

...and took an hammer in his hand, and went softly unto him, and smote the nail into his temples, and fastened it into the ground; for he was fast asleep and weary. So he died."

2. Judith, the heroine of the Apocryphal book which bears her name. She killed Holofernes, the chief captain of Nabuchodonosor, the King of Assyria. Judith xiii. 6, 7. "Then she came to the pillar of the bed, which was at Holofernes' and took down his fanchion from the neck, and approached to his bed, and took hold of the hair of his head, and said, Strengthen me, O Lord God of Israel, this day. And she smote twice upon his neck with all her might, and upon his head from him." Judith xvi. 26. "And there was none that made the children of Israel any more afraid in the days of Judith, nor a long time after her death."

130.—1. Psalm xi. 6. "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest shall be the portion of their cup."

a. 2. Ezekiel xxxviii. 22. "And I will plead against him with pestilence and with blood; and I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon many people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire and brimstone."

In the New Testament,—

1. Revelation xiv. 10. "The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the Holy Angels, and in the presence of the Lamb."

2. As I cannot find any other Book in the New Testament with the words "Fire and Brimstone" in the order asked of in your question, I submit the other passage from the Revelation as No. 2:—

b. 2. Revelation xxi. 8. "But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death."

P. S.—Perhaps your question intends only one verse from one book in each Testament, if so, please take the one marked (a) for the O. T., and the one marked (b) for the New.

131.—Esa vii. 21. (The letters, except J, I italicise)—"And I, even I Artaxerxes the King, do make a decree to all the treasurers which are beyond the river, that whatsoever Ezra, the priest, the scribe of the law of God of Heaven, shall require of you, it shall be done speedily."

132.—To Mary Magdalene. (St. Mark xvi. 9)—"Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils."

133.—There were six. (St. John ii. 6 and 7)—"And there were six waterpots of stone, after the manner of purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece. Jesus saith unto them, fill the water pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim."

134.—The 47th chapter of Isaiah, and the 19th chapter of the II of Kings, each beginning "And it came to pass when king Hezekiah heard it"—and ending, "And Esar-haddon, his son, reigned in his stead."

135.—Joseph, the son of Jacob, (Genesis ii. 26)—"So Joseph died, being an hundred and ten years old, and they embalmed him, and he was put into a coffin in Egypt."

ON THE GREEK TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Paper read before the Rural Deanery of Kingston, Diocese of Fredericton, by the Rev. Francis Partridge, M.A., B.D., Rector of Rothesay, N.B. and Canon of the Cathedral.

(Continued.)

The five principal editions of the New Testament are:—

1. That of Erasmus, A. D., 1516. This has been several times printed, and is now very rare. None of the MSS. which he consulted are of very great antiquity. The edition was executed in great haste, and is not thought much of. Nevertheless, to Erasmus belongs the distinguished honour of first giving to the world an edition of the entire N. T. (The first portion ever printed was by Aldus Manutius at Venice in 1504. Also St. John's Gospel was printed at Tubingen in 1514).

2. The Complutensian, 1514. This was not allowed to be sold until 1522,

before which time Erasmus had printed three editions. This is generally considered to have been formed from comparatively modern MSS. only. B. was certainly not used. (Birch.) The original MSS., from which this Text was constructed are said to have been sold at Complutum (Alcala in Spain) to a fire-work dealer, to make rockets with. (Horne.)

3. Robert Stephens, 1546. (Paris). This edition is noted as much for its beauty of typography as for its correctness. The edition of 1551 is noted as being the first divided into verses. If any of us have Valpy's edition of the Greek Testament, this is the Text on which it is founded.

4. Edition of Beza, 1565. (Geneva). Beza had several advantages over former editors. He had an ancient edition of the Gospels and Acts, numbered above as D., together with a MS. of St. Paul's Epistles, known by scholars as *Codex Claromontanus*, and the Syriac version with Latin translation. His edition of 1598 was adopted as the basis of the English version of 1611.

5. The *Textus Receptus*, 1624—33. (Leyden). The editor of this version is not known. The Elzevirs were the printers. The Text of this edition has been the base of almost all subsequent editions until the present century, hence its name. You will have observed that the editions heretofore have been chiefly derived from the Cursive MSS. and versions; the chief Uncials having either been not yet discovered, or not accessible.

