

of sins should be preached in His name? Did he ever read the absolution as pronounced at the opening of morning and evening service? When he has answered these questions we will have more.

IVY.

The Original Offer Still Open.

SIR,—Although I received only 317 orders for Hammond's "Polychurchism," or "What does the Bible say about the Church," I ordered 500 copies, which will be ready for delivery in a few days. Orders will be filled on receipt of cash, \$1.35, for ten, carriage paid, or \$1.20 carriage forward, and I will hold the original offer open till the 500 are disposed of. After that single copies will be 15 cents, quantities at 13½ cents each. Postage in addition to these rates.

ROBERT W. RAYSON,
Chairman Ont. Ch. Bk. Dep. Com.
Kingston, Ont.

"Three Handfuls of Earth."

SIR,—I question whether an anabaptist would be much impressed by the reasoning of Rev. W. E. Cooper that as the casting of three handfuls of earth upon a body was sufficient burial among the Roman Christians, therefore three handfuls of water in baptism constitute a sufficient "burial in baptism." The anabaptist would still argue that there must have been, after the casting of the earth, some disposition of the body. It was not left at the mercy of jackals and vultures. It was not really buried till it was interred. Of course no Churchman can agree with the anabaptist that immersion of the whole body, which is really submersion, is necessary to a proper performance of the sacrament. Because every well-instructed Churchman knows that though *baptizo* may sometimes mean a complete washing, as in "the washing (baptism) of pots and cups," yet it also means a partial washing, as in "the washing (baptism) of tables," and that, therefore, immersion is not the necessary meaning of the word. Hence Holy Baptism may properly be administered by immersion, or pouring, or even, less properly, by sprinkling. I say less properly, because the Church has not recognized sprinkling. "Three handfuls of earth" might satisfy the Roman Christians' conception of a burial, as Mr. Cooper says; but how about the Colossian Christians? They at least would understand by burial a coffin of earthenware, and interment in a grave outside the town. To such St. Paul writes, contrasting Jewish circumcision and baptism. Wherein lay the difference? See Col. ii. 11, 12. Circumcision was a cutting off of a part, baptism was a putting off of the whole body, of the flesh. Baptism was a complete death, burial and resurrection of the whole man. No doubt three handfuls of water are quite sufficient for a valid baptism, or one handful, or a thimbleful. The quantity signifies not. Contact with water in some way is the essential. But if baptism means the complete death, burial and resurrection of the whole man—the wholly putting off the old man and putting on the new—then it is most fully symbolized by the complete burial in the water, followed by the emerging from the water.

May 22nd.

J. D. CAYLEY.

"Whosoever Sins ye Remit, they are Remitted."

SIR,—The Rev. S. D. Hague, in his interesting letter upon the above subject, has unconsciously mooted the even more difficult problem of the origin of the "seventy," which must first be settled before the question of the power to forgive sins can be satisfactorily considered. That more than the Apostles themselves were in the room when Jesus gave the commission, St. Luke fully shows. But who were the "those with them," together with the two disciples who had walked with Jesus to Emmaus, and who returned to meet with the "eleven," (etc.)? In an article contributed to the *Eclectic* (U.S.A.), I ventured to show reason for assuming that those over and above the Apostles themselves were members of the "seventy," who thus with the original eleven, received equal power to remit and retain sins. If the power was only conferred upon the Apostles, then, notwithstanding what the Ordinal says, priests have not, nor never had this power, since one order of the Church could not possibly be viewed as capable of originating another, and conferring upon it Divine gifts only given to itself. To argue that the episcopate has the power to bestow upon an order originated by itself Divine gifts which it alone originally received, is to assume that the Church has power to create new orders, endowing them with Divine gifts at its own option, an idea repugnant to the whole conception of the Catholic Church as once and for ever constituted by Christ. This is an important subject, since either the representatives of the "seventy" were with the "eleven" when the

