

What, then, is the likelihood that we shall obtain another version so manifestly superior to the old, and so clearly free from party influences as to command universal assent? The Authorised Version came out with all the weight of Royal sanction, when the prerogative was at its height, and the ecclesiastical government bound up in closer communion with it than at any time before or since. What the Royal authority is worth now in any religious matter, let the discussion about Sunday observance, the decision of the Gorham case, or the refusal of the Crown to allow Convocation its liberties, attest. Who does not see that the new translation would have just so much authority, and no more, as the character of the translators, and the general reputation of their work might demand? And this reputation would not depend so much on that accuracy of scholarship of which very few could be competent judges, as on the general spirit of the version, its freedom from palpable errors and its success in making passages hitherto obscure to become easy of interpretation to the unlearned multitude. Its reputation would be at an end from the moment when it was discovered that particular views or theories had influenced its alterations, and that the doctrinal standards of any party or school had sought to find a justification in the amended phraseology of Holy Writ.

It is of no little significance that the motion which was made in Parliament to obtain the revision proceeded from one who has dallied with German theories of inspiration. What credit would a version made under such auspices have with the vast majority of Englishmen, who believe that they have the very Word of God as the rule of their practice and their faith? The same active innovator has made incursions upon the sanctities of our marriage law, and the morality which underlies it; he has endeavoured to overthrow religious ascendancy in the ancient Universities, whose teaching without religion would lose all its ancient pre-eminence; and he has sought to weaken the respect of the people for the Lord's Day, on grounds peculiarly offensive to the general religious sentiment of the country. A demand from such a quarter for a new Bible is simply a demand for the gratification of a scientific whim; it is asked for as men ask for a new Ordnance Survey or a statistical return. Whatever might be said of a really improved version of the Bible made with the whole authority of the Church, and with assent of learned men beyond her pale, we are sure that this would be a failure in every sense. Let us keep our ancient Bible, the noblest monument of our language, and the best inheritance of our race, until we have some happier augury of an improved revision than Mr. Heywood's patronage, or even the Parliamentary address, which he has failed, we are happy to say, for the present to obtain.—*London Guardian*.

Correspondence.

The Editors of "The Church Times" do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of their Correspondents.

FOR THE CHURCH TIMES.

Mr. Editor.—It saddens the heart of every right-minded Churchman to observe the narrow-minded and rancorous spirit of opposition which starts up like some foul bird from its gloomy hiding-place, apparently delighting in the fears it excites, or, when pursued with the light of truth, sinks nearly back into its vile covert, until again startled into day by some new advance.

Just witness the last attempt to throw odium upon our beloved, earnest, and right-minded Bishop, and that by a "Brother in Christ," professedly. Such stumbling blocks and obstructions ought to be very summarily disposed of, and make room for better and truer men; the power they make such a bug-a-boo about, they should be made to feel, if possible, and the very novelty of its exercise would make all good men rejoice, though at the same time it evidenced that the fears of these grumblers were well founded.

Instead of this wholesome check to ill-doers, we have still, in the words of the Commission Service, to grieve, "Brethren in the Primitive Church there was a godly discipline," and pray that it "may be restored again, which is much to be wished." Now, whoever this bilious individual may be, I have done with him, only begging to call his attention to that explicit text at 1 Thess. iv. 11; "Another Clericus" has him in his sturdy grasp, and will speedily bestow on him a salis-fecti.

But, Mr. Editor, how do you account for the extreme interest taken in the matter by the *Church Witness*? Don't you think that the current Church news of our sister dioceses would more consistently benefit those pages? An occasional reference to us would be only neighbor-

ly, but the continual publication of Nova Scotia letters (bela rather) maligning our Bishop and his acts, show, that there is a latent morbid feeling against our Diocesan, that augurs but poorly for its Editor's Christian charity, or its own motto, 1 Thess. v. 21.

No one desires to interfere with the way in which the *Church Witness* is conducted, but do you know that even in this obscure little Island, it is getting rather an extensive circulation, from the fact that something racy and ecclesiastically saucy is weekly dished up for the palates of its Atlantic readers. I do not like to impute motives, but perhaps this is the secret spring that sets the Malagana winking for the gratification of its supporters. Suppose, Mr. Editor, you cross-fire, and keep a strict surveillance over the affairs of the Diocese of N. B., and not be over scrupulous as to the animus of certain letters solicited from N. B. presbytere (if such could be found to serve your purpose) for an honest penny. But, seriously, the *Church Witness* does not evidently prefer the shady side of truth, and does not delight in healing charity. e. g., an article in the issue of July 9th upon "Theological Colleges in America," copied from the *Record*, (of which it is the New Brunswick shadow.) Here the writer in *verbosa et grandis epistola* charges upon the General Theological Seminary, New York, the unfounded slander, that "Popery itself never exhibited a more bitter and persecuting spirit than that which prevailed within the walls of this seminary. Everything Protestant was discarded as far as possible, and everything evangelical was despised; in dress, manner, practice, and doctrine, the young men imitated, as far as they could, Romish priests," &c., every word of which is utterly untrue. I can speak from actual observation, having been intimately acquainted with the Professors and students for nearly two years, during a sojourn in New York in 1847-48. A finer set of young men never were congregated together, nor more devoted to their studies, or more thoroughly attached to the Protestant Episcopal Church. Two of these students at that time were from St. John, N. B., and were probably known to the Editor of the *Witness*. The Rev. R. N. Merritt, B. A. was the one, the other name I have forgotten. Mr. Merritt was ordained in Canada and labored there for some time, but I have yet to learn that he imbibed Popish doctrines, practices, manners, and dress, from his connection with the General Theological Seminary.

