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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1881.

ART. I.—CHURCH DEFENCE INSTITUTION AND ITS WORK.

MOST people find it pleasanter to work, if not quite alone, yet independently, rather than as members of an organization. For organization demands a certain subordination in its component parts. Individuality must, to a certain extent, conform itself to system. When, however, the results of combination are made manifest, then, almost against their will, people admit that individual activity, however able, however zealous, is no match for the continuous and systematic operations of a society. The Church of England favours independence of action, as well as liberty of thought. In no other Church, and certainly in no lay profession, are the officers allowed so large a degree of responsibility as is entrusted to the incumbent of a parish. The beneficed clergyman is a freeholder *jure officii*, and cannot be removed at the discretion of the Diocesan. The deans and chapters form almost an *imperium in imperio*. The subordination of the bishops to the archishops is personal rather than authoritative. The clergy and the laity are very jealous of any infringement of this independence. The parochial system commends itself to the love of freedom, which is characteristic of Englishmen. They judge the system by its results. They find that the indifferentism, which has affected other Churches, has not chilled the spiritual life of England, and that their branch of the Church has been saved from the narrowness which appears in other Churches to accompany a strict dependence of the ministry either upon an individual head or upon committees of management and appointment.

Yet this system is not without drawbacks, which it is imprudent to ignore. The complete discipline of the Church of Rome

enables her to direct the movement of all under her command, as though they were a single person, with a single will. Her whole force is brought into action at once with the regularity of machinery, and extraordinary results have often followed a display of her energy. But absolutism has a tendency to alienate the best men; so in the course of centuries the power of the Church of Rome has been materially weakened. Still, what remains of that power is used with the same precison as of old. Again, we must admit that the system of the Nonconformist Churches, and of the Scotch Churches, where a large lay element controls the clerical element, tends from opposite causes towards the same results. The sympathies of the poorest classes, and the intelligence of the educated classes, are repelled. But still, for the purposes of political organization, such Churches seem well adapted, and are able to bring a direct and united influence to bear on the Legislature in matters which concern them. We must, therefore, confess that for the mere purpose of influencing legislation the spiritual hierarchy of Rome, and the mixed spiritual and lay management of Nonconformity, is more effective than the independence which is cherished within the Church of England. Yet the power of growth and the blessing of increase accompany the Church which adheres most to the principle of liberty. The diversities of the human mind are well expressed in the diversities which are admitted within the Church. The liberal-mindedness of the Church is preserved by the independence of her ministers. Thus, her methods of teaching are kept in harmony with the mental developments which grow up with the growth of every generation. And thus we seem to have attained, in some degree, within her pale to a practical union of authority with liberty, in harmony with the axiom of individual responsibility, which she has always supported. We could wish that she might be permitted to do her work undisturbed; that her clergy might be allowed to devote themselves to their laborious duties among the people without being called upon to defend their own right to existence. But this is not to be their lot in our generation at all events. The assault upon the Church is made on one side by Nonconformists, on the other by those who hold atheistic opinions.

We need not waste our time in deploring a state of things which it is our duty to endeavour to improve. We must recognize the fact that in our days no institution, whether spiritual or lay, will be allowed to work out its mission without being placed upon its trial; and we should endeavour to make certain that the verdict shall be given in favour of what we hold to be an exceedingly precious inheritance of the English people.

Now the doctrines of all Churches are always the subject of

dispute. A great part of the training which is required of the ministry must always consist in a preparation which will enable its members to defend the doctrinal truth of the Church which they serve. It may be prudent for Churchmen, specially trained, from time to time to draw together in close organization for the maintenance and defence of purity of doctrine. We do not wish to appear to overlook that supreme obligation, when we call attention to other and humbler work. There are many departments of Church work. We have the National Society, which turns its attention to religious education. We have the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. We have the Useful Knowledge Society, the Curates' Aid Society; we have a number of special societies devoting themselves to special business. So we have the Church Defence Institution, with a special work marked for it by the special necessities of the present time. Fifty years ago there would, perhaps, have been no reason for its existence; fifty years hence there may be reasons why it should no longer exist. But the part of wise men is to find out the work which their own generation demands of them, and to do it according to their intelligence; we may be certain that the work of each generation will vary. We propose then to consider what the Church Defence Institution has done, is doing, and ought to do.

We have said that attacks upon the doctrines of every Church have been made and will be made. But attacks upon the systems of Churches, as they are ordered for their labour and duties among men, are exceptional, and ought to be met from time to time according to their exceptional character. The system of the Church of England, quite apart from her doctrines, is now the subject of an organized assault. To repel the assault is the reason and justification for the existence of the Society. Work must be specialized to be well done. The artisan whose whole time is employed in making pins' heads need not consider his labours undignified; he does more towards the creation of a perfect pin than if he devoted his attention to the point as well.

The object of the Institution is to combine Churchmen of different political opinions in the promotion of legislative measures conducive to the welfare of the Church. It recognizes the fact that while Church questions cannot be kept out of Parliament, they ought to be removed from the sphere of party politics. Moreover, it entertains no question touching doctrine. The Bishops and Convocations are the authorities who should entertain such questions. A voluntary association, however, may fairly claim the support of Churchmen, though it does not profess to cover the whole field. Individual Churchmen are invited to become members by subscribing, and Church associa-

tions, collegiate chapters, ruridecanal chapters, and other Church organizations which desire to co-operate, may become members in their collective capacity by subscription, and appoint a representative at the Council.

Of late years a body of men have enrolled themselves into a Society for the definite purpose of procuring changes in the law of the land, which will destroy the system of the Church of England. Their Society we all know is called the Liberation Society. The Church Defence Institution imposes on itself the counter-obligation of maintaining or of altering the laws of the land, so as to preserve the efficiency of the Church of England. So vast a system as that of the Church, so old, so interwoven with the habits of the people, so rich in the aggregate, so poor in individual cases, offers at once to an assailant many points of attack, and requires from its sentinels continual watchfulness in order that an alarm may be sounded in due time; that notice may be taken whenever a buttress requires repair, or a weak point requires strengthening, in order that the garrison may know when they should abandon a useless position, and when they should make a sortie and take new ground. To make the best of the machinery which belongs to the National Church, and to enable her clergy to carry on their work without disturbance, is the business of the Association. Here we notice the supreme value of the methodical labour of a society, as compared with the spasmodic action of individuals.

The activity of the Institution naturally divides itself into two departments. First the duty of watching Parliamentary movements; Bills are introduced every Session which require criticism, amendment, opposition, or support from the Church. Individual members of Parliament are scarcely equal to the continual vigilance which is required. Then there are a number of Legislative Reforms demanded by the Church. Here the Institution would be willing to take the initiative; but the initiative cannot be taken until the general opinion of the Church has been expressed. Churchmen in both Houses of Parliament are often placed at a disadvantage. The general unanimity amongst Churchmen which exists is not sufficiently expressed. Some service has already been rendered to the Church in Parliament by the Institution. More will be rendered as Churchmen become more determined that their Parliamentary interests shall not be neglected.

But the operations of the Society have another development, which may be called educational. It has undertaken the duty of repelling attacks from without which are made upon the Church through the Press, and by means of public lectures. We are governed in these days by popular opinion. Knowledge, some people say, is strength; but do not let us deceive

ourselves—ignorance is strength too. As long as untruths are believed, their virtue in the minds of men is the same as if they were truths.

When a man's character is blackened it is not always wise for him to remain silent, for it is possible that silence may be misunderstood. Some abuse, no doubt, is of such a character that it may be passed over in silence, but not all. For instance, when a lecturer calls the clergyman "The parish tiger," perhaps the clergyman may rest satisfied in the knowledge that the lecturer has answered himself. But even in such a case we would advise him not to be too certain; for when into uninstructed ears a clever argument, appealing to class prejudices, is poured, very violent language is sometimes taken for an accurate statement of the case. When we hear of inflammatory addresses being delivered in parish after parish on the text that "the parson has robbed the poor;" when Mr. Joseph Arch describes the clergy to assemblies of agricultural audiences as "the unmitigated evils of the country," we may be very certain that such a form of agitation would not be used unless it were useful. We know as a fact that startling prejudices against the Church are aroused by such language in the hearts of whole classes of our fellow-countrymen, while many excellent Churchmen remain quite unsuspicious of their existence. Men are astonished sometimes at what appears to them a sudden outburst of fanatical hatred towards the Church. If they had observed the slow process and patient care by which the fire was kindled they would forego their astonishment. They would understand that the passions of men have not been suddenly aroused; but that they are influenced by impressions which have been carefully instilled into their minds. Sentimental grievances are as potent to move men to action as real impressions. Uncontradicted courses of lectures, founded on the idea that "the parson has robbed the poor," or that "the clergy are the unmitigated evils of the country," will in the course of time induce a majority of the people to believe that such statements are correct.

But it is not only in the speeches of the travelling lecturer that we find the arguments of the opponents of the Church clothed in such language. In so respectable a review as the *British Quarterly* we read that the "Church is arrogant, contemptuous, militant, mournfully blind to all goodness and achievement save her own," that she is a "by-word in Christendom, a scandal to unsophisticated morality." Such words would not be employed unless, as a matter of business, it was thought advantageous to the cause to employ them. We are forced to the conclusion that the writer has gauged the ignorance of his audience, and their craving for strong expressions, and is trading upon the one and supplying the other.

Now let us consider the position of the clergyman of a parish visited by a lecturer of the Liberation Society. The public indictment is apparently levelled at the Church in general, but it is really pointed against the incumbent who represents the Church. For personalities are always agreeable to public assemblies. If the clergyman replies, he appears to be defending himself. If he vindicates the title of the Church to tithes, he appears to be looking after his own money-bags. If he defends the system of the Church of England on a platform, he appears to be defending his own place in the Establishment; and he is sometimes reminded that he had much better attend to his parochial duties, which he is paid to attend to, rather than employ himself in speaking at public meetings. It is obvious to us that such lecturers as those from whose vocabulary we have selected extracts, and that such an organization as supports them, are disposed of better through a central organization of Churchmen than by individual clergymen. It is hard to throw upon the clergy the burden of such a battle. Public meetings are best handled by practised platform orators. An itinerant lecturer of the Church Defence Institution, backed up by the Churchmen of the parish, would probably be able to deal with Mr. Joseph Arch on a public platform better than the most learned and most conscientious incumbent. But, it must be remembered, that when such lecturers are invited to a parish they ought to be supported and countenanced by all the most influential Churchmen of the neighbourhood. It must be remembered, too, that the gift of effective public speaking is a rare gift; and the organizing ability which such lecturers ought to possess is a rare gift also. It seems to us to be a very necessary, and, at the same time, a very expensive part of the business of the Church Defence Institution, to supply such men. A single parish or even a diocese could not undertake such a task. The efficiency of the plan depends, moreover, on the power of the lecturer to move rapidly from one part of the country to another, so that he may be placed at once in the exact locality where his services are most required.

We turn to another branch of the work of the Institution, which we believe might be usefully developed. The clergy, we need not be ashamed to admit, are not lawyers; but their duties bring them necessarily into contact with many knotty points of law. To whom can they apply for information unless they consult some ecclesiastical lawyer at an expense greater than they are prepared to undertake? Besides which, many points are matters of practice rather than law. We believe that a department of the Church Defence Institution might be very legitimately devoted to answering questions on such points of difficulty and doubt without disclosing the names of the corre-

spondents. The *National Church* newspaper, the organ of the Society, would be the vehicle by means of which the replies to such inquiries might be made public, for the information not only of the individual inquirers, but of the clergy in general. Some assistance of this character has already been given in a pamphlet, published by Dr. Lee, the secretary of the Society, which elucidates the technicalities of the last Burial Act, under the title of "What it does, and what it does not." The pamphlet has gone through sixteen editions. The technicalities of the rating laws, of the tithe rentcharge, ordinary and extraordinary, of the law of dilapidations, of the laws and practices with regard to parish charities, and similar subjects, are often perplexing to clergymen; and some assistance, we believe, might thus be given in an easy form.

We have often been told that the best defence of the Church is the conscientious discharge of their duties by clergymen. Of course we accept this statement as true, but not as the whole truth. The discharge of those duties may be made far easier by an association undertaking to relieve the clergy from the distasteful task of answering unwarranted statements. The Archbishop of Canterbury himself, a man certainly not likely to make an appeal unless there were good grounds for it, has appealed in his recent Pastoral on behalf of the Church Defence Institution to the Churchmen of England; he has proclaimed, with all the authority of such a man, in such an office, the necessity of spreading true information amongst the masses of the people, and of facing boldly the methods and the movements of an organization avowedly maintained in order to disestablish and to disendow the Church of England.

STANLEY LEIGHTON.

ART. II.—THE TEXT OF THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

SECOND ARTICLE.

IT is proposed, in this Paper, to consider more in detail a few important cases of disputed readings in the New Testament, and to discuss the manner in which they have been treated by the Revisers.

These may, for our purpose, be grouped under three heads. First: those which needed no special consideration, the result being accepted by all "competent critics." Secondly: those which fall naturally into smaller groups, so that a few typical

instances would serve as precedents for similar cases. Thirdly: individual instances, in which full discussion of the conflicting testimony would be necessary. In these cases we are secured from needless changes, by the rule that no deviation from the Authorized Version could be retained without the consent of two-thirds of the members present at the final revision.

Instances of the first class will naturally be sought among the changes which are unrecorded in the margin of the Revised Version. They are fully exhibited in the Oxford and Cambridge Texts.[1]

The most important of these is the passage concerning the testimony of the heavenly witnesses, which, in the absence of all reliable evidence on its behalf, is silently removed from its long-known place in 1 St. John v.

Another (though not strictly analogous) case may be found in the still undetermined text of Colossians ii. 2; where the evidence inclines decidedly to the reading, "the mystery of God, even Christ;" and where the marginal note is as follows: "The ancient authorities vary much in the Text of this passage." The treatment of this various reading by Bishops Ellicott and Lightfoot in their several Commentaries, and by Dr. Scrivener (Introduction), forms a most instructive study in the textual criticism of the New Testament.

In 2 Cor. iii. 3, the preponderating weight of evidence has sufficed to substitute καρδίαις for καρδίας without any marginal note. The sentence is rendered thus: "But in tables that are hearts of flesh."

Others of minor importance may be taken almost at random from any part of the New Testament.

The following, from the early chapters of St. Matthew, are nteresting, from the associations which have gathered about the familiar sentences. In chapter i. 25, the words "her first-born" are omitted, and the birth of the infant Jesus is described thus: "She brought forth a son." In chapter vi. verses 4 and 6, the word "openly" is dismissed. In chapter ix. 13, "unto repentance" is omitted; and the sentence becomes, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners."

Similarly, in the narrative of the conversion of Saul in Acts ix., the following changes are made. In verse 5, the word "Lord" disappears. The whole sentence, "It is hard for thee to kick

[1] In this class, no doubt, must also be included a few instances of various readings *recorded* in the margin, in which there could not have been any serious difference of opinion within the Revision Company; as, for example, the Doxology in the Lord's Prayer (St. Matthew vi. 13); and the celebrated passage included in the narrative of Philip and the Eunuch (Acts viii. 37). Both of these have been rejected in the text, though recorded in the margin.

against the pricks," and the following words, "and he trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him," are also banished. In verse 8, the word "nothing" is substituted for "no man." In the 11th verse the phrase, "in a vision;" in the 18th verse "immediately;" in the 19th verse the name "Saul," are all removed; and other changes occur in the same context.

We take another instance from Romans x., where we find the pronoun "them," instead of the word "Israel," in the 1st verse; the word "righteousness" removed from its place after the words "their own," in verse 3; the language of verse 5 made more forcible, because more terse, by sundry minor changes; "of them that preached peace," taken from verse 15; "Christ" substituted for "God" in verse 17.

In the Book of Revelation we find, of course, a large number of changes, arising from the fact that the scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were limited to very inferior documentary evidence for the text of this book: evidence inferior even to that which they possessed for the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles.

All these changes prove the reliance which has been placed on the most ancient manuscripts, and some of the most ancient versions. The Vatican MS. B is treated as having almost paramount authority in its original form. The Sinaitic MS. ℵ holds the next place. The old Latin, the early Syriac, and the Memphitic versions, rank very highly in the scale of documentary evidence.

Under the second head may be placed the majority of the cases to which reference was made in the former article. We may now add a few more. In St. Matthew xvii. verse 21 has been relegated to the margin, with the remark, "many authorities, some ancient, insert verse 21, 'But this kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting.'"

The verse (we are told by Dr. Tregelles[1]) is omitted in ℵ first hand, and B, in the Memphitic version according to Mill, in the Thebaic, the Æthiopic, and two of the Syriac versions. It is contained in C D, and in later corrections of ℵ, in the other uncials, and the majority of the cursives, in the Latin version, in two Syriac (the Peshito and Harclean), and in the Memphitic (according to two of the printed texts.) On this evidence (which Dr. Scrivener pronounces insufficient), the Revisers consistently omit the verse.

The same class of testimony has led them to omit St. Matthew xxiii. 14; to retain the memorable words, "neither the Son," in verse 36 of chapter xxiv.; and to omit the word "new," before "Covenant," in chapter xxvi. verse 28.

[1] With Dr. Hort's Appendix.

These are typical instances of a very large and interesting class of readings, the consideration of which will abundantly repay the labour of the student.

An instance of a somewhat different kind, but itself, too, of a representative character, is to be found in Romans v. 1. In this case the documentary evidence is decidedly in favour of ἔχωμεν, "let us have," which has therefore been adopted by the Revisers; while the internal evidence for the indicative mood has led them to place the words "we have" in the margin. Their case may be stated in words quoted by Dr. Scrivener from the Preface of the Five Clergymen (1858):—

> An overwhelming weight of authority has necessitated a change which, at the first sight, seems to impair the logical force of the Apostle's argument. No consideration, however, of this kind can be allowed to interfere with the faithful exhibition of the true text as far as it can be ascertained; and no doubt the real word of God, thus faithfully exhibited, will vindicate its own meaning, and need no help from man's short-sighted preference.

In other words, they have not allowed themselves to hazard a conjecture as to what an inspired writer is, or is not, likely to have said. They have not applied "the *paradiplomatic* canon that the itacism of ω for ο, so familiar to all collators of Greek manuscripts, crept into some very early copy, from whence it was propagated among our most venerable codices, even those from which the earliest versions were made." They have not assented to the view "that this is one out of a small number of well-ascertained cases in which the united testimonies of the best authorities conspire in giving a worse reading than that presented by later, and (for the the most part) quite inferior copies." (Scrivener, "Introd." 544.)

Under the third head, we include passages which, for their own intrinsic importance, or for the special character of the documentary evidence, must have commanded individual and special treatment. We shall speak only of a few typical instances.

To this class must be referred the last sixteen verses of St. Mark's Gospel; the disputed words in the angels' hymn; the two verses, St. Luke xxii. 43, 44, concerning the ministry of the angel and the agony of our Lord in the Garden; the words in St. John i. 18, "the only begotten Son;" the narrative of the woman taken in adultery, St. John vii. 53 to viii. 11; the word "broken," in 1 Cor. xi. 24; and many other important instances.

Those which we have enumerated are very instructive and important cases of textual criticism, in five of which the result has been an important deviation from the Authorized Version; while, in the remaining instance, the margin contains one of the most striking alternative readings in the whole New Testament.

We shall confine our remarks to two of these—namely, the disputed words in the angels' hymn, and the reading in St. John i. 18.

The external evidence in the former of these two cases, according to Dr. Scrivener ("Introduction," p. 514) is: The reading εὐδοκία is found in the morning hymn in A; in the later corrections of ℵ, and of B; in the rest of the uncials; in all the cursives; in the Memphitic version; in the three extant Syriac versions; in the Armenian and Æthiopic; the Vulgate; all the forms of the Old Latin; and the Gothic. Dr. Scrivener also claims, on the same side, "the virtually unanimous evidence" of the Greek Fathers, "thirteen of whom flourished before the middle of the fifth century, and must have used codices at least as old and pure as ℵ and B."

For εὐδοκίας the evidence is, the original reading in B and ℵ; the text of A and D; also the old Latin Version, the Gothic, the Vulgate; quotations by Origen, St. Jerome, and Hilary.[1]

A strong argument in favour of the reading of the Authorized Version is derived from the rhythmical arrangement of the sentences. Mr. McClellan says:—

> As to the rhythm: The bimembral arrangement, necessitated by the genitive, produces a painfully rugged, inharmonious, and disproportionate couplet; while, on the other hand, the triplet, occasioned by the nominative, displays all the smoothness and beauty of symmetry of a purely-constructed lyric.

Dr. Scrivener, representing a view which must have been advocated in the Revision Company, says:—

> In the common text all is transparently clear. The blessed words are distributed, after the Hebrew fashion, into a stanza consisting of three members. In the first and second, heaven and earth are contrasted; the third refers to both those preceding, and alleges the efficient cause which has brought God glory, and earth peace. By the addition of a single letter to the end of the last line, by merely reading ευδοκιας for ευδοκια, the rhythmical arrangement is utterly marred, and the simple shepherds are sent away with a message, the diction of which no scholar has yet construed to his own mind.

The words so long familiar to readers of the English Bible, and to communicants in the English Church, could not be surrendered without a fervent appeal on their behalf. In that appeal very many devout persons will cordially sympathize. And the emotional warmth with which Dr. Scrivener and others put forward the internal and subjective evidence, will have a

[1] See Tregelles's "Greek Testament," and Dr. Hort's Appendix to that volume.

hearty response from this very large class of persons. We are confident that, in this case, Dr. Scrivener represents, not only an important school of textual criticism, but a widespread tone of thought and feeling among English Churchmen. They have habitually used the well-known sentence in the most sacred offices of public worship, and have thus learned to associate their own deepest feelings of devotion with its use; and they will find it difficult to resist the current of devotional thought which flows along such a channel. The emotions which stir the hearts of Christian worshippers, when deep personal feeling Godward is inseparably bound up with the sense of fellowship in the mystical body of Christ, cannot be set aside very rapidly. The language of the *Gloria in Excelsis*, in the form in which it is familiar to English Churchmen, with its own grand rhythmical cadence, with its memories of the Holy Communion, with deeply graven experiences of the most sacred moments in our life, must exert a potent influence even on the judgments of men. And to some, at least, this persuasive power will appear irresistible. They will think it hard to conquer the habit and to resist the charm.

Still, it must be said in reply, that this kind of appeal is not textual criticism, nor judicial weighing of evidence. And it may perhaps be described by some as mere blind sentiment. Nevertheless, it is a power; and it demands careful treatment.

