

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1881.

ART. I.—FIRST PRINCIPLES, OR ESSENTIALS AND
NON-ESSENTIALS.

IN the present state of opinion and parties in the Church of England, it seems a very important thing to distinguish clearly between essentials and non-essentials. There can be no question but that two portentous dangers stare us in the face. One is the insidious and ever-increasing approximation to the teaching of the Church of Rome which is apparent in a large section of the English Church; and the other is the gradual alienation of the more thoughtful portion of the laity from any distinctively Christian belief whatever. We verily believe that neither of these dangers is a mere bugbear, but that each is a very formidable reality. And, what is more, the connection between the two phases of thought is closer than appears at first sight. Not seldom has extreme Romanizing doctrine prepared the way for the excess of free thought, and most assuredly there is no escape from the abyss of unbelief even in the bosom of the Church of Rome itself. Those in authority who are not fully alive to the peril which threatens us from these apparently opposite directions have most assuredly not estimated aright the full gravity of the symptoms attending the present condition of the Church. And there can be no more urgent practical question than the consideration whether anything—and if anything, what—can be done under the circumstances to promote the welfare of the Church. Is greater unity of feeling and action desirable in itself? and, if desirable, can it be brought about? Now it can hardly be denied that the divided condition of the Church of Christ is itself an element of weakness that is only to be deplored. It is certain that in military tactics an enemy ceases to be formidable when indecision and dissension pervade its counsels, and division and

disloyalty hamper its action. A house divided against itself must eventually and inevitably fall, and if there is a common foe the only way successfully to meet him is to present a united front. The common foe that we as Churchmen have to confront is the spirit of unbelief, whether it is manifested in the restless and disintegrating scepticism of the present day, or disguised under the more attractive but not less fatal aspect of semi-Romanism. And in order to make head against this common foe, it is of all things most important that we should present a front as united and compact as possible. It would probably be for the advantage of the Christian cause generally if this union could be extended beyond the limits of our own communion; but that in the present state of religious feeling is a Utopian hope, and it may be questioned after all whether an outward and recognized uniformity is so indispensable an advantage as it may at first sight appear. At least we may well believe, or at all events cherish a hope, that the Christian cause at large is not without some compensating advantages in being maintained as it is from a Wesleyan, a Baptist, or an Independent, as well as from a Church of England standing-ground. But for those who are members of the same national Church, and who hold the common social position which is filled by the national clergy, it can hardly be doubted that it would be for our mutual advantage and welfare if the bonds of union could be drawn tighter around us.

How, then, is any such nearer approach to unity to be brought about? First it would seem to be a matter of considerable importance to understand what is vital and what is not. If we must take up opposite sides in the same camp, only let us see that it is no mere matter of routine or external practice that divides us: if there is a sin not unto death as well as a sin unto death, so most assuredly there is that which is essential as well as that which is non-essential. And it must be a matter of the very last importance not to confound the one with the other. What, then, may we regard, or, rather, what must we acknowledge, as essential? First, for any Church constituted on the lines of the Church of England, it is absolutely indispensable that the Holy Scriptures should be regarded as the sole rule of faith. One cannot but believe that the tone of feeling with regard to the Holy Scriptures is apt occasionally to be pitched somewhat too low among professed members of the English Church. The Bible is not recognized as an available standard; it is too often assumed to be somewhat removed from the ordinary ground of discussion and interest. But is not this in itself a fact fraught with instruction? The Scriptures undeniably occupy the foremost place in all sacred literature. They do so not only because of their intrinsic value, but because of the recognized

authority with which they proclaim their message. This authority relates to matter of the highest import. The Bible confessedly contains the Divine way of salvation. This is its essential topic, inasmuch as the Bible is unique in dealing with it. There are many other matters touched upon in Scripture which are of subordinate interest and importance. No one can for a moment confound the two. We all distinguish between the relative importance of the first chapter of Chronicles and the third chapter of S. John, between the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans and the fifth of the Second Epistle to Corinthians. It is not that the first chapter of the Chronicles and the last of the Epistle to the Romans have not an intrinsic importance of their own, but that they must yield in this respect to the others; and the reason is, because these rather treat of vital and essential truths which are of the very kernel of revelation. Now, it is because of the existence of such statements of truth as these that the Bible is a unique book; but being, as it is, a unique book, it follows necessarily that its authority in matters of faith must be acknowledged as supreme. No councils or canons, no decrees of the Church or opinions of doctors, can for a moment compare in importance or authority with the declarations of Holy Writ. It is, and must ever be, regarded as the highest and ultimate referee. It is, however, not a little significant that we find oftentimes more anxiety expressed for compliance with the letter of a rubric or some ecclesiastical order of the day, than for obedience to the letter of Scripture. Because forsooth it is affirmed the cases in question lie outside the declarations of Scripture. But is not this of itself sufficient at once to stamp them as of the nature of non-essentials? How many of the points upon which the Church has from time to time been divided are exactly those upon which Holy Scripture has not, with absolute certainty, pronounced. Take, for example, Episcopacy. It is quite possible, by a system of inferences perfectly legitimate, to arrive at the conclusion that the episcopal form of Church government is the original and apostolic one. But probably all will allow that this conclusion is the result of inferences thus drawn rather than of any one explicit statement of Scripture. Certainly it is hard to understand how so large a body of sincere believers as the Presbyterian community comprises should even exist if it were the indubitable order of Holy Writ that the Church should be governed only by bishops. In like manner with infant baptism. No one can for a moment maintain that the directions of Holy Scripture upon this matter are plain and unmistakable, or that they do not admit of the possibility of a doubt. Here, again, the decision in favour of the custom of baptizing infants is the result rather of an inference than of any definite provision; but if so, is not this a proof that the

question in point cannot be vital, and ought not to be so regarded?

And we might go further. What specific directions are laid down in Scripture for the ordination of the ministers of the Church? Manifestly the directions that are given are of a moral rather than a specific character. Is not this, then, an indication that so far as Scripture is intended to be our rule of conduct, these are not points upon which we are to be too precise and dictatorial? To be sure, it is easy to affirm that Scripture is not thus intended to be our rule of conduct, that it is not a sufficient rule, and that it must be supplemented by the rule of the Church; but then here comes in a radical change of principle. If the Bible is the ultimate rule of faith and practice, there is a hope of union on that basis, because then, however zealous we may be for the prescriptions of the Bible, we shall be equally generous concerning the points it has confessedly left open; but if, in addition to the Bible, we are to admit the co-ordinate or even subordinate authority of the Church, however defined, it is hopeless that the advocates of these too opposite principles can be brought to agree. There is a radical and profound element of discord, and this is to be found in the original estimate of the functions of the Word of God. It may be said, however, that this estimate of Scripture is itself a notion foreign to Scripture, that we have to go to the Church to gain that very estimate of Holy Writ which we forthwith ungraciously magnify to the disparagement of the authority of the Church. But is this so? What more common—in the Old Testament, at all events—than the continual asseveration of the authority upon which the Word is communicated. As far as self-asseveration is concerned, the writings of the prophets and the Old Testament generally do most assuredly claim for themselves the utmost deference. And the way in which the writers of the New Testament express themselves in regard to the Old is equally decided and deferential. Nor is there wanting evidence in the New Testament of a similar claim to the attention of mankind. St. John many times appeals to the consciousness with which he professes to be uttering the truth. And the same may be said of St. Paul likewise. The estimate in which we hold the Scriptures is part of the very completeness with which we accept their message concerning themselves and their subject-matter. It is in no sense the attribute bestowed upon them by the Church. They are not indebted to the Church for their authority, any more than they are indebted to the individual who believes their message. There is much confusion on this point, and in the early "Tracts for the Times" the position was carefully inculcated and maintained that if it had not been for the Church we should have known nothing of Holy Writ, nor

have been able to claim for it that amount of reverence which was demanded and instinctively conceded as right and proper ; and this, of course, with a view to divert in favour of the Church some small portion of that reverence for and dependence upon it which was as yet exclusively shown towards the Bible. But it is certain that no man receives the Bible as the Bible itself claims to be received on the authority of the Church. It is not what the Church says of the Bible, but what the Bible says of itself, and by itself, that is the ground of our acceptance of the Bible. And therefore if a man has a mind to be sceptical with regard to the authority of the Bible, it is in the highest degree improbable that he will be restrained by the verdict of the Church. If he is persuaded that the message of the Bible is unauthorized, it is not likely that he will be won by the authority of the Church to recognize the authority of the Bible.

So important, therefore, is it that we should acknowledge as one of the primary and most essential conditions of unity, the principle of absolute loyalty to Holy Scripture as the supreme and ultimate authority in all matters of faith and practice. Here then is an essential which must be duly recognized if we would arrive at anything like unity. The Church has manifestly power of self-organization, administration, and government, but power only within the limits virtually conceded by Scripture. The Bible is the polestar by which the Church must guide herself—the standard by which her own action must be regulated. She has no power to constitute herself a standard or a guide independent of Holy Scripture. This was the principle so triumphantly reasserted and successfully maintained at the Reformation, and there is no hope of any vital union till it is thankfully recognized and loyally returned to. But it will be said that the remarks and conclusions of modern criticism have contributed in no slight degree to render this position no longer tenable. Now, is this so? It is exactly here that we are liable to go astray. What are the conclusions of modern criticism? That the Gospels were written in the second century? No. But even if they were, the epistles of St. Paul are confessedly genuine. And these epistles contain, by implication, every important fact of the Gospels. That the Gospel of St. John was not written by him? No; but even if it was not, the position of St. Paul's great epistles is virtually identical with that of St. John's Gospel. The question therefore really is not whether we believe that St. John wrote his gospel, but whether we believe the gospel that he is supposed to have written; and if we believe that, not on the authority of the Church or of any college of critics, but on the authority with which it works conviction in the believing mind, we shall be little likely to be disturbed by any of the shifting vagaries of

human criticism on this or any kindred point. Once more, is the conclusion of modern criticism, that the chief part of Isaiah, or at all events the latter part, was not written by him? Say not the conclusion of modern criticism, but rather the reiterated assertion of some modern critics. What, then, shall we hold our judgment in suspense till these modern critics have been disproved, or say, rather, till they have proved their point (for it is not less easy to disprove their point than it is for them to prove it), or shall we not rather take even the latest of the Esaian prophecies and ask ourselves by whose authority they were written—whether in Babylon or Jerusalem?—and when we have determined that, then we shall be able to judge how far the conjectures about their composition are of any real importance, and whether the verdict concerning them is not, in fact, a verdict also concerning the power by which, under any supposition, they must have been produced.

Take, for example, such words as these, "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith your God." Is this the utterance of the prophet himself, entirely unauthorized; or is it the utterance of God? Is it the utterance of God only because it is the utterance of the better mind of the prophet in accordance with the assumed Divine will; or is there any ground to believe that the authority upon which alone the ambassadors of God can comfort His people is a distinctly Divine authority made known to man by means radically and essentially Divine—whether or not these means included the agency of predictive prophecy or of physical miracle? Now it is this which is the essential question, and not the other, which is subsidiary and subordinate, and it is only throwing dust in people's eyes to represent the main interest of the matter as concentrated in the human authorship of certain chapters of a certain book on the ground of the extreme improbability of predictive prophecy, while the far more important question whether the message contained in them, by whomsoever brought, is virtually human or essentially Divine is studiously and designedly kept in the background. And yet this is the question which we must decide before we can determine our true estimate of Holy Scripture, and whether it is the word of man or actually and in very deed the Word of God, a message from Heaven. Or again, in like manner, "I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions for My own sake, and will not remember thy sins." Was this the expression of a mere subjective conception of the prophet, or was it the authorized expression of the Divine will towards his people; and if so, how authorized? Does not any degree of true authorization involve a supernatural communication of the presence of the Divine mind to the mind of the prophet just as contrary to, and beyond the mere operation of, Nature, as the working of

miracles or the utterance of prediction. But is it not exactly *this* upon which we want information? May we, or may we not, trust this assurance of the prophet as a promise from God, the objective fact of the disposition of His mind, and not the mere subjective apprehension and conjecture of the prophet. And will any one venture to say that the absolution pronounced—by a Christian minister, for example—gives us, or is intended to give us, a surer hope of forgiveness than the word of the prophet accepted in all its length, and depth, and breadth, and fulness by the believing heart as the very word of the living God? But if this is the value of this passage of Isaiah, what does it matter, comparatively speaking, who wrote it, or when it was written; or, rather, if it pleased God actually to make known His will in this way to the prophet, was that intrinsically less wonderful than enabling him to look far into the distant future, and depict the return from Babylon, or the sufferings of Christ, or the ingathering of the Gentiles? Depend upon it, the real question is, whether or not we have received the message of the prophet, and whether that message is intrinsically worthy of our acceptance unless we can rest fully and firmly assured that it comes from heaven and not from him, and is a word of God and not of man, though even a prophet or apostle. It is therefore of the very last importance that we should clearly distinguish between the authority of the Bible and the authority of the Church. The one is virtually human, the other is intrinsically Divine; the one is temporary and local, the other is universal and eternal.

But the Church has a tendency continually to contract her limits. She was intended by her Divine Master to be literally Catholic in a sense far other than that in which the much-abused word is commonly employed. She was to be coextensive with the confines of the habitable world, and anything which tends to limit and counteract her charter of expansion must be contrary to the will of her Divine Master. Any barrier which she, by her corporate action, interposes between herself and the souls of men whom she should attract and not repel, is, and must be of necessity, prejudicial to her own interests, as well as derogatory to her Divine calling. And yet who does not see that this has been the action of the Church over and over again in her history. Religious movements, which owe their existence and their vitality to the energy and zeal of individual men, and in the first exercise of their inherent powers are a blessing to mankind in the creation of model societies, rapidly manifest a tendency towards disintegration, and the societies originated by them exhibit the spectacle of division and subdivision, of schism and separation, as though union and communion were not part of the original conception of the

Church. It is clear, therefore, that the innate tendency there is in religious communities to split up and to subdivide arises from a disposition towards narrowness and exclusiveness which is too often associated and identified with sensibility of conscience and high principle. If, however, the charter of the Church is expansiveness and universality, there is surely an element in her very being to which violence is done by the indulgence of this tendency to subdivide. It must be theoretically more essential at times to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, than to yield to the apparent dictates of an over-sensitive conscience on some minor points to which we are tempted by circumstances to give an undue prominence and importance. But in point of fact this tendency of the Church thus to usurp authority over the consciences of men is a mark of unfaithfulness to her true calling as it is of a want of appreciation of her real mission. The Church exists as a witness for Christ and the truth of His Word; to bear the message of salvation unto all people; and to hold forth the Word of life to the whole family of man. The Church mistakes her calling, therefore, when she imposes as conditions of communion any other terms than those which are the conditions of salvation. The Church exists to unite and not to divide; to gather together and not to scatter abroad. But whenever the Church affects to narrow the limits of her communion she virtually excludes men from the pale of salvation instead of winning them to the fold of Christ.

It is important, therefore, that she should rightly apprehend the difference between essentials and non-essentials; and those things must be non-essentials which are only connected in a remote degree with the precepts and teaching of Scripture. How, for instance, can the distinction between infant and adult baptism be of the nature of an essential? How can the present method of "confirming disciples," different as it manifestly is from the ministration of that rite in the Acts of the Apostles, be insisted upon as an essential binding upon all mankind? It is not, indeed, the formularies of the English Church which exalt these or kindred points into conditions of communion. But it may be questioned how far practically they have not more or less of such an effect in manifold cases. And it is certain we shall not approach nearer to an ideal condition of unity until we have learnt to estimate more exactly the distinction between essentials and non-essentials, and to apprehend and hold fast by the breadth and strength, fulness and freedom of first principles. For example, take the question of the surplice and its use in the pulpit or in choirs. Who does not see that it is a matter of absolute and entire indifference in itself, and that the surest way of making it anything else is to insist upon it as a badge of semi-Romanism? Surely there

is a way of rescuing things indifferent from abuse and reproach and of consecrating them to higher ends. And is not to do so to increase our spiritual wealth, which must at all times be better than ministering to intellectual or æsthetic poverty? By parity of reasoning it would be possible even to regard with equanimity a thing in itself far more offensive and to excuse the introduction of the eucharistic vestments were it not that the only possible excuse for introducing them is to inculcate a doctrine which is essentially opposed to the supremacy of first principles. For there is and can be no principle of union between the system which interposes a sacerdotal machinery between Christ and the individual soul, and that which proclaims access to the Saviour through belief of His Word as a moral and regenerative power. Though we must confess that the adoption of the eucharistic vestments and the eastward position would themselves be perfectly innocuous if disassociated from that which alone renders them of value to their advocates—the sacerdotal teaching which they symbolize.

And this brings us to the real point of divergence, in our opinion, between the existing parties in the Church. Nor do I, for one, see any way in which they can effectually be reconciled. The foundation principle, on one side, is the supremacy of Scripture; the foundation principle, on the other, is the agency of the priesthood as the sole administrators of the grace of God. In the one case, the Church is the whole body of believers, bound together by a common faith in a common Lord—a body having many members, discharging various functions; in the other, the Church is an organization through virtue of, and by union with, which alone we can become participators in the grace of God. These representative views may be held with various degrees of tenacity and completeness; but it seems to us that they are essentially opposed to each other. If the absolute supremacy of Scripture is held, it is indeed conceivable that together with it there may be a considerable faith in the power of the Christian Ministry and its sacred Orders; but unquestionably, as all experience proves, the tendency of exalting the priesthood is to lower and to supersede the vital power and supreme authority of the Scriptures; and when this is done the real foundations of the faith are imperceptibly undermined.

Earnestly, then, do we exhort all those who live in Him to lay to heart the ultimate importance of essentials, to accept willingly, and with a generous large-heartedness, any modifications of familiar customs that may commend themselves to large bodies of men, such as musical services, surpliced choirs, greater elaborateness in the details of worship, a more æsthetic

ritual, and the like, if only in conjunction with all these things: there may be an ingenuous loyalty to the life and authority of the written Word—the preaching of the fulness, freeness, and sufficiency of the grace of Christ, and the indispensable-ness of the guidance and illumination of the Holy Spirit of God. We are one in Christ; but it is only in Christ that we can be one, and Christ is the same living and Divine man that He always was, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—not an idea or a sentiment, or an aggregate of propositions and doctrines; but a living and ruling man, who has the characteristics of a man in being able to exercise and bring to bear upon the heart His personal influence. When Christ is thus apprehended He is sure to be the one thing needful, the pearl of great price, the hidden treasure for which all is gladly given. And when He is thus believed in and accepted, all other matters fall into their legitimate and relative positions. The supremacy of first principles dominates and holds sway, and the indifference of minor points is found to assume naturally its rightful place in the category of the non-essential. But as long as the non-essential is looked at through a microscope and intensely magnified, we cannot be surprised if it is confounded with the one great essential and substituted for it. In that case there is an end to all hope of unity or of reunion, for it is a false centre that is proposed instead of the true one for the unknown and as yet indefinite circle.

STANLEY LEATHES.

ART. II.—THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

SECOND NOTICE.

HAVING turned aside from questions of grammar, in order to present our readers with extracts from the new translation, of which we quoted twenty specimens, giving both the text and the marginal rendering, we revert to the consideration of changes which are the result of a more accurate acquaintance with the grammatical structure of the original. And from the consideration of the Article we naturally turn to that of the Aorist. Whereas the Latin language has no article, and in the Version of 1611, as we have remarked, the presence or the absence of the article is almost wholly disregarded, so again, the Latin language has but one past tense where the Greek has two, and the Revisers of 1611 failed, for the most part, to distinguish between the aorist and the perfect. The Revisers, in fact, were accustomed to write and to speak in Latin, and, as Bishop Lightfoot has

remarked, they unconsciously limited the range and capacity of the Greek by the measure of the classical language with which they were familiarly acquainted. Their knowledge of the grammar of the Greek language was, of necessity, imperfect. The present period, however, is remarkable for its Greek scholarship, and in the volume before us the grammatical errors of the Version of 1611 have been corrected. It was well remarked by a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, ten years ago:—"The Word of God, just because it is God's Word, ought to be presented to every reader in a state as pure and perfect as human learning, skill, and taste can make it. The higher our veneration for it the more anxious ought we to be to free it from every blemish, however small and unimportant. But nothing in truth can be unimportant which dims the light of Divine Revelation."

II. As to the Aorist. In St. Luke i. 19 the angel Gabriel is represented as saying, "I am sent," instead of "I *was* sent," the obvious reference being, not to the time at which he was speaking, but to his original commission. "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God; and I was sent to speak unto thee." Again, in 2 Peter i. 14, the Apostle is represented in the Authorized Version as saying, "knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ *hath showed me*." It is obvious that the special historical allusion to St. John xxi. 18, 19 is thus obscured, and were it not for the marginal reference to that passage (which is not contained in a large number of the Bibles in common use), might be wholly lost sight of; whereas in the rendering of the Revisers of 1881, "even as our Lord Jesus Christ *signified unto me*," the true import of this passage becomes much more clear; and when reference is made to the passage above named in St. John's Gospel, all doubt will be removed from the mind of the reader respecting the time of the intimation to which the Apostle alludes. Again, in 2 Cor. v. 14 the Authorized Version reads thus, "If one died for all, then *were all dead*." In this rendering, the state of death is substituted for the fact of dying. When we turn to the Revision of 1881, however, we find the rendering of the passage correctly, if not very idiomatically, given, in this wise: "Because we thus judge, that¹ one died for all, therefore *all died*." Verses 14 and 15 in the Version before us run as follows:—

For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died (*ἀπέθανεν, ἀπέθανον*); and he died for all (*ἀπέθανεν*), that they which live should no longer live unto themselves; but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again.

In this passage, the words "*all died*" have been explained by

¹ The *εἰ* is omitted in the Revised Text.

Bishop Lightfoot in the statement, "that all men have participated potentially in Christ's death, have died with Him to their former selves and to sin." Again, "St. Paul regards this change—from sin to righteousness, from bondage to freedom, from death to life—as summed up in one definite act of the past; potentially to all men in our Lord's Passion and Resurrection, actually to each individual man when he accepts Christ, is baptized into Christ." "It is the definiteness, the absoluteness of this change considered as a historical crisis, which forms the central idea of St. Paul's teaching, and which the aorist marks."²

In further illustration of St. Paul's argument that the true Christian "died with Christ," we may quote from the Version of 1611 and the Version of 1881, placing the renderings side by side. First, Rom. vi. 2, 8 :—

Version 1611.

How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein ?

Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death ?

Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death.

Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him.

Now, if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.

Again, in Colossians iii. 1 :—

If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.

Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth.

For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.

Version 1881.

We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein ? Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death ? We were buried therefore with him through baptism unto death. . . .

Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him. . . .

But if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.

If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth. For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God.

The ἀπεθάνετε of ii. 20, and of iii. 3, ought obviously, to be rendered in the same manner. The meaning of the passage is marred by the substitution of "ye are dead," for "ye died."³

¹ "On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament," p. 85.

² In Rom. vi. 10, the word recording an act which happened at a definite point is correctly rendered in the Authorized Version, "he died unto sin once," ἀπέθανε. The expression is altogether different from that (νεκροῖς εἶναι) of verse 11. In the volume before us these verses run thus :—"For the death that he died (marg. *in that*) he died unto sin once (marg. *once for all*); but the life that (marg. *in that*) he liveth, he liveth unto God. Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God. . . ."

³ The new rendering of Coloss. ii. 12, ff., is worthy of quotation—" . . . having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised

Again, in Ephes. ii. 5, 6:—

Hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace we are saved), and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. . . .

Quickened us together with Christ (by grace have ye been saved), and raised us up with him, and made us sit with him in the heavenly places, in Christ Jesus. . . .

the new version is better than the old. "Quickened," and not "*hath* quickened," "raised us up," and not "*hath* raised us up," is the faithful translation. In all these passages, without question, St. Paul's argument is this: "Ye (true believers) died, ye were buried, ye were raised up, ye were quickened."

