
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

CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1885.

ART. I.—THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. II.

THE USE OF ITALICS, AND THE DOCTRINAL WORDS.

THE eye of the most cursory reader will be struck with the great reduction of *italics* in the Revised Version. This is a great advantage, and the only doubt is whether the Revisers may not have gone a little too far. We still read "the *evil* Spirit from God" in 1 Sam. xvi. 23, and "*he made* the stars also" in Gen. i. 16. New italics are occasionally introduced, as in Isa. xxvii. 12, "the Lord shall beat off *his fruit*;" whilst the sense conveyed by others is altered, frequently for the better. This is notably the case in 2 Sam. i. 18, where we read, "He bade them teach the children of Judah *the song of* the bow," instead of "*the use of* the bow." In 1 Kings xi. 29, the sense is made much clearer by introducing the name of *Ahijah;* for in the Authorised Version it was not clear whether it was Ahijah or Jeroboam who had clad himself in a new garment. A missing link in Saul's genealogy is supplied in italics in 1 Chron. viii. 29; at first this seems a bold step, but a reference to the next chapter, where we have a second copy of the genealogy, shows that the name must have been dropped out from the earlier copy by some accident. A similar thing had already been done in the A.V. in 1 Chron. ix. 41. The word "flesh" is rightly put in italics in 1 Chron. xvi. 3. We are not so sure that the Revisers are right in substituting "Jordan at Jericho" for "Jordan *near* Jericho" in Num. xxvi. 3 and other passages. The expression is a peculiar one, and the word *at*, if selected at all, ought certainly to have been in italics.

There is no doubt that our Bibles have hitherto been over-

loaded with italics. A third of the supplementary words thus indicated might have been left out altogether, another third might have been printed in Roman characters, and the third remaining would have been all that was needed. A few instances will show the difficulty of deciding what ought to be done.

(*a*) The Hebrew text generally needs no *copula*, but English demands it. At times, however, there is an uncertainty as to what is the exact force of the original. Shall we say "Blessed *is* the man'? "Blessed *be* the man"? or "Blessed *shall be* the man"? in other words, shall we make the utterance a statement, a prayer, or a prophecy? In Deut. xxvii. the A.V. makes the curses to be imprecations, but in the following chapter the blessings and curses are treated as prophecies. The Revisers have done the same, but have dropped the italics.

(*b*) In Deut. ii. 13 the A.V. begins, "Now rise up, *said I*," etc., making the exhortation to rise up a thing of the past, and consequently part of the narrative. The Revisers have struck out altogether the words "said I," thereby making the sentence rather ambiguous. In a similar case, 1 Chron. xxiii. 5, we read, "the instruments which I made, *said David*, to praise therewith." Here the Revisers felt constrained to retain the italics. They have done the same thing in Nahum ii. 8, "Stand, stand, *they cry*," etc. The word "*saying*" is retained in italics in Ps. ii. 2, and in some similar passages.

(*c*) In the case of prepositions perhaps the most noteworthy idiom in the Hebrew is that which our translators render "Thou that dwellest *between* the cherubim." The Revisers do away with the italics, and translate, "Thou that sittest upon the cherubim." This certainly gives a very different sense. In the one case God is represented as enthroned on the Propitiatory or mercy-seat; in the other case He is regarded as high and lifted up above it, and borne upon the cherub's wings which are turned inward.

(*d*) The word *and* was introduced sometimes very needlessly in the A.V. Thus in Ps. x. 10 we read, "He croucheth *and* humbleth himself;" here the Revisers properly translate, "He croucheth, he boweth down." In Ps. xlix. 5, the word *when* ought to have been printed in italics, for the obvious reason that the verse is capable of another rendering than that given. It was printed rightly in the A.V. In Gen. xxxi. 30 we read, "*Though* thou wouldest needs be gone, *yet* wherefore hast thou stolen my gods?" The Revisers here retain the italics; but would it not have been more forcible to strike out the word *Though* altogether, and perhaps the word *yet* also? We should thus have an indication of the suppressed temper of the speech. In numbers of passages the words *as* or *like* are in italics in

the A.V. Sometimes the Revisers have retained the italics, as in Ps. xi. 1; and in other cases the words have been printed in Roman letters, as in Ps. xii. 6. It is hard to see the exact principle on which the Revisers have varied their course in this matter.

(*e*) The Hebrew writers sometimes omitted a name, when a particular person was conspicuously in their mind. Instances of this may be seen in Gen. xxi. 33, Ex. xxxiii. 9, and Num. xxiii. 15; in these cases the Revisers have followed the A.V.; but in Lev. xxiv. 11, 16, they have varied their method, putting in the one case "the son of the Israelitish (why not Israelite?) woman blasphemed the Name," and in the other "he blasphemeth the name *of the* LORD."

(*f*) Amongst other Hebrew expressions which call for supplementary words in English the following may be mentioned:

Gen. xxxiii. 8: "What **meanest* thou by all this drove?"
Ps. iii. 8: "Salvation **belongeth* unto the Lord."
Ps. cxviii. 2: "His mercy *endureth* for ever."
Eccl. viii. 2: "I *counsel thee* to keep the King's commandment."
Ps. xvi. 6: "the lines are fallen unto me in pleasant **places*."
Ps. iv. 6: "Who will shew us *any* good?"
Ps. ix. 18: "The expectation of the poor shall **not* perish for ever."
Ps. lxxv. 5: "Speak **not with* a stiff neck."
Gen. xviii. 28: "wilt thou destroy all the city for **lack of* five?"
Gen. xxiv. 60: "be thou *the mother of* thousands."
Gen. xxiv. 67: "he was comforted after his mother's **death*."
Num. xiv. 28: "*As* I live, saith the Lord."
Num. xxiii. 20: "I have received *commandment* to bless."
1 Sam. xx. 16: "Jonathan made a **covenant* with the house of David."

In this list, which is printed from the A.V., the Revisers have turned the italics into Roman characters where the words are marked with an asterisk. In each case their course is defensible, on the ground that there is no doubt about the translation; but whether it is expedient is another matter. The New Testament student looks to such passages as these to justify his translation of other passages, which might easily be enumerated; and we are not sure if the peculiar characteristics of the Hebrew ought not to be indicated in all such cases, —whether by italics or in some other way.

Another list may be noted, containing idioms about which there is no uncertainty, where it is a question whether to print in italics or not. The following samples are the most note-

worthy: "the dry **land*," "the tenth **month*," "the first **day* of the month," "a thousand **pieces* of silver," "full of *years*," "the third **generation*," "torn **with beasts*," "bitter **herbs*," "gathered *unto his people*," "tread *the grapes*," "shut *the door*," "gird *sackcloth* upon *your* loins." These passages are marked on the same principle as those given above, so that the tendency of the Revisers can again clearly be seen.

We supply one more list, which will illustrate still more clearly the need of supplementary words in English, and the course pursued.

Ex. xxxiv. 7: "that will by no means clear *the guilty*." R.V. the same.

Deut. xx. 19: "The tree of the field *is* man's *life*." R.V., "Is the tree of the field man?"

Judges ii. 3: "they shall be *as thorns* in your sides." R.V. the same.

Judges x. 11: "*did* not *I deliver you* from the Egyptians?" R.V. substantially the same.

1 Sam. ii. 32: "in all *the wealth* which *God* shall give Israel." R.V. prints "the wealth."

2 Sam. i. 21: "*as though he had* not *been* anointed with oil." R.V. omits words printed in italics.

2 Sam. xv. 32: "*when* David was come to the top *of the Mount*." R.V., "when David was come to the top *of the ascent*."

2 Kings x. 24: "*he that letteth him go*, his life *shall be* for the life of him." R.V. substantially the same.

2 Chron. xi. 22: "*he thought* to make him a king." R.V. substantially the same.

Job iii. 23: "*why is light given* to a man whose way is hid?" R.V. the same.

Job xi. 6: "God exacteth of thee *less* than thine iniquity *deserveth*." R.V. all in Roman letters.

Job xx. 11: "his bones are full *of the sin* of his youth." R.V. omits the words in italics.

Job xxiii. 6: "he would put *strength* in me." R.V., "he would give heed to me."

Job xxxiv. 31: "I have borne *chastisement*, I will not offend *any more*." R.V. the same.

Job xxxv. 3: "what profit shall I have, *if I be cleansed* from my sin?" R.V., "more than if I had sinned."

Job xxxv. 8: "thy wickedness *may hurt* a man as thou *art*; and thy righteousness *may profit* the son of man." R.V. substantially the same.

Ps. vii. 11: "God is angry *with the wicked* every day." R.V. omits words in italics.

Ps. xxvii. 13: "*I had fainted,* unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord." R.V. the same.
Ps. xxxiv. 17: "*the righteous* cry," etc. R.V. the same.
Ps. liv. 7: "mine eye hath seen *his desire.*" R.V., *my desire.*
Ps. xc. 8: "our secret *sins,*" etc. R.V. in Roman letters.
Ps. ciii. 9: "neither will he keep *his anger* for ever." R.V. the same.
Ps. cix. 4: "I *give myself unto* prayer." R.V. the same.
Ps. cxxxix. 16: "In thy book all *my members* were written." R.V. the same.
Prov. xviii. 17: "he *that is* first in his own cause *seemeth* just." R.V., "he that pleadeth his cause first *seemeth* just."
Amos i. 3: "I will not turn away *the punishment* thereof." R.V., "the punishment."

In some cases the Revisers have avoided italics by hitting upon a rendering that gives the sense without any supplementary words; but it will be seen from the long list now given that they have been somewhat lax in their proceedings, and that it would not be very easy for them to justify their method—if they have a method. We can readily appreciate the rendering of Isa. xxi. 8, "he cried as a lion" (though we should prefer to italicise the *as*), but it is not so easy to approve of Jer. xxiii. 6, "This is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord is our righteousness." One is glad to read in Jer. iv. 2, "They swear, As the Lord liveth," but one misses the little word *yet* in Jer. xxxvii. 4, where the Revisers simply say, "For they had not put him into prison." We still read in Isa. xi. 4, "with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked," instead of "the wicked one" (2 Thess. ii. 8).

We now pass to the consideration of the doctrinal terms of the Old Testament as affected by this Revision. Few things are more important for the Biblical student than a careful study of the sacred terminology of the Hebrew Old Testament, whether as bearing on great moral and theological topics, or in connection with sacred objects and rites. We propose to examine the R.V. to see what has been done with respect to these things.

I. The name of *God* remains unchanged throughout; but a few noteworthy changes have been made in certain passages, where the Hebrew name *Elohim* has been translated in some other way. Thus in Gen. iii. 5 the serpent is now made to say, "Ye shall be as God;" in Dan. iii. 5, on the contrary, Nebuchadnezzar is made to say that "the aspect of the fourth is like a son of the gods." In Exod. xxi. 6, where the A.V. reads, "His master shall bring him unto the judge," the R.V.

reads, "shall bring him unto God;" so in xxii. 8, 9, 28. If the Revisers had put "the gods" in the margin, with a reference to Ps. lxxxii. 6, the reader could have understood what he was about, and our Lord's reference to that passage in St. John's Gospel (x. 34-36) would have completely elucidated the text; but, as matters stand, the effect is doubtful. In 1 Sam. xxviii. 13 the woman now says to Saul, "I see a god coming up out of the earth;" why have not the Revisers indicated that the meaning here is "a judge"? The thought contained in this remarkable usage seems to be that the judges, as the expounders or administrators of the law, were to be representatives of the one living and true God. Where *they* were, there *God* was. Their decisions were to be final.

Another singular use of the word *Elohim* is to be noticed. In Ps. cxxxviii. 1 we read, "before the gods will I sing praises unto Thee." The Septuagint here has, "before the *angels;*" and there are several other places in which the Septuagint has interpreted the word with reference to angels. In this particular passage there may be reference to judges or men of high degree; if so, the fourth verse of the Psalm would convey a similar idea, where we read, "All the kings of the earth shall praise Thee, O Lord, when they hear the words of their mouth." The most important passage to examine in this connection is the eighth Psalm. The fifth verse runs thus in the English Bible, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels;" but the R.V. has, "Thou hast made him but little lower than God." Our old translators were probably guided in their rendering by the fact that the verse is quoted and commented upon in Heb. ii. 7; but the Revisers felt that they must revert to the original. The pity is that when they were about it they did not do it thoroughly. The word "made" introduced into both the Versions is very objectionable. There is nothing about "making" in the Hebrew text. The word which we render "to make lower" should be rendered "to put lower," or simply "to lower," or "to reduce," or "to bereave." The best illustration of the passage as a whole is to be found in the second chapter of the Philippians, where we are told that One who was originally in the form of God emptied Himself of the divine glory by assuming the limitations of manhood. The word translated by the Revisers "but little" would be better rendered "for a little while," as in Ps. xxxvii. 10 and other passages; and thus we should get the true significance of the passage in its bearing on our Lord's incarnation.

The Hebrew word *Elohim* occurs no less than 2,555 times in the Old Testament, in this plural form, and is used of the one living and true God in 2,310 of these passages. There is

a singular form of it ("Eloah") in 57 passages, chiefly in the Book of Job, and in all but 6 passages it is applied to the true God. There is an Aramaic form ("Elah") in Ezra and Daniel, and once in Jeremiah; altogether it is found in 85 passages, of which 72 refer to the true God. The Revisers have not attempted to distinguish between these; and any attempt to do so would have savoured of pedantry. The more simple form *El* is used of the true God in 204 passages, chiefly in conjunction with some other name, and is found especially in Job, the Psalms, and Isaiah. The A.V. begins the eighty-second Psalm thus, "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty;" but the R.V. has, "God standeth in the congregation of God." This sounds very bald. The Hebrew is, "*Elohim* taketh His stand in the gathering of *El*." Would not the Revisers have done better to have left the text as it stood, and to have put a note on it in the margin? If they say No, then let them look at the Hebrew of Exod. xxv. 15, Job xli. 25, where it is possible that we have the same root; and let them look at Ps. xxix. 1, "O ye sons of the mighty," where they have retained the English version, and have put the word "God" in the margin.

Passing on from this word, we call attention to the words in the Revisers' preface concerning the name *Jehovah*. Probably the course there indicated will meet general approval, though we confess that we should have preferred to see the name introduced much more freely. We are glad to see it in Exod. vi. 2, 3, 6, 7, though we know not why it should be printed in small capitals in the first two of these verses, and in ordinary letters in the last two. But ought it not to have come in Exod. xv. 3, "Jehovah is His name," and in Exod. xx. 2, "I am Jehovah thy God," and in Exod. xxxiv. 6, 1 Kings xviii. 39, and other notable passages in later Books, where something special seems to hang upon the name?

The title *Shaddai* is still translated "Almighty." It has been pointed out[1] that the usage of the word is in favour of the rendering "All-sufficient" or "Bountiful" rather than "Almighty;" but it would hardly have been wise on the part of the Revisers to make any alteration. The title *Adonai*, usually translated "Lord," has also been left untouched. A peculiar expression is used of the God of Melchizedek in Gen. xiv. 18, etc., and translated "the Most High God" in the A.V. The R.V. has "God Most High." This title ("Elyon") is used also by Balaam and by Moses, and it occurs several times in the Psalms. In Ps. lxxviii. 35, where we have the exact title contained in Gen. xiv. 18, the Revisers have, for some unac-

[1] "Synonyms of the Old Testament," p. 56.

countable reason, neglected to make the translation consistent. In Micah vi. 6 the expression translated "the high God" is a different one. The word "high" ought to have had a capital letter in this passage, and in others where the peculiar title (*Marom*) is given to God.

Before leaving this particular topic we should notice one or two passages which bear on the nature of God, or on the interpretation of His name. In Exod. iii. 14 the Revisers have wisely retained the rendering "I am that I am;" but they have offered three alternative renderings in the margin; viz., "I am because I am," "I am who am," "I will be that I will be." These three interpretations by no means exhaust all that might be offered; but they are sufficient to set men thinking of the depth of the words before them. In Isa. ix. 6 the only alteration in the titles of the Son is that the three last have been made to harmonize with the two first by depriving them of their definite article. The first verse of Ps. cx. is printed thus: "The Lord saith unto my lord." It seems rather wilful and capricious of the Revisers to print the word "lord" with a little *l*, especially with the Revised Version of the New Testament before them (see Matt. xxii. 44). The only critical defence of the little *l* is the fact that the Hebrew word is here punctuated *adoni* not *adonai*; but it seems to savour rather of pedantry to attach any importance to this.

II. We pass now to certain doctrinal and moral words which run through the Bible, passing from the Old Testament to the New through the medium of the Septuagint. The word to *repent* stands as before. It is chiefly used of God's repentance in the Hebrew Scriptures, and signifies literally to comfort one's self or be relieved. The verb in its simplest form is translated "comfort" in about seventy passages, and although we are always told by the clergy in church that the word "comfort" has lost its old significance, the Revisers have stuck to it. Encouragement rather than consolation is the true idea of the word *nacham* in the Hebrew, and of παρακαλειν in the Greek.

When the Revised New Testament came out, certain people plumed themselves on the idea that *conversion* had gone out of the Book. The *thing*, however, remains, even though the word is altered. The Hebrew word (*shuv*) means to turn or return, and is used very frequently of the great critical change a man makes when he comes back to God with a contrite heart. There are few more earnest calls in the Bible than this, "Return unto Me;" and the soul which obeys this call is "converted."

The idea that people can be *improved* is a popular but not exactly a Biblical one. The expression "amend your ways"

is found several times in Jeremiah, in the A.V., and the Revisers have not altered it. But the Hebrew word means "to make good," that is "to make pleasing to God,"[1] and indicates anything but a gradual improvement.

There has been so much discussion over the doctrine of *perfection* that it is interesting to notice how the Old Testament terminology has been affected by the Revision. In 2 Chron. xxiv. 13, the word "perfect" has been left by the Revisers, but by a mistake. They ought to have used the word "repair" in that verse, and perhaps "restore" in the previous verse where the Hebrew is different. In Jer. xxiii. 20, the word "perfectly" ought to have been "thoroughly." In Ps. cxxxviii. 8, instead of "The Lord will perfect that which concerneth me," we ought to read "The Lord will *perform* that which concerneth me," as in Ps. lvii. 2. The expression in Prov. iv. 18, translated "the perfect day," is literally "the established day," when the sun is fully up. It seems a pity that these different Hebrew words should be translated "perfect," which ought to have been restricted in its usage as narrowly as the Greek Τελειος has been. There are two Hebrew words very like one another, signifying "completion," viz., *Calah* and *Calal;* our translators unfortunately translated them "perfection" in several places, *e.g.*, Job ii. 7, Ps. l. 2, Ps. cxix. 96, Lam. ii. 15, Ezek. xvi. 14. In none of these places singled out for examination have the Revisers thought fit to correct the error of their predecessors. Another Hebrew word (*Shalam*) has three meanings apparently very different from one another, but yet related by an inner bond; the first of these is oneness or wholeness; the second, peace; and the third, restitution or recompense. We shall have to refer to this word presently in another connection, but meanwhile it is to be observed that our translators adopted the rendering "perfect" for it in a few passages, *e.g.*, Deut. xxv. 15 ("a perfect and just weight"); 1 Kings viii. 61, and similar passages ("a perfect heart"); 2 Chron. viii. 16 ("the house of the Lord was perfected"); Isa. xxvi. 3 ("thou wilt keep him in perfect peace"); Isa. xlii. 19 ("who is blind as he that is perfect"). In all these passages, except the last, the Revisers have religiously followed the Old Translation instead of giving English readers a more accurate rendering; but in the last passage they have printed the text thus: "Who is blind as he that is at peace *with me*;" and in the margin, "or made perfect, or recompensed." The usage of the word is really most remarkable, and the Revisers might have brought down the numerous renderings of it to three or four with the greatest advantage. There is usually implied in it either "a

[1] See "Synonyms of the Old Testament," p. 154.

bringing of some difficulty to a conclusion, a finishing off of some work, a clearing away, by payment or labour or suffering, of some charge."[1]

There yet remains the leading word answering to "perfection" in the Old Testament. It has over twenty different renderings in the A.V., and we had hoped that the Revisers would considerably reduce the number. It would be tedious to go through the whole, but a few shall be noticed which illustrate the Biblical doctrine of perfection.

Gen. vi. 9: "Noah was perfect in his generations," A.V. and R.V. The margin of the A.V. suggests "upright" as an alternative, but the R.V. suggests "blameless." Of these two the R.V. is the best, as will be seen by a reference to the usage of the Septuagint; but spotless or unblemished would have been better still.

Gen. xvii. 1: "walk before Me, and be thou perfect," A.V. and R.V. The A.V. puts in the margin "upright, or sincere;" the R.V. has no marginal note.

Deut. xviii. 13: "thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God," A.V. and R.V. The margin is the same as in the previous passage.

2 Sam. xxii. 31, 33: "his way is perfect . . . he maketh my way perfect." No substantial change introduced, and no marginal note. The same is the case in Job i. 1; viii. 20; ix. 20-22; Ps. xxxvii. 37; ci. 2, 6. In the last of these passages the R.V. suggests the word "integrity" in the margin; and this word is certainly useful, and was adopted by our translators in the text in several passages. The idea of the word is by no means sinless perfection in the modern sense, but thoroughness, whole-heartedness (if there is such a word), which will never let a man willingly commit any act of disloyalty to God.

The word *upright* ought to be reserved for the Hebrew *Yashar*. Our translators unfortunately adopted the word "equity" in some places for it, and the Revisers have not been altogether consistent. See Isa. xi. 4, where "equity" is retained; and Mal. ii. 6, where "uprightness" has been put in. The A.V. used the word "upright" in fourteen passages where the word "perfect" ought to have been adopted. The Revisers have corrected two of these; they put the word "integrity" in two others, and the other ten they have left unaltered. Why is this? One would think that one leading object of the Revision was to introduce something approaching uniformity in the use of important words. To walk "uprightly" is very good, but if God's Word uses the expression which we ought

[1] "Synonyms of the Old Testament," p. 160.

to translate "perfectly," why should not the Revisers be true to their Hebrew?

