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

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

MUDIE'S LIBRARY

For the CIRCULATION and SALE of all the BEST

ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN, ITALIAN, SPANISH, AND RUSSIAN BOOKS.

TOWN SUBSCRIPTIONS:

From ONE GUINEA per annum.

LONDON BOOK SOCIETY (for weekly exchange of Books at the houses of Subscribers) from TWO GUINEAS per annum.

COUNTRY SUBSCRIPTIONS:

From TWO GUINEAS per annum.

N.B.—Two or Three friends may UNITE IN ONE SUBSCRIPTION.

LIBRARIES & PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, TOWN & VILLAGE CLUBS, SUPPLIED ON LIBERAL TERMS.

Prospectuses and Monthly Lists of Books gratis and post free.

CHEAP PARCELS SUITABLE FOR VILLAGE CLUBS & LIBRARIES.

The following **Special Parcels of Second-hand Books** are made up and offered at the **low prices affixed, net** for cash with order:

50	Complete 1 Volume Novels by Popular Authors, rebound in strong cloth, gilt lettered	**63s.**
50	Volumes Assorted (25 Volumes of Travel, Biography, etc., and 25 Volumes Fiction) . . .	**63s.**
12	Volumes of Recent Travel (demy 8vos.), newly rebound in cloth, gilt lettered	**40s.**
12	Volumes of Theological Biography, newly rebound in cloth	**40s.**
20	Volumes of Miscellaneous Books, newly rebound in cloth	**40s.**
12	Volumes of Political Biography, newly rebound in cloth	**40s.**

FULL PARTICULARS ON APPLICATION.

MUDIE'S LIBRARY, Limited,

30-34, NEW OXFORD STREET,

241, BROMPTON RD., S.W., & 48, QUEEN VICTORIA ST., E.C., LONDON.

AND AT **BARTON ARCADE, MANCHESTER.**

Elliot Stock's New Publications.

BY THE LATE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

In foolscap 8vo., tastefully printed and bound, price 5s.

COUNSELS FOR CHURCHPEOPLE.

FROM THE WRITINGS OF

THE RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV. MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D.,

The late Lord Bishop of London.

SELECTED AND ARRANGED BY J. H. BURN, B.D.

"It would be difficult to overestimate the value of a book like 'Counsels for Churchpeople.' Bishop Creighton is invariably clear, sensible, and suggestive, and his manner of treatment is admirably united to the mental habits of the time."—*Literature.*

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE.

Tastefully printed and bound. Price 5s., post free.

THE LIFE OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE:

A Book of Devotional Thoughts.

From the Writings of F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Canterbury. Selected and arranged by J. H. BURN, B.D.

"An exceedingly valuable work, full of the choicest gems, brilliant and penetrating. Many a dull hour can be made bright and cheerful by studying the thoughts of the venerable Dean, as depicted in the pages of 'The Life of Christian Service.'"—*Family Churchman.*

"Devotional readers will find very little to dissent from in these pages. They will certainly find much from which to profit, and, it is needless to say, many brilliant passages of great eloquence and power."—*News.*

Tastefully printed and bound, gilt top, 5s.

HELPS TO FAITH AND PRACTICE:

A Book of Devotional Readings.

From the Writings of HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's Cathedral. Selected and arranged by J. H. BURN, B.D.

"It will greatly please the admirers of the orator and preacher, and gratify his friends as a remembrance of his deeds of kindness."—*Churchwoman.*

"There is not a page which does not contain a helpful thought or an inspiring message."—*Quiver.*

"A very charming book of devotional readings."—*Bristol Mercury.*

"A volume of reflections which will certainly prove helpful to many an earnest-minded person."—*Church Gazette.*

"We can recommend the book to those who have but little time for devotional reading."—*Church Review.*

"The book will prove very useful for short Lenten readings."—*Pilot.*

SECOND EDITION.—In foolscap 8vo., tastefully printed and handsomely bound, price 5s.

HELPS TO GODLY LIVING:

A Book of Devotional Thoughts.

From the Writings of the Right Honourable and Most Reverend FREDERICK TEMPLE, D.D., LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. Selected and arranged, with His Grace's permission, by J. H. BURN, B.D.

"We shall be surprised if this quiet little book does not do a solid amount of good on these lines. Church men will receive it with a cordial welcome."—*Guardian.*

"The book is a distinct aid to devotional literature, the presence of an index contributing also to its value."—*Family Churchman.*

"A good and suitable aid to meditation."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

"The work is likely to prove a helpful addition to devotional literature."—*Aberdeen Journal.*

"It is a beautiful book. The best possible souvenir of Archbishop Temple."—*Expository Times.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 6s.

A NEW TRANSLATION OF ISAIAH. With Explanatory Notes and a History of the Life of Isaiah. By Rev. E. FLECKER, M.A.

"The present translation is well done. The notes are concise, clear, and useful, and the life of Isaiah is full and informing."—*The Life of Faith.*

"A valuable contribution to Biblical knowledge, which will not only appeal to the student, but will be found helpful to all readers of the Old Testament Scriptures."—*Newcastle Daily Chronicle.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

ON THE PATH OF PROGRESS; or, The National Church and a Needed Forward Movement. By HENRY LATIMER JACKSON, M.A.

"The essays are exceedingly well written. We can strongly recommend the book to thoughtful Churchmen."—*Church Family News.*

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d.

THE VICTORY THAT OVERCOMETH. By H. A. D.

"The results of study and thought which this book modestly offers are worthy of careful perusal. There is a deal that is fresh and suggestive."—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

NEW VOLUMES OF VERSE.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

A BOOK OF VERSES. By Mrs. JAMES GLENNY WILSON, N.Z., Author of "Themes and Variations," "Alice Landor," "Two Summers," etc.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d. net.

POEMS. By ELIZABETH M. ALFORD.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

IN THE LAND OF MAKE-BELIEVE. By OLIVE VERTE, Author of "A Sunset Idyll, and other Poems."

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d. net.

COLLABORATORS. And Other Poems. By A. W. WEBSTER.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

SILVER LININGS TO THE CLOUDS OF LIFE; or, Crowns for Crosses. By WILLIAM ALFRED GIBBS.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d.

POEMS OF THE RACE. By MARSTON RUDLAND.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

EDUCATIONAL.

The National Protestant Church Union.

To Promote the Principles of the Reformation as set forth in the Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England.

President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.
Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary H. W. WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.
Treasurer—T. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq., J.P.
General Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON.

The Committee EARNESTLY APPEAL for the INCREASED SUPPORT of 1,000 NEW MEMBERS to enable them to extend the publication and lecture work of the Society. Full particulars of the Society's objects and operations and terms of membership can be obtained on application to the Secretary,

OFFICES OF THE UNION,
324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.

PAROCHIAL MISSIONS TO THE JEWS AT HOME AND ABROAD.

Honorary Secretaries:
The REV. CANON SIR JAMES E. PHILIPPS, BART., WARMINSTER.
The VEN. ARCHDEACON SUTTON, PEVENSEY, HASTINGS.
Organizing Secretary: The REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

OFFICE: A. C. S. OFFICE, 39, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

This Society is worked strictly on the parochial system of the Church. Duly qualified men are sent as curates, under the incumbents, to parishes in London and other big towns, where large numbers of Jews congregate.
All information gladly given on application to the Organizing Secretary.

NEW VOLUME OF SERMONS BY THE DEAN OF ELY.
In crown 8vo., cloth, with a portrait of the Dean, price 6s.

PRO PATRIA.

Sermons on Special Occasions in England and America.

By CHARLES WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., Dean of Ely.

"This book deserves to be widely read and pondered over, and to form the model for many more sermons than it is likely to do."—*Churchwoman.*

"An interesting volume. The sermons are robust and liberal in tone, and deal with questions of living interest."—*Glasgow Herald.*

"The volume altogether is fresh and stimulating reading, and may be recommended to both those who do and who do not accept Dr. Stubbs' advanced social teachings."
Sheffield Independent.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

The Rev. Prebendary W. H. PEPLOE writes: "*Very heartily do I commend the* EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE *to the Christian public. It binds together the Christians of different denominations with a bond of brotherly love and good will towards all men, which is most essential in these days of division; and where brethren have been suffering for Christ's sake in different parts of the world, it has done a remarkable work in calling attention to their wrongs, and in moving the arm of authority in different lands to stay the persecutions and give liberty to the sufferers. I earnestly commend the* ALLIANCE *to the attention of Christians in the hope that they will support it* LIBERALLY *with their gifts and prayers.*"

The Rev. Prof. H. G. C. MOULE writes: "*It is a pleasure to send to the* ALLIANCE *a cordial message of 'good luck in the name of the Lord.' May the noble wish of the* ALLIANCE *be carried on with more power and with richer results than ever! May our Master use it more than ever to draw His servants together across their minor and temporary demarcations, and may He employ their union of life, of witness, of influence, and of combined prayer, for His holy ends! I thank Him for the existence of a work so truly according to the tenor of His own High-priestly Prayer for unity in the Father and the Son.*"

PLEASE WRITE TO THE SECRETARY, 7, ADAM STREET, STRAND, W.C.

A NATIONAL APPEAL. URGENT.

TO COMPLETE THE GOOD SAMARITAN WORK OF THE

"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

Patron—H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

A further **£10,000**, or **200,000** shillings, still urgently needed to give **relief** to hundreds of aged, destitute, and afflicted victims of the great "Liberator" fraud, who were taught and trained in habits of temperance and thrift by their trusted leaders, only to find themselves suddenly robbed of their life savings, and driven to face the dreaded workhouse, in spite of all their praiseworthy endeavours to make some provision for their old age. Ninety per cent. of these sufferers are members of some section of the **Christian Church.**

"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the Law of Christ."

There are **3,014** cases on the Books of the Fund, of whom **1,548** are Widows or Spinsters. **824** are over **70** years of age, **233** are over **80** years of age, **1,486** are over **60** years of age. Deaths through the disaster over **400.**

THE BITTER CRY FOR HELP

is still coming to the Committee from sufferers who have bravely borne with their difficulties, till sickness or great destitution has compelled them to apply. **£10,000 required for new and urgent cases.**

Cheques and P.O.'s should be made payable to the "Liberator" Relief Fund, crossed "The London City and Midland Bank," and sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.

PROTESTANT REFORMATION SOCIETY.

The OLDEST Church Society for the Maintenance of the Religious Principles of the Reformation
The ONLY Mission to Roman Catholics in England.

(Established 1827.)

MISSIONARY. EDUCATIONAL. EVANGELISTIC.

Resident Missionaries to Roman and Ritualistic Centres.
Sermons and Lectures by the Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., M.A., Ph.D., Clerical and General Superintendent.
Educational Lantern Lectures on Church History by the Organizing Secretary, WALTER A. LIMBRICK.
Cheap effective literature dealing with subjects of present importance.
Donations, Subscriptions, or requests for Lectures or Sermons should be addressed to the Secretary.

Funds are Urgently Needed.

WALTER A. LIMBRICK, Secretary, 62, Berners Street, London, W.

THE PROTESTANT ALLIANCE

IS

The OLDEST Society

Which has for its object the UNION OF ALL PROTESTANTS in maintaining the Scriptural Principles of the Reformation against Ritualism and Romanism. It is

The ONLY Society

Having an ILLUSTRATED Protestant Monthly Paper, post free to Members. A copy of the current issue will be sent GRATIS on application.

Contributions in support of the general work of the Protestant Alliance will be thankfully received by
S. W. BRETT, SECRETARY, 430, STRAND, LONDON W.C.

THE EAST END MISSION TO THE JEWS.

Funds urgently needed towards the **MEDICAL MISSION,** the **GENERAL WORK.**
The **CHARITY WORK,** to alleviate the sufferings of the sick and distressed.
5,000 sick were treated at the Mission last year. Many confessed Christ.

Secretary: D. OPPENHEIM, 119, LEMAN STREET, E.
Bankers: LONDON & WESTMINSTER BANK.

PLEASE HELP THE FATHERLESS CHILDREN.

Patron: HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

RPHAN WORKING SCHOOL.

Founded 1758.

5,500 Children (of both sexes) have been Trained. 500 are now being Maintained and Educated.

Children are received from Infancy to 11 years of age, and are retained until 14 or 15.

Funds urgently needed.

Senior School: HAVERSTOCK HILL, MAITLAND PARK, N.W.
Junior School: ALEXANDRA ORPHANAGE, HORNSEY RISE, N.
Convalescent Home: HAROLD ROAD, MARGATE.

Treasurer: HORACE BROOKS MARSHALL, Esq., M.A., J.P., D.L.
Bankers: LONDON JOINT STOCK BANK, Ltd., Princes St., E.C.
Secretary: ALEXANDER GRANT.

Offices: 73, Cheapside, London, E.C.

SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS.

FAILURE of the **SPRING RAINS** has caused acute distress and illness among the poor Jews at Jerusalem. We are giving Water and Food to some hundreds, and employing seventy men at Abraham's Vineyard.

FUNDS GREATLY NEEDED for Employment and for Relief till rain comes next October.

Hon. Treasurer: F. A. BEVAN, 54, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.

Secretary: E. A. FINN, 41, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.

ECCLESIASTICAL INSURANCE OFFICE, LIM.

FIRE INSURANCE. GLASS INSURANCE. BURGLARY INSURANCE.

The Surplus Profits are devoted to Institutions, etc., for the benefit of the Clergy and of Church objects. **Already a sum of £33,000 has been so distributed**, including £3,000 to the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund.

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Lim., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., *Secretary.*

"This is a serious attempt made in good faith to help the Clergy to help themselves, and to husband the existing resources of the Church."—*Guardian.*

CLERGY PENSIONS INSTITUTION.

FOUNDED 1886. INCORPORATED 1892.

Joint Presidents.—The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. The ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

The distinguishing characteristic of the scheme of the Institution may be concisely stated in the three words, "Self-help aided." Clergymen who wish to secure the benefits of the Institution for themselves or their families, exercise self-help by making payments in purchase of Benefits; while Honorary Contributions are applied to augment the Benefits so purchased. The Institution comprises the following Funds:

1. Clergy Pensions Fund; 2. Sickness Fund; 3. Personal Accident Fund; 4. Widows and Orphans Fund; 5. Daughters Fund; 6. Other Benefits Fund.

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Lim., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., *Secretary.*

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:
H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CORNWALL AND YORK, K.G.
THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc.

Labours afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, bargemen, and emigrants. Seventy-three harbours are occupied. Expenditure in 1900, £49,166.

Increased Contributions and Offertories, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N., 11, Buckingham St., Strand, London, W.C.

THE LONDON & SUBURBAN BANK, Ltd.,

22, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

The Bank opens Current Accounts upon approved introductions.

Interest at 2½ per cent. allowed on minimum monthly balances when not drawn below £20.

Dividends, Coupons, etc., collected free of charge.

Approved Bills Discounted.

The Purchase or Sale of Securities undertaken.

Moneys received on Deposit at from 3 to 4½ per cent.

Every consideration given to the encouragement of thrift, both by the acceptance of small sums on Deposit, and by affording special facilities to the clergy and others in charge of parochial funds, charities, etc., for the deposit and withdrawal of such moneys.

ALFRED B. HARDING,
Managing Director.

THE

CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1901.

ART. I.—"THE CHURCHMAN" AND ITS READERS.

THE opening of a new volume, and with it a New Series, of THE CHURCHMAN gives a not unsuitable opportunity for a few words on a general subject closely connected with the aim and the characteristic contents of the periodical. That subject is the call to Evangelical Churchmen at the present time to see to it that, with due regard to the yet greater duties of life, they equip themselves adequately as students.

I address myself to them, not for a moment forgetting that THE CHURCHMAN does not appeal to them only, but asks the attention of all who belong to the large Centre, if I may call it so, of our Church, which, with many differences of viewpoint in detail, agrees in the cordial acceptance of the Reformation settlement of the main lines of our doctrine, worship and government. But I venture to claim for thoughtful and fair-minded Evangelical Churchmen, viewed in their ideal, a place very near the centre of that Centre. And it is with the earnest desire and hope that they may more and yet more realize that ideal that I offer the present brief remarks on their call in the direction of study.

THE CHURCHMAN, as I think all will allow who know it, aims in a special measure to promote and assist the student spirit. Not ordinarily addressing itself first to experts, it always addresses itself to educated and thinking readers. Let me add that it commonly addresses them, not as if it were a handy manual intended to save the trouble of wider reading, but as a help and stimulus to that very thing, extension of study. If I may instance the articles which it has so often contained on the criticism of the Pentateuch, and those others on the real Anglican Theology of Christian Priesthood and Sacrifice, or others, again, on the lives and on the teachings

of great Anglican leaders of past days, I think this will be felt to hold true. The magazine aims to inform, but so also as to stimulate to study.

