

and wings, representing *Time*, leading a young person in white silk—his own daughter—personating *Truth*. She held in her hand a Book, on which were the words, "*Verbum Veritatis*" (the Word of Truth.) It was the Bible in English, and was handed to the Queen. "As soon as she received it she kissed it, and with both her hands held it up, and then laid it upon her breast, greatly thanking the city for the present, and said she would often read over that Book."

By command, copies of the Great Bible were placed in the Churches, from which they had been removed in Mary's reign; and a bill was passed in the House of Lords which provided "for reducing of diversities of Bibles now extant in the English tongue to one settled vulgar, translated from the original." Parker (now Archbishop of Canterbury) undertook to set the whole work in motion by dividing it into portions and allotting them to other Bishops and such men who were marked for their scholarship. It required, of course, considerable time to complete the whole work, comparing the many different translations with the best copies of the original text; but all being done, these portions were sent to the Archbishop, who, with certain learned Divines, re-examined the whole. It was published in 1568, and is known as the Bishop's Bible. In it the initials of the names of those who assisted in this translation are printed at the end of their respective parts. Coverdale was still alive and had returned from the Continent after Mary's death. On account of his great age, being now 83, he took no part in this translation. We respectfully draw a veil over the good man's shortcomings and strange prejudices in his older days. They were the fruits of his Geneva exile, and they tainted more than he. He died in 1569.

We have said a good deal about Coverdale. We will be justified not only by his great and continued work as a Translator, but by the fact that when at the last Revision of the Prayer Book, the introductory sentences at Morning and Evening Prayer, and the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Holy Days were taken from the "Authorized" Version, the Psalms, and the "comfortable words" in the office of the Holy Communion were still left as before from Coverdale's translation. So that we are brought into contact with his work at those two parts of our worship upon which our minds dwell with the greatest fondness and frequency. Canon Westcott's words are so apt that I may be allowed to quote them:—"When the last changes in the Prayer Book were made, it was found, it is said, smoother to sing; but this is not a full account of the matter, and it cannot be mere familiarity which gives to the Prayer Book Psalter, with all its errors and imperfections, an incomparable tenderness and sweetness. Rather, we may believe that in it we can yet find the spirit of him whose work it mainly is, full of humanity and love, not heroic or creative, but patient to accomplish, by God's help, the task which had been set him to do, and therefore best in harmony with our daily lives."

In the Bishop's Bible Prefaces were written by Archbishop Parker for both the Old and New Testaments. I quote one sentence from that before the New—"Here we may behold our inheritance, not of the temporal land of Canaan or of the translation of us to the place of worldly paradise, but here may we see the full restitution of us, both in body and soul to the celestial paradise, the heavenly City of Jerusalem above, there to reign with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost for ever."

Principal Versions.—Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale (Matthew's and Laver's), Great Bible (Cranmer's), Bishop's Bible.

Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church, will not be admitted.

THE SEPTUAGINT.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—“Cohen's” letter of 9th June asked Mr. Shreve to account for the dissimilarity between the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old Testament. “R. S.” replies that if “C.” had asked his question of a very accomplished scholar the answer given, if advancing any definite theory, could be forcibly combatted on the authority of other equally learned men, which naturally means that one man's opinion is as good as another. A translation is either literal or free, and its value consists in conveying the proper meaning of the original; but our subject is of too serious a matter to be disposed of *calamò* style.

These are times of enquiry and research, and any one asking for information on any subject, more particularly on Biblical Hermeneutics, has a right to expect an answer, especially when attention has been directed to it. “C.” does not attach any very great importance to the Fathers, and so far as authority goes, they are considered valuable only when they agree with the Holy Scriptures. In reference to authorities “C.” is *in horto s.no.*, and must rely on the Hebrew and Greek texts for proof of what Philo calls “the sisters (Hebrew and Septu-

agint), as the same both in words and things.” “R. S.” has therefore not answered “C.’s” question as to where the 70 got their authority. “C.” must apologize for trenching on your columns, but he does not suppose that you would stop any discussion that promotes Biblical study.