The rendering of the aorist, no doubt, has its own difficulties, and the idiom of the English language cannot be slighted.¹ But it is not likely to be seriously maintained in any quarter that the proper force of the tenses in the sacred original is adequately brought out in the translations of the time of Henry VIII. and King James.

The aorist participle in combination with the finite verb is sometimes rendered in the Authorized Version in such a manner as to give rise to serious error. Thus, *e.g.*, in Acts xix. 2, the Authorized Version has "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" whereas the true rendering, as we find in the volume before us, is, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?"² The aorist of this verb, we may here remark, is precisely translated in other passages, *e.g.*,—

(συνηγέρθητε) with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead. And you, being dead (νεκροὺς ὄντας) through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you, *I say*, did he quicken together with him (συνεζωοποίησε)." "Ye were raised," not "ye are risen": "who raised him," not "who *hath* raised": and "he quickened," he did quicken, not "he *hath* quickened." Compare Galat. ii. —*e.g.*, v. 19, "I died," not "*am* dead." Also 2 Tim. ii. 11, "If we died with him," not "if be we *dead* with him." Two considerations in regard to what is termed the baptismal aorist must be always kept in view: first, the Apostle's language was addressed to those who had been baptized as *adults*, and second, it is *hypothetical*.

¹ In the Preface we read;—"There are numerous cases, especially in connection with particles ordinarily expressive of present time, in which the use of the indefinite past tense in Greek and English is altogether different; and in such instances we have not attempted to violate the idiom of our language by forms of expression which it could not bear. But we have often ventured to represent the Greek aorist by the English preterite, even where the reader may find some passing difficulty in such a rendering, because we have felt convinced that the true meaning of the original was obscured by the presence of the familiar auxiliary."

² One verse in the 2nd chapter of the Acts is probably not understood by the majority of English readers. Verse 23 in the Authorized Version runs thus:—"Ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." In the Revised Version, however, we read:—"Ye by the hand

ACTS xi. 17.—If, then, God gave unto them the like gift as *he did* also unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ.

ROM. xiii. 11.—Now is salvation nearer to us than when we *first* believed.

III. From the aorist tense we turn to the perfect.

In 1 Cor. xv. 4, St. Paul lays the stress of his argument, as Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, on the fact that Christ *is risen*. The perfect is repeated six times within a few verses (vv. 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20), ἐγήγερται, he hath been raised, while the aorist ἠγέρθη is not once used, because the point is, not that Christ *once rose from the grave*, but that having risen *He lives for ever*. The contrast between the two tenses in the fourth verse (ἐτάφη and ἐγήγερται, he was buried . . . he hath been raised) brings out this idea clearly. Nevertheless, in the fourth and twelfth verses the Revisers of 1611 treated the perfect as an aorist; “he *rose*.” Again, in Matthew i. 22 (xxi. 4, xxvi. 56), “Now all this is come to pass,” is much better than . . . “was done,” and in xxiv. 21, “such as hath not been from the beginning,” than “such as *was* not. . . .” In John iii. 26, “to whom thou hast borne witness” (Authorized Version, “*bearest* witness”), iv. 38, “others have laboured” (A. V., “laboured,”) vi. 38. “I am come down from heaven” (A. V., “I came”), are improvements.

Again, in 2 Cor. i. 9, the volume before us shows the perfect tense, and the translation of verses 8–11, which we may quote, is, throughout, precise and pointed:—

For we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning our affliction which befell *us* in Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power, insomuch that we despaired even of life: yea (marg. *but we ourselves*), have had the answer (marg. *sentence*) of death within ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead: who delivered us out of so great a death and will deliver: on whom we have set our hope¹ that he will also still

of lawless men did crucify (προσπήξαντες ἀνόμους) and slay,” and in the margin, *lawless, ἀνόμων*, is explained men *without the law*—i.e., the pagan Romans. In Dean Alford’s “New Testament Revised” (Strahan, 1869) the verse is rendered, “Ye by the hand of heathen men nailed to a cross and slew,” a footnote having:—“*literally*, men without law”; see 1 Cor. ix. 21. The true text, διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων, *by the hand of men without law*, makes the meaning still more evident. In the volume before us, 1 Cor. ix. 21 runs thus: “To them that are without law, as without law, not being without law to God, but under law to Christ, that I might gain them that are without law.”

¹ 2 Tim. vi. 17, “nor have their hope set on.” Matt. xi. 21, “in his name shall the Gentiles *hope*,” (John v. 45) and elsewhere. In Hebrews x. 23, the *faith* of the A. V., instead of *hope*, is unfortunate: v. 22, *faith*, v. 23, *hope*, v. 24, *love*. (THE CHURCHMAN, p. 228.)

deliver us; ye also helping together on our behalf by your supplication. (τη δεήσεται.)

IV. In rendering the Greek imperfect it is, as a rule, perhaps, practically impossible to give in English the precise equivalent, and in the Preface to the volume before us the revisers state¹ that they have been frequently compelled to leave the force of the tense to be inferred from the context. Nevertheless, where the English idiom permitted it, they have made the change. For example, instead of "they called," Luke i. 59, we read, "they *would have* called him Zecharias;" iv. 42, instead of "and stayed him," we read "they *would have* stayed him;" instead of "John forbade him," Matt. iii. 14, we read "John *would have* hindered him," thus bringing out the tentative force of the imperfect—he *was for* doing. . . . Again. The graphic description of events in the original is faithfully represented in such renderings as that of Luke viii. 23, "they were filling with water," where the Authorized Version translates as though the boat was really filled with water. To turn with this thought to renderings of the present² tense: in Matt. xxv. 8, what the foolish virgins really say in the original is "Our lamps *are going out* (not *gone out*, as in the Authorized Version); compare 1 John ii. 8, "the darkness *is passing away*" (not "is *past*"). In Luke xviii. 3, the A. V. simply says that the woman *came* unto him, a bald and feeble rendering of the Greek imperfect: "the woman *kept on coming* to the judge," "came oft unto." . . . The force of the imperfect in Acts ii. 47, is understood, of course, from the context: "the Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved."³ In Acts xvi. 25, the Victorian Version has "Paul and Silas *were* praying and singing hymns."

¹ The meaning of the Greek is clear, *e.g.*, in such passages as Mark xv. 19; (they *went on* doing. . . .); iii. 2, viii. 6, ἐδίδου, xii. 41.

² The vividness of the narrative is obscured when the Greek present is rendered by an English past tense. Many instances, in addition to the above, might be given. One consideration of no small importance, as Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, occurs in regard to the Epistle to the Hebrews. The present tense is habitually used concerning the temple services, yet the Revisers of 1611 substituted a past tense. For example, in ix. 6, 7, the A. V. has "the priests went in always." The R. V. has:—"the priests *go in* continually." The high priest alone *goes in* "once a year, not without blood, which he *offereth*. . . ."

³ It may be admitted that "such *as should be saved*" is not an exact reproduction of the original; and yet it is undoubtedly difficult to translate, οἱ σωζόμενοι. In 1 Cor. i. 18, the volume before us has "For the word of the cross is to them that are perishing foolishness; but unto us which are being saved it is the power of God."

V. Many passages occur in the Authorized Version in which the meaning of the original is commonly misunderstood, either by reason of an improper rendering of the Greek prepositions, or of a change in the meaning of their English equivalents since the year 1611. A few instances will serve to illustrate this statement.

The Greek preposition *διὰ* when followed by the accusative case is not unfrequently rendered in the Authorized Version as if it had been followed by the genitive. Thus, in Matt. xv. 3 and 6 we find “*by* your tradition,” instead of *because* or *for the sake of* your tradition,¹ the preposition being followed by the accusative, not the genitive case. In Heb. vi. 7 we read that the earth “bringeth forth herbs meet for them *by* whom it is dressed,” where the rendering should undoubtedly be, “*for* whom it is dressed,” or, as in the volume before us, “for whose sake it is also tilled.”²

Once more. In St. John xv. 3 we read: “Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you;” but the Revisers of 1881, by a more precise rendering, have brought out the meaning still more clearly: “Already ye are clean *because of* the word . . .”³ The “word” is not merely the instrument of the cleansing. (Compare Luke i. 78: “Because of the tender mercy of our God,” R. V.: “*by reason of*;” not, as in A. V., “*through*.”)

In many places, however, the error is owing, no doubt, to the change in meaning which the prepositions *of* and *by* have undergone; the former having been commonly used at the time when the Authorized Version was made in the sense in which we use the preposition *by*, and the latter in the sense in which we now use the preposition *through*. Thus, *e.g.*, in Matt. i. 22 and ii. 15, and other similar passages, where the Revisers of 1881 rightly read, “spoken *by* the Lord *through* the prophet,” the Revisers of 1611, intending to convey the same

¹ Compare St. Mark vii. 9: “Full well do ye reject the commandment of God *that ye may keep* your tradition.”

² It is worthy of observation that the Revisers of 1611 give the alternative rendering in the margin “*for whom*.” So also in Rom. viii. 11, although it is doubtful whether they were aware of the existence of a different reading, they give *because of* as an alternative to *by*. In the volume before us, Rom. viii. 11, has in the margin, “Many ancient authorities read *because of*.”

³ The revised Chapter has several improvements. Thus, verse 2, instead of “he *purgeth* it,” “he *cleanseth* it;” v. 5, instead of “*without* Me,” “*apart from* Me.” The verb in v. 2 “cleanseth,” is translated in Heb. x. 2 (the only other place in which it occurs in the New Testament) “cleanseth,” and not “purgeth” (Vulgate, *purgabit*).

meaning, rendered the words "of the Lord *by* the prophet."¹ A still more remarkable instance of the change of usage in regard to the preposition *by* occurs in 1 Cor. iv. 4 where, according to the Authorized Version, we read thus, "For I know nothing *by* myself," which would naturally convey to the mind of the ordinary English reader the idea of knowing nothing without Divine illumination. The true meaning, however, of the original Greek is correctly represented in the Revised Version by the change of the preposition *by* into *against*, one of the meanings which, in the seventeenth century, the preposition *by* was used to convey, but which it has now lost.

And here, before passing from the prepositions,² we may quote from the Version of 1881, as herein distinguished from that of 1661, a few translations:—

MATT. iv. 6.—On their hands they shall bear thee up, xxiv. 30. The Son of man coming on the clouds (*see* Rev. xiv. 15.)

¹ The distinction between *διὰ* and *ὑπὸ* is of no small importance touching the doctrine of Inspiration. As Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, wherever the sacred writers quote from the Old Testament, they apply the preposition *διὰ*, as denoting *instrumentality*, to the lawgiver, prophet or psalmist, and reserve *ὑπὸ* as signifying the primary motive agency, to God Himself. A few exceptions to this rule occur in the received text; but these disappear when the readings of the ancient authorities are adopted. In the Victorian Version the word *through* is placed in the margin of Matt. xxi. 4, "spoken *by* the prophet," *διὰ τοῦ προφήτου*. So in xxiv. 15, Luke xviii. 31, and elsewhere.

Secondly, in regard to the Office of the Divine Word, the peculiar preposition is *διὰ*. Thus, St. John, i. 3, "All things were made *by* (marg. *through*) him;" 10, "the world was made *by* (marg. *through*) him." The expression in the Nicene Creed, "By whom (*δι' οὗ*) all things were made," we may here remark, is perhaps, as a rule, scarcely understood. In Heb. i. 2 the volume before us has, "through whom also he made the worlds," and ii. 10 "for (*δι' οὗ*) whom are all things, and through (*δι' οὗ*) whom are all things;" and, once more, in 1 Cor. viii. 6, also without any alternative rendering in the margin, ". . . as there are gods many and lords many; yet to us there is one God, the Father, of (*ἐξ*) whom all things, and we unto (*εἰς*) him, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through (*διὰ*) whom are all things and we through him." The new rendering of this verse can hardly fail, we think, to be generally regarded as a great improvement.

² Here and there the full force of the Greek preposition cannot be brought out in an English version. For instance, the *εἰς τὸν κόλπον*, "Which is in the bosom of the Father," an expression of the deepest import (John i. 18). 1 Pet. ii. 24, motion towards; "who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree," in the margin, *carried up . . . to the tree*. Rev. xxii. 14, "that they may have the right to come to the tree of life;" in the margin, "the authority over;" their "right" leads even as far as. . . . While noticing Rev. xxii. 14, we may quote the new text of the first portion of the verse:—"Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life." For this precious promise-statement we may well be thankful.

MARK xii. 26.—Have ye not read in the book of Moses, in the place concerning the Bush, how. . . .

ACTS xix.—They were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. (In verse 3 the Version of 1611 accurately renders the preposition.) See Matt. xxviii. 19, baptizing them into the name.

1 COR. xii. 13.—For in (*ἐν*, not *by*) one Spirit were we all baptized into one body (*were* we all, not *are*).

2 THESS. ii. 1.—Now we beseech you, brethren, touching (marg. *in behalf of*)¹ the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him; to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind (*ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς*).

1 COR. viii. 11.—The brother for whose sake (*δι' ὅν*) Christ died.

LUKE viii. 12.—Taketh away the word from (not *out of*) their heart.

LUKE xxiii. 42.—Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.

JOHN iii. 13.—And no man hath ascended into (*εἰς*) heaven; but he that descended out of heaven.

JOHN vi. 57.—As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me. (Compare 2 Cor. iv. 11, “for Jesus’ sake.”)

ROM. xv.—I have, therefore, my glorying in (not *through*) Christ Jesus.

VI. We now proceed to notice some other instances, in which, as in the case of the prepositions *of* and *by*, words have acquired a different signification since the Revision of 1611, or in which, by reason of disuse, words and phrases which were common in the seventeenth century are no longer intelligible to the ordinary class of readers.

In Matthew x. 19, we find “be not anxious” in the place of “take no thought.” (“When they deliver you up, be not anxious how or what ye shall speak.”) The passages in the Sermon on the Mount, with Philipians iv. 4, which are parallel, were quoted in the last CHURCHMAN. Now, the word *thought* was commonly used when the Version of 1611 appeared, to denote *solicitude*, as we find not only in the Old and New Testament (*e.g.*, 1 Sam. ix. 5), but also in the writings of Bacon and Milton. In his “History of Henry the Seventh,” the former of these writers speaks of Harris, an alderman of London, as “dying of *thought* and anxiety;” whilst the latter represents Adam as “taking no thought,” but “eating his fill.” A prudent forethought, a carefulness which is not out of harmony with trust and dependence,

¹ The version of 1611, “*by* the coming of our Lord” (Vulgate, Beza, Calvin) cannot be defended. The use of this preposition for adjuration is not found in the New Testament: and it would be strange were a writer to adjure his readers by the very matter he was about to unfold to them. Bishops Ellicott and Wordsworth explain the preposition here “in behalf of” “in the interest of.”

is nowhere condemned in the Word of God; and the Revisers have done well to introduce a new word—*anxiety*, in the place of *thought*.¹ In 1 Pet. v. 7, they have marked the distinction between *μέριμνα* and *μέλειν*, thus: “casting all your *anxiety* upon him, because he *careth for you*.”

Again, the word *allow*, which is derived, through the French *allower*, from the Latin *allaudare*, originally denoted praise or approval,² and is thus used in Luke xi. 48: “Truly ye bear witness that ye *allow* (συνευδοκεῖτε) the deeds of your fathers.” It appears to be used in the same signification in Rom. vii. 15: “For that which I do, I *allow* not,” where it is the representative of the Greek *γινώσκω*. In the former of these places the volume before us has *consent unto* in the place of *allow*, and in the latter the primary meaning of the Greek verb is retained, “I *know* not.”

Again, the words *admire* and *admiration*, which, in accordance with their derivation from the Latin *miror*, originally denoted *wonder*, whether with or without approval, are used in the Bible of 1611 in their wide and general signification, but have subsequently become restricted in use to the sense of wonder with approval, and are often employed to denote *approval* in which *wonder* has little or no place. We have an instance in Rev. xvii. 6, in which the ordinary English reader of the present day is likely to be misled by the rendering of 1611, which represents the beloved Evangelist and Seer as “wondering with great *admiration*” at “the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.” The Revisers of 1881 have very properly adopted the rendering, “I wondered with a great wonder.” There are two other places in which the Revisers of 1881 have substituted the original for the acquired sense of these words, in which, however, we doubt whether the meaning of the original Greek is more accurately represented. We refer to 2 Thess. i. 10, “When He shall come to be glorified in His saints and to be *admired* in all them that believe;” and to Jude v. 16, “*having* men’s persons in *admiration* because of advantage.” In the former of these places the Revisers of 1881 have adopted the rendering, “to be *marvelled at* in all them that believed;” and in the latter, “*shewing respect* of persons for the sake of advantage.”

The word *by-and-by* (Greek *εὐθὺς*, or *εὐθέως*, or *ἔξαρῆς*) occurs four times in the Authorized Version of the New Testament in the sense of straightway or *immediately*, viz., St. Matt.

¹ On this archaism, which Bishop Lightfoot terms a *guilty* archaism, as distinguished from such *innocent* ones as “bewray,” “travail,” and “list,” see Archbishop Trench’s “Authorized Version.”

² The Prayer Book version of Psalm xi. 6, is, “The Lord *alloweth* the righteous.”

xiii. 21; St. Mark vi. 25; St. Luke xvii. 7 and xxi. 9. In these cases the Revisers of 1881 render the word *straightway*, *forthwith*, or *immediately*. At the time when the Authorized Version was published, the word *by-and-by* denoted the immediate future, but has now ceased to convey that meaning.¹

Another word which has changed its meaning since the time of King James's Revisers is *carriage*. We find this word used both in the Old and in the New Testament to denote *baggage*. Thus in 1 Sam. xvii. 22, we read that "David left his *carriage* in the hand of the keeper of the *carriage*;" and in Acts xxi. 15, we read that St. Paul and those who were with him "took up their *carriages*, and went up unto Jerusalem." In the latter of these places the Greek word employed is the verb cognate to the noun which occurs in the LXX. in 1 Sam. xvii. The Revisers of 1881 have done wisely in substituting for this word its modern equivalent *baggage*.

Another word which has changed its meaning since 1611 is *grudge*, which was formerly employed to denote open expressions of dissatisfaction, rather than inward feelings of envy. Thus—*e.g.*, in 1 St. Peter iv. 9, Christians are exhorted to "use hospitality one to another without *grudging*," where the Greek is *ἀνευ γογγυσμοῦ*, which the Revisers of 1881 have rendered "without *murmuring*." In St. James v. 9, an expressive English word would be "*Grumble* not . . ."

The word *usury*, again, was used in the seventeenth century, not only to denote the lending of money on inordinate interest, but the lending of it with any interest whatever. An illustration of this use occurs in St. Luke xix. 23, in which place the Revisers of 1881 have substituted the word *interest* for *usury*; "and I, at my coming, should have required it with interest."

The word *sincere*, again, whatever may be its etymology, is now used only in an ethical signification. It appears, however, to have been used at one time to denote freedom from the admixture of extraneous elements, as, *e.g.*, in 1 St. Peter ii. 2, where we read "As new-born babes desire the *sincere* milk of the word," the word *sincere* being used in the sense of *pure*, *unadulterated*. This does not appear, however, to be the correct rendering of the passage. The Greek is *τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα*; and the Revisers of 1881 have translated these words "the spiritual (Greek, reasonable) milk which is without guile." The Authorized Version is rather a paraphrase than a translation of the original; and it altogether misses the obvious allusion of the word *ἄδολον*

¹ Here may be quoted, Luke vii. 4, "they besought him *instantly*," A. V.; the Greek being, *they went on beseeching him with earnestness*,—with urgent importunity. "Instantly," in the A. V. means *urgently*, but English readers, as a rule, perhaps, do not see the force of the original.

to the *δόλον* of the preceding verse. "Putting away, therefore, . . . all guile . . . long for the spiritual milk which is without guile."

The word *room* was used in the seventeenth century to denote *place* in a different sense from that in which it would be commonly understood at the present time. Thus in Luke xiv. 8, our Lord cautions His hearers, according to the Authorized Version, when bidden to a marriage feast, not to "sit down in the highest *room*," *μὴ κατακλιθῆς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν*, a rendering which naturally conveys to the mind of the English reader of the nineteenth century the idea of a variety of *apartments*, of which some were more honourable than others. The obvious meaning of the passage, when reference is made to the Greek, is correctly conveyed in the Revised rendering, "sit not down in the chief seat."

A few other examples may be given with brevity. The word "*let*" now means allow, permit, but in Rom. i. 13 (Authorized Version, "was let hitherto") St. Paul's statement is "I was *hindered*." Similarly, 2 Thess. ii. 7, ". . . he who now letteth," is better rendered, "there is one that *restraineth* now." Again, in Matt. xvii. 25, instead of ". . . *prevented* him, saying," ". . . spake first to him, saying" is an improvement, although for members of the Church of England the archaistic sense of the word "prevent" has, comparatively, little difficulty.¹ Again, for "conversation" the rendering "conduct" is undoubtedly better; and in all cases, save in Philipp. iii. 20, where we find "citizenship," the Revised Version has "behaviour" (in Pet. iii. 1, *marg*, "manner of life"). In Luke xix. 13, instead of "*Occupy* . . ." we find, "*Trade* ye till I come;" in v. 15, the same word, ". . . what they had gained *by trading*." In 1 Tim. iii. 13, the R. V. ". . . deacons gain to themselves a good standing" is a decided improvement on "*purchase* to themselves. . . ." *Shamefastness* is, without doubt, better than "*shamefacedness*," 1 Tim. ii. 9, as Archbishop Trench has pointed out. In Luke xviii. 9, instead of *possess* we find, of course, *get*: "I give tithes of all that I get." The word "*observe*" in Mark vi. 20, a mistake rather than an archaism, could not fail to be removed; and we find the correct rendering in the R. V. as follows:—"Herod feared John, knowing that he was a righteous man, and a holy, and *kept him safe*" (Geneva, "did him reverence;" Wycliffe, "kept him"). Similarly, instead of ". . . as I suppose," 1 Pet. v. 12, the R. V. gives, ". . . "Silvanus, our faithful brother, as *I account* him;" and for "*business*," in Rom. xii. 11, *diligence*, the refer-

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 15, ". . . we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep."

ence being to spiritual duties, although not, of course, exclusively; as regards Christian earnestness be not slothful.

VII. We may now notice a few passages in which the Revisers of 1611 assigned to Greek words a signification which they cannot bear, or where, although a Greek word may admit the meaning which the Revisers assigned to it, the context leads to a different thought. We may also notice a few vague and doubtful translations.

In Matt. xiv. 28, the Revised Version has—"She being put forward by her mother;" for the verb in the original does not refer to time, but means to urge on. The Authorized Version "being *before instructed of her mother*" (derived from the Vulgate) is undoubtedly an error. To quote the remark of Archbishop Trench: "We may conceive the unhappy girl, with all her vanity and levity, yet shrinking from the petition of blood which her mother would put into her lips, and needing to be urged on or pushed forward before she could be induced to make it; and this is implied in the word."

In Mark iv. 29, the Revised Version gives the proper translation, "when the fruit is *ripe*."

In Luke iii. 23, the statement of the Authorized Version that Jesus ". . . began to be about thirty years of age," must have puzzled many English readers; but the Revised Version has the correct translation, which needs no explanatory comment. "When he began to *teach*, was about thirty years of age."¹

In 2 Pet. iii. 12, the Authorized Version "*hasting unto*" is an error. The verse, correctly rendered, brings out the great truth that the real Christian is one who is *waiting for* Christ's advent and *working for* it. The Revised Version has, "looking for and earnestly desiring (*margin*. hastening) the coming (*margin*. the presence) of the day of God." For ourselves, we should not have placed *hastening* in the margin, as it seems to us the most appropriate, as well as really accurate rendering of the original.²

In 1 Tim. vi. 5 the Authorized Version, "supposing that gain is godliness," is a most unfortunate mistranslation: the Revised Version has "supposing that godliness is a way of gain."

