

The Association for the furtherance of Christianity in Egypt, of which the Archbishop of York is Chairman, have, at the earnest request of the managers of the Iktissad Coptic School in Cairo, sent them, in the person of Mr. Oswald S. Norman, an English teacher, to give religious instruction, to teach English, science, mathematics, and to superintend the school under the Coptic committee. It is believed that under Mr. Norman's superintendence the Iktissad School will attain a state of efficiency which will render it unnecessary for the Copts to send their sons, as they have hitherto been doing, to Roman Catholic or Presbyterian schools, in order to get them properly educated. Mr. Norman, who begun his work on November 23rd last, has already won the friendship and confidence of the native committee of management and the respect of the teaching staff. One special feature is the introduction of religious teaching and Bible lessons. The number of scholars is 92, who all attend with fair regularity. This number will probably be increased on the removal shortly to larger and more suitable premises.

The Teaching of the Census in South Africa.—"The strength of our work is among the poor coloured people," writes the Bishop of Capetown on January 6. Hitherto the Wesleyans have claimed to stand second in the colony in point of numbers, but the recent census, framed by Government, shows the Dutch Reformed Church to have 298,000 adherents, of whom 220,000 are Europeans; the English Church stands second with 189,000 adherents, of whom one-half return themselves as Europeans, though the Bishop is "morally sure that a considerable number of them have a decided strain of colour, but prefer to be called white;" the other half consist of Kafirs, Fingoes, and 46,000 of mixed blood. The Wesleyans and other Methodists number 109,000, of whom 22,000 are Europeans, 63,000 Kafirs and Fingoes, and 19,000 of mixed coloured blood. The Roman Catholics number 17,000, the Presbyterians 32,000, and the Independents 66,000. These returns are for the whole Cape Colony. In the Diocese of Capetown, the land is almost entirely in the hands of the Dutch, and it is doubtful if there are 30 farmers belonging to the English Church, while in the towns and villages themselves the European members of the English Church are "only a small handful." Meanwhile, the openings before the Church are continually on the increase, and aid from the Society is indispensable.

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

N. B.—If any one has a good thought, or a Christian sentiment, or has facts, or deductions from facts, useful to the Church, and to Churchmen, we would solicit their statement in brief and concise letters in this department.

Is This the Spirit of the Church?

SIR,—The *Empire* of the 10th informs its readers that a Priest of the Church of England preached in the 1st Methodist Church at Owen Sound the previous evening. Is this in the spirit of the Church's rubrics and the ordination vows of a priest? Does the Bishop of the diocese sanction such acts? Should not the incumbent be doing service at his own church, and especially at the time of Lent?

CHURCHMAN.

Curious Lenten Fact.

SIR,—Would it interest you or your readers to know that, since the adoption of the new or Gregorian style, Lent has never begun on the 29th of February, and will not do so till the year 2096?

The 29th of February was on Wednesday in the following years, viz., 1584, 1612, '40, '68, '96, 1708, '36, '64, '92, 1804, '32, '60, and 1888, and will be in 1928, '56, '84, 2012, '40, '68 and 2096.

But in all these years but one Ash Wednesday was or will be on Feb. 15th, 22nd or March 7th, and in 2096 it will for the first time be on Feb. 29th.

B.

Calgary, Alberta, N.W.T., March 7th, 1892.

Church Choir Association.

SIR,—Will you kindly call the attention of your readers to our association, which has lately been formed in this city, and which bids fair to be a great success. Our president is Rev. Canon Du Moulin, and the other officers of the association as set forth in the accompanying copy of the constitution. Mr. W. Elliot Haslam, the well known conductor of the Haslam vocal society, and choirmaster of St. James' Cathedral, will be in charge of the combined choirs, and Mr. E. W. Phillips, the talented organist of St.