June 28th.

Yours,
COHEN.

IS CHRIST DIVIDED?

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—“Apologist and defender,” of the Christian denominations who teach the Protestant doctrine of salvation by Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. I accept the title in the sense in which the following authorities are their apologists and defenders. The Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking, recently, at a dinner given by the Lord Mayor of London in honor of the Rev. Dr. Moffatt, the great Missionary to Africa (not an Episcopalian) said—“when men were brought into contact with heathenism, they knew there was a gulf between it and Christianity before which the differences of the several Christian denominations sank into insignificance.” The inspired Apostle St. Paul, speaking to the Philippians, (revised version) says, “some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife, and some also of good will; the one do it of love, knowing that I am set for the defense of the Gospel; but the other proclaim Christ of fiction, not sincerely, thinking to raise up affliction for me in my bonds. What then? Only that in every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.”

And further, to such as deny Church unity to those non-Episcopal bodies who are known to preach effectually to the casting out of the demons of irreligion and heathenism, I humbly suggest a study of the Master's words in reply to His intolerant disciples; “Forbid them not.”

If the highest dignitary in our Church can overlook the distinctions of the denominations; if the Apostles of the Gentiles could rejoice in the proclaiming of Christ, even of fiction; if the Saviour would not forbid those who were not His followers, doing good in His name, who are we that we should consider as aliens and strangers good men of other denominations who preach Christ crucified to sinful men, and who preach Him, as it is undeniably known, with such success that the best men of our Church rejoice in their work.

The friends who have noticed my letters have set forward the importance of “the Church,” assuming that somewhere there exists a visible body, entitled *exclusively* to the appellation—that in it true unity is found; and one remarks, “if there is no true Apostolic Succession, there is no Church.” I have before asked, where, among the Churches having Apostolic Succession is “The Church?” Here is one claimant for the pre-eminence. The words are those of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Saint John. “Leo XIII, the 266th successor of Peter, who had sat on the Papal throne since Christ was on the earth—the head of the Eternal Church, that, notwithstanding the disturbances and tumults of the world, according to the promises of God, shall last to the end of the world.”

Another claimant is the Eastern Church, anathematized by the Roman Catholic Church, which Eastern Church assails the Papacy with equal severity, while antagonistic within itself—half the Greek Church denouncing the other half. The old Lutheran Episcopal Church goes on its steady way, interfering little with others. The Protestant Episcopal Church disparages the Reformed Episcopal Church; all these agree in one thing, all have the true Apostolic Succession. Have they unity? Is this the seamless garment?

Yet Christ is not divided!

There is a “Mystical body” of God's Dear Son. Our Church speaks of it in the Collect for All Saints' Day. I venture to think this expression refers to the universal Church of Christ, comprising all His faithful ones, on earth and those who have passed away in His “true faith and fear.” We can discern unity in this “Mystical body,” none in visible communities. Christ's words praying that His followers may be one, have their natural application to this, His invisible Church.

Doubtless, the day will dawn when unity will be visible on earth—it has not dawned yet. But every effort to advance that blessed period, by seeking to promote a spirit of love, and gentleness and forbearance among professed followers of the Lord should be ceaselessly made. Long experience, and not unfruitful efforts to bring recruits into the fold of our Church, have convinced the writer that the true way to promote our own progress in influence and numbers, is to recognize the good we see in others, and extend to them that charity which led the wise Apostle to say, “grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.”

Your obdt. servt.,

ROTHESAY.

THE REVISION.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—It may be interesting to call attention to the translation in the Revised Version of the first verse of the Epistle for last Sunday, 1 St. Peter, v. 5. The Authorized Version is—“All of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility.” By a fuller and more literal translation of

the word for “be clothed,” and by the omission of the word for “be subject,” for which the authority is slight, the Revised Version gives—“Yea, all of you gird yourselves with humility to serve one another.” This at once suggests the thought that St. Peter had in his mind the scene he once witnessed when the Master girded Himself with a towel to serve His servants; and that by these words St. Peter would enforce that example.

