
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

SEPTEMBER, 1885.

ART. I.—GENESIS AND THE BIBLE.

I. HISTORICAL RELATION.

GENESIS is the first book in the Bible. That is a great position. Does the book meet its requirements?

There are no such requirements, if the Bible is only a collection of independent writings, a Hebrew literature which reverence has preserved, with additions contributed in the early age of Christianity. But if the Bible be regarded as the Catholic Church regards it, then these requirements are important and distinct; for in that case the position of Genesis in the Canon of Scripture makes it the introduction to a divine scheme, and the opening of a predestined revelation. The student of Scripture and believer in revelation will therefore expect to find in the introduction preludes and forecasts of what is to follow, and to trace in the lines of the foundation the ground-plan of the future structure.

A structure it is, according to the Catholic contention, and one both composite and complete. The Bible, with all the variety, the freedom, and the occasional character of its parts is, in respect of the revelation which it contains, a scheme or constitution of things. Therefore we regard the parts not merely in themselves, but also in their relations to each other, their subordination to the end, and their contribution to the effect of the whole. If this be true of other constituent parts, it must be especially true of that part which is fundamental, and on which, from the necessity of its position, the weight of the fabric reposes. It may be added that this relative character still more demands attention, when it is considered that the Bible presents, not only a scheme in result, but one in process, evolving itself before our eyes. In reading it we are following a course of things; and that makes it more important to observe the direction given at first, the early preparation

for what will succeed, and ultimately the correspondence of the beginning with the end.

It is then in respect of the *method* of revelation, as well as of the *matter* of it, that these directions, preparations, and correspondences are to be observed; and if we consider first *how* the Bible teaches, and secondly *what* it teaches, we see the lines of its teaching in both respects laid down in its opening book. To the first of these lines the present paper shall be limited, leaving for a subsequent treatment the more important questions which follow.

I. The *method* of Scripture is *historical*. It is that of a revelation unfolding itself through a course of human history, mingling itself in divers manners and measures with the succession of events, with the scenes and incidents of the world, and the characters and experiences of men, so that the discoveries of God, whether in His dealings in act or His communications in word, are made part of the story of human life. Thus the intimations of His mind, His will, His purposes and relations with man, come in the way of accumulation, as events occur and time runs on. We are taught by narratives; and in the books which are not narrative (as the Prophets and the Psalms) still historically, by minds of strong individuality, moved and inspired by actual events, their words resonant of the circumstances and passions of their times. It is a drama that is going on all through the Scriptures, interrupted, suspended, but still advancing towards its conclusion in the manifestation of the Son of God, which is itself presented in the transparent story of what men saw and heard and handled of the Word of Life.

For this method of teaching the Book of Genesis lays down the lines at once. It makes no statement of abstract truths, or announcements of what is to be believed. It constructs no arguments and adduces no proofs. It is narrative from first to last, from "the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth;" to the day that "Joseph died, being 110 years old; and they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt."

And what a living narrative it is! It emerges from a remote antiquity in perpetual youth and freshness. How simple yet how telling are the touches which picture to us the Garden of Eden, the Fall, Cain and Abel, the Flood, the Tower of Babel, Abraham and Lot, Hagar and Ishmael, the sacrifice of Isaac, the embassy of Eliezer, the burial of Sarah, Jacob and Esau, the vision of Bethel, the incidents in the changeful life of Jacob, and the exquisite episodes in the story of Joseph! Then, besides the vivid scenes and picturesque charms of the in-

cidents, there are everywhere those natural utterances of the heart, which make us feel that the very truth of our nature is before us, and engage our sympathy for men of like passions with ourselves. We participate (even children do so) in the feelings awakened by the voice which walks in the garden in the cool of the day, in the flight among the trees, in the fear, the shame, and the excuses which follow. The fallen countenance of Cain, and the words "Am I my brother's keeper?" are still felt as primeval expressions of the sullenness of jealousy and the hollow pleas of selfishness which are known in every generation. There is surely nothing in literature more true to nature than are those lineaments of individuality and distinctive character which we mark in Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Rebekah, Esau, Jacob, Rachel, Reuben, Judah, Joseph. It is not many words that they say, but they all speak in character. We know them as well as our next-door neighbours.

It is in this method of living history that we obtain our first discoveries of the God Whom we trust and worship. His light shines on the paths of these men; His voice wakes or responds to the voices of their hearts. Following the course of the story, we find that we have learnt a thousand things about His relations with us, and ours with Him, about His presence and interest in human life, showing the God Who made heaven and earth as a God very nigh to us.

II. The next thing to observe is, that the book not only initiates the method of the Bible, as being history, but is in line with the history which follows, as being its proper introduction.

For such an introduction two things are wanted, because the revelation thus introduced is to be universal in its purpose, but limited in its course.

(1) If the ultimate purpose is universal, if the accomplisher of that purpose is to be the Son of *Man*, if His work is to be for the whole race of mankind, if there is to be a Catholic Church—then we want an introduction which will place all that follows on the broad basis of the common humanity, and give a pledge of universal interest in what is to be effected, as a salvation "prepared before all peoples," a redemption of the world, and a "reconstitution of all things."

On the other hand, if the purpose of God is to be carried out through a chosen race, if His revelations are to advance along the line of its history, if the Son of Man is to be the Son of David and the Son of Abraham, if the redemption is to be effected under conditions of time and place and circumstance, if the kingdom of heaven is to be prepared within the enclosure of an earthly covenant—then the introduction should

set us on this track, and lead us aside from the confused course of the world into a separate path, and interest us in the origin of a people who "shall not be reckoned among the nations."

Both these conditions are fulfilled; and each in the measure that is fit.

The first eleven chapters are catholic; archives of the heaven and the earth, and of the whole race of mankind. The particular line of mingled human history and divine revelation which is to run through the Bible is here shown as issuing from the common stock, into the heart of which it will again return. Beginning with the call to Abraham, "Get thee out of thy land, and from thy country, and from thy father's house," it is to end with the charge, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to all creation" and to show this charge as fulfilled in the books which follow. Thus all that intervenes between the first chapters of Genesis and the writings of the Apostles is fitted into a larger frame, the particular is presented in relation to the universal, and the narrow line of the history of Scripture is seen as the central line of the history of the world.

Therefore, when the Gospel is come, the holy word loves to mark the connections and correspondences between the opening and the close, of which a very few instances may be here recalled.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" is answered from afar by the words, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made through Him, and without Him was not anything made that hath been made." The first appearing of the heaven and the earth, and the emerging of the habitable world from the sea, is answered by, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away, and the sea is no more." We find ourselves on a temporary platform, on which the mystery of iniquity and the mystery of God are enacted. So Adam, as head and type of the solidarity of the human race, is responded to by the second Adam, origin and head of a higher humanity. So the nature and the work of each are paralleled. "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second Man is of heaven." "The first Adam became a living soul: the last Adam a life-giving Spirit." "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. As through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so through the obedience of the One shall the many be made righteous." Even the rivers of Eden and its Tree of life have their correspondences in the typical scenery of the final abode of man. The like observations might be made in regard to

the story of the Fall of man and victory of the Tempter, and the streak of hope and promise which breaks through the darkness. The features of the story are recalled to mind by distinct references, and the several steps of Paradise lost are matched by the several steps of Paradise regained.

After the event which decides the future character of mankind, the narrative completes the "universal" portion of its history by a few rapid stages. Traversing the long course of centuries, it notes the main facts which are antecedent to the divisions of the nations. Such are the conditions and moral state of the antediluvian world: the crisis of judgment in the Flood; the new birth (so to speak) of the race from its best stock, in a cleansed earth, and under a covenant securing the course of Nature; the separation of races to occupy and replenish the earth; and the final attempt to create a common centre for the power and spirit of the world, which was made and defeated at Babel. In this period there are, as we might expect, many connecting links between the Bible narrative and the traditions of the nations—more especially in respect of the Deluge, which has left confused traces far and wide on the memory of mankind, and has recently reappeared on Assyrian cylinders, with resemblances which, in their first effect, were almost startling.

(2) Having thus fitted into the common stock and story of mankind the particular narrative which is to follow, the book hastens to enter on the chosen line in which revelation will be evolved and the purposes of God wrought out. Its twelfth chapter opens with the call of Abraham, and the remaining thirty-eight chapters are the archives of the patriarchal family, up to the time when it will become a nation. There the book closes, and it is fit that it should close, marking the division between the family life which disappears into Egypt, and the national life which will emerge out of it.

In the course of revelation in the patriarchal period the two special features to be observed are its *personal* and its *prophetic* character.

We have here the relations of God with man individually, before we come to the relations with man in community. The sense of this is most distinctly expressed and perpetuated for ever in the title, which was made fundamental to all subsequent revelation, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. This is My name for ever, and this is My memorial to all generations." The living intercourse of a divine friendship which is carried on through the life of Abraham, the corrections and consolations which attend the sadder steps of Jacob, and the evidences of a special providence which illuminate the career of Joseph,

make it the first lesson of the Holy Word that the fundamental relations of God with man are those which belong to personal individual life. At the same time they throw a light upon the nature of those relations, which, for those who enter into them in all races and ages, teaches them what to expect and corresponds to what they experience. Suppose the sacred record to have lost the call of Abraham and the story of the Patriarchs, and to proceed at once to the call of Moses and the story of the people, and it will be felt at once that there would be an incalculable loss not only of introductory narrative but of the most precious elementary teaching which it enshrined.

The second feature to be noticed in these records is the prophetic purpose which pervades them. The whole story bears on toward things to come, and only for that reason is it there. The calling out of the family, its separation from the world around it, the special directions for its movements, the birth of its first heir out of the common course of nature, and the definition of its line by the setting aside of Ishmael and of Esau, are so many intimations that we are at the commencement of a predestined plan which future generations will complete and disclose. And this becomes yet more evident, when the promises, from time to time given or renewed to this family, are taken in connection with their conspicuous non-fulfilment, or at least utterly inadequate fulfilment, in the case of the persons who receive them. The inference from these facts is drawn by Stephen in his clear-sighted survey of the Old Testament story, and is intended also by the writer to the Hebrews in his review of the patriarchal time from the call of Abraham to the death of Joseph (Heb. xi. 8-23). It is the same inference which succeeding revelation justifies, namely, that we are here in the first stage of a great scheme, through which all nations shall ultimately be blessed, which will be developed through the ages, and have its issues in the better country and the city which hath the foundations. If the Gospel of the Kingdom did not, in its final disclosure, fulfil the forecasts of the Book of Genesis, it were as great a failure of sequence as if the streaks of daybreak in the east were to issue only in a doubtful twilight, never followed by the rising of the sun.

T. D. BERNARD.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—A RURI-DECANAL ADDRESS.

THE following address from Rev. Treasurer CAREY H. BORRER, Rector and Rural Dean, was delivered at Hurstpierpoint Church, at a meeting of the Clergy, July 2, 1885:

When, as to-day, brethren meet together "to strengthen their hands in the Lord," perhaps the most suitable words that an elder, and the minister of the parish in which we are gathered, can speak, will be on the nature, first, of our common difficulties; and secondly, of our special help in our clerical work.

Our difficulties are many. And the first of them all is, perhaps, the sense of our responsibility, the awfulness of a commission from God: to be "put in trust of the Gospel." The cry breaks forth from us, "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel," in all its fulness and its freeness, in its exactness, its authority, and its particularity! "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep." "Preach the Word: in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort." The "warning every man and teaching every man" that may be under our charge; and "Be thou an example of believers." The arduousness of such a task, the impossibility of satisfying ourselves, of reaching even man's standard, much less the hope of approving ourselves in the sight of the All Holy, may well depress our spirit; for we are "they who must give account," who "watch for souls," and whose work it is to "present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

Then the consciousness of our faithlessness and unlove, the backwardness of our will, the feebleness of effort; the sloth, the procrastination, the waiting for a more "convenient season;" the worldliness, the dislike of offending, the temptation to please, the love of approval, the desire of goodwill, the shrinking from hardness, the very danger of compassion and tenderness, the wickedness of indifference; the fear, by sympathy, of our making light of sin; the inclination to weariness in the daily routine, in visiting the same sick again and again, in warning the same impenetrable sinners (we can each add to the list)—these singly and collectively often overpower our hearts.

Again, the condition of the world around us, so changed in the generations that most of us have passed through, so regardless of authority, so steeped in worldliness, so unmoved about our great message, so respectable and so lukewarm; the younger growing up self-reliant and half-irreverent; the elder too indulgent and sensuous—of the flesh, and not of the spirit; the neglect of public worship by the working-men; the *anomia*, and the "falling away from the faith;" the open unbelief; the shaken faith in creeds and miracle and revelation; the question even of a God; the spread of foul and godless literature; the desecration of the Lord's day; in addition to these, the crystallizing of Dissent—separatists of so many kinds—consolidating into settled institutions, more or less hostile to the Church: all these unite to offer a phalanx of adverse opinion that the boldest may dread to encounter, not from apprehension of the positive truth and ultimate triumph of our belief, but from the impotence of our arm, the faintness of our trumpet-sound, the unskilled use of our heavenly weapons, the faltering courage of our opinions, that we "turn not back in the day of battle."

Yet once more, the divisions within the very camp of God, the jealousies and distrust, the extravagances and vanity, the narrow-mindedness, and the—yes! the ignorance often and the insufficiency of knowledge among our own flock and supporters; the half acquaintance with,

and imperfect weighing of evidence, of antiquity, of the claims and doctrine of the Church,—all sadly weaken our cause, and sensibly oppress our own convictions, and affect our plain speaking and clear views of the truth in the very teeth of the so-called moderation and liberality of many of our excellent friends.

I suppose everyone can add personal difficulties in situation and neighbourhood, class of parishioners, the absence or presence of persons of influence, ill-health, restricted means, the claims of a family, studious rather than active temperament and habits, the seduction of books, love of pleasure and ease. Overwhelming all these hindrances are to unaided flesh and blood. And were it only that this dispensation and apostolate of the Word of God were committed to us, we might in despair, like Jonah, flee from the presence of the Lord.

What, then, is our help? How can we pursue our ministry with any heart or hope of welldoing?

There is One, "God over all, Blessed for ever," Who laid the duty and office upon us; Who at our first going down to the battle called us inwardly to the work; filling our hearts with love to our brethren, and our spirit with gratitude and zeal for our Redeemer; Who anointed us, and ordained us outwardly by His servants carrying on the Apostles' appointment of "laying-on of hands": enrolled and numbered among the heroes and confessors, the martyrs, the preachers to the heathen and the Church—we enjoy the exalted dignity of Ministers of God and of the everlasting Gospel conferred upon us, servants in and of the purest, most Scriptural, and nearest to the primitive model, the grand historic Church of England; and if with the weaknesses, yet with the unconquered and undaunted energy of our fathers, because "underneath are the everlasting Arms," the Almighty, rather *pantocrator*—upholding, embracing, all—than *pantodynamos*, is with us, and over us, and in us, "always, to the end of days."

Then who can estimate the power of those two weapons of celestial temper, faith, and prayer to Him Who is "Head over all things to the Church;" Who employs "the base things of the world to confound the wise;" Whose "strength is made perfect in weakness"? First, what can resist real, intelligent, well-founded and unshaken faith in God with us in our words and works? Not personal backwardness; not the fierceness of man—"Vultus instantis tyranni;" not the spite of ungodliness nor the blandishments of the world; not the crude theories, nor the bold, groundless assertions of infidelity. Then prayer: who can place a limit to its power? the mighty God. And is not our powerlessness and failure so often traceable to our faithless, infrequent, and indolent prayers—to speaking and acting without a moment's prayer to the God of heaven? Massillon well said, that "a pastor who does not pray and love prayer, belongs no longer to the Church which prays without ceasing." And further, who of us, in anxiety and distress of spirit, has not found in God's house the shelter, the refreshment, the peace, the renewal, which has encouraged and enabled him to endure, to try again, to take up the cross, though with trembling hands and feeble knees, and stumbling steps and bowed head, but resolute and fixed heart? and, then, has God left us without witness and tokens of blessing and approval? a single instance of success; the bread, cast so many days ago as to have been forgotten, appearing on the water's surface to our joy; a letter from a lad; a sick-bed or dying testimony to our words—are not these sweet, balm, stimulants? But we must not dwell on success, or impatiently watch for results: it is enough that "the love of Christ constrains us"—that we have a commission from God Himself, are of His soldiery; have the nobleness of His work, His promise, His Spirit. Oh

that we dared presume upon His approval or reward! But He employs the feeblest instruments—"earthen vessels;" therefore, "Here am I, send me."

Lastly, we may comfort ourselves in the fellowship of our brethren in the world; the communion with the faithful, gone and alive, triumphant and militant; the increasing band of lay helpers; the manifest life in the English Church; the unspeakable support of the Bible, that wonderful, Book, ever opening in increased light and convincing language to meet the emergency of the Church; the unfailing might of Communion with our Life in the Lord's Supper. But behind and above all we have the communion and fellowship of God the Holy Ghost—His inspiration, His light, His guidance, strength and peace; to Whom we ever fly for comfort, in Whom we ever trust. Oh, how much more should I like to say! but let us end with, "Have compassion upon our infirmities;" "Thy kingdom come;" "I will glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me;" for "When I am weak, then am I strong;" "I will love Thee, O Lord, my strength;" and "I will make mention of Thee and of Thy righteousness only." "Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen."

ART. III. — THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

CEREMONIAL AND TECHNICAL TERMS, AND QUOTED PASSAGES.

IT is not easy to over-estimate the value of a careful study of Jewish ceremonial; and, for this purpose, one must begin by strictly weighing the ritual language of the Hebrew Old Testament. Nothing can exceed its technical accuracy; and this accuracy of usage is represented to a considerable extent in the Septuagint, and so passes on into the Greek New Testament. If the translators of 1611 somewhat failed in exhibiting the force of Hebrew ceremonial terms, and in supplying uniform renderings where needed, it might have been expected that our Revisers would have corrected any such failures. Let us see how far they have done so.

The first chapter of Leviticus begins thus: "And the Lord called unto Moses, and spake unto him out of the tent of meeting, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When any man of you offereth an oblation unto the Lord, ye shall offer your oblation of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock. If his oblation be a burnt offering of the herd, he shall offer it a male without blemish: he shall offer it at the door of the tent of meeting, that he may be accepted before the Lord. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him."

We first notice in this passage that the place formerly called

the tabernacle of the congregation is now called the tent of meeting. Our ideas of a tabernacle are rather hazy, and are affected in some degree by the fact that Mr. Spurgeon has thought fit to dignify his vast and substantial meeting-house by this sounding title. It may be well that all readers should be reminded that the object described in the Pentateuch is somewhat of the nature of a tent. The New Testament Revisers, however, shrank from doing away with the word "tabernacle," as will be seen in Acts vii. 44, Heb. ix. 2, and Rev. xxi. 3; moreover, in John i. 14, against the word "dwelt" they have put in the margin "tabernacled." On the whole, it might have been better to have retained this word tabernacle, giving it a capital T, and explaining it to mean a tent, in the first passage where it occurs. It will be observed, however, that the Revisers have retained the word "tabernacle" in Exod xxv. 9 and xxvi. 1, and other passages, where they might have done better by using the word "dwelling-place." The Hebrew word here used is not *ohel* (a tent), but *mishcan*, from the root of which the word "Shekinah" is derived, and which found its way into Greek in the word σκηνη. The Revisers translate it "tent" in Cant. i. 8. As this word *mishcan* was translated "tabernacle" in about 120 passages in the A.V., the Revisers had ample excuse for retaining it; only we feel that if the word "tabernacle" is good for *mishcan*, it would be still better for *ohel*. Before leaving this word, we may observe that where we read of the Feast of Tabernacles the word *sucah* (booth) is used. The Revisers have wisely retained the word "tabernacles" in the text, and have put "booths" into the margin.

So much for the word "tabernacle;" but were the Revisers justified in turning "the congregation" into "meeting"? We think they were; though the word "meeting" is not quite strong enough. The real thought in the word is "appointment," in the sense in which we speak of making an appointment with a person, and it is equally applicable to times and places.[1] There are two important passages where it is used, viz., Exod. xxv. 22, "There" (*i.e.* over the mercy-seat) "I will meet with thee;" and Exod. xxix. 43, "There" (*i.e.* at the entrance of the tabernacle) "I will meet with the children of Israel." The ordinary Septuagint rendering for the tabernacle of the congregation is σκηνη του μαρτυριου, Tabernacle of

[1] I have discussed the usage of this and other words referred to in these papers, in "Old Testament Synonyms" (Longmans); and perhaps I may be excused for referring to this book, as it is, I believe, the only book in the English language which has applied to the Old Testament, however imperfectly, the method which Archbishop Trench applied to the New.

Witness, and this expression is reproduced in Acts vii. 44. It would seem that the Greek translators connected the word with a Hebrew root which signifies to bear witness.

Reverting to our passage, we notice that the Revisers, in company with the translators, say that the offering is to be brought to the door. It is strange that they should not have recognised the difference between a door and a doorway. There is nothing whatever about a door in the Hebrew. The word simply means an entrance or opening, and this idea, which is a far pleasanter one, ought certainly to have been presented. The object which had to do duty for a door is now translated "screen" (Exod. xxxv. 12, etc.); in the A.V. it is called a hanging or covering.

The word "offering" has been turned to "oblation" where it stands for the Hebrew *Corban*. We have no particular fancy for the word "oblation," but we would gladly accept it for the sake of consistency, if only we could have a good rendering for the verb from which it is derived, which the translators rendered "bring" instead of "bring near" or "offer." On the whole, we should prefer the word "offer," and it is satisfactory to find that the Revisers have sometimes adopted this word—why not always?

