

to lead to it; and, as far as I can judge, the social question of our day will finally receive not one answer, but many. But, in one respect, all the answers will agree—all will be religious. Meanwhile, our office as Christian teachers is to proclaim the ideal of the Gospel and to form opinion. . . . We cannot doubt that God is calling us in this age, through the characteristic teachings of science and of history, to seek a new social application of the Gospel."

NO ALTAR, NO SACRIFICE.—1. The technical language of the Puritans is not that of the Bible or the Church. The old words are still used, but with a new meaning imposed by Calvin, and adopted both by "Evangelicals," who were his followers, and, in after years, by "Protestants," the followers of Luther, a meaning contrary to etymology and their use in Scripture and the Church. 2. *E.g.*, those words which have a typical meaning in reference to Christ in the Old Testament, have a similar meaning, only commemorative, in the New. With the Jews there were two kinds of priests; the former consisted of all lay Israelites who kept the law (Exod. xix., 6), and the latter of public priests, who were the ministers in holy things; this is also true under the Gospel of the clerical and lay priesthood, but the Puritans deny it. Sacrifices under the law were holy offerings, some pleading for pardon, some promising obedience, some typical of praise and eucharist; some, again, were immaterial sacrifices; others, like the offerings of animals, fruits of the earth, &c., were material and sacramental; so too is it under the Gospel, but the Puritans deny it; the public priest is the deputy, who offers to God for the congregation both the sacramental and the spiritual sacrifices of the people, and who is also deputed by God to absolve and bless the congregation in His name, and to be the angel and minister of His heavenly gifts. The Puritan denies this. Under the law a sacrifice could not be eaten unless it were a sacrifice; it must first be offered to God on His altar, and then the people fed at His table off the sacrifice. Consequently there could not be a holy table, unless it were first a holy altar (Malachi i., 7; Ezek. xli., 22). This the Puritans deny. They say that there can be a holy table which is not an altar, which is an impossibility. "We Christians have an altar whereof we can eat" (Heb. xiii., 10). It is a propitiatory offering for sin (v. ii.), "sacrifice of praise," and of "homologia," or allegiance (v. 15), and a "sacrifice of almsgiving" (v. 16). The Puritans deny all this because they have been trained to a non-natural use of theological and biblical language, so that a man like Archdeacon Straton, who no doubt really believes what Catholics believe, nevertheless needs to be untaught and re-taught the meaning of the simplest theological words, as used by the Catholic Church. 3. The word "altar" is not only necessarily implied in the word "table," but it is still preserved in the Coronation Service; and so the word "sacerdos" is used in our Articles (Art. XXXII.), just as the word "presbyter" in the primitive Church always meant a "priest" and *something more*. The priest, "sacerdos," meant an officer of holy things, but presbyter also meant that he was in charge of a parish. "Presbytery" was so high a title that it included not only priests in charge of a parish, but bishops also. In the Greek Liturgies "altar" is seldom used; "holy table" is generally used; but neither in Latin, Greek, nor English Prayer Books was ever the word used which the Puritans invented, and which the Privy Council in its judgments,

and Archdeacon Straton in his Congress speech, delighted to use, "Communion Table."

THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO ON THANKSGIVING DAY.

His Lordship of Ontario is announced in the daily papers as opposed to Thanksgiving Day, and is reported as having said that "Thanksgiving Day was no festival of the Church of England; no service for such a day was to be found in the Prayer Book." We cannot but think, if His Lordship is correctly reported, that he has been throwing the influence of his office upon the wrong side. It is no doubt true that the State long ago declared that it was desirable to sever all semblance of connection between Church and State, and so has no right to command the Church. But it is equally true that the Church did not sever itself from the State, but aims still at influencing, not only the individual acts, but the collective actings of men. And so every Christian ought surely to rejoice that the influence of the Church's teaching is still so strong that the Government, by the appointment of a Thanksgiving Day, acknowledges not only the existence of God and our dependence upon Him for temporal blessings, but our duty to render Him thanks and praise for our creation, preservation and all the blessings of this life. It is quite true, as the Bishop says, that every Sunday service (he might have said every day's service) is a thanksgiving service, while the highest service of thanksgiving is offered every Sunday in the great Eucharistic Office. But that surely does not discharge us from observing special days of formal public thanksgiving, any more than the fact that every day being God's day, and due to His service, absolves us from the duty of observing one day as specially dedicated to Him. It is true also that we above all other professing Christians obey the apostle's command to pray for kings and all in authority, and therefore we ought above all others to rejoice in the answer to that prayer which comes to us in that religious act of the Government in making this public acknowledgment of God and His goodness.

