

glad to be able to report that services have been started in three new centres in the district during the winter.

MACKENZIE RIVER.

James R. Lucas, Bishop.

Special interest attaches to the ordination of Mr. C. H. Quarterman at Wycliffe College, Toronto, last Sunday morning, from the fact that it was Bishop Lucas' first ordination since his appointment to the Bishopric. The presence of Rev. C. E. Whittaker and the veteran Rev. E. J. Peck added great appropriateness to the occasion. It was fitting that three such noble warriors of the Cross in the far North and North-West should unite in the setting apart of the younger man for this strenuous work. Mr. Quarterman enters upon a truly apostolic succession in being appointed to the arduous service of the diocese of Mackenzie River. He is to work at Chippewyan.

CALEDONIA.

F. H. DuVernet, D.D., Bishop, Prince Rupert, B.C.

TERRACE.—ST. MATTHEW'S.—A very impressive ordination service was held in this church, March 22nd, when Rev. W. H. J. Petter, of Terrace and Rev. L. C. Banks, of Port Eslington were advanced to the priesthood. The Bishop was assisted in the service by the Rev. T. J. Marsh.

Books and Bookmen

TWO EASTER BOOKS.

By the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.

The Evangelists and the Resurrection. By the Rev. R. W. Harden. London: Skeffingtons, 3s. 6d.

Legal and Historical Proof of the Resurrection of the Dead. By John F. Whitworth. Harrisburg, Pa., U.S.A. Publishing House of the United Evangelical Church, 50 cents.

Books on the subject of the Resurrection are always welcome if they help us to understand better the grounds and character of our faith in the Risen Lord. These two, which have recently been published, answer to this requirement, and it is at once a duty and a privilege to call attention to them. The first is by an Irish clergyman who is concerned at recent attempts to explain the Resurrection on naturalistic grounds. He believes the Gospels contain inspired history, that they are trustworthy, and that much of our modern criticism is opposed to the plain statements of the narratives. He also holds that the present unrest and unbelief is largely due to the ignorance of the plain meaning and contents of Scripture, and he therefore pleads for a thorough study of the Gospels themselves instead of being content with accepting what others say about them. His interpretations are often novel, always fresh, and usually convincing. He makes out a remarkably strong case for the view that the "brethren" to whom Mary Magdalene was to go were not our Lord's disciples, but His brothers who are mentioned earlier in the Gospel as not yet believing on Him. Mr. Harden wishes students to become convinced once again of the absolute truthfulness of the Evangelists and the bounden duty of a thorough examination of what they say before passing opinion in a dogmatic form on what they are supposed to contain. No one can use this book without becoming confirmed in his faith that in the Gospels we possess reliable records. It is a work which calls for thorough study and makes its appeal to students and teachers.

The other book is by a layman who is a lawyer, and in the course of four chapters he provides a convincing argument in support of the resurrection of the dead. The first chapter reviews with brevity and clearness various arguments of philosophers and scientists. Then follows a chapter on the "legal proof," in which the question is faced whether the New Testament gives legal and competent evidence in proof of the resurrection of the dead. This point is driven home by means of the well-known method of legal evidence for ancient documents, following the familiar and striking treatment of Greenleaf's Evidence, where we are told that the burden of proof is on

the objector to impeach the genuineness of these books, not on the Christian to establish it. Then the "historical proof" is considered, and the New Testament as it is now is shown to be the same as originally written. The familiar method of Paley is used here with great effect. Then in the fourth and last chapter the evidence in the New Testament is carefully examined, and with great force the impossibility of the rationalistic position is shown, and also the coherence of the New Testament with all avenues of truth. The evidence is cogent, cumulative, and overwhelming. For those who are troubled, or whose faith needs confirmation nothing could be better than this small, clear, and satisfying book. We are inclined to think that it was not Lyman Abbott, but Thomas Arnold who declared that "no event in the world's history was better attested than is the Resurrection of Jesus," (p. 67).

Received:—The Mission World, (M.S.C.C.); The Church Gazette, (National Church League); The University Monthly; The Chronicle, (Protestant Episcopal Church).

Correspondence

THE CHURCH.

Sir,—A correspondent has just written to the English weekly paper, the "Spectator," under the name of "A Converted Sacerdotalist." It occurs to me that your readers might like to see what he says:—

It is impossible for the High Churchmen to abandon the "Zanzibar" attitude in this question as long as they consider the "Apostolical Succession" and the "Three Orders" essential parts of a divinely constituted order for the Church. The late Dr. Hatch in his book on the organization of the early Christian Church has shown conclusively that this "sacerdotal" view is opposed to the facts in the Acts, and in early Church history. By diligent examination of Jewish customs and modes of thought in Apostolic times, he proves that the expression "laying-on of hands" had in those days a secular rather than a sacred meaning. He adduces evidence from Church history and from the early mosaics at Ravenna that for some centuries there was no such sharp line of demarcation between cleric and layman, or between Bishop, priest, and deacon, as is assumed in the High Church theory. If the facts Dr. Hatch collected and marshalled together with such convincing effect could only be laid before the High Churchmen individually, and without party bias, at the present crisis, it might help them to adopt an attitude less disastrous to the cause of Christian unity. They would realize that, as Hooker said, no system of Church government can be proved conclusively from Holy Writ. Without for a moment giving up their loyalty to the Church of England, they would realize that Nonconformists also may claim to have been guided in their development by the Holy Spirit. Instead of, as at present, having to admit rather grudgingly the many virtues displayed by other denominations, especially in the mission field, they would be able to exult in their victories and to march hand-in-hand with them against the forces of heathenism and Islam.

