

Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church, will not be admitted.

LIBERALITY.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—May I respectfully ask on what authority the Rev. Mr. Hill, in his recent speech on University Consolidation, states that Sir Alexander Croke was a man of narrow, bigoted, and illiberal views? Was he more so than his colleagues in the trust of the Governorship of King's College, and in what respect? The gentlemen associated with him were the Lieut-Governor, Sir John Wentworth, Bishop Inglis, Chief Justice Blowers, R. J. Uniacke, Speaker of the Assembly; J. Stewart, Solicitor General; B. Wentworth, Provincial Secretary. Are we to understand that they were all controlled by the "intense cleverness" of Sir Alexander? Though a man of great learning and distinguished ability, whose decisions as Judge of the Vice-Admiralty are held in respect by British and foreign tribunals, he was probably not free from some of the prejudices of the times in which he lived, and may even have held the opinion which many yet entertain, that the 39 Articles should be subscribed by all who seek to obtain the benefits of a collegiate institution sustained by Churchmen, founded by the joint action of the Legislature in 1789 and the Crown in 1803, when the great body of the people were of one persuasion, but is he or any man to be branded at this day as bigoted or illiberal on that account?

Dissenters had not contributed, and were not asked to contribute, to the support of the institution; but, right or wrong, the requirement to sign the Articles could not then be deemed unreasonable. Approving of the concession since made, dispensing with that requirement in the case of secular students, I do not regard as illiberal the man who may entertain a different opinion. Roman Catholic Emancipation was opposed, and the Corn laws were upheld for a long period by the Duke of Wellington and Sir R. Peel. The great and good Sir M. Hale believed in witchcraft, Bonaparte was superstitious, and many men of enlarged minds have held opinions to which few educated persons would now assent. Are these eminent men to be stigmatized as illiberal and narrow-minded? Is it not somewhat Pharisaical to pronounce any man's views narrow or bigoted since they coincide not with our own, it may be, in religion, politics, or any of the many questions on which intelligent men differ? Am I, Mr. Editor, to arrogate to myself and deny to you the appellation of liberality because I do not, and you, perhaps, may regard subscription to Articles essential under some circumstances? There is a spurious liberality which looks less at that which is true than that which is popular. What is the Rev. Mr. Hill's test of that which is genuine? It is quite possible that some may consider his views on certain subjects illiberal or bigoted; but what would be thought if, some eighty years hence, when he had passed into the eternal world, a person yet unborn and unknown to him personally, in the presence and hearing possibly of surviving relatives, friends or admirers, at a large assemblage of literary men, should apply to him the disparaging terms in which he has spoken of Judge Croke? Until better informed, as I wish to be, I must regard the statement as an assertion without proof. If any should be offered, I may, with your permission, have something further to say on the subject.

The good maxim, *'De mortuis nil nisi bonum'*, is one that on such, as on other occasions, it would be well to remember and observe.

27th June.

JUSTITIA.

THE REVISED VERSION.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—I think that many of your readers will be interested in the subjoined short speech of the Bishop of London, delivered in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury on the occasion of the presentation to that body of the Revised Version of the New Testament. The Bishop of London's words are wise and timely, and it will do us all good to ponder them.

I notice some correspondence in your paper with reference to the introduction of a Revised Version of the Holy Scriptures into the public services of the Church. There may be some doubt on the subject in England—though I think there can be very little after the letter of Lord Chancellor Selborne—but there can be none in the Dominion. The Canadian Church has legislated on the subject most distinctly in the 13th Canon of the Provincial Synod. That Canon enacts that "no alteration shall be made in the version of the Scriptures authorized to be read in churches, unless the same shall be enacted at one session of the Provincial Synod, and confirmed at another session of the same." It is worthy of notice also that while the Synod has given permission for the adoption in

Canada of alterations made in the Prayer Book by one authority in England, by the action of one session of our Provincial Synod, it has distinctly refused to allow this to be done in the case of a new version of the Authorized Version of the Bible. In order that such a version, after being adopted (suppose) by the two Convocations of Canterbury and York, and authorized by Act of Parliament, should be legalized for use in the Canadian Church, it must be adopted at one session of the Provincial Synod, and confirmed by the vote of two-thirds of each House at another.