On the other hand, even on the ground of sentiment [or of subjective evidence], associations of thought and feeling, equally strong, would be formed in connection with the altered text. And, as a matter of fact, countless numbers of reverent Christians have sung to God, or have silently given Him praise, in words which moved *their* deepest feelings; while they believed and felt that they were singing the true angels' hymn, *Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.*"

The school represented by Dr. Scrivener unhesitatingly pronounces this reading to be a "blunder of some early scribe, *who cannot, however, have lived later than the second century.*"

We have already remarked on the unreliable character of appeals of this kind: however, great their persuasive power. An equally fervent and eloquent appeal might be made on the other side. And if two such contradictory appeals were placed before us, side by side, we should learn how hazardous it must always be to allow textual criticism to be influenced by considerations of this kind. It is obvious that the Revision Company were not in a position to allow weight to the arguments drawn from this source, against preponderating testimony of the reliable documents. Under the conditions accepted by them, they were bound to give full authority to the documentary evidence. If, indeed, that evidence were uncertain, the rule which forbade

unnecessary changes would require the words of the Authorized Version to be inserted in the text, and would place the doubtful alternative in the margin. On the other hand, if a majority of two-thirds considered the evidence for εὐδοκίας to preponderate, they were bound to place that reading (as they have done) in the text.[1]

We venture to think it questionable whether this testimony is really unanimous in favour of the reading of B and ℵ. We do indeed recognize that, on the principles evidently adopted by the Revisers, the weight of external evidence *inclines* to the reading which they have actually adopted. But, in the uncertainty of the case, we should have accepted it as an act of adherence to the principle of avoiding unnecessary changes, if they had retained the familiar words in the text, and had relegated the deviation to the margin. We could have wished that they had seen it right to adopt in this case the course which they have chosen in another instance (St. Mark xvi. 9): where, retaining the passage in the text, they append in the margin the note, "The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end."

Another very instructive instance of critical inquiry and discussion is supplied by the variation of reading in St. John i. 18. It has elicited a strong opinion from Dr. Scrivener ("Introduction," p. 525). And it has been made the subject of a dissertation by Dr. Hort (Cambridge, 1876). Thus it furnishes a conspicuous occasion for exhibiting the different modes of treatment adopted by different schools of criticism. The words themselves are of profound interest in their bearing on the deepest truths of Christian theology.

The Revisers have retained the reading, "the only begotten Son," although the documentary evidence which weighed with them in other cases appears to preponderate in favour of the very remarkable and unique reading, "God, only begotten." Dr. Hort, in his "Dissertation," gives the evidence thus:—

For θεὸς, ℵ, B, C,* L 33.
Memph., Syrr. Pesh. and Hcl. marg. Valentiniani, Iren., Clem., Orig., Epiph., Did., Bas., Greg. Nyss., Cyr. Al.

For υἱός, A C^3 E F G H K M S U V X ΓΔΛΠ.
And all known cursives except 33. Versions: the old Latin, the Vulgate Latin, the old Syriac, the text of the Hcl. Syr., the Jerusalem Syr. Lectionary.
The Patristic evidence admits of various interpretations on some points.

[1] In the Greek Text of Drs. Westcott and Hort, this reading is marked for discussion in their forthcoming Appendix. We shall be better able to appreciate the reasons for the reading adopted, when that Appendix has appeared.

Probabilities of transcription will be recognized as favourable to θεός. Μονογενὴς θεός is an unique phrase, unlikely to be suggested to a scribe by anything lying on the surface of the context, or by any other passage of Scripture.

Μονογενὴς υἱός, and still more ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, is a familiar and obvious phrase, suggested by the familiar sense of μονογενης in all literature, by the contrast to τοῦ πατρός in the same verse by two other early passages of this Gospel, iii. 16 and 18, and by a passage of St. John's first Epistle, iv. 9.

Thus, on grounds of documentary evidence and probabilities of transcription alike, we are irresistibly led to conclude that μονογενὴς θεός was the original from which ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός and ὁ μονογενής proceeded. More than this, no evidence from without can establish; but in a text so amply attested as that of the New Testament, we rightly conclude that the most original of extant readings was likewise that of the author himself, unless, on full consideration, it appears to involve a kind and degree of difficulty such as analogy forbids us to recognize as morally compatible with the author's intention, or some other peculiar ground of suspicion presents itself.

The argument on the other side is stated by Dr. Scrivener thus:—

Every one, indeed, must *feel* θεος to be untrue, even though, for the sake of consistency, he may be forced to uphold it.

Those who will resort to "ancient evidence exclusively" for the recension of the text, may well be perplexed in dealing with this passage. The oldest manuscripts, versions and writers, are hopelessly divided, so that we can well understand how some critics (without shadow of authority worth notice) have come to suspect both θεός and υἱός to be accretions, or spurious additions to μονογενής. If the principles advocated in chap. vii. be true, the present is just such a case as calls for the interposition of the more recent uncial and cursive codices; and when we find that they all, with the single exception of Cod. 33, defend the reading ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς, we feel safe in concluding that former Codices, ℵ, B, C, and the Peshito do not approach the autograph of St. John so nearly as Codex A, the Curetonian Syriac, and Old Latin versions.

A somewhat similar treatment of the question is to be found in Mr. McClellan's New Testament. Both these scholars approach the question from the side of internal and doctrinal probability, and discredit the documentary evidence which contradicts this *à priori* reasoning.

The principles of criticism which have been adopted by the Revisers, and which are maintained by the "Critical Editors," appear to be conclusive in the present instance in favour of the reading which has been placed in the margin. And we are unable to reconcile this decision with that which has been accepted in the angelic hymn (St. Luke ii. 14), and in other passages.

In thus offering to our readers a few out of the many cases of various readings in which the Revisers have deviated from the Text adopted in 1611, or have recorded an alternative reading in the margin, we would earnestly commend to all readers of the Greek Testament who have access to a critical apparatus, the careful prosecution of this inquiry for themselves. It will abundantly repay the labour which they may be able to expend upon it. And it will leave on the mind of the student a deep impression of the fidelity with which the Revisers have adhered to their purpose and their commission, of presenting to the Church as near an approach as existing appliances can furnish, to the veritable autographs of the Sacred Writers.

J. F. FENN.

ART. III.—SOUTHERN PALESTINE.

1. *Southern Palestine and Jerusalem.* By W. M. THOMSON, D.D., forty-five years a Missionary in Syria and Palestine. 140 illustrations and maps. New York: Harper Brothers. London: T. Nelson & Sons. 1881.
2. *Le Pays de l'Évangile; Notes d'un Voyage en Orient.* Par EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ. Paris: Meyrueis. 1864.
3. *Our Holiday in the East.* By Mrs. GEORGE SUMNER. Edited by the Rev. G. H. Sumner, M.A., Hon. Canon of Winchester, and Rector of Old Alresford, Hants. Hurst & Blackett. 1881.

IT was a true instinct that led the translators of the Bible who provided for us the Authorized Version in the reign of James I., to intend to prefix to their work an account of the Holy Land. The proofs that such was their deliberate intention are to be found partly, if not chiefly, in the correspondence which took place between them and the members of the Synod of Dort, regarding the rules to be observed in the publication of vernacular Bibles in England and Holland. Some copies of our Authorized Version have such an account of Palestine prefixed. How far this document was viewed as official, and what its real value may have been, we need not now inquire. All that is here urged is that our translators instinctively and truly felt that there is an essential, and, so to speak, organic connection between the Holy Book and the Holy Land.

A very large part of our obligation for having this wholesome thought strongly and deeply impressed upon us in modern times, and, indeed, made part of our whole conception of Bible study,

is due to America: and it is not a little remarkable that help for understanding the immediate East should have so largely come to us from the remote West. It seems like part of the fulfilment of the prophecies regarding the binding together of all parts of the world in one sacred knowledge. The great work of Dr. Robinson may be somewhat dry and tedious: but it is wonderfully copious and exact: when it was published it conferred a signal benefit on all the English-speaking people of the future: and, in fact, as was often remarked by the late lamented Dean of Westminster (himself one of our great benefactors in this field), it constituted an epoch in the history of the science of Sacred Geography. Another American writer, Dr. Thomson, who has resided nearly half a century in Syria, and has travelled through Palestine on frequent occasions and in all directions, has in another way laid us under great and permanent obligations. His treatise, "The Land and the Book," with its lively illustrations of Bible scenes and Bible customs, has been long before the world. More recently, he has published, in New York and in London, with copious and sumptuous illustrations, a work entitled "Southern Palestine and Jerusalem," which is, in fact, a part of his former work, re-cast, re-arranged, and in a great measure re-written. It is to be hoped that this is only an instalment of a similar re-issue, with mature improvements, of his whole work. Meanwhile, this present publication may be used for suggesting some remarks on Southern Palestine, with collateral illustrations from a French book printed a few years ago, and a very recent account of a tour in Palestine by an English lady.

The great principle, stated above, of the essential connection between sacred history and sacred scenery, has been well laid down, in vivid language, by Dr. Thomson; and it is quite worth while to quote some of his sentences relating to this subject:—

> The land where the Word-made-Flesh dwelt among men must ever continue to be an important part of Revelation; and Palestine may fairly be regarded as the divinely-appointed table whereupon God's messages to man have been graven in ever-living characters by the Great Publisher of Glad Tidings. . . . . This fact invests the Geography of the Holy Land with special importance. . . . . Palestine, fashioned and furnished by the Creator's hand, was the arena, and the people of Israel were the actors brought upon it, and made to perform their parts by the Divine Master. . . . . The Land has had an all-pervading influence upon the costume and character of the Bible. Without the former, the latter, as we now have it, could not have been produced. . . . . The Land and the Book constitute the all-perfect text of the Word of God, and can be best studied together (pp. 1–3).

Such are some of Dr. Thomson's true words in his Introduction: and elsewhere he says, more particularly, that Palestine is "the birth-place of the psalm and the hymn," and that "God

made the Holy Land and the Sacred Poet, the one for the other." It must be added that the thought thus expressed is well sustained throughout the book.

As to the definition of Southern Palestine, it may be made, in the present instance, somewhat arbitrarily. This, however, is of little moment; for that which is aimed at is convenience of description, not precise geographical subdivision. It is hoped that this paper will be followed, at short intervals, by similar papers on the Jordan Valley, on Northern Palestine, and on Jerusalem. Beginning with the headland of Carmel, we may here follow the plain of Sharon, and then—after pausing at Lydda and Ramleh—the wider plain of Philistia; thence skirting the edge of the desert about Beersheba, may pass into the "hill country" of Judæa proper, taking Hebron and Bethlehem on our way to the Mount of Olives. In pursuing such a route we shall touch various distinctive passages of sacred history—the early journeys of Apostles—the great wars of Saul and David—the primitive homes, if it is proper to call them homes, of the Patriarchs—and, finally, both the earlier and later passages of Gospel History. The tribal territories we shall cross in this brief circuit are those of Dan, Simeon, and Judah, the most renowned of all, and two of the most obscure.

Carmel, to quote a phrase used by Camden of a certain district of England, "lies sore on the sea." Thence it runs southeastward, so as to form a frontier-line of very high ground, enclosing the land of the central and southern tribes as in a sanctuary. Thus, for some distance, the level ground along the coast is at first comparatively narrow, and then, to the south, widens out to a considerable breadth. The former may, for our immediate practical purpose, be termed the plain of Sharon, the latter the plain of Philistia, Joppa being taken as the point of division between them.

The plain of Sharon, as we see it now, hardly justifies the poetry with which its name is associated. There is, indeed, considerable woodland beauty near the higher ground; but along the coast there is a belt of sand and sand-hills, which has encroached on the pasture and arable land more and more. Another effect of this encroachment is seen in the damming up of the streams from the mountain country, so as to leave, here and there, large tracts of unprofitable marshy ground. The carefully made Roman road which passed this way, followed, as Dr. Thomson has remarked, in some places a line at some little distance from the shore, for the sake of securing better positions for bridges over these streams. It is in connection with such Roman roads, and with the early missionary movements of the Apostles, that the chief Biblical interest of this northern part of the plain along the coast is found.

Along the whole coast line of Syria and Palestine the communication was easy between Antioch and Alexandria: and important passages of the history of the Seleucidæ and Ptolemies are connected with this easy communication near the shore, as indeed is true likewise of modern passages of history, English, French, and Turkish. Our attention is here, however, to be given chiefly to the Roman and early Apostolic period. When the region of Syria was under Roman sway, the small part of Palestine with which we are now concerned was one of its most populous and flourishing districts. It is most instructive to study the Itineraries, to note the stations which are marked there, and to connect them, and the distances which separate them, with the early journeys of the Apostles. Taking the wider view of such journeys, we naturally think of the well-trodden road between Antioch and Jerusalem, over which St. Paul, with Barnabas and Silas, and other companions, travelled at various dates, on philanthropic and religious errands. But in connection with the coast line to the *south* of Carmel, we have chiefly to think of St. Peter and St. Philip. The journeys between Cæsarea and Joppa, first, of the messengers sent southward by Cornelius, and then of the same party northward, when Peter and his companions were with these messengers, are for ever memorable in the annals of our religion; and these few miles of unattractive coast deserve, on this account, a closer attention than is commonly given to it by travellers.

The chief interest of this part of the coast, as regards the Roman and early Apostolic period, is concentrated on Cæsarea. Nothing can be more dreary than its present aspect; and yet broken columns and fragments of fine masonry suffice to show what it once was. Tourists, however, rarely visit this memorable spot on the Syrian coast. It lies out of the line of the conventional route. Not now in this place is any "conflux issuing forth or entering," not now any governors "to their provinces hasting or on return," not now "lictors and rods, the ensigns of their power, legions and cohorts, or embassies from regions far remote." For, indeed, it is no exaggeration to apply to Cæsarea the language which Milton uses of the approaches to Rome. Here Herod built a magnificent city intended to be a copy of Rome. Here he opened mercantile communication with all the West. Here his grandson miserably died in the midst of public pomp. Here St. Peter threw wide open the doors of the Universal Church. From this harbour St. Paul was sent to Tarsus, when his first missionary efforts resulted in persecution; and from this city, after the magnificent successes of three missionary journeys, he went with Mnason to Jerusalem. Here he was two years in prison; and from hence he went finally to Rome. Nor does the historic claim of Cæsarea end for us here. It became

the seat of a Christian bishopric, and, in fact, a metropolitan see. Origen taught here, and Eusebius was one of its bishops. The romance of the Crusaders, too, has given a charm of its own to this desolate place on the coast. St. Louis fortified Cæsarea; and here was found the crystal vase which became the "holy grail" of the mediæval poets.

Nothing can be more curious than the contrasted histories of noted cities: and this general fact receives a good illustration in the instances of Cæsarea and Joppa. While the great harbour of Herod is utterly dead, the far earlier harbour, to which the Sidonians brought timber for King Solomon, lives on and retains its ancient name. There is a singular and almost comical variety in the associations of Jaffa. Here St. Peter prayed on the house-top, with the sea before him, over which the Gospel was to be conveyed to the islands and the far continent of the West. In the twelfth century of the Christian era Joppa belonged to the knights of St. John, was taken by Saladin, and was retaken by Richard Cœur de Lion. At the end of the last century associations of a very different character came over this scene. M. de Pressensé reminds us, with a sarcastic severity which we should hardly expect from a Frenchman, of Napoleon's remark, when he was urged to visit Jerusalem from hence, that Jerusalem "did not enter into his plan of military operations." It is in its character as the customary door of approach to the Holy City for modern travellers from the West, as well as because it marks the division between the plain of Sharon and the plain of Philistia, that we must here take special notice of Joppa. From the oldest associations we turn to the latest.

Mrs. Sumner has lately given to us a pleasant book of travel, written in an easy, natural and cheerful manner, from which we may take a description of the entrance upon a tour in Palestine from this point. It is thoroughly a woman's book: but it is all the better for its purpose on this account; and we must recollect that she had the benefit of the companionship of her husband, Canon Sumner, who, to say nothing of other writings, has enriched us by an excellent memoir of his honoured father, the Bishop of Winchester.

> On a grassy platform overlooking Jaffa, with its white, flat-roofed buildings, surrounded by acres of orange and lemon-trees, and the blue sea beyond, we found our encampment—five stately tents, adorned within most brilliantly with appliqué work, in red, white, crimson, and blue patterns. . . . . The Union Jack floated on the central tent . . . . and we began to feel the grandeur and freedom of nomad life. Here we were in this wonderful sacred and historic old country, with a ready-made and portable home, free to go or to remain, according to the dictates of our own will and fancy; and our first realization of gipsy life was highly exhilarating (p. 70).

The first mile out of the town took us through beautiful groves of orange and lemon-trees, as large as apple-trees in England. The size of the fruit is gigantic. Numbers of oranges are grown here for the Eastern markets; and at the time of the blooming of the trees their sweet perfume fills the air so strongly that, not only is the town of Jaffa redolent with it, but sailors some miles out at sea can tell that they are approaching the coast from the orange scent which is wafted to them from the luxuriant shore. We emerged from these fragrant groves into the plain of Sharon, with the snow-capped range of Hebron in the distance (p. 74).

All, however, is not unmixed delight in the first experience of the traveller in Palestine. The succession of noises round the encampment at night—the incessant talk of the Arabs lying in the open air—the fidgeting and fighting of the horses, getting loose and rushing through tent-ropes—the barking of the dogs of Lydda—are described with all the zest of discomfort. The filth of the streets of Lydda receives similar notice. The flowers, however, on the journey, are a perpetual charm. There is lunch at midday, after leaving this town, under the shadow of a great rock. "The ground was perfectly enamelled with scarlet anemones, purple and white cyclamens, abundant as English primroses, and as large as in a well kept greenhouse, pink linum, ranunculuses, chamomile, planta genista, and many others."

Such is the arrival of modern English tourists in the neighbourhood of the place where St. Peter wrought his miracle on Æneas. We leave them to pursue their route on the customary road by Bethhoron to Jerusalem, and turn our eye towards the broadening plain of Philistia. Here, again, if we go further backwards in the history of the earliest spreading of the Gospel, the active work of St. Philip furnishes a link for us between the narrower plain and the broader. We know that he was residing at Cæsarea when St. Paul returned from his Third Missionary Circuit; and even before we have any account of St. Peter's journeys, we find Philip preaching to the Ethiopian eunuch, on the "desert" road which led (probably by Hebron) to Gaza: and afterwards, we are told, he was found at Azotus or Ashdod. These are two of the five cities of the Philistines, the others being Ekron, Gath, and Ashkelon. This last of the Philistine cities has, for two reasons, a special interest for us. It was the only one actually on the shore of the Mediterranean: and it is memorable in the history of the Crusades. Dr. Thomson describes with great care, and with much feeling, the desolate ruins of this city, where our own King Richard held his Court. But we pass on to Gaza, which is still a very large town, and the position of which at the extreme south-western corner of Palestine, on the way to Egypt, has in all ages made it important. Here again we obtain very full impressions of the place from the same dili-

gent American traveller. Remembering, however, that his purpose is to illustrate customs, as well as topography, we may turn to a subject of another kind, which he instinctively connects with this region.

He has been riding through the village of Lydda, and he says:—

> The little circuit has afforded me a beautiful illustration of Scripture. Two women were sitting before the door of their house, grinding wheat on a hand-mill. I heard the ring of this apparatus some time before I saw it; and I now understand what is meant by the preacher when he says, "the grinders cease because they are few; the sound of the grinding is low." Jeremiah also saddens the picture of Israel's desolation by Nebuchadnezzar with the prediction that "the sound of the millstones" should cease. From this, on southwards through Philistia, there are no mill-streams, and we shall not cease to hear the hum of the hand-mill at every village and Arab camp, morning and evening, and deep into the night (p. 108).

The interest of this Biblical illustration reaches its highest point at Gaza. "This grinding at the mill was often imposed upon captives taken in war." Thus, Samson was compelled "to grind in brazen fetters under task, eyeless, in Gaza, at the mill with slaves," and, to continue Milton's description, "sung and proverbed for a fool in every street."

All through the period of the Judges, and during the reigns of the two first kings of Israel, this Philistine country is the geographical basis of the most exciting struggles.[1] Our topics, however, being very various, and our limits scanty, the connection of sacred topography and sacred history in this region, with its varied identifications of memorable sites, must be left with a mere allusion. We must not, however, fail to note in passing that from this region of the Philistines, or "the strangers," the Holy Land derives its permanent name of "Palestine."

It is a very curious fact that, for identifying sites in this south-western part of Palestine, one of the most important positions is a city, which did not exist, at least as a place of note, before the third century, and which ceased to exist in this character in the eighth century. This is the city of Eleutheropolis, now well ascertained to be identical in its site with Beit-Jebrin. We must not dwell on this topic, except just to observe that the different periods of historical geography in the Holy Land are so interconnected, that it is not safe to neglect any of them, while yet it requires great care to avoid confusing them with one another. Especially on the ground immediately before us it is important

[1] The romantic adventures of David during the time of his exile and wanderings have received much important illustration from the result of the survey of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Some particulars are given in the Quarterly Statement for last January.

to have regard to ecclesiastical and diocesan Christian history, and to the successes and reverses of the Saracens in this part of the world.

We may now take up our position suddenly on a totally new scene—namely at Beersheba—at the edge of the desert, on the south of the high land of Judæa. This region of nomadic life, where the patriarchs pitched their tents and fed their flocks, has a very distinctive character of its own. The exact place of Beersheba is known beyond any doubt; and its wells, and the scene around, are exactly in harmony with the patriarchal history. Whether the original name means "the well of Seven," or "the well of the Oath," we need not inquire. The name Bir-es-Seba is still there, as Dr. Thomson tells us, marking a spot "in lat. 31° 4′ and long. 34° 47′ east from Greenwich, and about thirty miles south, a little west, from Hebron." When, long after the time of Abraham, the tribes were settled in Palestine, the possession of Beersheba seems to have wavered between Simeon and Judah. Virtually, however, this was the southern frontier of Judah—as it was the extreme limit reached by the sons of Samuel in the exercise of their functions as judges, and by Joab in his census of the people during David's reign—and as it became the proverbial boundary of the whole country on the south, in combination with Dan at the source of the Jordan in the north.

