

upon capital to pay annuities for two consecutive years, it is not saying too much to hint that the fund is in danger. The *annuitants*, however, need have no fears, for, unless I am greatly misinformed, they have vested rights which the diocese must satisfy so long as there are any funds, of whatever nature, in the treasury.

THE CHAIRMAN W. & O. FUND, DIO. ONT.
The Rectory, Napanee.

Synodical Returns.

SIR,—Many of the clergy and others in Canada are busy at this season in making up their synodical returns, and must have their minds full of the unsuitability of our ecclesiastical year for matters of annual comparison. This past year from Easter to Easter chances to be one of fifty-five weeks, and our Vestries are jubilant over the increase of their incomes. Next year there will only be fifty-three weeks with a corresponding shrinkage of the funds: the following year will be still shorter and show the funds lower, but in 1895 there will be a rebound. Is not this form of calculation a case of ecclesiasticism run to seed? Would it not be more business-like to have our church reports made up to Lady-day as our term-day? Easter is seldom before the 25th of March: it will be next in 1894, 1951, 2085, &c. On such a fixed basis the annual returns would be of some real value, but on the present plan of constant variations no just comparison can ever be drawn.

JAMES GAMMACK, LL.D.
East Toronto, May 2nd, 1892.

Translation and Importation of Bishops.

SIR,—Your Quebec correspondent gives the names of four gentlemen, one of whom is likely to be chosen to fill the place of the late lamented Bishop of Quebec. I am sorry to see that two of these imply a contemplated translation and one an importation. The Church from the beginning has set her face against translations. The first grand Council of Nicea, Canon 15, and the Council of Sardica, Canon 1 and 2, absolutely prohibit such translations. And as long as the Church acted as one they were never permitted, as a matter of arrangement between a Diocese and any individual Bishop: but only after they had been considered and commended, or at least sanctioned by a Provincial Synod. And this was manifestly a harsh provision, as the bishop chosen would probably feel strong temptation to conclude that a translation that would be to his advantage or comfort, would also be to the advantage of the Church. And the Diocese choosing would be very apt to put its own interests above the interests of the Church at large. Then such a provision was soon found to be necessary to prevent schemes of ambition, and consequent secularity of mind and intrigue, on the part of the bishops. The feeling soon grew up that the bishop was married to his diocese (hence the Episcopal ring), and so could not without spiritual adultery put away his spouse and be married to another. Both the bishops named have been lately called to the Episcopate, and however strong the temptation may be to accept a more remunerative position, or however well adapted they may be for the Episcopal oversight of the vacant See, yet their translation would imperil, and in this case would sacrifice, most important interests of the Church which depend absolutely upon them. I hope therefore that no consideration of advantage on the one side or the other will lead to actions which would probably be disastrous to the general interest of the Church, and contrary to the judgment of the first ages of the Faith.

But if translations are contrary to the mind of the peerage of the Church, importations are contrary to the teaching of experience, and the judgment of our honest citizens, manifested in all other departments of public administration. Why should we think more of importing judges, bank-managers, or officers of our volunteer regiments? It is a Scotch saying that "all distant hills are green." I have no doubt, however, that there are just as learned and just as capable men in the Diocese of Quebec as the gentleman named from abroad. Then surely the education that come from being among a people is of vast importance in an office of administration. To know their habits, sentiments and genius, is of more value than any amount of book learning or canonical dignity. Englishmen are excessively national. They grow up with the innate feeling that whatever is not English is necessarily no good, and so they have less power of adaptation than any other race of men that comes to our shores. Then surely it is time that we learned to honor our own people. They have proved themselves capable in every other department, and they will do so in the Episcopate, if only they are trusted and tried. I have not written this letter in the interest of Canon Du Moulin, who would probably not accept the position if elected, but in the interest of the Canadian Church and the Canadian people. Let the Churchmen of Quebec

choose a clergyman of their own Diocese, or if they won't do that, at least of their own country—one whom they know and can trust, and not run the risk of importing into the Canadian Episcopate another "Higher Criticism" sceptic, or a fossilized Englishman who will be too old to learn the sentiments and ways of the Canadian people.

