

nonsense in our heads still, and the sooner we recognize the difference between the trumpeters on their own account, and the men who are anxious for the welfare of the Church the better. The Methodists and the Presbyterians look after their men, but it is not so with the Church of England in Canada. No wonder the Archbishop of Canterbury made the speech he did make, and no wonder one western Bishop could not get a single man in England. If the papers do not take this matter up the cause is lost, I know where there will be a greater "Exodus," if things are allowed to "drift" much longer.

Yours, TRAVELLER.

THE "CANADIAN MISSIONARY."

SIR,—Will you permit me to direct the attention of the clergy and others to the use of the *Canadian Missionary* as an excellent parochial for localizing as a parish magazine. It is proposed to use it in our parish next year, and in response to enquiries the following table of cost, &c. was received. It contains information which may be useful to others also, and I shall therefore be glad if you will kindly insert it for the benefit of your readers and the cause of parochial literature.

Yours, etc.,
PRINTERS' INK.

THE CANADIAN MISSIONARY AS A PAROCHIAL MAGAZINE.

	(Cost per Annum)	50	100	150	200	300
1. The Canadian Missionary (General Issue)		\$12	\$20	\$30	\$40	\$60
2. The same paper with change of name to make it a local paper		\$15	\$24	\$34	\$44	\$64
3. The same paper with Localized name and cover. 2 pages standing matter. 1 "new matter each month		\$40	\$50	\$60	\$70	\$90
4. Same paper with Localized name and cover		\$60	\$70	\$80	\$90	\$110
2 pages standing matter. 1 "new matter each month						
5. Same paper without cover, but with Localized name and 1st page filled with matter furnished by subscriber or local editor		\$30	\$40	\$50	\$60	\$80
6. Same as plan 5, but with 1st and 16th pages filled by matter with local editor		\$50	\$60	\$70	\$80	\$100

In plans 3 and 4 the standing matter might be in the form of standing parish notices of services, &c., and advertisements, which by a little exertion on the part of the members of the guild or parochial association, might be made to produce from \$40 to \$75.

Read the article on parochial missions. Address Box 259, Toronto.

PUZZLED.

SIR,—Your correspondent, X. Y. Z., in your issue of 8th inst., confesses himself "sorely puzzled" about the Lord's Table being called by High Churchmen an "Altar;" and begs us to let him know the reason why. He writes in so candid and earnest a tone, as to enlist one's sympathies: for most of us have passed through the "puzzled" stage, I trow. Let me then, as a brother priest, (X. Y. Z. may interpret this term as he will), endeavour to show him the line of thought which led me out of the maze, and induced me to accept the term "Altar" as—not the substitute but—the alternative of "The Lord's Table." For we do not object to this latter name; on the contrary, we complain that it is *not used*. If my brother will observe carefully, he will rarely hear it, even among Evangelicals. What he will generally hear—what I venture to think he himself would generally use, is:—"The Communion Table." Now this term we do object to: it is not the language of Scripture, nor of the Prayer-book; and besides, it is meaningless. The word "Communion" (as X. Y. Z. knows from his Greek Testament) is simply the equivalent of "partaking," or "participation." Every family dining-table is a "partaking" table. When men talk of the "Communion" Table, we would ask, Communion of what? (1 Cor. x. 16). X. Y. Z. does not, however, in his letter, make this mistake: he uses the proper term;—"The Lord's Table." But he does not see how "Lord's Table" and "Altar" can be used of one and the same thing. Such a difficulty, however, would never have occurred to the minds of any of St. Paul's converts, whether they had been Jews or heathens. The Jews read in their Scriptures, (Ezekiel xli. 22), "The altar of wood was three cubits high. . . . This is the Table that is before the Lord," and again, (Malachi i. 7):—"Ye offer polluted bread upon mine Altar. . . . in that ye say The Table of the Lord

is contemptible." Now, how comes it to pass that in these passages the words "Lord's Table" and "Altar," refer to the same article of Temple furniture? Our difficulty will vanish if we remember that there were two distinct parts in every sacrifice, viz., the Offering, and the Consumption of the victim.

