

think, the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN. If so, would the kind sender alter the address as follows: Miss Gore Currie, 50 High Street, Fareham, Hants, England. HENRY R.C.E.

#### Puzzled Layman and the Sacraments.

SIR,—The answer of "An English Catholic" to "Puzzled Layman's" question re the seven Sacraments, is not, in my judgment, fair. Had the quotation from the homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments been given in full paragraph, the inference drawn by "An English Catholic" would immediately appear unounded; and the limitation of the number of the Sacraments to two only would be confirmed. I give the whole passage: "Therefore neither it (i. e. orders) nor any other Sacrament, else, be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are. But in general acceptation the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified. In which understanding of the word the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five, commonly of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the seven Sacraments; but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby to repute them as Sacraments in the same signification that the two forenamed Sacraments are." When, therefore, "An English Catholic" quotes from this homily that it may appear to establish the existence of the so-called "Seven Sacraments," he is in danger of being hoist with his own petard. It is clear that the authoritative statements of the Church—articles, catechism, homilies alike—teach two only; and, if more, then the name may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified. The italics are mine.

A. F. BURT.

Shediac, N.B.

#### The Husky Dog.

SIR,—In your issue of the 26th ult., A. B. Savigny asks Mr. Lofthouse, missionary at Churchill, on the Hudson's Bay, whether the Husky dog takes its name from a tribe of Indians, &c., &c., and as the explanation asked for could not possibly reach your paper in less than six months, I would, therefore, in the absence of that gentleman, venture an explanation. The word Husky is an abbreviation of the word Esquimaux, the name of a tribe of Indians living around the Hudson's Bay, and, in fact, along the Arctic coast, and who are now so well known to all Canadians through the efforts of our missionaries. The name given to this tribe by the Europeans was taken from that given them by the Cree Indians, *Us-Kee-Mao*, plural *Us-Kee-May-Wuk*, meaning raw meat eaters. It was believed that these people, having no fuel with which to cook their food, were obliged to eat it raw, which, I think, is partly correct at the present time. The modern way of spelling this name, and the one generally adopted, is *Eskimo*, but among the Hudson's Bay people who trade with them, they are spoken of as *Huskies*, which might be termed their local name, not as euphonious as *Eskimo*, but handier to the tongue, hence their dogs are called *Husky dogs*. The *Husky dog* is a breed peculiar to the Arctic coast, and nearer akin to the wolf than any of the other canine species. They have been for a long time famous as train dogs. Explorers, missionaries, &c., &c., speak of them as being capable of enduring the greatest hardships of hunger and fatigue; it is generally conceded that they can live and work under greater difficulties and privations than any animal extant. Mr. Savigny, in referring to Mr. Lofthouse's journey, refers to it as a journey of 11,000 miles. Surely this must be a misprint; 1,000 would be nearer the mark. This then might be called the history of this name: Cree, *Us Kee May Wuk*; European (probably French), *Esquimaux*; Local, *Husky*; Modern (and more Christian), *Eskimo*. C. D.

#### How to Raise the Clergyman's Salary.

SIR,—Permit me to make a few suggestions in regard to the stipend of the clergy. It is well known that in many of our parishes the clergyman's salary is a source of anxiety, both to the clergyman and the churchwardens, owing to the difficulty often experienced in collecting it. Now I wish to lay before the Church a scheme, I think, whereby this difficulty may be overcome, and in doing so I stand open for criticism, as well as desiring the views of maturer minds than my own; also, this plan is intended to apply to the various bodies as well as to the Church itself. When the assessor comes to Brown, he will ask him what his income is, and to what religious body he belongs; to the Methodist, he replies. Jones states his income, and also states that he belongs to the Church of England. Now, according to their respective incomes, let them be taxed so much for Church support, the amount to be paid with their regular taxes to the township. The same to apply to the Roman

