

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## Reviews.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This first portion concludes with an appropriate Hymn.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

H. LAW.



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

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

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

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

#### THE OLD TESTAMENT COMPANY.

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

#### THE NEW TESTAMENT COMPANY.

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

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Member.

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

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

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

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

Professor Timothy Dwight, Congregationalist, New Haven, Conn.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

Canon Cook first considers the usage of the New Testament.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“is scarcely conceivable that any devout reader of the Bible should adopt.”<sup>1</sup>

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> In “The Speaker’s Commentary,” we may remark, on Matt. v. 37, Dean Mansel wrote thus:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Newman’s “Letter to the Bishop of Oxford,” 1841.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



## Short Notices.

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

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

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