commission in question was conferred, or else priests have no part at all in the matter. It is needless to say that personally I hold the former view. I have several copies of the article referred to above, and would be pleased to lend them to be read, if asked by any reader to do so. Mr. Hague further raises a good point when he says: "If the ordinal is correct, then such men (i.e., those who deny to the priest the power the commission confers) ought to go elsewhere for a sphere in which to use their abilities. If the ordinal be faulty in so serious a point, then we all should be earnest and genuine enough to clear away the offence." My good friend, Mr. Hague, has yet to learn that "a strange thing has come to pass," viz., that the majority of the members of the Anglican Church know nothing of the real commission upon which their priests are sent out to act, and when it is sought to give instruction on the subject, the commission is invariably denied as a Roman invention, contrary to the Word of God. This is a sad state of things, but it is true nevertheless.

ARTHUR. E. WHATHAM.

Will Mr. De Soyres Retract?

SIR,—As Mr. de Soyres has sent you his open letter addressed to me through the columns of the *St. John N.B. Globe*, I enclose you a copy of my answer printed in the *St. John Sun*. As soon as the correspondence is closed I will send the remainder of it to you for reproduction, if you please, in the *CANADIAN CHURCHMAN*.

HENRY ROE.

SIR,—Mr. de Soyres has sent me a copy of an open letter addressed by him to me through the columns of the *St. John Globe*, which he wishes me to accept as an answer to my letter printed in your issue of the 1st of May. It is evidently no easy matter to bring Mr. de Soyres fairly to face the question of fact raised in my letter. Mr. de Soyres is a clergyman of another diocese. He assails my Bishop, making certain definite statements about him, which he considers damaging—which he intends to be damaging. I am in a position to know that these statements are every one of them untrue, and I say so. How does Mr. de Soyres meet my contradiction? He does not meet it at all. He goes off and tries to draw me off upon side issues. First he says that his review has been in print more than three months, "and yet the reference to Quebec has never been contradicted." I am afraid we are not so familiar in Quebec as we ought to be with the deliverances of Mr. de Soyres. I can only say that I contradicted his statement as soon as I saw it; and that if it had met my eye three months ago, I would have contradicted it then. Next Mr. de Soyres reproaches me for omitting, in the words I quoted from his review, a "compliment" he paid the Bishop of Quebec; and this, he admonishes me, is a very blameworthy method of quotation. Mr. de Soyres' compliment reminds me of Joab's compliment to Amasa when he stabbed him under the fifth rib. The compliment was an integral part—one of the most offensive parts of Mr. de Soyres' indictments which I was repudiating. Thirdly, Mr. de Soyres said he "quoted the statement about the removal of the book from the Quebec depository upon the protest of the congregation of the cathedral, from the official statement of the Quebec vestry itself." I have the manifesto referred to before me (which by the way, is no official statement or any statement at all of the Quebec vestry), and there is indeed a reference in it to the book in question, but I find no statement that the Bishop of Quebec placed that book in or removed it from the depository. Such a statement the writers of the manifesto could not have made, for everyone in Quebec would know very well that it was not true, inasmuch as the authentic history of the connection of Staley's book with the depository had long before appeared in the Quebec papers. As for the rest of Mr. de Soyres' letter, I have hitherto understood that private correspondence between gentlemen was sacred. This is not Mr. de Soyres' interpretation of the code of honour; and it is plain that I must hold no private correspondence with Mr. de Soyres unless I am prepared to have extracts from my letters given to the public, through the newspapers, without my leave. Having disposed of these personal matters, I beg now to restate what I asserted in my former letter. Mr. de Soyres' Review states:

1. That the Bishop of Quebec has given his official sanction to Staley's Catholic Religion.
 2. That the book was placed by the Bishop of Quebec on sale in the church book depository in the city of Quebec.
 3. That it was only removed by him upon the earnest protest of the Cathedral congregation.
- I now repeat that there is not one word of truth in any one of these statements; and I call upon Mr. de Soyres either to justify his statement or to retract it, and to withdraw from circulation the pamphlet in which it appears.

HENRY ROE,
Archdeacon of Quebec.
Windsor Mills, P. Q., May 4th.