This aim was never more important than now. I for one cannot conceal from myself the unwelcome fear that just at present Evangelical Churchmen are not by any means adequately remembering the call, for their own and their Church's sake, to study. One occasion I have for this fear is that I see much less than I could wish in the way of rising and promising authorship of the Evangelical Church sort. To be sure, it would be deplorable to think of study as pursued only for the sake of authorship. But a certain percentage of authorship ought to result from a large diffusion of study. Have we at present much reason to anticipate that the next few years will see as much production as we urgently need of the sort of literature, books and articles, which can only spring from a generation of Evangelical men at once spiritually-minded and accurately studious?

As I write, one book rises to my thought, written by a clergyman comparatively young, and which I have examined with great thankfulness on that very account. Whether its author would call himself by the name of any "school" I do not know. I only know that the work is one which I, as an old-fashioned son of the Reformation, am very glad to hail. It is a history of the Reformation,[1] written with much literary grace and vigour, with signs all along of wide and careful reading, and in complete sympathy with the great Movement as regards its moral and spiritual essence. I cannot go with all its positions; the author, for one matter, judges Archbishop Cranmer far too severely, to my mind. But the book as a whole seems to me remarkable for its combination of genuine reading with a sympathy, large and deep, with the Reformation both English and Continental.

But my point is that this able book *is* "remarkable," in the sense of its being a phenomenon far less normal than we would fain think it. We greatly need the multiplication of well-equipped students and writers—not setting but rising suns. We need young men of thought and reading, who shall undertake, from many sides, the hopeful, fruitful, elevating task of restating, for our present day, and so as to catch the modern ear, the true history of our Reformed Church position, and the mighty spiritual principles, unalterable as truth itself, without which the Reformation could not have been.

I am only too well aware of the innumerable obstacles to

[1] By the Rev. J. A. Babington (Murray).

all this in the multiplication of Church activities and the general hurry of the times. But I am deeply persuaded that there is urgent need for some resistance to these obstacles by thoughtful men who have studious capacity, if there is not to be a great exinanition of the truest teaching and the truest living within our borders.

To promote the work of such men, to aid it, and of course also, as occasion offers, to receive contributions from it, which shall be fruitful in their turn, THE CHURCHMAN exists. May its labour and influence prosper! It will have, under the Divine blessing, if it is still guided on its old paths, results admirably free from all that is bitter, all that is really narrow, and full of what makes for established conviction on lines of truth too often now neglected or defamed, and for the peace, and strength, and order, and advance which are surely found upon those lines.

H. C. G. MOULE.

ART. II.—ON SOME FORMS OF THE PSALTER: LXX., P.B.V., AND DOUAY.

WHEN, some years ago, I was consulted by a missionary working thousands of miles away at the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular of the tribes among whom he was teaching, I could but feel it a very high privilege to be allowed to contribute any little aid that might be in my power. When my friend went on to say that, since he knew no Hebrew, or but little, he was in the habit, when the wording of the English Bible did not seem clear, of relying on the LXX., I could only reply that, as a rule, our familiar old A.V. was a much safer guide. This led me into a fresh line of thought. Numbers of educated people, who make no pretensions to Hebrew scholarship, but are keenly devoted to the intelligent and reverent study of the Bible, will constantly, as they consult their commentaries, come across a note, "The LXX. reads this or that," or "interprets in such and such a way," where yet they are of necessity quite unable to estimate the amount of weight to be assigned to this authority. Certainly the LXX. is of a very high degree of importance, both for the criticism of the text and its exegesis, but it is a matter where very careful discrimination is needed. It seems worth while attempting to give a general idea to those who have not made a special study of the subject, as to the relation which the old Greek translation bears to the original Hebrew text. For this purpose it is convenient to examine the phenomena in some special book of the Old Testament, and clearly no more

suitable or more familiar ground could be taken than the Psalter. The translation there is of an intermediate quality. Neither in accuracy of translation nor purity of text does it come near the version of the Pentateuch, but it is miles superior to the hopeless badness constantly displayed in the translation of Isaiah.

To Anglicans there is a further special interest from the fact of a certain amount of indirect influence exercised by the LXX. on the Prayer-Book Psalter. That version, less critically exact of course than the A.V.—for clearly three-quarters of a century should show a marked advance—has yet associations circling round it, and a musical ring in its sentences, which will always make it pre-eminently dear to English Churchmen. Let us urge, too, that a less literal translation may be quite as faithful to the essence of its original as a more literal one. For example, is the "O tarry thou the Lord's leisure" (xxvii. 16, P.B.V.) one whit less faithful than the "Wait on the Lord" (ver. 14, A.V.)?

There seems to be a good deal of vagueness in some quarters as to the sources whence the P.B.V. is taken, and it may be well to premise a few remarks on this point first. I have been more than once asked by educated persons if it were not a translation from the LXX. This was of course absurd, yet what one sees in print sometimes is strangely misleading, that it was based upon the Gallican Psalter. Let us try and make this point clear. For the first four centuries of Christianity, for Greek-speaking Christians, the Psalter in use was of course that of the LXX., for Hebrew scholars of Gentile race were practically non-existent. For Latin-speaking Christians the version in use for the whole of the Old Testament was a translation from the LXX. As a scholar nowadays may be asked to supervise a new edition of some important work for publication, so, towards the close of the fourth century, the famous scholar Jerome was asked by the Bishop of Rome to revise the text of the Old Latin Bible. His revision of the text of the Psalms, somewhat hastily done and still extant, is known as the Roman Psalter; but subsequently a more careful and thorough revision was made, known as the Gallican Psalter, as being first accepted for use in the Churches of Gaul. As many of our readers are aware, it became more and more borne in on Jerome's mind that the idea of revision, however thorough, was rotten at the core, for he would be bound conscientiously to preserve the countless errors of the LXX., which Jerome was too good a scholar not to perceive. Accordingly, there dawned upon him what seems to us the obvious and only sensible course—the idea of translating directly from the Hebrew original; and it is startling to see what opposition

the scheme met with, even such a man as Augustine viewing it as dangerous and almost profane.

The work was at last done, and slowly, but very slowly—not, indeed, for several centuries—grew into acceptance as the Bible of the Western Church. The old Psalter, however, had won far too strong a hold on men's affections, and the new translation by Jerome could never dislodge in Church use his *revision—i.e.*, the Gallican Psalter; and at this day in the churches of the Roman obedience throughout the world, save for a few individual exceptions, which need not be entered upon here, the Gallican Psalter is that in use "from China to Peru." Thus, in the ordinary printed Vulgate the Psalms are those of the Gallican Psalter, and in translations into the vernacular authorized by the Roman Church, such as the Douay English Version, this Psalter is the basis. That is to say, so far as the Psalms are concerned, the only English translation sanctioned, so far as it is sanctioned, by Roman authorities for their adherents is an English translation of a Latin translation of a rather poor Greek translation of the Hebrew.

We turn now to the Church of England. When the Book of Common Prayer was first issued in 1549, the English Psalms were naturally taken from that form of the English Bible then current, the so-called "Great Bible." As for this Bible, first published in 1539, it is sufficient for our present purpose to say that its Psalter does but reproduce, with unimportant variations of detail, that of Coverdale's Bible of 1535, the first printed English Bible. Good honest Miles Coverdale, making no pretensions to a learning he did not possess, stated on his title-page that he translated "out of Douche [*i.e.*, German] and Latyn." That is to say, in the Psalms Coverdale's bases were a German translation of the Hebrew (doubtless Luther's version, as printed at Zurich), and the Vulgate—that is, the Gallican Psalter—translated from the LXX.; and these are the two component forces (not to detain ourselves with minor disturbing elements) of which the P.B.V. is the resultant. It must suffice to say that the predominant, the vastly predominant, element is the former. Of course, the Douay Psalter is really based, professedly based, on the Gallican Psalter, and it would be a useful lesson to compare a Psalm or two in the two versions. Psalms lxviii. and xc. might be taken (lxvii. and lxxxix., Douay).

To come back now to the LXX. If literal translations of the Hebrew and Greek Psalters were set out in parallel columns, the differences in detail between them would amount to many hundreds, and that even if the Hebrew *letters* only are taken count of, regardless of the points, which, as many

of our readers are aware, embody a traditional interpretation, codified probably in the seventh century A.D., but doubtless of very great antiquity. When we come to inquire into the underlying cause of these differences, we find that there are several. Many of the Hebrew letters are extremely similar, even in print, and much more so in MSS.; and to this we probably find reference in the κεραία ("tittle") of Matt. v. 18, Luke xvi. 17. A translator, therefore, if not very much on his guard and very well informed, might very easily go wrong. It may be said that this is to forejudge the question. Granting that the Alexandrian translators read a certain consonant differently from the Masoretes, is it so certain that the latter were always right and the former always wrong? To this we answer that each case must be judged on its merits, and we believe it will be held by sober critics that in a very decided majority of cases the difference is due to a blunder. To put the matter differently, we believe that the Hebrew MSS. underlying the Greek translation did not, so far as the Psalms are concerned, differ materially from the Masoretic recension, though there may well be cases where an absolutely different reading has been preserved.

We now proceed to give illustrations of various disturbing causes, and if our readers will note the Douay renderings they will better realize what the difference amounts to, and will only accuse the P.B.V. occasionally of erring, in company with the LXX. and Gallican Psalter, or will think that these latter give a more reasonable meaning than the Hebrew. *For convenience, references are given according to the P.B.V.* In iv. 2, "How long will ye blaspheme Mine honour?" the similarity of *Beth* and *Caph* led the LXX. to read βαρυκάρδιοι ("How long will you be dull of heart?" Douay); and in xix. 13, "from presumptuous sins," is, by the confusion of *Daleth* and *Resh*, turned into ἀπὸ ἀλλοτρίων. Take one more case of this kind: "the wild beasts of the field" (l. 11) becomes from the similarity of *Vav* and *Zayin*, ὡραίοτης ("beauty," Douay). Of course, a host of examples could be given, but these will suffice. Another common phenomenon is that the Greek translators have often seen a letter less or more in a word than they ought. Thus, by adding to the word "the cheek-bone" (iii. 7), they get ματαίως. Or take lxxviii. 14. Here the familiar "He made the waters to stand *on an heap*" becomes, by adding an imaginary *Aleph* in the word, ὡσεὶ ἀσκόν; and so the Vulgate, "quasi in utre," "as though in a leathern bottle," a sufficiently peculiar metaphor. The Douay, however, shades things off a little, "as in a vessel." Again, a letter is sometimes dropped, as in the constant heading of the Psalms, "To the Chief Musician." In some

unexpected way the *Mem* which forms the first letter of the title was ignored, and the rendering εἰς τὸ τέλος ("Unto the end," Douay) evolved. One may well wonder what meaning was conveyed to the mind of the translator or his subsequent readers. Take, again, lv. 22, where for the "softer than butter" of the P.B.V. (*cf.* A.V. and R.V.), we have in the Douay, following the LXX., "divided by the wrath . . .," simply by the ignoring of an *Aleph*.

There is a phenomenon known to grammarians as *metathesis* —more familiarly, perhaps, known to many as Spoonerisms— in which the order of the letters in a word has been altered. This is a frequently disturbing cause. Thus, in xvi. 5, by confusing the Hebrew NSK and KNS, "their drink offerings of blood . . ." becomes οὐ μὴ συναγάγω . . . ("I will not gather together their meetings," Douay). An almost ludicrous case occurs in xxix. 6, where Sirion, the mountain, is read, from this cause as Jeshurun, the pet-name for Israel, and rendered as usual ὁ ἠγαπημένος ("as the beloved son of unicorns," Douay).

There is but one other cause to which we would refer. By the time the LXX. version was made, a form of Aramaic had replaced Hebrew as the vernacular. Though the two languages are akin, in not a few cases a root will mean one thing in Hebrew and another in Aramaic. It might have been thought that the requirements of the context—or, indeed, ordinary common-sense—would have kept the translator straight, but by no means does this hold. The root פרק means in Hebrew "to rend," and in Aramaic "to deliver." Thus, in vii. 3 we have the λυτροῦμένου of the LXX., with a μή gratuitously inserted to make sense. Again, the root רחץ is in Hebrew "to wash," in Aramaic "to hope." Hence, in lx. 8, cviii. 9, "Moab is my wash-pot," becomes λέβης τῆς ἐλπίδος μου ("Moab is the pot of my hope," Douay). Verily, a total lack of a sense of humour must have been the lot of these good Alexandrians. We say nothing here as to differences which would imply virtually a different pointing. This would bring us simply to the question of different interpretations, and our object here has been to show that a great mass of differences between the two texts are due to the blunders of the translators, and thus point to a Hebrew original not largely different from our present Masoretic text.

Further evidence can be adduced to the same end by considering whither the inference drawn from the occurrence of *Kri* and *Cthiv* in the Psalter point. Some of our readers may wish that we should explain these words. They mean respectively "read" and "written," the latter name being applied

to any word which, though occurring in the standard MS. or MSS., the Masoretes, the Jewish critics to whom we owe our present Hebrew text, judged, *on grounds which satisfied them, but are unknown to us,* to be incorrect; so that we may conceive them to have followed the line of an independent oral tradition, and so given what is known as the *Kri.* Some few, indeed, are merely cases of expediency, as where a euphemism replaces a word thought to be coarse or inelegant, or where a modernized spelling replaces an archaic one, as in the case of the name Jerusalem. Neither of these classes, however, concerns us here. The Masoretes might be absolutely convinced that the *Cthiv* was wrong and the *Kri* right; still, even the most infinitesimal risk of altering God's Word must be avoided, and the reading, believed to be incorrect, allowed to stand in the text, though no reason was seen why the points of the word to be actually read should not be added to the letters of the rejected word.

In the Psalter, the phenomenon of *Kri* and *Cthiv* meets us sixty-five times. In nineteen of these the variation in the Hebrew is a matter immaterial to the Greek—cases simply of differences of inflection or form. Besides these, five others are indeterminate. For example, in Ps. lviii. 8 (7, A.V.; 6, P.B.V.) the *Cthiv* has "his arrow," and the *Kri* "his arrows," while the LXX. gives *τὸ τόξον αὐτοῦ*, as seemingly more appropriate. We must thus deduct twenty-four instances in all, and in the remaining forty-one the LXX. follows the *Kri* in twenty-five cases, and the *Cthiv* in sixteen, a very fair proportion, considering all the circumstances. It is not consistent with our present plan to enter into any details on this point, but we should like to refer to two passages, where in one case the LXX. follows the *Cthiv*, and in one the *Kri.* The former is c. 3, "not we ourselves" (P.B.V. and A.V.; *οὐχ ἡμεῖς*, LXX.). Yet here we cannot doubt that the *Kri*, "to Him," is undoubtedly right (so R.V.). In the other passage (lv. 16, Heb. and P.B.V., 15 A.V.) we must perhaps speak more cautiously. Here the P.B.V., A.V., and R.V. agree with the LXX. in following the *Kri*, "let death come hastily upon them" (lit., take them unawares, beguile them). The case is an interesting one, because the LXX. has accepted the *Kri* in a place where such a course was not the obvious one, seeing that an *Aleph* has to be implied in the verb, and is not written. In the twenty-five passages in question, four turn on the omission or insertion of *Yod* (י), and in seventeen the variation is between *Vav* and *Yod* (ו, י). The inference from these two facts is one of interest and importance. It will be seen, of course, that in the Hebrew MSS. used by the Greek translators (1) the letters ו and י must have been similar,

and (2) the letter ' must have been a very small letter, which would readily be added or dropped improperly. On these two facts alone we should not hesitate to maintain that these Hebrew MSS. were written, not in Phœnician-Hebrew characters, but in "square" Hebrew, the ordinary Hebrew of MSS. and printed editions of the Bible. In the former *Vav*, and *Yod* are not specially alike, and *Yod* is as large a letter as any in the alphabet. Again, in square Hebrew, *Beth* and *Caph* are very similar letters, and were the two chosen by Origen to illustrate the meaning of the word *κεραία*. There is, however, no special similarity between these two letters in the Phœnician-Hebrew alphabet. Of course it may be objected that on Jewish coins, not only the shekels generally assigned to the high-priesthood of Simon Maccabæus, but also coins as late as those struck by Bar-Cocheba, we find the Phœnician letters always, and here we have arrived at a date long subsequent to the publication of the LXX. The simple fact is that the old character was retained in certain exceptional cases, like black letter in English printing; and, in face of all the direct evidence, we need no more suppose that in the days of the Maccabees the Jews still currently used the Phœnician alphabet, than argue, from the legend on an English sovereign, that in the twentieth century the English speak Latin.

So much for the underlying text. But how, it may be asked, have the translators fulfilled their task? Clearly many things go to the making of a good translator. He ought to have a scholar's knowledge of the language he is working from, and know as his mother-tongue that into which he translates. It goes without saying that he should be conscientious, and not import notions of his own into the text. If it be poetry he is dealing with, it would be well if he could retain some of the poetic fire in his translation. Anyone who would care to see what the noblest poetry looks like when the fire has been eliminated might be advised to read some chapters in Isaiah in the A.V., and then in the LXX. To a certain extent, it would be well that a translator should be consistent, always reproducing any word of his original by the same word in the translation. This rule, true to a certain extent, has often been vastly over-driven, for it is constantly true that corresponding words in two languages are far from being conterminous. Tried by any test, the LXX. version of the Psalms may be considered but an average, second-rate translation, far inferior in accuracy and ability of treatment to the version of the Pentateuch, but contrasting favourably with that of Isaiah.

