

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

The Churchman Advertiser.

FEBRUARY, 1904.

---

# MUDIE'S LIBRARY

(LIMITED).

---

## TOWN SUBSCRIPTIONS:

From ONE GUINEA per annum.

LONDON BOOK SOCIETY (for weekly exchange of books at the Houses of Subscribers) from TWO GUINEAS per annum.

## COUNTRY SUBSCRIPTIONS:

From TWO GUINEAS per annum.

N.B.—Two or three friends may UNITE IN ONE SUBSCRIPTION, and thus lessen the cost of carriage.

---

## SALE DEPARTMENT.

A New Edition of MUDIE'S CLEARANCE CATALOGUE is Now Ready, comprising the Surplus Copies of many Leading Books of the Past and Present Seasons, at Greatly Reduced Prices.

---

*The Oxford Teacher's and Reference Bibles, Nelson's Teacher's Bibles, also OXFORD PRAYER and HYMN BOOKS are now kept in Stock in various sizes and bindings.*

---

30, NEW OXFORD STREET, LONDON;  
241, BROMPTON ROAD, S.W.; and  
48, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.; and at  
BARTON ARCADE, MANCHESTER.

---

# BEMROSE & SONS' LIST.

---

1904.

## THE CLERGYMAN'S

1904.

### READY REFERENCE DIARY AND KALENDAR.

For the Special Use of the Clergy and their Parish Workers. Edited by the Rev. THEODORE JOHNSON, Rector of Bodiam, Sussex. Size, 6 in. by 3½ in. Cloth, limp, 3s. 6d.; paste grain, gilt edges, 5s.; ditto, with pocket and tuck, or flap and elastic band, 6s. *All the Bindings are with Round Corners.*

"Certainly the best book of its kind we have come across."—*Scottish Guardian.*

"A wonderful *multum in parvo* for the busy parish priest."—*Church Times.*

"A marvel of completeness and compactness."—*Church Union Gazette.*

1904.

FOR LOCALIZING.

1904.

## THE EVANGELIST MONTHLY.

Unequaled in the excellence of its typography, the beauty of its illustrations, and the attractiveness and variety of its articles.

"Is the best of parish magazines for localizing."—*Guardian.* "Always interesting"—*Church Times.*

"This excellent periodical."—*Rock.* "Deserves to be popular."—*Record.*

Pronounced by the Clergy to be "the only magazine that really interests." "Admirably edited."

"Just the sort of magazine for home reading." "Its general get-up is ahead of all the rest." Specimen and terms sent on application.

## A REGISTER WITH PRAYERS FOR CHURCH SUNDAY SCHOOLS, 1904.

4½ inches by 7 inches, cloth, limp, price 4d.

Arranged to avoid rewriting names of scholars throughout the year. Ruled and printed with dates.

## CHURCH AND REFORM:

Being Essays Relating to Reform in the Government of the Church of England.

Edited by MONTAGUE BARLOW. Crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

"This is an interesting volume."—*Guardian.*

"Every chapter is interesting and instructive."—*Christian Commonwealth.*

"The whole volume deserves attentive consideration."—*Record.*

## CHURCH REGISTERS, CHURCH DOOR NOTICES, SERVICE TABLES (8 kinds), OFFERTORY FORMS (7 kinds).

SPECIMENS AND PRICE LIST ON APPLICATION.

LONDON: BEMROSE & SONS, LTD., 4, SNOW HILL, E.C., AND DERBY.

---

## THE

# Expositor's Greek Testament.

## THE THIRD VOLUME OF

## THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT.

Edited by the Rev. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D. Handsomely printed and bound in buckram. Imp. 8vo. *Ready early in December.*

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. By the Very Rev. DEAN BERNARD, D.D.

The Epistle to the Galatians. By the Rev. FREDERICK RENDALL, M.A.

The Epistle to the Ephesians. By the Rev. Principal SALMOND, D.D.

The Epistle to the Philippians. By the Rev. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc.

The Epistle to the Colossians. By Professor A. S. PEAKE, M.A.

### ALREADY PUBLISHED.

VOLUME I., 880 pages, containing—

St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke. By the Rev. Prof. A. B. BRUCE, D.D.

St. John. By the Rev. Prof. MARCUS DODS, D.D.

VOLUME II., 954 pages, containing—

The Acts of the Apostles. By the Rev. Prof. R. J. KNOWLING, D.D.

The Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. Prof. JAMES DENNEY, D.D.

The First Epistle to the Corinthians. By the Rev. Prof. G. G. FINDLAY, D.D.

The price of each volume is 28s. Volumes I. and II. may still be had at subscription price, viz., 30s.

Those who have subscribed for Volumes I. and II. may have Volume III. on payment of 15s.

HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

*A Specimen Copy of the Shilling Edition of*

**THE HYMNAL COMPANION TO THE  
BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,**

Edited by the Right Rev. Bishop

E. H. BICKERSTETH, D.D., and a

Prospectus of the various Editions,

will be sent Gratis and Post Free to

any Clergyman who will apply for it,

and send address on Post Card to the

Publishers.

Full List on Application.

# THE ANCESTRY OF RANDALL THOMAS DAVIDSON, D.D.

(Archbishop of Canterbury).

## A Chapter in Scottish Biography.

BY THE REV. ADAM PHILIP, M.A., LONGFORGAN.

### EXTRACT FROM PREFACE.

The accession to the See of Canterbury of a Scotsman, the second within a generation, is an event of some interest to his countrymen. Amongst his English friends and admirers, there must be those who would like to know the streams of life and thought that have helped to form and enrich the Primate.

This sketch is intended to meet such a wish. If it tells of men who have lived and acted in less prominent spheres of service, it also speaks of men who had an intelligent and generous outlook on life, of men who fought bravely for the truth of God, and stood up fearlessly for the rights of the Christian people.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

Now Ready. In demy 8vo., clear type, with 23 Illustrations, about 400 pages.  
Cloth. Price 7s. 6d.

## WHAT HATH GOD WROUGHT.

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY by the REV. CANON RICHARD HOBSON,

*Late Vicar of St. Nathaniel's, Windsor, West Derby, Liverpool.*

With an Introduction

By the RIGHT REV. F. J. CHAVASSE, D.D.,

*Bishop of Liverpool.*

"The book appears to have a special message for the critical days in which we are now living."—F. J. CHAVASSE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool.

"It would form a very suitable and useful present to any young clergyman."—*English Churchman.*

SECOND EDITION, REVISED. In demy 8vo., stiff cover, price 7s. 6d. net.

## THE DOCTRINE OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

*In Relation to "The Sin of Man," "The Condemnation of the Law," and  
"The Dominion of Satan."*

By the REV. NATHANIEL DIMOCK, A.M.,

*Late Vicar of St. Paul's, Maidstone.*

With an INTRODUCTION by the REV. H. G. GREY,

*Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

*His Majesty's Printers.*

# EYRE & SPOTTISWOODE, Bible Warehouse.

“ROYAL” INDIA PAPER TEXT BIBLES.

“ROYAL” INDIA PAPER CENTRAL COLUMN REFERENCE BIBLES.

“ROYAL” INDIA PAPER DOUBLE COLUMN REFERENCE BIBLES.

“ROYAL” INDIA PAPER TEACHERS' BIBLES.

The Lightest of all Printing Papers,

The Most Opaque of all Printing Papers,

The Thinnest of all Printing Papers,

is the

“ROYAL” INDIA PAPER.

## THE HANDIEST LARGE TYPE BIBLE IN THE WORLD.

**Eyre & Spottiswoode No. 650 size.**

*Minion Type, with Central References, and Bound with an Indexed Atlas.*

*Size, 7 by 4 $\frac{1}{8}$  by  $\frac{3}{4}$  inches. 1048 pages. Weight, 11 $\frac{1}{2}$  oz.*

### BINDINGS AND PRICES.

	s.	d.
French Morocco, limp, round corners, red under gold edges, gold roll inside cover ...	6	9
French Morocco, Yapp, round corners, red under gold edges ... ..	8	3
Egyptian Seal, Yapp, leather lined, round corners, red under gold edges ... ..	9	9
Persian Morocco, Yapp, leather lined, round corners, red under gold edges, silk		
sewn ... ..	11	3
Turkey Morocco, Yapp, leather lined, round corners, red under gold edges, silk		
sewn ... ..	13	6

*Also, Bound with the Illustrated Bible Treasury, a large Concordance and a Bible Atlas, 1 $\frac{1}{4}$  inches thick.*

Before purchasing a Bible, send for specimen pages of “Royal” India Paper Bibles.

**LONDON : 33, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.**

*Retail of all Booksellers.*

*In 24mo. size, cloth limp, for the pocket, and uniform with the Prayer-Book, 2s. net.; also in leather binding, for Presentation, 3s. net.*

# THE PEOPLE'S PSALTER:

A plain Book for those who wish to use the Psalms in Church  
with intelligence and devotion.

By the Rev. G. W. S. WALPOLE, D.D.

*(Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of York.)*

This book might well be described as the Church-goers' Psalter, for its object is to give ready help in the Church rather than in the study, to the ordinary worshipper, who oftentimes finds it difficult to give a meaning to the Psalms he is invited to sing, rather than to the student.

It has three features:—

1. A very brief introduction to each Psalm, setting forth its probable origin, its application in the Christian Church, and the use to which it has been or may be put.
2. Clearly-set-out divisions with interpretative headings, so that anyone may be able to see the progress of the thought of the Psalm.
3. Very short explanatory footnotes, dealing with any serious difficulties of the text.

There is, in addition, an introduction showing how the Psalms may be used. In this the author divides them into four great groups: (1) Messianic, (2) Social, (3) Missionary, (4) Devotional, and his endeavour is to show how the Psalms, whether as Intercessions, Thanksgivings, or Meditations, meet the needs and difficulties of the present day, and provide a ready means for lifting them out of their earthly surroundings into the spiritual atmosphere of God. The principle adopted in their interpretation is to ground it on the original historical foundation, where it may be known, and it is hoped that in this way any serious criticism of it as mystical or extravagant may be met. The outline, for such only it is, will need thought and attention, but a few minutes in the Home, or, still better, in the Church, before the service begins will be sufficient to get a clear grasp of its meaning. It has been bound and printed in such form as to be readily carried, and contains the Canticles, so that to those who know the Prayers no other book but one containing the Hymns would be necessary.

## Foundations and Extracts from Reviews.

is admirably adapted for its purpose, and I trust it will have a very good sale."  
OF DURHAM.

book which I have long wished to have for use in Church, and after  
"—DR. LOCK.

have it and shall try to use it. It appears to answer what people  
to the meaning of Psalms for practical purposes."—ARCHDEACON

book, not a commentary or a fresh translation, but simply an in-  
troduction of the Prayer-Book Psalter."—*Scottish Guardian*.

practical volume."—*Rock*.

has been made to give us the Psalter in its up-to-date setting. . . .  
divided in accordance with the subjects treated."—*Life of Faith*.

Commended by the Archbishop of Armagh, Bishop Moule, and other Bishops of our Church.

# PENNY HOME BOOKS FOR THESE TIMES.

## I. Home, Sweet Home; or, Courtship and Marriage.

(1st Volume of the Series.)

By the REV. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D., Author of "The Queen's Resolve."

Price One Penny.

### AN EFFORT FOR 1904.

It would be simply impossible to exaggerate in any statement the demoralizing and degrading influence of the pernicious publications now circulating everywhere, amongst all classes in our land. Books and magazines and papers, sometimes shamelessly bearing no printer's name, and absolutely atrocious in their contents, are hawked from door to door of our cottage homes, and the inmates are lured or enticed to order more. Sensational tales especially, of the lowest type, are often secretly undermining the sanctities of home life, and especially the sacredness and the blessedness of the marriage relationship.

To a great extent the Clergy find it very difficult to deal in the pulpit with this dark phase of immorality, even if those who are thus being poisoned were in the Church; and the result is that our sons and daughters, at the most perilous stage of their early years, to an increasing extent, become victims of the unprincipled story-mongers whose exciting tales and emotional pictures of a depraved, "fast" life, fascinate so many to their ruin.

We want to inaugurate at HOME WORDS Office for 1904 a new effort in this special direction. We want to reach, as far as we can, the home life of the nation; and we want the Clergy and all our Readers to help us. In the past, for forty or fifty years, we have laboured in this field. HOME WORDS Office, through the hearty interest and co-operation of the Clergy and Friends of pure literature, has practically been a PARISH-PRESS UNION—the Pastor's "second pulpit" in hundreds of parishes and millions of homes. In one such parish we have just heard of a record of 193,000 copies of HOME WORDS alone circulated during the last fifteen years. In all instances, also, the efforts have been *self-sustaining*. There has been no need of Society aid. The people's pence have more than met the cost.

We cannot be too thankful for what has been done; but, with the really increasing need, we feel our thankfulness will best find its expression in continuous and extending effort.

We propose, therefore, if the Clergy, and "all who love Home," will help us (as they have always done), to issue a Series of *marvellously cheap*

### "HOME BOOKS FOR THESE TIMES."

These books, some of them hitherto sold in bound form as half-crown volumes, will now be produced complete, and with many art illustrations and ornamental cover, for

**1d. 6s. 3d. per 100.**

We have selected this Book because its contents bear *directly* on the great and vital conviction—"There's no place like Home"; and we want to secure at once the immediate and strenuous support of all who feel with us.

To convey some idea of the character and object of the book, we append a Table of the Contents.

#### CONTENTS.

Benedicts and Bachelors—The Pros and Cons of Matrimony—"A Main Thing"—Finding a Wife—"Falling in Love."  
 Looking Round—"Who can Find —?"—A Help-Meet—At Home—The Great Button Question—A Well-Cooked Dinner—Taking Counsel with Parents—The Choice of a Husband—The Dignity of "Womanhood."  
 Love and Wisdom—Whatever You Do, be Open—"Round the Corner Waiting"—The Union of Heart and Life—"A Woman's Question"—The Ruined Husband.  
 The Wrong Person—Marrying for Beauty alone—The Princess of Wales—The Poet Whittier—True Beauty—The Character of a Man—Diogenes—Men fit for Wives—Men with a Conscience—Garfield.  
 An Old Wedding Wish—Mistakes Made—Cultivation and Self-Sacrifice—Head and Heart—Queen Victoria's Obedience—The House-Band—"Love," not "Mastery."  
 Do not Look for Perfection—A Discipline of Character—"Our Wives"—The Perfection of Love—The Cultivation of Love—Two Models.  
 The Happiest Place—The Wife's Kingdom—The True Magnet—Nets and Cages—The Call-Bird—Personal Appearance—Learn to Keep House—Crumbs and Lucifer Matches—The Button Question Again—Home "Surprises"—Fireside Harmony—The Wife's Song.  
 The Newly-Married Pair—"Drops of Bitter"—The Irritation of Trifles—"Eyes Open and Eyes Half Shut"—"The Two Bears"—"Nagging"—Jeremy Taylor—Domestic Bliss—"One Light Together"—"Heaven More Near."

#### XV. ILLUSTRATIONS.

We again commend this effort to our Readers. We hope the success will at least equal that which attended the issue of the Million Numbers of THE NEWS, "HOLD FAST BY YOUR SUNDAYS," which so speedily gained a circulation of 300,000 copies. If only 50,000 of our Readers will start the effort by immediately ordering 12 copies each, and then introduce them to their friends, the 600,000 circulation thus secured would leave no doubt as to "the Million" we want to reach.

LONDON: "HOME WORDS" OFFICE, 11, LUDGATE SQUARE, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.



FOURTH EDITION NOW READY.

*In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d. net.*

# VITAL RELIGION;

OR,

## The Personal Knowledge of Christ.

BY

**Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D.,***Principal of Bede College, Durham.*

THE aim of the Author in this work is to show that true religion is essentially a matter of personal experience, that it is the power created by an intelligent realization of an actual fellowship with a Living Person as clearly traceable in the daily events of life as in the various ministries of grace, that it pervades what is called the secular side of life as closely as the religious. The character of this Fellowship as indicated by the word Friendship is first examined and explained. The way by which it is attained is then pointed out, and there follows a consideration of its actual experience in the personal life of Thought, Work, and Suffering, as well as in the wider life of the Church.

The question is purposely treated in a broad, practical and popular way, in the hope that it may attract the attention of those who, whilst they seldom read books of a devotional character, are interested in any work that goes to prove that man's life, insignificant as it appears to be, is subjected to Divine Interference and Guidance.

### **Extracts from Reviews.**

"The keynote of this interesting and beautiful book is the thought that religion is essentially the life of friendship and intimacy with God revealed in Jesus Christ. . . . We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Walpole has given us a work of real spiritual value, and we heartily commend it to all thoughtful readers, especially to those who lament the 'decay of experimental religion.' The present volume is a solid contribution to the solution of the problem how 'to find a basis for faith in actual experience.'"—*Guardian*.

"Dr. Walpole writes with a true moral passion. He pleads for a deeper, more intimate, more vital knowledge of God. Nothing could be more appropriate in a series calling itself 'The Church's Outlook for the Twentieth Century' than a volume like this, that sends us back to the fountain and source of all spiritual life."—*New York Churchman*.

"The perusal of that high-toned book has been to us a source of refined pleasure."—*Weekly Leader*.

"We must congratulate Dr. Walpole on having produced a very valuable work. It is of supreme importance that the personal element in religion should not be neglected, and that due attention be paid to the development of inner spiritual life. Dr. Walpole calls attention to real needs, and he gives excellent advice as to the means of satisfying them."—*Pilot*.

"No one who wishes to follow his argument will regret the half-crown it costs, so exceedingly helpful and uncommon is his treatment of the profoundest of all subjects—Living Union with our Living Lord."—*Church Bells*.

"This is a fresh and interesting presentation of a perennially important subject. . . . The book is characterized by a spirit of true devotion to our Lord, and is marked throughout by earnestness of thought and appeal."—*Life of Faith*.

"Contains many new and helpful thoughts."—*Mission Field*.

"It has the tone of sincere and earnest piety and the ring of honest conviction. In other words, we like the book and we like the personality which seems to lie in peace and confidence behind it."—*Saint Andrew*.

"There is a deal of force in the author's words about marriage, the shams of so-called worship, prayer, attitude, and daily duty."—*Family Churchman*.

"Many and weighty thoughts are expressed on the subject, which deserve careful consideration."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

ELLIOT STOCK 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

# The National Protestant Church Union.

To Maintain the Principles of the Reformation as set forth in the  
Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England.

