

DECEMBER 1889.

The  
Theological Monthly

---

ON FRENCH VERSIONS OF THE  
SCRIPTURES.

IT was about a century after the time of Wycliffe that the *Editio Princeps* of the Scriptures in French made its appearance. The volume bears no date but is believed to have been printed about 1478. The work was mainly done by Guiars des Moulins, a priest of Picardy.

About half a century later, while Tyndale was engaged on his translation into English and Luther simultaneously on his German Version, an anonymous French version also was in course of publication. These three translations were all brought out portion by portion, precedence being given to the New Testament. In one important particular however this French version, like its predecessor of 1478, was inferior to those brought out in England and Germany: it was not made from the original languages, but from the Vulgate. When this version was complete—which, though unnamed, tradition assigns to Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples—it was printed and published by Martin Lempereur at Antwerp in 1530 “cum Gratia et Privilegio Imperiali.” Doubtless Charles V. favoured this edition as a sort of antidote to the heretical character of Luther's work. The title of the volume begins:—“La Sainte Bible. en Francoys translatee selon la pure et entiere

traduction de saint Hierome conferee et entierement reuisitee selon les plus anciens et plus correctz exemplaires, &c." The Louvain Bible (1550) was this same text with corrections and expurgation of heresy. In the Preface the motive of publication is plainly stated: "d'autant que aucuns inuenteurs de recents erreurs, et suscitateurs d'antiques, y auoient semé la faulse herbe parmy le pur froment [tares among the true wheat]: dont issoit vne puanteur d'heresie, empoisonnante les cœurs fideles et catholiques."

Meanwhile there had appeared in 1535 the first *Protestant* French version, to which the Preface just quoted doubtless alluded. It was made, not from the Latin, but "le vieil [Testament] de Lebrieu et le Nouveau du Grec." On a blank page of the copy in the Br. Mus. a former owner has written: "Cette édition de la Bible est la premiere qui ait été mis au jour par les Protestans; elle est fort rare, et très recherchée des Curieux et des Amateurs. Le fameux Jean Calvin passe pour avoir eu la plus grande part á cet Ouvrage, et que n'osant pas encore tout-á-fait le publier sous son nom, il fit passer cette Version sous celui de Robert Pierre Olivétan [a relative of his], qui y travailla avec lui á la vérité, mais qui n'y mit que très peu du sien." (The present writer is not responsible for either the syntax or the accentuation of the above. It is perfectly intelligible however notwithstanding minor faults.) Although the work was published at "Neufchastel," where it was "acheue dimprimer le iiiii<sup>e</sup> iour de Juing," it acquired the name of the *Geneva Version*, because many editions of it have been printed under the care and with the revision of the Geneva Pastors. In that of 1588, in the production of which Beza took a leading part, an alteration was made in the rendering in the O.T. of the sacred name יהוה, Seigneur being discarded in favour of *Éternel*.

In 1555 a translation of the whole Bible, including also most of the Apocrypha and long extracts from Josephus, made by Sebastian Chateillon from the Hebrew and Greek, was published at Bâle. It is pleasant to observe the frankness and *naïveté* with which he confesses that there were passages too difficult for him: "e quand i' écri quei e n'entend pas un

tel passage, ou un tel, ie ne ueux pas pourtant donner a entendre, que i' entende bien tous les autres : ains [rather.] ueux dire que és [in the] autres i' y voi quelque peu, e en ceux lá ie n' y voi goutte : e le fai aussi afin qu' ē quelques tels passages on ne se fie pas trop en ma translacion."

Based upon the Geneva Version, especially the form given to it in 1588, were those of Diodati (1644), of Martin (1st ed. 1707), and of Ostervald (1724). But how freely the latter revisers deviated from the Genevan model may be seen by comparing the two following renderings of Gen. iv. 23. "Et Lamech dist a ses femmes ascauoir Adah et Zelah : Fēmes de Lamech oyez ma voix escoutez ma parolle : car iay tue vng homme en ma playe et vng iuenceau en ma blesseure" (Gen. 1535). "Et Lémec dit a Hada et Tsilla ses femmes, Femmes de Lémec, entendez ma voix, écoutez ma parole ; Je tuērai un homme, si je suis blessé, même un jeune homme, si je suis meurtri" (Ost. 1724).

Meanwhile (1701) a version had been given to the world which was not Protestant and hardly Catholic. It was the work of the Jansenists Antoine Lemaitre and his more famous brother Isaac Louis Lemaitre de Saci, from the latter of whom it takes its most common name, though it is also known as the Port Royal Bible and the Mons Bible. The title is : "La Sainte Bible contenant l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament ; traduite en François sur la Vulgate par Monsieur le Maistre de Saci." In this we find in addresses to the Deity, not *tu, toi, ton*, as in the Louvain Bible and all the Protestant versions, but the *vous* and *votre* which are so familiar to the reader of Massillon or of Pascal.

But as there was an important revision of the Geneva Version in 1588, so at the beginning of the present century there appeared another, which seems to have been the second and the last that was produced by a collective effort on the part of the Genevan pastors and professors. This second result of a long and painful parturition—for the work commenced in 1721 was not published till 1805—was not well received, and though the edition has long been exhausted, it has never been reprinted. A permanent Revision Committee

was afterwards appointed by the Pastors, but after several years' toil, which seemed to meet with ever-increasing difficulties, the Committee abandoned the work, and the Pastors have never renewed the effort.

