

announced that the Synod would meet for business at 2.30 p. m.

At 2.30 the Synod re-assembled, when the roll was called. This occupied over an hour and a half. A large majority of the delegates responded to their names.

Rev. J. B. Richardson was unanimously re-elected Clerical Secretary, and Mr. L. Skey Lay Secretary. Mr. E. B. Reed was retained as Secretary-Treasurer according to the provision of the Canon, and Messrs. James Hamilton and A. G. Smythe as Auditors.

His Lordship the Bishop then delivered his charge, in which he was able to make the following gratifying statement:—

God has again crowned the year with His goodness. Once more we are permitted to rejoice with thankfulness in the fact of a large increase in the free-will offerings of our people for Diocesan and missionary purposes. Two years ago the Diocesan income was \$11,809.46; last year it had increased to \$13,300.25; this year it had risen to \$15,007.85, an increase of \$1,707.61, as compared with last year, and an increase of \$3,298.40, as compared with the income reported at our Synod of 1879.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(From our own Correspondent.)

The two most interesting events of the week past to Churchmen have been the opening of the Theological College at Ely, and the stonelaying of the Selwyn College at Cambridge, which is to be a sister institution to Keble, at the other University, with this difference, however, that Selwyn is intended to help forward chiefly the Mission work of the Church. At the service in the Cathedral at Ely, the hymn which was sung was accompanied by a military band, which was placed in the triforium, and a grand effect it produced. In passing, I may say that "bands" are very frequently used at special services, where it is desired to invest them with more than ordinary dignity and grandeur. Your people in Halifax might with advantage take a leaf out of our home book in this particular. There are always good military bands to be obtained there, and the aid would be invaluable at Choir Unions and such like celebrations. In speaking of the Religious Societies, the *Rack* says: "This year the leading religious societies have been able to give favourable reports of their financial position, showing in almost all cases substantial increase upon incomes of previous years. Amongst the sums thus announced at the recent meetings are the Church Missionary Society, £207,500; the Religious Tract Society, £193,580; the British and Foreign Bible Society, £209,519; the Church Pastoral Aid Society, £48,519; Colonial and Continental Church Society, £39,715; the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, £138,288; Irish Church Missions, £19,625; the Church of England Sunday School Institute, £25,285; the Church of England Temperance Society, £7,311; the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society, £13,639; Missionary Leagues Association, £1,585; the Trinitarian Bible Society, £2,673; the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, £84,237; the Protestant Reformation Society, £3,601; the London City Mission, £50,857; Christian Vernacular Education Society for India, £10,826; the Ragged School Union, £7,591; and the Church of England Scripture Readers' Society, £10,775."

Mr. Green is still in prison, but there are hopes of his being set at liberty. The English Church Union has consulted Sir John Holker and Mr. Vanglin Williams, and they are both of opinion that he is in prison illegally, and that if he appeals to the House of Lords, he will be liberated. They both hold, notwithstanding the decisions to the contrary, that no power is given to Lord Penzance to imprison any one for disobedience to a monition issued by the Public Worship Act. It is true that Ecclesiastical Courts have power to imprison for contumacy, and that Lord Penzance is an ecclesiastical judge; but when Lord Penzance is a judge under the Public Worship Act, he ceases to be an ecclesiastical judge so far as the power of imprisoning goes. The lawyers have another point. The writ which sent Mr. Green to prison was not, it seems, properly displayed in the Court of the County Palatine. Upon the latter technical point, Mr. Green may find himself set at liberty one day, and sent to prison again the next. But on the large question, the success of the appeal would be fatal to Lord Penzance. A Judge who may issue sentences which he cannot enforce may as well not be a Judge at all. He is as idle as a painted ship upon a painted ocean.