President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.  
Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.  
Treasurer—T. F. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq.  
Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON, Bart.

The National Protestant Church Union witnesses for—

1. The supremacy and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God.
2. The sole and sufficient efficacy of the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross.
3. The justification of man by faith only in the Lord Jesus Christ.
4. The right of every believer to direct and unimpeded access to God, through Christ.
5. The freedom and sovereignty of the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.

**WILL YOU HELP THIS IMPORTANT WORK?**

For List of Publications, Terms of Membership, etc., apply to the Secretary, N.P.C.U.

**324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.**

## “LIBERATOR” RELIEF FUND.

Patron: H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

£10,000 required to Relieve New and Urgent Cases.

**HUNDREDS** of aged and afflicted victims, so cruelly robbed of their life-savings by the great Liberator Fraud, just as they were hoping to enjoy the fruit of their industry and thrift. Many of them are members of the Church of England. Cheques and P.O.'s should be sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, E.C.

### THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:

H.R.H. THE PRINCE  
OF WALES, K.G.

THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS,  
THE BISHOPS, etc.

Labours afloat and  
ashore, at home and  
abroad, among seamen  
of all classes and na-  
tions, fishermen, barge-  
men, and emigrants.  
Seventy-three harbours  
are occupied. Expenditure in 1902, £46,642.

Increased Contributions and Offerings, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N. 11, Buckingham St. Strand, London W.C.



In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered.  
Price 2s. 6d. net.

## God and the Sinner;

OR,

*Some Fundamental Truths of Christianity:  
Illustrated from the Parable of the  
Prodigal Son.*

By Rev. Canon DENTON THOMPSON, M.A.  
Rector of North Meols, Southport.

The contents formed the substance of a series  
of addresses to men delivered in Emmanuel  
Church, Southport.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

BY THE LATE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

In foolscap 8vo., tastefully printed and bound, price 5s.

## COUNSELS FOR CHURCHPEOPLE.

FROM THE WRITINGS OF

THE RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV. MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D.,

*The late Lord Bishop of London.*

SELECTED AND ARRANGED BY J. H. BURN, B.D.

"It would be difficult to overestimate the value of a book like 'Counsels for Churchpeople.' Bishop Creighton is invariably clear, sensible, and suggestive, and his manner of treatment is admirably united to the mental habits of the time."—*Literature.*

**UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE.**

Tastefully printed and bound. Price 5s., post free.

## THE LIFE OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE :

*A Book of Devotional Thoughts.*

From the Writings of F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Canterbury. Selected and arranged by J. H. BURN, B.D.

"An exceedingly valuable work, full of the choicest gems, brilliant and penetrating. Many a dull hour can be made bright and cheerful by studying the thoughts of the venerable Dean as depicted in the pages of 'The Life of Christian Service.'"—*Family Churchman.*

"Devotional readers will find very little to dissent from in these pages. They will certainly find much from which to profit, and, it is needless to say, many brilliant passages of great eloquence and power."—*News.*

Tastefully printed and bound, gilt top, 5s.

## HELPS TO FAITH AND PRACTICE :

*A Book of Devotional Readings.*

From the Writings of HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's Cathedral. Selected and arranged by J. H. BURN, B.D.

"It will greatly please the admirers of the orator and preacher, and gratify his friends as a remembrance of his deeds of kindness."—*Churchwoman.*

"There is not a page which does not contain a helpful thought or an inspiring message."—*Quiver.*

"A very charming book of devotional readings."—*Bristol Mercury.*

"A volume of reflections which will certainly prove helpful to many an earnest-minded person."—*Church Gazette.*

"We can recommend the book to those who have but little time for devotional reading."—*Church Review.*

"The book will prove very useful for short Lenten readings."—*Pilot.*

**SECOND EDITION.**—In foolscap 8vo., tastefully printed and handsomely bound, price 5s.

## HELPS TO GODLY LIVING :

*A Book of Devotional Thoughts.*

From the Writings of the Right Honourable and Most Reverend FREDERICK TEMPLE, D.D., LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. Selected and arranged, with His Grace's permission, by J. H. BURN, B.D.

"We shall be surprised if this quiet little book does not do a solid amount of good on these lines. Churchmen will receive it with a cordial welcome."—*Guardian.*

"The book is a distinct aid to devotional literature, the presence of an index contributing also to its value."—*Family Churchman.*

"A good and suitable aid to meditation."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

"The work is likely to prove a helpful addition to devotional literature."—*Aberdeen Journal.*

"It is a beautiful book. The best possible souvenir of Archbishop Temple."—*Expository Times.*

# TO VISIT THE HOLY LAND.

How a Life's Dream may be made a Reality.

A SPECIAL CRUISE HAS BEEN ORGANIZED IN CONNECTION WITH

## THE WORLD'S SUNDAY SCHOOL CONVENTION

At JERUSALEM, APRIL 18, 19 and 20, 1904.

### The Twin-Screw Atlantic Liner "FÜRST BISMARCK" (8,500 Tons, 14,000 Horse-power)

Has been chartered, and the party will be accompanied by the Venerable the Archdeacon of London, other well-known clergymen, Christian Workers, and their friends.

Members leave London, March 31st, 1904, and Marseilles, April 1st 1904. The Tour, which will occupy ONE MONTH, includes JERUSALEM, MOUNT OF OLIVES, BETHANY, RACHEL'S TOMB, and BETHLEHEM, in addition to many other interesting scenes in the HOLY LAND; also ATHENS, BEYROUT, ALEXANDRIA (for Cairo), and NAPLES.

Besides the obvious advantages of a Private Steamer, the unique features of this Cruise are the exceptional facilities afforded for visiting so many scenes of Biblical interest in so short a time, and for journeying in company with those whose sympathies and life-work are bound up in such sacred associations.

A large proportion of the steamer's accommodation being already engaged, the earliest possible application for berths is recommended.

*Illustrated Booklet, with full particulars and plan of Steamers, can be obtained free at any office of*

### THOMAS COOK & SON,

Chief Office, LUDGATE CIRCUS, LONDON, E.C., or from the General Secretary,  
SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, 56, OLD BAILEY, LONDON.

## EDUCATIONAL.

### WEYMOUTH COLLEGE, DORSETSHIRE.

Public School for Professional Classes, Clergy, Officers, Barristers, etc., conducted on Church of England principles. Best secular education. Junior House recently opened. Governors: E. S. HANBURY, Esq. (Chairman), BISHOPS OF DURHAM and LIVERPOOL, DEANS OF CANTERBURY and PETERBOROUGH, PREBENDARY WEBB-PEPLOE, and others.  
Apply, Head Master.

### ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, Near TENBURY, WORCESTERSHIRE.

BOYS thoroughly prepared for Public Schools. Most healthy situation; large playing fields and Fives Courts; separate cubicles. Head master, REV. W. A. RENWICK, M.A., late Scholar of Hertford College, Oxford.

APPLY: REV. THE WARDEN.

### DAVENTRY GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Founded A.D. 1600.

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION at moderate cost. Resident staff of University Graduates in Honours. Entrance scholarships. Special terms for sons of clergy and medical men. Sound Church teaching, Healthy situation, 800 feet above sea-level. Good buildings. Large Playing-fields, Laboratory, Gymnasium. Fives' Court. Experienced Matron.

**Entrance Scholarship for Sons of Clergy materially reducing Fees.**

For Prospectus apply REV. H. JOHNSON, Head Master.

TELEPHONE : 602 Holborn.

**EDE, SON & RAVENSCROFT***Founded in the Reign of William and Mary, 1689.*By Royal  Appointments**CLERICAL ROBE MAKERS and TAILORS,**

93 &amp; 94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

**PROTESTANT REFORMATION SOCIETY.**The OLDEST Church Society for the Maintenance of the Religious Principles of the Reformation.  
The ONLY Mission to Roman Catholics in England.

(Established 1827.)

**MISSIONARY. EDUCATIONAL. EVANGELISTIC.**

Resident Missionaries to Roman and Ritualistic Centres.

Sermons and Lectures by the Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., M.A., Ph.D., Clerical and General Superintendent

Educational Lantern Lectures on Church History by the Secretary.

Cheap effective literature dealing with subjects of present importance.

Donations, Subscriptions, or requests for Lectures or Sermons should be addressed to the Secretary.

**Funds are Urgently Needed.**

WALTER A. LIMBRICK, Secretary, 62, Berners Street, London, W.

**THE RISE and GROWTH of the  
Protestant Alliance Magazine.**Being an abridged reprint of the Jubilee Issue (with a Series of Illustrations) explaining the Basis, Principles, and Work of the Protestant Alliance. *PRICE ONE PENNY.***PROTESTANT ALLIANCE,**

Offices: 430, STRAND, LONDON. Opposite Charing Cross Hospital.

**THE EAST END MISSION TO THE JEWS.**Funds urgently needed towards **The Medical Mission, The General Work, The Charity Work to alleviate the sufferings of the Sick and Poor.**  
Over 24,000 sick people were treated at the Mission; many confessed Christ.

D. OPPENHEIM, Secretary, 119, Leman Street, E.

Bankers: London and Westminster Bank.

\* \* *The Twenty-third Annual Report sent on application.***HOME MISSIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.****ADDITIONAL CURATES SOCIETY.**

39, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER.

More than 1,200 ADDITIONAL CLERGYMEN are now at work in poor and densely-populated Parishes through the help of grants made towards their support by this Society.

No Party considerations affect the appropriation of the Society's Funds.

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

FEBRUARY, 1904.

---

ART. I.—THE EASTWARD POSITION: A ROMAN  
INNOVATION IN SPAIN.

IN the January CHURCHMAN Canon Meyrick wrote: "The eastward position at the celebration of the Holy Communion was unknown in Spain till the eleventh century." This statement, when repeated, usually excites surprise, and appeal is made to the very striking rubric in the Migne edition of the Mozarabic Missal—a rubric textually reprinted from the original (in more senses than one) rubric in the Ximenes Missal of 1500: "In ista Missa et in aliis non vertitur sacerdos ad populum, nisi quando dixerit. Adjuvate me fratres in orationibus vestris."<sup>1</sup> "It is impossible," say the critics, "that the eastward position should be unknown in Spain when the old service-book so strongly emphasizes the position as the only one adopted. In the Roman Mass the priest turns six times to the people, in the Spanish only once."

Pamelius (1571) is even stronger, for he says in the Mozarabic Mass there is "nulla conversio Sacerdotis ad populum. Quamdiu sacris operatur numquam se convertit ad populum."<sup>2</sup> Further confirmation of this view may be found in a manuscript volume, which I carefully read, in the National Library, Madrid. Its author is Francisco de Pisa, Chaplain of the Mozarabians in Toledo. In 1593 he wrote and published "Cum Permissu Superiorum," a compendium giving an account of the Mozarabic Mass. The work does not exist in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Migne, p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> Pamelius, "Liturg. Eccl. Lat.," vol. i., pp. 642, 643.

library in book form, but the manuscript is exceptionally valuable, as it gives the earliest account, in Spanish, of the origin of the service-book, and the position of the writer ought to make his testimony at once important and interesting. He states : "The priest does not turn his face to the people in all the Mass. Not even when he says 'adjuvate me fratres in orationibus vestris' is he accustomed to turn, although in this particular the Mass permits him ; before this his face is always turned to the altar, in order not to lose sight of it." If this alone were the evidence forthcoming, it would at once be concluded that the CHURCHMAN article was in error, and that, so far from its having been primitive Spanish custom to ignore the eastward position, no Church more consistently maintained it at the altar.

A careful scrutiny of the rubric and the two commentaries awakens suspicion, for it is seen that the Toledan priest asserts that a change had been deliberately made between 1500 and 1593, and in addition remarks : "Some wish to say that the custom of not turning to the people originated from the fact that anciently the altars were so arranged that the people came to be before the priest, where the *reredoses* (*retablos*) now are, as is the case to-day with the altar de prima in the choir of this holy church." This paper will show that the *obiter dictum* of the chaplain is a statement of fact, and that the development from 1500 to 1593 is simply the natural result of a perversion of history stereotyped by the Ximenes Service-Book of 1500. It will be proved that the old manuscripts differed from the printed editions of Roman Catholic editors, and that as the primitive Liturgy came from the East—the cradle of the faith—it preserved the Eastern custom of the westward position, and that even in the Roman Church of to-day the influence of primitive Spanish custom is to be seen in Spanish-founded churches.

The Mozarabic Missal, called by patriot writers a "column and cement of the faith," was the service-book of the National Spanish Church, which existed in complete independence of Rome until the close of the eleventh century. It is so called in consequence of its use by the Mozarabs,<sup>1</sup> or Christians, who lived under the protection of the Moors. The Spanish Moors, unlike their modern co-religionists, practised religious toleration, and from the time the country was fairly settled "a Christian Spaniard not only enjoyed personal liberty, but he attended the public administration of his own priests."<sup>2</sup> According to all liturgiologists, it is closely allied to the

<sup>1</sup> Mozarab is a participial form of the verb root *arb*, signifying one who has become Arabized (Burke, "Hist. of Spain," vol. i., p. 115 n.).

<sup>2</sup> Burke, *op. cit.*, vol. i. p. 118.

Ambrosian (Milan) and Gallican uses, and is undoubtedly of Oriental origin, coming from Ephesus through Lyons (according to some) or through Milan (according to others) to Spain.<sup>1</sup> It is unnecessary to decide whether Lyons or Milan be the channel of the transmission of the Liturgy, as the contending schools unite in an unquestioning belief in its Oriental origin. It was introduced into the West in the fourth century,<sup>2</sup> and naturally would preserve the customs of the land from whence it came. St. Isidore, the great seventh-century Bishop of Seville, considerably enlarged the Liturgy,<sup>3</sup> and students of its evolution are inclined to lay great stress on his influence. It was known as his Liturgy, and even to-day it is indifferently called Gothic, Isidoran, and Mozarabic.

Rome never tolerated with gladness independent national uses. Under Pepin the Short (as seen in a Charlemagne decree of 789) Gaul surrendered her Liturgy, and very little of the use remains.<sup>4</sup> Gregory VII.—the great Hildebrand—determined that the time had come for the Church in Spain “to emerge from infancy and to pass to perfect age.”<sup>5</sup> In the tenth century the Spanish Service-Book and Breviary had been declared by a Pope and Council, after examination, to contain nothing to be condemned, censured, or altered.<sup>6</sup> In the following century Gregory wrote to a Bishop of his own name, calling the supporters of the Spanish use “wolves and poisoners.” He recommended their persecution, even to the shedding of blood, in order that the books might be abolished and the Roman books substituted.<sup>7</sup> He gained his end in 1085, when the Council of Burgos ordered the abolition of the Mozarabic Books, and the measure was completed in 1094 by the substitution of Latin for Gothic characters. It at once follows that if manuscripts survive written in Gothic characters, their date must be placed before the close of the eleventh century, for after that period no copyist would copy in any other letter than Latin.

By special grace the old rite was permitted to be retained in six Toledo churches,<sup>8</sup> and the priests who said the national Mass were men accustomed to say the Roman Mass. After a time the custom became almost obsolete. At the close of the fifteenth century Cardinal Ximenes regretted the decay, and

<sup>1</sup> Duchesne, “Christian Worship” (S.P.C.K.), pp. 90-95.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 90.

<sup>3</sup> Meyrick, “The Church in Spain,” p. 342; Burriel, MS.

<sup>4</sup> Duchesne, p. 103.

<sup>5</sup> Guéranger, “Institutions Liturgiques,” vol. i. p. 268.

<sup>6</sup> Meyrick, *op. cit.*, p. 344.

<sup>7</sup> “Grande Encyclopédie,” vol. xxiv. (Vollet), and Guéranger, vol. i., pp. 268-278.

<sup>8</sup> Meyrick, p. 349.



determined to restore the old rite and perpetuate its use by printing the manuscripts and appointing a chapel in the cathedral where Masses might be said. Ximenes entrusted the task of editing the manuscripts to Ortiz, with the result that the printed volume is an effort to reconstruct the old Liturgy in conformity with the Roman Missal.<sup>1</sup> From this printed book the eastward position rubric is taken, and we have to inquire, Is it taken from the manuscript, and if not, is it the record of a Spanish tradition ?

In the eighteenth century a learned and honest Jesuit scholar, Father Andres Marcos Burriel, devoted himself to the task of investigating, cataloguing, and copying the contents of the manuscript rooms of the Toledan Library. By the generosity of the venerable and erudite doyen of Spanish scholars, the Rev. Wentworth Webster, the writer possesses a valuable unpublished manuscript containing reports of Burriel dated 1752, 1754, and 1756, which give detailed accounts of the progress of his work. He narrates how he copied, and in some instances made, facsimiles of the Gothic manuscripts used by the Ximenes editor. These manuscripts date of necessity before 1094. He records that the manuscripts "differ much in substance and order" from the Ximenes volume, "which mixes some things modern and omits some things ancient." Of this there can be no doubt, for the printed volume contains Masses for the festivals of St. Francis, St. Dominic, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Anthony of Padua, and *Corpus Christi*<sup>2</sup>—festivals that arose long after the abolition of Gothic writing and the Mozarabic Missal.

Fortunately, the Madrid Library contains the manuscript volumes made by Burriel. They are clearly written, and the facsimile pages are extremely well executed. It is a pleasure to observe the care with which he carried through his work, and my detailed examination of the volumes revealed the fact that they do not contain a single rubric. The names of the Masses and Prayers are simply given, and in no instance is there one word of direction to the celebrant. This is what might have been expected in the case of manuscripts. Even the first printed Missals have scarcely any rubrics, and not until 1485 were the words and ceremonies of the Mass set out together at length.<sup>3</sup> The Ximenes Book in 1500 followed the new plan, and rubrics were added by men who knew only the Roman use,<sup>4</sup> and had perhaps some ancient traditions, more or less corrupt, to guide them in some details. This at once

<sup>1</sup> Meyrick, p. 349; *cf.* Duchesne, pp. 192-204, ed. Migne, pp. 29-40, and on a similar process in Ambrosian Liturgy, Duchesne, p. 89, Hammond, "Liturgies," p. lxxxv.

<sup>2</sup> *V.* ed. Migne.