Now all these French versions, even those which profess to be based on the Hebrew and Greek originals, have been so greatly influenced by the Vulgate that Segond goes so far as to say that the Reformed Churches using the French tongue have never possessed a translation of the Bible made directly and simply from the original languages. The cause, we are told, has not been the want of men capable of performing the task, but the blind though reverential attachment of the people to the long familiar form of words, as though a version which is simply the work of men were like the Ark of the Covenant of old which even the priests were not permitted to touch. Just such a hold has the venerable Authorised Version among ourselves upon the affection of the majority of the religious world, who cling to it for the sake of its archaic flavour and for old association's sake.

Within the last fifty years however no fewer than eight French versions of the whole or part of the Bible have been published.

One of these was published at Neuchâtel, one at Lausanne. The former I have not had an opportunity of seeing. The Lausanne edition, containing the N.T. only, was brought out in 1839 "par une société de ministres de la parole de Dieu, sur le texte Grec reçu"; but though it thus professes to be taken direct from the Greek, its strong resemblance to Ost. seems to prove it to be a revision rather than an independent translation. Nor though professedly based on the Text. Rec. does it altogether spurn the results of modern textual criticism. For instance it gives "d'entre les morts" ( $\tauῶν ἐκ$  instead of  $\tauῶν$ ) in Phil. iii. 11. It was reprinted in 1849 with a few corrections.

A third, published at Paris, is the work of "une réunion de pasteurs et de ministres des deux Églises Protestantes de France," similar to the Swiss Committee. The publication commenced in 1864, and the ninth livraison

appeared in July 1874; but it seems to have proceeded no further. The work contains parts both of the O.T. and of the N.T.

The great and well-known work of Reuss, Professor in the University of Strasbourg, published at Paris in 1876-1881, is chiefly a commentary, though it contains a translation (*discerpta membra*) of the whole Bible.

More recent than Reuss is Ledrain. He has no doubt that the "Hexateuque"—so he names the Pentateuch together with the Book of Joshua—is not authentic; and in a Preface of 47 pages he reproduces many of Colenso's arguments, innocently unaware how utterly those arguments have been demolished by Canon Birks and others. The reader is scarcely surprised when at the end of the Preface the "Puisse" of the closing sentence introduces a prayer, not for the special benediction of the Almighty and that His glory may be advanced, but that the work may find favour "auprès des artistes et des lettrés"! The O.T. complete bears the dates 1886, 1887, and 1888. The author rejects the traditional forms of proper names, and prefers such as more nearly resemble the original Hebrew: Havva, Hanok, Qênan, Schoninguir (Shinar), Sedôm, Içhaq, Ribqa, Iaäqob, Ésav, Mosché, Pareö, Miçraim, Benê-Israel, Schimeschon, &c. He introduces also a number of Hebrew words into his text, such as *mischkan* (Tabernacle), *oël-moëd* (Tent of Meeting), *segénim* (elders), *kapporeth* (Mercy-Seat), *cohène* (priest or prince), *thora* (Law). The style and taste of his renderings may be judged from one specimen: "Toutefois Mosché dérida le visage d'Iahvé, son Élohim, en lui disant: 'Pourquoi, ô Iahvé, ta narine s'enflamme-t-elle contre ton peuple?'" Contrast this with the reverent tone of Reuss: "Alors Moïse apaisa l'Éternel son dieu et dit: 'Pourquoi, ô Éternel, t'irrites-tu contre ton peuple?'"<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> But his bracketing is in most cases, not in all, equivalent to rejection, so far as critical judgment on his part is concerned. His own words are:—"Les passages entre crochets [ ] appartiennent au *texte reçu*; ils'ont été conservés sous cette forme par égard pour l'opinion traditionnelle, mais ils sont omis par les meilleures autorités critiques."

Of Segond's admirable work, which is the sixth of the eight, the O.T. was published first; the first edition at Geneva in 1874. With the fourth edition the N.T. was included, the complete Bible being brought out in 1880. The whole was translated by Dr. Segond from the original languages. All questions of textual criticism of the O.T. he passes over in silence, but in the N.T. we find he has not translated at haphazard the first Greek text that came to hand. He has carefully considered the question of text—the value of the Vatican MS., of the Sinaitic MS., and many more, and of the critical editions of Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf—and has finally decided to base his translation mainly on Tischendorf's eighth edition (*octava critica major*), 1872. But, like other students of the Greek text, he has discovered that Tischendorf is by no means always consistent in carrying his own principles into practice, and accordingly we read: "Disons encore que nous n'avons point abdiqué notre droit de discuter les variantes admises par Tischendorf, et d'incliner en plus d'un cas du côté où les autorités nous semblaient mieux établies." The Greek readings that he has preferred are in most cases, as might be expected, those which have the support of the most ancient evidence, herein agreeing with the great majority of modern scholars. To mention a few instances: in Lu. ii. 14 he gives "parmi les hommes qu'il agréé"; in John i. 28, "Béthanie"; in Acts ix. 31, "l'Église était, &c."; in 2 Cor. i. 12, "avec sainteté et pureté devant Dieu"; in 1 Pet. ii. 2, "afin que par lui vous croissiez par le salut"; in 2 John 9, "quiconque va en avant"; in Apoc. viii. 13, "j'entendis un aigle"; and the last verse of Jude stands, "à Dieu seul, notre Sauveur, par Jésus-Christ notre Seigneur, soient gloire, majesté, force et puissance, dès avant tous les temps, et maintenant, et dans tous les siècles! Amen!" In like manner with almost all modern scholars he brackets or altogether rejects the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi. 13), the last twelve verses of Mark's Gospel, the 37th verse of Acts viii., the "à Éphèse" of Eph. i. 1, the undoubted interpolation concerning the three witnesses in John v. 7, 8, the *καὶ ἴδε* of Apoc. vi. 1, 3, 5, and the *τῶν*

σωζομένων of Apoc. xxi. 24. On the other hand he accepts the reading of the Text. Rec. in Matt. xi. 19, Acts 15, 23, Rom. v. 1, Phil. iii. 19, Eph. v. 15, &c.