George's Church, will preside at the organ, on the occasion of the first festival service to be given in St. James' Cathedral on the 19th May next, at 8 o'clock p.m. It has been a great effort to have the service in May this year, and the time left for preparations has been very short. The music will, in consequence, be of a simple character; but we hope in future to attempt something more elaborate. We shall be glad to enrol honorary members, as provided by clause iv. (subdivision ii.) of the constitution, which reads:—"The associate membership shall consist of persons who desire to forward the work of the association, and who shall contribute the annual dues of one dollar each." Besides the satisfaction of aiding in a good cause, the associate members will have the privilege of having seats reserved for them in the cathedral until ten minutes before the commencement of the service. Receipt cards will be handed to associate members. These will be ready very shortly, and may be obtained from the choirmasters of the choirs in union, or from the general secretary.

The book of the music to be sung will be published next week, and will be supplied gratis to members of choirs in union. It will also be for sale by Messrs. Rowsell and Hutchison, King St. East.

This year we expect to have some 650 voices, made up of the following choirs, which are those in union with the association, viz.—St. Alban's, St. Ann's, All Saints, St. Bartholomew, St. Cyprian's, Church of the Epiphany, Grace Church, St. George's, St. James', St. Luke, St. Margaret, St. Mark, St. Mary Magdalene, St. Mary (Dovercourt), St. Matthias, Church of the Redeemer, St. Saviour's, St. Simon's, St. Stephen, St. Thomas, Wycliffe College.

GEORGE H. LOUD,

Secretary, 624 Spadina Avenue.
10th March, 1892.

Biblical Criticism.

SIR,—Archdeacon Jones, instead of acknowledging that the facts are as I stated them, raises a cloud of dust and so tries to escape. The seriousness of the controversy forbids one to allow this to pass. Let us see how the case stands.

Dr. Osborne, whose courtesy I gladly acknowledge, tried in his first letter to minimize the principles at issue in the critical controversy. In answer, I pointed out that the question raised was of vital importance, and I stated those conclusions of the critics which were accepted by Mr. Gore and his followers, adding that they were substantially the same as those held by the leaders of the great Critical School of Germany.

Archdeacon Jones here intervened and accused me of misrepresenting Mr. Gore: "The head of the Pusey House and his associates have not gone over in a body to the so-called Higher Criticism," that is, if by that expression Archdeacon Rce means what he represents as such farther on in his letter? The issue here is clear,—does not Mr. Gore hold and teach that the critics have made good their assaults upon the genuineness and authenticity of the Old Testament in the points I mentioned in the latter portion of my letter.

In answer to the Archdeacon's amazing contradiction of what everyone who had paid the least attention to the controversy knew, I quoted from Bishop Ellicott, first, a synopsis of the critical points accepted by Mr. Gore as proved, and, secondly, the Bishop's judgment that these are substantially the same as the conclusions of the German critics. "Let any fair-minded man," he says, "set aside by side the statements of the Analytical (i.e., the German) view, and the six statements just made (i.e., Mr. Gore's concessions), and then form his opinion of the relation of the two. And will it not be this?—that the difference in tenor between the two is slight; and that it is impossible to regard the statements of the English writers (Mr. Gore, &c.) as otherwise than expressive of a general acceptance of the Analytical view."

Bishop Ellicott's six statements I extracted in my answer to Archdeacon Jones, and no one will deny that they are substantially the same as the statement in my first letter, to which the Archdeacon gave a flat contradiction, asserting that "the head of the Pusey House had not gone over to the Higher Criticism" as to those points. Will any fair-minded man doubt that I have abundantly indicated the truth and fairness of the account I give of the points at issue.

What does Archdeacon Jones say to this? Not one word; he ignores it altogether, and goes into eloquent and vituperative declaration upon another issue which has nothing whatever to do with the discussion.

His answer is, that Mr. Gore is an orthodox Christian, and that I am a wicked, dishonest wretch for trying to make people believe otherwise.

I rub my eyes in amazement. Why, I thought that was the very thing I complained of. If Mr. Gore had been an orthodox Christian, and a leader of orthodox men, who would have cared what he thought or said about the Scriptures? It is the brilliancy and in-

tensity of his orthodoxy which gives the sting, the whole significance to his critical concessions.