<sup>3</sup> "Cath. Dict.," Addis and Arnold; art. "Rubric." <sup>4</sup> Ed. Migne, p. 12.

disposes of the value of the rubric, relied on to prove the eastward position as the traditional use of the Spanish Church.<sup>1</sup>

The Missal is of Eastern origin, and preserves several striking Oriental peculiarities (*e.g.*, the division of the host). Scudamore in "Notitia Eucharistica" (p. 275) remarks: "Everywhere in the primitive Church, as still among the Greeks and Orientals, the seats of the Bishops and Presbyters were against the east wall, and therefore behind the altar. Hence the celebrant officiated with his face toward the people." The following facts prove the retention of this custom in the primitive Spanish Church:

1. Canon XVIII. of the fourth Council of Toledo, held in 633 under the presidency of Isidore, now a very old man, reads: "In future after the Pater Noster the Bread and Chalice shall be united (mixed), then the people blessed, and then only the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord received, and this by the celebrant and the Levites before the altar, by the Clergy in the choir, and by the people outside the choir."<sup>2</sup> The plain interpretation of this canon is that at the benediction the celebrant faced the people, for it would certainly be strange if he blessed the people with his back towards them.

2. The architectural arrangements of Spanish churches is in favour of the westward position being traditional. "The *Coro*, instead of beginning to the east of the transepts, is, like the *Chorus Cantorum* of the early basilicas, extended into the nave, and the central lantern tower is called the *Cimborio*, in memory, doubtless, of a time when it served as the *Cimborium* of the high altar now placed in the elongated choir, or, as it is called by the Spaniards, *Capilla Mayor*."<sup>3</sup> In the old cathedral of Salamanca, dating from the eleventh century, the apse contains the altar in the middle, with seats all round for the clergy.

3. Cardinal Lorenzana, known in Spain as "the great and good Cardinal," took a deep interest in the rite, and in 1770 published in Los Angeles, Mexico, an edition of the Mass *Omnium Offerentium* with the title "Missa Gothica." The Mass contains a number of prayers which I could not find in the Madrid manuscripts. At the close of these prayers the rubric reads: "Quo facto dat bene dictionem in unitate Sancti Spiritus (vertat se ad populum dicendo Benedicat vos

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the character of the printed rubrics, see Migne, pp. 29-40.

<sup>2</sup> Hefele, "Councils," vol. iv., p. 451.

<sup>3</sup> "Dict. Eccl. Antiq.," art. "Church," vol. i., p. 384.

Pater et Filius."<sup>1</sup> In his Commentary the Cardinal, discussing the non-turning of the priest to the people, says: "It is permissible to remark that only in this benediction and in the offertory, when the priest goes somewhat away from the altar, the priest turns himself to the people in the Mozarabic Mass. The principal reason of this is the antiquity of the Mozarabic rite, for in the first ages of the Church the altar was placed towards the faithful and the priest looked at the people, wherefore it was not necessary for him to turn when he saluted, as it is necessary to-day, for the people stand behind."<sup>2</sup> Lorenzana built a special Mozarabic Chapel in Toledo Cathedral, where I heard the Mass; but he did not place the altar at some distance from the east wall. In this he failed to preserve the old custom, for even now in the sister rite of Milan the altar stands at a distance from the east wall, and is censed all round by a deacon.<sup>3</sup>

4. In the edition of the Mozarabic Missal used in the Mozarabic Chapel, Salamanca, we have additional evidence. Its editor is Francisco J. Hernandez de Viesain, who was Chaplain in 1772. In the course of his Spanish commentary he translates with approval Lorenzana's remarks, and thus shows his acceptance of their meaning.

5. A most striking and unexpected confirmation of this early custom has been brought to our notice by the Rev. W. Webster, who is as ready to give help as he is indefatigable in his efforts to elucidate truth. South America was discovered and colonized by Spain. Its churches were founded and ministered to by Spaniards full of the enthusiasm of the Golden Age of Spain, and to this day the ancient custom of consecrating facing the people is preserved in some of the churches. Not only is it preserved, but in the report (p. 876) of the Latin American Congress held in Rome in 1899 we find Papal permission for the continuance of the custom.

From this short investigation it can be concluded that the East is the source of the Spanish Service-Book; that Spanish Churchmen before the subjection to Rome in 1085 preserved the primitive westward position at the consecration of the elements; and that in churches founded by Spaniards the custom still exists, although the founders of the churches were subject to Rome. Thus the appeal to antiquity confirms the statement of the historian of the Spanish Church, and once more proves that what is Roman is not of necessity Catholic, but is merely a local development, forced, it may be, on an unwilling people to further centralized domination at the expense of doctrinal truth and national freedom.

<sup>1</sup> Lorenzana, "Missa Gothica," p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 132.

<sup>3</sup> Webb, "Continental Ecclesiology," p. 204.

[Additional authority for the position of the officiating priest in primitive times is to be found in Bingham, "Ecl. Antiq.," vol. iii., pp. 89, 90; Fleury "Mœurs des Chrétiens," p. 150; Guéranger, *op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 31; Webb's "Continental Ecclesiology," pp. 204, 302, 303, 480, 485; *cf.* Mivart, "Essays and Criticisms," vol. i., pp. 192, 195.]

THOS. J. PULVERTAFT.

---

ART. II.—PRESENT-DAY PREACHING IN THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

**D**URING the last few years the attention of the public has been called from time to time in the newspaper press to the question of preaching in the Church of England. The subject was selected as part of the programme of the Folkestone Church Congress, and was ably dealt with by Canon Twells, the Deans of Norwich and Rochester, Mr. Justice Grantham, and other speakers. We shall agree with the opening words of Canon Twells: "The efficacy of preaching in the Church of England is not what it ought to be, not what it might be"—and we shall each one echo his aspiration—"not what I hope and believe it ere long will be." I shall not waste moments by speaking of the attitude of the laity of the present day as listeners to sermons. Mr. Justice Grantham, in his speech at Folkestone, said he "believed that the laity listened as well, if not better, than they did years ago, if sermons were good." Canon Twells, on the other hand, expressed his "decided opinion that, while the average standard of preaching has materially improved of late years, the habit of listening has materially deteriorated." One thing is apparent, viz., that the times are changed since the sainted Henry Venn wrote to a friend: "On Sundays I am still enabled to speak six hours at three different times."

I purpose in this paper to state what I believe to be some of the reasons why present-day sermons are not what they ought to be: then, with bated breath, and with fear of disapproval if the cap should happen to fit the head of any reverend brother, speak of some of the faults of preachers; and, lastly, indicate some remedies for the improvement and development of present-day sermons.

I. WHY ARE SERMONS, SPEAKING GENERALLY, NOT WHAT  
THEY OUGHT TO BE?

I do not think that any clerical reader will contest the statement involved in the question. Bishop Barry, in a

lecture which he gave some years ago on "Study and Preaching," said: "Of the three elements of spiritual life, the element of devotional earnestness (thank God!) has been marvellously revived; the element of practical activity for good has had, if possible, an even greater revival; but the intellectual element has not kept pace." I quote these words because I am convinced that the great revival of practical activity in the Church of England is one of the main causes, if not the chief, of the feebleness of many present-day sermons.

1. Hundreds of large parishes have been divided and subdivided during the last few years. New districts have been formed, and the clergy in charge have been so occupied in making stakes and hurdles for the fold that they have had little time for feeding the sheep. In thousands of parishes to-day the clerical staff is insufficient. The clergy are like the laity, at least, in this—that each man has only one body and one tongue, and yet he is expected to be everywhere and do everything. If I may put the case in the plainest terms, the Vicar is the coachman of the parochial drag, who has not only to handle the ribbons, but also to groom the horses, wash the coach, look after the harness, and grease the wheels, and then is expected to act the part of host, and serve up at least two or three times a week a dinner for passengers whose palates have been educated up to present-day gastronomy.

2. The second cause of bad sermons is the almost entire absence of instruction in the preparation and delivery of sermons in the theological training of the clergy.

3. Again, in the great revival of musical services, for the most part carefully rendered, and in the reinstatement of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in its due and proper position—a position which was given to it by the early Evangelical Fathers—by a law of reaction, preaching has been discounted, and many of the clergy, especially of the younger ones, have mistakenly argued: "If the service is everything, why should I take much trouble in the preparation of a sermon, which is an unimportant adjunct of Divine worship?" The art of preaching, as a consequence, has largely ceased to be cultivated.

4. The fourth reason why sermons are not what they ought to be, is that many of the clergy are unable to purchase the necessary books. The poverty of the ordinary clerical library is something appalling. You will find on the shelves of some of our parishioners works of theology which have formed and moulded the main current of our Christian literature which you will not discover in the bookcase of Vicar or curate. You might as well "advise astronomers to reject all instruments and all the copious accumulation of facts in so

many observatories, and betake themselves to the study of the heavens with the naked eye alone," as to expect preachers to proclaim and expound the Word of God with continual freshness in the neglect of aid from Christian teachers and guides. Forgive simplicity. A cow cannot give milk unless it eats grass, and hence a vast amount of watery pap in present-day sermons.

I must come at once to the second part of my subject :

## II. THE FAULTS OF PRESENT-DAY PREACHERS.

I earnestly hope that, if I may seem didactic, the reader will clearly understand that I myself have not attained even to my own poor standard, but "I follow after." I can say, with most men, I imagine, that I have learned more from my failures than my successes. A wise man is like a diamond, in that he is best polished in his own dust.

1. The great fault of preaching in this age is the lack of instruction.

Dean Goulbourn says men "have been exhorted to religion, but they have not been instructed in it. There is in our exercise of the ministry no systematic plan in which people are taught and brought on gradually towards the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." The "full assurance of faith" and the "full assurance of hope" depend upon the "full assurance of the understanding." Canon Bernard, in his Bampton Lectures on "The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament," writes: "On the Day of Pentecost there was a mighty influence on the emotions of the members of the Christian Church. We feel the presence of the comfort, the strength, the glow, the fervour, the joy, by which we see the disciples animated in the exercise of their new powers, but we trace up the cause. The fervour of emotion had its origin in a sudden access of intellectual light. The collect for Whit-Sunday seizes at once the central idea of the event. God at that time not only stirred, but taught, the hearts of His faithful people, and sent to them, not only the warmth, but the light of His Holy Spirit." We value the *παράκλησις*, but in the present-day sermons there is a great absence of the *διδασκαλία*. A well-known preacher said that, as a boy, he heard a Non-conformist pray that God would grant the congregation "intellectual repose." The tendency of sermons in the present day lies in this direction. Mrs. Poyser, when describing the two parsons of Hayslope, said: "Mr. Irwine was like a good meal of victual, you were the better for him without thinking on it; and Mr. Ryde was like a dose of physic, he gripped you and worreted you, and, after all, he left you

much the same." A sermon all physic, or, I may add, all stimulant, cannot build up and edify souls committed to our care. It has been said that the "formation of right moral habits and the discipline of spiritual life should be the supreme objects of pastoral preaching; but in the absence of ethical and religious knowledge we have no reason or right to look for the higher forms of moral and spiritual character." How can we expect the sheep to be fat when the pasture is bare? Shakespeare, in his "Henry IV.," puts the office of a preacher grandly when he speaks of the minister of Christ as an interpreter of truth, the distributor of the "bread of life," the "opener and intelligencer" of "the sanctities of heaven."

The absence of exposition in present-day sermons is one of the chief causes of their lack of instruction. The greatest preachers Christianity has produced were expository. "Polycarp was an expositor. Chrysostom brought Antioch and Constantinople to his feet by exposition. Ambrose of Milan and Augustine of Hippo were addicted to the same method." I am not surprised that intelligent laymen are crying out. No power of imagination, no vehement excitement, no natural eloquence, can compensate for religious instruction. Lord Bacon compared a sermon to an arrow: the steel point, the application; the shaft, the information, the instruction; the feather, the image, the figure, the illustration which wings and yet steadies the arrow's flight. In the sermons of to-day there are plenty of feathers and a multitude of steel points, but there is a great absence of shafts, and yet pastors after God's own heart, Jeremiah tells us, "feed" the people "with knowledge and understanding." "Moreover, because the preacher was wise," says Solomon, "he still taught the people knowledge."

2. The second fault of sermons to which I would refer is the great lack of variety.

It is true that we have in a sense only one theme. "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." But this fact affords no excuse whatever for uninteresting sermons. Very many of the clergy to-day cannot preach experimentally from that text, "Much study is a weariness of the flesh." They are "householders," but, as Charles Bridges says, "without a treasure." They are very ready in bringing forth the old, but very sluggish in producing the new. Their sermons are like the perpetual rice puddings of school-boy days; they may be nourishing when you get them down, but they are not appetizing. Jam, sugar, or honey are not to be found in the cerebral cells of the preacher, and I must add that the puddings are always served up in the same dish, or, in other words, cast in the

same mould. "The mischief is," says Dr. Dale, "that some preachers build all their sermons as though they were to stand side by side in a street. The front of No. 264 is precisely the same as No. 265. The door is always in the same place; the rows of windows are faultlessly uniform; there is the same number of floors in every one of them between the foundations and the roof; three principal divisions with three subdivisions under each, and then an application; they are all nine-roomed houses with attics at the top." Another large class of uninteresting preachers are the skeleton-sermon preachers. They are always producing Charles Simeon's bones without Charles Simeon's flesh and skin and life, and their sermons, like the bones in the prophetic vision, "are very many and very dry." I would say, in passing, that I am not urging the younger clergy to discard altogether the use of skeleton sermons, although I believe that they have ruined far more preachers than they have ever helped; but I would remind them of a good saying of the late Bishop of Carlisle: "A sermon should have a skeleton, as the human body has one; but it should not wear it outside, as a crab or a lobster. The skeleton should be known to exist by the symmetrical form which it gives to the whole body." There is no excuse for lack of variety in the sermons of the clergy if they would but follow the lines marked down in the Book of Common Prayer in the order of the Church's services. If a man selects his text one day from the Psalms, another day from the Epistle, another from the Gospel, one day from the first lesson, another from the second, he cannot lack variety of subjects. In the well-known lines of Keble:

"Along the Church's central space  
The sacred weeks, with unfelt pace,  
Will bear us on from grace to grace."

The late Mr. Spurgeon, in his admirable "Lectures to my Students," allows that "there may be some advantages connected with this pre-arrangement"; but he goes on to say that "the Episcopalian public do not appear to have been made partakers of them, for their public writers are always groaning over the dreariness of sermons, and bemoaning the sad condition of a long-suffering laity who are compelled to listen to them." I should imagine that Mr. Spurgeon must have thought of one advantage of this pre-arrangement when he states in one of his sermons which I read many years ago—I think that I am correct in stating his words—that he had never heard a sermon on the Second Advent from the lips of any Baptist preacher.

3. I believe that one of the reasons why the intelligent



part of the community is calling out against present-day sermons is the giving up written sermons, and especially amongst young men. In a subject so wide and suggestive as the one which we are considering, I should not have taken up this point, deep as my convictions are, were it not that the strong and, I must add, exaggerated statements made about written sermons at the Folkestone Congress did at the time and have since, I fear, largely increased the number of fugitive preachers—and by fugitive preachers I mean men who have the habit of running away from their text. I know that the average hearer prefers an extempore sermon, the reason being that a written sermon, in his mind, is associated with a monotonous delivery, a droning, bee-in-the-bottle hum, a rock-the-cradle, soporific tone of voice, or the unnatural twang which sometimes the best of men put on the moment they enter the pulpit. I am not arguing against extempore sermons when I desire to hold a brief for written sermons well delivered, for, as it has been well observed, for “want of good delivery some men make gold look like copper, while others, by the sheer force of a good delivery, make a few halfpence pass for gold.” The sermons which may attract and bring in outsiders are one thing; the sermons which are preached to settled and intelligent congregations are another. The friars of the thirteenth century, who by their fervid appeals brought religion into the fair and market-place, soon found the necessity of a more scholastic form of theology. Clarendon defined true eloquence to be a “strange power of making one’s self believed.” This power can be seen and felt in a written as well as an extempore sermon. The four greatest preachers of the last century, apart from Spurgeon—Chalmers, Melville, Newman, and Liddon—preached from manuscript, so did Hook and Wilberforce, Stanley and Lightfoot. The list is endless. I am told by one who ought to know that leading Nonconformist ministers are beginning to adopt this mode of preaching. I cannot dwell on the fact that a large number of preachers can never become effective extempore speakers, or speak of the painful exhibition of newly-ordained clergy trying their fledgling flights before an intelligent congregation, but I do stay for a moment to state that the men who have the greatest extempore gifts are the very men who ought to read at least one sermon a week. There are many extempore speakers who in their sermons are like Abraham, as it has been said, “who went out not knowing whither he went,” and of whom Archbishop Whately said they “aimed at nothing, and hit it.” I know no greater snare than readiness of speech. Freedom of utterance is a gift, and no gift has been more greatly abused; and over and

over again are we reminded, in listening to these ready preachers, of the orator Henley, immortalized by Pope in his "Dunciad," of whom the poet says: "How fluent nonsense trickles from his tongue!" Many men preach extempore to save themselves trouble, and then they make a grievous mistake. Phrases take the place of matter, sound takes the place of sense, idle platitudes of solid truths, and the intelligent layman can see poverty of thought like a skeleton peering through an abundance of words. Such sermons are like a shell which a child puts to his ear: it makes a sound because there is nothing in it. These sermons are an abomination. Someone says, in any case, the preacher has "a fine command of language"; I answer in the words of Whately on Rhetoric: "His language has a fine command of him." In favour of written sermons, I would remind my brethren of Hooker's well-known words in the fifth book of the "Ecclesiastical Polity": "Extemporaneous sermons spend their life in their birth, and may have public audience but once." If a man writes and reads, he can preach his sermon over again; and if a sermon is worth hearing once, it is worth hearing twice, and it is always pleasant when the congregation asks for its repetition. We must not, however, follow the example of Charles Page Eden, who fastened his eyes on his manuscript, and began: "My brethren, my sermon last Sunday afternoon struck me as being so very important that I propose to-day to read it over again." If extempore speaking is a difficulty to any man, let him take all means to acquire the power, and persevere until he succeeds, but let him not practice in the pulpit. A Bible-class is a capital opportunity for learning the art. You are expository then, and not topical, and if you find a twig giving way, you can hop on to another like a bird.

The longer I live, the more impressed I am with the importance of well-delivered written sermons. With practice, a written sermon may be so read that it will seem to be delivered extempore. Bacon says: "Reading makes a full man, speaking a ready man, and writing a correct man," and inaccuracy is one of the sins of the age. May all preachers be like the Rev. Tom Short, of Christowel, who addressed his flock, as they said, "on papper"; but "no other preacher could say so much in the time allowed, . . . and no other congregation in the diocese listened with attention so close and yawns so few." I have spoken strongly on behalf of written sermons, because I fear that what Bishop Stillingsfleet said in his day is largely true of the present age: "There is got an ill habit of speaking extempore, and a loose and careless way of talking in the pulpit, which is easy to the preacher and plausible to less judicious people." I close this

point in the words of good Charles Bridges: "The conscientious minister will consider the nature of his situation, the temper of his people, the character and suitableness of his individual talent, which mode is most adapted to subserve his own ministerial efficiency."