5th July, 1881.

THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Any sermon preached in the Church of St. John the Evangelist, Montreal, or elsewhere, would be justly exempt from public criticism so long as it was addressed only to the original hearers; but when, through your instrumentality, and without a word of comment from you, it finds its way into every Parish in Canada, the case is entirely changed, and it seems only right and just that any of your readers who think its teaching mischievous, and its language and reasoning rash and injudicious, should be granted the same opportunity of replying to, that has been given to the circulation of it.

I venture, then, to ask for space for a few remarks on the sermon of the Rev. Wm. Wright, M. D., published in your last issue. And first, sirs, I must express my surprise at the evidence which Mr. W. adduces as establishing his opinion that no revision of the New Testament should have been attempted. “Dean Alford said ‘sacred criticism is still in its infancy.’” But Dean Alford, if now alive, would scarcely sanction the use of his words as an argument against revision. For not only did he, in the same chapter and section, say of the *revised text* of the Greek Testament that its “critical authority was very feeble,” and speak of “the real gain which has accrued to our knowledge of the sacred text from that modern criticism which it is now becoming the fashion to despise; the positive progress which it has made in all those places where the ancient MSS. are unanimously against our received text,” &c.; but, as Mr. W. well knows, he published a New Testament for English readers, and was one of the original company of revisers. Whatever Bishop Eliott may have said at one time, he has, at all events, long laboured in the work of revision, having been associated with Dr. Moberly (whose Catholic spirit and tendencies Dr. Wright will not question), and three other clergymen, in preparing and publishing a revised edition of St. John's Gospel and some of the Epistles of St. Paul, as long ago as the year 1857; and his own words in presenting a volume of the Revised New Testament to the Upper House of Convocation are a sufficient answer to Dr. W.'s charge of inconsistency: “The time, however, was not then (1857) ripe, though the process of maturation had commenced. So half a generation passed away. Fresh critical subsidies were accumulating; new exegetical works were multiplying; and at last the time was ripe, and the great movement with which Convocation had been so intimately connected began in February, 1870,” &c.

Another subject of surprise is the imputation, on the authority of Bishop Cox, of a guiding principle which, I am certain, all the revisers would indignantly repudiate. Can any one, who calmly and dispassionately considers the composition of the Revising Committee, doubt that in revising the text they would honestly and fairly, and to the utmost of their great ability, consider and weigh well *all* the evidence for each individual passage that could be obtained?

I do not propose to follow Dr. W. through his list of omissions and changes. Some certainly are important; but the importance of others I cannot but think he has greatly exaggerated. I shall have occasion to speak of one or two a little later. I would only observe now that the most important omission, that of the Heavenly Witnesses, brings the text into harmony, not only with all the Greek MSS. before the 16th century, but also with the early versions and Greek fathers, who, according to Bishop Cox and Dr. Wright, were to be “overruled on the authority of two or three Egyptian codices.” But what I chiefly object to is the reasoning which leads Dr. W. to condemn the alterations which have been made. “They leave the text imperfect”; “some make it less graphic”; some tend “to obscure a doctrinal point.” (I hope Dr. W. means “makes the application of a particular text less pointed,” not “obscures the doctrine itself,” which never rests on a single text, &c.). All such criticisms are out of place when the question is, “what changes are required in the interests of truth?” Such difficulties as he adduces may well be left to take care of themselves.

