

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

(11) Acts ix. 3-9, and Acts xxii. 6-11. A look at the Scriptures here quoted will show how suggestive is the argument. It is hardly necessary to say that the exposition is that of a master, and will repay most careful study.

On almost every page appears a sentence well worth quoting; and several passages, as we read, we marked as specially suitable for extract. But our space is limited. Two or three quotations, however, may interest our readers who are not familiar with the learned Professor's style:—

It must never be forgotten that the history is not a history of the Resurrection, but a history of the manifestation of the Risen Christ. The fact of the Resurrection is assumed, but it is nowhere described. As a Revelation the incidents preserved in our Gospels are complete: as a history they are most imperfect (p. 17.)

The appearances on Easter Day seem to be mainly directed to the creation of an immediate present belief; those which took place afterwards to the establishment of a belief in Christ's future and abiding Presence.

She did not venture to enter the sepulchre as the Apostles had done, but as she wept she took courage just to look in (*παρέκλυθεν*). Even then the one object on which she could dwell was her Lord. The vision and the inquiry of angels were unable to surprise or to rouse her. The reply to their question she repeats, with few slight but significant changes (*my Lord for the Lord, I know for we know*), the words which she had before addressed to the Apostles (p. 20).

The special duties, privileges, responsibilities of the Christian ministry remain undiminished and undisparaged when we recognise the common priesthood of all believers as sharers in the Life of the Risen Lord, and charged to make known that which they have experienced. The greatest danger of the Church at present seems to be not lest we should forget the peculiar functions of ministerial office, but lest we should allow this to supersede the general power which it concentrates and represents in the economy of life (p. 89).

Doubts are often dallied with; and, still worse, they are often affected. It is strange that the hypocrisy of scepticism should be looked upon as less repulsive than the affectation of belief; yet in the present day it has become almost a fashion for men to repeat doubts on the gravest questions without the least sense of personal responsibility (p. 104).

"It is impossible to open many popular books of devotion," writes Dr. Westcott, "or to read many modern hymns, without feeling that materialism has invaded faith, no less than science, and that enervating sentimentalism is corrupting the fresh springs of manly and simple service." This is true. The work before us, we believe, will do good service, not only as regards unbelief and scepticism, but as regards the sentimentalism of what idolatrous Rome and her imitators term the "Religious" life.

This volume, we may add, is delightful as to type and paper.

Short Notices.

Should the Revised New Testament be Authorized? By Sir EDMUND BECKETT, Bart., LL.D., Q.C., F.R.A.S., Chancellor and Vicar-General of York. Pp. 193. Murray.
The Quarterly Review, No. 305.

That Sir Edmund Beckett's Essay is able and acute will be admitted on all sides without question. It contains a good deal of information, and is well worth reading. Here and there one meets a sparkling sen-

tence. At the beginning—*e.g.*, in referring to the suggestion that those clergy who like to see the R. V. in church should be at liberty to do so, Sir Edmund says:—

That revised version of “liberty” is remarkably popular among the clergy at present; and it means the liberty of making their parishioners submit to whatever their ministers like to put upon them: which has never been the theory of the Church of England, or of any sect in the world since the Reformation.

As a piece of really helpful criticism, we should think more of this book if it were less partial. It hunts out the defects and weak places of the R. V., and does not do justice, as we think, to its good points, the undeniable improvements, the value of the work as a whole. The value of the work as a whole, we say—*e.g.*, the harmony in the revised translation between one book and others by the same inspired writer. Some of the alterations to which Sir Edmund objects, we observe, have been given in the very conservative “Speaker’s Commentary.” In his eagerness to make telling criticisms he overlooks, not seldom, an important matter—*e.g.*, it is well to remind readers of Matt. xvi., that *basket*, in v. 9 and 10, represents different Greek words; herein is an interesting point, in considering the two miracles—as to place, people, and basket, there is a difference; it is well, we think (though this book says “it certainly does no good”), to alter “out of Egypt have I called” into “. . . *did I call*” (granting that the aorist cannot always be so rendered) inasmuch as fulfilment of prophecy is pointed out; it is well to mark in Matt. xiv. 20, that the “broken pieces” were not the “fragments” which remained here and there among the multitudes. Many other passages of a similar character we had marked; but we must refer the candid student to Sir Edmund Beckett’s book, simply adding this piece of advice: read the Greek together with the book.

