

the responsibilities as widely as capacity for efficiency will warrant. Lead everybody into doing something useful for somebody else." We believe a serious mistake is made when we shut our eyes to the good work done by others, and complacently think that because we have adopted and pursued certain methods of work they must suffice. We should not be blind to the fact that marked changes—in some instances decided improvements—have taken place in parish methods in recent years, and that he who is wise will study to be progressive and not blind to the fact that when a cause is limited to the personal preferences of its agent it may thereby grievously suffer for lack of enterprise on the part of the leader, and consequent lack of interest and enthusiasm on the part of his depressed and dispirited followers.

The Parish Year.

In many parishes the custom has grown up of closing the accounts on a certain day in the calendar year instead of basing them upon the ecclesiastical year from Easter to Easter. That year varies very much. For instance, last year there were 350 days; the year 1908 to 1909 was almost the same length, 357 days, but the previous year, ending at Easter, 1908, was 385 days long. Consequently a year of 365 days is more convenient in every way. For instance, in a short year churchwardens have to bemoan smaller returns, while, as a matter of fact, the parish may have made greater progress than in preceding ones, which had the accident of being ecclesiastically long.

The Point of View.

The fact that not only every class in the community, but every locality has its own special advantages or drawbacks has been markedly illustrated by the refusal of Dr. Jowett, of Birmingham, to accept more from a Fifth Avenue (New York) Presbyterian church than the equivalent of his Birmingham stipend. The clergy have unanimously assured him that he is mistaken, that his house rent and calls on his charity will enormously exceed his resources. Again we have an unlooked-for evidence that the English Bishops were justified in saying that their incomes were only apparently large. The wives of the New York clergymen of all denominations have also been duly interviewed, with the result that they fear Dr. Jowett's declaration will have the effect of stopping the movement in the city for a general rise of clergymen's salaries. The wives say that in New York a successful pastor must keep abreast of current literature and employ a secretary; he must respond liberally to appeals for charity, and, if he desires to do good work among the better classes, he must be able to allow his wife to dress on the same scale as the ladies of the congregation.

What is a Small College?

To this question which has been asked us we are fortunately able to give a fairly definite answer. The Rev. A. Christy Brown has issued a letter on behalf of Carroll College, in Wisconsin, which he looks on as a model small college. There are nearly three hundred students and a faculty of eighteen. Mr. Brown says that it is conceded by those who have studied the question that the great work of making future leaders is done best in institutions where the first aim of the instructors is to build character, where the small number of students permits the teachers to mould the pupils to lofty ideals, where there is a prevailing Christian life and spirit. As illustrating the spirit of its supporters he cites the action of an elderly clergyman, who has no children and only a little savings, but who says: "My life has been given to building character and in trying to build up the Kingdom of Christ. The time is coming when these lips will be silent, and after I am gone I want any little money I may have accumulated

to help to support some one who will help to build up character and teach righteousness for all time." So, in return for a life annuity, he has given his money to the college.

Reverence the Name.

Occasionally at public meetings the name of the Deity is used to point a joke or to belittle what the speaker deems to be excessive national pride. For example, we recently heard from the platform at a large public meeting the term, "God's country," used, as it appeared to us, in the latter sense. Doubtless such expressions would not be used were it not thought by the speaker that their use would help his argument and be acceptable to his hearers. We hold it to be a good rule never to use the Divine Name save where there can be no possible doubt that the use is apt and reverent. It may be that in a large public gathering there are a few people who would take pleasure in a careless reference to "God's country," but we are confident that to the mass of the people such expressions are objectionable; for, though a man may not consider himself a devout Christian, yet in all probability he has a sincere respect for God, and does not wish to hear His name taken in vain.

The Revision of 1611.

Some very interesting extracts from Mr. Alfred W. Pollard's bibliographical introduction to two reprints of the Authorized Version of 1611, which the Oxford University Press is publishing in celebration of the Tercentenary, have been issued by Mr. Henry Frowde. In one of them the following extract from Selden's Table Talk is given: "The translators in King James's time took an excellent way. That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue (as the Apocrypha to Andrew Downs), and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues, or French, Spanish, Italian, etc. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on." Then Mr. Pollard says: "Whether the wonderful felicity of phrasing should be attributed to the dexterity with which, after meanings had been settled and the important words in each passage chosen, either the board of twelve or the two final revisers put their touches to the work, or whether, as seems more likely, the rhythm, first called into being by Tyndale and Coverdale, reasserted itself after every change, only gathering strength and melody from the increasing richness of the language, none can tell. All that is certain is that the rhythm and the strength and the melody are there."