We will now take a few cases by way of illustration. In

ii. 9*b* the "break them in pieces" of the P.B.V. is quite correct, while the LXX. has ποιμανεῖ αὐτούς, "shall shepherd them." This, it is true, is merely a question of a difference of points, yet the "bruise them" of the foregoing clause ought to have sufficed to keep them right. In xxxii. 4, "my moisture is like the drought in summer" has caught the metaphor, though rather loosely (see A.V. and R.V.). The LXX. by a twofold blunder renders "I was turned to misery, when a thorn was thrust in me." Let our readers compare the P.B.V. of lxiv. 7, which does reasonable justice to the original, with the following rendering of the Douay version, which reproduces more or less several errors of the LXX., "God shall be exalted. The arrows of children are their wounds." That the sixty-eighth Psalm is one of the noblest in the Psalter will be allowed by most, in spite of the dictum of a German professor that it is "artificiosior quam sublimior." A careful comparison of the whole Psalm in the P.B.V., though, of course, there are not a few points capable of improvement, with the rendering in the Douay Bible, should prove a striking object-lesson. We pick, almost at random, a couple of cases. In the former, ver. 12 yields a plain, definite meaning. In the latter it runs: "The king of powers is of the beloved, of the beloved; and the beauty of the house shall divide spoils." (This is the wording of the Douay version as now published, but it is a slight touching up of the wording of the Douay text of 1609.) Roman Catholic theologians must find it rather hard to explain to inquirers the meaning of the passage. Or take ver. 16, "ye high hills" (so, too, A.V. and R.V.). A more literal rendering would perhaps be "many-peaked." Yet the LXX., by connecting the word with one similarly spelt, gives the grotesquely inappropriate rendering, ὄρος τετυρωμένον—"mountain made of cheese" ("curdled mountain," Douay). In these, and scores more like cases, it is hard to suppose that the translators had the slightest glimmering as to the meaning of the passages, and we do not know whether the absence of scholarly accuracy or of elementary poetic taste is the more glaring.

We now take an instance or two of a different kind of phenomenon. There is a wooden type of pupil, who, having to translate a passage of Greek or Latin, finds his only safety in absolute literalness: if no very definite sense results, well, it cannot be helped. We have been assured that the following story, known probably to some of our readers, is literally true. At a college examination the words γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος (Acts xii. 23) were rendered "appointed a Skolecobrote" (clearly an official of high position!). "But," mildly re-

marked the examiner, who surely must have had a marvellous command of his features, "how, then, would you translate ἐξέψυξεν?" Here what we can only call a real flash of genius struck the candidate. "Died in the enjoyment of the office." Yet this is no more really absurd than not a few of the cases which meet us in the LXX., where, to one who understands the Hebrew, the Greek is only so much Hebrew disguised as Greek; to one who does not understand Hebrew, the words are meaningless. We are convinced that a little committee, say of Senior Classics, if ignorant of Hebrew and without a clue to the source of the passages, would find themselves very much at sea. In vii. 14 (P.B.V.) a certain Hebrew word may be explained, either of burning arrows, *malleoli*, such as those with which Saguntum was taken (so R.V.), or of fierce persecutors (so P.B.V. and A.V.). The LXX. rendering is τὰ βέλη αὐτοῦ τοῖς καιομένοις ἐξειργάσατο, literal certainly, but in itself hardly intelligible. Our next illustration will perhaps be less pointed because of considerable doubtfulness as to the meaning of the Hebrew: "a furnace of earth" (A.V.), "a furnace on the earth" (R.V.); the P.B.V. (xii. 7) is less exact. The difficulty centres in the word "earth" and its dativel prefix. The LXX. have sought safety in the usual way (δοκίμιον τῇ γῇ). If only there were some support for it, one would be glad to accept Kimchi's view that בעליל is a reduplicated form of בעל, and render "pure Silver is He who is Lord of the earth"; but we feel that it is nothing more than a guess, commended only by its innate convenience. We will just take one instance more. Who, not knowing the clue, could properly render ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ? Yet it is simply so much Hebrew (*cf.* lxviii. 18, P.B.V.). St. Paul believed that in this verse was a clear prophecy of the Ascension, yet it would have been very hard to extract any intelligible meaning from the above Greek, and the Ephesian Christians would have been decidedly puzzled had it been cited for them. But since the Hebrew verb has a wider range than the Greek λαμβάνειν, and can include the idea of taking in order to give (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Gen. xv. 9, and often), St. Paul boldly went to the root of the matter and rendered ἔδωκε δόματα.

There is one other characteristic of our translators, of which we must speak. How far do they give us what may be called Midrash, interpretation right or wrong, instead of a rendering? They certainly are swayed by their feelings not unfrequently. Thus, the Hebrew word צוּר, a rock, is often used for God, as in the phrase "Rock of Ages" (Isa. xxvi. 4). Yet when it is so used the LXX., as a rule, represent it by Θεός, to avoid what seemed too materialistic a phrase. In

Ps. xviii. 3 they could not do so, because of the preceding Θεός, and they accordingly put βοηθός. Or take the familiar words "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels" (παρ' ἀγγέλους) in Ps. viii. 6, an expression made doubly familiar by the use made of it in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 7*f*). Yet while we are not prepared to say that this view is impossible, and though it has the support not only of the LXX., but of the Peshito and Targum, we believe that *Elohim* here, spite of the wide range of meaning that this word has, from God to human judges, must be translated "God" (so R.V.). The contrast is not between man, the highest of God's visible creatures on the earth, and yet mightier created beings; but the reference is to man, who, though a mere speck in creation, is endued with attributes only short of the Divine. In xxiv. 6, the vocative "O Jacob" seems strangely inappropriate; Israel itself is not to be an object of devotion. The LXX. seeks to avoid the difficulty by reading into the verse τοῦ θεοῦ before "Jacob," and so R.V., a somewhat bold step. Yet we cannot doubt that the clause should be translated, "Such are they who seek Thy face, such is Jacob, the true Israel of God" (*cf.* R.V. marg.). Our last reference shall be to lxxiv. 17, "the light [lit., the luminary] and the sun." Whether "the luminary" here means the moon in contradistinction to the sun, or whether it refers to both luminaries, and then the sun, "the greater light," is specially mentioned, we are not prepared to say. The LXX. had no doubt; they render ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην, not merely identifying "luminary" with the moon, but rectifying what would seem the wrong order, though the natural one to those who spoke of "the evening and the morning."

The remaining question which awaits us is as to the condition in which the text of the Greek translation has reached us; how far, in the long course of ages, corruptions have crept in and have found a permanent lodgement. The Psalter has certainly suffered less than most of the other poetical books, perhaps from special care taken of it from its liturgical use. Yet there are not a few cases where a comparison of the Greek text with the original shows that mischief in various forms was at work after the translation left the translators' hands. We will notice first some cases of *additions*, expansions of supposed imperfect statements, embellishments of what seemed harsh or abrupt, glosses embodied in the wrong place, and the like. Of the few instances we cite out of a *considerable* number, it will be found that nearly all occur in the P.B.V., a passing trace of the influence of its Latin parent. All of them occur in the three great MSS. ℵ, A, B, unless the contrary is stated.

iv. 8. "Their corn and wine and oil." The words "and oil," though found in the LXX. and Peshito, have no authority from the original.

vii. 12. "Strong and patient." Into the general difficulty of the verse we do not propose to enter; but as to the clause cited, the "strong" has arisen from taking the preceding word for "God" a second time, differently vocalized, and the "patient" is an unauthorized addition.

xiii. 6. "Yea, I will praise the name of the Lord most highest." Here, in the text of the LXX. and of its daughters, we have a clause borrowed from vii. 18.

xiv. 5-7. This long insertion is found in ℵ, B, etc., and in the Latin, but is not in Cod. A. It is identical with a chain of quotations wrought up by St. Paul from five distinct passages of the Old Testament, following on a partial quotation of the first three verses of Ps. xiv. It seems pretty clear that sundry texts of the LXX. were influenced by the fact of St. Paul's composite quotation following immediately on the quotation from Ps. xiv., and so borrowed the passage wholesale from the Epistle to the Romans. There seems no other reasonable way of accounting for the phenomenon. It is worth remarking that we find almost the same composite quotation in Justin Martyr ("Dial.," c. xxvii.), which must point to the early date by which this insertion had found lodgement.

xiv. 9. "Even where no fear was." This clause is due to some editor's or copyist's too facile pen. So, too, are the following:

lxxi. 7. "That I may sing of Thy glory." This is in B (without warrant), but omitted by ℵ. (A is wanting.)

lxxiii. 27. "In the gates of the daughter of Sion." (A is wanting.)

cviii. 2. The second "my heart is ready." (B is wanting.)

cxviii. 1, 2, 3. Here we have ὅτι ἀγαθος thrice; yet the corresponding Hebrew only occurs in ver. 1. The P.B.V., it will be seen, has it also in ver. 2, "that He is gracious."

cxlvii. 8. "And herb for the use of men." (This is omitted in A.) The clause is borrowed from civ. 14, where the Greek is the same, though the English is not quite the same.

We must next notice some cases of a different phenomenon, passages where the Hebrew appears in duplicate. These double renderings—doublets, as they are often called—are due to the fact that in various revisions of the LXX., Hexaplaric

and other, a second improved rendering was added to a faulty one, whether faulty by reason of inaccuracy or of inelegance, with a special differentiating mark prefixed to each of the renderings. Copyists, being constantly extremely wooden, often copied straight on regardless of the marks; but, even apart from the Hexaplaric fragments, internal grounds will generally suffice us as between the two renderings. We take a couple of instances outside the Psalter. In 1 Sam. v. 4*b*, "both the palms . . . threshold" appears twice in the LXX. (and as regards one word "threshold" we have even a triplet), where inelegance has been the cause of the repetition. In Mic. vi. 16, "the statutes of Omri are kept" appears twice, or, rather, a rendering of the clause appears side by side with an earlier blundering translation of the Hebrew, in which the Hebrew has been misread twice *ἀφανισθήσεται νόμιμα λαοῦ μου*.

In the Psalms this phenomenon is comparatively rare, again, perhaps, from the liturgical use of the Psalter; but there are a certain number of cases, and some of them enter into the P.B.V. We now proceed to cite some examples:

xxix. 1. "O ye mighty." It will be noticed that in the A.V. and R.V. this verse consists of two clauses, in the P.B.V. of three. On going nearer to our sources, we find that the LXX. and Vulgate (Gallican Psalter) have three, but the Hebrew only two clauses. As a matter of fact, the first clause of the Hebrew is represented by the first two clauses of the Greek, Latin, and P.B.V., two words being capable of being rendered "young rams" (lit., sons of rams; "offspring of rams," Douay) and "O ye mighty" (lit., sons of gods, or of God). The doubling appears to be due to the Hexapla, as we are told by Eusebius (*Comm. in loc.*) that the *first* clause of the Greek was the one obelized, or marked with the sign of condemnation. On this view, the meaning of the verse will be, "Offer to God the offering which your law enjoins, but offer also the higher sacrifice of the heart's worship." It will be noticed, however, that both A.V. and R.V. accept the other rendering of the debatable clause.

xxxvii. 28, 29. The last clause of the former and the first clause of the latter verse are "doublets." The true meaning of the Hebrew appears in the clause "they are preserved for ever"; the following clause reproduces that Hebrew as misread in the first instance by the LXX. This latter clause was clearly the earlier Greek, condemned in the Hexapla and replaced by the former clause, and now preserved side by side with

it. It may be worth adding that the wording of the clause, as it stands in Codd., א, B, and in most printed editions of the LXX., *ἄμωμοι ἐκδικηθήσονται*, is a case of corruption superimposed on a blunder in translation. Clearly, what was originally written was *ἄνομοι δὲ ἐκδιωχθήσονται*, as we have it in A and various other MSS. (So P.B.V. and Douay.)

The ninetieth Psalm gives us a couple of instances. One of them (ver. 6) is a very simple case: "Dried up and withered" reproduces, through the Latin, the Greek *σκληρυνθείη καὶ ξηρανθείη*, for which, however, there is but one word in the Hebrew. The other, however, has long been a puzzle, and much has been written upon it. The rendering of the P.B.V., "We bring our years to an end, as it were a tale that is told" (ver. 9), is, in its way, perfectly faithful to the original. The Douay Version gives the astonishing rendering, "Our years shall be considered as a spider," on which there is the following marginal note: "As frail and weak as a *spider's* web, and miserable withal, whilst like a *spider* we spend our bowels in weaving webs to catch flies." This rendering reproduces the Latin, but with a curious mistranslation: "Anni nostri sicut aranea meditabuntur." One more step back brings us to the Greek, which, we think in all editions before Dr. Swete's, ran: *Τὰ ἔτη ἡμῶν ὡς ἀράχνη ἐμελέτων.* (The concluding verb is, of course, ambiguous, but there can be no doubt that it should be taken as a first person singular.) We would point out, however, that for the nominative *ἀράχνη* the two oldest MSS. read the accusative *ἀράχνην*. There is thus no longer a comparison between ourselves spending our years in toil and the spider spinning its web; it is the years themselves which are the subject of the metaphor. But, then, whence "spider" at all? Without entering into details, we would say that we have no doubt that *ἀράχνην* is a corruption of *ἄχνην*, "chaff." (Those who feel interested in the matter may compare Hos. xiii. 3, where, for the "chaff" of the original, rightly rendered *χνοῦς* in the LXX., seven cursive MSS. read *ἀράχνη*, and the Complutensian has *ἄχνη*.) The meaning of "chaff" was obtained by seeing in the Hebrew one more letter than is actually there (צ), and so from כְּמוֹ is got "like chaff." Thus, the *ὡς* or *ὡσεὶ* and the *ἄχνην* are doublets, the verb "meditated" being got by a slight change in the following noun.

Surely, if this explanation be correct, and we ourselves have no doubt of it, we have a startling instance of the state of the Bible text to which the Roman Church condemns its adherents. Bound to the Vulgate hand and foot, they are of necessity bound in the Psalms to the countless errors of the

LXX. and its many corruptions. How nobly the P.B.V., spite of its inevitable imperfections, stands out in contrast! To any open-minded scholar in this twentieth century the long-lasting grip of the dead hand of the Latin must seem amazing. Of course, to an educated Romanist who dares to defy the prohibitions of his Church there are the original Hebrew and Greek, and he knows of the existence of our own A.V. and R.V. as translations of them, the study of which would show him how much he can learn from them which the Vulgate cannot teach. Yet to some of the races of Europe even this forlorn hope is not an available one. For example, not until the year of grace 1897 did Breton-speaking Christians get the chance of reading the Word of God in a translation from the original tongues, and even then, it need not be said, it was not by the action of the Roman Church, but by the labours of the Protestant pastor Lecoat.

R. SINKER.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. III.—THE POSITION AND POWER OF THE LAITY IN THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

THE wide and interesting discussion during recent years of the question of autonomy in the Church of England has naturally called attention to the conditions under which other Episcopalian Churches are governed. The papers (and to a still greater extent the debate which followed) on the subject at the Church Congress, held at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in September of last year, gave prominence to this point—the measure of autonomy enjoyed by the Church in the United States and in the Colonies. Some interesting particulars were given, especially with reference to the Church in Canada and Australia; but these were necessarily of a general character, and no attempt was made to describe in detail the methods adopted for the maintenance of discipline, or for internal administration in the churches referred to. The point most strongly brought out was the fact that in each case the laity bore their share of the burden of government. The exact position allotted to them, the precise amount of responsibility undertaken by them, was not made plain, and many Church people at home are looking forward to learning more on these points from the further discussion of the question of "autonomy," which, it is announced, will take place at the Brighton Church Congress, now so near at hand.