In Heb. xi. 13, the Authorized Version *embraced* is incorrect. The Revised Version has, "not having received the promises, but having seen them and *greeted them from afar*." As one

¹ For the word *began*, compare (Acts i. 1) the first verse of St. Luke's latter "treatise;" also Matt. iv. 17.

² Dr. Eadie ("English Bible," vol. ii. p. 222) advocates *hastening*, and refers to the expression in the Burial Service of the Church of England, "that it may please Thee . . . to hasten Thy kingdom."

of the Revisers, Professor Roberts, remarks:¹ St. Chrysostom pointed out the beauty of the image; it is that of sailors who, catching a glimpse of the wished-for shores, salute them from a distance. So Cowper ("Task," Book I.) speaking of a promontory by the sea, says:

his hoary head
Conspicuous many a league, the mariner,
Bound homeward, and in hope already there,
Greeted with three cheers exulting.

In 1 Pet. iii. 21, instead of "the answer . . ." must clearly be read "the *appeal* of a good conscience towards God." The Revised Version has the "interrogation" or "inquiry."

The Revised Version has a precise and a graphic rendering of the statement by St. Luke (xxii. 56) as to the maid-servant recognizing the Apostle at the fire: "A certain maid seeing him as he sat in the light of *the fire*, and looking stedfastly upon him, said. . . ."

(To be continued.)

ART. III.—SEVEN YEARS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Seven Years in South Africa. Travels, Researches, and Hunting Adventures, between the Diamond-fields and the Zambesi (1872-79). By Dr. EMIL HOLUB. Translated by ELLEN E. FREWER. Two vols. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1881.

FROM the days of his boyhood Emil Holub, a Bohemian by birth, had been stirred with the desire to devote himself in some way to the exploration of Africa. The narratives of those travellers who had done something towards the opening up of the Dark Continent gave a definite shape to his longings; and in the year 1872, when an opportunity was afforded him of gratifying his desire, he decided that South Africa should be the field of his researches. For seven years he applied himself to his undertaking with energy and with success; and the narrative of his three journeys, written in a pleasing style, gives a good deal of information, and has an interest of its own. As a discoverer, Dr. Holub cannot rank with Major Pinto; but as a naturalist he is entitled to first-class honours. The distinguishing feature of his work, indeed, is the description of the regions through which he passed, their *flora* and *fauna*. The

¹ "Companion to the Revised Version." By Alex. Roberts, D.D.

incidents of travel, however, and of hunting, are described with a graphic pen; he gives sketches of life and manners among tribes of whom, after all that has been written of late years, we know next to nothing; and, in short, as we have said, the book is not only readable but informing. It has a good map, and many attractive illustrations.

In May, 1872, Dr. Holub left Southampton for Cape Town. Of the thirty-six days of the voyage no less than thirty were stormy, and, as he was suffering from dysentery, the sight of land was especially welcome. In August he started on his journey from Port Elizabeth to the Diamond Fields, where he intended to practise as a medical man. His vehicle was a two-wheeled cart, drawn by four small horses; and he accomplished the distance to Grahamstown, 86 miles, in eleven hours. The capture of elephants along this line is forbidden by law; consequently, wild herds still exist in Cape Colony, whilst in the Transvaal, the Orange Free State, and the Bechuana country the race has become totally annihilated. The species of animals are numerous and diversified. Thus, Dr. Holub says:—

Ground squirrels and small rodents abound upon the bare levels where there is no grass, associating together in common burrows, which have about twenty holes for ingress and egress, large enough to admit a man's fist. In places where there is much long grass are found the retreats of moles, jackals, African pole-cats, jerboas, porcupines, earth-pigs, and short-tailed armadillos. In the fens there are otters, rats, and a kind of weasel. On the slopes are numerous herds of baboons, black-spotted genets, caracals, jumping mice, a peculiar kind of rabbit, and the rooyebock gazelle; and besides the edentata already mentioned, duykerbock, and steinbock gazelles are met with in those districts where the trees are in detached clumps. The tracts of low bushwood, often very extensive, afford shelter to the striped and spotted hyæna, as well as to the strand-wolf (*Hyæna brunnea*); and there, too, amongst many other Rodentia, is found a gigantic field-mouse; also two other gazelles, one of them being the lovely little bushbock. The bushes on the slopes and the underwood are the resort of baboons, monkeys, grey wild-cats, foxes, leopards, koodoo antelopes, bushvarks, blackvarks, buffaloes, and elephants, the elephants being the largest of the three African varieties. A hyrax that is peculiar to this locality, and lives in the trees, ought not to be omitted from the catalogue. Leopards are more dangerous here than in the uninhabited regions of the interior, where they are less accustomed to the sound of firearms; and so desperate do they become when wounded, that it is generally deemed more prudent to destroy them by poison or in traps.

The varieties of birds to be seen along the route from Port Elizabeth to Grahamstown are numerous; an ornithological traveller would consume months before he could exhaust the material for his collection; and a sportsman might easily, day

after day, bring down different kinds of bustards, snipes and plovers, partridges, sand-grouse, wild ducks, geese, and fowl. Long-tailed *Nectarinia*, or sun-birds, flit about; tiny green-and-yellow songsters feast among the shrubs. On the tops of the waggon-trees hawks and shrikes keep a sharp look-out; the leafy mimosas attract some birds; and the rushes are kept in perpetual motion by finches, weaver-birds, and reed-warblers:—

As representatives of the reptile world, gigantic lizards are to be found near every running water; tortoises of many kinds abound on land, one sort being also met with both in streams and in stagnant pools; there are a good many poisonous snakes, such as puff-adders, cobras, horned vipers, besides coral snakes; likewise a species of green water-snake which, however, is harmless. Venomous marine serpents also find their way up the rivers from the sea.

On the table lands north of Grahamstown, Dr. Holub met with the springbock.¹ The snare called the hopo-trap, described by Livingstone in his account of the gazelle hunting among the Bechuanas, would probably be now of no avail, as game is wilder and less abundant than in the great Missionary Doctor's days. A hopo-trap in use was never anywhere seen by Dr. Holub. The nests of the social weaver-birds are curious. So closely are several nests fitted together, that, when finished, the entire fabric has the appearance of one huge nest covered in by a single conical roof; the entrances are from beneath. In one nest Dr. Holub killed a great snake² just as it was beginning its work of destruction. Its tail was hanging out, but several birds had already been killed.

After a successful medical practice, Dr. Holub was able to

¹ The springbock is one of the handsomest of the antelope tribe; its shapely head is adorned with a fine pair of lyrate horns. Under the ruthless hands of the Dutch farmers, and the unsparing attacks of the natives, this graceful creature is becoming rarer every day. Springbock hunting is usually done on horseback. A gallop of about two miles brings the huntsman within a distance of 200 yards of a herd of flying antelopes; the rider dismounts and takes a deliberate aim. The Boers are marvellously clever marksmen. Englishmen, adds Dr. Holub, hunt springbucks with greyhounds.

² Of all the poisonous snakes in South Africa three of the cobras, a green sort, a black, and a yellowish, are the most venomous. Sometimes the green and black cobras will make an unprovoked attack on human beings. One species of cobra, in the more northerly parts of South Africa, attacks cattle in a curious way. Choosing a spot over a track in the woods by which the wild cattle pass on their way to drink, the creature will let its body hang from a bough, straight as an assegai, ready to make its attack at the proper instant. On one occasion, Dr. Holub found his dog in front of a great tubular ant-hill, barking furiously. A yellow cobra-capella, nearly seven feet long, was winding itself round the ant-hill; its neck was inflated, and it was hissing vehemently. A charge of small shot settled the question. This made a notable addition to the naturalist's collection.

purchase a waggon and many of the requisites for travelling, and in February, 1873, he set out from the diamond fields for his first journey, one of reconnaissance. At Likatlong, a capital of the Batlapins, the mission-house was in ruins; the church was built of unbaked bricks, with a gabled roof covered with dry grass. A missionary of the London Missionary Society has been sent to this place. On his way to the Vaal River our traveller suffered much from thirst. The Free State shore of the Vaal is elevated, and to a great extent covered with woods. Many of the well-to-do farmers, owning 3,000 acres of land, complained of the losses sustained through the hyænas; and one farmer, having lost eighteen head of cattle, poisoned the hyænas with strychnine. With Potchefstroom, the most populous town of the Transvaal, and one of the most important places in South Africa, Dr. Holub appears to have been pleased. With its neatly white-washed houses rising among the shrubs, river banks covered with flowers, and orchards well kept, it has the appearance of a garden, and vindicates its title of the "flower-town." The picturesque little English church is overgrown with ivy. Potchefstroom, about which town a question is asked in the House of Commons while we are reading Dr. Holub's description of it, carries on an active trade with the diamond-fields and Natal. Many of the farmers distil a kind of spirit from peaches, which is known in the Transvaal as peach brandy. At Wonderfontein, the limit of Dr. Holub's first journey, he made a stay too short, considering its zoological attractions; but a hospitable farmer expressed his surprise that he should spend so much of his time in collecting "vermin." Wonderfontein is on the northern boundaries of the Orange Free State. Dr. Holub did not go on to Pretoria, and, as a rule, he skirted the Transvaal without entering it. On his return journey, meeting some Batlapins roasting locusts over red-hot ashes, he tasted the favourite national dish. In flavour he thinks roasted locusts not unlike dried and strongly-salted Italian anchovy. Having been away two months, many of his patients had chosen another medical man, and some Dutch farmers had left for the Free State. His journey had cost him £400. For the next six months he settled down hard to his practice; he soon recovered his position. Of the thousands of black men who at that time acted as servants in the diamond-fields, the majority, he writes, belonged to the Basuto, Zulu, and Transvaal Bechuana tribes. They earned from 7s. 6d. to 10s. a week, and rarely stayed at the diggings more than six months; with £5 or £6 to buy a gun and some powder, a woollen garment or two, and a hat, they reckoned they had made enough. They belong to the third great division of the natives of South Africa. First, the Bushmen proper;

second, the Hottentots proper, the Griquas, and the Korannas; third, the Colonial Kaffirs, Zulus, Basutos, Bechuanas, Makalakas, and other tribes, forty in all. The Basutos are yearly increasing in wealth; their agriculture is more advanced than that of any other tribe.

In November, 1873, Dr. Holub again set out from Dutoitspan. For his second journey he was fairly well equipped, and he had three companions. On one occasion, after the oxen had not tasted water for thirty hours, in a district where not a drop of rain had fallen for months, the party narrowly escaped a fearful death. Looking over the plain in front of them, they beheld a sheet of flame. Their only hope was a little hill; they reached it just in time. The heat of the atmosphere was intense, and as there was a good deal of powder in their waggon, the danger was great. In the course of the journey, on one or two occasions, they were mobbed by the natives, anxious to get brandy. At Taung, Dr. Holub found a missionary, Mr. Brown, who gave him a very kindly welcome. Bringing the waggon into the missionary enclosure, he escaped being pestered by the natives. The mission-house is a stone building standing in "a nice little garden." Mr. Brown's Sechuana dictionary has since been published. Taung is the foremost of all the Batlapin towns. In the course of his march onwards Dr. Holub was one day pelted by baboons from a cliff; another day he was mobbed by the natives because he would not pay 5s. a head for his cattle to drink in the village pools. On one occasion he hunted hyænas¹ by moonlight, but without success; and, again, he was caught in a tremendous storm while after gnus. Warned by a friendly chief that lions were in the neighbourhood, the travellers had to take especial precaution, the bushwood being dense; but no lion was seen. One day, on reaching the top of a plateau, they saw a vast plain, twenty miles in extent, fringed with mimosa groves, covered with a rich carpet of new green sward, studded with brown ant-hills; around the pools, the grass grew high. Here were striped gnus and black gnus, blesbocks and harte-beasts, springbocks and zebras; some grazing, some gambolling, whilst here and there a herd was stalking along in single file. Quite near to Dr. Holub and his friends was a group of about 150 zebras. Bustards, ibises, cranes, and countless birds, contributed to the general charm. For a full hour the travellers, forgetting the necessities of their weary cattle, feasted their eyes on this lovely and enchanting scene.²

¹ The spotted hyæna is a most enduring creature, and extremely tenacious of life; it will withstand the effects of fearful wounds for double the time that other mammalia can hold out.

² The numerous salt pans on this plain, Dr. Holub found out, have a great deal to do with the wonderful way in which game thrives. The-

In Molema's Town, one of the most pleasing of all the native settlements of Central South Africa, Dr. Holub found a commodious mission-house belonging to the Wesleyan Missionary Society, and enjoyed a conversation with the missionary, Mr. Webb. The population is thriving. The sale of brandy in this country is forbidden by the king; and there is no "local option." Former missionaries introduced European cereals. Molema, the governor of the town, is a Christian and a preacher. He complained bitterly of the encroachments of the Boers in the east; and Dr. Holub writes, that after his visit the jurisdiction of the country was offered to the English. Molema was an old man, and suffering from asthma; he said he had not seen a Nyaka (doctor) since Nyaka Livingstone. When they had journeyed¹ about 70 miles from Molema's town, they met with Montsua, the King of the Barolongs, who gave them a cordial welcome. A good proportion of the young people—here, as with not a few of the Bechuana tribes—embraced the truths taught by missionaries; and the orders of the heathen king in certain cases have been disregarded by the *Bathu ba lehuku*, "the people of the Word." When the king found that the converts remained faithful subjects, and, moreover, were the most industrious and thriving of all his population, he ceased to persecute, and even to some extent favoured the new faith. The work of the missionaries, we read, "has borne good fruit." The population of Moshaneng is about 7,000. Montsua was so weary of the annoyances he suffered at the hands of the Boers that he resolved to leave Moshaneng. In return for a Snider rifle he gave five strong bullocks; and by the aid of the missionary, Mr. Martin, five more bullocks were obtained. Dr. Holub continued his journey northward, therefore, with a very strong team.

The extensive highlands beyond Moshaneng are infested by large numbers of that most dangerous of all the South African beasts of prey, the *Canis pictus*, also called *Lycan pictus*, or *venaticus*, commonly called the "wild dog:"—

It is one of the most rapacious and destructive animals on the face of the earth, and is a deadly enemy to all kinds of cattle. Both

capture of a wild goose (*Chenalopez*), the handsome skin of which he considered a great prize, gave him much trouble. He recognized the cackle as that of the Egyptian goose. Amongst other Coleoptera, he secured a large and handsome tortoise-beetle, having its wing-sheaths dotted with greenish-gold and brown spots.

¹ In this country Dr. Holub noticed a good many specimens of tropical vegetation; out on the plains the grass stood four foot high. He shot a heron; also two spurred plovers, whose peculiar cry, "tick-tick," attracted his attention. The women working in the fields were cleaner than the Batlapians; and he thinks that these northern Barolongs are of a higher grade.

Montsua and Mr. Martin had warned me to be on my guard against their attacks. "Never let your bullocks graze out at night," were Montsua's words to me; "and never let them be unguarded, even by day, if you expect to bring many of them to Molopolole." In size this dreadful animal is about as large as a young wolf, only more slender, and in shape it is a cross between the proteles and hyæna. Always hunting in herds they are especially dangerous; they attack the larger quadrupeds, oxen, elands, and hartebeasts, whilst their ravages amongst sheep, goats and wild pigs are still more destructive. They are not content with one victim, but seize a second and a third, so that the devastation they make is really frightful. They do not confine their visits to the native territory, but make their way to cultivated lands on the border of the Transvaal. They have their holes underground, and sometimes leave their quarters in winter to range over wider districts, returning in the spring. When they start on their raids, they hold their noses high in the air, and if unsuccessful in discovering a scent, they divide into little groups, and disperse in various directions, with their noses downwards to the surface of the ground. Having found the track of any wild or domestic animal, except the horse, which is too swift for them, the entire pack, yelping and baying, darts off upon the chase with such eager impetuosity that many of them fall into bushes or run foul of rocks and ant-hills. Through being so small, they not unfrequently succeed in getting close to cows or antelopes before they are observed; and whilst the cow may be defending herself by her horns from the assailants in front, two or three of the voracious brutes will be biting at her heels, and as many more at her belly; finding defence hopeless, the unfortunate creature will take to flight; this occasionally succeeds, and cows are from time to time seen reaching their homes in the farmsteads with dreadful wounds all over their bodies; but if they stumble, or get seized by the neck or nostrils, or bitten through their knees or in the stomach, so that the bowels protrude, it is all over with them, and they die in the most horrible agonies.

Dr. Holub gives an interesting account of the rock rabbits, called by the Boers "dossies." These creatures are the smallest of all extant Pachydermata, and, on account of being so continually hunted by the natives, are very shy. They watch the traveller from the ledges of rock, and on the slightest alarm bound away to the nearest crevices. This *Hyrax capensis*, if it be not actually the same species as the *Hyrax abyssinicus*, is certainly, we read, closely allied to it. In size it is rather larger than the rabbit; the flesh is eaten by both white men and natives. It is preyed upon by the caracal, the southern lynx, and the brown eagle; nevertheless, it thrives wonderfully.¹

¹ Of the *Hyrax syriacus*—Proverbs xxx. 26, the "coney"—Dr. Tristram gives an account in his valuable book "The Land of Israel" (page 248). A pale russet spot on the middle of its back, which alone diversifies its tawny fur, distinguishes the "coney" (*shaphan*) of Scripture from the African *hyrax*. This little creature is a true pachyderm. The peculiar motion of its jaws resembles the act of rumination.

After a prosperous journey, the little party entered the territory of King Sechele, and arrived at Molopolole, the most picturesque of all the Bechuana towns. It is a well chosen stronghold, with a royal residence, a "villa," aristocratic houses, a spacious store (Messrs. Taylor's, next to Francis Grant's the most important in the whole Bechuana country) and villages. Sechele, the king, to whom Livingstone devoted more than one chapter of his "Travels," formerly lived near the Transvaal frontier: and at Kolobeng, now in ruins, he was visited by the Nestor of African travellers in the year 1842. At present, our author thinks, Sechele has only about 35,000 subjects. The two missionaries in Molopolole, Mr. Price and Mr. Williams (London Missionary Society) gave the party a cordial welcome. Mr. Price, by his marriage with Miss Moffat, became related to Dr. Livingstone. The Missionaries had been obliged, by reverses, and by a non-success described as "complete," to abandon their work among the Makololos; they have since left the territory of Sechele. In an interview with the king our author was not favourably impressed; he esteemed Sechele a double-faced intriguer, a hypocrite. The new palace had just been built by Messrs. Taylor at a cost of £3,000, the money being raised by the sale of ostrich feathers and oxen. Sechele has quite adopted the European style of living; the chairs and couches of his drawing room were of walnut wood covered with red velvet. The king spread out his pocket-handkerchief on the chair he selected for himself, and sat on it. Tea was served in cups shaped like little bowls; "the tea was good, and the cakes unexceptionable." While Dr. Holub was being questioned about the diggings, and the action of the English Government, the queen fell asleep, and the king, vexed at this breach of etiquette, gave her sundry pushes.

From Molopolole to Shoshong the road is 128 miles long; but in consequence of the deficiency of water a long circuit has to be made during certain months. On New Year's Day, 1874, in the heart of the South African wilderness our travellers drank the health of the Emperor of Austria. The next day Dr. Holub lost himself. Hunting a giraffe, he experienced, probably, a sun-stroke; at all events, he fell into a sort of delirium, and wandered about aimlessly, till, falling upon his knees, he was laid hold of by a black man; his life was saved. He entered Shoshong, the capital of the eastern Bamangwatos, on Jan. 5, and, as his funds were getting low, he resolved to proceed no farther, but to return to his practice at the diamond fields, and prepare for the third journey. Of the chief missionary in Shoshong, Mr. Mackenzie (London Missionary Society), author of "Ten Years North of the Orange River," he writes in the warmest terms, as a noble-hearted and accomplished man,

“thoroughly a messenger of love.” It is entirely owing, he says, to Mr. Mackenzie, that King Khame is now one of the best native sovereigns in the whole of South Africa. In regard to Christian Missions, the testimony of Major Pinto, a Portuguese, in the last CHURCHMAN, and that of the Austrian, Dr. Holub, may well be taken together. Christianity has been preached and practised in South Africa by “messengers of love;” and the good fruits are being made manifest.¹

On the 7th of April, 1874, Dr. Holub arrived at Dutoitspan.

In March, 1875, he left Dutoitspan, hardly expecting to return to Cape Colony, and having in view a journey like Livingstone’s, from the Zambesi to Loanda. The picture of the Atlantic at Loanda, unfolding itself to the gaze of his imagination, was an attraction irresistible. Journeying again by Molema’s Town, to Shoshong, he met with the usual difficulties, not unmingled with dangers. At Shoshong he spent a fortnight, the guest of Mr. Mackenzie. King Khame, he found, had prohibited the sale of brandy; the chief incentive to idleness being thus removed, it was easier to maintain peace and order; and, also, to suppress the heathen orgies, which had been grievously pernicious. On his journey to the Great Salt Lakes, Dr. Holub heard complaints concerning Boers, who had gone about everywhere killing game merely for the sake of their skins; and he found the natives sometimes by no means friendly in their behaviour. The eland, the largest of all the antelopes, we read, is so short-breathed, being lusty and well-fed, that it can be overtaken by the fleet-footed natives, who are skilful in hurling their assegais so as to inflict a mortal wound. Mounted Dutch and English hunters chase the elands in the same way as giraffes, right up to their waggons, where they shoot them down.

In the Great Lake basin the largest salt-pan is the Soa; it is quite shallow, being only four feet deep; it is grey in colour, and is rarely completely full. When the shallow bed of Lake N’gami is filled by its northern and western feeders, it sheds its overflow eastwards down the Zooga to the salt-pans. At the Soa our travellers met with some Dutch hunters, on a chase for elephants and ostriches; also, they had a difficulty with some fierce marauding Zulus, who levied black-mail in the shape of

¹ On the return journey he came to a group of trees near to some well-cultivated fields; conspicuous among the trees were some eucalyptus about sixty feet high. Here were some houses built in European style. The secret of the order and prosperity in this neighbourhood was the residence of a Missionary, Mr. Jensen (of the Hermannsburg Society), whose instruction and example has had such an influence on the Baharutse that they have become thriving agriculturists. In the fields round the mission-house, maize and wheat were growing, and in the gardens were peaches, apricots, pears, figs, oranges, with roses and many other flowers.

powder and lead. A little farther on, finding a pool of fresh water, near which fresh lion¹ tracks were conspicuous, they encamped; and Dr. Holub tells the story of that night's encampment in the following words:—

Meriko was entrusted with a breechloader to keep guard over the bullocks. An extra strong fence was made, considerably higher than usual, and four great fires were lighted, which would keep burning till nearly two o'clock in the morning.

Poor Niger [his dog] was in a state of great excitement all night. Lions were prowling around us, and the hyænas and jackals kept up such a noise that sound sleep was out of the question, and in my dreams I saw nothing but stuffed lion skins dancing before my eyes. Just before morning the concert seemed to rise to its full pitch, two jackals yelped hideously in two different keys, the hyænas howled angrily with all their might, while the lion with its deep and sonorous growl might be taken as choragus to the whole performance.

In the rambles that Pit and I took, the following morning, the lion-traces were so many and so recent that we felt it prudent to keep a very sharp look-out. We crossed the river-bed several times, and observed that the tracks were particularly numerous in the high ground that commanded a view of the place where the various antelopes, attracted by the salt, would be likely to descend. On our way we passed a tree, the bark of which was torn in a way which showed that it had been used by lions for sharpening their claws; the boughs of the trees were wide-spreading, branching out like a candelabrum, and forming what struck me as a convenient perch. Here I resolved to keep a long watch of some ten or twelve hours. I was determined, if I could, to see the lions for myself. Accordingly, just before sundown, I took Niger, and accompanied by Pit I returned to the tree, and having made myself comfortable in my concealment, I sent Pit back to the waggon in time for him to arrive while it was still tolerably light.