The text settled, by what rules is the translator guided? At what excellences does he aim? He answers: "*Exactitude, clarté, correction*: telles sont les trois qualités auxquelles il est essentiel de viser, si l'on veut à la fois être fidèle et s'exprimer en français." Moreover, while desiring to produce a literal version, he does not carry this to the extent of the *verbo verbum reddere* disapproved by Horace. "Such are the principles," he adds; "but how are they carried out? Such is the ideal, an ideal impossible to realise. Consider: the resources which a translator, however high his qualifications may be, has at his disposal—linguistic, ethnographical, archæological knowledge, the study and comparison of the works of his predecessors—these resources are purely human, and therefore exposed to chances of error, notwithstanding, or rather in consequence of, the enlargement of which they are capable. Undoubtedly the believer, the man for whom the Bible is no common book, will not undertake and persevere in labour so protracted and of such solemn importance as the translation of the Holy Scriptures, the depository of the revelations of the Almighty, except as relying on God's help, and constantly invoking it in the midst of his own doubts and conscious insufficiency. But who shall say within what limits and under what forms Divine aid shall exhibit itself in such a case? Can one expect to be kept from every inaccuracy by supernatural power, by a sort of inspiration which was not vouchsafed even to the copyists to whom we are indebted for the original texts the meaning of which is to be reproduced in some modern tongue? When grappling with difficulties—why not confess it?—the translator here and there is conscious of being baffled, simply unable satisfactorily to reproduce in his own language the exact thought that he grasps, or thinks he grasps, in the sacred original. And even where he thinks he has been most successful by keeping close to the words of Scripture in order scrupulously to preserve its expression, figures, shades of

meaning, does he never go too far, never sail on the wrong tack? Moreover how many minor blemishes escape observation, creeping in in spite both of intention and of principles!" It was worth while to quote this passage that the reader may be led to sympathise with a translator in his frequent perplexities here so neatly and tersely set forth. Indeed who that has really tried to make a careful and satisfactory translation of a chapter of Thucydides or Demosthenes, a scene from Aristophanes or Plautus, or an ode of Sappho or Horace, does not know that even that is no easy task? How much more difficult is it adequately—that is to say, *perfectly*—to reproduce Holy Scripture, the Word of the Living God, in any other language than that in which it was first given to man!

Segond has not deemed it necessary or desirable in interpreting the original to follow only the beaten track. In the freedom thus asserted he altogether repudiates the mere love of innovation as his motive, and urges—what will be readily intelligible to those "qui sont au courant du mouvement de la science et des progrès de la philologie sacrée"—that there were positive errors that demanded correction, besides that in many cases various renderings were possible among which "une simple préférence" has decided.

This simple preference leaves a large loophole for error to creep in, but the important question is, what are the merits of the results arrived at? In my judgment the translation *as a whole* is far superior (as assuredly it ought to be) to our English A. V., and about on the same level as our R. V. To examine it in detail in its entirety is plainly impossible here, but it is both possible and desirable to look somewhat closely at a few passages.

The difficult word מִן, which the LXX. leave untranslated in Gen. xxxvi. 24, Segond renders "les sources chaudes," following the Vulgate and the great majority of commentators: Luther follows some of the Rabbins and gives "Maulperde," and our A. V. "mules," but R. V. "hot springs." In Ex. iii. 22 he, with De Saci and Ost., renders מִן "demandera," not as in our A. V. "shall borrow," but

like our R. V. "shall ask," being fully justified in so doing by the LXX. *αἰτήσει*, the Vulg. *postulabit*, and the use of the same verb in Deut. xiv. 26, 1 Sam. xii. 13, Ps. cxxxvii. 3, &c. The rendering in Ex. xxix. 42 of "tente d'assignation" for אֹהֶל־מִוֹדָע (Luth. "die Hutte des Stifts," A. V. "tabernacle of the congregation," R. V. "tent of meeting") is no doubt intended to convey the true meaning, as shown by the verse following, that that was the place which God appointed for *Himself* to meet the Sons of Israel. In Lev. iii. and elsewhere, as in Luther's Version and our own, there is no distinction shown between the "fat," חֵלֶב (suet, *suif*), which equally with the blood all Israelites were forbidden to eat, and other fat (שֶׁן), Is. lv. 2, Jer. xxxi. 14, or מִשְׁמַנִּים, Neh. viii. 10) which lay under no such prohibition: in De Valera's Spanish Version the former is distinguished as "sebo." In Ps. lxxx. 9 the ambiguity, non-existent in the Hebrew, which is found in our English Version and which correct punctuation does not fully suffice to obviate ("Behold, O God our shield" being often quoted and understood as "Behold, O God, our shield") is completely prevented by the rendering, "Toi qui es notre bouclier, vois, ô Dieu."

In Is. i. 5, 13 the sense is well brought out: "Quels châtimens nouveaux vous infliger?" and, "Je ne puis voir le crime s'associer aux solennités." Also in Is. xl. 4 (where the English "Comfort ye" is often misunderstood as though it were "Comfort yourselves," "Take comfort," which is in fact the sense Jerome preferred) there is no ambiguity, any more than in the Hebrew original, in "Consolez, consolez mon peuple," which is also the rendering of Ostervald and Chateillon; and so the LXX. (*παρακαλεῖτε*), Luth. (tröstet), and Diodati and De Valera in their Italian and Spanish Versions (consolate, consolad). Ambiguity is avoided in some of our early English Bibles (as in Cranmer's of 1553) by added words: "Comfort my people (O ye prophets), comfort my people, saith your God."