The *Quarterly Review* article demands, and it will repay, very careful consideration. Its closing passages were given in the last CRURCHMAN. At leisure, we have read the article, and enjoyed it. But the pleasure of perusing so brilliant a paper, so rich, so telling, so earnest, has been somewhat diminished by what we venture to call its one-sidedness. The eager Reviewer, of whose erudition and literary ability, or reverence for Holy Scripture, it would be an impertinence to write one word, becomes, if we may say so, with sincere respect, extreme. There is a lack of the judicial temper. On this point we might say more, but we refrain.

The *Quarterly* criticisms on the R. V. divide themselves into two parts: (1) the Text; (2) the Translation.

(1) In many of the eminent dignitary’s remarks as to alterations in the text we must confess we agree; and even in some passages, as to which, after diligent inquiry, our doubts are not removed, we think his protestations against not only the changes in the text, but also the marginal renderings, are justifiable. We may quote two or three bits, as specimens, from the protests:—

“No hint is given *which* be the ‘ancient Authorities’ so referred to: nor what proportion they bear numerically to the ‘ancient Authorities’ on the opposite side: nor whether they are the *most* ancient Authorities obtainable: nor what amount of attention their testimony is entitled to claim. But in the meantime, a fatal assertion is hazarded in the Preface (p. xiv.), to the effect that *in cases where ‘it would not be safe to accept, one reading to the absolute exclusion of others,’ ‘alternative readings’* have been given ‘in the margin.’ So that the ‘Agony and bloody sweat’ of ‘the world’s REDEEMER (Luk. xxii. 43, 44),—and His prayer for His mur-

“murderers (xxiii. 34),—and much beside of transcendent importance and “inestimable value, may, according to our Revisionists, prove to rest upon “no foundation whatever! At all events, ‘it would not be safe’ (i.e. it is “not safe), to place absolute reliance on them. Alas, how many a deadly “blow at Revealed Truth hath been in this way aimed with fatal adroit- “ness, which no amount of orthodox learning will ever be able hereafter “to parry, much less to repel! . . . In the 3rd verse of the first chapter “of St. John’s Gospel, we are left to take our choice between,—‘without “Him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the “life,’ &c.,—and the following precious alternative,—‘Without him was “not anything made. *That which hath been made was life in him; and “the life,’ &c.* But we are not informed that this latter monstrous figment “is known to have been the importation of the Gnostic heretics in the 2nd “century, and to be as destitute of authority as it is of sense.—At St. “John iii. 13, we are told that the last clause of that famous verse (‘No “man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, “even the Son of Man—*which is in heaven*’), is not found in ‘many “ancient authorities.’ But why are we not also told that the precious “clause in question (ὁ ὄν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) is found in every MS. in the “world, except five of bad character? is recognized by all the Latin and “all the Syriac versions; as well as by the Coptic, Ethiopic, Georgian, “and Armenian:—is either quoted or insisted upon by Origen, Hippo- “lytus, Athanasius, Didymus, Aphraates the Persian, Basil the Great, “Epiphanius, Nonnus, ps.-Dionysius Alex., Eustathius; by Chrysostom, “Theodoret, and Cyril, each four times; by Theodorus Mops., Amphilo- “chius, Severus, Theodorus Heracl., Basil Cil., Cosmas, J. Damascene, “in three places, and four other ancient Greek writers; besides Ambrose, “Novatian, Hilary, Lucifer, Victorinus, Jerome, Cassia, Vigilus “Zeno, Marius, Maximus Taur., Capreolus, Augustine, &c.:—is acknow- “ledged by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf: in short, is quite above “suspicion: why are we not told that? Those 10 Versions, those 37 “Fathers, that host of copies in the proportion of 995 to 5,—why, con- “cerning all these is there not so much as a hint let fall that such a mass “of counter-evidence exists? . . . Alas! for the learning which comes “abroad only to mislead the blind, and to perplex the weak, and to un- “settle the doubting! . . . Why then (it will of course be asked) is the “margin of St. Mark i. 1 and of St. John i. 3, iii. 13, encumbered after “this fashion? It is (we answer) only because the *Text of Drs. Westcott “and Hort* is thus depraved in all three places. Those scholars enjoy “the unenviable distinction of having dared to expel from St. John iii. 13 “the words ὁ ὄν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, which Lachmann, Tregelles and Tischendorf “were afraid to touch.”