We now come to the important Hebrew word (*Tsadak*) which answers to our words "righteous" and "just." We confess that we should have been pleased if the word "righteous" had superseded the word "just;" it is a far better word, and implies conformity to God's great law of right, which is the law of love, —in other words, it expresses the very nature of God. Sometimes distinctions are drawn in theological works between the righteousness and the love of God; but these distinctions are very dangerous, unless they can be clearly shown from God's Word. Justice to an English mind signifies too often the rendering of a *quid pro quo;* but the Righteousness of God is a very different thing from that. The only solid reason for retaining the Roman words *just* and *justice* is that we need the verb derived from them—to *justify.* This word signifies to *acquit,* or to reckon and pronounce in the right. We have a verb "to right," but it is little used, and after all it does not give quite the sense we need, which the Latin word "justify" fairly expresses; so we must put up with the imperfections of our language, and make sure that we always get beneath the surface and find out the sacred usage of words which so inadequately express the ways of God.

The tendency of the Revisers has been to introduce the words "just" and "justice" more frequently than the words "righteous" and "righteousness;" and for this we are sorry. In dealing with the *verb,* great care has to be used to give the force required by each voice. It is only once used in the reflexive voice, Gen. xliv. 16 (A.V., "How shall we clear ourselves?"). The R.V. has no change; but why did they not put, "How shall we justify ourselves?" What Judah and his brethren wanted was that they should be neither thought, nor pronounced, nor dealt with as guilty; and these are the ideas connected with justification. The word is used once in the passive, viz. Dan. viii. 14, of the cleansing of the Temple. The R.V. has rightly put "justified" in the margin. It is used five times in the intensive voice: in four of these the Revisers have made no alteration; but in Jer. iii. 11 we read, "Backsliding Israel hath shewn herself more righteous" instead of "hath justified herself." The word is used twelve times in the causative voice. The Revisers have left these passages as they stood before. None of them signify the producing a moral change in a person, but the doing justice to persons; that is, the decision in their favour, and the dealing with them accordingly.[1] The last of the twelve is Isa. liii. 11,

[1] These important passages are separately commented on in "Old Testament Synonyms," p. 257.

"By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many." The Revisers have left the text as it stood before; but they have thought fit to put in the margin, "or, make many righteous;" and they have thereby committed a doctrinal blunder. The word *never* means to make a person morally different from what he was: it only has to do with the way in which he is accounted and dealt with. The Lord is first a sin-bearer and then a justifier, and these are the two thoughts in Isa. liii. 11; but there is nothing in this verse about implanted righteousness—that must be looked for elsewhere. There yet remains Dan. xii. 3, where the A.V. and R.V. read, "They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars." This rendering, if correct, would seem to militate against what has now been advanced; but a little reflection will probably lead us to the conclusion that we must interpret the verse in accordance with the last verse of St. James's Epistle. We can no more justify a man than we can convert a man; but we may be the means of bringing men to God in Christ, and then both conversion and justification become accomplished facts.

There still remain twenty-two passages where this verb is used in the active (or rather neuter) voice. These have been translated in the A.V. in no less than four ways, viz., "to be righteous," "to be just," "to be justified," "to justify one's self." The Revisers have only abolished the last of these translations; they might certainly have reduced them to *two*, or (by a right use of the margin) to *one*.

Another word of great interest is that which is ordinarily translated *judgment*. Our translators adopted the word "right" for it in fourteen passages. If the Revisers thought fit to follow the old translation in this respect (which they have generally done), they might have inserted the word "judgment" in the margin. At least, this ought to have been done in Gen. xviii. 25 ("Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?"), where the force of the original is brought out far more clearly by the introduction of the word "judgment." The Biblical idea of judgment is righteous administration of law without respect of persons; and this sense must be borne in mind when we are dealing with special passages.

Several other words were rendered "right" in the A.V. which ought to have been translated in some other way, *e.g.*, Ps. li. 10, "Renew a right spirit within me." The Revisers have left the text as it stood, but have inserted the word "stedfast" in the margin. Instability had led the Psalmist to fall, and he prays for stability; but why not say so in the text? The same word is used in Ps. v. 9, and translated "faithfulness;" see also Ps. lxxviii. 37.

Only one word ought to have been translated "faithfulness," namely, the Hebrew word *Emunah;* whilst the word *Emeth* should always have been translated "truth." The former of these words is generally used of the faithfulness of God; but in Heb. ii. 4 it is man's faith or faithfulness which is spoken of. The Revisers have rightly inserted in the margin in this passage "in His faithfulness." Justifying faith is thus seen in a fuller and more practical light than can be otherwise conveyed. We are glad that in other passages the Revisers have inclined to the word "faithfulness" instead of "truth" as the rendering for *Emunah:* see, *e.g.*, Deut. xxxii. 4; Ps. xxxiii. 4, lxxxix. 49; but here, as in so many other cases, they have not persisted in their good course: see, *e.g.*, Isa. lix. 4.

We pass now from the idea of *faith* to that of *trust.* Although we are much in the habit of regarding these as synonyms, the Old Testament keeps them carefully apart. The Hebrew word generally translated "trust" means "to lean upon;" it is never translated by the Greek πιστευω, "to believe." Another word, which is rendered "trust" about thirty times in the Old Testament, conveys the idea of fleeing for refuge; and this idea might always have been brought out in our translation. Thus Ps. ii. 12 might be rendered, "Blessed are all they that take refuge in him." The Revisers have given this in the note; but why not in the text? In Ps. xxxiv. 8 they have retained the word "trust" without the note; so in Ps. cxviii. 8, Isa. lvii. 13, and Zeph. iii. 12. In Isa. xiv. 32 the translation is corrected, and reads thus, "The Lord hath founded Zion, and in her (? in it) shall the afflicted of his people take refuge."

In Ps. xxii. 8 a peculiar word, signifying "to roll," is used. Our A.V. notified the fact in the margin, but the Revisers have unwisely departed from their course here. In Job xiii. 15 we have a very familiar passage, "though he slay me, yet will I trust in him:" here a word usually rendered *hope* is used, but the Revisers have put in the word *wait* (see also their note). There is no objection to this rendering; in fact, if it had been always used for the Hebrew term in question, the English readers would have distinctly gained. In Isa. li. 5 we meet with it again. Here the A.V. is, "The isles shall wait upon me, and on mine arm shall they trust." The R.V. runs thus, "The isles shall wait for me, and on mine arm shall they trust." But they have neglected to do here what they have done in Job. The truth is, we have in this verse the two Hebrew words usually rendered "hope:" the first of them signifies the straining of the mind in an expectant attitude, and the second signifies patient waiting; so that we

need some such rendering as this, "The isles shall hope for me, and on mine arm shall they wait patiently."

We are sorry that the Revisers have not emphasized the distinction between *grace* and *mercy*. One of these conveys in Hebrew, Greek, and English the idea of freeness and undeservedness; the other, of pity exercised towards one who is helpless. In Prov. xix. 17 we read, "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord;" but this is not the meaning of the sacred text. Why have not the Revisers translated the words according to their true usage? So in Prov. xxviii. 8 and in Job xix. 21. The word signifies not to have pity but to deal graciously in all these passages. It is curious that the old-fashioned and ambiguous word "pitiful" has been preserved by the Revisers in Lam. iv. 10, "The hands of the pitiful women have sodden their own children." There are really two defects in this rendering, for the use of the definite article is as misleading as the use of the word "pitiful." What we need is, "The hands of compassionate women," etc. The Hebrew word expresses the most tender feelings. In two passages the A.V. rendered it "love," viz., in Dan. i. 9 and Ps. xviii. 1. In the first of these the Revisers have rightly put "compassion." The second they have left alone. They could not use the word "compassion," but they could have given the idea of tender feeling.

There is a special Hebrew word for *mercy*, translated ἐλεος by the Septuagint in 135 passages. Our translators, unfortunately, did not keep to one rendering for it, but have sometimes used the words "pity," "favour," "goodness," "kindness," etc. In Ps. lxxxix., verses 33 and 49, the Revisers have rightly put "mercy" instead of "lovingkindness;" but in Hos. vi. 4 they have kept "your goodness is as a morning cloud," and have thereby caused readers to miss the connection between this verse and the sixth ("I desired mercy and not sacrifice").

It would be natural to suppose that the adjective derived from this word would be translated "merciful;" and so it is in some passages, *e.g.* Ps. xviii. 25 ("with the merciful thou wilt show thyself merciful"); but the word seems to have obtained a peculiar significance amongst the Jews; the LXX. renders it ὁσιος, and our translators have frequently adopted for it the renderings "godly," "saint," and "holy." The Revisers must have felt the difficulty of dealing with the word, and all the more so because of its bearing on the New Testament; we do not see, however, that they have mended matters at all. Thus in Ps. lxxxvi. 2 the A.V. reads "I am holy;" whilst in the margin we read "one whom Thou favourest." The Revisers have put into the text "I am godly." Why not "I am merci-

ful"? In Ps. cxlv. 17 the A.V. reads, "the Lord is holy in all his works;" the margin adds "merciful or bountiful:" but the Revisers have discarded all three renderings and have unfortunately substituted the word "gracious." Is not this playing fast and loose with God's Word? Why should we not give to the English readers the benefit of a consistent rendering of important words? In Deut. xxxiii. 8 we read, "let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy holy one." Here the Revisers have substituted "thy godly one," and have put in the margin "him whom Thou lovest;" but in Ps. cvi. 16, where the same word is used in the same connection, the Revisers have kept in the text "the saint," and in the margin "the holy one;" thus they have ingeniously succeeded in obscuring the relationship between these references to a characteristic found in two of the priestly family. In 2 Sam. vii. 15 we have the title-deed of the House of David, and the word "mercy" is retained, and so in 1 Chron. xvii. 13; but, alas! the reference to these passages is lost by the substitution of the word "kindness" in 1 Kings iii. 6 and 2 Chron i. 8, though retained in 2 Chron. vi. 42 and throughout Ps. lxxxix. The other most noteworthy passage where the word occurs is Ps. xvi. 10, still rendered "Thine holy one." We did not expect to find an alteration, but we looked with interest to the margin, where the reader will find "godly or beloved." Why not "merciful"? Is not Christ the embodiment of the divine mercy? Are not the sure mercies of David fulfilled in Him? Let the Greek Testament scholar read St. Paul's speech at Antioch (Acts xiii.); he will find the solution there.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR.

VIII. AUGUST. GOSPEL AND EPISTLE FOR ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY.

A. THE LEARNING OF HUMILITY.

"*Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.*"—MATT. xx. 26, 27.

"*He that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.*"—LUKE xxii. 26.

IT is remarkable that on two successive Saints' Days precisely the same moral lesson, and in nearly the same words, should be set before us in the appointed Gospels.

The occasions upon which the almost identical words were spoken were not the same; but it may be confidently asserted that Jesus Christ very often repeated the same words on various occasions. Again, when He did so repeat them, they have a special claim on our reverential regard. That there was such repetition in the present instance appears evident; and certainly no lesson is more worthy of being reiterated than that which we find in these two passages.

In the former instance it was when St. James and his brother St. John had ambitiously desired to be placed on the right hand and the left hand of the Lord in His[1] kingdom, and when the ten were made indignant by the request, that Jesus "called them to Him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." These words must have been deeply impressed upon those who heard them, and carefully remembered by them afterwards—especially when they were actually engaged in founding the kingdom of Christ. And with none of them would the impression be more serious and abiding than with the two brothers—with John, who was the last of the twelve to leave the earth, and with James, who (after Judas Iscariot) was the first.

In the second instance it was at the most solemn of all moments, even at the Lord's Supper itself, that there again occurred a dispute for precedence; and the Lord said once more, "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve." This saying seems to have been closely connected with the washing of the disciples' feet,[1] when the lesson of humility was impressed upon all of them, and especially upon St. Peter, by a parable in action which could never be forgotten.

This repetition in the appointed Gospels for two successive Saints' Days can hardly be accidental; and perhaps one reason of the arrangement is this, that the grace of humility here described is, above all other graces, characteristic of the Christian saint. There might also be a consciousness, on the part of those who drew up these services, that the circumstances of the case did not admit of any special or minute allusion to these two Apostles. Of St. James, separately from his com-

[1] Luke xxii. 24. [2] John xiii. 1.

panionship with St. John, we know hardly anything, except that he was cut off by an early and cruel martyrdom.[1] And concerning St. Bartholomew we possess no exact information, unless we identify him with Nathanael, which cannot be done with perfect confidence. Hence there is good reason, in this commemoration, for simply giving reiterated attention to this grace of humility, which should be the special object of ambition to everyone who aspires to be a Christian saint.

But what is *humility?* It is essential that we apprehend the right Scriptural meaning of the term; and mistakes are often made on this point. Thus it comes to pass that men fail to achieve good progress in the acquisition of this grace, because an erroneous view of the matter has been taken at the outset.

With many persons, when they think of humility, the one idea in their minds is of abasement before God, confession of unworthiness in His sight, of deplorable sin, and of exceeding corruption in the heart. All this is most true: and it is essential that all this should be acknowledged. But all this may be acknowledged fully and honestly, where yet there may be very little humility. In respect of unworthiness and sin, we are all on the same general level before God. "There is no humility in thinking ourselves no worse than our neighbours." We may be so conscious of the fitness of this general abasement before God, that we may become blind to the pride we are indulging in regard to them. Do we not remember the servant in the parable, who, after freely confessing the enormity of his debt to his master, immediately proceeded, on account of a very small debt, to seize his fellow-servant by the throat?[2]

The humility, of which the New Testament speaks so much, is humility in reference to man. The degree of this humility is ascertained by the estimate we take, or are willing to take, of ourselves in comparison with others. "The essence of humility," it has been well said, "is comparison." And now, without attempting anything further in the way of definition, let us ask ourselves four very simple questions, which are useful in helping us to a clear view of the way in which humility operates, and which thus supply a test for judging of our own position in regard to this most important matter.

1. First, do we readily recognise superiority in others, wherever we find it, whether this superiority be in the form of talent, or wider influence, or more justly deserved popularity? Are we willing to take the place which properly belongs to us, even though that place is not a very high one?

[1] Acts xii. 2.

[2] Matt. xviii. 28.

Can we, without grudging, see others above us? Can we rejoice in the success of one more eminent than ourselves? Can we promote his credit and his prosperity as cheerfully as we should our own? Have we that generous charity which "envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up?"[1]

2. But, secondly (and this is more difficult of attainment), can we yield precedence to others who, on a really fair estimate, are *less* worthy than we are? Can we bear it patiently if a man, who is *not* our superior, is preferred before us? Can we bear to see him praised, when we are conscious that the praise ought to be more properly *ours?* Can we do useful work, and gladly allow others to have the credit? Can we thankfully acquiesce in those Providential arrangements, under which it constantly is brought to pass that "the last" becomes "first," and the first "last?"

3. And, further still, can we bear injury without resentment? With what beauty and what gentleness St. Peter—himself naturally a hot-headed and impatient man—sums up this side of the subject, in the later part of his life! "If, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow His steps: Who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth: Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again; when He suffered, He threatened not; but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously."[2]

4. And then, fourthly, are we able to take any place, however low, if in that low place we can do good? Many of us would be willing to do large service to others, if only we were admired and praised for it, and if, in the doing of it, we were conspicuous. But this is not humility. Again, this may be illustrated by the highest of all examples. Christ was among His disciples as one "that served." We have only once more to recall the scene when Jesus washed His disciples' feet; and His word and His example say to us, "If I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet."[3]

These are four very searching questions. By interrogating ourselves in this way we find how very little real humility we have obtained. We see how contrary this grace is to the obstinate tendency of human nature; and, this being so, we see how characteristic it is of Christianity. This is not a virtue to which any of us are predisposed. And there are two other tests of a general kind which lead to the same conclusion. Other religious systems have recommended some

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 4. [2] 1 Peter ii. 23. [3] John xiii. 14.

virtues, such as temperance, fortitude, patriotism; but this is quite peculiar to the teaching of Christ. Again, in the social life of mankind, whatever form it may take, there is always some kind of aristocracy. We cannot escape from this, however earnestly we may make the attempt. The characteristic aristocracy of the kingdom of heaven is an aristocracy of humility.

B. SOLOMON'S PORCH.

"*They were all with one accord in Solomon's Porch.*"—ACTS v. 12.

A very large amount of the historical and religious interest of the Jewish Temple was concentrated on that part of it which was popularly called "Solomon's Porch." This designation carried the mind back at once to the very beginning from which all this architectural work was dated. The name of the founder lived on at this spot through all successive demolitions and restorations. Something, too, of the original work of Solomon was actually to be seen there: certainly the substructure, consisting of those huge blocks of stone, which are so prominently mentioned in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, and which indeed can be seen to this day.[1] But probably more than this. In such a case, even when a great demolition has occurred, a considerable part of the ancient masonry is left; and, in rebuilding, the old is blended with the new. An obvious parallel is supplied by our cathedrals, in which, for instance, we can commonly trace portions that date from our early Norman kings, side by side with or in combination with conspicuous portions which rose during the reigns of the Plantagenets or Tudors, or which belong to a period even very recent.[2]

We must, indeed, be careful not to press the parallel too closely, or to imagine that the general architectural appearance of Solomon's Temple was similar to the general architectural appearance of an English cathedral. The differences were very marked, corresponding with diversities of climate and diversities in the mode of worship. The Jewish "Temple," taking the word in its widest sense, was a series of large courts open to the sky, and surrounded by handsome colonnades. The "Temple," in its narrowest sense, containing the Holy of

[1] See "The Recovery of Jerusalem."

[2] Good instances are supplied in very different ways, by the Cathedrals of Gloucester, Chester, and Winchester.

Holies, entered once a year by the High Priest, was an extremely small building on the highest ground, in the midst of these courts. It is with the former that we have to do on this occasion. What was sometimes called "the Porch of the Temple" was a mere doorway or entrance to that small sacred building. What is here called "Solomon's Porch" was, strictly speaking, not a porch at all in the English sense of the word, but one of the large open colonnades that surrounded the courts.[1] We might compare it with one side of a cathedral cloister; but we must remember that it was far loftier, and larger in all respects, than the cloisters with which we are familiar. The Jewish historian tells us how Solomon built up the ground above the deep valley on the east side of Jerusalem, and on it erected the colonnade, which ever after recorded his name. And from the same source we obtain information concerning its dimensions and appearance, after the magnificent restoration by Herod, which was just fresh, and indeed hardly complete, in the time of Christ. The whole length of the four sides of the outer court was three-quarters of a mile. The eastern side was "Solomon's Porch." It was a vast gallery of columns in double rows. Each column, thirty-five feet high, consisted of one piece of white marble. The roof above was in panels of cedar-wood. The view through the columns, eastward and outward, ranged across the valley over the Mount of Olives. The inward view was into the court itself, which was planted with trees, and where, at festival times, there were crowds of people.

It is evident that such a place as this would be, for many reasons, a convenient and favourite place of concourse. Beyond any doubt, in the long progress of the Jewish annals, it witnessed many scenes of surpassing interest. Three such scenes are recorded for us in the New Testament itself. It cannot but be profitable to review them one by one; and this train of thought will bring us, by a most natural order, to the subject of the Festival which marks this month.

The first of these scenes is in the Gospel History. Our Lord Jesus is there the conspicuous figure. It was not very long before the close of His ministry. We read in St. John: "It was at Jerusalem the feast of the dedication, and it was winter; and Jesus walked in Solomon's Porch."[2] The *time*, as well as the *place*, is worthy of attention, and also the *manner* of our Lord's appearance on the occasion.

At Jerusalem it is often very cold in winter, and often very wet. We know that even in the early spring, after that winter, when Jesus was brought before the High Priest, the weather

[1] See Dr. Edersheim on "The Temple," pp. 20-22. [2] John x. 23.

was cold, and that Peter was glad to "warm himself by the fire."[1] Thus Solomon's Porch would be a place convenient for shelter, as well as easy of access and accommodation for a large number of people. There was certainly a large concourse then in Jerusalem and about the Temple Courts, for it was the Feast of the Dedication.[2]

At this time Jesus was "*walking*" in Solomon's Porch. There is much solemnity in contemplating Him walking here among the pillars of this famous colonnade, and it is interesting to compare this passage of the life of Jesus with a much earlier one, also recorded by the Evangelist. We read in the first chapter that Jesus was "*walking*"—in solitude—by the banks of Jordan, while John the Baptist and two of his disciples looked on.[3] Then, perhaps, the Lord was meditating on His great mission, on the beginning of His work, and on the calling of the first disciples which speedily followed in that place. Now, perhaps, He was meditating on the accomplishment of His work, on the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish Temple, and on the doom of the Jewish people. The impression upon the mind is very serious when we think of Jesus, on either of these occasions, as walking in silence, whether by the banks of the famous historical river, or in this colonnade of the Temple, which, in another way, is equally famous in the sacred annals.

There is no space here for reflections upon the discourse which followed. At the close of it, as on an earlier occasion, they "took up stones to stone Him"[4]—some of the stones lying on the ground in connection with Herod's restoration, which in fact was hardly then fully complete.[5] As on that former occasion, "Jesus hid Himself and went out of the Temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by," so here we read that He retired, "escaped out of their hands and went away beyond Jordan." The next time He was in Jerusalem it was at the Great, the Last, Passover, when the cup of their guilt was full.

We now turn to the next mention in the New Testament of this part of the Temple. Two of the Apostles, Peter and John, as we read in the Book of the Acts, had gone thither at the hour of prayer. There, in the name and by the power of Christ, they had healed a lame man who had been a cripple from his youth; and then it is added that, while he clung to them with gratitude and joy, "all the people ran together

---

[1] Mark xiv. 54; John xvii. 18.

[2] For the original meaning of the Feast of Dedication, see 1 Macc. iv. 52-59.

[3] John i. 36. [4] John viii. 59; x. 31. [5] See Mark xiii. 1.

unto them in the porch that is called Solomon's, greatly wondering."[1] And this assemblage became the occasion of one of St. Peter's great sermons, through which some of the first disciples were gathered in to the Church of Christ.

