

## WHY SOME CLERGYMEN FAIL.

BY RICHARD FERGUSON.

PEOPLE instinctively despise apologies and compromises. A compromise, at best, is only a makeshift, and an apology presupposes some weakness. Any institution that has to be apologised for, or is in anyway built upon a compromise, righteously merits and inevitably receives the contempt of the public, and will not stand. So it is with men as with institutions. The man who avowedly adopts a certain course of action from prudential motives, or from a desire for ease, peace or safety, whatever may be his intrinsic worth in other respects, and however excellent the reasons for so doing may be, will not stand high in public estimation, and will exercise little influence upon the world. "Say a thing and stick to it," epitomizes a course of action that must in the end command the respect and, to a certain extent, the allegiance of mankind. People respect consistency even of the most unlovable kind, and the man who adopts a certain line of action upon principle, and, scorning expediency, sticks to it through thick and thin, cannot fail to gain a large number of admirers and a certain number of followers. By showing people that he believes in himself, he will get other people to believe in him, because following is safer, easier and pleasanter than leading, and the majority of men would sooner pin their faith to some man or institution than go to the trouble and danger of hewing out a path for themselves, wherein is, I think, taking all things into consideration and making a liberal allowance for human wrong-headedness, a merciful dispensation of Providence. It is better to follow a strong mistaken man than a weak mistaken man, which latter alternative would be the case if all men thought and acted for themselves.

But, be this as it may, the following instinct is strong in man, and it is wonderful how ready and willing he is to allow others to act and think for him, if a bold, consistent and not inordinately harsh claim is made upon his allegiance. And this is true of churches as of other institutions. The Church which makes bold, strong, consistent claims and sticks to them, will be respected and will gain adherents. The one great secret of Rome's power is her unbendable and unbreakable consistency. She says a thing and sticks to it. She makes high claims and lofty pretensions, and then shows forth by her actions that she believes what she says. And so she presents a solid front to the world, and by proving that she believes in herself, she gets others to believe in her. This is true moreover of many of the Protestant sects, notably, of the Baptists, who rigidly stand upon a principle and scout all compromises, and, in a more modified sense, of the Methodists, Presbyterians and smaller sects, including even those sourest and most hopelessly heretical of people—the Plymouth Brethren.

Now, nothing has injured the cause of the Church of England in Canada and elsewhere

more than the apologetic tone of her clergy when speaking about her, and the consequent widespread idea amongst people that she is a sort of compromise between Popery and Protestantism, an idea to which that brilliant historical romancer, Macaulay, "intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity," and the feminine intensity of his personal likes and dislikes, has unfortunately given wide currency. We sometimes wonder how it is that the Church, with seemingly everything in her favor, and specially constituted as she is to commend herself to all thoughtful men, does not progress faster in Canada. The reason, I believe, will be found in the too common apologetic tone of her clergy. And thus, we have another cause of clerical failure. Too many clergymen, to use the trite phrase, *don't preach and teach Church principles.*

And the longer I live and the more I see of brother clergymen, the more immoveably am I built up in this opinion. How many men I have met, who started out from some "Evangelical" college loaded to the muzzle with beautiful ready-made theories about Christian fellowship and inter-communion, who have confessed to me that the only way of building up a parish was upon church principles. And this is in accordance with common sense, as any one with half an eye can see. If you are a grocer and wish to get a good business together, you don't spend money in advertising the man across the way; if you are a physician and wish to work up a good practice, you don't waste your time going about the country recommending rival practitioners. And although the other grocer and physician may be first-rate fellows, and personally worthy of all respect, you don't consider that in pushing yourself and yourself alone you are sinning against them. This is, under one and the lowest aspect, exactly the case as it relates to a parish priest of the Church of England in Canada. He is sent to a certain locality to push the interests of the Anglican Church, to this work he has been solemnly dedicated, of his own free will and accord he has offered his services, and his offer has been accepted in good faith, and unless he carries out the self-imposed programme of duties, he is guilty of a breach of trust just as flagrant as the insurance agent, who, while professing to give all his time and energies to one company works on the sly work for another.

This is perhaps a harsh way of putting the case, and I know there are many excellent men in the ministry who follow an opposite course from the best and purest motives; but, I think, when anyone looks into the matter carefully and dispassionately, he must be constrained to admit the soundness of my logic. Even were the denominations friendly to the Church, and not averse to her welfare, a parish priest has no business to be expending time and energy in giving them a forward shove. But they are notoriously hostile, every individual one of them is an organized protest against some fancied "error" of the Anglo-Catholic Church, their common ground is enmity to the very vital principles of Angli-

anism, what the Church declares to be essential they declare either non-essential or utterly false and unscriptural. Either they must be right or we must be right. If we are right they are wrong and *vice versa*, and the priest, who at his ordination vows to drive away all "strange and erroneous doctrine," and to teach the people to "keep" all the doctrines of the Church, cannot with strict faithfulness hold up these organizations or societies as being sister institutions of the Church of England.

## EARLY ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

THE first seven editions of the Great Bible were printed by Grafton and Whitchurch, and came out within twenty months (April 1539; April, July, and November, 1540; May, November, and December, 1541). All of them differ. The fourth and sixth are said on the title to be 'oversene by Cuthbert, bysshop of Duresme, and Nicholas bisshop of Rochester.' The six quarto editions of this version, printed by John Cawoode, the folio of 1540, by E. Whychurche, and the last edition, printed at 'Roven at the coste and charges of Richard Carmarden,' in 1566, much resemble each other.

William Whittingham's New Testament, printed at Geneva in 1557 by Conrad Badius (the first English Testament divided into verses) was never reprinted, for when the Genevan Bible appeared in 1560 a new version was inserted. This was reprinted about fifty times unaltered, but occasionally an edition was published with certain arbitrary verbal changes; notably the octavo printed by Thomas Vautroullier for Christopher Barkar in 1575, from which the words 'babe' and 'babes,' so frequently occurring in all other copies of the Testament, were eliminated.

The Genevan Testament was revised by Laurence Tomson in 1576, and this version became very popular, and almost superseded the Genevan, and from the year 1587 is often to be found bound up with the Genevan Old Testament; and when in 1616 this version ceased to be printed in England, it was adopted by the Dutch printers, who imported editions of it down to the year 1644.

The Bishops' Bible underwent continual revision. The first, a grand folio volume, is dated 1568; the following year a quarto was introduced, interesting from its marking the transition from paragraphs to verses, the text not being divided, but the letters, A, B, C, D, &c., placed down the margin for reference, as they were in the older books, and the verse-numbers interspersed in the letterpress. The rendering of the 1569 quarto is in many places entirely different from the first edition, and the second folio of 1572 differs so much from both as frequently to read like a new translation. After this, eleven folio, five quarto, and one octavo editions were put into circulation, in most of which slight alterations may be detected, the greatest number being in the folio of 1602, the Bible selected by King James' revisers as the basis of our present version.