In the meantime it may prove not uninteresting to glance

briefly at the position occupied by the laity in the councils of the Scottish Episcopal Church. It is, of course, essentially a self-governing Church. The State does not recognise it; the titles of its dignitaries are mere courtesy titles, and it looks in vain for any aid from public funds even for its schools. It has to fight its own battle, and so far it has managed to do so with very fair success. Its small "population" of 125,000 is almost lost in the sea of Presbyterianism which surrounds it, and the comparatively numerous body of clergy (over 300) in charge of "parishes" are fully occupied in tending flocks scattered over vast tracts of country. In nearly every respect there is greater likeness to the Church in the Colonies than to the great Church across the Border. And in government the similarity is maintained. Until about a quarter of a century ago the condition of the Scottish Episcopal Church, from an administrative point of view, was somewhat chaotic. There was an almost total want of organization, and Bishops, clergy, and laity, each in their own particular province, acted without reference to, and often with little consideration for, one another. The laity were autocrats in the congregation, but had little influence in the councils of the Church. The institution, in 1876, of a governing body, termed the "Representative Church Council," changed all this. It is true that this Council deals with nothing beyond the finances of the Church, but in this, as in many other instances, the control of finance gives the key to the situation, and in some respects the Representative Church Council is the most powerful factor in Scottish Episcopal Church Government. Further powers are given to the laity under certain of the Canons of the Church, a Code which also dates from the year 1876; but it is in the Church Council that laymen are given the opportunity, if they have the will, to make their influence widely felt. With certain noteworthy exceptions, it may be confidently stated that they do not take full advantage of this opportunity. There is probably not the same apathy with regard to Church affairs in Scotland as in England, but it is only on very rare occasions that one meets with a layman who has even the most elementary knowledge of the internal working of the administration of his Church, and this remark applies to office-bearers as well as to the ordinary and generally uninterested Church members. This suggests a difficulty which will have to be reckoned with in formulating any scheme of self-government for the Church of England. The ignorance which obtains amongst all classes of society on all matters of Church government will only be removed by years of persistent labour on the part of those,

clergy and laity alike, who are really and truly interested in the welfare of their Church.

Writing as a member of the Church of England long resident in Scotland, I should say that, while there is not the same apathy with regard to Church questions amongst Scottish Episcopalians as may fairly be laid to the charge of their brethren across the Border, there is, considering that they are members of a small community struggling for existence in an unsympathetic atmosphere, a woeful amount of ignorance where one would expect to find intelligent knowledge. In England the laity of the Church allow themselves to be put to shame by the systematic and business-like manner in which members of the Nonconformist bodies manage their church affairs. In Scotland the genius for administration which so distinguishes the race is liberally drawn upon by Presbyterians for the perfecting of the organization under which their churches are administered. The elder or deacon of a Scottish Presbyterian Church is almost too well informed on every point touching its discipline and government, and it may safely be assumed that the representative to the General Assembly (a synod held annually, in May, in Edinburgh) will have an intelligent appreciation of every subject likely to arise for discussion.

At the same time, it must be conceded that a marked improvement has taken place during recent years in the interest manifested by Scottish Episcopalians in Church work. An authority on the subject[1] was able recently to announce that it was interesting to note the "great influence which the Representative Church Council has had on the welfare of the Church in Scotland since it was called into existence nearly a quarter of a century ago. By giving the laity an equal voice with the clergy in all that relates to the practical management of her affairs, those in authority in the Scottish Episcopal Church have shown that her ancient and Scriptural system of government is not inconsistent with the democratic sentiments of the Scottish people, and have thus taken out of the way part, at least, of the old opposition to Episcopacy—that it is oligarchical and absolute in government. It is to be hoped that the early years of this century will see a further extension of the same principle in the direction of permitting laymen to share with the clergy the responsibility of carrying through whatever legislative schemes may be deemed advisable in order to adapt the organization of the Church to the varying needs of the times." This tribute to the satisfactory work accomplished by the Church Council is probably well de-

[1] The editor of the "Scottish Episcopal Church Year-Book."

served, but I am inclined to think that the success claimed for the organization has been achieved by the energy and business capacity of a comparatively small section of the members of the Council rather than the intelligent interest of a majority of the representatives.

It is not easy to ascertain with any degree of definiteness the precise position occupied by the laity in the Church, and the extent of their power varies greatly in different congregations. This want of uniformity arises from the fact that in nearly every case the individual church has its own constitution, differing perhaps (although often on some point of minor importance) from the rest. This constitution dates in many instances from the foundation of the particular incumbency, originating probably at a time when the Church had no central authority, and was maintaining what appeared then to be an almost hopeless struggle for existence. Thus it comes about that the power of the laity is in some respects more apparent than real, in others more real than apparent. This statement will best be made clear by a short outline of the varying conditions under which laymen exercise such power as they possess. They exercise it both in connection with the government of the Church, and also (and to a far greater extent) in the management of the Church's finances.

1. *Government.*—Under this head may be considered, for convenience' sake, the part which the laity are permitted to take in the election of Bishops and clergy. The seven Bishops of the Church are elected by the clergy and lay electors, who are called together, upon a vacancy occurring, by a special mandate from the Primus. The Primus is elected by his brother Bishops, and it is interesting to note that only a few weeks ago the Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness (the Right Reverend James Butler Knill Kelly, D.D.) was elected Primus in succession to the aged Bishop of Brechin (the Most Reverend Hugh Willoughby Jermyn, D.D.), who has been the chief pastor of the Scottish Episcopal Church since 1886, but felt called upon to resign owing to advancing years and failing health. Practically all the clergy doing duty in the diocese have the right to vote in the election of a Bishop. The lay electors above referred to are the congregational representatives, and must be male communicants of not less than twenty-four years of age. They are appointed by the franchise of the male communicants of the congregation of not less than twenty-one years of age, hold office for three years, and are eligible for re-election. One lay elector is appointed to represent each incumbency or mission charge. They derive their power from Canon IV. of the Church's Code of Canons, and act only on the occasion of the election

of a Bishop. In that election they have no power of nomination, and they vote in a separate chamber from the clergy. The nomination takes place in the presence of the whole of the electors, but must come from the clerical side. It is competent for any elector to address the meeting in regard to the nomination made. For the purpose of voting the two chambers are then formed, and in order to secure election a majority in favour of the nominee must be recorded in both chambers. Failing this double majority, the Canon provides that the meeting may either proceed to take another vote for the same or another person, or may adjourn from time to time; and should no appointment be made by the expiration of six months from the issue of the mandate, the right of election falls into the hands of the Episcopal Synod—*i.e.*, the Bishops of the Church. It will thus be seen that, while the laity have no power of nomination in the election to the Episcopate, they have the power to block the way should a candidate not congenial to them be proposed. In the election of the clergy they occupy a totally different and very much stronger position, but here their power varies in different congregations. The constitution of the majority of the incumbencies confers upon the Vestry all the prerogatives of a close corporation. They nominate and elect their own clergyman. He is chosen by them, and remains at their pleasure. In the words of Canon XIII.: "When the Pastoral Charge of any church becomes vacant, the right of presentation shall be exercised by the person or persons in whom the said right is vested by the constitution of the said church, or whose right of patronage has been established to the satisfaction of the Bishop of the diocese. If any dispute arise as to the person or persons in whom the right of presentation is vested, the question shall be determined by the Bishop of the diocese, subject to an appeal to the Episcopal Synod, provided that in all cases wherein the Bishop of the diocese is one of the parties in such dispute, the question shall go direct to the Episcopal Synod." The right of presentation is in many cases vested in the Bishop of the diocese, in other cases in trustees, in others in private individuals, in several in a combined patronage of Bishop and trustees or Bishop and Vestry; but the Vestry (as elected by the congregation) is by far the most powerful elective agency within the Church, and is often called upon to undertake a task of much delicacy and no little responsibility. It is euphemistically stated that "Charges are raised to incumbencies by the Bishop in his Diocesan Synod after the application from the congregation has been considered," but the fact remains that the power of veto with which the Bishop is vested is exercised upon

only very rare occasions. I do not remember a single instance of a Bishop refusing to install an incumbent chosen by the congregation through their representatives the members of the Vestry. I can call to mind the case of an incumbency to which three nominations have been made within less than ten years, and the congregation in question seem quite determined not to settle down until they meet with a pastor after their own heart. Whether this is for the good of the Church or not is not so apparent, and is a question that I am not at the present moment concerned with; but the fact remains that in certain cases the power possessed by the laity is a very real power, and that they do not hesitate to exercise it. It is, however, not a general power, enjoyed by every member of the Church who may be elected by the congregation to the position of church manager (as the members of the Vestry are termed), but extends only to those cases where the Church managers have the right of presentation to the incumbency. In one church a manager may have very extensive powers and serious responsibility; in another his influence is as restricted as that of the English churchwarden. In more than a half of the 189 incumbencies of the Church, the right of presentation rests with the Vestry or other representatives of the congregation, and the qualification of the congregational power to be found occasionally in the Church's Year-Book in such announcements as "Patrons: The Vestry, with the consent of the Bishop"; or "The Vestry, with the Bishop as adviser"; or "The Vestry, the Bishop sitting as a member of the Vestry for this purpose," merely serves to accentuate the fact that the lay position in the matter of the election of pastors is, where it obtains at all, a very strong one.

For the purposes of the general administration of the secular affairs of the Church (apart from finance, which will be dealt with separately), the laity are entitled to at least an equal voice with the clergy. Here, again, the practice varies under the differing conditions of the constitutions of the various churches; but, speaking generally, the church managers (or Vestry) are responsible for the proper maintenance of the fabric of the church and rectory, the arrangements for seating are in their hands, and the appointment of organist rests with them. In every case it has clearly been the aim of the framers of these statutes or constitutions to relieve the clergy as far as possible from the trouble and worry of purely business matters, leaving them free to give their whole attention to the conduct of the services of the Church and their ministerial duties generally. And to the laity also is given a large share in the management of the Church's schools. Seventy-three day-schools are maintained by the Scottish

Episcopal Church, and more than 13,000 scholars receive their education under Episcopalian masters and mistresses, who are subject to the control of a governing body of school managers. These committees are differently constituted in different dioceses, but in nearly every case there is at least one lay member for each clerical member. They do good work, without any assistance from the State or from the rates beyond the grant given to all elementary schools, and it is satisfactory to be able to record a steadily increasing number of scholars and a standard of education (as shown by the reports of the Government Inspector) equal, in most cases, to that of the rate-aided Board Schools.

It will thus be seen, I think, that the measure of autonomy conceded to the laity in matters of local administration in the Episcopal Church in Scotland is considerable. The weak point lies in the fact that it is not uniform. The election to incumbencies by direct congregational vote exists but in few cases; but the Church managers, with whom, as has been shown, patronage rests in so many cases, are elected by the popular vote (and as a rule have to be re-elected every third year), and may in most cases be trusted to make choice of a pastor who will be acceptable to the majority of the congregation. The Bishops, on the other hand, where the selection is left entirely to them, naturally, in nearly every instance, select men of their own school of thought, without reference to the predilections of the particular congregation concerned.

Beyond the powers already referred to, members of the Church who are communicants are entitled[1] to attend the meetings of the Diocesan Synod (consisting of the Bishop and beneficed clergy of the diocese), and to address the synod upon the subject which may happen to be under discussion, but not to vote. They may also be licensed by the Bishop, as lay-readers and catechists,[2] to read the Common Prayer and Holy Scriptures at such places within the diocese as he may deem expedient. And, further, a layman may under special circumstances be permitted by the Bishop, at the request of any rector or priest in charge, to address a congregation in the church.[3]

In connection with the government of the cathedral churches, the constitution also varies in different dioceses. In the case of an existing church appointed a cathedral, the existing constitution remains in force, and it would appear that in such a case the appointment of the cathedral clergy rests with the church managers if the patronage of the charge vests in them. In the case of the erection and institution of

---

[1] Canon XXX. [2] Canon XLIII. [3] Canon XIX.

a new cathedral, however, the Bishop becomes the head of the cathedral,[1] and the appointment of the Provost (as the rector of the cathedral church is termed) and other clergy rests with him. The Dean of the diocese is not necessarily connected with the cathedral; his charge may be at the other end of the diocese, but he is always a member of the Chapter. The more modern cathedrals (*i.e.*, instituted since 1876) are governed in accordance with a code of statutes approved by the Bishop and the Diocesan Synod, but no layman has any voice in the administration of these statutes. The general management of the financial affairs of the cathedral is, however, usually vested by a separate constitution in a congregational committee consisting of the Provost and precentor, acting *ex-officio*, and a dozen laymen, eight being elected by the popular vote and four afterwards appointed by the Provost. This committee not only deals with financial affairs, but has the power of nominating the organist, choir-master, choir, vergers, and any other laymen engaged in the service of the Church. In connection with Cathedral administration, there has recently arisen a case of much interest as illustrating the conditions of government obtaining in the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Provost of a cathedral (and Dean of the diocese), finding himself unable to see eye to eye with his Bishop, felt called upon to resign his Provostship, in order, as he expressed it from the pulpit, that the cathedral might become, as in the days of the primitive Church, the Bishop's own church. A congregation in the same diocese, the majority of whom were in sympathy with the views of the ex-Provost on Church questions generally, at once invited him to become their pastor, the incumbency having recently become vacant, and he was elected to the charge by the unanimous vote of the church managers, and was soon afterwards installed by the Bishop for whose comfort in matters ecclesiastical he had shown so much consideration. Everything was conducted amicably, and all concerned remain good friends. The instance is probably unique, but goes to prove, I think, that the freedom of a Free Church has some advantages, and that the power of patronage is at least sometimes in good hands when it is vested in the congregation.

The position and power of the laity thus far defined has relation almost exclusively to questions of local autonomy. It is, as will be seen, considerable, but a varying quantity. In matters of discipline pure and simple the laity have no voice; the Primus and Bishops hold undisputed sway. It is difficult to see how it could well be otherwise. The value

[1] Canon IX.

of the Episcopacy as an organization lies in the strength and supremity of the ruling power, within the limits to which the Church as a whole resolves that that power shall extend. In the most delicate questions of discipline the authority must rest with the chief pastor. It behoves the laity, therefore, to appreciate and use with the greatest care the power given to them in the election of their Bishops. But it is in questions connected with the finances of the Church that the position of the laity in the Scottish Episcopal Church is best defined, and here the power conceded to them is not only real, but has universal application.

2. *Finance.*—The financial affairs of the Church are in the hands of the Representative Church Council. This Council consists of the Bishops, all instituted and licensed Presbyters, diocesan officials, and a lay representative from each incumbency and licensed mission in the Church. The function of the Council is to be the organ of the Church in all matters of financial administration; to take cognisance of the whole financial affairs of the Church; to have custody of all the corporate funds of the Church (so far as committed to it); and to collect and distribute money for all Church purposes of a general or corporate character (as distinguished from those which are strictly congregational or diocesan), but does not deal with questions of doctrine or worship, nor with matters of discipline save to give effect to canonical sentences of the Church. The Council meets annually in one of the large towns of Scotland, but the work is carried on throughout the year by an Executive Committee, and by Boards having the control, respectively, of the Clergy Sustentation Fund, Home Missions, Education, and Foreign Missions, all of which hold frequent meetings at the central offices of the Council in Edinburgh. The lay representatives are elected by the cathedral and church congregations at an annual meeting held for the purpose. Owing to each misson being entitled to send a representative, the number of laymen on the Council is slightly in excess of the number of clergy. On the Executive Committee the laity preponderate in the proportion of about two laymen to one clergyman, but on the Boards dealing with Education and Missions the clergy have the majority. A reference to the report of the Council for the current year shows that nearly all the members of these committees, both clerical and lay, attend the meetings with exemplary regularity, and it may fairly be claimed for the Council that since its inception a great advance has been made in the administration of the financial affairs of the Church. How far this success is due to the excellent work done by the permanent officials at the central offices it is not

easy to judge, but to them and to a small body of enthusiastic members of the Church resident in Edinburgh much must be ascribed. The Council, however, is almost entirely dependent upon the congregation for supplies, and here again it is to the local organization and energy that we must look if we wish to discover what opportunities of usefulness the laity enjoy, and whether they use them well. One of the chief duties of the Vestry or congregational committee is to collect contributions to the Clergy Sustentation Fund. These contributions usually take the place of pew-rents, and in a well-organized congregation the district (corresponding to the English parish, but topographically embracing a great many parishes) is divided into several "wards," for one of which each member of committee is responsible. The actual work of collection is carried out by lady members of the congregation, who report to the member of committee who has charge of their ward. In small districts the whole of the work is often done by the secretary to the Vestry; but in a self-supporting Church the Clergy Fund is necessarily of the highest importance, and in no field has the Representative Church Council done such good work as in the effective organization of the means for dealing satisfactorily with the Church's requirements in this direction. The collections for the other central funds are made in church at the discretion of the incumbent. The division of the Clergy Fund is made on the equal dividend principle, each incumbency being allotted the same amount.

The laity are also represented (to the extent of one representative from each congregation, with a few additional members) on the Diocesan Council, of which the Bishop and all the clergy are members, which meets twice a year for the purpose of dealing with questions of diocesan finance.

Those who are seeking for the Church of England a measure of autonomy, which will give the laity of that Church a position of much greater responsibility than they now possess, will probably not see much that is attractive in the limited power enjoyed by their Episcopalian brethren in Scotland. In the Scottish Episcopal Church the statutory government of the affairs of the Church at large rests with (1) The Episcopal Synod, consisting of the Bishops and dealing with appeals and with accusations against Bishops. The laity have no voice here. (2) The Provincial Synod, called together only on rare occasions, and consisting of the Bishops (who form the First Chamber), and the Deans and a proportion of the clergy specially elected by the Diocesan Synod (who form the Second Chamber). The Provincial Synod has the sole power of legislating for the Church by the enactment or amendment

of canons. The laity have no voice here. (3) The Representative Church Council, the constitution of which has already been fully explained. Here the laity have at least an equal voice with the clergy. They have as large a share in the control of the finances of the Church as their clerical brethren, they have an equal voice in the election of Bishops, and they possess the right of presentation in the case of the majority of the incumbencies.