I can only mention other faults of present-day preaching. Lack of adaptation to present-day circumstances is one; affectation of intellectualism is another. Lack of sympathy, said the late Bishop of Wakefield to me, is the fault of many sermons—the want of putting one's self in another's place, and realizing the other's standpoint and thoughts and feelings and difficulties. I dare not leave the subject without stating what I believe to be the gravest fault of nineteenth-century sermons. I refer to the lack of clear doctrinal teaching about sin and the spirituality of the law of God; the deity of Christ; His offices and character as the God-man; and, above all, the absence of the atoning blood—the most precious blood, the eternally precious blood, of Jesus Christ. We lack faithfulness and fearlessness in dealing with souls. Let the thought of popularity, the greatest snare to which the preacher is liable, be blown to the winds of heaven. Yet none the less the conscience of the hearer is on the side of the preacher. "I am sure," said Lord Cairns to his family one Sunday, "the sermon this morning was a good one, it has made me so uncomfortable." As Louis XIV. said to Bossuet after Massillon's Advent course at Versailles: "When I hear other great preachers I am satisfied with them, but when I hear Massillon I am dissatisfied with myself." How can we strain after the reputation of being original preachers and intellectual preachers and eloquent preachers and interesting preachers and popular preachers—thank God, I need not add political preachers when speaking of the clergy of the Church of England—when we are face to face with immortal souls? Our sermons suffer because we have so little time for preparatory prayer. "*Bene orasse est bene studuisse.*" We need to realize a more absolute dependence upon God the Holy Ghost, and to give all our endeavours to say with St. Paul to the elders at Miletus: "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you . . . testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

### III. REMEDIES.

I shall of necessity be brief on this last part of my subject.

1. More time for preparation. The laity must be taught that the clergy, like doctors and lawyers, have times when they cannot be seen save under exceptional circumstances.

Nothing is more common than for laymen to call upon the clergy upon Saturday, with the naïve remark: "I called this morning because I was sure to find you in." Vicars must see that their curates, apart from the time given to the Scripture lesson in the day-school or to Morning Prayer in the Church, have their mornings to themselves for steady, persistent reading. I am not surprised that some of the younger clergy to-day are like shopkeepers who put everything in the window and have nothing in stock. No curate ought to preach more than one sermon a week. If he does not make use of the opportunity afforded, the fault is not the Vicar's; but the Vicar must remember that his curate's future depends very largely upon him. All patrons know that there is no difficulty in finding men for vacant livings who are good parish priests, but there is a difficulty in finding this in combination with reading and learning--of finding men who after a year or two will not have given out all they know. The reign of King Edward is like that of Asa, the good King of Judah, in one respect: there is a dearth of "teaching priests."

2. Sermon preparation and the delivery of sermons must form an important part of clerical education in our Universities and theological halls. The Bishops have this matter in their own hands.

3. We must put an end to contraband sermons by letting it be clearly understood that the younger clergy, and the older, too, if they like (and they sometimes secretly do), have the Bishop's public sanction to preach other sermons than their own. Let the Vicar select, if he will, but let him lead off by reading one himself. I tried this course in my late parish each Lent, and the sermons were greatly appreciated. My experience is different from the humorist who sang:

"To church once I went,  
But I sighed and I sorrowed;  
For the season was Lent,  
And the sermon was borrowed."

A lady friend said to Archbishop Whately: "Will Dr. D. preach this Lent?" "My dear," said His Grace, "he always preaches Lent sermons." Of course I always announced the writer. The sainted Fletcher of Madeley, than whom few men have been more greatly blessed, says: "I preach on Sunday morning and Friday evening, and on Sunday evening I read one of the Homilies or a sermon of Archbishop Usher." I know that George Herbert in his "Country Parson" says: "Every man's own is fittest, readiest, and most savoury to him." I observe that he says to himself; he does not say to the congregation. Neither had George Herbert a large parish in the year 1904. Nor are there many George Herberts in any age.

4. In every diocese one of the Bishop's chaplains should be selected for the special work of instructing the clergy in sermon preparation. Why should it not be the work of the Rural Dean, or, better still, of the Archdeacon? Then, in addition to being the Bishop's eye, he would be the curate's tongue. I have tried it in a small way; the junior clergy who attended my class were good enough to be pleased, and I deeply regretted that pressure of work compelled me to give it up.

5. In every town or other leading centre in the country there ought to be a theological library for the use of the clergy—a library composed, not of old folios and the remnants of the shelves of deceased Bishops and other dignitaries, but of modern theological literature. I am perfectly aware that to a few of the clergy this library would be of no more use than a present of a comb to a man who is absolutely bald; but speaking generally it would be of the greatest service.

I must conclude. I have raised many points. I have had no space for elaboration or for safeguarding some remarks from misunderstanding. I cannot close without stating my belief that one class of sermon has certainly not deteriorated in recent years. I refer to the clergy as "epistles read and known of all men." The best sermon, and one that we can all preach, is the example of a holy and consistent life. "Longum iter est per præcepta, breve et efficax per exempla." Aristotle in his "Rhetoric" says that "your power of persuasion will depend upon the opinion your hearers entertain of you." May God give His grace to all ministers of Christ in this realm to remember St. Paul's injunction: "Take heed to thyself and to the doctrine." As we think of the great and serious responsibility of our office, we cry: "Who is sufficient for these things?" As we grasp the truth of the Apostle's answer, we face the future calmly, courageously, hopefully, for "Our sufficiency is of God."

J. W. BARDSLEY.

---

#### ART. III.—THE FUNCTION OF THE LAITY UNDER ST. CYPRIAN.

"THE Convocational Report on the Position of the Laity" seems to me to wholly misjudge the passage in the history of the African Church under St. Cyprian, which relates to the case of the *lapsi*, when the Reporting Committee infer on p. 9, near bottom, that "at the councils of bishops the

laity were present, not in silence, but for active discussion and effective influence" (the references given are Cypr., "Epp.," xx. 3, lv. 6, lxiv. 1, xvii. 3, xix. 2, xxxiv. 4), "and that they could and did oppose and contradict—*obnitente plebe et contradicente*" (lix. 15).

In the first place, the question at issue was manifestly not deliberative, but *judicial*. Cyprian's own description of it proves this, even if it were not patent on the face of the facts. He calls it (xxxiv. 4) a *cognitio*, a *cognitio singulorum*—i.e., a trial of each case on its own merits; and again, in lix. 15, *iudicio et cognitioni*. The term *cognitio* is well known in Roman legal usage from Cicero downwards (cf. Cic., "Verr.," II., ii. 25). In "Ep.," lix. 14, Cyprian lays down clearly the method of procedure—*ut unius cuiusque causa illic audiatur ubi est crimen admissum*; and, further, *infra*, each is to *agere illic causam suam ubi et accusatores habere et testes sui criminis possint*. Indeed, by distinguishing (on p. 12, sect. 3) the function of *judicial discipline* as a separate head (under which, on p. 14, the passage, xxxiv. 4, is cited at length), the Report acknowledges this; but then on p. 15 seems to found on it, conjointly with other sources, a claim for "a very large and real, though secondary, place" for the laity "in the whole guidance and government and practical administration of the Church of Christ." I believe those other sources are similarly misconstrued in the Report, but must confine myself at present to the disciplinal and judicial aspect of the case of the *lapsi*.

In the first place, it is axiomatic that, to make excommunication a valid reality, the active concurrence of the laity is indispensable, and this in every age, not excluding the Apostolic. Therefore St. Paul (2 Cor. ii. 6) speaks of the censure on the Corinthian offender as "inflicted by the majority" (τῶν πλειόνων). Therefore a prominent share of the laity in the case of the *lapsi* goes without saying. But I proceed to show that this latter case had some exceptional and probably unique features, unless so far as reflected in the contemporary Church at Rome and elsewhere.

What is here necessary is to ascertain exactly, if possible, what it was which went on—what were the actual steps of fact indicated in St. Cyprian's letters.

Firstly, then, these *lapsi* constituted the actual lay majority, and probably a large majority, in the African Church. Cf. "Plebem nostram ex maxima parte prostravit," xiv. 1. These seem to have sought to overbear discipline by weight of numbers. Cf. "Impudentia vos" (the confessors) "quorundam premi et verecundiam vestram vim pati," xv. 3, and

“Ut pacem . . . extorquere violento impetu niterentur,” xx. 3.

Next, a section among the clergy had shared the sin of the *lapsi*. Cf. “Ut etiam cleri portionem sua strage perstringeret,” xiv. 1, and “Per lapsum quorundam presbyterorum,” xl., l. 15.

Thirdly, another section of the clergy had unadvisedly, and without observing the rules of discipline and the counsel of Cyprian, given “the peace of the Church” to many of these *lapsi* among the laity; cf. xv. 1 and 2 (too long to quote).

Fourthly, a promiscuous and not duly scrupulous use had been made of the letters of intercession from confessors and martyrs on behalf of these *lapsi*, thus compromising the respect due to those holy sufferers. This appears *passim*; see especially xxvii. 1.

Fifthly, Cyprian himself was, as he confesses to Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, compromised also, by having granted “peace” to some whose subsequent conduct had proved them unworthy of his lenity, indulged in opposition to the popular voice. Cf. “Unus atque alius, obnitente plebe et contradicente, mea tamen facilitate suscepti peiores extiterunt quam prius fuerant,” lix. 15. A similar course, prejudicial to sound discipline, had been taken by Therapius, a Bishop (*collega noster*, etc., lxiv. 1).

All these complications, especially, we must suppose, the last named, raised cross-waves of tumultuous controversy, and placed an enormous moral leverage on the side of the laity who had stood firm against persecution. It seems, therefore, a mistake to deduce normal conditions of discipline from such an unprecedented state of things.

Now, let us next endeavour to see from precise statements what it was which actually went on in the process called *cognitio* and *iudicium*. That a Council or Councils met in which bishops, clergy, and laity were all present, although with each a different weight of authority, seems clear. Nothing, we may be sure, would, under Cyprian's influence and guidance, be done in the dark, nor any attempt made to cloak the real proceedings. Therefore the presence of the laity—any who could be present—was welcomed with open doors. They would thus learn directly and at first hand every resolution adopted and every discussion which led to it. This was the way in which the concord of all ranks was established, and the peace of the Church assured for each and all. There was in Cyprian's day nothing of the morbid distrust and supercilious suspicion which enters subsequently into the mutual attitude of cleric and lay. The laity were there because the clergy were there, and because there was no

reason why they should be absent. They were there also for moral support and sympathy. They were there, lastly, to learn and assimilate the teaching of a great occasion, the sealing and ratifying the peace of the Church to the numerically greater, but morally weaker, section of their own brethren who had lapsed. But there was one point on which they, too, had an authoritative weight, and that point arose directly out of the fact noticed above, that excommunication depends in the last resort upon lay agency in effecting it.

Besides the complications noticed above, a special feature of the whole occasion was that the *stantes laici* were on the side, not of concession, but of severity. In their scandalized sense of Christian principle compromised had arisen the chief obstacle to the reception of the *lapsi*. It taxed the ascendancy of Cyprian's influence to the utmost to wring the concession from them. Cf. "Plebi vix persuadeo, immo extorqueo, ut tales patiantur admitti," lix. 15. Nay, there were some, it seems, against whom the door remained shut. Cf. "Quibusdam ita aut crimina sua obsistunt aut fratres obstinate et firmiter renituntur, ut recipi omnino non possint," *ibid. sup.* A general amnesty, with a reserve of excepted cases, would thus seem to have been the course finally taken in a full council of bishops, clergy, and *stantes laici*, the latter substantially ratifying that amnesty formally pronounced by the former.

This I regard as the crowning act; but what had preceded? That *cognitio singulorum* (xxxiv. 4), above referred to, and more fully in lv. 6: "Ut . . . examinarentur causæ et voluntates et necessitates singulorum." I assume the method of procedure previously quoted to have been followed, that "the cause of each should there be heard where the offence was committed, that a section of the flock be assigned to individual pastors for each to rule and guide," so that each defendant "would have to plead his cause where he might have both the accusers and the witnesses to the charge against him"—*i.e.*, to use a modern analogue, in his own parish and among his own neighbours. These detailed investigations must, therefore, have gone on in the particular churches and among the local congregations scattered about each diocese. Here, no doubt, it was that the keenest contests took place. Before the assembled local *plebs* the local delinquents would be introduced, and would present any letters of confessors, etc., pleading on their behalf. Then would be heard hostile murmurs and perhaps angry shouts from the *obnitente plebe et contradicente*. I infer Cyprian's own presence from his own phrase, *vix plebi persuadeo*, etc., above cited. He might go round to them all in turn, holding, in fact, "a visitation."



And here each case would be settled on its own merits where those were best known.

Now these proceedings before individual congregations, in which the laity, as incriminators or compurgators, played so large a part, the Report seems to me to transfer to the Council, and thence to infer mistakenly their "share in that whole guidance, etc., of the Church," which it ascribes to them, as above cited.

But we further find traces of an earlier stage antecedent to both these—*i.e.*, to the local inquiry or *cognitio*, and to the final ratification. In lv. 6 we read of a "copious number of bishops" as having been convened by Cyprian (when the persecution was lulled which had given rise to the *lapsi*), by whom it was resolved that a remedy be applied to their cases by a course of individual inquiries, as described above. The course followed in the parallel case at Rome was somewhat different at the moment, owing to a vacancy in that see at the time. But that there were, at least, two stages in the proceedings recommended by Cyprian to the Roman clergy and adopted by them, is to be inferred from the phrases *prius* and *deinde sic*, occurring in both the letters which describe those proceedings (xxx. 5 and lv. 5).

Thus, the net result of our review exhibits three stages in all: (1) A Council in which the question is dealt with generally, and principles stated to guide its further course; (2) a series of local inquiries, turning mainly on lay testimony, held on the spot where each case befell; and (3) a Council, with the laity certainly present, to confirm and ratify the conclusions arrived at. These, I believe, were the actual steps of fact in the case, and if this be so, the conclusion of the committee is clearly erroneous.

I fear there are not a few other instances in which the Report either misconstrues the purport of the precedents which it cites, or, after pointing out a false principle, virtually readmits it, to the prejudice of those precedents.

The absence of any line of cleavage between cleric and layman is what fills one with a sense of contrast to modern developments as we study Cyprian's letters. The line of cleavage instead runs impartially *across* both. It is between *lapsi* and *stantes*, between those amenable to discipline and certain recalcitrants. The clergy were at that time the natural representatives of the laity. They sprang from the *populi universi suffragio* (lix. 6; cf. lv. 8). "Restore this"—implying the restoration withal of a measure of discipline—is, therefore, the lesson which these letters eloquently teach. But no! Our Convocational Committee deduces strangely the opposite lesson—that of lay representatives for laymen—

with an obvious result of the wedge driven deeper and the cleavage widened.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.



ART. IV.—ONE-SIDEDNESS.

THE party spirit which prevails in the Church is lamented by some and boasted of by others. The more closely we look into the cause of our unhappy divisions the more clearly we perceive that they arise not from one party holding the truth and the other an error, but from each party holding one side of a truth so firmly as to be unable to grasp the other side of the same truth. Two eyes have been given to us, though one might have been thought to be sufficient, in order that we may see both sides of an object. Mentally also we need two eyes, for most subjects have two sides at least, and contentions arise from looking at a part and imagining it to be the whole. Christians in England may be roughly divided into three classes: Churchmen, Roman Catholics, and Nonconformists. All are equally conscientious, and yet are opposed to each other. The Pope regards us as heretics sometimes to be cursed and sometimes to be prayed for. Some Protestants have spoken of the late Pope as "that wicked old man." At the present moment there is much bitterness on the part of Nonconformists because of the existence of the Church's elementary schools, though they have no objection to the schools of the Roman Catholics and the Jews. We are all Christians; we are all equally conscientious. It is strange that there should be these differences and divisions amongst Christians; it is doubly strange that they should exist in the Church of England. I am convinced that the chief cause of our unhappy divisions is one-sidedness of view. It is a disgrace to us that there should be C.M.S. and S.P.G. in our Church instead of our uniting to support one great missionary society. I have known some clerical supporters of the C.M.S. refuse to sit upon the same platform with an S.P.G. deputation; they thought it would somehow be inconsistent; they thought it right to emphasize the evangelical side of truth. By all means let them do so, but not in such a way as to appear to condemn S.P.G., and to ignore the good work that is being done by that society. The C.M.S. brings prominently forward the need of individual conversion; the S.P.G. lays great stress upon the corporate life of the Church. These are opposite views, but not opposed. My left hand is opposite to my right, but not opposed to it.

This one-sidedness is particularly apparent in the views held about the Holy Communion, and the view we take of this central act of worship colours all our other services. One party see the sacrificial side so clearly that they seem to ignore its communion side, and *vice versâ*.

In the Old Testament times there were priests and altars and sacrifices and vestments and incense, all ordered by God Himself. Those sacrifices had no value in themselves; they were efficacious only in connection with the coming sacrifice to which they looked forward.

In New Testament times we have the Holy Communion looking back to that same sacrifice on Calvary, and efficacious only in its connection with that sacrifice. Is it any wonder that some devout Christians should be so impressed with this sacrificial view of Holy Communion as to call it a sacrifice, and to retain the terms "altar" and "priest," and to wish to adopt vestments and incense? I for one can truly sympathize with them, though at the same time I marvel that they should appear to shut their eyes to another side of the truth which is equally true—the Communion, or partaking of Christ and *with* fellow-Christians. Many of them are present only as worshippers assisting a priest whilst he (they say) offers the sacrifice. They partake neither of Christ nor *with* their fellows. They so exalt the words, "Do this," as to exclude the words, "Take, eat." Now, I would never condemn anything simply because the Roman Catholics do it; so long as the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer are used by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike there is always a possibility of union; but no thoughtful reader of history can fail to observe that the whole fabric of Roman Catholicism rests upon the sacrificial view of the Eucharist having entirely suppressed the Communion view. The Mass of the Church of Rome is a sacrifice, and not a communion. The Holy Communion of the Church of England is a memorial of a sacrifice, as the Catechism puts it, "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ."

