

term, "Lord's Supper," as used in the present day, is one of the most misleading expressions in common use. It is now usually applied to the Holy Communion, and in that application of it, would appear to indicate that the Eucharist is a supper in our ordinary use of the term—an evening feast; whereas Holy Scripture distinctly informs us that this Sacrament was instituted "after supper." And moreover, the term "Lord's Supper," as it occurs in the New Testament, does not allude to the Sacrament at all, but to the primitive "love feast," or *agape*; which was, in the early church, sometimes connected with the Sacrament; but most frequently the "love feast" took place in the evening—the Sacrament being, as far as we can learn, celebrated in the morning. Nor was the term "Lord's Supper" ever applied to the Sacrament for several centuries after the close of the New Testament Canon; and therefore the continued use of it in that way is unscriptural, and consequently, wrong.

The phrase, "In the same night," is similarly and strangely misunderstood. As generally applied in the present day, it would seem to indicate what we generally call *night*, in contradistinction to the early morn, as well as to the daytime—as perhaps from nine to twelve at night. Now a little more careful attention to the statements of Holy Scripture would correct this error, as well as many others. The Jewish rendering of the terms used to indicate "night," such as "evening" in Genesis I., &c., "the time of the going down of the sun," and others of a similar character, as we shall further see presently, would be from sunset to sunrise, and would therefore include the period that we should call the early morning. Neither, therefore, of the phrases we have mentioned, will give the least indication as to the exact time when the Holy Communion was first instituted.

It was certainly instituted after Christ and the Twelve had eaten the Passover. On this point, we presume, there will be no dispute. Now the Passover itself was to be killed "between the two evenings," wrongly translated in our version, "in the evening." Although some discussion has taken place in reference to the meaning of this expression, it has been satisfactorily shown from the Talmud that it means "between the evening of one day and the evening of the next." It should help very considerably to come to an understanding of the Jewish mode of expressing the divisions of time, if we compare Exodus 12, 29, &c., with Deut. 16, 6. From the passage in Exodus we learn that Jehovah smote the firstborn of Egypt at midnight, after which the departure took place. So that we cannot hesitate to admit that, in the passage in Deuteronomy, the phrase, "at the going down of the sun," means the whole period of the sun's absence from a particular portion of the earth's surface, including both the late night and the early morning—pretty nearly, in tropical climates, from six to six.

It would therefore appear that the killing, and the eating of the Passover, if both of them were done in the early morning would be more in consonance with the Divine command than at any other time.

As regards the time of the Holy Communion then, even supposing that we were to grant that Christ and His disciples ate the Passover—if they partook of the Paschal feast at all—early in the evening, at six, seven, or eight o'clock, as our modern notions might lead us to suppose—but which is almost certainly inadmissible—even then, if we take the entire statements of the Four Evan-

gelists, it is next to impossible that the Eucharist could have been instituted before that portion of the twenty-four hours which we should call "the morning." It must then have been the first substance taken internally on what we should term, *that day*, by Christ and the Twelve, and would therefore be received fasting—St. Augustine to the contrary, notwithstanding. That eminent Father was but little acquainted with Jewish customs; though, by his writings, he has justly exercised an influence over the Western Church second to none, since the days of St. Paul.

Having, we think, shown that, almost to a moral certainty, the Holy Communion was instituted in the morning, as we should term it, (and also, as we should consider it, fasting) all the nonsense we meet with, in support of evening Communion, from the supposition that it was instituted at that time, falls to the ground. As for the betrayal, in reference to which the expression, "in the night," is used (not in the same night, as our version has it)—that must have been in the morning.

But the main arguments against evening Communion, as some of our correspondents have shown, are far stronger than anything derivable from the time of the first institution. They are, we apprehend, chiefly two; but we have only space at present to indicate them in general terms.

The first is that which has reference to the regard, which every Christian ought to have to the institutions of the Lord Jesus Christ. And can any man be paying that regard who glories in attending to every thing else before he attends to the commands of his Saviour? No Evangelical Christian could possibly object to pay the very highest respect to the institution of his Master. The watchwords "Christ and Him crucified," so often misapplied, should teach us in our day's devotions at least, first of all to attend to the injunctions of Him who was crucified for us. And hence the propriety of fasting Communion—which simply means, paying the highest regard to the institution of Christ.

The second argument would be derived from the fact that the Catholic Church has always condemned evening Communion. The universal practice of the Church is equivalent to a command from her Master. We observe the Lord's Day instead of the Sabbath, solely from an application of this principle. The New Testament has no command for it; and it can scarcely be said that there is any thing but the remotest reference to such a change in any of the Apostolic writings, if indeed there can be said to be any reference to it at all. The first definite allusion to it is in the epistle of St. Ignatius, where he recommends "not to Sabbatize, but to keep the Lord's Day." The condemnation of evening Communion, till very recent times, was all but universal; and hence the almost absolute authority of the Church against it. No Churchman therefore can be undecided in the matter; and as, with the exception of a few heretics, evening Communion were unknown to the Church, till recent times, the practice is as great an innovation as the dogma of the Immaculate Conception or that of the Infallibility.