Compared with the Church of England the Episcopal Church in Scotland may be described as possessing complete autonomy, for it is entirely self-governing. No man of alien religion has the right to legislate for its members, but this has been so only since 1864, the date of the Act removing the disabilities affecting the Bishops and clergy of the "Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland." Since then it has been a free Church, and has made some use of its freedom. It has much yet to learn—much ignorance within its walls and without to contend with—and, as in England, it will probably depend upon the combined and continuous effort of clergy and laity united in the bond of one community of purpose, whether or not it be proved in the future that there is nothing in the principle of Episcopacy opposed to the attainment of the highest perfection of order and good government.

Briefly, then, the layman in the Scottish Episcopal Church who takes an intelligent interest in the Church's work, and is not afraid to accept responsibility, has certain opportunities for usefulness denied to the layman in the Church of England. It would be idle to say that he appreciates these opportunities at their full value, or even that, in the great majority of cases, he understands that they are open to him. The average layman is as little versed in Scotland as in England in the principles of government ruling the administration of his Church's affairs. There is a widespread indifference in lay circles to all matters connected with organization, whether relating to the Church, the diocese, or the congregation, and a lamentable lack of interest in such questions is manifested by all but a very small minority of the members of the Church. Membership of the different committees is rather avoided than sought after, and the attendance at Synod and Council is not what it should be. In this and other respects the laity of the Church in Scotland differ in only a very slight degree from their Episcopalian brethren in England. As a rule, little interest is taken in the election of office-bearers, and there is little or no competition for the honour of representing the congregation as lay elector or lay representative. The question of Church administration is rarely referred to from the pulpit,

although there seems no reason why the clergy should not occasionally endeavour by some means to make their congregations understand the position of the laity in the Church's scheme of government. It could at least do no harm, and would remove one of the arguments frequently used by laymen when the work of any of the Church's committees is brought to their notice—that they have never heard of it before! There are, of course, many men in the Scottish Episcopal Church, as in all churches, who devote much of their time and energy to work connected with their Church's affairs. They constitute a comparatively small army of working bees in a hive of drones, and to them is due the credit of having carried to a successful issue the various schemes of which I have endeavoured to give an outline. As I have, I trust, shown, such men share in the responsibility of the election of Bishops and clergy, they help to manage the day-schools of the Church, and they have more than an equal voice with the clergy in the control of financial affairs. It is true that their franchise does not extend to interference with the fundamental laws of the Church, and most people will be inclined to think that, under present conditions, it is as well so. Some day, in both England and Scotland, the laity may be aroused to a fuller appreciation of their position and its natural responsibilities. For the present it must be acknowledged that even as the great mass of the laity lack the enthusiasm of purpose necessary to good work, so do they lack the knowledge of Church history and government, without which their efforts would be of little use.

H. D. HENDERSON.

ART. IV.—ASIA IN EAST LONDON.

SOME sixty years ago a few supporters of the Church Missionary Society discovered, to their sorrow, that while missonaries were being sent to Asia, not only was nothing being done for the many Asiatic seamen who visited this country, but that the treatment which they received in the East of London was a disgrace to civilization. In consequence of the complaints made by these and other people, the secretaries of the Missionary Societies in London discussed the matter at their monthly conference, and decided to see for themselves if the state of the Asiatics was as bad as it was represented. To their surprise, they found it was worse.

For they discovered that these strangers on coming ashore with money in their pockets were met by rascally

natives of India, who contracted for their keep during their stay in London, and treated them, once they were in their power, with less consideration than they would bestow upon cattle. Six or eight men were usually packed in some small insanitary room or cellar, utterly devoid of furniture or bedding. They slept on the bare floor, and spent the greater portion of their days smoking, eating and sleeping in the same unsavoury room. In the evening visitors of a most objectionable character, in league with the landlord, came in, and, while their victims were under the influence of drink or opium, cheated or robbed them of every penny which they possessed. Once their money was gone, the landlord ruled the men, whom he had contracted to keep, as if they were slaves. If one of them offended him he was locked up in an ordinary cupboard and kept without food for a day or two. Some who escaped, starving and desperate, stole food from shops and were imprisoned. Every year a large number of natives of India died in London prisons, workhouses and hospitals, without anyone understanding a word of what they said on their death-beds. "Found dead" and "Died of cold and starvation" were the verdicts common at inquests held on Asiatics in the East End of London, and magistrates and local authorities were unanimous in testifying to the great need that existed for a home for Asiatic seamen. It was discovered, also, that among the men living in misery in these Limehouse dens were two or three who had been converted to Christianity by English missionaries in India. One of them, who had been imprisoned for a robbery which he had not committed, and had been unable to prove his innocence through the court interpreter being bribed by the prosecuting lodging-house proprietor, had come to the conclusion that Christianity was a deception and that the missionaries were sent to India for some political purpose. The interpreter just mentioned was an Englishman who had served as a soldier in India. He was a thorough scoundrel, and one shudders to think of the misery which he must have caused before his infamy was discovered. Eventually he was dismissed from the court, and committed suicide in a low class public-house.

The Missionary Societies were convinced of the absolute necessity of a home for Asiatic seamen being started, but, unfortunately, they were all in want of funds for their own work, and could not see their way to raise the money required to build the much-needed institution. The matter would undoubtedly have been shelved for some years, had not the Maharajah Duleep Singh opportunely arrived in England. He was a Christian, and, hearing of the desire to start a home

in London for his unfortunate countrymen, invited one of the secretaries of the Church Missionary Society to call on him and discuss the matter. The result of that meeting was that the Maharajah gave £500 to start a public subscription. Merchants having business connections with the East subscribed liberally, and on May 31, 1856, H.R.H. the Prince Consort laid the foundation-stone of the Strangers' Home for Asiatics, Africans and South Sea Islanders. From all ports of Europe came Asiatic seamen to witness the beginning of the great work on their behalf. Mohammedans, Hindus, Chinese, Arabs, South Sea Islanders and Africans, attired in new picturesque native costumes obtained for the occasion, formed an avenue along which the more distinguished guests were to pass. Colonel Sykes, Chairman of the East India Company, and the Maharajah Duleep Singh, were two of the most notable, and great interest was taken in a Christian Princess, the only child of the Rajah of Coorg, who presented Prince Albert with a silver trowel. In acknowledging an address of thanks for taking part in the proceedings, his Royal Highness said: "It has, as you justly suppose, given me great pleasure to co-operate with you in the good work, the foundation of which has this day been laid. It appears to me to be our duty to assist and protect, as far as lies in our power, from the dangers and temptations to which their helplessness and ignorance expose them, the natives of remote regions who are brought to our shores, assisting in our commerce, and contributing by their labour to the riches of this country."

On June 3, 1857, the Home was opened. West India Dock Road was crowded that day with Asiatics and other coloured men, who were addressed in various languages by different speakers, who explained to them clearly the objects of the Home. They told them, among other things, that the institution was to be self-supporting, and not a charitable one, and that all who were admitted would have to pay. The directors also made known on that occasion, in the following words, the way in which the missionary work was to be conducted: "It is not the intention or wish of the directors to interfere with the prejudices of the natives of the East; but they feel it their duty as Christians to set the Gospel plainly before those who are willing to listen, and to give some portion of the Holy Scriptures to those who can read and desire to have a copy in their own language; and, with this object in view, a Scripture-reader, conversant with their language, habits and customs, has been engaged."

Joseph Salter, the Scripture-reader, or missionary, referred to, was indeed a remarkable man. He had been stationed

for some years by the London City Mission in the Chapel Street, Edgware Road, district, and in his spare moments had taught himself French and Italian. A bandmaster, who had been for some years in India, gave him, as a curiosity, a Hindustani New Testament. Salter at once made up his mind to learn Hindustani. He procured a manual, and had made considerable progress in his study when the Nawab of Surat, with twelve followers, arrived in England and settled down in Paddington close to his district. Salter soon obtained an introduction to the Nawab's suite, and became very friendly with Dost Mohammed Shah, a man of some education. Finding that he was desirous of learning English, Salter suggested that he should teach it to him in exchange for lessons in Hindustani. Mohammed Shah was delighted with the idea, and the interchange of languages was carried on with great earnestness in the Nawab's noisy, garlic-smelling kitchen. When the lessons had been continued for some weeks Salter asked his tutor to read aloud every evening a portion of the Hindu New Testament, so that he might get the proper accent. Mohammed Shah complied willingly, and thus Salter had the pleasure of knowing that while he was improving his knowledge of Hindustani the natives present were hearing the Word of God in a tongue which they understood.

A little later Salter had a splendid opportunity for enlarging his circle of Asiatic acquaintances. The Mohammedan King of Oude had been deposed, and his kingdom annexed to our Indian Empire; but his mother, the widowed Queen, who had spent nearly the whole of her life in the seclusion of her harem at Lucknow, decided to visit England to plead for her son's restoration to the throne. This display of maternal affection aroused universal admiration, and the Queen's arrival in England was awaited with the greatest interest. She landed at Southampton with 130 followers, probably the most picturesque party which had ever visited England. Among them was the royal astrologer, who had been brought over so that he might by his knowledge of the stars discover propitious days for the Queen to petition Parliament and the East India Company.

Oriental etiquette demanded that the Queen of Oude should be conveyed to London without being seen by any of our countrymen; and, to insure this, great precautions were taken. The Queen remained on board until all the other passengers had left the ship, and then, entering her palanquin, was carried on the shoulders of four natives to the railway carriage set apart for her. A bodyguard of stalwart Indians, armed with formidable sticks, kept a sharp look-out

for intruders; but an Englishman, possessed of more inquisitiveness than politeness, had concealed himself on the top of the railway-carriage, and as the Queen stepped from her palanquin to enter the train he peeped over and obtained a good view of her. This unlooked-for incident created the greatest consternation among the Queen's followers. Her bodyguard, vowing vengeance, endeavoured to strike the presumptuous Englishman with their sticks, but he escaped injury by jumping down on to the line and running to a place of safety.

The remainder of the Queen's journey was performed without any further disagreeable experience, and when she had taken up her residence at Harley House, Marylebone, Joseph Salter was introduced to some of her followers by his friend and tutor, Mohammed Shah, as a *padre* who was learning Hindustani. He became a constant visitor to them, teaching them English and increasing his knowledge of their language and habits, until the terrible news of the Mutiny reached England and dashed to pieces the Queen of Oude's hopes. In great sorrow she crossed over to France, and soon afterwards died.

Joseph Salter began his work for the Home for Asiatics, a month before the institution was opened, by visiting all the low lodging-houses in London and making inquiries into the case of every Asiatic and African whom he found. He obtained employment for many of them, and induced others to come to the Home when opened and wait there until work could be found for them. Later, he started a crusade against the houses of ill-fame to which Asiatics were lured, and had the satisfaction of ruining them. Three notorious Asiatics who for a score of years had been the curse of their compatriots in London came at last to the Home and begged to be sent back to India, a request which was complied with joyfully. Salter lived to work for the Home for Asiatics for very many years, and Anglo-Indians and educated natives who met him and conversed with him in Hindustani were invariably astonished when they heard that he had never been out of England.

The Home for Asiatics has also been very fortunate in its honorary secretaries. The first was Lieutenant-Colonel R. Marsh Hughes, a Madras officer, who occupied the position for twenty-five years and bequeathed his property to the Home. Mr. J. H. Fergusson, a merchant, was his successor, and retained the office for twelve years, being succeeded, in 1892, by Major-General F. E. A. Chamier, the present honorary secretary.

To-day Asiatic seamen on leaving their ships at the

docks go to the Home as a matter of course, and when I visited it a few months ago there was a picturesque group of lodgers, representing many Eastern nations, standing on the steps gazing dreamily at English life as seen in the West India Dock Road. The building is a substantial one, but apart from the men lounging on the steps, there is nothing Oriental about the front of it. But the back of the premises, with two verandas running the length of the building, is decidedly Eastern in appearance.

Opening from the entrance-hall is a large room in which captains desiring a crew can nearly always find sufficient men ready to be shipped. When I saw it the sole occupants were Chinese and Japanese. Two of the former were playing draughts and apparently the game was an exciting one for the players were surrounded by a crowd of both nationalities, the men in the rear standing on tip-toe and peering over their shipmates' shoulders. A few yards away two Japanese were playing bagatelle with great seriousness, caused probably by their being novices at the game.

In this room the missionary instructs all who are willing to be taught, and presents to every man who desires it a copy of the Holy Scriptures in his own language, but no services are held, and no preaching is permitted.

Descending to the ground-floor I entered the kitchen, where the smiling cook, a man from Mauritius, and his black assistants, are prepared at any time to cook for 150 people. When the Home is full of Hindus, Chinese and Japanese the cook has a busy time, but when a Mohammedan crew is lodging there his work is light as the Mohammedans prefer to have their meals cooked by one of themselves. For their accommodation a big shed, fitted with two large cooking-stoves, is provided. When they take possession of this kitchen-dining room it is scrupulously clean, but when they vacate it its condition is the reverse.

The two dining-rooms used by Hindus, Africans, Chinese, Japanese, Malagasees and other strangers who come to the Home are arranged as if Europeans dined there. They are ten times cleaner than the coffee-shops patronized by British working-men, and free from their stuffiness. In the better-furnished of the two rooms dine the members of the first-class mess. They pay fourteen shillings a week, and receive joint and curry for dinner, fish and eggs for breakfast and supper, as well as tea, coffee and bread and butter. The men who join the curry-and-rice mess pay ten shillings for eight days, and dine in the other room. The above prices, it must be remembered, include lodging, baths and medical attendance, so that an inmate has no further

expenses beyond purchasing any clothes which he may require.

From the dining-rooms I went upstairs to the dormitories—large, lofty, well-ventilated rooms—and with recollections of how the poor live in some parts of Asia, I was astonished to find them so clean and fresh. The steward, who has occupied his position for thirty-four years, admitted that it was not an easy task to keep them in that condition, especially when the occupants were Chinese. As soon as a Chinese crew leaves, the dormitory vacated by it is cleaned and fumigated from floor to ceiling. As I passed through the dormitories many of the men were indulging in a forenoon slumber. A few were lying on their beds reading, and others were apparently lost in day-dreams—perhaps of the perfume-laden streets of their native land, perhaps of nothing more poetical than rupees and annas. In one room I espied a Japanese artist at work on his bed, but with most unprofessional modesty he hid his picture on being approached, and declined, smilingly but emphatically, to show it. He may have been a caricaturist, and feared to offend by exhibiting an uncomplimentary sketch of an English visitor. At any rate, it was another proof of the versatility of modern Japan to find one of her seamen employing some of his time ashore in the pursuit of art. I was glad to see that there was no overcrowding in the dormitories, and, as a proof of the healthiness of the Home, General Chamier informed me that during the eight years he had been honorary secretary there had only been one death, and that was caused by excessive opium-eating. It is, of course, impossible to stop opium-eating, except by persuasion, but opium-smoking is absolutely forbidden.

After glancing at the rooms occupied by cooks, stewards, and others accustomed to separate accommodation on board ship, I went down into the honorary secretary's room and was shown the log, in which is entered particulars of every man who applies for admission to the Home. It is full of interesting matter, and I gathered from it that it was quite a common thing for natives of India to come to England for the sole purpose of seeing Queen Victoria. Unfortunately, they seemed to think that when they had paid their passage to London they had done all that was required of them, and arrived in England with little or no money. In a few days they reached the Home, penniless and starving, to ask for admission. They are not exactly the class of people for whom the Home is intended, but no destitute native of India is ever turned away and many youths are thereby saved from wandering in the streets and drifting into crime. They are kept at the Home until arrangements can be made for sending them back to

their own country. Very few, I fear, managed to see our lamented Sovereign.

A man who visited England for a different reason was Jowahir, a Bombay Brahmin cook, who had been in the Home four months when I saw him. He left India as a stowaway on board a ship bound for the Cape, but not with any desire to take part in or witness the war. The Government, as probably he expected would be the case, sent him on to England, and in due course he presented himself at the India Office in a destitute condition. The India Office passed him on to the Home for Asiatics, where he told the following tale. He had left India to come to England to find his brother, who had run away from home after quarrelling with his family. He had not succeeded in discovering anything of the runaway, and although he had given up hope of finding him (England being a much bigger place than he had imagined), he was determined not to return to India, as he had lost caste because of the food which he had eaten during his travels. It was pointed out to him that he could get back his caste by paying a sum of money which was not beyond his means if he took the trouble to work; but still he refused to return, and declared that if he were turned out of the Home he would go to the workhouse and die there. He expressed, in my presence, his belief that he would not live much longer, but there was nothing in his appearance to lead one to think that there was anything the matter with him. He declared that he could never sleep at night, but an official, who had brought him in straight from his bed, remarked that that was because he slept so much during the day. It was suggested to Jowahir that if he worked during the day he would, in all probability, sleep soundly at night, but apparently he considered that a Western idea unworthy of testing. A few minutes later he assured us that he was very fond of work, but the before-mentioned official remarked that although many opportunities were given to him for gratifying his liking he refrained from availing himself of them.

