

that new ministry was the result of a reaction for which the established order was largely responsible.¹

These are questions which thoughtful minds are already discussing. It would be a mistake to press conclusions or to forestall practical results. These will come as the inevitable consequences of convictions formed outside the heat of party conflict, as in the case of many other once burning questions, which have been silently determined by an unwritten consensus, and thereby revolutionized modes, of religious thought.

But these also are academical questions, the discussion and decision of which do not touch either of the two pressing demands of the day, both of which lie beyond the strict limits of the Oxford Movement.

These two demands are concerned, one with the attitude of the Church towards agnosticism and scientific unbelief, the other with the evangelization of the masses. As regards the first, there is need of a school of philosophy, Christian by conviction, whose task it will be to restate and reaffirm the foundations of belief. For the second there is need of a revival, and, therefore, of some great teacher-prophet who shall have power to stir the latent Christianity of the masses, and to create disciples who will follow in his steps. It is from the people, and not from the Universities, that we may hope for the new revolution, for, as Bishop Westcott has taught us, "the movements which have changed the world have drawn their forces from the poor."²

ARTHUR CARR.

ART. III.—A POINT OF TECHNICAL ACCURACY IN THE GOSPELS—*πλοῖον* AND *πλοιάριον*.

IN an illuminative article on "St. Luke's Gospel and Modern Criticism" in the *CHURCHMAN* for February, 1903, Mr. Jennings makes the following statement. On p. 256, footnote 2, he writes: "John vi. 22-24 shows that there is no distinction in his use between *πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον*." This is the *prima facie* view, and it has tradition to support it. But writers of commentaries, transcribers of the New Testament who introduced into a margin running in parallel columns with the text their own conjectures of what the author meant, and compilers of lexicons, have not generally as practical a knowledge about boats as they have about

¹ "Ministerial Priesthood," p. 58.

² "Lessons from Life," p. 56.

Greek words; possibly they regard all boats as similar in kind, but differing in some undefined way in degree. Theoretically they are right, practically they are wrong. And as fishing-boats are used by fishermen who, from the nature of their occupation, have a practical intuition of the adaptability of certain boats for certain purposes, we shall not, therefore, be surprised if St. John and other fishermen on the Lake of Galilee had different sorts of boats suited to the different requirements of their work, and that he distinguished between them by the above-mentioned Greek words respectively. It is, moreover, proverbial that the landsman knows little, very little indeed, about a seaman's business, and that these two classes of the community hardly understand each other's language. And as in marine cases litigated ashore it is found to be necessary that a nautical assessor shall sit with and assist the civil judge, so also in matters of exegesis the same principle may be applied innocuously to operations of research and criticism conducted by scholars, historians, and expositors. It is necessary to clear the atmosphere of all misconceptions, be they established by tradition or recent opinion, before the proper meaning and relation of a word can be duly understood with reference to its context. The meaning of a word may, in the lapse of time, so vary that it bears in later writers almost a different idea to what it did in earlier ones. Classical Greek words may have a technical sense when used by a writer like St. John, whose vocabulary was limited when compared with St. Paul or St. Luke. We therefore see no reason why he should have attached the exact shade of meaning to the word *πλοιαριον* that Aristophanes did some four hundred years previously. We maintain that he was at liberty to use it as a suitable vehicle for conveying a local idea contemporary with his own age, and explanatory of the object he had in view, even if it did not quite harmonize with the meaning which classical writers attached to it.