Again, we may quote the Reviewer on the extremely interesting passage in Acts xxvi. The rendering of the R. V., he says, is “rash and infelicitous—thrust upon us without apology or explanation:”—

“And Agrippa said unto Paul, *With but little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian.* And Paul said, I would to God, that whether with little or with much,” &c. Now this is indefensible. For, in the first place, to get any such meaning out of the words, our Revisionists have been obliged to substitute the fabricated *ποιῆσαι* (the peculiar property of N, A, B, and a few Cursive) for *πειθεῖσθαι* in ver. 28. Moreover, even so, the words do not yield the required sense. We venture to point out, that this is precisely one of the occasions where the opinion of a first-rate Greek Father is of paramount importance. The moderns confess themselves unable to discover a single instance of the phrase *ἐν ὀλίγῳ* in the sense of ‘within a little.’ Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 350) and Chrysostom (A.D. 400), on the contrary, evidently knew that here the expression can mean no other thing; and they were competent judges, seeing

that Greek was their native language. "Such an amount of victorious grace and wisdom did Paul derive from the HOLY SPIRIT" (says Cyril), "that even King Agrippa at last exclaimed," &c. From which it is evident that Cyril regarded Agrippa's words as an avowal that he was well-nigh overcome by the Apostle's argument. And so Chrysostom, who says plainly that ἐν ὀλίγῳ means "within a little," and assumes that "within a little" St. Paul had persuaded his judge; even puts παρ' ὀλίγου into Agrippa's mouth. So also, in effect, Theodoret. From all which it is reasonable, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, to infer that our A. V. reflects faithfully what was the Church's traditionary interpretation of Acts xxvi. 28 in the first half of the fourth century. Let it only be added that a better judge of such matters than any who frequented the Jerusalem Chamber—the late President of Magdalen, Dr. Ronth—writes: "*Vertendum esse sequentia suadent, Me fere Christianum fieri suades. Interp. Vulgata habet, In modico suades me Christianum fieri.*" Yes, the Apostle's rejoinder fixes the meaning of what Agrippa had said before.

On the marginal note of Rom. ix. 5, R. V., we must remark that the *Quarterly* has good reason for its pungent protest. From the first moment, we felt the strongest repugnance to the reference made by the Revisers to "*modern interpreters*," and after duly weighing all that has been written in its defence, we are bound to say that such a reference in such a work, seems to us, to say the least, a sad mistake.

(2) As to the Translation. In many places we cannot agree with the Reviewer. His observations in defence of "Charity," e.g., seem to us altogether wide of the mark. He speaks of "St. Paul's exquisite and life-like portrait of CHARITY" (*sic*) almost as though St. Paul had written "Charity," and not ἀγάπη! The question is—inasmuch as Holy Scripture, A. V., has "God is love"—has not the R. V. done well in rendering the same word "love" instead of "charity" in that Scripture which defines—to quote the Reviewer's words, "the very choicest of the Christian graces." Tyndale had "love," and we think the R. V. did well to follow him.