It is not to be wondered at that the Puritans swung to the other extreme; shocked at what they considered to be "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits," they tried to destroy altars and priests so as to get rid of the sacrificial idea. For altars they substituted tables, and for offering a sacrifice they substituted partaking of a meal. They were not wrong in holding this view; they were wrong in supposing that it was the whole view of the matter.

In 1549 the words of administration in our Communion Service were as follows: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto

everlasting life." That was all, but that was objected to, on the ground that it savoured too much of the sacrificial view. So in 1552 it was rejected, and these words were substituted: "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." The former sentence expressed the sacramental view, the latter the memorial view. Both are right, neither should exclude the other; so in the reign of Queen Elizabeth both were inserted, and in combination they have remained in our Prayer-Book ever since.

Two different views of the other Sacrament have divided men so strongly that in some congregations the utterance of the words "baptismal regeneration" is like shaking a red rag in the eyes of a bull; and it is the baptismal covenant teaching of the Church Catechism which has brought the whole of the Catechism into dislike with some people. Some regard baptism as the dedication of a child to God. So it is; but it is much more: it is a new birth, a new relationship towards God, a regeneration. It is curious that those who hold strongly the necessity of a personal conversion to God dislike the idea of baptismal regeneration, whilst some who hold to baptismal regeneration shudder at the sound of the word "conversion." Surely the truth is neither on the one side nor the other—a combination, not a compromise. In Baptism the child is dedicated to God, and acceptance of this dedication is sealed on God's part by the gift of the Holy Ghost; the child "is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church." But if the child lives and falls into sin something more is needed—conversion; but this conversion is the outcome of regeneration; it is the work of the Holy Spirit given in baptism. In regeneration a power is given, in conversion that power is exercised. In regeneration the child is passive, in conversion he is active. The one view, whichever it be, must not exclude the other.

Some years ago a gentleman invited me to attend a prayer-meeting at his house for the purpose of dedicating his infant son to God. I declined to be present, saying that I knew of no better dedication of a child than holy Baptism. He believed that the infant should be solemnly dedicated to God. Quite right; but he failed to see that the child ought also to be received publicly into that part of God's family which we call the Church on earth.

Confirmation also has two sides, whereas, unfortunately, some can see only one. One view of Confirmation is that it is the formal acceptance of membership in the Church by those who were baptized in infancy, or have hitherto belonged to some other body of Christians. It is regarded only on its

active side as something to be done. Those who hold this view prefer that the candidate for Confirmation should be about sixteen or seventeen years of age.

Another view is that Confirmation is almost sacramental, that it is a means of grace, and that as grace is needed by quite young children, it is advisable to have them confirmed at the age of nine or ten.

Personally, I regard Confirmation as the complement of infant Baptism, but removed from Baptism by this difference : that in Baptism the grace is given to the infant unconditionally, whereas the grace offered in Confirmation is conditional upon the state of mind and heart of the candidate. In the majority of cases this condition is reached at the age of sixteen or seventeen.

*Preaching and the Sacraments.*—One-sidedness of view affects our estimate of the relative importance of the duties of the ministry. Some care little about preaching, but highly exalt the Holy Communion. You see this in the arrangement of their churches : the pulpit is insignificant, and thrust to one side, whilst all the honours and decorations are lavished upon "the altar." The chief service on Sunday is the celebration called "High Mass." The sermon is altogether omitted, or cut down to five or ten minutes. The newspaper paragraph names the celebrant and the server.

Others exalt the sermon, and seldom or never go to the Holy Communion. The preacher is much advertised. The pulpit until recently blocked the end of the middle aisle, and obstructed the view of the holy Table. Some go to worship, and leave before the sermon. Others will not go at all unless there is a sermon, and are somewhat impatient at the length of the prayers. One clergyman thinks it best to reach the soul through the eye by ritual and symbol. Another addresses the soul only through the ear. Surely both are right to a certain extent ; both are wrong to condemn each other. The same Master who said, "Do this in remembrance of Me," said also, "Preach the Gospel." The Prayer-Book describes the clergy as "ministers of the Word and Sacraments." Why exalt one part of this ministry above the other ? Let us not be one-sided.

In the way in which we clergy try to bring souls to God there is a danger of one-sidedness. Some are all for revivals, missions, special efforts ; their idea of Gospel preaching is a perpetual appeal to sinners to be converted and receive the pardon of their sins. Very good ; but what is to come after that ? The soul cannot live upon forgiveness.

Others prefer the quiet instruction of ordinary services, the secret growth of religion in the soul. They dislike revivals,

they shudder at Sankey's hymns, and are suspicious of all enthusiasm. You may listen for a year to their preaching and never hear any appeal to sinners to be converted. There are many Protestant preachers who never preach evangelical sermons.

Let us combine the two methods as far as our own particular gifts enable us. There are times which require the law to be preached in all its terrifying sternness; other times need the Gospel with its winning sweetness. We must warn and win. In the history of every parish and of every individual soul there comes a time when there must be an awakening, a revival; but the soul cannot live and grow upon this. Quiet instruction must follow. Our Lord first awakened Jairus' little daughter by the summons to arise, and then He commanded that something should be given her to eat.

Some people see very clearly that Christians belong to an organized body with special ministers and rules. They recognise the corporate life and action of the Church almost to the exclusion of the individuality of the soul. Others see that each man must separately and individually make his peace with God, and are so impressed with their personal relation to God that they ignore the Body of Christ, called the Church, in which we are not only members of Christ, but also members one of another.

So I plead for more charity in our judgment of one who differs from us; for more humility in our estimation of ourselves, who differ so much from Christ; and for more wisdom, that we may not only hold fast the truth that we have gained, but also discover the truth which our brother sees.

S. BLACKETT.



#### ART. V.—THE SMACK AND DINGHY THEORY.

*Περὶ πλοίων καὶ πλοιαρίων.*

AN article of mine, pleading for a distinction of meaning between the words *πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον* in the Gospels, which appeared in the *CHURCHMAN* for last August, has evoked an unexpected criticism from the pen of the Rev. A. C. Jennings. His article on the "Boats of the Gospel Story" was published in the *CHURCHMAN* for last October. It has produced no substantial alteration of opinion on my part, but it lays me under the obligation of replying to his strictures, as well as of reviewing those three passages from the Gospels which are said to be subversive of the distinctions involved in the "smack and dinghy" theory. The whole

subject of the discussion turns upon the relative uses to which "smacks and dinghies" were practically put for performing fishing operations. If, on the one hand, they were used for the same particular purpose, then their identity is completely established; but if, on the other hand, the *dinghy* functioned as a *tender* to the *smack*, then they are two distinct words, and represent two materially separate substantive ideas. This article will endeavour to demonstrate, from the nature of the fishing methods described in the Gospels, that "smacks and dinghies" were used for distinctly different purposes, and therefore that they are several words, conveying two specific technical ideas, and that, moreover, they cannot be used interchangeably.

The Greek nouns, which my first article ventured to translate "smack" and "dinghy" respectively, may now be further explained as *parent-boat* and *attendant-boat*. This idea underlies the word "tender," which is there used to describe the latter. They both have a common root, πλέω or πῖμ-πλημι. But there is a marked contrast between them. They stand to each other in the relationship of a noun and its diminutive. This connection involves notions of magnitude and use. If it be postulated that the larger boat and the lesser boat are equivalent in meaning (and therefore in size), then it may be replied that the greater equals the less, which, as Euclid tells us, is absurd. But if there is any distinction at all between them, then, indeed, with strict regard to language, as a vehicle for the perpetuation of ideas, one word cannot be substituted for the other or equated with it in meaning. The indigenous history and philosophy of human thought and the philology of language connects one mental conception with one substantive noun. It persists through the art of writing. When one root generates two words, though a generic unity connects them, yet a specific divergence differentiates them; nor is it always easy to discover the cause of the bifurcation of sense, though it is probably situated somewhere in the region of applied ideas. Πλοῖον is chronologically anterior to its diminutive πλοῖάριον; therefore the later noun supposes that some modification of design, size, or use should, in the process of time, have originated its introduction into the Greek language. As a possible explanation of its appearance there, it may be remembered that all trades and occupations have their technical phraseology, and that nautical terminology is more obscure than others. The force of diminutive words is more apparent and expressive in the Irish Gaelic than it is in English. A few examples will illustrate my meaning; but, as they are selected from the dialect spoken on the south-west seaboard of Ireland, all

responsibility for their orthography is repudiated on the ground that they may merely be local colloquialisms. The diminutive form of the Irish noun is made by suffixing the termination “-een” to the major stem. Thus “copal,” a horse, becomes “copaleen,” a pony; “bor,” a highroad, becomes “boreen,” a byway; the adjective “dhu,” black, becomes “dhudeen,” a little black thing; *i.e.*, a clay pipe blackened by the influence of tobacco.

The present writer, when recently visiting the westernmost parts of County Kerry, had occasion to find an Irish equivalent for “cigarette.” Remembering that the local Irish word for *smoke* was “gel,” he added the diminutive ending “een” to that noun, the result being the formation of a new word, “geleen.” Its meaning was easily understood by the country people, and was so perspicuous that local retailers of these delicacies of civilization adopted it to procure a ready sale for an article that previously had been foreign to the tongue and taste of the native population. “Cigar” and “cigarette” are similar instances of a noun and its diminutive in English; perhaps when it becomes a dead language attempts will be made to show that they are interchangeable terms.

Nautical language is replete with technical expressions. Landsmen and sailors, though they possess but one vocabulary, attach different meanings to its words. We must therefore ascertain the precise shade of meaning implied by the evangelist's use of *πλοῖον*. Luke contrasts it with *πλοῖάριον* (adopting Tischendorf's reading) in chapter v. 2, 3; and with *σκάφη* in Acts xxvii. 16, 30; and with *ναῦς* in Acts xxvii. 41. We will firstly examine those passages in the Acts, and leave for future investigation those in the Gospels till they can be scrutinized and elucidated by the information meanwhile obtained. When narrating the circumstances of St. Paul's shipwreck, the third evangelist informs us that the Apostle of the Gentiles intended to sail to Italy in a ship of Adramyttium (*πλοῖον Ἀδραμυττηνῶ*). *Πλοῖον* is a merchant ship; *ναῦς*, a man-o'-war; *σκάφη*, a ship's cutter, in ordinary nautical language. These renderings are not pressed as being in every respect accurate translations of Greek ideas into modern thought, but they are only suggested as suitable terms for differentiating the notions contained by those words respectively. In Acts xxvii. 41 the *πλοῖον* of ver. 2 is described as *τὴν ναῦν*. It is not contended that the two words are used indifferently or that one mental conception is common to them both, for they spring from two distinct root ideas. Nor is it likely that two separate vessels were intended by the author. In what sense, then, could the “ship of Adramyttium” be called a “man-o'-war”?



There was a practice prevalent in the early days of the Roman Empire that has persisted till the present time of merchant ships being chartered by the Government authorities for use as military transport ships. When thus temporarily transferred from one service to another they are reckoned, as far as international law and accuracy of designation are concerned, as, for all practical purposes, "men-o'-war." Thus, the merchant ship (*πλοῖον*) that conveyed Paul and his party and Julius and his soldiers was accurately described as a military transport (*ναῦς*). Nor is any confusion of narrative introduced by the change of nomenclature for one and the same vessel. The relative magnitude of the ship in question is partly surmised by the fact that it carried a complement of 276 persons—passengers and crew—together with a cargo of wheat. It was also able to hoist its *σκάφη*, or ship's cutter. There is, however, no record in the Gospels that the Galilean fishing *πλοῖα* hoisted their attendant *πλοιάρια*, as has been attributed to the "smack and dinghy" theory.

Reflections on the *πλοῖα* of the Acts, together with some misapprehension on the relative functions of smacks and dinghies, seem to have inspired the inflated conceptions of the Galilean fishing craft that the "Boats of the Gospel Story" describes. Serious thoughts, however, soon dissipate the expressed exaggerated notions desiderated in that article. The following quotation from it, if uncorrected, might leave a lasting misrepresentation of what the "smack and dinghy" theory pleads for: "We are presented with a picture of the Apostles plying 'fishing smacks' large enough to be served by (and therefore to carry) dinghies." The premise is true, but the deduction—the clause within brackets—is an unwarranted inference, and raises false issues. This slight correction will render the superstructure based on an hypothetical foundation innocuous to my contention. The *πλοῖον* on the Lake of Galilee could only carry some twelve or fourteen persons, and was liable to sink under an exceptionally large haul or freight of fish. The establishment of a specific difference between "smack" and "dinghy" does not suggest that "the Apostles' fishing operations were on a scale of magnificence," because it affirms nothing as to the size of either. A "dinghy" was designedly defined as a "tender" to a smack. A gunboat in the royal navy is called a "tender" to her parent ship with which she is associated, but this does not warrant our assuming that she is hoisted and carried by the larger vessel. No conjecture was contained in my former article of the comparative size of, or any contrast between, a *σκάφη* and a *πλοιάριον*. These two words describe two distinct classes of boats. When this practice of classification

is applied to the boats of the Gospel story the two words used by the evangelists will fall into their relative positions as regards magnitude and use. But if we only look at dead words apart from the living ideas that underlie and inform them, we shall be apt to attach merely an academic significance to them. The Gospel *πλοῖον* was properly a merchant ship to the Galilean fishermen. It carried one or more nets, according to the needs of the day's fishing, and it was associated in its operations with a "dinghy" as a *tender*.

A short digression explanatory of the description of nets used in fishing operations will materially assist in demonstrating the use which the *tender dinghy* would be made of relative to the *smack*. Three words for net are found in the Gospels, but the most frequent term is *δίκτυον*. It is connected with the verb *δίκειν*, of which there are only a few tenses in use. It is also germane to the Latin root "*jac*," and means *to throw*. Thus the *δίκτυον* seems to have been what fishermen now technically call a *striking-net*. It is thrown into the current and is carried down with it. Fish push up against the current, and entangle themselves by their gills in the netting that obstructs their progress. They become prisoners in its meshes, and, being carried down with the current, they are drowned. The net is kept in a vertical position in the water by means of weights attached to the line that runs along its lower selvage, as well as by buoys fastened to the one that sustains the upper selvage. A net used for inshore fisheries must fish both top and bottom if it is to kill fish. When a fish strikes a net it instantly seeks some means of escape, round fish by getting over the floating line, and flat ones underneath the sinking line. Striking-nets are kept extended longitudinally by having one end attached to a large floating buoy and the other made fast to the smack. Thus net and smack drift together with the current: hence in some districts these nets are called "drift-nets." But there is an alternative mode of using a striking-net. One end of it is made fast to an anchor, which is put in shallow water; the smack then pays out her net, and stations herself at the other end. While the net is thus fixed, a dinghy is rowed about above it and "plunges" with oars, which action is supposed to have the effect of frightening the fish into the concave side of the net. When this process is deemed to be completed, the smack and dinghy pick up both ends of the net simultaneously. But practically fishermen find one net too short to take any considerable amount of fish, and one continuous sheet of netting of sufficient length would be too cumbersome and unwieldy to work. They therefore resort to the expedient of having a number of lengths of net, which are temporarily

joined together when fishing, and separated as soon as they are cleared of fish; hence the contrast in the Gospels between τὸ δίκτυον and τὰ δίκτυα. Ranks of nets of this device are sometimes nearly a mile in length, either worked as drift-nets or as fixed engines. When the former course is adopted, it is necessary that some smaller boat of shallow draft of water should co-operate with the smack. Nets often fasten themselves on some submerged projection, and unless they can be speedily liberated, their sweep (or curved form) is destroyed and the draught spoilt. It would be impossible for the smack which keeps the chain of nets at the required tension to proceed to the spot where the fastening occurred, so a dinghy is used as a tender. There are also indications that it drew less water than the smack, because from John vi. 22 it was apparently used for embarking into the smack, and in John xxi. 8 for disembarking from it. The idea of a fishing smack towing her dinghy, or carrying it on board amongst all her nets, could not possibly occur to anyone who had any practical experience of working one. A smack could not simultaneously tow a dinghy and shoot a net. To sum up what has been already said on the classification of ships and boats, to note the comparative sizes of those mentioned in the New Testament, to reflect on the special purposes for which they were used, to especially consider the relative functions between smacks and dinghies (whether on the Lake of Galilee or elsewhere) while engaged in working drift or striking nets, and to apply the aggregate of the evidence now adduced and arrayed to those three passages of the Gospels which are supposed to be subversive of the "smack and dinghy theory," will be the object in view of the remainder of this present article.

I. *Luke v. 1-11.*—This paragraph records the first miraculous draught of fishes. There is a *varia lectio* in ver. 2 between δύο πλοία and δύο πλοίαρια. Tischendorf receives the latter reading into his text, while Westcott and Hort retain the former. It would far exceed the limits of the present article to discuss the respective claims of these two readings, and to estimate the reasons why these learned editors should be at issue on the point. Tischendorf's text has been accepted as the working basis of the theory, as well as of the objections that have been made against it. It has been contended that if πλοίαρια be the preferential reading in ver. 2, then its meaning must be identical with ἐν τῶν πλοίων in ver. 3. This contention is grounded upon the supposition that if St. Luke really meant to convey the notion of "dinghies" in ver. 2, he has been guilty of an unprecedented instance of a want of perspicuity and confusion of sense.

The real meaning of the sentence depends upon the word admitted into the text. The imaginary confusion is commensurate with the mental attitude, preconceptions, and amount of information on fishery matters that the individual reader brings to bear on the evangelist's narrative. If, on the one hand, the passage now under review is simply regarded with a view to elegance of diction, then the two words in the Greek may be rendered by one in the English ; but if, on the other hand, microscopic accuracy of language and technical detail of expression were the objects of the third evangelist, then on this occasion also he has manifested himself to be an historian of the first order. If it is, moreover, clear, from considering those other passages in the New Testament where *πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον* are in juxtaposition and contrast, that each class of boat had its own several and particular use, then it is probable (not to say certain) that in this passage also the same technical distinctiveness of meaning also prevails. There is admittedly not sufficient evidence in the third Gospel, considered apart from the other three, to confirm and establish the particular contrast and difference of meaning that is advocated by the "smack and dinghy theory"; but the care that St. Luke has shown in collecting the materials for his works leads us to suppose that he would not be at issue with the other evangelists. Assuming, then, for the purpose of the present stage of the inquiry, that the distinction in meaning between *πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον* may be proved from those other passages in the Gospels where those words are contrasted, and using Tischendorf's text as a basis, we will endeavour to detect the supposed confusion involved by this contradistinction.