The substantive *πλοϊον* is derived from the verb *πλέω*, I fill, possibly connected with the idea of filling with a hollow cavity the space from which the heavier water has been displaced, this being the fundamental condition of floating. This word, used from Homer downwards, means generally a ship for carrying cargo or merchandise, in contradistinction to *ναῦς* (*νάω* or *νέω*, I float), which describes a larger vessel for fighting purposes, or a military transport ship (Acts xxvii. 41). Our object is to ascertain the exact notion that was present to St. John's mind when he wrote *πλοιάριον*. Was he familiar with its classical meaning when he used it four times in his Gospel to express the Hebrew notion of the boats then in use on the Lake of Galilee? The following considerations suggest

a negative answer. His writings do not afford an extensive evidence of his familiarity with Greek literature. His early life was spent among the fishing industry of the Lake of Galilee. His interests were Jewish. His influence in official circles was able to obtain admission for St. Peter and himself to hear the formal judicial examination of Jesus before Caiaphas. His home in Galilee was the stronghold of Hebrew instincts and traditions, and its fishing population possessed the energy and independence necessary to express them. But, on the other hand, it may be urged that before he wrote his gospel he had been sufficiently brought in touch with Gentile influences, Roman manners, and the Greek language to justify the opinion that he used the word with whatever technical meaning it therein had. My conviction, however, founded on the internal evidence of the fourth gospel, is that he uses it in a special manner and in contradistinction to *πλοῖον*, with which it is contrasted in the passages where it is found.

This contention requires justification. We must seek for explanation in those passages which contain both the words under discussion. I would venture to suggest as an English equivalent for *πλοῖον*, in those places where it is conjoined with *πλοιάριον*, *fishing-smack*, or simply *smack*. It may not be possible to translate other passages in the New Testament by the same equivalent uniformly, but it may generally be adopted where matters of the Galilean fishery are concerned. This industry seems to have been most flourishing at the northern end of the Lake, and the gospels infer, moreover, that it was practised in certain families in hereditary succession. We are, therefore, entitled to surmise that a traditional form of boat or smack would be handed down from father to son, and persist with little or no alteration for many generations; and that a Galilean fisherman would describe it by *πλοῖον*, whatever the original signification of that word might be. It is beside our present inquiry to enter into the details of naval construction either of Greek boats or of the fishing-smacks in the Gospel narrative; but the latter would be built to suit the local circumstances of the conformation of the bottom of the Lake of Galilee, the shelving beach, the ground swell, the prevailing winds, and the description of nets they would have to carry and work. The "currahs," still used on the west coast of Ireland, where there is deep water, would be useless either in the bays or river estuaries on the west coast of England, which become dry at low water, or on our east coast, where the ground swell requires a boat with a deep keel forward and a flat bilge in the after-part. This class or build of boat is termed a "cobble," and is beached stern first. The "currah" is not beached at all, but is lifted out of the

water as soon as it comes alongside of the landing-place. Both these classes of boats differ from the "punt," a build of boat used in the estuaries of our west coast rivers. This digression has been inserted only with the view of illustrating my contention that boats "would be built to suit the local circumstances of the Lake of Galilee." There is no evidence in the Gospels that the *πλοιάριον* was ever used for fishing purposes, which, according to the evangelists, were conducted from a "smack." But this want of information does not warrant our assuming that the class of boat indicated by this latter word was never used, or was unsuitable for, such purposes. According to St. John, they seem to be tenders to the "smacks"—*i.e.*, for ferrying or conveying persons to or from them. The word is only found six or seven times in the New Testament, and in the majority of them *πλοῖον* is the alternative marginal reading. Considering, then, only the use of such boats indicated in these passages, and quite independently of the classical meaning the word previously had, or what meaning was subsequently attached to it, I venture to think that our word "dinghy" would best convey the idea of the evangelist. Thus it will be seen that the *πλοῖον*, or "smack," was, as regards the purposes for which it was used, quite distinct from the *πλοιάριον*, or "dinghy."

