

# *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)

upon, and, having no home of her own, she generally resided at a boarding-house at the seaside. She alone knew the facts of the case.

After I heard this narrative of woe, I left, promising to call next day.

I called, but the invalid was not there. She had gone, during the night, to the place where "the weary are at rest." Peacefully she passed away, about one o'clock in the morning, having been unconscious for about two hours before her death. Her husband returned from his "place of business" three hours afterwards. On going into the dining-room, he saw the lonely watcher by her sister's body, and for a moment or two, as his sister-in-law stated, he seemed to feel his position and its surroundings, and, with a long look of pain at the face of his dead wife, whom he had so grossly deceived, he retired, as usual, to his room.

In a few days a very simple funeral took place. A hearse with two horses, and one mourning-coach containing two persons, the husband and the deceased wife's sister, conveyed away the mortal remains of the poor heart-broken woman. The house was shut up, the furniture removed, and, in a few months, new occupants entered into possession. The husband went on with his "professional" occupation as if nothing had occurred. The sister-in-law died soon after, and the husband, I understood, followed both to that land where the righteous reaction of retributive providence metes out the just reward for those unrepented deeds of secret wrongs for which no human law provides any remedy.

G. W. WELDON  
(Vicar of Bickley).

---

## Reviews.

---

*Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome.* By R. F. LITTLE-DALE, LL.D., D.C.L. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.  
*The One Offering.* By M. F. SADLER, Prebendary of Wells. London: Bell and Sons.

*The Church Quarterly Review*, No. 26. January, 1882.

*The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist: an Eirenicon.* By the Rev. E. F. WILLIS. Parker and Co.

(Concluded.)

WE think, then, that the contention of those who would make *rovro nouëire* to mean "*sacrifice this*," has been sufficiently disposed of.

But then, taking the words in their natural meaning—Will they not gather, it may be asked, a sacrificial signification from what Christ Himself did at that Passover table? Here we are brought to another question—Did Christ sacrificially offer Himself to the Father in His own Supper?

That He did is argued from the use of the present participles, "given for you," "shed for you," *διδόμενον, ἐκχυνόμενον*, as if "now being given, now being shed." Again we cannot but express our grief not less than our surprise that this argument has found an advocate in Mr. Sadler. He has ventured to say, "It was there and then given in sacrifice in the sense of being there and then surrendered at the time when He blessed and brake; and His Blood was then 'being shed,' for it was then surrendered to be shed.<sup>1</sup> This was the solemn time at which He offered Himself" (p. 23).

In answer to this argument it may suffice to quote the words of an eminently learned and unbiased Romanist—"Porro prout κλόμενον et διδόμενον reddo per paulo post futurum (s'en va estre donné) quemadmodum quod Marc. ix. 31, legitur παραδίδοται est μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι. Matth. xvii. 22, et Matth. xx. 22, βαπτίζομαι significat μέλλω βαπτίζεσθαι, ex proxime præcedente, μέλλω πίνειν.<sup>2</sup> Imo hoc ipsum nostrum præsens Vetus Interpres reddit per futurum, ut per præsens: et legitur etiam in futuro in Canone Missæ effundetur, vel fundetur Luc. xxii. 20." (Picherellus, "De Missa," p. 138.) "Quod autem Christus in Cæna Deo sacrificaverit, jussurique ut hoc exemplo in remissionem peccatorum sacrificaremus, nullibi legitur." (Ibid., p. 134). Those who require further evidence may be referred to Morton "On the Eucharist," B. vi. ch. i. pp. 394-97; or to Albertinus, "De Eucharistia," pp. 74, 76, 78, 119.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> No doubt in purport and design the Blood was shed, and the Lamb slain and offered, then (perhaps specially) and long before; but the question is, Was Christ then by any sacrificial act or deed, or in any strictly sacrificial sense, there offered to the Father? As to some obscure testimonies of Fathers, Waterland says that they "at most prove only that our Lord devoted Himself in the Eucharist or elsewhere, before His passion, to be an expiatory sacrifice on the cross." (Works, vol. v., pp. 168.) See pp. 170, 171, 174, and vol. iv. pp. 752, 753. See also Goode, "Rule of Faith," vol. ii. p. 406. It has been very well said: "No sacrifice was offered by Christ at the institution of the Supper in the Upper Chamber. It was no place of sacrifice. There was no altar of sacrifice. It was an hour unlawful for sacrifice. The posture as they reclined at meat was no posture of sacrifice. And Christ offered no words of sacrifice, beyond the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which are the only sacrifices that the Church of England offers in the celebration of the Lord's Supper." (Dr. Stephens' Argument in Bennet case, p. 222.) Compare Mr. Milton's "Eucharist Illustrated," p. 42. See also Jewell's Works, P. S. Harding and Thess., p. 714.

<sup>2</sup> So Cajetan: "Eadem ratione quæ illi evangelistæ futuram in cruce effusionem sanguinis significaverunt in præsentī effunditur, eadem ratione Paulus futuram in cruce fractionem carnis Christi significat in præsentī, dicendo *frangitur* . . . præsens enim grammaticè non est instans, sed quoddam confusum præsens." (In Pauli Epist. 1 Cor. xi. fo. 72, 1540.)

<sup>3</sup> Waterland says: "The plea from *hoc facite*, when first set up, was abundantly answered by a very learned Romanist . . . who wrote about 1562, and died in 1590. Protestants also have often confuted it; and the Papists themselves, several of them, have long ago given it up. The other boasted plea, drawn from the use of the *present tense*, in the words of the institution, has been so often refuted and exposed, that I cannot think it needful to call that matter over again, in an age of so much light and learning." (Works, vol. v. p. 162.) See also Willett's "Synopsis Papismi," vol. v. p. 349, and Bp. Bull's Works, vol. ii. p. 254, Oxford, 1846.

We may, however, very well connect with the present tense of the words of institution the teaching that the "*res sacramenti*" of the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ as in the condition of death—"not Christ's Body as now it is, but as then it was, when it was offered, rent, and slain, and sacrificed for us. . . . We are in this action not only carried up to Christ (*Sursum corda*), but we are also carried back to Christ as He was at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering. . . . He, as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefits of it. If an host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ

It may, indeed, very well be that there was that, in the *doing* of our blessed Lord at that Sacred Supper in that Upper Chamber, which was intended to give to our "*doing this*" as He did—a Godward tendency.

For when, with the elements in His hands (and with uplifted eyes, as the Liturgies<sup>1</sup> attest), He blessed and gave thanks, the Blessing was undoubtedly a blessing *of God*; and the form of thanksgiving which He used was probably after this sort, "Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, who hast sanctified us with Thy commandments, and made the fruits of the earth," and "Blessed art Thou, O Lord God, King of the world, who hast created the fruit of the vine."<sup>2</sup> Moreover, it may be, perhaps, that to this was added a memorial of the Passover Sacrifice, with the prayer, "Remember us, O Lord, on this day for our good."<sup>3</sup>

But, however this may be, there will certainly be nothing here to warrant us in giving to the words *τοῦτο ποιῆτε* anything like a strictly sacrificial signification.

But we have yet to deal with the argument from the word *ἀνάμνησις*. Does this term involve the idea of a sacrificial memorial to be offered in the Eucharist to the Father?

That we do in the service of the Eucharist plead before God the one atoning sacrifice of Christ, therein commemorated, is what the Fathers certainly taught, and what we, it must be hoped, shall never deny. How could Christians continue a perpetual memory of that His precious death, and fail to do this? In doing this we do not doubt that we are doing that which is according to the mind of Him Who ordained this Sacrament as a memorial of His passion. Surely the whole service is a remembering *before God*. And *something*, no doubt, may be said in favour of connecting the idea of a sacrificial memorial before God with the words *εἰς τὴν μὴν ἀνάμνησιν*.<sup>4</sup> Yet it is certain that the use of this word for any

offered is it; thither we must look. To the Serpent lift up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver*." (Andrewes's "Sermons," vol. ii. pp. 301, 302, A. C. L. See also Vogan's "True Doctrine of the Eucharist," pp. 131, 361-64.)

<sup>1</sup> The Liturgies of St. James and St. Basil add *καὶ ἀναθεῖξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ*. (See Neale's "Tetralogia L.," p. 133, and Daniel's "Codex Lit.," tom. iv. p. 429.)

<sup>2</sup> See Lightfoot, "Temple Service," ix. p. 161, as quoted by Milton in "Eucharist Illustrated," p. 62. With this we may very well compare Justin Martyr's account of the Eucharist (Dial., § 41), and especially the fragment of Irenæus in which he says: "We offer to God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving thanks unto Him for having commanded the earth to bring forth these fruits for our food." (Frag. xxxviii. Ed. Ben.) See Blunt's "Early Fathers," pp. 446-49. Mr. Milton has well observed ("Eucharist Illustrated," p. 60) that the order of the celebration of the Passover by our Lord forms the framework of all early Liturgies.

