

CORRESPONDENCE.

[The name of Correspondent must in all cases be enclosed with letter, but will not be published unless desired. The Editor will not hold himself responsible, however, for any opinions expressed by Correspondents.]

SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

DEAR SIR,—The latter clause of your excellent leader, over the signature H. W. N., in your issue of Sept. 1st, on this subject, suggests two remedies for the present unsatisfactory state of Sunday-school teaching.

I beg to add another alternative remedy, the more readily as you ask for a "better plan." It is universally acknowledged that school teachers are not generally competent to teach. This not from any deficiency of intellectual, moral or spiritual capacity, but simply because the art of teaching is, first of all, "a natural gift," which may be improved, but not created.

First, let a scheme of Sunday-school lessons be adopted. I am not to enter into this subject. Then assemble your school at the usual hour. Proceed at once to the lessons: that is, let each teacher *hear* the set lessons recited, and make the usual award of marks for attendance, conduct and recitation. Then let all the auxiliary work of the Sunday-school hour be done—the giving of library books, papers, reward cards, &c. Then adjourn in proper order the whole school to the church. There engage in a bright musical service, shortened evensong, metrical litany, &c.

Let the clergyman, or some one whom he deposes—and he must hand his teaching responsibility over to no one unless properly qualified—catechize, i.e., teach by question and answer and explanation, the whole school.

It may be objected that every clergyman has not the gift of teaching. In answer to this, it must be remembered that a clergyman without some gift of teaching is unfit for his office as a parish priest, and that, even allowing the case, it is easier for the parish priest to find some one person fit to receive the delegated authority than to find twenty or thirty persons so qualified.

The advantages of this plan—and the writer has had two years' experience of it—are:

1. The teachers and scholars are both taught.
2. The school is familiarized with the church services in the church.
3. The teaching is uniform and connected.
4. Teachers who absent themselves or come late do not throw their classes and the school into chaos.
5. The highest work of the class teacher—to visit the children committed to their care, and to be to them, as it were, godfathers and godmothers—is not in any way interfered with.

Lastly.—The plan comes nearest to the Church's direction that the Curate shall every Sunday assemble the children of the parish and catechize them in God's House.

C. E. W.

THE "REVISED" VERSION—A WORD OF RESPECTFUL WARNING TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CANADIAN PROVINCIAL SYNOD.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—A report has reached me (I am unwilling to believe that it can be a true report, but I have it on very respectable authority) that there is to be a proposal made at the approaching Canadian Provincial Synod to adopt that most infelicitous of recent literary performances—the "Revised" Version of the Old and New Testaments.

I take leave in the most respectful manner,

but, at the same time, without the slightest hesitation, to warn the members of that august body against the egregious error of which they would most certainly be guilty, should they, in an unguarded hour, be induced to extend their sanction to a work which, here in England, is deservedly regarded with universal disfavor; and, by the best informed sort, is already recognized as the grossest literary blunder of the age.

The fatal feature of the Old Testament portion is the undue partiality it evinces for the corrupt Septuagint Version. But it is in the New Testament that the incompetence of the "Revisers" most specially comes to light. They have been convicted of falsifying the inspired Greek Text in countless places; and the sacred original, thus falsified, they have rendered into English so utterly devoid of taste (as well as destitute of true scholarship) as to provoke the indignation or the derision of every competent reader who has approached their work without prejudice.

Condemned on every side, instead of either attempting some vindication, as well as of their New Greek Text as of their New English Version—or else withdrawing silently from public notice,—the "Revisers" have adopted the sinister policy of secretly forcing their spurious wares on an inattentive public and an unlearned age. It would be easy to expose this feature of their policy; but it would lead me away from my present purpose, which is simply to put members of an important and honored branch of our Church on their guard against being defrauded of their birthright by the well-meant (but certainly most misguided) efforts of a few of their brethren to palm off upon them one of the foulest Greek texts which has ever seen the light, as well as the most tasteless and unscholarlike of English translations.