RELIGIOUS LONDON.

If religious London, as is sometimes said, is the reflection of the religious life of the country, the kind of services most esteemed in London will be a matter of considerable interest both to the residents in town and country. For a knowledge of this Mackeson's *Annual Guide to the Churches of London and its Suburbs* is a most trustworthy instructor. In

its more complete form it has appeared for eleven years, so that we are now enabled to compare the state of things in 1869 with those existing in 1879. At the former of these periods there were 620 Churches in London; in the latter 872, an increase of 252. Moderate High Churchmanship may be considered represented by weekly Holy Communion, early Holy Communion, daily service, surpliced choirs, and surplice in pulpit. Weekly Holy Communion was celebrated in 164 Churches in 1869, and in 409 in 1879. Early Holy Communion had increased from 135 to 478, daily service from 113 to 245, surpliced choirs from 114 to 375, and surplice in pulpit from 83 to 470. Those opinions commonly called "Ritualistic" may be taken to be distinguished by daily Holy Communion, Incense, Eucharistic vestments, and altar lights. Of these, in 1869 there was daily Holy Communion in 11 Churches, and in 48 in 1879. Incense was used in 8 Churches at the former period, and in 13 at the latter. The use of Eucharistic vestments had increased from 14 to 33, altar lights from 36 in 1874 (no previous statistics are given) to 56 in 1879. The only specific Low Church practice enunciated is that of Evening Communion, and these have increased from 65 in 1869 to 262 in 1879. Shorter services had been adopted in 89 Churches, in 151 a Dedication Festival was observed, and in 214 the eastward position is used in the celebration of the Holy Communion. A weekly offertory is the practice in 387 Churches, in 270 the seats are "free and open," and no less than 123 are open continually for purposes of private prayer. From the above particulars the character of the services in London Churches may be fairly estimated. Those usually denominated moderate High Church may be said to prevail in about one-half, moderate Low Church is rather less than a third, and those distinctively "Ritualistic" is about a twentieth of the Churches in the metropolis and its suburbs.

LENT.

The Season of Lent has been, for many centuries, set apart by the Church of Christ as a time of special self-denial and abstinence. It extends from Ash Wednesday to Easter Eve, and has forty days, not counting the Sundays, which are always Festivals.

The forty days, as we are reminded in the Collect for the first Sunday in Lent, are kept in remembrance of our Lord's forty days' fast in the wilderness. The Church of England desires her children so to keep them.

There are some people who fancy that such abstinence is not consistent with the free spirit of the Gospel. But they must surely forget that our Lord, in His Sermon on the Mount, speaks of fasting just as He speaks of prayer, and gives directions as to the manner in which men are to fast, if they wish it to be a real part of their devotion. (Matt. vi. 16-18.) And in like manner, when His disciples were reproached with not fasting, Jesus said, "The days will come when the Bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast." The Bridegroom is now for a season, taken from the Bride, and she must fast and watch and pray, and long for His appearing.

And besides, our Lord taught his disciples that great spiritual power could be obtained only through prayer and fasting. When He cast out devils, and His disciples could not, He told them: "This kind goeth not out, but by prayer and fasting."

The question of fasting, therefore, is quite settled for all who receive our Lord's teaching. If we want to be His disciples in deed and in truth, we must try to be so in His way. No one can tell us what a Christian is to be, or what he ought to do, but Christ, and those who are taught by Him.

We will not here cite many instances of what Christians in every age have said on this subject, but will

give but one who is much unfortunately. The Rev. Jolmons: "The way to prays."

Well, but s at particular fast just when

Because in neglect fasting, times for pray pray—what w

Some, perh: Some do live: presence of G: up the practic

It would be Perhaps most all, and would lose the blessing

Have we no to break, no p: habits which v: have more spit: temptation, to Him and to be

Well, then, v: stinence, and v: Church has ap

How then sh

1. First of al: We do not fast: fast that we m: because we fas

We fast that world may hav: spiritual things: We deny ourse: and sensual, at: of sin.

2. Then, agai: by fasting.

Poor people: their food. De: But everybody, alteration in thei: off some luxury

3. But we can: be self-denying:

(1.) We can c: are not absolute

(2.) We can a: or as much as is: larger amount o: tion and medita: ture, and the pu

(3.) We can e: of God and the: tempt ourselves:

We can teach, o: work for Christ's

4. We can giv: which we save b: the fast which G:

Let us think v: ask: What can I: heartily, regular: the sacrifice, if it: it. And when L: worldliness and

day that our L: ning, and not th: Lent, so kept will

Copies Church Book at: on application to: E.O. Price 25 c