Here, then, is another of the memorable events connected with "Solomon's Porch." In some respects it was very different from the former. The weather was greatly changed. It was warm. It was not now winter. Whitsuntide, as we in England should say, had made the year bright and warm—far warmer than it would be with us—and this great cloister-walk would be frequented then rather as a shelter from the burning sun than from the rain and the cold. But, above all, great events had happened since our Lord had instructed and rebuked the Jews in that place. There had been the denial and the forgiveness of Peter; there had been the crucifixion of Christ; His resurrection; His ascension; and now was beginning the gradual growth of that Church which He had "purchased with His own blood."[2] Peter and John stand now as the prominent figures where Christ had stood before. They were the preachers in His pulpit. "Solomon's Porch" must have been, as it were, consecrated to them by the recollections of their Master. As an old writer remarks, His place had been "hanselled" by His servants, and they were now gladly following Him in the work He had appointed them to do.

So we come to the third instance where Solomon's Porch is mentioned in the New Testament, in the passage which sets its mark on our services for St. Bartholomew's Day. Again we find the Apostles assembled in this place "with one accord." It is probable that they often assembled there and preached there. "A greater than Solomon"[3] had been in that place; and the memory of their dear Master must have been constantly present to them as they walked among the pillars or addressed the people.

It seems as if at this time a peculiar awe and reverence had fallen upon the minds of the people. "Many sights and wonders were wrought among them by the hand of the Apostles;" and while they were with one accord in Solomon's Porch, "of the rest durst no man join himself to them, but the people magnified them." They were indeed arrested by the angry Sadducees and put in prison, but they were miraculously delivered; and again they returned to their work, and "daily in the Temple"—no doubt specially in this same part of it—they "ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ."

"Teaching and preaching Jesus Christ." Looking back on this scene, we appear to see here, in Solomon's Porch, the

[1] Acts iii. 11. [2] Acts xx. 28. [3] Matt. xii. 42.

beginning of that long succession of Gospel teaching and Gospel preaching which has gone on with more or less of purity, more or less of corruption, ever since. That group of Apostles has long since been dispersed. Some were put to death—the martyrdom of St. James, at a very short interval of time, is recorded first—others travelled into distant places and there died. Among these were perhaps Bartholomew, whom we commemorate in this month. We hear a little more of St. Peter and St. John, and then they disappear; but "their sound is gone out into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world;" and each crowded church, where Christ has been faithfully set forth in His love and His power, and according to the teaching of the Apostles, has become a "Solomon's Porch."

J. S. Howson.

Art. III.—THE "DE IMITATIONE CHRISTI."

THE *De Imitatione Christi*, which we have lately heard was one of the few favourite books of General Gordon, was written in the year 1441. Its author, Thomas à Kempis, was born in the year 1380 at Kempen, a small town in the duchy of Cleves and diocese of Cologne. His parents, John and Gertrude Hæmmerlein, were people of humble life, but of this Thomas was never ashamed. Rather, like Luther in after days, he rejoiced in his lowly rank. From his father, who was an honest mechanic, he learnt industry, simplicity, and perseverance; and from his mother he received a heritage of piety, which became richer and more precious as the days went on. Even in tender youth Thomas must have evinced fine talents and shown an inclination for study, or his parents would hardly have thought of making him a scholar. The cost of education and subsistence away from home was altogether beyond their means. To young persons in such circumstances at this period the institutions of "The Brethren of the Common Lot" offered a helping hand; and in this way the Hæmmerleins were enabled to educate their son. At thirteen years of age Thomas was sent to the College of Deventer, then regarded as the Athens of the Low Countries, where his elder brother, John, had been resident for some years previously, under the instruction of the great preacher and scholar, Gerhard Groot. Here he made considerable progress in secular knowledge and in the knowledge of divine things. He read eagerly under the direction of Florentius Radewins,

who had succeeded Groot as superintendent of the college—"a man," to use the words of à Kempis, "adorned with virtues, and filled with divine wisdom in the knowledge of Christ." The young student at once became a favourite with Florentius. He lent him books which he was too poor to purchase, and procured him lodgings in the house of a pious woman, as afterwards happened to Luther at Eisenach. In the course of time à Kempis connected himself with the Brethren of the Common Lot, and soon became one of the most devoted of that Brotherhood. He read and copied much of the Holy Scripture, and gave himself heartily to all the religious exercises of the place. Amongst his companions was a young man of fervent piety, Arnold of Schœnhofen, whose example acted upon the mind of à Kempis, as did that of Augustine upon the mind of Alypius a thousand years before, and that of John Wesley three hundred and fifty years after, in the classic halls of Oxford, upon the susceptible mind of young Whitfield. Arnold used to rise every morning at four o'clock, and after uttering a short prayer upon his knees by his bedside, quickly dressed himself and hastened to the worship. Besides, he frequently withdrew, in imitation of his Divine Master, to some solitary place, in order to devote himself unobserved to prayer and meditation. Thomas à Kempis sometimes accidentally witnessed these outpourings of his friend's heart, and says: "I found myself on such occasions kindled by his zeal to prayer, and wished to experience, were it but sometimes, a grace of devotion like that which he seemed almost daily to possess." But in Florentius, his superior, he had a higher and more finished model. The apostolic simple-mindedness and dignity, the urbanity, gentleness, purity, and self-sacrificing activity for the common welfare which characterized the master, inspired à Kempis with great admiration and reverence. He hung upon his words; he observed his minutest actions with a view to learn some lesson from them; and he sought to express the spirit of the good father's life in his own thoughts and temper and conduct.

In the year 1400 he became an inmate of the Augustinian Monastery of St. Agnes, close to the town of Zwoll, and there he lived to the great age of ninety-two, the flame of his serene and beautiful piety investing the obscure monastery with a brighter glory than shines in the palaces of Christendom. From day to day his life flowed on like a limpid brook reflecting on its calm surface the unclouded heavens. Like Wordsworth's "Wanderer," we may say of him:

> In his steady course
> No piteous revolutions had he felt,
> No wild varieties of joy and grief.

Quiet industry, lonely contemplation, and secret prayer filled up the hours of the day and a good part of the night too. "Rise early, watch, pray, labour, read, write, be silent, sigh, and bravely endure all adversity"—these are à Kempis's rules of life, which he never wearies of repeating again and again. The narrow cell lighted up by the love of God, with unseen angels hovering round, is to him a haven which he would not exchange for the palace of the Emperor or the crowns of the world. Indeed, he regarded the world with abhorrence and contempt, as a chief foe to the spiritual life, and maintained that no compromise was to be made with it, no parley held with it. "It is vanity," he says, "to mind only the present world, and not to look forward to that which is to come; to suffer our affections to hover over a state in which all things pass away with the swiftness of thought, and not raise them to that where true joy abideth for ever." Again, he quotes with approval the saying of Seneca: "As often as I mingled in the company of men I came out of it less a man than I went in," *i.e.*, less humane, with less of the spirit of true manhood in my disposition. His biographer, Franciscus Tolensis, was once shown a picture of him, even then much effaced, but with the characteristic motto at the foot—"I have sought rest everywhere and found it nowhere, save in solitude and books." Books were his chief companions, and of these he liked best the Psalter and the works of St. Bernard; but he carefully studied the whole Bible, and likewise its patristic and mystical expositors. "Woe," says he, "to the clergyman without education or knowledge of the Scriptures, for he often becomes the occasion of error, both to himself or others! A clergyman without the Holy Scriptures is a soldier without weapons, a horse without a bridle, a ship without a rudder, a writer without a pen, and a bird without wings." The renunciation of self, the crucifixion of natural and worldly desires, the absorption of all our interests and passions in the enjoyment of God, the study of the Scriptures, active exertion on behalf of his brethren—these things were his delight. Obedience, prayer, psalm-singing, all exercises of devotion, were to him a delicious feast. We are told by his biographer that during the singing of the psalms he stood in an erect posture, never studying his ease by leaning or supporting his body; his look was often raised heavenward, his countenance in a manner shone, and his whole frame involuntarily followed the direction of his soul. No distracting influences were allowed to draw away the mind of the holy man from the one aim and end of his life—the attainment of greater holiness. Nature with its glories never tempted him away from the contemplation of the beauty of Jesus. Science and philosophy suggested to him no doubts,

and occasioned him no conflicts and pains. Art, charming and beautiful, and so often the handmaid of religion, disturbed not his inward musings on the sweetness of divine love, or the imperishable joys of heaven. On and on between "the posts of duty" coursed his happy uneventful life towards the goal of eternal bliss. One might suppose that art, especially in so far as it was consecrated to the service of Christianity, would be likely to attract his susceptible mind. Even in that early age it had displayed in the Netherlands great life and riches. Antwerp possessed five painter-and-sculptor establishments within a few years after the birth of à Kempis. Hubert and John van Eyck had executed the miracles of their pencil. Hemmling was his contemporary. The glories of Gothic architecture were everywhere about him, but they had no charms for him. Sacred music, however, he loved; and he seems to have written some poetry, chiefly ecclesiastical hymns, *cantica spiritualia*, which celebrate the Trinity, the Passion of Christ, John the Evangelist, St. Agnes, and others. With the deep rapture of a mystic his thoughts were only centred in the spiritual. The feeling of his heart may be well expressed in the lines of Tersteegen (translated by John Wesley):

> Thou hidden love of God, whose height,
> Whose depth unfathomed, no man knows,
> I see from far Thy beauteous light,
> And inly sigh for Thy repose;
> My heart is pained, nor can it be
> At rest till it find rest in Thee.

The beauties of Nature and the glories of Art were subordinated to the one unconquerable desire within him—to become like Christ, to resign himself wholly to the will of Christ. And in his lonely cell, whose bare walls were illumined with the light of angel-faces, apart from the feverish rush of life and the wild tumults of the world, this desire was becoming more and more every day converted into a supreme fact. His life was being transformed, exalted, sublimated into a divine glory, until at length, to use the words of an American poet—

> Heaven's rich instincts in him grew
> As effortless as woodland nooks
> Send violets up, and paint them blue.

In this spirit and with this object, he wrote his famous book on *The Imitation of Christ.* The authorship of the work has indeed, as our readers know, been the subject of a long and heated controversy, and hundreds of books, pamphlets, and articles have been written on the subject. Endeavours have been made to claim the honour for Gessen or Gersen, a Benedictine Abbot in Italy; but, as has been remarked, in spite of

all that has been written on the subject, one vital fact yet remains to be proved, and that is neither more nor less than that this Abbot Gessen ever existed! He is, according to some writers, a myth. The first person who put forth his claims was another Benedictine monk, Dom Constantine Cajitano. He published an edition of the *De Imitatione* in the year 1616, and in the title-page Gersen is declared to be the author. Around him rallied all the Benedictines, who struggled hard to win the honour for a member of their brotherhood. Thomas à Kempis was not, however, without defenders. Like Hector, when struck down prostrate by Ajax, he was in an instant covered by a thick crowd of shields. Facile and able pens wrote in his behalf. A learned Jesuit, Sommalius, who first divided the text of the "Imitation" into separate verses, vindicated the authorship of the Augustine monk, in reliance, as he said, on certain manuscripts of the work in the handwriting of à Kempis himself, then to be seen at Antwerp or Louvain.[1] He was followed on the same side by Rosweid, another Jesuit, whose reasoning is said to have influenced the famous Cardinal Bellarmine to abandon the Gersenian standard. On the death of Rosweid, his baton passed to Fronteau, a regular Canon, who signalized his accession to the Augustinian cause by a work called "Thomas Vindicatus." This drew into the field the congregation of St. Maur, who, by their champion Dom Quatremaire, threw down the gauntlet in the form of a pamphlet entitled "Gersen Assertus." It would be a wearisome and profitless task to pursue the literary controversy. Even in our own day has been heard the noise of the battle. In a series of articles published in the *Civilta Cattolica* of Rome, a Jesuit priest, P. Mella, advocates with angry zeal the cause of Gersen, and with a bitterness so sadly common in theological and ecclesiastical warfare, he does not hesitate to call the saintly à Kempis *Il Prussiano*. He writes, however, in vain. All efforts to deprive the Monk of Zwoll of the honour of authorship have, it must be admitted, signally failed. His rights are incontestable, and are admitted by the best judges to be so. Amongst these we may mention Monseigneur Malou, Bishop of Bruges, whose literary reputation is European. In his admirable work, "Recherches Historiques et Critiques sur le Véritable Auteur du Livre de l'Imitation de Jésus Christ," the learned prelate gives a *résumé* of the arguments in favour of à Kempis. The controversy indeed may be considered closed.

The autograph manuscript of à Kempis is preserved in the

[1] Now at Brussels and Louvain. Thomas à Kempis composed numerous works.

Royal Library at Brussels. The writer placed at the beginning of the volume a table of the treatises therein contained. The following inscription ends the manuscript:

> Finitus et completus anno domini MCCC
> XLI. per manus fratris thome Kempis
> in monte sancte Agnetis prope Zwollis.

Bishop Malou justly observes that as the four books of the "Imitation" head the list of his works, à Kempis declared himself to be their author.[1]

As to the book itself, Ullman truly remarks it is a book which "charms us by truth which is the genuine reflex of the author's life, and is self-evidenced in every word by the heart that beats in it; by the pure, unmingled tone, the silver accent of inward genuineness, the simple childlike spirit which pervades the whole." It is true the introspective type of piety which it represents is not greatly in favour in these earnest, active, busy times, but the treatise will always have religious value, not only from the saintliness of its purpose, but from the knowledge of human nature which it displays. In this respect it may be said to occupy within the circle of religious literature the position which the plays of Shakespeare hold in the secular world. A distinguished writer of our time says of the book—"It was written down by a hand that waited for the heart's prompting . . . . . And so it remains to all time a lasting record of human needs and human consolations: the voice of a brother who ages ago felt and suffered and renounced—in the cloister perhaps with serge gown and tonsured head, with much chanting and long fast, and with a fashion of speech different from ours—but under the same silent far-off heaven, and with the same passionate desires, the same strivings, the same failures, the same weariness."

The treatise is now and then objected to on the ground that it does not recognise sufficiently the doctrine of justification by faith. There is a jealous fear on the part of some lest the honours and importance of Christ's righteousness should be invaded by any undue stress being laid on the personal righteousness of the believer, as if the one could not be maintained as the alone valid plea on which the sinner could lay claim to an inheritance in heaven, and at the same time the other be urged as his indispensable preparation for its exercises and its joys. The "Imitation" does not certainly abound in formal and direct avowals of the righteousness

---

[1] The whole volume, and especially the books of the "Imitation," has been much used, but it is nevertheless, on the whole, in good condition. A cheap facsimile edition of the "Imitation" was noticed in the July CHURCHMAN.

which is by faith. But we know of no teaching that is more calculated to shut us up into the faith, none more fitted to deepen and strengthen the basis of a sinner's humility and so reconcile him to the great doctrine of salvation by grace, than that which is here set forth. This, however, was not the object of à Kempis in writing the book. His object was to lead men to a more strict and separate devotedness of life than is often to be met with amongst the professed followers of Christ. To Him the inward life, the disposition of mind, is the great matter. He makes war, not with heretics but with the world, not with objective error but with subjective evil. In his eyes sin is the great heresy, the monster error of the universe, and it is the object of his uncompromising hostility. And surely he is right. And well would it be for the world if Christians in our day, in imitation of à Kempis, would turn their weapons which are now used to hack and slay each other, against the sins and vices and corruptions of the age. "It is better to die," says Plato, "than to sin." "It is better to avoid sin," says the good monk, "than to shun death." In reading this book, then, let us bear in mind the aim of the writer. Like most mystics, he occupies St. John's point of view rather than that of St. Paul. To him Christ is more the image of God and the pattern of a life in and with God, than the author of atonement and redemption, and the cross is more the symbol of self-mortification than the memorial of Christ's sacrificial and mediatory death. And hence not justification by faith but purification by love constitutes the centre of his whole religious system. Love sanctifies everything. It is the confluence of all that is great and glorious in Christianity. With Bishop Jeremy Taylor in after days he holds that "theology is rather a divine life than a divine knowledge." Piercing through the outer form and varying representations of truth, he struggles increasingly after Him Who is the centre and sum of all truth, and finds his life not in Christianity but in Christ. "It is not profound speculation," he says, in the first chapter of his "Imitation," "but a holy life that makes a man righteous and good and dear to God. I had rather *feel* compunction than be able to give the most accurate definition of it. If thou knowest the whole Bible by heart, and the sayings of all the philosophers, what would all that profit thee without the love of God and without grace?" He points out again and again the moral grandeur of the Saviour's character and life, and he asks us to imitate it. "Receive Christ," he says; "let Him be found within thee; follow Him and imitate His example, and with Him thou hast all." In his mind Christ is the All in All, the Divine Image, the Pattern of the active as well as of the contemplative life.

"He that intently and devoutly exercises himself in the most holy life and passion of his Lord, will find all that is useful and necessary to his redemption in such great abundance that he need not seek after anything out of or better than Jesus." Thomas à Kempis shows us the beauty of holiness, the preciousness and power of faith, the excellence of love, and the sure and unfailing reward of a patient and faithful carrying of the cross; and he asks us for our own good and the good of the world to cultivate this spirit and temper, and to walk in close conformity to the will and commandments of God.

À Kempis, according to the standard of his age, was not, as we have before said, without learning, or incapable of inspiring a taste for it in others. But learning is not his standpoint. He even unduly depreciates it as ministering to presumption, and filling the mind with vanity. Everywhere he underrates the theoretical to the practical. He puts no value on any knowledge that is not of direct moral utility. "Submit yourself to God," he says, "humble your mind to believe, and the light of knowledge will be given you, in as far as it is salutary and needful." In one place he admits that "every man has by nature a desire of knowledge;" but he immediately adds the restriction, "Of what avail is knowledge without the fear of God? Better the simple peasant who serves God than the proud philosopher who, neglecting himself, contemplates the courses of the stars." But while he thus disparages mere knowledge as a thing insufficient of itself to satisfy the desires of the soul, he, on the other hand, enjoins *wisdom*, which is at once practical in its nature, and inclusive of perfect humility. Knowledge is of the world, he says, and entangles with the world; wisdom is heavenly and pure. It comes from God, and leads to God. The distinction has often been pointed out. The poet Cowper, in "The Task," draws a graphic contrast between knowledge and wisdom, which comes to our minds as we read some passages of the "Imitation:"

> "Knowledge and Wisdom, far from being one,
> Have ofttimes no connection. Knowledge dwells
> In heads replete with thoughts of other men,
> Wisdom in minds attentive to their own.
> Knowledge, a rude unprofitable mass,
> The mere materials with which Wisdom builds,
> Till smoothed and squared and fitted to its place,
> Does but encumber whom it seems to enrich.
> Knowledge is proud that he has learned so much,
> Wisdom is humble that he knows no more."

"Whatever book thou readest," says à Kempis, "suffer not thy mind to be influenced by the character of the writer, whether his literary accomplishments be great or small, but let thy only motive to read be the pure love of truth; and

instead of inquiring who it is that writes, give all thine attention to the nature of what is written. Men pass away like the shadows of the morning, but 'the Word of the Lord endureth for ever;' and that Word, without respect of persons, in ways infinitely various, speaketh unto all." "He is truly good," he says in another place, "who hath great charity; he is truly great who is little in his own estimation, and rates at nothing the summit of worldly honour; he is truly wise who 'counts all earthly things but as dross that he may win Christ;' and he is truly learned who hath learned to abandon his own will and to do the will of God."

The great popularity of the "Imitation of Christ" is the best proof of its value. Between the years 1470 and 1500 it is said that eighty editions issued from the press, and since then nearly four thousand editions have gone forth to the world. It has been translated into forty-six different languages, and has penetrated into almost every region of the globe; and wherever it has gone it has quickened the conscience, and touched the affections, and strengthened and refreshed the spiritual life. Protestants and Roman Catholics have felt it to be a word of God to their souls; and in times of weariness, sadness, and desolation of heart (and alas! such times come to us all) they have found a "quiet resting-place" at the feet of the old monk of St. Agnes. The fact that à Kempis was a member of the Roman Church will no doubt in this day, when party spirit runs so high, give many persons a prejudice against the book. Like those of old who asked, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" they will ask, "Can lessons of truth and holiness come from the cell of a monk?" We can only reply as did Philip to Nathanael, "Come and see." To anyone we may say: *Tolle, et lege* ("Take up the book and read"). Read the specimens here given you and then proceed to the book itself, and we are sure that you will rise from its perusal wiser and better, with a more earnest desire to live a holier and more Christ-like life, and will be ready to acknowledge that the sub-Prior of Mount St. Agnes's Monastery was no less than St. Bernard, St. Francis de Sales, Cardinal Borromeo, Fénelon, Pascal, Lacordaire, and many another shining light of the Church of Rome, a true man of God, "an Israelite indeed in whom was no guile." These men, unsatisfied with mere ceremonial religion, entered, so to speak, within the veil, and there finding the Father of Spirits, they worshipped Him in spirit and in truth. In solitude and retirement and abstraction from the world and its many-sided interests, they sought "Him of Whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write." They sought Him, and He was found of them; and from their own joyful experience they could bear

testimony to that great and unspeakable privilege which the sincere lover of God has always enjoyed, of an inward communion with their Lord. It is this inestimable experience which makes the "Imitation of Christ" so refreshing, so excellent a tonic to the jaded spiritual life. À Kempis had a profound knowledge of the religious life such as is not to be acquired but by a mind truly devoted and long accustomed to spiritual exercises. He is not satisfied with exhorting men to self-denial, renunciation of the world, watchfulness and prayer, but he leads them on to that absolute resignation, entire faith, and pure love which are the strength and beauty of the renewed nature—the nature that can alone enter into heaven because it comes from heaven, that can alone love, desire, and unite with God because it is born of God. "Some," says our author, speaking in the person of Christ—"some place their religion in books, some in images, and some in the pomp and splendour of external worship; these honour Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me. But there are some who, with illuminated understanding, discern the glory which man has lost, and with pure affections pant for its recovery. These hear and speak with reluctance of the cares and pleasures of the present life, and even lament the necessity of administering to the wants of animal nature; these hear and understand what the Holy Spirit speaketh in their heart, exhorting them to withdraw their affections from things on earth and set them on things above—to abandon this fallen world, and day and night aspire after reunion with God."

