

Theology on the *Web*.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

—♦—
VOL. XII.
—♦—

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

the Revisers "deliberately expelled PRESBYTERS from the first Christian Council," and "by a side-wind set up LAY-ELDERS in their room," is the charge which the eminent Reviewer makes. Why in the world should the Revisionists have given "the Apostles and THE ELDER BRETHREN"? "Will any of those who are responsible for the innovation . . . venture to maintain that it is probably a correct way of rendering the original? We suspect that, were they to do so, "999 unprejudiced men (moderately acquainted with Greek) out of 1000, would be heard to flout them for their pains. How can "you pretend (men would be heard to ask) that the phrase *οι Ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ Πρεσβύτεροι*, which confessedly means 'the Apostles and the Presbyters,' and no other thing, in ver. 2, and again in ver. 4, and again in ver. 6, and again in ver. 22, suddenly means something essentially different in ver. 23; where it is clear that the selfsame persons are still being spoken of? Turn the page, and note that in ch. xvi. 4, *with reference to this very document*, the selfsame phrase (*οι Ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ Πρεσβύτεροι*) recurs; and this time, by your own showing, it means the identical thing it meant in verses 2, 4, 6, and 22 of the preceding chapter. On what principle, then, do you propose to defend your inconsistency? You have made an ordinary adjective of what, immediately before and immediately after, you recognised to be a substantive noun—the established designation of a well-known order of men. Do you not know that you may not thus,—only because it is etymologically possible to do so,—entirely shift your ground? The Sultan of Turkey, for instance, five times in succession spoken of as 'the *Grand Signor*', may not on the fifth occasion be translated 'the *grand old man*'; more especially if the expression occurs in the superscription of letters from 'the Sublime Porte to her Britannic Majesty, and is to appear in a 'Blue Book.' The supposed case is strictly parallel with what has been actually effected in the R.V. of Acts xv. 23. And let us not be reminded that, in the latter case, the added word (*ἀδελφοί*, claimed to be in opposition,) is harsh, is even unprecedented. Does not that very circumstance (we reply) bring you to your senses? For who is to be blamed for the difficulty of the expression (such as it is) but yourselves?"

The last article in the *Quarterly* is headed, "The Gladstone Ministry: a Retrospect." Of its power there can be no question; it will be largely read outside Conservative circles probably; and in a pamphlet form, perhaps. Here is one sentence: "It is estimated that fully 9,000 British soldiers have been killed or invalidated in Mr. Gladstone's Egyptian campaigns, and 60,000, at the very least, have perished on the other side."

THE MONTH.

THE Conservative Ministry has settled to work, and the results of several elections have justified Lord Salisbury's acceptance of office. The House of Commons met the new Ministers in a very friendly spirit, and Sir Wilfrid Lawson's characteristic protest was supported by two votes. Mr. Gladstone accepted Lord Salisbury's statement of policy in regard to the defence of Afghanistan.

The Marquis of Salisbury, Prime Minister, is Minister of

Foreign Affairs. The Earl of Iddesleigh (Sir Stafford Northcote) is First Lord of the Treasury. Lord George Hamilton is Secretary of the Admiralty.

The state entrance of Lord and Lady Carnarvon into Dublin was the occasion of a great ovation; the demonstrations of disloyalty were slight. The noble Earl's speech in the House of Lords on the abandonment of the Crimes Act had given pleasure to the people, doubtless; and the experiment of governing Ireland by firmly administering the ordinary law is perhaps worth trying.

The Duke of Argyll's masterly speech in the Lords, an exhortation to Liberals not to make common cause with extreme Radicals, may influence many.

The Lower House of Convocation decided by 45 votes to 22 to replace the eighth resolution relative to the house of laymen which had been struck out by the Upper House. The Archbishop of Canterbury stated that there was no real difference between the Houses.

In his recent Charge the Bishop of Ely has again called attention to the union, here and there, of small contiguous country parishes, a reform from the first advocated in *THE CHURCHMAN*.

