

ture of power," is certainly more liberal than—"the result and product of the efforts of imagination, creative genius,"—which limits literature to poetry and prose fiction. "Anything within the covers of a book," is perhaps a little too liberal; but I think anything within such covers, sound in style and grammar and affording wholesome instruction or pleasure to the reader, has been and ought to be included. Mr. Horning would exclude it if true. We have been accustomed to consider the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," Locke, Tillotson and South, and even a good dictionary or the *Encyclopædia*, or in French Boscuet and others, as literature, though not fanciful or imaginative, and also great parliamentary speeches as those of Fox or Burke, and even of Demosthenes vs. Philip, and Cicero vs. Catiline. Mr. Horning even refuses our Hansard, which many of the men who make it, though they do not write it, declare it to be often highly fictitious and imaginative on one side or the other. I am specially grieved, too, for my friend Dr. Kingsford, who says his seven volumes, are strictly true and unimaginative, as I believe Mr. Parkman held that his were. I hope Mr. Horning will modify his dogma which would make Cinderella superior, as *literature*, to any of the works I have named. Your contributor, Miss Merrill, contradicts those who prophesy oblivion for Longfellow; and I agree with her; but his "Psalm of Life" is better entitled to immortality than his "Evangeline," which Dr. Kingsford says contains a good deal of anti-English fiction and fancy. I am charmed with the description of the Cathedral built by Mr. Marquis and long to see it; ask him to tell us where he built it. He should not imitate Mr. Davin who told us admirably what our Dominion Ministers should be, but refused to tell us who they should be; and so enable us to vote for them. Uncle Sam's two houses of Congress indulged in a good deal of fanciful and imaginative eloquence lately on the Silver question; but the President answered them nobly when, by vetoing their Seignorage Bill, he refused to connive at the attempt to coin and issue fifty millions of immensely depreciated silver dollars, to be used in payment of American debts of any amount. Thomas Carlyle's plan of one man government works well when that man is the best; and in Grover Cleveland his countrymen appear to have chosen their best.

CANADIAN LITERATURE.

To the Editor of The Week:

Sir,—I quite agree with Helen M. Merrill in your last issue when she questions the usefulness or utility of the late correspondence—it would not be quite correct to call it a discussion—on Canadian Literature. Some of it was rather clever fencing with shallows, some of it was an ill concealed mutual flattery and the greater part of it was evasive, the writers apparently falling easily into the style of commencement day essayists, not so much from an inability to clearly express themselves as from a timidity to do so. Mr. Mair, the author of "Tecumseh" seemed to be the one correspondent both able and willing to attack the question manfully and his contribution should act as a tonic or nerve stiffer on his fellow authors.

Correspondence on Canadian literature is not to be despised, but the main point is to really upbuild that edifice at the same

time by each writer being himself and not some fancy creation. No Canadian can help feeling a thrill of pride when he surveys the comparatively long list of Canadian writers, each one with fairly creditable productions, but at the same time no honest critic can fail to see that a demon of false word-culture is creeping into our literature and becoming fashionable. The front of the structure is a wealth of veneer and stucco, but alas! there is no tenant. The bats fly about its silent halls and the spiders weave their airy webs from the ceilings. For the heart-sympathies with their world-encircling sweep, too many of our Canadian poets have substituted polished phrases which must have cost hours of patient conning. We admire the workmanship but our hearts beat no faster. Poets we have in abundance, but many of them, especially the recognized leaders, seem to have overlooked the truth—the one essential truth that *real* poetry has a living soul, a reason for its existence and that polish the phrases as we may, and hunt for bizarre words as we will, if the full outpouring of the human heart and sympathy is not behind it all with its tale of human experience to tell, then it is not poetry at all, but only a surface polish which any clever and laborious workman could give as well.

An almost unknown Canadian author and one whom many will place among our minor poets, seems to me to have got more naturalness and real vigor into his poetry than almost any other of our writers. I refer to D. McCaig, of Collingwood, and his lately published "Milestone Moods and Memories," in which he sings of the really poetic element in our national make-up, namely, the early settler and his struggles.