To advert to the detail of the Gospel narrative. When the Lord was standing on the shore of the Lake of Galilee, the first and nearest objects that would arrest his attention would be the "dinghies." They would be nearer to the land than the "smacks," or larger vessels. The fishermen had left them to wash their nets. The nets were sometimes landed in the "dinghies," as we learn from John xxi. 8. The dinghies on the occasion of the first miraculous draught of fishes might have been thus used, and the fishermen may have cleared the nets on the shore, as they did in the second similar draught of fishes. Luke's diction is quite free from any confusion if the respective functions of smacks and dinghies be remembered and associated with the exigencies incidental to the use of a striking-net. If any anterior uncertainty as to technical methods of working fishing boats and nets resides in a reader's mind when approaching the Gospel narrative, then that uncertainty is read into the passage, and its meaning becomes confused to his apprehension. My attention has been called to the use of

ἔτερος. In Luke xxiii. that pronoun is contrasted with and refers to the noun *κακοῦργοι* and *κακούργων* in vers. 32, 39, and 40 respectively. In Luke v. it is contended that it refers to *πλοιάρια*, *πλοίων*, *πλοίω* in vers. 2, 3, and 7 respectively. There is an imparity of grammatical construction in these two passages. In Luke v. the pronoun is said to serve as a "catena" or "vinculum" between the nouns *πλοιάριον* and *πλοῖον*. Far be it from me to say that this use is without precedent in Luke's writings, but no similar instance presents itself to my mind at the moment. But even granting all that may be argued from a synthetical figure, the figure is subordinate to the mental conceptions of the words with which it deals. It is a vehicle of expression rather than a definition of terms. The relevancy of the mention of dinghies in ver. 2 depends (apart from questions of textual criticism and pronominal constructions) upon the technical uses to which the smaller boats were put. It may also be further remarked that some small degree of light is thrown upon the subject by contrasting the uses of *καί* and *δέ* in the section under consideration. The former is a copulative particle used for joining words and sentences; it never really has an adversative force. The latter is used to call attention to the fact that the word or clause with which it stands is to be *distinguished* from something preceding, and usually having an opposing or adversative force. It frequently is used to pass from one thing to another, when it may be rendered *and further*. These considerations, derived from reliable sources, led me to paraphrase Luke v. 3: "He next observed some smacks." Objection is taken to this exposition on the ground that it introduces a chasm that needs to be bridged over. This chasm vanishes, however, when the distinction between the particles is observed. As my former article suggested nothing respecting the relative sizes of "smacks and dinghies," the criticism that the Apostles' fishing operations were conducted on a scale of magnificence is devoid of meaning. The introductory remarks to this article are intended to remove any erroneous impressions that may remain. The fact that an exceptionally large haul of fish was capable of disturbing the floating conditions of a Galilean fishing smack has not much bearing on the case, because we are not told what the gross bulk of the freight was, other than that it was of miraculous magnitude. The expression "began to sink" need not mean more than that the boats in question were heavily laden, and consequently were lower in the water. The loading of ships depends upon a law of nature, which has remained unaltered and unalterable from St. Luke's time till now. If a single haul of fish had any perceptible effect on a

Galilean fishing smack, it goes to prove my conjecture that this class of boats would not contain more than about fourteen persons, and some of these would probably be in substitution of the ballast the smack would usually carry. Matters of nautical detail, and of circumstances springing therefrom, seem to have been overlooked in "Boats of the Gospel Story." That article affords the *prima facie* impression that it regards boats from a landsman's point of view.

II. *John vi. 15-24.*—This passage may be divided into two sections: (a) The journey of the disciples from Bethsaida Julias to Capernaum in vers. 15 to 21, with which we have the parallels Matt. xiv. 22-33, Mark vi. 45-52; and (b) the observation of the miraculously-fed multitudes near the former place and their journey to Capernaum in quest of the Lord. In the first section (a) there are no variant readings of any importance in the passages recording the event. We discover from them, coupled with others, that the Lord seems generally to have employed a *πλοῖον* when crossing the Lake of Galilee, possibly because it was less affected by weather and afforded better accommodation for Himself and His party. These passages have further interest in that they afford instances of the use of a "smack" and a "dinghy" on one and the same occasion. The voyage in question was performed in a *πλοῖον*. The course steered was in a westerly direction. A storm arose, blowing from the west. During the time it was prevailing—before 6 a.m.—the Lord walked on the water and abated it. On the morrow (*i.e.*, after 6 a.m.) the multitudes left at Bethsaida Julias observed that there was no other "dinghy" there except the one that the disciples got into. Here we are introduced to a "smack" and a "dinghy" in association. The former had gone away the previous night to Capernaum; the latter was left behind at Bethsaida Julias, possibly because it was owned by some resident there. On this occasion there is no suggestion of the *smack* carrying its dinghy, or of towing it either, for this latter course would have greatly impeded its progress, a circumstance which would not be uppermost in the mind of a critic who was not familiar with practical navigation and seamanship. (b) We now come to examine John vi. 22-24. Here we have no parallel in the synoptists. Their evidence, from the accounts they give of the events under the preceding section (a), establishes the fact that when the disciples were leaving Bethsaida Julias there were two boats there—viz., the dinghy they left behind and the smack they went away in. We are further informed that they entered into the dinghy. We can but reasonably conclude that they did so to embark into the smack. If "smack" and "dinghy" are interchangeable terms, the result of the passage

would be that they got into a vessel and then got into another similar one. Fishermen are not in the habit of making these venial mistakes, but they are in the habit of borrowing the first dinghy that comes to hand to ferry themselves to their own smack, and leaving the dinghy at the place where they borrowed it from. This passage is one of those vivid touches of real life and everyday experience that would convince a fisherman that the fourth Gospel was written by a fisherman. St. John, then, in this section illustrates one of the purposes for which a dinghy was employed, and also differentiates its use from that of the smack. It matters not to my contention whether the people who arrived from Tiberias came in dinghies or smacks, as we have no means of making a comparison between them in this section of the narrative, and comparison is the basis of opinion. It may be noted, however, that the westerly head wind that impeded the progress of the Apostles' *smack* would assist the craft that came from Tiberias. It is not a remote thought to apprehend that a practical boatman like the fourth evangelist would probably be moved by considerations other than those of elegance of diction in selecting words to express his ideas. While indicating one of the uses to which the dinghy was applied, he has not told us that the smack was ever similarly employed. The circumstance that the multitudes were conveyed in dinghies from Bethsaida Julias to Capernaum affirms nothing as to their dimensions, nor does the distance traversed by these smaller boats afford any information as to their seaworthiness.

My remarks on the identification of the site of Bethsaida Julias have called forth a reference to the late Dean Farrar's "Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel." That book was known to me when writing. But as the topographical history of Palestine is an extensive subject, of which my knowledge is only superficial, dictates of prudence restrained me from committing myself to any positive statement. Archæological discoverers are sometimes misled by an enthusiasm which confuses probable evidence with direct proof.

III. *John xxi.* 1-11.—These verses give an account of the second miraculous draught of fishes. Here, again, we have a picture of a "smack and dinghy" in association on the same occasion. Seven of the Apostles, including the narrator of the events, were returning from a night of unsuccessful fishing. The "smack" seems, from his account, to have been nearing the place where she had left her "dinghy." A stranger hailed them from the beach just as the day was breaking, and St. John recognised His sacred personality. St. Peter instantly waded ashore out of the "smack," a

distance of about one hundred yards. Sunrise is often the coldest part of the day, so the impetuous Apostle girt his fisher's coat about him; *i.e.*, he kept it out of the water while wading. The *ἐπενδύτης* was a linen blouse or overall, worn, probably, to preserve the underclothing from contact with the wet net and the slimy fish. The remaining six Apostles seem to have brought their "smack" alongside the "dinghy." From the combination of these circumstances we may conjecture that the "smack" would draw about three feet of water, while the "dinghy" was easily beached; in fact, it might have been almost flat-bottomed. St. Peter would not be reluctant to wade, because the temperature of the water at sunrise is often much higher than that of the surrounding atmosphere. On one occasion with a thermometer I registered in the water ten degrees of heat in excess of the air. While St. Peter was wading the others came ashore in the dinghy towing the net. They would have anchored the smack, and not allowed it to have gone adrift, as has been suggested. There is no need to suppose any transfer of the fish from the smack's decks to the dinghy's bottom, because the net was not cleared till it was on the beach, and after some conversation had intervened between the risen Redeemer and His Apostles. The boat-line of the net could easily be transferred from the smack to the dinghy. St. Peter himself drew it up on to the beach and removed 156 large fish from it. This circumstance convinces me that it was a drift-net, in which the fish were caught by their gills, otherwise they would have escaped as soon as the tension of drawing had been removed. The possibility of its being a *σαγήνη*, or draught-net, is similarly excluded; and, moreover, upon that supposition it would have been cleared of fish necessarily on the beach, and there would have been no occasion for St. John to have specified its being specially taken there. Striking-nets are usually cleared into a boat, and draught-nets, or seines, on the beach.

When sufficient reasons are adduced for the need of the association of two boats (*πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον*, a larger boat and a lesser boat) for duly conducting fishing operations, the phantom difficulties suggested in the "Boats of the Gospel Story" disappear. The statement that "such insignificant verbal variations are characteristic of this Apostle's (St. John's) writings" is merely an assumption based on the hypothesis that they are insignificant. The "smack and dinghy" theory attaches a specific meaning and purpose to each word. If the *ipsissima verba* of the New Testament, and the indigenous notions they convey, are to be evaporated whenever a point of technical acumen is needed to explain them, then that



volume would cease to be an actual record of facts. If a desire "to secure euphony and avoid tautology" be dominant with the sacred writers, then their writings have little more than a vague and semi-poetic signification. Matters of elegance of diction are subordinate to those of accuracy of expression. Questions of "subtle euphonic influence" and of conjectured indifference of meaning are out of place amongst technical nautical terms. The work of a generation of textual critics and learned editors is dissipated by such theories. The especial work of the Reformation in the department of theology was the recovery of long-buried and long-forgotten Greek. Previously tradition, supplemented by a Latin version, was the only means available for ascertaining the actual events that took place during the Lord's earthly life and ministry. Considering all that that movement accomplished, my readers will probably acquit me of any hostile intentions when I contend for something more than mere elegance of style and euphony of diction when writing about the records which the sacred writers have bequeathed to us. The faith of future generations is founded on facts, not fancies. Possibly no question of immediate vital importance is involved *per se* in the "smack and dinghy" theory; but it does entail as an ultimate consequence the technical accuracy of the evangelists, which places them upon a higher platform than those writers who merely make literary perfection the leading feature of their work. The four Gospels are unique. They present the unilateral impressions that inspired their authors respecting the Lord's life and person. The evangelists wrote regardless of human criticism, because their mental vision was concentrated on truth and heaven.

J. E. GREEN.



## ART. VI.—STUDIES ON ISAIAH.—II.

### HISTORICAL SURVEY.

THE writings of a prophet such as Isaiah, with their wide historical and political allusions, will be but ill understood by the reader, and especially by one who desires to make their contents intelligible to others, without some idea of the condition of the world at the time at which they were written. We may defer the consideration of the state of the less imposing nationalities, such as Syria and Moab, until we come to the chapters in which reference is made to them. But the drift of whole chapters will be imperfectly apprehended unless we have some idea of the position of the great

world-empires in the prophet's day, and unless we understand the political, social, and religious condition of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah at the time at which he wrote.

Until lately the only authorities for the history of the period were the books of Kings and Chronicles; but of late archaeological discovery in the East has largely multiplied our store of information. It is the fashion just now to depreciate the trustworthiness of Hebrew historians. If we are to believe recent critics—and, little as we desire controversy, we are compelled, for the information of the reader, to refer to their position on this and one or two other points—never was national history, religious or secular, handed down in so careless, slovenly, and even intentionally inaccurate, a manner as that contained in the Old Testament. The modern critic asks us to believe that at a period when Israel had ceased to be a nation her whole history, especially her religious history, was fashioned afresh by priestly hands in order to recommend the acceptance by the nation of the institutions contained in the Pentateuch as we now have it. Not only was the history boldly, and yet at the same time clumsily, fabricated out of documents of various periods, but the Jewish people was somehow persuaded to accept it, when thus reconstructed, as dating from the Mosaic era. Nor is this all. The remaining books, founded apparently on the public records of Israel and Judah, contain deliberate falsifications of the contents of those public records, designed to suit the views of the priestly party. The thought might occur to an inquiring mind that the substitution of falsified documents for ancient records, the entire disappearance of the former, and the blind and unquestioning acceptance by the nation of the fabrications of the priestly party, are events of a kind extremely unusual in history. And some might think it not a little strange that the very history in which the presence of truth is most essential is precisely the one of all others in which it is least to be found. The Vedas, the Zendavesta, the obscure histories of Buddha, the Koran, are subjected to no such hostile analysis. The statements of the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian monuments are accepted almost without question. The Old Testament alone among the historical writings of the world has, it would seem, to undergo an amount of reconstruction which is needed by no other history in the world. This, it must be confessed, is hardly treating the Bible "like any other book." It must also be confessed that archaeological discovery has in no way tended to confirm the theory of the modern critic. Save in some slight details of chronology, the testimony of the Assyrian and Egyptian inscriptions has been to establish very emphatically the accuracy

of the statements in the Hebrew Scriptures, whether they regard early or contemporary history; whereas, if the modern critic is to be believed, the earliest writing contained in the Old Testament is that of an obscure Hebrew scribe or scribes writing long after the facts he so correctly records had faded into the obscurity of a far distant past.

Into the vexed question of chronology we will not enter. There seems some reason to believe that, beside the evident tendency of the Hebrew writers to substitute generality for exactness in the matter of dates, some change in the Hebrew notation of figures has thrown Hebrew chronology into confusion. In the period with which we are dealing, the difficulty appears to be well-nigh confined to the synchronism between the kings of Israel and Judah. But the question is one of pure scholarship, and has little bearing on the objects which the present "studies" have in view.

The question, however, of the value of Chronicles as an authority, when dealing with the historical situation, is one which it is impossible altogether to pass over. The position of the modern Biblical critic on this point is once more unique, so far as I know, in historical criticism. It certainly differs from that adopted by every historical writer of note. The position is this. The modern critic discovers in the books of Chronicles a tendency to magnify the ancient greatness and glory of the Abrahamic race, and especially of the kingdom of Judah. And he further contends that their author or authors, writing at a very late date<sup>1</sup> with the intention of recommending the religious polity which they had invented, or accepted, or developed in the course of ages from the obscure germ of religious and moral teaching handed down by Moses, found it convenient to embellish their presentation of the ancient history of their country with a series of wonderful exaggerations and purely imaginative descriptions of pretended Mosaic observances which they represented as being in use in the times of which they wrote. Now, even if this were the case—and we are very far from admitting it—it would be foolish to attach no weight whatever to the chronicler's history. It must be full of interesting information, which, when properly sifted, would be found most valuable. That is not the way of the modern critic. Chronicles is rejected *en bloc*; and Wellhausen, the *coryphæus* of the school of criticism at present in fashion, has overwhelmed the chronicler with a torrent of ridicule, as amusing as it is—in historical criticism, at least—unprecedented, when dealing with an ancient document.

---

<sup>1</sup> The date assigned to Chronicles by writers of this school is 800 to 200 B. c.

Unprecedented, we say. For, to begin with, Chronicles was written some 2,000 years before its critics sat down to destroy its credit. Now, as a rule, the historical critic approaches an ancient document of that kind with some degree of respect—with a desire to learn from it, not to set it aside. And next, Chronicles alone, of all the books of the Old Testament, is written on modern historical principles. As a considerable time had elapsed since the occurrences the chronicler set himself to record, he specially names the authorities on which he bases his account. Modern criticism, however, as usual, is equal to the occasion. The chronicler, it declares, had never seen the books he professes to quote, but had only found them embodied in a later volume. This statement will not bear investigation. But it is only another illustration of the unique character of modern Biblical criticism. The historical student will consult in vain the works of Gibbon, Macaulay, Froude, Freeman, Stubbs, or Lecky, to say nothing of other historians, for an instance of this summary method of treating ancient authorities. The Assyrian and Egyptian inscriptions of the time of which we are writing receive, as has been said, no such contemptuous treatment at anyone's hands. It is books in the Bible only which are treated by Christian clergymen as an adverse witness is treated in a court of justice. We shall see, when we come to our historical survey of Israel and Judah, what important touches of detail the history receives from the chronicler. And we shall probably feel that, whether the accusations of exaggeration and invention have any foundation or no, a more respectful treatment of an ancient document than that which has been described will be desirable if our object is to arrive at the truth. We proceed to a brief sketch of the general history of the period at which Isaiah writes.

1. *Assyria and Babylon*.—The statements of Holy Writ in regard to the history of Assyria and Babylonia have been confirmed to the very letter by recent discoveries. Gen. x., which describes the settlement of the nations after the Flood, represents the Japhetic, or, as it has since been called, the Aryan, race as having spread more widely than the others, as having intermingled itself geographically with the Semitic race at an early period, and even as having already—see Gen. ix. 27, unless this is to be regarded as a prophecy—enslaved some of its brethren of the third, or Turanian, race. The Turanians, however, as we learn from Gen. x. 8-13, were the first to settle in the fertile lands between the Euphrates and the Tigris. The statement of the sacred historian has been most surprisingly corroborated by modern research. Traces of Turanian occupation of that territory at a very early date have been found. The language of the settlers has been

recovered, and proves to have been Turanian. A kingdom of Akkad or Agadé has been discovered, answering to the Accad of Gen. x. 10, and the ruins of the other cities mentioned in the sacred narrative have been identified. Now, the theory in fashion at the present moment insists that the earliest parts of the Bible were written by one or more anonymous writers of the eighth or ninth century B.C.—*i.e.*, not before 900 B.C. How these writers attained to such minute accuracy in regard to facts so long past is not explained. But as these Turanian, Accadian, or Sumerian monarchs are supposed by some to have flourished as far back as 3500 B.C., it must be confessed to be difficult to understand how a Palestinian scribe, writing nearly 3,000 years after the events he records, contrived to possess himself of such accurate information. It is still more surprising if, as has been suggested, the Israelites were a race unacquainted with the art of writing.<sup>1</sup>

Recent criticism divides Gen. x. between the Jewish scribe who lived after 900 B.C., the Priestly Codist, writing after 500 B.C., and the redactor, who combined the narratives of the two other writers at a somewhat later date. But this only increases the difficulty. The Priestly Codist, to whom the larger part of Gen. x. is ascribed, deals correctly, it is admitted, with a period 3,000 years anterior to the date at which he writes. It is true that he is supposed to have been one of the Babylonian captives, and to have therefore had access to the Babylonian archives. This is a tolerably wide supposition in itself. And we must remember that the critical investigation of historical records is a thing of very recent date indeed, and to imagine that a Jewish captive in Babylon would approach his subject in the spirit of a modern historian or archaeologist is a very large assumption indeed. Besides, the passage Gen. x. 8-12 is ascribed to the *earlier* of the two writers,<sup>2</sup> who could not have had access to Babylonian authorities under the circumstances in which he is supposed to have written. The impartial student must perforce admit that there is considerable ground for the supposition that Genesis was compiled at a very early date, that the compiler, whosoever he may have been, had access to documents of an earlier date still, and that the modern critic of the type popular just now approaches his facts under the dominion of invincible preconceptions.