The life of Abraham carries us in a direct line from Beersheba to Hebron. Nor is the journey thus traversed very far in distance. The change, however, is very great in the character and elevation of the country. It is interesting to revert to Dr. Robinson's journey along this route. He describes how, with the mountains of Judah in view, the desert was gradually left behind; how, after travelling over an undulating country, green with grass and bright with flowers, he had left behind him the tamarisk of the wilderness—the Reten, or juniper-tree, under which Elijah rested; and saw, instead, around him the olive-tree of the hills, and found himself travelling among cliffs, and ascending and descending the steep sides of valleys. The vineyards of Hebron form one of its chief characteristics now, as was the case in the time of Joshua. "With Hebron," says de Pressensé, "begins the vine-region of Judah. At every step we meet, as many travellers have remarked, the beautiful and touching parable of Isaiah: nothing is wanting, neither the vine, nor the hedge, nor the tower of the keeper of the vineyard." It is, however, the memory of Abraham that gives its most lively associations to this city, which is often spoken of as the most ancient in the world.

The oak which bears Abraham's name, and which is shown near Hebron, is a magnificent tree, of vast age, whose branches spread their

shade far over the grass. This legendary designation could not have a better place than in this country of the patriarchs. It was in such a place that Abraham, with that noble dignity which was always found in his tent, and with that urgency which was characteristic of his great heart, offered hospitality to weary travellers passing before him under the midday sun. There it was that in these travellers he recognized the angels of the Most High, and that, in a wrestling even more sublime perhaps than that of Jacob, he prefigured the mercies of Christ in interceding for the accursed city. Hebron is filled with his memory; and there repose his ashes, and the ashes of his family (p. 167).

We must add here, however, that the lives of Abraham and David converge at this point in the most remarkable manner; for here David reigned seven years before Jebus was taken by him and became Jerusalem. And while we are thus connecting sacred topography with sacred history, let us not fail to observe once more the great height which we have reached above the plain, alike of the coast and of the desert. Dean Stanley observes, in one of those vivid comparisons which help us so much, that Hebron is only 500 feet lower than Snowdon. How well, he adds, one understands the expression, "They went *down* into Egypt."[1]

But here other associations demand our attention. This "hill-country of Judæa," in some part of which took place the solemn meeting of Mary and Elizabeth, is the scene of the earliest narratives of the Gospel history, and of the infancy of our Saviour. The interest of the whole is, of course, concentrated in Bethlehem, which is not far to the south of Jerusalem. Again a sentence may be quoted from de Pressensé, the charm of whose French writing reminds one of Chateaubriand and Lamartine, while he is free from the fetters of their traditional views, and, though equally devout, is on a level with the results of modern research:—"From the terraces of Bethlehem the view is far extended. We are shown in the distance the field of the Shepherds. However this may be, these are the plains which heard the angelic message. We felt afresh the power of that sweet and serene poetry which is in the earliest chapters of St. Luke."

Bethlehem is very near to Jerusalem. Let us pause, then, at the Mount of Olives; and here let us recall the impressions which have been made in the mind during our rapid circuit from Carmel and round by the coast and the edge of the desert. The Mount of Olives, too, will combine itself easily with what we shall have to say hereafter; for it connects itself very closely with the

[1] We must not forget that Southern Palestine is bounded on the east by the Dead Sea. In the middle of the shore-line of this sad salt silent sea is the sanctuary of Engedi, noted in the life of David. De Saulcy says he was not prepared for a place of such rest and beauty in so desolate a region.

Jordan Valley, and in the end it will bring our view full upon Jerusalem.

It was with Jerusalem full in view, that our Lord, seated on the Mount of Olives, on two occasions during the solemn days immediately preceding the crucifixion, spoke words which have sunk deep into the heart of Christendom. Mrs. Sumner has touched these two points in the manner which is most natural to the English traveller:—

March 21.—It was Palm Sunday; and after morning service in the English Church, which was crowded, we determined to walk to Bethany, and so return back to Jerusalem along the very same road which our Lord had trodden on the first Palm Sunday. Bethany lies on the other side of the Mount of Olives, between two and three miles from Jerusalem. The road, which wound along the mountain-side, was wild and rocky. The blue iris and bright crimson anemones—called "drops of blood" by the pilgrims—studded the hill-sides. Occasionally we passed fig-trees, bearing, as is usual at that season, small early figs. The interest of our walk culminated as we returned towards Jerusalem, and rounded one of the shoulders of Mount Olivet, when the view of Jerusalem suddenly burst upon us, and we felt that we must be standing at the very point where Our Lord halted as He rode from Bethany. The valley of Jehoshaphat was immediately beneath us; the Holy City crowned the mountain beyond. It was spread before us like an ideal city, surrounded by battlemented walls, adorned with domes and minarets gleaming in the sun, almost like the pictorial descriptions of the heavenly Jerusalem (p. 108).

March 28.—On Easter Sunday afternoon, spent a long time high up on the Mount of Olives, looking over Jerusalem. It was a brilliant day, glorious with sunshine and blue sky, and the view was splendid. In this very place Our Lord Jesus Christ might have sat with His disciples, when they came to Him "for to show Him the buildings of the Temple," and when He said, "Verily, I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." Again the description in the Book of the Revelation forced itself upon our minds as we gazed on the city before us, all radiant and resplendent in the glorious sunlight (p. 153).

Dr. Thomson, after describing the ascent upwards from the Jordan Valley and Jericho, may be said to end his account of Southern Palestine with the Mount of Olives; for he prefixes these words to each of his four last chapters. His tent was "pitched under a spreading fig-tree in the open court of a cottage on the north-west side" of the mountain. He describes excursions made from this camping-ground, again and again, through the streets and in the environs of Jerusalem. We shall use these descriptions, along with the accounts given by others, when, after some further survey of the Holy Country, we come to the Holy City.

J. S. Howson.

ART. IV.—THE CHURCH OF ST. PATRICK.

THERE can be little doubt but that there were Christian settlements along the southern and eastern coasts of Ireland at a very early period. It was not, however, until the fifth century that there was any special effort made for the conversion of the country. In the year 432, a missionary landed, named PATRICK, or *Patricius*. He was most probably a native of Dumbarton, in North Britain. He met with the most remarkable success, and was the means of turning the nation as a whole to the Christian religion. Hence he has been styled "the Apostle of Ireland." There was at one time very grave doubt expressed as to his existence, and indeed as to all the statements made in the Celtic annals of Ireland. But further examination has shown that these authorities are eminently trustworthy, and that even their most trivial details have a real and historical value. The very success that attended Patrick's efforts has been a cause of doubt and disbelief. Yet, if we fairly consider his position, and his qualifications for the work, our surprise is considerably lessened. Patrick had been for seven years a slave in Ireland; he was, therefore, thoroughly acquainted with the language and the national peculiarities of the Irish people. He had not to contend with any of the preliminary difficulties of a missionary entering a foreign land. His manner of adapting himself to the national feelings wonderfully contributed to his success. He preached first to the chiefs, and did everything in his power to gain their influence, well knowing that, if he gained them, the common people would hear him gladly. Leary, the king, became, if not his convert, at least his friend. Many important chiefs attended his preaching, became Christians, and granted him sites for churches, and lands with which to endow them.

Patrick has been regarded sometimes as a Protestant prelate, sometimes as a Presbyterian elder, sometimes as a sort of Methodist preacher. It is the greatest mistake to import modern ideas into historical questions. We must take history as we find it, and as it interprets itself. History tells us that Patrick was a missionary bishop of the Church of Gaul of the fifth century. Whatever then the Church of Gaul of the fifth century was, he belonged to it. What a bishop of that Church was, he was. The institutions and doctrines of that church, and of that time, he was the means of introducing into Ireland.

In one respect the circumstances of the Church planted by Patrick in Ireland differed from those of the mother Church of Gaul. Gaul was settled and civilized, and under regular

municipal and general government; Ireland, on the other hand, was divided into numerous tribes and principalities, continually at war, and only recognizing the power of the High King, or monarch, when it could be enforced. Hence the Church fell into the national type, and presents most marked tribal characteristics. The abbats, or chief ministers of the great churches, were called *principles*, chiefs, *comarbs*, or successors of the founder, and those under their government were called their *people*. The abbats were chosen from the natural or spiritual line of the founder, before all strangers, no matter how eminent. Even a psalm-singer, who was kin, was preferred to a bishop who had not this necessary qualification; clanship ruled in Church and State.

But this was only one peculiarity of the Celtic Church of Ireland. In common with the Celtic Church of Britain, it differed in many respects from the Churches of the Continent, and especially the Church in Italy. Rome was the capital of Christendom; and the Church of Rome had not only a foremost position as the Church of the capital, but as the see of St. Peter and head of the Catholic Church of the West. Modifications and innovations in ritual and practice, sanctioned by the see of Peter, developments of doctrine, and every change that would enhance the authority of the Church of the metropolis, became fashionable in the provinces, and recognized as part of the ritual and doctrine of the Catholic Church. Celtic Britain and Ireland, being far away from the influence of Rome, and very much isolated, were slow to adopt the changes and fashions of Rome. Hence, the history of the Church in Britain and Ireland, until the twelfth century, is the history of a struggle on the part of Britain and Ireland to preserve their ancient traditions and insular peculiarities, and reject the influence and institutions of Latin Christianity. The early Celtic Church protested against and opposed Latin Christianity, which then in the West monopolized the name of the Catholic Church.

In four points the Celtic Church of Ireland differed from the Latin Churches.

(1.) *Traditions.*—The Church of Rome held the tradition of its descent from St. Peter, and, on that account, claimed the allegiance of the world, as being the seat of the prince of the Apostles. The Church of Ireland proclaimed that it held its traditions and peculiar usages from the direction and example of St. John, and looked upon the memory of the last of the Apostles with especial regard. At the Synod of Whitby, the advocate of the Roman Church, defending Catholic custom, said that all were agreed except "only these (the Irish) and their accomplices in obstinacy, I mean the Picts and the Britons, who foolishly, in these two remote islands of the world, and only in part of them, oppose all the rest of the universe." Bishop Colman, on the Celtic side,

replied, "It is strange that you will call our labours foolish, wherein we follow the example of so great an Apostle, who was thought worthy to lay his head upon our Lord's bosom, when all the world knows him to have lived most wisely." There are a great many traces in the earliest remains of the Church of Ireland of a Greek influence, undoubtedly due to a connection with the south of Gaul, in which there were Greek colonies from Asia Minor, where St. John spent the last years of his life. It is remarkable that St. John's Day still holds a prominent place amongst Irish festivals.

(2.) *Easter Observance.*—This was one of the two greatest points of controversy. The Roman Church, and those of the Continent, calculated the occurrence of the Easter festival by a new and more accurate method. The Irish and British Churches calculated by an old and defective rule, which they considered had been transmitted to them from St. John. The difference was sometimes so much as a whole month between the Celtic and the Catholic Easter. When the two Churches came into contact, as they did in the North of England, this discrepancy gave rise to scandal and controversy. Rome used every effort, in which she was at last successful, to compel or cajole the islanders into uniformity. But this did not take place until after a severe struggle.

(3.) *Tonsure.*—It is unquestionably a great practical convenience that clergymen should have some peculiarity of garb or special mark. It is not so long ago since clergymen might be known by having their chins and faces shaven. In old times the top of the head was shaved or clipped. The Roman and Continental clergy cut the hair on the crown of the head, in imitation, it is said, of the crown of thorns. The Celtic clergy cut the hair on the front of the top of the head, from a line drawn from ear to ear. This had the effect, to say the least, of giving the Celtic clergy a remarkably intellectual appearance. They had all fine foreheads, extending to the top of the head. The Romans nicknamed this custom "the tonsure of Simon Magus." It seems to us a slight matter for a great dispute; but we must remember it was an obvious mark, and showed at once whether a priest was Celtic or Roman, and as being the most prominent sign, evoked more hostility than it deserved from its intrinsic importance.

(4.) *Episcopacy.*—Ireland being broken up into separate tribes, which were frequently at war, and recognized only occasionally any superior authority, it was impossible to have the kind of episcopal government to be found on the Continent in the large cities and important towns. Patrick settled bishops in all the principal tribe-lands, for there were really no towns in Celtic Ireland, except possibly a few on the coast. In the great

churches founded by him a succession of bishops was at first maintained. In the next century, however, St. Columbkill, who was born in 521, declined, either from humility or disgust, to be consecrated a bishop; and in the churches founded by him, and in imitation of his, it became the strict rule that they should be governed by abbats, who were only presbyters. But in order that these churches should carry on their work as missions, and colleges, sending out clergy, it was necessary that there should be bishops to ordain, for in the Celtic Church the power of ordination was confined to bishops. Hence in these churches there was commonly a resident bishop—a bishop to whom the abbat could apply and authorize[1] for this purpose. Hence arose the anomaly, that was so long the difficulty in Irish Church history, How it could come to pass that a bishop should be under the jurisdiction of a presbyter! from which some interested authors have drawn the conclusion that presbyters and bishops were all one in the ancient Irish Church. The truth is, that nowhere was the distinction more carefully maintained than in Ireland between the orders of bishop, priest, and deacon. But in the Irish Church, a bishop had, for the most part, not a local office, but a personal rank. The local office was that of abbat, or head of the Church. He was in Patrician Churches usually a bishop; in Columban, and others of the second order, like Iona and Bangor, always a presbyter. There was nothing to prevent his being a deacon; and it is more than likely that in later times the abbat was occasionally even a layman. Such would be the case when he who was elected, or entitled to succeed, declined to take orders, and delegated his spiritual functions to an episcopal or presbyterial vicar, as the case required. Uniformity with Catholic arrangements, as regards the episcopacy, was not completely secured until the eve of the English invasion. There was, however, always the idea of diocesan episcopacy in Ireland, though it was incompletely carried out in the first instance, and upset to some extent by the Columban custom. In the Brehon laws we find that the three dignitaries of a territory were the king, the bishop, and the brehon. This seems to have been the idea of Patrick; and he tried to settle a bishop in every tribeland. As the tribes were numerous, and some of them small, this could not be carried out. Hence, many places where he settled bishops had no succession, but became merely country churches; others, as time went on, were swamped by the increasing importance of the great monasteries.

[1] A curious instance of this same sort of thing occurs in later times. We find in the "Register of St. Albans" a memorandum that John, Bishop of Ardfert, held an ordination at the High Altar in Advent, at the desire of John of Hertford, Abbot (presbyter) of St. Albans.—Nicholson's *Abbey of St. Alban*, p. 96.

In some other respects, also, Ireland neglected later Catholic usage. It was not an unusual thing to make a layman a bishop at once, as was the case of St. Ambrose, made thus Bishop of Milan. The Irish Church also neglected, or did not receive, the canon requiring the presence and concurrence of three bishops at a consecration.

Gradually the pressure of Latin Catholic opinion, and respect for the chair of St. Peter, compelled uniformity in all the above particulars. The Celtic Church protested; but her protests were smothered by the ever-advancing wave of Latin Christianity.

We come now to the period immediately preceding the Anglo-Norman invasion, when every effort was put forth to bring the old Celtic Church of Ireland into conformity with the rest of Western Christendom, and to make it agreeable to the Roman model. We find records of a series of synods, which show how the Church was guided in a Latin direction.

(1.) *Synod of Fiadh-mac-Naogusa*, 1111.—This synod was the first, and it seems to have been merely preliminary. King Mortough O'Brien called it together. It was attended by Maolmurry O'Dunain, Bishop of Cashel, by Cellach MacAodh, successor of Patrick, by eight other bishops (some say fifty-eight), and by a great number of the other orders. Keating tells us that many wholesome laws and regulations were established, not only for the government of the clergy, but of the laity likewise, throughout the kingdom.

(2.) *The Synod of Uisnech*, 1111.—In it a beginning was made in the distribution of territory into regular dioceses. In the old Church there were, as we have already said, two classes of sees—bishoprics of tribes, and bishoprics of great churches, or monasteries. The former were really diocesan. It is too often forgotten that the diocesan principle always existed in the ancient Irish Church in this class of sees. To the present day many of the Irish dioceses are exactly coterminous with ancient principalities and tribal territories. The bishop of a monastery had jurisdiction over the district under the influence of his monastery. Hence the necessity of defining the boundaries of territory claimed by tribal and monastic bishops, and by the bishops of different churches. The latter was one of the points settled in one case by the Synod of Uisnech, and it is typical. We read: "The great Synod of Uisnech was held in the same year; and it was in this Synod the diocese of the Feara Midhe (Meath) was divided into two parts, between the Bishop of Clonmacnoise and the Bishop of Clonard—viz., from Clochan-au-imrim westwards to the Bishop of Clonmacnoise, and from the same Clochan eastwards to the Bishop of Clonard, by Murchadh O'Meloghlin, and by Eochaidh O'Kelly, and by the congregation of Ciaran, with Gillachrist O'Malone, Abbat of Clonmacnoise."

(3.) *Synod of Rathbrassil*, 1115.—This synod completed the work thus begun, settling the number of the sees and their boundaries, under the presidency of Gillaespuig, or Gilbert, Bishop of Limerick, an ardent advocate of Catholic uniformity, who appeared on the scene in the new quality of legate of Ireland. By the records of this synod, it appears that all Ireland, except Dublin—then Danish, and therefore connected with England—was divided into twenty-five dioceses. These, with some amalgamations, continue to the present day,

(4.) *Synod of Innispatrick*, 1148.—After Gilbert, Bishop of Limerick, the first great leader in the ultramontane movement in the Celtic Church of Ireland, came Malachy, successively Bishop of Connor, Primate of Armagh, and Bishop of Down. This remarkable man, who was well acquainted with the Church on the Continent, and who was fascinated by the authority and claims of the See of Rome, cast into the struggle the whole weight of his personal and official influence. He was horrified at the irregularities of the Church of Ireland, and the abuses, however magnified by Roman authorities, that unquestionably existed. He saw no remedy but in union with the chair of Peter, and in conformity with the ecclesiastical system of the Continent. This was the grand object of his life; and though he did not live to see his plans carried out, it was his influence, and, above all, the influence of his holy life, that attracted the wayward and independent Celts, and caused some of them, at least, to look to Rome for a cure for existing evils. He went to Rome, and entreated the Pope to establish a regular ecclesiastical connection between the chair of Peter and the bishops of Ireland by granting palls to the principal prelates. This the Pope positively declined to do until the request would come, not from an individual bishop, however earnest or exalted, but from a general synod of the Church. Malachy's interviews took place in 1139, and yet it was not until 1148 that he was able to convene a synod for this purpose. From all Ireland only fifteen bishops met at Innispatrick. Malachy gained his point, at the conclusion. "Then Malachy, moreover, proceeded from that synod to confer with the coarb (successor) of St. Peter." He, however, was only able to reach Clairvaux, where he died, 1148, attended in his last moments by his friend and biographer, St. Bernard, last of the Fathers. He was the second legate appointed for Ireland, and the first Irish saint canonized by the Pope.

(5.) *Synod of Kells*, 1152.—Up to this time the work of reorganization was not complete. The Irish bishops had still no official connection with Rome, and acknowledged no dependence on the Roman See. At last the palls were granted, and were sent from Rome for four Irish archbishops. There were no

official archbishops in the old Irish Church. The real primates were the successors of Patrick and Columba; these stood in the first rank of ecclesiastics, though the latter was only a presbyter. Afterwards, the Bishops of Armagh and Cashel were looked upon as the High Bishops of Ireland: but the successor of Patrick alone had undisputed primacy. John, Cardinal Papiron, and Gilla-Christ, or Christian, Bishop of Lismore, the third legate, convened this important synod, and conveyed to the Irish bishops this compliment from the Roman See. The northern clergy were furious at even Cashel being put on a level with Armagh, much less the two new archbishoprics, Dublin and Tuam. But it was done, and Rome thus gained one, or rather, indeed, four points of vantage in her encroachments on the liberties of the Irish Church. When the synod was over, and his work was done, Cardinal John began his journey home, and passed the sea on the 24th of March. We have on record the names of the bishops who took part in this important synod. They are the fathers of the mediæval Church of Ireland, as distinguished from the old Celtic, and from them the succession of the pre-Reformation bishops, so far as it is Celtic, must be traced. The bishops present were :—

Gillachrist O'Conery	Lismore.	Gilla Aodh O'Heyn	Cork.
Giolla MacLiag	Armagh.	Maolbrennan O'Runan	Ardfert.
Daniel O'Lonergan	Cashel.	Turgesius	Limerick.
Hugh O'Heyn	Tuam.	Murtogh O'Maolidhir	Clonmacnoise
Gregory	Dublin.	Maolissa O'Conachtain	Orior Connact
Giolla na Naomh	Glendalough.	O'Rudhan	Achonry.
Dungall O'Caollaighe	Leighlin.	Macraith O'Moran	Ardagh.
Tuistius	Waterford.	Eathruaid O'Miadhachain	Clonard.
Daniel O'Fogarty, Vic.-Gen.	Ossory.	Tuathal O'Connechty	Annadown.
Fionn Mac Tiagurnan	Kildare.	Murray O'Coffey	Derry.
Gilla an Chomde, or Deicola.	——	Melpatrick O'Bannan	Connor.
O'Hardwhaoil	Emly.	Maolissa	Down.

The details of these early synods may seem to be dry and uninteresting, but their records are amongst the title-deeds of the modern Irish Church in establishing her claim to be the Church of Ireland, and the Church founded by St. Patrick. So far, we can see that the action of the Roman See was to get recognition and gain influence; she could not yet exercise control.

(6.) *Synod of Armagh*, 1170.—The work was going on too slow. Soon an opportunity presented itself. King Henry of England asked a grant of Ireland from the Pope, and the Pope (Adrian IV.) made the grant in return for a penny from every house for St. Peter. Let every Irishman know who sent the Saxons to Ireland. Adrian's bull says, "We do grant that you (for the extension of God's Church, the punishment of sin, the reforming of manners, planting of virtue, and the increasing of

Christian religion) do enter to possess that land." And further, "We do strictly charge and require, that all the people of that land do with all humbleness, dutyfulness, and honour receive and accept you as their Liege Lord and Sovereign, reserving and excepting the right of Holy Church to be inviolably preserved; as also the yearly pension of Peter pence out of every house, which we require to be truly answered to St. Peter, and to the Church of Rome." This bull was issued in 1156; in 1169 the advance guard of the English came. "In this troublesome time," says the chronicler Hamner—

The Primate of Armagh called the Prelates and Clergie to a Synod; at Armagh assembled a Councell; where, according to their wisedomes, they endeavoured to finde out the cause of these miseries that fell upon the land; they inquired not whether the Bishops had bought their Bishoprickes for money, whether their parsons did pray, whether their ministers were lettered; what whoredom, symony, or lechery, with other enormities raigned amongst the Clergie, but simply, like themselves, posted over all to the Laytie, and concluded (*insipienter*) that the iust plague fell upon the people, for merchandizing of the English nation; for then they bought and sold of the English birth, such as they found, and made them bondslaves; so they served Saint *Patricke*, called the Apostle of Ireland, who was a bondman sixe yeeres in Ireland, but *Patricke* preached Christ, and the English nation reformed the land. Here the sacred letters reconcile all, *the stone which the builders refused is become the corner stone, and why so? the answer followeth, it is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.* But I may not so leave my Prelates, they synodically decreed as followeth: *that all the Englishmen within the land, whatsoever they were, should bee manumised;* a worshipfull piece of worke, and no thanke to them all, for the English sword was then ready to cut off the Irish heads; this reformation was but a sweeping of a house with a foxe's tayle.