There are others who stigmatize à Kempis as a mystic, and therefore shun him, as if to be a mystic was to be guilty of some deadly heresy, hateful to God and man. So Francis de Sales was denounced by his enemies, and Fénelon by Bossuet, and William Law, the author of the "Serious Call to a Holy Life," by Alexander Knox. But what is it to be a mystic? Is not Christianity itself a mystery—"the mystery of godliness"? And therefore every true Christian may be regarded as a mystic in that degree, and in no other, in which he becomes a faithful follower of his crucified Lord. The great majority of professing Christians, content with forms and superficial observances, having no experience of the quickening, sanctifying power of the Gospel in the heart, know nothing of mysticism, except as a term of reproach synonymous with heresy and enthusiasm, in the modern acceptation of the terms. Mysticism is a stigma which is too often cast at those who dare to assume as an axiom in theology that vital Christianity, a Christianity that can renew, enlighten, unite to God, make us partakers of the Divine nature, and lift us up into an atmosphere purer and more serene than that which most

of us are in the habit of breathing, is somewhat more sensitive and spiritual in its nature than the world of shallow professors will admit it to be. Mysticism is a necessity involved in the advance and progress of our spiritual being; it loves to commune with God in secret places; it sees God in all things—in the pattering of the rain-drops on the boughs, and the music of the bee among the flowers, and the glinting of the sunshine through the forest trees, and the sobbing and sighing of the sea upon the shore—and it sees all things in God. He is their Source, their Centre, and their Glory. According to the scientific definition of a modern theologian,[1] mysticism is a system which examines religious phenomena simply as facts resulting from the immediate contact of God with the individual soul. And does not the New Testament favour such views? Is not direct communication possible between the human spirit and God the Spirit? Are not the writings of St. Paul and St. John full of expressions which go far to justify the mystic—of Christ being formed in men, and dwelling in men; of God abiding in man, and man in God; of Christ being the life of men; of men living and moving and having their being in God? Does not that profound and beautiful phrase in the "Communion Office," which points out the "great benefit" of receiving the "Holy Sacrament" "with a true penitent heart and lively faith"—"for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, *then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us*"—vindicate the highest and noblest teaching of the mystic? Let no one, then, look with suspicion upon the author of the "De Imitatione" because he has been accused of mysticism. He is a mystic only in the sense in which the most earnest and pious souls are mystics. Spiritual religion was to him everything; and communion with God—quiet, constant, rapt communion with God—was the chief means of cultivating it in the soul. "Give thyself wholly to God," he says, in one of his smaller books, "and thou wilt wholly receive Him." "O God, Who art the Truth," he cries, "make me one with Thee in everlasting love! I am often weary of reading, and weary of hearing; in Thee alone is the sum of my desires. Let all teachers be silent; let the whole creation be dumb before Thee; and do Thou only speak unto my soul."

We do not, indeed, think that the type of piety set forth in the "De Imitatione" is the highest type. There is a glow of monkish colouring, if we may so say, upon it which is somewhat out of harmony with the picture of Christianity drawn in the New Testament. "True piety is cheerful as the day."

[1] Reuss, "Théologie Chrétienne," i. 210.

The religion of Christ, taken as a whole, is a stronger and more manly product; though we readily admit that in those fierce, lawless times in which à Kempis lived, the monastic establishment was often a training school for the strong and vigorous, where the men were formed and disciplined who afterwards ruled the Church or converted the world. The characters which our Lord impressed upon His disciples were: "Ye are the light of the world," "Ye are the salt of the earth." We are not, as His followers, to shun society, to abandon the world, to ignore beauty, art, poetry, innocent amusements, joyous life; but to carry our religion—high, holy, Christian principle—into all these things, and shed its sweet and sacred influences over them. "In the world, not of the world"—that is to be the rule of the disciple of Jesus. Still, we cannot condemn the course which the holy monk pursued, or the ideal Christian life which he delineated. The world in his day was so impious and brutal and profanely wicked that it seemed as if in the cloister alone men could cherish faith in God and sustain their spiritual life. And, weary with the Babel-voices around him, the pious soul hastened into the lonely retreat to spend his life in communion with God. The nobler and better thing, no doubt, would be to "let his light shine before men that they might see his good works, and glorify his Father in heaven."

What dreadful times were those in which Thomas à Kempis's life was cast! The iron ages, the leaden ages, the dark ages—these were the terms commonly applied to the period in which he lived, denoting its barrenness of learning, of faith, of reverence, of order. Pure Christianity was hidden away like a rare gem amongst heaps of rubbish. It was only here and there that its clear light gleamed before the wondering eyes of men. "The world was one complicated imposture." Godly souls were "few and far between."

Apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto.

Physical degradation, intellectual thraldom, spiritual darkness, political corruption, lawlessness, violence, chicanery, mad revelry, lust, ungovernable passion, sacrilege, necromancy, ambitious strivings after power—these were characteristics of the times in which Thomas lived. All sacred things had become venal, crime and debauchery held revel in the Vatican, while the afflicted Church, wedded at once to three husbands (such was the language then used), witnessed the celebration of as many rival masses in the metropolis of Christendom." From the immortal pages of Dante, and the more modest "Vision of Piers Ploughman," we may learn much of the spirit of those times. Kings and princes, barons and prelates, lived a wild turbulent life. Priests and monks were steeped

in corruption. "Viler than a priest" had passed into a proverb. The common people were ignorant, enslaved, degraded. From the "chair of St. Peter" a lying spirit went forth on its diabolic mission through the courts and camps and villages of Europe, seeking whom it might devour. Darkness overspread the land. The Tables of the Decalogue were again broken, the Sermon on the Mount was a dead letter. The impassioned eulogiums on justice, mercy, and truth, of Prophets, and the moral precepts of Apostles, were unknown or discredited by cleric and layman alike. Piety, as Von Ranke remarks, sometimes retired into the rugged mountain or the lonely forest to devote all her harmless days to divine contemplation and prayer. Longing for death, she already denied herself every enjoyment offered by life; or with youthful fervour she laboured, if dwelling amongst men, to body forth in serene, sublime, and profoundly suggestive forms the mysteries she dimly surmised, the ideas in which she had her being. But here and there, amid the general gloom, the bright shining of a star of righteousness might be seen; here and there, yearning for better days for the afflicted Church, or the rest of heaven for their own wearied spirits, there were sweet and saintly souls, witnessing for the beauty of holiness and the glory of God. I need only mention Thomas Bradwardine, called "the profound," who was not more celebrated for his learned work, "Concerning the Cause of God against Pelagius," than for his holy life and blameless manners; and his pupil, John Wycliffe, "The Morning Star of the Reformation," hateful to all who hated goodness and truth; and Jerome Savonarola, whose great words, like arrows tipped with fire, pierced the false Florentine heart till it lay throbbing in penitence at his feet; and in à Kempis's own country, John Ruysbrock, "the ecstatic teacher," as he was called, described by Thomas as "Ætate grandævus, affabilitate servus, morum honestate reverendus;" and Gerhard Groot, the great preacher of righteousness, who "had God always before his eyes;" and Florentius Radewins, of Deventer, who, as we saw, first drew à Kempis to the service of Christ, and whom he calls his "good master;" and Arnold of Schoenhofen, the early friend of Thomas, whose seraphic piety was a household word on the lips of all who knew him; and Henry Suso, "the Minnie-singer of eternal love and wisdom," and "the particular friend of God;" and John Tauler, the Dominican, who received the honourable designation of "Theologus sublimis et illuminatus," and whose writings won the admiration alike of Luther and Melancthon, of Cardinal Bossuet and Du Pin; and John Wessel, called "Lux Mundi" and "Magister Contradictionis," in allusion to his great skill in controversy, to

whom the "De Imitatione Christi" had given his first and vigorous incitement to piety; and the clear-eyed, clear-souled à Kempis himself, the saintliest spirit of them all, whom we love to think of sitting in his cell, with

> Looks commercing with the skies,
> And rapt soul sitting in his eyes,

lifting up holy hands in prayer, or studying some passage of the Sacred Word, or patiently transcribing some old manuscript, and surrounded by his devoted scholars, Rudolph Lange, Moritz, Count of Spiegelberg, Louis Dringenberg, Anthony Liber, and, above all, Rudolph Agricola and Alexander Hegius, embodying in his own life the counsel he gives in his "Vita boni Monachi":

> Sustine vim patiens.
> Tace, ut sis sapiens.
> Mores rege, aures tege.
> Sæpe ora, sæpe lege.
> Omni die, omni hora,
> Te resigna sine mora.

And thus the years of the old man crept on; the hair became whiter, and the gait feebler, and the frame more bent, but the heart was becoming more weaned from the world which it never loved, and the soul was becoming more refined and spiritualized for the heaven which it had always been yearning after. God was nearer and dearer to him every day. He was his "exceeding joy."

> Beautiful spirit! fallen, alas,
> On times when little beauty was:
> Still seeking peace amid the strife,
> Still working weary of thy life:
> Toiling in holy love,
> Panting for heaven above.
>
> For none so lone on earth as he
> Whose way of thought is high and free,
> Beyond the mist, beyond the cloud,
> Beyond the clamour of the crowd,
> Moving where Jesus trod
> In the lone walk with God.[1]

WILLIAM COWAN.

ART. IV.—EGYPT IN FULFILLED AND UNFULFILLED PROPHECY.

EGYPT is deeply interesting to us now, its past hardly less so, and its future cannot fail to concern us greatly, and is bound up with the establishment of God's kingdom upon earth.

[1] "Orwell" (Dr. Walter Smith).

Prophecies respecting Egypt, either fulfilled or unfulfilled, are to be found in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Joel, Psalm lxviii., and Zechariah; not, I think, in any other prophet, nor is there any prophecy respecting Egypt in the New Testament.

The prophecies which are certainly fulfilled are contained in Isaiah xxx., xxxi.; Jeremiah xliii., xliv., xlvi.; Ezekiel xxiv., xxx., xxxi., xxxii.; in part of Isaiah xix., and in parts of Daniel viii. and xi.

The predictions in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and some of those in Isaiah, relate to events which were to begin to happen almost immediately, and were, many of them, fulfilled within a few years. The power of Babylon swept over Egypt like a flood, and desolated it for a time. After some years it in part recovered, but was again overthrown by the Persians under Cambyses, revived when Alexander the Great founded Alexandria, became, on his death, one of the four kingdoms into which his empire was divided, and, as such, one of the "four notable horns" of Daniel viii., and flourished under the Ptolemies as the king of the south of Daniel xi., till absorbed in the Roman Empire, of which it became the granary. Alexandria remained a great seat of learning and school of philosophy, first heathen, then Christian, one of the metropolitan cities of early Christendom, till at last, on being conquered by the Saracens and finally subjugated by the Turks, it sank into debasement and barbarism.

Isaiah's prophecy, in chap. xix., is entitled "The burden of Egypt." In the earlier part of this chapter a condition of the land is described in many respects very like what it is now. The waters failing from the sea, the emptied brooks, the papyrus withered, manufactures ruined, its princes fools, no work for Egypt which the head or tail, branch or root, may do. It is more difficult to say when this has not been fulfilled than when it has. When we read of the overthrow of idolatry and the government of a cruel lord, we naturally think of Cambyses the Magian and his conquest. But there was a later fulfilment, at least equally striking, when the Saracens destroyed the idolatry which, under the name of Christianity, had disfigured the churches where once Clement, Origen, Athanasius taught.

The Mahometan rulers of Egypt, both Saracens and Turks, have been emphatically cruel lords. The condition of the land, such as it is now, is the result of their rule. The prophecy in the early part of the nineteenth chapter is a brief summary of the whole tale of Egypt's sorrows, commencing with Nebuchadnezzar, intensified by Cambyses, but most completely fulfilled by those Mahometan powers which have for so many centu-

ries encamped upon its soil and wasted it. And in the same way the words of Ezekiel (xxix. 14, 15), referring especially, to begin with, to Egypt after its conquest by Nebuchadnezzar, and literally true ever since (for even during the proudest years of the Ptolemies Egypt never again became one of the world empires), yet have at this time an emphasis of meaning which we cannot but be conscious of: "They shall be a base kingdom. It shall be the basest of the kingdoms; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations." In our own time it has continued "a base kingdom," in spite of the vigorous efforts of Mahomet Ali and Ibrahim Pasha to emancipate it from vassalage. And the words (Ezekiel xxx. 13), "There shall no more be a prince of the land of Egypt," have been fulfilled from the days of Cambyses to our own. No native Egyptian has ever ruled Egypt.

If it is a true interpretation of the first part of Isaiah xix. that it includes the desolation of Saracens and Turks, then what follows, from the sixteenth verse to the end, must still be future. But the question whether the latter part of this chapter is fulfilled or unfulfilled is one of both interest and difficulty, because an avowed attempt was once made to fulfil verses 18 and 19: "In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of hosts; one shall be called the city of destruction" (marginal reading, "the sun"). "In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt."

In the reign of Ptolemy Philometer, while the Jews were suffering under the oppression of Syria, Onias, son of a high-priest of the same name, sent to Ptolemy and Cleopatra and requested leave to build a temple at Leontopolis, in the province of Heliopolis, in imitation of that of Jerusalem, and to appoint priests of his family to serve in it. By quoting this prophecy, which seems to have suggested the idea, he persuaded the king and queen to consent. The temple was built (Josephus, "Antiq.," Book xiii., chap. 3), and sacrifices were offered there, and a rival priesthood set up which lasted till the destruction of Jerusalem, when that temple also was destroyed by order of Titus ("Wars of the Jews," Book vii., chap. 10). Onias built this temple B.C. 160 (Herzog, "Real-Encyk.," Band vii., f. 210), during the divisions which prevailed at Jerusalem under the high-priesthood of Alcimus, whom Demetrius Soter made high-priest, though not of the family of Aaron—a time of Judah's deepest depression.

There are two questions which have to be settled: first, as to the proper reading of verse 18; secondly, as to the fact whether the temple of Onias was the real fulfilment of the prediction.

First as to the reading. הֶרֶס, *Heres*, "destruction" (if genuine—*hap. legom.*) is found in most MSS. חֶרֶס, *Kheres*, "the sun," in some others. I am persuaded that *Kheres* is the right reading, and consequently the "City of the Sun," or Heliopolis, the right rendering. It appears from the Gemara that no priest who had served in the temple of Onias could again be admitted to minister in that of Jerusalem, and that no vows could be validly performed there (Herzog, "Real-Encyklop.," Band vii., f. 210). The orthodox Jews would never have changed "The City of Destruction" into "The City of the Sun," but were not unlikely to change "The City of the Sun" into "The City of Destruction." We can actually see the first step in doing so in a quotation from the Targum given in the "Speaker's Commentary": "City of the House of the Sun, which is to be destroyed." The "Speaker's Commentary" adduces this as a proof that they had the reading *Heres*, or destruction. What it really shows is that they had the reading, *Kheres*, "the sun," and played on the similarity of sounds, saying, in fact, "It is (*Kheres*) the sun; it should be (*Heres*) destruction."

But secondly, was the attempt of Onias to fulfil this prediction its real fulfilment? Some commentators so think, and Josephus took this view. But Herzog rejects it on the ground that the prediction is not of Jews worshipping, but of the conversion of Egyptians. And at that time Egypt was not like women, nor was the land of Judah a terror to it, as predicted in the previous verses, but Egypt was prosperous and Judah in agony, which was the very reason why Onias asked leave to build the temple.

Passing over the strange notions of some about the Great Pyramid being the "pillar," the whole of the subsequent passage is plainly future. We must therefore consider the latter part of the chapter, beginning with verse 16, as yet awaiting fulfilment.

I will not attempt minutely to interpret this prophecy. But thus much it teaches, that a day will come when Judah will be a terror to Egypt, and that in five Egyptian cities, one of which will be called Heliopolis, either Egyptians or Jews will in considerable numbers begin to worship the Lord of hosts, and set up an altar in the midst of the land of Egypt; not, perhaps, for sacrifice, but, like that of the two tribes and a half, only for a witness, and erect a memorial pillar for the same purpose, and cry unto the Lord, Who will make known to them the Saviour's Name. "And the Lord shall smite Egypt; He shall smite and heal it: and they shall return even to the Lord, and He shall be entreated of them, and shall heal them." The Assyrians also, or inhabitants of Central

Asia, will turn to the Lord, and Assyria, Egypt, and Israel be what the two former have never yet been—a blessing in the midst of the earth.

And I cannot but think that in verse 23 we have an express prediction of the Euphrates Valley railroad. That railroad, as projected, exactly skirts the borders of the promised land as defined in Gen. xv. 18, Numb. xxxiv. 8, and Deut. i. 7. In these predictions the north border is "the entrance of Hamath;" that is to say, the mouth of the Orontes, which is as much the entrance to Hamath, or Antioch, as the mouth of the Thames is to London; Mount Hor, by which it is pointed out, being placed by the Talmud "at Mount Amanus, the modern Alma Dagh, north of the Orontes" ("Heth and Moab," p. 9, Conder, who, however, does not agree with this view); and by Keith identified with Mount Casius, south of the mouth of the Orontes, on the sea coast; the east border is the Euphrates, and the south a line drawn from the Euphrates to the "river of Egypt," by which I understand the Nile. The projected railway is to commence at the ancient Seleucia at the mouth of the Orontes, to run under Mount Amanus in an easterly direction to the Euphrates, down the Euphrates valley through Bagdad, from which, or some other place, a branch will form a highway from Assyria to Egypt. Probably at the same time the tongue of the Egyptian Sea, as described in Isaiah xi, will be dried up, a process which, as has been shown by late surveys, has been going on gradually for ages (Quarterly Statement of Palestine Exploration Fund, April, 1884, and April, 1885), but will then be suddenly completed, and the land of Egypt thereby enlarged.

What is the time to which these prophecies refer? The words, both in Isaiah xix. and Isaiah xi., imply the previous restoration of all Israel, not of Judah only; they are, therefore, subsequent to the appearing of Christ to translate His Church. It does not follow from this that the Euphrates Valley railroad may not have been made previously; but the time of blessedness described must be subsequent to that event, because it supposes all Israel restored. From Zech. x. 11 it appears that when the ten tribes are in the course of being restored, "the pride of Assyria shall be brought down, and the sceptre of Egypt shall depart away"—a final affliction preparatory to their ultimately being made a blessing in the midst of the land. And from Zech. xiv. 18 we learn that after the Lord has come with all His saints to reign, the Egyptians will go up year by year to Jerusalem to worship the Lord of hosts and to keep the feast of tabernacles. But what is the meaning of the words, "I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee" (Isaiah xliii. 3)? Does

it mean that at some time or other Egypt and the Soudan are to be the price paid by some nation to some other nation for permitting the return of the Jews, or of all Israel, to their own land? So Chamberlain ("Isaiah's Call to England") seems to think, and he may be right.

Some commentators suppose that Isaiah xviii. refers to Egypt, as indeed it must if the land addressed sends ambassadors by sea in vessels of bulrushes or papyrus. But though Moses was placed in an ark of bulrushes, and the Egyptians are said to have used light boats of that material on the Nile, it is very unlikely that they, or any other nation, ever sent ambassadors by sea in bulrush vessels or paper ships. The word rendered "bulrush" or "papyrus" is *gomé*, which literally means "drinker." It signifies a water-consumer, and is an appropriate word for bulrush, and a no less appropriate word for a steam-engine. I think Chamberlain right in believing "the land shadowy with wings that which is beyond the rivers of Cush," as it may be translated, to be a nation exercising protective power in India or South Africa (one or both, as there is an Asiatic Cush and an African Cush), which sends ambassadors by sea in steam-vessels. This cannot be Egypt. We must therefore leave Isaiah xviii. alone, however interesting, as not forming part of our present subject.

The predictions we have looked at are in what we may call the far distance, that is to say, not to be fulfilled till the Church is with Christ in glory. There remains a prophecy which is even now perhaps on the eve of fulfilment, the close of Daniel xi., which immediately precedes the prophecy of Michael standing up for the children of Daniel's people, and which therefore must be fulfilled before the first Resurrection and the translation of the Church at Christ's appearing.

In the previous part of the chapter, after very minute and exact descriptions of the wars between the King of the North and the King of the South, or of Syria under the Seleucidæ, and Egypt under the Ptolemies, at verse 36 we have the Roman Empire introduced, which, on the submission to it about 130 B.C. of both Syria and Egypt, became the fourth world-empire. From verse 36 to 39 a very slight sketch is drawn of the Roman Empire, West and East combined in one view—the ten-horned beast of Daniel vii., with its little Latin horn or Popery, and the four-horned goat of Daniel viii., with its little Greek horn or Greek Church. In the perspective of this distant prophecy there is no distinction between East and West, or between Empire and Church. It is my firm persuasion, elsewhere expressed, that at the time of the end the Eastern Empire will be revived by Russia or some other power at Constantinople, and the Western Empire by France,

or some other Roman Catholic power, at Rome, and that a united Christendom at Jerusalem, in Council Œcumenical, will teach men submission to the revived empire.

This I understand to be the result of the events spoken of from verse 40 to the end of the chapter. "The King of the South" at the time of the end must be the ruler of Egypt over which the Ptolemies reigned, and the King of the North the ruler of the land over which the Seleucidæ reigned. Who will these powers be? Who is going to rule Egypt and the Soudan, evidently in verse 42 still connected together? And who will the King of the North be? The kingdom of the Seleucidæ ran up into Central Asia—at one time including the country between the Euphrates and the Indus. Who will he be? Who will be Emperor of Central Asia?

And what is predicted as to the action of these two powers? I think it is left purposely indefinite. I know, on very high authority, that it is impossible to say whether in Daniel xi. 40, "at him," means "against him," or in conjunction with him. The preposition is "with," and may be meant in either of the two senses in which we use "*with*." The King of the South, or Egypt and the Soudan, either makes war with "the King," or Roman Empire, or enters into active alliance with him, and the King of the North comes "*to*" the King of the South "either against him or to make league with him," like a whirlwind, with chariots and with horsemen, and with many ships." Then "the King," or Roman Empire, apparently including the King of the North, will take possession of the glorious land of Palestine west of Jordan, be for some reason unable to conquer the land east of Jordan, will subdue Egypt and the Soudan, plant his tabernacle on Zion, and then come to his end, and none shall help him.

This might be fulfilled in more ways than one, and I will not attempt to prophesy. But so much at least is implied, that Egypt and the Soudan will become of great importance at the time of the end. And it is also clear that these events will occur before, and immediately before, Gabriel's standing up for Daniel's people, before the restoration of Judea and the first Resurrection and the coming of the Lord, and therefore in the near distance—perhaps at the doors. Can we judge how near?

