

fter recovery from the scarlet fever, at a time when one would think that a damp foot or sudden chill would be fatal, I was obliged to jump out of my canoe into the Neepigon River to try and pull it up the current. There was not one Indian with us at the time, and we were obliged to make our way from Red Rock to the Mission—a distance of sixty miles—with three navvies who were by no means adepts in the work. The Indians at the Mission had not hoped to see me again. They thought that the scarlet fever would take me away as it also carried away our dear little Frank some short time before. And now let me state briefly the present aspect of our work and the apparent improvements that have been made from time to time. There are eight log-houses, a Church, school and Mission house. When the Indians are all at home we have a congregation of forty. They are as regular and as attentive at Divine Service as any flock could possibly be. We have two services on Sundays at which we chant the "Te Deum" in English at morning and the "Nunc Demittis" in English at evening service. We have also a prayer meeting in the school house on Wednesday evenings.

The day school is conducted by an Indian who has been educated at the Shinwauk Home. There are fifteen children on the roll. They read and write and talk and sing in English. Any one of these, with the exception of two or three very small ones, can repeat in English the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and twenty verses from the Holy Scriptures.

There is about twenty acres of cleared land at the Mission, and all the gardens are thoroughly fenced. Three hundred bushels of potatoes have been raised in our midst last summer, besides turnips, parsnips, carrots, radishes, peas, beans, wheat and Indian corn. But I am sorry to say that a considerable quantity of our potatoes which we have in our cellars for winter use has been frozen, although we keep fires going all night, and although they were securely covered with hay. Our Mission house is in a miserable condition. I don't think it will stand another winter. The snow comes in through the roof and then melts through the ceiling upon our heads when the room is warm. I wish some one who may read this account, and who has money to spare, would invest a few hundred dollars in God's land that a good warm house may be built for the Missionary and his family. Perhaps some of my readers will wonder when I tell them that there is not one solitary board in the composition of our bed-room; bark and rough hewn logs covered with paper is all that we can yet afford. And then if another kind friend would help us to line the roof of our Church with dressed lumber, so that the snow may not fall upon the Communion Table. Last Christmas morning the bread was frozen when I administered the Holy Sacrament. A few words more about the Indians and then I shall close. They have family prayer in their houses morning and evening. They always say grace at meals. They no longer squat upon the ground when eating. They have made tables and eat like Christians. Formerly, dining-room, bed-room and kitchen was all one. Now they have both bed-rooms and kitchens added.

During the first three years I could not prevail upon them to make an offering to God at Christmas; but last Christmas morning their united offerings in fur and money amounted to ten dollars.

I will leave your readers to draw their own conclusions. Without any painting or exaggerations I have stated facts; and if these poor Indians, who have to live the whole winter round on frozen fish and potatoes, could make an offering of ten dollars out of their penury to show their gratitude to God for the gift of His Dear Son, how will it be with those who give almost nothing out of their abundance? I would think it a great honor conferred upon me, if along with my own time and thought and life, I could afford to give \$1,000 to the cause of Christ and His Gospel. Hoping that I have not intruded too far upon your valuable space, I remain, Dear Sir,

Dec. 31, 1886. ROBERT RENISON (Missionary).

DIPPING VS. IMMERSION.

SIR,—G. C. Mackenzie finds fault with the teaching of Leaflet No. 7, on the subject of Immersion. After carefully looking over the Leaflet again, I do not see how it can be altered consistently with facts. There is surely no need for us, in our controversy with Baptists, to hide the fact that immersion of the person more or less was the practice of the early Church. The Baptists are not wrong in practicing immersion; but in insisting that immersion is the only mode of baptizing. Immersion is practiced in some parts of our Church. It is to be wished it were more frequent, as no other way of baptizing symbolizes so well our burial with Christ in baptism. The Leaflet says that the Church recognizes two methods, dipping in the water and pouring (or sprinkling) water, but that the material point is not the quantity but the use of water. The Leaflet also says the Church, while recognizing