The sensation of being alone in such a spot was sufficiently strange. I soon began to look about me, and noticed that the trees around were considerably higher than that in which I was perched, the ground was in some places elevated, but thinly grassed, so that the light sand could be distinguished which covers the flaking strata of the salt lakes. Just below me was a bare circular patch, which bore no footprints at all, except our own and those of the lions that had passed by; on my left was a rain-channel some six feet deep and twenty feet wide, much overgrown and opening into the Nataspruit about twenty yards away. The nights were now extremely cold, and appeared especially so in contrast with the high temperature of the day, and I took precautions of tying myself to one of the strongest boughs, in case I

¹ The full maned lions of the northern part of the Continent are seldom to be seen in South Africa. Maneless lions are found in the valley of the Central Zambesi. The most common are those of the short-maned species. Usually, the South African lion is an exceedingly cautious beast. Except the fox, no animal surpasses it in craftiness for securing prey.

should fall asleep, and a tumble off might bring me into closer contact with the monarchs of the forest than might be agreeable; but having made myself secure, I soon settled down in the middle of the triple-forked recess that I had chosen for my ambush.

The sun, meanwhile, had all but set; only a few golden streaks on the highest boughs remained, and these gradually faded away. My insight that night into scenes of animal life proved even far more diversified than I could venture to anticipate.

Amongst the first of the sounds to arrest my attention was the sonorous "quag-ga, quag-ga" of the male zebras, they were on the grass-plains keeping watch over their herds; with this was soon mingled the melancholy howl of the harnessed jackal, awakening the frightful yell of its brother, the grey jackal; the beasts, I could not doubt, were all prowling round the enclosure of our camp. For some hours the various noises seemed to be jumbled together, but towards midnight they became more and more distinct, so that I could count the beasts that made them. After a while a peculiar scraping commenced, caused by rhyzænas hunting in the sand for worms and larvæ; it went on all night, except during the brief intervals when the busy little creatures were temporarily disturbed by some movement near them.

The gazelles and antelopes came down quite early to lick at this salt mud in the Nata-bed; they evidently were accustomed to get back to their haunts in the open lands before the beasts of prey quitted their lairs in the wood. Some of the little steinbocks (those most graceful of South African gazelles) came down so cautiously along the track that it was only through accidentally looking down that I was aware of their being near me. I think there were three or four of them. They were followed by some other gazelle, of which the movements were so light and rapid that I failed to catch a glimpse of it. After a considerable time a single antelope passed beneath me, of another species, larger than the others, making a succession of short leaps, then pausing and bounding on again, but I could not recognize what kind it really was.

The slow, steady tramp of a large herd on the other side of the bank proceeding towards the salt pools, and in the direction of the one fresh-water pool, could not be mistaken; moreover, the crashing of their horns against the wood in the thickets left no doubt of the approach of a number of koodoos. While I was listening to their movements I heard another tread on the game-path beside the river; straining my eyes in that direction, I saw a dark object stealthily making its way towards the descent: it was about the size of a young calf, and I could have little doubt that it was a brown hyæna; it sniffed the air at every step, and after stopping a few seconds just beyond the channel, started off at a brisk trot.

As the hours of the night waned away I was beginning to think that I should hear or see nothing of the monarch of the forest. I had not, however, to wait much longer before the unmistakable roar, apparently about half a mile away, caught my ear. I could only hope that the beast was on its way once more to sharpen its claws upon

the accustomed tree. I had now no heed to give to any other sound ; neither the barking of our own dogs beside the waggon, nor the yelling of the jackals around our encampment could distract my attention, and I listened eagerly for at least half an hour before the roaring was repeated ; it was now much nearer. I listened on, and it must have been nearly twenty minutes more when I distinguished its footsteps almost within gunshot. The lion was not in the ordinary track, as I had expected, but right in the long grass in the rain channel. Its strides were generally rapid, but it paused frequently. I could only hear its movements ; it was too dark for me to see.

I was sure that it could not be more than about fifteen yards from me, and could hardly restrain myself from firing. I feared, however, that a random shot would only be fired in vain, and with no other effect than that of driving the lion away. Accordingly I waited on. It came still nearer and crouched down somewhere for about another quarter of an hour without stirring an inch. At last I became convinced that it had caught sight of me, I saw the bushes shake, and the great brute looked out as if uncertain whether to make a spring towards me or to effect its escape. It was a terrible mistake on my part not to fire then and there, but my moment of hesitation was fatal to my design ; the lion made a sudden bound, and in an instant had disappeared for good.

It was no use to me that Niger's frantic barking made me aware what direction it had taken. My chance was gone. I was much mortified, but there was no help for it. With the cold night air and my cramped position I was stiff all over, and much relieved when daylight dawned, and Pit appeared with Niger to accompany me back to the warmth and shelter of the waggon.

Of his reception by Sepopo, the ruler of the central Zambesi, Dr. Holub gives a graphic sketch. Sepopo had been expecting him for months ; he had often enquired of the traders from the South when the Nyaka was coming to travel through the country like Nyaka Livingstone ; and, although since the visit of the great explorer, Sepopo had had interviews with at least fifteen white men, he was desirous to give the new Nyaka a most imposing reception. The king was dressed in European style, with an English hat upon his head, decorated with a fine white ostrich feather ; he shook hands with the travellers while the royal band produced excruciating music. A Bechuana, who had resided at this Court three years, acted as interpreter. As soon as they were seated the king began to ask questions ; broiled fishes were then served, and the king having handed a portion to two chiefs (to see that the food was not poisoned), took a fish himself, and handed another to Dr. Holub. Fingers had to do duty in the absence of forks. The Marutse excel in their methods of dressing fish ; and a great many fish, after being sun-dried, are kept for months. When Sepopo and his guests had eaten, water was brought to wash their hands ; some

little green balls about the size of a walnut were brought upon a platter. Dr. Holub did not understand what these balls were, and the interpreter called out, "Smell them, sir!" They were of the nature of soap. In the evening, Dr. Holub supped, in the palace, with Sepopo and the queen; boiled eland flesh was served upon plates, and knives and forks—introduced by traders from the West Coast—were supplied. Honey beer was distributed in tin mugs. The king is described as by no means honest. In the course of the night our travellers saw him rummaging among the goods, and his majesty walked off with a waggon-lantern that the English trader had refused to give him during the day. Sepopo now and then, it appears, treats his people with inhumanity; he has a delight in human sacrifices, and against the advice of his council, perpetrates superstitious barbarities.

And here we must close our notice of this work. Illness seized the traveller, and he was compelled to return to the Colony. He embarked on board the *German* in 1879, bringing with him a splendid collection. We have only to add that, in regard to the Zulu war, he is of opinion that Sir Bartle Frere acted with the wisdom of a statesman.

ART. IV.—UPPER CLASS SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

THE question is not unfrequently asked, What is the future of Evangelical religion? What will be the state of the Evangelical body fifty years hence? The answer is not difficult: the future will be, under God's good pleasure, what the present makes it. It rests with us of the present day to bring up the children of this generation so as to ensure the growth and stability of the great Evangelical body in the time to come. And how is this to be done?

Let us take a fair view of the religious education of the children of the middle and upper classes, and see where it is likely to lead them. First of all, is it an uncommon thing for the children of decidedly Evangelical parents to go out into the errors either of scepticism or of superstition? Have not many families been saddened by the utter division of the children on the most important of all matters? And is not this in many cases attributable to the very imperfect education which has been given in the distinctive teaching and the technical knowledge of the doctrines of grace? Many words rise to the lip, many well-worn phrases rise to the tongue; but too often there is no real knowledge at the root, no power of giving a reason for

the hope that is in them ; and therefore the intellectual heaven or the carefully-prepared scheme of superstitious dogma finds a ready entrance to the ill-kept, ill-arranged citadel.

Again, what vagueness of idea seems to hold in many minds as to the boundaries between our Church and Nonconformity ! Very many grown-up people of both sexes who take a prominent position as Christians, and who indulge without hesitation in religious controversy, are utterly ignorant both of the letter and the spirit of the Articles of our Church. Many well-educated persons believe that the point of difference is merely a matter of preferring extempore or liturgical prayer, and many excellent people mix up scraps from different schools of thought, in an utterly heterogeneous compound, and then wonder that they are perplexed and troubled again and again by religious difficulties. "Brethren, these things ought not so to be."

The present paper proposes to deal only with one remedy—that which may be called "Upper Class Sunday Schools," which may be defined as the gathering together the children of the upper classes on Sundays, under competent teachers, to receive systematic religious training similar to that given in a good Sunday school of the ordinary type.

"Certainly not," many of our readers will exclaim. "The home is the proper Sunday school. Nothing ought to interfere with the home teaching." Once for all, let us realize the fact that the parent is the person who is responsible to God for leading the little heart to the knowledge of Him ; to no other can be delegated that precious trust ; on no other can the responsibility devolve, but still there is ample room for our upper class Sunday school.

Let us remember that we are contending for systematic religious instruction and clear teaching on all the doctrines of the Gospel, and of that Church which is the pillar and ground of the truth. Now look at the teaching power in many homes—not as it ought to be, but as it is.

The father has possibly been engaged in professional duties all the week ; his mind wants a rest. He may have great power as a doctor, or as a lawyer, or as a financier, and yet be far from being either a successful or a taking teacher. His explanations may be very well meant, but very hazy ; the child may puzzle the father, and then it is no uncommon result that the mind, unsatisfied in its researches, becomes estranged from the parent in the very highest matters, instead of feeling that confidence and trust which is the closest bond on earth. The mother, too, with her numerous duties and cares, with perhaps younger children needing more of her time on a day when naturally every effort is made to spare servants, may be by no means the best teacher in the details of Christian doctrine. She

is of course the one who, with the father, is particularly bound to take her children to the Saviour, to show them the beauty of holiness, to make their Bible a loved book, and the times of prayer times of gladness. It is from her lips that the "sweetest name" is to sound, and sound the sweetest; but for all that, she may be by no means the one whose teaching will either be always available or always the best in the doctrines of the Gospel.

There is yet another point to be considered in favour of the "Upper Class Sunday School." Sunday is sometimes a very long and somewhat dull day to the children of Christian parents; the idea is more clear as to what they are not to do than as to what they are to do, and so sometimes children think of Sunday as a day on which they are losers rather than gainers; and anything is to be deprecated, and if possible avoided, which gives a child a gloomy view of that day which is "the Lord's" own day.

If, on the other hand, one hour or an hour and a half be spent at the Sunday school, involving, as it should do, some amount of previous preparation, in which parents are consulted and interested, there is at once something to look forward to, companions to meet, just a little touch of emulation, a kind of teaching that does not come in exactly any other way, and a measuring of the little individual against others, which goes far to keep down pride and self-sufficiency, whilst at the same time it teaches a child a great deal more about himself or herself than is otherwise likely to be known.

Many difficulties will occur to the mind as attaching to the plan here suggested; but although incompetent teachers, a somewhat mixed company, and the other difficulties attendant on all Sunday schools may occur, still, in the opinion of the writer of this Paper, who has himself tried the experiment for nearly four years, the benefits outweigh the disadvantages.

But of course there must be the greatest possible care taken on the part of those who have the management, to ensure the proper carrying on of such a school; first of all, it should be definitely attached to one particular church, and under the guidance of one particular clergyman. This is most important, as otherwise there is no real guarantee for what is taught, and changes in teachers or superintendents may involve a diversity even of doctrines taught, in that teaching, the systematic and accurate character of which is of such great importance. Whatever be the duties and relations between a clergyman and the teachers of an ordinary Sunday school, it is beyond all things necessary that if he undertake one of the sort which we are now advocating, he meet his teachers constantly, and furnish them in the rough with the materials for their lessons. And the lessons should aim very pointedly at instruction; of course this should

be the aim of all Sunday-school lessons ; but in the case before us we must remember that the need of systematic instruction is the very *raison d'être* of such schools, and therefore time must not be wasted in the mere technicalities of Sunday school, but something definite, and something carefully selected and well worked out, must be actually taught. It is not well to presuppose a great deal of knowledge—far better begin at the beginning, and secure the actual giving of that real knowledge ; children have very little idea of their ignorance, or of the indefiniteness of their knowledge, until they come to measure themselves by others, and then great gentleness and encouragement is needed, lest the discovery of ignorance or inaccuracy before unsuspected become a damper and a hindrance to the little scholar.

A most important matter is the selection of teachers : these must be all of good social position, for it is essential that they shall be on equal terms with all whom they have to teach, and any mistake on this point is simply fatal. Then they must be well educated, and capable of dealing with and answering the questions which will come from the children as soon as they are sufficiently at home to express their difficulties ; they must have their hearts in the work, for no one is quicker than a child to detect anything the least approaching to unreality, and they must be, as far as one can judge of another, decided Christians. Far better to have fewer teachers, and, even if it must be so, a smaller school, than run the risk of difficulties by admitting teachers of the wrong sort.

Next, as to discipline. This must be most firmly, but unobtrusively, maintained. Good conduct must be one of the principal conditions of admission, and a high tone of "honour" must pervade the whole. It should be set clearly before the children that "punishment" must be unheard of, for the simple reason that the conduct must be such as never to require it, and to this end it may be well for the superintendent to admit all children wishing to join, not at the school on Sunday, but at her own house—for it is taken for granted that the superintendent will be a lady—during the week previous.

Another point of importance is the learning of lessons for the Sunday class, either collect, hymn, passage of Scripture, or, in some cases the Articles of our Church, and also, when practicable, the writing answers to questions on the lesson which has been given. This plan not only helps the memory of the child and fixes the lessons upon its mind, but, as has been said before, it brings the parents into connection with the school work—it lets them know what kind of instruction is given, and gives them a share in carrying it out—it enables them to satisfy themselves what their child is taught, and to see how much it learns.

But after all, it may be said, does not public catechizing meet this want, or cannot it be supplied by home instruction given on a fixed plan, such as that devised and adopted with great success by Canon Richardson? The answer is, that in the judgment of the writer neither of these plans really meets the case. Systematic instruction may be *given* in catechizing, but there is not the same power of ensuring its reception and its being actually understood. A few children, either specially intelligent or specially forward, may get all the catechizing to themselves, and the more timid or more ignorant get no good out of it at all; and, further, the catechizing, from its very conditions, will take away much of the freedom and the pleasure of learning which is to be found in the Sunday school, while the plan of settled lessons to be taught at home, and questioned upon once a month in church, as suggested and carried out by Canon Richardson, though admirable and helpful, does not seem quite to hit the mark we are aiming at; for the instruction given three Sundays out of four will be very variable, and the catechizing on the fourth Sunday will embrace so wide a field that many will come very short of the elementary teaching that they want, whilst the advantage of learning in the midst of a small body of companions will be lost altogether.

One point remains to be alluded to on this important subject—that is, the bond of Christian fellowship that is thus established. Friendships are formed in the Upper Class Sunday School which will last through life. A union of Christian children is thus made, who, as they grow up together, will become a power, and a united power, for good in a place. Religion becomes the uniting link, and a link which will become stronger as years go on; and so there is the beginning of a real union for the work of the Lord, which we, as a body, seem sadly to lack at the present time. Of course, the plan has many difficulties—nothing that is good is without them—but it has succeeded. And doubtless wherever it is attempted in a prayerful spirit, humbly seeking and following the Master's guidance, it will succeed. At any rate, one thing is clear, we must, either by this or by some other means, give our children a clearer and more definite education in the saving truths and doctrines of our faith, if they are to be fitted to contend with the numerous enemies of that faith, who are to be found both within and without the borders of the Church to which we belong.

J. H. ROGERS.

ART. V.—CHARLES JOHN ELLIOTT.

MANY others, besides the readers of *THE CHURCHMAN*, will mourn the loss of the estimable and distinguished clergyman whose name appears at the head of the present Paper. Mr. Elliott has left a void in the foremost ranks of English Biblical scholarship. In the Jerusalem Chamber a voice will be heard no more which was wont to be listened to with respect and deference by the first Hebrew critics of the age. And, with these, sympathize a yet wider range of mourners. If they are many who will miss the scholar, they are more who will miss the friend;—the bright intelligence, the gentle spirit, the tender conscience, the unselfish and kindly heart. We all feel that one is gone from us whom the Church will acknowledge to have been an ornament, and in whom the world saw an example of deep and unaffected piety.

L. Charles John Elliott was born in 1818, and thus was called away in his sixty-third year. He was the son of John Sherman Elliott, the elder half-brother of the Rev. Henry Venn Elliott, and Edward B. Elliott of Brighton, two uncles with whom he always lived on terms of affectionate intimacy; they, not slow to discern in him the promise of future usefulness; and he, holding, in natural reverence, the splendid abilities and high academical distinctions with which the names of both relatives were associated.

Canon Elliott was brought up chiefly at a school, at that time of considerable repute, at High Wycombe; leaving it only for a course of University preparation under a private tutor, Mr. Singleton of Shoreham. He entered at St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, in 1836, being then eighteen years of age. Among the men of his year, and, at that college especially, he seemed quite a junior. But only in years. In attainments, in intellectual acuteness, in force and ripeness of character, and, above all, in unswerving steadfastness to the principles of Evangelical doctrine, he was far beyond many his elders. It was no surprise that he came out first in college examinations, and great things were expected of him in his final degree. But, at the end of the second year it became evident that his health would not bear the strain of reading for honours—that is, reading for them in the way as all who knew anything of his mental habitude, knew he would read. Accordingly, he was obliged to content himself with the ordinary degree. Yet even this he was not satisfied to do in any perfunctory manner. Whatever he proposed to do, he always did with his might. To be "Captain of the Pol," as it used to be called in those days, might seem to be no high

academical distinction to aspire after, but it was the highest place attainable by those whom failing health or other circumstances excluded from the competitions of the tripos; and it was no secret, among the Examiners, that, humble as some may consider the first place among the *δι πολλοί*, our friend was *facile princeps*.

But the vigour of Canon Elliott's intellectual character, and perhaps a feeling of what was due to the honourable name he bore, made him resolve not to leave his University without a permanent place in its Calendar. From the time he found himself obliged to give up mathematical honours—at that time a necessary preliminary to an entrance for the classical tripos—he gave himself assiduously to the study of Hebrew, as well as those branches of theological and patristic literature which form the staple of the examination for the Crosse and Tyrwhitt scholarships. These distinctions, as being open to all graduates of the University of a certain standing, hold a high rank among Cambridge theological prizes. Mr. Elliott obtained them both: the Crosse scholarship in 1840, the year in which he graduated, and the First Tyrwhitt scholarship in 1842.

In the latter year, he took Orders. But this only after a good deal of mental struggle. A keen sensitiveness of conscience was a marked feature in our friend's character; and with an ardent desire to be employed in the ministry of Christ's Church, it was, for some time, a matter of painful hesitation with him, whether he could declare his hearty "assent and consent" to all things contained in the Book of Common Prayer. Eventually, however, he was able to see his way clearly to the taking of orders;—assisted probably, in the resolution of his scruples, by the clear judgment and enlightened piety of his first Vicar, the Rev. Henry Venn, the well-known Secretary to the Church Missionary Society. To this excellent clergyman he was distantly related by his own family; but the tie became strengthened by his marriage with Mr. Venn's niece, the daughter of Matthew Babington, Esq., of Rothley Temple, Leicestershire,—a name to be held in honour from the connection of the family with the great anti-slavery struggle originated by Wilberforce, and the other leaders of the great Clapham movement. Canon Elliott remained curate of Mr. Venn until 1844, when he was presented to the living of Winkfield by his relative, Dr. Pearson, the Dean of Salisbury.

In the duties of this pastoral charge, he remained until he died, a period of thirty-seven years. Of his work for the parish, during that long incumbency, we cannot stay to speak particularly. The chief feature of it to be noticed was his subdivision of the parish into four separate districts, a measure, which, however beneficial to the spiritual interests of the parish,

was attended with a considerable diminution of the income of the living. This, however, was not a consideration to enter into his self-forgetting nature. He felt that the parish had largely outgrown his powers of pastoral superintendence, especially as he never hesitated to acknowledge that his *forte* did not lie in organizing and carrying out the details of parochial work. Still he did more in this way than many, less given to the language of self-depreciation. And in the restoration and beautifying of the parish church; in the contributing to the building of four new churches; in the erection and enlargement of parochial schools; in the building of almshouses for the poor; and in the organization of mission services for outlying districts—proofs, more enduring than words, are left, to tell of a faithful, earnest, constant, and unwearied pastorate. And this a grateful parish acknowledged. It was evident to all present, that the poor who assembled, in such weeping throngs, in that village churchyard on May 14th, felt as keenly the loss of the affectionate and sympathizing pastor, as did the clergy and other sorrowing friends feel the loss of the accomplished scholar and the sound divine.

II. But let us glance at the literary career of our deceased friend, both as a writer in controversial theology, and in the department of exegesis and criticism.

It is somewhat curious, that, large as was the produce of his brain-work in his later years, and wide as was the field traversed by his labours, no evidences of his literary aptitudes showed themselves till nearly twenty years after taking his degree. Dr. Arnold, in speaking of authors, used to say, a man who has not made his mark before he is forty, will never do anything noteworthy afterwards. Our friend had overpassed this intellectual zenith when he made his first important literary effort. In 1859 he published "An Enquiry into the Doctrine of the Church of England on Private Confession and Absolution." It was evidently the work of a well-instructed theologian,—of a hard reader, a close thinker, a painstaking and conscientious searcher after truth, regardless of any offence to this party in the Church or that. Regarded as a literary composition, the work was not particularly attractive. To the last, he cared very little about the graces of style;—for the clear and persuasive presentment of his argument, often too little. But the style was part of the man,—concentrative, vigorous, earnest, full of point and strength. There was, moreover, in all his controversial writing, a scrupulous carefulness to look at a question all round; and this, not more from a mathematical habit of exactitude and precision, in regard to detail, than from a tender religious shrinking from all argumentative unfairness, whether in the way of keeping back that which would tell

against the side he was advocating, or of exaggerating the force of any considerations which might be urged in its favour.

Such a habit of mind was much needed in dealing with the delicate question on which the minds of men at that time were painfully exercised, that of Confession and Absolution. Auricular confession—stated systematic, and, as precedent Holy Communion indispensable—had been openly encouraged and practised by numerous ministers of our Church; and that, as a usage, for which they could plead the plainest warrant and authority of the Prayer-book. Furthermore, they were in a condition to say of this habit of confession, "The people love to have it so." There was no necessity, they urged, for using any compulsion. Those who came to them, were, in the words of our Communion exhortation, unable to "quiet their own conscience," without so doing. They required comfort, and counsel, and the repose which comes of repairing to the minister of God's word, that they might "open their grief." The danger was increasing. Young persons, generally young women, were found to be habitually seeking private interviews with the clergy; finding, or thinking they found, in the words of comfort and assurance uttered on such occasions, a certain pledge of rest to their souls. That such rest was a false rest, founded on false views of Christian duty and Christian doctrine, it is needless to point out. Those who have recourse to it, forget that a certain degree of striving, and prayer, and waiting God's time, and persistence in the use of means, form a part of the ordained work and warfare of the Christian life. And, therefore, all this craving for present immediate, artificial sedatives, oral assurances, and priestly pardons, bespeak an impatience of the cross; a low and impoverished spirituality; a chronic and diseased fretfulness of soul, which insists on being quieted by pernicious stimulants, when the man ought to be bracing himself to effort by a patient study of the Word, and wrestling with doubts and fears upon his knees. In special and emergent crises of the spiritual life, for seasons of exceptional depression, under the accusations of the sin-burdened conscience, the seeking to a godly pastor, for Christian guidance and consolation, is both a scriptural thing and a lawful thing. But of sacramental confession, of absolution pronounced by a priest, either as essential to forgiveness, or as the ordained channel of conveying it, our reformed Church knows nothing, and our Prayer-book says nothing. "No, no," writes our noble Hooker, "these opinions have youth in their countenance: antiquity know them not, it never thought nor dreamed of it."¹

In the work our friend gave to the world, the views of the soundest divines on this much controverted subject were collected

¹ "Ecc. Pol," Book VI. 14.

with his characteristic industry, and set forth with his accustomed fairness and discrimination. He was a sound but moderate Churchman. Ever true to his Evangelical principles, and perfectly loyal to his inherited sympathies and traditions, he never allowed himself to be classified as belonging to any particular party in the Church. There were points in regard to which he was at issue with them all. And, therefore, in any of the current controversies of the times, he would always reserve to himself the most unfettered freedom of speech and action.

Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.

In this vexed question of confession and absolution his course was clear. He loved the Prayer-book, and stood by it, honestly and courageously. He had studied its history thoroughly: having a familiarity with all the phases of change and addition it had gone through, and the reasons of them, which would have secured him a foremost rank among advocates in the Court of Arches. Accordingly, he had no difficulty in admitting, to the fullest extent, all that could be urged, by the friends of sacramental confession, whether from the Exhortation to Holy Communion, or the Ordinal for the Priesthood, or the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. The course of argument adopted by him, in his treatise, we cannot, within our limits, do more than indicate. The stress of his reasoning, as might be expected, was addressed to the question of what were the real and proper "benefits of absolution?" The position had been advanced boldly, and unqualifiedly, that the absolving utterances of God's minister were not *declaratory* only, not *precatory* only, not *assuring* and comforting only, but were ordained channels of forgiveness, an actual CONVEYANCE, to the soul of the penitent, of remission of sins.

The key-note of our friend's exposure of this infatuated neresy is well furnished by the motto from Hooker, given on his title-page:—"What is then the force of absolution? What is it which the act of absolution worketh in a sinful man? Doth it, by any operation from itself, alter the state of the soul? Doth it really take away sin, or but ascertain us of God's most gracious and merciful pardon? The latter of which two is our assertion: the former theirs." This great principle is supported by a *catena* of extracts and authorities, evidencing abundantly the writer's wide and varied reading, as well as leaving it a marvel how, in the face of testimonies, gathered from divines, whom High Churchmen especially hold in the greatest veneration, these priestly pretensions could be advanced for a moment, or how any minister of the Anglican communion could presume to claim for himself a power of absolution, which Hooker, and Taylor, and Hammond, and Bingham, would have repudiated

with a righteous abhorrence. Among modern citations against the recent heresy, none will command more suffrages than the following, which our friend quotes from Dr. Hook: "Absolution is, in truth, nothing more than a verbal and authoritative application to individual persons of the great doctrine of justification by faith."¹

Having dwelt at such length on Mr. Elliott's first work of controversial theology, some others which followed may be dismissed with slighter notice. His next treatise, published a few years afterwards, was entitled "The North Side of the Altar." It had reference to a phase of ritual usage, at that time considered to be of crucial importance. No attempt was made, by those who adopted it, to deny that the position recommended to the celebrant was intended to symbolize high sacramental doctrine; was, in fact, a part of a general scheme of Eucharistic adoration. In favour of the practice, an elaborate appeal had been made by Dr. Littledale to Jewish tradition, primitive usage, and to pre-Reformation, or the earlier post-Reformation rubrics, all of which, it is contended, go to prove that the right position of the priest was *in front* of the altar or table, at which he officiated. To these three sources of Biblical and Liturgical information, on their bearing on the rightful place of the celebrant, as well as in the doctrinal significance of the position itself, our friend addresses himself, with all the accumulated stores of his liturgical knowledge and all the trenchant strength of his vigorous mind. The work bristles with references, and one seems to wonder that the fruits of so much massive learning should have to be expended on a point, which, apart from any doctrinal significance, seems to be of such trivial import. A recent judgment of the Final Court of Appeal,—making the eastward position permissive, so long as the concomitant manual actions of the celebrant are visible,—has, of course, shifted the ground of the controversy on which our friend's treatise chiefly turns; but his work will remain a text-book for all who may desire to know what countenance is furnished by Jewish precedent, by early Christian practice, by the rubrics and ritual of the English Church, to the kind of theology which many suppose to underlie that ambiguous, if not self-contradictory rubric, beginning, "When the priest, standing before the table."

Mr. Elliott published several controversial pamphlets in his later years. One entitled, "Some Strictures on a Book entitled 'The Communicant's Manual,'" as well as another growing out of it, containing letters between Mr. Elliott and Canon King, formed the subject of a notice in *THE CHURCHMAN* in the month

¹ Appendix, p. 128. Notes to Dr. Hook's "Sermon on Auricular Confession," p. 70.

of November, 1879. The only remark on these pamphlets we deem it right to make is, that the writer of them must not be supposed to be chargeable with that tendency to depreciate the Sacraments, of which the opponents of high Eucharistic doctrine are so commonly accused. Our friend was the last man to speak disparagingly of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Speaking on the subject to the writer of this Paper, he observed, "It is the highest act of worship known to the Church."

So much for the polemical writings of our lamented friend. They represent but a slight portion of the product of his unresting brain. During the last decade of his life, especially, fields of extensive usefulness were continually opening before him, in connection with commentaries, Biblical dictionaries, as well as the more influential sections of our periodical literature. His friends had felt that, respectable as were some of the smaller religious publications, to the pages of which he was continually contributing, they belonged too much to the class of *peritura chartæ*, for a man of his intellectual powers, and that his labours ought to be employed upon a larger field. Accordingly, though not without something of unaffected diffidence and humility, he, some years ago, allowed his literary claims to be brought under the notice of a leading quarterly journal. Not long was the accomplished editor of the *Edinburgh* in discovering that, in the comparatively unknown Berkshire vicar, he had found a valuable accession to his staff. As a first subject, for the trial of his critical skill, there was proposed to our friend, an article on "The Fourth Gospel." The admitted differences between this and the three synoptic gospels,—in style, and treatment, and subject-matter,—had, from the earliest ages, made St. John's Gospel the object of sceptical attack. But, of late years, these attacks had been reversed by writers of the German school—by Strauss, Baur, de Wette, and others—with a parade of critical learning and research which it could hardly be to the credit of English Biblical scholarship to pass over. The task of breaking a lance with these modern neologians was wisely and well assigned to Canon Elliott; and we think none will rise from a perusal of his article in the *Edinburgh* with a shadow of doubt remaining on their mind as to the genuineness and inspired authority of the Gospel of St. John.

Other articles, in the same Review, followed this on the Fourth Gospel, at successive intervals; and we happen to know that a most valuable Paper, on the widely interesting subject of the Revised New Testament, was far in advance, for insertion in the next number of the *Edinburgh*, when the last illness of the writer forbade the completion of his task.

This notice of the literary labours of our lamented friend would not be complete without adverting to two of them with

which Bible readers generally can scarcely fail to be familiar—namely, his work on the Committee for the Revision of the Old Testament, and his contributions to the “Speaker’s Commentary.” For seven years incessantly, and with the most scrupulous regularity, did he give himself to the work of the Revision Committee—all his colleagues testifying to the assistance derived from his wise and scholarly comments. Nor was a less high estimation of his scholarship entertained by the learned editor of the “Speaker’s Commentary.” The actual part assigned to Canon Elliott, in that invaluable work, was the portion of the Psalms included between xci.–xcix., and cxli.–cl. But we violate no literary confidences in saying that, in other portions of the work, when questions arose requiring the most exact acquaintance with Hebrew for their elucidation, with no one was the Editor more glad to take counsel than with the subject of the present memoir.

Of Canon Elliott’s contributions to other Biblical and theological works—to the Commentary edited by Bishop Ellicott, to that recently published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, to the Dictionaries of Biography and Antiquities edited by Dr. Smith—our limits will not allow us to speak. What has been said, we trust, will suffice to vindicate our opening remark, that the decease of Mr. Elliott has left a void in the foremost ranks of English Biblical scholarship.

III. Glad should we have been to have supplemented this “*in memoriam*” notice, by more of personal particulars, either in regard to the life of our dear friend, or to the circumstances attending his illness and latter end. But it is owing to the retiredness and unobtrusive quietness of the man, that only the scantiest materials are left us for this purpose. After a curacy of less than two years’ duration he entered upon an incumbency. And his first incumbency was his last. Except his honorary canonry, the so-called preferments of the Church were never offered to him, and he was the last man in the world to seek them. That, for the sake of redeeming more time for his Biblical labours, he must sometimes have desired, even as all his friends most ardently desired for him, a post affording greater opportunities for learned leisure, may be supposed; but, as a rule, during all that long incumbency, it might be said of him:—

Remote from towns he ran his godly race,
Nor e’er had changed nor wished to change his place.

Connections and friendships he could number, which, in the hands of any keen preferment hunter, would have been a certain passport to high places. But he was doing the work to which God had called him. By his studies he was instructing many; by his Church ministrations he was comforting many; by his

visits to the homes of his sick and distressed parishioners, he was winning the gratitude of many. What mattered to him the much or little of worldly advantages? He would rather it should be said of him that he was "more skilled to raise the wretched than to rise." "He would have been astonished," says one who had the best means of testifying to the fact, "if he could have known how much his parishioners loved him." And not they only. As is well observed by a writer in the *Guardian*, "those who knew him only as a scholar, or through his controversial writings, could form no real view of his character. The great charm in him was his kind-heartedness." Whilst, in an address of condolence to the widow, conveyed by the Master of Wellington College, as chairman of a Clerical Society, after the mention of "his learning and ability," reference is specially made "to the gentleness, courtesy, and largeness of mind with which he used to maintain his own views, and listen to the views of others."

Of the latter end of our beloved friend, and its accompanying testimonies to the simplicity of his faith and trust in "the one only Name," there is little to be said. As a rule, he was especially reserved and reticent upon the subject of his own religious feelings. And it was probably owing to some premonition of the end approaching, not perceptible to those around him, that, in an early stage of his attack, he volunteered unusual expressions of his firm trust in the merits of his Saviour. The attack itself came on with a fainting fit during the reading of the Litany, on the morning of Sunday, May 1st. He was assisted into the vestry, and on reaching home gave most encouraging signs of recovery. But on the next and following days acute pains in the limbs set in, for the relief of which the use of strong opiates became needful, causing such brief and intermitted seasons of consciousness, that, to the last, the oral testimonies were few which he was able to give of the strength and certainty of his hope. It was characteristic of his lowliness, and meek humility of spirit, that, a short time before the end came, he said, "I have not the joy some have, but I have peace;" and then, a little afterwards, fearing that after his departure friends should speak too highly of him, he left them a solemn charge, "See that nothing to my praise be put over my grave. All I would say of myself is, 'God be merciful to me a sinner.'"

So passed away this faithful servant of God. It may truly be said of him that he died in harness. The brief and distressing seasons of mental wandering which accompanied his illness, were divided between prayer and work—between devout supplications for the spiritual welfare of those he loved, and imaginary discussions, in the Jerusalem Chamber, as to the right

understanding of some passage in the Word of God. But all is light to him now. The clouds and shadows of the present state have become dissipated, as the morning mists upon the mountains; whilst all the obscurities, in that Holy Book, to the right understanding of which he gave the ripest years of his labour and thought, will now be made clear in the higher exegesis of eternity and the fuller disclosures of the Book of Life.

D. M.

ART. VI.—THOUGHTS ABOUT LETTERS.

IT was a bright day of sunshine, when the ash-buds were showing "black against the front of March," and the first blush of the wakening life of spring was on the beech-trees which clothe the Cotswold Hills in many parts with an ever-changing grace, when I was looking from Birdlip over one of the loveliest views in England.

The Vale of Gloucester, with all its undulations, its villages, and wooded knolls, its meadow-land, and homesteads lay below, under a nearly cloudless sky. The tower of Gloucester Cathedral was distinctly visible—Glevum, that bright city of old times, which has seen so many changes and chances within its walls. Opposite, across the valley, like sentinels on guard, rose the stately Malvern Hills, with their grand mountainous outline, and abrupt termination at the Herefordshire end. Nearer to the left rose the steep sides of Leckhampton, and Cleve Cloud; Cheltenham, lying under their protecting heights, with her many villas and church towers, clearly defined. To the right, the mouth of the Severn shone like burnished steel, and beyond, many miles away, range upon range of low-lying shadowy hills were wrapt in the soft "fine-weather haze" of the spring day.

Near us, though hidden, lay the old Roman remains which were, in 1818, discovered by some labourer who was rooting up a tree. These remains, and the probable history attached to them, led my thoughts to the posts of those days, in contrast to the swift communication of these in which we live, by the touch of that electric chain with which we are darkly bound. For the Roman villa which had been disinterred in the heart of those beech woods was the probable residence of the Post-master; and the buildings, of which traces are left in all directions in the neighbourhood of the villa, were for the breeding and rearing of horses.

The Roman system of communication by means of signals was carried to very great perfection. Stations for horses, such as the

one below us in the wood, were presided over by an officer of high rank, and from the terrace in front the signal-posts on Cooper's Hill, and on Birdlip, where we stood, could be plainly seen, and horses despatched to Painswick by "Green Street," or by the "Salt way" through the wood.

Those beautiful beech woods are said to be a legacy to us from the Romans, and how graceful is the outline of their branches, how stately they grow on the hill-side, As the sun shines through the swelling buds, it sets the carpet of fallen leaves of past springtime all aglow with the golden-bronze colour, richer and more intense than any words can tell. Beautiful beech-trees! they seemed to whisper to me of days past, and days present, as the brisk March wind played through them, and awoke the same music that the Roman ladies heard as they returned in their chariots along the Via Viridariensis (or road through the plantation), and saw the signal on the hill-crest, and knew that the post was returning or going out.

In these days of rapid communication, when letters fly over the country—their name Legion and their speed that of Pegasus—it is hard to realize the absence of what is now so permanent a feature in our daily life, and the existence which was not enlivened by the excitement by the arrival of the daily post.

The Roman system of posting was on an enormous scale, and the whole island was brought under its influence. But scarce and few must have been the opportunities for exchanging the thoughts and ideas, and domestic gossip and chit-chat, which now swell the leathern bags of the modern postman to overflowing!

"The Life of Sir Rowland Hill," the inventor of the penny post, may have enlightened the younger generation as to the increase of letters since the days of their grandmothers, when franks were eagerly sought from members of the Houses of Parliament, and letters were so expensive a luxury that no one cared to pay for them—oftener than need, absolute need, required.

Now, every facility is given for the pen of the ready writer to exercise the gift. To the high-born lady who writes to wile away ten minutes of *ennui* on her thick sheet of ivory note, to the poor girl in service who hopes "these few lines will find her mother well, as they leave her at present," sending the letter off is so easy, that in neither case is there any hesitation in writing it. No doubt, the very facility of despatch increases the number of daily letters many thousandfold. And is this to our gain or our loss? It is well to look at a picture in every light, and to be sure of our position; to see the brightness and the shadow with impartial clearness, if it is possible; so let us try to do this with posts and letters.

I think we are all agreed that the carefully-written and well-thought-out letters of a Cowper or a Newton, the fatherly counsels of Legh Richmond and Simeon—nay, the gossipy but *naïve* descriptive epistles of Horace Walpole, are a thing of the past. These are not the type of the budget which, with unflinching regularity, the postman of to-day delivers in the early morning, at mid-day, and in the evening. In rain or shine, in snow or fiercest heat, the modern postman knows no respite; and year by year the circulation of letters is increasing.

It would be a curious task for one of the good Fairies of olden story to separate the mass of letters at a post-office received in the course of a single day at any of our large towns or cities into heaps, and, by the touch of her wand, separate the necessary from the unnecessary letters—those which *must* have been written, those that *might* have been written, and those which had better never have been written at all.

Of the first of these there would doubtless be a goodly heap, large enough in itself to make the penny postage of to-day a thing to be thankful for. Letters of business which require answers, letters of affection from parents to children—from children to parents—letters of information, letters of inquiry, and, alas! letters, too, which are the bulletins from a sick-room—a preparation, perhaps, for the telegram which is so soon to follow!—letters which raise hopes, and are welcome as flowers in May, letters which put out hope, and are as the darkening of the sun of our very life—bad news that must be told, good news which it is a joy to read; letters of true sympathy and friendly interest in the work, the health, the well-being of a friend, with well-chosen remarks on the topics of the day, in politics, art, and literature—surely letters such as these must go into the heap of those which were *necessary* and good to write.

But this heap, which we are picturing as lying in one room of the Post Office, would be small when compared to the unnecessary heap which the magician's wand has separated from the rest.

Here we find letters addressed to those who may happen to be our "grumbling blocks," in which are to be found a long list of small grievances, and complaints, and worries.

All these grow by the telling, and magnify by the writing to an enormous extent. How often have we all written such, and before the letter was on its flight could have wished to recal it!

There, too, are gossiping letters—family chronicles of "small beer" or trivial incidents, foolish stories of faults and failings, supposed extravagance in our friends. Perhaps the report of the ill-doing of somebody's only son—in which the pen of the writer of these unnecessary letters delight! If a guest leaves the house, it is a signal for describing her—her dress, what she said, what

she did, how untidy in her room and habits, or how precise and particular, what she ate and what she did not eat. A little praise may be mingled with this; but the grace of the hostess is for ever marred, if it should filter round that she posts three or four sheets of this dissection to some relation or intimate friend, as soon as the subject of it is fairly gone. Gossiping tongues are a sad evil; but I am not sure that gossiping pens are not a greater. Words that are written are mightier than words that are spoken. When the thought is once in black and white it may work untold mischief. And here, by the way, let us protest against a too common practice of sending letters to be read by others than those to whom they were addressed. Sometimes a few lines are scored out, and the very fact of the scoring out quickens curiosity. The sheet is perhaps held up to the window, and the words are partly visible. A half-truth is worse than a lie, and it is the half-truth which is sometimes thus sent floating like a poisonous seed to do its work!

Then there are the letters which cause needless trouble, and cannot, therefore, be consigned to the *necessary* heap. Some one is in dire distress for a cook or a housemaid; instantly a letter is despatched to a friend to prosecute immediate inquiries for the right person. The friend energetically does her best, is full of her success, and writes by return of post to say so. Meantime the need has been supplied, a treasure has been secured, and a letter crosses the one written, after some trouble, and in haste for the post, begs that no more trouble should be taken.

It is the same with lodgings and furnished houses; and more especially those who live in watering-places are subject to this class of unnecessary letters. An entreaty from an anxious mother to find clean and comfortable lodgings for herself and an unlimited number of children, with an incredible amount of luggage, is promptly attended to. Innumerable stairs are climbed, innumerable landladies interviewed and worn out and tired, a history, after great effort, of probable success at No. 2, Sea View Terrace, is reported, covering several sheets of note-paper. Alas! long before the letter reaches its destination another is written beseeching that no trouble may be taken about lodgings, as it is discovered that there has been a case of scarlet-fever at Sandsea, and Clevedon was considered more healthy.

I once heard a lecturer on "The Days of Swift" say that if "those times had their drawbacks, at least they were free from the horrible infliction of post-cards, coming in a vicious shower to irritate and annoy." Post-cards are useful enough, but alas! a great many little fidgets are thought worth the outlay of a half-penny which are not considered quite worth the expenditure of a penny! This humility is amusing, and there is some-

thing *piquant* in the habit of some people who make post-card correspondence a speedy, if telegraphic, style, with a French word introduced here and there, for the purpose of puzzling a too curious footman. Surely thousands of post-cards may be despatched to the heap of clearly unnecessary correspondence.

The third heap may be, and we hope is, infinitely smaller. In this, of course, lie anonymous letters, which are, we trust, rare as they are intolerable. Such offences against good taste are seldom perpetrated. There are letters written in angry haste, or letters full of passionate reproach; there are letters which distil poison, and, read between the lines, are as sad as they are sinful; there are cruel shafts tipped with venom, which strike deep and wound some faithful heart with a wound no human power can cure. These letters may go to the heap of those which ought never to have been written, and let us hope their number is lessening year by year.

And as we think of letters and of posts, most of us can recal a heap untouched by the Fairy's wand, which we keep in a quiet treasure-house, all our own. Old letters which we prize, and to which we turn, when the present is hard and barren, for refreshing, as from perennial streams;—letters which, as we read them, recal the day when we read them first—a day when youth was in its prime and our hearts were set to the song of joy and gladness.

Letters from those who have crossed the stream and entered through the gates into the City. As we read their words, the cold silence which lies between us and our dead seems broken, and once more they speak and we hear. Letters, too, from those who loved us once, but who, in the press and hurry of life, have drifted far from us. But though they love us no longer, they loved us once. And however weak, nay, foolish, it may be, we like to read these letters—a living witness that the hand which wrote, and the heart that dictated them, was ours once, and that the past was not wholly a dream.

Letters in clear round text-hand—the first from a child we love; letters in feeble irregular characters—the last we ever received from a dear friend. Letters which bring back the music of boyish laughter which is silent now—of girlish happiness which is lost in the deafening strife of the noisy world. Letters which tell of that sweet interchange of thought and interest, which is the charm of correspondence, and without that charm the very word has no meaning. We may have many to whom we write a letter, but there can be only an inner circle of correspondents. The former may be, as we have seen, reduced to our own and our friend's absolute gain—the latter, we may hope, to continue while life lasts, and earthly love flows in a fuller, deeper stream, as it draws near, to lose itself in the great ocean of eternal love.

The old Roman posting-station struck the key-note of these thoughts about letters. Let me sound it once more, before it sinks into silence. From the whispering beech woods I seem to hear a voice from a letter written long, long ago—a letter which was older than the time when the Roman chariot swept along the Via Viridariensis, and the queenlike dark-haired women, who were exiles from the sunny land of Italy, thought tenderly of those they left there, and wondered if the post, signalled from the hill crest, would bring them tidings of their friends, from the city of the Seven Hills. I hear that voice sounding along the stream of time, "*Ye are our epistles known and read of all men.*" Yes, if we are living epistles of love, and purity, and truth, we may be very sure that our letters in pen-and-ink shall be such as may be safely added to the many which are written in the present, and have been written in the past, of which it may be said, that they are as streams from a pure fountain, for refreshment and healing to those who read, from those who write them.

EMMA MARSHALL.

“BEHOLD, HE PRAYETH.”

“Arise, and go into the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus: for, behold, he prayeth.”—ACTS IX. 11.

I

A SINNER, wrestling in his guilt,
 “Forgive, Thou canst, Lord, if Thou wilt,
 Whose life-blood for my soul was spilt” :—
 Behold, he prays.

2

A child, compelled by love to press
 Still nearer to Thy holiness,
 Who cries “ Bless me, my Father, bless” :—
 Behold, he prays.

3

A saint, whose heart's compassions yearn
 To see the prodigal's return
 And lost ones all Thy mercy learn :—
 Behold, he prays.

4

A sufferer beneath the cross,
 Whose gold is daily fined from dross,
 The while he proves the world is loss :—
 Behold, he prays.

5

A wayfarer whose course is run,
 The Jordan flushed at set of sun,
 And blessèd Canaan almost won :—
 Behold, he prays.

6

Oh, voice of prayer ! Oh, voice of song
 Borne through the gates of heaven along !
 Amid the everlasting throng :—
 Behold, he prays.

E. H. BICKERSTETH.

Written at Damascus, April 3, 1881.

Reviews.

The Holy Bible with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation. Edited by F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter. New Testament. Volume III.: Romans to Philemon. 844 pp. John Murray. 1881.

