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

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

distasteful that I felt, being pretty callous as to what the world says, that it was better to go at once."

It was on June 3 that he resigned his appointment under Lord Ripon. News of his resignation appeared in the London papers of the following day, and was read, among other people, by Mr. J. D. Campbell, the agent in England of Mr. Hart, the Chinese Commissioner of Customs at Pekin. This gentleman thereupon forwarded to Colonel Gordon a telegram which he had received from Mr. Hart.

Colonel Gordon at once accepted the invitation, and set out for China. In an interview with his old friend, the statesman Li Hung Chang, he learned the position of affairs; his counsel was, "Peace, not war;" and he left China with the knowledge that peace would be maintained between the Russian and Chinese Empires.

We may add that this volume is printed in large type, and contains a good map.

ART. IV.—THE SIXTH PETITION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER.

WE have received, from a valued correspondent, the following letter, which we print with pleasure. Our own opinion, as against the alteration introduced by the Revisers, would have been expressed more decidedly and fully if we had not heard that a reply to Canon Cook's pamphlet, from the pen of a most distinguished Reviser, was in preparation. The alterations in the Lord's Prayer will tend, we believe, above all things, to produce prejudice against a really noble work.

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—I am induced by your notice of Canon Cook's *Protest against the Change in the Last Petition of the Lord's Prayer, adopted in the Revised Version*, to hope that you will permit me to offer a few thoughts on the same subject.

The question brings us face to face with a problem which, with the Origin of Evil itself, is perhaps the most subtle and mysterious on which the human mind can be exercised—the share, namely, to be assigned to the Personal Tempter, and the share belonging to the fallen heart of man, in evil thoughts developing themselves in evil actions. To define these limits accurately is, perhaps, beyond the keenest mortal ken, and the quest may only land us in metaphysical perplexities from which there is no solution. The practical answer is, perchance, the only one attainable—"Deliver us from evil whencesoever it may come."

The view of the petition which I venture to submit to the consideration of your readers explains, and even necessitates, the article before

πονηροῦ, without requiring any change in the version familiar to us; and it also leaves it a matter of indifference, as far as doctrine is concerned, whether we translate εἰσενέγκῃς "lead," or "bring."

Students are conversant with the controversy between the East and West as to the number of petitions in the *Pater Noster*. The Eastern Church, delighting in mystic numbers, found therein a sacred septenary. The Western maintained that there were only six petitions, asserting the division familiar to ourselves, and adopted by the Church of England, as the punctuation in our Prayer Book plainly shows, where a new sentence commences after a full stop—"And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil." It may be observed, in passing, that any variations adopted by modern versions into their text in no wise affect the Lord's Prayer, as we learn and use it in our Catechism and Prayer Book; for that formulary is a translation from the Latin Breviary introduced into our earliest vernacular Service books, and has never been since altered.[1]

The sentence before us, then, is one petition with two clauses. The first is, Lead or bring us not into temptation. Its purport is the same as the prayer of David, Lead me into a plain path because of mine enemies. (Ps. xxvii. 11). Or, in the words of Agur's prayer, Remove far from me vanity and lies: give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me; lest I be full and deny Thee, and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor and steal, and take the name of my God in vain. (Prov. xxx. 8, 9.) All extremes are positions of danger. "A plain path," "an even place" (so rendered in the previous Psalm, xxvi. 12)—the *secretum iter et fallentis semita vitæ*—is the first request, because through the weakness of our mortal nature we cannot always stand upright. God *tempts* us with extremes, in the

---

[1] The Doxology was not added till the Final Review (1662), probably as finding a place in A. V. The great *Renaissance* scholar, Lorenzo Valla, who was alternately petted and proscribed by the Papacy, inveighs with the bitterness with which critics waged war in that time against what he represents as a theft by which the Church had been deprived of an important part of the Lord's Prayer. In his *Annotations*, Erasmus defends the insertion of the Doxology into his text, though with seeming misgiving, as having found it in all the Greek MSS. to which he had had access; whilst he implies that he would not have admitted it on the mere authority of ecclesiastical writers, however eminent. Since his time the balance of MS. evidence inclines, as is well known, the other way. The controversy on the question and the acceptance of the Doxology by Protestant theologians did not escape Donne's sarcasm:—

> In those first days
> When Luther was profest, he did desire
> Short paternosters, saying as a fryar
> Each day his beads; but having left those laws,
> Adds to Christ's prayer the power and glory clause,

(*q.d.*, As long as it was a penance, he cut it as short as he could.)—Satire II.