(7.) *Synod of Cashel*, 1172.—King Henry II., having been received as the Pope directed, "with all humbleness, dutyfulness and honour," commanded the assembly of the Church of Ireland in national synod. It was attended by Gillachrist, or Christian, Bishop of Lismore and Legate of the Pope; Donat, Archbishop of Cashel; Laurence, Archbishop of Dublin; Catholicus, Archbishop of Tuam, and the other bishops, except the Primate, who could not attend, but who afterwards concurred in its decrees. Three English clergymen attended on the king's part. In that synod the following decree was passed:—

That all the divine service in the Church of Ireland, shall be kept, used, and observed in the like order and manner as it is in the Church of England; for it is meet and right, that as by God's providence and appointment, Ireland is become now subject, and under the King of England, so the same should take from thence, the order, and rule, and manner how to reform themselves, and to live in better sort.

It is very curious to notice how strictly in conformity with the terms of this canon were the proceedings at the time of the Reformation. They did take from the Church of England "the order, and rule, and manner, how to reform themselves." No doubt for this very reason the latter clauses of this canon have been attributed by Roman Catholic historians, not to the Synod, but to the reporter, Giraldus Cambrensis.

(8.) *Synod of Dublin*, 1186.—The above canon of the Synod of Cashel could not be allowed to remain a dead letter. No doubt in the more remote parts of Ireland it was extremely difficult to enforce conformity; and in all probability the usages of the old Church of Ireland continued to be observed for many a year. It is a question whether, even at the time of the Reformation, complete uniformity had been secured. Within the pale however, and supported by the authority of the English king, there could be no reason for delay. Yet we find that it was not until 1186 that active steps were taken. Archbishop Comyn, the chaplain and nominee of King Henry, was the first English Archbishop of Dublin. In the above year he called a synod, which sat in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Dublin. It does not appear whether this synod was national or provincial. Possibly it was as national as English authority could make it. From the very first canon of this synod, we learn what was the usage of the old Celtic Church concerning the principal act of Christian worship, and what were the novel practices introduced by English authority. We find, too, a complete justification of the acts of the Reformers of latter times. The canon—

> Prohibits priests from celebrating mass on a wooden table, according to the usage of Ireland; and enjoins that, in all monasteries and baptismal churches, altars should be made of stone; and if a stone of sufficient size to cover the whole surface of the altar cannot be had, that in such a case a square, entire, and polished stone be fixed in the middle of the altar, where Christ's body is consecrated, and of a compass broad enough to contain five crosses, and also to bear the foot of the largest chalice. But in chapels, chauntries, or oratories, if they are necessarily obliged to use wooden altars, let the mass be celebrated on plates of stone of the before-mentioned size, firmly fixed in the wood.

Thus we have traced the steps of ecclesiastical legislation by which the independent, national, Celtic Church of Ireland became united to the Church of England in polity, worship, and faith, and in absolute dependence upon the crown of England and the see of Rome.

CHARLES SCOTT.

ART. V.—THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

CONCLUDING NOTICE.

IN accordance with the principles laid down at the commencement of the present Review, we continue our classification of the changes which the Revisers of 1881 have made.

VIII. Alterations of the Authorized Version in cases where it was inconsistent with itself in the rendering of two or more passages confessedly alike or parallel. Further, alterations rendered necessary by *consequence*, that is, arising out of changes already made, though not in themselves required by the general rule of faithfulness.

The "studied variety of rendering," which was adopted by the Revisers of 1611, say the Revisers of 1881, in their Preface, produced, in numerous passages, a degree of inconsistency that cannot be reconciled with the principle of faithfulness. And here, upon this matter, we may quote from the Preface to the Version of 1611, an exceedingly interesting document, which is, we fancy, but little read, or even known. The Revisers wrote thus:—

Reasons inducing us not to stand curiously upon an identity of phrasing.

πολύσημα.

Another thing we think good to admonish thee of, gentle Reader, that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men somewhere have been as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places (for there be some words that be not of the same sense every where), we were especially careful, and made a conscience, according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as for example, if we translate the *Hebrew* or *Greek* word once by *purpose*, never to call it *intent*; if one where *journeying*, never *travelling*; if one where *think*, never *suppose*; if one where *pain*, never *ache*; if one where *joy*, never *gladness*, &c., thus to mince the matter, we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the atheist, than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them, if we may be free? use one precisely, when we may use another no less fit as commodiously? A godly Father in the primitive time showed himself greatly moved, that one of newfangledness called κραββάτον, σκίμπους, though the difference be little or none; and another reporteth, that he was much abused for turning *cucurbita* (to which reading the people had been used) into *hedera*. Now if this happen in better times, and upon so small occasions, we might justly fear hard censure, if generally we should make verbal and unnecessary changings. We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good *English* words. For as it is written of a certain great philosopher, that he should say, that those logs were happy that were made images to be worshipped; for their fellows, as good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire: so if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always; and to others of like quality, Get you hence, be banished for ever; we might be taxed peradventure with St. *James's* words, namely, *To be partial in ourselves, and judges of evil thoughts.*

Abed. *Niceph. Callist. lib.* 8. *cap.* 42. *St. Hieron. in* 4 *Jonæ. See St. Aug. Epist.* 10.

These, then, were the reasons which led King James's Revisers to reject *consistency* in rendering: they were not willing "to stand curiously upon an identity of phrasing;" they reckoned "niceness in words" the "next step to trifling;" they ignored a saying previously made in their Preface as to being "*holpen by conference of places.*" Yet the Revisers desired that "Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar."[1] Now, the question before the Revisers of 1881, having in view the "vulgar," as well as others, was this:—Ought the studied variety of rendering, even in the same chapter and context, a principle with their predecessors, to be preserved? Their decision was in favour of consistency, or uniformity, in rendering, so far as may be; and we believe that this decision was wise. When the translation of the same word is capriciously varied in the same sentence and in the same paragraph, a false effect is inevitably produced, and the reader is more or less seriously misled.[2] In some passages the variation—an "insufficient adherence to identity," to quote Professor Blunt—obscures the connexion; and in other passages utter confusion is produced: the English, indeed, is musical and vigorous; but it is a free translation approaching a paraphrase, rather than a faithful reproduction of the inspired original.

Every Bible-Class Teacher who has made good use of Commentaries remembers the surprise and pleasure evidenced in the class when, in comparing passage with passage, the remark was made, "In the original, it's *the same word!*"[3]

We give some illustrations.

---

[1] "Without translation into the vulgar tongue," say the Revisers of 1611, "the unlearned . . . . . cannot come by the water" of the Well of Life. Fuller, quoting another sentence from the Preface, says that "now Rachel's weak women may freely come, both to drink themselves, and to water the flocks of their families at the same." The passage above quoted, we may add, was probably directed against the Rhemish (Roman Catholic) Version, which contained many Latinisms. An allusion may have been made to the letter of the redoubtable Broughton, laying down the rule, "The same terms must be translated in the same way."

[2] Bishop Lightfoot: "A Fresh Revision," 1871, p. 35.

[3] In every translation, of course, some subtle distinctions of the original must be lost. Rigid uniformity, again, is not advisable. But why perplex plain people by concealing concords? (*e.g.*, "simple as doves," Wiclif; A.V. harmless: Rom. xvi. 19, *simple*). Why introduce artificial distinctions? In 2 Thess. ii. verse 9, St. Paul wrote, "the working of Satan," verse 11, "a working of delusion." The A. V., improving, so to speak, on St. Paul, rendered, in verse 11, "strong delusion." In 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, St. Paul uses the word *sanctification*; in v. 7, the same word. Yet in v. 7 A. V. gives *holiness*. (The preposition in v. 7 is *in*, not *unto* sanctification.) Many of the variations in the A. V. are altogether unaccountable. A long list of the "bewildering" variations is given in "The English Bible." By John Eadie, D.D. 2 vols. Macmillan & Co. 1876.

In Matt. xviii. 33, the R. V. has—"Shouldst not thou also have had *mercy* on thy fellow servant, even as I had *mercy* (A. V. *pity*) on thee?" the word in the original being the same. Again, in Matt. xxv. 32, we read, "He shall *separate* them one from another, as the shepherd *separateth* . . . . " where the A. V., as though the verbs were different, gives "separate" and "divideth." In Rom. xv. the "patience and comfort" of verse 4 recurs in verse 5, R. V.; whereas in the A. V. instead of *comfort* appears *consolation*. The present rendering is as follows:—

For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through [new text, διά] comfort of the scriptures we might have hope. Now the God of patience and of comfort grant you. . . . .

In Philipp. ii. 13, the R. V. gives consistently, "*work out* your own salvation . . . . for it is God which *worketh* in you both to will and to *work*." In Acts xxvi. R. V., the same Greek word has the same English word, "thou art mad, ... to madness; . . . . I am not mad." Similarly, in 1 Cor. iii. 17, the Revisers of 1881 render, "If any man *destroyeth*,[1] (A.V. defile) the temple of God, him shall God *destroy*:" and in xii. 4 ff. diversities, diversities (A. V. *differences*) diversities, the word ἐνεργήματα, both in verse 6 and in verse 10 being rendered *workings*, thus:—

Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of *workings* [energ. . . . .] but the same God who *worketh* [energ. . . . .] all things . . . . to another *workings* of miracles.

In 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28, one Greek word appears six times in the same sense; the A. V. gives "put under," "be subdued," "be subject:" the R. V. keeps the same note, *subject*, throughout.

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, as Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, is remarkable for the recurrence of key-note words, a fact which was systematically disregarded by the Revisers of 1611. They aimed at producing agreeable variety: they failed to perceive that in such cases monotony is force. Thus, for instance, in the first chapter of the Epistle, vv. 2–10, St. Paul's stress lies upon the word *comfort*. He uses this noun and the verb again and again; yet in verse 5 and verse 7, the Revisers of 1611 changed the word for *consolation;* and in verse 6 they gave both "consolation" and "comforted." Again, in the opening verses of the second chapter, instead of adhering to the same word *sorrow*, they gave "heaviness," "sorrow," "grief." Again, in the fifth chapter, one word was rendered in v. 6, *to be at home*, in verses 8 and 9, *to be present*. This passage in the R. V. runs thus:—

[1] Matt. xxi. 41, R. V., "He will miserably destroy those miserable men." κακοὺς κακῶς.

Being therefore always of good courage [confident, A. V.], and knowing that, whilst we are *at home* in the body, we are absent from the Lord . . . . are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be *at home* with the Lord. Wherefore also we make it our aim, whether *at home* or absent, to be well-pleasing with him. For we must all be made manifest [appear A. V.] before the judgment seat. . . . .

The words *made manifest,* in the R. V., connect v. 10 with v. 11.

In John xvi. 30, the R. V. has:—"Now *know* we [A. V., "we are sure"] that thou *knowest* all things;" so in 2 Cor. xii., "I *know* such a man (whether in the body or apart from the body, I *know* not [A. V. "I cannot tell"], God *knoweth*);" the same word in the Greek.[1]

In 2 Pet. ii. 1, 3, the R. V. has ". . . . *destructive* heresies . . . . swift *destruction* . . . . *destruction* slumbereth not," where, for the same Greek word the A. V. gives, damnable, destruction, damnation. The same Greek word is rendered in the 3rd chapter, v. 7, *perdition*; but in the 16th v., *destruction.* In both verses the R. V., of course, gives "destruction."

In John i. 12, "the right [A. V. "power"] to become," is a gain.[2] The R. V. preserves, to a great extent, the meaning of δύναμις (Mark v. 30), ἐξουσία (John i. 12), ἰσχύς (2 Pet. ii. 11), κράτος (Eph. i. 19.), and ἀρχή (Jude 6; A. V., "first estate," R. V., "principality.")[3]

A Greek verb, in the Fourth Gospel, chapters xiii. and xxi., is precisely rendered, and consistently, in the R. V., *leaning back.* Several graphic touches are obscured in the A. V. The Evangelist records that he was "at the table reclining in Jesus' bosom" (ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ) when Peter beckoned to him; "he, leaning back as he was,[4] on Jesus' breast (ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος) saith. . . . " Thus, a link between chapter xiii. and the closing sentences of the Fourth Gospel is, in the R. V., preserved.

In Eph. iii. 14, the R. V. gives, "every family" (marg. *father-*

---

[1] (οἶδα). In Jude 10 the R.V. distinguishes between οἶδα and ἐπίσταμαι, thus:—". . . . rail at whatsoever things they *know* not; and what they *understand* naturally, like the creatures without reason . . . ."; and in Acts xix. 15, between γινώσκω and ἐπίσταμαι, thus:—"Jesus I know (marg. *recognize*) and Paul I *know*." The knowledge and the *full* knowledge, in 1 Cor. xiii. 12, is expressed in the R. V. margin. Compare 2 Cor. vi. 9, "*well* known."

[2] Cf. CHURCHMAN, p. 257.

[3] The student of N. T. synonyms will, as a rule, thoroughly appreciate the careful discrimination of the R. V. Here and there, however, one sees reason for doubt. In Rom. vii., *e.g.*, the attempt was made to distinguish between I *do*, and I *practise*. But, as Dean Alford pointed out, the verbs are interchanged in verses 19, 20. In St. John, no doubt, the habit, continuous action, is referred to.

[4] "*As he was*," new text, οὕτως. Compare the fourth chapter of this gospel, verse 6:—"sat *thus* (as he was) by the well."

hood, as Wiclif, following the Vulgate; *Pater, paternitas)*; in Luke ii. 4, and Acts iii. 25, "family" (A. V. "lineage" and "kindreds").

In the margin of Acts xvii. 21, we find, "had leisure for nothing else"; vacabant; as Fuller says, "*vacation* was their whole *vocation*." (Mark vi. 31: "they had no leisure so much as to eat.")

The true force of St. Paul's word, in Eph. iv. 3, is brought out in the R. V. "giving diligence" (A. V. *endeavouring*: archaistic); 2 Pet. i. 15, "I will give diligence;" 2 Tim. iv. 9, and in other passages.

It is a gain in 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5, that the same word in the original has one and the same word in the translation: ". . . . as unto a *living* stone . . . . ye also as *living* stones. . . ." The A. V. word "lively," as Archbishop Trench has pointed out, was formerly almost, if not altogether, equipollent to "living."[1] Nevertheless, we are glad to have here, as elsewhere, the very same word applied to Christians and to Christ.

The Greek word in verses 1 and 2 of 1 Cor. xvi., now appears for the English reader as *collection* (not "collection" and "gathering," A. V.). The Greek word in Jas. ii. verses 2 and 3, is consistently rendered "clothing;" in 1 John v. 9–11, "witness;" in Matt. xxv. 46, "eternal." One English word, "throne" (the Greek word *thronos*), now appears in the place of "seat" and "throne":—"round about the throne were four-and-twenty thrones" (Rev. iv. 4).[2]

In the First and the Second Gospel, now, the English reader sees the same words: "All these things have I observed" (Matt. xix. 20, Mark x. 20): "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. xxvi. 11, Mark xiv. 38): "A leathern girdle" (Matt. iii. 4, Mark i. 6). It has been remarked that by purely gratuitous variations the English version hitherto has closed, to a considerable extent, for the mere English reader, the deeply interesting fields of inquiry concerning the relation of the Four Gospels one to another. With respect to quotations from the Old Testament, the parallelisms of the Evangelists, and the coincidences of language which occur in allied Epistles,[3] and in the Revelation,

---

[1] In *Titus Andronicus*, act iii. sc. 1, "Now I behold thy *lively* body so." And in Massinger's *The Fatal Dowry*:—

> "That his dear father might interment have,
> See, the young man entered a lively grave."

[2] See Archbishop Trench's suggestive remarks, "Authorized Version," p. 91. (Parker, 1859.) Compare Rev. ii. 13, iii. 21, iv. 4, xi. 16, xvi. 10, Matt. xix. 28.

[3] See the second lecture, Professor Blunt's "Parish Priest." Murray, 1857. Also Paley's "Horæ Paulinæ."

together with the Gospel and Epistles written by St. John, the A. V. is defective in the extreme. No attempt was made to preserve similarity of diction: agreements obvious in the original are concealed in the translation. In regard to quotations, a single illustration may here be given, the renderings in the volume before us being set by the side of those in the A. V.:—

1611.	1881.
It was *counted* unto him for righteousness (Rom. iv. 3).	It was *reckoned* unto him.
It was *imputed* to him (Rom. iv. 22).	It was *reckoned* unto him.
It was *accounted* . . . . (Gal. iii. 6) [marg. *imputed*].	It was *reckoned* unto him.

These are the renderings of the same inspired statement, ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην (Sept.), Genesis xv. 6 (A. V. *counted*) (Rom. iv. 11). The uniformity of the R. V. here, and in other such passages, is an indisputable gain.

The building termed by three Evangelists πραιτώριον, (Matt xxvii. 27, "common hall," or "governor's house;" Mark xv. 16, "prætorium;" John xviii. 28, "hall of judgment"), is rendered in the R. V. "palace." (Acts xxiii. 35.) In Philipp. i. 13, we find "prætorian guard."

The variation of the A. V., "a sweet-smelling savour" (Eph. v. 2), "an odour of a sweet smell" (Phil. iv. 18), has disappeared.

A marginal note in Matt. xxii. points out that the "bond-servants" (*douloi*) of v. 3, and the "servants" or "ministers" (*diakonoi*) of v. 13 are not the same. (The Douay Version has "servants" and "waiters.") Men invite their fellow-men; angels "stand by" (Luke xix. 24) to take away or to expel. So, too, in the parable of the Tares; bond-servants[1] and *reapers*.

In John xiii. 12, the R. V. distinguishes between the *guarding* and the *keeping*, thus bringing forth a beautiful truth. Jesus guards and protects so that His own are kept and preserved. The same two Greek verbs, we may remark, occur in Prov. xix. 6; he that φυλάσσει the commandment, τηρεῖ his own soul.

In rendering the word Παράκλητος in four places "Comforter," but in the fifth place "Advocate," the Revisers of 1881 have laid themselves open, no doubt, to a charge of inconsistency. Nevertheless, in adhering to the A. V. translation of the First Epistle of St. John ii. 1, they have, we think, done well. It seems, as Archdeacon Hare remarked, almost "an act of sacrilege" to change the word in the A. V. of the Gospel according to St. John[2].

---

[1] The R.V., in the margin, has "Paul, a *bond-servant* of God." So too, in John xv. 15. "Slave," no doubt, would convey an inexact impression, while "servant" goes hardly far enough.

[2] In the Douay Version, after Jerome, *Paraclete* in the Gospel, *Advocate* in the Epistle. We are sorry to see *consolation* removed to the

Concerning the translation of τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, the American Committee have recorded their preference for "the Holy *Spirit*." In the list[1] of renderings preferred by the American Revisers we read:—"For Holy Ghost adopt uniformly the rendering Holy Spirit." The English Revisers, however, have chosen to retain the word *Ghost*. In 1 Cor. xii. 3, the words in the first clause ". . . . in the Spirit of God," led them to render in the second clause ". . . . in the Holy Spirit" (A. V., "by the Holy Ghost"). In John xiv. 26, Luke ii. 25, and other passages they have given "Spirit" instead of Ghost;"[2] but, so far as we can see, they have not followed any rule in this matter; and certainly, with the sweet sounds of Prayer-Book phrases in our ears, we can pardon the inconsistency.

The rendering of Eph. iv. 30—"Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye were sealed," has been objected to by the Unitarian Reviser, Mr. Vance Smith. He has written, we observe, that the words "'*Ghost*' and 'Spirit' are by no means of identical force and meaning;" the former "has far more of the personal force in it than the latter; 'Ghost' should everywhere have been rejected." As to Eph. iv. 30, he argues that if *in* rather than *by* is to appear here, as in other passages, the translation should be—"in *which* ye were sealed" (not in *whom*;[3] the neuter, not the masculine). But the Revisers had herein an Apostle for their pattern. St. John wrote:—"When he (ἐκεῖνος), the Spirit of Truth (τὸ πνεῦμα . . . .), is come, he will guide you," xvi. 13 ("*whom*, ὅν, I will send to you," xv. 26). The new rendering, therefore, of Rom. viii. 16—"The Spirit himself (A.V. itself) beareth witness," to which also Mr. Vance Smith objects, is consistently correct.

In Jas. i. 3, and 1 Pet. i. 7, appears the word δοκίμιον, A. V. "the *trying*" and "the *trial*." R. V., in both places, "the *proof*" (1 Pet. i. 7, ". . . . though it is *proved* . . . ."). It is better, we think, to keep the same English word; but is "the *proof*" better than "the *trying*?"[4] Dr. Davidson, in his Translation,

---

margin in Acts iv. 36. Inasmuch as this two-sided word is not uniformly rendered *exhortation*, "Barnabas, son of consolation," should have been, we think, left in the text. In John xiv. 18, we were sure to find "orphans," or "desolate" in the place of *comfortless*.

[1] Given at the end of the volume, a list worthy of careful study.

[2] A marginal note on Matt. i. 18, runs thus:—"Or, *Holy Spirit*: and so throughout this book."

[3] *In whom*. So even Dr. Davidson renders. "The New Testament Translated." By Samuel Davidson, D.D. King & Co. 1875.

Mr. Vance Smith complains of "theological bias" in the new rendering of Matt. i. 21, "It is he that shall save his people;" the complaint has no more warrant in this case than in the other. Here may be noticed the change in Jas. i. 13:—"he himself (αὐτὸς) tempteth no man."

[4] In 1 Pet. iv. 12, the R. V. renders "to *prove* you." But the verse, a literal translation, is awkward and unmusical.

gives "the *proving* of your faith;" but test, proof, trial, is undoubtedly more exact. The objection to "trial," of course, is obvious; with the marginal rendering *trials* before him, the mere English reader might suppose that the Greek word in verse 2 (Jas. i.) is the same as in verse 3 [v. 6 and v. 7, 1 Pet. i.]. The R. V. runs thus:—

> Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold temptations [marg. *trials*]; knowing that the proof of your faith worketh patience.