COMPREHENSIVENESS, NOT VAGUENESS.

We Church people are accustomed to loudly proclaim and to derive much comfort from what we are pleased to call "the comprehensiveness of the Church of England." The expression has, in fact, become a stock phrase. It is in almost universal use, and, on the whole, it has met with fairly general acceptance outside our own communion. It does seem to be commonly conceded that the Church of England is what it claims to be viz., a comprehensive organization, one, in other words, whose terms of membership are not unduly exacting. Now, a Church may be comprehensive in one sense and exclusive in another, or it may be comprehensive in both. Terms of membership in all societies and organizations fall under two heads, theoretical and practical. Every man who becomes a member of any society must profess his belief in certain "principles," or facts or theories, or "doctrines," and he must promise in some respects to govern his conduct according to the rules of the society in question, be it a church or a fraternity, or even a business association, and the only difference between cases will be in the

number and exact nature of the conditions imposed, which is a mere matter of detail; the same principles will apply in both cases. The question follows, In which sense is the Church of England "comprehensive;" in a doctrinal or in a disciplinary sense, or is she comprehensive in both? In both. But comprehensiveness is not vagueness. This is what it means undoubtedly in popular parlance as applied to individuals. The "broad-minded man" is the man of vague opinions (on certain subjects) and easy-going standards of right and wrong. But the comprehensiveness of the Church of England is not of this kind. Indeed, it is only because she is not vague that she is or can be comprehensive. The comprehensiveness of the Church of England is the direct result of her definiteness. A Church so definite and so outspoken on the fundamentals of belief and conduct can well afford to be comprehensive, just as the strong man can afford to be gentle. An impression, we know, has got abroad that the Church of England in her teaching and discipline is vague and indefinite, that she has very elastic standards of belief and conduct, and draws no sharp or clearly discernible lines anywhere. But nothing could be further from the real facts of the case. Doctrinally, the Church, comprehensive as to systems of theology, is uncompromisingly and immovably firm as to facts. What Christian body, if we must even indirectly make comparisons, has safeguarded and maintained, without addition or mutilation, the ancient Catholic creeds as she has undoubtedly done? In what human composition will you find so clearly set forth the faith of the undivided Church as in the Book of Common Prayer? Whatever private theories you may be able to read into the formularies of the Church of England, and however men may differ as to those theories, there can be no shadow of doubt or uncertainty as to the facts embodied therein. The great Catholic verities stand out of its pages distinct, clear, unmistakable: the Incarnation, the Atonement, Sacramental Grace, the Trinity, the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture, etc. On these fundamentals the Anglican Church surely, least of all churches and religious bodies, can be accused of "vagueness," though she undoubtedly has had, and still has, those whose interpretation and application of these great truths will widely vary. Then as to vagueness in her standard of conduct. The Church of England at home, and in all her branches, has never possessed a "discipline" in the common meaning of the term. Her discipline has always been the Ten Commandments, to which she has never added. Now, the Ten Commandments can hardly be accused of vagueness, and they are certainly the most comprehensive standard of conduct in the world. As a matter of fact, and to judge by results, can it be said that the conduct of Anglicans generally, so far as the practice of the fundamental virtues goes, compares unfavourably with that of other religious bodies? On certain disputed questions of faith and conduct the Church of England is most assuredly non-committal, and purposely and deliberately vague, and will remain so. But these are questions which do not involve essentials, and about which men will always lawfully differ.

THE CRISIS.

The late Goldwin Smith once made this pregnant remark: "The man who ignores or depends upon sentiment in public affairs is equally mistaken." This was the experience of one of the most accomplished historians and independent thinkers of our age, who had closely followed, and to a certain extent actively participated in, most of the great political movements of the last sixty years. Sentiment, he held, will in politics carry you a certain distance, but not the whole distance. It is a factor to be reckoned with in all political movements, and it is madness to ignore