinguished scholarship. Who are your masters? asked the committee man. Well, replied the chaplain, One is my master. To God, the Queen, and my Bishop I acknowledge allegiance. Oh, no, quote the other, we are your masters, and so you'll find when quarter day comes! And so he did, for the committee kept back his salary for six weeks, and then mulcted him for fifteen per cent. loss on the exchange, besides a claim of three pounds for back insurance tax.

If the chaplain ventures to remonstrate, or expostulate, or appeal, he is "thin skinned," "quarrelsome," "ill-tempered," "unchristian," &c., and the reply which his appeal receives is probably that he should "keep his temper," and use "tact and conciliation," in other words that he should "grin and bear it."

My God, my Father, while I stray
Far from my home, in life's rough way,
O teach me from my heart to say—
"Thy will be done!"

If Thou should'st call me to resign
What most I prize, it ne'er was mine;
I only yield Thee what was Thine—
"Thy will be done!"

Morn after
sward,
A tiny soul
guise
And timid
For uninvited
A daily bar
Is made a
frost
And snow
return.
Repay me
From some

Of sombre
breast
'Tis some
state
Of winter
That warm
our
For through
time
There com
der pai
Of how the
earth,
(Which veil
see her
When One
life.

The agonie
chill,
The twin
pierced
And not a
ease.
The men
stone,
At misery
A tiny bird
ven,
To show th
To sympath

How tender
Withdrew a
brow,
Or how it
Which tore
vain!
But on that
warmly
With indign
A drop of
The stamp

'Tis thus
hue
Has marked
us
A lesson—
things
Which walk
made
The ministr
Win their b
blood—
Which seals

Whose thric
crowns,
And strikes
pain
Than any n
to shan
And crucify.

ARCH
DIE

James U
learned Arch
interesting
was original
chaplain, D
has been rec
Rev. R. B.
cester. Fro
lect the follo
Only a fe
St. Donat's
protection a
of King Cha
were interr
in which a v