One inconsistency in the *Quarterly* must be noted. The Reviewer writes strongly in regard to the Authorized Version, as though protesting against any revision. Yet he suggests that preparation be made for revision: only, the pith of his advice is this—"let the Church (*sic*) address herself to the great undertaking." It is of the Church of England evidently that he speaks; but what then becomes of the bond of union between the ninety millions of English-speaking people about whom so much has of late been said?

Ely Lectures on the R. V. With an Appendix containing the chief Textual Changes. By B. H. KENNEDY, D.D., Canon of Ely, and Hon. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Pp. 165. Richard Bentley & Son. 1882.

This is an interesting book; and we have read many of its pages with pleasure. As one of the Revisers, distinguished as a Greek scholar, the venerable author has a peculiar privilege and speaks with authority. He reveals two or three secrets. He says, e.g., that as to ἀπὸ τοῦ ποτηρίου he has been in a strait. Once he voted for placing "evil one" in the margin; later on, feeling the strength of the argument for the masculine, he did not vote; and he still doubts on which side the scale of obligation preponderates. As to the adoption of "love" for "charity," he intimates that all the Revisers, like Prebendary Humphry, believed the alteration to be "certainly right and absolutely necessary." He says—and we agree with him—that "in accuracy of translation the R. V." is decidedly superior to the Authorized: our opinion was stated in the June CHURCHMAN. But "neatness, and elegance of style and

rhythm" are important merits. The real question, with many, is this :—Does the R. V. read as well as the Authorized ?

Dr. Kennedy, as an old Head Master, knows how to censure; and it is a treat to see him criticizing critics. The eminent *Quarterly* critic, e.g., makes a strong assertion as to R. V. *mystery* *He who was manifested*. Dr. Kennedy thus answers:—

When the Reviewer calls *μυστήριον* . . . *ὁ* a "patent absurdity," he seems to have forgotten the facts of grammar. If *μυστήριον* means Christ (and it does), the reference to it by masc. *ὁ* is one of the simplest examples of synesis, a construction which abounds in Greek and Latin, and becomes in this place inevitable.

Again, a severe critic of the grammar and style of the R. V. called the Revisers to account for employing an ellipse common to Greek, Latin, and German, as well as to our own tongue—the use of the singular verb with several subjects. 1 Cor. xiii. 13, "now abideth . . ." *νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις, ἀγάπη, ἀγάπη, τὰ ῥήματα πάντα*—nunc autem manet spes, fides, caritas, tria hæc—nun aber bleibt Glaube, Hoffnung, Liebe, diese drei—each version is, forsooth, alike erroneous. "Perhaps," says Dr. Kennedy, "the idiom of four concurring languages, represented severally by Paul, Jerome, Luther, and the Revisers of 1611 and 1881, may be a quadrilateral strong enough to sustain, without succumbing, the assault of one modern English grammarian." As regards Tit. ii. 13, we agree with Mr. Humphry, not with Dr. Kennedy. In the first notice of the R. V. we stated our conviction that "our great God and Saviour" is the true rendering of St. Paul's words. In Rom. ix. 5, Dr. Kennedy entertains "little doubt" that the words "Christ came" should be followed by a full stop. To ourselves, it seems clear that the A. V. is correct:—"Christ came, who is over all, blessed for ever." In the Greek is no formal, pointless ascription of glory, tacked on, not connected with the argument. St. Paul speaks of "Christ as concerning the flesh:" surely it is the most natural thing in the world, if so we may speak, that he should add, "Who is over all, God blessed for ever." For ourselves, we must confess that we hardly like the tone of Dr. Kennedy's remarks in regard to that other passage in which St. Paul (A. V.) speaks of Christ as God; 1 Tim. iii. 16. Dr. Kennedy says:—"Is not St. Paul's evidence still quoted in terms which he did not use, 'God was manifest in the flesh'?" The italics are our own. We do not deem it a slight matter that divines at once so learned and so conservative as Bishop C. Wordsworth and Dr. Scrivener, have forsaken the reading *θεός*; but a somewhat less positive tone in referring to the A. V. rendering of such a passage would (we say it with respect) be more becoming in a sermon. Dr. Kennedy makes no allusion, so far as we have observed, to the R. V. and A. V. in Acts xx. 28, "the Church of God, which he purchased with his own blood." To other matters in Dr. Kennedy's book we may, at leisure, return; at present we touch only on points of translation. We thoroughly agree with Dr. Kennedy that the Revisers of 1881 did well in giving (with Tyndale) *love*, instead of *charity*. Luther and other German translators have *liebe* (*lieben*) and nothing else. The Revisers of 1611 did not follow Jerome so far as to write (*Deus est caritas*) "God is charity," which the Douay has:—

