

To Shoot Again.

SIR, II Kings xiii. 18 reads: "And he said take the arrows, and he took them, and he said unto the king of Israel, smite upon the ground, and he smote thrice and stayed."

In his "Brief Thoughts and Meditations," Archbishop Trench, in treating the above verse, speaks thus, "This done, and the explanation given, he bade the king to take other arrows and to smite, or more accurately, to shoot again, etc."

I have searched in vain in my Greek and Latin Bible for any word which could be rendered "to shoot again."

Trench is such high authority, and as he says "more accurately," that I would like some of your many learned readers to tell us if there be a reading, "to shoot again."

J. H. Mc.

Toronto, March 3rd, 1892.

Canadian Church History.

SIR,—The Rev. Dr. Gammack cannot find better sketches of the Canadian Church than what is recorded in the Report of the Jubilee proceedings. Another good account is contained in Hawkins' Missions of the Church. And yet, another interesting account is given by Mrs. Akins, entitled, "A Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the Church of England in the British North American Provinces." Mr. Anderson has also written upon the subject.

I understand the Rev. Dr. Langtry has either written, or is engaged writing a history of the Canadian Church.

PHILIP TOCQUE.

March 3rd.

Wanted, "Attention."

SIR,—Perhaps I am wrong, but I feel that the Church in Manitoba demands the urgent attention of the Church of England in Canada and England.

How many of your Eastern readers know or care what we are doing or suffering for want of present help? In the Winnipeg Free Press of February 18th, I find the following: "Manitoba College may be expected to become increasingly the centre of our Western Missionary life. It is generally agreed that the teaching staff will be increased, so as to be as strong as that of any college in the Church. Indeed it is expected some of the most gifted and earnest men in different parts of the Church will lay upon the altar of missions their services."

"What a magnificent showing for God there will be if fifty of the flower of our theological students throw all their zeal and devotion into our Western mission work next winter."

"The sum of \$50,000 will be spent this year in making 'Manitoba College' equal to anything in the East."

The above refers to the Presbyterian College in Winnipeg, and what "Manitoba College" is to the Presbyterian Church in the West, St. John's College, Winnipeg, is (or should be) to the Church of England.

Manitoba College is known and heartily supported by the whole Presbyterian Church, for they recognize the importance of Western missions. So also does the Protestant Episcopal Church in the States, but alas! for the indifference and lethargy of the Canadian Church.

Mr. Editor, you can help us in this matter. If you can spend about six weeks visiting our missions to white folks, and see the pressing needs of the Church, I think you would return to your sanctum, and fired with enthusiasm, write rousing articles on the Church in the diocese of Rupert's Land.

H. D.

Perilous Flights of Fancy.

SIR,—Your correspondent, Alfred Osborne, in a somewhat curt and discourteous letter in your issue of the 25th instant, declines to notice a criticism by "Grapho," on the ground that it is anonymous. Such an objection ill becomes a man who himself fails to give his address, so that probably most of your readers are, like myself, in ignorance as to whom Alfred Osborne is, where he hails from, and whether his position in our Church is such as to lend any weight to his perilous flights of fancy and speculations on such an all important subject as the Inspiration of the Bible, where angels might fear to tread. If Mr. Osborne sends you any further communications for publication it is to be hoped he will afford your readers some information on these points, but would it not be well for him (unless his object be to cause the little ones of Christ's flock to stumble) to pause before he adds further to his efforts to sustain the ideas and speculations of those who have caused so much offence in the Church?

Probably the able arguments, against the views of the so-called higher critics, of such a giant of Biblical learning as Bishop Ellicott, will in the opinion of your readers far outweigh those of many such controversialists as Alfred Osborne, even when we are informed who he is.

ARTHUR GEO. HEAVEN.

Boyne, Ont., Feb. 29th, 1892.

Retires from the Controversy.