To make this distinction clear, a more detailed examination of the passages containing the latter word will be required. In John vi. 16 *et seq.*, after the feeding of the five thousand in the neighbourhood of Bethsaida Julias, on the north-eastern shore of the Lake of Galilee, the Lord told His disciples to return to Capernaum, on the western side of the lake, a distance of between four and five miles. They then "went down to the beach, and, getting into a *smack* (or perhaps '*the smack*') went towards Capernaum, on the opposite shore. . . . Having rowed about three miles and three-quarters, they observe, between three and six o'clock in the morning, Jesus walking on the water; and being close to the *smack*, they were afraid . . . and they were willing to receive Him into the *smack*; and immediately the *smack* was at the land for which they were making." The above extract from John vi. 16-21 is that evangelist's account of the sea-passage from Bethsaida Julias to Capernaum, he himself being one of the party. The parallel passages in the synoptists are Matt. xiv. 24-33 and Mark vi. 47-52. Now, it will be noticed that *πέραν* in John vi. 17 refers to Capernaum, the destination of Jesus and His disciples, whereas *πέραν* in verse 22 means Bethsaida Julias, the place from which the party started. In John vi. 17, 19, 21 there is no suggestion, as far as I know, of *πλοιάριον* being in any case an alternative

marginal reading for *πλοίου*. Moreover, Jesus, when crossing the lake, seems uniformly to have performed the journey in a *smack*, possibly because of the number of disciples who attended Him. If John intended to convey no distinction between his use of the two words in question, we are surprised at the silence of transcribers and commentators in not suggesting a similar variation of the text that they do in other places. But it is quite possible that marginal readings may have been originally a genuine attempt to accentuate, or at least preserve, the distinction I plead for. The venial mistakes made in the transcription of manuscripts probably first gave rise to the general impression that the two words involved no distinction.

In illustration of John vi. 16 *et seq.* we will compare John xxi. 3, 8. There we find the two words in juxtaposition, and presumably in contrast and involving a distinction. This occasion is one of the appearances of the Risen Lord. Seven of His disciples had gone out for a night's fishing. They used a *δίκτυον*—*i.e.*, a striking net, which drifted with the current. The fish would strike against it: its mesh would be too small to allow their bodies to pass through, yet sufficiently large to permit them to insert their heads as far as their gills, when they would find their progress checked; they would then naturally endeavour to turn round—for a fish cannot swim backwards—and this act would entangle their gills in the mesh of the net, and they would remain prisoners in it. This description of net was, according to the evidence of the Gospels, generally used from a *smack*, though it is quite possible that a smaller amount or lesser length of this netting might be worked with a *dinghy*. When, however, John recognised the Person of the Risen Redeemer on the beach in the early morning, and suggested to Peter that it was the Lord, the latter Apostle waded ashore out of the *smack*, while the remaining six came ashore in a *dinghy*, a distance of about one hundred yards. This circumstance shows that a *dinghy* was able to approach nearer to the shore than a *smack*. We therefore conjecture that it was used to save the fishermen wading as Peter did on the present occasion, that it drew less water, and that it was a convenient vehicle for ferrying the fishermen and their fish between their *smacks* and the shore. If the *dinghy* was in every respect equivalent to the *smack* it is hard to imagine why St. John should have used these two words in describing one boat—if there was but one indeed, as those who maintain that no distinction exists between the two Greek words seem to argue—in the Gospel narrative. My contention, however, is that there were two boats: one the *smack* which they used when

fishing; the other the *dinghy* that they went ashore in. The author was a practical fisherman, and familiar from childhood with the classes of boats in question, and that his use of the distinguishing words was not only on his part intentional, but that it is an incidental disclosure that the fourth Gospel was written by a fisherman, thereby affording additional proof of its genuineness and of its authenticity.