1. "The offering" of the victim.—This did not necessarily mean the *slaughtering*: that was done "at the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation;" and often by the worshipper himself (see Levit. ch. i. iii. iv. &c.). The "offering" was especially the Priests' work, and consisted in presenting and offering the flesh and the blood of the victim—separately—on the Altar, which was quite a distance from the "Door of the Tabernacle of the congregation."

2. The "Consumption" of the victim.—This was sometimes effected by a "whole burnt offering"—sometimes by the priest partaking (communicating), sometimes by the worshipper partaking (communicating) of the "sacrifice." When the "sacrifice" was "offered" to God, the article of furniture upon which it was offered was the "Altar:" when the priest or the worshipper "partook" of the sacrifice, that Altar became the *Lord's Table*. So also, even among the heathen. When sacrifices were offered to heathen gods, (which in Christian eyes were only "devils"), and afterwards "partaken of," such Altars were called by the Apostles "The tables of devils." (1 Cor. x. 20). Now, if my brother, X. Y. Z., will bear all this in mind, that in all sacrifices, whether heathen, Jewish or Christian, the *slaughtering* of the victim was one thing, the *offering* another thing, and the *consumption* still another thing: he will see a force and beauty in St. Paul's reasoning (1 Cor. ch. viii-x) which he never saw before. He will see why the Apostle "drags in" the Lord's Table when he is arguing about "meats sacrificed to idols." He will see what the inspired writer meant when he said, (Heb. xiii. 10) "We have an Altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle." He will understand, as he never did before, the language of 1 Cor. ix. 13, "They which wait at the Altar are partakers with (communicants of) the Altar." And, also, (1 Cor. x. 18); "Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers (communicants) of the Altar?" Here let me insist, as strongly as I am sure X. Y. Z. would do, that there is only—that there was only—that there ever will be only "one perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world;" and that was the actual death of our Blessed Lord upon the Altar of the Cross. All other sacrifices, whether before or since that death, are such only in relation to that one true and perfect sacrifice as "showing it forth." But, just as

"All the blood of beasts
On Jewish Altars slain."

(which, by the way, is not correct, for the "beasts" were not "slain" on the "Altars"); just as all the Jewish sacrifices showed forth the Lord's death until He came "in great humility": so all Christian Eucharists show it forth until He comes again "in His glorious majesty." The one series of sacrifices looked forward; the other looked back as well as forward.

Let me add that this view of the "sacrifice," and the "Feast upon the sacrifice" (1 Cor. v. 7, 8), gives a significance and force to our Lord's atoning death, and to the whole doctrine of the Incarnation, which I cannot enlarge upon here, but which, let me assure my brother, is well worth his study. As to the word Altar not appearing in the Prayer-book. Our reformers were theologians; but they had to deal with cranks. They used a "middle term," which was acceptable to all parties, Puritan and Catholic, alike. They knew well enough that the term "Lord's Table" involved the idea of "altar;" and they took good care that the "Offering" should be made which would constitute it an altar, (see the "Offertory" with its rubrics, and the term "oblations" in the prayer for the Church militant). They knew that the Altar off which men "partook" became thereby the Lord's Table; so they avoided the term which was objectionable to the "weaker brethren." No matter what shape the article of Church furniture may be; if it is only a three-legged stool, the moment anything is "offered" to God thereon, it becomes an "Altar." And if we "partake" or "communicate," of that which has been "offered" thereon, that "Altar," whether of wood or stone, becomes then and there the Table of the Lord.

G. J. L.

LORD SELBORNE ON DISESTABLISHMENT.

LETTER V.

SIR,—The various augmentation funds of the Church and modern gifts are next treated by Lord Selborne, and

I. *Queen Anne's Bounty*.—For the maintenance of the Crusades the Pope took from his bishoprics as they fell vacant the first year's revenue, first-fruits, and from other livings as well, in addition to which, a rateable annual tax was levied called *Tenth*.