The expression "burnt offering" is retained for the Hebrew *'olah*, which probably means something which is caused to ascend; but why are not the two English words joined with a hyphen to show that they stand for one Hebrew word? The same question may be asked with respect to all the offerings. We think that the Revisers have strangely neglected their duty by omitting this hyphen; we think also that they should have given the literal meaning of the Hebrew names for the offerings in the margin, because they are the best possible comment on the nature of the rites in question.

Readers will notice that the words "he shall offer it of his own voluntary will" are altered to "he shall offer it that he may be accepted." This is an important and most necessary change, though we should have preferred the more literal rendering "for his acceptance." The force of the third verse is thus brought out in its connection with the fourth, where we read that "it shall be accepted for him" (literally "to him," as if put down to his account).

The sentence continues thus: "to make atonement for him." We desiderate a hyphen connecting the words "make atonement;" in fact, there is no reason why the Revisers should not have said "to atone;" and with regard to the expression "for him," it would have been well to have noted in the margin that the literal meaning is *on* or *over*, the idea being that of a covering or shelter beneath which the sinner is accepted. It

is not till Lev. xvi. 10 that the Revisers deemed it wise to point out this last fact in a note, and even then it seems doubtful if they observed its real significance.

We notice, when we get on to the fifth verse, that the word "offer" has been departed from, and the word "present" has taken its place. This is a serious drawback, because it leads the reader to the idea that the priest's work has a different object from the offerer's, whereas the same word is used in the Hebrew to indicate that the priest is carrying on the offerer's work; acting, in fact, as his representative. Again, in the ninth verse, the priest is described as "burning" the whole on the altar, without a note of indication that the word translated "burn" does not mean "burn," but rather "turn to vapour," the idea being not *consumption* by fire but *ascension* by fire; the victim going up to heaven in the form of vapour as an acceptable sacrifice, having been presented by the offerer through the mediation of the priest.

We have thus far traced the Revisers through the first nine verses of Leviticus, noting only salient points, and the result is by no means perfectly satisfactory. When we look at the names of the Revision Committee we feel sure that they must have weighed all such matters as we have referred to; no careful student of the Hebrew text could fail to do so; yet they seem in their united wisdom to have come short just where we expected them to have succeeded.

We must now pass rapidly over other sacrificial words. The "meat offering" is rightly changed to "meal offering," but without the hyphen. "Peace offerings" are retained, but a feeble effort is made in the direction of a better rendering in the margin, where we find "thank offerings." The so-called "peace offering" is really something *rendered* to the Lord in return for His mercies; and "recompense-offering," or some such expression, ought to have been put in the margin. The word is translated "make restitution" in Lev. v. 17 (A.V., "make amends").

"Sinning through ignorance" is turned into "sinning unwittingly" in Lev. iv. 2; but the margin gives a far more adequate rendering, viz., "sinning through error." It will be observed that four cases come under the sin of error (Lev. iv.); the cases of the priest, the congregation, the ruler, and one of the common people. The first of these is introduced thus in the A.V.: "if the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people." For this we find in the R.V.: "if the anointed priest shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people." The Revisers are manifestly right in establishing the distinction between the Hebrew words for "sin" and "guilt" (*chattah* and *asham*), and perhaps they are right in the noteworthy inter-

pretation they give to the passage; but a marginal note is needed—to say the least—indicating that the literal meaning of the word is "for the guilt of the people." In the second case the Revisers have retained the distinction (Lev. iv. 13) between the *congregation*, that is the people as a whole, and the *assembly*, that is the people in conclave as represented by their elders (*'Adah* and *Kahal*).

The "trespass offering" (Lev. v. 6) is most properly changed to a "guilt offering," and the word "trespass" is rightly reserved for the acts of the offender (Lev. v. 14—vi. 7). The English student will also see the advantage of having the early part of the sixth of Leviticus grouped with the latter part of the fifth, the cases of restitution for trespass being thus thrown together.

In Lev. vi. 9, instead of reading "it is the burnt offering because of the burning upon the altar," the Revisers read "the burnt offering shall be on the hearth" (marg., "or on its firewood") "upon the altar." We are not sure that the translation is strictly grammatical; but the rendering "hearth" is defensible, as the Hebrew student will see by a reference to Ps. cii. 3, A.V (R.V., "firebrand"). The defect of this new rendering is that it destroys the connection between the middle part of the verse and the last part, where the Revisers still read "the fire of the altar shall be kept *burning*." The meaning of the passage is that the fire should be allowed to smoulder on, and the fresh offering should be laid on the old embers, the fagots being renewed and the ashes removed day by day. Perhaps the word "embers" might have been introduced here, and certainly they would have given the right sense in Ps. xxx. 14, where we read of a potsherd being used to gather fire from the "hearth."

The change from a "heave shoulder" to a "heave thigh" (Lev. vii. 32) will strike everyone. We all know the difference between a leg and a shoulder of mutton; and the Revisers have come to the conclusion that it was the former that was allotted to the priest. But if so, why not say "leg" plainly? It is really ludicrous to read in 1 Sam. ix. 24, "the cook took up the thigh." Meanwhile, the most important authorities, the Targums, the Septuagint, and Gesenius, are altogether in favour of our old rendering. We know of no reason whatever for departing from Gesenius' view of the Hebrew word (*shok*), viz., that whilst it means "leg" or "thigh" in a man, it means what we technically call a "shoulder" in a quadruped.

Leaving the Revisers to digest their heave thigh at leisure, we observe that Lev. vii. 35 now runs thus: "this is the anointing-portion of Aaron and the anointing-portion of his sons . . . it is a due for ever throughout their generation."

We are glad that for once the Revisers have recognised the use of the hyphen; and the word "due" is good, provided it is true, but "statute" or "ordinance" is better. Why then make the change?

There are two singular expressions in several verses of Lev. xiii., rendered in the A.V. "to pronounce clean" and "to pronounce unclean." We looked with interest to see if the Revisers had altered them or had condescended to add a note to them, but it is not so. The point of the expressions lies here, that in the Hebrew "to pronounce clean" is literally "to cleanse;" and this bears on our Lord's work in cleansing the leper, on the words spoken in vision to St. Peter in Acts x., and on the declarative idea connected with the doctrine of justification and absolution.

We now come to the ritual of the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi.). It is not our intention to write a treatise on the word *Azazel* (A.V., "scapegoat"), or to dilate on the baldness of the marginal alternative ("dismissal"). In the sixth verse Aaron is described as offering (R.V., wrongly, "presenting") a bullock because of his own sins. (The Revisers have missed the force of the preposition "because of.") He then causes the two goats to stand (the Revisers weakly "set" them, as if they were tables) before the Lord, at the entrance of the tabernacle (R.V., "the door of the tent"). Aaron's business, after deciding the destiny of the two animals by lot, is (A.V.) to offer the one for a sin-offering. Now the Hebrew here (verse 9) is very noteworthy: "He shall make him (*to be*) sin" (compare 2 Cor. v. 21). The Revisers have tamely reproduced the A.V. without giving a hint in the margin of the literal meaning of the words, and without even preserving the italics supplied in the A.V. Again, in the sixteenth verse the R.V. follows the A.V. in saying that the priest makes atonement for the holy place because of the uncleannesses of Israel. There is no real objection to this rendering, but the fact ought to be pointed out that the preposition here rendered "because of" literally means "from," indicating the doing away with the contamination referred to. When, however, the Revisers get on to the nineteenth verse they venture to put the word "from" into the text (following the A.V.). But if the word "from" is good for the nineteenth verse, why not for the seventeenth?

Our translators began the twentieth verse thus: "When he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place." The reason which led them to use the word "reconcile" rather than "atone" was probably the fact that the preposition which ordinarily follows the verb to "atone" is missing from the Hebrew text. The Revisers ignore this fact, and print,

"When He hath made an end of atoning for the holy place," neglecting to mark the word "*for*" in italics.

One more point in this important chapter has been missed by the Revisers. In the twenty-seventh verse we read (A.V. and R.V.) that the bullock and goat whose blood was brought into the holy place were to be burnt without the camp. But the Hebrew word for burning is a very strong one, and utterly different from that used in the ritual of the offerings. It means to *burn up*, not to turn to vapour. The force of this apparently small point will be considered when the remarkable rites of the Great Day of Atonement are fully weighed. Sin produces two effects. It contaminates God's dwelling-place, and it brings death to the sinner. Blood-sprinkling and utter consumption are provided to meet the one evil; escape and life are provided for the other.

There is an important passage in the seventeenth of Leviticus which must not be passed over. The eleventh verse runs thus in the A.V.: "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." Here, against the word *life* the Revisers have given a correct marginal note (Heb., *soul*), and they have translated the last clause thus; "for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." This is an improvement on the A.V.; but it is not absolutely accurate, for the preposition rendered "by reason of" means simply "in." There are three statements in the text; first, the soul-life of an animal is in its blood. Every physiologist knows what this means. Secondly, God appoints the life-blood of victims to make atonement for (or over) the soul-life of man. Thirdly, the reason of this is that the life-blood of victims is one with (literally *in*) their soul-life. Again in the fourteenth verse we read (A.V.): "It is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life thereof;" but the R.V. has, "As to the life of all flesh, the blood thereof is *all one* with the life thereof." The expression rendered "all one with" is literally *in;* and if the Revisers had simply put "one with" in both passages, with a marginal note on the literal meaning of the word, the sense of the whole would have been clear.

Before passing from the sacrificial rites, it is worth while to examine how far the Revisers have been consistent in their terminology in some other notable passages of the Old Testament where these are mentioned. In Ps. xl. 6 we have the four classes of offerings named together, viz., the sacrificial feasts, which all partook of; the meal-offerings and sin-offerings, of which the priests ate certain parts; and the burnt-offerings, which no one ate. Here the Revisers have failed in

one point only, viz., that they have put meal-offering into the margin and not into the text. The sacrificial passages in Pss. l. and li. are fairly dealt with, but in Isaiah liii. the interesting reference to the guilt-offering (verse 10) is thrown into the margin instead of being brought into the text.

Lying at the root of the Old Testament sacrificial system is the thought of *atonement*. It has often been remarked upon that this foundation-word only occurs once in the New Testament, and then by a mistranslation; but the *thing* is there, under the name of propitiation. The Hebrew term (*caphar*) has not been translated very consistently in the A.V., so that the Revisers have had an excellent opportunity for improving the version in this respect. The word occurs in the following passages where italics are used. They are quoted from the A.V., and the changes in the R.V. are appended:

Num. xxxv. 33: "The land cannot be *cleansed* of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." Margin, "there can be no *expiation* for the land.' R.V., "no *expiation* can be made for the land."

Deut. xxi. 8, 9: "*Be merciful* unto thy people whom Thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood to thy people of Israel's charge. And the blood *shall be forgiven* them." R.V., "*Forgive* thy people whom thou hast redeemed, and suffer not innocent blood (to remain) in the midst of thy people Israel. And the blood *shall be forgiven* them."

Deut. xxxii. 43: "He *will be merciful* unto his land (and) to his people." R.V., "He will *make expiation* for his land, for his people."

1 Sam. iii. 14: "The iniquity of Eli's house shall not *be purged* with sacrifice nor offering for ever." R.V. the same, but the word "*expiated*" put in the margin.

2 Chron. xxx. 18, 19: "The good Lord *pardon* everyone that prepareth his heart to seek the Lord." R.V. the same.

Ps. lxv. 3: "As for our transgressions, thou shalt *purge* them *away*." R.V. the same.

Ps. lxxviii. 38: "He being full of compassion *forgave* their iniquity." R.V. the same.

Ps. lxxix. 9: "*Purge away* our sins for thy name's sake." R.V. the same.

Prov. xvi. 6: "By mercy and truth iniquity *is purged*." R.V. the same; but in the margin, "*is atoned for*."

Isa. vi. 7: "Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin *purged*." R.V. the same, but "*expiated*" in the margin.

Isa. xxii. 14: "This iniquity shall not *be purged* from you till ye die." R.V. the same, but "*expiated*" in the margin.

Isa. xxvii. 9: "By this shall the iniquity of Jacob *be purged*." R.V. the same, but "*expiated*" in the margin.

Isa. xxviii. 18: "Your covenant with death shall be *disannulled*." R.V. the same.

Isa. xlvii. 11: "Mischief shall fall on thee; thou shalt be unable *to put it off*." R.V., "*to put it away*."

Jer. xviii. 23: "*Forgive* not their iniquity, neither blot out their sin from thy sight." R.V. the same.

Ezek. xvi. 63: "When *I am pacified* toward thee for all that thou hast done." R.V., "*I have forgiven* thee."

The reader who carefully studies these passages will note a slight tendency towards a consistent rendering, though very slight, on the part of the Revisers, and he will observe the introduction of the word "expiation" for the first time into the text; but is all done that ought to have been done? In all the passages where the A.V. had "reconciliation" for "atonement" the Revisers have very properly returned to the word "atonement" except in one, viz., Dan. ix. 24. Why was not the change made here also? They have turned "satisfaction" into "ransom" in Num. xxxv. 31, 32, and "bribe" into "ransom" in 1 Sam. xii. 3; while "bribe" remains in Amos v. 12. A "sum of money" is turned into "ransom" in Exod. xxi. 30; and this word is retained in Exod. xxx. 12; Job xxxiii. 24; xxxvi. 18; Ps. xlix. 7; Prov. vi. 35; xiii. 8; xxi. 18; and Isa. xliii. 3. In the large number of passages still remaining to be noticed—about eighty altogether—the Revisers have retained the word "atonement."

Passing to the kindred idea of redemption, we find no such multiplicity of renderings for the Hebrew *gaal* in the A.V. or R.V. The idea of Kinsman is still combined with that of Redeemer, in the use of *Goel*. In Job xix. 25, as a marginal note against the passage, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," we find the word "vindicator" introduced. There is another word (*padah*) which signifies deliverance from slavery, or rescue from some danger, which has been rendered "redeem" in the A.V. in several passages, but this seems unfortunate; and, strange to say, the Revisers have not thought fit to correct one of them.

It is only one step from the thought of redemption to that of salvation. Our translators have given us six English representatives for the Hebrew *yasha'* (from which the names of Jesus is derived); namely, save, help, preserve, rescue, defend, and deliver. Of these the most misleading is the word "help," which gives to an English reader the idea of assistance, as if God did part of the work and man another part. Singling out this word, we find that the Revisers have only corrected three out of the seventeen passages which needed to be dealt with.

We pass now to the subject of *repeated and quoted passages*—a very profitable topic for study. Not only are there about 600 Old Testament texts quoted in the New, more or less exactly, but also the later Old Testament writers quote their predecessors to a very much larger extent than many people are aware of. The Pentateuch seems to have been a sort of Bible to the Israelites after their entrance into Canaan. It was studied by prophets and kings, and its con-

tents were known to a certain extent among the common people. It was their handbook to the sacred places of the Patriarchal age, as well as their text-book of Law and Promise. It provided them not only with the ritual of their national feasts, but also with the circumstances under which those feasts came into existence. No wonder, then, that we find it verbally quoted again and again in the subsequent historical writings and the prophetical books. But this is not all. The Psalms are not only historically, but also verbally related to the records contained in Samuel and Kings. Isaiah and Micah, who were contemporaries, had access the one to the other's writings. Jeremiah, who lived some time afterwards, makes free use of both, and of other prophets also. Joel had probably read Jonah; Daniel had certainly read Jeremiah; Malachi had read Zechariah. These are only samples of a vast treasury of facts which have hitherto been little used, but which will, we trust, ere long be exhibited before the student. Their bearing on certain Biblical questions must be self-evident. We observe, in the first place, how special thoughts and passages stamped themselves on the mind of godly men. We are not surprised to find words spoken at the crisis of Israel's history, when the Egyptians were behind them and the Red Sea before them, reproduced at a later crisis, when, humanly speaking, the dangers were as great (compare Exod. xiv. 13 with 2 Chron. xx. 17); or portions of the song delivered by Moses reproduced *verbatim* in the Psalms and prophets (compare Exod. xv. 2 with Ps. cxviii. 14 and Isa. xii. 2); or the poem committed to the people before Moses' death, leaving its mark on several later writers. We do not wonder to find words from David's lament over Saul quoted verbally by Micah (2 Sam. i. 20 and Micah i. 10); or Micah's own prophetic utterance of the downfall of Jerusalem quoted and commented on a hundred years afterwards (Micah iii. 12 and Jer. xxvi. 18). But there are other things to be learnt. We find Psalm after Psalm and chapter after chapter in duplicate, to an extent hardly realized until we put them side by side; and the phenomena thus presented give us new light on the ways of God and on the doctrine of inspiration—perhaps, also, on the relationship of certain books to one another in the New Testament. All this goes without saying; and yet we have not got to the bottom of the matter. There are at the present time many speculations about the age, compilation, and authorship of the books of the Old Testament, about the variations in dialect, and about the condition of the sacred text. What if God has preserved to us in the Hebrew Old Testament a sort of stratification answering to that which we find beneath the surface

of our soil, whereby many of our present speculations may receive, if not solution, yet illumination?

Readers of THE CHURCHMAN, however, will not thank us if we pursue this subject further; but they will probably agree thus far: (1) that all quotations should be exhibited, whether by inverted commas or otherwise; (2) that quoted passages should be translated uniformly where the text is the same; (3) that where the text is only slightly different the differences should be minimised. The translators of the A.V. aimed fairly at the second of these principles; and the Revisers have gone a little further in the same direction, and that is about all that can be said. They have frequently notified in the margin that certain Psalms and chapters are to be compared with certain others, and textual differences have been occasionally noted; but the work has not been carried out fully or consistently. Possibly they feared to go too much into matters purely critical, but it might at least be expected that such passages as those noted above would have been marked as quotations; yet of the nine passages which we have cited as examples only one has so much as a side-note referring to the passage from which it is quoted, viz., Jer. xxvi. 18.

The more familiar branch of this topic, viz., the reproduction of passages from the Old Testament in the New, has yet to be considered. We are not now dealing with the Revised New Testament. Most of our readers have heard enough about it, and we shall neither bless it at all nor curse it at all; but it must be our business in the remaining part of this paper to inquire into the treatment of the quoted passages by the Old Testament Revisers.

After examining the whole series, which may easily be done with the aid of such a book as Gough's "New Testament Quotations," we find that only about 40 out of the 614 passages to be dealt with have been materially altered, and even here the touches are slight, and usually for the better. We will now give in their order the passages which strike us as most interesting or suitable for comment.

Gen. xviii. 14: "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" No change is made here. The margin has "wonderful." But the LXX. has "impossible." If any reader compares the Greek rendering of the verse with Luke i. 37, and the analogous nature of the circumstances referred to, and the comment on the history given by St. Paul in Rom. iv. 19-21, he will come to the conclusion that the angel Gabriel intended to remind the mother of the Lord of the words spoken in Genesis. But alas for the rendering of Luke i. 37 in the R.V. "No word from God shall be void of power"! All that we desiderate here, then, with respect to the Old Testament, is that the

Revisers should have given us the word "impossible" as an alternative rendering, and should have put with it a reference to St. Luke. Before going on it may be as well to observe that the Hebrew word translated "hard" is that which we have in Isa. ix. 6, where the Revisers have retained the rendering "wonderful;" it occurs also in Judges xiii. 18: "Why asketh thou thus after my name, seeing it is *secret?*" (R.V., "wonderful").

Gen. xlvii. 31: "And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." No change in the R.V., and no reference. The Septuagint has, "Israel bowed himself (or worshipped) upon the top of his staff;" and in this form the verse is reproduced in Heb. xi. 21. It is strange that the Revisers should have ignored this fact, with which they were all familiar. The Hebrew words for "bed" or "staff" are the same, the vowel points (which are not part of the original Hebrew) being different. Whether it was the staff of office which Joseph carried—as seems most probable—or whether it was Jacob's own staff which is referred to, there can be no doubt that it was this staff which the old man touched with his forehead in the act of prostration, not the head of the bed. It is not even clear what a "bed's head" would mean in those days, or what attitude Jacob would have to put himself into in order to prostrate himself upon it; whereas the sense of the text, as conveyed through the LXX., is clear, though neither our translators nor Revisers have done justice to it in the Old and New Testaments.

Exod. ix. 16: "For this cause have I raised thee up." R.V., "have I made thee to stand." The Revisers have here fallen into the fault which they have usually avoided, but to which their brethren of the New Testament were so prone. In the attempt to be literal they have become absurd. St. Paul's version of the passage (Rom. ix. 17) is quite as literal, and far more sensible and conformable to similar passages.

Exod. xxxiv. 33: "And (till) Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face." R.V., "and when Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face." The difference of sense is noteworthy; and the new rendering, which is advanced without any marginal alternative, seems to be borne out by the comments made by St. Paul in 2 Cor. iii.

Deut. xxvii. 26: "Cursed (be) he that confirmeth not (all) the words of this law to do them." R.V., "cursed be he that confirmeth not the words of this law to do them." The Revisers are justified in omitting the word "all," which, however, must still be understood. The Septuagint is very strong, "Cursed is every man who continueth not in all the words of

this law to do them;" and St. Paul's citation is according to the tenor of the LXX. (see Gal. iii. 10).

1 Kings xix. 18: "Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel;" margin, "or, I will leave." The Revisers adopt this margin, led to do so by the grammar of the first clause of the verse, without reference to the second clause; concerning which we say, with all respect, that St. Paul was as good a grammarian as the best of them (see Rom. xi. 4). The LXX. has, "Thou shalt leave." There is no material difference in the sense in any case.