We will now recur to the occasion of the passage in the *smack* from Bethsaida Julias to Capernaum (John vi.). The multitudes which stood on the opposite shore—*i.e.*, at Bethsaida Julias—naturally wondered where Jesus went to after He had supplied their wants in such an unexpected manner. John, the author of the narrative, is now at (or near) Capernaum, and he is describing events as they appeared to him from that place. When, therefore, he uses the expression *πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης*, he refers to Bethsaida Julias, because it is on the other side of the sea from Capernaum. He states that “on the morrow”—*i.e.*, the day after the feeding of the five thousand—those who had been fed, and who had remained at Bethsaida Julias, observed that there was no other *dinghy* there, except the one that the disciples of Jesus got into previous to their departure in the *smack*. It is clear that they did go away in it to Capernaum, or it could not have been at the eastern Bethsaida. John, moreover, tells us that the voyage was performed in a *smack*, and with this the synoptists agree verbally. We can only conjecture, then, that the Apostle and Evangelist's use of the two words in chap. vi. is analogous to that of chap. xxi. In vi. 22 he states that there was no other *dinghy* at Bethsaida Julias except the one that the Lord's disciples got into, and that they went away alone in the *smack*. In xxi. 3, 8 he tells us that seven disciples went out for a night's fishing in a *smack*, and that six of them went ashore early the following morning in a *dinghy*. What can be more clear than the almost irresistible conclusion that on both occasions, in the same neighbourhood, under similar circumstances, and at no great interval of time apart, a *dinghy* was used for embarking into or disembarking from a *smack*, a *dinghy* was used as an accessory boat? In John vi. 22 the majority of manuscripts read *πλοῖον*, but the edition of Rob. Stephanus in 1550 reads *πλοῦριον*; this is evidence of the traditional view that the Evangelist intended to imply no distinction between the two words, but this view, it is contended, is based on the want of technical experience of transcribers and commentators. Opinions founded on the similarity of Greek words, quite irrespective of the classical meaning they bear, are not safe guides for the exegetical interpretation of those words, where

it is evident that an author is writing purely from a local and technical standpoint, and uses them to convey a particular signification. John vi. 23 states that other *dinghies* arrived from Tiberias, near the place where they ate bread—*i.e.*, they were sailed or rowed over by those who were interested in or inquisitive about the doings of Jesus. Tiberias is on the western shore of the Lake of Galilee, and the wind that was contrary to the disciples' *smack* in its western progress would be favourable to the eastern (or north-eastern) progress of the Tiberias *dinghies*. There is a difficulty arising out of the topography of Bethsaida and Tiberias which is connected with the narrative we are considering, and therefore not entirely irrelevant to the subject of the present discussion. We will therefore confine ourselves, by way of explanation, to the remark that these two places were distant about eight miles across the lake; our authority for locating the former place in the district of Gaulonitis, near where the upper Jordan empties itself into the lake, is Grimm's Lexicon of the New Testament (*s.v.*) Βηθσαϊδά. In Luke ix. 10 *et seq.* we read that Jesus took His Apostles away privately to a place belonging to the city called Bethsaida, and that crowds followed Him there, where He fed five thousand people. In Mark vi. 45 we are informed that the Lord, after the feeding of the five thousand, constrained His disciples to go to the other side of the lake, "unto Bethsaida." Luke does not record the event of the Lord's walking on the water; but Mark does, and, moreover, he states that it happened on the occasion of the disciples being sent in a *smack* to Bethsaida. John likewise records it, but with the variation that the disciples were rowing towards Capernaum. We therefore are entitled to conjecture that there were two places bearing the name of Bethsaida (or fishtown)—the one mentioned in Luke ix. 10, to which the Lord withdrew His Apostles and where He fed the five thousand; the other named in Mark vi. 45, to which He sent them after He had fed the five thousand. From John vi. 17 we conclude that the Bethsaida mentioned by St. Mark was near Capernaum, and from John vi. 23, 24 that it was on the same western side of the lake as Tiberias. John vi. 22-24 is an involved sentence, but the accuracy of its statements is a proof of its genuineness and of its being written by one who was familiar with the topography of the neighbourhood.

We must now resume the thread of the Gospel narrative. When the people at Bethsaida Julius saw the arrival of the *dinghies* from Tiberias, they persuaded those who had brought them over to give them a passage to Capernaum, probably thinking that they would find the Lord there, judging from