Doubtless some of Segond's renderings will be questioned. For instance, he follows De Saci in the rendering (Ex. iii. 14) "JE SUIS CELUI QUI EST"; as the LXX. also has Ἐγώ εἰμι

ὁ ὢν. Sometimes a change of person of the verb substantive does not affect the sense, as for example the ἐγὼ εἰμι of Matt. xiv. 27, which is *ic hyt eom* in the A.S. Gospels and *ich bin es* in Luther's German, is exactly equivalent to the modern "It is I"; but in the case before us the sense is not the same. "I am He who is" does indeed assert the uncreated self-existence of God; but "I am what I am," besides declaring that He is, rebuffs an idle, and awes even a reverent, curiosity by intimating that His nature is mysterious, inscrutable, incomprehensible, infinite. That the Heb. אֲנִי הוּא is the same both before and after the relative אֲשֶׁר is an argument against Segond, and yet not absolutely decisive. For this also is to be observed, that God immediately added, "Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." It would seem therefore that the self-existence of God is the fact to which He himself gives most prominence, while His unsearchableness is also to be remembered. The Vulg. gives the verse thus: "Dixit Deus ad Moysen: EGO SUM QUI SUM. Ait: Sic dices filiis Israel: QUI EST misit me ad vos."

Prov. xiv. 9 is not satisfactorily translated:

"Les insensés se font un jeu du péché,  
Mais parmi les hommes droits se trouve la bienveillance."

Surely the true meaning (pace Revisorum dixerim) is, with a real parallelism of the clauses,

"Fools mock at the guilt-offering,  
But among the righteous it is an object of delight."

Some have objected to Segond's interpretation of Lev. xvii. 11: "Car c'est par l'âme que le sang fait l'expiation." The first clause of the verse having declared that the life (or soul, נַפְשׁ) of the flesh is in the blood, Seg. takes the last clause to say that the blood expiates only by virtue of the life (or soul) that is in it. But that is assuredly true. Chateillon renders: "Car le sang ét celui par lequel on appaisera Dieu pour l'âme," and Ost., "Car c'est le sang qui fera propitiation pour l'âme"; and so indeed נַפְשׁוֹ is capable of being rendered, but "by the soul (or life)" is more in accordance with the common force of פֶּ. And the English R.V. sides with Seg.

Remarks on certain passages in the N.T. will be found below.

Turning now from Segond's work we observe that in 1886 was published in Paris a French version of the Gospels which excited extraordinary interest. It bears the *imprimatur* of the Abp. of Paris dated Nov. 11, 1886, and was highly lauded in a message from the Pope conveyed in a letter, dated from Rome Dec. 4, 1886, written by His Holiness's Secretary of State, Cardinal Jacobini. The letter, addressed to the translator, commences thus :—

“Illustrissimo Seigneur,

“Il Santo Padre, che ebbe regolamente la traduzione francese di' Santi Evangelii da Lei intrapresa, e condotta a termine con plauso e l'approvazione di cotesta Curia Arcivescovile, m'incarica di encomiare l'intendimento cui Ella s'inspirava nel porre mano e nel pubblicare l'interessante lavoro.”

It seems scarcely credible that within a single year this work reached the 26th edition and was then disapproved, and placed in the Index of forbidden books by the same Pope who had at first so highly commended it.<sup>1</sup> Such is the hatred that Rome—most justly in her own interest!—cherishes towards the Sacred Volume. Let us hope—nay, we will confidently hope—that the translator, a sincere and reverent lover of God's Word, though thus severely disappointed when trusting to the tutelage of his Church, will obtain an ample reward from Him who is infinitely more trustworthy, and will find in his own experience the truth of his own words: “Le Souverain Maître ne nous demande point la réussite et le triomphe, que Lui seul donne quand il lui plaît: il nous demande le bon vouloir et l'effort, lesquels ne sont jamais inutiles, alors même qu'ils semblent momentanément perdus” (Préf., p. xxviii.).

And who is this translator? Monsieur Henri Lasserre. To us Protestants it cannot but occasion some astonishment

<sup>1</sup> For full particulars and documents see Dr. William Wright's most interesting pamphlet, *The Power behind the Pope*. Though suppressed in France, Lasserre's charming little volume can be obtained without difficulty in London, from Bagster and other publishers.

that such a work should have been accomplished by one who has written no fewer than four volumes of *Œuvres historiques sur les Apparitions et les Miracles de Lourdes*. Nay, the Translation itself is dedicated "À Notre-Dame de Lourdes." "May She shed the dew of her grace on this poor grain of wheat which we are casting on the ground, and may She cause it to fructify in a nourishing harvest to bring to the souls of men the sacred life-giving bread, the sacred bread of the Truth!" A lover of God's Word? Yes, truly. "Qui me réjouit à la parole de Dieu," he says of himself. And listen to this that you may know something more of the man: "Mayest thou, O Book divine, always the same and unchanging even in this new form adapted to my age and country, mayest thou bring the Living God to the knowledge of those who know Him not, strengthen all who are weak and tottering, comfort those who are in tribulation, restore hope to the despairing, and confer faith in the future Kingdom and in an endless and boundless bliss on those who are groaning in misery here below! Go forth, Holy Word, and amidst the imperfections of our work and the inadequacy of our language carry light into men's intellects and souls, carry charity into their hearts, just as the Sun, in spite of mists and clouds rising from the earth, ceases not to illumine the world with its beams and to fill it with fruitfulness!" And again: "Is not the Gospel the very word and example of Jesus Christ piercing the gloom of ages and presenting itself to the souls of all that they may hear and see?" What a lesson in Christian charity it teaches us, when we listen to such words from one whom many, judging from that other production of his pen, *Les Épisodes miraculeux de Lourdes*, will suppose to be shrouded in the Egyptian darkness of the grossest superstition!