A DELEGATE.

Biblical Criticism.

SIR,—In the introductory chapter to Hatch on "The Organization of the Early Christian Churches," we have a very clear description of the modern scientific historical method. In dealing with the questions of which his book is an answer, Hatch tells us he uses this modern method. We are all aware how Gore, using the same method in his book on "The Church and Ministry," arrives at several conclusions strangely differing from Hatch. We ordinary individuals are thus forced to the conclusion that although we grant the "method" perfect, its application is not also invariably perfect, and when doctors differ, we mediocre mortals may have an opinion. Some years ago this method was applied to the New Testament, in such a way as to prove that the Apostles were at daggers drawn, and that the books of the New Testament (many of them) were written with the express purpose of discrediting each other. Lightfoot, again applying the same method in his works on the Pauline Epistles, and especially in his essay on "Paul and The Three," demolished this conclusion. This was a German theory, afterwards appearing rather awkwardly in an English dress called "Supernatural Religion." Matthew Arnold in the preface to "Literature and Dogma," warns us that to get "the facts, the data in most matters of science, but notably in theology and Biblical learning, we must go to Germany. This is half apparent to English religion even now, and it will daily become more and more apparent," but "a man may have the facts and yet be unable to draw the right conclusions from them." After we have got all the facts, justness of perception to deal with the facts is still required, and is even the principal thing of all. But in this sort of tact the German mind does seem to be even by nature somewhat wanting. Give a Frenchman, an Italian, an Englishman, the same knowledge of facts—removing from him all such disturbing influence as political partisanship, ecclesiastical antipathies, national vanity—and you could in general trust his perception more than you can a Germans." Matthew Arnold may seem a peculiar authority to quote in this connection, but I have done so simply because he is certainly a disinterested authority.

What many feel is not that Gore has pushed into prominence radical and destructive views of Old Testament criticism, but that he has been over hasty in conceding certain points to German critics. The subject had not remained long enough in the crucible: there was no great necessity for hurry. It is rather a painful process to extract the fangs from hostile theories regarding the title deeds of the Faith, and if the theories be not final ones, the process has been an unnecessary one after all. "We may suppose" (writes Gore) "Deuteronomy to be a republication of the law" in the spirit and power "of Moses, put dramatically into his mouth. Criticism goes further and asks us to regard Jonah and Daniel, among prophetic books, as dramatic compositions worked up on the basis of history." "What we may suppose to have happened is that Moses himself established a certain germ of ceremonial enactment in connection with the ark and its sacred tent, and with the 'ten words,' and that this developed always as 'the law of Moses,' the whole result being constantly attributed, probably unconsciously and certainly not from any intention to deceive, to the original founder."—"the Holy Spirit and inspiration." I have quoted these passages to make Gore's position clear, and now for another side of the question—for most questions have two sides. Siddon's answer to this is as follows:—"We may have noticed perhaps that when estimates of this kind are put forward, they are constantly prefaced by the observation that the Christian Church has never defined what inspiration is, and it is left to be inferred that a book may still be in some singular sense inspired, although the statements which it contains are held by the critic to be opposed to the truth of history or the truth of morals. It is, no doubt, true that no authoritative definition of what the inspiration of the Holy Scripture is has ever been propounded by the Church of Christ, just as she has propounded no definition of the manner and effect of the action of the Holy Spirit on the soul of man. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof, and can'st not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth.' In the Book of Deuteronomy many addresses are ascribed to Moses, and Moses himself describes a series of events of which he claims to have been an eye-witness. When we are told that these addresses and these

narratives were in reality unknown to the real Moses, that they were composed by some Jew who lived many centuries after Moses . . . we must observe that such a representation is irreconcilable—I do not say with inspiration—but with the veracity of the book, which certainly claims to be one thing, and is, according to the critic, quite another.