THE third volume of this valuable work, a work remarkable for its learning and its labour, appears opportunely with the Revised Version of the New Testament. Theological students, whether of the laity or of the clergy—and we are thankful to believe that the number of laymen who are painstaking students of God's Holy Word has been steadily increasing of late years—may compare the renderings of the "Speaker's Commentary" with those of the Revised Version. Whatever else in equity should be said of the noble Commentary published by Mr. Murray, the volumes of which now form an imposing and honoured shelf of one's library, concerning its scholarship, never paraded, but throughout gratefully perceived, or its ability in unfolding the results of long-continued reverent research, there can hardly anywhere be two opinions. The volume before us, the third volume of the New Testament, containing an exposition of the sacred writings from Romans to Philemon, is—as a whole, we think, of equal merit with its predecessors. The Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John, written by Canon Westcott, gave to the volume which contained it a peculiar interest and importance; and, in regard to that Commentary, on which, at the time of its appearance, heartiest commendation was bestowed in *THE CHURCHMAN*, we may take the opportunity to remark that, in proportion as we have studied it, we have admired its richness, both as regards the needs of the devout inquirer and the objections of the sceptic. In the volume before us, the commentators are Dr. E. H. Gifford, Canon Evans, the Rev. Joseph Waite, the Deans of Chester and Raphoe, the Bishops of Derry and London, and Prebendary Meyrick. For the present we must limit our remarks to the two portions of the volume which we have had leisure to examine—viz., the Epistle to the Romans, by Dr. Gifford, and the Epistle to the Galatians, by Dean Howson.

In his Introduction, Dr. Gifford has a special section on "The Law." Quoting Origen's remark, ". . . *Si quando igitur Mosis legem nominat, solitum nomini preemittit Articulum . . .*" he proceeds to enquire whether, admitting that where the law of Moses is meant, νόμος usually has the article prefixed, there are any exceptional cases which cannot be explained on any known principle: does St. Paul use νόμος and ὁ νόμος indifferently to signify the law of Moses? Quoting, again, Mr. Green's "Grammar of the New Testament Dialect," as to the principle of the general rule for the insertion or the omission of the article, Dr. Gifford points out that, in regard to St. Paul's use of the word νόμος, Mr. Green is not consistent. Mr. Green, however, goes so far as to say that St. Paul has been "precise with respect to the article in those passages . . . where any ambiguity was undesirable." Let this statement, then, be contrasted with the comments of Dean Alford on Rom. ii. 12, ff. Dean Alford affirms that in οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου (A. V., "the hearers of the law," R. V., "the hearers of a law") νόμος is indisputably, as elsewhere, "the law of Moses." Bishop Ellicott, in his Commentary on Galatians, adopted Dean Alford's views, while Bishop Lightfoot agrees with Mr. Green, Dr. Westcott, and Dean Vaughan.

It may be observed in passing, as we have the R. V. before us, that the view expressed in the writings of Ellicott and Alford has not given way, in certain passages, to the view expressed in the writings of Lightfoot, Westcott, and Vaughan. In Philipp. iii. 5, Ellicott's Commentary gives "in respect of the law (of Moses) a pharisee," while Lightfoot's has—"law," not *the law*; for though the Mosaic law is meant, it is here regarded in the abstract as a principle of action, being co-ordinate with $\xi\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\mu$." In this verse the R. V. has—"as touching the law, a pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the church; as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless." In Galat. ii. 19, the R. V. has—"I through the law died unto the law," but gives "law" in the margin. In Rom. ii. 13, as we have pointed out, instead of "hearers of the law" (A. V.) we read in the R. V. "hearers of a law." Dr. Gifford renders "hearers of law," thus, verses 12, 13:—

For as many as have sinned without law [so, correctly, in the Authorized Version] shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned with law shall be judged by law. For not they who are hearers of law shall be just before God, but the doers of law shall be justified.

Having referred to the distinctly opposite opinions in regard to νόμος maintained by eminent commentators, Dr. Gifford remarks that a further investigation of the case is clearly necessary. He therefore examines (1) the usage in the Septuagint, (2) in the New Testament generally, and (3) in St. Paul's Epistles. The question is, whether νόμος *without* the article, is ever used, like ὁ νόμος, simply as a Proper Name of "the law" of Moses. No such use, he says, is found in the LXX., Apocrypha, Gospels, Acts, or Catholic Epistles. As to St. Paul's Epistles, Rom. iii. 31, may be taken as a crucial text: "*Do we then make νόμον of none effect? . . . nay, we establish νόμον.*" Dean Alford says, "*not law, but THE LAW, the law of God given by Moses.*" But Dr. Gifford asks whether we can really believe that St. Paul meant, "*we establish the law*" of Moses? And he quotes Gal. ii. 18, with Dean Alford's commentary on it, against "reasserting the obligation of the Law."¹

Dr. Gifford renders verse 21, "Apart from law a righteousness of God has been manifested"; v. 28, "For we deem that man is justified by faith apart from works of law"; v. 31, "Do we then make law of none effect through faith? Nay, we establish law." Quoting Bishop Lightfoot ("*Revision of the New Testament,*" p. 99) . . . "behind the concrete representation—the Mosaic law itself—St. Paul sees an imperious principle . . ." Dr. Gifford adds that "law" assumes the form of an imperious principle opposed to grace and liberty only when it is viewed as the condition of justification, the means of attaining righteousness before God through the merit of good works. Viewed according to its true idea "law" is "holy, just, and good" (vii. 10, 12, 14).

¹ On iii. 31, we may quote from that valuable work, *Haldane on the Romans*, (vol. i. p. 297):—

V. 31, *Do we, then, make void law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish law.* From the doctrine of justification by faith alone, which the Apostle had been declaring, it might be supposed that the law of God was made void. This consequence might be drawn from the conclusion, that a man is justified by faith, without any respect to his obedience to law. This the Apostle denies, and on the contrary asserts, that by his doctrine the law is established. The article is here wanting before law, indicating that the reference is not to the legal dispensation, or to the Books of Moses, as in the last clause of verse 21, but to the general law of God, whether written or unwritten.

To turn now to the Commentary. In chap. i. v. 5, instead of "for obedience to the faith" (*margin*. A. V., "to the obedience of faith"), Dr. Gifford renders, "for obedience to faith": not, as in Acts vi. 7, "to the faith"—*i.e.*, to the gospel or doctrine of the faith—for the Greek Article is here omitted:—

Obedience to faith is man's surrender of himself in mind and heart to faith as the principle and power, "the organic law," of the new life in Christ.

Margin: "to the obedience of faith." But the meaning "obedience to faith" is confirmed by the similar phrases "obedience to the faith" (Acts vi. 7); "obey the gospel" (Rom. x. 16, 2 Thess. i. 8); and the construction of the genitive is not unusual: compare "in obeying the truth," lit. "*in the obedience of the truth*" (Pet. i. 22), and "the obedience of (*i.e.*, to) Christ" (2 Cor. x. 5).

The Revised Version, we may remark, renders the words (i. 5) *εις υπακοήν πίστεως* "unto obedience of faith," and in the margin, "to the faith." In 1 Peter i. 22, *ἐν τῇ υπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας*, the Revised Version renders, "in your obedience to the truth," and in 2 Cor. x. 5, we find the R. V. adhering to the A. V., "obedience of Christ."

Of the 17th verse, "therein is the righteousness of God revealed" (R. V., "therein is revealed a righteousness of God"), we find the following exposition:—

Therein is the righteousness of God revealed. Compare Ps. xcvi. 2, "*The Lord hath made known his salvation: his righteousness hath he openly showed* (Marg., "revealed," Sept., *ἀπεκάλυψεν τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ*, Vulg., "revelavit") *in the sight of the heathen.*" St. Paul's reference to this passage is made evident by his adoption in verses 16, 17 of the Psalmist's three chief words, "salvation" "righteousness," "revealed," and of the parallelism between "salvation" (verse 16) and "righteousness" "revealed," and of the parallelism between "salvation" (verse 16) and "righteousness" (verse 17).

the righteousness of God.] Rather, "a righteousness of God." This term occurring in a summary statement of the great theme of the Epistle is more likely to be used in a comprehensive than in a restricted sense. We must, therefore, be content at present to define its meaning only so far as it is determined by the form of the expression, by the immediate context, and by St. Paul's previous usage. We thus find that it is a righteousness having God as its author and man as its recipient, who by it becomes righteous; its effect is salvation, and its condition faith; it is embodied first in the person of Christ, "*who is made unto us wisdom from God and righteousness*" (1 Cor. i. 30), and it is bestowed on us because of Christ's redeeming work, wherein He "*was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*" (2 Cor. v. 21). See more in Notes on iii. 21-25.

To the men who listen to the Gospel without faith, continues Dr. Gifford, the righteousness of God is not therein revealed, but remains hidden: "to him who listens with faith, the righteousness of God begins to be therein revealed, and its progressive revelation tends to produce a higher degree of faith as its result."

On chapter vi. verse 2, Dr. Gifford remarks that the tense must be rightly rendered, "we that died" (not, as in A. V., *are dead*). It is a mere truism to say that to live in sin is inconsistent with a continued and present deadness to its influence. What the Apostle means is that to live in sin is inconsistent with *having once died* to it. Of the statement that each true believer, at some particular period, or moment of time, *died to sin*, Dr. Gifford's exposition is scarcely satisfactory; or rather, perhaps, we should say, scarcely clear enough. His views on the doctrine of justification by faith are sound; and on the Atonement he writes plainly and precisely. But St. Paul's expression, "died to sin," as we understand it, refers to the believer's death to the *guilt* of sin; not, *i.e.*, to sanctification, but to justification. To explain the expression as

having reference to freedom from the *power* of sin confuses the Apostle's argument. It is WITH CHRIST that the Christian "died to sin." And it seems of high importance to bring out this truth with clearness.

On verse 4, *in newness of life* (ζωῆς) the distinction between βίος and ζωή (Trench, N. T. Syn.), the life that is lived day by day, and, the life which liveth in us, is well brought out.

In regard to baptism, Dr. Gifford's exposition appears to us to lack precision. He makes a remark, indeed, concerning the difference between infant baptism in a Christian country, and adult baptism among heathens. But upon vi. 3, he says that "the union with Christ in baptism is expressly ascribed to all who are baptized, because it is a gift of God bestowed freely on all, *though from its very nature dependent on a right use for its continued efficacy.*" The italics, of course, are our own. If all who are baptized, really died with Christ to sin, according to St. Paul's "express" statement, they therefore did all, as it is "expressly" stated by St. Paul, really rise with Christ. Yet St. Paul teaches—Dr. Gifford refers to one passage—that Christians were raised with Christ *through the faith of the operation of God* (Coloss. ii. 12). An explanation of his words—"a gift of God," "the union with Christ in baptism"—is what we desiderate.

Dr. Gifford's remarks on viii. 29, ff, are marked by the reverence of Hooker's wise caution (i. ii. 2.) He remarks as against "Calvin, Leighton, Haldane," that "*foreknew*" must not be taken as equivalent to "*foreordained.*" Quoting i Pet. i. 2, "elect according to the foreknowledge of God," he observes that Scripture keeps distinct, foreknowledge and election. Augustine remarks that there can be no predestination without foreknowledge, but they may be foreknowledge without predestination. Other remarks are quoted. Whether readers agree or disagree with the observations of the pious and learned Commentator on this passage, they will not fail to recognize the sense and judgment with which he writes.

Turning now to the Epistle to the Galatians we regret the lack of time which prevents us from doing justice to the Dean of Chester's labours, in his commentary upon it. We had marked several passages for quotation, but we can only touch upon a few points, here and there, with a very brief reference to the revised translation, by the eminent Commentator, which is exceedingly good.

In i. 6, the Dean points out that "*another Gospel*" is "a different kind of Gospel" (the R. V. we observe has "a different Gospel"); in v. 13, he gives the more precise—"ye *heard* of my conduct" (manner of life),—v. 14, "and made progress in Judaism" (not as in A. V., *profited* in.) On v. 15, God *separated* Paul . . . the Dean remarks that it is an essential part of the Apostle's argument that from the first moment of his existence God's free choice and grace made him what he was. As in his "predestination" from the first, so in his "effectual calling," when the appointed time came, all was of God's free and gracious agency.

In ii. 3, for "but neither Titus . . ." we have, "But not even was Titus . . .;" and the Dean on this verse remarks that St. Paul always has regard to the future, and to the continuity of true Gospel principles. In v. 11, instead of "because he was to be blamed," the true translation is given, "because he was condemned,"—*i.e.*, his very conduct palpably carried its own condemnation. The force of the Greek participle in v. 14 is brought out:—"being a Jew by birth" (a Jew to *begin with*), compare Acts xvi. 20. In v. 17 we find the right rendering—"If while seeking (while we sought) to be justified in (not, *by*) Christ, we ourselves also were found sinners" (not, *are found*, as in A. V.). The tense should be observed, as in the verse before, "we believed" (not *have* believed); the tense points to a definite time. On verses 19-21, which Bengel terms *summa*

ac medulla Christianismi, the Dean's comments appear to us rather too brief. He does not show in v. 19 that the tense is still the same; *I died, not am dead*. He prefers *law* (law in general) to *the Law*: *For I through law died to law*. A valuable Note on St. Paul's journeys to Jerusalem closes the comments on the second Chapter: a Note on Agar appears at the end of Chapter iv.

On iv. 13, Dr. Howson explains the "infirmity of the flesh"; *an attack of bodily illness*. Taking the correct text, he renders "your temptation which was in my flesh"; the malady from which St. Paul suffered while he first preached the Gospel to them, was to them a temptation.

On v. 17, the Dean gives the exact translation—*in order that ye may not do the things that ye would*." The true rendering of vi. 11, is given, "See with what large letters!" the reference being to the size of the characters in which the Apostle was writing.

To the present notice of the third volume of "The Speaker's Commentary," we may add that a charming exposition of the Epistle to Philemon, by the Bishop of Derry, forms its concluding pages.

The Communicant: A Manual of Devotions for Holy Communion. Edited by W. O. PURTON, Rector of Kingston-by-Sea. Elliot Stock. 1881.

WE welcome this little volume with cordial thankfulness. It is a joint production. The contributors are among the most distinguished and beloved of those who do honour to the Church of England. Their separate opinions on any point of Sacred Truth would be entitled to the utmost respect. But we have here their combined judgment on one of our blessed Sacraments. Commanding authority therefore belongs to this treatise.

It appears, too, at a time when minds have been sadly perplexed, and grievously misled by erroneous notions. Of late the grossest superstitions have defiled the Sacred Institution which is its subject. Hence the writers—the topic—and the seasonableness, strongly claim most earnest attention. It is now our happy task to lead our readers to its most instructive contents. It commences with a pertinent enquiry as to the intention of this Holy Institution:—What thoughts occupied the great Redeemer's heart when in the plenitude of His love and wisdom He ordained this Rite? The reply is here given in the clearest terms. It is taken from the lips of the blessed Jesus. It is reiterated by numerous quotations from our inimitable Liturgy. It is briefly comprised in the words of that admirable compendium of Divinity—the Church Catechism. All authority then combines to state that the Rite is commemorative—ordained with the purport of keeping the expiating Sacrifice of the Lord Jesus constantly before the eye of faith. It is the desire of our blessed Lord ever to dwell in our adoring hearts, and to occupy the central position of our affections, and to be encircled by the embraces of our love. It was to promote this object that He ordained this Rite, and commanded its perpetual observance. For such design can we be sufficiently thankful? But the purpose expands beyond this thought. The commemorative Rite is moreover a spiritual Feast. As our bodies are strengthened by the bread and wine, which are the emblems here selected, so our souls are spiritually regaled and nourished in this ordinance. In spirit we hear the invitation—"Eat, O friends; drink, yea drink abundantly, O Beloved." We obey. We enter the banquet-house of love, and we retire bold in faith and strong in the Saviour's grace to

fight the good fight of faith, and to show ourselves Christ's faithful soldiers and servants unto our lives' end. These are the purposes which are here luminously exhibited.

Others might have been adjoined. For instance, this Rite has the especial significance of manifesting the holy fellowship of Christ's little flock, and their exhibition to the world as one with the Lord and with each other. But this hand-book wisely limits its teaching to the main purposes of commemoration and conveyance of grace. To confirm this statement, we give the following quotation from the work itself:—

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, therefore, according to the Scriptures, was instituted for "a continual remembrance" of the Saviour's atoning death. It is our "duty to receive the Communion in remembrance of the sacrifice of His death, as He Himself hath commanded." And this holy ordinance is commanded to be used and continued until the Lord Himself shall come.

But further, the Holy Communion is not a mere commemoration; it is a *Feast*. At the Lord's Table believers "feed on the banquet" of heavenly food.

In the Exhortation before the Sacramental Service, we read that "it is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that He has given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our *spiritual food and sustenance* in that holy Sacrament." And likewise in the Exhortation to communicants we read that, "If with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament . . . the benefit is great . . . for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood."

This first portion concludes with an appropriate Hymn.

The second portion directs our attention to the importance of devout preparation. For the purpose of becoming meet recipients, we are invited to meditation on seven most striking texts: each meditation is followed by a prayer. This is hallowed ground. It would border on sacrilege here to extend the hand of criticism. Let it suffice to say, that we have here the feelings of hearts conversant with God. The commixture with these thoughts can scarcely fail, by God's blessing, to raise us far above earth. We extract the following as confirmatory of this statement:—

How shall I prepare for the Holy Table? How shall I commemorate the dying love of my Lord and Saviour, and not be filled with thankfulness and praise? I would seek with sorrow to acknowledge *all my sins*; but with joy I would try to remember *all His benefits*. This is a matter only between myself and my God. "A stranger doth not intermeddle with" my joy. I have opened my heart to the Lord; I have told Him of my sins, my sorrows, my infirmities. He knoweth all concerning me. But He hath unfolded to me the riches of His grace, in His kindness towards us, through Christ Jesus: "In whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins." "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God." "I know whom I have believed." "My Beloved is mine, and I am His."

A prayer of a soul not firmly established in the faith is here introduced: the portion then concludes with suitable thoughts for self-examination.

The third portion takes us directly to the Service so admirably constructed in our Liturgy. In this division we find suitable meditations and prayers before and after the reception of the emblematic bread and wine. We will only say that the devout recipient will here find help for more intelligent reception and more devout thanksgiving. This head concludes with eight hymns—the most precious and inspiring of our Sacramental collections.

We need scarcely say that fervent thanksgiving next finds its place. These Thanksgivings are three in number, each full of unction, and will

help the soul to ascend in adoration to the throne of grace. The following passage is a specimen extracted from the second :—

As the children of Israel in Egypt ate the Paschal lamb which had been slain, the blood of which sprinkled on the lintel and door-posts protected the first-born from the sword of the destroying angel, and as the worshippers at the temple ate the peace-offerings which had been sacrificed, and the blood of which had been sprinkled on the altar to make atonement for the soul, even so thou, O my soul, in the Holy Supper eatest by faith the body of Christ, in which He bare thy sins on the tree, and drinkest His blood which He shed on the cross to be a ransom to deliver thee from going down to the pit. And as in the Paschal lamb and peace-offerings the sacrifice preceded and the feast followed, so also it is here, as saith St. Paul, "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the feast." At this heavenly feast thou hast been, O my soul, a welcome guest; thou hast fed upon the fruit of the death and passion of thy Lord, which is pardon and peace, strength and vigour, joy and gladness. When thou didst eat the bread and drink the wine, thou didst not approach to an altar where a sacrifice is offered for the propitiation of thy sins—Christ having by one offering perfected for ever them that are sanctified; but thou didst approach to a table on which a supper—a feast of fat things and of wines on the lees well refined—a feast of all the blessings which the fulness of Christ supplies—was spread before thee. Thou hast seen also pledges of God's love and good-will towards thee. In this Sacrament thou hast been assured that as He spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for thy offences, so with Him He will freely give thee all things.

We thus reach the last portion of this devout Manual. It consists of some valuable thoughts on the expression of the service, "Sacrifice of Praise and thanksgiving," and finally, on the important words, "Ye do show forth the Lord's death till He come."

We trust that this outline will induce our readers to study this invaluable little work. It is thoroughly unctious and devout. It is enlightened and heart-stirring, and studiously avoids all allusions to controverted points. Such allusions might have ruffled rather than have calmed the spirit at this solemn time of service. But still we regard its present appearance as most seasonable. It indirectly, but not the less forcibly, gives solemn protest against the tendency which has recently appeared to mar the simplicity, and thus to diminish the solemnity of this holy rite. The feature which is so very conspicuous in the Service is its pure simplicity and utter freedom from all low and sensuous adjuncts. In this treatise nothing is introduced but what tends to exhibit this simplicity. Different, indeed, is this from the childish and therefore irreverent display, against which a Bishop of the Northern Province has recently protested in words of scathing contempt! He speaks of a multitude of Ritualistic acts as "distracting the mind instead of concentrating it, awakening sensuous feelings rather than spiritual ones, and preventing a discerning of the Lord's Body, while bells were tinkling, and censers were swinging, and acolytes were flitting about on their errands, now on the one side, and now on the other, and the priest was saying his office so rapid and in such under-tones that he could not be heard; and they were invited now to cross—now to genuflect—and almost to prostrate themselves."

We welcome this Manual as containing in itself an indirect protest against such profanation of the holy Rite. We cannot recommend it too strongly for frequent use. It would be well for each Clergyman to place a copy in the hands of the candidates whom he presents for Confirmation, and whom he is preparing for their first Communion. It would be too, a valuable present to the Teachers of the upper classes in Sunday Schools. It is adapted to advance the cause of real religion, and as such we hope that God's abundant blessing may rest upon it.

H. LAW.

Companion to the Revised Version of the English New Testament. By ALEX. ROBERTS, D.D., Professor of Humanity, St. Andrews. pp. 160. Cassell, Petter & Galpin.

Lectures on Bible Revision. With an Appendix containing the chief Historical Editions of the English Bible. By SAMUEL NEWTH, M.A., D.D., Principal, and Lee Professor of Divinity, New College, London. pp. 240. Hodder & Stoughton.

DR. ROBERTS, and Dr. Newth, are Members of the New Testament Company of Revisers. The volumes before us therefore have a peculiar interest. They are well written and will no doubt be widely read.

Professor Newth has given a list of the members of the American Companies; and as we gave a list of the English Companies in the last CHURCHMAN, the Professor's list may well here be quoted:—

THE OLD TESTAMENT COMPANY.

Professor T. J. Conant, Baptist, Brooklyn, New York.
 Professor G. E. Day, Congregationalist, New Haven, Conn.
 Professor J. De Witt, Reformed Church, New Brunswick, N.J.
 Professor W. H. Green, Presbyterian, Princeton, N.J.
 Professor G. E. Hare, Episcopalian, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Professor C. P. Krauth, Lutheran, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Professor, Joseph Packard, Episcopalian, Fairfax, Va.
 Professor, C. E. Stowe, Congregationalist, Cambridge, Mass.
 Professor J. Strong, Methodist, Madison, N.J.
 Professor C. V. Van Dyke,¹ Beirut, Syria.
 Professor T. Lewis, Reformed Church, Schenectady, N.J.
 In all eleven members.

THE NEW TESTAMENT COMPANY.

Professor Ezra Abbot, Unitarian, Cambridge, Mass.
 Dr. G. R. Crooks, Methodist, New York.
 Professor H. B. Hackett, Baptist, Rochester, N.Y.
 Professor J. Hadley, Congregationalist, New Haven, Conn.
 Professor C. Hodge, Presbyterian, Princeton, N.J.
 Professor A. C. Kendrick, Baptist, Rochester, N.Y.
 Dr. Alfred Lee, Bishop of Delaware.
 Professor M. B. Riddle, Reformed Church, Hartford, Conn.
 Professor Philip Schaff, Presbyterian, New York.
 Professor C. Short, Episcopalian, New York.
 Professor H. B. Smith, Presbyterian, New York.
 Professor J. H. Thayer, Congregationalist, Andover, Mass.
 Professor W. F. Warren, Methodist, Boston, Mass.
 Dr. E. A. Washburn, Episcopalian, New York.
 Dr. T. D. Woolsey, Congregationalist, New Haven, Conn.
 In all fifteen members.