<sup>3</sup> See Archdeacon Freeman's "Principles of Divine Service," vol. ii. pp. 290, 291. But Mr. Milton, we think, is right in regarding this as more probably being of old a part of the Temple Service. (See "Eucharist Illustrated," p. 70.)

<sup>4</sup> The argument in favour of this view is very fairly stated by Mr. Sacler in "The Church and the Age," p. 280: "The word is used twice in the Septuagint, and in each case refers to a solemn ecclesiastical commemoration before God, the reference to the Godward character of the memorial being very express. In Numb. x. 10 reference is made to the blowing of the trumpets over the burnt offerings, 'that they may be to you a memorial before your God,' *ἀνάμνησις ἐναντὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν*. But by far the most remarkable and suggestive of the two cases is that in Lev. xxiv. 7, 8. Translated according to the Septuagint we read: 'And ye shall put on a row (of loaves, as the shewbread) pure frankincense and salt, and they shall be for loaves for a memorial (*ἀνάμνησιν*) set before the Lord (*ἐναντὶ Κυρίου*) continually in the face of the children of Israel for an everlasting covenant.'"

Mr. Willis observes that the word occurs also in the titles of Ps. xxxviii. and lxi. (lxx.).

such purpose, in the Septuagint, is (at most) rare and exceptional rather than usual;<sup>1</sup> and that if our blessed Lord had intended to convey this idea, He would more probably (to say the least) have used the word *μνημόσυνον*—which is the technical term in familiar use for this purpose<sup>2</sup>—as when it is said to Cornelius, “Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial (*μνημόσυνον*) before God.” And it is certain also that nothing at all like a universal *consensus* of Patristic interpretation can fairly be alleged for any such sacrificial sense of *ἀνάμνησις* here.<sup>3</sup>

It is, however, to be noted that what appears to be the true sense of the Hebrew in Lev. xxiv. 7 applies the words “for a memorial” not to the bread, but to the frankincense (see the “Speaker’s Commentary” in *loc.*), and that Num. x. 10, as compared with the preceding verse (*καὶ ἀναμνησθήσεθε ἑναντί Κυρίου*) is best understood with the usual and natural sense of *ἀνάμνησις*. And it is very material to observe, that whereas in both these instances (as Mr. Sadler observes) the Godward character of the *ἀνάμνησις* is *very expressly stated*, there is an entire absence of any such statement in the words of institution.

Is there any example to be found anywhere of the word *ἀνάμνησις* without such an addition as *ἑναντί τοῦ Θεοῦ* being used in the sense which Mr. Sadler contends for?

Bishop Wren’s view that the expression *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* “does most properly signify, ‘To put me in mind of you’” (see Jacobson’s “Fragmentary Illustrations of Common Prayer,” p. 81) seems to be quite independent of this sense of *ἀνάμνησις*. But Bishop Sanderson’s exposition is preferable. (*Ibid.*, pp. 23, 24.)

<sup>1</sup> Canon Trevor (in whose manual there is much to be commended) seems to have fallen into the error of regarding *ἀνάμνησις* as “the technical name of that part of the meat-offering, or peace-offering, which represented the whole before God.” (“Sacrifice and Participation of the Holy Eucharist,” p. 129.)

<sup>2</sup> Satisfactory evidence of this will be found, we think, in the following passages:

Lev. ii. 2. *καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον· θυσία ὁσμῆς εὐωδίας τῷ Κυρίῳ.* This is said of the meat-offering.

Lev. ii. 9. *ἀφελῇ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίας τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον.*

Lev. ii. 16. *Καὶ ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς . . . κάρπωμά ἐστι Κυρίῳ.* This is said of the Minchah of Firstfruits.

Lev. v. 12. *τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς ἐπιθήσει ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων Κυρίῳ· ἁμαρτία ἐστὶ.* This is said of the trespass-offering of flour.

Lev. vi. 15. *Καὶ ἀνοίσει ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κάρπωμα ὁσμῆς εὐωδίας, τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς τῷ Κυρίῳ.* This is said of the meat-offering.

Numb. v. 15. *ἐστὶ γὰρ θυσία ζηλοτυπίας, θυσία μνημοσύνου, ἀναμνησκουσα ἁμαρτίαν.* Of the trial of jealousy.

Numb. v. 18. *Καὶ δώσει ἐπὶ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς τὴν θυσίαν τοῦ μνημοσύνου, τὴν θυσίαν τῆς ζηλοτυπίας.*

Numb. v. 26. *Καὶ δράξεται ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίας τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς.*

Isa. lxvi. 3. *ὁ διδοὺς λίβανον εἰς μνημόσυνον, ὡς βλάσφημος.*

Tobit. xii. 13. *προσήγαγον τὸ μνημόσυνον τῆς προσευχῆς ὑμῶν.*

Ecclus. xxxviii. 11. *δὸς εὐωδίαν καὶ μνημόσυνον σεμιδάλεως.*

Ecclus. xlv. 21. *καὶ εὐωδίαν εἰς μνημόσυνον.*

Ecclus. l. 19. *εἰς μνημόσυνον ἑναντί ὑψίστου.*

Compare also Exod. xxviii. 23 (29) *καὶ λήφεται Ἀαρὼν τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ . . . μνημόσυνον ἑναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ* (with v. 12). This is said of the breastplate.

And Exod. xxx. 16. *Καὶ ἔσται τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ μνημόσυνον ἑναντί Κυρίου, ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.* This is said of the half-shekel offering.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Malan says: “Philo, who wrote at Alexandria in Apostolic times, and may have known there St. Mark and St. Luke, finds no ‘memorial’ in *ἀνάμνησις*.” (“Two Holy Sacraments,” p. 173.) When St. Paul (Heb. x. 3) speaks of the *ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν*, he uses the word in the sense of remembrance of sins past; but assuredly (as Dr. Malan observes) “not ‘in order to remind God of them,’ an

Theodoret understands our Lord's words as pointing to a memorial whose aim and object it is that *we* may be reminded and *our* minds affected by the contemplation of the sufferings thus represented. He says: τοῦτο γὰρ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Δεοπότης προσέταξε, Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν· ἵνα τῇ θεωρίᾳ τὸν τύπον τῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γεγενημένων ἀναμνησκώμεθα παθημάτων, καὶ τὴν περὶ τὸν εὐεργέτην ἀγάπην πυρσέσωμεν, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν προσμένωμεν τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν. (In Ep. Heb., cap. viii. tom. iii. pp. 594-95, edit. Schulze.)<sup>1</sup>

Other ancient Fathers appear to have taken the same view, which is also supported by the language of the Liturgies.<sup>2</sup> And indeed we are

expression utterly unintelligible." ("The Holy Sacraments," pp. 176, 177.) In this sense certainly St. Chrysostom understood St. Paul's words. (See Ibid., p. 178.) And in view of the context, it seems most natural to understand the ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν as standing in apposition with the συνείδησις ἁμαρτιῶν of the preceding verse.

<sup>1</sup> So also the author of the treatise "De Baptismo," which has been attributed to St. Basil the Great, who, after quoting the words of the institution with the Apostle's comment, 1 Cor. xi. 26, adds: τί οὖν ὠφελεῖ τα ρήματα ταῦτα; ἵνα ἐσθιόντες τε καὶ πίνοντες, αἰεὶ μνημονεύωμεν τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντος καὶ ἐγερόντος. . . ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, δηλονότι εἰς ἀνεξάλειπτον μνήμην τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντος. (Lib. i. cap. iii. § 2. Op. edit. Garnier, 1722, tom. ii., Append., pp. 650, 651.)

St. Chrysostom, too, compares this ἀνάμνησις of Christ with the keeping a commemoration of a deceased relative: ἀλλ' ἐμὲν υἱοῦ ἢ ἀδελφοῦ τετελευτηκότος ἀνάμνησιν ἐποιεῖς. (See Op., tom. x. p. 246, edit. Montfaucon, 1732.)

Compare Sedulius Scotus: "Suam memoriam nobis reliquit, quemadmodum si quis peregre proficiscens, aliquod pignus ei quem diligit derelinquat, ut quoties cunque illud viderit, possit ejus beneficia et amicitia recordari." (In 1 Cor. xi. in Bibliotheca Max. Patr. Lugd. 1677, tom. vi. p. 545.) So another Commentary (perhaps the work of Remigius of Auxerre): "Relinquens Dominus hoc sacramentum . . . ut illud infingeret cordibus et memoriae eorum, egit more cujuscunque hominis, qui appropinquans morti aliquod munus pretiosum dimittit alicui amicorum suorum in memoriam suam, inquit; accipite hoc munus . . . et tene illud . . . in memoriam mei, ut quotiescunque illud videris, recorderis mei." (In Bibliotheca Max. Patr. Lugd. 1677, tom. viii. p. 971.)

So also Christian Druthmar: "Sicut si aliquis peregre proficiscens dilectoribus suis quoddam vinculum dilectionis relinquit . . . ita Deus præcepit agi a nobis, transferens spiritaliter corpus in panem vinum in sanguinem, ut per hæc duo memoremus quæ fecit pro nobis de corpore et sanguine suo, et non simus ingrati tam amantissimæ Charitati." (In Mat. Evang., fo. lxxxiv. edit. 1514.)