I cannot congratulate Prince Leopold on the name of the title by which he has been raised to the Peerage. It is all very well in itself, of course—an ancient, a distinguished, and even an illustrious title. But none of its associations are inspiring, and some of them are quite the reverse. Two or three of the Dukes of Albany lost their heads, and even those who continued to keep them, have kept them only by crossing the water, and keeping out of the way of the Headsman and his axe. Of course, there are no risks of that kind for Princes to run now. The title brings with it scarcely any additional power, nor does it shed any new lustre on its bearer. Nevertheless, it is justly regarded as a recognition by Her Majesty of her youngest son's merits, and as such, is popular in the country. It is usually the case, that members of a large family like that of the Queen, have each their particular spheres or departments. The Prince of Wales is

Her Majesty's representative. He is the gracious host, and the welcome visitor *par excellence*. The Duke of Edinburgh has become a trained and experienced sailor, and though the son of the Queen, he has more accomplishments than Captain Corcoran; for besides reefing and steering, he is an adept with the violin—often more difficult to master than an ironclad. The Duke of Connaught is a military man. The Marchioness of Lorne is an artist, so also is the Princess Imperial of Germany. Prince Leopold has gradually become associated in our minds with literature and social questions. He it is who seems most likely to follow closely in the footsteps of his father, and this it is which will endear him to his country. He is well known as a sympathizer with all progress in Art, Literature, and Social Science, and he often presides at a meeting connected therewith, where he delivers thoughtful addresses—words of encouragement to the students, or of respectful praise to those from whom he has learned.

Family Department.

THE THUNDERSTORMS.

"THE GOD OF GLORY THUNDERETH."

Say if there is not glory
In the solemn, awful roll;
If the flash athwart yon heaven
Does not thrill the heart and soul?
The loud reverberation
That tells of danger past,
Of immediate preservation
From the blinding, fiery blast,—
Well rings out its glad message,
Though with trembling we rejoice,
As we list amidst the darkness
To the God of glory's voice!

Say if there is not glory
In the swiftly coming storm;—
In the noonday light o'er shadowed
By the cloud of varied form?
Dark, heavy-laden, riven,
In hopeless speed it drives,
Till across the clear blue heaven
Not one gleam of light survives.
Then from out its sullen masses
Fiery flames leap forth to tell
That the God of glory hideth
Where the clouds and darkness dwell.

Say if there is not glory
When the storm is overhead;—
And the crash, and shock, and sparkle,
In one moment break and spread,
And in its passing splendour,
Like grand, retreating foe,
Scarcely willing to surrender
As he turns with footsteps slow?
Stranger, too, the softened silence,
When the whirl and strife have done,
And the God of glory beckons
For the light of summer's sun.

God out of glory thunders;—
His prerogative alone;
From the "lightnings and the thunders"
That surround His Holy Throne,
Where cherub pure rejoice
In the glowing glory there;
Shall we listen to the "voices"
Ever calling us to share,—
Through the God-man once appointed
As the whisperer of peace,—
When all present perturbations
In eternity shall cease.

SELINA A. BOWER.

Ringland Vicarage, Norwich, G. B.

THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

A Sermon Preached in St. John the Evangelist's Church, Montreal, by REV. WM. WRIGHT, M. D.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."—St. Matt. xxiv. 35.

The Holy Bible is the jewel of the Church, a jewel "more precious than rubies," "more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold." It is the sacred deposit of truth which the Almighty has committed to her safe-keeping. It enshrines the faith once delivered to the saints, for which "ye should earnestly contend." It is as the corn which, though it be sifted, "yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth." And it has the eternal words of the Word of God Himself, who has said "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away." Whatever is done to the Scriptures must be of the utmost importance to God's people. I purpose, therefore, saying a few words to you now upon the Revision of the New Testament, which has been grandiloquently styled "the great event of the nineteenth century." This work is set forth as the version of 1661, the one we have always had, "compared with the most ancient authorities and revised." Upon hearing this, the question at once arises: has such ability, have such new MSS. or versions, or other aids, have such greater attainments in learning sprung up during the past two centuries to warrant the undertaking of revision? Witnesses can be adduced whose evidence answers this enquiry in the negative. Dean Alford said "sacred criticism is yet in its infancy." Bishop Ellicott, who inconsistently enough was Chairman of the Revisers, once affirmed, "for any authentic revisions we are not yet mature either in Biblical learning or Hellenistic scholarship." The time has not yet come for such a work. Our age is not the one to be crowned with success. It is, as has been well described, an age "dealing in unlicensed criticism and deceitful dealing with the

Word of God." The principle, too, by which the Revisers was guided would lead to certain failure. It was to overrule, according to Bishop Cox, "the early versions and Greek fathers, as far as it could presume to dictate, on the authority of two or three Egyptian codices reducible, perhaps, to a single original and proceeding from the worst school of ancient Christian thought."