I am very much afraid of chronological prophecies, but by means of books Daniel learned when the Babylonish captivity was about to end, and I do not see any antecedent impossibility in our learning also from books when the long exile of Judah is about to close; and if we knew that, we should know that these events in Egypt must happen soon. There is a prophecy which seems to give, at all events, an approximate date of the close of Judah's exile.

I assume the correctness of the interpretation (in which I differ from Elliott) that the Seventh Trumpet has yet to sound. I also assume (in this agreeing with Elliott) that Revelation x. relates to the Reformation. And I adopt the view held by many that the word "time" in verse 6 is used for a prophetic "time" or year, and that the meaning of the angel's oath is "that there shall be a time no longer"—no longer 360 years to elapse from the epoch at which he utters it before something occurs which he then mentions. That something is "the mystery of God" being "finished." This has been often understood (as indeed the words as rendered in our Authorized Version assert) of the contents of the Seventh Trumpet. But this explanation rested on so palpable a mis-translation that it is difficult to account for its having been ever made. The words are, "There shall be a time no longer. But in the days of the voice of the Seventh Angel when he is about to sound" (as in Revised Version, not "when he shall have begun to sound," as in Authorized Version), "the mystery of God shall be finished, as He has declared to His servants the prophets," or, "then is finished the mystery of God, according to the good tidings which He declared to His servants the prophets."

What is this great event which is to happen shortly before the Seventh Trumpet begins to sound? In Eph. iii. 3-6, St. Paul speaks of "the mystery" as being this, "that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel." And in Romans xi. 25, he connects the mystery with the casting off of Israel: "I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, that blindness in part is happened unto Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." In short, "the mystery" is an Apostolic phrase for the Gentile dispensation; and therefore its being finished must signify the close of the times of the Gentiles, when God's favour will again be shown to Israel.

If so, since this has not happened yet, the angel's oath implies that the Seventh Trumpet has not yet sounded, since the mystery is to be finished when the Seventh Angel "is about to sound," and also directly asserts that from some certain point of time when he takes the oath there shall not be 360 years before the close of the times of the Gentiles.

When did the angel take the oath? Not till after John had received the command to seal up and not to write what the seven thunders, "the mimic thunders from the seven hills," said—not till what Elliott calls the revelation of Antichrist to Luther—not till Luther had learned that Roman thunders were the voice, not of God, but of Antichrist—not before 1520 A.D.

But we cannot take so early a date; for the angel when he swore had one foot on the sea, which, as Elliott shows, means that the Reformation was in England as well as on the Continent. We cannot date the English Reformation earlier than 1534 or 1535 A.D., when the Papal authority was renounced. Possibly we ought to date it later. But if we assume 1535 for the correct date of the English Reformation, then the 360 years terminate in 1895. And in that case the angel swore that the times of the Gentiles would close, and Zion's time of favour begin to come, before 1895.

The events connected with Egypt in the close of Daniel xi. immediately precede the standing up of Michael the great prince for the children of Daniel's people (Dan. xii. 1), which must coincide with the close of the times of the Gentiles. What these events will be it is not, as I have pointed out, easy to be sure. They appear to me to be contemporary with a revived Roman Empire, the reunion of Christendom in apostasy at Jerusalem, and the death of the witnesses (Rev. xi. and Rev. xiii. 13-17). But whatever they are, if 1535 is the true date in God's calendar of the Reformation in England, and of the angel's oath, these events must happen before 1895. The actual date I have named may probably be incorrect, too early. But if it is a possible date, it brings the possible close of the times of the Gentiles very near. And if it be so, it brings something else still more important very near. For Michael standing up for Judah is soon followed by the resurrection of the saints, and therefore by the coming of the Lord. And if the times of the Gentiles are about to close, we ought to lift up our heads because our redemption draweth near, and, like Daniel, pray.

I wish to repeat, because those unused to such investigations so often misunderstand them, that the suggested date is not that of the Second Advent—"of that day and that hour knoweth no man"—but of the close of "the times of the Gentiles" and God's returning favour to His ancient people; and that however right I may be in the interpretation, the actual date depends on a most uncertain element, the light in which God regards certain events in the Reformation era.

But whenever the times of the Gentiles close, and the mystery of God is finished, we shall be "in the days of the voice of the Seventh Angel when he shall be about to sound;" and then the Glorious Appearing of Christ and our gathering together unto Him cannot be far off.

Till He comes to translate His Church, Egypt will continue "base;" but the Egypt of the future, when Christ has come to reign, will form an honourable part of His kingdom upon earth, for "princes shall come out of Egypt." "Ethiopia," or

the Soudan "shall soon stretch out her hands unto God." And He will say, "Blessed be Egypt, My people."

SAMUEL GARRATT.

ART. V.—ÆSCHYLUS.

THE grand characteristic of Æschylus is terror. All forms of awe find in him their most powerful embodiment, and its most favourite embodiment is the supernatural. Six out of seven entire surviving dramas attest this. The great trilogy is a triple-twisted cord of crime, retribution, and expiation. In the "Prometheus" the entire conception is formed from a supra-human standpoint. The sympathy of all Nature in her mightiest forms waits upon the sufferer whose doom was procured by his relief of the sufferings of humanity; yet proper humanity is wholly excluded from the action, as being too puny, abject, and ephemeral to contribute even sympathy for the great Titan, their benefactor. The "Seven against Thebes" is one continual clash of arms and parade of the horrors of war, amidst which rises ever and anon, as in a minor key, the wail of the terrified maidens of the Chorus, now anticipating the havoc of capture, now dirging the fratricidal brothers, whose death crowns the plot, if plot it can be called, with a catastrophe in kind. But amidst the whole natural terror of the scene there hovers, like a vulture in lurid gloom, the curse of Œdipus on his unnatural sons, imparting a supernatural climax to the tragic intensity. In the "Persians," impious human pride finds its loftiest impersonation then known to history in Xerxes. Here again the poet breathes his native air of martial ardour. We hear the crash of the charging triremes and the splintering of their oars, the war-cheers of the Greek mariners, the trumpet-call to action, and the roaring rush of beak and broadside as the galleys lash the waves of Salamis into foam. Solemnly, over the demoralized remnant of the broken host, rises the august Shade of Darius, the father-king, whose wisdom had built up the empire shattered by the audacious rashness of his son, to learn the tale of rout and wreck and ignominy from the lips of living despair; and to denounce the impious havoc of altar and sanctuary as having drawn down the lightning of Heaven's vengeance on his overweening son. Pride and sacrilege must have a fall. Strict reckoning and heavy damages must all expect who so presume. With such words of cold comfort the royal ghost sinks back beneath the tomb.

The sole exceptional play is the "Suppliant Maidens."

Their innocent fears, and heroic ecstasy of resolve to die rather than be wed by force, form the chief topic of pathos. The sagely gnomic father who chaperons their flight from Nile-mouth to Argos, and the chivalrous lord of the soil and city who guarantees their safety when there, form a companion pair of heroic portraits in mighty *chiaroscuro*. They are rescued from the marauding pursuer, escape the contemplated noose and precipice, and are received under public protection, as their father assures them, "rent-free." Here the story pauses rather than terminates, being continued in the next number of its trilogy, the "Danaïdes," which has perished.

Through the whole series, religion is the motive. As conceived by the poet, it was full of awe and gloom. The will of Zeus the inscrutable, with stern Necessity—the inevitable—to support and back it, like a beacon, radiating lightning, platformed on a tower of adamant, is the source whence all springs, the deep to which all returns.

The rise of the Greek Drama, especially its Tragedy, finds a close parallel in that of the Western mediæval stage. Not only in the facts of its plot being those of sacred story, but in the material altar of a deity being its scenic centre, the close alliance of religion with histrionic representation stands cemented, and shows from how deep a root in human nature the dramatic instinct springs. The Greek original of the word "scene" serves alike for the erection which the genius of Æschylus adorned, and in the LXX and New Testament for the "Tent of Meeting." The thymele, or altar of Dionysus, was not only the one fixture around which scene and actors revolved, but even became, as in the "Choëphoræ" and the "Persians," an actual chief piece of stage furniture, appearing there as the tomb of a hero-king. Precisely in the same way the first mediæval theatre was a church, the altar of the Sanctuary figuring as the Holy Sepulchre, the drama being the "Resurrection," and the first performers the choirmen or monastics. This was precisely the state of public sentiment congenial to Æschylus. Tragedy and Comedy alike kindled their first fires by a brand snatched from the altar. In his hand it became a torch of sacred mysteries, in that of Aristophanes one of festive revel and headlong license.

The successive phases of Greek tragedy in its three mightiest masters represent closely those of Greek thought—Religious in Æschylus, Ethical in Sophocles, Rhetorical in Euripides. It is with the first only that we are concerned at present. He was warrior as well as poet, like Calderon and Lopez de Vega, monarchs of the Spanish stage. They had both been Churchmen, too, before they wrote, and Æschylus had learned of

Pythagoras, and was not improbably an Areopagite, and an Initiate of the mysteries. As with them, his sympathies were mixed from his experience; but his genius sprang from the most eventful crisis of his country's fortunes—the struggle of the heroic few against the barbarous many, of tactics inspired by patriotism and guided by skill against brute force. He belongs to the great half-century which, after the establishment of Greek independence, placed the key of maritime empire in the hand of Athens. His contemporary was Pindar, more delicate, versatile, and dazzling in art, and more expressly chivalrous, as his standpoint is more purely human, in sentiment. But in both their minds religion, although tinctured in Pindar by the critical faculty, formed the largest and grandest factor. In Æschylus this element often thrusts all others into the background. The gods in the "Prometheus" and the "Furies" not only hold the stage, but fill it. The portentous presence which met momentarily the eye of Æneas when the films of humanity were purged from it, seems to have been normally present to his:

> Apparent dirae facies inimicaque Troiae
> Numina magna Deum.

But, as there in the crash of Troy's overthrow, all is stern and awe-inspiring. Every god of the Æschyleän drama is a jealous god—jealous of his own attributes and prerogative, jealous of human success and prosperity, as though feeling therein a *laesa maiestas*, jealous even of the fame of heroic deeds and the renown of triumphant valour.[1] It is in reliance on this feeling that Klytæmnestra persuades her husband against his sounder instincts to march on tapestry from his chariot to his palace, and thus, from the superstitious standpoint of the age, sets a man-trap for him in spreading it, much as William the Norman did for Harold in the relics on which he induced him to swear. Only the relics were in that case hidden from view; in this the sumptuous carpet is spread for all eyes to see. This arrogance in the moment of success to which she counsels him is the anti-climax to the desperate suggestion of Job's wife in the darkest hour of his suffering, "Curse God, and die!" It is in effect, "Defy Heaven, and never mind the consequences!" He, however, consents at last with deprecating apprehension, as of divine wrath before his eyes. We see here the mind of the future murderess bent on sealing his doom with consent of deities to his fall. But it requires a fine and close insight into the mode of viewing things adopted by a reverential Greek to discern the awful weight of her impious motive. She seeks to stamp him with Heaven's condemnation, and then to strike

[1] τὸ δ' ὑπερκύτως κλύειν εὖ βαρύ.—*Agam.*, 469.

him down in security, forsaken by the angered gods. Thus she closes a strain of adulation chiming in with her treacherous counsel by the invocation with concealed meaning:

> Zeus, Great Effective! grant my prayer's effect!
> And have Thou heed to what Thou art t' effect.

Here the prolonged play upon the words τέλειε, τέλει, τελεῖν, reminds us of Macbeth's "If 'twere *done* when 'tis *done*, then 't were well 't were *done* quickly." Then follows the choral ode presentient of murder in the air. The poetic augury, drawn now from the monarch's consent to presume, had hovered vaguely before round the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, the cruelty to the vanquished and the pride inspired by conquest. It becomes more defined at this provocation given. I will present it to the reader in the prose paraphrase of a careful Cambridge scholar.[1] It would be difficult to find a passage in which this aspect of Greek deity is more clearly seized:

Why does this hovering phantom ever flit before my heart, and why can I not spurn it and restore confidence to my soul? I have seen the Argive host set sail for Troy; and now with my own eyes I have witnessed its return. But still my heart of its own impulse sings the Fury's lyreless dirge, and refuses to be encouraged by hope. And I know that this feeling within me is not all in vain, and that it points to some fulfilment of my forebodings; but yet I pray that my fears may prove groundless and without result.

Great prosperity is ever insatiate to extend its limits, reckless of the close neighbourhood of calamity; and human fortune, as it sails onward, strikes a hidden reef. Yet the sacrifice of a part of the cargo to save the rest may keep the ship from sinking, and the fortunes of the house from falling, and one plenteous harvest averts all danger of a famine. But far otherwise is it when the life-blood of a man has once fallen to the earth; this no incantations can recall. Were this not so, Zeus had never stopped Æsculapius from raising the dead. My only hope is in the thought that one line of fate fixed by the gods may sometimes interfere with another line of fate (also fixed by the gods), and so hinder it from securing too much; were this not so—had I not this desperate hope to encourage me—my heart would outstrip my tongue and pour forth all its burden. But, as it is, I can only hide my grief in darkness, sore vexed, and with no hope of ever seeing order come out of this confusion, while my soul is burning within me.—*Agamemnon*, 975-1034.

The whole notion of any hope of Divine mercy is here ignored. The very foremost note of religious solace as known to us is silent. The mere fact of external success provokes the wrath of Heaven, without regard to the inward temper of the successful. That wrath may be averted by flinging overboard a part, which act becomes an insurance to the residue. But when homicide has been committed, the loss is total, and the only hope left is that one line of fate may overrule or neutralize another. Who could draw the waters of consolation

[1] Mr. W. W. Goodwin, *Journal of Philology*, No. xx., p. 229.

from such a rock as this? This is really the key to the monotone of gloom which pervades Greek, and especially Æschyleän, tragedy. Man is weak, and God or fate is mighty; but besides, man is prone to overfill the cup, and God is relentless to dash it to the ground.

A well-defined general characteristic of Æschylus is the closeness with which he clings to the skirts of Homer, and is content with intertwining two or more threads from the epic loom. In the great trilogy, however, we see that epic myth had fructified by the inclusion of various fruitful germs before it reached Æschylus. In him we trace the profounder ideas of a perpetuated curse, a retribution treasured up against the perpetrator of crime, and the notion of blood requiring blood as an expiation—one murder, as it were, washing out another, and requiring its effacement by a third. Thus the daughter's death is the plea of the faithless wife for slaying her husband, while that deed calls down vengeance by the hand of her son. Here at length theurgic means interpose to stay the ruin of the house from being total. It is, however, by no prerogative of mercy, but by formal trial and bare acquittal on the merits, and still further by ceremonial purgation, that Orestes is at last rescued and spared.

"Homer," no doubt, in Æschylus's day, included a great deal more than our "Iliad" and "Odyssey." There was a tendency among the rhapsodists to claim no authorship for themselves, but to affiliate all their effusions upon the Father of Epic; whilst in expanding and rearranging the pre-existing poems of the epic cycle, a license reigned with no scruple to refrain or criticism to control it. Thus the epic Νόστοι, or homeward voyages of the hero chiefs from Troy, including, of course, the sons of Atreus, may have furnished the tragedian with themes or incidents which cannot now be traced to their source. A large number of the lost dramas of Æschylus seem by their titles, and, where fragments remain, from those fragments too, to have been taken from such an epic repertory.[1]

Round the great trilogy peculiar interest will always centre; everyone who thinks of Æschylus thinks first of that. The fate of Agamemnon by the hand of his treacherous rival

[1] Those of the Trojan cycle are the following: the "Thracian Women," founded on the suicide of Aias (Ajax), of which perhaps the "Heralds" formed the satyric afterpiece; the "Myrmidons;" the "Mysians;" the "Adjudication of (Achilles') Arms;" the "Bone-gatherers," a satyric drama to a trilogy which included the Penelope following: the "Penelope;" the "Proteus," satyric epilogue to the Oresteän trilogy; the "Telephus;" the "Philoktetes;" the "Ransom of Hektor;" the "Soul-weighing." This last is founded upon a single passage in the "Iliad" (xxii., 209-13), but was by the poet applied to the fatal struggle of Achilles and Memnon, in

Ægisthus, with his queen, seduced by the latter, as an accomplice and secondary, is continually kept before our minds in the "Odyssey," and gives to the Eleventh Book, containing the hero's visit to the Shades, its most interesting episode. The fidelity of Penelope, beset as she is by suitors on all sides, forms a striking contrast to the treachery of Klytæmnestra, who yielded to a single suitor; just as the return of Odysseus in disguise, to conquer at last by the aid of a faithful few, is contrasted with the return of Agamemnon, flushed with victory, to perish by domestic treason. The Odysseän narrative is very simple. Ægisthus, having corrupted the affections of Klytæmnestra, and made away with a bard whom Agamemnon had appointed as her custodian, sets a spy to watch for the hero's return, then meets him with feigned hospitality, and invites him to a stately banquet with a large retinue of comrades. They are all slaughtered there, Ægisthus's followers also being all killed. Agamemnon is slain "as one might slaughter an ox at the stall." How far his wife had a hand in the actual deed is not consistently stated.[1] She is, at any rate, equally involved with Ægisthus in its guilt; although the Titanic traitress of the Æschyleän Klytæmnestra is foreign to Homer's conception of womanhood, and by him she is drawn as "gifted with good principles," but yielding to Ægisthus[2]—a woman who slides, in short, from weakness to wickedness, but not the arch-hypocrite, crafty, vindictive, resolute, and bloodthirsty, which dwarfs all other female figures in tragedy. Ægisthus on this is lord of Mykenæ for seven years unchallenged. In the eighth year Orestes returns; but though he slays Ægisthus, there is no direct statement that he slays his mother, and the one line which seems to countenance it is probably one of the numerous later accretions on the Homeric text due to the popularity of the legend in its later form.[3] If this surmise is correct, the Homeric proto-

which application some poet of the epic cycle had perhaps preceded him. The precise links which connect the plots of several of these with Homeric incidents have been considered in my preface to volume iii. of the "Odyssey," pp. lvi. foll., and need not be repeated here. But I may add to the list the "Odysseus Pseudangelus," mentioned by Aristotle, "De Poët.," c. 16.

[1] See "Od.," iii. 250 foll.; iv. 516 foll.; xi. 409, 410, and 453. That she assisted and abetted seems clear, although we are probably to regard the death-blow as given by Ægisthus.

[2] *φρεσὶ γὰρ κέχρητ' ἀγαθῇσιν.*—"Od." iii. 266.

[3] The passage is "Od." iii. 309, 310:

δαίνυ τάφον 'Αργείοισιν,
μητρός τε στυγερῆς καὶ ἀνάλκιδος Αἰγίσθοιο,

in which the latter line seems to me suspicious. See some remarks in Preface to vol. ii. of the "Odyssey," pp. xxv., xxvi.

plasm of the story is merely a murder complicated with adultery, and the vengeance taken for the former. There was room between Homer and Æschylus for intervening poets to expand the tale. The sacrifice of Iphigeneia was probably unknown to the poet of the "Iliad," in which the detention of the Greek fleet at Aulis is expressly mentioned, but without any notice of the victim to release it. This generated a blood-feud, as it were, within the house itself, and opened an ethical question with opposite sides, by which the tragedian at once complicates the plot and reinforces its moral interest. In short, by the time that Æschylus fastened upon it, it had acquired all the materials suited to his genius. Similarly nothing about the Thyesteän banquet and the quarrel of Thyestes and Atreus is traceable in "Iliad" or "Odyssey," although a favourable occasion for noticing it occurs in the tale of the "demise of the sceptre" of Agamemnon.[1] We see from these facts how slender was the Homeric source, and how full the later flow of the legend had become under the treatment of Stesichorus and others. On all these fruitful germs of horror and pathos the genius of Æschylus set sympathetically to work.

The closest parallel to that genius is to be found in Dante, differentiated by the intense personality which the later poet imports into his tremendous descriptions, and by the bitter root of patriotism which he infuses. In sculpture Æschylus is symbolized more closely by Michael Angelo than by his own near contemporary, Pheidias. The gracious majesty of the Olympian Zeus by the latter is wholly foreign to the stern and awe-guarded potentate who personifies the inexorable and darkens doom by portents in so many passages of the Æschyleän Chorus. Dante was limited in his sternness by Christian tradition; but the feeling which has made the "Inferno" more popular than the "Paradiso" shows how much there is and ever was in human nature on which Æschylus could draw for sympathy in his Oresteän feast of horrors. Either poet was "back-boned" in his conceptions of humanity by the theology of his time. But there is in Æschylus more of religious reserve. He does not lay bare the whole subject in the ruthless visions with which Dante dwelt familiarly. He rather deals in partial glimpses of the inscrutable, and hints through figures of mystery that, but for the reserve imposed, "he could a tale unfold," than actually unfolds it. He seems to hold the clue of a labyrinth of which a step only

[1] The passage was early known as the Σκηπτροῦ παράδοσις, and is referred to by Thucydides, l. 9, as giving that designation to the whole section of the poem which included it. It is "Iliad," ii., 100 foll.

here and there peeps up to light. Whether he had any coherent and connected system of what we may call theology in his mind may be doubted; but that there was a lower deep either of dogma or of questionings than he cared to reveal, especially as to the ultimate relations of the will of Zeus to destiny, and the attributes of that will in reference to human responsibility, seems clear. The phantoms of these ghostly thoughts seem to flit before his mind, never fully exorcised nor made to deliver their burden in the light of day. He heaves the lead deep down, but it never really touches the bottom, and leaves the mind which has laboured through his mystical enigmas of language overwhelmed with a vague sense of the unfathomable.