Catholic Church, the same for all. It may be objected that this would be on the basis of establishment, but it is not, for no one body then has precedence of another, each still supporting their own. The clergy and ministers then be allowed to draw their income the same as the public school teacher. Again it may be suggested an inequality of tax. No—for the poor man would only pay according to his means, and the wealthy, instead of giving their paltry ten or fifteen dollars, would have to contribute more. In case of a man not having any amount of means, like some poor farmers, still let the amount be one dollar per year at the least. Again, it may be suggested that free giving would be greatly hindered, charity would not be supreme. But is there not still ample scope for charity and its exercise? There is the support of the Mission Fund, the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, &c., and the various calls for general management of the parish. Again I think it would tend much to heal the divisions that now exist, namely: the little sects who would not have sufficient membership to support a minister, they would see their difficulty and die; the law then compelling them to support some religious body, they would have to enter the ranks of the larger, and swell their number. In case a man states that he belongs to no particular body, then let him be assessed for the support of that body which he last adhered to, as stated on the previous assessment roll, or support the body he and his may agree to, and if no agreement, then the one by which he was baptized or where his family attend. The reader may see what all this implies—the relief of the clergy from business worries, and the relief of the wardens or trustees from their many difficulties in collecting, and the placing of the Church upon a better financial basis. I would like very much to hear the opinion of clergy and laymen upon the matter, that it may profit myself as well as others.

REV. E. C. JENNINGS.

#### Extracts from Browne on Thirty-Nine Articles.

##### FOURTH COMMUNICATION.

11. *The Real Presence*.—"The doctrine of a real spiritual presence is the doctrine of the English Church, and was the doctrine of Calvin and of many foreign reformers. . . . There have, no doubt, been different ways of explaining the spiritual presence among those who have agreed to acknowledge such a presence, but perhaps the safest plan is to say that because it is spiritual therefore it needs must be mystical. . . . From the time of the Reformation to the present, all the great luminaries of our Church have maintained the doctrine which appears on the face of our formularies; agreeing to deny a corporal and to acknowledge a spiritual feeding in the supper of the Lord. It is scarcely necessary to recount the names of Mede, Andrews, Hooker, Taylor, Hammond, Cosin, Bramhall, Ussner, Pearson, Patrick, Bull, Beveridge, Wake, Waterland. All these have left us writings on the subject and all have coincided, but with very slight diversity, in the substance of their belief. They have agreed, as Hooker says, that Christ is personally present: albeit a part of Christ be corporally absent; that the fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the Body and Blood of Christ—but that the real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament (i. e., in the elements), but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. . . . Though we acknowledge Christ's presence, and not only acknowledge but rejoice in it: yet we hold not that presence to be in the material bread, nor can these words (viz., 'this is My Body') prove that it is there. . . . There is evidently no Scriptural authority for the elevation of the host, the command being, 'Take, eat.' The Roman ritualists themselves admit that there is no trace of its existence before the eleventh or twelfth centuries, and no certain documents refer to it till about A.D. 1200. (On Art. XXVIII.) Though the Fathers believed . . . that the Holy Ghost would sanctify the water (of baptism) to the mystical washing away of sin, yet they neither believed in a change of the substance of the water nor in an admixture of the Holy Spirit with the water, nor that an unworthy recipient obtained the blessing of the Spirit's sanctification. We must suppose the same principle to apply to the sanctification of the symbols in the Eucharist. . . . In short, all circumstances show that the true and ancient intent of that part of the service was not to implore any physical change in the elements. No, nor so much as a physical connection of the Spirit with the elements, but a moral change only in the elements as to relations and uses and a gracious presence of the Holy Spirit upon the communicants. (On Art. XXIX.) If the earliest Fathers really believed that Christ in the Eucharist was offered afresh for the sins of the quick and dead, it is certainly a most extraordinary example of silence and reserve that for two centuries after Christ they should never once have explained the sacrifice of the Eucharist in any manner, but either as an offering of

first fruits to God like the mincha or fine flour of the Israelites, or else as an offering of praise and thanksgiving and spiritual worship." (On Art. XXXI.)