two methods, prefers the former, i.e., dipping in the water. Surely no one can deny this in the face of the rubric of the office for Public Baptism of Infants. Mr. Mackenzie quotes a portion of the rubric in the Office of Baptism for those of riper years, and asks how the rubric can be obeyed, i.e., how an adult can be dipped in the water in the small fonts which he assumes were in use when the rubric was compiled. I would ask Mr. Mackenzie how he obeys the rubric—whether he dips an adult in his font, in any sense which the term "dipping in the water" will bear. The fact is that Mr. Mackenzie has committed the most curious oversight in quotation that it has been my lot to meet with. He has quoted only a portion of the rubric, and has omitted the very material words, "or pour water upon him," a direction which Mr. Mackenzie will admit is not so difficult to obey even with a font of ordinary capacity. How does Mr. Mackenzie account for this curious oversight? I assume that by the use of the expression "dip in the water," the Church means the same thing as immersion, and uses it as an equivalent for the "sub trina mersione" of the older rubrics, and thereby maintains her historical continuity with the early Church, in which unquestionably immersion was the practice, as Tertullian, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and others testify. Perhaps I ought to add that the compiler of the Leaflet sees a difference between immersion and submersion, though Mr. Mackenzie seems to consider them synonymous. The Leaflet teaches that the probable method of baptizing in early days was pouring water upon the person while standing in the water—as portrayed in old pictures. If Mr. Mackenzie still thinks that this is the kind of teaching to favor Baptists, I would ask him to read it carefully through and not fasten upon one question and answer. If Mr. Mackenzie will consult Sadler's Manual or Bishop Doane's, which is almost wholly taken from Sadler's without acknowledgement, he will see that the Leaflet differs from them on only one point—that of aspersion. Mr. Mackenzie would defend this, but to be strictly accurate the Church recognizes only dipping and pouring. Being responsible as chairman of the Committee for the Leaflets as finally issued from the press, I submitted this lesson to Dr. Carry for the benefit of his wide reading and accurate scholarship. He very kindly corrected it by drawing his pen through the word "sprinkling" and the reference to Isaiah lii. It was not Dr. Carry's fault that the correction reached me too late to be of use. I am convinced, however, after consulting T. K. Cheyne on Isaiah that Dr. Carry is right, and that it was a mistake (not a very serious one) to refer to this passage to illustrate "sprinkling," though Wordsworth says that the Jews understood it as prophetic of Christ baptizing. On a point of Hebrew scholarship Cheyne is more trustworthy than Wordsworth. The correction hardly affects the question of sprinkling which, as it is almost universally practiced, may be defended as one way of pouring. Certainly any effort at pouring water without a shell, which is not strictly rubrical, will result in sprinkling more or less. To insist, however, on any one or two methods of using water as alone lawful or valid, is to fall into the error of the Baptists. The material point is (as the Leaflet teaches) not the quantity of water or the mode, but the use of water as the matter of the Sacrament. We may be content with the conclusion of so careful and accurate a Divine as Dr. Maclear, whose Manual on the Catechism is accepted by the whole Church. He says that "there are not wanting indications that baptism by sprinkling may have been practiced in Apostolic times, and when the Gospel spread into colder climes sprinkling was deemed sufficient." He adds in a note: "By the rule of our own Church baptism may be administered either by immersion or sprinkling." Perhaps you will allow me to add a word on finding fault with the Institute Leaflet in the public press. The fault finding comes too late for practical use, and only serves to suggest that the teaching generally is untrustworthy, which I am sure the writer does not intend. Would it not be wiser to suggest correction when necessary by private letter? I shall always be most thankful for such suggestions if made in a kindly and courteous spirit.

Jan. 14, 1887.

J. D. CAYLEY.

THE SOCIETY OF THE TREASURY OF GOD.

SUNDAY SCHOOL MONEY BOXES FOR LENT.

SIR,—This plan has met with very great success in the American Church. Last year it was taken up too late to work it properly in our Church. The results, however, were very satisfactory. They were supplied to 41 parishes; only 21 clergymen reported results. The amount collected by them was \$412. The spiritual gain to the children cannot be estimated in dollars.

I shall be glad to send the Report to all applicants, and to receive orders for the boxes at once. Price \$1 per 100. Tithe envelopes sixty cents per 100. 20 Bellevue Avenue, Yours, Toronto, Jan. 19, '87. C. A. B. POOCK.