The suggestion made by the Revisers on the other side the Atlantic with regard to this word *temptation* seems to us of weight. "Whenever enticement to what is wrong is not evidently spoken of," they suggest that *trials* should be substituted for temptations. It is true, of course, that every "trial" from the Father of mercies may become a "temptation" from the believer's adversary, the devil; but an exhortation to "count it all joy" when one falls "into manifold *temptations*" presents, for a great number of readers, a serious difficulty, especially if Jas. i. 3 be contrasted with 1 Pet. i. 6, A. V., "ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations,"[1] and with the petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Lead us not into temptation." We are glad, therefore, to have *trials*, though only in the margin.

"Easter," as the rendering of πάσχα, *passover*, has disappeared. The word was retained in Acts xii. 4, probably, by an oversight; in the earlier versions it frequently occurred.

Its, instead of *his*, appears in the R. V. "If the salt have lost its savour;" "the gate opened . . . . of its own accord." (Geneva: "*it* own accord.") In the A. V. "its"—found two or three times in Milton's poetry—nowhere occurs.

On the subjunctive we have not space to touch. We may remark, however, that such passages as Heb. v. 8, "though he was a Son" (A. V. *were*), 1 John v. 15, "if we know that he heareth us" (A. V. *hear*), are improvements. In the last-quoted passage the original words "request" and "make request," are not reproduced with exactness: "If we know that he heareth us whatsoever we ask (*request*, αἰτώμεθα), we know that we have the petitions (*requests*, αἰτήματα) which we have asked (*requested*) of him."[2] Consistency, full-orbed, would exhibit the "requests" of Philipp. iv. 6, also αἰτήματα, in a parallel passage on prayer such as this.

The A. V. "This man calleth for Elias" is changed into "this man calleth Elijah." In Matt. xvii. 10, also, we now read, "that

[1] Turnbull's rendering is:—"Keep yourselves perfectly cheerful when you are exposed to a variety of trials!"

[2] "The Help of Prayer." By W. O. Purton. Nisbet & Co.

Elijah must first come." For many in a country congregation, as Dr. Trench has pointed out, *Elias* is but a name; yet it is of high importance to keep "vivid and strong the relations between the Old and New Testaments in the minds of the great body of English readers and hearers of Scripture." We may remark in passing that as regards names of places and of persons, technical words, and other such questions—on which we are not able to dwell—the Revisers of 1881 have, on the whole, as we think, shown sound judgment. To give two or three instances. "Proconsul," Acts xiii. 7 (following Wiclif), is an improvement on "deputy," and "Zarephath," Luke iv. 26, on "Sarepta" [1 Kings xvii. 9], while "Joshua," instead of "Jesus," Heb. iv. 8 (Acts vii. 45) is a great gain. The question remains, of course, how far on such points the Old Testament Revisers will be found to agree with the alterations in the volume before us.

The word **οἰκονομία** is rendered in 1 Tim. i. 4, a *dispensation* or "stewardship" of God (A. V. "godly edifying," **οἰκοδομία**): in Luke xvi. 2, and 1 Cor. ix. 17, stewardship,"[1] Eph. i. 10 and iii. 2, and Col i. 25, "dispensation."

In only one passage of the A. V. occurs the word "atonement,"—viz., Rom. v. 11; and the general reader probably is not aware that in passages where he meets "reconciliation," or "reconciling," the Greek is the very same word. Rom. v. verse 11, compared with 2 Cor. v. verses 18–20 R. V., puts the reader of the translation, as nearly as may be, on the same vantage-ground as the reader of the original; and much as we regret the loss of the word "atonement," so far as regards the New Testament, we nevertheless welcome the consistency of rendering in so important a word as St. Paul's "reconciliation." And here we may remark concerning another of the Apostle's leading words—words which must be termed, indeed, *sedes doctrinæ*—that the Victorian Revisers have done well in rendering **τὸν ἁγιασμὸν**, "the sanctification"—CHURCHMAN, p. 228. (This word occurs in Rom. vi. 19, 22, 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7, 2 Thess. ii. 13, 1 Tim. ii. 15, 1 Pet. i. 2.) It is the foundation principle of growth in grace, that Christ is made to the believer **ἁγιασμὸς**, "*sanctification*, 1 Cor. i. 30; but much of the erroneous teaching as to sanctification by faith which has spread during the last few years, first in the United States, and then in the British Islands, would have stood self-condemned, as more than once was pointed out in this Magazine, if, together with 1 Cor. i. 30, had been read and carefully considered, the inspired

[1] In Luke xvi. 8, for "*unjust* steward" the R.V. gives "the *unrighteous* steward," thus preserving the key-note word of these verses, *righteous*. The rendering "for their own generation" is an improvement.

teaching of Heb. xii. 14—διώκετε τὸν ἁγιασμὸν, follow after, earnestly follow, sanctification.[1]

In Acts xx. 9 and 12, the A. V. gives one English word for two Greek words; the R. V. keeps "young man" in v. 9, but renders "lad" in v. 12. Comparing Luke ii. 43, and other passages, not forgetting that up to ii. 43 St. Luke uses παιδίον, we regard the new renderings of παῖς as inexpedient.

In 1 Cor. xiii. the Revisers of 1881 have done well, in that, after considering the claims of the Latin "charity" and the Saxon "love," they have gone back to the older rendering. Ignoring the positive protest of Tyndale,[2] the Revisers of 1611 adopted "charity." The Rhemish Version, indeed, has—"God is charity," and Lord Bacon admired the "discretion" of the Rhemish translation upon this point. But no three words in our English Testament are more sacred than these—"God is *love*." And upon every ground, in 1 Cor. xiii., as in eighty other passages, *love* is far better than *charity*. It would have been a most serious mistake, as we think, if the Revisers of 1881 had, in this important passage, neglected their principle of consistency.[3]

In 2 Cor. ix. 10, as in 2 Cor. i. 5 and Galat. iii. 5, the Greek verb is rendered "supplieth." With ". . . . in your faith supply [Tyndale: "minister"] virtue, ..." 2 Pet. i. 5, we cannot say that we are satisfied.[4]

The change in Col. i. 16, "in him [A. V. *by*] were all things created," will probably excite discussion. On this use of the preposition ἐν, here, and in other passages, we have not, at present, space to touch. But as to the particular passage now cited (13–22), it may be remarked that the authorities are in favour of *in*. The R. V. gives, at the end of verse 16, "through him and unto him."[5]

---

[1] On the article here, "*the* sanctification," no great stress need be laid. St. Paul writes, 1 Cor. xiv. 1, "follow after charity," διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην.

[2] Yet Tyndale, oddly enough, introduced "charitably" in Rom. xiv. 15; R. V., "in love" (in Rom. xiii. 10—"Love is the fulfilling of the law"). Against Tyndale's great work Sir Thomas More wrote with bitterness, and "love" was one of the six words specially complained of.

[3] One change in the English which follows inevitably from a change in the Greek, will be regretted on all sides. 1 Cor. xv. 57, 58, new text, runs thus:—Κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῖκος. Ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νῖκος; ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον; τὸ δὲ κέντρον. . . . . R. V., "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting? The sting of death. . . . ."

[4] "In your love of the brethren love" is not felicitous. Surely "in *brotherly affection* love" is better. (We do not forget that the Greek word, with the heathen, meant only the love between "brethren" in blood.) Bengel's remarks are excellent.

[5] The A.V. rendering of v. 15, "*the first-born of every creature*" is by no means satisfactory, as that great champion of the English Church against Arianism, Waterland, complained. Yet, is the R. V. "the first-born of all creation," much better?

The Revisers of 1881 have attempted, and not in vain, to distinguish between the verb *to be*, and *to become*, or *be made*. For example, "Before Abraham was [*marg.* was born] I am" (following Cranmer: Vulgate; Antequam Ab. *fieret*, ego *sum*. Douay; Ab. *was made*). Heb. v. 11, "Seeing ye are become (A. V. *are*) dull of hearing." The A. V. in John viii. 33, preserves the contrast: the Jews said, we *are;* the Saviour said, "Ye shall *be made* (become) free."

One change of an important character results from the R. V. consistency of rendering. The proper force of ἴδιος (*his own*, as in Matt. xxv. 14) appears in John v. 18 ". . . . called God his own Father, making himself equal with God." The charge of blasphemy clearly was that Christ claimed to be God's own Son in a peculiar and unparalleled sense.

Our analysis of the alterations of the R. V. must here terminate. Under the heading of (1) the article, (2) the aorist, (3) the perfect and present, (4) the imperfect, (5) the prepositions, (6) archaisms, (7) incorrect and vague translations, (8) consistency, we have arranged the alterations, giving—with more or less of comment—typical illustrations. Hitherto, we have expressed no opinion concerning the R. V. regarded as a rival, or successor, of the "Authorized" Version. Our aim has been to prove, in accordance with our statement at the outset, that the Revised New Testament is a "more faithful and accurate representation of the original than its predecessor of A.D. 1611."

We will now, with brevity, remark, first, that the changes made by the Victorian Revisers are too numerous; and, in the second place, that the English in the passages which have been altered is, too often, either weak or stiff and unmusical.

(1.) The changes are too numerous. This is, perhaps, the general verdict; and their own rule is quoted, not without justice, against the Revisers. It is easy to understand, however, that as the work progressed, and grew upon them, they were led to consider "alterations by *consequence*" of real necessity. Still, the great number of changes, many of them trivial, and others of only secondary importance, has excited prejudice. Here and there, too, an alteration appears pedantic: an excellent rule, as regards, *e.g.*, the proper force of the tenses, is pressed to no purpose. Sometimes the alterations irritate.[1] One important change—perhaps,the most important—has been already criticized in this Magazine—viz., the substitution of "the evil one" for *evil*. While we honour the courage which brings into prominence a Scriptural doctrine especially disliked at the present day, we cannot—as at present advised—consider so great a variation in

[1] *E.g.*, instead of the A. V. "Lord, is it I?" the R. V. has "Is it I, Lord?"

such a passage either expedient or sound. And, again, "Bring us," instead of "lead us," is, no doubt, consistent and correct; but the value of the alteration seems of the smallest. To meddle with the Lord's Prayer is a dangerous matter.[1]

To dwell upon the changes which appear to us needless would be an ungrateful labour. Criticism has been copious; and not a few of the critics have seemed more anxious to point out blemishes than to give that credit which is undeniably due. Fault-finding is easy. For ourselves, a single sample seems sufficient. Some of the alterations in the first chapter of St. John, quoted below, we think unnecessary:—

A.V.	R.V.
there was a man.	there came a man.
that all men through him might believe.	that all might believe through him.
his own.	they that were his own.
John bare witness.	John beareth witness.
is preferred before me.	is become before me.
the prophet Esaias.	Isaiah the prophet.
whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose.	the latchet of whose shoe. . . . .
I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove.	I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven.
He first findeth.	He findeth first.
brought him to Jesus.	brought him unto Jesus.
abode.[2]	they abode.

(2.) In the altered passages the language is occasionally poor. With the Revisers of 1611 the strong point was English; with our Revisers it is Greek. Here and there, it is true, appears a terse and felicitous rendering; but in certain passages, where more than one word has been changed, the English is thin, not sonorous; it is that of a scholastic, too literal, and savouring of the class-room. That the translation of every clause and of every paragraph throughout the volume is, as a rule, clear, and remarkably accurate, is admitted on all hands, but it is said, and with reason, that a Version which has to be read aloud must be more than lucid and faithful.

Whether the Revised New Testament will win its way[3] as did

---

[1] In the Angels' Hymn, again, "Peace among men in whom he is well pleased," is a paraphrase.

[2] "Come and ye shall see" is the new text in verse 30.

[3] The Preface to the A. V. thus opens:—"Zeal to promote the common good, whether it be by devising any thing ourselves, or revising that which hath been laboured by others, deserveth certainly much respect and esteem, but yet findeth but cold entertainment in the world. It is welcomed with suspicion instead of love, and with emulation instead of thanks: and if there be any hole left for cavil to enter (and cavil, if it do not find an hole, will make one) it is sure to be misconstrued, and in danger to be condemned. This will easily be granted by as many as know story, or have any experience. For was there ever any thing projected that savoured any way of newness or renewing, but the same endured

the "Authorized" Version, depends, to some extent, of course, on the character of the revision of the Old Testament. When the whole work is completed, another effort may be called for, and the revision be revised. Time will show. It is easy to speculate, and it is useless. For ourselves, we can only say that our study of the present Revision has deepened our admiration for the conscientious care with which the labour has been done. The work was carried on, we believe, in a true spirit of prayer, and dependence upon God. Of the learning, the candour, the ability, and the unwearied assiduity of the Revisers there can be but one opinion among unprejudiced readers. And the number of readers will increase, we have no doubt, who entertain a very high sense of the value of the boon which the Revisers have conferred upon the English-reading population of the Christian world.

ART. VI.—SUNDAY CLOSING.

IN the article in last October's CHURCHMAN on "Local Option and Local Control," it was truly remarked that, to anyone unacquainted with the temperance question these terms convey of themselves no definite ideas. It may, however, be doubted whether to many of those who are acquainted with the temperance question, and of those who voted in the recent divisions in Parliament in favour of Local Option, they convey any very definite idea, or are associated with any tangible proposal for carrying them into effect. The demand for Sunday Closing, on the other hand, is a definite, tangible, and practical proposal. It postulates the introduction of no new principle into our legislation.[1] It asks for no exceptional dealing in the case of the liquor traffic. It simply proposes the extension of restrictions already in operation, and the application to this traffic of the prohibition which already exists in the case of other trades. It is directly based rather on the distinctive character of *the day*, than of *the trade*, affected; although, as a matter of course, the latter largely enters indirectly into the consideration. Hence it stands on a platform

many a storm of gainsaying or opposition?" The Translators of 1611 foresaw the enmity and opposition which their work would meet with. They knew what St. Jerome had to undergo. The first critic, bitter enough, was the erudite but arrogant Hugh Broughton, who had been passed over. Broughton was so vain that when he went to the Continent it was said he was gone to teach the Jews Hebrew.

[1] Even the application of the principle to the whole day has been conceded by the Legislature in the creation of six days' licences.

of advantage over all other projects of temperance reformers, and unites in its support, not only those who are jealous for the sanctity and due observance of the Lord's Day, and the honour of its Lord, but also those who desire the suppression of intemperance, and the limitation of the sale of intoxicating liquors. It has this further advantage, that it proposes no untried experiment, as Sunday Closing is already, and has been for some time, in operation, in portions of the United Kingdom and in the Colonies; and invariably with the most beneficial results. It has, therefore, been proved to be *practicable.* And it may be fairly claimed for it by its advocates, that it would be likely to do more for the suppression of intemperance than any other practicable measure which is at present before the public. On the one hand, the effect of the break which it would introduce in the drinking habits of a large portion of the community, would be likely to be of incalculable advantage, in the promotion of sobriety during the remainder of the week;[1] while, on the other hand, it would remove temptation out of the way of those who have an unoccupied day on their hands, and a considerable portion of a week's wages in their pockets. There can be no doubt that, owing to these facilities, many, especially of the young, learn the first lessons of drunkenness in the Sunday School of Bacchus.

Blackstone lays down this general principle, which regulates our legislation as to Sunday trading, and his language is worthy of serious attention in these days with respect to the wider question of Lord's Day Observance:—

> Profanation of the Lord's Day, vulgarly (but improperly) called Sabbath-breaking, is a ninth offence against God and religion, punished by the municipal law of England. For besides the notorious indecency and scandal of permitting any secular business to be publicly transacted on that day in a country professing Christianity, and the corruption of morals which usually follows its profanation, the keeping of one day in seven holy, as a time of relaxation and refreshment, as well as for public worship, is of admirable service to a State, considered merely as a civil institution. It humanizes, by the help of conversation and society, the manners of the lower classes (which would otherwise degenerate into a sordid ferocity and savage selfishness of spirit); it enables the industrious workman to pursue his occupation in the ensuing week with health and cheerfulness; it imprints on the minds of the people that sense of their duty to God so necessary to make them good citizens, but which yet would be worn out and defaced by

[1] Mr. Ivie Mackie, a large wine and spirit merchant, in his evidence before the Select Committee of 1868, said: "Closing on Sunday would be a great benefit to the public, because if any man requires rest one day in seven, it is the drunkard who drinks six days; and I think it would be of the greatest benefit to him for the houses to be shut on Sundays."

an unremitted continuance of labour, without any stated times of recalling them to the worship of their Maker, and therefore the laws of King Athelstan forbad all merchandizing under very severe penalties, &c. &c.—*Commentaries*, iv. p. 63.

At the present time an exception is made to this general prohibition of trade, in favour of the sale of intoxicating liquors; and the questions which have to be determined in dealing with this exception are, "Is it beneficial?" and "Is it necessary?"

As to the former, no lengthened argument is needed. To many of us it might be sufficient to ask, "Is it for God's glory?" inasmuch as we believe that whatever is for God's glory must be in the truest sense for man's good; while, on the other hand, whatever is for man's good must be for God's glory. There is but one answer possible to this question, and that is, that there is nothing which causes so much dishonour of God, and leads to so much profanation of His Holy Name, and so much neglect of His worship—nothing which in our large towns and their outskirts so greatly tends to convert the Lord's Day into the devil's high day—nothing which is so responsible for turning God's good gift to man into a curse, as the facilities afforded publicly for drinking on Sunday.

Can it then be for man's good that this exception exists? Let us endeavour very briefly to sum up the arguments against it, and in its favour.

I. We maintain that the Sunday sale of intoxicating liquors is undoubtedly injurious.

(*a.*) *To the community at large*, as tending to form and foster habits of drinking, which result in the pauperism, crime, disease, and insanity which entail vast expenditure in the shape of taxation on the community.[1] Statistics show that, *in proportion to the number of hours in which the houses are open*, there are more arrests for drunkenness on Sunday than on any other day of the week, excepting, perhaps, Saturday; while the opinion of gaol chaplains, and others qualified to judge, is almost unanimous to the effect that Sunday drinking is directly or indirectly connected with the larger proportion of the crime of the country, and that, if public-houses were closed on Saturday evening and Sunday, crime would diminish in a marvellous degree.

(*b.*) *To other tradesmen.*—It is calculated that at least fifteen millions of pounds are annually spent on Sundays on intoxicating drinks. Is it not, looking at it from merely a financial point of view, a hardship and injustice to other traders that this large amount should pass into the till of the publican, largely because he has the monopoly of exercising his calling on the

[1] See evidence of the Writer before the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance.

day when the working-classes have money to spend, and time to spend it; while they are precluded from keeping their shops open? Of course, this argument, from a higher point of view, has another side to it.

(*c.*) *To the neighbours of the public-houses;* who have a right to have the quiet and peace of their much-needed day of rest shielded from the disturbance and unseemly sights and sounds, the products of Sunday-drinking, which haunt our streets long after the public-house has disgorged its besotted frequenters at the hour of closing.

(*d.*) *To the wives and families of those who frequent the public-house;* who would hail with thankfulness the removal of that which is not only the formidable rival to home, but also, in too many cases, the cause which makes home miserable on the day which ought to be the day of home.

(*e.*) *To those who frequent the public-house;* multitudes of whom, while too weak to resist the temptations placed in their way, are, in their better moments, sincerely desirous to be delivered from them. This was established by the evidence given before the Select Committee of 1868, of Revs. Newman Hall, Verner White, Messrs. S. G. Jowett, of Bradford, Joseph Leicester,[1] W. Cockburn, &c.

One injurious effect of Sunday-drinking is seen in the largely-prevailing absence of men from work on Monday and, to a lesser degree, on the days immediately succeeding. "Saint Monday," as it is called, is too often the legacy of a drunken Sunday. The effect of the holiday, instead of being, as Blackstone writes, to "enable the workman to pursue his occupation in the ensuing week with health and cheerfulness," is, in too many cases, to unfit him for work during the earlier part of the ensuing week; and, in this way, Sunday-drinking destroys the beneficial effect designed in the institution of a day of rest. Economically speaking, this has become a very serious evil.[2]

---

[1] As a sample of such evidence, Mr. Leicester, Secretary to the Glass Making Societies of Great Britain and Ireland, stated that he should say that it was the habit of the working-classes in London to more largely indulge in drinking beer on Sunday than any other day, and that there are thousands of those who have been slaves to the habits of intemperance who would wish to be delivered from this temptation.

[2] Mr. B. Whitworth, M.P., said, in a speech in Exeter Hall (June 14, 1875):—"I am connected with concerns in this country employing 45,000 men, and paying something like £4,000,000 every year in wages. I will just give you the result of Sunday drinking in one of those concerns. We pay £10,000 a week, and employ between 7,000 and 8,000 hands. We never commence work on Monday, because we find the men do not come in sufficient numbers to make it worth our while to get up the steam to turn the machinery. Now, I have calculated very minutely what the cost of that is to that concern. It is £35,000 a year of a loss—equal to 4 per cent. on the capital employed. I want to know how long this country

(*e.*) But probably *on those engaged in the trade* the greatest injury is inflicted by their deprivation of a day of rest, more needed, perhaps, by them than by any other class of the community, when we consider the physically injurious character of their occupation (evidenced by the fact that the death-rate among publicans is 155 against 100 of the whole population), the length of the hours during which they are employed, which may be 108 hours a week in the country, and 123½ hours in London, and still more the unpleasant and morally-injurious character of their occupation. The number of these is estimated as at least 340,000, and many of them are young persons—barmaids and potboys. In their interests this measure is imperatively demanded. And it is believed that a great majority of them, and especially of the more respectable amongst them, greatly desire it. This has been evidenced by the canvasses which have been made to ascertain their feelings on this point. In Liverpool, out of a total of 1,399, 756 signed in favour of total closing, while 113 more stated that they would be glad of the Act; 85 closed already; 97 were servants not in a position to sign; 90 were not seen; 6 were in favour of keeping open an hour or two; and only 252 refused to sign. It may, indeed, be asked, Why, if this be the case, none of them do not take advantage of a six days' license? The answer is, that many of them would not be allowed to do so by their landlords, and that others fear to lose their customers on the remaining days of the week, to their rivals who keep open, if they refuse to entertain them on the Sunday. There are, however, an increasing number of

---

can stand such a drain as that. We are competing with the whole world, and I say that with a weight like that, we shall not long be able to compete with it."

Mr. W. Cockburn, Manager of Messrs. Pease's Ironstone Mines in Yorkshire, stated in evidence before the Select Committee of 1868 that, having taken an account of the percentage of men off work on different days of the week during three years, he found, in one mine where the men were paid fortnightly, 14 per cent. were off work on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in the week after pay-day, and 9 per cent. on the three following days; in the following week, 13 per cent. on the three first days, and 8 per cent. on the three last. In one mine, 21 per cent. were off work on Monday, against 9 on Thursday; and in another, 17 per cent. against 9; and accounts for this difference by the effects of their drinking principally on the Sabbath-day. He stated that he believed that the majority of the men would hail Sunday Closing as a boon.