The Revised New Testament is characterized by omissions and changes of parts of the text of the Old Version.

I. OMISSIONS. In the Revised Version several truths and facts are left out which are in the one we use. As examples may be mentioned, the doxology in the Lord's Prayer, the reason for the troubling of the water of Bethesda, the faith required of and professed by the Eunuch before being baptized by St. Philip, and the declaration about the three heavenly witnesses in the first Epistle of St. John. In most of these a whole verse is dropped. In another set of passages the excision is less, only reaching from one to more words. Instances of this occur in the Annunciation, where "blessed art thou among women" find no place; in the sermon on the Mount, where, in the allusion to anger "without a cause," are left out; in the account of the transfiguration "as snow" are not retained; and in the reference to the father of the child vexed with a spirit, "with tears" are expunged. Other omissions are, "take, eat" in St. Paul's description of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament—as well as "unworthily" and "Lord's" in a verse a little further on. "God" is taken away from "was manifest in the flesh," and "He who" substituted. Lastly, some parts are either spaced off or bracketed to throw a doubt on their authority or genuineness, or both. These omissions take from the text and leave it imperfect. They also lead to other disadvantages. Some make it less graphic; some tend to obscure a doctrinal point as that of the Incarnation; and some cause Scripture to contradict Scripture; while in one place, just referred to, all anger is represented as sinful; in another it is not so, for we are told "be ye angry and sin not."

II. CHANGES. The changes in the Revised New Testament are said to be about 10,000. Happily, none of them shew any error in what the Old Version teaches about God, the soul, and the future. The greater number are purely literary, consisting in either verbal alterations, or putting a stop in one place instead of another, or the use of the definite for the indefinite article, or the substituting a modern for an obsolete expression. Many are simply pedantic, and very many are anything but improvements. Several of the changes affect the sense, as in these illustrations. "Hell" is displaced for "Hades," where the latter occurs in the Greek, so that Christ and the rich man, after death, are consigned to the same state, one of torment. "Deliver us from evil" is particularized as "from the evil one," by which the broad scope of the petition, as we use it, is lost, for it includes the evil of our own hearts, and the evil of the world as well as the evil of the Devil. Instead of calling our Lord's mighty works "miracles" they are characterized as "signs," as one might stamp anything that was not supernatural. In place of "good will toward men" in the Angel's Christmas Carol, the words are "among men in whom He is well pleased." "Wisdom is justified of her children" is turned into "by her works." "Lunatics" are made "epileptics." Agrippa told St. Paul "almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," the New Version represents him as spurning the petty efforts of the Apostle, thus, "with little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian." "The word was made flesh" is transformed into "the word became flesh," which does not suggest, as the former, He was made or "conceived by the Holy Ghost." And in 1 Cor. xiii. "charity" is withdrawn, and "love" inserted in its place. Yet the two are not synonymous—the first is never applied to express any form of selfish passion such as is denoted by the last. There is the love of money, of fame, of pleasure, &c., and the word love might suggest them, but charity would never do so.

What do these omissions and changes mean? Can they be justified? Certainly not,—as we have seen—on the ground of scholarship, however vaunting it may be of its own independency and sufficiency. Even were it all that could be desired, it alone has no right to change the Scriptures, to chip and mar the Jewel of the Church, to falsify the Divine prediction, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away." No men, however clever,—no single branch of the Church, not even the Church of England, with all her Continental offshoots and American alliance,—has the right to let slip a single grain of the Bible, to let a single word or meaning fall to the ground. If the Bible belong to the whole Church, a part of that Church has no right to meddle with it without the consent of all the other branches, or to make any change in it without their approval. If the re-consideration of the text of Scripture is to be undertaken, there should be representatives from every part of the Church to assume the work, an ecumenical council. Instead of that, it was assigned to a Protestant Committee of 27 members, consisting of some who belonged to the Church of England and others, among whom was a Presbyterian, a Wesleyan, a Baptist, and a Unitarian. It may be urged that any other combination would be impossible, since no Roman, nor Eastern, nor Old, nor other Catholic would join in such a proceeding. What follows? why that till this impossibility be removed, no revision should be attempted, but the

Scriptures retained as they have been from the beginning. The impossibilities of men may be means by which God's will is sometimes wrought. They may be the means of preserving inviolate His Holy Scriptures, of which He has said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away."