But all could feel the fascination of the terrible which pervades his *mise en scène*, and to which the least educated minds in every age are most susceptible. All could thrill with horror at the spectral charnel-house of the palace, and the captive maiden-prophetess walking to her foreseen doom amid the ghastly visions of earlier victims of the same polluted hearth. All would feel their flesh creep and blood curdle as the train of sleeping hell-hounds rouse and scent their fugitive, and rush off in pursuit. The veil of startling and abrupt imagery, the confusion of metaphor and simile, which so often checks the modern student of his page, would rather add a zest of mystery to those who witnessed his drama, marching, without complexity of plot, right to the end, and by its tremendous impressiveness forcing its sense into the difficulties of dialogue, or even chorus, by a sympathetic illumination drawn from the action itself. A large portion of those difficulties arise from the nature of his subject, which required a deeply shadowing drapery rather than a nude exhibition of thought. Another portion are due to the imperfect formulation of Greek syntactic principles at his period. This, which is largely traceable even in Sophokles, appears on a much greater scale in the earlier master. The analytical exercises which come so powerfully to the front under Sokratic influence in the next age had not begun their process of solving and re-combining according to law when he composed. Hence we have vast lumpy phrases, turning on no dialectical hinge, incorporated in his odes as they occurred to his mind. They are strung on to one another, as it were, fortuitously, and gain rather than lose in their awful impressiveness by their oracular style and loosely floating massiveness of diction. His mind seems like a sea choking with the wreck of an iceberg, where the fragments roll so deep that you cannot trace their true form. There is, perhaps, no poet in the study of whom it is so needful to catch the governing idea, and yet where the governing idea is so difficult to seize.

His best-known editor in this generation, Professor Paley, says, after noting the difficulty caused by some of the mental characteristics above dwelt upon:

> In the next place Æschylus is difficult, because his mind was given to brood over subjects in their own nature obscure, and the point and interest of which centres in the very fact of their being obscure. Dreams, prophecies, oracles, bodings, omens, and portents, were the favourite food of his fancy. In a word, the supernatural was his delight. We have ghosts and demons, furies and gory spectres, prophetic ravings and dark presentiments—all grand and terrific both in the language in which they are clothed and the conceptions which they embody.

One salient point of myth, which I have not seen duly noticed by Mr. Paley or anyone else, is the utterly immoral attitude of the Zeus of his "Prometheus." The fact of this play having been the middle drama of a trilogy, the first and last members of which are lost, prevents us from knowing how far the poet reduced these attributes, if he did reduce them, ultimately to his normal view of the Will of the Supreme being the solvent of human paradoxes. It is not enough to say, as Mr. Paley says, "In the 'Prometheus,' daring rebellion is curbed and disobedience is made a fearful example." The sympathies of the spectator are and were clearly intended to be from first to last with the suffering demigod—how is the relative antipathy to his tyrant and persecutor to be evaded? The deliberate cruelties of the opening scene, in which the benefactor of humanity is impaled to the rocks of the Scythian steppe, are meant to harrow the feelings, and the key-note of the drama is struck by the hammer of the fiend Brute-force, here personified. The sympathetic reluctance of the Fire-god himself to wreak these tortures on a kindred being of immortal mould would carry the audience with them. If one wished, on the other hand, to produce from the ancient drama a full-length portrait of selfish and ruthless tyranny, it would nowhere be found so fully and faithfully drawn as in the Prometheän Zeus.[1] The sufferer's sole crime is his boon to hapless mortals in their misery, on whose extermination Zeus had resolved. He is a new ruler, with the taint of usurpation, and is depicted as inexorable, arbitrary, of merciless inhumanity, and trampling by the aid of his thunderbolts on domestic sanctities. Beyond even this, the stigma of base ingratitude rests upon him. Prometheus had been at pinch of need his

[1] One may cite a single line as an epigrammatic epitome of the tyrant, *τραχὺς μόναρχος οὐδ' ὑπεύθυνος κρατεῖ* (324): add to this the accessory touch of the untrustworthiness of tyranny in its own nature, as founded on the fear which casts out love, *ἔνεστι γάρ πως τοῦτο τῇ τυραννίδι νόσημα, τοῖς φίλοισι μὴ πεποιθέναι* (224, 225). It is uttered by Prometheus, but evidently expresses the poet's own moral standpoint also.

ally, had aided in establishing his sway against the faction of hostile powers, and counselled him how to disable permanently those who withstood him. Zeus, further, is a monster whose love and whose friendship are equally fatal. The hapless princess Iô is first haunted by flattering yet terrifying visions, and is then by the edict of oracles from Pytho and Dodona driven outcast from her father's house, under fearful threats, her shape transformed from human to bestial, the ever-wrathful and ever-watchful Argus set upon her tracks, as it were to keep her restless, for whom, when a sudden doom removes him, the tormenting gadfly, his eidôlon after death, is substituted (567-574, 642-682). Retaining her own feelings and utterance, she appears with wild cries of agony, vainly entreating Zeus to terminate her woes by death, and too intensely absorbed in her suffering to notice at first that of Prometheus extended before her. They confer, and each tells his or her tale; the common point of sympathy being that Zeus' gratuitous and ungrateful cruelty is the root of wrong for each. Prometheus then reveals the future link of destiny which connects them yet further. He had before proclaimed that Zeus should yet need his aid; he now discloses that Iô's descendant in the thirteenth generation (770-74) would imperil the tyrant's sway, who would be, unless rescued by Prometheus' counsel, the victim of his own lawless passions (908-927). This would enable Prometheus to dictate his own terms, the choice apparently lying between his unconditional release and Zeus' overthrow by the son of Iô's line, who is no other than Herakles. Zeus further seems to know less of the future than Prometheus, from whom he seeks to extort some further information about the secret of the fates. The demand for this by Hermes, as Zeus' envoy, forms the last scene in the play. On Prometheus' disdainful refusal the whole scene breaks up with thunder from above and earthquake from below, and we have a glimpse of the "winged hound of Zeus" entering to fasten on his immortal prey. Baffled of everything but the exercise of brute-force and the infliction of pain, the slave of carnal appetite, and the tyrant-tormentor of his benefactor and paramour, Zeus is the standing example of the "right divine to govern wrong." Prometheus, the philanthropist and benefactor of god and man, is requited by an immortality of torture not *per accidens*, be it observed, but expressly *because* of his kind and helpful efforts towards the doomed and helpless race of men, appointed victims of the same tyrant's wrath. To him might be almost applied the words, "He saved others, himself he could not save;" while the proverb, "Physician, heal thyself," appears in nearly literal

phrase in the reflections of the Chorus on his doom.[1] The implied parallel diverges from this point absolutely. Prometheus is haughty and defiant—as resolute, implacable, and unbending as Zeus himself. The great heathen ideal, it is needless to say, shows no trace of the Lamb of God, in gentleness, resignation, and blamelessness of utterance; and the divergence is even more instructive than the parallel. For these reasons the loss of no single drama is more to be regretted than that of the "Unbinding of Prometheus," which contained whatever solution of this conflict of goodness and right with cruelty and might the poet was able to effect. The tenor of one rather long grand passage is known to us from Cicero's Latin translation ("Tuscul. Quæst.," ii. 10); but it turns wholly on the pains of Prometheus, and yields no trace of the ethical harmony after which we wonder in vain. Wild trains of Oriental mythology seem to meet us in this grand exercise of the poet's mysticism. The cow-headed Herê appears here in the reflex image of Iô transformed, the victim of that jealous goddess, whose share in this outrage on her rival is only glanced at (590-2). The form is familiar to us from Dr. Schliemann's Myceneän excavations, and is referred to a Vedhic original. The Brahminical sanctity attaching to the ox has thrown the long shadow of its powerful superstition down to modern times, as witnessed in the episode of the "greased cartridges," which led up to the Sepoy outbreak in 1857. Besides this, we have the essential sacredness of fire, supposed stolen by Prometheus and given to mortals, which still survives among the Parsees; as well as the transmigration of souls in the death of Argus and the appearance of his eidôlon[2] as the gad-fly, while the notes of his pipe still haunt the charmed air (574-5).

This aspect to the mind of Æschylus of a suffering saviour of mankind is one of the most striking figures in all heathen mystic theology. Prometheus suffers not as a propitiation that he *may* rescue, but penally, because he *has* rescued; and his will is not in accordance with, but in resistance and defiance to the will described as Supreme. This, instead of bringing God and man together by reconciliation, drives them further apart. Nor has the rescue any reference to sin or pollution, even ceremonial, but solely to the miseries of mortal life. The expiator and purifier, even as the oracular revealer of that will, is embodied in another distinct mythical form—that of Apollo or Loxias, especially as he appears in the "Furies." These last

[1] *Κακὸς δ' ἰατρὸς ὥς τις ἐς νόσον πεσὼν ἀθυμεῖς καὶ σεαυτὸν οὐκ ἔχεις εὑρεῖν ὑποίοις φαρμάκοις ἰάσιμος* (473-5).

[2] *βροτῶν εἴδωλα καμόντων*, "Od.," xi. 476, cf. xxiv. 14, is the Homeric phrase for the shades of the departed; cf. "Prom.," 567.

have been by some regarded as the objective shadows cast by an evil conscience. But that is not the conception formed of them by Æschylus.[1]

To return for a moment to the moral problem of the "Prometheus." If any doubt could remain that the feeling of detestation expressed for Zeus is shared by the poet, let us regard the attitude of the Chorus, to whose special function ethical comments on the action pertain. They, when threatened by Hermes at the close with the tyrant's thunder, show no touch of feminine weakness, although full of tender, womanly sympathy so far; they declare, in short, their resolve to suffer, if need be, with the suffering hero, and reject with lofty disdain, touched by female impetuosity of self-sacrifice, the suggestion of cowardice and desertion and truckling to superior force (1063 foll.). This is their last word on the subject.

Æschylus belongs to the heroic school of poetry. He not only receives and moulds the epic legends, but he shares largely their antique and simple spirit. What he brings to them is a mind which had drunk deeply of the Pythagorean doctrines from the West, of the Ionian sages from the East, and of oriental mysticism from that further orient, which the collision with Persia brought within the mental horizon of Hellas. But these teachings were overlaid on a nature-worship, the protoplasm of the Greek Olympian pantheon, in which we trace vast elemental deities all rooted in Mother Earth and called thence "Chthonian." Earth seems to hold all powers in her lap. Stagnant and impassive in herself, the energy passes from her under the various forms of good or evil genii, potent in proportion as she is inert. She rears the produce which supports all life, and, as she is the source, is the receptacle of all. She thus is appealed to when any of these genii become oppressive in their agency. Iô, haunted by her gadfly, the eidôlon of the earth-born Argus, appeals to Earth to efface or suspend his infliction upon her.[2] The Suppliant Maidens

[1] The *conscience* of the sufferer is at rest. He has obeyed a divine mandate as well as fulfilled natural piety, as then understood, although by an outrage on the ordinary relations of nature. It is that outrage which brings the furies upon him, as the avengers of any infraction, however justifiable, of nature's law, especially one in which blood is shed. The curious special pleading which the situation calls out, touching the father's right and mother's wrong, and the share of either parent in the son's personality and consequent claim on his duty, shows in the mimetic struggle of the stage, more clearly than any passage in real history exhibits it, the weakness of human casuistry to decide on difficult questions of duty by the light of nature ("Eumen.," 657-66). In short, the whole illustrates rather the weakness of conscience, until trained by a revealed ideal, than the strength of it.

[2] Ἄλευ' ὦ Δᾶ.—"Prom.," 568.

make a similar appeal: "Mother Earth, Mother Earth! turn away the fearful omen."[1] This old nature-worship had been largely displaced by the newer mythology; and the struggle between them is represented by the Titans, etc., overthrown, and Zeus with his satellite deities enthroned in their stead. The tenacity with which he clings to the antique mythology stamps Æschylus as more primitive in his religious conceptions than even Homer. He seeks to reconcile the old and the new, and in reconciling somewhat confuses them.[2] On this, however, I have not now space to dwell. These Chthonian powers appear chiefly in a noxious or punitive agency: authors of fire, flood, earthquake, pestilence, and blight.[3] Among them seem to be classed the Fates and Erinyes, who guide the helm of Necessity ("Prom." 516), and therefore are foremost powers. But these are daughters of Night, as representing perhaps the primeval darkness before earth yet was. They form a dark background occasionally in other tragedians, where the sympathies of the subject require it, as in the "Œdipus at Kolonus" of Sophokles. But in Æschylus they obtrude in the foreground of his grandest theurgic conceptions, and dwarf for the purposes of dramatic interest the agency of the brighter dynasty of deities. Being mostly demons of darkness, they demand and receive expiation and propitiation, and on their acceptance of it, to darkness they return.[4] The ghosts of the dead have the further connection with earth which arises from the associations of sepulture. They are wrought upon by spells which gain power by reiteration and accumulation, and the prolonged stationary pause in the action of the Choëphoræ at the tomb of Agamemnon, which shallow critics often blame, is nothing else than the gradual working of the appeal addressed by his children to the royal shade, acquiring concentration and intensity up to the necessary point which rouses him effectually to assist them. We have seen how Prometheus is made to know more than Zeus—nay, claims knowledge of all the future, and nothing can surprise him.[5] Yet he asks with nervous eagerness, just before the Nymph-chorus enters, "What is this rustling as of birds, the ether whirring with light wing-strokes? All that comes near me alarms me!" Similarly the shade of

[1] Μᾶ Γᾶ, μᾶ Γα, *βοαν φοβερὸν ἀπότρεπε.*—"Suppl.," 890, 891.

[2] See Mr. Paley on "Prom.," 213, and "Eumen.," 1.

[3] See the stanzas sung by the Chorus in the scene which concludes the drama of the "Furies" and closes the great trilogy, in which the exertion of such noxious influence is expressly renounced as against Athens. "Eumen.," 938 foll.; cf. also 810-18.

[4] Cf. *βᾶτε δόμῳ, μεγάλαι φιλότιμοι Νυκτὸς παῖδες ἄπαιδες . . . γᾶς ὑπὸ κεύθεσιν ὠγυγίοισι* ("Eumen.," 1032-6)—the invocation under which they withdraw.

[5] *πάντα προὐξεπίσταμαι σκεθρῶς τὰ μέλλοντ', οὐδέ μοι ποταίνιον πῆμ' οὐδὲν ἥξει.* —"Prom.," 101-3.

Darius is first of all in ignorance of the catastrophe of the Persian force, and asks the news, as Rip Van Winkle when unearthed from his cave; then proceeds to develop a knowledge of details which have *not* been told him, in order to draw the necessary moral that impiety brings down ruin on the sacrilegious ("Persæ," 693, 715, 717 foll., compared with 809 foll.). He begins by being unaware that the leader of the expedition was his own son, and he ends by giving the information that in it the Persians had not scrupled to wreck and burn the Greek shrines! Omniscience and prophecy are rather unmanageable stage-properties.

Our poet was an ardent conservative of the Solonian Constitution as remodelled on the expulsion of the Peisistratids. He had little sympathy for the growing extension of political rights to every citizen, and the removal of checks to popular impulse. He regarded such changes as so many steps towards anarchy. Yet he is no venerator of Oriental absolutism.[1] The stand made in vain in behalf of the Areopagite political influence shows that he treasured it as a brake-power on the downhill force of democracy. To this end he dedicated the crowning effort of his great genius in the last scenes of his mighty trilogy. Its failure may be said to have drawn after it the demoralization of Athenian political life. So long as the Areopagus subsisted as a state-force, there was an influence at work above party with its degrading strife, its disintegrating forces, and ever-waxing unscrupulousness. It had not been extinguished for a generation ere political murder became a common resource. Had its powers remained unshorn at the ominous epoch of Arginussæ, the voice of Sokrates would not have been uplifted singly and in vain in favour of acquitting the generals arraigned for the loss of their crews. From that time onwards the impulses of alternate cowardice and ferocity prevailed among the populace more and more freely, the strife of parties became strained into a life-and-death struggle, and Athens was her former self no more. But of this gloomy train of political consequences the poet knew not. He is believed to have retired to Sicily; some said in mortification at his defeat by younger poets, some said a victim to the bigotry of the Athenians; more probably in disgust at the rising tide of democracy under the leadership of Perikles and Ephialtes, with the feeling expressed in his own line:

καθιππάζει με πρεσβύτην νέος.[2]

[1] This is sufficiently clear from the attitude of the hero-king to the Suppliant Maidens, who must consult his people ere he guarantees their reception, although he afterwards undertakes to persuade his subjects ("Suppl.," 397 foll., 517, 518).

[2] "Eumen.," 731, with the adaptive change of sex merely, the Eumenides being female.

Æschylus appears to view man as firmly fixed in the grasp of Necessity, yet as morally responsible. We must suppose that he held that what befell man externally was what fate fixed, but that his inner nature was free. But acts of impiety soon entangle a man in some inner web of Atê, whence nothing can extricate him.

But the poet regards Justice as bound to prevail, although not all at once. This justice has an outwardness about it which shows that moral problems had been only superficially examined. It does not seem to seek to correct the sufferer or to warn the careless by example, but to strike a moral balance of retribution against sin. The overthrow of Troy, however, may be taken as an instance in which human justice went hand-in-hand with divine. It is the breach of hospitality, the outrage against "Zeus Xenios," not the stain of sexual impurity, which is prominent in the poet's view of Helen's abduction. For the injurer to get off scot-free would be a fatal precedent, an affront to the moral sense, and a breach of the moral order. No question of his repentance and forgiveness seems ever to occur to the mind as part of the possibility. The poet seems always to assume that the guilty harden in their guilt, or that, without assuming that, to forgive would be weakness—a trifling with the supremacy of that pillar-principle δράσαντα παθεῖν, that "the offender must suffer." He has, by offending, laid the wrong on some one else; and that wrong is *his own*, it must come back to him. He must reap as he has sown.

The same conception, without its poetical vehicle, will be found to underlie the social sense of right and wrong in practice among all half-civilized tribes still. No inner moral work of justice on the soul, no turning of man to righteousness, seems ever contemplated by them. The grand conception of a future judgment was, however, held by Æschylus—"There is a Zeus below who judges offences in the last judgment." "The god of the unseen state is a stern scrutineer of man, and notes all that he does in the tablets of his mind." Such are some of his utterances on the subject, with which others of Pindar, his contemporary, are in close harmony; as, for instance, in the second Olympian Ode: "Among the dead sinful souls at once pay penalty, and the crimes done in this realm of Zeus are judged beneath the earth by One who gives sentence under dire necessity (*i.e.*, from which there is no escape)."

Harsh and mechanical as many of the features of this ethical system are, it has a true and noble ring on the whole. It was a living sense at Athens at the time, not a theory of some clique of philosophers. The character and popularity of Aristeides proves this; and it was a higher one on the whole than ever prevailed there at the successively later epochs of Greek

history. The age which saw the grandest sacrifices of patriotism and the noblest inspirations of poetry witnessed also the highest moral standard. From this high-water mark public and private morals sink together until one stood "on Mars' hill" five centuries later and proclaimed the regeneration of the world.

HENRY HAYMAN.

ART. VI.—THE ROYAL MAIL.

The Royal Mail: its Curiosities and Romance. By JAMES WILSON HYDE, Superintendent in the General Post Office, Edinburgh. Second edition. William Blackwood and Sons.

THIS is a very readable book, and we are by no means surprised to observe that a second edition has been quickly called for. The author has held an appointment in the Post Office, we learn, during a period of twenty-five years; and it has been his practice to note and collect facts connected with the Department whenever they seemed of a curious and interesting character. He has made good use of the Annual Reports, and various authorities, official and private; but his information is given in a chatty and anecdotal style.

The chapter headed "Strange Addresses" contains many amusing instances of mistakes made, from various causes, in addressing letters. Sometimes the writing is so bad as to be all but illegible; sometimes the orthography is extremely at fault; sometimes the writer, having forgotten the precise address, makes a paraphrase; sometimes, through forgetfulness or interruption, only a part of the address is given. The vagaries of writers in addressing letters indeed are manifold.

"No. 52, Oldham and Bury, London," was once written for "No. 52, Aldermanbury, London." "Epsig," "Ibsvig," "Ipswitz," and fifty-two other varieties of Ipswich were noticed on letters addressed to the Danish and Norwegian Consul in that town. A letter from Australia addressed to

Mr ———
Johns 7
Scotland

proved to be intended for Johnshaven, a village in the north of Scotland. On one occasion the following address appeared on a letter:

too dad Thomas
hat the old oke
Otchut
10 Bary. Pade
Sur plees to let olde feather have this sefe;

the address being intended for—

The Old Oak Orchard,
Tenbury.

The following address was written, it is presumed, by a German:

Tis is fur old Mr. Willy wot brinds de Baber in Lang Kaster ware ti gal is. gist rede him assume as it cums to ti Pushtufous;

the English of the address being—

This is for old Mr. Willy what prints the paper in Lancaster, where the jail is. Just read him as soon as it comes to the Post office.

Whether the address "Mr. ———, Travelling Band, one of the four playing in the street, Persha [Pershore], Worcestershire," served its intended purpose or no, we are not told; but the writer had added a request on the envelope, "Please to find him if possible." In the two following instances the indications sufficed, and the letters were duly delivered. Thus:

To my sister Jean
Up the Canongate
Down a Close
Edinburgh.

She has a wooden leg;

and—

My dear Ant Sue as lives in the Cottage by the Wood near the New Forest.

This letter had to feel its way about for a day or two, but "Ant Sue" was found living in a cottage near Lyndhurst. An American gentleman having arrived in England, and not knowing where a sister was residing at the time, addressed a letter to her previous residence thus:

Upper Norwood,
or Elsewhere.

The letter having been delivered to the lady, the writer intimated to the Post Office that he had received a reply in ordinary course, and explaining that the letter had been delivered to her on the top of a stage-coach in Wales. In admiration of the means taken to follow up his sister, the writer ventured to add that "no other country can show the parallel, or would take the trouble at any cost."

In the London Post Office, indistinctly addressed letters are at once set aside, so as not to delay the work of sortation, and are carried to a set of special officers—apt to decipher—who oddly enough are termed the "blind officers."

A very interesting chapter is headed "Abuse of the Franking Privilege, and other Frauds." In its earlier days the Post Office, says our author, was called upon to convey not only franked letters, but, under franks, articles of a totally different

class. The following cases are taken from the first Annual Report of the Postmaster-General—the things consigned having been admitted for transport on board the special packet-ships of Government, sailing for the purposes of the Post Office:

Fifteen couple of hounds going to the King of the Romans with a free pass.

Two servant-maids going as laundresses to my Lord Ambassador Methuen.

Doctor Chrichton, carrying with him a cow and divers other necessaries.

Two bales of stockings for the use of the ambassador of the Crown of Portugal.