St. Chrysostom seems to have understood "in remembrance of me" . . . "till He come" as running parallel with the command concerning the Passover that "this day" should be "for a memorial . . . throughout your generations" (Exod. xii. 14): Καθάπερ Μωσῆς φησι τοῦτο μνημόσυνον ὑμῖν αἰώνιον· οὕτως καὶ αὐτός, εἰς μὴν ἀνάμνησιν ἕως ἂν παραγένωμαι. . . Ὅσπερ οὖν ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰσραδίων, οὕτως καὶ ἐν ταῦθα τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἐγκατέθηκε τὸ μνημόσυνον τῷ μυστηρίῳ. (Op. ed. Montfaucon, tom. vii. pp. 782, 783; Hom. lxxxii. in Mat.)

In this Chrysostom has been followed by Bishop Patrick ("Mensa Mystica," ch. i. p. 6, edit. 1717), who (while contending for the commemoration before God, pp. 12-14) gives no sacrificial sense to ἀνάμνησις (p. 4), and interprets καταγελλεῖ in its natural sense (pp. 8, 12). See also Bp. Andrewes "Sermons," vol. ii. p. 306, A. C. L.

<sup>2</sup> For, not only is the obedience to our Lord's word expressed by μνημένον (as in the "Liturgy of St. James"—see Neale's "Tetralogia," p. 137), but the remembrance is made to include not only the sacrifice, but the resurrection and other particulars. (See also the "Liturgy of St. Chrysostom," p. 136.) Compare the Coptic "Liturgy of St. Basil": "Quotiescunque manducabitis ex hoc pane, et bibetis ex hoc calice, mortem meam annuntiabitis et resurrectionem meam confitebimini, meique memores eritis donec veniam." (In Renaudot, tom. i. p. 15. See also p. 217, tom. ii. pp. 228, 235.)

not aware that any sufficient evidence has yet been alleged, or that any good evidence from Christian antiquity can be alleged, which can be said at all distinctly to support that sacrificial sense of *ἀνάμνησις* here, which, till some authority is forthcoming for its support, we must take the liberty of regarding as a novelty of interpretation.

It remains that we inquire concerning St. Paul's language in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians (ch. xi. 26), "Ye do show the Lord's Death till He come:" does it, or does it not imply a sacrificial offering of Christ's death to the Father?

Mr. Sadler says: "To ascertain the scope of this word (*καταγγέλλετε*) we must be guided by what is said in other places respecting the design of the Holy Communion, as to whether we are to understand this 'showing' to be 'before God,' or 'before men,' or 'before both.' That St. Paul means that it is the design of this ordinance to preach Christ is simply incredible for this reason—that the proclaiming of the death of Christ in such an ordinance is exceedingly indirect, the ordinance itself requiring to be explained and preached about before it can be understood in the least degree" (p. 99).<sup>1</sup>

Yet, without assigning to this sacrament the office of preaching the Gospel to the heathen, it is assuredly conceivable that it may very effectually cause that Jesus Christ may be set forth as Crucified before the eyes of God's faithful people, may bear powerful witness to them of the sufferings and death of the Redeemer, may teach and preach<sup>2</sup> to their hearts the love of Christ which passeth knowledge—how when they were yet sinners Christ died for them; and thus may be one great and divinely-appointed means of proclaiming—on and on, down the whole history of the Christian Church, from generation to generation, and from age to age, the grand and glorious truth, "God made Him to be

---

Compare Asseman, Cod. L. lib. iv. p. 163. It is difficult to believe that the word *μνησθῆναι* would ever have been chosen to express the idea of making a sacrificial memorial before God. It may, doubtless, in connexion with the context, and in prayer to God, not unnaturally connote the idea of Godward commemoration, which some Liturgies more distinctly express. (See Mede, book ii. ch. ix. Works, p. 377; and compare Waterland, Works, vol. iv. pp. 486-87); but can hardly be said very naturally to contain it.

In connexion with these testimonies from the Liturgies should be noted the account of the Eucharistic Service as furnished by Justin Martyr in his "Apology" (p. 83, edit. Ben. 1742, § 67), who, after giving the history of the institution from the Gospels (in which he quotes our Lord's words as *εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν μὲν*, which Mr. Scudamore regards as the formula which would most correctly express "to excite your remembrance of Me," N. E., p. 626), adds: *Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα λοιπὸν αἰεὶ τούτων ἀλλήλους ἀναμνησσκομεν*. And with this should be compared the Pfaffian Fragment of Irenæus: "*Οἱ οὖν ταύτας τὰς προσφορὰς ἐν τῇ ἀναμνήσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἄγοντες . . . πνευματικῶς λειτουργοῦντες τῆς σοφίας υἱοὶ κληθίσονται*." Irenæus, *Fragn. edit. Migne*, No. xxxvi. Opera, c. 1253.)

<sup>1</sup> Incautious and misleading words (as we cannot but think), pointing in somewhat the same direction, have sometimes been used by Divines of high esteem in the Church of England.

<sup>2</sup> The Ambrosian Liturgy seems certainly to interpret the Apostle's language of "preaching": "Commanding also and saying to them, These things as oft as ye shall do, ye shall do them in memorial of Me: ye shall *preach* My Death, ye shall announce My Resurrection, ye shall hope for My Advent, till again I come to you from heaven." (See Professor Ince's Second Letter to Bramley, p. 8.)

So in Mar Abd Yeshua's "Creed of the Nestorians": "Seeing that it was impossible that His identical sacrifice upon the cross for the salvation of all could be *showed forth*, in every place, throughout all ages, and to all men, just as it was, without any alteration, He beheld with an eye of mercy, and in wisdom and compassion thus ordained, 'In the night in which He was betrayed . . . He took bread,' etc." (See Badger's "Nestorians," vol. i. pp. 176, 409.)

sin for us Who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him ;" that so, one generation should praise His works unto another, and declare His power ; that so, the memorial of His abundant kindness should be showed, and men should sing of His righteousness.

And if the ordinance of Christ can do this, and has been ordained to do this, and still more, if its celebration was intended to be accompanied (as from the Liturgies we know well it was in fact accompanied) by an oral annunciation<sup>1</sup> such as should effectually secure its doing this, then what possible or conceivable necessity can there be to justify us in allowing ourselves to be driven to the extraordinary predicament of having to fasten on the word *καταγγέλλετε* a sacrificial sense?<sup>2</sup>

We are not, of course, questioning or disputing the truth that in this ordinance, the showing forth or announcing of Christ's death is solemnly made, and intended to be made, before the angels of heaven and before the throne of God. But we do question whether to teach us this was the design of the Apostle's words ; and what we do dispute is that the language of St. Paul can fairly be understood as pointing directly to any Godward act of oblation, or in anywise supporting the teaching that the aim and end of the Eucharist is sacrificially to show forth the Lord's death to the Father.

Let any one of our readers look at the meaning of this word as used by heathen writers. Then let him examine every place where it is used in the New Testament (we do not think that it is found in the LXX. at all),<sup>3</sup> and then let him say whether anything short of a doing violence to language can make the Apostle's word mean anything like presenting or offering in sacrifice the death of Christ to the Father. Supposing even the word *καταγγέλλω* to possess such ambiguities as might readily admit such a sense, is it conceivable that the Apostle would have chosen this word (seeing it has another obvious meaning) in preference to some other verb which might have clearly expressed the idea of sacrifice or offering, if this was the sense which he really desired to convey?

Was the Apostle at a loss for such a word? It is what no one will believe. But if not, it is impossible to suppose that he chose the word he did choose except on the supposition that he did not desire to express that idea at all.

And yet it must be acknowledged that when the Apostle was writing thus he had a very suitable occasion for expressing this idea, and strongly insisting on it, if indeed he thought it a leading truth to be insisted on.<sup>4</sup>

Indeed, it is scarcely conceivable that in this connexion St. Paul should not have desired to express it, if, in his view, the primary and prominent point in this showing forth of the Lord's death had been to

<sup>1</sup> This would answer to the "Haggadah," i.e., the annunciation of Israel's Redemption in the Passover Feast. (See Milton's "Eucharist Illustrated," p. 61.)

<sup>2</sup> That Christians in the very act of thus showing forth the Lord's death should desire to plead its merits before God was almost a necessity. That this showing forth should connect itself with a liturgical commemoration before God was nothing but natural. It cannot argue any inherent sacrificial sense in the word itself.

<sup>3</sup> On the doubtful reading in Ps. xxxix. 6, see Schleusner *in voc.* *καταγγέλλω*.