Let us love one another, because charity is of God He that loveth (*diligit*) not, knoweth not God: because God is charity.

As *caritas* has no verb of its own, Jerome was constrained to use *diligere*: he thus placed the whole theory and practice of Christian love at a disadvantage. The Revisers of 1611 made use of his noun, but, as for his verb it was impossible; *lieben*, to love, stood alone. On Acts xxvi. 28, Canon Kennedy refers to a sermon by Bishop Ryle in which the

translation of the A. V. "Almost thou persuadest me . . ." is defended. The "excellent interpretation" of the R. V., he says, "is contested by no less a person than Dr. Ryle, Bishop of Liverpool." We cannot lay our hands on the Bishop's sermon; but if our memory serves us well the sermon was preached (and printed in some periodical) before the R. V. appeared, and contained no allusion whatever to the change of text.

Canon Kennedy, we may add, makes a suggestion. Might not the Revising Company be invited to meet again? They might review their reviewers and themselves.

"*Deliver us from Evil.*" A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of London, in Answer to Three Letters of the Lord Bishop of Durham. By F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter. Pp. 107. John Murray.

In the CHURCHMAN of July, last year, appeared a review of Canon Cook's "protest" against the change in the Lord's Prayer adopted in the R. V. After the publication of that protest, Bishop Lightfoot, in defence, wrote three letters to the *Guardian*; and Canon Cook has felt himself constrained to issue a second letter, replying to the Bishop, which is the pamphlet before us. A pamphlet answer was promised by the Bishop, and it may be published soon. The whole question, then, in its chief aspects, will, during the present year, be fully debated by two of the most eminent men of the time—divines whose ability, profound scholarship, and sound judgment are esteemed in every branch of the English-speaking Church.

The pamphlet now before us is worthy of the most careful study. For ourselves, having read every page with interest and gratification, we must confess that our original impression, as we studied the R. V. last May, and Canon Cook's letter in June, has been decidedly deepened: *the change was not necessary, and the old rendering is better.*

Canon Cook remarks (page 8), that—

Whatever may be the feeling of the Revisers, for the Church in general the one question to be considered in every important change, is whether the change is *necessary*, on grammatical, philological, or, to go to the furthest extent, on general, critical, and historical grounds.

The old rendering is, to say the least, more comprehensive, and, in its bearing upon spiritual life and teaching, seems to us to be preferred.

The learned and revered Bishop of Lincoln asks whether it would not be better to accept both renderings, than to press for one to the exclusion of the other. To this Canon Cook replies, that had the Revisers left the text untouched, he might not have objected to their giving the other rendering in the margin. "But the question once raised cannot now be set at rest." Earnest and thoughtful Christians ask, What is the true value of the alteration? Does it accord with Scriptural usage, with the spirit of Christianity? Does it involve a doctrine in accordance with the mind of the Church?

Point by point, step after step, Canon Cook goes over the argument in reply to the Bishop: the usage of Scripture, the early Christian and Jewish writers, the Septuagint, the Versions, the Liturgies, the Fathers, German Commentators, and "Theological Propriety;" in most, if not in all, we think, he has the advantage.

Palestine Explored. By the Rev. JAMES NEIL, M.A., formerly Incumbent of Christ Church, Jerusalem, Author of "Palestine Repeopled," &c. Pp. 315. Nisbet & Co.