It is instructive to notice that while a similar state of things prevailed in Scotland previous to the passing of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, according to the Report of the Commission of 1858, and the evidence given before the Select Committee on the Irish Bill (1877) by the chief constables of Edinburgh and Glasgow, there are no complaints on that point now, or not to anything like the same extent—the number who absent themselves from work on Monday being small compared with previous years.

those who do avail themselves of this provision (2,352 being in operation according to the last returns of the Board of Inland Revenue).[1]

(*f.*) To these we may add, those *who are engaged in Christian work* for the elevation and evangelization of the masses of the population. These find in the open public-house the most formidable antagonist to their efforts on that day, when, but for this hindrance, they would have the readiest access to those for whose welfare they are concerned. To this cause is largely due the absence of the working-classes from public worship. It is this which, more than anything else, neutralizes the work of the Sunday School, and interferes with every endeavour to improve the opportunities which the day affords for the benefit of the working-classes.

II. Having considered the injurious effects of the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday upon various classes of the community, from which we may conversely infer the benefits which Sunday Closing would confer on those classes, let us ask who would be injured by it.

(*a.*) Travellers and lodgers in licensed houses are excepted in the proposed measure. It is, however, very desirable that the difficult question of the *bonâ fide* traveller should be settled by stricter definition.[2]

(*b.*) It is objected that working men would be deprived of what is virtually their club and place of resort during these leisure hours; and touching pictures are frequently drawn of the discomforts of their homes. But it may be replied that the home has to suffice for the wives and children: that Sunday is the day on which the home ought to be made most comfortable; and that the money spent on that day in the public-house, if spent upon the home, would, in many cases, serve largely to increase domestic comforts. Surely, instead of tempting men away *from* their homes, we should rather encourage them to find their happiness, and to seek to promote the happiness of their families, *in* their homes on that day, which should be especially sacred to home. But, as a matter of fact, as those who are most conversant with the subject well know, the public-house is almost exclusively used as a place of drinking rather than of innocent resort

[1] There have been instances of the publicans in a town uniting to close voluntarily on Sunday, and the arrangement being defeated by the refusal of a single member of the trade. They need, in such cases, protection against the tyranny of a minority.

[2] The Committee of the Irish Association for the Prevention of Intemperance, in their Report for 1880, suggest as a remedy for "this fast-increasing nuisance," as they call the *bonâ fide* traveller, that, unless to hotels of a *bonâ fide* character, no license should be issued that is not limited to six days; and that hotels should be only at liberty to supply *bona fide* guests.

and social intercourse. The case of the metropolis, where many live in lodgings, and habitually take their meals at a public-house, is exceptional, and might have to be dealt with by exceptional legislation.

(*c*). The objection, however, which is most commonly advanced, and which is found to be most formidable by the advocates of Sunday Closing, is based on the difficulty which would ensue in the way of the working man obtaining his beer for his Sunday dinner and supper—the former being generally his best meal during the week. Of course, many have an easy solution of this difficulty in the answer, "Let him go without." But this by no means disposes of the objection as held and put forward, not by working men themselves so much as by their self-elected advocates; nor ought it, I think, to dispose of it, as the question at issue is not whether beer be a necessity, or beneficial or not. The true answer is, that the beer may be procured, like other articles for consumption, on the Saturday; and if it be genuine, and properly treated, need be none the worse for the keeping, even if bottled beer be found less palatable or too expensive. The Select Committee of 1854 reported:—

"That it is the practice of such publicans as close on Sundays—and there seem to be many who close throughout the country—to provide their customers with stone bottles and jars in which to take their beer home well-corked on Saturday night for Sunday's use. The best evidence that the practice is found to answer is, that none of them speak either of complaints of their customers or loss of custom."

Since that time the number of those adopting this practice has largely increased, and the result has been equally satisfactory.[1]

Surely we may safely leave the demand to create the supply, and the trade to adapt itself to the new conditions under which it would be placed.

This would do away with the necessity of keeping the houses open for a short time at noon, and in the evening for the sale of drink to be consumed off the premises as proposed by Mr. J. Abel Smith in 1868, and by Mr. Pease in his Bill this Session—a plan which would in reality deprive the publican and his servants of their holiday, and which is not generally desired by the working-classes themselves. This has been established by canvasses in which their opinion has been taken on this point. In Preston, for example, 8,142 were for total closing; 416 for closing *except for two hours*; 394 against Sunday Closing.

[1] Mr. Alderman Mackie, of Manchester, and in the liquor trade in Dublin, Liverpool, Birmingham, Birkenhead, London, Brighton, as well as Manchester, in his evidence before the Select Committee of 1868, was asked, "Do many working men, within your knowledge, buy their beer on Saturday night, and keep it for Sunday's dinner?" and replied, "I know, of my own personal knowledge, that hundreds and thousands do."

and 2,075 neutral. Amongst the *working-class* population the majority against two hours' opening was 21 to 1. In Liverpool, out of upwards of 60,000 canvassed, 44,149 were in favour of total Sunday Closing; 6,417 for closing except for two hours; 3,330 against Sunday Closing; and 6,339 neutral.[1]

III. A few more general objections to the measure deserve a brief consideration.

a. There is the old "cant" cry about interference with the liberty of the subject. The simple answer to this is twofold; First, that you do already interfere with that liberty; and that the principle is conceded, as in the whole system of licensing so in the closing of the houses for a great portion of the day: and still more in the facilities given for the granting of six days' licences which virtually place the liberty of the subject in the power of the publican. The question at issue is merely one of degree. Restrictions on the drink traffic are imposed by every State in the interests of social order. And the only question is how far are these restrictions to go—a matter to be decided by experience alone.

Secondly, that all legislation implies, and must imply, restriction upon the liberty of the individual in the interests of the community. A man has only a right to do as he likes so long as he does not injure his neighbour.

b. It is repeated *usque ad nauseam*, that "you cannot make people sober by Act of Parliament." This we are ready freely to admit. You cannot, in like manner, make people healthy by Act of Parliament, yet you desiderate and enact sanitary legislation. You cannot make people instructed by Act of Parliament, and yet you have your Compulsory Education Act. At the same time it will be conceded that laws should set a standard of right and wrong: should make vice difficult and virtue easy: and should strengthen the weak against the strong. It is, moreover, a matter of fact that in our past legislation we have largely helped to make people drunk by Act of Parliament; and in the same way may hope to help to make them sober.

c. It is further objected that the proposed measure would

[1] The objection, indeed, has been recently advanced that Sunday closing would tend to increase drunkenness and to aggravate its evils, inasmuch as working men would be likely to lay in large quantities of drink on the Saturday, and to drink themselves drunk in the presence of their wives and families, and even to tempt them to like excess. In rare instances this *might* be the case: but surely it is a gross libel upon working-men in general to suggest that they would be capable of such deliberate wickedness, although they may not be strong enough to resist temptation when it is thrown in their way in the shape of the open public-house. It is somewhat inconsistent that this argument should be put forward by those who complain that the advocates of this measure are unjust in thinking that the working-man needs protection against himself.

savour of *class legislation*. It would indeed affect all classes alike, and close the hotel or bar-parlour frequented by the rich, as well as the bar or the vault used by the poor. Doubtless, however, the poorer classes would be chiefly affected by it, but the question remains whether they would be effected *beneficially* or otherwise. We claim for this legislation that if it be class legislation, it is so because it is *in the interests* of a class; and because it is in accordance with their desire. I have alluded to the canvasses which have been made of the wishes of the people on this subject. In about 500 different places the householders (only) have been canvassed with the following results;—

For Sunday Closing	756,846
Against	89,417
Neutral	55,814

or more than 8 in favour to every one against. In 56 workshops canvassed the number were—In favour, 10,627, against 1,190; neutral 514. Here the proportion is larger. And when we come to analyze the canvasses we find invariably that the lower down in the scale of population we go the larger is the majority in favour of closing. The question is a working-man's question, and working-men have plainly expressed their opinion upon it, and would soon settle it if they had their own way. The objections and opposition chiefly come from well-meaning friends of the working-man, as they have constituted themselves, who are ignorant of his wishes in the matter; and from those who are pecuniarily interested in the Trade.[1]

(*d.*) Lastly, it is objected that you will not lessen intemperance by Sunday Closing. This brings us to the important evidence furnished by Scotland and Ireland.

In the former country, the Forbes-Mackenzie Act has been in operation for twenty-seven years. It closes public-houses during the whole of Sunday, and on other days from 11 at night to 8 in the morning.

In the ten years before the passing of the Act, in 1854, the consumption of British spirits in Scotland was 66,675,852 gallons. In the ten years after the Act came in force the consumption amounted to only 51,442,915 gallons, although the population was largely increased. It may enable us to judge of the passing of the Act, if we compare this state of things with that in England and Wales, in which the consumption of British spirits for the ten years ending 1853

[1] It is, however, frequently suggested that it is not fair that the public-house be closed while clubs are allowed to be open on Sunday. No argument, however, can be legitimately drawn from the one to the other: for the club is not a trading establishment, nor open to the public: nor are there any complaints as to the effects of clubs being open on Sunday, nor any requests from those who use them that they should be closed, as is the case with reference to the public-house.

amounted to 91,632,344 gallons; and for the ten years ending 1864 to 111,888,703 ("Report of the Commissioners for Inland Revenue, 1870," vol. ii. pp. 8, 17).

The results in Edinburgh are very remarkable:—

	Average of 1852-3; before the Act.		1872-3; after the Act.
Total number drunk and incapable . .	6,047	...	1,923
Number of persons arrested for drunkenness between 8 o'clock on Sunday morning and 8 o'clock on Monday morning .	367	...	53
Number of persons arrested for drunkenness on Monday	752	...	234
Daily average number of prisoners in the city gaol	575	...	329

notwithstanding an increase in the population of 38,488 betwen 1851 and 1871.

Important evidence was given before the Select Committee "On Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill 1877."

Capt. Alex. M'Call, Chief Constable of Glasgow (connected with the police force of that town since 1850), stated that his experience of the effect of Sunday Closing had been that there had been a wonderful change wrought upon the peace and quiet of that city; that since the public-houses have been closed on Sundays it has been a very rare thing to see people going about the streets drunk on those days from 6 o'clock in the morning until 12 o'clock at night; whereas, before the Act came into operation, it was very common; that the Sunday used to be perhaps the busiest day of the week with the police, but that has entirely changed now; that there are no complaints about "idle Monday" now; that the number of illicit houses (which it is argued that Sunday Closing would increase) is not one-third of what it was before; that he could not see any sign of an increase of private drunkenness, nor does he believe that such is the state of things; for if the people were in the habit of getting privately drunk, as it is called, it would be sure to lead to disturbance in some parts of the city, and the attention of the police would be called to it; and that he looks on the Act as the greatest benefit conferred on Scotland, and especially on Glasgow, for the last fifty years.

Mr. Thos. Linton, Chief Superintendent of Police, and Procurator-Fiscal of Edinburgh, connected with the police force for forty years, gave evidence to the same effect. He said that, before closing of public-houses on Sunday, a larger force of police was required than now; in fact, between eight o'clock on Sunday morning and ten o'clock on Sunday night, there were only twenty-six men at a time on the beats in the whole of Edinburgh, and on week-days there were seventy-eight. The closing of public-houses on Sunday had led to a decrease of drunkenness on Monday, and the number who now absent themselves from work on that day is small compared with previous years. The

shebeens have diminished in number since the passing of the Act, and he had not seen any sign of an increase of private drunkenness. He was quite satisfied that if the votes of the publicans were taken, there would not be one in five who would not say they considered it a great boon; and the same proportion would be the result of the votes of the people. He had no doubt that Sunday Closing in Edinburgh has been very beneficial, and the improvement in the social and moral condition of the people is great.[1]

Ireland.—The result in Ireland has been equally satisfactory. It was predicted during the struggle to obtain the measure that it would lead to riot, disorder, and increased private drinking; but since the Act came into operation (Oct. 13, 1878), there has not resulted a single breach of the peace, and drunkenness has diminished beyond the most sanguine hopes of the promoters of the Bill.

The Board of Trade returns give the following figures for the years 1878 and 1879 respectively:—

	1878.	1879.
Consumption of spirits in Ireland .	£6,101,905	£5,335,000
„ „ beer in Ireland .	4,850,424	4,040,695
Total	£10,952,329	£9,576,634

being a reduction of £1,576,634.

The returns for the first six months of 1880 are even more satisfactory. The following are the figures for the half-years ending June 30 in 1878, 1879, and 1880:—

	1878.	1879.	1880.
Spirits returned for home consumption in Ireland . . gals.	2,959,814	2,675,666	2,352,904

showing a reduction in 1879 of 284,148 gallons compared with 1878, and in 1880, of 322,762 gallons compared with 1879, during the six months.

The returns of beer are equally satisfactory. The figures show a reduction of 1,968,696 gallons on the six months.

But the results of Sunday Closing are seen more clearly by a reference to Parliamentary Returns affecting the day itself, from which it appears that the arrests on Sunday, not including the five large towns which are partially exempted from the operation of the Act, were—

For the year preceding Sunday Closing	4,555
For the first year of Sunday Closing	1,840
Decrease (about 60 per cent. on the whole) ...	2,715

[1] The whole evidence is worthy of careful attention. It has been reprinted in a pamphlet. Price 6*d.* Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C.

In the five towns partially exempted the result stands thus:—

For 1877–78 (with seven hours' sale) . . .	2,820
For 1879–80 (with five hours' sale) . . .	2,132
Decrease (nearly 25 per cent on the whole) . .	688

The testimony of the judges of assize, magistrates, and clergy, are unanimous as to the beneficial effects of the measure, while the publicans declare that it has largely affected their trade throughout the week.

Such facts speak for themselves; and those relating to the consumption of beer are especially valuable, inasmuch as objections are constantly made to arguments drawn from the success of the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, in favour of a similar Act for England, on the ground that spirits are the staple drink in Scotland, while beer is in England.

A Bill for Sunday Closing in Wales, called for by the almost unanimous voice of the Principality, is now before Parliament, and will, it is hoped, have become law before these pages meet the eye of the reader. The second reading was carried on May 4th, by 164 to 17, and it is remarkable that in the division no Welsh or Scotch member voted against the bill, and only four Irish members against twenty-eight in its favour.

Surely when—not to mention the Colonies—Scotland, Ireland, the Isle of Man,[1] and Wales, enjoy the blessing of Sunday closing; and its beneficial effects are recognized in them all, the same boon cannot long be denied to England. In order to secure this result, it needs only that all who are jealous for the sanctity of the Lord's Day, all who desire to check the intemperance which so lamentably prevails in our land, and all who desire the true prosperity and peace of our country, our Christian ministers and Sunday School teachers, and other workers, should unite, as these have so successfully done in Ireland and Wales, in earnest determination to make their voices heard in Parliament, and their wishes known to their representatives; and, by God's blessing upon such united effort, at no distant time will the blot which the existence of this traffic leaves on the Christian character of our country be wiped out, and the Lord's Day be emancipated from that which more than anything else robs it of its blessing to thousands of our countrymen.

T. Alfred Stowell.

[1] It may be stated that in the Isle of Man—the writer has it on the authority of H.M. Attorney-General—the Sunday Closing Act has worked well; greatly diminished Sunday drinking, and given rise to no practical difficulty. See also the writer's evidence before the Lords' Committee.

Reviews.

To the Central African Lakes and Back. The Narrative of the Royal Geographical Society's East Central African Expedition, 1878–80. By JOSEPH THOMSON, F.R.G.S., in command of the Expedition. With a short Biographical Notice of the late Mr. Keith Johnston, Portraits, and a Map. Two volumes. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1881.

TWO recently published works of Travel in Africa, Major Serpa Pinto's "How I Crossed Africa," and Dr. Emil Holub's "Seven Years in South Africa," both published by Messrs. Low & Co., have been reviewed in THE CHURCHMAN. The work now before us has an interest of its own. It deals with Central Africa, and it gives an account of a remarkable expedition, unique, indeed, in many of its characteristics. The subject of African exploration, no doubt, has lost much of its novelty; such puzzling problems as those of the Nile and the Congo have been settled; and of the mysteries which enshrouded the Dark Continent not many now remain. Nevertheless, for a really good book of tropical travels, readers are sure to be numerous; and, with respect to Central Africa, there is yet a great deal to be discovered and described of interest to many who are not usually reckoned in the "general reader" class.

In the Preface of the work before us, Mr. Thomson writes as follows:—"Mr. Keith Johnston, who, on account of his well-known and varied "abilities, was chosen to lead the Society's East African Expedition of "1878, succumbed[1] at the very outset of the undertaking; and I, an "unskilled youth, who had been selected only as an assistant, found "myself unexpectedly in a position of difficulty and responsibility, which I "feel myself far from being competent to fill. But I remembered I was "the countryman of Livingstone, and my Scottish blood would not allow "me to retreat till I had performed my duty to the best of my ability." Mr. Thomson further remarks, that though it was not to be expected that he should bring back the rich harvest of accurate geographical facts which Mr. Keith Johnston would doubtless have reaped, yet the expedition was by no means fruitless. The Royal Geographical Society expressed its approval in flattering terms, and testified that the objects of the expedition had been fully attained. Mr. Thomson writes:—

In carrying out the objects of the expedition, an immense area of country has been traversed for the first time. I have had the honour of being the first to reach Lake Nyassa from the north, to journey between Nyassa and Tanganyika, to march along the west side of the latter, and to pass for sixty miles down the

[1] Mr. Keith Johnston, who was stricken down almost at the commencement of the long journey into the interior, had achieved fame as a geographer, having been specially trained; and his reputation as an author and cartographer was steadily increasing. He was the only son of Dr. Alexander Keith Johnston, of Edinburgh, the author of the "Physical Atlas" and other well-known works. Born in 1844 (he was only thirty-four years when he died), he came to London at the age of twenty-two, and, for a year, worked in the geographical establishment of Mr. Stanford. In 1870, he published his "Lake Regions of Central Africa," illustrated by an original map drawn by himself; this little work attracted the attention of Dr. Livingstone, who praised "the geographical acumen of Keith Johnston *secundus*." In 1873, he accepted the offer of the Paraguay Government to take part in a scientific survey of that country. In 1878, he offered himself as leader of the Royal Geographical Society's Expedition. Mr. Thomson was only twenty, having just left Edinburgh University, when he offered himself as an assistant to Mr. Johnston.

Lukuga. Lake Leopold has also been visited for the first time, and some light has been thrown upon a variety of geographical subjects—such as the rivers Ruaha and Uranga, the mountainous region north of Nyassa, and the interesting question relating to the drainage of Tanganyika.

Mr. Thomson writes warmly of the honesty and faithfulness which characterized the men of his company; at the bottom of their semi-savage nature he discerned a really genuine character. He records neither desertions and plundering by the porters—usually supposed to be the inevitable adjuncts of African exploration—nor battles and bloodshed. In the majority of places he found the natives peaceable, and not given to plunder. Almost everywhere he was received with hospitality and friendship. He never fired a shot in anger.

Several new tribes were discovered. No inconsiderable additions have been made by his collections to our knowledge of the botany of East Africa. Conchology has also received contributions of a valuable nature. A general idea has been given of the geological formation of the region of the Great Lakes. Anthropological details are scanty, as the author's aim has been to describe only *what he saw*. From many writers on East Central Africa he has seen causes to differ on such subjects as the prospect in trade of that region, and the value of railways and roads in a commercial. Their "roseate views," he thinks, are vain. Not a single article did he see, except ivory, which it would pay to bring down from the interior.

In November, 1878, the Expedition left London. The sum of £1,500 was placed at their disposal. In January, 1879, having had to wait a fortnight at Aden for a steamer, they arrived off Zanzibar, which, with its evergreen mantle of waving cocoa-nut trees, was a refreshing sight after the dreary barrenness of the country on either side of the Suez Canal, the burnt-up mountains inclosing the Red Sea, and the glazing sands of Berberah. Zanzibar, according to our author, has been much maligned. The children of Dr. and Mrs. Kirk looked as healthy as if they had never been out of England. Merchants, consuls, missionaries, and their wives, bear good testimony of the climate. And, then, there is the Bishop. "In making our calls" writes Mr. Thomson, "we did not neglect to visit that genial and laborious gentleman, Bishop Steere, whose life for the last sixteen years in East Africa presents a record of travel, and of literary, philological, and missionary work, so vast and varied in character, as at once to dissipate the notion that the climate of East Africa is destructive of all energy." Writing of the "sights" of Zanzibar, Mr. Thomson alludes to Bishop Steere's "*grand church*" as a "*striking illustration of the misapplication of money and energy*, which might have been so much more usefully directed into other channels." What a pity it is!

One of the most important of their preparations in Zanzibar was to study the Ki-swahili, a language not only spoken by the natives at the coast, but so well-known in the interior as to enable the traveller who can speak it to pass almost from one side of Africa to another. In their studies they were assisted by Bishop Steere, the best of Swahili scholars. Chuma, whose long and faithful services with Livingstone is not forgotten, was engaged as their chief head-man. Of Susi and Jacob Wainwright, Mr. Thomson does not give a very gratifying account. Susi, he says, had fallen into drinking habits, and Jacob Wainwright, after his return from England, was found impudent and impracticable. A trip to Usumbara gave them an insight into the difficulties of managing a caravan, and also an introduction to the dreaded fever; and the fever, in Mr. Johnston's case, was followed by an abscess. On their way, the third day's journey from Pangani, they reached Magila, where the Universities'

Mission has established a station. "Here," writes Mr. Thomson, "a "number of missionary gentlemen make themselves martyrs to the conven- "tionalities of their Church in a manner which greatly amuses one. "Perhaps their consistency may be worthy of admiration, but I confess "it tickled my fancy to see these men, with the thermometer at 90° in "the shade, wearing long, black, priestly garments hanging to their feet, "ropes round their waists, and shovel hats, in which they pushed through "forests and jungle, plunged through swamp and stream, handled the "axe or the spade, and finally held Divine service in their fancifully "decorated chapels. I have no desire to convey the impression that this "ritualistic mission is doing no good in Magila. Undoubtedly, the "missionaries are learned and devoted men, whose soul is in their work; "but in their methods there is unquestionably much that is absurd, if not "worse. They certainly succeed in raising the vulgar admiration of the "natives, by their showy vestments, ceremonial processions, candles, and "altars; and by substituting a cross when they take away the 'dawas' "or charm, from the negroes, they convey an idea of the Christian religion "which suits naturally superstitious minds. But whether all this is "calculated to produce the highest results I very much doubt." No wonder!

