

the Christian Scriptures. The divine element in the Old Testament was the spiritual germ from which the Gospel evolved, the rudimental teaching out of which the doctrine of Christ was developed. Instead of being Christianity's millstone, therefore, the Old Testament is rather Christianity's foundation-stone, because it forms the spiritual groundwork, so to speak, from which the Christian superstructure rises, or on which the Christian system rests.*

* Reprinted from PUBLIC OPINION, New York (condensed from North American Review).

III. T. ARNOLD HAULTAIN, TORONTO.

To the Editor of the Mail and Empire.

SIR,—In a leading article of May 9th, you characterize Dr. Workman's reply to Mr. Goldwin Smith's article as "remarkable." Remarkable it is; but remarkable, not so much because it meets Mr. Goldwin Smith's objections to the Church's view of the Old Testament, as because, coming apparently from a Churchman, it, in reality, supports and enforces those objections.

Dr. Workman's line of fire, probably quite unknowingly to himself, is—he will pardon me for saying so—entirely misdirected. Throughout his article he presents, not the Church's view of the Old Testament, but the "modern scholar's," that of "respectable scholarship," the "competent instructor's," the "true apologist's," the "judicious teacher's." But not the particular opinions of "modern scholars" and "judicious teachers," but the general doctrines of the Church, as at all events these are weekly taught from pulpit, and Sunday-school and reading-desk, were, it seemed to me, the objects of Mr. Goldwin Smith's criticism. The "modern scholar" is often quite heterodox, judged by the ordinary standard of the orthodoxy of the Church. "The Church," says the 19th Article of Religion, "is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached." Let us see how "modern scholarship," in the person of Dr. Workman, interprets the "pure Word of God."

Dr. Workman looks upon "what was once regarded by theologians as literal history" as now merely the "misconceptions of traditionalism"; he does not think the story of the Fall "teaches the primeval personality of evil"; he rejects what to many has seemed the fundamental doctrine of the Church, the vicarious sufferings of Christ (in face of Article II. of the Articles of Religion, of the Collects for the First and Second Sundays after Easter, of the Anthem for Easter Day, of the Proper Prefaces, and of the Prayer of Consecration in the Communion Service; in face of Section V. of Chapter VIII. of the Westminster Confession of Faith; and in face of Article III. of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Church), for he denies that the New Testament writers anywhere "represent God as punishing Christ for the sins of men" (despite John 10 : 49-52; Rom. 3 : 25-26; Rom. 5 : 8-10; Rom. 8 : 3; 1 Cor 15 : 3; Heb. 9 : 11-15, 22, 26, 28; Heb. 10 : 10, 11, 14, 19, 20; 1 John 1 : 7; 1 John 2 : 2); he regards "the earlier chapters of Genesis" as "traditional narratives" as "myths," and as "allegorical pictures"; "some features of the story of creation," he frankly admits, "are not to be taken literally"; he will not "attempt to correlate Genesis and geology"; he emphatically states that "Old Testament writers did not duly discriminate between a natural sequence and a divine design"; he distinctly asserts that "the ethnological statements of the Book of Genesis are imperfect"; "The Biblical account of the Creation, the Fall, the Flood, and the Tower of

Babel," he version " of Lord's app of an an calls "a tra daylight by of the Pent chronology left for the Bible on the theory that originally h not to say d of those an All this, s like proving Mr. Goldwin

is a letter to facts and figu ive duties in number of co average numb convictions as As it is gen unity into th reasing the p ways follows of poor, that p Mr. Ellis, of many well-kno that in France work, a decrea decrease in p number of con Before answe points that con me that alwa The surround at there are al