But with the beginning of the present century arose a new departure in the editing of the Sacred Text, of which the main characteristics may be said to be two. First, the regarding of the authority, especially since the discovery of the Sinaitic MS., of four or five Uncials as far out weighing the accumulated testimony of hundreds of later origin; and secondly, the testing of the value of MSS. by their arbitrary arrangement into groups or families. I need only mention the names of Lachmann, (A. D., 1831—42), Tischendorf (1849—59—70), Tregelles (1857), and Alford, as the prominent names of modern editors.

Taking the latter characteristic first, this theory of classifying MSS. in accordance with supposed recensions of the Greek Testament, apparent in different classes or families of MSS. was originated by Bengel, and adopted by Griesbach, and has now few supporters. But with some eminent critics it still appears to be necessary first to determine the lineage and affinities of a MS., and then to allow its weight as evidence. Historical evidence of the descent of most MSS. is almost wholly wanting, and must be supplied from conjecture. The labour of arranging MSS. in families must be interminable, and, after it is done, can have no argumentative value, since it has no stable foundation. There are absolutely no data to rely on, save those which can be extracted from the MSS. themselves; and it is easy to see that principles founded thereon will vary with each successive editor.

And now concerning the weight really due to the early uncials. My attention was first attracted to the subject by examining the edition of the Greek Testament edited by Tischendorf, (the sixth,) and published by Mendelssohn, at Leipzig, in 1870,—a copy of which was given me, with his usual kindness, by our Bishop. In comparing this Text with the others, and especially with the *Textus Receptus*, which I used as the best standard of comparison I possessed, (founded chiefly on Cursive MSS.) I was pained to see in how many hundreds of instances the text is altered from that edition; sometimes in apparently the most arbitrary way, and contrary to the sense of the context, and the genius of the passage, both in itself and as compared with other parts of Scripture. This text of Tischendorf is adopted after careful collation of the Sinaitic MS., and is professedly founded upon it. We can readily understand that Tischendorf would place great reliance on so ancient a MS as the Sinaitic. He discovered it. His previous high estimate of the earlier uncials would naturally be increased by the finding of a parchment earlier than either of them. But I began to ask myself whether such extensive alterations and omissions were to be regarded as a kind of proof that earlier editions founded on later MSS. had all the time been misleading us; and whether it might not at least be possible that the text of Tischendorf was the work of a specialist, who, absorbed entirely in his own view of the subject, did not make proper allowance for the views of others,

who though engaged in the same work, did not follow the same principles which guided himself. I began then to compare different editions which were within my reach; and found, it must in candour be confessed, that several eminent scholars, e. g., Alford, Tregelles, Westcott, and Hort, were in substantial agreement with him. At the same time, others, e. g., Scrivener, Wordsworth, were not. And although it might seem most presumptuous in an obscure country parson to have any opinion at all on the matter, I still was not satisfied that it could be a correct principle of New Testament criticism to rely for our ideal text upon some half-dozen MSS., including the evidence of hundreds of others, especially when all are copies, and the only question is as to their comparative antiquity. I thought, and compared, and said nothing. Last winter, I read a review of a work by Mr. Birks, of Cambridge, of which I forget the exact title, not having the review by me now, but it bore on this very subject. I made some notes at the time, of which I make free use in concluding my paper,

[To be Concluded.]

CHATHAM, N. B.

CHATHAM follows quickly upon Woodstock in responding nobly to the Appeal for special donations towards the D. C. S. Deficiency Fund. It is creditable alike to the respective Rectors, and to the individual members of each Parish, that so prompt and liberal a response has been made. This is what we have just had sent us from Chatham:—

"The offerings for the D. C. S. Deficiency Fund, in St. Paul's and St. Mary's Churches in this Parish, on Whitsun-Day, amounted to \$138.64, which, with the addition of \$16 previously contributed, amounts to \$154.64 thus far from Chatham towards the Deficiency. Further contributions will be forthcoming. It is to be hoped that so laudable an example will be imitated by other Parishes, and that without delay. The deficit should be wiped out at once. We should not depend alone upon individual contributors sending their contributions to the place of deposit at Moncton. Let us have handsome Parochial contributions from each Parish in the Diocese that may be in a position to lend its aid."