Jowahir's peculiar case was reported to the India Office, but after consideration Lord George Hamilton replied that it was not one in respect to which he would be justified in charging the revenues of India with the cost of repatriation. So Jowahir remains at the Home, resolved that if turned out he will go to the workhouse and die speedily. It is to be hoped that his brother will before long find his way to the Home, and that the pair will then return to their native land.

The next man whom I saw had no objection whatever to returning to India. He had arrived at the Home, destitute, some weeks previously, and asked for lodging until a re-

mittance which he expected arrived. He was a respectable-looking young fellow, and if his embroidered cap had been replaced by a silk hat he would have looked the equal of any of his Bayswater middle-class compatriots who endeavour to pass themselves off as princes.

"Has your remittance arrived yet?" the honorary secretary asked as the youth faced us.

"No, sir," he replied smilingly, as if waiting for an overdue remittance was the most delightful experience which a man could have. Alas! that remittance may possibly exist only in his imagination.

Many Asiatics who can pay pretend, when applying for admission, that they are penniless, but General Chamier has a sharp eye for detecting such men.

A Chinaman walked in and concluded his application with the important statement, "Me no money."

"Me no take you," General Chamier replied promptly, whereupon the Chinaman departed, but returned quickly and paid in advance for several weeks' lodging.

On another occasion two Chinamen, pretending to be destitute, begged to have their passage home paid. The assistance was refused, whereupon one of them calmly produced a cheque on a London bank for £300, and handed it over for their passage-money and keep until the day of sailing arrived. The balance was returned to them on their departure.

Chinamen apparently cause more trouble than any other race. A few months ago twenty-nine of them, having paid nothing for ninety days, were requested to join the second-class mess. They declined to do so, and also flatly refused to leave the Home. The matter was then placed before the Chinese Legation, who professed to be unable to do anything beyond making a donation of £30—the first contribution which the Home for Asiatics, which has done so much for Chinamen, has ever received from China. Eventually twenty-four of the men were found ships, but the remaining five refused the work offered, and quitted the Home after a stay of 124 days.

Fortunately, the majority of Asiatics make no attempt to avoid paying for their keep. When they leave their ship they bring their money to the honorary secretary, who opens accounts in their respective names, remits money to their families, debits their keep, and acts as their banker. Some of them, I noticed from the accounts, get through their money very quickly. One lascar drew £17 in five days, but that, at any rate, was far better than losing it all the first night ashore, as he probably would have done, had he not brought his money to the Home.

Advance notes are also cashed at the Home. When a man is about to join a ship the law allows the master of the vessel to advance him one month's wages, and no more, so that he may purchase his kit and pay any debts. The Home charges 5 per cent. discount and gives the balance in cash, a great boon to the seamen, for at the numerous other places where advance notes can be cashed the discount is higher and a kit has to be purchased. These dealers, therefore, get two big profits on one transaction. Asiatic seamen are beginning to see this, and it adds to their appreciation of the Home to know that there is no necessity for their going to such dealers.

Many Asiatics come to the Home year after year, in spite of wily land-sharks' endeavours to lure them elsewhere. As I was quitting the building there was a gray-bearded little man from Goa standing on the steps.

"When did you first come here?" General Chamier said to him.

"As soon as it was opened," he answered promptly, and then, turning his sharp little eyes on me, declared with evident pride, that during those forty-three years he had always paid for his board. Once he left the Home indebted to the extent of £1 5s., but the first thing he did on returning to England was to pay the bill in full. And what he said was quite true.

I have not written as much as I should have liked about the missionary work of the Home for Asiatics at the present day, as when I visited the Institution the missionary's house, which adjoins it, was empty. Mr. C. Haupt, who for twelve years had worked with much success for the Home, had resigned his position through ill-health and returned to Germany, his native land, and his successor had not then been appointed.

HENRY CHARLES MOORE.

ART. V.—NOTES ON GENESIS XXXIV.

SOME time back I wrote a paper on Genesis xxxiv., discussing the probability of certain theories as to its origin which have found currency of late. I propose to pursue this inquiry by examining the linguistic features of the chapter. I ask pardon if the investigation prove somewhat technical, but I will endeavour to make it as clear as I can.

According to some of the critics who assume to have settled, down to half or a quarter of a verse, what part of the Book of Genesis was written by one author, and what by another, the author of the Priestly Code is responsible for the following words at the commencement of Genesis xxxiv.: "And Dinah,

the daughter of Leah, which she bare unto Jacob, went out. And Shechem, the son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the land." It will be observed that the words "to see the daughters of the land" (לראות בנות הארץ) are omitted here; they are assigned to JE. What "stylistic criteria" enable the critic to make this separation, or why the editor should have turned aside from the narrative before him to insert them, is not very clear. The words thus assigned to JE are not particularly characteristic. So Professor Driver assigns the whole passage to P. Another curious circumstance is that Kautzsch and Socin (I take the information from Mr. Bissell's "Genesis," printed in colours) assign the words "saw her" to J. But in the Hebrew "saw her" is one word, and it *precedes* the words which, in English, follow it.

Therefore once more *one single word*, and that word so common a one as the words "saw her" are in English, is severed from a consecutive narrative, and assigned to another author than the rest. We have a right to ask those who make this demand on our intelligence on what grounds their assertion is based. It may further be remarked that, on Professor Driver's authority, we are bound to believe that the nominative case in ver. 2 is taken from one author, and the verbs following it, "saw her and lay with her, and defiled her" from another. The editor or compiler of this singularly composed narrative must have been a psychological phenomenon.

But to proceed. In ver. 3 we have the word "damsel" in the *masculine* form—a peculiarity only found in the Pentateuch—assigned in the first part of the verse to P, and in the second to JE. In other words *both* these authors use a form of the word only found in the Pentateuch.[1] As one of them wrote four or five centuries later than the other, this is at least a singular coincidence. Is it not far more probable that the Pentateuch is, after all, what it has been generally believed to be until the present century, the earliest book in the Bible, and that the common gender used for "youth" and "maiden" alike is an archaic use?

Then we find *another* word—a rare one, which only occurs three times in the whole Old Testament—used for maiden in ver. 4. The use of a different and remarkable word is generally supposed by the critics whom we are criticising as characteristic of a separate author. But this, too, as well as the other, is here assigned to the post-exilic priestly author. So that we have this author (P) using one rare word in one verse, and another rare word in the next verse, and the other author

[1] The feminine form of the word is only found in the Pentateuch in Gen. xxiv. 61 in the plural, and the singular feminine in Deut. xxii. 19.

using the first rare word in a passage which occurs between the two selections from P. And all this in the two verses 3 and 4 of this chapter.[1] Is it not fair to contend that the new criticism is just a little capricious?

Another instance of inconsistency is in the assignment of ver. 5 to JE by Kautzsch and Socin and Professor Driver. Professor Driver, it is true, admits that it is a little difficult to arrive at a satisfactory analysis of this chapter. He may well say so, for pretty nearly each critic has a different scheme. But if the use of a particular word is characteristic of a particular author, what has Dr. Driver to say to the occurrence of the word *defile* (טמא) three times in this short narrative—once (ver. 5) in J and twice (vers. 13 and 27) in P, or, as Kautzsch and Socin assert, in the redactor? Authorities whom Professor Driver usually willingly delights to honour, but whom in this instance he has deserted, contend that טמא is a ceremonial word characteristic of the priestly writer. This kind of criticism is common in the German critics, and is apparently on as sound a foundation here as anywhere else. Why, then, do many abandon it here? Wellhausen, though he does not scruple arbitrarily to rearrange the text, characteristically ignores the question of נער as a feminine altogether, and skates very warily over טמא. So distinguished an Oriental scholar can hardly have overlooked these very palpable facts. Why, then, does he not attempt to deal with them? Simply from the practice, so common among German commentators, of laying the utmost stress on things, however slight, which seem to support their theories, and of ignoring all, however strong, which make against them. I must once more point out, at the risk of wearying my readers by repetition, that this is not scientific investigation, but very eminently the reverse.

Again, in ver. 5 there is a linguistic fact which, if it does not count for much, yet as far as it goes tends to support unity of authorship. חרש in the Hiphil does not often occur in the Pentateuch,[2] but when it does it is found about as often in JE as in P. Another point appears to have escaped the critics, in spite of their industry. It is that עצב in the Hithpahel only occurs twice in the sense to *grieve* in the whole Bible, each of these times in Genesis—once in JE (vi. 6), and once in P (xxxiv. 7). This is another instance of the one-sidedness of the critical processes, another indication that they are prompted by the desire to establish a theory rather than to ascertain a fact.

---

[1] This rare form occurs *twenty-two* times in the Pentateuch, and not elsewhere. It cannot, therefore, be a copyist's blunder.

[2] Never in Joshua or Deuteronomy.

Once more, it would appear that the expression "folly (נבלה) in Israel" in regard to sins of the character here described, which occurs here and there in the sacred books, is far more likely to have been derived from this passage, supposed to have been written by a person of recognised weight and authority, than that the writer of the "eighth or ninth century B.C." should have taken it (perhaps) from Judges, or 2 Samuel, and that Jeremiah should have taken it from him. One does not, of course, regard such a point as proved, but many a critical "proof" has a far slenderer thread of probability to depend on.

In ver. 8 we have the rare word חשק, expressing *loving desire*. It seldom occurs elsewhere in the Bible. Its appearance here constitutes a link of connection between P and Deuteronomy, where it appears three times in the same sense. It only occurs three times in that sense in the whole of the rest of the Scriptures. Surely this fact is quite as strong evidence for identity of authorship of P and Deuteronomy as any that can be adduced for diversity? If the argument for the cumulative force of the linguistic evidence in favour of the separate authorship of P be pressed, we have here a proof that cumulative evidence may be produced on the other side. Then, we are told (ver. 10) that אחזה is a characteristic of P; but if so, then רכוש, which has much the same meaning,[1] ought surely to be characteristic of a different author. But both, it does not appear for what reason, are regarded as marks of the same author. The verb סחר (*to trade*) only occurs *four* times in the whole Bible, of which *three* are in the Book of Genesis and *two in this chapter*. Gen. xlii. 34, where it occurs again, is ascribed to JE. Here, then, we have another and no slight indication of unity of authorship of this book. Ezekiel, whose close connection with the Priestly Code is much insisted on, has נתן for *to trade*, though he uses the substantive kindred with סחר for *merchants*.

מהר, again, in the sense of endow (verb) and dowry (noun) only occurs five times in the Old Testament.[2] But it is found here (JE) as a noun and three times as a verb in the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xxii.), and the noun only once beside, in 1 Sam. xviii. 25. Once more, therefore, we have a possible indication of identity of authorship between JE and the Book of the Covenant, and one more among the many proofs of the antiquity of the language at least of the Book of the Covenant

[1] The one word signifies what is *grasped*, the other what is *gathered*.

[2] Some give Ps. xvi. 4 this signification; but the more probable translation by far is "hasten."

and of JE.[1] Then אות, in the sense of *consent*, occurs only *four times in the Old Testament*, of which *three* are in this chapter. The probabilities, therefore, instead of inclining towards the very intricate partition between JE and P which the critics have adopted, point very strongly indeed in the direction of an early and authentic tradition of Dinah's fall, handed down either orally or in writing, in the exact form in which the compiler has inserted it in his history. רחב ידים (broad of hands, ver. 21), though it is found in the later Hebrew, has once more all the appearance of an early phrase, though it never became obsolete. It has already been observed that the reference to the gate of the city has also a primitive appearance. After the time of David we hear comparatively little of it. It would be a pure assumption, absolutely incapable of proof, to assert that P uses it here to impart an archaic flavour to his story. Yet similar assertions to this are often made, and not unfrequently believed, though everything in the shape of proof be wanting. In ver. 23 קנין is regarded as a characteristic of P. Thus, we have *three* words for the same idea of possession, all of which are assumed to be characteristic of the priestly author; רכוש (gathering), אחז (with the idea of grasping, seizing *by force*), and קנין (acquisition). It suits the critics here to assign all these phrases to one author. Had it suited them to assign them to *different* authors, they would unquestionably have done so, and would have had at least some ground to go upon in doing it. That they have done otherwise is yet another illustration of the utterly arbitrary methods to which they have resorted. בטח, again (ver. 25), occurs only here in the sense "boldly,"[2] and used adverbially without the prefix ל, it only occurs eight times in the Old Testament. Three of these are in the Pentateuch, one here, and two in Deuteronomy. לפי חרב (with the edge of the sword), once more, is a phrase of the early Hebrew. It occurs *twenty-eight* times in the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, and only six times elsewhere. It occurs thirteen times in the Book of Joshua alone, three times in Deuteronomy, three times in the rest of the Pentateuch. Of these it is assigned here to the priestly, in Exod. xvii. 13 and Numb. xxi. 24 to the prophetical (JE) writer. Possibly this proves nothing. But we may reply that such considerations as these are held to prove anything when it suits the

[1] The mention of dowry, however, seldom occurs in the Old Testament. Another word occurs in Gen. xxx. 20 (JE) for dowry. This should be the sign of another author.

[2] In Judg. viii. 11, 1 Sam. xii. 11 the sense appears to be "in security," a *passive* sense. Here it has a more active signification, "without fear."

critics to use them for that purpose. It is not sound criticism to allege facts when they make for your case, to ignore them when they make against it. One complaint against the critical school is, not that they criticise the Old Testament, but that their criticism is unfair and one-sided. In ver. 28, again, there is surely a touch of local colour in the mention of the "sheep and oxen and asses." We do not hear in the later history, when civilization had advanced, of asses as spoil in the sacking of a city. The whole tone of the passage savours of a primitive and pastoral age, when not only flocks and herds, but beasts of burden, formed the whole wealth of those who possessed them. What touch of genius enabled the returned fugitives from Babylon to catch so completely the tone of days long past?

I have devoted this paper to linguistic considerations. I will only add that in Jacob's lament, attributed to JE, that he and his were "few in number," falls in precisely with the stratagem to which Simeon and Levi resorted in order to equalize the strength of the combatants. Here, again, one of the delicate undesigned coincidences on which considerable stress was laid in days when a sounder criticism was in vogue results, if the critics are right, from the juxtaposition of two discordant narratives. The improbability that this should be the case amounts almost to impossibility. It is not, however, by any means the first instance, as has been shown in these papers, in which such an improbability has been introduced by the alleged critical discoveries.

Thus the phenomena of this chapter, when critically examined without any preconceived theories, do not support the marvellous mosaic postulated by the German school in this chapter, but lead to the conclusion that the author of Genesis has embodied, almost word for word, an ancient and perhaps authentic tradition of the early history of his race. It may be further remarked that in Gen. xlix. (Jacob's song), which, we are told, has been ascertained to have been "incorporated by J from an independent source," there is a reference to this history. As J was combined with E "approximately in the eighth century B.C.," J must of course have been written earlier. As J's narrative incorporates Gen. xlix. from a different source, that must have been written earlier still. Consequently, even on the theory of the German school itself, there is very early traditional authority for the occurrence related here. The poetic tradition and the linguistic features of the narrative, taken together, constitute strong evidence for the authenticity of the narrative as we have it.

J. J. Lias.

ART. VI.—THE DECLINE OF SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

THE value of Sunday-schools to the Church of England does not need demonstration at this period of their history. Our Nonconformist brethren are only too well aware of their importance as a nursery-ground to the chapel. They not only collect and train future members for the sect, but keep together, in touch with the minister and elders, the young men and women of the congregation. All this is equally true, or should be so, of the Church and its parishioners, and anything like a decline in the numbers or efficiency of Church Sunday-schools is a circumstance to be viewed with the gravest anxiety.

The study of the statistics of the Official Year-Book of the Church of England for 1901, suggests matter for serious consideration. In the year 1898-99 the number of infants attending school was 657,237; in 1899-1900 it had decreased to 647,313. The number of boys attending has decreased in the year from 806,480 to 805,453. That of girls, curiously enough, has increased from 931,187 to 934,914. This number, however, is 10,000 less than the total of 1897-98, and upwards of 2,000 less than that of 1896-97. A similar down-grade meets us in the teachers' statistics. Male teachers have gone steadily down from 1895-96 to the present date. The latest estimate is 55,453, as against 58,057 five years ago. Female teachers have fluctuated in number during the same period. They rose gradually till in 1898-99 they were 150,250; but in 1899-1900 they descended to 148,449.

We are thus brought face to face with a state of things which is, to say the least, disquieting to all Churchmen who look beyond the present moment. To find a remedy which will arrest the deterioration of this most useful agency must be the earnest desire of all actively engaged in the struggle; and the first step towards this desirable end is to ascertain the causes which have produced the failure.