<sup>4</sup> Surely the Apostle is here not only insisting on the very sacred character of the ordinance, but in these very words giving us, in part, his interpretation of the words of institution. Could he then have chosen such a word as *καταγγέλλω* to express his meaning, if he had understood the Saviour's words, or the main purpose of the ordinance, as pointing to a sacrifice which Christian priests were to offer to God? It seems to us that the Apostle's language affords a most forcible argument against any strictly sacrificial sense as belonging to any one of the words of our Lord enjoining the observance of the ordinance.



set it forth before God as a sacrificial offering or presentation to the Divine Majesty.

And this leads us to a very important observation with which we must conclude the present article. We have already expressed our opinion that in the Eucharist we may and must plead before God the One Sacrifice and oblation<sup>1</sup> of Christ once offered to make a perfect atonement for the sins of the world. This seems to us absolutely inseparable from the true view of the Sacrament as ordained for a continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ. It would surely be most strange and unnatural if Christians, met together in sacred service to commemorate that redeeming death according to their Lord's own institution, should not in fervent prayer plead the merits of that death for the obtaining of all the benefits of His Passion. And this *pleading* of that sacrifice may no doubt be called, and many times has been called (in ancient and modern times), an *offering*<sup>2</sup>—an offering, that is, in the sense of presenting to view that sacrifice, which, in the only true sacrificial sense of the word, has already once for all been offered, to make the one perfect oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. But it is an inquiry of weighty significance—very weighty in view of present controversies—whether this is the prominent and primary design of the ordinance of Christ.

If it were so indeed, would the writers of the New Testament—or, rather, would the Holy Spirit of God, by Whom they were inspired to write—have left the teaching of this truth wrapped up in dark sayings, to be, in after ages, laboriously drawn or spun out by learned and subtle arguments from uncertain analogies and doubtful or more than doubtful expressions?

If this were the main thing which Christian hearts were to be looking to in the Lord's Supper, is it possible that—as regards the teaching of Holy Scripture—it should have been left hidden under a bushel instead of being set on a candlestick, and placed on high that all might see it clearly?

No one, we believe, except under the strongest prejudice, will deny that the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist has not this clear and prominent place in the teaching of God's Word.<sup>3</sup>

And, if this be so, then we make bold to affirm that it will not be with-

<sup>1</sup> On this account St. Augustine regards baptism also as the offering of sacrifice: "Holocausto Dominicæ passionis, quod eo tempore offert quisque pro peccatis suis, quo ejusdem passionis fide dedicatur, et Christianorum fidelium nomine Baptizatus imbuitur." (Ad Rom. Expositio inchoata, § 19, Op. tom. iii. par. ii. c. 937, ed. Ben. 1680.) A little below this is spoken of as "*holocaustum Domini, quod tunc pro unoquoque offertur quodammodo, cum ejus nomine in baptizando signatur.*"

<sup>2</sup> "Christ, I own, is in some sense offered up to God by every communicant in the Sacrament." (Payne, in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. vi. p. 255.)

<sup>3</sup> "The sacrifice of the Cross, or Christ Himself, may be said to be offered in the Eucharist. But then it means only offered to *view*, or offered to Divine consideration: that is, *represented* before God, angels, and men, and *pleaded* before God as what we claim to: not offered again in *sacrifice*." (Waterland, Works, vol. v. p. 129, note.)

<sup>3</sup> In this we are very glad to find Mr. Sadler in agreement with us. He has very well said: "It is clear, then, that the Saviour primarily instituted the Eucharist as the means whereby His people are to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. His first object must be ours, and we humbly trust that in the form of service which we have inherited, this first intention of our Master is fulfilled." ("The Church and the Age," p. 269.) In the able article from which we quote on "Liturgies and Ritual" there is so much that is really valuable and seasonable that we heartily wish we could express entire agreement with the whole of it.

out danger that we aim at giving it a place in our doctrinal system which Scripture has not given it.

View this Sacrament primarily as ordained to be a sacrifice, and then, we believe, this view will grow and lay hold on the ground of men's hearts, until (however we may seek to make the partaking a part of the sacrificial service) Communion will by degrees become a matter of very secondary, or only occasional importance; and congregations will come not very unnaturally to behold and gaze and adore, but not to receive the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ; that is, in other words, will come just to leave undone what Christ, in ordaining the Sacrament, appointed to be done.

This tendency has surely been seen in the history of the whole Christian Church. And is not the history of our own branch of that Church showing it too plainly even now?

If, on the other hand, we regard the primary object of the Lord's Supper to be for the Communion or partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, as given and shed for us (and we may confidently affirm that the Holy Scriptures justify us in so regarding it), then, though we may willingly still admit and allow the use of sacrificial language, we shall be thankful for the work of our Reformers in the decided steps they took in their way of dealing with our Churches and our Services, to give prominence to the aspect of the Lord's Supper as a Communion rather than as a Sacrifice.<sup>1</sup> Do we then deny that all Christian antiquity bears witness to the Eucharistic service, as the oblation of the redeemed Church of Christ? We would not if we could. And certainly we could not if we would. It may be, that we need, some of us, to be reminded of this truth. But we are persuaded that the true view of this spiritual Sacrifice—of the service we herein render to God—is secondary and subservient to the true view of the gift which in these holy mysteries we receive at His hands. It is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, as therein to be verily and indeed taken and received, which is to be the true object of our faith in this holy Sacrament. This certainly is the teaching we have received from our Reformers. On this point we cannot do better than quote the words of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in their Report on the case of *Liddell v. Westerton*: "When the same thing is signified, it may not be of much importance by what name it is called;<sup>2</sup> but the distinction

<sup>1</sup> See some excellent remarks of Professor Mozley in "Lectures and other Theological Papers," p. 217.

<sup>2</sup> "It is called a *table* with reference to the Lord's Supper, and an *altar* on the score of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving there offered to God Almighty." (King Edward's Letter, A.D. 1550, quoted in Waterland, Works, vol. v. p. 269.)

"That very law which our Saviour was to abolish, did not so soon become unlawful to be observed as some imagine; nor was it afterwards unlawful *so far*, that the very name of Altar, of Priest, of Sacrifice itself should be banished out of the world . . . the names themselves may (I hope) be retained without sin, in respect of that proportion which things established by our Saviour have unto them which by Him are abrogated. And so throughout all the writings of the ancient Fathers we see that the words which were to continue; the only difference is, that whereas before they had a literal, they have now a metaphorical use." (Hooker, "Eccles. Pol.," book iv. ch. xi. § 10; Works, edit. Keble, vol. i. p. 460.)

Whatever doubt there may be as to the time when the Communion-table first came to be called by the name *altar*, it seems certain that the frequent use of such language co-existed with the admission that Christians had no altars. (See Mede, Works, 383-392; L'Aroque, "Hist. of Eucharist," pp. 43-46; and Goode, "Rule of Faith," vol. ii. pp. 368, 369. Perkins, Works, vol. ii. p. 553. See also Origen, "Con. Celsum," lib. viii. § 17, p. 755; edit. Ben., and note there; Op. ed. Migne, tom. i. c. 1539, *sqq.*)

"Christians have an altar, whereof all partake. And that altar is Christ our

between 'altar' and 'Communion-table,' is in itself essential, and deeply founded in the most important differences in matters of faith between Protestants and Romanists—namely, in the different notions of the nature of the Lord's Supper which prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation, and those which were introduced by the Reformers. By the former it was considered as a Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Saviour. The altar was the place on which the Sacrifice was to be made; the elements were to be consecrated, and being so consecrated were treated as the Body and Blood of the Victim. The Reformers, on the other hand, considered the Holy Communion not as a Sacrifice, but as a feast, to be celebrated at the Lord's table; though as to the consecration of the elements, and the effect of this consecration, and several other points, they differed greatly among themselves. This distinction is well pointed out in Cudworth's 'Discourse concerning the True Notion of the Lord's Supper,' chap. v. p. 27: 'We see, then, how that theological controversy which hath cost so many disputes, whether the Lord's Supper be a Sacrifice, is already decided; for it is not "*sacrificium*," but "*epulum*;" not a sacrifice but a feast upon sacrifice; or else in other words, not "*oblatio sacrificii*," but, as Tertullian excellently speaks, "*participatio sacrificii*;"<sup>1</sup> not the offering of something up to God upon an altar, but the eating of something which comes from God's altar, and is set upon our tables. Neither was it ever known amongst the Jews or Heathens, that those tables on which they did eat their sacrifice should be called by the name of altars. . . . Therefore, he (St. Paul) must needs call the Communion by the name of the Lord's Table, *i.e.*, the table on which God's meat is eaten, not His altar on which it is offered.'<sup>2</sup> (Brooke's "P. C. Judgments," pp. 66, 67).

We need not wonder (it could hardly have been otherwise) if Divines have followed who have considered that the caution of the Reformers was carried too far. No doubt they preferred to leave behind them what some will even regard perhaps as a liturgical loss, rather than to leave behind them anything like a doubtful testimony to the prominence in the Eucharist of the aspect of Communion over that of offering or sacrifice. Are not events in our own days tending to justify their wisdom and their caution?

Certainly we should be very slow to put our hands to the work of undermining their testimony, until there is no danger of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist again claiming for itself its former position of eminence and prominence. And they who now carefully scan the ecclesiastical horizon from the standpoint of Church of England doctrine, will hardly come to the conclusion that that time has yet arrived.