Several of our Nova Scotia clergy have been also there, and we do not hear of any of them having imbibed a "bitter and persecuting spirit," unless, indeed "Clericus," be one of its graduates.

Of the Professors one only was considered to hold ultra opinions, he was a man of singular gentleness, deep learning, and sincere piety, in one word a Churchman and a judicious one: the other members of the faculty, quite the reverse, indeed; the Dean and the Professor of Systematic Divinity were esteemed Low Churchmen, and I feel well assured that did such men visit St. John, N. B., the Editor of the *Church Witness* would speedily invite them to occupy the pulpit of Trinity Church?

But again to revert to this truthless article, whilst the seminaries at Virginia and Gambia, Ohio and Middletown, Connecticut, are lauded highly, poor struggling Nashotah, the Christian pioneer in the forests of Wisconsin, like St. John in the Wilderness, is dragged to the light only to strike its head off. Why? because it is a sound Church institution, poor, perhaps, (its only crime) but pure and Catholic in its objects and teachings.

Alas, the malignity of party spirit! the distorted fancies of sectarianism in the Church! Instead of the exclamation of old, "See how these Christians love one another," we perform most eliminate the love and substitute "hate and devour."

May a merciful God regard our frailties and weaknesses in love, and heal our dissensions for Jesus' sake.

Yours truly,

OBSERVER.

P. E. Island, Aug. 21, 1856.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHURCH TIMES.

PHILOSOPHY OF FOG.

SIR,—In a recent number of the *Presbyterian Witness* is quite a philosophical editorial on fog. The writer, however, is guilty of the common error in supposing that there is more fog on the coast of Newfoundland than Nova Scotia, and that the climate of the former is colder than the latter. The winters in Newfoundland are not by many degrees so cold as in Nova Scotia or the Northern States, nor is the climate so changeable. In Nova Scotia the temperature sometimes changes thirty or forty degrees in twenty-four

hours. In Newfoundland, the instances are few of the temperature changing ten or fifteen degrees in a day. January and February are the coldest months of the year, when the thermometer sometimes sinks below zero; but, at the coldest times, not more than ten degrees below it. In Nova Scotia, the thermometer sometimes sinks from twenty to thirty degrees below zero. In Newfoundland, the coldest wind in winter is from the North West, which generally prevails about nine months of the year. In spring, Easterly winds prevail, and in winter and summer North-easterly winds are cold. South and South-easterly winds in winter are generally accompanied with snow or sleet, and sometimes rain, and in summer rain or fog. July and August are the hottest months in the year, when the thermometer is said to have attained ninety degrees in the shade; but this rarely occurs. The usual temperature of those months is from sixty-five to seventy-nine degrees.

But it may be asked, what has all this to do with fog? It has everything to do with it; because upon the temperature the writer in the *Presbyterian Witness* founds his theory of fog, and which is, I believe, a correct one.

In Newfoundland, the sea-fog prevails only on the eastern and southern shores, and then only during the summer months. I do not remember to have seen more than two or three foggy days in a year in Conception Bay, and none on the South shore of Bonavista Bay. In Trinity Bay, however, it obtains with South winds, where it is brought over the narrow neck of land which separates that Bay from Placentia Bay, and known as the Province of Avalon. The fog along the coast from Cape Race to St. John's (a distance of fifty five miles, and the direct route of vessels from America to Europe,) hardly ever approaches nearer than within two or three miles of the shore. I have seen more dense fog on the West coast of Nova Scotia in one month, than I have seen in Newfoundland during a period of thirty three years.

According to a register kept at St. John's, Newfoundland, in 1841, (which is more exposed to the bank fog than any other part of the coast,) the average of thick shore fog and partial light fog, extending a short distance inland, was as follows:—

	Thick fog.	Light fog, only lasting a portion of the day.
In January,	1½ days	1½ days.
February,	none.	half day.
March,	none.	none.
April,	1 day.	2½ days.
May,	3 days.	3 "
June,	2 "	2½ "
July,	1 "	2½ "
August,	1 "	1½ "
September,	4 "	2½ "
October,	1 "	1 "
November,	2 "	1 "
December,	1 "	1½ "

It thus appears that there were 17½ days of thick fog, and 19½ days of light fog and mist, making a total of only 67 days of cloudy weather throughout the year. I have no table by me to institute a comparative view of the cloudy days of Nova Scotia with Newfoundland. But according to a table kept by Dr. Woodward, Superintendent of the Lunatic Hospital, at the city of Worcester, which is 483 feet above the level of the sea, and about the centre of the State of Massachusetts, there were

In 1841,	-	-	110 cloudy days
1844,	-	-	136 " "
1845,	-	-	117 " "

From the foregoing the reader will at once perceive that the climate of Newfoundland has been grossly maligned and misrepresented by almost every writer.

The Editor of the *Presbyterian Witness* is in error, in supposing that a very severe winter necessarily produces a great quantity of fog the succeeding summer. The production of fog entirely depends on the difference of temperature. There is abundance of fog where no ice is found at all. Along the coast of Peru the atmosphere scarcely ever possesses sufficient moisture to produce rain; it contains, however, enough to create widely extended and continued fogs. The winter season, in that country, lasts from April to October, and throughout the whole of this country, a veil of mist shrouds sea and shore. During the months of August and September, the vapor is extremely dense and rests for weeks immovably upon the earth. The fogs, are said to be at times so heavy, that the moisture falls to the earth in large drops, which are formed by the union of small globules of mist. England, surrounded by a warm sea, is subject to thick fogs, that prevail extensively in the winter. The London fog is so extremely dense that it is necessary to light the gas in the streets and houses in the middle of the day.

Fogs originate in the same cause as rain, viz. the union of a cool body of air with one that is warm and