Four Members have since been added to the Old Testament Company; namely:—

Professor C. A. Aiken, Presbyterian, Princeton, N.J.
 Dr. T. W. Chambers, Reformed Church, New York.
 Professor C. M. Mead, Congregationalist, Andover, Mass.
 Professor H. Osgood, Baptist, Rochester, N.Y.

One Member, Professor T. Lewis, has been removed by death.

¹ Corresponding Member.

Four Members have been added to the New Testament Company:—

Dr. J. K. Burr, Methodist, Trenton, N.Y.

Dr. T. Chase, Baptist, President of Haverford College, Pa.

Dr. H. Crosby, Baptist, Chancellor of New York University.

Professor Timothy Dwight, Congregationalist, New Haven, Conn.

Four also have been removed by death, Dr. Hackett, Dr. Hadley, Dr. C. Hodge, Dr. H. B. Smith; and two by resignation, Dr. Crooks and Dr. Warren.

“It hence results,” says Professor Newth, “that altogether ninety-nine scholars have, to a greater or less extent, taken part in the work of this revision, forty-nine of whom have been members of the Episcopalian Churches of England, Scotland, Ireland, and America, and fifty members of other Christian Churches. This fact is in itself full of interest and significance. Upon no previous revision have so many scholars been engaged. In no previous revision has the co-operation of those who were engaged upon it been so equally diffused over all the parts of the work. In no previous revision have those who took the lead in originating it, and carrying it forward, shown so large a measure of Christian confidence in scholars who were outside of their own communion. In no previous revision have such effective precautions been created by the very composition of the body of Revisers, against accidental oversight, or against any lurking bias that might arise from natural tendencies or from ecclesiastical prepossessions.¹ On these accounts alone, if on no other, this revision may be fairly said to possess peculiar claims upon the confidence of all thoughtful and devout readers of the Bible.”

“The Companion” is divided into two parts; the first discussing the changes arising from an amended text, the second, the changes arising from an amended translation. We quote a specimen passage from the first portion of the work, in which Dr. Roberts treats the new rendering of 1 Pet. iii. 5, “sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord”:—

The departure here made from the Authorized Version . . . amounts to nothing less than the identification of *Christ* and *Jehovah*. For, as all admit, the Apostle here borrows his language from Isa. viii. 13, where we read “Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself.” Since, therefore, the language made use of in the Old Testament with respect to Jehovah is here applied by St. Peter to Christ, there could not be a clearer attestation to the deity of our Redeemer than that which is furnished by this passage as read in the Revised Version. And the necessity of the change here made in the text admits of no question. For the reading of the Authorized Version there are only a few manuscripts and Fathers; while for that of the Revised there are all the great Uncials, several of the Fathers, and all the best versions.

From the concluding pages of the work we may quote the following concerning the correction in the R. V. of needless variations in the translation of the same Greek words:—

After all that has been said, no sufficient idea will have been conveyed to readers unacquainted with the subject of the vast amount of unnecessary variation in the translation of the same Greek words which exist in the

¹ Referring to the English Companies, Professor Newth says:—“It will be seen that of the sixty-five English scholars who have taken part in this work, forty-one have been members of the Church of England, and twenty-four members of other churches. Of the latter number two represent the Episcopal Church of Ireland, one the Episcopal Church of Scotland, four the Baptists, three the Congregationalists, five the Free Church of Scotland, five the Established Church of Scotland, one the United Presbyterians, one the Unitarians, and two the Wesleyan Methodists.

Authorized Version. Pages might be filled with additional examples. The most arbitrary and uncalled-for changes will frequently be found in the compass of a few verses, or even of the same verse. Thus, the word rendered "profession" in 1 Tim. vi. 12 is changed into "confession" in verse 13; "jailor," in Acts xvi. 23, gives place to "keeper of the prison" in verse 27. "God, even the Father," at Rom. xv. 6, &c., becomes "God and the Father" at Col. iii. 17, and "the God and Father" at 1 Pet. i. 3, &c. The word rendered "truth" in the parenthetical clause of 1 Tim. ii. 7 appears as "verity" at the close of the verse; and so on, in almost innumerable cases, the variations generally having no ground of advantage or necessity, and serving only to bewilder and mislead the English reader.

"The great object to be kept in view," says Dr. Roberts, "in every translation is to place the reader of it as nearly as possible on a footing of equality with one who has access to the original. This is especially desirable in regard to a version of the Holy Scriptures. Those who have the privilege of reading God's Word in the form in which it came from Himself ought to recognize it as their bounden duty to do their utmost that their less favoured brethren may have as exact and accurate a transcript of the original in their own language as can be furnished. To secure this object, scholarship may worthily put forth all its powers, and diligence strain its efforts to the uttermost. The plain man's Bible—though it cannot be all to him that the original is to the scholar—should, at least, contain no obscurities or errors which erudition and painstaking are able to remove. It should be such, for example, as that he shall have it in his power, through consistency of translation, to form an opinion respecting the questions discussed in connection with the verbal agreements and differences found in the first three Evangelists. It should be such that he will be able, by means of a Concordance, to compare passages in which the same word occurs, and thus to make them mutually explanatory of each other. For the reasons that have been stated this cannot be done with any certainty while using the ordinary English translation, since in it there is, on the one hand, an unnecessary confounding of one Greek word with another in the rendering which is given; while, on the other hand, there is a vast amount of needless variation in the translation of the same Greek words; but both these causes of possible, or certain, mistake have been guarded against in the Revised Version."

"Deliver Us from Evil." A Protest against the Change in the Last Petition of the Lord's Prayer, Adopted in the Revised Version. A Letter to the Bishop of London. By F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, late Preacher of Lincoln's Inn, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London, Editor of "The Speaker's Commentary." Pp. 16. John Murray.

EARLY in the present year Canon Cook was informed, to his extreme surprise and grief, that the Revisers of the Authorized Version had resolved to introduce an alteration "of vital importance" in the Lord's Prayer. He has found that the work is issued with that alteration, substituting "the evil one" for "evil" in the closing petition. He has observed, moreover, that the great importance of the change is recognized by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, who defended it in the speech addressed to the Upper House of Convocation. Canon Cook now writes :

Certainly no change likely to be adopted by men so learned, so high in the estimation of their fellow-Christians, could be proposed which would produce a more general and lively feeling of astonishment and pain—a change affecting the

prayer which bears the emphatic designation of the Lord's Prayer, in which every Christian sums up his deepest and most earnest petitions, in which the Church recognizes the model and law of her devotions.

Willing and ready as we are to accept the decisions of the Revisers on most points of pure scholarship and theological learning, on such a point as this all must be anxious to know on what grounds the correctness and the necessity of this alteration can be maintained. For my own part, after repeated and earnest inquiry, and, I must add, after consultation with scholars of the highest eminence, I have arrived at the deliberate conviction that its correctness is, to say the least, exceedingly doubtful, and its adoption by the Revisers indefensible.

I will endeavour, with all possible brevity, to state the grounds on which this conviction rests.

Canon Cook first considers the usage of the New Testament.

"The real question," he says, "is whether τοῦ πονηροῦ is masculine or neuter. 1. If it is certainly masculine, it is correctly rendered 'the evil one,' whether that evil one be a spiritual or human adversary. 2. If it is neuter, 'evil' is the only true rendering. 3. If, again, the gender is doubtful, a double rendering—one in the text, another in the margin—is admissible, or necessary.

"1. In support of the Revisers' amendment, we have the important fact that ὁ πονηρός, 'the evil one,' is a designation of Satan in the New Testament.

"Thus, in Matt. xiii. 19, we read, 'then cometh the evil one.'

"St. John, moreover, in his First Epistle, four times uses the masculine adjective, with the definite article, as equivalent to Satan.

"This leaves no doubt as to the admissibility of the rendering, when it is supported by the context; but it must be observed, first, that the Epistle of St. John was written more than half a century after the delivery of the parable in St. Matthew—i.e., at a time when the expression, taken from the exposition of the parable itself, had probably become idiomatic; and, secondly—a point of great importance—that St. John does not represent the evil one as a foe, or tyrant, from whom the Christian has to be delivered, but as an enemy whom even the young men have overcome (1 John ii. 13, 14), and who is powerful over those only who abandon themselves to his influence: ch. v. 18, 19. As for the Christian, St. John assures us, THAT EVIL ONE TOUCHETH HIM NOT.

2. "On the other hand, St. Paul uses the Greek word (τὸ πονηρόν), Rom. xii. 9, in the precise sense of 'evil': 'Abhor that which is evil,' lit. *abhorring evil*—i.e., wickedness. Τὸ πονηρόν is the antithesis to τὸ ἀγαθόν, τὸ καλὸν καὶ ὠφέλιμον.

"These are the only passages in the New Testament in which the gender is distinctly marked. They certainly do not settle the question, so far as the grammatical construction is concerned. We are free to choose that sense which is most in accordance with Scriptural teaching; in my opinion, it is that which fixes our mind upon the real point of spiritual danger,—the sinful thought, word, or act which alone gives access to 'the evil one,' from whom Christ has delivered every true child of God.

"3. We have now to consider the oblique cases (τοῦ πονηροῦ, and τῷ πονηρῷ) which occur in St. Matthew's Gospel.

"Ch. v. 37, 'Ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἔστιν. There the A. V. has 'cometh of 'evil.' The Revisers consistently give another rendering, 'is of the evil one' in the text, and relegate 'evil' to the margin; thus implying a dissentient minority.

"But to that alteration there is the formidable and, as it seems to me, insuperable objection that it must imply that every adjuration or oath is either prompted by Satan or originates with him, a view which it

"is scarcely conceivable that any devout reader of the Bible should adopt."¹

After discussing this point, Canon Cook proceeds to Matthew v. 39: *Μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ*. A. V. "Resist not evil." The Revisers, "*Resist not him that is evil.*" "Here is a point of considerable importance," he says, "that although the Revisers, and the generality of modern commentators, adopt the masculine adjective, they do not suppose that it refers to Satan. That would, in fact, be in direct opposition to Scriptural teaching. 'The evil one,' if a personal agent, is the man who inflicts the injury. Chrysostom, however, on whose authority special reliance is placed with regard to the petition in the Lord's Prayer, here brings in the personality of Satan; thereby materially weakening his authority as a sound expositor, especially on a point where he might be influenced by prevalent notions."

Further on, Canon Cook considers the witness of the Church as recorded in the writings of the Antenicene Fathers. "I do not," he says, "at all undervalue the witness borne by later Fathers,—among them stands foremost Chrysostom, in many respects the greatest expositor of the writings of the New Testament,—but it may be stated, without at all derogating from their legitimate authority, that they represent the views of their own age, which certainly differed in many subordinate points, especially in matters of exegesis and traditional interpretations, from those of the earlier Fathers. I would also observe that when we come to the writings of the fourth and fifth centuries we find a marked difference in representations of the relative positions of Christians and the arch-enemy. The earlier Fathers agree, as I believe, with the Scriptural view, which looks upon him as an enemy who has been expelled from the precincts of the Church, whom the Christian as such opposes, resists, and overcomes, armed as St. Paul describes him in the panoply of faith, and safe under the protection of his Lord. But after the absorption of great masses into the visible Church, the most earnest and influential Fathers recognized Satan as an enemy within the camp, leading captive many a redeemed soul, and as such the object of deprecatory petitions. The prayer 'deliver us from that evil one' might then be of intense interest. Certainly in Chrysostom's time, whether in voluptuous Antioch or in Constantinople, the centre and home of Antichristian influences, he and all devout hearers might naturally use it or inculcate its use. Still even then, so far as I can call to mind, the public prayers, and probably the private devotions of Christians, were not offered for deliverance from Satan, as having the mastery or dominant influence over them, but for protection from his devices, from the assaults of his instruments and agents, and from the subtle temptations addressed to man's lower nature."

We have touched upon the chief points in this able argument, and have quoted several passages. The pamphlet contains many striking quotations, and it deserves to be read with most serious attention. For ourselves, we must confess that, in the main, we are inclined to agree with its eminent Author.

¹ In "The Speaker's Commentary," we may remark, on Matt. v. 37, Dean Mansel wrote thus:

37. *Cometh of evil.*] In the original *is of the evil*. It seems most natural to interpret these words of the evil one . . .

To Dean Mansel's exposition an editorial note was added thus:

Weiss defends the other interpretation, *Matt. E. p. 167. F. C. C.*

In his comments upon the Lord's Prayer, however, Dean Mansel prefers "deliver us *from evil.*" The neuter, he says, is more comprehensive.

Canon Robert Gregory: *A Letter of Friendly Remonstrance*. By JOHN WILLIAM BURGON, B.D., Dean of Chichester. Pp. 80. Longmans.

A MORE remarkable pamphlet we have never read. The eminent Author needs no introduction to the readers of *THE CHURCHMAN*; his writings, whether controversial or expository and theological, are well known throughout the Church, and his ability, learning, and consistent courage are everywhere esteemed.

The pamphlet before us, no doubt, will be set aside by some with the remark, "This is Burgon all over." Mr. Burgon does, indeed, here, as elsewhere, take his own line. A happy thing for the Church that he does!

The Dean refers, we read in the first sentence, "to the cruel persecution which the Church of England is at this instant undergoing at the hands of a small section of Romanizing Clergy within her pale." And he addresses himself to Canon Gregory, because he (though no Romanizer himself) has "yet seen fit to come forward on many occasions as the Apologist and Champion of the persecuting party." The Dean proceeds:

You have the advantage of me in so many respects that you can afford to submit to a few words of calm expostulation and friendly remonstrance. In the Lower House of Convocation you enjoy a considerable following, and obtain very much your own way. I am without either advantage. You have besides lately been the conspicuous advocate of "a distinctly avowed policy of Toleration in respect of matters of Ritual," which has been largely signed; and you are doubtless elated by your apparent success. Both in and out of Convocation, therefore, you aspire, if not to lead, at least to represent a party; and my purpose is to remonstrate with you on the Sectarian course you have been for a long time past pursuing. I appeal (not without hope of a sympathetic response) from your supporters in the Convocation of Canterbury synodically assembled, to those same individuals returned to their several homes,—settled down in their several spheres of labour and responsibility.

From Convocation, however, the Dean appeals "to the great bulk of the English Clergy, of which Convocation is after all but an insignificant fraction: the country Clergy, I say, of the Church of England,—which are her strength, and in whose loyalty and orthodoxy, as a body, I have entire confidence. I speak of the 16,000 to 18,000 Clergy (more or less) who have deliberately declined to put their names either to your Memorial or to Bishop Perry's: or else have signed one of those two documents not without mental reservation and some reluctance; as not by any means agreeing entirely with either, but feeling themselves on the whole drawn more in *this* direction than in *that*. Lastly, I make my appeal from you and your party to the whole body of the faithful English Laity, whose voices have never yet been heard in this behalf: but who have an undoubted right to be heard when (as now) a deliberate attempt is being made to tamper with their birthright—viz., the Reformation settlement of the National Religion."

The Dean avows that his Churchmanship is of that "old-fashioned type which approved itself to Andrewes and Hooker, Sanderson and Cosin, Taylor and Laud, Bull and Pearson, Beveridge and Butler;—a kind of Churchmanship with which *that of*" Canon Gregory's "Ritualistic" friends seems to have wondrous little in common. The Dean derived it traditionally, forty years ago, from those who were then accounted Churchmen of the loftiest and most learned type. But a change has come over the Church of England since that time:

If there was one lesson more than another which the teaching of those days enforced, it was a lesson of *Reverence*. Next to Reverence, which secured the claims of God, came *Dutifulness*, which secured the claims of Cæsar. We were

taught *Submission to Authority* as a first principle—almost as the fundamental principle of our Christian life. It was, in fact, universally the teaching of what, while there was any meaning in the phrase, used to be called “the High-Church party.” “A Bishop’s lightest word *ex cathedra*” (we were assured) “is heavy. His judgment on a book cannot be light.” “I trust I may say sincerely” (wrote the leader of the party in 1841), “that I shall feel a more lively pleasure in knowing that I was submitting myself to your Lordship’s expressed judgment in a matter of this kind”—(the withdrawal of any of his own “Tracts for the Times”)—“than I could have even in the widest circulation of the volumes in question.” *Sobriety* was to be the very key-note of our religion. “Next to a sound Rule of Faith” (so wrote the author of “The Christian Year”) “there is nothing of so much consequence as a sober standard of feeling in matters of practical Religion. And it is the peculiar happiness of the Church of England to possess in her authorized formularies an ample and secure provision for both.” As for Romanism, it was represented to us in colours certainly the reverse of attractive. “Speak gently of our sister’s fall!” exclaimed the writer last quoted; and the pathetic plea was allowed. In a well-known stanza he faithfully contrasted Roman with Anglican teaching, in respect of the Eucharist:

O come to our Communion feast;
There present in the heart,
Not in the hands, the Eternal Priest
Will His true Self impart.

It startled us a little, to be sure, to be told by the leader of the movement that Rome is “a pitiless and unnatural relative,” “A lost Church,” “a Church beside herself;” “heretical,” “profane,” “unscriptural,” “impious,” “blasphemous,” “monstrous,” “cruel;” “resembling a Demoniac,” and requiring to be treated “as if she were that Evil One which governs her.” It startled us, I say, to hear such strong words; but we received them as sincerely as they were spoken, and we regarded them as an earnest of the genuine Anglicanism of the movement to which we surrendered ourselves with generous warmth and undoubting confidence.

A calamitous change has, indeed, come over the Church since then.

The claim of the “Ritualists” to represent the “great Catholic movement” to which Dean Burgon refers, collapses hopelessly under every test.

“As for the ‘Anglicanism’ of the party,” says the Dean, “let the most eloquent of our Bishops be allowed to declare how the case actually stands. ‘No one can deny,’ (he says,)—‘the most advanced members of the party do not themselves care to deny,—that it is in its latest development marked by a close and even servile imitation of all the minutest details of Roman Catholic ceremonies; a hankering after ‘Romish Theology and Romish forms of private devotion; an almost childish affectation of all the most Romish modes of thought and forms of expression; in short, as they themselves express it, by a ‘deferential’ ‘Latinizing’ of our Church: and to such an extent, that one might not unfairly suppose that the one aim of such persons is to make themselves, in all respects, as like Romish priests as possible, and their greatest happiness to be mistaken for such: and that the accusation which they would most keenly resent would be that they were capable of supposing that on any point whatever on which the Church of England differs from that of Rome, she can by any possibility be in the ‘right.’”—The self-styled ‘Ritualistic’ party of these last days is in fact a purely *Sectarian* body. They might reasonably claim to be designated

¹ Newman’s “Letter to the Bishop of Oxford,” 1841.

² Bishop (Magee) of Peterborough’s *Charge*, 1872—from which the extract in page 35 is slightly abridged.

“as ‘Congregational Christians.’ The men talk, reason, act, like Separatists. They would have been disowned by ‘Churchmen’ of every age and every school, I may add, and of every clime, from the beginning until now.”

The Dean then quotes from Bishop Wilberforce :—“It is a decrepitude. It is not something very sublime and impressive, but something very feeble and contemptible.” Yes, says the Dean—

It is something “very feeble and contemptible” indeed. But, in fact, it is a worse thing than that, or we could afford to pass it by in silence, with pity or with contempt. It is, *treasonable* as well. Not only are principles now freely taught, which, forty years ago, would have been rejected with abhorrence by all respectable persons ;—not only have practices crept in which, at the time I speak of, were not so much as known among professing Churchmen ;—not only is phraseology in vogue which is essentially Romish, as when the celebration of Holy Communion is familiarly spoken of as “High” and “Low Mass”—but no attempt is any longer made by the more advanced of the party to conceal the Romeward tendency of their practices and their teaching. They even glory in their treasonable intention.

We should gladly quote other passages, but we must refer our readers to the pamphlet.

The Dean makes, in concluding, a strong appeal to Canon Gregory—*“Pray come out from the camp of those disloyal, those unfaithful men.”*

One statement, in the closing passages, is, we believe, thoroughly true. Ritualism blocks the way of “Comprehension,” and hampers Church Defence. These “mediæval extravagances are making, if they have not already made, reconciliation with our Wesleyan brethren a thing impossible. There is no telling in fact how fatal is this retrograde movement to the progress of real Churchmanship throughout the length and breadth of the land. ‘Ritualism’ (for so *disloyalty to the Church* is “absurdly called) is the great difficulty with a surprising number of the Clergy in our large towns—especially in the northern dioceses. The working people simply *hate* it. They will not listen to ‘Church defence’ while this ugly phantom looms before them. Hundreds are being driven by it into dissent. ‘I dare not call a Church defence meeting in this town’ (writes an able and faithful incumbent); ‘it would be instantly turned into an anti-Ritualistic demonstration.’ Thus, the cause of Christianity itself is suffering by the extravagances of a little handful of misguided men.”



Short Notices.

The Imprisoned Clergy: Pleas of Conscience. A Letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Manchester. By B. A. HEYWOOD, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. With his Lordship’s Reply. London: James Cornish & Sons, 297, High Holborn.

We extract a portion of Mr. Heywood’s forcible and timely “Letter.” On “the Plea of Conscience” he writes :—

In 1840, the Court of Queen’s Bench was more than once occupied with applications respecting Dissenters who had been imprisoned for refusing to obey the monitions of the Court of Arches with reference to the payment of church rates. These persons were imprisoned under precisely the same legal process as that recently adopted in the cases of the Rev. Messrs. Dale, Enraght, and

Green. The names of two of them were Thorogood and Baines, and the latter, failing to get his release through the courts of law, presented a petition to the House of Commons, where a Motion was made in his favour to the purport that his imprisonment was an infringement of religious liberty. This Motion was opposed by the leaders on both sides of the House. Lord J. Russell "thought that in setting an example of disobedience to the established laws of the country Mr. Baines was acting in a way to shake the authority of the law, and the confidence and respect which ought to belong to it;" and Sir R. Peel held "the true and only safe principle to be, that while the law remained in force it must be obeyed. Alter the law if they pleased, but while it remained in force there would be a dissolution of the bonds of society, if upon the allegation of religious scruples individuals should presume to violate it." The *Times* of the 20th of March, 1841, wrote thus: "The whole argument about Baines' conscience, seeing that his allegiance as a British subject involves his submission to every statute until his liberty of protest can induce the Legislature to repeal its provisions, is an insult to common sense. Had the Motion succeeded . . . it is evident that the sovereignty of our legal code would gradually be supplanted by the supremacy of private conscience—a state of things which would be tantamount to the wildest anarchy and misrule." Mr. C. G. Prideaux, Q. C., a well-known lawyer of decided High Church sympathies, treated the matter thus:—"The plea of conscience, even when sincere, cannot under any circumstances be admitted as a valid excuse for disobedience to the laws of the country; for if this were once permitted, the natural result must be that the authority of the law would be superseded by the supremacy of private judgment, and every man would, in his own case, be the sole judge of the measure of his obedience due to the State in which he lived." (See Churchwarden's Guide," 11th edition, p. 282.) No objection can be taken to the foregoing remarks, so far as relates to the general principles comprised in them, but the language of the *John Bull* newspaper of 28th March, 1841, was really offensive. "We are sick," wrote the journalist, "at the dishonesty of this new-patent-safety-Church-rate-martyrdom-system, and regard your Thorogoods, your Baineses, and their supporters as equally entitled to imprisonment and to public commiseration for it."

The Life of George Stephenson. By S. SMILES, LL.D. Centenary Edition. Pp. 230. London: John Murray.

The first edition of this deeply-interesting biography, a brief preface tells us, was published twenty-four years ago. Since then much new information has been communicated to the author by pupils of George Stephenson—railway engineers, engine drivers, and platelayers. For the first fifty years of his life Stephenson "had everything against him. He owed nothing to luck, to patronage, to the advantages of education. He owed everything to bravery, to intense conviction, and prolonged perseverance. He had to teach himself everything, from the A B C to the principles of mechanics. He had to conquer every inch of the ground on which he stood." How he succeeded in perfecting the locomotive, in overcoming the opposition of scientific men, in laying down "impossible" railroads, is well told in the book before us. The centenary of Stephenson's birth was celebrated on the 9th of June last.