It has been further established that as early as 3500 B.C.,

---

<sup>1</sup> This, the primary principle on which Wellhausen, the leader of the school of criticism at present in fashion, has based his theories, has been altogether exploded by recent archaeological discovery.

<sup>2</sup> Driver, Introduction, p. 12.

and even earlier still, according to some authorities, a Semitic kingdom was established in Mesopotamia. The Semitic race ultimately reduced the Turanians to submission, and we find the predominance of the Semites firmly established by the time of Abraham. Gen. xiv. further describes a confederacy of monarchs under the chieftaincy of a King of Elam—a condition of things to which the monuments also bear witness—but we learn from other sources that the famous Mesopotamian King, Khammurabi, identified by more than one archæological scholar with Amraphel, King of Shinar, mentioned in Gen. xiv., afterwards overthrew his former suzerain, and established his own authority over his neighbours.<sup>1</sup>

From that time forward Mesopotamia,<sup>2</sup> assisted by the excellence of its climate and its fertile and well-watered territories, advanced rapidly to a position of importance. Whether we are to attribute the superiority of Assyria over Babylon for a long period to the fact that Nineveh was near to the mountains, and that it nurtured a hardier race, we cannot tell. But certain it is that the Babylonian power, at one time in the ascendant, fell, not once, but repeatedly, under the sway of the chieftains of Northern Mesopotamia.

The Assyrian monarchy, at and after the very early date which has been assigned to Semite supremacy, was powerful and warlike. Yet at first it was overshadowed and kept in check by two Turanian empires, the Egyptian and the Hittite. The latter was crushed by the Egyptian King, Thothmes III., in the sixteenth century B.C. It would seem that after this period all three powers fell, from various causes, into decay, leaving an opportunity for the brief supremacy of Israel under David and Solomon. In the days of Ahab, however, the Assyrian monarchy appears to have revived. The monuments represent the Kings of Israel, after her separation from Judah, as paying tribute to more than one Assyrian Sovereign. But the formidable Assyrian empire with which readers of the Bible are familiar commenced with the great Pul, who, after founding a new dynasty, assumed, apparently

<sup>1</sup> No less than four of the kings mentioned in Gen. xiv. have been identified by archæologists with personages mentioned in the Assyrian tablets. This identification has, of course, been energetically contested. There are doubtless some scholars of repute who are too anxious to find in ancient records confirmation of the Scripture story. There are others who are ever on the lookout to prove Scripture wrong. Between these extremes lie two other classes of critics. One is so scrupulously afraid of claiming too much for the sacred record that it abandons every doubtful point to the adversary of Scripture. There is room for a *fourth* class of critic—one who, in consequence of the demonstrated general trustworthiness of the Bible historians, is inclined to accept their authority on points confessedly doubtful. Is this course altogether unreasonable, unfair, or unscientific?

<sup>2</sup> Aram-Naharaim—Syria of the two rivers.

from considerations of policy, the name of Tiglath-pileser, which had been borne by some of his predecessors. Under him and his successors, Shalmaneser, Sargon, and Sennacherib, the Assyrian power attained formidable dimensions, overthrew Syria, brought Egypt to her knees, reduced Israel to bondage, and seriously threatened Judah. Of their civilization, learning, and capacity the monuments convey to us a high idea. Of their warlike character, their cruelty, rapacity, and pitiless ferocity we have also abundant evidence. We can, therefore, well understand the terror and despair with which their devastating approach was expected by the peoples against whom they marched. We have a vivid description of it in Isa. x. 28-31.

One word in conclusion about Babylon. There was an attempt on the part of the capital of Southern Mesopotamia to assert its independence about the time with which we have to deal. Under the brave and capable Merodach-Baladan the Babylonian revolt seems to have had a measure of success. It was apparently when its prospects were brightest that the envoys of the Babylonian chieftain arrived at the Court of Hezekiah. Under the circumstances in which Hezekiah was then placed we can readily understand that they were likely to find a warm welcome from him. But Isaiah, under Divine inspiration, was enabled to announce to Hezekiah the vanity of the hopes with which he flattered himself. The prophet's anticipations were verified. The might of Assyria proved for the moment too great to be withstood. First Sargon, and then Sennacherib, crushed repeated attempts at rebellion on the part of the Babylonian chieftain. It was not until the time of the great Nebuchadnezzar that predominance in Mesopotamia passed once more to its southern capital. But under him Babylon took the place of Assyria, and the same fate which had befallen the ten tribes befell Jerusalem also. As Isaiah had predicted, "all that was in Hezekiah's house, and that which his fathers had laid up in store unto his day," was "carried to Babylon." "Nothing" was "left." Even "his sons whom he begat" were "taken away," and they became "eunuchs in the palace of the King of Babylon" (Isa. xxxix. 6, 7).<sup>1</sup>

*(To be continued.)*

#### ERRATUM.

On p. 214, line 3, of my former article, the word *evolution* has accidentally been substituted for *revolution*. The omission of the one letter obscures the argument, which is that Nature has her moments of sudden as well as of gradual change.

<sup>1</sup> We may well regret to find that the commentary in the Cambridge Bible for Schools finds this prophecy "not easy to reconcile with the

ART. VII.—“SUN, STAND STILL”<sup>1</sup>

THE miracle of Joshua has been a cause of ridicule and a stumbling-block even to believers.

Bishop Colenso affirmed “that the miracle of Joshua is the most striking instance of Scripture and science being at variance.” I can scarcely believe that he ever carefully examined the Hebrew words. An evangelical Dean of sincere piety pronounced the miracle as, in our Bible, worse than the fables of Hindoo or Mahomedan. I wrote to him, and pointed out that the Hebrew did not sanction the idea of the sun standing still, and the consequent destruction of the universe. It is sad that men of position and accounted learned should magnify the difficulties of God’s Word, instead of fairly meeting them in the original Hebrew. I have read the Hebrew Bible for sixty years, and when in Birmingham gave lectures to different young men’s classes and at different institutions, so I took up astronomy, geology, and all science that threw light on the Word of God. One day, talking to Dr. M’Cann, lecturer to the Christian Evidence Society, he said he had never seen any explanation such as I gave to scientific difficulties, and urged me to print my views. Fourteen years ago I therefore printed the little work “Hebrew Bible and Science,” and though I have spared no expense nor trouble to bring out the truth and testify to the inspiration of Scripture, yet I have been amazed to find great ignorance on the subject of this miracle and kindred difficulties. Truth is simple and only needs plain statement. I ask you, my readers, to observe that the word *dōm* never means “stand still.” In Hab. ii. 19, “the *dumb* stone”; nine times “keep silence,” as Ps. xxx. 12; five times at least “be still,” as Ps. iv. 2; also Ps. cxxxi. 2, “quiet one’s self”; and 1 Sam. xiv. 9, “tarry”; Ps. lxii. 5, “wait”; and Ps. xxxvii. 7, “rest.” Thirty times, at least, these renderings occur, but *never*

---

circumstances.” There is no difficulty whatever; for (1) it is Hezekiah, not Isaiah, who concludes that there will be “peace” in his days. It is an inference, not a prophecy. And (2) Hezekiah simply infers that he and his will not be the victims of the Assyrian invasion which threatened him at that period. It is unfortunate that the youth of this age should be fed on the husks of explanations which do not explain, but only explain away, instead of learning, like their forefathers, to receive with respect the utterances of men inspired by the Divine Spirit to foretell things to come.

<sup>1</sup> Within reasonable limits, the pages of the *CHURCHMAN* are open to the discussion of doubtful questions, and are not confined to the statement of only one view of such questions. In deference, accordingly, to a much-respected contributor, this alternative view of the miracle of Joshua is presented, in reference to some articles lately published in these pages.



"stand still," except in this unfortunate passage. If any readers will try to apply "stand still" to any of the above texts, the same absurdity will be found as in the application to the sun of "stand still." "Stand still" may properly apply to a restless child, but is utterly misplaced as addressed to the great orb of day. Take one other passage (Ps. lxxxiii. 1): "Keep not Thou silence, O God," which implies, "come forth, speak"; but "stand still" would be a direct contradiction. The words "stand still," therefore, are *utterly unwarranted and misleading*.

The next word to which I direct you is the most important in the sentence, "midst," Hebrew "Chetse," and it is literally "half." So Taylor, in his "Hebrew Concordance," renders the verb "to divide, or part in two." In only three or four cases it is rendered "midst," and they would be better "half." The verb and the noun occur when Solomon (1 Kings iii. 25) said, "*Divide* the living child in two, and give *half* to the one and *half* to the other." Would "give a midst to the one and midst to the other" speak sense or nonsense? In *one hundred and ten* instances this word has the true meaning of "half," and "midst" is wrong; and would be as ridiculous if applied to those one hundred and ten cases as it is: "Sun, stand still; and the sun stands in *the midst of the heavens*."

By the proper meaning of these two words, we are *perfectly sure* that the passage should be rendered: "Sun, rest, or wait, or tarry, in *the half of the heavens*." Now, the *half* of the heavens must be the *visible horizon*. The ancients counted the stars and classed them in constellations, and therefore were acquainted with the whole circle of the heavens; the half must therefore imply a division into two. So the word "half" refers to the portion of the heavens visible to Joshua; and "tarry or wait" is an injunction to the sun to tarry or wait in the half. So we read: "The sun tarried in the half of the heaven, and *hasted* not to go down."

When considering this passage, I felt that the word "hasted" was significant, for if we say, "the boy does not hasten," we imply that he is *moving*. Now, this word occurs in Prov. xxviii. 20: "He that hasteth to be rich"; again, Prov. xix. 2, "he that hasteth with his feet sinneth." So the word implies great effort and speed; therefore we may read: "The sun is not hastening, or making haste, to set"—language most appropriate in Eastern countries, where there is little or no twilight, and the sun dips down below the horizon suddenly and darkness supervenes. That the sun did not thus hastily set implies that he *continued in motion and in sight*.

Further, the words "about a whole day" are not suffi-

ciently exact. “About” in the Hebrew is “as,” and is not a mere comparison, but marks out the definite period such as makes up a whole day; just like, “we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten”—*i.e.*, the glory which *really pertained* to the only begotten. So Patrick and Lowth, on Josh. x., remark: “It may simply be translated a *whole day*, the particle *Caph* signifying nothing of similitude, but the very *thing itself*.” The words “as a whole day” mean the exact and definite time such as makes up a *whole day*. Now, the word “whole”—*shawim*—stands for a full and perfect number of anything; so (1 Sam. xvi. 11), “Are thy children complete” (Hebrew, “whole”), or, “Are the whole here?” When considering this passage, its peculiar force and definite meaning, it struck me at once that there must be some means of measuring this definite period; that if the earth was not moving, there could be no measure of time; if the clock of the world was “standing still,” it would be folly to speak of an exact or complete day.

To sum up, the word “tarry,” the word “half,” the word “hasten,” and the word “whole,” give four reasons which *cannot be controverted*. Taken separately they exclude the idea that the earth stood still, and taken together they become a link in a chain which *cannot be broken*; they expose the carelessness and rashness of Bishop Colenso and other objectors. The whole passage may therefore be translated in some such words as the following: “Then Joshua is speaking to Jehovah, and says before the eyes of Israel, Sun [or sunlight], over Gibeon tarry: and moon in the valley of Ajalon: and the sun is tarrying, and the moon stayed till the nation is avenged of its enemies. Is not this written in the book of the upright, and the sun is tarrying in the half of the heavens, and it does not hasten to set for a whole day, and there has not been as this day before it or after it.” More fully the Hebrew runs: “There hath not been as the day, *this day*, before the day and after it—*i.e.*, this day—at the Lord’s hearkening to the voice of a man.” God granted the marvellous extension of daylight to the prayer of Joshua.

Common-sense tells us that Joshua saw sunlight diminishing, so “sun, tarry over Gibeon,” would mean, “continue thy light.” If the sun were setting, its rays would fall on Gibeon in the East, and, continuing above the horizon, would be visible the night through, and pass on into the following day. Two days forming one day, “there hath not been as this day before or after in Israel.”

An Archdeacon wrote to me: “Now you must show scientific men how the sun’s light was continued.” I laughed. Explain a miracle! However, I turned to the “Gallery of

Nature and Art," and (vol. iv., p. 521) I read: "February 5, 1674. M. Hevelius, near Marienburg, wrote: 'Under the sun, near the horizon, there appeared a mock sun of the same size to sense as the true sun. The spurious sun grew clearer and clearer, and put on the genuine solar light.'" I can't give all the account, only enough for me to ask: "If Almighty God in Nature has granted continuance of light by mock suns, are we to limit His Divine power for continuing the rays of light of the true sun?" The examination of the Hebrew discloses the folly of anticipating the utter destruction of the universe, and that it concerns merely the rays of light, and not universal ruin!

Was it a worthy occasion for the exercise of Divine power? Undoubtedly! It was a crisis in the history of the world. If Israel had been vanquished and annihilated in that battle, what of God's promises to Abraham, of Israel's future, of the Christian dispensation? Besides, Baal, the sun—the god of the heathens—fighting for Israel must have disconcerted the heathen armies, and Joshua's decisive victory may have prevented innumerable battles and further destruction of life, so then in wisdom and compassion was granted the continuance of that long double day.

W. COLLINS BADGER,  
Rector of Bressingham.



#### ART. VIII.—SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR HEBRAISTS.

IT is well known that Hebrew, like Latin and Greek and French, has two forms for the negative particle. The one we may call the objective, the other the subjective, negative. It is on the force of these negatives respectively, and their appropriate rendering in English, that I want to offer, as the fruit of careful study, a few hints. I would offer them with all becoming modesty. Yet I would add that the habitual adherence to the principles involved has, in my own case, led to results which have been interesting and profitable.

Before going farther, it will be needful to remind readers of another well-known fact, the bearing of which will presently be seen. It is this: The Hebrew language admits no such thing as a direct *negative imperative*. What, then, is its practice? To express cautions or prohibitions by means of the future tense. (With Peter Mason, who is, perhaps, the greatest of living Hebraists, I retain that name; and, indeed, the fact just stated is one of the facts which manifestly

support the name's propriety.) Now, it is to the force of the two negative particles in connection with this tense that my remarks will refer.

In English, Henry Martyn observes, we have but two tenses, as in Persian and in Hebrew. We call our two present and past. When we want to express other tenses of other tongues we use what we call auxiliary verbs. And, in regard to the future, we have this peculiarity. In the case of simple indicative futures, we regularly use "shall" for the first person, "will" for the other two. In the case of *dependent* or *hypothetic* futures, curiously enough, we act differently. It should be noted, too, that so careful an English scholar as the late Dr. Weymouth doubted whether, at the time our "A.V." was made, this distinction between "shall" and "will" was so firmly established as it is now. This, if it be so, may account for many passages which, if the principles I am advocating be sound, should undergo the change which I am about to point to.

For one thing which I am specially driving at is the modifications which careful attention to the usage of Hebrew and English severally would bring about in the case of the cautionary and prohibitive utterances above referred to. Let us begin with the earliest.

"But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. ii. 17).

Here, as is so commonly the case in first occurrences in Holy Scripture, we have a clue to later ones. (It is one of the characteristic maxims of Thomas Boys always to note these first occurrences; it has been pointed out by a still more recent very diligent Biblicist that they generally, as has been above hinted, furnish a clue for future ones.) What strikes a student in this passage of Genesis is that it is not the subjective, but the objective, negative that is found. (Observe, too, that here the Greek has the same feature.) So, then, the idiomatic rendering in English will be: "Thou *will* not eat of it." But this raises the question: Why should we have this form rather than the other here? The answer, if I am not mistaken, is this: The Divine Speaker is addressing one who had been created in "His own image"; one who is spoken of in Luke iii. 38 as a "[son] of God." So He presupposes that *he will act in character*; will show himself, that is, a son worthy of the name. (And here it may be instructive to observe that, if I have been rightly informed, the custom in our own army is to avoid "shall." "You *will* do so-and-so," rather than "you *shall* do so-and-so," is, I am told, the military style. It is the naval usage, I believe, too.

But what is the underlying principle? Just this: "Thou art a soldier or sailor of thy King and country: thou wilt act in character.") And what a high and noble principle this is! How worthy of Him from whom all that is high and noble comes! This, at least, is how the case presents itself to my own mind. I find a sacred pleasure in so looking at it.

Let me observe, before proceeding to my next instance, that this and the foregoing verse in Genesis supply us with an instance of the *concessive* future, if we may so style it, as well: "Of every tree . . . thou *wilt* freely eat"; and also of the simple, direct future: "For in the day of thy eating of it thou *wilt* surely die."