My humble prayer to the Synod is, after all, but this,—that they would, like wise men, *suspend their judgment*. Let another decade of years pass over our heads. Let opportunity be given for passion, and prejudice, and party-spirit to subside. Let men remember that the Church is always in time to take a step of this momentous description,—if indeed, (which I venture to pronounce incredible), she should ever become thoroughly persuaded that it is her duty to do so. On the other hand, how terrible is the responsibility which *they* would incur, who, by their unconsidered votes at this time, should inflict upon a branch of the Church of Christ a depraved revision of the Sacred Oracles,—even after a faithful warning like the present has been sounded in their ears; and after they have been earnestly implored, in God's name, not to take a step, which once taken, it will evermore be impossible for them to retract.

JOHN W. BURTON, Dean.

Deanery, Chichester, }
Aug. 30th, 1886. }

THE MISSION OF POINT EDWARD.

SIR,—In the issue of your paper of the 14th July, I noticed among the Church news from the Diocese of Huron, a description of the state of the Church property in the mission of Point Edward, "one year ago, when the Rev. Wm. Hinde was appointed" to the mission; also of the improvements made, and of the reopening of the Churches of Point Edward and Perche. While it is very gratifying to Church people to see such news items, is it not a pity that the good work done by a new clergyman in a mission cannot be reported as Church news without some times unfairly at least reflecting upon his predecessors. It seems to be the fashion of some of those who supply news for Church papers to exaggerate the state of things, and not give the whole truth, to show how clean the new broom sweeps, and how neglectful the old one was. The parsonage certainly needed repairs and was neglected, shamefully so; but it

was not because the owners of it were not asked and urged again and again to repair it. I think, therefore, that your informant would have best consulted the good name of the Church people at the Point, had he said nothing about "the sills being rotten," &c. I deny that "the two Churches, both inside and out," were *dirty*, in the sense usually attached to that word.

The Point Church was renovated inside and out, all through, in 1878 or 1879, and, as was then thought, an excellent job was done. This was done by the people themselves, and paid for when finished. The Grand Trunk Railway officials have always manifested most kindly feelings towards this church, and on the occasion referred to assisted the Church people by having the fence surrounding the church painted, and the walk from the gate to the church door repaired and a new one put down to the vestry door. Of course it was expected that the church would require to be "done over" again at some future time, and I cannot see, therefore, what object your correspondent has in saying so much about the condition of the church.

The Perche Church is an old building, and by no means ecclesiastical—from a Church of England standpoint—either inside or out; but I deny most emphatically that ever it was *dirty* inside or out. A few years before I left the Mission an attempt was made to remodel and repair "old St. John's." We had a sum of money on hand, and the balance required was nearly all subscribed, when one of the principal alterations proposed was so seriously objected to by persons who were the means of having any church building at Perche at all, and whose wishes on other grounds all the parishioners and myself respected, that, under the circumstances, I thought it better (wisely or not) to let the matter drop, especially as the alteration objected to was such that without it the building would have been neither a church, nor a meeting-house. I suppose we could have gone on in spite of the objection and wishes of these persons, and I know that they are such staunch members of the Church that they would not have shown their objections in any other manner, but that is not my way of proceeding in such cases; and if I cannot repair and renovate a church without having my people with me, I am content to be more than suspected neglectful in my supposed duty. This is the reason why the Perche church was left as it was. It was not because the people are neglectful; on the contrary, I always found them ready to spend and be spent in the service of their Church.

And now that so much activity and enthusiasm has been aroused in the parish of Point Edward during the past year, of course the "overhauling of the parsonage, the new sills, the verandah," &c., as well as "the skill and taste of the artist," as shown in the renovation of the Church, are all paid for, by the parishioners themselves and probably with a handsome surplus on hand—a fact which your correspondent no doubt in his modesty omitted to say. I hope, sir, that you will pardon me for troubling you with this letter; my plea is that I feel I have been indirectly and unfairly accused of having been neglectful of the temporal affairs of the Point Edward mission during my occupancy of it. I believe that the duty of looking after the property of the Church in any parish belongs to the wardens and the vestry; at all events it is their duty to keep the parsonage and the Church in a proper state of repair.

Yours truly,

J. BEARFOOT,
Ex-Incumbent of Point Edward.

A PROMINENT Clergyman in the Diocese of Niagara writes: "I like your paper (THE CHURCH GUARDIAN) very much, and only wish it were in the hands of every member of the Church in our Dominion."