"But, Mr. Archdeacon, you roundly asserted that Mr. Gore had not made these concessions,—what do you say to my proof that Mr. Gore has made them?" He says nothing, the oracle is dumb,—why, let your readers judge.

In the meantime, let me ask your readers not to be led away by clouds of declamation upon the orthodoxy and excellence of members of the new school, the torture of Galileo, of which I think we have heard once or twice before and common places of that kind, from the importance of the points really involved in this discussion. Whether Mr. Gore is right or wrong, it is wrong to throw dust in people's eyes and prevent them from obtaining a knowledge of the facts of the controversy, and weighing them well.

The Christian Church has for 1850 years—and the O. T. Church, it is granted, for 300 years more, at least—believed that the Pentateuch was genuine and authentic. It is acknowledged that our Saviour Himself thought so. We are now asked to give up this belief—to hold that our Lord Himself was, and His Church for nearly nineteen centuries, has been mistaken. Surely that is a very serious matter. We are required to hold that Moses wrote none of it. Worse than that, to hold that whoever wrote it, the facts stated in it are not true; God did not give the Law to Moses as there set forth; the Law, except a germ of it, had no existence at all for hundreds of years after Moses. That Deuteronomy is a religious novel or drama of the age of Manasseh or Jonah. That the historical books are, some less, some more, idealized—contain not the facts that did occur, but that ought to have occurred. That many of the predictions of the Prophets were contradicted by the event. This is only a part; but right or wrong, this is all very serious, and every serious Christian ought to resist efforts to pooh-pooh it, or close our eyes to its gravity.

HENRY ROE.

Lennoxville, 11th March, 1892.

Biblical Criticism.

SIR,—Not to seem discourteous to my friend and neighbour here, Judge McDonald, I shall notice his letter only with a regret and a brief remark. The regret is that a layman so eager to champion the Declarationists and Archdeacon Roe should be a supporter of an Institution which publishes as one of its text books the late Dr. Hatch's most mischievous work—a crying shame, by the way, for any orthodox Christian College. Hatch notoriously did all he could to undermine the accepted doctrines of the Gospel. Still, if rather *ultra crepidam*, I know the worthy Judge means well. He has proved himself open to conviction, and as he has been a convert from many youthful heresies, political and religious, so I trust his enquiring and judicial mind will lead him further to accept the "truth and nothing but the truth" in reference to Biblical Criticism. Meanwhile let me assure him there is a great gulf between his theologian Hatch (whom Dr. Langtry boldly calls "a blasphemer") and my theologian, Charles Gore of the Pusey House.

Now, sir, for a last word on this very serious subject. I have said I should not, and could not, discuss the case on its merits. There is, however, just one point on which I venture to offer an opinion. It underlies all Biblical Criticism. It is the acceptance of this fact—as a fact—that in the Bible there is a human as well as a divine element. The admission of this in no way compromises our belief that the Bible is the "Word of God." "The sufficiency of the Scriptures for salvation"—that great Reformation watchword—we may still maintain. The appeal of the Protestant party of the sixteenth century was from the unwritten traditions of the Church to the written Word of God. The swing of the controversial pendulum, however, took men to the extreme opposite, until, almost to our own day, Church authority and the voice of catholicity were of no account, compared with what any individual man or woman chose to consider as divine truth. We all see the disastrous result of every man becoming his own theologian. And yet the appeal to the written Word of God was fully justified, although it has been abused almost to the wreckage of the ship. This appeal to the "written word" is the key to our position as Anglo-Catholics. "Let God be true but every man a liar," is still our motto, and we feel sure that God having once spoken unequivocally in His Word, no traditions and no dogmas of the Church can possibly be the teaching of the Holy Spirit, if they contradict it. It becomes, then, of most vital importance that we should know for certain that it is the Word of God and not the word of man that is speaking in this awful arbitrament between infallible truth and human error. What is the Word of God? We say it is the Bible. Yes, but what Bible? The Hebrew, or Septuagint, or the Greek Testaments, Old and New, or our English translations? We come at once to the question:—What are we to regard in the Bible as definitely and exclusively the