Ps. ii. 9: "Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron." R.V., "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron." The Septuagint has, "Thou shalt rule (or shepherd) them;" and this rendering is retained in Rev. ii. 27; xii. 5; xix. 15. Moreover, in the first of these passages there is a definite reference to the second Psalm in the words, "even as I received of my Father." We think, therefore, that if the Revisers felt constrained to alter the rendering in the Psalm, they should at any rate have retained the old rendering in the margin, on the authority of the LXX.

Ps. iv. 4: "Stand in awe, and sin not." R.V. the same; but in the margin, "Be ye angry." This note is useful. The verse, as given in the LXX., is quoted verbatim in Eph. iv. 26.

Ps. xvi. 9: "My flesh also shall rest in hope;" margin, "Heb., dwell confidently." R.V., "shall dwell in safety." Of these three renderings the middle one is the most accurate, and the Revisers have got it in the margin. The expression to dwell safely or in safety is such a common one in the Old Testament that the Revisers were quite justified in introducing it here. There is some doubt in the mind of the English reader whether it is the dwelling in life or the lying down to rest in death which is here referred to; but the Hebrew and LXX. are both in favour of the former view. The same Hebrew words for dwelling safely are to be found in juxtaposition in Deut. xxxiii. 12, 28; Prov. i. 33; Jer. xxiii. 16; xxxiii. 16.

Ps. xxii. 8: "He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him;" margin, "he rolled himself on the Lord." R.V., "Commit thyself unto the Lord; let him deliver him." The revised margin gives the old rendering of the A.V., and for this view of the passage we have both the authority of the LXX. and the citation in Mat. xxvii. 43.

Ps. lxviii. 18: "Thou hast received gifts for man;" margin, "Heb., in the man." R.V., "Thou hast received gifts among men." Our margin is literal, and the LXX. almost agrees with it. From a theological point of view, the passage might be taken as meaning that the Lord in human nature went up

and received gifts which he might dispense. St. Paul in quoting it (Eph. iv. 8) does not profess to give the passage exactly as it was written.

Ps. lxix. 22: "Let their table become a snare before them; and (that which should have been) for (their) welfare, let it become a trap." St. Paul quotes this in the following form: "Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a recompense unto them." At first sight his version looks very different from the Hebrew; but when we remove the words put in brackets, and turn the word "welfare" into "recompense," which the Hebrew word frequently means, we find that the difference is considerably reduced. The R.V. has: "Let their table before them become a snare; and when they are in peace, let it become a trap." The word translated "when they are in peace" cannot possibly mean it; and the LXX. and St. Paul are ignored without a shadow of reason.

Ps. xcv. 7, 8: "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart, as in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness." R.V., "To-day, Oh that ye would hear his voice! Harden not your heart, as at Meribah, as in the day of Massah in the wilderness." We are glad that Meribah and Massah should be referred to, either in the text or in the margin; and we are glad that the Revisers have found out that "if ye will" means (according to Hebrew idiom) "Oh that ye would;" but it is a pity that they did not find it out when translating Exod. xxxii. 32, where, instead of, "if thou wilt forgive their sin," we ought to read, "Oh that thou wouldst forgive their sin."

Ps. civ. 4: "who maketh his angels spirits, his ministers a flame of fire." R.V., "who maketh the winds his messengers, his ministers a flaming fire." R.V., margin, "who maketh his angels winds." In Heb. i. 7 we read, "And with reference to the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits (or winds), and his ministers a flame of fire." We should reject the Reviser's text, but we approve of their margin. If the Revisers were right in their text, they ought to have read thus, "who maketh winds his agents, flaming fire his ministers." This would make good sense, and would fit in with the context; but the order of the words in Hebrew is decidedly in favour of the view taken in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and we believe that the Psalmist is comparing the action of God's angelic ministers to the action of the wind and of fire. The second and third verse of the Psalm describe God's dwelling-place and his personal movements; the fourth verse describes the position and characteristics of ministering angels; the fifth and following verses describe the preparation of earth for man.

Ps. cxvi. 10: "I believed, therefore I have spoken." R.V., "I believe, for I will speak." R.V., margin, "I believed when I spake thus." St. Paul translates the passage as the LXX. does, and deliberately applies it to himself: "according as it is written, I believed, therefore have I spoken; we also believe, and therefore speak." The Revisers by their alteration have slipped into a bit of pedantry, and have lost the sense which the LXX. and St. Paul fortunately retained. Hengstenberg's note on the passage is good. He shows that the real force is, "I believed, for I did speak," the speech being the proof of the presence of faith, just as the love of the sinful woman in Luke vii. marked her sense of obligation. We must not sacrifice our common-sense on the altar of grammar; we must rather enlarge our grammars so as to take in such brief and pregnant sentences as that under consideration.

Prov. iii. 4: "so shalt thou find favour and good understanding in the sight of God and man." The LXX. rendering of this passage is twice referred to by St. Paul (Rom. xii. 17; and 2 Cor. viii. 21), but the Revisers, following the A.V., ignore the possibility of any meeting-place between the Hebrew and the Greek.

Prov. iv. 26: "Ponder the path of thy feet." R.V., "Make level the path of thy feet." This is an improvement. The LXX. has "Make straight paths for thy feet;" and in this form the passage is quoted in Heb. xii. 13.

Isa. vii. 14: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son." R.V. the same; but there are three notes: first, instead of saying *a* virgin, we may say *the* virgin; secondly, instead of using the word "virgin," we may use the word "maiden" (which means exactly the same thing); thirdly, we may read it "the virgin is with child, and beareth a son," which, when one comes to reflect on the matter, is nonsense, unless it is supposed that there was some virgin in Isaiah's days who was then and there to bring forth a son. The arrangement of the Hebrew words is peculiar, and the Revisers have been thus led on to think that the grammar was doubtful; but in this case the arrangement is manifestly adopted in order to give emphasis to the leading word in the great prophecy of the Incarnation.

Isa. viii. 17: "And I will look for him." R.V. the same. But the LXX. has "I will be confident in him;" and in this form it is quoted in Heb. ii. 13. The rendering of the LXX. might have easily been grafted into the text thus, "I will hope confidently in him."

Isa. x. 22, 23: "Though thy people be as the sand of the sea, (yet) a remnant of them shall return; the consumption decreed shall overflow with righteousness. For the Lord shall

make a consumption, even determined, in the midst of the land." R.V., "Though thy people be as the sands of the sea, (only) a remnant of them shall return: a consumption is determined, overflowing with righteousness. For a consummation, and that determined, shall the Lord make in the midst of all the earth." The passage is not an easy one. It is quoted by St. Paul, in Rom. ix. 27, 28. The first part of it is easy to translate, but the difficulty is to know exactly the force of it. This the Revisers have given, according to a view held by many commentators, by inserting the word "only" into the text. The Revisers of the New Testament have done something similar, for they have put, "it is the remnant that shall return." This interpretation goes on the supposition that a remnant is a small portion only of the population, as we talk of a remnant of cloth, etc.; but this is not the force of the Hebrew. The idea *may be* exactly the contrary, and the sense may be given thus, "though the people become" (not *be*) "as the sand of the sea in multitude, yet the whole number shall be restored;" or, as St. Paul puts it, "*all* Israel shall be saved." There are no less than eight Hebrew words translated "remnant" in the A.V. The expression here used for "the remnant shall return" is *Shear Jashub*, which is given as a significant proper name in Isa. vii. 3; we have it also in the twenty-first verse. We trace this "remnant" in process of restoration in Isa. xi. 11-16, where we get a triumphant reminiscence of the old days, when they came out of Egypt leaving not a hoof behind. On the whole, we think the Revisers have been too clever in putting in the word "only," and we recommend readers to strike their pen through it.

Passing to the latter part of the verse, we may notice first that the words "consumption" and "consummation" stand for two forms of one and the same Hebrew word; secondly, that the obscurity of the passage is somewhat relieved when it is read in the light of Isa. xxviii. 22, which has a manifest reference to it; and thirdly, that the passage should be compared with the latter part of Dan. ix. 27. St. Paul quotes from the LXX., but the English version hardly gives the force of the Greek, whilst the Greek is not so full and expressive as the Hebrew. The meaning of the whole passage may perhaps be found in some words of our Lord's, "except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." We are not, however, writing a commentary, but a critique on a Version, and we must pass on.

Isa. xxv. 8: "He will swallow up death in victory." R.V., "He hath swallowed up death for ever." The expression may

mean "for over," but it seems rather to mean "utterly" or "triumphantly." St. Paul translates it literally.

Isa. liii. 4: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." R.V. the same. We desiderate the word "Himself," which both St. Matthew and St. Peter give us in referring to this verse. It lies in the Hebrew, and ought to have been expressed in the English.

Isa. liii. 8: "He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living." R.V., "By oppression and judgment he was taken away; and as for his generation, who (among them) considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living?" The preposition which the Revisers translate *by* means "from," and the A.V. is literal enough, whatever meaning we attach to it. But the Septuagint is based upon a slightly different Hebrew reading, and this is the version preserved to us in Acts viii. 32, 33. But by no possible means can the sense put by the Revisers on the last portion of the verse be got out of the Hebrew; for the word "generation" is in the accusative case, but they have so twisted it about that it is hard to know what case they make of it. The word translated "declare" (R.V., "consider") means to meditate or muse upon something, and hence to commune or talk of it. Thus the question is, "who will meditate upon his generation?" or, "who will tell it to others?" not "who of his contemporaries considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living?"

Isa. lxiv. 4: "neither hath the eye seen, O God, beside thee, what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for him." R.V., "neither hath the eye seen a God beside thee, which worketh for him that waiteth for him." St. Paul's reference to the passage is, we think, undoubted, though fragmentary. The Revisers have approached the sense of the LXX., which runs thus: "neither have our eyes seen a God beside thee, and thy works which thou shalt do for them that wait for mercy."

Hos. vi. 7: "They like men have transgressed the covenant." The Revisers have followed the margin of the A.V., and have put "like Adam." There may be a reference to this passage in Rom. v. 14.

Hos. xiii. 14: "O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction." R.V., "O death, where are thy plagues? O grave, where is thy destruction?" This is an approximation to the familiar text in 1 Cor. xv. 55. It is to be noticed, however, that the word translated "grave" is "Sheol" or "Hades," and that for "destruction" the LXX. has "sting."

Zech. xiv. 11: "And there shall be no more utter destruction." R.V., "And there shall be no more curse." This change is a

good one, as it enables us to recognise the quotations from the LXX. in Prov. xxii. 3.

With this text we may close what we hope is neither an unimportant nor an uninteresting part of our inquiry.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

(To be continued.)

ART. IV.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR. IX. SEPTEMBER. ST. MATTHEW THE PUBLICAN.

A. THE TRUE FOLLOWING OF JESUS CHRIST.

"*Follow Me: and he arose and followed Him.*"—MATT. ix. 9.

THE instruction derived from the incidents of this kind that are described in the Gospels is like the instruction which we draw from the parables.

Such cases as the calling of John and James, Peter and Andrew, from the fishing-nets, by help of which they exercised an honest trade;[1] or the calling of the rich young man to part with his possessions, to "sell all that he had," and then to "follow Christ" in His poverty;[2] or the calling of St. Matthew here to leave the toll-booth or custom-house (such appears to have been the fact of the case) where he was collecting the tax levied on those who came along the Damascus road by a bridge over the Jordan[3]—such cases, as a very little reflection will show us, cannot possibly for ourselves, under ordinary circumstances, be literal examples.

These three instances might be taken as representative of the three sections into which the sum-total of the ordinary occupations of men may be divided. We have here the labourer, the capitalist, and the man of business. Now it is manifest that if, in every instance, the labourer were to give up his craft, the capitalist to dispense his property and separate it from himself, the man of business to close his shop, to burn his ledgers, to give up communication with all his correspondents, the great machine of social human life would come to a standstill: and the principles of Christianity would not, by this method, have penetrated the world. The principles of Christianity would, in fact, have very little remaining on which to act at all.

These Gospel incidents, therefore, are intended to be, so far as we are concerned, not so much examples to be imitated, as

[1] Matt. iv. 20. [2] *Ibid.*, xix. 21.

[3] See below, in the next section for this month.

vivid illustrations of the great religious change which marks the true disciple of Christ. The grand problem which the disciple of Christ is called to solve is this, how to be united to Christ by faith, by love, by devotion, while yet discharging all ordinary duties in a world which is unfriendly to Christ. This problem is very difficult; so difficult, indeed, as to be impossible to man's unassisted powers. It can be solved only by God's grace. But it was very essential that the grave reality of this demand upon us should be set forth very forcibly and very explicitly in Holy Scripture.

And nothing could produce this result more effectually than these incidents which are recorded in the Gospels. We see in them distinctly, as in a picture, this great truth, that Christ is to be held as of more value than anything else, or than all other things put together. *He must be followed:* and to follow Him we must turn our back upon the world. Just as St. Paul represents this giving up of the world and this union with Christ under the image of *death*—"I am crucified unto the world, and the world to me; I am crucified with Christ, and the new life which I now live is by faith in Him"[1]—so here the same thing is represented under the form of *separation.* The fishing-nets are to be left upon the shore, that they may be taken up by other hands; the large property is to be brought into the market, and the proceeds given to the poor; the seat at the receipt of custom is to be vacated, and to be occupied by some one else. These are as parables intended to show that the Christian's heart must be alienated from the world, if he is truly to follow Christ.

And now, having plainly before us the general import of this kind of Scripture lesson, let us fix our thoughts on one or two characteristic marks of this following of Christ thus understood. The subject is very great and comprehensive; but three particulars may be singled out for attention. If we truly follow Christ, we must follow Him in *secret communion with God.* The outer life of any man in this world is not the point of main importance. The inner life is of greater moment; and the outer life is bound up with the inner by a necessary connection. Now, in the life of Christ—and never more than when active public duties were requiring attention—we can distinctly trace the habit of close private communion with the Father. This is a fact which becomes more and more evident to the student of the New Testament, in proportion as he studies the New Testament carefully. And this only need be added, that, if such was the customary inner life of Him Who knew no sin, surely we—whose whole being is weakened

[1] Gal. ii. 20; vi. 15.

by sin at every point—cannot follow Christ at all, unless the first condition is fulfilled, of secret communion with God.

Another distinguishing mark of our blessed Lord's life on earth was His *kindly intercourse with those around Him.* There was nothing harsh, nothing morose, nothing formal in His intercourse with men. All was friendly, easy, natural, and gracious. He stopped to listen to the suppliant's story by the wayside. If children were brought to Him, He took them up in His arms. If He was invited to a marriage, He went. He looked at the flowers. He spoke of the weather. He watched the work on the farms. And from these things, in conversation, He drew instruction. And we too, in all this, are called upon to follow Him. It is a difficult following. It is not easy to be thoroughly interested in the concerns of those by whom we are surrounded, in this varied scene of nature and of society, without being absorbed in the love of the world. We need a great example, and that example we have in Christ.

Thirdly, let us bear in mind *His willing self-sacrifice for the sake of others.* Here again His footsteps are before us; and our path of safety and happiness is to follow Him. It need not be said that to this following of Christ there is a limit. In the Great Sacrifice He was and must be alone. But the law of His life, as well as the deep, awful motive of His death, was self-surrender for the sake of others. He gave His thought, He gave His time, He gave His work, He gave His sympathy for others. And our life must be modelled on this pattern, if in death and in eternity we are to be His.

In these remarks it has not been forgotten that in such cases as those of Matthew, and of Peter and Andrew, James and John, there was something more than this religious following in the heart. Christ needed *Apostles,* and those Apostles were under special training through literal personal following of Christ. One meaning of our Lord's life on earth was that He might train the teachers of the world. Their extraordinary following of Christ was a preparation for our ordinary following. We do not think enough of this. But our following, though not literally the same, must be equally real. What we read concerning the Apostles must have a counterpart in our experience, or we cannot be true disciples of Christ.

B. THE PLACE OF THE RECEIPT OF CUSTOM.

"*A man named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom.*"—MATT. ix. 9.

What is the meaning of this phrase? What was the receipt of custom, and where was it? How far are we able to make for ourselves a true picture of the employment of St. Matthew

at the time when our Lord Jesus Christ spoke to him, and he forsook his vocation that he might follow a new vocation under this new Master?

These are interesting questions; for we must wish to know as much as we are permitted to know of the Twelve, who were with Christ in the closest intimacy, who were privately taught by Him, who received from Him a special commission, and whom we see, as we look back through the Christian centuries, standing at the head of the series of all who have borne the Saviour's name. They are likewise important questions. For the choice of these Twelve was not accidental. In each separate case there was a meaning in the choice, though the whole of this meaning may not be evident to us. In four instances, as we remember, Apostles were fishermen.[1] Only in one other case are we told anything of a specific occupation in life. St. Matthew was called "from the receipt of custom;" elsewhere he is termed "a publican." We must put these two points together.

One circumstance to be determined, if it is possible, is the exact moment in the life of Christ with which this calling of St. Matthew is connected. This can be determined with very little difficulty. All the three Evangelists who mention the calling of St. Matthew connect this event with the healing of the paralytic man in the house at Capernaum. St. Matthew says: "As Jesus passed forth *from thence*, he saw a man named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom."[2] St. Luke says: "*After these things* he went forth and saw a publican, named Levi, sitting at the receipt of custom." In these two statements, as regards time and place, we can perceive no difference. But St. Mark, after his manner, adds a fresh particular, which tends to give life and reality to the scene. He says: "Jesus went forth again *by the seaside:* and as He passed by He saw Levi, the son of Alphæus, sitting at the receipt of custom."[3] "By the seaside"—*i.e.*, at the edge of the lake. And we must carefully take note of what we find in each of the three accounts. Matthew, or Levi, was seated at the receipt of custom. This gives the idea of a stationary, habitual employment at one particular spot. The word "publican," too, denotes that he was in some sense a collector of public dues.

Putting all these things together, we reach a conclusion regarding which there is really very little reason to doubt. To Capernaum boats came across from the opposite side of the lake, with produce for the market, and with persons who for various causes made use of what was practically a ferry. Connected with this traffic was a toll; and Matthew, or Levi,

---

[1] John xxi. 2 gives the impression that Thomas also was a fisherman.
[2] Luke v. 29. [3] Mark ii. 14.

the son of Alphæus (for such was his father's name), sat there daily at the toll-gate by the water-side to receive the toll from those who came out of the boat, that they might enter into the town with or without marketable goods.[1]

All this was on a small scale; but it is one characteristic of the Gospel history that it presents to us great principles in connection with the most ordinary life. Still, Matthew is represented to us as comparatively a rich man; and no doubt we may say, bearing in mind the scale of things with which we here have to do, that his business was lucrative. We feel that this must have been the case, as we read onward in the narrative. All these three Evangelists alike tell us what immediately followed the calling of St. Matthew, just as they had told us what immediately preceded. And thus, again, we obtain part of the correct framework of the event commemorated in the Church during the present month. Matthew gave an entertainment to Jesus and His disciples. One of the Evangelists says that it was a large and sumptuous entertainment. A very mixed company were present; some of them, whatever their true character might be, having a bad reputation. And it was on this occasion, at this banquet, that two of those proverbial sentences were spoken, the prolific meaning of which has enriched the thought and guided the conduct of generations in the Christian Church. First, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. I came, not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." And secondly, "No man putteth a piece of new cloth on an old garment, else the rent is made worse. Also, no man putteth new wine into old bottles, lest the bottles be burst: but new wine-must be put into new bottles: then both are preserved." Thus we obtain a full view of the circumstances that surrounded the calling of St. Matthew, the miracles that preceded it, and the parable that followed it; as well as of the place, Capernaum and the lake, and the "receipt of custom" near the boats.

We do not by any means lose our time in thus taking pains to surround this Gospel incident with its true environment. It is the environment given in the sacred volume itself, and it is not given by accident. In this case, too, there are none of those

[1] See the preceding section. Four good reasons can be given for the placing of an important "receipt of custom" at Capernaum. It had reference, first, to the *octroi* of the city; next, to the dues upon the ferry; thirdly, to the rates of payment connected with the frontier; fourthly, to traffic on the great road from Damascus to Ptolemais. See Geikie's "Life of Christ," vol. ii. It is probable that a very large staff of publicans were established at Capernaum; and it is evident that Matthew was by no means one of the meanest and most degraded of the class.

difficulties in detail which we find in other parts of the evangelic narrative. And now let us single out simply one point from the moral and religious teaching of the occasion. It must strike everyone that the sudden speaking of Jesus Christ to St. Matthew in this way must have excited wonder, and that St. Matthew's sudden obedience—obedience, too, so complete, that he changed his vocation at once—was equally wonderful. But, after all, do not events of the same kind happen to us in our own lives? Does not Christ sometimes suddenly speak to us, so that we are unexpectedly placed under the responsibility of listening or refusing? Do we not sometimes find ourselves all at once in an emergency? and are not such moments full of great consequences for good or for harm? Are we ready to listen to the voice? And when we hear it, shall we have courage to obey? "Jesus speaks, and speaks to *thee*." The happiness of the soul depends on promptitude in listening and willingness to obey.

J. S. HOWSON.

ART. V.—LADY VERNEY'S "PEASANT PROPERTIES."

Peasant Properties and other selected Essays. By Lady VERNEY. 2 Vols. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1885.