First and foremost, I am afraid the self-indulgence of the age is accountable, to a great extent, for the decrease in the number of teachers, and that decrease explains at once the falling off in the scholars. Anyone who has had much to do with Sunday-schools knows that a good Superintendent and capable, regular teachers, can always keep up the numbers of a school, or get one together if starting; while a scarcity of teachers invariably means the gradual diminution of the school attendance. If classes are too large they cannot be properly taught; the discipline is bad; there is not sufficient time after hearing the lessons to make the subject of the day interesting; then the children, missing the individual atten-

tion which they like, become irregular, and finally go somewhere else, or join the army of juvenile Hooligans who make Sunday afternoon hideous with their yells and mischief. It is scarcely probable that the number of serious-minded young people is smaller now than it was a few years ago; the change seems to be in the standard of conduct. Formerly they frequently, we might say generally, when we speak of the gentler sex, regarded it as a duty to give Sunday afternoon in some form to religious observances. They also believed it incumbent on them to make some sort of effort for the spiritual welfare of their fellow-creatures. Now they seem to consider attendance at Church (and perhaps at Holy Communion) entitles them to pass the afternoon in idleness, or in any form of quiet diversion which suggests itself. "Sunday is a day of rest," they plead; "teaching troublesome children for an hour in a close schoolroom is really too much to expect of us."

The growing habit of regarding the Lord's Day rather as a holiday than a holy-day enables young people at once to find many more inviting ways of spending Sunday afternoon than Sunday-school teaching. Sunday at homes, Sunday lunches, and promiscuous Sunday callers are becoming increasingly the fashion, not only in society, but among the middle classes. Mothers intent on marrying their daughters object to their going to school, because that is the time when young men, their sons' friends, come to the house. The young ladies are required to entertain the callers. No doubt, also, Sunday bicycling has much to answer for in the way of hindering teachers. A young man or a girl has bicycled twenty miles or so into the country, or to friends. He or she arrives in time for church and attends service, but after lunch, naturally the charms of a garden, a quiet stroll, or in some cases even an easy chair, are irresistible. Besides, of what use is a teacher who only comes once a month, perhaps, or for a few weeks in the summer? On the other hand, the cyclist declines to take a class in town, because he is often away on Sundays, and irregularity is so undesirable. Week-end tickets also account for many absentees. They have undoubtedly great advantages, but it may be questioned if they always help young people, from a religious point of view, and assuredly they make it more difficult for them to help others. In cases where sons and daughters employed in town go regularly from Saturday to Monday to their parents, of course there is no obstacle in the way of teaching; but when a girl has many friends, and goes to a different place every Sunday, perhaps for weeks together, however well-disposed she may be, it is manifest she cannot be of use in a Sunday-school.

Sunday-school teachers have always made sacrifices of times of rest, and of brain-power; but when there was absolutely nothing to do for a decidedly religious person but to sit at home, read religious books, engage in devotional exercises, or go to sleep till the welcome tea-bell announced that it would soon be time to get ready for evening church, many of the young found it really agreeable to have a definite employment, an excuse for a walk, and a meeting with other teachers at school, even at the expense of a little exertion and a few unpleasantnesses incidental to the work. All this is changed now. You see the grown-up children even of Evangelical clergymen reading novels on Sunday without any sense of incongruity or twinges of conscience. They do not feel obliged to refrain from their ordinary week-day pursuits, of a pleasurable character, by duty towards God, and often select Sunday as their special day for letter-writing. For them to give up the afternoon to the children of their poor neighbours manifestly requires a much greater sacrifice of inclination than was called for on the part of their fathers and mothers. It may be said that teachers influenced by such inferior motives would be of little use, even were they secured; but that is a different question altogether. There can be no doubt that hundreds of just such young people used to teach who now refrain. For my own part, I am inclined to think that it is not undesirable to employ young men and maidens of this description. It does them good by obliging them more or less to study the lessons. It fosters a sense of responsibility and tends to unselfishness, while, with regard to the scholars, they are clearly better off than with no teacher at all, which seems to be the alternative.

Another hindrance to Sunday-school work lies in the vastly increased amount of brain-work required now of young women in the week, which renders it advisable, if not absolutely necessary, for them to enjoy as much mental rest on Sunday as possible. High School mistresses, teachers in National and Board schools, accountants, clerks, and students all fall more or less within this category. Scarcely any of these professions existed for women fifty years ago; but the numbers engaged in them are rapidly increasing year by year. Connected with this is a cause of decline which is the direct outcome of the great improvement in the quality of teachers now recognised as desirable. Formerly, anyone who could read was considered, and considered herself, competent to teach. Now, systems of lessons, teachers' classes and examinations, and the general tone of public opinion demand much more than a benevolent wish to do good. Girls ask themselves if they are equal to the task, and shrink

from the time and labour necessary to make them fit. "I have plenty of work already," says the intellectual woman; "I cannot take on any more." "My poor head is not equal to it," says the lazy or frivolous one. "I never could understand all those lessons; it is useless to try."

I have kept what perhaps is the crowning obstacle to the success of Sunday-schools to the last, because it differs from the others in being absolutely unnecessary, and should be easily disposed of when once recognised. I refer to the failure of the clergy in many, if not most cases, to realize the importance of the Sunday-school as an engine of parish machinery. Some clergy openly flout it, jest in an unseemly manner at the toil of the teacher, and pity the imprisoned little ones, who might be running wild in the streets, the parks, or the fields. Happily, this class is small; but, still, it no doubt influences a certain proportion of young persons who like to be "up to date" and are glad to excuse their idleness by quoting so superior an authority as a parson's opinion. Other clergy speak in the highest terms of the value of the school, but practically neglect it altogether. They never open it or attend it in person. They never try to make acquaintance with the children or to encourage the hard-working, regular teachers. They starve the school as far as money is concerned, while lavish with funds on cricket clubs, concerts, and the like. I have known instances where a clergyman was absolutely ignorant of the names of his teachers, and, when meeting a young lady in society, was quite nonplussed at an inquiry connected with his school, meeting it with the remark: "Why, are you a teacher?" The head class in the Sunday-school should melt into the Young Women's Bible-class. The Confirmation candidates should not have to shrink with dismay from an unknown rector when he gathers them for preparation. There are parishes both in town and country where the rector's face is as familiar as the superintendent's, and every child feels that he knows and cares whether they come to school or not; but, alas! there are more where he is an unknown quantity to the lambs of his flock, so that when they grow too old for school there is no thread of continuity to draw them to church.

I am quite aware that the clergy are hard-worked, that Sunday is a heavy day to most of them—in towns, at least—and we agree with Archbishop Sumner that they ought not to have to teach if it can possibly be avoided. One may go further, and say that it is better, if possible, to have a lay superintendent; but this does not prevent its being expedient that the clergyman should regularly appear in the schools, though

perhaps only for a few minutes. He might open boys', girls', and infants' in turn once a month or so. On other Sundays he might look in, shake hands with the teachers, ask a few sympathetic questions, and keep himself thoroughly in touch with everyone there. The children would learn to look for his smiling greeting, and their parents would hear of it and be pleased. Teachers might take the opportunity to commend specially good scholars. The superintendent's hands would be strengthened, and he would be able to make suggestions and ask counsel on points connected with the school. If the rector sometimes looked in five minutes before the hour for beginning, he would see for himself who was punctual and who was late, and the laggards would feel ashamed, while the regular ones would be gratified. In the week, too, the teachers' class should not be pushed into a corner, but be regarded as one of the most important parochial functions. It should not be left to some young curate who knows less, perhaps, than half the teachers he is supposed to instruct. It should not be omitted, or postponed, or held irregularly. The rector should show that he holds it one of his principal engagements, not lightly to be put aside. He should carefully prepare for it, and give the teachers of his very best. He should never lose an opportunity of showing that he feels his teachers are fellow-workers with himself in the Lord's vineyard, and helpers towards whom he cherishes the warmest sympathy and gratitude. He should take pains to get teachers, and influence parents to impress on their sons and daughters the duty as well as privilege of thus serving the Master. He should bring the subject before the newly confirmed, and keep himself well informed as to the system and arrangements of his school. If a new teacher comes he should be congratulated and encouraged. If an old teacher leaves he should be visited and thanked for past services. An impromptu examination from the rector, bright, and not too hard, is sometimes found a satisfactory stimulant to the children. Of the annual treats it is needless to speak, as they are rarely neglected; it is, however, a good plan in vogue in some parishes, when Sunday scholars are included in one great treat with the day school, to allow them some special privilege, unshared by others. They should be admitted free, if others have to subscribe, or provided with dinner, if others have to bring their own.

I almost hesitate to mention what, it is whispered, is in some cases the secret cause, unconsciously to himself, of the rector's indifference to the prosperity of the Sunday-school. With bated breath people utter the word—jealousy. The superintendent has immense influence (if effective and sympa-

thetic) with teachers, parents, and scholars. Practically, he or she is more honoured, perhaps more warmly welcomed, in the homes of the parents, and possesses more actual power in the Sunday-school than the Rector. It is even possible that occasionally the superintendent rather plumes himself on his importance, and fails to realize, as he certainly ought, his position as the incumbent's representative and subordinate. Some men are sufficiently large-minded to rejoice if their people benefit, even though they get none of the credit of it. They have also sufficient foresight to recognise that with proper attention in the transition stage, children, loyal and devoted to teacher and school, will become men and women equally loyal to Church and clergy. Consequently, they overlook or put up with inevitable defects incidental to the working of a system which yields such magnificent results as a whole.

There is one remedy for the decline of Sunday-schools open to all. Let them be remembered at the throne of grace, at family prayer, in secret, in congregational prayer-meetings where such are held. Let the needs of teachers, children, and parents be earnestly pleaded before Him who said: "Suffer the little children to be brought unto Me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

M. A. DIBDIN.

ART. VII.—EVANGELICALS AT THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

THE programme of the Church Congress, which meets this month at Brighton, is distinguished by its array of names more or less distinctly associated with Evangelical Churchmanship. The fact is interesting because Chichester is hardly, perhaps, a diocese in which one would expect a Church Congress programme to bestow on Evangelical Churchmen unusual favours. The extremes to which pronounced Anglicanism has been carried in Brighton may also have produced an impression that any Congress held there would reflect the type of Churchmanship most often associated with its name. But any such anticipations have been falsified. And in the face of the prominence given to Evangelicals on the programme of this year's Congress, it is not surprising that people should ask whether the time is not come for all Evangelical Churchmen frankly to accept the Congress as a useful feature in Church life, and to support it, where possible, as members. At present they cannot all bring themselves to this view, with the result that the Evangelical membership

and the representation of Evangelical views on the platform are nearly always less complete than they should be.

The antipathy to the Congress which has so long persisted found expression from the very first. Mr. Eugene Stock, in his "History of the C.M.S.," explains the fact as a natural outcome of past experience on the part of Evangelical Churchmen. "In the earlier part of the century they were so completely excluded from the Church life of the period—such as it was—that they had become accustomed to meet only by themselves; and when, in the middle of the century, their position was more recognised, they naturally and unconsciously continued their wonted habit. Then, when modern plans for united conference and united action in the Church began, started mainly by men more alive than themselves to the importance of external development alongside spiritual growth, they were not prepared for such combination, and doubted its expediency."[1] Probably, too, although Mr. Stock does not go further than a hint, the objection to "such combination" was due to the strong feeling against the rising tide of Ritualism. That objection has survived in some quarters until the present day. Ought it any longer to exist?

In seeking an answer to this question we are bound to look at the facts. It will be agreed that the Congress has never been a party organization. Any distinctive character which it may have is due always to the President for the year and to the labours of the Subjects Committee which helps him. But, as we should expect, so strenuously fair have the authorities sought to be that it has again and again happened that where the surroundings are those of Higher Anglicanism the Evangelical School has been well represented; and where Low Churchmen have been in the majority, High Churchmen have dominated the programme. Nor has there ever been, so far as I am aware, any attempt to limit the representation of Evangelical or Protestant views. Father Ignatius has been excluded from the platform; Mr. Kensit was admitted to it.

Let it be noted, also, that Evangelical leaders were amongst those who helped to found the Congress. The first Congress, held in the hall of King's College, Cambridge, in 1861, was rather a local than a general gathering. There is no exact record of the number of its members, but they were estimated at 300, and several distinguished Evangelicals (including the Rev. W. Cadman) were amongst them. When the Congress met at Oxford in the following year, the Rev. W. Cadman and the Rev. E. A. Litton were on the list of speakers. On this occasion, as Mr. Stock points out,[2] Foreign Missions,

[1] Vol. ii. pp. 357, 358. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 359.

perhaps the best-loved topic of Evangelical Churchmen, claimed attention. At the third Congress, held at Manchester, the list of readers and speakers included the names of Bishop Perry, Canon Stowell, and Canon McNeill. It is clear, therefore, that the foundation of the Church Congress owed something to Evangelical Churchmen, and that men whose championship of Reformation principles was an outstanding feature in the Church life of their day saw no reason for avoiding the new organization.

A survey of the programmes for the first ten Congresses shows that, although the propriety of Evangelicals taking part in such gatherings was repeatedly discussed, the Congress was never banned. I have spoken of the three first meetings. At Bristol, in 1864, Lord Harrowby and Mr. R. Baxter spoke. At Norwich, in 1865, Lord A. C. Hervey, Lord Harrowby, the Rev. T. R. Birks, the Rev. Daniel Moore, the Rev. J. C. Ryle, and Sir Joseph Napier were heard. In 1866, at York, the Rev. E. Garbett, the Rev. W. Cadman, the Rev. Joseph Bardsley, and Lord Harrowby were on the programme. At the Wolverhampton Congress of 1867 the names of the Rev. C. Marson and the Rev. H. B. Tristram appear for the first time. Mr. Tristram, Mr. Ryle, and Sir Joseph Napier were again prominent at Dublin in 1868. At Liverpool, in 1869—the Congress at which there was a formal protest against the admission of Mr. Mackonochie to the platform on the ground that he was defying the law—Bishop Ryan, the Rev. W. Saumarez Smith, the Rev. E. Garbett, "Rob Roy" Macgregor, the Rev. Dr. Blakeney, and the Rev. J. Bardsley were all on the programme. At Southampton, in 1870, the Rev. J. C. Ryle, the Rev. E. Garbett, and the Rev. A. W. Thorold were speakers. Thus the first ten Congresses show that Evangelical men, and especially those associated with a very definite Protestantism, were ready to help the young organization.

Since that date the proportion of Evangelical speakers has increased, and no charge of unfairness in the choice of subjects, or the selection of the speakers, or the conduct of the debates could be alleged. Moreover, a survey of the reports shows that the principles distinctive of Evangelical Churchmanship have in no way suffered in the course of debate. Some causes more especially identified with it—such, for example, as foreign missions—have always received the fullest attention.

Surely, then, the time is come for laying aside any suspicion of the Church Congress, and regarding it frankly as a useful feature in Church life. The policy of refraining from attendance at the Church Congress, like that of standing aloof

from all diocesan organizations, cannot be advantageous. It is true that principles are often stated on the Church Congress platforms from which Evangelical Churchmen must dissent; but whether Low Churchmen attend or stay away, those principles will be championed. Is it not better that men should be there to challenge those things, to refute them (if they can), to present the other side with as much force as possible? And if men already attend who can do this, ought not those who feel with them to be present in person in order that any who stand forth to state or defend their side of the question may be well supported in the audience? Evangelical Churchmen have no reason to dread criticism of their position nor discussion of its details. Why should not the minority who view the Church Congress with hesitation or alarm and refrain from its membership lay aside their hostility, and unite with others to secure that the cause of loyal and sober Churchmanship shall always have their watchful and judicious aid at the sessions of the Church Congress?

A. R. BUCKLAND.

The Month.

THE article with which the Bishop-designate of Durham opens the new series of the CHURCHMAN is in the nature of a warning and a plea. It is a warning, for no school of thought can long flourish which is not supported by some measure of learning, and of the learning which is set before the public. If young authors are not coming forward on the side of Evangelical and moderate Churchmen, the principles held by them will assuredly lose ground. It is also a plea—a plea for more accurate and careful study, but also inferentially a plea for more encouragement of learning and authorship. We very much hope that this latter aspect will not be overlooked.

The November number of the CHURCHMAN will contain an article by the Rev. N. Dimock on "Conscience and the Gospel."

Early numbers of the CHURCHMAN will contain three articles by Dr. Wace on "Protestant Theology in the Sixteenth Century," and Dr. Henry Gee will write on "The Elizabethan Communion-Table."