The privilege of franking was much abused. Before the year 1764, members of Parliament had merely to write their names on the covers to ensure their correspondence free passage through the post. Packets of such franks were furnished by the members to their friends; and even a trade was carried on in franks by servants of members. On the introduction of the penny postage, of course, in 1840 the franking privilege was abolished. The Post Office has been exposed to frauds in other ways. Thus it was a common device to take a newspaper bearing the newspaper frank, prick out with a pin certain words in the print making up a message to be sent, and the newspaper so prepared served all the purposes of a letter as between the sender and receiver. Other expedients were resorted to in order to avoid paying postage. The late Sir Rowland Hill told the following anecdotes:

Some years ago, when it was the practice to write the name of a member of Parliament for the purpose of franking a newspaper, a friend of mine, previous to starting on a tour into Scotland, arranged with his family a plan of informing them of his progress and state of health, without putting them to the expense of postage. It was managed thus: he carried with him a number of old newspapers, one of which he put into the post daily. The postmark and the date showed his progress, and the state of his health was evinced by the selection of the names from a list previously agreed upon, with which the newspaper was franked. Sir Francis Burdett, I recollect, denoted vigorous health.

Once on the poet's [Coleridge's] visit to the Lake district, he halted at the door of a wayside inn at the moment when the rural postman was delivering a letter to the barmaid of the place. On receiving it she turned it over and over in her hand, and then asked the postage of it. The postman demanded a shilling. Sighing deeply, the girl handed the letter back, saying she was too poor to pay the required sum. The poet at once offered to pay the postage, and did so. The messenger had scarcely left the place when the young barmaid confessed she had learnt all she was likely to learn from the letter; that she had only been practising a preconceived trick—she and her brother having agreed that a few hieroglyphics on the back of the letter should tell her all she wanted to know, whilst the letter would contain no writing.

Our author gives a very readable description of "Old Roads," and his quotations from travellers in days before the Post Office

had a history, and for some time after the birth of that institution, will be to many readers new. In the year 1690, Chancellor Cowper, who was then a barrister on circuit, wrote to his wife that the Sussex[1] ways were "bad and ruinous beyond imagination." In Scotland the roads were no better. The first four miles out of Edinburgh, on the road towards London, were described in the Privy Council Record of 1680 to have been in so wretched a state that passengers were in danger of their lives, "either by their coaches overturning, their horse falling, their carts breaking, their loads casting and horse stumbling, the poor people with their burdens on their backs sorely grieved and discouraged; moreover, strangers do often exclaim thereat." We are told that the common carrier from Edinburgh to Selkirk, a distance of thirty-eight miles, required a fortnight for the journey going and returning, and the stage-coach from Edinburgh to Glasgow took a day and a half for the journey. In the year 1703, in the course of a journey made by Prince George of Denmark from Windsor to Petworth, where a length of way was forty miles, fourteen hours were consumed in traversing it; "almost every mile was signalized by the overturn of a carriage, or its temporary swamping in the mire. Even the royal chariot would have fared no better than the rest had it not been for the relays of peasants who poised and kept it erect by strength of arm, and shouldered it forward the last nine miles, in which tedious operation six good hours were consumed." In the year 1727, King George and Queen Caroline were proceeding from the palace at Kew to that at St. James', when they had to spend a whole night upon the way; between Hammersmith and Fulham the coach was overturned, and the royal travellers were landed in a quagmire.

Mr. Hyde's chapter on curious letters, one of the most interesting in the book, has many entertaining quotations. The following are specimens of letters addressed to the "Dead Office:"

We heard in the paper about 12 or 14 months back Mary Ann —— the servant girl at London was dead. Please send it to the Printer's office by return of post whether their was a small fortune left for ——.

---

[1] Sussex, no doubt, had a bad name. Defoe mentions that near Lewes "a lady was usually drawn to church by six oxen, the ways being so stiff and deep, that no horses could go in them." Dr. John Burton similarly speaks of the proverbial "*Sussex* hit of road," as a specially bad bit. He says: "Come now, my friend, I will set before you a problem in Aristotle's fashion. Why is it that the oxen, the swine, the women, and all other animals are so long-legged in Sussex? May it not be from the difficulty of pulling the feet out of so much mud by the strength of the ankle, that the muscles get stretched, as it were, and the bones lengthened?"

I rite a Line two see if you hard Enny thing of my husband —— that was left at —— ill. pleese will you rite back by return of post as we are in great trobble.

To controul of the
Dead Office, Newcastle.

Lord John Manners, in the Reports, gave many curious and entertaining letters. Here is one application:

May 1878.

My Lord,—I ask you for some information about finding out persons who are missing. I want to find out my mother and sisters who are in Australia, I believe. If you would find them out for me please, let me know by return of Post, and also your charge at the lowest.

Yours, &c.

The following letters of inquiry tell their own tale:

Springfield Illinois U.S.
1 *Jan.* 1878.

Mr. Postmaster if you would be so kind as to seek for us work as we are two colored young men of —— Illinois, and would like to come to England and get work as Coachmen or race horse trainers, as we have been experance for twelve years practicesing training—if any further information about it we can be reckemend to any one that wish to hire us, pleas to advertise it in the papers for us.

Kansas
Feb. 16—1878.

Honerad Sir,—My Grandfather Mr. John —— made a will on or about 22 Oct. 18— dated at —— leaving to his son, my Father, £1000, the interest to be paid to him half-yearly, the prinsaple to be divided among his children at his death. My father died on the —— last leaving myself and one brother who wishes you to look up & collect the money for us.

Dec. 31 1877.

John —— acting as Farmer here would be very much obliged to the Postmaster at —— if he would be so good as to name a suitable party at —— to whom he might sell a 30 stone pig of good quality well—for he understands it is the best place to sell. The pig is now quite ready for killing.

April 1878.

Sir,—Will you, if you please, let me know if there is such a gentelman as Mr. —— in ——. i beleave he is a Chirch Clurdgman. There is a young man in —— who has been engaged to my sister and he says Mrs —— at —— is his sister. i should very much like to know, if you will oblige me by sending. i thought if Mrs —— was his sister i would rite and ask for his charetar because he is a stranger to us all.—please oblige

——, ——.

—— Kent.

Sir,—Will you please inform me if there is to be a Baby show this year at Woolwich; if so, where it is to be holden, and what day.
I have enclosed —— stamp.

A Frenchman writes "A Monsieur le Directeur de la poste de Londres" as follows:

J'ai cinquante trois ans. Veuillez être assez bon de me faire réponse

pour me donner des résultats sur l'existence de Madame —— ? Si parfois elle était toujours veuve, je voudrais lui faire la proposition de lui demander sa main d'après que j'en aurais des nouvelles. En attendant, Monsieur, votre réponse,—J'ai l'honneur d'être, &c.

Mr. Lewins's description of the scene at the General Post Office in London, as six o'clock in the evening draws near, is graphic and well known:

> Now it is, that small boys of eleven and twelve years of age, panting Sinbad-like under the weight of large bundles of newspapers, manage to dart about and make rapid sorties into the other ranks of boys, utterly disregarding the cries of the official policemen, who vainly endeavour to reduce the tumult into something like post-office order. If the lads cannot quietly and easily disembogue, they will whizz their missiles of intelligence over other people's heads, now and then sweeping off hats and caps with the force of shot. The gathering every moment increases in number; arms, legs, sacks, baskets, heads, bundles, and woollen comforters—for who ever saw a newspaper boy without that appendage?—seem to be getting into a state of confusion and disagreeable communism, and yet "the cry is still, they come."—"Her Majesty's Mails," by W. Lewins (1864).

But the stirring scenes which used to attend the closing of the letter-box at St. Martin's-le-Grand (when the great hall led right through the building) no longer exist, at least as things worthy of note. The pillar-boxes and branch offices, in all large towns, lessen the pressure at the chief office.

Mr. Hyde's chapters on Stage and Mail Coaches, Postboys, the travelling Post Office, and those relating to the Savings' Bank and Telegraphic Departments, are interesting and instructive. The volume is well got up, and has several illustrations.

Reviews.

A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament: being an Expansion of Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Dublin. By GEORGE SALMON, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity. London: John Murray. 1885.

THIS is an excellent work; and we may hope that before long the Committee of Bishops will place it among the subjects of examination for candidates for Holy Orders. As regards intellectual training for the ministry, there are not many English books which give the information supplied by Dr. Salmon in anything like the same clear and well-balanced way. One feels as one reads that one is in the hands of a writer who is master of his subject, and who treats it with a reverent freedom and fairness.

The book is well-timed in its appearance at this season. The lectures were delivered some years ago, and the steady "expansion" of them under the pressure of modern controversy has more than doubled them

in bulk, and probably in value. In spite of some evidence to the contrary, there are good reasons for believing that the wild school of criticism, which once had its headquarters at Tübingen, and which with numerous modifications has thence spread all over Europe, is steadily on the wane; not merely as regards its first crude theories, but also as regards those more specious elaborations which would reach the same goal by less violent means. The desired goal is the disproof of the supernatural: and the means adopted is to throw discredit on the chief evidence for the supernatural. If the life of Jesus Christ lies in the first forty years of the first century, and if our earliest documentary evidence for its supernatural character can be shown to be of a date so long after the events as to be unworthy of credit, then a belief in its supernatural character becomes scarcely tenable. Hence every device has been employed in order to throw the dates of the several books in the Bible as late as possible. And if any fair-minded man wishes to know with what success these devices of criticism have been used, he can scarcely do better than read the summing up in each case of Dr. Salmon. The positiveness of assertion with which destructive critics are wont to supplement their arguments is beginning to break down under the accumulated resistance of old and new facts. And now that the tide seems to be turning, a book of this kind, solid in matter, genial in style, and fair in tone, may be of immense service in helping young students (and old ones too for that matter) to weigh for themselves the chief items of evidence as to the credibility of the books of the New Testament. A reproduction of the contents of this volume in popular style from the pulpit would probably do much good in educated congregations. It is impossible to estimate the number of persons who listen (when they do listen) to sermons with the latent conviction that scarcely a book in the New Testament was written by the person whose name it bears, and that consequently there is little or no contemporary evidence of the main facts of the life of Christ, and not very much of the lives of His Apostles. But whether or no such things can be adequately handled in the pulpit, no one can doubt that it is imperative that every clergyman should be furnished with a solid answer to such questions, whenever they may be put before him in private conversation.

After very valuable criticisms of the theories of Strauss, Renan, Baur, and others in his first four lectures, Dr. Salmon goes on in his fifth lecture to discuss the Muratorian Fragment, respecting which we have already had an elaborate dissertation from his pen in the "Dictionary of Christian Biography," edited by Smith and Wace. As is well known, Dr. Salmon dates this invaluable fragment about forty years later than most other scholars (about 210 A.D. instead of about 170 A.D.), and conjectures Caius to be the author of it: and he argues, not unsuccessfully, to show that *nuperrime temporibus nostris* is not absolutely fatal to this view. But most people will probably continue to think that this expression is an unlikely one to use of what took place some sixty years before. We should not now, under any but the most exceptional circumstances, be led to speak of the Battle of Waterloo as having taken place "very recently in our own time." But what is of more importance for our present purpose than the date of the Muratorian Canon is the evidence which this fifth lecture gives us of Professor Salmon's independence and fairness of judgment. He does not hold a brief for orthodoxy. He examines each question on its own merits, and endeavours to arrive at a just conclusion, without being prejudiced by the effect which that conclusion will have on the case for the authenticity of certain books. If the Muratorian Canon is forty years later in date than has commonly been supposed, then one very important witness as to the authority of

most books in the New Testament is appreciably diminished in value. With this conspicuous instance of Dr. Salmon's freedom from bias before us, we go on with increased confidence to examine his conclusions on other matters.

In the sixth and subsequent lectures he has some exceedingly valuable remarks upon the very plausible theories, generally destructive in their tendency, of which Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, Master of the City of London School, is one of the chief exponents. They will be found in his article on the Gospels in the new edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, in the *Modern Review*, 1882, pp. 559, 716, and in the (in some ways) useful little book "The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels."

It used to be the fashion among those who questioned the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel to deny that it was known to Justin Martyr. After the admissions of Renan, and the demonstrations of Dr. Ezra Abbot (whose early death is one of the most serious losses to Christian scholarship in the present generation), this is no longer possible. Consequently, the ground has to be shifted. It is admitted that Justin knew the Fourth Gospel, but it is urged that if he had valued it he would have used it very much more. Hence it becomes a matter of serious importance to reduce the coincidences between Justin and this Gospel to a minimum. This is the line adopted by Dr. Edwin Abbott: "He does "not deny that Justin may have been acquainted with St. John's Gospel," says the Professor, "but he denies that he valued it, or indeed that he "ever used it. A number of coincidences are explained away one after "another. . . . . It seems to me that, however difficult it might have "been to resist the cumulative force of so many coincidences, Dr. Abbott "would have done better for his theory if he had avoided making the "fatal concession that Justin might have known the Fourth Gospel. For "then we have a *vera causa* which at once accounts for the coincidences "with it, and it becomes unscientific in the last degree to invent imagin- "ary disciples of Philo or unrecorded traditions in order to explain what "can be perfectly well explained without any such hypothesis. If any "author of the present day presented as many coincidences with a pre- "vious writer, he would be laughed to scorn by his reviewers if, while he "had to own that he had seen the previous book, he denied that he "valued it or had used it. . . . . It seems to me clear that, if Justin "knew the Fourth Gospel, he used it, and that copiously; if he used it, "he valued it, for his whole theological system is founded on it."

When pressed to explain how this Gospel, despised by Justin (according to Dr. Abbott's view), came so soon afterwards to be everywhere accepted, Dr. Abbott replies: "Because it truthfully protested against the thaumaturgic tendencies of the Church, by exhibiting Jesus principally as a worker of spiritual, and not material, marvels." On this Dr. Salmon quietly remarks: "This seems undeserved praise to give to the "narrator of the healing of the man born blind, and of the raising of "Lazarus; nor does it seem a satisfactory explanation to say that a "heretical" [*i.e.*, admired by the Valentinians, and therefore, according to Dr. Abbott, disliked by Justin] "book won the favour of the Church by "reason of its protest against the tendencies of the Church."

Passing on to the question of the antiquity of the Synoptic Gospels, Dr. Salmon well remarks that an urgent necessity for written Gospels must have arisen just at the time when tradition tells us that the first three Evangelists wrote. The Apostles ordained Elders in every city, and these new Elders had to teach the facts of the Gospel history. How were they to obtain and preserve the knowledge when the Apostles moved on to other places? How was the knowledge to be securely transmitted to successors? A written statement was the obvious device, and, in a com-

munity in which many could write, a device almost certain to be adopted. "If Matthew, Mark, and Luke wrote their Gospels at the time tradition "says they did, they only met a demand which must have been then "pressing, and which, if they had not then satisfied it, somebody else "must have attempted to supply" (p. 150). And again, with regard to the jealousy with which the Gospel narrative, once written, was preserved from change, Dr. Salmon says: "I cannot believe that those who "were in possession of narratives, supposed to have been written by men "of such rank in the Church as Matthew, Mark, and Luke, could allow "them to be altered by inferior authority. Little do those who suppose "such an alteration possible know of the conservatism of Christian "hearers. . . . . The feeling that resents such change is due to no later "growth of Christian opinion. Try the experiment on any child of your "acquaintance. Tell him a story that interests him; and when you "meet him again, tell him the story again, making variations in your re-"cital, and see whether he will not detect the change and be indignant at "it" (p. 152). The present writer had chanced to make this very experiment before reading Dr. Salmon's book, and with precisely the result predicted. The child noticed the change at once, and resented it. Its rooted conviction was, "The old is good"—too good to be altered without loss.

In discussing theories as to the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, Dr. Salmon shows how unworkable is the hypothesis that any two or one of them borrowed wholesale from the other one or two. He contends for a common Greek original, probably in a documentary form, which was used by all three of the Synoptists as one of their main sources of information. But he has nothing favourable to say of Dr. Abbott's attempt to recover this common Greek original by the mechanical process of striking out all that is not common to all three Evangelists. How illogical to suppose that all three Evangelists use the whole of this common material; that it may not frequently happen that two use it and the other not; that it may not sometimes happen that one uses it and the other two not. The reader who is acquainted with Dr. Edwin Abbott's writings will appreciate the gentle irony of the following passage:

"It is certainly worth considering, if we could find the 'original Gospel,' "what would be its value as compared with those which we have. Sup-"pose, for instance, we could recover one of those earlier Gospels which "Luke mentions in his preface, that would certainly be entitled to be "called an 'original Gospel.' It was probably defective rather than "erroneous; and we may certainly believe that all that was not erroneous "has been embodied by St. Luke in his work, so that by a simple process "of erasure, if we only knew how to perform it, we might recover all "that was valuable in the 'original Gospel.' But would that be an im-"provement on St. Luke? The Primitive Church did not think so, which "allowed the earlier work to drop into oblivion. But could it now be "restored, the whirligig of time would bring in its revenges In the "eyes of modern critics every one of its omissions would be a merit. 'It "only relates six miracles!' 'What a prize!' 'It does not tell the story "of the Resurrection!' 'Why, it is a perfect treasure!'"(p. 180).

The source of that earlier Gospel, of which all three Synoptists have made so much use, Dr. Salmon conjectures to be St. Peter. After a very interesting discussion of the much-debated question as to the original language in which St. Matthew's Gospel was written, Dr. Salmon is "disposed to pronounce in favour of the Greek original." The way in which he shows how the imposing amount of testimony as to the existence of a Hebrew original might have arisen without there being any Hebrew original, is masterly. Specially valuable is the careful sifting of

the, at first sight, irresistible evidence of Jerome, who believed that he had himself not only seen, but translated, the Hebrew original of St. Matthew. When properly cross-questioned, Jerome turns out to be a witness for the other side.

Lectures XII. to XVII. are devoted to the Johannine Books. The results at which Professor Salmon arrives after patient inquiry are these: that the five books commonly attributed to the Apostle St. John, the Revelation, the Gospel, and three Epistles, were written by him; that the difference in style is not fatal to common authorship if we suppose the Apocalypse to have been written considerably before the other four, and is more than outweighed by the coincidences, especially in doctrine, between the Apocalypse on the one hand and the Gospel and First Epistle on the other; that the very existence of any such person as John the Elder is highly problematical; that the Second Epistle is addressed to a Church, and not to an individual, and is probably the very letter referred to in the Third Epistle (v. 9), "I wrote somewhat to the Church."

In discussing the Apocalypse, without setting up any counter theory of his own, he shows good reasons for distrusting some of those which are very popular just at present, and which have found a vigorous advocate in Archdeacon Farrar. One of the strangest passages in the latter writer's works is in vol. ii., p. 295, of "The Early Days of Christianity," in which he prints the number of the beast, not in capitals, as St. John's readers would see it, but in small letters, and then comments as follows: "The very look of it was awful. The first letter was the initial letter of the name of Christ. The last letter was the first double-letter (st) of the Cross (*st*auros). Between the two the Serpent stood confessed with its writhing sign and hissing sound." To this Dr. Salmon evidently alludes in a foot-note: "Young computers must be warned against an "error into which some have fallen, viz., that of confounding the Episemon, which denotes six in the Greek arithmetical notation, either with "the final sigma, or with the comparatively modern abbreviation for στ "which printers now use for the Episemon, thereby so misleading simple "readers, that I have found in a scientific article the information that "the name of this numerical sign is Stau! It need hardly be said that no "light is cast on the number 666 by observing how it looks in modern "cursive characters" (pp. 300, 301).

The Professor remarks that with a little ingenuity and laxity of spelling almost any name can be twisted in either Greek, Latin, or Hebrew, so as to make 666, and that, therefore, to find a name that fits the number is not much towards solving the riddle. As an amusing illustration he points out that "Neither Farrar's nor Renan's explanation of this [the false prophet allowing no man to buy or sell who has not his mark] is so natural as that we have here a plain prediction of 'boycotting;' and sure enough παρνέλλος makes 666."

The pleasure of writing about this most instructive volume has already made this notice of considerable length. Only one topic more can be mentioned—the discussion of 2 Peter in Lecture XXV. Dr. Salmon sums up one-half of the argument thus:

"On a review of the whole external evidence we find clear proof that "2 Peter was in use early in the third century. With regard to second-"century testimony, the maintainers and the opponents of the genuine-"ness of the Epistle make it a drawn battle. There is no case of quota-"tion so certain as to constrain the acknowledgment of an opponent; "but there are probable instances of the use of the Epistle in sufficient "number to invalidate any argument against the Epistle drawn from the "silence of early writers" (pp. 617, 618).

As regards the internal evidence he believes that the writer of 2 Peter used the Epistle of Jude, and not *vice versâ*, and that this in no way excludes the possibility of Apostolic authorship; for in his First Epistle St. Peter certainly uses the Epistle to the Romans. Following the *Speaker's Commentary* (p. 228), he points out that the resemblances between 1 and 2 Peter must be set against the differences, and that some of the latter are such as might occur in any two letters written on different occasions by the same person.

Dr. Salmon then proceeds to deal with Dr. Edwin Abbott's attack on 2 Peter in the *Expositor* of 1882, based upon (1) alleged ignoble language, (2) alleged ignoble thoughts, (3) alleged borrowing from the *Antiquities* of Josephus, a work not published until A.D. 93, when St. Peter had been dead many years. Dr. Abbott contends that the Greek of 2 Peter resembles the "Baboo" English of an Indian newspaper; the author aiming at fine language, but making himself ridiculous by constant misuse of words and constructions. Dr. Abbott gives some specimens of Baboo English, and then translates some portions of 2 Peter with the bald literalness of a third-form schoolboy, claiming thereby to have proved that 2 Peter is written in pretentious, incorrect Greek. Not only any book of the New Testament, but the *De Corona* itself, might be proved by such a method as this to be written in Baboo Greek: "One "may readily acknowledge," says the Professor, "that 2 Peter offends "at times against the proprieties of Greek speech, without being con- "vinced that his style is fairly represented in the English of Dr. Ab- "bott's translations. Now, in respect of Greek, we are all more or less "Baboos—I suspect that there are few of our prize copies of Greek prose "or verse to which a Greek of the age of Pericles would apply a more "gentle epithet—so that if 2 Peter be written in Baboo Greek, it is odd "that it should have been left for a Baboo to find it out. Of the Greek "Fathers—whether those who accepted the Epistle like Athanasius, or "those who rejected it like Eusebius—none seems to have made the "remark that its Greek is absolutely grotesque" (p. 631).