With reference to the merits of the Revision, it would be going against the Bishop of London's advice to pronounce dogmatically, without the fullest and most careful study of the entire Book. I may, however, say, as the result of the examination which I have been able so far to make, that, in my judgment, it is altered in a vast number of places unnecessarily, and in a great many places and respects for the worse. There are a great many blots in it, which must prove fatal to its acceptance unless they are removed. One thing, too, is evident: that much of the rhythm and sweetness of the old Book is gone; there is a baldness and harshness about the new to which no one who knows the old could ever be reconciled. I trust it is not impossible to hope for a further revision of the Revision, by which all the excellences of the new version (for this it is) may be retained, and the music and the sweetness of the old also.

HENRY ROE, D. D.

Bishop's College,
Lennoxville, 24th June, 1881.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S SPEECH.

"I should just like to say one or two words in regard to the Revision of the New Testament. I hope it will not be misunderstood by the clergy and laity, as it appears to be misunderstood by some, and, indeed, by many writers for the public press. It has been spoken of as if it was a revision which any clergyman was authorized to use in his place on the Sunday or other day if he thought fit. As your lordships know, it was decided by Convocation that when the contract was completed it would go out to the public, but that it could come before the Church for its consideration and, after those amendments had been made which approved themselves to the Church, that it should be recognized as such; and that the time will come (how soon we know not) when it will be received as the Authorized Version, and by some authority (I know not what) be permitted to be read in churches. I think it would be a great misfortune if it should be thought by any clergyman that he was at liberty, merely because he had the Book in his hand, to introduce, according to his own will and judgment, such parts of the Revision as he happened to have approved. Many of these alterations at first sight may startle the old prejudices and feelings of a large number of Church people, and any clergyman who, at his own option, introduces it as the revised edition to be read in churches, takes a liberty which he has no right to take. I rather hope, too, that it will not be made the subject of frequent discussion for the next two or three years, especially by young clergymen, who, perhaps, can hardly construe the original, and that they will not preach to their people as to the differences between the old version and the new, and express their opinions and draw lessons from it. A great deal of patient study is required, and all should go through that necessary process before they ought to pronounce or press the claims of superiority of one version over the other. Attention is sometimes given to portions to which it has not been given before, and the thought strikes them that they ought to give it to their hearers. The real value of this Revision is to lay before the Church, clergy and laity the result of the study and the mature scholarship of the best scholars of our day, and of those who have read the opinions of the ancient Church. The result may be an extremely valuable one, but we cannot give our opinion on it at present, because we may be entirely ignorant of it as a work—a work for which we are very thoughtful indeed, but a work which those who have undertaken it feel needs the especial supervision of the Great Author of the Holy Scriptures, Who, in His mercy and goodness, has permitted them to carry it out to the end. I can only express the hope that it will not be assumed too readily and too hastily that it is to supersede the version which has been in use so long, and which all English speaking Christians so much esteem, love and reverence."

PRESENTMENT TO PARISHES.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—In your last number (16th inst.), "D. C. M." proposes to put me through a catechetical course, and asks a series of questions. I think he is travelling away from the subject he started with. He began his contributions to the GUARDIAN with suggesting how much better the affairs of the Church, and especially the Presentation to Parishes, would be managed if the rights of nomination and election were removed from the parishioners and conferred upon the Bishop and a Clerical Board. I joined issue with him by endeavouring to show that the law, the customs of society, and ancient Church precedents were in favour of lay action, even to the appointment to the Apostleship; and instead of his showing that I was wrong or mistaken, and even without raising a demurrer to anything I have stated, he draws up a set of articles which he asks

me to answer. Even this I am willing to comply with, and will consume as little space as possible in doing so. I take his questions as he numbers them.