THE LATE MUNICIPAL CONTEST IN NEW YORK CITY.

As we are essentially a church paper, it is not our intention to interfere with political matters, but we cannot help giving to our readers the following extract from an article on Municipal Reform, which appeared in the *New York Evening Post* of October 25th, as showing the terrible state of affairs existing in that city. The article concludes as follows:

"If, therefore, under these circumstances, Tammany should win at the approaching election, its victory would mean an open avowal on the part of a majority of the voters that they really like the kind of government Tammany has given them, and see nothing shameful or objectionable in living under it. There will be no escape from this conclusion. We, for our part, shall not try to find one. We shall simply continue to work at the most repulsive task probably ever set before a journalist, or politician, or moralist, the task of persuading the bulk of the inhabitants of a great Christian city that it is a disgraceful and debasing thing to live and bring up their children in absolute subjection to a small oligarchy or club, made up as follows:

Professional Politicians	29
*Convicted Murderer	1

*The principal outside adviser and intimate friend of the "Big Four," who control the Committee, is also a convicted murderer.

Tried for Murder and Acquitted	1
Convicted of Felonious Assault	1
Indicted for Bribery	1
Indicted for Misdemeanor	1
Professional Gamblers	4
Former Gambling-House or "Dive" Keepers	5
Liquor-Dealers	4
Former Liquor-Dealers	5
Sons of Liquor-Dealers	3
Former Pugilists	3
Former "Toughs"	4
Members of the Tweed Gang	6
Office-Holders	17
Former Office-Holders	7
Former Book-Keeper	1
Former Car Conductors	3
Former Plasterer	1
Former Navy-Yard Caulker	1
Former Carpenter	1
Lawyers	2
Nominal Lawyers	3
Favored City Contractors	2

It is an astonishing fact that after warnings such as this the Christian citizens of New York through their apathy have allowed Tammany to again control their city.

And to show that New York is not an exceptional case, we quote as follows from an article on Municipal Reform appearing in the *Chicago Living Church* of November the 8th:—

"It is a notorious fact, openly charged by the press, that the mayor is in collusion with a ring of gamblers who secured his election, and whom he rewards by conniving at their nefarious calling. City ordinances are openly violated, and wronged citizens can obtain no redress. There is scarcely a department of the administration which is not grossly mismanaged.

"The effrontery with which law is defied and the corruption of municipal affairs are illustrated by the recent murder of an ex-alderman. This man had amassed money by the sale of liquor. He had been the proprietor of three saloons, and a man of such influence was honored by an election to the city council. He was engaged in an all-night debauch, his companion being a 'health' officer of the city, a former bar-tender of this alderman.

"It will be noted that this man was killed during a drunken carouse, and that at the time of the shooting, he was so drunk that he fell when he rose from his chair; that it was not an uncommon thing for him to be in such a condition. Yet the taking off of this man is lamented as a public calamity. The city council officially deplore his loss, and by resolution declare that (in their opinion), 'the city has lost an enterprising and energetic citizen, and his friends a warm, true-hearted man, whose geniality of temperament was proverbial, making of him the most companionable of men.' As one of the speakers at this occasion truly said, it was an announcement 'doubly sad' which he had to make. Yes, we should think it doubly sad; sad not only on account of the soul sent out of this world under such conditions, but sad also that the council of a great city, by a rising vote, should declare its profound sense of sorrow at the death of a man who was killed in a drunken quarrel in the company of gamblers at the end of a night of debauchery, and who should testify their sense of the public calamity by attending the funeral of the slain man in a body. Has the influence of gamblers and saloon-keepers reached such a height that men of all parties should stand mourning around the bier of this dead debauchee, and a great city be stricken