

Church of God," not *The Church in God*, we read of the "Church of England" (*vide* book of Common Prayer Title Page) but not of *The Church in England*; we read of "The Church of Ireland," not of "The Church in Ireland," when we read our formularies and legal documents. Let us hope that before we attempt to name another daughter of the Mother Church, we are determined to make up our minds, cost what it may, to give her the only name she can have, if she is to be correctly known among National Churches. (*Vide* also Article xix). As Bishop Cleveland Cox, of U.S.A., is so often pointing out, nationalism in the churches is the one thing of all others obscured to-day to the decay of Christendom. We cannot be too particular and too conservative in our use of language. His Lordship of Qu'Appelle and the Rev. Jas. Gammack, in the first instance, show this. Let us not give any name if we are not prepared to assume full responsibility for our actions. The Mother Church has taught us a grand lesson in having the words "The Church of England" in the Magna Charta of England. Let us have the words, "The Church of Canada" in the Magna Charta of Canada, or let us leave a large blank whereby we declare there is as yet no Church (only missionary bands of persons,) in our midst.

Rome is ever against nationalism. She detests it. We are for it. What Mr. Gammack means by "too restricted" we know not, for he does not explain. Surely he does not want, for he cannot have, a wider term than that of "The Church of Canada." If Newfoundland should come into the Dominion, all will be well. If they set up a nationality for themselves, then they must have a national Church.

If they were to join the nation to the south of us, they would come under "The Church of the United States of America," not as some foolishly try to term it, "The Church of America," a most absurd title.

C. A. F.

A Grievous State of Affairs in the Diocese of Huron.

SIR,—A careful perusal of the Huron Synod Journal for the year 1891 reveals the astounding and deplorable fact that in only four out of the 246 churches of the Diocese there is a weekly Eucharist, that is to say, that in less than two per cent. of our churches is the Lord's service on the Lord's Day celebrated.

Surely this is a lamentable and altogether inexcusable state of affairs, for making liberal calculation for out-stations, there must be at least one hundred churches where the Blessed Sacrament could be celebrated every Lord's Day.

What wonder that the general public estimates lightly and cheaply the ministerial office, contemptuously terms our priests "preachers," and refuses to accord them any higher position than that of men—Sunday lecturers.

And on higher grounds, now, I ask, can we ever look for any real blessing in connection with our work, when we deliberately degrade the Blessed Sacrament into a mere hole and corner affair, and allow the place of the "Divine Liturgy" to be usurped by "glorified matins" and by the humanly ordained services, instead of honouring our risen and ascended Lord by, on His Day at least, and in His House, showing forth before God and man His Death, and pleading before the Throne His "full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

We talk glibly and complacently about the errors and corruptions of Rome, and I am in no wise desirous of minimizing them, but is there any Roman corruption or defection worse than this degradation of the Blessed Sacrament on the part of the Church of England. With all her errors, the Roman Church has stood faithful to this great duty of making the "breaking of the bread" and "the showing forth of the Lord's Death" the great central act of worship. And may we not believe that in thus honouring her Lord she has been forgiven many sins of omission and commission, or at least preserved from the extinction that to some would seem her righteous desert?

We heard a great deal about the various hindrances to the prosperity of the Canadian Church, but considering the way in which we dishonour our Lord by neglecting and slighting His Ordinance, the wonder to me is that we are half as prosperous as we are, and that God has not long since removed our candlestick from the land. And of this I am firmly convinced, that until the "Divine Liturgy" is restored to its right and proper place, the work of the Canadian Church will languish and falter. Only by the power of prayer can we go in and occupy the land, and only by the mighty and effectual pleading of the one great sacrifice in the way that Christ has ordained can we hope that God, for the sake of Him who pleads above, will open the windows of Heaven and shower down upon us the abundance of His grace and mercy.