12. *Tradition*.—"Tradition may be useful in the interpretation of Scripture, though not as adding to its authority. . . . We allow no doctrine as necessary which stands only on Fathers, or on tradition oral or written. We admit none for such but what is contained in Scripture and proved by Scripture, rightly interpreted. . . . It is indeed most necessary that we do not suffer our respect for antiquity to trench upon our supreme regard for the authority of Scripture. To Scripture we look as the only source of Divine knowledge. But when we have fully established this principle we need not fear to make use of every light with which God has furnished us for the right understanding of Scripture." (On Art. VI.) The topics here dealt with are in these days much discussed and controverted. The extracts given are weighty, calm, moderate and representative. Moderation in stating doctrine, coupled with emphasis on the facts of grace and redemption, will disarm the suspicion to which Bishop Courtney referred. The vital thing in the religious life is still "looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith"—not the utterance of a Shibboleth nor even adherence to a party.

T. G. A. WRIGHT.

#### St. Paul's Ordination.

SIR,—While fully aware that most commentators take the ground advocated in your issue of Dec. 10th, that Acts xiii. 1-3 tells us of the ordination of St. Paul to the apostleship, I profess myself not convinced; for all who take that view, as far as I have seen, evade the difficulties attendant upon such an interpretation of the passage. One of these difficulties is that the supposed ordainers were not themselves apostles. How could prophets and teachers ordain to the highest order of the Christian ministry? Hammond, indeed, gets bravely over this difficulty by making the persons there mentioned all bishops, saying in his paraphrase: "And there were at that time in Antioch some eminent persons or bishops of the churches of Syria of that age, and of these, some having the gift of prophecy. And as they were upon a day of fast, performing their office of prayer to God, the Holy Spirit by some afflatus or revelation commanded them to ordain or consecrate Barnabas and Saul to the apostleship to which God had already designed them. And accordingly they observed a solemn day of fasting and prayer, and so by imposition of hands ordained them, and sent them away about the work designed them by God." Whitby has well replied to Hammond: "He would have had no temptation to call those three there named bishops, but that he finds them laying on of hands, imagining that it was for ordination; whereas it was by way of benediction in their enterprise only, or to recommend them to the grace of God (xiv. 29): for who ever heard before of an apostle ordained by laying on of the hands of prophets and teachers." At that early period of the Church there were no other bishops but the apostles. Was it necessary that two of their number should go down to Samaria to confirm those whom Philip the Deacon baptized? And could men be consecrated to the highest order of the Christian ministry by prophets and teachers? But further should we not expect to find some more direct statement that this was an ordination to the apostleship? Now was the first great missionary journey in the history of the Church to be undertaken. God, by prophetic voice, selected St. Paul and St. Barnabas to undertake it, and the Church at Antioch sent them forth with fasting, prayer and benediction. Mark how this is referred to at the end of the journey (Acts xiv. 26, 27.) "And thence sailed to Antioch from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God for the work which they fulfilled. And when they were come, and had gathered the Church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how He had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." Instead of from whence they had been "commended to the grace of God for the work which they fulfilled," surely we should have read some such words as "where they had been consecrated apostles," if we are to regard Acts xiii. 1-3 to signify their ordination. No, I believe that passage tells us of a farewell service in which they "were commended to the grace of God." And on their return there was a great missionary meeting in which they showed that it was not in vain that they had been thus commended. But again, the Epistle to the Galatians is in direct opposition to any human ordination of St. Paul. He begins that Epistle by saying, "Paul, an apostle (not from men, neither through man) but through Jesus Christ and God the Father." He seems here to say that man had nothing at all to do with his consecration to the apostles' order, and in that epistle he justifies this declaration that after God had revealed His Son in him, he conferred not with flesh and blood, that he did not go up to them that were apostles before him, but went