The next instance—and for the present the only other one—which I wish to adduce is that of the Ten Commandments. And here, I think, we have a very specially instructive illustration of the value of the principles now contended for. The customary rendering, "Thou shalt not," does seem to favour the erroneous idea that the Law embodied in these Ten Commandments is more or less a *covenant of works*. Let us consider, however, to whom these "ten words" were spoken, and when and where. They were not spoken in Egypt. They were not spoken immediately after the passage of the Red Sea even. They were spoken in the desert, the type of that world in which God's people "pass the time of their sojourning." They were spoken when Joshua, the type of "the Captain of Salvation," had won his first prayer-gotten triumph over Israel's foes. They were spoken, therefore, as time and place and circumstance show, to a baptized, redeemed, covenanted people, who had begun to feed on the Divinely-sent food, and to slake their thirst with the Divinely-furnished water, and to fight the good fight of faith. And what is the principle, then, that underlies these "ten words" themselves? Just as the principle which underlies the setting apart of the Jewish nation as God's peculiar People is, as Moses so carefully points out, the principle of *Divine spontaneity*, or *grace* (see, e.g., Deut. vii. 6-8), so the principle which underlies the Ten Commandments is that principle of *characteristic action* already set forth. It is, so to say, the counterpart of the other. "As thou hast been Divinely chosen, and hence hast been redeemed, covenanted, baptized, and art being Divinely led and protected and fed, thou wilt act in character. Thou wilt have no other gods but Me. Thou wilt not make for thyself any graven image." And so throughout. While, as we have seen the *positive* side of the question, so to call it, in Gen. ii. ("Thou *wilt* freely eat," wilt eat with all the conscious freedom of a *son*), so here, too, in the two central commandments we have a similar blending of the positive

with the negative: "Remember the Sabbath day," "Honour thy father and thy mother." (In these *positives* we have one infinitival imperative, and one which *may*, it would seem, be either infinitival or ordinary. These infinitival imperatives deserve exact study.)

This view of the Commandments seems to me very helpful toward the right understanding and use of them—in teaching the Catechism, for instance, to learners. And it seems to offer a beautiful explanation of the place they are directed to hold in our Churches. For they are indissolubly connected, not with the entry, nor with the font, the typical "laver" of new birth, but with the Lord's Table—the Table at which the Lord's children, His sons and daughters, are invited to meet, to refresh themselves in their warfare and their service and their hardships. And with them on either side stand the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. So that we have the rule of *faith*, the rule of *walk*, and the *Source* whence strength for continuance in the faith and continuance in the walk must be gained.

SYDNEY THELWALL.



#### ART. IX.—THE MONTH.

THE Islington meeting is generally admitted to have been an important one. The attendance was very large—perhaps larger than ever; and it is probably true, as has been observed in the press, that a larger number of clergy were collected there than at any other similar gathering. The subjects selected on this occasion were of urgent interest and of cardinal importance. The Incarnation and the Atonement are, in practice, the cardinal points of Christianity, and the question of the true standard of Catholicity is a vital one in the Ritualistic controversy. The Vicar of Islington is to be congratulated upon having obtained a paper on the first of these subjects from Dr. Knowling, the Professor of the Exegesis of the New Testament in King's College, London. Dr. Knowling's influence as a learned and judicious scholar has been steadily growing, and the part he has taken in the current discussion on the Gospel narratives of the Incarnation has been of great service to the Church. He is thoroughly acquainted with the course of thought on the subject, and his combination of wide learning, impartial judgment, and deep spiritual conviction renders his treatment of the question peculiarly valuable at this juncture. The Bishop of Durham's paper on the Atonement was very weighty, and ought to assist in bringing that vital truth into a position in current

religious thought more correspondent to its prominence in the New Testament. There is far too great a tendency in current religious thought to let the truth of the Atonement be subordinated to that of the Incarnation. This tendency is connected with an inadequate appreciation of sin, and an almost Pelagian tendency to exalt the capacities of human nature. Whatever may be theoretically conceivable, the supreme necessity of the Incarnation is practically to be seen in the deep corruption of human nature and the absolute necessity of a Divine atonement for sin. That is the practical reality which holds the foremost place in the theology of the New Testament, and unless it holds a similar place in our own theology, the balance of doctrine in our hearts and minds must be dangerously disturbed.

There is doubtless a deep connection with such erroneous views in the alarming tendency in some quarters, even among clergymen, to treat the belief in the Virgin Birth of our Lord as anything less than vital to Christianity. The practical meaning of that belief to Christian minds can perhaps only be appreciated in proportion as "the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam" is duly appreciated. In proportion as that is felt, the Christian mind must feel an inexpressible recoil from any conception of our Lord which treats Him as naturally belonging to that offspring; and those who are tampering with this belief may well be warned in time that they are in danger of awakening a depth of indignation, or even outrage, feeling which will unite the vast mass of the Church in vehement revolt. But apart from this aspect of the matter, it is very difficult to understand how any persons with the intelligence of Canon Henson, or Mr. Beeby, can for a moment suppose it to be compatible with the obligations clergymen have undertaken to admit any doubt on the subject into their teaching. It must, indeed, we think, be admitted that the Bishop of Worcester, and the Higher Critics whom he shelters, are giving a very questionable example of non-natural interpretation of the formularies, in maintaining that their views on the Old Testament are compatible with a candid reply to the question of the Ordination Service: "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?" But in the present case there can be no question of a non-natural interpretation. It is surely undeniable, either that the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke distinctly assert the doctrine of the Virgin Birth as a matter of historical fact, or that the whole Catholic Church accepted and asserted the statement in the Creeds in the sense of those two Gospels. If a man rejects it, he cuts himself off from

historical Christianity. It is conceivable he may found a new religion; but the Christianity of the Church it cannot be.

A letter in the *Times* the other day gives reason for apprehension that, in reliance on one incident in the case of *Essays and Reviews*, an attempt may be made to assert before the courts the compatibility of subscription with such views as those of Mr. Beeby. Mr. Wilson was practically charged with evacuating the historical meaning of the narratives of our Lord's Birth, by ascribing to them an ideal significance, and the charge seems to have been dismissed on the ground that it concerned simply a question of the interpretation of Scripture, and that "to maintain a figurative sense of parts of Scripture is not to deny their canonicity." But however this may be, the question which is now raised is whether a truth, or rather a fact, specifically asserted in the Creeds and the Articles can legitimately be questioned by a clergyman. We earnestly trust the writer in the *Times* is mistaken in supposing that there is even a possibility of a legal decision to such an effect. But if there be the slightest chance of it, the thanks of the Church are due to the Bishop of Worcester and, we may add, to Mr. Beeby, to the one for asserting, and the other for practically acknowledging, the moral inadmissibility of the position in question. Could it be rendered legally permissible for clergy of the English Church to question in their teaching the fact of the Virgin Birth, her position as a true branch of the Catholic Church would be destroyed if she acquiesced in such a permission. A conflict would then arise between Church and State, such as would rend the existing settlement to its foundations, and in which all sections of the Church but a small minority would be united in a deep and unyielding resistance, whatever the temporal consequences it might involve. The writer of the letter to the *Times* says that "what was 'criticism' is now 'religion,' with a philosophy, a piety, an enthusiasm of its own." A religion it may be, but it is not the Christian religion; and to the question with which he concludes—"Will the Church of England drive it out?"—we can only reply that the Church of England is under a sacred obligation to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's word."





## Notices of Books.

---

*Sunday Observance: An Argument and Plea for the Old English Sunday.* By the Rev. F. MEYRICK, M.A., Rector of Blickling, and Non-Residentiary Canon of Lincoln. London: Skeffington and Son. Pp. xv, 218. Price 5s.

Canon Meyrick's most useful book is evidently written out of the fulness of his heart, as an antidote to some recent publications which represent Sunday to be merely an ecclesiastical festival. That the Lord's Day is an institution resting upon the authority of the Apostolic Church, the Jewish Sabbath having been abrogated, was maintained by Bishop Jeremy Taylor. But the line he took differed widely from that adopted by various writers of the present day. "We do," he says in his "Rule and Exercises of Holy Living," "upon great reason comply with the Jewish manner of confessing the creation so far as it is instrumental to a real duty. We keep one day in seven, and so confess the manner and circumstances of the creation, and we rest also that we may tend holy duties." The modern writer who relegates to a supposed priestly code of late date the account of the seventh day in Genesis and denies the authenticity of the narrative occupies another position altogether. We sympathize with the just indignation of the author of this volume at the flippancy with which the whole subject is treated by the members of a certain school. Canon Meyrick traces back the institution to a Sabbatical law given by God at the beginning of the world, binding on all men conscious of His revelation. The law contained in the Fourth Commandment binds the Christian Church, but has now to be interpreted spiritually instead of literally, as a living principle of conduct enthroned in the heart. Part of the book consists of an historical survey relating to the Christian observance of the Lord's Day from primitive times down to the period of the Reformation, and followed by a catena of passages from English divines. The question of Sunday amusements is dealt with in a long chapter of great interest and importance. Avowed secularists act consistently in endeavouring to break down the barriers, but this can hardly be said of their professedly Christian allies, and Canon Meyrick's criticisms on some of their very illogical utterances are marked by much quiet humour. In support of his plea for the old English Sunday, he quotes the testimonies of Archbishop Benson, Lord Selborne, Miss Yonge, and others. Lord Selborne's—which extends over ten pages—is an elaborate statement of the reasons for his action in Parliament when opposing the Sunday opening of national institutions. It will well repay careful perusal. Our experience is that many people who are anxious to defend or promote the observance of Sunday do not know where to go for facts and arguments; they will find here what they want.

*The English Church from the Accession of Charles I. to the Death of Anne (1625-1714).* By the Rev. WILLIAM HOLDEN HUTTON, B.D., Fellow, Tutor, and Prælector of St. John's College, Oxford, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. Pp. ix, 368. Price 7s. 6d.

This is the sixth volume of the new "History of the English Church" in course of publication by Messrs. Macmillan. The fifth, in which Mr. Walter Frere is to tell the story of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., has not yet made its appearance, but may be expected shortly. From the historical point of view the Elizabethan period fully equals the Caroline in importance and interest, if not actually surpassing it, yet for most people the latter possesses a greater attraction. It is the one period in the annals of the Church of England which is enveloped by a halo of romance. Poetry and sentiment have cast a charm over it. Its *dramatis personæ* are familiar names to thousands who know nothing of the less picturesque, but not less able and devoted, Churchmen of a preceding generation. In his narrative of the ninety years following the accession of Charles I., Mr. Hutton has had a wealth of material ready to his hand. The histories of Clarendon and Burnet, to say nothing of later writers, such as Dr. Gardiner and Lord Macaulay, cover between them the whole of the time embraced in this volume. Evelyn's "Diary" all but covers it, while the mass of contemporary memoirs, journals, controversial literature, and State Papers, is almost overwhelming. Under such circumstances the difficulties of selection and arrangement are considerable, but Mr. Hutton has successfully seized upon the salient points and given us a very interesting book. His study of the period is, on the whole, marked by much fairness. In a chapter on "The Church and the Clergy before the Civil Wars" he draws attention to some forgotten facts, describing the amount of quiet religious work that was going on below the surface, and the narrowness of the division in spiritual things between different sections of Churchpeople. He speaks highly of Puritanism at its best as "a powerful, and in many respects a righteous, force," encouraging a stern simplicity, and remarks that "much that was beautiful as well as strong in later English life was not a little due" to households trained on its principles. It is sometimes the fashion to represent the loyal devotion to the Church manifested by so many of her children during the Commonwealth time as the result of Laud's influence. Its growth is shown in these pages to be of much earlier date, and traceable to other sources. The truth is that no small number of those who suffered under the Protectorate disapproved of the policy which had involved Church and King in a common overthrow.

Charles I. is dealt with here rather severely. Whatever his political offences may have been, we do not think that the troubles in the Church can be laid at his door. Mr. Hutton, while admitting the violence of Laud's methods, considers that his aims were realized to a large extent even in the few years while he was in power. He credits the Archbishop

with having "seen clearly where the dividing-line lay," for his measures "made it clear to Englishmen that a rigid Calvinism and a Presbyterian hierarchy were alike inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England." The conclusion arrived at corresponds more or less with the view expressed in the epigrammatic phrase that Laud found the Church fluid and left it solid. But the illegalities perpetrated by the High Commission Court, and the contempt for law of which Clarendon complains, arousing the hatred of almost the whole legal profession, are passed over far too lightly by the author; neither do we share his apparent admiration for Archbishop Neile of York. The concise account of the interregnum makes very good reading, and contains a useful sketch of the religious system then set up, with remarks on Cromwell's theory of liberty of conscience. He looked for "the formation of a federated religious body which should be Puritan in its essential principles, excluding English Churchmen and Romanists, and should labour under State control to advance the righteousness of the people." The events of the last two Stuart reigns have been so often described that little room is left for a fresh treatment of them, and the most important portions of the latter half of the book are those relating to Church affairs between 1688 and 1714. Of the Nonjurors too favourable a picture is drawn. The Comprehension Bill and the proposals for Prayer-Book revision in 1689 are noticed at some length; but we fancy that Mr. Hutton has not seen the full text of the Comprehension Bill as printed by the Historical Manuscripts Commission in an appendix to their twelfth report. He has also devoted a separate chapter to the Convocation controversies which extended over several years, and the questions involved in these unseemly wrangles—some of them important ones—are explained with much care. Before Anne's death the romance and glamour of the Caroline period had begun to fade into the light of common day.

There are just a few points that call for friendly criticism. We do not think Mr. Hutton is correct in saying that the canons of 1640 appear to be still in force. The last section in the Statute of 1661 (13 Charles II., c. 12) was carefully worded; but its obvious effect was to annul those of the 1640 canons which related to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or extended unconstitutionally the operation of the Penal Laws, and to put things back to the state they were in at the end of 1639. The cultivation of amicable relations with the Eastern Church, with which the Nonjurors are credited here, really began in the time of Charles I. The *Codex Alexandrinus* was given to the King by Cyril Lucar. Men like Isaac Basire, Bishop Morton's chaplain, and others who had served as chaplains in the Levant, took a keen interest in Eastern Christianity, and the Prayer-Book had been translated into Greek. In the paragraph on South, whose sermons have fallen nowadays into sad neglect, we should like to have seen a more adequate recognition of his great gifts. It is said that "he died a Canon of Christ Church, where, indeed, he had preferred to be." But he was Prebendary of Westminster as well as Canon of Christ Church, and it is at Westminster that he lies buried. One remarkable

incident should have received fuller notice. The case of Bishop Watson is almost the solitary instance of the deprivation of a Bishop by judicial sentence since the abolition of the High Commission Court, and the only one in which the questions of jurisdiction involved in such a proceeding were discussed in a court of law. The opinions pronounced by the judges have been handed down in the legal reports of the time. Mr. Hutton's too brief reference to Bishop Watson makes no allusion to these circumstances, and the omission of something like a summary of the particulars is to be regretted. Though it is only a trifling matter, we dislike the change in the spelling of our old friend Denis Granville's name. An improved index is also a desideratum. But as an introduction to the study of the eventful period with which it deals we would warmly commend this volume.

*William Wilberforce: The Story of a Great Crusade.* By TRAVERS BUXTON, M.A., Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. London: The Religious Tract Society. Pp. 187. 2s. 6d.

It is some time since such a thoroughly good popular biography made its appearance. Mr. Travers Buxton has given us not only a narrative of the long fight for the abolition of slavery, but a graphic sketch of the personality of the leader to whose untiring fortitude and patience the victory was largely due. Many of those who took an active part in the earlier stages of the struggle passed away before it ended. Wilberforce himself had the happiness of living just long enough to see the good cause triumph, receiving the news a week previously to his death. We are afraid that the present generation knows little about him, and Mr. Buxton has rendered a real service in resuscitating his memory. Wilberforce's surroundings, both in early and later life, are well described, as are also his religious and political opinions, and the various philanthropic enterprises in which he engaged. It is interesting to note that, besides being one of the earliest promoters of the Church Missionary and Bible Societies, he led the way in London hospital reform, and did much for the spread of education among the poor. To many readers the extracts from his correspondence, skilfully interwoven by Mr. Buxton with the narrative, will prove a source of attraction. These extracts, as remarkable for their mild wisdom as for their piety, relate to a number of subjects, public and personal. We observe amongst them a curious criticism on Gibbon, who is described as "coxcomb all over: but of great learning as well as very great show of it. He has the merit, also, of never declining a difficulty. But his style is abominably affected . . . and then his paganism is vastly more confirmed than that of Tully, or any other of the old school." There is much about Pitt and Burke, John Newton, the Milners, Hannah More, and some of Wilberforce's immediate allies in the campaign against slavery, including Granville Sharp and Clarkson. Mr. Buxton takes some pains to clear Clarkson from the charge made against him by Wilberforce's sons of depreciating their father's work in order to magnify his own, and shows the accusation to have been unjust.

The book contains a few good illustrations. We desire to draw attention to this truly excellent account of a great Christian patriot and benefactor of humanity, whose memory should be treasured by every Englishman.

*Steps towards Christian Unity.* By ARTHUR C. TURBERVILLE. London: Elliot Stock. Pp. xiii, 208.

The views on home reunion expressed in these pages are the views of a thoughtful Nonconformist who desires to see the attainment of a real and effective unity. Mr. Turberville thinks that the perpetuation of our divisions is due to inherited estrangements rather than to any vital divergence of faith, and the object of his book is to mediate between those who really believe alike, but seldom work or worship together. He discusses the points of agreement between the Church of England and orthodox Nonconformity, with an outline of a scheme which he considers might form a possible basis for intercommunion. The two chief deficiencies of the English Church are said to be a lack of Christian fellowship and a failure to recognise the rights of the laity. Efforts in the direction of reunion must, in Mr. Turberville's opinion, proceed in the first instance from the unofficial rank and file, and are not to be looked for from a body such as the Free Church Council, since the leaders of that organization are mainly occupied in the promotion of "sectional interests." Many interesting quotations bearing on the question are given, and the spirit in which the book is written is admirable. Its contents claim the notice of Churchpeople.

*'Neath Palm and Pine.* By A. G. PENNY. London: The Religious Tract Society. Pp. 63.

Our readers should note this extremely well-written description of missionary work in Indian villages in the neighbourhood of Gorakhpur. We gather from internal evidence that the writer is a lady. She tells her story in a straightforward and simple style, contriving to convey a very vivid idea of her surroundings. Pictures are given us of the daily routine at different times of the year, of work in the schools and the zenanas, and one chapter contains a bright account of a holiday in the Himalayas. The booklet is beautifully printed, but ought to have a more substantial cover.

*The Church Navy: Thoughts on the Pioneer Work of the Church.* By the Rev. CHARLES T. OVENDEN, D.D., Canon of St. Patrick's. London: S.P.C.K. Pp. xiv, 236.

The peculiar title of this volume affords little indication of the nature of its contents. It is a collection of plain sermons on different departments of parochial work and the obstacles most commonly encountered. Church choirs, education, interest in foreign missions, are amongst the subjects chosen. There are two very good addresses on moral cowardice and "The Unfair Critic." Canon Ovenden's observations are the outcome of a long pastoral experience, and he describes with accuracy a condition of things that may be found in many town and country parishes. His sermons, which are of the simplest description, are full of good sense and sound advice.