That God may guide us in this Diocese to a fuller appreciation of our privileges and duties in this su-

premiely important matter, that the present grievous state of affairs may be reversed so that a parish church without a weekly celebration of the Holy Communion may be as much the exception as now, alas, it is the rule, is my most devout and heartfelt prayer. "Them that honour me I will honour."

FRONDEX.

Diocese of Huron, Oct., 1891.

Inspiration.

SIR,—Will you kindly permit me to write a few lines with reference to the article entitled "Inspiration—Verbal or What?" published in your issue of Sept. 24th. I cannot but think you have somewhat underrated the strength of the position of those who hold, more or less fully, what are known as advanced views on this subject.

It may be the case that some of the articles which appear on this subject in our magazines and reviews, are the hasty utterances of men whose enthusiasm has overpowered their judgment, but that this class of writers alone advocates more liberty in the matter of views on inspiration, can hardly be maintained in face of the facts. The impression left upon the mind by your article is that the new views of the origin and construction of the Old Testament are supported by men of very inferior calibre, who rush hastily into print with the expression of crude views and ill-founded judgments concerning that whereof they write.

I do not think anyone will be disposed to regard Prof. Sanday, of Oxford, as one given to "dashing off articles" of a "shallow character." Yet he has recently felt impelled, I might say, reluctantly impelled, to approach the subject of inspiration, and to give expression to views based upon a candid recognition that many of the results of modern criticism are now fairly established.

A few quotations from "The Oracles of God" will serve to illustrate Sanday's general position. After speaking of the present disquietude arising out of the spread of the new views, he says: "This uneasy feeling is not lessened by the fact that the expressions of opinion by which it has been excited, have not had anything of the nature of an attack. They have not come from the extreme Left or from the destructive party in ecclesiastical politics and theology, but they have come from men of known weight and sobriety of judgment, from men of strong Christian convictions, who, it is felt, would not lightly disturb the same convictions in others,—men, too, of learning, who do not speak without knowing what they say." (The Oracles of God, pp. 5, 6.)

So again, a little further on, speaking of the English critics, he says, "I have also the advantage that some of those engaged in these studies are personal friends of my own, and to their singleness of mind and earnest religious purpose, as well as to their thorough competence to deal with questions of so much importance, I must needs bear testimony." (pp. 6, 7.)

Prof. Sanday next proceeds to give the reasons for these changed views. These are "partly external and partly internal. Partly they turn upon the discovery or extended use of new material, and partly they depend upon the closer analysis of the sacred texts." (pp. 7, 8.)

a. The testimony of the monuments generally confirm Old Testament history, but not always. In the sphere of chronology, though the monumental chronologies "present a great deal of approximate agreement with the Books of Kings, there are some not unimportant differences." (P. 9 and cf. note 1.)

b. The discovery of Babylonian versions of some of the early narratives has convinced many men of learning and candour that "traditions in respect to the Creation and the Flood were originally the common property of the Semitic races, developed by each in accordance with the genius of its religion." (cf. p. 10, note 1.) "The history of science reveals plainly that God has permitted the evolution of true ideas on scientific subjects to be entangled in a mass of fantastic error. In the Biblical account this appears to be reduced to something like a minimum—more than this we cannot say." (P. 10, n. 1.)

c. In regard to the literary treatment of the Bible, Dr. Sanday says: "The Bible is a literature, and it was inevitable that the same methods which had been applied to other literatures should be applied also to it." (p. 11 and esp. cf. n. 1. That Dr. Sanday is inclined to accept, at least in a great measure, the views of modern criticism on the subject of the date of the writings of the Old Testament appears from Appendix II, where he quotes with approval Dr. Siegfried's judgment that he who would really trace the development of Israel's religion, must start from the elder Prophets, on which Sanday remarks: "Probably the order thus sketched is the best that the student could adopt. By going first to Isaiah and the prophets who are grouped around him, he will penetrate at once to the very centre of the religion of Israel; he will learn to understand its distinctive features, and he will be in the best position for tracing them both backward

in the order of their genesis, and forward in their ulterior developments." (Pp. 146, 147.)