IT is strange that, while in England the question of peasant properties is coming to the front as the solution of agricultural difficulties, in France it is declared that of all the changes in their financial habits the greatest is the cooling of the public passion for the ownership of land. "The desire of it," says a French authority, "has hitherto brought about most of our social crises; but the excessive division, which is the inevitable result of our laws of succession, is no longer pursued with the same fury." Again, it is said that "the succession duties paid to the State by the constant changes of property have become so high as almost to absorb the total value of individual property by the community." The consequence of the fear of this, and that other investments of money are gradually becoming popular with the peasants, has made land much less valuable than it was.[1] The disease

[1] It has also encouraged the rush upon great cities. The surplus labourer does not emigrate; and in Paris—supposed to be the Eldorado of high wages and constant pleasure—he often sinks to the lowest level of distress.

in the vines, the mulberry, and the olive, and the impossibility of finding a fruitful appropriation for the devastated fields, has brought down rents, and forced proprietors to cultivate at a loss the land which has been abandoned. In the centre and south, says another French authority, "la petite culture est impraticable" at the present time. Wherever the subdivision of land is excessive, the poverty is very great. The state of the peasants in the different departments of course varies greatly. In Touraine a number of large estates still remain, and many of the old families reside in the *châteaux* for a great part of the year. Work for pay, therefore, is to be obtained, and there is comparatively little distress. The small owners appear to be best off in the provinces of the north-west, for there they have the command of the London market, and send over eggs, fowls, butter, and so forth. In the department of the Hautes Alpes, Lady Verney heard of a Protestant village where the subdivision had been so great, and the cutting of the forests by the peasants so injurious, that the snows had come down on the place and the soil had been carried away. The poverty of the people had increased in consequence to a degree amounting almost to starvation; and the Protestant Committee of Lyons, aided by English friends, had sent the greater part of the inhabitants to form a little colony near Oran, in Algiers. "In the neighbourhood of Vichy, a friend of our own," writes Lady Verney, "intended to take a walking tour, but he found that at the village inns the only food to be had was a *potage* made of cabbage, of a few slices of bread, an onion or two, and a piece of lard. The cauldron was filled up with water three, and sometimes four, times in the day, without anything else being added. This was the habitual food of the peasants, and there was nothing else but black bread to be had." Other facts which show the extreme poverty of the small owners in certain departments at the present time are given in the work before us. Five essays in the first volume deal with the subject of peasant properties.

When you consider the extraordinary advantages of climate and soil in the south of France, says Lady Verney; that trellises of vines can be grown every thirty yards or so apart, with crops of maize, roots, and haricots between; that grass can be cut three or four times in the year; that fruit of all kinds ripens season after season, and has a good sale; that little fuel need be consumed, a fire during the chief part of the year being only lighted for an hour or two—it is marvellous that the owners are not more prosperous with all their hard work and thrift. It would seem as if the only explanation was that, *adscripti glebæ*, their land system induces them to try and get a subsistence out of small patches which are

utterly incapable of affording it.[1] The cultivation of the French holdings is so bad, according to Mr. Caird, that production is nearly as two to one in favour of the English system; while it takes eight peasant farmers and their families to work the same extent of land in France as is done here by a farmer and five or six labourers. And the English labourers, says M. de Lavergne, the greatest French writer on agricultural affairs, are far better off than the French small proprietor. There is no doubt about it. The state of the French peasant is going down, that of the English labourer is in the ascendant; his wages have risen and his dwelling has been improved. He, indeed, benefits more than anyone by the agricultural improvements which have been introduced, while in France an ignorant conservatism prevents such novelties; so that when the fields of wheat in California of 3,000 acres are considered, with every advantage of machinery, it is no wonder that French agriculturists are in fear for the future. That machines, which are the very life of agriculture in America and in England, are occasionally to be found in France, says Lady Verney, there is no doubt, "but they must indeed be few, when, during three weeks of very careful investigation and inquiry, after having seen the corn reaped in the north, the hay cut and carrying everywhere, and ploughing going on along the whole line of journey, we" only came across a single one. Those who have marked the size of the peasant plots, indeed, must see how impossible any help from machines would be. The difficulty of turning even a common plough within their minute limits is so great, and so much damage is necessarily done to *le voisin*, that questions of compensation would become serious were it not that *le voisin* does as much harm in return. A steam-plough would be like a bull in a china closet.

As to the health of the women and children in different districts, Lady Verney gives a good deal of information. Thus, in the neighbourhood of Aix-les-Bains, she writes: "In general the sickly, worn look of the women, and even of the men, in the fields, was very striking; they are underfed and overworked." They eat little but rye-bread, it seems; they do not drink their own wine, and only the buttermilk from their own cows. The *morcellement* of land is so great and the mortgages on it are so heavy that the peasants cannot live on the produce of the plots; in a bad year they are reduced to starvation. The weakly look of the children is sad to see. The mothers are forced to go out to work, and cannot take

[1] Writing at Geneva, Lady Verney remarks that the division of property in the canton is exceedingly great, but the Swiss emigrate to so large an extent, and are besides so industrial and commercial a people, that, unlike French peasants, they do not call on the land exclusively to support them.

proper care of them. "Hard times," said an old woman, sickly, worn, and unkempt, with her house as wretched as herself; she would have been supposed to be in the lowest dregs of poverty in England. In a glorious bit of country, where the great bunches of purple grapes, the figs, the standard peach-trees made a most idyllic picture, the houses—picturesque with overhanging roofs and balconies and outward stairs—were filthy; the smells were almost overpowering; the children, pale and sickly, were wallowing in the dirt; the women, stunted and ugly, were dragging little carts, cutting grass, carrying great loads on their heads. Again. In another village, where the soil was most fruitful, and a good market for produce was close at hand, peasant proprietorship might be expected in perfection. Yet here the struggle was severe. A widow with two grandsons, who had a cow and a heifer on the mountain, a piece of vineyard and of maize, and a bit of land "où il y a un peu de tout," hemp, beans, hay for forage, etc., was hideous, dirtier even than the floor of her house. The room would have been quite dark, for the tiny window was so blocked and dirty that it gave no light, but that two sticks were flaming in the open fireplace; the uneven mud floor was the same as Lady Verney saw everywhere; a broken press, some dirty sacks, two chairs—nothing else was in the place. The proprietress begged for a sou. In another house, where was a winepress, the mistress was young, but withered and haggard with overwork. "Ah, c'est un vilain pays ici," she said, "laid—tout montagne." "We think it all beautiful," said Lady Verney. "Ah, pour vous," she sighed. Everything was done at home. She dressed the hemp and spun it, after which it was sent to the village *tisserand* to be woven into coarse cloth; there is no division of labour here—all is done at home. In the house there was no kind of cupboard, press, or drawers; the clothes of the family were hanging on a rope. Their two cows spent the summer on the mountains, on the communal ground, and it took an hour for the eldest daughter to go up and milk them. She made butter but once a week; she baked every fortnight, and put a little wheat into the loaf, "pas beaucoup." The possession of a *pressoir* implies a certain amount of dignity and profit; the neighbours who have not got one send in their grapes to be trodden, and in payment leave behind the mass of hard-squeezed skins and stalks called *marc*, from which, after it is steeped in boiling water, an *eau-de-vie* is distilled. But even with a *pressoir* the proprietor was very poor. The winepress was in a dark, dirty hole beneath the "house-place," with a great cask, where the grapes were trodden by men's feet before being put under the screw of the machine.

The amount of work done by the women [we read] is enormous, without which it would be utterly impossible to cultivate these small scattered plots, as the owners cannot pay for labour. Here was an old woman, dirty and worn, working with a great hoe, her gold cross hanging from a gilt heart, dangling above the dirt, as she bent her stiff old body over the work; another was guiding the plough, which two oxen were dragging, and which only scratched the earth; another was harrowing with the little three-cornered harrow used here, a baby laid by her on a heap of sticks in the open field. Some were breaking the hard lumps of soil with a sort of hook. In a ploughed field, far from any cottage or village, was a mother sitting in the middle of her work, suckling her baby, with three small children hanging round her; the fatigue and anxiety to a woman of dragging such tiny feet to such a distance, where they had to be kept the whole day, perhaps only a woman can rightly understand. At Chambéry we met four men riding on a bullock car, their three women walking by the side. Even on Sunday, poor souls! they work on after Mass, with an attempt at better clothes, it is true; but they are too down-trodden to have courage enough or time enough to attend to their looks or the looks of their houses. Indeed, the use of beauty is certainly altogether ignored in French country life here. A woman is treated as a beast of burden, and the general civilization suffers.

As to the houses, filthy discomfort, it seems, is the rule: clay floors, no furniture, no presses for clothes, the children sitting on the ground for lack even of stools. "We did not see," says Lady Verney, "a single book or newspaper, or ornament of any kind in the thirty-five or forty houses we visited. The struggle for life is so severe, the wolf of starvation is so close to the door, that the effort to get bread enough to eat seems to exhaust their energies. But owners who had cows and oxen, pigs and winepress, were just as squalid as their neighbours; the richer houses were not a whit more comfortable than the poorer ones. The ideal had sunk to the level of the most miserable everywhere."

In a flour-mill on rather a large scale, where we went, says Lady Verney, to look at a press which made colza oil for lamps and walnut oil for salad, the old miller, who looked like a day labourer, took us into his house. In England he would have had a smart parlour, with prints on the wall and books on the table—an attempt, at least, at art and literature. Here the one room was so small that it was hardly possible to sit down; a flour-bin on one side, the staircase on the other, and the cooking-stove set in the large unused chimney-corner on the third, and everything dirty and bare. These stoves are now taking the place of the great wood fires, and are very convenient. A flat iron box, four inches deep, is set on four legs, with three or four round openings in the top—a handful of fuel is put inside, and as soon as it is alight the pots are set in the holes to simmer, while an iron tube carries off the very

small amount of smoke. His two daughters were making some soup—haricots, leeks, sometimes a little maize or potatoes, no milk, a little bit of butter, seldom any meat, they said—this was the usual *potage* of the district, and, indeed, generally in France. The miller employed no workmen; they did all in the family, and "had a good piece of land of their own." In England the sons would have resisted being made into day labourers, and would have gone off into other trades; but here the only object seems to be to avoid hiring, and to keep the piece of ground together. The idea of "bettering" themselves, of rising in the world—which is the great object of the Anglo-Saxon race for themselves, or at least for their children—is entirely absent here. There is no ambition but that of putting money by in the funds, or hiding it in an old stocking, after the barest necessaries of life have been provided; and no capital is invested in cultivating the land.

The agricultural difficulties, just now, are truly great. The wheat, cheese, and pork are undersold by American produce; the "déplacements d'industrie et de commerce" occasioned by arrivals from the New World, unhinge everything. As population increases in America and the cost of production with it, an equilibrium will probably be found; but there will be much distress in Europe first. And among peasant proprietors, in France, as in Germany, there is real distress.

Lady Verney's third essay, "Jottings" in Auvergne, shows much the same state of things. The *morcellement* is greater than even at Aix-les-Bains; scraps of ground with hay or corn lie between the vines; a piece fifty yards by thirty looks quite large; a bit here, a bit there, often at an hour's distance from each other; "nobody has land lying together!" They will not buy up or exchange so as to have their property lying under their hands; there is the greatest jealousy of each other. "L'échange des parcelles s'accomplit rarement," writes Le Play. In the minute patches, isolated and scattered, to which the *partage forcé* reduces peasant properties, he adds, the proper employment of water for irrigation, all improvements in the cultivation of cereals, and so forth, become impossible. In some places the width of the plot is from four to five furrows. It is easy to see at a glance that waste of time and money and labour is serious.

At Beaumont, a little village town in the midst of the vineyards, the women sat gossiping and knitting in the roadway; there was no furniture in the dismal, dark houses, which did not seem to be intended to live in, but merely for sleeping and eating. At Montferrand, in fine old stone houses, the *cultivateurs* were squatting—it could scarce be called living—amidst heaps of dirt; everywhere squalor and nastiness. Ig-

norant, narrow-minded, and dirty, they seem to have no object but to put by many sous: they imperil the future of France by a diminishing population in order to carry out their ideal of having only children enough to enable them all to be kept at home, so as to succeed to the wretched little property.

The last census of France shows that the population is nearly stationary, and that it is diminishing in thirty-four rural departments.[1] An average of three children to a family is the smallest that can keep up the present number, and even this is not now attained. Two children are more common than three—very often there is only one.

"Je n'en ai pas; à quoi bon avoir des enfants? Il faut vivre," was one cynical answer to Lady Verney's question. An old woman said she had three sons and only four grandchildren. An old man said his two sons were married; "et nous leur avons donné à chacun du pain et du vin"—*i.e.*, a bit of corn-ground and of vineyard; but the old people had great difficulty in living on the diminished remainder. The peasant marriages are, to a large extent, mercenary. As to morality in relation to the married life, some medical critics, we believe, have given a very unsatisfactory opinion.

After visiting several cottages, dark, dirty, and wretched,[2] Lady Verney chatted with her French neighbours at the *table-d'hôte;* they showed no surprise. "How is it, then, with you?" she said to a lady from Brittany. "Hommes, femmes, et bêtes, tout ça vit pêle-mêle," was the reply. "How is it in Touraine?" she asked another lady. "Oh no; they do not live in the cowsheds," said she—"only in the stables, and there is generally a little off-place where they sleep." There is little difference in this respect, it seems, in the different parts of France; but in Normandy, where the subdivision is not so great, and many tenant farms remain, the land being better cultivated, country life has more of charm; "homes" are cleaner and brighter. Comfortable homesteads, with "trente bêtes à cornes," are to be seen in Normandy.

The essay on "Peasant Proprietors in Brittany" has much information, precise and accurate, taken by the accomplished essayist from the *Revue des Deux-Mondes* for November, 1844. The *Revue* describes the cottages with roofs reaching to the

[1] "Il y a moins de naissances en France que dans les autres pays de l'Europe." The calculation is made from the beginning of the century, when the diminution of the proportion of births to deaths began. Some statisticians consider that the "phénomène tient à la loi du partage forcé."—*Revue des Deux-Mondes*, June, 1882.

[2] We read (p. 134) "The floor was without pavement of any kind; filthy to a degree not describable, with the cow's litter, the chicken's dirt . . . They all slept summer and winter in the dark and horrible discomfort from choice, in order to save fuel."

ground, the interior black with the smoke of heather and dried rushes (their only fuel); the owner and his family half naked, sleeping in a box, without sheets, on a chaff mattress, with a cow, a pig, or a donkey at the other end of the hovel, as not uncommon. During the last forty years *la petite propriété* has increased enormously:

The state of the country, socially, seems to be of the lowest. Food for a working-man is calculated at £8 a year, for a woman at £6. A *soupe*—of course without meat—with or without lard, water-gruel with black bread ill-baked, butter and potatoes (the lard generally in small quantities), is the food for employer and employed alike. This diet produces *une mollesse et une lenteur* very bad for work. The women are particularly worn and weakened by it. *Les abus alcooliques*, to which a too great number of the peasants yield, seem to be the reaction from a state of semi-starvation. The evil has grown worse of late in the lower stratum of the working-class, unhappily the most numerous. Alcohol has taken the place of wine and cider, and drunkenness among women goes on increasing. Their excuse of bad food does not hold good for the women of Normandy, who are addicted to the same vice.

The drinking at fairs, at sales of land, and at feasts and "Pardons," is excessive for both sexes, especially on Sunday. The ceremonies of the Church, however, are dying out:

Nothing improves more slowly than the dwellings: it is the last use to which the savings of the peasant are applied. The houses are generally exceedingly damp, and the inhabitants have to choose between being frozen or smoked; and the *cohabitation du cochon* is general, though sometimes he is separated from the family by a thin partition. The beds are arranged one over the other, like the berths of a ship—*le système Breton*—dirty, the feathers ill-cured and full of smells. *L'ascension pénible et ridicule du docteur* to a patient above may be imagined. The want of windows and doors is general everywhere; and these wretched hovels are rented at £1, £2, and even £4 a year—letting, of course, is not confined to large owners. Wages vary in the different communes: about 15d. a day for men without food, 10d. with; 10d. or 7d. for women; "and we have met cases of 5d. for women with food, and 8d. without." In the Côtes du Nord even the men have only from 5d. to 6d. a day during the winter—"*c'est misérable!*" It is only in harvest-time, and in the more prosperous districts, that the labourer in Brittany obtains two francs a day; two and a half is very exceptional. The work is so bad that this cheap rate costs as much as better pay for more efficient labour, but the employers are too poor to give more.

In the great majority of middle-sized and small farms, we read, the wife is humble and submissive—*façonnée au joug de l'homme*. She is like a servant without wages; she waits on the men at table and eats their leavings—*un ridicule très marqué* attaches to an indulgent husband in popular estimation. Unfortunately, the habit of parents to strip themselves

of their property during their lifetime for their children, only tends to make *des ingrats*. Education, it seems, is at the lowest. In the Morbihan, sixty out of a hundred cannot read; in the Île et Vilaine, according to the census of 1872, the population was over 589,532; those who could read were only 355,400, and of some 234,000 of these the instruction was very bad. Strange superstitions linger in the province, and the state of the peasants we should consider extremely low. Mendacity is a tradition and a career—*on est né mendiant en Bretagne.*

A remark of Lady Verney—already quoted—that "ceremonies" are dying out, and that the influence of the Church has diminished a good deal, has many illustrations. At Amiens, an *ouvrier*, clenching his fist, remarked with a scowl that the statue of Peter the Hermit ought to be pulled down and broken up. At Aix, a workman complained of the sums paid to the Church: "*Cinquante-deux millions sur le budget*, and we don't want the priests."

"Do you think it right [he cried] for a woman to go to confession to a man, and tell him all her husband says and does? It is abominable. The priest ferrets out all the gossip in the village, and puts his nose into all our affairs; but the husbands won't allow their wives now to confess, except *quelques vieilles dévotes*, and the fathers won't even let their daughters go, after they have once made their *première communion*.[1] . . . I don't want the curé, or his teaching or his preaching."

Religion is dying away, because the true and the false are so bound together. Lady Verney quotes the saying: "On veut nous faire croire un tas de bêtises qui sont incroyables, et nous n'en voulons pas, je vous le dis tout court!" Earnest "Catholics" in the Church of England who are apt to laud the Church of Rome may be recommended to study such testimonies as these, or those in other recent publications, showing the moral[2] and religious condition of France. Italy is hardly worse than France.

The curé is extremely ill-paid, only 900 francs by the State, besides his fees, which are not high; he is hardly ever a man of education, and generally rises from the poorest families; he only associates with the gentlefolks professionally; "thus a link between the upper and lower classes is wanting in France, such as is found in the English clergyman." Between the

[1] Confession, Lady Verney heard, "was nearly extinct in the North of France also."

[2] We read (p. 68) "The books the people read (when they read at all, which is not the case with the peasants) are bad, and the papers worse; the *feuilletons* of the cheap press are simply disgraceful." The proportion of suicides in France has greatly risen. In London the proportion is 85 per million; in Paris, 200 (p. 108).

seigneurs and the peasants, as a rule, there has been a social chasm. Eugénie de Guérin mentions, says Lady Verney, that one day she asked an old woman to fetch soup from the *château;* she did not come, and when questioned, she replied that her grandchild had said, "N'y va pas, grand'mère; on t'y mangera!" Such grim traditions of hostility English people can hardly understand; between the manor-house and the cottage, as a rule, there has been, and still is, a very friendly feeling. In England a thousand village people may play at cricket, and games of all sorts in the park, visit the gardens, and take tea on the lawn, with self-restraint and thorough enjoyment. Lady Verney, however, heard of a *fête* given on the occasion of a marriage at a *château*, where the gardens had been opened, but everything had been "pillé, ravagé, et saccagé; c'était comme si l'ennemi avait passé par la campagne." Of Christian ministry by lay-folk, again, one hardly ever hears. In the *Récit d'une Sœur*, as a proof of her extraordinary sanctity, the angelic Alexandrine is described as visiting the sick, and teaching the children of the poor near her father-in-law's home, in the way that is done by wives and daughters of the clergyman and the squire in almost every village in England, as a matter of course, without any notice being taken of it. As Lady Verney, in her notes on Paris, remarks, while there is "much regulation work" of an earnest type among Roman Catholics in France, there is little spontaneity, very little private voluntary effort. For ourselves, we may go further; the teaching of Rome in regard to what is termed the Religious life must necessarily, we think, chill and cramp the zeal of the "laity"; it is not consistent with the independence of Christian service as set forth in the New Testament.

In regard to French Protestantism, its character, and its prospects, Lady Verney's remarks in the main agree with the article by Dr. Pigou, in a recent CHURCHMAN.

Lady Verney's essay on "Little Takes" in England, as in contrast with "Peasant Properties" in France and Germany, is very readable, and is, besides, a timely and a really practical contribution to a subject which is just now engaging much attention. The unwisdom of much that is advanced by Radical land reformers in England, as well as in Ireland, about agricultural labourers with three acres of their own, is very plainly shown.

In connection with the subject of allotments is a matter to which many country clergymen have of late been giving serious thought—we mean the use of portions of glebe-lands by labourers in the parish. To this subject we hope soon to return.

Art. VI.—ERASMUS.

THE life of Erasmus is, for many reasons, very interesting. He greatly contributed to prepare the way for the Reformation. He was the most learned man of his time in Europe, and has been justly called the envy of his own age, the wonder of all succeeding ages. He was gifted with mental faculties of the highest order, which had been greatly improved by diligent application. His industry was so great that, notwithstanding the want of books, his great poverty, the want of masters who were qualified to instruct him, and an infirm constitution which hindered him greatly in the attainment of his object, he rose to a proud pre-eminence above the common herd of his fellow-creatures, and secured for himself a high place in the Temple of Fame. To himself he owed almost all his knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages. In the latter all his works were written. His memory was so retentive that, at the age of thirteen, he knew the whole of Horace and Terence by heart. He was the "observed of all observers." He held constant correspondence with princes, nobles, and others, who endeavoured to induce him to make their country the land of his adoption, and to take up his abode permanently among them. Learned men flocked to him from all parts of Europe. We are told that Albert, Archbishop of Maintz, was greatly afflicted because he was not likely to see him before his death. As many pilgrimages were made to Erasmus during his lifetime as to the shrines of any of those canonized saints whom the Church of Rome has embalmed with her praises, and has taught her followers to regard with superstitious reverence.