We are not so foolish as to deny that, from the first ages of Christianity, the Eucharist has always had a certain sacrificial character. Why should we hesitate to add that this character seems commonly to have been regarded as derived from the ordinance of Christ? We trust there are not many minds among us so warped by prejudice or blinded by bigotry as altogether to refuse to join in calling our whole Eucharistic Service "Our

---

Lord, Who is Altar, Priest, and Sacrifice, all in One. . . His table here below is a secondary altar in two views; first, on the score of our own sacrifices, of prayers, praises, souls, and bodies, which we offer up from thence; secondly, as it is the seat of the consecrated elements, that is, of the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, of the Grand Sacrifice, symbolically represented and exhibited and spiritually there received." (Waterland, Works, vol. v. p. 269. See also p. 130, and vol. iv. p. 749.)

<sup>1</sup> See Tertullian, "*De Oratione*," § xiv.; Op. p. 136, edit. Rigaltius, 1689.

<sup>2</sup> Cudworth adds: "It is true, an altar is nothing but a table; but it is a table upon which God Himself eats, consuming the sacrifices by His holy Fire; but when the same meat is given from God unto us to eat of, the relation being changed, the place on which we eat is nothing but a table." (P. 28.)

Christian Sacrifice."<sup>1</sup> Only this we must insist upon, that its sacrificial character of old stood side by side with clear declarations and open avowals that Christians have no altars<sup>2</sup> and no victims, no sacrifices and no offerings of blood—that they serve their God with the spiritual sacrifices of the heart's prayer and praise, with which He is well pleased. And for ourselves we must insist upon this—that in this Church of England the Eucharist as "the Christian Sacrifice" must stand beside the truth that we have no altars and no masses, no hosts and no offerings of Christ, or of Christ's Sacred Body and Blood, for the living and the dead—no sacrifices save our true Eucharistic oblations with our spiritual sacrifices in commemorating the One Great Offering and Sacrifice of our Blessed Redeemer.

And we are persuaded that we are best carrying out the purpose of Christ's institution, and best following the example of Christians of old time, in regarding *that* as the primary end of the ordinance which is set before us in the words of the Apostle, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.

*Alice, Grand Duchess of Hesse, Princess of Great Britain and Ireland.*  
Biographical Sketch and Letters. With Portraits. John Murray.

In the April *Quarterly Review* appeared an admirable article with the title "Two Royal Books," reviewing the Queen's new book, "More Leaves from the Journal of a Life in the Highlands," and also the volume published last year in Darmstadt, "Alice, Gross-Herzogin von Hessen und bei Rhein, Prinzessin von Gross-Britannien und Irland." The *Quarterly* writer, with good taste and judgment, touched on the attractive features of these "Royal books," and gave some charming extracts from the Princess's letters to the Queen, an English edition of the German work being at the time in preparation. For the Darmstadt volume, of course, these letters were translated into German. In the volume before us, which has a preface by her Royal Highness Princess Christian, the letters are given in their original form. Princess Christian's touching preface, which adds largely to the interest of the work, has a winning simplicity and frankness. Its opening words record

<sup>1</sup> So Archbishop Sharp, whom Waterland pronounces "as judicious a Divine as any our Church has had," declares: "We offer up our alms; we offer up our prayers, our praises, and ourselves; and all these we offer up in virtue and consideration of Christ's Sacrifice, represented before us ['I would only add, *and before God.*' says Waterland, Works, vol. iv. p. 762] by way of remembrance or commemoration; nor can it be proved that the ancients did more than this: *this whole service was their CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE, and this is ours.* But the Romanists have invented a new sacrifice, which Christ never instituted, which the Apostles never dreamt of, which the primitive Christians would have abhorred, and which we, if we will be followers of them, ought never to join in." (Works, vol. v. p. 197, Oxford, 1829; Sermon on 1 Cor. xi. 23-25.)

<sup>2</sup> It must not be supposed that the force of such assertions can be altogether evacuated by the distinction (which will not be found to hold good universally) between *βωμός* and *θυσιαστήριον*. Origen ("Con. Celsum," viii. § 17) admits the charge of Celsus that Christians have no altars (*βωμοί*), and declares that the *soul* is the true Christian altar (*βωμός*). He could certainly not have written thus, if he had supposed that the Christian Church had its true *θυσιαστήρια* of stone or of wood.

"the great affection" with which Princess Alice "has ever been regarded in this country, and the universal feeling of sympathy shown at the time of her death."

"In these days, when the custom has become general of publishing biographies of all persons of note or distinction," continues Princess Helena, "it was thought advisable, in order that a true picture might be given of my sister, that a short sketch of her life should be prepared by some one who was personally known to her, and who appreciated the many beautiful features of her character. The choice fell upon a clergyman at Darmstadt, Dr. Sell." To help Dr. Sell in delineating the domestic side of her character, adds the Princess, "my mother selected for his guidance the extracts from my sister's letters to her, which appear in the present volume." And, without doubt, thoughtful persons who read these letters, selected by the Queen, will feel thankful to her Majesty for granting them, in this way, a closer insight into so "beautiful and unselfish" a life. As regards English readers, particularly, we may speak with confidence. For in these letters, the grace and realness of which all must admire, they will see with satisfaction how devoted Princess Alice "was to the land of her birth—how her heart ever turned to it with reverence and affection as the country which had done and was doing for Liberty and the advancement of mankind more than any other country in the world." How deep was her feeling in this respect, we read, was testified by a request which the Grand Duchess made to her husband, in anticipation of her death, that an English flag might be laid upon her coffin.

The divisions in the volume before us are, "Childhood and Girlhood, 1843-62;" "In her New Home, 1862-65;" "At Home and at Work, 1866-72;" "Trials, 1873-77;" and the closing chapter, 1878, together with concluding remarks and an appendix. There is a portrait of the Princess, 1860, after the well-known photograph; another portrait, 1878. Many passages in the memoir, as well as in the letters, invite quotation; but the book has been widely reviewed, and it deserves to be read, and preserved. Our quotations, accordingly, shall be brief.

At the age of seventeen the Princess met Prince Louis of Hesse; and the engagement took place a few months later, when he paid a second visit to Windsor. One day "after dinner," wrote the Queen, in her Majesty's Diary, "while talking to the gentlemen, I perceived Alice and Louis talking before the fireplace more earnestly than usual, and when I passed to go to the other room both came up to me, and Alice, in much agitation, said he had proposed to her, and he begged for my blessing. I could only squeeze his hand and say 'Certainly,' and that we would see him in our room later. . . . Alice came to our room, agitated, but quiet. Albert sent for Louis to his room: he went first to him, and then called Alice and me in. . . . Louis has a warm, noble heart. We embraced our dear Alice, and praised her much to him." This was on November 30th, 1860. On December 28th "our dear bridegroom," as the Prince Consort called the young Prince, left Windsor. In March, 1861, the Duchess of Kent died, and on this occasion, we are told, Princess Alice "showed the comfort and help she was fitted to be to her family in times of sorrow and anxiety." In the following December the

Prince Consort fell ill ; and what a stay and comfort she was to the Queen during the course of that illness, and in the period following, was then well known, and has never been forgotten. The *Times* well said : " It is impossible to speak too highly of the strength of mind and self-sacrifice shown by Princess Alice during these dreadful days. Her Royal Highness has certainly understood that it was her duty to be the help and support of her mother in her great sorrow, and it was in a great measure due to her that the Queen has been able to bear with such wonderful resignation the irreparable loss that so suddenly and terribly befell her." The unanimous opinion of eye-witnesses as to what the Princess went through at that time is truly astonishing. " Herself [writes a friend] filled with intensest sorrow, she at once took into her own hands everything that was necessary in those first dark days of the destruction of that happy home. All communications from the Ministers and household passed through the Princess's hands to the Queen, then bowed down by grief. She endeavoured in every way possible, either verbally or by writing, to save her mother all trouble." In this connexion we may quote from letters written in later days. Thus, in 1864, she wrote :

March 14th.

MY OWN DEAR PRECIOUS MAMA,

These words are for the 16th, the first hard trial of our lives, where I was allowed to be with you. Do you recollect when all was over [death of the Duchess of Kent], and dear Papa led you to the sofa in the colonnade, and then took me to you ? I took that as a sacred request from him to love, cherish, and comfort my darling Mother to all the extent of my weak powers. Other things have taken me from being constantly with you ; but nothing has lessened my intense love for you, and longing to quiet every pain which touches you, and to fulfil, even in the distance, his request.

In 1862, the Princess wrote to her Majesty as follows :

Take courage, dear Mama, and feel strong in the thought that you require all your moral and physical strength to continue the journey which brings you daily nearer to *Home* and to *him* ! I know how weary you feel, how you long to rest your head on his dear shoulder, to have him to soothe your aching heart. You will find this rest again, and how blessed will it not be ! Bear patiently and courageously your heavy burden, and it will lighten imperceptibly as you near him, and God's love and mercy will support you. Oh, could my feeble words bring you the least comfort ! They come from a trusting, true, and loving heart, if from naught else.