C. M. SINCLAIR.

PROFESSOR SANDAY ON THE HIGHER CRITICISM.*

By that large and continually growing class of readers who are interested in the important questions raised by what is popularly if somewhat unfortunately known as the "Higher Criticism," the publication of Professor Sanday's Bampton Lectures on Inspiration has been eagerly anticipated. It is possible that some readers will be disappointed with their contents, for the lectures present neither that comprehensive treatment of the subject which the times so urgently demand, nor even an outline of such a treatment.

This, however, is not Dr. Sanday's fault, although I think the work might have been more happily entitled, for it is really not directly upon Inspiration, but upon the "Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration." It is the work of a scholar rather than a philosopher, and within its own limitations it is packed with valuable material, and not a few useful hints for future writers on Inspiration.

Dr. Sanday has naturally a good deal to say upon the subject of the Higher Criticism, both of the Old and of the New Testaments, and his remarks possess a peculiar weight in virtue of his great learning, his perfect candour, his extreme caution, and last but not least, his Christian temper. Traversing in every lecture subjects which are being vigorously discussed, there is not a word which a Christian

* Inspiration. Eight Lectures on the Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration. London and New York. 1894.

gentleman could wish unsaid. Only those who know something of the charges and countercharges, so lavishly bestowed upon writers on these topics can fully appreciate this admirable feature of Dr. Sanday's book.

I propose in this article to give in briefest form some of Dr. Sanday's conclusions in regard to Old Testament criticism. He disclaims the title of specialist in this sphere, but is a disinterested and conscientious student from without. From this standpoint, he feels that what is called the critical view of the Old Testament comes to him with great force. When he compares such works as those of Kuenen and Wellhausen on the Continent, and of Driver and Montefiore in England, with those which maintain the traditional, or a slightly modified traditional view, he finds it "impossible to resist the impression that the critical argument is in the stronger hands, and that it is accompanied by a far greater command of the materials" (2nd ed., p. 119). The cause of criticism, taken in a wide sense, and not identified with any particular theory, is, he finds it difficult to doubt, the winning cause. Nevertheless, he considers the continental critics somewhat one-sided, and believes that some of their views will twenty years hence be pronounced impossible.

Dr. Sanday regards these two general points as established: (1) The untrustworthy character of Jewish traditions as to authorship, unless confirmed by internal evidence, and (2) the composite character of very many of the books. "The Historical books consisting for the most part of materials more or less ancient set in a frame-work of later editing; some of the prophetic books containing as we now have them, the work of several distinct authors bound up in a single volume; and books like the Psalms and Proverbs also being made up of a number of minor collections only brought together by slow degrees." (p. 120).

From this general statement we may pass to some of its particular applications. In regard to the Pentateuch, Dr. Sanday holds that it contains a "genuine Mosaic foundation," but "it is very difficult to lay the finger upon it and say with confidence, here Moses himself is speaking" (p. 172). Ignoring minor subdivisions we find the Pentateuch to consist of these three main parts: (1) A double stream of narrative, the work of prophets, variously dated between 900 and 750 B.C. (2) The Book of Deuteronomy, the greater part of which belongs to a date not very long before 621 B.C., and lastly the Priest's Code (Leviticus in part and other sections of the law) which either falls at the end of the exile or else had a latent existence somewhat before it.

Next to the Pentateuch, the date and authorship of the Psalms are the chief subject of discussion. The Psalter as we have it is made up of a number of smaller collections, which once had a separate existence. They were composed at various times, and upon various occasions from David down to a late date, but how late it is impossible to say. Sanday is not of those who believe that Maccabean Psalms are contained in the Psalter, but there can be no reasonable doubt that many of them were written subsequent to the Captivity. Similar remarks apply to the Book of Proverbs.

Most readers will readily acquiesce in this view of the Psalms. Not many of them will believe with a scholar of the