SIR,—The reply of the Ven. Archdeacon Roe is just what I expect from a Christian gentleman, and it compels me to give, in the same spirit, a word or two of explanation. At present the critics appear to have it, but the last word has not been said. Men of faith are not like harlequins on the stage; they do not twist and turn and jump to every critic. Even should they be accused of false positions, they can bear it, for while they go to reason for proofs, they never go to reason for faith. At the same time I plead for liberty, for I know (who does not?) that "the orthodox" have too often been disposed to crush the spirit of enquiry. The Church and the Bible are the better for assault. If neither can stand criticism, let them go. But why should we fear? To my mind the position of "the infallibility of the Bible" is as hard to maintain as that of "the infallibility of the Pope," if by "infallibility" is meant that the letter of all Scripture is to be maintained as without fault. But if the word "infallibility" means no more than the court of ultimate appeal in all matters necessary to salvation (Art. vi.), I can accept it, and further I do not care to go. All sects, schisms, isms, heresies, mumbo-jumbo evangelists, etc., etc., appeal with equal force to the Bible, and if any criticism, or even persecution, can force us to recognize the Catholic Faith—"There is One Body," I for one say, let it come. The present position of the Christian Church, claimed to be based on "the infallibility of the Bible," is the great lie of this century. Surely the *Ego* of criticism cannot do more harm than is done already by the *Ego* of "orthodoxy." Let us not be afraid, but have faith in God. This continual fear of criticism is not faith, though I admit this fear is at times my experience.

With many thanks, sir, for your space, I must close this correspondence, as I am about to leave Canada for a time.

ALFRED OSBORNE.

Biblical Criticism.

SIR,—Perhaps by this time, and upon due reflection, the Venerable Archdeacon Bedford-Jones regrets that he wrote his letter of the 29th January, in answer to and attacking Archdeacon Roe.

Dr. Jones speaks of the declaration of the thirty-eight English clergymen as having been "ill judged." If he will pardon a simple layman for differing from him, I would say that those who signed the declaration deserve, and doubtless have received, the thanks of many thousands of sound Churchmen for the action they took, and surely great must have been the sense of the necessity for action which could have impelled men who differ so materially upon many important points to sin in their differences for the nonce, and to join in common action in defence of the faith. Dr. Jones will further pardon me for saying in answer to his slurring remark upon the scholarship and erudition of the thirty-eight, that among them are men at whose feet even he might not be ashamed to sit. And indeed I am not without hopes that he will yet recede from his (perhaps hastily formed) opinion of the declaration. I fear that the *Guardian* and Archdeacon Wilson must bear much of the blame of the unfortunate mistake into which Archdeacon Jones has fallen. I use the term "unfortunate" advisedly, and for this reason, Archdeacon Jones is one of the examining chaplains for the Bishop of Ontario. He, perhaps more than any other man, is in a position to influence candidates for Holy Orders in this diocese. Hence the importance—the paramount importance—that a man occupying his official position should not, by voice or pen, give utterance to any expression which might, of course inadvertently on his part, produce doubt in the impressionable minds of the young, and thus be fraught with consequences far reaching to an extent by him undreamed of.

As to the attack upon Archdeacon Roe, Dr. Jones need have no fear that Dr. Roe will lose either his head or his faith, and I believe the great majority of your readers will agree with me, that so far from Dr. Roe's letter being "calculated to create a panic in the minds of Christians," it will open their eyes to the insidious attacks which, under misleading names, are being made upon Christianity, and there is much reason for thankfulness that we have men like Archdeacon Roe who are walking in the old paths, and who are able and minded to champion the cause of truth, even at the risk of being called old fashioned, or considered as being behind the times.

I do not always see eye to eye with the CANADIAN CHURCHMAN, but gladly embrace this opportunity of thankfully acknowledging the firm stand which you have unvaryingly taken upon this subject of Biblical Criticism, and against the attacks upon God's Holy Word of those who seem to prove the truth of the old saying that "a little learning is a dangerous thing."

HERBERT S. McDONALD.

Brockville, 26th February, 1892.

Unfair Criticism.