1. *Whether I believe the same methods should be used in selecting Ambassadors of Christ as representatives of the people?*

Ans. Yes, as a general rule; the Church in some of her ordinances pursues a somewhat similar practice. What is the "Si Quis" but a nappel to the public to approve of the proposed ordination of a candidate, or if objection is had to him to declare it at once. It is a notice read out publicly, calling for approval or objection; and has not any person who hears it the right to reply to it if he has any reply to give?

2. *Whether the 120 disciples of 1 Acts were a body equivalent to our parishioners.*

Ans. Yes; except that the parishioners of the present day are a better organized body than the early disciples were, resulting from the higher development of the Church's system and discipline.

3. *Whether St. Matthias was chosen from those already ordained to be a parochial minister?*

Ans. Matthias was not chosen from a body of ordained persons. There were none such at the time. St. Matthias when elected to be an apostle was an ordinary lay disciple. Whether after his election he was ever ordained or not there is no evidence to show. All we are told is he was numbered with the eleven. Whether he underwent any ceremony of ordination, as we understand the word, or what his subsequent career and work were, is not known. The Scriptures never mention him again, and tradition is almost equally silent. Whether he had a local or parochial charge only or travelled about like the other apostles to old or places is no where recorded.

4. *Whether I ignore the Apostles query, "How shall they preach except they be sent?"*

Ans. The only sentiment I have ignored is "D. C. M.'s," that a clerical or any outside boards is superior to the great body of parishioners in the choice of an Incumbent.

5. *How much more influence can the laity have, &c.?*

Ans. In asking this question, "D. C. M." has enumerated those influences which he conceives the laity already possess, e. g., (1) two to one of the clergy in Synod, (2) the veto, (3) power to compel institution of their nominee, (4) choice of wardens and delegates, (5) power of the purse. To the several counts of this indictment I plead natural right as appertaining to the laity. (1) Two to one over the clergy is but a very moderate representation on the principle of population and interests involved. (2) The veto is nothing more than the lay vote; counterbalancing "D. C. M.'s" words, the laity can equally say "the Bishop and clergy can veto the laity on all points." (3) Institution is regulated by law, and rightly so, for if the Incumbent or Rector who should be chosen by a body of parishioners should be one already at work in the Diocese, or one who should be brought in from another Diocese, with the proper letters dismissory, why should his institution to the Parish which elected him be refused. Compulsory institution in such a case ought not to be looked upon, I should think, by any cleric as a grievance, and it certainly cannot be reckoned as one of the rights or privileges of the laity. Has not "D. C. M." gumption enough to see that the law to compel institution is a protection to his own order? The laity do not care whether a Rector is instituted or not. (4) The choice of wardens and delegates is one so naturally belonging to the laity that I will not place myself in the ridiculous position of attempting to defend it. (5) The power of the purse, in the only sense in which "D. C. M." can use the phrase, means that people who have money can give if they choose to; but as far as controlling the funds of the Church, it cannot be said that the laity hold the power of the purse. "D. C. M." asks finally "what more can they have?" Like Oliver I would ask for more. I would ask to assimilate all church business to the rule observed in national and political matters. At the Board of Home Missions and in the Synod I would have all money grants and expenditures originate with the laity, who are the Commoners of the Church. The Committee (Cabinet) of each body should, like the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or our Finance Ministers, bring in a budget each year of proposed expenditure and probable income, and grants should be made accordingly, and all expenditures should be mercilessly kept within the possible income. If by so doing it should be found that some Missions and Stations have to be given up, then give them up until the funds are provided to sustain them. It is no more creditable to the Church than to an individual to go into debt for righteousness sake, and the great bulk of the laity think this, and many speak of it, and the irritation created by indebtedness is really one of the causes which helps to create the deficiencies which are continually presented to us from almost every fund of the Church. If we would only conduct our church business on the principle of pay as you go, and incur obligations only as they can be met, with certainty, for a few years, our position would soon change for the better. This, however, can only be accomplished by the business men among the laity insisting upon it, and this is one of the points I had in mind when I claimed for the laity more influence in church matters.

J. W. H. R.

Yarmouth, 20th June, 1881.