What we, you and I, have to note is this: that unless there is such a thing as the inspiration of inerrancy, we must choose between the authority of some of our modern critical advisers, and any belief whatever in the inspiration of the books which they handle after this fashion . . . Our Lord went out of His way (if we may reverently speak thus) to sanction not a few portions of Holy Scripture which our modern scepticism too eagerly rejects . . . The trustworthiness of the Old Testament is, in fact, inseparable from the trustworthiness of the Lord Jesus Christ, and if we believe that He is the true Light of the world, we shall resolutely close our ears against any suggestions of the falsehood of those Hebrew Scriptures which have received the stamp of the Divine authority."—(Liddon—"The Value of Scripture.") "The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Truth . . . If it could be really shown that the addresses ascribed to Moses in Deuteronomy were the compositions of a writer of the age of Josiah, who desired to secure for later legal decisions or institutions the countenance of the great law-giver, or that speeches attributed to David in the Book of Chronicles were never uttered by David at all, but only represented the opinion of a sacerdotal scribe after the exile, as to what David if properly instructed would or should have said,—or that passages in Daniel which claim to be predictions of still future events, are really a history of events, which the writer had himself witnessed, . . . it surely would be shown that the Holy Spirit could not have inspired the writings in question." And again, speaking in reference to the Old Testament he says, "If the Holy Spirit is in any degree concerned in the production of its contents, we may be sure its language is not such as to create a false impression, and that which claims on the face of it to be history is not really fiction in historical guise." (Liddon, "The Work of the Holy Spirit.")

I have made these lengthy quotations simply that your ordinary readers may be able to follow this question, for although we may not, and, indeed, cannot do original work on this question, yet we are at liberty to judge the conclusions of those who are in a position to do such work. Doctors differ, all original work is not faultless, neither is every application of the method we first of all referred to, perfect.

WM. BEVAN,

Mount Forest.

"What is to be the Future of the Church in Canada?"

SIR,—The great question before the Church in Canada to-day is that of consolidation, or rather the question which I have set at the head of this communication: "What is to be the future of the Church in Canada?"

Canada is no longer a small and insignificant colony of the British Empire; vast in territory, almost boundless in resources, abounding in mineral and agricultural wealth, the outlook of her future is full of the brightest promise and richest anticipations. Whether she is to be part of a Greater Britain, the mighty daughter of a noble mother, bound with her sister colonies in a Federated Empire more splendid than the world has ever seen, or to become an independent nationality, time alone will show. The statesmen of our country, looking forward to the time when the vast fields of the North-West will be peopled with the overflow of population from Europe, have made provision for the recognition and establishment of provinces as the growth and settlement of the country may require. Should not the Church of England take the same large and hopeful view of her own future and make like provision now? Ought we not to expect "great things," and prepare for great things?

The Church of England is by name and by her history the National Church of the English-speaking peoples. This is what we Churchmen of to-day should look forward to, her becoming in the Canada of the future the National Church. Should we not, then, as the Church of the ancient Roman Empire did, try, as far as may be, to adapt the Church to the national ideal, identify her with the growth and development of the nation, and in order to do so, follow out in her system the provincial lines and boundaries of the State so far as possible? The question that is to be discussed at the next Provincial Synod of the formation of a Dominion Synod, is one of the greatest importance to the future of the Church. The difficulties that meet us are the immense territory covered, the great distances to be travelled, the expense entailed, the present preponderance of population in the Eastern part of the Dominion, and the existing Provincial Synods. Would

it not be
sider th
which v
fit in wi
hopes?

For i
Eastern
Province
wick, I

This ar
It is inc
ally to
vinces.

tion, be
Domini
inconve
and he

so diffe
the pre
and an
make it

time a
West a
increas

Should
provisi
early C

not nec
when t
touch

almost
with bi
Might

indeed
future;
1. T

soon as
Provin
2. T

repress
vinces
3. T

three
4. S

in any
separa
vincial

a prov
We
least f

or fifty
two in
Huron

cial Sy
Edwa
leave

Quebe
Edwa
the de

might
pace v
With

the co
will g
histor
that s

work
Ha

Pri

SIR,
excus
tle's r

inst.
and n

the A
upon

be do
wise

portio
the sc

troub
of the

of the
chief

ties w
we ca

ed at
gratia

Eccle
are n

and o
reten
becor

to ho
court
the G

centr
here
these

new
of a l
ting