Our old version of the New Testament accords with the Bible of every land in substance, in subject, and in the letter. It has the Catholic text; but the revised work drops out parts of that text and changes its sense in other parts. A single passage thus treated is enough to sever it from the Bible of Christendom. One word "filioque," or "and from the Son," refused by the Eastern Church, keeps millions from holding communion with one another.

The Revised New Testament has no authority. In England it dare not be read publicly in the Church. The Lord Chancellor has declared that any one so using it may be treated as an offender against the law. For the Church of England to adopt it would be to stand apart from the rest of the Church Universal, to hinder the union of herself and them, and to prefer a text purely Academic to one that is Catholic. To adopt it, would be, also, to stultify herself. The Prayer Book would at once become inaccurate; it would contain a different Lord's Prayer, a different Epistle, a different Gospel, and a different expression of its Scriptural statements generally. Furthermore, the Sixth Article would have to be altered. Its words "the New Testament commonly received" mean the version we have always had and not the revised, for that neither is, nor will be, commonly, that is to say, universally received.

The reception of the Revised Testament has been remarkable. It has been ushered in with a great flourish of trumpets. It has been magnified into a work of the greatest importance. The rush for it exceeded anything of the kind ever made for any book previously. Hours before the warehouse doors were open crowds sought a copy. Ten loads were carted away to the shops. Two millions were sold in two days. It was enquired after as the book in which there was no hell nor devil; and many seemed to think it was to relieve the world of a monster that had become insufferable. It has been variously criticized. Among those who reject the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures and weaken the evidence of our Lord's Deity, as it does, it has been most popular. By several of the best reviewers it has been denounced. One writer says "it is bad English, bad grammar, and the whole thing is a bungle."

"Prove all things," prove the Bible by the voice of the Church, its "witness and keeper." What though there be 135,000 readings of the New Testament she is our guide. We must take for Scripture what she receives as it and not what is tampered with by those who bring in another version. What though there be blemishes in the old version: there were blemishes in the Septuagint, yet Christ used it. They do not affect either the integrity or the sense of the text. Insignificant blemishes are a far less matter than the flood of evils which would be let loose by the adoption of this revision. It would depreciate "three hundred millions of Bibles out in the world," as well as the vast array of Commentaries, Dictionaries, Handbooks and other works with which it is out of gear. But what are these to consequences which nothing can remedy, such as the undermining of the faith of the unlearned and the strengthening of the hands of the scoffer. By this revision the pious feelings are outraged of more humble Christians than can be told; by this work the bitter taunt is fanned: where is the boasted stability of Scripture? what better is your Bible than the abortions of ever-shifting science as she travails through her stages of transition? what means that saying "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away?"

"Hold fast that which is good." The merits of the version we have used are indisputable. It has been pronounced by Selden to be "the best translation in the world," and by another "a master piece of English prose." "It reflects the meek wisdom of earlier days in its every utterance. It appeals to every devout Christian as the version of Bishop Andrewes and his pious-learned allies." "It has worked blessings and revolutionized the nations for good." "Its sacred pages are hallowed by the dearest associations." It has led many of your kindred to the pearly gates of Paradise, and can do the same for all. It was the book your loved parents prized. In its treasured lines they taught your infant lips to read the truth as it is in Jesus. It appeals with the constraining force of one that has ever done good; and it links you with all who have loved God most and served Him best during the centuries that are past. Realize the glorious band of the faithful lifted up on the wings of the dear old pages above the sorrows of earth and joined to the blessed assembly of those who are in perpetual joy and felicity. From its pages, it may be, wet with many a tear and impressed by many a mark, they drew the hope of eternal life. Surely what sufficed for them may well suffice for you. Their revision was not of the Bible, but of their lives. They might tell us, it is not so much a new book we need as the better use of the old. Be true to it. And let your highest esteem be shewn by gaining from its well-worn leaves more and more of the mind of Him, who has said "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."