The complete title of this volume is "Palestine Explored, with a View to its present Natural Features, and to the Prevailing Manners, Customs,

Rites, and Colloquial Expressions of the People, which throw Light on the Figurative Language of the Bible." A notice of the book has been, by some mischance, delayed; but we have no hesitation whatever in recommending it as interesting and ably written, a good, sound, useful piece of work. The author spent three years in Palestine, 1871-1874, and in the year 1875 he made a three months' tour in sacred lands. He has had ample opportunity, therefore, to make observations, search, and sift. Here and there in his work, we notice a passage more especially new and original; but every portion is readable and good. "Shivering the potter's vessel," "The ancestral staff," "Crushed straw," and "The orange" are some of the chapter-headings. Mr. Neil argues that for "apple tree," Canticles ii. 3, should be read *orange* :—

As an orange tree among the trees of the rocky-mountain-forest,
So is my beloved among the sons,
I sit down under his shadow with eager desire,
And his fruit is sweet to my taste.

Dr. Kitto understands it to be the citron; but Dr. Thomson holds to the A. V., enlarging on the similarity of the Arabic colloquial term for apple, *toophakkh*, and the Hebrew *tappooakh*. Mr. Neil, however, has never eaten good apples in any part of the Holy Land, except at Wady Urtas, near Bethlehem, in the watered garden of the late Mr. Meshullam, and those were from foreign varieties freshly grafted. Dr. Tristram has come to the conclusion that the apricot, *mushmushak*, alone is the apple of Scripture. Mr. Neil gives reasons, however, for preferring the orange: first, pleasant and powerful perfume; second, sweet and graceful foliage; third, foliage which forms a delightful shade; and fourth, a golden colour.

Meditations and Disquisitions upon the First Psalm, the Penitential Psalms, and Seven Consolatory Psalms. By Sir RICHARD BAKER, Knight, Author of "A Chronicle of the Kings of England," &c. &c. London: C. Higham, 27A, Farringdon Street. Pp. 450. 1882.

Sir Richard Baker's "Meditations" first appeared in 1639; printed "by E. Griffin, for F. Eglesfield," says the original title-page; they were "sold at the Marigold, in Paul's Churchyard." The Bakers are a very old English family;¹ and the genealogical table is not without interest. Sir John Baker (son of Richard Baker, No. 12 on the list) was Chancellor of the Exchequer to Henry VIII.; and one of his sons, Richard, of Sissinghurst, was knighted by Queen Elizabeth, on the occasion of a State visit. A nephew of this Sir Richard, our "Sir Richard," the author, was knighted at Theobalds in 1603. His "Chronicles" is a work of judgment and ability. Sir Roger de Coverley, the *Spectator* says, was very partial to it; and dog-eared, well-worn copies of the old folios are still to be met with in old manor-houses. Of Sir Richard's "Disquisitions on the Lord's Prayer," an old Oxford friend, Sir Henry Wotton, admiring "the very Charity of your stile, which seemeth unto me to have not a little of the African idea of St. Augustine's age: full of sweet raptures, and of researching concepts; nothing borrowed, nothing vulgar . . ." writes in glowing terms. Dr. Thomas Fuller, in his "Worthies," makes mention of the pious and learned Knight. We are glad to see a reprint of the most valuable of Sir Richard's writings; apart from any antiquarian sentiment, these *Meditations* have their own interest and value. There is in them, as Dr. Grosart remarks, in a graceful preface, evidence of varied culture and deep thought; there is quaint playing with words and deft phrasing; but the signet of the whole is their savour of godliness, their fragrance of prayerfulness, their music of thankfulness, their pathetic

¹ Sir Samuel Baker, the distinguished author and traveller, is a descendant.

yearning and aspiration. The volume before us, we should add, is well printed.

The Second Book of Samuel. Commentary, by the Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, M.A., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Trin. Coll., Cambridge. The Cambridge Warehouse, 17, Paternoster Row. 1831.