How to Make Sermons Attractive and Profitable.

SIR,—The minister has preached two sermons—good, gospel, practical sermons—on Sunday, and he hopes they have, by the blessing of God, done some good to his congregation. Then he visits a number of his hearers during the week, but he hears nothing about his sermons. He hears a good deal about bodily ailments and the remedies for them; the weather, and perhaps the crops; politics and elections; public entertainments, or the last social scandal. The nearest to anything religious may be Church finances, or the choir and its music, or something about Low Church or High Church; but not a word about the sermons. There is as profound a silence on that subject as though he had never preached at all; and it would never do for him, either directly or indirectly, to ask his hearers what help or benefit they had derived from his discourses; or even to give them a hint, however (modest) or delicate, suggesting that they might indicate in some way or other as to whether they were interested in them, understood them, liked them or otherwise. If he were a medical man who had been ministering to their bodily health, they would be sure to tell him how they "felt now," and he, as a doctor, would perhaps know what to do or not to do next for his patients; but he, as a clergyman, hears not a whisper of encouragement, or enquiry, or of spiritual ailment or health, to indicate what should be the nature of his discourses next Sunday. There may be among his hearers gray-haired men and women who are but babes in religious knowledge, understanding and experience. There may also be among them spiritual difficulties, temptations, sorrows, skeptical doubts, weakness of faith and weakness of hope, bordering on black despair; all of which he ought to know so as to afford him suitable subjects on which to speak, either in sermons or in private conversation. But there may be also some of his hearers whose doubts have been removed, whose faith has been strengthened and whose hearts have been cheered through his ministrations, and who, while now rejoicing in hope, give thanks to God for His servant, their pastor. They ought to let their minister know such things to cheer and encourage him in his work, and such cheer will enter into his very sermons. The Venerable Archdeacon Siuclair is now, perhaps, the most popular preacher in London, England. His sermons are always written, and vigorously delivered in reading. They are simple and easy in language, practical, and exhibit thought, originality, wide reading and sympathy with his hearers. He draws immense congregations in St. Paul's Church, and is most acceptable to the working classes. He has ever been a hard-working, faithful pastor, and knows what a sermon ought to be. The following is what he said a few weeks ago at St. Margaret's Church, Westminster: "Sermons will be very largely what you make them. If the preacher fires them off over your head and you take no notice of them, and never let him know whether you agree or disagree, whether you understand or were puzzled, whether you were moved or remained cold—what can he do? He knows nothing of what you are thinking or feeling. If you want sermons to be a reality and a living sympathetic help, you must let the preacher know your doubts and difficulties; you must tell him what kind of effect his discourses have had; you must suggest subjects which you wish treated; you must encourage him without reserve to be practical, effective, useful and suggestive, bringing the light of the Gospel of Christ into every department of human life. He will be greatly indebted to you on his side, and you will find the interest of the weekly exhortation or discussion so growing and increasing that you will never wish to be absent from it. You have lost your right of free speech in the Christian assembly by reason of ancient disorders; but in this way you can still exercise its equivalent. It is in your own power to make the pulpit as vigorous, effective, real and pertinent for every aspiration of your heart, and in every enquiry of your mind, as it was in its most powerful and popular days."

W. J. M.

Being Born of Water and of the Spirit.

SIR,—In your issue of May 9th, your correspondent from Franktown (Ontario Diocese) expresses himself strongly against the Bishop of Huron and his book, "Life in a Look." In such cases it is always pertinent to ask "cui bono"—does any good result accrue? The chief objection hitherto made against that book had regard to the Bishop's interpretation of "being born of water and of the Spirit." It is instructive, therefore, to set some of the Bishop's words beside those of Hooker and Westcott, who are weighty authorities with all parties in the Church. Bishop Baldwin—"To be born of water is to be born by the agency of God's Word. . . . As there are many who believe that by this word 'water' we are to understand baptism, I wish now to say on what grounds I utterly dissent from such an interpretation" ("Life in a Look," pp. 29, 30). Hooker—"I