SIR,—It was not, and is not, my intention to engage in a theological discussion of the case on its merits, as the lawyers say. For this, I confess I do not consider myself competent. Very few indeed are. And it is well to remember the folly of rushing in where angels fear to tread. I may humbly state, however, that having been a reading man for the last two score years, I am likely to know a good deal, and perhaps as much of the subject, as Archdeacon Roe; and therefore I shall not venture to write with so much self-confidence. In passing I may remark on the inconvenience of a correspondence in your column, when it takes, I suppose unavoidably, a fortnight to get the letter into print, and a month more before a rejoinder appears. For this kind of thing life is too short, and it is not possible to maintain one's own interest, to say nothing of your readers', in the discussion. Besides, I have an intense aversion to a newspaper controversy, and have little faith in its being a benefit to anybody. And the fun of the thing now is, that I am acting the champion of the eminent Pusey House divines, not because I agree with their views in all respects, but because I felt that they were being grievously misrepresented and slandered by a Canadian clergyman who should have known better. With renewed regret I see that his letter written in the characteristic style of Archdeacon Roe, persistently maintains this misrepresentation and slander, and at the earliest moment possible I devote an hour to a few remarks thereon.

1. Well, sir, let me say at once that I am not ashamed of one word written in my last letter, of which I have not a copy, but am quite sure that I never without qualification asserted that Dr. Roe "intentionally misled" anybody. Certainly it did seem extraordinary, and it seems more so now, that any man who pretends to a knowledge of the fact, should so pervert truth as to class together for a moment the Pusey House divines and the avowed unbelievers of the Tübingen school. This was the "astounding phenomenon," which provoked my first letter. This, and the unqualified endorsement of that unfortunate declaration of the Thirty-eight, which has already died out of notice in England. I rejoice indeed to learn that the misleading was not "intentional" on the Archdeacon's part, and if I suggested this, I hereby express my regret and retract. But to my mind it is my old friend who should acquaint himself, with facts and the writings of Mr. Gore. Is it possible that the Archdeacon does not know that to the very moment of Canon Liddon's death Mr. Gore was his most intimate and trusted friend? It is true there was a brief misunderstanding, and a repudiation by the great Canon of what, whether rightly or wrongly, he considered dangerous in some few unguarded expressions of *Lux Mundi*. But the dearly loved pupil and friend cleared up and explained his language, and it was to him that Canon Liddon entrusted all his papers and the continuance of the literary work in which he was engaged. It is a real outrage to the memory of the great Liddon to class the bosom friend, who closed his eyes, with the heterodox critics and sceptics of Germany. Here I must respectfully remind Archdeacon Roe the most positive assertion is not argument, nor in these days will dogmatism pass for proof. From Archdeacon Roe's misstatements (as I believe them to be), however unintentionally made, I must simply appeal to Mr. Gore himself. Following the example, perhaps not wisely, of the Archdeacon, I beg leave to express my doubt as to whether he has really read Mr. Gore's great books—"The Christian Ministry," the *Lux Mundi* Essay, and above all the Bampton Lectures of 1891. All persons who desire to have their Christian faith strengthened should read this splendid book entitled *The Incarnation of the Son of God*. It is intensely interesting, and most justly has made a deeper impression on the public mind of England than any similar production since Liddon's famous Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of our Lord. I wish I had space for a few quotations I had marked. They would fully justify my assertions.

2. Sir, the sounding phrase, "the great body of Conservative Churchmen," does not impress me as any argument. About 300 years ago the great body of Conservative Churchmen tortured the Astronomer Galileo into recanting his belief in the Copernican theory. They fondly supposed they had the Bible at their back. Does it not say that God "has made the round world so sure that it cannot be moved?" For all that it does move, whispered the victim of Conservative Churchmen, after signing the papers. The fact is that it is these prejudiced people, lay and clerical, who stand in the way of all church progress and reformation. As they opposed the Reformation of the 16th, so they opposed that of the 19th century, both in matters of doctrine and ritual, and they are the main cause of our unhappy divisions and disputes. But sooner or later, "*Veritas aeterna et repalearit*"; and if one thing more than another will attract enlightened humanity to the Gospel of Christ and membership with His Church, it is the fearless and honest respect for truth which is proved to be truth. We may depend upon it, that the Christian