And this last point refutes the charge of ignobility of thought also. On this question men like Athanasius, and Jerome, and the Fathers at the Council of Laodicea, were at least as good judges as Dr. Abbott. The A.V., and even the R.V., may be better English than the original of 2 Peter is Greek. But that does not affect the *thought* of the Epistle. Each of us can here judge for himself whether the teaching of 2 Peter is twaddle.

Dr. Salmon puts his finger on the source of these wrong-headed criticisms. "Dr. Abbott's whole tone is amusingly like that of one correcting a "schoolboy's exercise." That is just it. With Liddell and Scott by his side, he scores a red mark wherever 2 Peter has a word not found in that indispensable volume, or a usage not sanctioned by passages there cited. Yet Wharton's *Etyma Græca* contains a collection of 5,000 words not given by Liddell and Scott; and it would be rash to suppose that any Greek Dictionaries exhaust the Greek language. And the attempted proof of ignobility of thought reminds one of 'Arry putting a moustache and tall hat to a bust of Venus and then remarking that that isn't his style of beauty.

The much more serious attack remains. Did the writer of 2 Peter borrow from Josephus? And here Archdeacon Farrar seems to Dr. Salmon, and to a good many other scholars, to have made very hasty and uncritical concessions. He declared in the *Expositor* his conviction that Dr. Abbott had proved "beyond all shadow of doubt that Josephus and the writer of the Epistle could not have written independently of each other;" and said that "it would be impossible for him to feel

respect for the judgment of any critic who asserted that the resemblances between the two writers were purely fortuitous," and that outside theology "no critic could set aside the facts adduced without being charged with a total absence of the critical faculty."

Dr. Abbott thought to strengthen his case by showing that 2 Peter borrows not only from Josephus, but from Philo. Dr. Salmon makes him a present of a good many more instances of coincidences between 2 Peter and Philo, and shows that the sum-total of them does not prove borrowing.

"But I have no interest now in contesting that point; for I am surprised that Dr. Abbott had not acuteness to see that, in endeavouring to establish 2 Peter's obligations to Philo, he was doing his best to demolish his own case. Josephus admired Philo, and notoriously copied him (*Dict. Chr.. Biog.*, iii. 452). The preface to the *Antiquities* of Josephus, which Dr. Abbott supposes to have served as a model to 2 Peter, is itself derived from the opening of *De Opif. Mund.* of Philo (p. 646).

"We are now in a position to deal with Dr. Abbott's list of coincidences. We first strike out coincidences in commonplace words; for the whole force of the argument from coincidences depends upon the rarity of the words employed. . . . . [We next strike out] alleged coincidences in which there is no resemblance. . . . . When Dr. Abbott's lists have been thus weeded of futilities, and I come to inquire what Archdeacon Farrar refers to as 'startling and unusual words,' or, as he calls them *hapax legomena*, found in two authors, I can think but of two cases—that 2 Peter uses ἀρετή concerning the excellence of God; and that he speaks of the divine 'nature' θεία φύσις" (pp. 647-649). And upon examination it turns out that the first of these two comes, if borrowed at all, from either 1 Peter ii. 9, or from Philo, and the second also from Philo. "Thus," continues Dr. Salmon, "Dr. Abbott has completely failed to establish his theory: but I must add it is a theory which it was never rational to try to establish. . . . . I must, therefore, estimate Dr. Abbott's speculation at the same value as the ingenious proofs that have been given that the plays of Shakespeare were written by Lord Bacon, or the Epistles of Clement of Rome by Henry Stephens."

In a foot-note it is pointed out how admirably Mr. Cotterill's *Proteus Peregrinus* illustrates the fallacious character of Dr. Abbott's argument. Mr. Cotterill has collected coincidences quite as close and far more numerous in his attempt to show that Stephens forged the Epistles of Clement. But these Epistles are found in MSS. which were in existence many centuries before Stephens was born, as well as in a Syriac translation. Which shows how exceedingly precarious the argument from coincidences is.

With this sketch of the discussion of 2 Peter, a notice which has exceeded its limits must close. The writer will rejoice if what he has written induces some to study the volume for themselves. He can assure those who do so that they will not find that the reviewer has picked out all the plums: he has not found a dull or uninstructive lecture. The work is probably the most solid and trustworthy book of the kind that has appeared since Dr. Westcott's volume "On the Canon of the New Testament," and Dr. Salmon's book contains a great deal of matter not to be found in the earlier work, and for the ordinary student is in a more convenient form.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Justifying Righteousness. A Consideration of some Questions concerning the Acceptance of the Believer before God. With an Appendix of Extracts from Fathers and Older Anglican Writers. By H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Seeley and Co.

This is a valuable treatise on a most important subject. A clear apprehension of the ground on which our acceptance as sinners before Almighty God rests, is essential to the due formation and development of the Christian character. Without it, the conscience can have no solid peace, the spirit no true freedom, the life no real power. To contribute to such a clear apprehension on the part of his readers, by setting aside one mistaken view of the ground of acceptance, and asserting in its place the true Scriptural view, is Mr. Moule's object in this little volume. That he has attained his object and rendered useful service cannot, we think, be doubted.

In these busy days of many books and little leisure for reading, we are grateful to a competent writer, who has himself mastered his subject, if he will give us, as Mr. Moule has done, the results rather than the processes of thought and study. We have here, in some twenty pages of clear, readable print, the whole discussion, unencumbered by notes and references, a *catena* of authorities being reserved for a brief Appendix.

The mistaken view of Acceptance with God, which it is the author's aim to combat, we gather to be that which regards it as resting, in whole or in part, on the work of grace in the believer's soul as its procuring cause. He begins by tracing that work of grace to its root and source in "the mystical union of the Lord Christ with His people," which "from the point of view of our spiritual life" he holds to be "the central truth of the whole Gospel." Of the nature of that union, and of its absolute necessity to the reception and maintenance of spiritual life, it would be difficult to speak in more forcible terms than are to be found in these opening pages. To some of the statements and methods of expression we should be inclined to demur. It does not help us, for example, to be told that "the Lord Christ's exalted Being and His people's are *solidaire*." But with the general conclusions we substantially agree.

Granting, however, the necessity of union with Christ and its possession by the individual believer, the question still remains to be answered, What is the ground of his acceptance with God? "I ask, then, how and why at this moment am I, a member of Christ, ACCOUNTED RIGHTEOUS BEFORE GOD? How am I, in union with the Lord, viewed as satisfactory at this moment before the LAW, as regards my acceptance from the LAW'S point of view?" To this question the answer given is, that I am not so accounted righteous, and am not so viewed as satisfactory, by virtue of my union with Christ, if by union we mean only that aspect of it "which is concerned with communication of Nature and of Life-power." Other aspects of revealed truth exist, and one of them especially must be taken account of here. It is not Christ in me, but Christ for me, that is the ground of my peace with God. The Law has a demand upon me; and that demand is satisfied, not by what Christ is in me, but by what He is for me.

"'The life of Jesus may be manifest,' and in blissful degrees of outshining beauty and of internal truth, 'in the mortal flesh' (2 Cor. iv. 11), and yet the saint may be (and if his view of facts be a healthy one, he will be) just the very man to shrink, with his face in the dust, before the uncreated Light of the spiritual Law. Coming into its presence, consciously and as a sinner, though a regenerate and life-possessing sinner, he comes across ideas and demands of *another order* than those of birth

and life and health and growth, and the out-blooming of the flower of glory from the holy bud of the present indwelling of his Lord."

He needs, therefore, to be "in Christ" in another sense, as having an interest in His perfect obedience, and His satisfaction of the demands of the Law. He needs to apprehend Christ not only as in him, the life of his life, but as for him, his Advocate with the Father and the Propitiation for his sins. In a word, "The believer must go evermore for his divine secret of power for service, and of inner deliverance and victory, to the great central truth, CHRIST IN ME, I IN CHRIST; to the mystical union in its aspect of communicated Life. But he will not dare to forget, if the Scripture is supreme with him, that even this leaves wholly unaltered the claim of Eternal Law, taken in itself, and that *another* range of 'the truth as it is in Jesus' is needed to meet that claim and transfigure it into peace and rest."

In this conclusion and in the main argument by which, if we have understood him rightly, Mr. Moule arrives at it, we heartily concur. It is, if our memory serves us, the late Mr. Robertson of Brighton who somewhere compares the present holiness of a Christian, as it is in itself, to the Flora of a tropical clime struggling to develop itself in an Arctic region, and as it is regarded and accepted by God in Christ, to the same Flora in all the glory and beauty of its perfect development in its native home. But even so regarded and accepted, it enters not into nor forms any part of the ground of our acceptance. The perfect righteousness of Another stands alone there.

The minor details of Mr. Moule's treatise we have neither space nor inclination now to criticize. Its concluding section on the Sacraments would require a separate paper to deal with it. In taking leave of it we would only express our wish that in addition to what he has given us, the writer had shown clearly, what indeed he has more than once hinted at, how both aspects, that of spiritual life and that of justifying righteousness, are, if not always exhibited, yet really included in the one truth of the mystical union of the believer with his Lord. If *Christ in me* be the fountain of my life, no less true is it that *I in Christ* is the ground of my acceptance. "I am crucified with Christ," writes St. Paul. Christ's death was my death, not only morally but legally. "He speaketh here," says Luther. "of that high crucifying, whereby sin, the devil, and death are crucified in Christ and not in me. Here Christ Jesus doth all Himself alone. But I, believing in Christ, am by faith crucified also with Christ, so that all these things are crucified and dead unto me." So again, describing the mystical union under this its other aspect of justifying righteousness, the same Apostle writes: "There is no condemnation to them that *are in Christ Jesus*." So, too, he sets it forth as his own high aim to be "*found in Him*, not having a righteousness of my own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." My justification is complete, my peace is assured, not only because *Christ is for me*, but because *I am in Christ*. In the familiar but never trite words of Hooker, "Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him. In Him God findeth us, if we be faithful; for by faith we are incorporated into Him. Then, although in ourselves we be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet even the man which in himself is impious, full of iniquity, full of sin; him being found in Christ through faith, and having his sin in hatred through repentance, him God beholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment due thereunto by pardoning it, and accepteth him in Jesus Christ as perfectly righteous, as if he had fulfilled all that is commanded him in the law. Shall I say, more perfectly righteous than if himself had fulfilled the whole law? I

must take heed what I say: but the Apostle saith, 'God made Him which knew no sin to be sin for us; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.' Such we are in the sight of God, as is the very Son of God Himself." And this by virtue of the mystical union, as it procures acceptance for us and conveys to us justifying righteousness.

T. T. PEROWNE.

Short Notices.

The Spiritual Needs of the Masses of the People. [Report of Joint Committee of Convocation.] Published under the direction of the Tract Committee. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

IN the July CHURCHMAN (in the article on "Archdeacon of Lewes and Cathedrals") appeared an allusion to this Report of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury. We are pleased to see the Report as a publication of the S.P.C.K. The Appendix has been omitted, for which some will be sorry, but on the whole perhaps the omission was wise. The Report by itself, now before us, takes up thirty pages; and it will, we hope, have a very large circulation. What subject more important? what *so* important? We earnestly invite attention to a pamphlet, the work of leading clergy, and of Bishops, which deals with "the spiritual needs of the masses of the people."

In the first part of this pamphlet appears a summary of questions and replies. Among the replies sent in from clergy in various parts of the country, we notice, suggestions for Church Reform are prominent, and of these several have been strongly advocated in THE CHURCHMAN.

The second part of the pamphlet contains the suggestions of the Committee. It is of high value, the more especially from the stress which is laid upon the spiritual aspects of ministerial work. We quote the opening paragraph:

> We have reason to fear that even now, after all that has been said and done on this subject, there are still to be found among the clergy some who, though kindly it may be, and generous, abundantly willing to minister to their flocks in carnal things, accepting a certain amount of Sunday duty, and occasionally visiting the schools, yet are not sufficiently impressed with the great truth that they can win souls only by toil, self-sacrifice, unworldly living, continual prayer for each and for all, by being constant in season and out of season, by putting their profession before aught else, and suffering nothing to hinder them from carrying out the duties of their calling, whether in towns or in the country. This, as we think, lies at the root of all, and the answers which we have received tend to show that wherever this is grasped and realized, the work of the ministry very rarely fails.

Around the Cross. Some of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ. By W. HAY M. AITKEN, M.A., author of "The School of Grace," "The Highway of Holiness," "Mission Sermons," etc. John F. Shaw and Co.

By an accident which we sincerely regret, a full review of this volume, written some months ago, soon after the book appeared, was mislaid and lost. It is the third volume of "The Mission Pulpit." The second volume of this valuable series we had the pleasure of recommending as a book of singular merit and value; but we are inclined to think the present volume will prove, for evangelizing purposes, the most useful of the series. The

subjects are handled in a systematic and methodical manner; and many who have for years been growing in the grace and knowledge of Jesus will find it good for their souls to listen to these expositions. "Around the Cross" is a true title. Mr. Aitken is so well known as the most powerful Mission Preacher of our day that it is hardly necessary to say anything about his addresses, their suggestiveness, accuracy, richness, and force. We earnestly recommend this volume as emphatically a book for the time, combining, as perhaps hardly any other book of the kind does, unction and ability.

William Fairlie Clarke, M.D., F.R.C.S. His Life and Letters, Hospital Sketches and Addresses. By E. A. W., author of "Hymns and Thoughts in Verse," etc. With portrait. Pp. 294. W. Hunt and Co.

We earnestly recommend this volume. It is likely to do great good, particularly among medical men. Dr. Fairlie Clarke, to whose memory we pay a sincere tribute of respect, was well known probably to some of our readers. He removed from London to Southborough in the year 1875, and entered into rest when fifty-one years old, in the year 1884. Emphatically "*a good man*," his continual prayer (to quote from a sonnet he penned on recovery from sickness) was to be more humble—

> More filled with love and tender sympathy—
> More patient, gentle, and considerate.

Dr. Clarke contributed a paper to the *Quarterly Review*, April, 1884, "The Medical Charities of London;" the *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1877, "Metropolitan Medical Relief;" the CHURCHMAN, May, 1882, "Model Arrangements for the Sick Poor." His "Sketches and Addresses," here given, are excellent.

Saving to the Uttermost: the Story of Twenty-five Years' Labour in St. Giles'. By G. HOLDEN PIKE, author of "The Romance of the Streets," etc. Pp. 148. Hodder and Stoughton.

This is an interesting book. It exhibits the results of the work carried on in St. Giles' by Mr. George Hatton during a quarter of a century; the gathering in of criminals and outcasts under the power of the Gospel, and the benefits conferred on society, on the commonwealth, by criminal reclamation, social and moral reform. There are portraits and illustrations.

Lanherst. A story of sixty years ago. By Mrs. ENSELL. Pp. 264. Elliot Stock.

A well-written tale, pleasing and wholesome; pictures of life quiet, sensible, and happy. To the "good heart" of Mervine—

> Dearly to love and not approve him,

[Captain Venables] would have been unceasing sorrow. The Captain, the Vicar, and the Curate are skilfully drawn, and altogether the story shows ability, and is very readable.

The Stoic Moralists and the Christians in the First Two Centuries. The Donnellan Lectures for 1879-80, preached in the chapel of Trinity College, Dublin. By the Rev. THOS. JORDAN, D.D., Rector of Magherafelt. Second edition. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co.

We have pleasure in inviting attention to this thoughtful and ably written treatise. In the first lecture Dr. Jordan treats of the undoubted merits of the Stoic teachers; the second chapter is "St. Paul and Seneca; a contrast in life and in death;" the lessons of Epictetus are then discussed. In Lecture IV. is presented a contrast between Nature and Fate of the Stoics and the Fatherhood of God as revealed

in the Gospel; in Lecture V. the philosophers in the time of Marcus Aurelius are examined, in relation to the masses; and in the closing chapter Dr. Jordan shows the narrowness of the Stoics.

We are pleased to notice a statement in the preface to this new edition that many of the National School Teachers of Ireland have received the little book very kindly. We hope that it may become equally well known on this side of the silver streak. It gives a good deal of information in a pleasing and practical way. The tone is spiritual, so that any devout and thoughtful reader may find it profitable. Very few among the "general readers," perhaps, know much about the Stoics. Few at all events, if questioned, will show the scorn with which the Dominie replied to Colonel Mannering, when, after he had spilled some scalding water on the Colonel's favourite spaniel, he was told that he forgot the difference between Plato and Zeno, though they may remember Counsellor Pleydell's little joke about the quadruped and the Cynic school.

A Glance at the Italian Inquisition. Pp. 86. Religious Tract Society.

This is a translation of a little book (by L. Witte) published in Germany at the time of the Luther commemoration. It is a sketch of Pietro Carnesecchi, who upheld the doctrine of justification by faith, and sealed his testimony with his blood. In the year 1540 Carnesecchi met, at Naples, Juán de Valdés. Ochino, it will be remembered, owed much to Valdés. The Neapolitan circle, in which Carnesecchi learnt much, was influential; but the cruel tyranny of Rome crushed and stifled the truth. Carnesecchi was arrested in Florence in 1566 by order of the Pope, Pius V. (a ferocious Dominican, the supreme Inquisitor of Paul IV.), and tried before the Inquisition at Rome. In 1567 he was put to death. Being a member of a patrician family, he was beheaded, and his body was then committed to the flames.

Where to find Ferns. With a special chapter on the ferns round London. By FRANCIS GEORGE HEATH, editor of the new edition of Gilpin's "Forest Scenery." Illustrated. S.P.C.K.

This is a charming little book, bright and attractive, very full, and wonderfully cheap. The author of "The Fern Portfolio," "The Fern World," "Trees and Ferns," is presumably one thoroughly well acquainted with the beautiful flowerless plants which "where to find" we are herein told. But Mr. Heath is widely known as a clever writer upon subjects of country life. His present manual is an excellent gift-book for boys and girls in rural parishes, and in urban too, who may be induced to take an interest in this delightful and refining study. Among young people, as with the elders in many circles, it ought to be a favourite companion.

Our Navvies: a dozen years ago and to-day. By Mrs. GARNETT. pp. 302. Hodder and Stoughton.

The object of this book is twofold; first, to record instances of redeeming love and power; second, to lead readers to take an interest in navvies. The task has been well done. It is interesting to read the results of devoted labour; and many whose hearts are touched by the story of success will find it a pleasure to help, in one way or another, the Navvy Mission Society. The interest which the Dean of Ripon has taken in work among the navvies is well known.

Mary Chute, or "Incidents in the Life of a Village Girl" (E. Stock), is a good little book for servants; cheap.

In the *Church Sunday School Magazine* appears Part I. of "The Revised Version of the Old Testament," by Canon SAUMAREZ SMITH.

A new volume of *Friendly Greetings* (R.T.S.) may be strongly recommended. This magazine of "Illustrated Readings for the People," skilfully and judiciously edited, has several times been favourably noticed in these pages. The annual volume, with its attractive cover, its pretty pictures and coloured texts, and its simple and interesting headings, is the best thing of the kind, so far as we know, to give or to lend.

The July *Art Journal* (Virtue and Co.), an admirable number, has an etching, "Evening on the South Downs," and several charming pictures of Eastbourne.

The July Part of *Little Folks* (Cassells) begins a new volume, and begins it well. This charming Magazine has often been recommended in our pages; it is admirably edited. The July number has a frontispiece in colours—"Great expectations," with much interesting and entertaining matter.

The *Church Builder* (Rivingtons) has a report of the annual meeting of the Society.

In *Blackwood* for July, a very good number, the political papers are pungent. "Fall of a Ministry of Vacillation and Blood," is the title of the closing paper.

In the *National Review* appears an article on the political situation, precisely what one might expect. Here is a tribute, just and graceful, to a distinguished statesman:

> The relinquishment of the Leadership of the Party in the House of Commons by Sir Stafford Northcote, and his transfer to the Upper House, under the title of the Earl of Iddesleigh, were assuredly not suggested by Lord Salisbury, and would never have been listened to for a moment, unless a wish to that effect had been communicated to him by Sir Stafford Northcote himself. It would be affectation to deny that that wish, influenced in great degree by impaired health, was in conformity with what his chief colleagues and followers in the Lower House thought, upon the whole, best for the Party and the country. Thus the new First Lord of the Treasury, who assumes that distinguished post at the instance of the Prime Minister, has once again exhibited that single-minded devotion to the public interests which has made his name revered wherever it is mentioned.

In the *Quarterly Review*, just published (July 17th)—an excellent number—appear articles on Fénelon, the Channel Islands, the Leeds and Bland Burges Papers (the political memoranda of the 5th Duke, printed for the Camden Society last year, and Letters and Correspondence of Sir J. B. Burges, 1885), English Society, the Electress Sophia, and the Game Laws. Lord Lytton's *Glenaveril* is reviewed. Sir James Fitzjames Stephen's new work, "The Story of Nuncomar," is the basis of an able article, full of interest. The *Quarterly* establishes the fact that if the charges against Sir Elijah Impey had been reinvestigated, the Judge would have been cleared. "Impey must have been acquitted, and Lord Macaulay, instead of losing any of the lustre of his fame, would himself have enjoyed the supreme satisfaction of saving from reproach and infamy the fair name and reputation of an innocent and honourable man."

As to the authorship of the article entitled "The First Christian Council" (A.D. 50), nobody will have a moment's doubt. The traditional text of Acts xv. 23, is οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί: "the Apostles and the Presbyters and the brethren." Westcott and Hort's text is οἱ ἀποστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοί; and the Revised Version renders it, "The Apostles and *the elder brethren*." From some ancient manuscripts "*and the brethren*" disappeared; in others καὶ οἱ ("*and the*") are not found, ἀδελφοὶ remaining. (The Latin version has *Apostoli et Presbyteri, fratres*: "the Apostles and the Presbyters, brethren.") That

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 inno-"vation . . . . 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 οἱ 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 refer-*"*ence to this very document*, the selfsame phrase (οἱ 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 re-"minded 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 your-"selves?"

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 invalided 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.