The Archbishop of Canterbury has conferred the degree of Bachelor in Divinity on the Rev. W. Cyprian Finkham, incumbent of St. James' Church Winnipeg in Rupert's Land, on account of his general services to the Church, and especially for his services in the cause of education.

Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church will not be admitted.

APPOINTMENT TO PARISHES.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—I was both surprised and pleased to see your leader on "Appointment to Parishes," May 6th. Surprised, because I was thinking of asking admission for such an article, and pleased that you published it just at this time, viz., before the meeting of Synod. I wish simply to be permitted to ask the members of the Synod to give the subject particular attention during the next few weeks, in order that they may be fully prepared to vote on the motion which I am pledged to bring forward. Many of us look upon the subject as one of the highest importance.

D. C. MOORE.

APPOINTMENT TO PARISHES.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

MONTREAL, 13th May, 1880.

Sirs,—*"To err is human."* I suppose editors and newspaper correspondents are no exception to the rule. The *Dominion Churchman* makes a false statement,—the CHURCH GUARDIAN perpetuates it, and states that "the Rev. O. J. Booth preached by special request at St. Thomas'

Church, St. Catherines." Now, Messrs. Editors, I did nothing of the kind. I received a *bona fide* offer of the Rectorship of St. Thomas' Church before I set my foot in St. Catherines; and had I been requested by the congregation to put myself on trial, I should not, under any circumstances, have accepted the position.

It is somewhat amusing, after having publicly denounced as pernicious and degrading, the custom of preaching trial sermons, to find one's self the subject of such remarks as your issue of the 6th inst. contains. The man who preaches for position is but making a stepping stone of the Holy Gospel of God, and neither he nor the persons who invite him, can, in my estimation, be possessed of a high spirituality.

I hope, Sir, in justice not only to myself, but also to your paper, you will correct the mistake made by making public this letter; and as an evidence that I am one with you in your denunciation of those "pious exhibitions," I beg to enclose you a year's subscription to your paper.

Remaining in great haste,
Very truly yours,
O. J. BOOTH.

WHITSUNDAY OR WHITSUN-DAY

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—I was a little puzzled yesterday when asked to explain how it was that, if the ordinarily accepted derivation of the name Whitsunday" are correct, we speak of "Whitsun week," as in the Prayer Book. Hammond L'Estrange's ingenious supposition does not help us at all. He conjectures that it was formerly written *Whit-Sunday*, that is the eighth Sunday, including Easter; with reference, no doubt, to the "Feast of weeks."

And the other deviations of W(h)it-Sunday, "Wit" being the older English for "Wisdom," in allusion to the great gift poured upon the Apostles; and "White Sunday," as being one of the great seasons for baptism in the Early Church, when the candidates were robed in white, seem to force the pronunciation Whitsunday, and to forbid Whitsun-Day.

But on pushing the enquiry further, I met with the explanation—quite new to me, though perhaps familiar to the most of your readers—that the word "Whitsun" is traced directly from the German word "Pfingsten," which is identical with Pentecost, meaning *fiftieth*. Whitsun-Day is therefore Pentecost Day, (Acts ii. 1).

S. S. TEACHER.

Monday in Whitsun Week.

HAVE WE A PRIESTHOOD?

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—Your correspondent "P" in the CHURCH GUARDIAN of April 8th, propounds a very serious question; one I certainly did not expect to raise in suggesting a distinctive appellation for clergymen, and one I am loth to enter upon, because the controversy has, in past times, run to such great lengths. It appears to me to have passed out of the province of argument and to rest in conviction—those who believe in a Priesthood being fully satisfied of the correctness of their position; those who do not so believe, being determined that there is not, nor shall be, any such thing.