Dr. Moule's appointment to the See of Durham was received with very unusual unanimity. But the accession of a third Cambridge Professor to the diocese of Lightfoot and Westcott produced from the *Guardian* a curiously ill-timed protest against the policy of choosing a Low Churchman for Durham. The theory of the *Guardian* apparently is that representatives of the three schools of thought should be sent in regular succession everywhere. The assumption that the theology of Dr. Moule is much the same thing as the theology of Dr. Westcott will come as a surprise to most people. Moreover, it can scarcely be a secret that in the latter part of his life Dr. Westcott so far yielded to High Church influences as to give that party advantages which were received by many other

people with surprise as well as regret. Possibly the sudden term set to the play of those influences by the appointment of Dr. Moule may have something to do with the protest made. But, as the *Record* pointed out, the plea for alternating the schools of thought comes a little late in the day. Why was it not made when High Churchmen succeeded High Churchmen in the Sees of London, Oxford and Chichester? Perhaps, however, the *Guardian* was looking as much to the approaching vacancy in the See of Worcester as to that which had been filled at Durham.

Professor Moule will be consecrated Bishop of Durham in York Minster on St. Luke's Day (Friday, October 18). We do not doubt but that he will on that day be especially remembered in the prayers of all who thankfully recall his past work, and look with the highest hopes to his discharge of new and still graver responsibilities.

The prospects of the Brighton Church Congress are good, and the meeting should be really useful. Some curiosity is felt as to how the endeavour to make "speakers" speak, and not read their addresses, will fare. There are indications that some of the speakers will disregard the direction, and others obey it by delivering addresses already in type. But in a few cases a really "live" debate may be insured. The programme has not undergone many changes, and the lamentations over the dropping of the "Church and the Press" subject was hardly worth raising. In too many cases the discussion has in the past been largely confined to persons who had little or no experience of the press; and those who have knowledge are indisposed to think that a Congress debate on the subject could be of much value. It was duly proposed to the committee of the London Congress, when the few members with special knowledge of the subject were against its appearance on the programme.

The choice of Northampton for the Congress of 1902 is natural, and in full accordance with Congress precedent. The Congress is long overdue in the Midlands, which have hardly been visited as often as might have been expected. Moreover, the Bishop of Peterborough has not yet had an opportunity of presiding over a Church Congress, and that, according to Congress rule, is a reason for visiting his diocese. It is curious how cathedral towns are avoided; but visits to manufacturing centres are likely to be of much more service to the Church.

The Rev. Henry Lewis, Rector of Bermondsey, is one of the clergy who have boldly tackled some of the more urgent social problems of poor parishes. He has broken a lance with local authorities over the question of overcrowding, and has shown that the incumbent of a parish can take up the work of a social reformer without loss of his spiritual influence. Mr. Lewis has contributed to the *Record* two articles on the treatment of Christian Socialism and of social questions of Evangelical Churches, which have attracted some attention. Perhaps his use of the title, "Christian Socialism," was likely to alarm some people; for although the Bishop of Liverpool and the Bishop-designate of Durham are both members of the Christian Social Union, there is a good deal of suspicion of the phrase. Mr. Lewis means by it nothing more than the application of Christian principles to social life, and all who know the strong common-sense which marks his character will be well aware that he is not likely to champion wild or fanciful schemes of social reconstruction. He is not, therefore, developing any new doctrine or any strange application of Evangelical principles, but he does contend that Evangelicals are not alive to the greatness of their opportunities in this matter. It seems to be supposed

in some quarters that they neglect social work altogether. According to Mr. Lewis, "Again and again it is said in the most public manner by Labour papers and Labour leaders that Evangelical Churchmen have no sympathy with the poor in their sufferings from overcrowding, from the difficulty of obtaining employment in certain localities, from the awful forms of poverty which are among them, from the cruel nature of certain trades, and from the growing evil of compulsory residential divorce from the prosperous classes. They leave it to others to speak of these things. They never plead the cause of the helpless toilers against the crushing forces of our marvellous (but in some aspects of it savage) civilization. They are silent upon the terrible inequalities between the rich and the poor. They are enthusiastic for the heathen abroad, but of enthusiasm for the worse-conditioned heathen at home they have none. All this, of course, is untrue. Evangelicals are, and always have been, among the most laborious and self-sacrificing friends of the suffering poor among the masses. But the masses are ignorant of it. Other schools have got their ear, and Evangelical Churchmen have not got it, for the simple reason that they have not tried to get it. They have done their work without advertising it. They have not troubled to use the press. They have avoided rather than courted the Church Congress platform. Neither have they put any of their strength into the production of an Evangelical socialistic literature. And for these reasons both Church and people have been led to think that Evangelicals in the Church of England are not interested in modern social problems, and that as a school they do nothing for them."

Mr. Lewis urges that Evangelical Churchmen cannot afford to be misunderstood in this way. That is so. But even more important than the correction of a misstatement is the urgent need of more social work. Much of it is being done, and well done, by Evangelicals. Other men may only want a little stimulus and guidance. We are glad to see that a regular conference of clergy in charge of very poor parishes is in contemplation.

Distinguished leaders of English Nonconformity often visit the Australian Colonies, and are of material assistance to the causes of their co-religionists there. Distinguished clergy of the English Church seem to be less frequent visitors, but the meeting of the Australian Church Congress at Adelaide at Michaelmas next year will offer an occasion of which some prominent clergy might well take advantage. The Bishop of Adelaide, in pleading for such visitors, says:

"The Motherland and the Greater Britain beyond the seas are now bound together by the strongest ties. Australia has given of her best to the service of the Empire in South Africa, and the federation of the Colonies is another element of progress and a fresh inspiration for spiritual work. At this most interesting epoch in our history we should be greatly stimulated and encouraged by the presence of representatives of the Mother Church at the Congress, the members of which will be gathered from all parts of this continent to take counsel for the advancement of the kingdom of God in Australia. The hospitable instincts of Australians are proverbial, so that I need scarcely assure any visitors of a very hearty welcome; and we think, moreover, that a close acquaintance with the ecclesiastical and social problems that confront us in the Sunny South cannot fail to prove of much interest to them. I may also add that the climatic conditions of this 'Queen City' of Adelaide at Michaelmas are delightful."

Any clergy or laity who are disposed to think of such a visit to Australia should communicate with the Hon. Sec. of the Congress, the Rev. Canon Samwell, Rectory, Port Adelaide.

The assassination of President McKinley created a deep feeling in the United Kingdom—a feeling which was reflected in the religious services of the Sunday after his death and of the day of his funeral. There was no such manifestation of interest and sorrow here at home when the Emperor of Russia, the Empress of Austria, the King of Italy, or the President of the French, were murdered. After all, blood is thicker than water; and a common speech, common literature, common habits of life, make ties which, in the moment of trial, we all rejoice to feel. The simple piety of the American President counted for much in the eyes of the English people. Both he and his successor, President Roosevelt, spoke with some enthusiasm of foreign missions at the Œcumenical Conference held at New York last year. Mr. McKinley, in the course of a warm eulogy of the work and its workers, said: "The story of the Christian missions is one of thrilling interest and marvellous results. The sacrifices of the missionaries for their fellow-men constitute one of the most glorious pages of the world's history. The missionary, of whatever Church or ecclesiastical body, who devotes his life to the service of the Master and of man, carrying the torch of truth and enlightenment, deserves the gratitude and the homage of mankind." Mr. Roosevelt bore personal testimony to the work of missionaries amongst the Red Indians. One passage is worth recalling: "I saw a missionary gathering on one of those Reservations—just as much a missionary gathering, though not of the same grade, as is this here to-night. It was a gathering in which 99 per cent. were Indians; where the father and mother had come in upon their lodge-poles two hundred miles over the prairie to attend that missionary Conference; where they had their mothers' meetings and other branches of work arranged; and where all the practical details of the Conference were carried out by the Indians themselves, helped by the white missionaries, but doing it mostly for themselves, subscribing out of their little all that they could, that the work might go on among their brothers who were yet blind. It was a touching sight—a sight to look at, a sight to learn from."

One of the most interesting and most charmingly illustrated books on the war is that of Mr. Mortimer Menpes, the artist and war correspondent. Unhappily it contains some very sweeping condemnations of all army chaplains at the front, save, if we remember right, those of the Roman Catholic faith. The Methodists felt keenly the allegations made, especially in regard to one of their number. Happily Mr. Menpes has publicly recanted. In his letter he says: "From information I have received since the book was written, I am satisfied that I saw only one side of the question of which I treated, and that I gave undue credence to untrue information as to the chaplain of whom I spoke. I am therefore the more distressed at the misunderstanding. I regret exceedingly that the chapter was introduced into the book at all, and I can only say that if the volume had to be written over again I should either omit those pages altogether, or else modify them considerably. In the next edition I shall certainly suppress them, and thus—so far as is in my power—make full reparation." People who are accustomed to the charges so freely made by some observers against missionaries and their converts will be disposed, perhaps, to wonder how often the example of Mr. Menpes ought to be followed.

It is not often that the Vatican blunders as badly as it has done over the "bones of St. Edmund." After all the inflated language of the Pope, Cardinal Vaughan and the English Roman Catholic press as to the distinction which the new Westminster Cathedral would gain by housing these relics, it must have been a trying task to admit that the bones are

not St. Edmund's after all. Cardinal Vaughan says that so long as you suppose a relic to be genuine, it really does not matter much whether it is or is not; but the doctrine has been received with more amusement than assent.

Reviews.

HOMILETICAL AND DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE.

Thoughts for the Sundays of the Year. By. H. C. G. Moule, D.D. London: R.T.S.

THIS volume appeared just as the public learned that Professor Moule was to succeed Dr. Westcott in the See of Durham. By those who do not know its author's works it may be read in search of guidance as to his teaching. Written, as much of the volume was, for an undenominational magazine—the *Sunday at Home*—it is confined to the treatment of such truths as are received by all Evangelical Christians. But whilst this may in some quarters be deemed a defect, it may elsewhere be recognised as a distinct advantage; for at least it shows us how great are the truths which unite the Churchmen and the Nonconformists for whom Dr. Moule originally wrote. Apart, however, from this characteristic, the book is one of real and permanent value. In these meditations for Sunday the doctrines of the Christian faith and life are set forth in due proportion, illustrated from the resources of a scholarly and observant mind, and everywhere presented with a gentle persuasiveness hard to resist. We commend the book to all in search of devotional literature, which, in the right sense of the word, may edify. Clergy should especially note how accurate scholarship and wide reading can be made subservient to the purposes of simple teaching. Too often simplicity is supposed to condone or demand superficiality of treatment. This book is a lesson in the art of plain instruction.

A Course of Sunday-school Lessons for the Year beginning Advent, 1901. By the Rev. G. Nickson, LL.D. Liverpool: Sunday-school Institute.

In the stress of work now falling on the clergy everything which helps towards the development of lay help must be cordially welcomed, and no lay-helpers are of more fundamental importance than Sunday-school teachers. Yet it may be questioned if, however widely we may find Christian zeal and devotion, there is always a sufficient training for the work. There are, indeed, plenty of manuals for Sunday-school use, but too many of them are simply attempts to save the teacher trouble, and furnish him with the lesson exactly as it is to be given. Aids of this kind, a sort of feeding-with-spoon food, will no more make good teachers than the free use of "cribs" will make schoolboys into good scholars. We have more pleasure, therefore, in calling attention to this little book. It covers the Gospel of St. Luke up to the beginning of the narrative of the Passion, and 1 Samuel, and seems to us to be exactly what such a book ought to be. Fifty-two lessons are provided. In each case the idea and scope of the lesson is shown, the central thought which must underlie the whole preparation. Notes follow on the subject-matter of the lesson,

much more full, indeed, than will be needed for the class ; yet clearly any teacher deserving of the name, Sunday-school or other, must know much more of his subject than he imparts to his pupils. Next to this come "Suggested Outlines," where we think the word "suggested" is all-important. Some teachers will need more direction than others, but plainly the right thing is not to supply teachers with a ready-made lesson, but to teach them to think for themselves. Lastly, sources of information are indicated, which will be found useful by older and more experienced teachers. Dr. Nickson and his colleagues are to be congratulated on this little work, and we trust that it will be found useful beyond the bounds of the Diocese of Liverpool.

Spiritual Letters of Edward Bouverie Pusey. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON and the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT. London : Longmans and Co. New and cheaper edition.

The comparative failure of the great "Life of Pusey" is one of the curious features of modern Anglican development. Pusey is left behind, and therefore the interest in him has dwindled away. It was, however, to be expected that more interest would attach to the supplementary volume of his "Spiritual Letters," which has not been long in reaching a new edition. They represent one of the most striking sides of Pusey's character, whilst they also illustrate in much detail the growth of the Oxford Movement.

By the Power of the Spirit of God. By a Yorkshire Priest. London : Elliot Stock.

The author of these short sermons has felt deeply the unreality which marks some religious services, and the tendency to use unworthy methods in winning hearers, as well as in raising funds. He desires more spirituality in worship, more consistency in life. His protests are made without bitterness, but forcibly and upon the basis of Holy Scripture. They will arouse an echo in many hearts, and may do real service.

The Temptations of our Lord Jesus Christ: Seven Sermons. By the Rev. L. R. RAWNSLEY. London : Elliot Stock.

Mr. Rawnsley's sermons are simple, yet showing thought and knowledge of life. Delivered with intelligence and conviction, we can understand them arresting and keeping the attention of all their hearers. They may suggest a Lenten course to some brethren of the clergy.

The Evangelist's Wallet and Christian Worker's Note-book. Compiled by J. ELLIS. London : Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

A useful little budget of outline sermons, addresses and "Temperance Chats," very conveniently arranged.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

A Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames. By the late CHARLES WAREING BARDSLEY, M.A., late Vicar of Ulverston, and Hon. Canon of Carlisle Cathedral. Revised for the press by his widow. With a Preface by the Bishop of Carlisle. London : Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.

Many readers of the CHURCHMAN will have deplored the early close of the late Canon C. W. Bardsley's career. From his undergraduate days in Oxford insomnia sapped his strength and impaired his powers of work. Yet he struggled on, doing excellent service as a parochial clergyman, and finding recreation in literature until retirement from active labours became inevitable. He then took up his residence at Oxford, and devoted

himself to his favourite study until the end came in October, 1898. As a young clergyman he had made a distinct mark by the publication of his "English Surnames: Their Sources and Significations," and for thirty years he had worked at the dictionary which the Clarendon Press has now published. Its completion is due to the affectionate care and industry of his widow. The Bishop of Carlisle, in an interesting preface, gives some pleasant views of the personality and family life of the late Canon Bardsley of Manchester, to whom and to whose stock the Evangelical school in the Church owes so much. The author's own Introduction is a statement, with ample illustrations, of the principles upon which he worked. Incidentally we are reminded that the labourer in such a field is not in every quarter deemed a friend. Some years ago Canon Charles Bardsley, in a magazine article, expounded the origin of the occupative surname Mason. One result was curious: "A few days later I received an angry letter from a lady in the West Country, who stated that her name was Mason, and that she was a direct descendant of Mnason in the Acts of the Apostles, and that the family had worked their way through Phrygia and Pamphylia into Western Europe, and finally settled in the county from which she addressed her letter." A good many people who cherish delusions as to more or less flattering origins for the family name may feel equally annoyed at some of Canon Bardsley's statements.

The method of this work is historical. Its author seeks to show the origin and meaning of a surname by tracing its appearance in documents. Rolls of Parliament, Writs of Parliament, the publications of the Camden Society, the Surtees Society, and other agencies dealing with ancient records, are examples of the sources to which Canon Bardsley went for earlier proofs, whilst parish registers have been of the utmost value for later centuries. Occasionally, but not very often, the investigator is at fault, and sometimes he is in conflict with other authorities. Thus, he defends the theory that surnames derived from the mother's name were common, and denies that illegitimacy was necessarily implied. "If anyone will take the trouble to study the Yorkshire Poll-Tax of 1379 he will be astonished to find how many children were styled after the mother's personal name while the father was living, probably because she was a stronger personality than he in the eyes of her neighbours, or because she had a dowry. In many cases, too, the child would be posthumous." Canon Bardsley traces many names to the signs of taverns, but will rarely allow that names apparently derived from fish have that source. A few examples of origins may be interesting: "Temple" is a local name, "of the temple," and 1273 is the date of the earliest example cited. "Moule" is a baptismal name—"the son of Matilda." Professor Freeman has pointed out that "in the mouths of Englishmen pronouncing French names it (Matilda) became Mahtild, Mahault, Molde, Maud, and so forth ("Norman Conquest," ii. 291). "Lightfoot" is a nickname (*cf.* "Golightly" and "Pettifer"). There is a Cambridge example of it in 1273. "Perowne" is baptismal—"the son of Peter," from the Old French "Perron." It was introduced into England at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. "Wilberforce" is local, "of Wilberfoss," a Yorkshire parish. There is an example in 1273. "Ellicott" is local, "of Elcote," a name found in Wilts in the thirteenth century. Canon Bardsley made room to quote the late Dean Elliot, of Bristol, who used to say that he was the Bishop without the "c." "Sheepshanks" is a nickname of respectable antiquity; "Jayne" is only "the son of Jan"—John; "Ryle" is local, "of Royle," in Cheshire. But every page of this book is full of interest. It is an exceedingly useful addition to works of reference, and one of permanent value.