This illustrious man was born in Rotterdam on October 28th, 1467. He was sent, when he was four years of age, to a school kept by a certain Peter Winkel; and afterwards, when he was nine, to a very good school at Deventer. Sintheim, who was his chief instructor at it, foretold that he would rise to the highest pinnacle of letters. At the age of thirteen he lost his parents. His guardians, appointed by his father, used all the means in their power, which were only too successful, to induce him to become a monk, in order that they might deprive him of his little patrimony. He has described those means, and the misery which he endured in the monastery of Stein, which he had been induced to enter, in letters to Servatius, the Prior of the monastery, and to Grunnius, a scribe at the Papal Court. He writes to the latter, describing himself under the assumed name of Florentius:

"They suborned various persons, of different sexes and conditions of life, monks, half monks, male and female cousins, young men and old

men, the known and the unknown, to carry on the plot to its conclusion. With how many battering-rams was the mind of that boy shaken! One brought before him the lovely image of monastic tranquillity, exhibiting that kind of life in the best possible point of view; and another, in a very tragic manner, exaggerated the dangers of the world—as if monks lived out of it, as they paint themselves, in a very strong ship, while everyone else is tossed on the waves, certain to perish, unless they throw out to him a pole or a rope. Another terrified him by fabulous tales. A traveller, wearied, sat down on the back of a dragon, thinking that it was the trunk of a tree. The dragon, being roused, angrily turned its head and devoured him. So the world devours its votaries. They carried on their designs with as much care, zeal, and vigilance as if their object had been to take an opulent city."

Afterwards, writing to Servatius, he says: "I never liked the monastic life, and I liked it less after I had tried it; but I was ensnared in the way I have mentioned. Whenever the thought has occurred to me of returning to your fraternity, it has called back to me the jealousy of many, the contempt of all; converse, how cold, how trifling, how lacking in Christian wisdom! feastings more fit for the laity! the mode of life, as a whole, one which, if you subtract its ceremonies from it, has nothing left that seems to me worth having."

At length, after five years' misery, Henry de Bergis, Bishop of Cambray, obtained permission for him to leave the monastery, that he might accompany him to Rome. The Bishop abandoned his design, but Erasmus remained with him five years, engaged in the prosecution of his studies, and afterwards went to the famous Montaigu College at Paris. Lord Mountjoy, one of the pupils whom he was obliged to take that he might add to his scanty means, brought him to England in his train in 1498. He immediately went to the University of Oxford, that he might learn Greek from that little band of men who were engaged in the study of it in that University. We have seen, in an article on Dean Colet [CHURCHMAN, vol. x., p. 418], that here he became acquainted with him, and through his influence was led to come forward and do battle with the champions of scholasticism. This was the first of several visits to this country.

We in England ought to feel the greatest interest in him, because he preferred our country to any other, and because he laboured successfully for the advancement of polite learning in England during the many years which he passed among us. Writing to an English friend, Robert Fisher, he speaks in the highest terms not only of the fertility of the soil and the salubrity of the climate, but also of the learning and refinement of the inhabitants. Writing to a friend going to England, he says that he infinitely prefers our country to his own. He thus continues: "It is something to have seen Britain, cele-

brated as the home of men who are conversant with every branch of learning. You will find also that intercourse with so many remarkable for their erudition will tend greatly to the refinement of your manners and the enlargement of your knowledge." In a letter to Henry VIII., he says: "When I consider how many years I have lived in Britain, how many excellent and sincere friends I owe to it, I have as hearty a love and esteem for it as if I had drawn my first breath in it." Other extracts from his works might be given to the same effect. He met with the greatest encouragement in England. The number of dedications of his works made to Englishmen afford us convincing evidence that he found more patrons in our own than in any other country. Most of his earliest and best works owed their origin to the suggestions and advice of many of the greatest men in England, the names of some of whom fill a large space in our national annals.

After his departure from England, in 1500, he spent several years in Paris, Orleans, and the Low Countries. Often during those years he gave way to despondency. It had now become the settled purpose of his life to separate himself as much as possible from secular, and to apply himself to Scripture studies. All his pursuits were considered by him as important only so far as they were subservient to the attainment of that end. But constant ill-fortune had hitherto attended his efforts. Those years had been passed in a constant struggle with poverty. He had been obliged to engage in literary work, which, as he says, had ceased to be pleasant to him, that he might procure the means of subsistence, and of prosecuting his studies. He had laboured for three years at Greek, because he considered that without it he could not be successful in the study of Holy Scripture. But he persevered in his self-allotted task. This poor student had worked on amid failing health and amid the greatest difficulties, animated by the desire of doing good in his day and generation by preparing himself to devote his powers to the propagation of Christian truth throughout the continent of Europe.

The first edition of that remarkable work, the "Adages, or Proverbial Sayings of the Ancients," was published in the early part of this period. It was much enlarged in subsequent editions. We stand amazed at that ardour in the pursuit of learning which led him, when many classical works existed only in manuscript, and were scattered in various parts of Europe, to persevere till he had collected at first 3,200 proverbs, and afterwards more than 4,000, searching for them with that care which was necessary, as well in the works of the greater as the more obscure classical writers. We learn from this work that the sayings, "Use is a second nature,"

"One swallow does not make a summer," "Let the cobbler stick to his last," "To have one foot in the grave," and many more, were used in the streets of Athens and Rome in the days of those mighty monarchs who have moulded the taste and genius of mankind in every succeeding age of the world's history.

But the most interesting part of the work contains those digressions in which he animadverts in the strongest terms on the vices, follies, and crimes of popes, monarchs, statesmen, monks, and people in the age in which he lived. Thus in the proverb "Sileni Alcibiadis," he first shows that just as the unprepossessing images of Silenus, seen in ancient Greece, to which Alcibiades compared Socrates, disclosed the features of a god, so many things which appear to be mean are really worthy of the greatest admiration; and then he proceeds to show that appearances are deceitful as to many objects and classes of men which appear beautiful. Then he attacks the sins and follies of the Church dignitaries of his day:

"If you look, for instance, at the mitres of some of our bishops, glittering with gold and gems, their jewelled pastoral staff, and all their mystic panoply, you would expect to find them more than men; but, if you open the Silenus, you will find within only a soldier, a trader, or a tyrant. Take, again, the case of those whom you meet everywhere. If you look at their shaggy beard, their pale face, their cowl, their bent heads, their girdle, their sour looks, you would say that they are remarkable for their piety; but if you look inside the Silenus, you will find only rogues, impostors, debauchees, robbers, and tyrants. . . ."

A similar mistake is made as to names. "We call," he says, "priests, bishops, and popes the Church, although they are only the ministers of the Church; for the Church is the whole Christian people."

"And of the Church we say that she appears in honour and splendour, not when piety is increased and vice is diminished, when good morals are prevalent and true doctrine flourishes, but when the altars are embellished with gold and jewels—or rather when, religion being totally neglected, the prelates rival temporal lords in lands, domestics, in luxury, in mules, in horses, in houses, or rather in palaces, in everything that makes a show or a noise. This is thought so just a manner of speaking, that even in Papal bulls, these encomiums may be found: 'Forasmuch as Cardinal A., by his sumptuous equipage, and numerous train of horses and domestics, does singular honour to the Church of Christ, we think it right to add to his preferments another bishopric.'"

He afterwards proceeds to speak against the wealth and temporal power of the popes. He says that, while he wishes that priests should reign, he considers that earthly dominion is unworthy of the heavenly calling. "Why," he says, "do you estimate the successor of St. Peter by that wealth which

Peter himself boasts that he does not possess? Why do you wish the vicars of Christ to be entangled with the riches which Christ Himself has called thorns?"

Next to the "Adages" came the "Enchiridion, the Christian Soldier's Dagger," "which," he says to the person to whom he dedicated it, "you should not lay down even at your meals, or during your sleeping hours." We shall see hereafter how this work aided the progress of the Reformation. He aims in it a heavier blow than before at the whole ecclesiastical system. An examination of it will serve to show us that he never swerved from opinions expressed on points of doctrine at the beginning of his memorable career. He did not hold those which Luther and his associates considered to be the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. He does not think with Luther that man is averse from good and inclined only to evil, and that he has not the power or the inclination to walk in the path of holy obedience; for he says that "the soul, mindful of its heavenly birth, with the greatest energy mounts upwards, and strives with its earthly incumbrance." We see, also, that he holds the meritoriousness of good works; for he says, "these will all be added to the sum of your merits if they shall find you in the way of Christ;" and that he could not hold that doctrine of justification by faith in Christ's righteousness which Luther calls the article of a standing or falling Church.

Erasmus was at length enabled, by the kind assistance of his friends in this country—especially William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom he became greatly attached[1]—by the sale of translations of Lucian and of Greek authors, as well as by taking pupils, to carry into effect his design of paying a visit to Italy, that he might be instructed in Greek by the emigrants who, after the fall of Constantinople, were unfolding its beauties to the view of the inhabitants of that country. This visit was not, indeed, directly serviceable to him in regard to the enlargement of his knowledge of the Greek language; but it led to the composition of that remarkable satire, the "Praise of Folly," which, by its lively and stinging exhibition of the absurdities and vices of many of the ecclesiastics of the Church of Rome which he witnessed in Italy, may be considered, as we shall see hereafter, as having directly aided the cause of the Reformation. This work is one of the most remarkable satires which the world has ever seen. It was written in a week in More's house in Bucklersbury, London,

[1] He gives this character of him in the account of his visit to Canterbury: "He is courtesy itself. He has so much learning, so much simplicity of character, so much piety, that nothing is wanting to make him a perfect Bishop."

soon after his arrival in England from Italy, in June, 1510, when he was ill, and could not apply himself to his studies. As he never lost any time, he meditated the work while riding across the country on horseback. Folly, personified, pronounces her own panegyric, and shows by various humorous examples that mankind are indebted to her for the happiness which they enjoy.

"Can anything [writes Erasmus] exceed the folly of those who, after the daily recitation of the well-known seven verses of the sacred Psalms, hope to rise to the summit of human felicity? Several of these fooleries which are so absurd that I am almost ashamed to refer to them, yet are practised and admired not only by the common people, but also by professors of religion. Similar to this is the folly which leads every country to claim its particular guardian saint, and to assign certain offices, certain modes of worship, to every one of them, so that one gives relief to the toothache, another assists in childbirth, another restores stolen property, another aids in shipwreck, another guards the flock. But it would be tedious to go through the offices of all of them. Some there are who have prayers addressed to them on all occasions, especially the Virgin Mary, to whom the common people attribute more power than they do to her Son. Now, from these saints, what, I say, do men ask, excepting those things which relate to folly? . . . Among the numerous trophies with which, as tokens of gratitude, you see the walls, the brazen gates, and the roof of certain churches covered, have you ever seen any from one who has been cured of folly? They are such as these: one is grateful because, after a shipwreck, he has swum safely to land; another, because, after having been hanged on a gibbet, by the favour of some saint who was friendly to thieves, he has fallen, and has been able to follow his old trade of stealing; another, because he has escaped from prison; another, because his waggon was overturned, and yet none of his horses were lamed. But why do I launch out into so wide a sea of superstitions?

> No, had I e'en a hundred tongues,
> A hundred mouths, and iron lungs,
> All Folly's forms I could not show,
> Nor go through all her names below."[1]

During this visit to England, he was engaged at Cambridge, as we learn from his letters, on an edition of the New Testament in Greek, accompanied by a Latin translation designed to correct the errors of the Vulgate. We find, also, that he was working hard at a correction of the text of St. Jerome. He owed all his advantages here to the celebrated Fisher, President of Queen's College, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, who was beheaded for denying the King's supremacy. He always spoke of him with gratitude. Fisher made him Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Professor of Greek. After having left Cambridge at the end of 1513, he proceeded to Basle, that he might superintend the printing of these two

[1] Altered from Virgil, "Æneid," Book VI., lines 625-627.

works at the printing-press of John Amerbach and Froben. He had been preparing himself for many years for his work on the New Testament. In comparison with that work, every occupation, however in the judgment of the world important, or however exalted, appeared to him to sink into utter insignificance. The "new learning" was considered by him as important only so far as it was subservient to the attainment of an improved knowledge of Holy Scripture, Christian antiquity, and the lives of the Fathers. At length, on March 1st, 1516, the New Testament was published at Basle. We are quite willing to admit that the Greek text, having been brought out at a time when the study of Greek had only commenced in Europe, will not stand the test of modern criticism. Still, we may affirm that his notes contain many exact philological remarks; and that though he has been surpassed by many men inferior to him in ability and industry who lived when critical knowledge was very generally cultivated, yet he must have the merit given to him of having been the pioneer in that work of criticism which has shed a bright light on many parts of the records of heavenly truth.

We gather from his "Paraclesis," or "Exhortation to the Study of Christian Philosophy," which was prefixed to the New Testament, that his object in publishing it was to bring before the world an accurate record of the life and teaching of Christ. He thus concludes the treatise:

"Let us, then, all thirst for this knowledge; let us embrace these books; let us, since all reading should end in practice, be transformed into the spirit of what we read. If any pretend to show us the footprints of Christ, how devoutly we fall down and adore them! Why do we not rather worship His living and breathing image in these books? If any offer to show us Christ's robe, to what part of the world are we not ready to run to kiss it? But if the whole of His wardrobe were exhibited, you would find nothing which represents Christ more clearly and truly than the writings of the Evangelists. From love to Christ, we adorn with jewels and gold His image of wood and stone. Why do we not rather decorate with gold and jewels, or even with more valuable ornaments, those books which bring Christ before us so much more vividly than any image? That, indeed, if it bear any resemblance to Him, only expresses His bodily likeness; these exhibit to us the living image of His most holy mind, and bring back to us Christ Himself, speaking, healing, dying, rising again. In a word, they set Christ so plainly before us, that we could not see Him better if we were to see Him with our bodily eyes."

He has also given expression to his feelings on this subject in his "Ratio Veræ Theologiæ."

"Since the great object of the teaching of Christ is to bring us to lead a holy life, we should examine carefully the sacred volume, that we may find in His example a rule for our guidance in all the circumstances of our lives; especially the Gospels, from which a knowledge of our duties

is mainly derived. We should observe that Christ acted in a different manner towards different people. . . . We should understand, also, what reasons He gave to His followers for their treatment of their relations and friends; of the deserving, and those who rejected the grace of the Gospel: of persecutors; of the weak, erring, or incorrigible brother; and of many other classes of persons with whom they are likely any day to have intercourse."

He thought that mis-translations, or errors of any kind, were like clouds which obscured the brightness of the Sun of Righteousness. He wished that they should be removed, in order that all who opened the sacred volume for light, holiness, blessing, and comfort, might rejoice in his life-giving and invigorating beams.

We find that this New Testament stirred up more opposition against Erasmus than any work which he had written. The schoolmen opposed it because they held the absolute inspiration of every letter of the Latin Vulgate; and because they absurdly fancied that Erasmus was correcting the Holy Ghost when he published an amended translation of the New Testament from the Greek original. These divines exerted every effort to suppress what they could not confute, judging that, if this work were generally read, their own credit would be greatly endangered. Writing to his friend Boville, at Cambridge, he mentions a report which had reached him that "'a decree had been issued at one of the colleges, that no one should bring that book within its bounds on horses, in ships, in waggons, or by means of porters.' . . . 'O heaven! O earth!' they say, 'Erasmus is correcting the Gospels.' Whereas, we might more justly say of themselves, 'O the sacrilegious wretches, they have corrupted the Gospels!' Are they afraid that the young men should be called from studies which they ought to unlearn? Why do they not look into the matter more carefully? Nearly thirty years ago nothing was learnt at Cambridge but those antiquated lessons from Aristotle and the questions of Scotus. In the progress of time, useful studies were introduced; mathematics, a new, or rather a renewed Aristotle, and a knowledge of the Greek language. Many other authors were added. What, I ask, is consequently the condition of your University? It has become so flourishing that it may vie with the best University of the age. . . . Are they displeased because they will now read more carefully the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles?" He adds, "These men ought to be called back to the fountain-head."

But this work was, as he informs us, more praised than censured. The learned of all countries in Europe united in extolling it. Colet wrote to him a letter expressing unbounded admiration of the work, and Archbishop Warham informed

him that he had shown it to some of his brother-bishops and to professors of theology, and that with one voice they declared that the work amply repaid him for the trouble which he had bestowed upon it. The first edition had so rapid a sale that he was soon busy in revising it and preparing a second edition. It was published about three years after the first, and was dedicated, like it, to Pope Leo, who was now induced to issue a brief, stamping authority upon it. The two together consisted of 3,300 folio copies. He endeavoured also to correct the errors, some of them typographical, which his enemies alleged as their pretext for assailing him. These errors may be excused on account of the haste with which the work was completed. Only five or six months were occupied in the printing and editing of it. When it was so well received by the wise and learned through Europe, he felt that he could laugh to scorn his monkish and scholastic calumniators. These men exerted every effort to prevent the Bible from being given to the people. But Erasmus, in that noble passage, quoted in the article on Dean Colet, in which he expressed a wish that the husbandman should sing the verses while following the plough, the weaver while throwing his shuttle, and that the traveller should beguile with them the tedium of his journey, has pronounced a distinct condemnation on the views of these divines, which he has rendered still more emphatic by publishing at the same time the works of Jerome, who endeavoured to give the Bible to the people in their own language. The wishes of Erasmus have now been fully gratified. Other men have opened the sacred Scriptures to the view of multitudes from whom they were locked up in a barbarous, obscure, and inaccurate version in an unknown tongue. But, while acknowledging the debt of gratitude which we owe to them, let us never forget to express our obligations to him who, amid difficulties occasioned by an imperfect knowledge of the art of deciphering manuscripts, the want of experience on the part of the printers in the use of the Greek type, the want of money, and other causes which might well have daunted the most determined courage, prepared the way for that Reformation of the Church which they conducted to a successful issue, not only by publishing the works of Jerome and of the other Latin fathers, thus unfolding to the world the doctrines of the ancient Church, but also by being the first to give an improved version of the Greek original of the New Testament and a better translation into Latin. He thus rescued from the Church of Rome many passages which, in the Vulgate, favoured her dogmas, and afforded a guide to those who soon enabled all orders of the community to "read in their own tongues the wonderful works of God."

We now come to the connection of Erasmus with that great religious revolution, the Reformation, which shook to its foundation the usurped dominion of the Roman Pontiff. His first impulse was to support Luther. At a memorable meeting at Cologne in 1520, he encouraged the Elector of Saxony to protect him from the Pope. He even wrote to the heads of the Church, deploring its abuses, recommending certain reforms, declaring that on many points he agreed with him, and exhorting them to refute him by fair argument. Luther at first thought that Erasmus must be altogether on his side. But he soon found on an examination of his New Testament that there was a fundamental difference between them. We have seen the nature of that difference in the "Enchiridion." When he came to the annotations on chapter v. of the Epistle to the Romans, he finds Erasmus denying that doctrine of original sin, which he held to be the fundamental doctrine of Christianity. He found also that he could not accept, as we have seen in the "Enchiridion," the doctrine of justification by faith in the righteousness of Christ. We need not, therefore, be surprised to find him writing that every day, as he reads, he loses his liking for Erasmus. "I love to see him," he says, "reprove with so much earnestness the priests and monks for their ignorance; but I fear that he does small service to the doctrine of Jesus Christ. He has more at heart what depends on man than what depends on God. The judgment of a man who attributes *anything* to the human will is one thing; the judgment of him who recognises nothing but grace is another thing. Nevertheless, I keep this opinion to myself, lest I should strengthen the cause of his opponents. I trust that the Lord will give him understanding in His own good time."

These two great men were, not only on points of doctrine, but also in regard to the mode of reforming the Church, antagonistic to each other. Luther was always ready to bare his bosom to the strife, and to rush into the heat and sorest part of the battle. He never hesitated nor faltered in his onward career. Erasmus, on the contrary, could not oppose all the dogmas of Romanism. He did not recognise that in this war there could be no neutrality. He joined Luther in condemning the luxury of the hierarchy and clergy of the Roman Catholic Church; he opposed auricular confession, the trust in the Virgin, the invocation of the saints, the worship of relics, and other doctrines of the Church of Rome; but he could not accept, as we have seen, the distinguishing doctrine of the Reformation, asserting that faith in Christ meant to aim at virtue only; to imitate those graces which shone forth in His all-perfect character, and proclaimed the indwelling of the Godhead. Thence it was that he often commended Luther

and exhorted his opponents to refute him by fair argument; and that he urged the reformer to be moderate, and recommended him to adopt a less uncompromising tone in his opposition to the dominant Church. He laboured by every means to promote the peace of Christendom.