To my mind the objection to a Priesthood—of course neither "F" nor I mean Priest as derived from *Presbyter*, but the office as conveyed by the Greek *Hiereus*—arises to a great extent, if not wholly, from prejudice. That we are naturally opposed to a sacerdotal Priesthood, I do not believe. Rather, I think, that the deepest feelings of our nature go out towards that; and the fuller, the more devout, and stronger our religion, whether Christian or not, the more do we believe in, and wish for, such an office. But the abuse of an office by the office-bearers, sooner or later, makes men ill-disposed towards the office itself. And there have been sacrilegious Priests from the days of Hophni and Phineas to the men who held the Priesthood before the Reformation. One quotation from Massingberd will give an idea of what that was: "It is impossible here to enter upon the scandal which meets us in every page of the Church history of these times arising from the unhappy endeavour to enforce celibacy. It seems to have given rise to what are called left-handed marriages. But it is an odious task to investigate such matters" (the English Reformation Ch. xiii.) Also from "The Church's broken Unity." "The Latin Church

sunk into corruption by the venality and profligacy of her chief prelates." This was the state of things just preceding the Reformation; but "Baronius, an historian of great reputation among the Roman party, describes the whole Church during the 9th and 10th centuries as 'exceedingly foul.'" (Ibid.) Now, the Church could not have arrived at this state without a long and gradual departure from purity. And during the whole time the people would, with increasing conviction, ascribe the sins of the Priest to the office of the Priesthood, until in the Reformation there was a strong will, in that great number who will not examine causes, to sweep the whole thing away, and the more so because of the implicit confidence formerly placed in the Priests. The process of defection was slow; the process of recovery will be slow. But, I believe, it wants but a firm and discreet assertion of the existence of such an office, with the necessary and inseparable sanctity of life, to bring people to a thankful acknowledgement of the power and duties of a Priest. But this is not argument, except as to the cause of the change of sentiment; and I don't wish to argue, but I must give some reasons why I am convinced of the necessity of a Priesthood. Our Lord is repeatedly styled our High Priest, and I fail to see how there can be a High Priest without subordinate Priests. And Christ identifies Himself most intimately with His disciples—the Body Incorporated of His Church—they are one with Him. And St. Paul speaks of them as standing to their fellow-men in *Christ's stead*, really effecting reconciliation by Christ, because God "hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." And reconciliation is a Priestly act, for "in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." If in all things He is made like unto His brethren, in all things His brethren must be made like unto Him. A Priest is one ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices unto God, so that presenting gifts alone on the altar would imply the Priestly office; but St. Paul, to my mind, clearly represents the Holy Eucharist as a Sacrifice. I Cor. x. 14, 21. The late Bishop of Toronto, in his charge to the Synod, 1878, says: "If any one be called a 'Sacerdotalist' because he has a reverence for the Priestly office, as comprehending those who have authority to administer the divinely appointed and refreshing Sacraments, he does not feel that he is contravening but obeying his Lord's will. And if he magnifies the office because the transmission of that authority came from Christ to His Apostles, and from them to whom it is imparted by their Episcopal successors, he has satisfaction and thankfulness in the conviction that this is not a usurped authority, but one divinely communicated." But not only does the power to offer gifts and sacrifices constitute a Priest, the power to bind and loose, to remit and to retain sins, to bless and to ban, establishes the Sacerdotal character. And this, of all our Saviour's utterances, is among the strongest and most unquestionable. My opinion is, that without Sacerdotalism—powerful and pure—powerful as it is, pure as it must be—there is little hope for the Church. Without that as a necessary part of Apostolic succession, we shall divide and sub-divide till we lack names to express the divisions, and gradually merge into a blank and staring infidelity, as the sects are now doing.

This is necessarily a cursory view of an important, an awful thing, which requires an essay rather than a communication to a public journal. I am embarrassed, not by want of matter of proof, but by want of skill to choose and arrange. Allow me to recommend "F" to consult Sadler's "The one Offering" as a concise, clear, and temperate work on the subject.

Yours faithfully,
PHILECCLESIA.

May 10th, 1880.

P. S.—Let me add, as something that will have weight, at least, with true Churchmen, that in the 1st century, A. D. 96, Clemens Romanus and others, styled the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper an "Oblation"; now, an oblation is an offering, a sacrifice. This was during the life of St. John. Then in A. D. 150, while the memory of the Apostles was still fresh, and their teaching household words, this mystery is called by Justin Martyr and St. Cyprian "The Sacrifice." P.