THE INSTITUTE LEAFLET.

SIR,—In the same Leaflet, No. 7, to which a correspondent refers in your paper of to-day, I find another point needing explanation or expurgation. Where does the Prayer Book recognize "sprinkling" as a legitimate mode of baptizing? Let me ask, also, why is Isa. 52:14, "So shall he sprinkle many nations," adduced as an authority for it? The Hebrew text is esteemed uncertain and the meaning obscure; for which reason it is preposterous to employ the place as a "proof text." Besides, if the word "sprinkle" be correct, it would more naturally refer to "the Blood of Sprinkling," as the Hebrew word shows. The uncertainty of the word is seen in the marginal rendering of the Revised Version, where we read "startle." Indeed the Leaflet may be regarded as a "startling" specimen of Catechetical Church teaching. Yours,

Port Perry, Jan. 18, '87.

JOHN CARRY.

P. S.—Professor Cheyne says that the received text, with due regard to Hebrew usage, can only mean, "So shall he expel and scatter them from his land," and he observes "a most difficult passage." The Revised Version leaves the Leaflet without excuse. Work on such a bad foundation must tumble. J. C.

PROGRESSIVE THOUGHT ON GREAT SUBJECTS.

SIR,—In common, with very many of the Anglican clergy throughout the Dominion of Canada, I have been favored with a copy of the work bearing the above title, and issued by "The Swedenborg Publishing Association." I do not know what the elder clergy may think of the work, but from what little knowledge of theology that I possess, I believe it to be a very dangerous book indeed. It opens with a grand attack on the Trinity in unitate, which belongs to us since the days of Tertullian, and in language as coarse as it is shallow, it makes an onslaught on orthodoxy in a way peculiarly western. I have read the book through, making notes here and there in it, so that if it should fall into the hands of any of my people they may see the errors therein, but I do hope those of my clerical brethren who have a leaning towards "Eternal Hope" may not take this work for anything else than for what it is worth. I am an "Evangelical" myself, holding fast to the doctrine of the "vicarious" sacrifice of Christ, and I cannot see a single thing in this work to replace this doctrine. After "Brown on the first five Articles," and "Pearson with notes," the Rev. N. F. Ravlin seems to me to be a very very poor writer indeed. Carried away with the Mohammedan cry of "Allah," (*Deus Solus*), and "with the exuberance of his own verbosity," as D'Israeli said of Gladstone, the author of "Progressive Thought" would have us have Christ an "essential" of the Father, crying from the Cross, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani," a thing perfectly unintelligible from its own showing. It is no wonder the writer has been by his own people pronounced a heretic. His language is so vain-glorious and empty that there is no soundness in it. When he says "I bade the commandments, traditions and councils of men an everlasting farewell," he spoke the truth, and if one may be allowed to say so he made himself a very little idol that will, doubtless, soon find itself cast to "the moles and to the bats." If there are many who think of following this writer, let me ask them these questions: (1). "Who was Christ?" (2). Where is salvation if not in a "vicarious" atonement? In man? Rev. N. F. Ravlin, if not a Patripassian, is very near it. We ought to prefer the Scriptures (literally) to Swedenborg (spiritually) any day, and while assured of the "love of God" for all mankind, we should be in no hurry to clip the "everlastings" of Scripture. His best chapter seems to me to be the vii, but I still hold and probably I shall ever hold that while "love to God and charity towards the neighbour" are in their place, and in a sense good and upon them hang "all the law and the prophets," yet one saith in another place: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: To visit the fathers and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." What of the being who does not do these things. If there be no sacrifice, "there can be no hope unless we take the Purgatory of Rome. Better let 'the old customs prevail' than to have a religion of contradictions. I am, sir, yours.

C. A. FRENCH.

[The following letter was sent to the *Christian Guardian* for publication in that Journal, and was not inserted].

METHODICUS AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

To the Editor of the *Christian Guardian*.

SIR,—In your issue of the 15th inst., Methodicus says in his correspondence that a minister of the Church of England had taken part in revival services,