The schemes of Erasmus were not at all calculated to accomplish the object designed by them. He hoped that the human race, refined by polite learning and enlightened by the diffusion of Scriptural knowledge, would shake off the superstitions of the middle ages, would adopt a religion drawn directly from the Bible, and would pursue their onward career of moral and spiritual improvement. Herein Luther would, to a certain extent, agree with him. These two eminent men exerted a vigorous, a sustained, a persevering effort to disperse the darkness then brooding over the nations. But Luther was not so deficient in common sense as to suppose, like Erasmus, that mild exhortations would induce the rulers of the Church to reform abuses from which they derived benefit; that they would willingly resign the pomp and luxury with which they were surrounded, the gay cavalcade, the table piled with costly viands, the jewelled mitre, and the gorgeous robe; that anything short of a terrible convulsion would tear up the towers or dismantle the bulwarks of that structure of ecclesiastical power which had been continually growing up, and had been consolidated by the addition of fresh materials and strong buttresses through successive generations. Mild measures had been employed for ages, and all of them had failed of the wished-for success. The Mendicants had attempted to reform the Church; but by their covetousness, their arrogance, and their disputes they had increased the evil which they were established to remedy. The poets had attempted in vain to arrest the progress of that moral leprosy which was infecting all orders of human society. Council after Council had laboured for the same object. The moral pollution of Christendom had, notwithstanding those efforts, become continually greater, until at length men stood aghast at the revolting features which it exhibited. Erasmus, however, was not satisfied that a reform could not be effected in the manner above referred to. He persevered in his exhortations and remonstrances. When, however, he found that all this well-meant advice proved of no avail, then he thought that it would be better to wait till some future time, when the reformation could be effected without those civil and religious convulsions which might, as he feared, shatter the Church into fragments, and might even be the means of dissolving society into its original elements. But that day could never arrive. A desperate disease required a strong remedy. A change so

great as the one now before us could not be accomplished without terrible convulsions. If we wait till we can prevent evil from mingling with the good, we shall have to abandon many of those enterprises which have for their object the amelioration of society. The elements of strife in the bosom of the Church were labouring for a vent, and would accomplish it ere long. As well might the men of those days have saved Europe from that outburst, as they could have prevented that stream of lava from issuing from the summit of the mountain, which changes the gardens of roses at its foot into a bleak and desolate waste, possessing scarcely one spot of verdure. If the Reformation had been postponed according to the wishes of Erasmus, the consequence would have been that the common herd of the people, unrestrained by that piety which it promoted even among the poorest and vilest, would have rushed forth with uncontrollable violence, and would have spread ruin and desolation around them. We owe a debt of gratitude to those who laboured to prevent this catastrophe; who, instead of shrinking from the dangers and difficulties which they were sure to encounter, endeavoured to contend with and to destroy those evils which followed in the train of the Reformation, when she went forth on her errand of mercy to the nations of the earth.

We have seen some of the points of difference between Erasmus and Luther. He differed also from him in another respect: he had not his moral courage. Though a thousand hostile forces thronged the path he was pursuing, Luther was still prepared to march forward. Erasmus, however, trembled and drew back when he surveyed the whole length and breadth of the danger to which he would have been exposed if he had made common cause with him. He had a religious horror of war. He would rather surrender some portion of the truth than disturb the peace of Christendom. In a letter to his friend Pace, the Dean of St. Paul's, when speaking of Luther, he says, "If he had written everything in the most unexceptionable manner, I had no inclination to die for the truth. Every man has not the courage requisite to make a martyr; and I am afraid, if I were put to the trial, I should imitate St. Peter." We must not, indeed, suppose that Erasmus acted against his conscience in this unwillingness to come forward and lead the assault on the confederated legions of Rome. On the contrary, he felt that this was a work to which, on account of his age, his infirm constitution, and his peculiar temperament, he was altogether unequal. For another reason he was disqualified from being a leader in the work. He greatly disliked all the modern languages, and would not take the trouble to gain a sufficient knowledge of them to enable

him to hold a conversation in them. But the Reformation was to be an emancipation wrought among people not of Latin, but of Teutonic descent, through the medium of the vernacular language. He was unwilling, too, to separate from his friends Warham, More, Mountjoy, Fisher, and others, whose names were hallowed by a thousand tender recollections. We cannot, indeed, suppose that the probable loss of his pensions and the fear of coming to want would have had the effect of preventing him from openly placing himself under the banner of the Reformers; but still I am afraid that the prospect of losing the favour of Henry VIII., Charles V., and the Popes might have had a considerable influence in determining his conduct, for he often showed a childish vanity when he spoke of the numerous letters which he had received from them, and of the many gifts which they had conferred upon him. Perhaps he would have shown more decision if he had been free from the prejudices of education. He had very confused notions about the authority of the Roman Catholic Church as an arbiter of controversies. He talks about implicit submission to her judgment. Luther was under the influence of the same prejudices. "Who was I, at that time," he said—"a poor, wretched, despicable friar, more like a dead body than a man—who was I to oppose the majesty of the Pope, in whose presence not only kings, but, if I may so speak, heaven and earth trembled?" Since then a man in the prime of life, of an iron constitution, of great personal courage, and an indomitable will, found it very difficult to cast off his superstitious reverence for the Pope—a man, too, who had not the same connection as Erasmus with the latter, the bigoted sovereigns of Europe, and the dignitaries of the Church of Rome—we can easily imagine that he would find great difficulty in making a change, if we remember that he had come to an age when men cannot, without a strong effort, divest themselves of cherished prejudices and prepossessions; that disease incapacitated him for that effort, or for vigorous action of any description; and that he had arrived at a time of life when a mind, the whole force of which had been given in youth and manhood to the investigation of truth, longed ardently for repose, and was unwilling to give itself to the solution of perplexing and difficult questions. He could not at first decide for either party, for he thought that both had some errors. Causes of his alienation from the Reformers will be mentioned in the next paper. We could have wished that the case had been otherwise, not only on account of his peace of mind, but on account of the vast influence which, if he had been decided, he might have exercised on the progress of the Reformation. But, while we condemn him for his failings, let

us never forget the debt of gratitude which we owe to him; that he spent a long and laborious life in opposing barbarous ignorance, blind superstition, and many of the errors of the Church of Rome; and let us admit that he deserves to be called the most illustrious of the Reformers before the Reformation.

ARTHUR R. PENNINGTON.

(*To be continued.*)

Correspondence.

ECCLESIASTICAL DILAPIDATIONS.

To the Editor of "THE CHURCHMAN."

SIR,—The article on Dilapidations in your last issue calls for some comment, as it misrepresents, or misapprehends, the reasons why a large majority of the beneficed clergy regard the Act of 1871 with strong and increasing dislike, not to use even a stronger word.

Whether it is of any use for them to complain of anything, however oppressive, which from time to time is added to the burthen of their cares and responsibilities, is a question which perhaps most of them would now answer in the negative. They have no real voice in making or modifying those laws which bind them; and the stream of public feeling has, of late years, been decidedly against giving them a voice, or even listening to their expressions of opinion at all. But lest the "Hon. Sec. of the Association of Diocesan Surveyors" should plead hereafter that the voice of protest is silent, I may be permitted to point out why the sufferers under that Act continue to regard it as unjust and oppressive; and why they are determined to leave no stone unturned to procure its repeal.

From the earliest times it has been customary for the holders of glebe to be responsible for its repair; and it is simply calumnious to say they now shrink from that responsibility. The Archdeacon used to be empowered to see that the glebes were repaired; but abuses no doubt crept in, bribes were offered and accepted, and instead of the dilapidations being repaired, Archdeacons grew rich. Some years before the Act of 1871, the Archbishop of York tried to pass a new Dilapidation Act; and, when modified, it finally became the Act of 1871. Had justice been done, a short and stringent Act should have compelled Archdeacons, under penalty, to do their duty, which does not consist in delivering Charges echoing the Bishop's opinions, but in maintaining in efficiency the fabrics and glebes of the Church. That Act gave Bishops the power of appointing Diocesan Inspectors; and they appointed architects, of some standing perhaps as architects, but whose qualification for dilapidation surveys was not by any means apparent. Residing, for the most part, far from their work, living probably in London, they cannot be aware of the local value of labour, the cost of materials, etc.; and their assessments, as no one can wonder, are often far wide of the mark, made perhaps on a scale of prices which obtain elsewhere. Numerous cases may be cited when the assessments have been as much as 30 or 35 per cent. above local prices. But no redress is possible, and no available appeal. The appoint-

ment of surveyor, which ought to be made by the clergy alone, and annually, is virtually a life appointment, by the Bishop alone, and adds one more member to the Episcopal staff, with constant access to the secretaries and others who have the ear of the Bishop. Feeling that they are thus placed in an impregnable position, the new surveyors have in multitudes of cases conducted themselves as virtually irresponsible, and inflicted truly terrible hardships upon isolated and defenceless clergymen. The ears of all honest and generous-minded men would tingle could they hear the letters which I have received, containing details of cases from every part of England and Wales, in illustration of this statement.

On the avoidance of a living and subsequent appointment of a Vicar, the surveyor sends him a statement of dilapidations which he is forthwith to make good, and the amount of which he could not guess at before his institution. Cases have come under my notice when livings would have been refused had not the sum so required been concealed. But when he has entered upon the living, and cannot draw back, the surveyor will tell him that the sum, *whatever it may be*, is a debt due to him from the old Incumbent, or his widow, probably penniless; but that he, the new Incumbent, is actually made responsible for recovering it, and anyhow must pay it to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty (so called) within six months, whether he recover it or not! And this paternal imposition is laid upon him under a threat of immediate sequestration, which to many a poor clergyman means practical ruin! He must pay it into that powerful body without the faintest guarantee that it will ever be repaid to him. And, more shameful still, that wealthy Corporation, composed chiefly of Bishops, have, in numerous instances, withheld all or part of this money, till it has amounted, including interest, by competent calculation, to the sum of upwards of £300,000! So this Act, which was passed on the pretence of benefiting the clergy, has managed to extort out of their pockets, and place practically in mortmain, a sum which is stated to reach this considerable amount, in addition to what they have expended in the preservation of their glebes, chancels, and houses; and this in fifteen years! It only wanted one more touch to make this beautiful contrivance perfect. That last touch is given when we learn that the new Incumbent—and, poor man, he alone—is to pay all the fees which can be accumulated round the survey by the joint ingenuity of his skilful phlebotomists! the amount of which, by the way, in the Diocese of Chichester is carefully shrouded from the public eye, and finds no place, as in most other dioceses, in the "Diocesan Calendar;" and it has been very difficult to arrive at this abstruse piece of ecclesiastical history. It was found at last, hidden away in the Blue Book, ordered to be printed by the House of Commons, giving the proceedings of a Committee of Investigation into the working of the Act after five years' trial. From that Blue Book it appears that the survey in the Diocese of Chichester is divided into three cases. In the first, the fees are at the rate of £31 7s. 6d. per cent. of cost of repair—*i.e.*, to get £20 worth of repairs done, the clergyman must first pay to the surveyor the sum of £6 5s. 6d. In the second case, the fees are £32 17s. 6d. per cent.; and in case 3, we find that it will cost the unhappy clergyman the sum of £3 13s. paid down to that gentleman to get *no repairs done at all!*

It should be added that the Committee appointed to investigate the working of the Act in 1876 reported as follows:—"Your Committee are of opinion that the operation of the present Act has in many respects failed to accomplish the objects for which it was enacted; that it has provided no remedy for the most important complaint made under the old law, namely, the inability of the representatives of deceased Incum-

bents to meet the amount assessed for dilapidations, but has cast upon new Incumbents an obligation to pay over the amount, and attached also to them a liability for fees previously unknown to the law, and has deprived the clergy of all power of acting in their own matters, of choosing their own advisers, and of all practical appeal against the official surveyor appointed under the Act. Your Committee are of opinion that some legislative alteration is needed to remove the well-grounded complaints of a large body of the clergy."

Allowing for the fine point which, in such documents, is always put upon condemnatory language, it is clear that in the real opinion of the Committee the Act of 1871 is little short of iniquitous. And now that the surveyors have bound themselves together in an Association to rivet their chains upon the clergy, it is high time for the clergy to form an organization to obtain the repeal of the Act, by sending to Convocation practical men from the lower ranks of the Church; by urging on all friends of the Church the prompt removal of the scandal of Queen Anne's Bounty amassing money wrung from the clergy on dilapidation accounts; and by opening the eyes of the hitherto untouched holders of livings to the injustice which hangs over their heads, and which makes a mere surveyor their absolute master instead of their hired servant; and, above all, by warning all our rulers of the danger of imperilling the paternal authority of the Bishop by associating him with frequent acts of oppressive exaction perpetrated in his name. The surveyors, as a body, complained that they had not been asked by the Committee for their suggestions how to make the Act more tolerable by the clergy. This at least proves that they know how it could be amended. But no suggestion with that object has ever emanated from them that I know of; and now they are found, through the agency of their secretary, bolstering up the Act with all its provisions! Is this because it would be quite impossible to make it any better in the interests of the surveyors, though it could easily be amended in those of the clergy? The only remedy is for the clergy to stir to amend it for themselves. A Bill could easily be framed which would be a boon to the Church. The clergy do not wish to get rid of responsibilities, which are indeed bulwarks against disestablishment and disendowment. They do not even wish to get rid of surveyors; for the Archdeacon has no authority over their glebes; but they wish to hire their surveyors at their own wages—they wish to get rid of exorbitant fees; and, by making the office elective and terminable, they wish to put a check upon abuses. Above all, they wish for a real and effective court of appeal; and that a schedule of what is and what is not assessible be drawn up for the whole Church. And they are prepared to present to Parliament a Bill embodying these suggestions.

H. Glanville Barnacle, M.A., F.R.A.S.

Kirk Chapel Vicarage, July 24th.

REMARKS ON THE USE AND NON-USE OF ITALICS IN THE REVISED VERSION.

Sir,—These remarks were written before the learned article on the same subject by the Rev. Canon Girdlestone was in print, and are offered with considerable diffidence; the more so, that they are an expression of regret that the italics of the A.V. are not more generally retained; whereas his opinion is "that our Bibles have hitherto been overloaded" with them. On this general statement I offer no opinion, but as an ordinary reader think it may be well to draw attention to one of the uses of italics, to which Canon Girdlestone does not make special allusion, and

which the Revisers have overlooked ; for it seems to me of considerable value.

The A.V. use of italics was to indicate what words, being absent in the original, were supplied by the translator to make the sense complete, or, rather, to make the sentence readable in English. The value of the rule cannot be more strikingly illustrated than by Luke xv. 2, where, unfortunately, this rule has not been observed. "This man receiveth sinners" ought to have been printed, "This *man* receiveth sinners." Comparing the passage with Luke xxiii. 2, where the word "*fellow*" is supplied, as also in Matt. xii. 24 ; xxvi. 61, 71 ; Isa. ix. 29 ; Acts xviii. 13 ; xxii. 22 ; xxiv. 5, the omission of the word for "man" seems to have been intentional. It was a bitter sneer of the Pharisees and scribes who thus murmured, meaning to say, "See what company this *fellow* keeps ; yes, and even makes friends of them !" May we not also say that these words, when taken up, and accepted by our blessed Lord as most true, are the more strikingly applicable to Him through this omission of the word for "man" ? So marvellously does the Holy Spirit make the wrath of man to praise Him ! The parables that Jesus spake unto them (the Pharisees and scribes) were not merely words of welcome to the publicans and sinners, who, by this His marvellous tact, were kept listening, but they were words which get all their life-giving power and preciousness from being the words of One Who was no mere man. This interesting and instructive point is lost by printing the word "man" in ordinary type, and not in italics, according to the usual rule. But in the R.V. the old rule is abolished, and for it is substituted this new one, "That all such words now printed in italics, as are plainly implied in the Hebrew (and Greek) and necessary in English, be printed in common type." And more than this, in the reprint of the A.V., which is given in the parallel versions, very many of the words formerly printed in italics are printed now in ordinary type. This is much to be regretted, for the new rule often limits very materially the scope of a passage. I give an instance, this time from the Old Testament, and similar ones may be found on opening the Bible almost anywhere. In Ps. xxiii. (A.V.), "The LORD *is* my shepherd" might be read, "The LORD *has been*," and "The LORD *will be*" as well as "*is*." In the New Version by omission of the italics this breadth of meaning is lost. It is still the language of faith, but no longer of thanksgiving and hope. The comprehensiveness of the A.V. contrasted with the comparative meagreness of the R.V. does not leave room for two opinions. The old is better.

These remarks, however, will fail very much in their object if regarded simply as critical. The more useful purpose will be served, if by them the English reader is led to note more carefully than heretofore the words that are italicised ; and to discover—thoughtful consideration will seldom fail to note it—that something, at times very much, is to be gathered from the word or words that are omitted. In the Bible *every* word is precious; and in the printing it differs from all other books in this, that the words, not those of most, but those of least importance are italicised.

One word more. A criticism of the R.V. would be very faulty if it were not accompanied by an expression of deep indebtedness to the Revisers for their labours. "Spread over eighty-five sessions of ten days each, six hours of close application being given on an average each day, to say nothing of the amount of preliminary work done by each Reviser in his own home,"[1] and all (if I mistake not) without pecuniary reward.

---

[1] THE CHURCHMAN, Canon Girdlestone, "The Revised Version of the Old Testament," July, 1885.

The work itself has no doubt been its own reward; and the increased amount of attention given to the study of God's Word that has resulted will have fully repaid them. But our indebtedness is not thereby diminished; and even though the blemishes had been tenfold more numerous than they are, supposing all the blemishes to be real ones, which is not likely, yet the indirect testimony we have thus obtained to the excellence of the A.V., and the invaluable commentary which has by this careful and laborious revision been supplied, makes the debt one that should on all possible occasions be gratefully acknowledged.

A LAYMAN.

Reviews.

Can the Old Faith Live with the New? A Problem of Evolution and Revelation. By the Rev. GEORGE MATHESON, D.D. Blackwood and Sons: Edinburgh.

"CAN the old faith live with the new?" In other words, Can the old faith live with *evolution?* For this is the problem which Dr. Matheson has set himself to solve. He accepts the evolutionary theory as an established law. But hypothesis and law are by no means convertible terms; and evolution, by universal consent, has not yet got beyond the hypothesis stage. It is doubtful whether, even if it were perfectly true, it is susceptible of absolute demonstration; for no man has ever seen the development of a new species. Indeed, Sir John Lubbock, in a recent address to the British Association, is reported to have stated that it was a popular misconception to imagine that the evolutionist held the Darwinian principle to be in operation now; while the records of the vast periods which the theory demands for the accomplishment of its objects have no existence. It is true, many of the advocates of evolution speak as if it were an indisputable law, accepted by all except perhaps a few narrow-minded and ignorant persons; yet Darwin himself did not venture to affirm as much. In his "Descent of Man" he says: "Of the older and honoured chiefs in natural science, many unfortunately are still opposed to evolution in every form." Of these "honoured chiefs" the illustrious Agassiz is not the least, and his opinion of evolution is given in unmistakable language. "The theory," he says, "is a scientific blunder, untrue in facts, unscientific in its methods, and ruinous in its tendency." A long roll of distinguished names might be added to the list of those who have not accepted the theory of evolution, but it is unnecessary to labour the point.

After giving the animal and vegetable kingdoms a start in the world somehow—by spontaneous generation, or by life communicated by a meteoric visitor, or by one or more primordial germs containing an inherent power of development, for these are all suggested—the advocates of evolution build up the whole superstructure of the present condition of the world, with its multiform organizations, including man himself, on the assumed law of natural selection and survival of the fittest.

With many of the objections to this hypothesis readers of THE CHURCHMAN are no doubt familiar. It would, therefore, even if it were possible within the limits at my disposal to refer to them all, be unnecessary to do so. It will be sufficient to adduce one, if I can show that it is

an insuperable barrier to the reception of the evolution theory. And the laws which obtain in reference to *hybridism* afford just such an objection —an objection which has not been met, nor indeed ever can be met while the present constitution of the animal kingdom remains. "Species," to use Darwin's language, "are the modified descendants of other species," or as he has more definitely expressed it in another place, "In living bodies variations will cause slight alterations, generation will multiply them almost infinitely, and natural selection will pick out with unerring skill each improvement." We have here a compendious statement of the theory from the founder of the school. Let us see whether it will "hold water."

It is unnecessary to say that a transformation of one species into another is contrary to all the experience of mankind. No man has ever witnessed such an event. Why? Because the Creator has placed impassable barriers between the manifold species of living creatures which prevent their confusion and transformation.

God has impressed upon each species of the lower animals an immutable law by which it is kept distinct through an unconquerable instinct of repulsion towards every other species. In a wild state animals never cross. Sparrows do not cross with swallows, nor ducks with gulls. And the Creator has set His seal upon this law in a very remarkable way. Even where crosses have taken place between some of the allied races of domesticated animals, as the horse and the donkey, the offspring is not prolific; the mule leaves no descendant. "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further," is the rule of the Divine law; it is what in human law would be called a "perpetual injunction."

And this brings us to a remarkable fact. The whole theory of evolution leads up to man; the progression of the lower animals from protoplasm to the highest ape is of no value in the eyes of the evolutionist if it does not advance a step farther and take in man. To man as the ultimate product, the disciples of this school are ever looking. Not only the outward organization—the form and figure—but his mental and religious sentiments, we are told, are simply the outcome, the evolution, of inchoate emotions of like nature previously existing in the lower animals.

Now if this theory be true—if, for example, the red man of America is the descendant of an American monkey, and the negro the descendant of an African chimpanzee, then these races of men must constitute species as distinct as their simian ancestors. The differences between the white man and the negro are greater than the differences between many varieties of the lower animals which are distinctly recognised as specific differences. But we now come to an impassable gulf between man and all other animals. However different in colour or "habitat," we are distinctly told that God hath made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth. No law of hybridism prevails as between whites and blacks, polar men and tropical men, Europeans and South Sea Islanders. Mulattos are as prolific as pure white or black or red men. There is, indeed, a mighty gulf between man and all the rest of the creation which no skill in dialectics nor sophistry, however subtle, can bridge over. When the inspired Evangelist traced the genealogy of our Lord, beginning from His reputed father Joseph, he speaks of each individual as being the son of another individual, "which was the son of David, which was the son of Jesse," and so on to the last human link in the chain, Adam, "which was the son of God," not the son of an ascidian tadpole, nor of an ape, but of the Omnipotent Creator Himself.