A letter of a staff officer in Egypt to the *Times*, describing the evacuation of Dongola, furnishes a sad commentary on Mr. Gladstone's Egyptian policy, or absence of policy. In an article on this letter the *Guardian* says:

The staff officer tells us what is seen and felt by the witnesses of this "evacuation." The poor inhabitants are seen from Dongola "floating down the river on their own sakeeyah-wheels, looking inexpressibly melancholy." They have lost their little all, their "patch of river frontage, with its sakeeyah and its cow," and they have nothing else in the world to live upon. Not less, we are told, than 12,700 of these unhappy peasants have "cleared out of the place, every one of whom is ruined, and the mass of whom will starve." And this is our doing. Last autumn, when our troops first went there, "the whole province was, as things go in this country, well-to-do and prosperous." We have come and gone, and left behind us a wilderness. The whole place is desolate, and the town is absolutely deserted. "We have turned all the inhabitants, who were fairly thriving before, into wanderers and beggars, and many of them, no doubt, will die of hunger, and nobody at home," the writer adds, with a just indignation, "so far as I can judge, gives all this a thought." . . . Those who actually witness the misery caused by them may well wonder, as this staff officer does, "whether the English nation—taken as a nation—has any conscience at all." He sees all this going on before his eyes, and does not find that it produces "the slightest stir of any sort or kind at home." He can but enter his own protest against this callous indifference, and describe in emphatic terms how it looks to him on the spot. "I do not believe," he writes, "that any nation ever committed a more cold-blooded, cowardly, wicked act of selfishness than we have done in our evacuation of Dongola."

These are strong words; but they are not stronger than the occasion justifies, and they are, unhappily, words which might be applied to a

great deal more than the evacuation of Dongola. The abandonment of friends, servants, allies, and dependents seems to have been the uniform policy of the late Ministry and expiring Parliament all over the world.

Mr. Gladstone's appointment to Stroud Green—of a piece with many of his ecclesiastical appointments—has been severely criticized.

The *Rock* makes a welcome announcement:

The Church Pastoral Aid Society is bringing out a cheap Mission Hymnal for the use of clergymen holding missions in their parishes. The price at which it is to be issued is one penny. The hymns number over two hundred and fifty, and comprise a number of mission-hall favourites, together with many of the older Church of England hymns, which have become almost as much hallowed in the minds of the Church-going public by their age as by their subject matter.

The publication of General Gordon's *Journals* has brought forth much strong, but apparently, as a rule, quite justifiable comment. On November 8th Gordon wrote:

If it is right to send up an expedition now, why was it not right to send it up before? It is all very well to say one ought to consider the difficulties of the Government, but it is not easy to get over a feeling that "a hope existed of no expedition being necessary, owing to our having fallen." As for myself, personally, I feel no particular rancour on the subject, but I own I do not care to show I like men, whoever they may be, who act in such a calculating way, and I do not think one is bound to act the hypocrite's part and pretend to be friendly to them. If a boy at Eton or Harrow acted towards his fellows in a similar way, I *think* he would be kicked, and *I am sure* he would deserve it. . . . Remember, also, that I do not judge the question of abandoning the garrisons or not: what I judge is the indecision of Government. They did not dare say, "Abandon the garrison," so they prevented me leaving for the Equator, with the determination not to relieve me, and the *hope* (well! I will not say what their *hope* was) ("March, April, . . . August, why! he ought to have surrendered, he said, six months")—there is my point of complaint.

At the annual meeting of the Church Defence Institution, the Bishop of Durham in the chair, some stirring speeches were made.

At the Mansion House banquet to the Bishops, his Grace of Canterbury deprecated the Church drifting into politics in a low sense.

A remarkable address on the secularization of the Panthéon has been delivered in Paris by M. Hyacinthe Loyson. In the midst of applause and tumult, he cried out: "La Croix, je vous le dis, c'est la liberté."

Mr. Bradlaugh, by 263 votes to 219, has again been defeated in the House of Commons.

We have to record the death of Dr. Moberly, the aged Bishop of Salisbury.

A baronetcy has been conferred upon Mr. Fowler, the universally esteemed Alderman and Member of Parliament, second time Lord Mayor of London.