broad neutral sense of the word, which St. James so instructively opens to us. The noiseless tenour of a quiet life may be eminently beautiful, and highly to God's glory; but it is far from exhausting the possibilities of human nature, especially when strengthened by forces, whether from above or below. To *all* people extremes may come, and do come—health and sickness, wealth and poverty; and with each one it is the crucial passage of his life; but where there are strong natural passions, concentration of thought, vivid imagination, resoluteness of will,—with such innate gifts their possessors cannot choose, if they would, the mediocre path which sits happiest on the many, and they *must* leave their mark either for good or for evil. For them the second clause of the petition has its emphatic fitness. Add to these natural gifts the circumstances which offer them free scope. Here is a highly charged atmosphere of temptation. Shall it break in a bountiful shower, or in a destructive tempest? Then comes in the clause—Deliver us *out of the* evil inherent in the situation—τοῦ πονηροῦ. Make it a blessing, and not a curse. It may be, for we know so little beyond what is direct revelation, that the Evil One himself is waiting and watching to achieve, if he may, the triumph of his own cause. Satan desired to have Simon ("obtained him by asking," is the alternative rendering of the R. V.), that he might sift him as wheat. Simon was suffered to learn—oh, how much!—by succumbing to the evil inherent in his trying position, and into which he had been permitted to thrust himself; he had gone, or been led, or been brought into temptation, but his Lord prayed for him, and he was delivered from the evil of it —*non sine sudore aut sine sanguine*—but delivered still. In the mysterious opening of the book of Job, there is much light thrown on this subject. The Patriarch had been eminently prosperous, but he had stood the trial well. He was not only thoroughly alive to the special perils that beset the children of wealthy men, who come into the enjoyment of their father's accumulated wealth without the discipline of thrift and self-denial through which their father had past; he thought and prayed and sacrificed for them in the midst of their gratifications and pleasures: but he was also eminently unselfish, and his philanthropy was unusual (ch. xxix.). The reason of his successful endurance of the trial was that God "preserved" him, God's "secret," God's "candle" was upon him. His history tells how the other extreme, in all its fierceness, was suffered to try him; and how, notwithstanding the devices of the Adversary, he endured, for God was with him still; and we know the issue.

Just so, in (what good old Traill persists, with Puritan pertinacity, in calling the Lord's Prayer) the 17th chapter of St. John—our Lord's petition for His disciples is precisely the same, and the rendering in the A. V. cannot be amiss, "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from *the evil*" = not spare them from all trial; for if they were to be witnesses for the truth in the world, how could this be? but keep them from the evil inherent in all contact with it; keep them, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ = and all the more are we constrained to this interpretation if critics are right in telling us that ἐκ is used not of persons but of things.

And thus I submit that we may cling to our old formula, and decline to have it narrowed into a petition which expresses only a part of the truth as to evil, and leaves out of sight that corruption and weakness of our nature, without which outward things could not prove an occasion of falling. My object, in fact, has been to show that the article before *πονηροῦ* by no means settles the question as to the reference being to the Evil One, who is certainly not excluded by the rendering familiar to us, as the explanation in the Church Catechism shews us; but that no less on grammatical than on dogmatical and ethical grounds, when the true scope of this two-branched suffrage is ascertained, we are justified in believing that "THE evil" is the particular evil involved in the temptation, itself often neutral, but bad or good, just as it conquers or is conquered.

Yours faithfully,

W. KNIGHT.

Pitt Rectory, Tiverton, July 8th.

ART. V.—SISTER AUGUSTINE.

ONE of the most interesting biographies which have recently appeared is the Life of Sister Augustine,[1] a German Sister of Charity, who closed a life of devoted service among the sick and poor, under the ban of the Romish church to which she belonged—excommunicated and disgraced, because she would not give her adhesion to a doctrine she believed to be false—and dying, morally speaking, a martyr to her firm stand for truth against Papal decrees.

Amalie von Lasaulx was born at Coblentz in 1815. She was the youngest child of Jean Claude Lasaulx, a distinguished architect, and the descendant of an ancient Lorraine family, who had been settled for nearly three-quarters of a century on the banks of the Rhine. The Lasaulx family had always been characterized by great energy, talent, and versatility: and Jean Claude, no less than his relatives, displayed these qualities. After trying a variety of other callings, he had taken to architecture as a profession, and hard study and natural talent combined, made him one of the most eminent architects in the Rhine-land. Like his whole family, he was a Roman Catholic, but was considered very lax in religious matters. His wife (Anna Maria Müller) was stricter in her views, and conscientious and diligent in her duties; but her cold, stern and reserved character kept her children at a distance, and imparted a gloom and constraint to the household: combined with her husband's habitual absence

[1] "Sister Augustine." Pp. 340. Kegan Paul & Co. 1881.