In the middle of May the travellers left Zanzibar in earnest, for the mainland, Mr. Johnston having first made a voyage of inquiry as to the best route. At Dar-es-Salaam, a harbour till within the last few years quite unknown, Mr. Johnston was smitten again with fever, and for two or three days he was very ill. When they set out they had in all seventy guns, thirty being Government Sniders. They numbered 150 men, including a few engaged at Dar-es-Salaam. In expediting their preparations Dr. Kirk was of great use. Five donkeys arrived safely in a dhow from Zanzibar. No better organized caravan ever left the coast.

They had not journeyed far before Mr. Johnston took cold, "hippo" hunting in a marsh; he felt a pain in the back, which he supposed to be rheumatic, but which was really the beginning of a deadly disease. He journeyed along in pain and weakness; the close, steaming air was impregnated with malaria; the rain was violent; the long grass was bad, and the swamps worse. After a time he broke down; but, without taking sufficient rest, he gave the word to set out again, and he was carried along on an extempore hammock. The donkeys, whether from the climate or the nature of the food, pined and died. At length the caravan reached the eagerly anticipated haven, the pleasant village of Behobeho, and hope of their leader's recovery rose within them. But they had come too late. Poor Johnston, who had discovered that his disease was dysentery, and had suffered agonies of pain while he was being carried, gradually grew worse; he could take no food, and a convulsive cough, the result of extreme exhaustion, rarely left him. Letters reached them on the 22nd of June; and he struggled hard to get through his. Sinking fast, and becoming insensible, he passed away on the 28th.

In their journey onwards, Mr. Thomson being now the leader, they came to the river Ruaha, the first time it had ever been seen in its lower portion by any European traveller. Its upper sources had been explored, from the north end of Lake Nyassa to Ugogo, by Captain Elton, in the journey which ended in his death. The caravan crossed the river in Admiral MacDonald's little collapsible boat.

At length they reached the end of the lowland journey. With exultation and delight, says Mr. Thomson, they reached the mountains which bound the interior plateau. "Africa has been compared to a nut, only "hard to deal with from the outside. Once through the shell, and the "prize is gained. We had got through the shell, which in East Africa

"means the low-lying country between the coast and the edge of the "plateau. This is in many respects the most trying part of an explorer's "journey; for here the European is first brought face to face with the "hardships of travel; here he has to do battle with disease, bad fare, "hard work, and danger, and to be ever on the alert against desertion "and stealing. Nature soon weeds out the incapable, and determines "who is 'fittest to survive.' Few caravans have crossed this tract of "country without manifold troubles, as the history of all East African "travellers has shown. We read of nothing but marshes and swamps, "fevers and dysenteries, with difficulties of various kinds." Mr. Thomson himself had nearly succumbed to the fever, and still suffered from the malaria. But he records with triumph that, during their march of over 350 miles, they had not lost a single man by desertion or death (Mr. Johnston excepted), and not a yard of cloth had been stolen.

On the 17th of August they marched over a pass 7,000 ft. high, and stood on the Plateau of Inner Africa. On the 20th of September they heard the faint roar of the Nyassa breakers; weak and weary, Mr. Thomson hurried down the slopes and bathed in its waters.

On the 3rd of November, as they were drawing near to the Great Lake, from the entire caravan burst forth a shout, "Tanganyika! Tanganyika!" When they came in sight of the splendid prospect, the men fired their guns, and danced like schoolboys. After a little, when they had descended to the shore, for the first time for a month the roll was called; a sonorous *Eh wallah*, "Here, sir!" followed each name. Not one of the 150 men were absent. A speech was made, and all in turn shook hands.

Pambetè is memorable as the spot where Livingstone first reached Tanganyika (April, 1867). Mr. Thomson's first day here was marked by two incidents; he narrowly escaped from a crocodile, while enjoying the cool waters of the Lake, and, secondly, he met Mr. Stewart, a lay missionary from Livingstonia, who had travelled to open up communications with the agents of the London Missionary Society.

The ill-success of the Belgian expedition, we read, is due to the lack of care and common-sense.

Our author's return journey to the coast, by Unyanyembe, was accomplished by the middle of July, and they entered Bagamoyo in triumph. Only one porter of the 150 was missing; and after travelling some 5000 miles, the men were in good health and spirits.

Canonicity. A Collection of early Testimonies to the Canonical Books of the New Testament. Based on Kirchhofer's "Quellensammlung." By A. H. CHARTERIS, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism and Biblical Antiquities in the University of Edinburgh; and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains. Pp. 580. Edinburgh & London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1880.

AT the time when we received a copy of this work—nearly a year ago—we gave a few lines of cordial commendation in our "Short Notices" without delay, expressing our intention of giving at a future time a review more fit and becoming of a work which a hasty examination was sufficient to stamp as able and important. It is with pleasure that we now call to it the attention of our readers—in particular, of theological students, and of laymen who have learning and leisure for such inquiries. Not seldom on the southern side of the Tweed have scholars welcomed aids, both literary and theological, by Scottish pens; and the book before us, written by a divine of the Church of Scotland, a Professor in the University of Edinburgh, will be regarded as a work of first-class merit.

Professor Charteris has evidently studied, with due care, the works of Continental[1] and British scholars of the present day, and all standard authorities; but he has taken a line of his own. His title-page, indeed, states that "Canonicity" is based upon Kirchhofer's *Quellensammlung;* yet the work is really independent. Everywhere we see signs of patient research, and also of accuracy and sound judgment. Dr. Charteris has not forgotten to "verify his references," neither has he made a single page tedious by unnecessary quotations. "Canonicity" will take a good place, we believe, among Christian classics.

The first portion of the work is the Introduction, which occupies 120 pages. It gives an account, brief but not bald, of the early writers. The closing portion, on the Fourth Gospel, refers to recent controversies, starting from Bretschneider (1820); and in nine pages, as full and forcible as anything we have ever seen, Dr. Charteris replies to criticisms all along the line. With the writings of Canon Westcott and Dr. Sanday it forms a satisfactory answer to both German and English objections upon every point. We have great reason for thankfulness, indeed, that the appearance of such melancholy works as *Supernatural Religion* has been followed by a series of sound, scholarly publications of the very highest rank.

Of the volume before us Chap. I., "Oldest Testimonies to a Collection of Sacred Books;" Chap. II., "Testimonies to the Canon, of later date," beginning with the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 360), and including the Confession of Basle (A.D. 1536), the Swiss (1566), Gallican (1559), Old Scottish (1560), Bohemian (1535), Anglican Articles (1562), with the Westminster Confession (1643); Chap. III., "The New Testament as a whole;" Chap. IV., "The Gospels"—these take up a hundred pages. A separate chapter is devoted to each separate Scripture: the chapter on the Apocalypse ends with p. 357. Part II. contains "Testimonies of Heathen;" Part III., "Testimonies of Heretics;" Part IV., "Extra-Canonical Gospels."

We may notice briefly two or three points in the Introduction. And, first, the Epistle of Clement of Rome. Only one of the writings which bear Clement's name can be rightly reckoned as his. Now, the testimony to the Canonical Scriptures borne by this, the "First" Epistle of Clement, writes Dr. Charteris, is specially important, because it is unquestionably of very early date:—

> That it is indeed a very early work there can be no reasonable doubt. Traditional testimony consistently establishes the existence and prominence of a letter of "Clement to the Corinthians," and furnishes us also with a key to its characteristics, as written by him in the name of the Church. . . . . It was habitually read in the Church of Corinth in the end of the second century; it was evidently used by the author of the Epistle of Polycarp; and both Eusebius and Jerome tell us that it was still publicly read in some churches in their times.

It is singular that an Epistle which received so much honour in the Early Church disappeared entirely from view. Not till the middle of the seventeenth century, when the Archbishop of Constantinople sent to our Charles I. the Codex Alexandrinus, did it reappear. Of that great gift, Cod. A., the Epistle of Clement was a part: it formed an appendix to

[1] In his Preface, Dr. Charteris makes especial mention of Professors Weizsäcker and Christlieb, and the Rev. W. Pressel, Lustnau, for the encouragement which induced him to undertake the work. We may add that while he pays a just tribute in regard to Kirchhofer's book, which has been a trustworthy storehouse for some forty years, Dr. Charteris remarks that his admiration of Lardner (on whom Kirchhofer almost exclusively relied) has increased with increasing knowledge of the wide field over which the labours of that eminent apologist extended.

the New Testament. And until lately this MS.—incomplete—was the only one known to exist. Six years ago, however, (1875) students were startled by the appearance of a careful and complete edition published in Constantinople from a MS. discovered in the "Library of the Most Holy Sepulchre" in that city. Its editor is Philotheos Bryennios, Metropolitan of Serræ. Six new chapters (containing, among other interesting matter, a prayer of singular beauty) are added by this new MS. Scarcely was this discovery realized, when a Syriac MS. of the two Epistles was also found in Paris, so that three MSS. of this most ancient Christian work are before the critics of this critical age. With the discovery of so important a manuscript, as Dr. Lightfoot remarked, in an Appendix to his edition of Clement's Epistles—referring to the treasure found by Bryennios—a hope of future discoveries in the domain of early Christian literature was opened out, in which the most sanguine could not have ventured to indulge before. Singularly enough, in the same year (1876) in which the Parisian MS. of Clement appeared, was published—at Venice—a translation of a Commentary on the Diatessaron of Tatian by Ephraem the Syrian, a document of the highest importance. Ephraem's work, indeed, in some sort overshadows the discovery of Bryennios.

Concerning the Epistle of Clement, inserted in the middle of the New Testament after the Catholic Epistles in the newly-found Syriac MS., the comments of Dr. Charteris are candid and cogent; he sums up the evidence fairly, and in a small compass, not unduly pressing any point. The earlier date of the Epistle is not, he says, at all well supported: "It is by no means improbable that Clement, Bishop of Rome, and writer of this Epistle, is the same as Clement, nephew of Vespasian, and Consul of the city, who was slain in the year 96 A.D." Be this as it may, the most probable date of the Epistle is about 90 A.D. And its testimony is remarkable. "Its author's mind is steeped in the thoughts, doctrines, and associations which are preserved to us in Scripture." In every unstudied line is shewn "the general acceptance of the Gospel narratives and of the Epistles now found in our New Testament." It may be said, indeed, of Clement and Polycarp, that they "manifest in every page, and in almost every line, the power of a religion based upon the truths of our Gospel. The men have rested their faith upon Jesus Christ as their Saviour; they have done that once for all; and now they are occupied in living up to the requirements of Christianity in daily life." Their aim was mainly ethical; but in the outpouring of their hearts we see the πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη. When regarded in their true light, the Epistles of Clement and Polycarp furnish an argument for the canon from this very fact: *they imply far more than they express.* They imply the previous acceptance of the existing documents and doctrines of the New Testament.

The chapter on Polycarp's Epistle is exceedingly good—so good, indeed, that we could wish it were a little longer. Concise as it is, however, it is clear. As to the date of Polycarp's death, the learned Professor shows that the acceptance of A.D. 155 leaves us at issue with some ancient authorities. The researches of M. Waddington have supplied contending critics with abundance of material. Wieseler defends the date of Eusebius, A.D. 166 (Jerome, 167). He founds upon the common consent of antiquity that Polycarp suffered in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and on the visit of Polycarp to Rome in the episcopate of Anicetus, which began A.D. 157 or 158. Bishop Lightfoot follows M. Waddington. Bishop Wordsworth, however, we observe, after an able analysis of the arguments adduced by M. Waddington, rather inclines the other way. Concerning the Epistle, Dr. Charteris writes with becoming firmness. "As far as any literary production can be regarded as of assured antiquity, this can; and, although there may be some uncertainty as to the very year of its

origin, its being written by Polycarp is quite certain." This Epistle, then, written by a disciple of the Apostle John, a document of the highest importance, what is its testimony? We gather it not merely from particular passages, but from the very warp and woof: the whole letter breathes the spirit of the Scriptures. Clement cites the words of Jesus with special solemnity: thus, "as the Lord said;" "as the Lord said teaching." It is obvious that he used the Epistles of St. Paul as *Scriptures*. He says, *e.g.*, "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches?" "In these Scriptures, it is said, 'Be ye angry and sin not.'" Again: "Neither I nor any such other one can come up to the wisdom of the blessed and glorified Paul." Dr. Charteris rightly remarks:—

> We could not ask stronger testimony, direct or indirect, to our New Testament than this. Its author—the disciple of John, and the teacher of Irenæus—was a leading and representative man among the Christians during his long life, and "in his old age," as Irenæus says, "had a glorious and splendid martyrdom. To whom, then, does this saint testify? Not only to the Epistles of his own Master, but to St. Peter, and to the writings of St. Paul. There is no trace of jealousy, and he is one in spirit with all the "three mighty ones."

Dr. Charteris adds, in one of the too few *ad clerum* passages, some well-weighed words:—

> It may not be out of place, in a book primarily designed for students of theology, to draw attention to a practical lesson. Polycarp—now old and revered—was asked by the Philippians to write them a letter. He accordingly exhorts them to Christian duty and faith: proclaiming the truth as it is in Jesus, "who" (as he says) "bore our sins in his own body on the tree," and "for our sakes was raised again from the dead;" but his words are not so remarkable even for their tender courtesy and touching humility, as for the fact that all his exhortations are based on the authority of Holy Scripture.

The writings of Justin Martyr are especially important in the history of the canon, inasmuch as he occupies a position equidistant from St. John on the one hand and Irenæus on the other. In concluding his remarks on the controversy about Justin's knowledge of our Gospels, Professor Charteris puts the case clearly, and in few words. He says:—

> Justin quotes memoirs written by Apostles and their companions; he calls them Gospels; his words are the words we find in our sacred books; he says they were used in public worship along with the prophets every Sunday; Trypho knew them; they are described as accessible to heathen; Justin's knowledge of Christian truth, whether fact or doctrine, is bounded by their contents, for the little apocryphal items are not worthy of being dwelt upon; and if these things do not prove that Justin was a reader of our Evangelists, it is hard to say what would prove it.

Other points in "Canonicity" we had marked for notice; but we must wait for a second edition. We should add, however, that the quotations from the Latin and Greek authorities are printed in large clear type.

Kurum, Kabul, and Kandahar. Being a Brief Record of Impressions in Three Campaigns under General Roberts. By CHARLES GRAY ROBERTSON, Lieut. 8th (the King's) Regiment. Pp. 240. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1881.

THIS is a well-written and interesting book. It is dedicated to Major-General Robertson, C.B., late Lieut.-Colonel 8th Regiment, the author's father. Plans were placed at his disposal by Sir Frederick Roberts and Colonel Barry Drew. The book has an especial attraction, of course, for members of military circles; but all who take it in hand will find the narrative very readable.

The first of the three campaigns described ends with the Treaty of Gandamak. The second campaign, the events of which are narrated in fourteen chapters, beginning with "Returning to the Front," and ending with "Summering the Troops," is the advance to Kabul, the series of struggles within and around Kabul, and the repulse of the enemy:—the chapter—"General Roberts at bay"—is exceedingly good. In the third section of the book, we have "The Lesson of Maiwand," "The March," and "The Victory."

The march from Kabul to Kandahar—a march that will be remembered when every other incident of the second Afghan War has faded out of history—was begun on the 8th of August, 1880. Lieut. Robertson gives a clear and spirited account of it. He says:

It was hard work from the first. But the earliest stage—the march divides itself naturally into three—was the least trying. Men and animals were fresh, comparatively speaking, — for it is not the least notable part of this forced march of 300 miles, that it was undertaken at the end of an arduous and protracted campaign. . . . . There was a regular block at the Tanji Wardak. It took two days to get the division either through the Pass or over the Kotal. But the dead pull did not make itself felt till we left Zaidabad in the Maidan Valley. From this point we said good-bye to all trees and verdure of every kind. . . . . Under foot were stone and sand and choking dust. . . . . Ghazni was sighted in a week. . . . . Next day we marched thus twenty miles. . . . . A real night's rest at Khelat-i-Ghilzai was a priceless boon.

"On the 31st of August," writes Lieutenant Robertson, "the goal of all our toils was reached:"

Kandahar is a perfect example of a walled town, square and compact, without so much as an outhouse or a garden straggling beyond its defences. Looking down from the upper citadel on the gaily-coloured uniforms, the sentries, and the big guns, the commissariat, magazines, and all the shine and brave show of warlike preparation, it was difficult to believe that any semi-organized hordes of Afghans had lately been surging round its ramparts, and were even now insulting us with their presence only a few miles off. From the day we left Khelat-i-Ghilzai, the General's sole pre-occupation was to force Ayoub to have it out somehow; as he caught sight of the enemy's piquets extending from the Golden Mine Pass westward to Babar Wali and beyond, he may well have felt that his enemy was delivered into his hand.

Unlike the northern capital, Kandahar does not lie in the shadow of lofty hills; but about three miles off from the north, westward, to the south, there runs a bare, serrated range, with many a fantastic peak and clearly-cut block showing against the sky line:

Behind this screen Ayoub had posted himself. His position might be approached by the Golden Mine and Baba Wali Passes; but the first of these was difficult of access, and the second was strongly held with artillery. Further west, however, there is a great gap in the hills, where the Kandahar plain narrows and runs in the Argandab Valley. To force a passage in this direction, through thickly-sown villages, and gardens, and vineyards, was no child's play. Without masses of well-trained infantry the attempt could not have been made at all. But, on a level with the hills, Ayoub's flank was laid bare, and his line of retreat might be threatened with cavalry. Once more General Roberts gave the first place to the consideration in his plan of attack, and again its peculiar supremacy in Asiatic warfare was made evident.

The struggle and the success are well described.

We may add that the book is printed in clear type, and contains three good maps.

History of Religion in England, from the Opening of the Long Parliament to the End of the Eighteenth Century. By JOHN STOUGHTON, D.D. Six volumes. New and Revised Edition. Hodder and Stoughton. 1881.

TO the present edition of this History a brief allusion was made in the last CHURCHMAN. Dr. Stoughton is well known and greatly respected; and his writings have been warmly recommended by critics of every shade of opinion in religious circles. In a brief prefatory note to the new and revised issue of his History, from which we well may quote, he writes as follows:—

Volumes relative to the History of Religion in England, which I have published within the last twenty years, are now brought together in one harmonious form. Several minor inaccuracies, sure to creep into matter of this kind, have been corrected; valuable criticisms in periodical reviews and private communications have improved the narrative . . . . a few chapters are almost wholly rewritten; but as to important facts and opinions the History remains the same in substance as before. My object throughout has been, not to give prominence to any single ecclesiastical party to the disadvantage of others; but to point out the circumstances of all, and the spirit of each, to brace their mutual relations, and to indicate the influence which they have exerted upon one another. . . . . I have sought to do honour to Christian faith, devotion, constancy, and love wherever they are found, and never to varnish the opposite of these qualities. And I shall esteem it a great reward to be, by the blessing of God, in any measure the means of promoting what is most dear to my heart, the cause of truth and charity amongst Christian Englishmen.

Not every work answers to its preface; but the lines laid down by Dr. Stoughton, as above quoted, really exhibit the principles on which this History has been written. We do not agree with him in all the inferences which he deduces; and in his historical arguments or doctrinal allusions a keen Episcopalian critic, even of the Evangelical school, may here and there pick holes with satisfaction. His regard for fairness, however, stands out upon every page; a few readers may sometimes be reminded that he is a Nonconformist, but all will appreciate his Christian courtesy and reverence for truth.

The six volumes have the following titles:—

The Church of the Civil Wars.
„ of the Commonwealth.
„ of the Restoration.
„ of the Restoration.
„ of the Revolution.
„ of the Georgian Era.

A work of such scope we cannot now pretend to review. Its character is known so well, indeed, that criticism is almost needless. We may supply, however, two or three specimen quotations.

In the first volume, p. 17, we read as follows:—

Anglicanism allowed no exercise of private judgment, but required everybody to submit to the same standard of doctrine, worship, and discipline. Moderate Puritans were to be broken in, and Nonconformists harried out of the land.[1] Whitelocke, when Recorder of Abingdon, was accused and cited before the Council Table because "he did comply with and countenance the Nonconformists then, and refused to punish those who did not bow at the name of Jesus, and refused to receive the sacrament kneeling at the high altar." It might seem a trifle that people should be fined for not attending parish churches; but imprisonment and exile for Nonconformity struck most Englishmen as a stretch of justice perfectly intolerable.

[1] The Scotch King of England declared, "I will harry the Puritans out of the land, or worse."

On Ecclesiastical Courts, we read that "so late as 1636 the Archdeacon of Colchester held forty-two services at four different towns during that single year. The object of the canon law and the ecclesiastical courts being *pro morum correctione et salute animæ*, immoralities such as the common law did not punish as crimes came within the range of their authority, together with all sorts of offences against religion and the Church." Among the charges some seem very strange; such as hanging up linen in a church to dry, matrons being churched without wearing veils, setting up May-poles in church time. Other charges relate to disturbing and reviling the parish ministers; refusing to stand and bow when the Creed was repeated. Brownists ("Independents," or "Congregationalists") were mentioned.[1] Admitting that these Courts, in the rude life of the Middle Ages, might possess some advantages, Dr. Stoughton rightly remarks that they "became the ready instruments of intolerance when great differences in religious opinion had appeared." On those two arbitrary and abominable courts, the High Commission and the Star Chamber, and also on Archbishop Laud's policy, linked with Strafford's imperious illegalities, Dr. Stoughton's remarks are sound and vigorous. He adds—

Rigid ceremonialism, desecration of the Sabbath, sympathy with Roman Catholicism, fondness for imitating popish practices, cruel intolerance, alliance with unconstitutional rule, and clerical immorality, will seem to explain how it was that Puritan feeling surged up so fearfully in 1640.

"The majority of divines at that time," writes Dr. Stoughton, "were thoroughly Anglican or thoroughly Puritan; yet a great many had only partial sympathies with the one or the other. Nor did they form a class of their own." Amongst them—of the middle party, though not "party" men—was Dr. Jackson, sometime Vicar of Newcastle, afterwards Dean of Peterborough (whom Coleridge ranks with Cudworth, More, and Smith as Plotinist rather than Platonist divines) a decided Arminian, and a rather High Churchman, the author of many theological works. Southey ranks Jackson in the first class of English divines; and his writings, says our author, "rise far above sectarian levels, and are suited to enrich and edify the whole Church of God." Dr. Christopher Sutton, author of "Learn to Live" and "Learn to Die," is another theologian of the same class. "The well-known Bishop Hall is a more striking example of the Puritan divine united with the Anglican ecclesiastic."