To this volume we give our very warm commendation. Mr. Kirkpatrick's Commentary on the Book of Samuel, of which the first volume was reviewed in a recent CHURCHMAN, forms portion of that valuable series, "The Cambridge Bible for Schools," edited by the Dean of Peterborough. Every volume of this series—with a single exception—has seemed to us a good text-book; and with some of the volumes—e.g., Mr. Plummer's on St. John, Archdeacon Perowne's on Jonah, Mr. Moule's on the Romans—we have been greatly pleased. Mr. Kirkpatrick's Notes are terse and suggestive.

The Clergy Directory and Parish Guide, 1882. An Alphabetical List of the Clergy of the Church of England, with their Degree and University, Order and Date of Ordination, Benefice and Date of Induction; also a List of Benefices, with the Population, Incumbent, Annual Value, and Patrons; an Almanack, giving the Table of Lessons; and other useful information. London: Thomas Bosworth, 66, Great Russell Street, W.C.

A cheap, well-printed, handy volume. The information, so far as we have examined, seems to have been carefully collected, and to be complete up to date. The Signatories of Archdeacon Denison's recent Petition to Convocation, of the Dean of St. Paul's Memorial in favour of toleration, and of Bishop Perry's Counter-Memorial to the Archbishop, are indicated by marks against the respective names.

At Home. Illustrated by J. G. Sowerby. Decorated by Thomas Crane. London and Belfast: Marcus Ward & Co.

The adjective "nice" is now-a-days rather spoilt. People praise a nice speech, a nice walk, a nice apricot. But such a book as this is really "nice;" it is handsome, refined, and *delicious*; a lady critic may well be pardoned for saying "it's the nicest picture-book I've ever seen." Messrs. Marcus Ward have printed and published a good many illustrated volumes; but this, in its own way, a book for little folks, heads the list. The rhymes are pleasing. After a wonderful sale, a new edition is issued.

Stephen Mainwaring's Wooing. With other Fireside Tales. Home Words' Office.

A pleasing volume, well suited for a parish or lending library. We gladly recommend it. The tales are written by Miss Holt, Mrs. Marshall, the Rev. C. W. Bardsley, and Mr. E. Garnett.

Notes, chiefly Critical and Philological, on the Hebrew Psalms. By W. ROSCOE BURGESS, M.A., Vicar of Hollowell. Vol. II. Williams & Norgate.

The first volume of this work was reviewed in the CHURCHMAN of January, 1881. We bore testimony to its scholarship, but complained of conjectural emendations of the text; of the volume before us we must say much the same. Mr. Burgess has evidently devoted much time and thought to this study; and his "Notes" deserve respectful consideration. We cannot agree, however, with all his comments on the Psalms; and, of his alterations of the Hebrew, some, as we have said, appear to us unwarranted and fanciful. In Psalm cxxxix, the opening portion, surely,

treats of the mystery of *God*,—specially the omnipresence; while the second part treats of the mystery of *man*. The Omniscient manifests Himself; and on the believer's side there is satisfaction; in realizing the Presence there is praise. We certainly cannot agree to render verse 17, "*O how precious were Thy favourable regards*"—i.e., as soon as I became conscious of them; and verse 18, "*I awoke [from the unconsciousness and darkness of the womb] and I was still with Thee.*" In these verses David speaks of the believer's constant communion with God.

Old Wells Re-opened. A Manual of Devotion from Forgotten Sources. Edited by MARCUS DODDS, D.D. Pp. 124. Hodder & Stoughton.

A tasteful little volume: a good abridgment of George Hickeys.

Pleadings with Vedantists. By JOHN GRITTON, D.D., formerly Missionary in India. Pp. 260. Christian Book Society.

This volume is the re-issue of one published in 1872, under the title of "Missionary Monographs," a title which, at the time, as we read the book, we thought was—to say the least—not well chosen. Dr. Gritton is known as a man of thought and ability; and his present work may serve, for one thing, to show how undeserved is the reproach sometimes laid on Missionaries that they deal only with the Pariah and the ignorant, and shrink from argument with the high-caste educated natives of India.