Yours, Churchman.

HURON W.A.

Sir,—Allow me to correct an error in your issue of this week. The Branches of the Huron W.A. did not contribute \$620 to Huron College, as stated on page 217, but to the education of six missionaries' children, which constitutes its educational work.

Gertrude Waller,
Convener of Educational Committee.

CANON PLUMMER AND CONFIRMATION.

Sir,—I am glad to find that I am quite in accord with Canon Plummer in one sentence in his letter in your issue of 12th inst., which I regret I only read to-day, 24th inst. "I believe (with him) that careful study will end in strengthening the position of Confirmation," i.e., if he means in the hearts and minds of Churchmen. He tells us, however, that "the rule requiring Confirmation as a preliminary to Communion is not scriptural." May I remind him that so soon as "the

apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John," (Acts 8:14, etc.)? Again, when "Paul came to Ephesus he found there certain disciples and said unto them, Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?" etc., (Acts 19:2, etc.). Canon Plummer will tell me that there is no reference here to "the laying-on of hands," (Confirmation), as a preliminary to Holy Communion, but he will at any rate agree with me that the apostles considered it necessary for the baptized, and that as soon as possible after Holy Baptism. Then Canon Plummer tells us that our Lord "did not ordain" Confirmation. This statement is at least gratuitous. Will Canon Plummer tell us of what our Lord spoke to the apostles during the great forty days, (Acts 1:3)? There is only one way that we can know, i.e., by what the apostles both did and taught. That He did speak to them of Confirmation, ordination, etc., is at least probable, and I would have as much right to claim that Confirmation is one of the things of which our Lord spoke, as another has to assert that "He did not ordain" Confirmation. The Church very wisely has said neither the one nor the other. However this may be, we do know that the Holy Spirit guided the apostles "into all truth," (St. John 16:13), and "taught them all things, and brought all things to their remembrance, whatsoever He had said unto them," (St. John 14:26). Let us suppose that our Lord did not ordain Confirmation, at least Canon Plummer will admit that the holy apostles acted under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. He taught them to "lay hands" upon the baptized. We find that immediately after the Descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, when the people were pricked to the heart and asked what they should do, "Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," (Acts 2:37, 38). In Acts 8 and 19 we read of the apostles "laying on hands" that they might receive the Holy Ghost after Holy Baptism. I do not know why the Holy Spirit chose this way of coming to the baptized, but Holy Scripture tells me so and I believe it. The Church of England evidently believes this to be the method by which the Holy Spirit comes in His seven-fold gifts. The action of the apostles in laying on hands upon the baptized as soon as possible after baptism seems to me at least to warrant the Church's rule that "none shall be admitted to Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous of being confirmed."

Canon Plummer says that this position (i.e., requiring Confirmation before Communion) "ought not to be the attitude of a Church with a universal message." Surely he has forgotten that St. Peter said on the day of Pentecost, "The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," (Acts 2:39). Comparing this passage with Acts 1:4, "Wait for the promise of the Father," it is quite plain that "the promise" referred to is the promise of the Holy Spirit, consequently, Confirmation or "the laying-on of hands" by which the Holy Ghost is given is something intended for all. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls it one of "the foundation principles of the doctrine of Christ," (Heb. 6:1, 2), and as such is certainly a "Catholic" practice or ceremony. Canon Plummer himself acknowledges it to be "Apostolic," and "holds strong views on its 'sacramental' character." I am glad we can agree in this.

I need hardly remind Canon Plummer that the preface to the Confirmation Office tells us that it is the Church of England which has deferred Confirmation until children have come to years of discretion, but the Office needs only to be read to make manifest that she is quite clear in her teaching that the Holy Spirit is conferred through the laying-on of hands, a gift in which the recipient is "to daily increase more and more until he come unto God's everlasting kingdom." As to whether Confirmation "creates a spiritual condition in the recipient" depends not upon the gift alone but upon the manner in which the gift is received and guarded. There is no question that if the Holy Spirit be received with repentance and faith He does "create a spiritual condition in the recipient," and does help him in preparation for the further gift of the precious Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in the Holy Communion; only the Holy Spirit can make us such as He will accept in that Holy Sacrament. "A person who is ready to be confirmed," Canon Plummer says, "is just as much unconfirmed as one who has no intention of being confirmed." Surely Canon Plummer forgets that means of grace are necessary for us, but not for God. That if prevented