A Discourse on Scottish Church History from the Reformation to the Present Time. With Prefatory Remarks on the St. Giles's Lectures, and Appendices of Notes and References. By CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.C.L., Bishop of St. Andrews. Pp. 104. Edinburgh and London: Wm. Blackwood and Sons. 1881.

This is an exceedingly interesting work, and we have read it with pleasure. Here and there we agree with the learned prelate, and sometimes we differ from him; but we can cordially recommend his "Discourse." The "Lectures" by eminent clergymen of the Established Church of Scotland to which he refers we have not seen.

Instruction for Confirmation, for the use of Senior Class Teachers. With some Suggestions as to Instruction for Baptism. By the Rev. E. P. CACHEMAILLE, M.A., Vicar of St. James, Muswell Hill, Author of "The Church Sunday School Handbook." Second Edition, pp. 128. Church of England Sunday School Institute, 1881.

This is one of the many really useful little works for which Churchmen are indebted to the Sunday School Institute. Mr. Cachemaille has done his work—by no means an unimportant one—with skill and sound judgment, and although in his preface he says no pretence to originality is made, yet his Manual, so far as we know, stands alone. We heartily recommend it. Such books ought to be much more widely circulated among Evangelical Churchmen than at present (so far as we know) they are.

The Greek Testament, with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. London: Henry Frowde, 7, Paternoster Row.

To this companion of the Revised Version, to the preface of which is appended the name of Archdeacon Palmer, we shall return. We merely mention, at present, that the proof sheets were looked over by Dr. Scrivener, and that the typographical work is well done.

The Children's Hymn Book. For use in Children's Services, Sunday Schools, and Families. Arranged in Order of the Church's Year. With Accompanying Tunes. Rivingtons, Seeley and Co.

The Editor of this hymn book is Mrs. Carey Brock. We have always heartily recommended the books written by Mrs. Carey Brock; and not small is the number of really sound and attractive works which have proceeded from the Deanery, Guernsey, and which have had a large circulation. As regards the present work, we were fully prepared to give it a cordial welcome. The title-page, together with the preface, tells us that the selection of hymns has been revised by Bishops Oxenden and Walsham How, and the Rev. John Ellerton, and the hymn book is really the work of several "Compilers." So far as we have examined, the selection is doctrinally, viewing it as a whole, sound and good; but there are two or three hymns which we should not ourselves have inserted. We can well believe that the work—which in many respects we can commend—is the result of "years of thought and labour." There are several editions—one at a penny. The edition with music is well printed and well arranged. Of tunes there is a great variety, and a musical critic is likely, we believe, to praise them warmly. We may quote two verses of a hymn for Holy Communion (Dr. Neale's):

Behold thy servant drawing near
Thine altar, Lord, to day;
And though I come with doubt and fear,
Oh! send me not away.

I would not dare to seek Thy Throne,
With such a guilty soul,
But that Thy Flesh and Blood alone
Can make a sinner whole.

The Revision of the New Testament. By GEORGE SALMON, D.D., Dublin. Hodges, Figgis & Co. Pp. 27.

A Paper read before the Irish Church Conference a month ago by the able and accomplished Divinity Professor of T. C. D.

In the last CHURCHMAN we gave a notice of Mr. Trevelyan's "Early History of Charles James Fox," containing several references to the state of religion at the commencement of the reign of George III. In Dr.

STOUGHTON'S *The Church in the Georgian Era*, being the sixth volume of his *History of Religion in England*, a new (a cheaper) edition of which has just been published (Hodder and Stoughton), appear many extremely interesting passages, from which we should gladly quote. The following touches the movement in regard to subscription, to which reference was made in our review of C. J. Fox:—"Francis Blackburne, Archdeacon of Cleveland—a learned, clever, and honest man, of firm decision, and of courage bordering on audacity; ready with his pen, addicted beyond measure to controversy, attacking Warburton and Butler, and intensely disliking Secker, appears to have been an Arian of the same type as Samuel Clarke. It is plain that he differed from the formularies of the Church in many respects; and it seemed to be a main object ever before him to seek a change in the law of clerical subscription. Relinquishing a position he had once held, namely, that the Church formularies were entitled to a wide interpretation, he attacked the principle of subscription altogether, contending that Churches had no right to make creeds, and that every creed contains material decisions from which an intelligent Christian who has duly examined the Scriptures may not unreasonably dissent. He affirmed that to impose interpretation of the Bible is to interfere with the right of private judgment, so vigorously asserted at the period of the Reformation. . . . In accordance with such proposals a meeting of London clergymen was convened, when a petition drawn up by the zealous Archdeacon was adopted. It asserted the rights of conscience, and then it prayed for the Protestant privilege of interpreting Scripture without being bound by human explanations. The document received 250 signatures, including those of thirty or forty physicians and lawyers. The petition, presented to the House of Commons in February, 1772, by Sir William Meredith, was opposed as a blow for 'the absolute destruction of the Church;' and was supported on the ground that some of the Articles were 'incomprehensible and self-contradictory.' . . . The proposal to receive the petition was negatived by 217 to 71." We are somewhat surprised that Dr. Stoughton did not quote a few sentences from the speech of Burke against the petition.

From Messrs. Hatchards we have received a pamphlet of sixteen pages, *Union in Church Missions: Is it Desirable or Practicable?* By FRANCIS CLOSE, D.D., Dean of Carlisle. (Carlisle: Thurnam.) We quote the honoured Dean's closing words:

To convey salvation to the perishing heathen, in strict accordance with the rites and ordinances of the Church of England, in subordination to its discipline, in accordance with its faithful adherence to the doctrines of the Gospel, and in obedience to the great command, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," this [the C.M.S.] Society originated, and has since maintained its firm, uninterrupted course, with results far surpassing the most sanguine expectation of its founders and early supporters; and it presents itself now to our view, and solicits our support, under circumstances of the deepest interest, and demands our most earnest consideration. It stands alone in the amount of its income, in the marvellous outstretching of its labours, reaching from within the Arctic Circle on the North to the extremity of New Zealand on the South, penetrating many countries, extending its benevolent influence in the four quarters of the world; it surely may and ought to sustain its undoubted independence, and not to be entangled in the co-operation of another Society

which is only partially a Missionary Society, dividing the interest and disturbing the support of thousands who now, with a zeal and self-denial of no ordinary character, by their labours and by their prayers in public and social life, urge it on its way to spread the pure Gospel in all lands, gathering out of them a people redeemed and dedicated to the worship and service of God. Loving this great work as I do, and in one way or another having served its interest and followed its fortunes since the year 1812, I cannot help feeling jealous of any measure which, in my judgment, appears likely to impede its progress, and even to hazard its very existence. My counsel therefore is, Let each Society pursue its independent course on its own lines. We desire no jealousy, no opposition, while at the same time we seriously deprecate any combination or union whatever between the two Societies.

We are pleased to recommend Mr. JOHN B. GOUGH's *Gleanings from my Life Work*, entitled *Sunlight and Shadow*. (Dickinson, 89, Farringdon Street.) A cheap edition of an interesting work.

A selection of hymns, 54 in number, *Lispings for the Little Ones*, has been prepared by Mrs. CAMPBELL-COLQUHOUN (Christian Book Society), neatly got up and cheap. The little book may be found very useful.

We understand that, in answer to the correspondence which has recently appeared in a contemporary concerning the desirability of a Church Year Book being issued, Mr. Elliot Stock will publish annually "The Year Book of the Church," and that the work will be edited by Mr. Charles Mackeson, the compiler of "The Guide to the Churches of London."

In the *Antiquary* appears, as usual, a good deal of information. The last number contained an interesting paper, following one in the March number, on the settlement of French Protestants in America. Ten years before Baron de Sancé conceived the idea for exodus of French Protestants from England to Carolina, the English Ambassador at the Hague was instrumental in the departure of some sixty French and Walloon Protestant families to the infant colony of Virginia. About the middle of the sixteenth century, as will be remembered, Admiral Coligny attempted to form a colony of Huguenots in Florida. Serviceable covers for the *Antiquary* numbers (Elliot Stock), we may here remark, are handsome and cheap.

We are much pleased with Mrs. Warley's *Lodger* (Religious Tract Society), one of a good large type series, cheap, attractive, with an illustration.

From Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton we have received another volume of their series, "Men Worth Remembering," viz., *Thomas Chalmers*, by DONALD FRASER, D.D. An interesting and well-written book.

From Messrs. Clarke, of Edinburgh we have received the second volume of Professor GODET's *Commentary on the Romans*, and the second volume of Professor DORNER's *System of Christian Doctrines*, another instalment of their valuable "Foreign Theological Library."

We heartily recommend a valuable little book, just published (Elliot Stock) *The Choice of Wisdom*, by the Rev. Canon BELL. It contains eight chapters: such as, "The Wise Choice," "The Holy War," "Ways of Pleasantness and Peace." We are not acquainted with any work of the kind so good as this. We hope Dr. Bell's earnest and affectionate counsels may reach many anxious inquirers. The little book has a very tasteful cover.

The Morning Star of the Reformation (R. T. S.) is simple, but accurate and full. The author has made good use of Lechler. Cheap and well printed, this book ought to be widely known.

The Magazines of the Religious Tract Society are quite up to their usual standard. With an article on the Revised New Testament in *The Sunday at Home*, by Dr. GREEN, we are much pleased.

THE MONTH.

THE criticism of the American press on the Revised New Testament has a peculiar interest. *Scribner's Monthly* says :—

The New Revision is accompanied by an appendix in which the points are set down in which the American committee were unable to acquiesce in the decisions of the English committee. For the merits of the Revision as it stands, whatever they may be, the American branch deserves no small share of credit. Their opinions, we are given to understand, have had a large influence. . . . On this list, as it appears to us, are many changes which deserve to be adopted. "Tempt," in the sense of "make trial of" is now obsolete, and the use of it where no enticement to evil is meant is misleading. Such archaisms as "who" or "that" for "which" in speaking of persons, and "wot" or "wist" in the sense of "know," "knew," are needless blemishes in the translation. With the American company, we should prefer "demon" and the cognate terms to represent the Greek terms from which it is derived, as in the various places referring to demoniacal possession. In the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi. 11, Luke xi. 3), the marginal reading is suggested: "Our bread for the coming day," or "our needful bread." This explanation is required to give the English reader an exact idea of the two meanings of which the original term is susceptible. In Matt. x. 36, "He that findeth his life shall lose it," and in several other passages, the Americans would strike out "soul," the alternative reading for "life" in the margin. "Life," and not "soul," is the sense of the Greek word. "For judgment, and mercy, and faith" (Matt. xxiii. 32; also Luke xi. 42), "justice, and mercy, and faith," is properly suggested. In a considerable number of instances the different translations of the appendix rest on a different view as to the original text. It is plain that the American committee was disposed to go farther than the English in removing obsolete or obsolescent terms.

One of the English New Testament company, Mr. Vance Smith, has criticized, in the *Nineteenth Century*, the Revised Version. He finds fault, mainly, with the use of the term "Holy Ghost" instead of the "Spirit," with the substitution of "the evil one" for "evil" in the Lord's Prayer, and with the retention of "hell" instead of "Gehenna."

A reviewer in *Fraser* comes to the general conclusion that in the Revised Version "positive mistakes of the Greek have been corrected; mistakes in Greek grammar have been rectified; unintelligible archaisms have been removed and proper names consistently translated; consistency has, as far as possible, been maintained in translating the same Greek words, and unnecessary confounding of one Greek word with another in translation has been avoided."

The Bishop of Oxford, in his Charge, refers to the Clewer case. His lordship says :—

No one at all acquainted with the history of ecclesiastical law can doubt that its theory has been inconsistent throughout with the notion of a common-law right to employ its process in satisfaction of every private complainant's fancied wrong. Usurpations and errors there have been, indeed, in almost every age; but the spiritual jurisdiction has still borne on the face of it the spiritual character to be traced originally to the plain words of our Lord and of His Apostles. Its proceedings have been instituted *pro salute animæ*; its object has been to reform men's lives; to put sinners to open shame, and bring them to repentance; to cast out unworthy members from the Church, if no lighter censure would induce them to amend their lives. That this discipline should be set in motion by the *mandamus* of a temporal court, in order to relieve a complainant who alleged special damage to himself as the ground of his complaint, appeared to me to be alien to the whole idea of a spiritual court, and at variance with its precedents and history from the dawn of Christianity. The "apparent incongruity" of the interference was, indeed, frankly acknowledged by the Court of Queen's Bench itself. The judgments of the superior courts made it plain that the interference was an incongruity to which the law, rightly interpreted, gave no support. . . . I do not forget, while I congratulate you on the result of this suit, that the decision goes but a very little way towards the solution of the great problem of enforcing, or reviving, the discipline of the Church. That discipline, in the true idea of it, is for the laity, quite as much as for the clergy.

The Bishop of Liverpool has issued a Pastoral Address, an earnest appeal to Churchmen on behalf of Diocesan Institutions.¹

The foundation-stone of Selwyn College, Cambridge, was laid by the Earl of Powis, High Steward of the University.²

¹ It is vain to shut our eyes to the fact that there is an immense amount of spiritual destitution in the diocese of Liverpool. There is reason to believe that the recent Census will show that we have nearly a million and a quarter of inhabitants in this diocese, while there are not more than 200 incumbents and 140 curates at present provided by the Church of England for this huge population. Some allowance, no doubt, must be made for the undeniable fact that many inhabitants of the diocese are Roman Catholics or Nonconformists. But, after making every deduction, there is no room for doubt that the spiritual destitution of the south-west part of Lancashire is great and appalling; that thousands are living and dying in a very unsatisfactory state; and that there is an urgent want of more clergy and more places of worship, if the Church of England is to maintain her position as "the Church of the people." District after district could easily be named in our diocese in which 10,000, 12,000, 15,000, and even 20,000 souls are nominally under the care of one solitary incumbent, and in which a mighty multitude are left like "sheep without a shepherd."

² "In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti. Amen. Hunc lapidem ponimus in piam memoriam patris in Christo admodum reverendi, Georgii Augusti Selwyn, de Nova Zelandia, et postea de Lichfeld episcopi, ad cultum virtutis ac doctrinæ, ad augmentum fidei Christianæ ad ethnicos usque, et ad sempiternam Dei gloriam, per Jesum Christum Dominum ac Salvatorem nostrum. Amen."

Bishop Lightfoot condemned the use of gloomy language with respect to the state of religion in the University.

The Rev. Herbert Pelham met with a fatal accident in Switzerland.¹

At the Annual Meeting of the Church of Ireland Sustentation Fund held in Lambeth Palace, Mr. Robert Hamilton, of Belfast, made an eloquent speech. "I do rejoice to say," he said, "that our people have kept themselves entirely free from that agitation called the Land League. . . . Our people are fully conscious of the object of the federation I refer to. They say, 'Tear off its mask, and you have Rome and separation from England.'"

The subject of tithes has been discussed in some Chambers of Agriculture. At Cambridge, Mr. Ellis moved the following resolution :—

That this Chamber is of opinion that the increased value of the tithe having occurred through a system of selling by weight instead of by measure, and other causes, it is desirable that the method of commutation should be revised; and that tithes, being deemed national property, should be applied to defray the expenses of recently imposed local burdens—lunatic asylums, police, education, and roads; or of Imperial taxation.

Mr. Marshall said :

In 1836, as they all knew, tithes were commuted. The principal reason for the change was that it was such a discouragement to the development of agriculture that a tenth part of the improved produce should be taken possession of by the clergyman who had contributed nothing to its production. One of the provisions of the Tithe Act was that the annual sum to be arrived at should not exceed the average amount which the tithes had yielded for the previous seven years. The arrangement was a most happy and righteous one; it was advantageous both to the clergyman and to the landowner; the act of taking the tenth part was got rid of; the act of appropriating what appeared to be a portion of the industry of another was got rid of. And in exchange for what? That the tenant should have nothing to

¹ A correspondent of the *Record* at Montreux says: "Mr. Herbert Pelham had only lately arrived to join his brother, who had already won the respect of the Christian community of this place. For him there is the deepest sympathy in his trying position, as well as for the respected Bishop of Norwich and family." An Oxford correspondent writes: "It seems but a short time since he left us in the prime of manly strength, renowned as an oar (he rowed twice at least in the University eight), and deeply respected for the quiet, unflinching steadfastness of his religious life. Surrounded by all the ordinary temptations of the place, he hardly appeared to notice them, and yet none who knew him could for a moment deem him gloomy or austere. In his character were beautifully blended the fresh, buoyant happiness of youth and the dignity of a life passed in habitual communion with God. Free from all tinge of fanaticism, he was a lover and upholder of all good works, and not ashamed to be thought or called an Evangelical."

do with the tithe for the future, but that it should take the form of a rent-charge issuing out of the land, and that the landlords should pay it for the time to come. No doubt, if the landlord did not pay, the tenant could be distrained on for the rent-charge, but he was enabled to tender the receipt to his landlord as the payment of so much rent. Strictly speaking, the tenant would have no more reason to inquire as to whether the land was subject to tithe than as to what mortgages there might be on it, or as to any other of the landlord's private charges. Besides, according to Mr. Caird, when the annual value of the land was £35,000,000, the tithe had been commuted at £4,000,000; but though the land had risen to £50,000,000, the tithe remained at £4,000,000.

At the close of the debate the resolution was divided into two parts; the former of which was carried unanimously, and the latter by 12 to 7. The School Board rates, no doubt, in many districts, tend to make tithes unpopular.¹

June 9th, being the hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Stephenson, was observed as a holiday in almost every town of Durham and Northumberland. The cottage wherein Stephenson was born is situated at Wylam, an old-fashioned and now decayed pit village, on the banks of the Tyne, eight miles above Newcastle.

The *Lincolnshire Chronicle* is glad to learn that the Ven. W. Kaye has withdrawn his resignation of the archdeaconry of Lincoln.

The Rev. T. Pelham Dale, in a letter from Lincolnshire to the Bishop of London, attempted to justify his "passive resistance" to the law.

In comment upon the Church Boards Bill, withdrawn by Mr. Albert Grey, the *Guardian* says:—

All we now claim is that if any man exercise the right which the law now confers of forsaking the church of his forefathers, and as a consequence refuse likewise to contribute anything towards the support and extension of that church, he is thereupon disentitled to intermeddle with her internal affairs, her discipline, worship, finances, and so on. This principle is plainly just, and is plainly recognized

¹ Speaking at a Norfolk Agricultural Gathering, the Earl of Kimberley said: "As to tithes, it seemed to him that any diminution of them must go straight into the landlords' pocket. Therefore, he was unable to see how they could interest the tenant farmers, except as regarded the estimates on which they were taken from year to year, and which they might wish to have placed on some other basis."

The Bishop of Ely, addressing the Ely Diocesan Conference, said his clerical brethren had suffered severely from the depression in agriculture, which interest was still a cause of grave anxiety. Recent events had forced upon his mind a subject which he thought must come on very soon for discussion, both in diocesan conferences and in larger and more powerful assemblies—namely, the question whether or not it was desirable that there should be a consolidation of small parishes.

by the Compulsory Church Rates Abolition Act of 1868. A man need not, under the clauses of that Act, pay Church rates if he do not choose so to do. *Per contra*, he is most righteously deprived of vote and voice about the application and expenditure of the funds raised by other people. Mr. Albert Grey and his friends of the Church Reform Union wish to give the man who absents himself from church a control over offertory moneys, raised from the church congregations exclusively—a control which the law refuses as regards Church rates to the man who does not pay them. It will never answer to propose this.

Sir Wilfrid Lawson, in the House of Commons, made his annual motion in the following form:—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to give legislative effect to the resolution passed on the 18th day of June, 1880, which affirms the justice of local communities being entrusted with the power to protect themselves from the operation of the liquor traffic.

The motion was then carried by 196 to 154. Mr. Gladstone voted in the minority. In the majority were Mr. Forster, Mr. Bright, Mr. Goschen, and Dr. Playfair. Most of the leaders of the Opposition voted with the minority. Last year the numbers were—for the resolution, 229; against it, 203.

The Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the Clerical and Lay Society for Devon and Cornwall was held at Exeter, on the 15th and 16th, under the presidency of Dean Boyd, and was largely attended.

Prince Leopold has taken his seat in the House of Lords as Duke of Albany (Baron Arklow, Earl of Clarence).

Several letters have been published concerning the "Authorized" Version. The Bishop of Lincoln recently wrote to the *Times*:—

As some objection has been raised to the statement of the Lord Chancellor in his letter to me of May 27, where he argues that there is strong presumptive evidence that our present Authorized Version was "appointed to be read in churches" by an Order of Council, I venture to call attention to the words of King James himself in the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, when one of the divines present (Dr. Rainolds) "moved his Majesty that there might be a new translation of the Bible." The King's answer to this proposal is recorded as follows by Dr. Barlow, who was present:—

Whereupon his Highnesse wished that some special paines should be taken in that behalf for one uniform translation; and this to be done by the best learned in both the Universities; after them to be reviewed by the Bishops and the Chief Council of the Church; from them to be presented to the Privy Council; and, lastly, to be ratified by his Royal authority; and so this whole Church to be bound unto it and none other.—(Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 188.)

A letter from a distinguished correspondent followed, thus:—

Nothing could show more conclusively that no Order in Council was passed in reference to the Authorized Version than the quotation from "Cardwell's *Conferences*," cited by the Bishop of Lincoln in the *Times*

to-day. According to that quotation, the translation was to be "reviewed by the bishops and the chief council of the Church," prior to its being laid before the Privy Council. When did that review by the bishops and the chief council in the Church take place, and where is it recorded?

That eminent French scholar, M. Littré, has died at the advanced age of eighty. A Positivist, at the solicitation of his wife and daughter he was baptized on his dying bed.

Archbishop Croke¹ and other prelates of the Roman Church in Ireland have been pressing for the amendment of the Irish Land Bill according to their own suggestions as absolutely necessary for the temporary contentment of the people.

General Sir Duncan Macgregor has entered into rest.²

At the Anniversary of the Southport Clerical and Lay Evangelical Conference, the Rev. Canon Clarke, D.D., presiding, the Rev. Canon Hoare read a Paper on "The Evangelical Body as compared with what it was Fifty Years Ago." He expressed his conviction that, in some respects, there had been a decided and most healthy progress.

The General Assembly of the Scotch Free Kirk has deposed Mr. Robertson Smith from his Professorship.

At the 70th Annual Meeting of the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church, the Archbishop of Canterbury said: "It will be satisfactory to learn from the last returns of the Education Department that the accommodation in our Voluntary schools is now for 2,327,000 pupils, whereas the accommodation in Board schools is only for 1,082,000, and in other Voluntary schools for a comparatively small proportion of the total. On the register of our schools are 2,079,000 pupils, and the average attendance is 1,471,000.

¹ The *Saturday Review* says: "Comparatively slight development of the present state of things in Ireland might alter the situation in a very remarkable way. The scattered sparks of civil dissension may break out at almost any moment into a wide-spread conflagration.

² General Sir Duncan Macgregor, K.C.B., died at Vanbrugh Park, Blackheath, in his ninety-fifth year, after a few days' illness. He entered the army when thirteen years old, and was a captain at eighteen. He was one of the very few survivors of the disastrous Walcheren expedition. He commanded the 93rd Highlanders for many years. General Macgregor was the author of a popular account of the loss of the *Kent*, East India-man, which was burned in the Bay of Biscay on the 1st of March, 1825. General, then Major, Macgregor was on board the vessel with his wife and infant son. Nearly all on board were saved; the first person rescued from the cutter of the *Kent*, by a passing brig, was Major Macgregor's child (John), who has since become well known to his countrymen not only as the voyager of the "Rob Roy" canoe, but as the philanthropic originator and founder of the Shoe Black Movement, and an active member of the Open Air Mission Society, and other societies for improving the social and religious condition of the masses.