Lasserre's version is, as might be expected, made from the Latin Vulgate; nevertheless, "we have spared no pains," he says, "to ascertain the exact significance and extent of meaning of every phrase and word of the Greek or Latin, and of every Hebraism." (Strange hold that Jerome's Latin has on the Roman mind, that it can be thus co-ordinated with the Greek, as though of equal authority!) Like Segond, whom

indeed he surpasses in freedom of rendering, he avoids perfect literalness, and falls back on the authority of Jerome who says, "A word-for-word translation conceals the sense which it intends to transmit"; but he declares "we have made it our aim to set fully and truly before our readers the thought and the sentiment, nothing being added, nothing taken away, nothing disturbed, nothing lost, just as with a thousand precautions one passes some precious liquor from one vessel into another, fearing equally to let fall a single drop or to admit any foreign substance." At the same time, while with some translators it has seemed to be almost a point of conscience to take no account of the language *into* which they were translating, his aim has been to write *French*—words, idiom, style, all *French*.

Of the great pains bestowed upon the work—pains rewarded by such marvellous popularity until the ecclesiastical extinguisher descended—some idea may be formed from the statement: "It is twelve years that the whole of the present volume has been in print at the Imprimerie Générale Lahure et C<sup>ie</sup>. and that we have been paying a rent for the type in order to have perfect freedom to correct, rehandle, and retouch at our pleasure year after year the successive and innumerable proofs."

To enable the reader to compare Segond with Lasserre one short specimen may be given, John xiii. 6-10.

## SEGOND.

Il vint donc à Simon Pierre; et Pierre lui dit: Toi, Seigneur, tu me laves les pieds! Jésus lui répondit: Ce que je fais, tu ne le comprends pas maintenant, mais tu le comprendras bientôt. Pierre lui dit: Non, jamais tu ne me laveras les pieds. Jésus lui répondit: Si je ne te lave, tu n'auras point de part avec moi. Simon Pierre lui dit: Seigneur, non seulement les pieds, mais encore les mains et la tête. Jésus lui dit:

## LASSERRE.

Il s'approcha donc de Simon-Pierre. Mais celui-ci protesta: —Me laver les pieds, Seigneur! . . . Vous? . . . à moi? —Ce que je fais, tu ne le comprends pas maintenant, répondit Jésus, mais tu le comprendras par la suite. —Jamais, non jamais, vous ne me laverez les pieds! s'écria Pierre. —Si je ne te lave, tu ne m'appartiens plus!

Celui qui est lavé n'a besoin que de laver ses pieds, pour être entièrement pur.

Et Simon-Pierre de dire alors :  
—Seigneur, non seulement les pieds, mais les mains et la tête ! . . . .

—Celui que le bain a déjà rendu net, répondit Jésus, n'a besoin que de se laver les pieds : il est pur dans tout son corps.

The latest of the eight recent versions is that of Stapfer, Paris, 1889. It contains the whole of the N.T. As to appearance this is a more attractive volume than either Segond's or Lasserre's (except the *édition de luxe* of Lasserre, not now obtainable) being a large octavo of 740 pages. As in Lasserre's work, the lines run across the page ; while Stapf. imitates both of these his predecessors (as well as some of *their* predecessors) in adding frequent explanatory footnotes, and in not breaking up the text into verses, but dividing it into paragraphs, not however with such numerous and minute subdivisions as Lass. prefers.

Dr. Edmond Stapfer is a Pastor of the Reformed Church of France, and "Maître de Conférences à la Faculté de Théologie protestante de Paris." He dedicates his work to his old Pupils in an epistle which is a model of brevity : "Mes chers amis, Cette traduction vous appartient comme à moi ; nous l'avons faite ensemble. Je vous la dédie. E.S."

His edition contains, besides a Preface to each Book of the N.T., an Introduction of 35 pages. The subjects treated are—the origin of the N.T., the oldest MSS. (to which Stapf., like almost all scholars, attaches the greatest value), the various readings, the latest critical editions of the Greek,<sup>1</sup> the division into chapters and verses, the order of the Books, the principles of translation, and other kindred topics ; with tabulated lists of the uncial MSS. both of the N.T. and of the early Versions.

Stapfer's version is, roughly speaking, about as literal as

<sup>1</sup> "Partout où Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott et Hort sont d'accord, nous sommes certains d'avoir le meilleur texte possible dans l'état actuel de la science." His proclivities are quite evident.

Segond's, less free than Lasserre's. For the sake of comparison I give here his rendering of the same passage as is quoted above from Segond's and Lasserre's versions.

Il vint donc à Simon Pierre qui lui dit : "Toi, Seigneur, à moi ? me laver les pieds ?" Jésus lui répondit par ces paroles : "Ce que je fais tu ne le sais pas maintenant, tu le sauras plus tard."—"Jamais, lui dit Pierre, non, jamais, tu ne me laveras les pieds !"—"Si je ne te lave, répliqua Jésus, tu n'as point de part avec moi."—Simon Pierre dit alors : "Seigneur ! non seulement les pieds, mais aussi les mains et la tête !"—"Celui qui s'est baigné, ajouta Jésus, n'a plus besoin que de se laver les pieds ; dans tout le reste il est entièrement pur."

Let us now compare the renderings of a few passages in the N.T. in these three modern versions ; and in the Gospels first, which are included in all three.