As Dr. W. advances, I find it more difficult to follow him and ascertain what he really has in his mind. “Scholarship alone,” he says, “has no right of itself to change the Scriptures, to chip and mar the jewel of the Church, to falsify the Divine prediction, ‘Heaven and earth,’” etc.—(St. Matt. xxiv. 25.) If there were any question of changing the Scriptures, I should say that not only would scholarship alone and of itself have no right to make such change, but that nothing in Heaven or earth could possibly give such a right to it. But surely it is a legitimate and praiseworthy employment of scholarship to ascertain as far as possible what really are the words of Scripture. Again Dr. W. says, “no man, however clever, no single branch of the Church, not even the Church of England, with all

her Colonial offshoots and American alliance, has a right to let a single grain of the Bible, to let a single word or meaning fall to the ground.” True. But would Dr. W. give such a right to the Universal Church?

When he goes on to tell us that “if the reconsideration 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;” and further tells us that “our old version of the New Testament has the Catholic text,” but that the “revised work drops out part of that text and changes the sense in other parts,” and “that a single passage thus treated is enough to sever it from the Bible of Christendom,” he seems to me to be leading us far from the realms of the practical and the true. That he is dealing with the impracticable he himself sees. But I would ask him on what authority he speaks of a Catholic text? Did the text of the New Testament ever form the subject of an Ecumenical Council? Is it not true that the Greek, which corresponds to our present version, does not correspond throughout to any printed Greek Testament known to be extant when the version was made? Is it not a little singular that the *Tablet* calls attention to the decided approximation of the Revised New Testament, in a multitude of instances, to the rendering of the Vulgate; and mentions particularly the hymn of the angels at the Nativity, and the omission of the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer in St. Matthew's Gospel.

Whether the present version will ever be adopted authoritatively or not no one knows, but I cannot for a moment conceive how the Church would stultify itself by adopting it. And surely Dr. W. is not only dealing in exaggerated language, but is forgetful of the fact that for half a century after the present version was authorized, the Epistle and Gospel were read from an earlier version, when he dilates upon the difficulties that would arise; and he quite takes away my breath when he gravely tells us that “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.” I must confess that it had never occurred to me as possible that any one reading the words of the Article, “*All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received*,” would for a moment imagine that the idea of any version was in the compilers' mind, that the Article was intended to teach more than this, viz., that the Church of England accepted as Canonical the *Books* which the Universal Church accepted as Canonical, and none other. And not less improbable should I have thought it, before experience, that a preacher in a City Church could make the categorical statement the words “New Testament as commonly received” meant a *version of the New Testament which was not published until fifty-nine years after the Article had been compiled*.

While, sirs, it is well that the Revised New Testament should run the gauntlet of a severe, but calm, thoughtful and dispassionate criticism, it is not well that such criticisms as Dr. Wright's should, unchallenged, be freely circulated by your aid in all our Parishes; and on this ground I ask that you will not refuse to this letter a place in your columns.

Yours,

D. SMITH.

Sydney, C. B., July 4th, 1881.

PAROCHIAL VISITS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—The very interesting Table of Statistics to be found on page 48 of the last Report just issued of the B. H. and F. M. supplies much material for thought.

Let me mention some of these suggestive figures. It has been sought for many years to impress upon the minds of the clergy, particularly the younger, that “a house-going Parson makes a Church-going people.” Can we apply the test of experience to this maxim of accumulated wisdom? From said page 48, it would appear we are—

| Parochial Visits in four Missions. | Average attendance at Service in four Missions |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 2360 (!!!)..... | 80(!) |
| 1800..... | —(!) |
| 1284..... | 65 |
| 1220..... | 58 |

And now on the other side—

| Visits. | Average Attendance. |
|----------|---------------------|
| 800..... | 150 |
| 500..... | 300 |

Some one who is better acquainted than the present writer with the geographical nature of these Missions, *i. e.*, whether scattered or compact, might suggest a *partial* explanation; but it would really seem that the proverbial saying had received a heavy blow. And yet I am unwilling to believe it.

DOOR BELL.

THE S. P. G. REDUCTION.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Will not the interest of the Endowment Fund be available for the purpose of making up the deficiency caused by the reduction of the S. P. G. Grant?

Yours,

D. L.

[Yes, but the reduction added to the present calls on the fund about equals the whole interest; and what of the future?—EWS.]