the direction in which His disciples had gone away in the *smack*. The word *πλοίαρια* in John vi. 23 has an alternative marginal reading *πλοία* (Ν ἐπελθόντων οὖν τῶν πλοίων); the same word reads *πλοῖα* in the third edition of Rob. Stephanus. The circumstance that *dinghies* should have gone over from Tiberias in sufficient numbers to be capable of conveying any appreciable part of five thousand persons from one side of the lake to the other indicates the fact that either *smacks* were not much used at Tiberias, or that they were temporarily engaged in fishing, while the *dinghies* were unoccupied. Another possible explanation is that fishing operations were suspended to enable the fishermen to duly attend to their religious duties consequent upon the season of the Passover, to celebrate which the crowds were making their way up to Jerusalem. The distinction, or the identity, of meaning between the two words which is the subject of the present article certainly has occupied the attention of New Testament transcribers and editors from the earliest times down to the middle of the sixteenth century, but their evidence throws no further light upon the subject beyond confirming the traditional ambiguity that exists concerning their meaning. The solution to that difficulty, to my mind, can only be settled by careful attention to the internal testimony of the fourth gospel witnessed by the testimony and authority of the fisherman Evangelist. This, then, sums up the case as far as his gospel is concerned.

It now only remains to collate the evidence of the synoptists and note its bearing upon what St. John wrote. The passages for examination are Mark iii. 9, iv. 36; Luke v. 2. (1) In Mark iii. 9 we read that Jesus was densely thronged by a representative audience from all parts of Palestine, and even from the Syro-Phœnician towns of Tyre and Sidon. The scene is laid by St. Mark at "the sea"—*i.e.*, the Lake of Galilee. The exact spot is not disclosed, but we may reasonably suppose, by the presence of a *dinghy* there, that the place was either the western Bethsaida, Capernaum, or Tiberias. The Lord possibly wished to address the multitudes from the boat, or else to employ it as a means for placing Himself at a respectful distance from them, so that He might enter into more intimate relationship with the twelve Apostles. On the assumption that Mark wrote under the inspiration of St. Peter, we here trace the influence of the practical fisherman in the Greek word used by the Evangelist. At any rate, the word "dinghy" seems to betray that familiar association with the fishing industry of the Lake of Galilee that we should expect from one who had been practically connected with it. We are not told that the Lord on this occasion made any lengthy

journey in the boat, and, to my knowledge, *πλοῖον* is not read in the margin of any manuscript as a variation from the text. (2) Mark iv. 36 contains the second of the two instances where the Evangelist uses the words under discussion; and here we again meet with the same variety between text and margin that we found in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel. Here the authorized version (so-called) reads, "And when He had sent away the multitude, they (the disciples) took Him even as He was in the ship. And there were also with Him other little ships." The marginal substitution of *dinghy* for *smack* rests mainly on the authority of R. Stephanus, whose edition (in the absence of any evidence to the contrary) is presumed to have been the text used by the translators of 1611. The circumstances of the Gospel incident are as follows: The Lord was crossing the Lake of Galilee in a *smack* with His disciples, and other vessels were sailing or being rowed in company with His *smack*; during the passage a storm of wind arose, which He rebuked, and He calmed the sea. The parallel passages in the other two synoptists uniformly use the word *smack* to describe the vessel conveying the Lord on this occasion, but neither of them contrast it with the other word *dinghy*. St. Mark's Gospel contains both words according to the edition above quoted, but the evidence preponderates in favour of the word *smack* being read in both instances. The mere fact that "*dinghy*" should have been introduced in the second instance, notwithstanding the weight of testimony against it, seems to be additional proof that the person responsible for it admitted the distinction between the words, and imported it into the text by using them both instead of one only; no other important consequences are attached to this variation. (3) In Luke v. 2 we are again confronted with a conflicting reading as to which of the two words truly and genuinely represents the original text. This passage receives a certain amount of illustration by the reference it contains about the nets (Luke v. 4) mentioned in it. We will give its general outline and drift, and then examine its statements in detail in order to extract its full meaning. A crowd of persons were thronging the Lord on the shore of the Lake of Galilee. He wished to instruct them, and was doubtless looking about for an advantageous place from which to do so. His eye fell upon two *dinghies* close to the shore, but the fishermen were gone out of them and were washing their nets. There was nobody to take charge of them and to manage them while He was speaking. He then noticed Simon Peter in his *smack*, so He got into it with him, and sitting down therein He taught the people who were standing on the beach, while the future