*Μετάνοια* and *μετανοεῖν* occur in all 24 times—26 times in the Text. Rec.—in the Synoptic Gospels : in St. John they are not found. In both the Protestant versions the noun is rendered uniformly by *repentance*, and the verb by *repentir*, or *se repentir*, or (in one case) by the noun *repentance*. Lass. prefers a greater variety of expressions—*pénitence*, *conversion*, *amendement* ; *faire pénitence* (only in Matt. xi. 21 and xii. 41 and the corresponding passages in St. Mark), *se convertir*, *s'amender*, *se repentir*, *avoir regret*, and (in one place where there is a negative, Matt. xi. 20) *impénitence*. *Pénitence* (evidently in the sense of *penance*) and *faire pénitence* are almost exclusively used in other Roman Catholic versions.

In dealing with these words Lass. has displayed a noble courage in leaving the beaten track of the theologians of his Church, but he has not been uninfluenced by Romish teaching in his translation of *ἀδελφός* and *ἀδελφή* in certain places. The doctrine of the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord interferes here. "Jacques et Joseph et Simon et Jude, ne sont-ils pas ses *cousins* ? Ses *proches parentes* n'habitent-elles pas toutes parmi nous ?" (Matt. xiii. 55, 56.) And in Mark iii. 31 "des *personnes de sa parenté*," and vi. 3 "ses *tantes* et ses *cousines*. Are these then unfaithful renderings ? Certainly not. Lass. honestly (we cannot doubt it) believes

that we have here the Hebrew idiom according to which "brother" or "sister" includes "cousin" or other collateral relation. We Protestants judge otherwise, and could remind Lass. that to express that sense *συγγενής* and *συγγενίς* were available terms, actually found in the N. T. Seg. and Stapf. use "frère" and "sœur," as in the Vulg. also we have "frater" and "soror."

*Παράκλητος* in the four places where it occurs in St. John's Gospel is translated by Seg. by *consolateur*, by Stapf. by *Conseiller*, by Lass. by *soutien* once, by *Paraclet* three times.

*Καταφιλέϊν* is rendered by Seg. by the simple *baiser*: both Lass. and Stapf. give almost everywhere the full force, which in our R.V. is relegated to the margin. Their forms are *embrasser* (Luke vii. 45), *embrasser avec effusion*, *baiser de ses lèvres*, *baiser longuement*, *baiser longtemps*, *couvrir de ses baisers*.

*Γένηται* in Matt. xxiv. 34, Mark xiii. 30, Luke xxi. 32, is *arrive* in Seg. and Stapf., but *s'accomplisse* in Lass. in the two former places, and *se soient réalisées* in the third. Seg. and Stapf. evidently perceived that *γένηται* may well mean something less than *πληρωθῆ*.

*Διατίθεμαι* in Luke xxii. 29 is given as *je dispose* by Seg., *j'adjuge* by Stapf., and *je prépare* by Lass. No one of these renderings seems to convey the full meaning of *giving by covenant* or *covenanting to bestow*.

The last clause of the Lord's Prayer is rendered by Seg. and Lass. "délivre-nous du mal," by Stapf., "du Malin." In Matt. v. 39 all three take *τῷ πονηρῷ* to be masc.—"au méchant," the wicked man.

In Mark viii. 37 Seg. writes: "Que donnerait un homme en échange de son âme?" Stapf., "en échange de sa vie?" Lass. alone brings out the true sense: "Avec quoi donc lui serait-il possible de racheter sa vie perdue?"

All agree in correctly rendering *τῶν τοιούτων* in Matt. xix. 14, Mark x. 14, and Luke xviii. 16 by "ceux qui leur ressemblent; and the rest of the clause is rightly given in each place by Seg. and Stapf., "c'est à ceux qui leur ressemblent qu'appartient le Royaume de Dieu" (or in Matt., "des cieux"), or words equivalent. They thus obviate both the

errors of interpretation that so often are thoughtlessly admitted or distinctly maintained (as by Doddridge) in dealing with the English version, "For of such is the Kingdom of God" (or "of heaven"). Lass. however does go wrong in the verb, which he gives as "est composé de," a meaning of which *ἐστίν* with a simple genitive and with no other noun is quite incapable. That it may mean "belongs to" is clear from *ἡμῶν ἔσται*, Mark xii. 7, *τελείων ἐστίν*, Heb. v. 14, and many other passages, including

*αὐτῶν ἐστίν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*

(Matt. v. 3, 10), the exact correspondence of which to

*τῶν τοιούτων ἐστίν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*

is too commonly overlooked. That Lass., not himself a professed scholar, should have fallen into error here is not surprising.<sup>1</sup>

Nor again when he failed to see the force of the tense in *ἴσχυεν* in Mark v. 4, where the sense is that no one "was strong enough to" overpower the unhappy demoniac. "Était parvenu à" in his rendering: Seg. and Stapf. give "avait la force de."

Also Lass. is less accurate in his handling of the passage in Luke x. 18, *ἐθρώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπήν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα*, "j'ai vu moi-même Satan succomber, aussi vite que la foudre qui tombe du Ciel." Seg. and Stapf. both give, "je voyais Satan tomber du ciel comme un éclair." All three however rightly translate *πεσόντα* by the infin., and not by the part. like Chat. (*trébuché*) and the Laus. editors (*tombé*). The "having fallen" of our R.V. is indeed astonishing. The aorist is the tense used to indicate the action looked at in its entirety: the mood is the participial, in accordance with the general rule after *verba sentiendi* in Greek. How would our Revisers translate Hom. Odyss. II. 528-530,

*κεῖνον δ' οὐ ποτε πάμπαν ἐγὼ Φίδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν  
οὐτ' ὠχρήσαντα χροῶα κάλλιμον, οὔτε παρεῖων  
δάκρυ ὁμορξάμενον—?*

<sup>1</sup> Chateillon gives, "a tels ét le regne de Dieu;" De Saci, "est pour ceux qui leur ressemblent;" Ost., "à tels est, &c.;" and the Lausanne edition, "est à ceux qui sont tels."