From page 51, we may extract the following:—

Taking Andrewes and Donne as exponents of Anglican theology, the reader may regard Bolton and Sibbs as representative of Puritan teaching. Their works were exceedingly popular with the Evangelicals of Charles I.'s reign. In rough leather binding they might have been seen on the humble library shelf of the yeoman's house, or in his hands well thumbed, as he sat in his window seat

[1] An interesting account of Robert Browne appears on p. 343. "The Independents of the next age," says Dr. Stoughton, "repudiated any connection with Browne's name, and held his character and history in the utmost abhorrence." Dr. Stoughton also states that a Congregational Church existed in London so early as 1568; and a quotation is given from a certain document which "*bears internal signs of genuineness*," although, adds our author, "it is not said where the original may be found." As at present advised, we regard Browne as the real founder of Congregationalism. The quotation from "Ecce Homo," p. 343, seems to us beside the mark; and the pious and learned author's own words that the Christian religion does not need support from "*political* governments" is not, as we think, a favourable specimen sentence of his arguments. To the position of "Congregationalists," as regards the principle of "National Religion" upheld by Puritans, we may hereafter call attention.

or walked in his little garden. "The Four Last Things" led many to prepare for the future life; and the "Bruised Reed" became honoured as the chief means of Richard Baxton's conversion. The tone of piety in these men partook of a glow and ardour which made their spiritual life at times appear like a rapture, and rendered their death "a perfect euthanasia." . . . . If, to use a figure of Coleridge, the Cross shines dimly in certain Anglican authors, that Cross is all radiant in Puritan theology.

We may add that these volumes are well printed, as to size "handy," neatly bound, and cheap.

Short Notices.

"*The Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools.*" *The Gospel according to St. Matthew. With Maps, Notes, and Introduction.* By the Rev. A. Carr, M.A., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford; Assistant-Master at Wellington College. London: Cambridge Warehouse, 17, Paternoster Row.

In undertaking an edition of the Greek Text of the New Testament, with English notes, for the use of schools, the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press did not think well to reprint the Text in common use. The form of the Text most used in England is that of Stephens's third edition (1550), and the name "Received Text" is popularly given to the Elzevir edition of 1633, based on that third edition. To reprint this Text, no doubt, is to disregard the results of searching and successful investigations of modern days. To prepare an entirely new and independent Text, however, is a very responsible task. Again. The Syndics were unable to adopt one of the more recent critical Texts. It is obvious that they could not leave each contributor to the series to frame his own Text. What was to be done? "They believed that a good Text might be constructed by simply taking the consent of the two most recent critical editions, those of Tischendorff and Tregelles, as a basis." Lachmann and Stephens were to act as balancing weights. "It is hoped," says the Dean of Peterborough (the Editor of the Series), "that a Text formed on these principles will fairly represent the results of modern criticism." At the very time, therefore, when the R. V. brings textual changes to the bar of public criticism, a new Version for Schools is published. With the "Notes," by Mr. Carr, in the volume before us, we are much pleased; so far as we have searched, they are scholarly and sound. The quotations from the Classics are apt; and the references to modern Greek form a pleasing feature. On v. 28 (A. V. "offend thee") *allure them to destruction* is given; not a very precise rendering. But it is correct to say that temptation or allurement is the primary thought in σκανδαλίζειν, and secondly, *to bring into difficulties.*

Conquering and to Conquer. A Sermon preached in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, on Ascension Day, May 26, 1881, at the Consecration of the Bishop of Singapore and Sarawak. By William Cadman, M.A., Rector of Trinity, St. Marylebone, and Prebendary of St. Paul's. Printed at the Bishop's request. London: Kerby & Endean, 190, Oxford Street. 1881.

Among representative dignitaries of the present day no man is more sincerely respected than the author of this Sermon. Whether among those Churchmen who are distinctively Evangelical, as in the Lay and Clerical

Associations—happily now increasing their influence in many counties—and at the annual gathering of clergy under the presidency of the Vicar of Islington, or in the sometimes heated atmosphere of a Church Congress, his words are listened to with respect and regard. If any of our brethren more or less "High" Church should desire to see what Evangelical Churchmanship really is, its tone and temper, and its truths, we could not do better than invite them to read the sermons or the speeches of Mr. Cadman. The Sermon before us shows that Evangelicals—we did not arrogate the name, as Mr. J. H. Blunt supposes, but we will not abnegate it—are staunch Churchmen upon the good old lines, and that Evangelical Churchmanship is sober, steady, Scriptural. We quote one passage:

(iii.) GREAT RESPONSIBILITIES are awakened to-day. To some minds it may seem of little importance—to ours it calls for devout thankfulness—that the ascended Saviour, in bestowing His gift of ministry upon this branch of His Church to which we belong, calls us in His Providence to work within Apostolic lines. In the calling of our brother now to be consecrated to the office of a Bishop we see the continuity of this gift, and His true interest in the work which He calls His Church to carry on for Him. We cannot but see in reading the Holy Scripture (not to dwell upon the testimony of ancient authors), that of those first ministers of the Church to whom the name of Presbyter and Bishop might be alike applied, there were some who were charged with peculiar duties. The four chief particulars of those duties correspond with what we now attribute to the office of a Bishop. These were and are—

a. The ordination of other ministers.—Titus was left in Crete to ordain elders in every city.

b. The superintendence of the doctrine of those ministers.—Timothy was to abide at Ephesus that he might "charge some that they teach no other doctrine."

c. The superintendence of their conduct.—The direction was, not to receive an accusation against an elder except at the mouth of two or three witnesses. To receive charges and hear evidence implies the position of a judge.

d. The taking order for the regulation of such matters as were not settled by Divine command. Things that were wanted were to be set in order.

We cannot but believe that these directions were given by the Spirit of Wisdom, and that if the carrying of them out was a blessing to the Early Church, they surely ought not to be despised by us.

It is not, then, in a spirit of boasting, but of humble thankfulness, that we avow our belief that the heritage of Apostolic truth, and the example of Apostolic effort, have been handed down to us in connection with Apostolic order.

On the Present Disquietude in the Church. A Letter to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Lincoln. By CHR. WORDSWORTH, Bishop of Lincoln. Pp. 54. Rivingtons. 1881.

In this Letter appear many wise counsels. The Bishop's "private opinion," does not prevent him from stating the facts of the case in regard to the administration of Law and Ecclesiastical Courts. Taken together with Dr. Blakeney's Swansea Church Congress Paper (and we venture to add Dr. Blakeney's Article in THE CHURCHMAN), the Letter of Bishop Wordsworth supplies an admirable statement—sufficiently complete—in regard to the points just now so eagerly discussed. The esteemed and honoured Bishop says:—

As for the "*Reformation Settlement*," as it is called, the action of Parliament was, as we have seen, precisely the same at that time as it is now; Parliament enacted the "Statute of Appeals" in A.D. 1533, which regulated the manner in which the Royal Supremacy was to be exercised in Ecclesiastical causes—namely by the *Court of Delegates*, which our best Divines do not hesitate to call a *Spiritual* Court, not because it consisted of *spiritual persons* (for this was not the case), but as having authority in spiritual causes. And this "Statute of Appeals" remained in force, as we have also seen, for three centuries; and, as

has been already shown, this mode of Parliamentary action was defended by all our greatest divines, such as Richard Hooker, and Bishop Andrewes, and others during that time.

If the "Judicial Committee of Privy Council" is to be condemned as a "*State-made Court, consisting of State-made Judges,*" the same condemnation must be pronounced on "The Court of Delegates," which was our Court of Final Appeal from the Reformation to our own age.

They, therefore, who appeal to the "Reformation Settlement" ought to acquiesce in this Parliamentary action; but if they condemn this Parliamentary action, they have no right to invoke the "Reformation Settlement."

The fact is, if the Judicial Committee had nothing to fear but the censure of those who seem to misapprehend the matter, and call it a "State Court," a "Secular Court created by Parliament for taking cognizance of Spiritual causes which ought to be judged only by spiritual persons," it need not be very uneasy.

The Humiliation of Christ. The Sixth Series of the Cunningham Lectures. Second edition, revised and enlarged. By ALEX. B. BRUCE, D.D., Professor of Divinity, Free Church College, Glasgow. Pp. 450. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1881.

This book should have received an earlier notice. Dr. Bruce is known as an author of a valuable work—"The Training of the Twelve," scholarly, sober, and really suggestive. We are by no means surprised to see a second edition of his Lectures on "The Humiliation of Christ," which we read with satisfaction when they first were issued. The subject is difficult, but important, and, for theological students, full of interest. Dr. Bruce writes with reverent carefulness, and everywhere exhibits sound judgment. The rendering of Philipp. ii. 5–9, in the Revised New Testament is that which he advocated. The A. V. *thought it not robbery to be equal. . . .* which follows the post-Nicene Latin Fathers, is not suited to the connection or the grammatical construction. On page 217 we read an analysis of the views, "crude, undigested, and nondescript," of Mr. Haweis. Being "an eclectic and a child of the Zeitgeist, under its English form," that clergyman "utters opinions on the subject of Christ's Person which defy classification." "The incarnation taught by Mr. Haweis has more resemblance to that believed in by the worshippers of Brahma than to that embodied in the creed of the Christian Church."

A Chaplet for the Church. Original Christian Melodies. By JOHN DAWSON HULL, B.A., Vicar of Wickhambrook, Suffolk. Pp. 120. Elliot Stock.

Mr. Hull is known to us as the author of some thoughtful and experimental sermons, thoroughly evangelical. As a writer of hymns and poems he is entitled to the praise of evident earnestness and true Christian sentiment. Some of his melodies are pleasing and expository. The little book is tastefully got up.

The Roman Breviary. A Critical and Historical Review, with copious classified extracts. By C. H. COLLETTE. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Pp. 116. W. H. Allen & Co. 1880.

An earlier notice of the new edition of Mr. Collette's work should have appeared in these columns. We content ourselves, at present, with recommending it as showing the real character of the Breviary, a book of lying wonders, forgeries, and follies, to the truth of which the Church of Rome is positively pledged.

Royal Geographical Readers. No. 3. *The British Empire.* T. Nelson & Sons.

This is a delightful little book; by far the best thing of the sort, so far as we know.

A Plea for the Poor South of the Thames. By the Rev. C. H. GRUNDY, Organizing Secretary of the Rochester Diocesan Society. *The Church of England Pulpit* Office, 160, Fleet Street, E.C. 1881. An interesting sermon.

Messrs. Nelson and Sons have sent us specimens of their *Royal Readers*, third series: No. 1 for Standard I., No. 2 for Standard II., 3 for III., and 5 for V. The "Royal Reader" volumes are well known as among the best (some will say they hold the first place) of illustrated School Reading Books. The new set, the third series, is exceedingly good: "nothing could be better," we should say. The selections are excellent; well varied and full of interest. The questions and explanations are admirable. As to illustrations, type, paper, cover, size of book, we must write in praise; and the books, it should be added, are cheap.

The *Leisure Hour* is an admirable number. We heartily recommend *Friendly Greetings* (R. T. S.).

We have received from Messrs. Benyon and Co. (Fine Art Publishers, Cheltenham) an admirable portrait of Dr. RYLE, Lord Bishop of Liverpool. Large size, well executed, on good paper, this pleasing and expressive likeness of a much-honoured Prelate will ornament many a library. We are greatly pleased with it.

We earnestly invite the attention of our readers to *The Thirty-seventh Annual Report* of that very valuable Society, the Church Sunday School Institute (34, New Bridge Street, Blackfriars, E.C.). The Institute is doing a great work, and deserves to be supported with a generous liberality. We have frequently recommended the *Magazine* and other publications. The organizing work of the Society, we are glad to see, is increasing. As to statistics, only 8,405 parishes in England and Wales made returns; 6,064 parishes did not make returns. The total number of scholars on the books of the Schools in the 8,405 parishes which complied with the request of the Institute is 1,289,273. We should like to see these returns discussed at some length, in the light of the recent census.

We have received the *Report of the Church Missionary Society for* 1880-81; "eighty-second year." Ably edited, it is readable throughout; full, but clear, and interesting. The Committee have done well in publishing in a separate form the valuable article on "Retrenchment and Extension," from the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* of July. We touch on only one or two points in the *Report*, which will, we trust, be widely read, and stir many hearts. Under the heading "East Africa," appear testimonies of Naval Officers to the efficiency and success of the Mission. Captain Brownrigg—*e.g.*, of H.M.S. *London*, was "deeply impressed" with all he saw at Frere Town. Under the heading "Nyanza Mission," including the Mission in Uganda, and the intermediate stations in Usagara and Unyamuezi, we find much interesting information. In Mpwapwa, Dr. Baxter is the secular head of the Mission, Mr. Price the ordained missionary, and Mr. Cole the agriculturist. There is a good map showing the routes between the coast and the lakes. Concerning Mtesa, the Committee can only say that their great enterprise was begun and carried in a spirit of prayer; results are God's. May the blessing of our gracious Master rest upon their agents, here and elsewhere! Our love for this noble Society grows year by year.

We hear with lively interest that the Rev. Canon Carus has now completed for publication some Memorials of the illustrious and venerated McIlvaine, late Bishop of Ohio. On many accounts these tidings excite

pleasing thought. The biographies of the great and good rank high among the publications which enrich English literature; and among these we place in the first rank the reminiscences of the distinguished heroes in the fight of faith. Next to the inspired Word of God, such volumes have contributed largely to give solace, instruction, and delight to Christian readers. Many a weary minister has received peace and holy reflections from such hallowed pages. Hence it is a matter of regret that so few of these Christian volumes have been translated into the language of other countries. It is our high appreciation of their value that leads us to hear with joy that our shelves are about to receive an important addition to their wealth. The fame of Bishop McIlvaine is world-wide. His labours, his zeal, his eminent gifts, his writings, his example, exalted him to a high place in love and admiration, not only in his own country, but in this land, where he was so well known by his visits and by his reputation. Sad, indeed, would it have been if his memory had only lived in the hearts of those who personally knew him. We cannot repress the expression of our thankfulness that the Memoir of such a Prelate will soon be in our hands. We indulge the hope that in our next Number we shall be enabled to introduce our readers to a summary of the contents of a volume to which we now bespeak attention. There never, perhaps, was a day in which such a publication was more needed, and more likely to be an extensive blessing.

THE MONTH.

THE Bishop of Derry and Raphoe, at the close of his Charge, largely occupied with a friendly notice of the New Testament Revision, thus speaks of the Irish Church Act and the Land Bill:

We live, I repeat, in a land of ruins that have no history and no beauty—the ignoble trophies of statesmen who legislate in passion or in panic. The ruined glebe-house and the alienated Church-lands may soon have in their neighbourhood ruined mansions and broad acres parcelled out in small lots between impoverished peasants. We have probably not seen quite the last of the abject theatrical penance in which English statesmen love to pose themselves before the world: atoning for the intolerance of English Parliaments in the last century by plundering the Irish Church in the present, redeeming the selfishness of English tradesmen and manufacturers in the reign of King William III. by a vicarious flagellation inflicted upon the Irish landlords in the reign of Queen Victoria. We may have other "messages of peace" sent over to us with their carriage unpaid, profitable to the senders and the belligerents, tremendously costly to those "who are quiet in the land," and to them only. The prospect, indeed, is gloomy enough. An agitation which threatens to be chronic in the North is communistic rather than national; in the South national and communistic in about equal degrees. The endowment of outrage elevated into scientific brutality by the certain impunity which it

has attained naturally perpetuates outrage. Every interest languishes, every higher pursuit is unheeded, in the monomania of the day. Ultramontanism itself seems yielding to the solvent of Communism.

The condition of Ireland is truly deplorable.[1]

The Land Bill has, at length, passed through Parliament. Together with the Coercion Act, it consumed nearly the whole of the legislative time of this memorable, melancholy Session. We hope the Land Act may have a fair trial.

A grand discovery has been recently made at Deir-el-Báhari, near Thebes. Of the thirty-nine mummies of royal and priestly personages discovered, twenty-six are accurately known. No archæological deposits on the same scale have been disinterred since Sir Henry Layard revealed the glories of Nineveh.

The Bishop of Liverpool proposes to hold his first Diocesan Conference in November. His Lordship addressed a friendly letter to the President and members of the Wesleyan Conference assembled in Liverpool; a cordial reply was sent.

Some correspondence has been published concerning the sale of Mr. Green's furniture for the payment of costs. The course pursued by the Church Association, which we much regret, will inevitably excite odium; it cannot possibly do any good.[2]

Earl Beauchamp's Discharge of Contumacious Prisoners Bill, having the commendable object of releasing Mr. Green from prison, has passed through the House of Lords. We fear it will be blocked in the House of Commons.

The speech of Mr. Mundella, in moving the Education Estimates, was satisfactory, and full of interest.

Lord Stanley of Alderley, in the House of Lords, called atten-

---

[1] In the *Times* which contained the above extract from the Bishop of Derry's Charge, appeared this item of news:—"The Orange Emergency men engaged in cutting hay on the Boycotted farm at Birdhill, near Limerick, are now protected by a large force of military and police, including a party of Engineers and men of the Army Service Corps. The constabulary are planted in the hedges fully armed, and the peasantry confine themselves to groaning at the Emergency men. No meetings of the peasantry have been held."

[2] As to the St. Vedast case, Mr. James Girdlestone, "Solicitor to the Churchwardens," writes, in the *Record*: "For seven years Mr. Dale, as the Rector of St. Vedast, successfully occupied himself in carrying out the policy of the English Church Union by defying both the laws of the Church of England and its authorities in the persons of the Churchwardens of the parish, the Bishop of the diocese, and the Dean of the Court of Arches. During the greater part of that term he drew the full profits of the benefice, and throughout that term he cast upon the Churchwardens most of the heavy expense of the cumbrous and dilatory ecclesiastical litigation which culminated in his defeat; and now a plea is raised that he cannot afford to pay a sum amounting to less than half-a-year's income of the benefice."

tion to the action of the Ministry towards the Church of England in Ceylon. Lord Kimberley replied that it was unjust to continue the endowment of Anglicans and Presbyterians, while Roman Catholics, Mohammedans, and Hindoos are not subsidized. The Archbishop of Canterbury pointed out, however, that the exemption from taxation of the Buddhist temple lands is a very considerable endowment.

We have received a copy of the Report of the Proceedings at the first meeting of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences. This meeting was held in London, on July 7th, and allusion was made to it in the last CHURCHMAN. We have read the authorized *Report* with pleasure. In twenty-eight pages it gives a list of the clergymen and laymen summoned as Members, or "invited to be present," a summary of the speeches and papers, and much interesting matter. A short statement (preliminary), by the Venerable the Archdeacon of Ely, explained the position. The Archdeacon said:

> For some years past the need and value of some organization, which should fairly represent the views and aims of Clergy and Laity alike, for the greater efficiency of the Church of England, and the correction of defects and abuses, have been much urged.
>
> The two independent and co-existent Convocations of Canterbury and York, even if reformed and enlarged in their representation of the Clergy, could by no means meet the object aimed at, inasmuch as the Laity would still be excluded from taking any part in their deliberations. So strongly has this defect been felt, that an influential Society has for years been striving to alter the whole constitution of the Convocations by the admission of the Laity, as well as by transforming the whole into one united assembly of Clergy and Laity of both Provinces.
>
> To meet in part the strong desire for lay co-operation expressed in so many quarters, the Southern Convocation, a few years back, resolved that it was desirable to associate with Convocation a Lay House. But, notwithstanding many debates and petitions and efforts on the subject, there might seem to be, in the view of many in high authority, insuperable difficulties in the way of reforming and enlarging the Clerical representation of the Lower House of the Southern Convocation, without going to Parliament: with like or greater difficulties in the way of the introduction of Laity in any form, or of uniting the two provinces in one Convocation."

Two years ago some leading members of various Conferences met together for the purpose of considering what steps could be taken for bringing out the deliberate views of Churchmen on pressing subjects of interest, and to promote co-operation.[1] Archdeacon Emery, proceeding, said:

[1] A "Resolution," we read, was forwarded by the Archdeacon of Ely, as Chairman of the Meeting, to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Pro-

The result of the answers generally to the invitation notice and agenda paper tends to prove undeniably that the feeling which prompted the formation of this Council is deep and almost universal, and the sympathy therewith most encouraging. Not half a dozen unfavourable criticisms have been received, after very extensive correspondence, whilst many letters from acknowledged leaders of Church opinion of all political views in Church and State have enthusiastically welcomed this effort to draw all more closely together for practical Church objects, with due respect to our ancient Convocations and to the Constitution of the land.

The present meeting must, indeed, be considered rather in the light of a constituent assembly brought together, in a tentative way, to meet long-repressed aspirations which past important gatherings of Clergy and Laity have fostered and developed.

To this subject we shall return. Meantime, we may remark that we thoroughly agree with *The Guardian:* elections for the Central Council, and for the Diocesan Conferences, should be as free as possible, and the representatives should be really representative men.

---

vinces of Canterbury and York, but no united or definite proposition from their Lordships resulted,

Meanwhile, opportunities were afforded of testing the views of the Conferences themselves on this plan of a Central Council, by the meeting of the Conferences of Ripon, Norwich, St. Asaph, Winchester, Chichester, Lichfield, Truro, Ely, Rochester, Salisbury and Canterbury. At all but the last two it was found the feeling was either unanimous, or by considerable majorities, in favour of nominating Clerical and Lay representatives to such a Council; whilst, in the case of the last two, the subject was referred to Committees to report further thereon.

In several other Dioceses, where hitherto no opportunity has been offered to test the opinion of the Conference, the Bishops have readily agreed to nominate for this first meeting certain members, who might thus be able hereafter to explain to their several Conferences the proposed constitution, plans, &c., of the Central Council. Thus, in an informal way, the Dioceses of Bangor, Lincoln, Manchester, Bath and Wells, Carlisle, Chester, and St. Albans are represented at this meeting. It was deemed so desirable to call together this first meeting at as early an opportunity as possible, that time has failed to obtain concurrence or sanction in other Dioceses; but, from the almost unanimous support and influential sympathy already extended to this movement, a good hope is cherished that on future occasions the remaining dioceses which have conferences may, with the sanction and concurrence of their bishops, be represented also. To test opinions still further amongst leading Churchmen, and to give greater weight to this first novel gathering of clergy and laity from both provinces, it was determined, by those chiefly responsible for the movement, to invite the presence and help of other Churchmen well-known for the active share they take in promoting the best interests of the Church of England.

Among the representative men "invited," we may remark, were Mr. Hugh Birley, M.P., Sir T. Brassey, M.P., Sydney Gedge, Esq., Sir J. H. Kennaway, M.P., Prebendary Cadman, and Canon Fenn.

INDEX TO VOL. IV.