In the same year, a few days later (23rd August), she gave this counsel : " Try and gather in the few bright things you have remaining and cherish them, for though faint, yet they are types of that infinite joy still to come. I am sure, dear Mama, the more you try to appreciate and to find the good in that which God in His love has left you, the more worthy you will daily become of that which is in store. That earthly happiness you had is indeed gone for ever, but you must not think that every ray of it has left you. You have the privilege, which dear Papa knew so well how to value, in your exalted position, of doing good and living for others, of carrying on his plans, his wishes, into fulfilment ; and as you go on doing your duty, this will, this must, I feel sure, bring you peace and comfort. Forgive me, darling Mama, if I speak so openly ; but my love for you is such that I cannot be silent, when I long so fervently to give you some slight comfort and hope in your present life.

"I have known and watched your deep sorrow with a sympathizing, though aching heart. Do not think that absence from you can still that pain. My love for you is strong, is constant; I would like to shelter you in my arms, to protect you from all future anxiety, to still your aching longing! My own sweet Mama, you know I would give my life for you, could I alter what you have to bear!"

"Trust in God! ever and constantly. In my life I feel that to be my stay and my strength, and the feeling increases as the days go on. My thoughts of the future are bright, and this always helps to make the minor worries and sorrows of the present dissolve before the warm rays of that light which is our guide."

Passages like these, and there are many such, may serve to remind a thoughtful Christian of the twofold meaning of παράκλησις, exhortation and encouragement. In Barnabas (Acts iv. 36) there was candour and courage to exhort, we may suppose, even while he was consoling.

The life of Princess Alice, a daughter of consolation, was one of manifold trial; it was full of sympathy for the sorrows and sufferings of others. Hers was truly "a thoughtful love"—to quote Mrs. Waring's sweet hymn—"through constant watching wise"; there was

"A heart at leisure from itself  
To soothe and sympathize."

It is pleasing to read, in this connexion, the Princess's own words, concerning bereavement. Prince Louis's sister, who was "very unselfish," of a "gentle, humble spirit," was taken away. Princess Alice, referring to the grief of her parents-in-law, writes to the Queen (21st April, 1865): "As I have shared their joys, so with all my heart do I share their sorrow. You well understand this, darling Mama. From you I have inherited an ardent and sympathizing spirit, and feel the pain of those I love as though it were my own."

The death of her sister-in-law, in the year 1865, brought home to her the uncertainty of life and necessity of labour, self-denial, charity, and all those virtues which we ought to strive after. "Oh," she adds, "that I may die, having done my work, and not sinned with *Unterlassung des Guten* [omission to do what is good], the fault into which it is easiest to fall." Again, in the same year, on 30th December, she writes: "Each year brings us nearer to the *Wiederssehen* [re-union with the dead], though it is sad to think how one's glass is running out, and how little good goes with it, compared to the numberless blessings we receive. Time goes incredibly fast."

The picture of the Princess as a wife is full of charm. Henry Venn Elliott, of Brighton, a Christian who did not speak rashly, once said of the wife he so tenderly loved and deeply lamented, "God knows her faults, I do not." The picture presented in this volume reminds us of Mr. Elliott's remark. Certainly, as a wife, Princess Alice ranks among the gentlest and noblest. And not inferior is her picture as a mother, wise, loving, and devoted. The grand old poet speaks of a tender watchfulness over a sleeping child:

ὥς ὅτε μήτηρ  
παιδὸς ἔργει νύκτα, ὅθ' ἡδέε' λείατο ὑπνῶν :

and Princess Alice shows herself among her children, as well as in a sick-chamber, a most attentive and accomplished nurse.

The very sad and distressing accident of May 18, 1873, when little Prince Fritz fell through a window on the pavement below, was followed by many experiences in the school of sorrow. "The horror of my darling's sudden death," she wrote, "at times torments me too much, particularly waking of a morning; but when I think he is at rest, free from the sorrow we are suffering, and from every evil to come, I feel quite resigned." The bereaved mother refers to a hymn by Miss Procter, an old favourite of ours, called *Friend Sorrow*; it expressed much of what she felt, at this time, about a deep grief. It may be a service to some of our readers, perhaps, to mention, that this hymn appears in "Legends and Lyrics." The opening lines are these:

"Do not cheat thy Heart, and tell her,  
'Grief will pass away;  
Hope for fairer times in future,  
And forget to-day.'"

It was known that for a period the Princess was under the influence of German scepticism; but it was also known that, after she had made a friend of God-sent sorrow, her faith, through grace, was again made quick. A memorandum, written by an intimate friend, has an especial interest: "After her son's death," we read, "I thought I observed a change in her feelings. Before that time she had often expressed openly her doubts as to the existence of God; had allowed herself to be led away by the free-thinking philosophical views of others. After Prince Fritz died, she never spoke in such a way again. She remained silent while a transformation was quietly going on within, of which I afterwards was made aware, under the influence of some hidden power. It seemed as if she did not then like to own the change that had come over her." Some time afterwards, however, she told her friend, in the most simple and touching manner, how the change had come about. "I could not listen to her story without tears. The Princess told me she owed it all to her child's death, and to the influence of a Scotch gentleman, a friend of the Grand Duke's, who was residing with his family at Darmstadt. 'I owe all to this kind friend,' she said, 'who exercised such a beneficial influence on my religious views; yet people say so much that is cruel and unjust of him, and of my acquaintance with him.' Another time she said, 'The whole edifice of philosophical conclusions which I had built up for myself I find to have no foundation whatever; nothing of it is left: it has crumbled away like dust. What should we be, what would become of us, if we had no faith, if we did not believe that there is a God Who rules the world and each single one of us? I feel the necessity of prayer; I love to sing hymns with my children, and we have each our favourite hymn.' Such a statement, as we have said, has an interest of its own. But we thankfully quote an editorial note: "*This memorandum does not go far enough. The Princess returned to the faith in which she was reared, and died in it, a devout Christian.*"

The Princess's character, portrayed in this volume, a daughter, a wife, a mother, is, as we have remarked, singularly beautiful and instructive. It is hardly necessary to add that her Christian sympathy was by no means limited by "family" ties. In charitable works of various kinds, specially



among the sick and the poor, she took a hearty interest, endeavouring herself to follow the blessed steps of Him, her "comfort and support," Who went about doing good, and Whose true disciples are "the light" and "the salt" of an evil world.

*The Life of Christ.* By Dr. BERNHARD WEISS, Counsellor of the Consistory and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated by J. W. Hope, M.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. Vols. I. and II., 1883. Vol. III., 1884.

The rapidity with which one "Life of Christ" follows another, and one Commentary on the New Testament follows another, is proof positive that, whatever reasons there may be for stigmatizing the present age as one of scepticism and irreligion, yet the Gospel narrative shows no sign of failing in power to interest and attract. Utterly fragmentary as are the records of Christ's life and work on earth, no theologian or body of theologians has thus far been able to convince the world that the most has been made of them. The four Gospels, which scarcely contain as many words as would fill an ordinary newspaper, have been expanded again and again into biographies a thousand pages in length; and still the hearts of Christian students remain unsatisfied. We have scarcely digested one voluminous "Life of Christ," from the pen of some leading scholar, before we are invited to consider another from some one else whose claim to our attention cannot be gainsaid. In our own country, the works of Archdeacon Farrar, of Dr. Geikie, and of Dr. Edersheim will occur to everyone as illustrations of this statement. On the Continent, there are those of Keim, Hausrath, Renan and others, all of which have been translated into English for some years. And now we have yet another from the hand of Professor Weiss, first given to the world in the original German in 1882, and the very next year published in part in an English translation through the enterprise of Messrs. Clark. The two volumes of the German edition have been broken into three in the English. The third volume appeared as these pages were in the press.

After the favourite manner of German writers, Dr. Weiss divides his work into "Books"—seven in all. Of these, volumes one and two contain four: I. The Sources; II. The Preparation; III. Seed-Time; IV. The First Conflicts. The remaining Books are, V. The Crisis; VI. Jerusalem; VII. The Passion. Of these seven books we are inclined to think the first by far the most valuable, especially the chapters which relate to the Fourth Gospel. Here Dr. Weiss writes with the authority of one who is thoroughly master of his subject. And though even here his standpoint is not exactly ours, nor that of most of our readers, yet, in the main, one agrees with his conclusions and is grateful to him for the powerful arguments with which he supports what the Church has all along believed.