Surely the plain meaning is, "Never saw I him *grow pale* or *wipe* a tear from his cheeks." So II. 6, 284,

εἰ κείνόν γε φίδοιμι κατελθόντ' Ἄφιδος εἶσω,

"were I to see him *go down* into Hades." Hector had no desire himself to be in Hades *after* Paris had descended in death, in order to see him there. No thought could be less germane to the passage than that. And one example more: ἰδὼν τῇ προτεραίῃ τῶν τινα Λυδῶν κατὰ τοῦτο τῆς ἀκροπόλιος καταβάντα ἐπὶ κυνέην κτλ., Her. i. 84. The meaning is perfectly plain: Hyrcæades undertook to lead a scaling party to attack the citadel even on its strongest and apparently impregnable side, because the day before he had seen a Lydian soldier of the garrison "*climb down* at that point" to recover a helmet that had rolled down from the top. But in fact this use of the aor. part. is found elsewhere in the N.T. itself. Saul of Tarsus in the vision (Acts ix. 12) saw Ananias *come in* (εἰσελθόντα) and *lay* (ἐπιθέντα) his hands on him. And similarly εἰσελθόντα and εἰπόντα in Acts x. 3; περιλάμβαν in Acts xxvi. 13; ἐνεχθείσαν in 2 Pet. i. 18; ἐξελθοῦσαν in Luke viii. 46, Text. Rec. and Ln; in every case after a verb *sentiendi*. In all of these to use the part. in Engl. or in Fr. is to mistranslate.

Turning now to the Acts and the latter half of the N.T., where Lass. is left behind, we find many points of interest in comparing Seg. and Stapf., and may look at a very few of them.

In Acts iv. 13 the ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται is not ill rendered "des hommes du peuple sans instruction," Seg., or "des gens du peuple sans instruction aucune," Stapf. Obviously the ἰδιῶται is taken first by these translators, and "gens du peuple" fairly well represents the meaning of the word "as the general antitheton to ὁ τέχνην ἔχων—whatever the τέχνη may be": see Thomson's excellent note on Plat. Phædr. 258 D. Here of course the τέχνη was that of the Scribes, who were also teachers of the Law: Peter and John were not members of that profession. Nor had they gone through a course of instruction at the feet of those teachers: they were therefore ἀγράμματοι also.

In Acts vii. 34 ἰδὼν εἶδον is too much for our translators.

This use of the part. to accompany and strengthen the kindred finite verb (equivalent therefore to the Hebrew infin. absolute which Seg. most commonly omits in the O.T.) adds emphasis and intensity to the verb, and its omission by Seg. ("j'ai vu") is to be regretted; but it does not introduce a new and distinct thought, and therefore Stapfer's "j'ai regardé et j'ai vu" is inaccurate. "I have seen, I have seen" is the felicitous rendering in our A.V. (by no means improved on in the R.V.), and French is no less tolerant than English of such an *epizeuxis*.

Both these translators give "ils firent nommer" for the *χειροτονήσαντες* of Acts xiv. 23. St. Luke is speaking of the appointment by the Apostles Paul and Barnabas of Elders in each of the newly formed Churches in Lystra, &c., and the word employed indicates a show of hands by the assembled Church, which is yet plainer (if possible) in the *Teaching of the Apostles*, § 15, *χειροτονήσατε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους*: of this "ils firent nommer" gives no hint.

Numerous other points invite remark, but my space is almost filled, and I can only comment briefly on one passage more.

The distinction in English between "he has died" (*ἀπέθανεν*) and "he is dead" (*τέθνηκεν*) unfortunately cannot be represented in French. The distinction however is very important. Christ "has died" for us, but He now no longer "is dead," but is "alive for evermore." It is then a defect in the language, but not the fault of the translators, if *ὁ ἀποθανών* in Rom. vi. 7 is rendered "celui qui est mort." The whole context shows that the thought is this, that the believer has died in Christ; therefore he has (in Christ) paid the penalty of his sin, and must now in simple equity be declared not guilty, and God "is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins," the very justice of God being now enlisted on the sinner's side. *Δεδικαίωται* is therefore used in its proper forensic sense, and there is no warrant for the "est délivré" of De Saci and Ost., or the "is freed" of our A.V. Seg. in like manner is wrong in his "est libre du péché," and Stapf. in his expansion "est déclaré juste et est délivré du péché." Our Revisers have brought out the true sense of this short but important sentence. RICHARD FRANCIS WEYMOUTH, D. Lit. Lond.

## CONCORDANCES TO THE SCRIPTURES, AND THEIR USES.

AMID all the aids to the study of the Holy Scriptures—and they are now really very numerous—there are none that can compare in value with Concordances. Many of the so-called aids are what learning, with piety and reverence it is hoped, has brought *to* the Scriptures, especially in the form of Commentaries; but, alas, when we have several of these we may get *as many* interpretations of a passage, and perhaps find that we have obtained no real help. How often a text of Scripture seems much more simple *in itself* than it does when elaborately explained; as it was with Mason's explanatory notes to Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, which were more difficult to a simple man, to whom he gave a copy, than was Bunyan himself. In very early days one was led to exclaim, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel with words without knowledge?" Much greater would be his surprise now.

