

works. Of course this accounts for our custom of three handfuls of earth cast upon the coffin at a burial. In this parish it is not customary to throw three "shovelfuls" of earth; the proper custom is observed; "*Lacet injecto ter pulvere curras*," says Horace, Odes, Book I, Ode xxviii.

W. E. COOPER.

Campbellford, May 2nd, 1895.

Explanation.

SIR,—In answer to "S. D." in THE CHURCHMAN of May 2, is not the explanation to be found in the meaning of the perfect tense—which is to express the abiding force or result of a past act? Heb. x. 14—"He hath perfected." It is a work begun and going on. Phil. iii. 12—is a work begun and going on—only in this place we have St. Paul describing its necessary incompleteness. C.

Want Support and Nursing.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me a short space in your valuable paper for the following: In your issue of the 18th ult., there is an article by "Lex" on "Church Finances." In this article "Lex" tells us: "The Church in Canada is in one of three positions—a mission, a parish or a rectory; the mission being supported and nursed by the whole Church, as a mother looks after and takes pride in the babe, and expects great things when the weakling has reached manhood,"—etc. Now, sir, my charge being a mission of about 500 miles in extent (square miles), we feel ourselves to be just in that position—we want a little of that "support and nursing" spoken of by "Lex." May I, therefore, be allowed to plead more earnestly for a little of that "support and nursing" which, from "Lex," appears to be so necessary for the "babe" and "weakling"? Our people are very poor, and are also very mixed—we have a number of half-breed families, and just on the borders of the mission a number of Indians—we have not a well-to-do family in the whole of the mission—all are poor—so that it will be seen how necessary it is we should be encouraged by a little "support and nursing." Somerset is about the centre of the whole mission, and we have had the parsonage built here, but we have no church or building of any kind in which we can hold service. But our people, though very poor and few in number, have decided to build a church of some kind during the summer—providing we are given a little "support and nursing," without which I am afraid it will be practically impossible for us to build. At the present time we have \$100 (one hundred dollars) in hand and have about \$150 (one hundred and fifty dollars) promised, if the crops are good. At the very lowest estimate we can put on our proposed church, lumber and other things being so expensive here, it will cost about \$750 (seven hundred and fifty dollars). You, sir, will thus see just what our position is—we have a possible \$250 or \$300 towards our church. I would further say, could we build it here at once, our church would take such a stand that the other two bodies now working here would not have much of a showing, but unless we can build we shall lose ground. A kind friend in Montreal—Mrs. Hutton, 1,013 Sherbrooke Street—has very kindly promised to receive, acknowledge and forward any donations for the above work. Thanking you in anticipation, and earnestly asking for the kind help of your readers. All help either sent to Mrs. Hutton or myself will be most gratefully acknowledged.

(REV.) ALBERT TANSEY.

Somerset, Manitoba.

Rev. J. de Soyres' Reply.

SIR,—In case a letter from Archdeacon Roe has been published in your columns contradicting a statement of my own, with regard to the distribution of Staley's Manual in Quebec, I shall ask you to be so kind as to insert the following reply.

J. DE SOYRES.

St. John, N.B., May 2, 1895.

DEAR ARCHDEACON ROE: After your courteous letter of April 23rd, in answer to which I promised and immediately sent to the *Evangelical Churchman* a correction (upon your authority) of the impugned statement, I was greatly astonished to read in this morning's *Sun* your published communication. You will forgive me for saying that its expressions and its tone are alike unjustifiable. Assuming that my information was inaccurate as to the origin of Staley's Manual being sold at Quebec, a simple correction was sufficient, and such expressions as "dragging in personal matter," and "striking at a Bishop," are not only absurdly inappropriate, but are unworthy of your reputation. In this reply, which I propose to make public, I must call your attention to the following points:

1. My review of Staley's Manual was first published in the *St. John Sun*, and later in the *Evangelical*

Churchman, more than three months ago. Yet the reference to Quebec has never been contradicted.