Great as must have been the number of persons who had witnessed leading acts in the life of Christ, and heard many of His discourses and conversations, yet it would be chiefly in "the limited circle of the Church in Jerusalem" that the oral tradition respecting His words and works would insensibly be created. In connexion with this fact Dr. Weiss makes an important remark. Whereas in the northern parts of Palestine the languages in common use were a good deal mixed, it was in Jerusalem "that the language was spoken which Jesus Himself had employed. And the poverty of the Aramaic dialect, which admitted of no great variation of expression, contributed to the early establishment of a fixed type of narration, which became the more settled even in details the oftener that

subject was referred to. The main points in the utterances of Jesus, the principal junctures in the narration of the events in connexion with which they were spoken, or which memory associated with them—these took more and more a permanent form, from which there was, in their subsequent recital, an ever diminishing deviation" (i. p. 17). Of course Dr. Weiss does not mean to imply that our Gospels are translations from Aramaic originals—not even of St. Matthew would he assert that—but merely that an oral tradition arose in the first instance in Aramaic, and that this had considerable influence upon the form which the Greek tradition and Greek documents afterwards assumed.

Dr. Weiss holds fast to the primitive tradition that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Aramaic, and he believes this to have been the earliest Gospel of all. He thinks its date can be ascertained with something like certainty. Irenæus (III. i. 1) says that Matthew wrote when Peter and Paul were founding the Church in Rome. This must refer to the last years of Nero, A.D. 65-68. Eusebius (H. E. III., xxiv.) says that Matthew, when he quitted Palestine, bequeathed his Gospel to the Hebrews as a substitute for his personal teaching. This must refer to the departure of Christians from the country after the outbreak of the revolutionary war in A.D. 66. Lastly, in our Gospel of St. Matthew (xxiv. 15) there is the remarkable parenthesis, "Let him that readeth understand," which seems to refer to a moment when the writer saw the Lord's words in process of fulfilment, and wished to warn his readers that the time for flight from the doomed city had already come. From these data Dr. Weiss would fix A.D. 67 as the time when the first Gospel was given to the Church by St. Matthew in Aramaic. But of this first Aramaic Gospel the Greek St. Matthew is anything but a mere translation. This is now perhaps universally conceded. Dr. Weiss considers that the existing First Gospel is the compilation of some unknown writer, who made use of the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel of Mark, and probably other materials.

With regard to the Second Gospel, Dr. Weiss holds fast to the primitive tradition that it is practically St. Peter's, and considers that its language and contents adequately establish the statement of Clement of Alexandria that it was written in Rome and for Romans. He does not discuss the conflicting evidence as to its having been written before or after St. Peter's death, but, without assigning reasons, decides for the testimony of Irenæus, who tells us that Mark wrote *after* the death of Peter and Paul. He considers that Mark ii. 26 implies that the temple with the shewbread is still in existence; so that the Gospel can hardly have been written later than 69 A.D., just a year or two after the date assigned to the Aramaic Gospel of St. Matthew. In connexion with this subject he expresses his conviction that the Apocalypse "was undoubtedly (*zweifellos*) written before the destruction of Jerusalem," a conviction with which we entirely agree. He does not think that St. Mark was entirely dependent upon St. Peter for his materials. His family belonged to Jerusalem, and while living with them he must have been acquainted with the Gospel narratives in circulation there before he became accustomed to hear St. Peter's form of narration.

On the vexed question as to the last verses of St. Mark's Gospel, recently revived by the republication of Dean Burgon's vehement articles from the *Quarterly Review*, Dr. Weiss writes as follows:

That the present conclusion of the Gospel (xvi. 9-20) is shown, both by the testimony of the MSS. and also by its peculiarities of language and style of narrative, not to have belonged to the original Gospel, may now be regarded as admitted.

As to the Third Gospel, the one thing which he considers to be quite

certain is that it is quite independent of St. Matthew's. Scarcely less certain is it that St. Luke compiled his Gospel mainly from documentary sources, as seems to be shown from the marked difference of style between the preface and the Gospel itself. When the evangelist is quite free from Hebraic influences, he writes with "the hand of a practised Greek writer." But, seeing that he came to Palestine with St. Paul, he may quite possibly have there become familiar with the oral tradition. With all this it is not difficult to agree. But it is hard to follow Dr. Weiss when he contends that the so-called peculiarities of St. Luke's style "demonstrably originate with his sources." How can this be when they are scattered broadcast over every chapter of the Gospel and of the Acts? Let us assume, for the sake of illustration, what is in itself highly probable, that in the contents of the first three chapters of the Gospel St. Luke has edited for us three or more separate documents; then how can we account for the marked similarities of diction and construction which pervade them all, if these do not come from the evangelist, but from his sources? Anyone who will take the trouble to go through three or four chapters of either the Gospel or the Acts and mark all the things which are characteristic of what is commonly called St. Luke's style, will soon be convinced that the style is rightly called his. Let the chapters be taken not consecutively, but at intervals, the result will be exactly the same. Only where we come upon what has conveniently been styled "the triple tradition"—i.e., that large element which is common to all three of the Synoptic Gospels—do these peculiarities abate somewhat. Elsewhere, no matter what may be the source from which St. Luke derived his information, these characteristics abound. The obvious inference is that they come from the evangelist, and not from his sources.

As to the date of this Gospel, Dr. Weiss considers that "the definite indication given by the prophecy of the fate of Jerusalem (xix. 43, 44) puts it beyond doubt that the Gospel, if not its source, was written after the destruction of Jerusalem" (i. p. 88). Curiosity prompted us to look to the discussion of this passage in the as yet untranslated portion of the work, to see whether Dr. Weiss went the length of maintaining that this prophecy is an invention put into the mouth of Christ after the event. Not quite that. He has too much literary acumen to believe that the evangelist *could* have invented the intensity of that appeal, "If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace!" But in his exasperatingly dogmatic way he tells us that *for the sake of effect* St. Luke has placed the weeping over Jerusalem next to the triumphal entry, although *beyond doubt it does not belong there*, and that the wording of the lamentation has been altered so as to make it fit more exactly with the details of the fulfilment. This is only one of numerous instances in which the statements of evangelists are brushed away without the smallest compunction when they chance to conflict with the convictions of our author. On this point we shall have more to say presently.

But of this First Book it is the chapters which treat of the Fourth Gospel that can be read with the largest amount of satisfaction. Here one finds one's self usually in harmony not only with the conclusions reached, but with the method of reaching them. He condemns as quite unreasonable the attempt which has lately been made to throw doubt upon the abundantly attested tradition that John the Apostle lived at Ephesus until near the close of the first century. Any confusion with "the presbyter John" is incredible. He holds firmly to the belief that the unnamed disciple in John i. 35, xiii. 23, 24, xviii. 15, 16, xix. 34, 35, xx. 2-8, is John the Apostle, the writer of the Gospel. In John xxi. 25, an addition made by the Ephesian elders, we have "a witness to the

origin of the Gospel as ancient and reliable as we could ever wish to possess." They "added this closing word to the final chapter as it was about to pass away from this circle to the Church, which of course knew quite well from whose hands it received it, and who those were who spoke here" (p. 95). On the history of modern attempts to discredit the apostolic origin of the Fourth Gospel, he writes crushingly as follows :

Criticism has torn to shreds the external evidence for the Gospel. Baur would allow no trace of the Fourth Gospel before the last quarter of the second century. His followers have had to concede one after another the testimonies which he impugned. All that has been discovered since then—the *Philosophumena* with their ample quotations of John from the Gnostic writings, the end of the *Clementines* with the history of the man born blind, the Syriac commentary on Tatian's *Diatessaron*—has positively refuted assertions of criticism long and obstinately clung to. The last energetic opponent of the genuineness of the Gospel has latterly been compelled by the external evidence to push back the origination of the Gospel to the second decade of the second century. And the obvious impossibility of conceiving a forgery of the Gospel taking place so soon after the death of the Apostle has made it necessary for him to contest the tradition of the Apostle's residence at Ephesus, a position regarded as untenable hypercriticism by all prudent representatives of the Tübingen school. (P. 98.)

And as to the character of the Gospel, for the authenticity of which he so ably argues, Dr. Weiss puts the case forcibly thus :

Christianity is no philosophy which thinks to redeem the world through its ideals, while it either does not know sin or looks for its being overcome by the world's natural progress. Christianity announces an act of love on the part of God, through which the world is saved in the sending of His only-begotten Son. That in the manifestation of Christ the divine act of love perfected itself, that it was the guilt of unpardonable unbelief when Jesus was not recognised as being what He was, that in Him the faithful saw the glory of the Eternal Word brought down to the level of the senses—these are the facts which the Gospel of St. John proposes to oppose as an invincible bulwark against the approaching storm of that false Gnosis. (P. 133.)

Dr. Weiss has no sympathy with the sceptical dogmatism which pronounces the miraculous to be quite incredible or even antecedently improbable. "Indeed, whoever considers that a marvellous historical revelation, preparatory to the appearance of Jesus, is an established fact, will think it only natural that this possibility (of miracles) should be realized." Whether it was so or not is simply a question of evidence.

In passing on from the discussion of the sources of the Gospel narrative to the construction of the "Life of Christ," we find ourselves much less frequently able to agree with Dr. Weiss's method and results. A criticism of his own on Renan's work on the same subject might fitly be applied to himself : *mutato nomine de te*. A vivid reproduction of the past out of elements which are very fragmentary is a work expected from the historian.