Apostle maintained it in a suitable position for Him to do so. It will be further noticed that nets (observe the plural τὰ δίκτυα) were afterwards used from the *smack*, which caught a miraculous draught of fishes. Now, it seems at first sight as if there could not, at least here, be any distinction between the two Greek words, but this view is dissipated upon a closer examination of the passage. Two empty *dinghies* were standing beside the Lake, but the Lord did not get into either of them. He next observed some *smacks*, "and getting into *one of them*, which was Simon's, He asked him to put out a little way from the land." This passage demands further explanation owing to the confusion introduced into it by the authorized version and the Greek text which is presumed to underlie it. When the substitution of "*smack*" for "*ship*" is made that version reads: "He . . . saw two *smacks* standing by the lake; but the fishermen were gone out of them . . . and He entered into one of the *smacks*, which was Simon's, and prayed him," etc. This involves a contradiction by saying that the Lord saw two *smacks* without any fishermen in them, and finding Simon on board one of them, He prayed him that he would thrust out a little from the land. But this contradiction vanishes when, translating from Tischendorf's text, we read πλοῖα instead of πλοῖα with R. Stephanus, as I have ventured to paraphrase the passage above. This reading of Tischendorf best satisfies the demands of common-sense by indicating that a distinction between those two words existed in the mind of St. Luke. The plural "*nets*," in Luke v. 4, should be compared with the singular "*net*" in John xxi. 6. The former evangelist has vindicated his claim to be a first-rate historian by his careful collection of the materials for his history, and his accurate expression of them in the technical language used among Galilean fishermen and in the Gospel of St. John the fisherman. The former records that "*nets*" were used to obtain two *smacks* full of fish; the latter that "*a net*" was employed to catch 153 fish. The nets in Luke v. 4 would be temporally fastened together while fishing, and separated when they were cleared, mended, or washed; this practice still prevails with striking nets. In John xxi. 6 only one net is used, with a proportionately small catch of fish, and is cleared on the beach. The careful regard to minuteness of detail shows that each evangelist is relating a distinct event, and each, moreover, mentions the technical words *smack* and *dinghy*.

I do not press either of them as being the best English equivalent for their Greek congeners, but simply use them to convey the distinction that I plead for. More competent scholars than myself may correct me in these matters, and

their corrections will be most sincerely welcomed; but yet when anyone writes he must express his own opinions. My efforts have been confined to an examination of the internal evidence of the Gospel narratives, and my criticisms are rather those of a nautical assessor than of a judge. Persons living solely in the atmosphere of grammars, lexicons, commentaries, and the apparatus of textual criticism may be excused for their want of technical information about boats and nets. With the classical use of these words this article does not deal, nor yet with the external influence that Greek literature may have had on the mind of the fourth evangelist; the subject would far exceed the limits of a single article, and would only be remotely connected with the object it has in view.

J. E. GREEN.

ART. IV.—ABRAHAM, MOSES, AND CHRIST.¹

THERE are many religions in the world. Most of them have some elements of truth in them. It would be strange if they had not. As systems of belief and practice they differ much from one another. The religion of the Bible, though one of these, differs from all the rest more widely and radically than any other. It is obvious that all these religions, though with some truth in them, might be false. But if one is true, it follows logically that all must be false so far as they differ from it.

The religion of the Bible claims to be the one true religion, and it rests that claim upon the fact that it has been divinely revealed. It has not been thought out by man. It is not the result of any evolutionary process of human reasoning, or experience, or the remembrance of ancient myths and traditions, but has been made known to man from the beginning by the One, True, Living God.

This great truth lies at the root of our Christian Faith, which perishes if that root is destroyed.

It will help us to realize this if we consider how much our Christianity rests upon our belief in the recorded history of three great personalities who stand out conspicuously upon the page of history—Abraham, Moses, and Christ.

Some of our modern critics have got rid of Abraham as anything like a real historical person; a University Professor has now disposed of Moses; and "What think ye of Christ?"

¹ A paper written for the Winchester Clerical Association by the Rev. Canon Huntingford, D.C.L.