2. You leave out half of the sentence you quote, breaking off at a comma, surely not a proper proceeding, and omit my most sincere compliment to Bishop Dunn's "courage of opinions." I am sure that you would not approve of such methods of quotation in others.

3. The statement about the "removal of the book upon the protest of the Cathedral congregation" was quoted from the official statement published by the Quebec Vestry in June, 1894. You must settle with that authority as to whether "there was no shadow of foundation" for their words.

4. The whole tone of your letter, and especially the remarkable phrase you employ about the Bishop being precluded from "striking back," implies obviously a belief on your part in which I heartily agree. It clearly appears to you that the circulation of Staley's Manual is a scandal to our Church, and that to charge any Churchman with being accessory to it is an accusation which should be indignantly repudiated by innocent parties. I rejoice to learn, even in this indirect way, that you view with the same feelings the propagation of doctrines which such Churchmen as Bishop Wilberforce, or Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, or your own Reverend Bishop Williams, would have regarded with abhorrence. May I, in conclusion, venture a suggestion. Three years ago, in the course of a friendly correspondence which I valued highly, you admitted to me that Sadler's Church Doctrine contained "indefensible statements," and I earnestly entreated you to join with me in my effort to discourage its circulation among our younger clergy and laity. Would it not be more worthy of your high and deserved reputation as a theologian, to use your powers in this crisis of our beloved Church's history to stem the tide of Romanizing heresy, to protest against the garbling of history and the Fathers, which you achieved so admirably in your Minority Report on the Divorce question, and to vindicate the ancient Anglican Churchmanship which you and I, from different standpoints, love so well, and which in these days of compromise and Romanizing encroachment, men of your standing and character should at all cost defend. Believe me, yours very sincerely,

JOHN DE SOYRES.

The Ven. Archdeacon Roe, D.D.

The Rev. J. De Soyres and Evangelical Progress

SIR,—Although we are heartily opposed to the methods pursued by the promoters of the A.C.U. in the Diocese of Ontario, it is impossible not to mark with thankfulness the occasional notes of progress sounded by the leaders of the movement. A recent article in the *St. John Sun* from the pen of that active and clever agitator, the Rev. J. de Soyres, presents us with several such. Mr. de Soyres, for example, evidently approves the description of Lord Beaconsfield's attempt to "put down ritualism" as a "colossal blunder." That this is a distinct movement forward is unquestionable, when we recall the truism that, "blunder" as Lord Beaconsfield might, he could have done no harm had not the prototype of the A.C.U., the notorious Church Association, seized with such avidity the "blunderbuss" forged for its use. It is really not fair for the Evangelical party to put all the blame on the Conservative statesman. But the mere attempt shows that they would like the long record of disastrous victories and shameful prosecutions to be wiped out, as far as possible, and the announcement that "the most advanced ritualist" is to be left free to follow his desires "when he has law and a majority of the congregation on his side," is an advance for which we ought not to stint our thanks. The proviso itself, however, is a curious one, and we cannot help wishing that Mr. de Soyres had told us what course was to be pursued when law was on one side and a majority of the congregation on the other. Which is to be paramount? Have we here a gentle intimation that when the congregation dissent, law must hide the head of its diminished majesty, as they would have Catholic truth do? Or have this party made the further advance that, when civil and ecclesiastical law come into conflict—as they have done in past years in England—the Catholic party has been right in maintaining that God's law must take precedence of Caesar's? Until this point is cleared up by some further oracle, we shall hope the latter is the case. In another part of Mr. de Soyres' *communiqué* there is a lesson which all Churchmen need to take closely to heart. The Evangelical party must "eschew," says its spokesman, "once and forever, the inquisitorial spirit which makes war on details and loses sight of principles." This is excellent, indeed, and well will it be if some are reminded thereby that the Christian, the Catholic life, does not consist in attending a ritualistic church, defending candles and vestments, using the holy sign, bowing before the altar, and the like; but in true penitence and earnest con-