"This isolated position of man throughout the whole period of his history," says Sir William Dawson, in his "Story of Earth and Man"

(p. 364), "grows in importance the more it is studied; it deprives evolution as applied to our species of any precise scientific basis, whether zoological or geological." And even Agassiz, although he denied the unity of the human race, yet taught in the clearest language the complete isolation of man from all other members of the animal kingdom. In speaking of the similarity to man of some of the vertebrates, he says:

> This connection is not the consequence of a direct lineage between the fauna of different ages. There is nothing like parental descent connecting them. The fishes of the Palæozoic age are in no respect the ancestors of the reptiles of the Secondary age, nor does man descend from the mammals which preceded him in the Tertiary age. The link by which they are connected is of a higher and immaterial nature; and their connection is to be sought in view of the Creator Himself.

Let us now turn for a few moments to the other phase of the evolution theory, the survival of the fittest. And here the most popular although not the most logical of the advocates of evolution has furnished us with an illustration which will, when examined, show the untenable nature of the theory. In the first of his recent Sunday lectures at Grosvenor House, Professor Drummond asked his hearers to suppose an observer visiting an island in the autumn, when he would find it inhabited by a thousand birds; if he returned in the spring, he would find but a hundred. "Why?" he asks. "The biological answer," he replies, "is, that only the birds of the quickest wing, the most cunning ways, and the strongest muscle have survived." Now Mr. Drummond might readily find a thousand islands in which the same difference would be found between autumn and spring. But his inference is utterly erroneous and without any foundation in fact. Instead of an imaginary island let us take an actual instance—the Province of Nova Scotia—which is a peninsula. Although it lies considerably to the south of England, yet, as we all know, the isothermal line in crossing the ocean moves in a curve, so that the transatlantic winters are much colder than the winters of the same latitudes in Western Europe, and the summers are considerably hotter. Now during the summer in Nova Scotia, in every garden may be seen that most delicate and beautiful little creature, the humming-bird. Visit the same gardens in the spring and not a humming bird is visible. Why? Is it because, being neither quick of wing nor strong of muscle, it has not survived? Nothing could be further from the truth. It fled, on the approach of winter, to warmer and sunnier lands in obedience to its God-given instincts, and when the proper season again comes round it will be found in as great numbers as ever in every garden in the province. Look at a map of North America and see the enormous distance which this, the tiniest and most defenceless of birds, has traversed in the interval. Away from Nova Scotia to Florida or Georgia, and thence back to Nova Scotia, over many weary stretches of mountain and river, lake and ocean, this, the most helpless of all the fowls of the air, travels every year in safety, escaping the attacks of predacious birds and animals and the vicissitudes of intervening climates. Is this the survival of the fittest and strongest?

In the journal kept by an officer on one of the Arctic voyages of discovery, he mentions the delight with which, on the return of the short summer in that high latitude, he saw a snipe alight upon the earth. Next to the humming-bird there is hardly a more defenceless bird in existence than the snipe. And yet over what boundless tracts of land and sea it must have travelled to reach its breeding-grounds within the Arctic circle! Is this the survival of the fittest and strongest? It would be easier to believe in the Claimant or in the Holy Coat of Treves than to believe that, either in the case of the snipe or of the humming-bird, its survival is due to its strength of muscle or wing.

The truth is that, even among the lower animals, the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong, but the care of their Creator is over all, even the weakest of His creatures; and the most defenceless races are those that survive in the greatest numbers.

What then can be the outcome of a system which in its fundamental principles sets aside the plainest facts in creation, and substitutes a theory resting on unproved assumptions in their stead? There can be but one reply. The tendency of the whole system is ruinous to faith. Take one of the most popular and widely read advocates of evolution perhaps since Darwin, Professor Drummond. To what has it led him? The real drift and tendency of his work on "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" has been shown by various writers; but he has himself, in his recent Sunday lectures at Grosvenor House, furnished unmistakable evidence of a steady retrogression from the truth. In his first lecture, in order to bring the Scriptures into harmony with evolution, he tells us that he can only consent to regard the Book of Genesis as a poem addressed to children's minds, like George Macdonald's poem "The Baby," not literally true, but true for the child; that the Fall appears to be after all not a fall but a rise; and the difficulty of accepting the miracles is met by the statement that there is "no need of accepting any miracle but the Resurrection, and this science makes possible and even probable."

The most recent contribution to the discussion of the question before us is Dr. Matheson's volume, "Can the Old Faith Live with the New?" and the *modus vivendi* which he advocates is virtually a concession to the modern evolutionary school of the most important conditions of the controversy.

It will be noticed by the readers of his book that in nearly every instance he states very fairly the views of those holding the old faith, and then those of the evolutionary school. But, having done this, he proceeds to state that there is no collision between them; that both are true. He entirely overlooks, however, the fact that the chief advocates of evolution, who ought to know their own minds, by no means admit this. Mr. Herbert Spencer, whom Dr. Matheson calls "distinctively the apostle of evolution," in a paper in the *Nineteenth Century*, clearly lays down, as the basis of reconciliation between theology and science, the abandonment by the former of all its anthropomorphic traits. His aim is to turn out the Personal God of the Christian from the universe, and to substitute that unknown blind Force which constitutes the ultimate factor in his system. Nor can it be denied that the whole school of scientific materialists on the Continent hailed the advent of the Darwinian theory as affording fresh grounds for denying the existence of the Christian's God.

Let us see how far Dr. Matheson has succeeded in his process of reconciliation, or, in other words, what he has given up to effect it. I have only space to refer to one or two instances. In his tenth chapter on "Evolution and the Second Adam," at page 270, he is speaking of the doctrine of the Atonement, where we read: "What we say is, that the Christian doctrine of the Atonement depends for its validity on the uninterrupted continuance of the law of mental evolution." Now no evolution, either physical or mental, has ever been proved to exist—up to the present hour, evolution is a mere figment of the imagination. The doctrine of the Atonement depends for its validity on no such illusory foundation; it depends on the Word of the living God conveyed to us by men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

This statement, then, that the doctrine of the Atonement depends on the law of mental evolution, seems to wander far enough away from the "old faith;" but Dr. Matheson's speculations on the origin of man have led him into a still deeper maze of error.

Scripture tells us that by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and again it asserts, in equally clear language, that by man came death. Dr. Matheson, however, informs us that man was always subject to death like other animals; that he had been evolved, like all other animals, from previously existing organizations, and was, like them, subject to death: and this condition of things must have existed for long periods of ages. This imaginary account is utterly opposed to that of Scripture. Moses informs us that God created man in His own image; and when all was finished, pronounced His work to be very good. Dr. Matheson tells us that the primitive man, so far from being very good, had a "potentiality of virtue," but was only "actually harmless"—that he was in short a harmless fool. Dr. Matheson has thus certainly succeeded in finding, or rather in inventing, the missing link between the ape and man, for which the evolutionists have so long been searching. But he proves too much. "The doctrine of evolution," he tells us, "admits of no leap in the order of nature; it allows no paroxysm, no catastrophe, no sudden or unexpected emergency to break the ordinary sequence of that great chain of continuity which binds the highest to the lowest." The narrative of Genesis, he affirms, "in passing from the animal to man, recognises indeed the fact that nature has made a vast progress, but it holds the progress to have been made not by leaping but by stepping." And this is the significant conclusion at which he arrives: "The formation of man from the dust of the ground, and the breathing into man's nostrils of that breath of life which constitutes his humanity, would seem to have been not one act but two."

Now if this fantastic dream were true, let us mark well what its inevitable result would be. It would sweep away every vestige of foundation for the Gospel plan of salvation. If the lower type of man, after he had emerged from the simian stage, but before he received the afflatus "which constitutes his humanity," continued in this lower state for "a long period of ages," then at the time that he received his "higher and later life," and became true man, there must have been many millions of the race in existence. This banishes into the region of legendary myths the Mosaic account, which represents the human family as descended from a single pair; but it goes much further, for it destroys the plan of redemption by one Man, Jesus Christ, which God has indissolubly connected with the creation and fall of the head of the whole human family. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," are His own words. And Adam cannot here be used as a generic term including a multitudinous race of human beings; for St. Paul, as if to shut out all controversy on the point, says in another place, "As by *one* man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of *one* shall many be made righteous."

And when, we may ask, did all these untold myriads of men, into whom was breathed the breath of life, lapse into sin? Was the lapse universal and simultaneous? If so, as Dr. Matheson appears to hold, there is clearly no room for the story of the serpent tempting Eve to a single definite act of disobedience. This must also be given up as a poetical myth, adapted to the infancy of mankind, but not to be treated seriously by men of intelligence in the present day. If, on the other hand, the fall was not simultaneous, but men were lapsing, one to-day and another to-morrow, over a long period of time, when did the declaration of Scripture become true? "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one."

This, however, and many other insurmountable difficulties, are only the inevitable outcome of the adoption of the evolutionary hypothesis. The attempts to reconcile the old faith with the new can only succeed by

compromising, and conceding, to the men who set science before religion, everything that is worth preserving. They remind one of the matrimonial quarrel which was settled by compromise. The husband, being a man of prosaic tastes, wished to dine at one o'clock; the wife, with loftier social aspirations, preferred dinner at seven; and an unhappy feud was the result. At length, however, the controversy was amicably arranged; and the husband, in answer to the inquiries of a friend to whom he had confided his grief, informed him that the quarrel was over and peace restored—that they had "compromised" on seven o'clock. This, it appears to me, is precisely what the advocates of harmony between Scripture and Evolution are now engaged in doing. I fear, however, that their efforts will never lead any soul into rest or peace. To attain that, the inquirer must walk in another path. "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

P. CARTERET HILL.

Old Church Life in Scotland. Lectures on Kirk-Session and Presbytery Records. By ANDREW EDGAR, Minister at Mauchline. Pp. 365. Alexander Gardner: Paisley, and 12, Paternoster Row. 1885.

Every summer brings to Mauchline visitors from all parts of the world, from Maidenkirk and John o' Groats', from England and Ireland, from Australia and the great Republic of America. All or nearly all these visitors make a loving and curious inspection of the churchyard. That little enclosure is to them an object of the deepest interest, but it is not because old stern Covenanters are resting there from their warfare, nor because morbid-minded monks, weary of the world, were buried there under the shadows of the old sanctuary, where morning, noon, and night they sang and prayed, and led sad but saintly lives hid with Christ in God. It is because the place has been consecrated by the genius of the national poet of Scotland. Many a time have the feet of Burns trod that hallowed ground. It was in the old church that he worshipped, and I presume it was in the old church that his marriage was "solemnly *confirmed*." It was in the old church and the present churchyard that those scenes of mingled solemnity and profanation were witnessed, that have been described, perhaps too truly, in his Communion satire. It was in the modern mansion adjoining the churchyard and contiguous to the castle, that Gavin Hamilton, the poet's friend and landlord, lived, and where the poet spent many of his gayest and happiest hours. It was about a stone-cast beyond, in a green meadow, on the banks of what was then a bright and purling brook, that tradition says the poet first caught sight of the village belle who became his bride, and whose charms he has immortalized in imperishable song. It was in the upper room of a small two-storied, red-sandstone house, facing the eastern gable of Mr. Hamilton's mansion, that the poet and his wife took up their first abode together. It was in one of the houses that still form the north-eastern boundary of the churchyard, and is separated from Burns's own dwelling

> By a narrow street
> Where twa wheelbarrows tremble when they meet,

that Nanse Tinnock had her comfortable and respectable alehouse.

We have quoted the preceding paragraph from the opening lecture on Churchyards in the volume before us by the "Minister at Mauchline;" it will have an interest for those who have paid a visit to that classic spot. He proceeds to speak of Mary Morrison's house, and adds that in the churchyard of Mauchline are the graves of many that were known and endeared to the poet. But in addition to the immediate surroundings,

he says, you look out from the church-tower on Mossgiel and Ballochmyle, the Ayr and the Lugar, the banks of Afton and the Braes of Doon.

While we refer to Mauchline as the home of Burns, we may quote a few sentences from the preface of this volume which relate to the poet in connection with Church discipline. In dealing with cases of scandal the author has generally withheld the names of persons involved when it seemed possible "that such names could be identified with families still represented in the district of Mauchline." But to this rule he has made one notable exception. "The public interest in the national poet is so absorbing," we read, "and people are so anxious to know the whole truth about his bright and sad career, that I have thought it proper to tell nearly all that the Session Records of Mauchline have to say about him and the persons that figure in his poems." We learn that Burns never had to sit on the Repentance Stool.

The information given about discipline is very curious, and will strike many readers with surprise. Officers were appointed to keep the people in till the service was ended. The kirk-officer of Perth was bidden to have "his red staff in the kirk on the Sabbath day, wherewith to waken sleepers and remove greeting bairns." The Kirk-Session of Monifeith in 1643 gave the "bedall 5s. to buy ane pynt of tar to put upon the women that held the plaid above their head in church." A reason was given by one Kirk Session in 1642 why "no woman be suffered to sit in the time of sommer with plyds upon their heads." The reason was "it is a cleuck to their sleeping in tyme of sermon." One minister is reported to have paused in the reading of the Scriptures, and to have called out—"I see a man aneath that laft wi' his hat on. I'm sure ye're clear o' the soogh o' the door. Keep aff yer bannet, Tammas, an' if yer bare pow be cauld, ye maun jist get a grey worsit wig like mysel." Kirk Sessions, of course, did not always succeed in making the people amenable to their rule. It often happened, indeed, that the stool of repentance was broken to pieces by some irate offender. One Agnes Ronald, when brought before the Session, "declared her resolution to continue in the sin of drunkenness;" "ane verie vitious woman in face of Session threatened her goodman;" and in 1645 a woman was brought before the Session of Fenwick for "upbraiding of the Session from off the public place of repentance, when she should have made confession of her fault."

The Kirk Session is made up chiefly of "such as are commonly called elders." But who is really an *elder?* In the Church of Scotland, says Mr. Edgar, "elders and presbyters mean the same thing." A Presbyterian Church, therefore, he says, means a Church that is governed exclusively by presbyters or elders; all its Courts might with perfect propriety be called either Presbyteries or Elderships. The General Assembly might be called the general or "haill" Presbytery of the Church; the Synods might be called Provincial Presbyteries; and Kirk-Sessions might be called the Parochial Presbyteries. Each of these Courts is composed of Presbyters or Elders. But—here is the explanatory line—there are *two kinds* of Elders. First, there are "those that not only exercise authority and take part in government, but labour in word and doctrine." There are the Ministers or Pastors, and Doctors of Divinity. Second, there are Elders who have no licence to preach, or administer sacraments or solemnize marriages. Their office is simply to exercise rule, and for that reason they are called *ruling* Elders. There is a common notion, however, that there is some specially important personage in the Kirk Session—some one that in virtue of rank or commanding influence is exalted above the other Elders. This is not the case. All Elders, says our author, are ruling Elders. That some members of the Church of England should make a mistake upon this point (as recent discussions on Church Courts seemed to show) is very natural; and even officials of the Scottish Kirk have gone astray.

Short Notices.

The Martyrs of Polynesia. Memorials of Missionaries, Native Evangelists, and Native Converts, who have died by the hand of violence, from 1799 to 1871. By the Rev. A. W. MURRAY, author of "Missions in Western Polynesia," and "Forty Years' Mission-work in Polynesia and New Guinea." Pp. 217. Elliot Stock.

THIS is a thoroughly good book. Its author is well known, and a book of his is sure to be well read. The London Missionary Society has been remarkably successful in Polynesia, and a faithful history of martyrdom in the islands of the South Seas by a veteran Missionary of that Society will be welcomed by earnest supporters of Missionary work in many circles. Of Mr. Murray's fifteen chapters seven are taken up by memorials of the martyrs of the New Hebrides, and four are devoted to martyrs of the Loyalty Islands. Records of the martyrs of Tonga, of the Tahitian group, and of the Melanesian Missions complete the work. Several of the papers, it seems, have already appeared in Australian periodicals. Of those about whom Mr. Murray had to write many were more or less personally known to him. John Williams he knew well. Of Mr. Harris [Eramanga, 1839] he knew a little, and considerably more of the elder Gordon and his wife [Eramanga, 1861]. Most of the native martyrs he knew intimately.

In recommending the volume as a valuable addition to the Missionary library, we should add that it contains some illustrations, and a good map of Polynesia.

Anno Domini. A Glimpse at the World into which Messias was born. By J. D. C. HOUSTON, B.D., Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Hyde Park, Belfast. Pp. 160. R.T.S.

This little volume is designed for that section of the great general reader class who have neither time nor opportunity to consult standard works, and who wish to know something of the religious and moral state of the world at the time when the Word was made flesh. The information about the Gentiles and the Jews is given in a clear and interesting form.

The Parallel Bible. The Authorized Version arranged in parallel columns with the Revised Version. Henry Frowde: Oxford University Press Warehouse, Amen Corner.

A noble volume, worthy witness to a great and memorable work. The manner in which the printing and publishing of the Revised Version has been carried out is really wonderful, and merits unstinted praise. It is a treat to use the beautiful book before us.

Sermons in Brief. From the MS. notes of a London Clergyman. Dickinson: Farringdon Street. 2 vols. 1885.

These sermons, as a rule, seem sound, sensible, and suggestive, the divisions being fairly natural, and not dry-bony. Here and there is an excellent discourse. But how far such sermon-heads are really helpful, and desirable, is a matter of opinion. The volumes are very well printed.

Book-Lore. A Magazine devoted to Old Time Literature. Vol. I. Elliot Stock.

In this handsome volume, printed with great taste, appears a variety of interesting matter. A paper on some remarkable misprints which have given names to different editions of the Bible has curious bits. The articles are short, as a rule, but rich and readable; the reviews and the notes will be specially welcome to many.

No Condemnation—No Separation. Lectures on Romans viii. By MARCUS RAINSFORD, B.A., Minister of Belgrave Chapel, London. Hodder and Stoughton.

Many will be glad to hear of and make themselves acquainted with these lectures; and others who have read previous books by Mr. Rainsford will, to say the least, equally value his present work.

The Public Schools Historical Atlas. By C. COLBECK, M.A., Assistant Master at Harrow School. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

This most useful atlas contains in all 101 maps, and may fairly be regarded as affording every possible historical illustration that would be of general advantage. Many histories of special periods have of late been published, each very fully accompanied with maps; but, so far as we are aware, this is the first complete atlas which illustrates every epoch—each map dealing with one period only, ranging from one of the Roman Empire to a plan of the Battle of Waterloo. The maps are drawn and coloured well.

The Scottish Church, a sixpenny magazine, is published by Messrs. R. and R. Clark, 42, Hanover Street, Edinburgh. The August number contains several well-written papers. "The latest Liberationist: Lord Lorne," is extremely clever, "hard-hitting," and not without a spice of bitterness. "The latest convert to Liberationism is the Most Noble the Marquis of "Lorne, K.T., LL.D. His confession and testimony, partially confided to "the Radicals of Hampstead by word of mouth, are bestowed on such of "his countrymen in general as read the *Scottish Review* in the pages of "the July number of that organ. . . What will most immediately strike "every educated reader is the Marquis's very defective style. His com-"position is so faulty, his relatives and antecedents are so loosely jumbled, "and the limbs of his periods are so ill jointed, that it is often hard to "make out what he is driving at. The very first sentence is a puzzle: "'The General Assembly of the "Establishment" has announced its "intention to go to the polls, and will no doubt influence, for some years "to come, the question of "religious equality."' What does he mean? "The General Assembly will for some years to come influence the question "of religious equality! Possibly; but what connection has this with its "'going to the polls'? or what does the Assembly's going to the polls "mean? The sentence is a fair sample of Lord Lorne's crooked style and "of his reckless assertions. The General Assembly never announced its "intention to go to the polls, whatever that may signify. It never did or "said anything that, to an observer with the slightest discernment, could "convey the impression of political pugnacity, which Lord Lorne no doubt "wishes to convey under this phraseology. Equally unwarrantable is his "next allegation, founded on a remark of Lord Salisbury's as to the igno-"rance of Scotch ecclesiastical affairs in England, and the relation of the "liberation campaign in Scotland to the design of disestablishing the "English Church. 'So matters of conscience with us are to be judged, "entirely, as they may affect a Tory party, assisted by a bench of bishops "in England.' Partisan ill-will has seldom invented a more unjust and

"misleading insinuation. But these random strokes fall on every page. "When 'the State gift,' by which it pleases his Lordship to designate the "patrimony of the Church, 'brought undue State interference, divisions "began.' The statement is absolutely baseless. The endowments of the "Church were never a 'State gift,' and never 'brought undue State inter-"ference,' which, in its turn, created schism. The first divisions in the "Church—which, as far as we understand Lord Lorne, are not those he "specially refers to—arose out of the conflicts between Presbytery and "Episcopacy, and continued, with alternations of fortune, for nearly one "hundred years, without creating anything that could be called dissent. "Each party, as it triumphed, absorbed or subdued the other. The "Presbyterian 'divisions,' of which Lord Lorne doubtless intends to "speak, sprang out of no State interference with any question of the "Church's property. They were—from the secession of the Erskines to "that of Dr. Chalmers—schisms originating within the Church itself, in "disputes about claims and principles with which the Church's endow-"ments had nothing to do. Even in the 'ten years' conflict,' which pro-"duced the secession of 1843, it was not the Church's property that "invited State interference, but the Church's violation of the terms of her "compact with the State. Before he lectures us upon our divisions, Lord "Lorne should master the rudiments of their character and history. He "should also learn to speak with propriety of the religious institutions of "his country, and of the Presbyterian ministry, one of the greatest of "them. Although Mr. Buckle was ludicrously wrong in describing Scot-"land as, next to Spain, the most priest-ridden country in Europe, it is "undeniable that the Scotch, as a rule, hold the ordinances of religion, "and those who administer them, in high respect. This is a sentiment "common both to Churchmen and Nonconformists. It is one which the "noble Lord seems to spend his feeble ingenuity in outraging."