Though the Crusades came to an end, these exactions did not, but they changed pockets, being by Act of Parliament granted to Henry VIII. Queen Anne gave them back to the Church in 1704 at the instance of Bishop Burnet. They were never put to any good use, being mostly bestowed as pensions upon favorites. In 1886 they amounted to £14,409. 8s. 8d. The fund is now largely employed for loans to the clergy in building parsonages and securing appliances for the cultivation of their glebes, as well as for the augmentation of poor livings, conditional, however, upon larger or equal amounts being provided by private gift or contribution. The Lib. Soc. represents all the income of the Board—another appetite-whether. In 1886 the income was £167,147 8s. 8d.

II. *The Ecclesiastical Commissioners*.—In 1884 a royal commission inaugurated an improved management of Episcopal or capitular estates, and a better distribution of their revenues. Incomes were then fixed at their present amounts, the surplus forming a common fund which has been principally devoted to the augmentation of poor benefices, especially in the larger populations, and under the same conditions as Queen Anne's Bounty. Between 1840 and 1885 the commissioners endowed or augmented the endowments of 5,800 benefices, the total value of their parts in various forms for this purpose amounting to £739,000 per annum in perpetuity. By this outlay private benefactions were called out whose capitalised value is £4,580,000, or £151,000 per annum. For the five years ending 1884, a single item shows as capital of their grants £171,738, and in annual sums £15,475 per annum, to meet private benefactions amounting altogether to £738,473. In the present year they contemplated an appropriation equivalent to a capital of £450,000 to meet private benefactions. And all this, be it remembered, is strictly the Church's own property.

III. *Parliamentary Grants*.—In 1818 a million stg. was granted by Act of Parliament for new churches in populous places, and another half million in 1824, of which sums the Established Church of Scotland had a part. These grants were generally met by private contributions, as out of 127 churches and chapels assisted between 1830 and 1840, but 22 had their whole cost defrayed by the common forms.

IV. Nothing need be said of *Church Rates* save that now while all parishioners have a right to the use of the Church and burying-ground, the burden of providing and preserving them is thrown upon Churchmen alone.

V. There is no general knowledge of what was done between the Reformation and 1840 in church building, restoration and endowment, though some particular cases are known. But from a parliamentary return in 1875 (made on the motion of Lord Hampton), we now know what was accomplished in the 34 years ending 1874. The return makes no account of any expenditure under £500, and yet presents a total of £2 453,361. In this sum cathedrals are not included, nor are lands, buildings, rent charges, invested funds, or money for parsonage houses, glebes, endowments—all which, of course, necessarily make up a large amount. Or if the expenditure be calculated down to 1884, as there are ample means of doing correctly, we have for 40 years a total for church building, parsonages, endowments, and burial grounds, of £44 841 275, and in this are not included the endowments of the new bishoprics, which deserve a separate mention.

VI. Within the last 50 years seven new sees have been founded. The endowment for an eighth, Wakefield, is nearly completed; and the endowment for Bristol (to be separated from Gloucester), proceeds satisfactorily. The sums already contributed for these and the five new sees of Truro, St. Alban's, Liverpool, Newcastle and Southwell, amounted to £482,761, which added to the above gives a total of £45,324,936. This is the work of our own day.

Yours,

Port Perry, 28th Oct., 1887.

JOHN CAREY.

FUTURE PROBATION.

SIR,—I have before me a little work on this subject by a Presbyterian Divine, Dr. S. H. Kellogg, which seems to be a reply to "The Future State," of Prof. Dörm. This is a pamphlet that ought to be in the hands of every one of our students. It is possible all may not agree with Dr. Kellogg in everything he says, but there is good ring and tone about the work, no one can dare deny. The more I read the (commonly-called) Athanasian Creed through and through, the more firmly convinced am I that to whatever century we attribute it, the day the Church Catholic puts it away, that day she puts aside a grand, glorious document. I should very much like to see verse 6 of 1 Peter, 4th chapter, discussed in your columns. The following, taken from "Brown & Faussett" on 1 Peter 3rd, 18, 19 seems to me quite remarkable. Can any of your readers say if others hold a like idea. Faussett & Brown say:—"Not His Spirit, but His Soul went to Hades. His Spirit was commended by Him, at death, to His Father, and was thereupon "in Para-