The Second Book of Livy. Edited chiefly from the Text of Madvig, with Notes, Translations and Appendices. By HENRY BELCHER, M.A. Rivingtons.

With this handy volume we are much pleased; it is an admirable school-book—good in every way. The scholarly notes are clear, simple, short, and yet sufficiently full. Each paragraph has its own heading. The type, both of the notes and of the text, is very good.

Prairie and Forest. A Guide to the Field Sports of North America. By PARKER GILLMORE. Pp. 400. W. H. Allen & Co.

This is a book which many men, youths, and boys, who have not the slightest prospect of camping on a "prairie," or shooting ruffed grouse in a "forest," will read with pleasure. It is the work of an experienced sportsman and hunter, who is, at the same time, a practised writer with a very graphic pen. Of buffalo, cariboo, grizzly bear, grey, or prairie wolf, moose, and of curlew, ptarmigan, turkey, teal, the descriptions are interesting. There are several illustrations.

Shall We Know One Another? By the Right Rev. J. C. RYLE, Lord Bishop of Liverpool. Cassell, Petter, Galpin, & Co.

It is enough to say that we have here a new edition of one of Dr. Ryle's excellent little books. This is the thirty-eighth thousand.

From Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton comes a fourth edition of Dr. VAN OOSTERZEE'S *The Theology of the New Testament*. The characteristics of the learned Professor's writings are well known; when one cannot agree with him we yet acknowledge the candour and clearness of his argument. Of the present work the first English edition was published ten years ago. To well-grounded students of Holy Scripture this "Handbook" may prove of real service.

From the *Home Words'* publishing office we have received a pleasing little volume, *Scripture Echoes in our Church's Collects*, by the Rev. JOHN

P. HOBSON, M.A., Vicar of Starestead Abbots. The expositions are short, simple and suggestive; and the hymns, as a rule, are well chosen.

We have received the second volume of the Bishop of LINCOLN'S *Church History* (Rivingtons). The first volume brought us down to the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325; the present portion of the work goes on to the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. On certain points in the History—e.g., especially with regard to Ancient Liturgies—we should express ourselves in somewhat different terms; but the characteristics of the honoured Prelate's writings are well known. When the third volume comes before us we shall endeavour to write a worthy review.

In Professor MILLIGAN'S Lecture on *Ancient Greece*, "Faiths of the World," Lecture VI. (W. Blackwood & Sons), we read:—

It has been said by an eloquent writer of the day,¹ that what concerns us at the present time is to learn how to face the problems of the world with Greek serenity. If we have nothing more to face them with, we shall sink before them, as Greece did.

Messrs. Longmans & Co. have published a new, cheap, edition of *Endymion*. All Lord Beaconsfield's novels, probably, will be issued in the same form.

Messrs. Cassell & Co. have published the first monthly part of Canon FARRAR'S *Life of St. Paul*, an illustrated serial edition. The work is to be completed in about 30 parts. Type, paper, and illustrations good.

The February magazines of the R.T.S. are exceedingly good. The *Boys' Own Paper* keeps up well.

A New Introduction to Dogmatic Theology, on the Basis of the Thirty-nine Articles, by the Rev. E. A. LITTON, we are glad to hear, is in the press, and will be issued shortly by Mr. Elliot Stock. A work of this kind, we have long felt, is greatly needed; and, certainly, no theologian was better fitted for it than Mr. Litton, a scholar and thinker of the highest rank.

THE MONTH.

PARLIAMENT was opened on the 7th. The debate on the Address terminated on the 17th. In the earliest hours of the session "a crushing defeat was inflicted upon the Government." By a majority of 58 votes the House of Commons reaffirmed the Resolution which it passed last session refusing to allow Mr. Bradlaugh to go through the form of repeating the Oath of Allegiance. Sir Stafford Northcote's motion was carried, or rather Mr. Gladstone's attempt to evade it by the previous question was defeated, by a majority much larger than that of

¹ Symonds, "The Greek Poets," second series, p. 381.