The *Leisure Hour* has the following :

It is very well known that any person discovering a printer's error in an Oxford Bible will be paid a guinea if he will take the trouble to point it out to the Controller of the Press—provided, of course, that it has not been discovered before. The editions of the Sacred Scriptures issued by the University are very numerous, and from one or another of them errors are now and again picked out, and several times during his term of office the present controller has been called upon for the guinea, and has paid it. When the Revised Bibles were about to be issued the question arose as to whether guineas should be paid for printers' errors in this enormous issue of entirely new print. Every edition, of course, is an independent work of the compositors and proof-readers, and in an undertaking of such magnitude it could hardly be doubted that mistakes would in the aggregate be numerous, and prudence seemed to suggest that no undertaking should be entered into until the work had for a time had the benefit of the gratuitous criticism of the public. Up to the moment of our writing, however, after running the gauntlet of public scrutiny for a good month, only three printer's errors have been discovered in all the editions. In the pearl 16mo. edition there is an error in Ezekiel xvii. 26, where an "e" is left out of righteous, and the word is printed "rightous." In the parallel 8vo. edition there are two mistakes. In Psalm vii. 13, "shatfs" appears instead of "shafts," and in Amos v. 24, in the margin, "overflowing" should be "everflowing." Of course there may be others to be found yet, but that for a whole month only these should have been brought to the notice of the authorities is astonishing, considering the magnitude of the enterprise.

The Approaching Australasian Centenary. This pamphlet (Elliot Stock) is a reprint of the article in a recent CHURCHMAN by Mr. B. A. HEYWOOD, author of that excellent book "Memoir of Captain Stephens, R.N." It will have, we hope, a large circulation in its new form.

The Scottish Review, Number XI., contains several interesting and informing articles (Alexander Gardner, 12, Paternoster Row). A paper by Lord Lorne on Disestablishment in Scotland, appears to bear marks of haste; we, at all events, are disappointed with it. "The time has come," says the esteemed writer, "to ask that Scotland shall have religious equality;" and accordingly, Disestablishing agitation is spoken of as "invigorating." The noble Marquis seems to have no fear that "agitation" may affect other institutions besides the Establishment, although Irish landlords, as a rule, have complained that confiscation has been contagious; but what he suggests has the mild and attractive watchword "*Union*." Would Presbyterians who hold to the principle of a National Church be brought to unite with the U. P. body and the Free Church by the shock of Disestablishment? We greatly doubt it. The *Scottish Review* also contains an able review of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," and the reviewer, we think, is right in saying that the defence in the *Expositor* "fails to reconcile the Professor's contradictions or to vindicate his book from the charge of superficialness and erroneousness." The conclusion of "The Political Portrait Gallery" is that the interest of the future, so far as can be proved at present, centres round four persons—Lord Salisbury and Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Rosebery.

Picturesque Wales is a cheap and pleasing little hand-book of scenery accessible from the Cambrian Railways (Adams, 59, Fleet Street).

The *Art Journal* (J. S. Virtue and Co.), a capital number, contains "A Reverie," from the drawing by Marcus Stone, A.R.A., some more sketches of Eastbourne, and "An Old Coach Road," with bits of Canterbury and Dover.

In the *Sunday at Home* appears another instalment of "The Jews after the Dispersion," by the Rev. H. C. ADAMS. These papers have all along been excellent; they are readable as well as full of information. The literary power of the learned author has long been known; his present work shows considerable research, and it happily meets a want. We hope it will appear in a separate form. Dr. Green's paper on the Revised Old Testament is, of course, exceedingly good.

Some of our readers may be glad to make acquaintance with a shilling pamphlet, published by Mr. A. Gardner (Paisley and London), having this title, "*On Natural Law in the Spiritual World*," "by a brother of the natural man." It concludes that Professor Drummond's work is a book that "no lover of men will call religious, and no student of theology scientific."

A reprint from *Home Words* entitled *Tim Teddington's Dream*, by Miss GIBERNE, has already had a large circulation. We heartily wish it a much greater success. Only a penny, like so many valuable little publications, it comes from "Home Words" office, 7, Paternoster Square, E.C.

In the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* appears "Bishop Hannington's visit to Chagga," and several interesting papers.

In the *National Review*, a very good number, "Gordon or Gladstone," by Mr. Stanley Leighton, M.P., will be read with painful feelings by many who take little interest in the disputes of "party" politics.

THE MONTH.

THE Session has closed, and we are now virtually without a Parliament. "Good fortune has still attended the Government," says the *Record*. "If they have not accomplished all they wish, they have the satisfaction of feeling that they have done a great deal more than even their best friends expected of them. The passing of the Irish Land Purchase Bill through Committee, and of the measure for the Housing of the Poor through the stage of the second reading on one and the same evening is a feat of legislation unequalled in present times."

Mr. Gladstone has made a yachting trip along the coasts of Norway, in the *Sunbeam*, the yacht which made the voyage celebrated in Lady Brassey's book.

Lord Randolph Churchill, in introducing the Indian Budget, made a vigorous attack upon Lord Ripon's lack of policy in regard to Russian advance. The Secretary's able speech (says the *Guardian*) "suggests the hope that the responsibilities of power may in time convert the reckless demagogue into a serious statesman."

The discussions in Parliament on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill have not lessened the regret felt by many earnest advocates of such a measure at some of the modes adopted for obtaining a knowledge of certain facts or at the indiscriminate diffusion of such knowledge. On the provisions of this important Act, and the general subject, an article in these pages is unavoidably postponed.

Mr. Chamberlain's electioneering programme includes free education, the creation of a peasant proprietary, graduated taxation, and so forth. The question is how far the great Liberal party will agree with him.

Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and leader of the House of Commons, has somewhat tardily acknowledged that Lord Spencer, the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland under the late Government, is entitled to the hearty thanks of the country.

Colonel Stanley, Secretary for the Colonies, has given "the fullest meed of approval" for the admirable way in which Sir Charles Warren carried out the primary object of his expedition in Bechuanaland. Sir H. Robinson's great services were also acknowledged; and a definite police in Bechuanaland, Basutoland, and Zululand may happily now be looked for.

At the Wesleyan Conference Dr. Osborn made some remarks upon political partizanship. He suggested that Methodist ministers should not interfere in political matters. Dr. Rigg criticized the policy of giving up villages for the sake of towns; unless they kept their villages they would be beaten.

The Bishop of Worcester has given two sums of £1,000 each to form the nucleus of a Clergy Pension and Insurance Fund for the archdeaconries of Coventry and Worcester.

The reports of the spread of cholera in Spain have been of the most painful description.

A testimonial subscribed for by persons of all ranks and classes in the county was presented at Exeter to Bishop Temple.

The Bishop of Carlisle, preaching in his cathedral, spoke of England entering upon a new chapter in her history; and he wished to see the whole truth as to the Church put before the country.

The Pluralities Bill has at length become law. Some of its provisions are excellent.

Discussions on the functions of the Provincial House of Laymen can hardly fail to do good service.

The Rev. John Wordsworth, son of the late Bishop of Lincoln, has been appointed Bishop of Salisbury. The *Times* says:

Mr. Wordsworth belongs to the moderate High Church school. He has gained so entirely the esteem and respect and regard of those who have known him at the University that the news of his appointment to the See of Salisbury will be received there with general satisfaction, and with a full conviction that no unworthy choice has been made. We welcome his appointment to this new sphere of work, for we are confident that he will not fail in any way to maintain the high reputation and high character which he has hitherto borne.

A letter from the Bishop of Rochester on the Church and State question contains the following paragraphs:

For the permanent and complete protection of the vast interests at stake, I want you to think out clearly, and to weigh carefully, even solemnly, what your duty must be in defending for your children as well as for yourselves the material forces which the Church now holds on trust for her responsible and ever-augmenting duty. For the widow and fatherless, who have no helper; the children who never needed more than now the incessant care of a vigilant and resident clergy; the religious bodies outside us, which sometimes recognise with generosity the value of a National Church, with its activities, scholarship, and devotion; the artisan, who welcomes a clergyman in his home, though he may seldom follow him into his church; the peasant, who would soon regret the friends he had lost, when missing the refined and kindly inmates of the parsonage—the great question is now at stake—is it, or is it not, for the welfare of the people at large that the National Church should be maintained?

Roughly analyzed, the advocates of what is called Disestablishment may be ranged under three classes. The secularists, bitterly disliking

revealed religion of any kind, clearly perceive that to deprive the great English Church of material resources for exercising her functions would be to strike a blow at the Christian religion throughout the world. Certainly the destructives would be the gainers. The political class, enamoured of a specious theory of religious equality, and resenting the obstacles which the Church in former times is alleged to have continually opposed to salutary and indispensable reforms, would punish her for the past by crippling her for the future. Some religious Nonconformists (perhaps the most formidable of all) honestly believe that alliance with the State means subservience to it, resent that the Anglican discipline and formularies should be recognised as the national ideal of the truth and rule of God, and seem able to persuade themselves that were we sent into the wilderness of a wholesome poverty we should, after an interval no doubt, emerge into a higher level of goodness and a loftier idea of duty than the world has seen since Constantine. I say "some," for there is a strong minority the other way. It is true that few thoughtful persons would care to deny that a Free Church has advantages and opportunities. But do they preponderate over those of a National Church, and what would happen until the tribulation was over?

These are resolute adversaries, neither to be softened by pathetic appeals, nor deterred by brotherly persuasion, nor intimidated by the consequences of success. Since they attack us, of course we must defend ourselves. But we need not lose our heads, nor set an example of petulant scolding, nor waste time and breath in dissuading them from an appeal to Parliament. We must use better weapons than adjectives; we must have at our disposal arguments which will bear constantly repeating, and facts which we can invite all men to sift. Ours, too, is the faculty of speech, and we shall use it when we think proper. As yet we are by no means alone. But of these two things we ask our fellow-countrymen to be well assured. What is being forced on us with a fierce eagerness means a religious war, which will penetrate every home, set class against class, and neighbour against neighbour, in a kind of strife which, as history tells us, is wont to be far more bitter than a mere civil dispute, and perhaps much more protracted. The responsibility is not ours but theirs. Also, we have a word for the neutrals, that large body of undecided bystanders who will look on in a cynical indifference at what, though pastime to them, is almost death to others. The Church, if she falls, will not fall alone. A good deal else is sure to come sooner or later out of her destruction, which those who let her fall may not particularly care for. When the dust and smoke of the battle clear away, there may be found other ruins than hers.

Some things will assuredly come to pass. In many of the rural districts the Church organization, from want of material support, must disappear; and, as our Nonconformist neighbours are in no instances asking for a share of the alienated endowments, it is hard to see how, even if they wished to do so, they could take up our dropped labours. In country towns the effect might be less severe, but in the great centres of labour, such as Liverpool, or Leeds, or Leicester, or Bristol, the Church's framework would be utterly submerged; and just at the moment when she was beginning to overtake the neglect of a past generation, and was earning the gratitude of all good Christian souls by her sacrifices and devotion, she would be struck down with paralysis.

The Bishop also refers to Education, and proceeds as follows:

Very quickly, indeed, all our Church schools would go; and there would be free, perhaps secular Board schools everywhere in their place. The Church, indeed, would live and work on as best she could—tested

and purified by trouble. Bishops and clergy would not be the least likely to forget their duty to their native land, nor their faith and duty to their Divine Head, nor their care for the poor, nor the great privilege of still being the ministers of an Historical Church, which has, with all her faults and shortcomings, done good service to England for more than 1,200 years. But they would be working with lessened numbers, and straitened revenue, and (being men) with a very sore heart. It is to be doubted if she could remain as wide and deep and Catholic as she is now. Her tendency would be to Sectarianism. She would be in danger of imperfect sympathies with the intellectual movements of the time, and of isolation from the outside national life. . . . Space does not remain for me to indicate, as the occasion requires, all the methods by which this attack can best be repelled. The duty of circulating by tens of thousands short, readable papers on the actual facts of the case, and of controverting by clear and full statements the preposterous fictions that are being continually propagated by those who ought to know much better, as to the incomes of the clergy, and their mode of payment, and the origin of tithes, and the meaning of a National Church, cannot need pressing on you. The Church Defence Institution has already done admirable work, prudently as well as boldly, by public meetings, where circumstances called for them. . . . Let it never be said of us, that we did not think it worth while to master the facts of our case, or to be at the pains of explaining them to others, or of stoutly contending for our magnificent inheritance. . . . On no political party, on no clever intrigues, on no favour of man will we for one moment stake our victory. Only in God above us will we trust, and in the justice of our cause; in the purity of the truth we declare, in the consistency of the lives that we live among our fellows.

Mr. Osborne Morgan, Q.C., M.P., who held the office of Judge-Advocate-General in the late Government, addressing a meeting of his constituents at Rhos Ruabon, referred to the question of Disestablishment. He said there was no doubt that Disestablishment was in the air, and no one but its most sanguine opponents could believe that it could be kept out of the range of practical politics (loud cheers). There were forces at work, both without and within the Church, which were steadily pushing into the front the growing independence of religious thought, the levelling spirit of the age, and the disposition to judge all institutions on their own merits.

THE CHURCH AND THE MASSES.

AT the recent meeting of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, a paper was read by Mr. W. Egerton Hubbard, supporting a resolution "that the distinct interests of the masses in the preservation of the National Church is a subject worthy of special attention by Diocesan Conferences at the present time." Mr. Hubbard said:

The first difficulty of writing a paper in support of this resolution is, that it admits of so little argument. The object aimed at is so self-obvious

as to amount almost to a truism. A really National Church provides that the poor who constitute the masses should have the Gospel preached to them; that this should be done is then their distinct interest in the preservation of the Church, for if it be neglected, they can have very little other interest therein. But the resolution proceeds to say that the recognition of the distinct interest of the masses in the Church is of special interest at the present time. This signifies, I take it, that it is of special importance to the Church that the interest of the people therein should be recognised and satisfied at a time when a large proportion of them are to be entrusted with political power. The present time does not render the Church of especial importance to the masses, for no particular period can diminish to them the importance of their spiritual preparation for another world; but it does render them of especial importance to the Church, for if they do not feel her value and influence now, they may add to the power of those who think other forms of worship, other ecclesiastical constitutions, are equally good, or better. It is, therefore, of importance for Churchmen to see that, as far as possible, the Church should be rendered capable of carrying out its divine mission; and the present time is specially suitable, not only for setting forth the strong points of our National Church, but also for considering her weak points, and the best means of making her at every point potent for her work. It would be impossible within the scope of this paper even generally to indicate the many phases of Christian charity which Church-work represents. In the present day—thank God for it!—the Church is alive, and every loving impulse to mitigate the effects of sin and suffering finds an outlet in her manifold organization. Whether it be the work of conversion or of edification; whether it be the work of teaching or of ministry; whether it be the ministry of the Word and sacraments, or the ministry of temporal benefits to the needy; whether it be aid to sick and suffering, or instruction to the ignorant, to old or young, to Christ's creatures at home or abroad—it cannot be denied that every phase of Christian work is being undertaken and executed with a zeal and devotion unparalleled since the primitive age of the Church. But this is true not only of the English Church; it is true in varying degree also of other Christian bodies. It is in part, at least, an outcome, for which we cannot be sufficiently grateful, of the unprecedented development and activity of the present age, in which all phases of life are being pushed and extended in a manner impossible in past times. We may be sure, however, that the powers of evil are not less active; we may fear lest they should even be in advance of the march of religion and virtue, and extending with even more rapid steps over the kingdoms of this world. We should, then, be false to our colours if, while we sought to advertise the blessings which a National Church may bring to a people, we tolerated for one instant longer than necessary any known imperfections of human origin which are marring the perfect beauty and efficiency of the Divine Institution. It will not be enough to call attention to the activity and zeal of the Church in Christian work, either of a spiritual or charitable character. Even if the value of that work be not denied, Nonconformists may say, "We do the same; and, in our opinion, do it better." It will be necessary to point out advantages to the masses *peculiar* to a National Church; we must be able to show what these are in theory, and to maintain that they are offered in all their fulness by the Church of England at the present time. The value of a National Church may be viewed under two aspects: its value to the nation as a whole, its value to the nation as a number of individuals. We maintain that the Church of England presents to the people the most authentic and purest form of religious worship presented by any Christian body. We can assert that it is geographically universal in England, and that every English man, woman, and child has a legal right to its ministra-

tions if it chooses to accept them. The recognition of the Divine power of a spiritual community, of a form of worship by the State, marks that State as a religious body—as a body not trusting and acting only in its own strength, but seeking inspiration and aid from a higher Power, which is everlasting, unchangeable, almighty. The State in England recognises as its Church officially that spiritual community which is coëval with, or even of greater antiquity than, itself.

Mr. Hubbard then touched upon the recognition of Divine authority by the State, and proceeded as follows:

The recognition of the Divine by the temporal power is, however, not an advantage solely for those who are designated in the resolution by "the masses." Citizenship of a religious country is a privilege and a blessing to all alike, and to no class, however large, exclusively. We are asked, however, to-day to consider especially the present position of the Church with regard to the democracy. Times are changed in the last two hundred years: the masses of the people were then ignorant and superstitious, they are now intelligent and partially educated; they are not credulous or very submissive; and if their distinct interest in the National Church is to be accepted and endorsed by them, it must be supported by the clearest of proofs. If Church is to be better to them than Chapel, they will want to know the reason why. The advantages of an Establishment must have something more substantial to stand on than tradition or precedent. If the new electorate are to be asked to refuse any rupture of the union between Church and State, now twelve hundred years old, some solid reasons must be given for preserving the present state of things. If the present constitution of the Established Church be faulty or obsolete, its imperfections must be remedied by the spontaneous action of Churchmen from within, lest the whole temporal fabric be swept away by unsympathetic hands from without. The Church of England is not in that stagnant condition which could cause the most hasty revolutionist to say, "Cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?" It occupies its ground in most instances with profit; it has a crop of previous fruit to show as the result of its life, a result worthy of its earlier days: but, at the same time, it feels still, and still shows the effects of the blights which have from time to time paralyzed its life and cankered its fairest branches; some of its limbs are withered and sere, and if closer examination be made some of the choicest fruit is borne not by the ancient stock itself, but by seedlings of the same lineage, but which have sprung spontaneously into being in recent times, and have been nourished, not by the parent tree, but by their own life, flourishing in some instances in spite of, rather than by virtue of, the ancient stock itself. If then the ecclesiastical constitution of the Church of England is to be accepted by the masses, it must, in my opinion, be reformed. It must be pruned, regulated, and cultivated fairly and impartially; Churchmen must decide, and decide promptly, what is the substance and what is the shadow of a State Establishment. The great mass of the people of England desire, I believe, that the State should be based on religion, on religious belief, as well as on the principles of justice and morality. The people will not be unjust in the matter of the rights of property unless they are blinded by the abuse of property by those in possession. They desire that their rulers should be men of piety, but I fear that they will not exert themselves to any extent to ensure that any proportion of their temporal rulers should necessarily be Bishops of the Church. While desiring to maintain the recognition of religion they may acquiesce in the title of the Church to be the most ancient of the religious bodies which now claim their right to worship God without let or hindrance, and the official exponent of the religion of the land; but they will resent

too great an admixture of temporal power and social rank with the spiritual office of pastors in the Church. They will not tolerate any disadvantage or inequality ensuing from differences of religious belief, and scandals, whether arising from lax discipline, or the spirit of insubordination or idleness, or glaring inequalities in the distribution of remuneration, will make them impatient of the existence of a body which assents to such a state of things, and will eventually cause them to range themselves with those who clamour for its overthrow rather than with those who urge its reform. The ministrations of the Church are, indeed, geographically universal; but they are not universally efficient, nor are they by any means sufficient. The want of means will be pardoned, but the misapplication of them will not. The endowment of the Church will not be safe as long as sinecures exist, or so long as incumbents, secure in their own freeholds, irremovable so long as they discharge a wretched minimum of duty, are able to take the wages of the Church, while, defying alike the admonition of their Bishop, the requirements of their people, and the warnings of public opinion, they neglect the most urgent and valuable parts of their pastoral work. Working people will also require an explanation of why the purchase of the nomination to a cure of souls is still permitted in the Church when the purchase of the command and care of the bodies of men was, by a great struggle, abolished in the Army. It seems to me, then, that if we are to enlist the masses on the side of the Church, the consideration of the conferences cannot be too promptly or too seriously given to the removal of any proved defects in the term and constitution of the temporal union between Church and State in this land, that whatever therein is unjust, impracticable, obsolete, or impolitic, may be abolished; and so the Church may be rendered capable of carrying on her warfare untrammelled by conditions suited only to a time very different from the present, and absolutely detrimental to her welfare. It is not the time now to discuss what are the necessary, or what are the most urgent, reforms required in the present crisis of the life of the Church; but I hope that the acceptance of the resolution I am about to move may be taken to convey a suggestion of the Conferences that they should consider how the Church may be made more generally an institution of distinct interest for the masses, and how best to bring home to the minds of the people the interest they have in her preservation in a vigorous and healthy existence.

In urging the expediency of reforms in the temporal constitution of the Church, Mr. Hubbard in concluding, said: "I cannot but think that the interests of the masses, as distinct from that of people more able to help themselves, would be increased by the adoption of changes which would free the Church from bonds which in some places hinder her action, and cause charges to be brought against her of which as a rule she is innocent; and if the Conferences do feel that the distinct interests of the masses in the Church is worthy of their special consideration at the present time, I must respectfully submit that they can do no more faithful, valuable work, than by boldly facing these difficulties, freely discussing their solution, and so prevent revolution by the acceptance of a timely reform."

INDEX TO VOL. XII.