trition for sin manifesting itself in the careful observance of fasting and almsgiving, prayer and confession, due use of the sacraments and Church services, the holy days of the Church, and all those means of grace which are given us in the Church. Mere aestheticism is an enemy to be carefully watched. Still another ground for thankfulness may be found in the absolute condemnation of the "invented ritualism" which clung to "black gowns and dusty churches, three-decked pulpits and funeral psalmody." Even the "six points" are apparently to be tolerated; perhaps we may anticipate their partial adoption, as in many cases across the border, if they are not accompanied by the assumed errors of doctrine to which Mr. de Soyres and his party so strenuously object. And the "trimmers" of the day "who aim at popularity and influence by the means of saying pleasant things to both parties," are roundly denounced. We are thoroughly at one with the basal principle of this passage, which is that ritual in itself is of slight importance. Indeed, from the first the Catholic party have attacked those things which are here condemned by Mr. de Soyres, solely on account of their irreligious tendencies; while, on the other hand, the ritual, at least of the earlier Tractarians, was always subservient to the truths symbolized by it. It is, therefore, no small thing to find the slovenly ways of the old Evangelicals thus abandoned by one of the leading lights of their modern representatives. The significance of this whole article, however, must not be overlooked. The struggle of the future is to be not so much about lights and vestments, three-deckers and the Genevan gown, as about the doctrines underlying these things. This doubtless means keen strife, which is greatly to be deplored; yet it is, nevertheless, a distinct advance to have so far secured the acceptance of the decencies of public worship that the fight is to be concentrated on the more essential side of doctrine and practice. For the result we need have no fear. The same courage, earnest study and patient teaching which have beaten the black gown and its accompaniments out of the field, will not be less effective in restoring a clearer faith and more consistent life. And, as ever, "the blood of the martyrs has been the seed of the Church," so now the self-sacrificing lives and earnest devotion of men who hold the faith as once delivered to the saints, will, we doubt not, be purified and strengthened by the struggle which seems inevitable to win to the truth the Church in Canada and make it in very deed the Church of Canada.

A. P. COE.

"Fads."

SIR,—Mr. Mackenzie gives me over much credit when he apparently assumes that I am the writer of the *Teachers' Assistant*. I am merely an editor—a reproducer—of the Church of England S. S. Institute's Lesson Notes on the Course of Instruction drawn up by the Institute, and selected by our Inter-Diocesan Committee. The book has gone through several editions in England and has been used in thousands of Sunday-schools there. We are using the latest edition and we have given the meaning of Kephas word for word from its pages. We have not heard of any Sunday-school teachers or clergy being "muddled" by the explanation given, and I am surprised by Mr. Mackenzie's fears that they should be led thereby to lean upon St. Peter as the Rock of Salvation, and trust that the danger may be limited to the Diocese of Huron. Mr. Mackenzie's last letter convinces me more and more that we must adhere to our teaching. He argues that as Peter denied our Lord before his conversion, and was guilty (once) of dissimulation afterwards, his name of Kephas must be interpreted accordingly. Mr. Mackenzie speaks of Saint Peter as a "very shifting, unstable stone." And he assumes that the new name which Christ gave him was significant of this character. The late Provost Whitaker used to say, "We often take great liberties in our criticisms of the Holy Apostles." Certainly Mr. Mackenzie takes great liberties with Saint Peter. I wonder how he can read the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Peter and speak of the chief of the Apostles as "a very shifting, unstable stone," as if he were the same manner of man after the Resurrection as before. Certainly Mr. Mackenzie makes the issue clear enough. Hitherto the name of Kephas has been taken to be a name of commendation—he makes it a name of reproach. According to his argument Christ gave His most favoured Apostle a nickname to stick to him for life—a name significant of shiftiness and instability, to cast a slur upon him, and prejudice his character and usefulness. "Thou art Simon, thou shalt be called Kephas," that all men may know what a shifting, unstable stone thou art. "Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood," etc.; "and I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter," a shifting, unstable stone, "and upon this rock I will build My Church." Mr. Mackenzie's new patch agreeth not with the old. The Christian