Here lies the highest task of the historian, but also his greatest danger. Renan's "Life of Jesus" is not a history, but a romance. Not because, with rare intellectual gifts, he attempted this task at all ; but because, being one to whom our sources in their actual form were distasteful, or positively unintelligible, he could not escape the danger of correcting them according to his taste, or of making purely arbitrary selections from them. (P. 205.)

This is precisely the fault that we have to find with Dr. Weiss. One would be very far indeed from asserting that he has no sympathy with the Gospels ; still further from hinting that he fails to comprehend them. But we do complain of the manner in which, when the evangelist plainly says one thing, Dr. Weiss peremptorily asserts that something quite different is the truth. One instance of this kind of thing has been given

above in the paragraph respecting the Third Gospel : a few more may now be added. They seem to be cases in which, like Renan, he has been unable to resist the temptation of altering the Gospel narrative in order to suit his own fancy, and of adopting just as much or as little of it as he pleases. Thus of St. Luke's account of the Annunciation, he writes : "If it is considered to be an actual fact that Mary received a Divine revelation of the miracle which was to be wrought upon her, it must at the same time be acknowledged that *the representation belongs to the narrator*. But if anything in it can, in the highest sense, lay claim to historical truth, it is the lowly resignation with which Mary submits herself to the decree of God thus announced to her" (p. 223). Again, Elizabeth's declaration respecting Mary, "Blessed is she that believed" (Luke i. 45), "*can only belong to the writer*" (p. 244). And why? Because it is an obvious allusion to the unbelief of Zacharias ; and of the unbelief of Zacharias, Elizabeth could know nothing. Has the statement that she "was filled with the Holy Ghost" no bearing on the question? The statement that "Herod the king was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him" (Matt. ii. 3), is pronounced to be "no historical record, but only the writer's conception" (p. 269). Yet the intrinsic probability of Herod's fear is admitted. He identifies the healing of the "nobleman's" son (John iv. 45) with that of the centurion's servant recorded by the Synoptists (Matt. viii. 5 ; Luke vii. 2). In order to do this he has of course to assume that first one evangelist and then another has made surprising mistakes as to the place, the person cured, the petitioner, and the disease (ii. pp. 46-50). Yet he justly condemns the identification of the woman who was a "sinner" with Mary of Bethany, and the anointing by the one (Luke vii. 37, 38) with the anointing by the other (John xii. 3) as absolutely untenable (ii. pp. 132, 133). The points of difference in the one case are quite as strong as in the other. We read in the Gospels that some one once asked Jesus what he must do to win eternal life, and St. Matthew (xix. 20) tells us that he was a "young man." Dr. Weiss assures us that he "cannot possibly have been a youth, for it is said that he could look back upon a youthful life free from reproach" (ii. p. 246) ; as if this were not a reason for believing the evangelist. The older the questioner was, the less likelihood there would be of his being able to say that his life had been free from reproach. When Jesus said, "He that is without sin, let him first cast a stone," it was the older men that slunk away first. (John viii. 7-9.)

But enough. These instances will suffice to illustrate what seems to be the glaring defect in this able work. And yet the defect itself is not all loss. Here is an acute critic who handles the Gospels with the utmost freedom : who has no scruple whatever in roundly asserting that the evangelists, under the influence of their own purposes or preconceived ideas, have frequently described as taking place in one way what really took place in quite a different way, or perhaps even did not take place at all. And yet, with all this amount of liberty, the results obtained are in the main not negative or destructive, but positive, edifying, and in harmony with traditional Christian beliefs. It is pleasant to give a few examples. Thus, in reference to the healing of the son of the royal official, a cure effected miles away from the sick person, Dr. Weiss remarks :

To those who deny the miraculous, this narrative presents an insoluble difficulty. . . . Criticism rightly rejects every idea of spiritualistic causes remote from the spot, as well as every analogy from magnetic healing forces operating at a distance. It is evident that in this case, where Jesus never comes into contact with the invalid, no natural interposition of a corporeal or psychical kind can be admitted. If the authenticity of the narrative is disallowed, then nothing is left but to regard a story guaranteed by a twofold apostolic authority as myth or fiction. (II. p. 50.)

Dr. Weiss says "*twofold* apostolic authority," because he regards this miracle as identical with the healing of the centurion's servant. Still more strongly with regard to the feeding of the five thousand :

Thus much is absolutely certain : that all our accounts are *intended* to narrate a miracle ; and by this we must abide, unless the origin of the tradition is to remain an inexplicable riddle. But, in that case, nothing remains but to admit that a miracle of Divine Providence took place. (II. p. 385.)

Yet here, unfortunately, Dr. Weiss cannot let well alone ; while admitting that "the divine operation was no doubt invisible," he suggests that the miracle consisted in Christ's power over all those who had any food, inducing them to surrender it to Him for the use of all. Yet the disciples state expressly that the people "have nothing to eat" (Mark vi. 36), and the mention in all four narratives of the five loaves would be almost unintelligible if besides these five there was abundance of food. And how could His inducing others to give up their provisions kindle the enthusiasm which would have made Him a King even by force ? But, with all these drawbacks, the important fact remains that Dr. Weiss finds the evidence for miracles in the Gospels quite too strong to be set aside. Our concluding quotation shall be a passage in which he contends that miracles of healing are *necessary* to the mission of the Messiah :

In truth they formed a most essential part of His ministry. The utterly unhistorical view, that the Messiah was really nothing more than a reformer of religion and morals, must be abandoned. He is nowhere represented as such in Old Testament prophecy ; and therefore Jesus cannot have regarded His Messianic calling in this light. The ultimate aim of the Messianic activity never varied from being the reformation of the nation's life as a whole, the healing of all its miseries, the satisfaction of all its needs, and the bringing about the most ample salvation and blessing even as regards its external existence. . . . He recognised the profound connexion existing between the misery of sickness and the misery of sin. . . . The great Physician of sin, therefore, had to be a physician of the body as well, in order to show that the salvation which He brought embraced both soul and body. His ministry of healing became a great sermon in deeds on the Divine power which had appeared on earth, saving, healing, and blessing. . . . No one has recognised this more distinctly than the fourth evangelist ; and therefore Jesus's miracles in general, and His miracles of healing in particular, are by him always called *signs*. (II. p. 103.)

From these specimens our readers will see that the merits of this work are somewhat mixed. It is a book for the teacher rather than for the learner. The experienced student will learn a good deal from it ; the inexperienced will be likely to be often led astray. There is a freshness and suggestiveness about it that will often set the reader thinking ; but if he accepts its very positive assertions without thinking, he may find that he has exchanged the plain statements of inspired writers for the conjectural emendations of Dr. Weiss.

The translation is fair, but not excellent ; and in quoting it we have

not scrupled to alter it considerably, in order to do more justice to the German original. But the learned author's fondness for compound words makes translation into idiomatic English somewhat difficult. Only once have we had to resort to the German, in order to find out the intended meaning of the English ; and there (i. p. 105, "The one contains," etc.) it is not easy to see how the queer English sentence expresses the meaning of the original. It was also startling to find a chapter headed "The Immaculate Conception," and we at once referred to the German to see whether Dr. Weiss had really given such a title to a portion of his work ; and we found that he had not. What can have induced Mr. Hope to give "The Immaculate Conception" as a rendering of *Empfangen von dem heiligen Geiste* ? Does he think that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception refers to the conception of Jesus Christ ? And we cannot congratulate him on the one addition which he has made to the work of Dr. Weiss. The footnote on p. 44 of vol. i. is both misleading and wanting in dignity.

D. D.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*A Summary of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commissioners' Report, and of Dr. Stubbs' Historical Reports ; together with a Review of the Evidence before the Commission.* By SPENCER L. HOLLAND, B.A., Barrister-at-Law. Parker and Co., Oxford and London. 1884. Pp. 320.

THE title of this book, which is, so far as we know, the first literary effort of a young barrister, is not a little misleading. We expected from it to find, presented to us in a compendious form, the pith of the Commissioners' Report itself, and of the appendices containing the present Bishop of Chester's historical dissertations, followed by a synopsis of the voluminous evidence which was taken before the Commission. We were, no doubt, prepared to find also the author's own opinions on the documents which he had summarized, and should have had no right to complain on the ground of their being submitted to us at considerable length. But on taking into our hands what promised to be a useful substitute to persons unable to possess or consult the Report itself, we have speedily been undeceived. It is true that in an Appendix there are given the names of all the Commissioners, and the names of all the witnesses who attended before them. But these are the only particulars on which full information is vouchsafed to us ; and the very fragmentary idea which we can obtain from the book of the contents of the two-volume Blue-book in which the Report and Evidence are set forth, is rendered still more difficult to grasp by the titles of the three parts into which the work is divided. Part I. has no title ; but the pages throughout it are headed, "A Summary, etc., Introduction." This "Introduction," in fact, contains the substance of the Report itself, mixed up with not a few quotations from the evidence taken before the Commissioners, and much argumentative matter for which the author is himself responsible. It is a little singular that all this should be considered by him