There is then, according to Dr. Sanday, a human as well as a Divine element in the Bible (p. 15), "and the tendency of the last 50 or 100 years of investigation is to make it appear that this human element is larger than had been supposed." This view is grounded upon (a) the uncertain state of the text (pp. 18, 287.) (b) The divergence between scriptural expressions and scientific discoveries (pp. 24, 25), and (c) the strong reasons which exist for supposing that "in the Old Testament . . . there are books which are composite in their origin, which were not so written, as we have them, all at once, but which were put together at sundry times and in divers manners, one document here and another document there, welded together into a single whole, but not so welded that all traces of the combination are obliterated, . . . that there are aggregates of writings which pass under names which of right belong only to part of them; that laws and customs of a later date are sometimes attributed to an earlier; that not all the historical statements rest upon contemporary record, but that some of them have passed through a stage—longer or shorter—of tradition before they were committed to writing. This we are told, and that not lightly or conjecturally, but as a result of close examination. The body of proof is weighty and cannot easily be rejected." (Pp. 28, 29.)

It is not my object now to speak of the able way in which Dr. Sanday shows that, in spite of the fullest allowance of these facts, the Bible is assuredly the Word of God. I am only interested in showing that a learned and honoured occupant of a chair of Biblical learning in the University of Oxford, holds those views which are so (pardon the word) contemptuously dealt with in your article.

May I ask you to consider the case of that man of profound learning and no less piety, whose death was so deeply deplored by all Biblical scholars, viz., the late Franz Delitzsch, concerning which Sanday says, "A very significant fact was the conversion of the veteran Delitzsch, who died on March 4th of this year, at the age of nearly seventy-seven, substantially to the new views. A man of extraordinary learning and of deep piety, he had all his life contended for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, until first in two preliminary essays published in 1880 and 1882, and then in the fifth edition of his Commentary on Genesis (1887), he threw over this, and without admitting any change in his religious convictions, he practically went over to the other side," (p. 11, n. 1).

Space will only allow me to mention other names. But surely those of Canon Driver, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford; of Canon Cheyne, Professor of Biblical Interpretation, at Oxford; Professor Ryle, of Cambridge; Mr. Gore, of the Pusey House; and amongst Presbyterians, of the learned and careful Dr. Davidson, of Edinburgh, and many others who hold more or less similar views to those of Dr. Sanday, but who occupy honoured positions in great seats of learning, should suffice to render a writer, with a due sense of the responsibility of his position, very slow to pen such words as those contained in the article on Inspiration.

The work of these men cannot fairly be described as one of "piecemeal undermining." It is not seemly that such men should, by implication if not by name, be compared to sappers who attack "each his one little stone, expecting that, in course of time, the whole fabric will fall." Such is not, to use your expression, "the game." Further, your readers should be aware that your words, "There can, in fact, be no other inspiration than verbal inspiration," are simply an expression of private opinion, not the judgment of the Catholic Church, which has yet to be given.

Permit me, sir, in conclusion, briefly and humbly to state what seems to me the state of the case. For more than one hundred years, a profound and earnest study of the Holy Scriptures, and all that could by any possibility be brought to throw light upon them, has been conducted by scholars, some of whom, it is not denied, have been hostile to the faith; but not all, and many candid, open-minded men have come to the conclusion that our old views, inherited mostly from the generation that followed the reformers, can be no longer maintained. I do not say that these new views are demonstrated, but the facts on which they are based have been felt to be of such cogency that many are convinced of their truth, so that they can no longer honestly profess the old views. But they have clearly seen that no essential doctrine of the Church is destroyed thereby, and yet they know that many earnest, good people are much distressed (1) because they too are in doubt about the old views, and (2) they still desire to cleave to the faith, but supposing their doubts are heretical, gradually fall away. It is to these latter that men like Dr. Sanday more particularly address themselves, in order to show that there is, after criticism has done its worst, a solid standing ground upon which faith may rest.

The critics then ask not that everyone shall think