On the other hand, what we gather by a Concordance, if a rightly made one and rightly used, is something we get direct *from* the Word, instead of something brought *to* it. Indeed, it is the Word itself dissected, and then the parts collected together, showing the places where the same word occurs. But even this, though very useful, may sometimes mislead; for occurrences of the same word may be collected together from different parts where the *meaning* of the word may be quite different. The immediate context, as well as the subject in hand, must always be studied in order to learn the truths intended to be taught. If we wish to gather from Scripture, we must take care that we gather only what is really there.

It will readily be seen that some text must be taken on which to form a Concordance. For the Old Testament it would naturally be formed from the Hebrew. There was one

by Rabbi Nathan, published as early as 1523. Of the New Testament it would be from the Greek. Henry Stephens issued one in 1624. A Latin Concordance of the Bible was issued by Robert Stephens in 1555, though a Concordance had been formed of the Vulgate some 300 years before. It is gratifying to see that England, which is not now behind any nation for its stock of Concordances, was soon honoured by possessing one of the New Testament; it was issued by Thomas Gypson in 1535. This was followed by others, and in 1631 one of the whole Bible, using the present Authorised Version, was published. For the Septuagint, one by Kircher was published in 1607. Many others must be passed over, and attention given to some of the principal ones of modern date.

Many persons use a Concordance simply to find a passage with which they are more or less familiar, but do not remember where it is to be found. A Sunday-school teacher, for instance, desirous of finding a subject for his class, may remember just a word or two of a sentence, but not its connection, nor how it is applied, and he opens his Concordance to ascertain where it is to be found.

Now it is certain that such a use of a Concordance, while perfectly legitimate and at times of great service, is one that may be abused. A person may make such a constant use of a Concordance that though he is fairly familiar with Scripture, and could repeat thousands of sentences, would yet be puzzled to find, off-hand, a score of them. It has been noticed that some persons who have never used, and perhaps never had a Concordance, can find almost any passage in the New Testament and many in the Old much more readily than those can who rely little on their memory and make a constant use of a Concordance. The great advantage of being able to find, unaided, every familiar passage should be impressed upon the students of Scripture; and it greatly helps one to do this by remembering, (1) the immediate context; (2) the subject treated of; and (3) the book in which it occurs. The young student will do well to spend a little time in search; and if he succeeds, such search will greatly aid him

to find the same another time ; and if he fails, he will at least have seen subjects and connections where it is *not*. Doubtless some may view such search as loss of time, but this really is not the case, because of the help it will be in future ; whereas simply a dive into a Concordance, though it may save a minute or two at the time, in no way helps one to find the same passage afterwards.

Some, by always using the same Bible, remember that a certain passage is on the right or left-hand page, and that it is situated about the middle, or top, or bottom of the page, and they can thus find it after a little search. This, with other supposed advantages, has led to the production of facsimile editions of the Bible, so that when a larger print is needed, one can be had exactly page for page with the old familiar one. But this is not as good as remembering the place unaided ; for with a strange Bible the places cannot be found because the sign-posts are gone.

For simply finding a passage, a copy of Cruden's Concordance is all that is needed ; and this, or modified forms of it, are now bound up with the various editions of the Teacher's Bible, and are becoming very numerous. Concordances are also now published for the Revised Version.

But there are other and more important uses of Concordances, and for which other books have been prepared. Many a student of Scripture has longed to be able to refer to what he has heard called the "original." He may have heard such a remark as, "Oh, that is not the meaning of the passage ; you have been misled by supposing the word in A is the same as in B ; it is a totally different word in the original ;" and though he knows no language but English, he has wished he could discover by some means such differences. This desire is all the more earnest if he believes in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures ; he wants to have light upon the actual words which GOD caused the writers to use.

Well, there are books published to aid such a person in his study, and furnish him with what he desires, if he on his part can make a good use of them. Attention will first be confined to the New Testament. There are

1. "The Englishman's Greek Concordance."<sup>1</sup>
2. "Hudson's Critical Greek and English Concordance."<sup>1</sup>
3. "Young's Analytical Concordance."<sup>2</sup>
4. "Bullinger's Critical Lexicon and Concordance."<sup>3</sup>
5. "Gall's Interpreting Concordance."<sup>4</sup>
6. "Bruder's Greek Concordance."<sup>5</sup>
7. "Schmid's Greek Concordance."<sup>1</sup>

To make their use manifest short specimens will be given :  
this is from the first in the list,

*ἀνομος, anomos.*

Mar. xv. 28. numbered with the *transgressors*.

L.u. xxii. 37. reckoned among the *transgressors* :

Acts ii. 23. by *wicked* hands have crucified

1 Co. ix. 21. that are *without law*, as *without law*, being  
not *without law* to God,  
gain them that are *without law*,

2 Th. ii. 8. then shall that *Wicked* be revealed,

1 Ti. i. 9. for the *lawless* and disobedient,

2 Pet. ii. 8. to day with (their) *unlawful* deeds ;

This Concordance is based upon *the Greek*. It takes a Greek word and records every place in which it occurs, and by the words in *italic* shows how the Greek word is translated.

But the question will naturally arise, How can an Englishman, quite ignorant of Greek, find this or any other word? Well, suppose he is reading the Gospel of Mark, and he wants to know the word in the original which is translated "transgressors" in chap. xv. 28, and to know whether it is the same Greek word in Gal. ii. 18 and in James ii. 9, 11. He must turn to the English index of the same Concordance, and there, on looking for the word "transgressor," he would find *ἀνομος* page 55, and *παραβάτης* page 587. On turning to page 55 he would find what is given above, and would see that neither Gal. ii. 18 nor James ii. 9, 11 are included ; and thus he would know at once that it is *not* the same word in these passages as in Mark xv. 28. On referring to *παραβάτης*

<sup>1</sup> Bagster & Sons, London.

<sup>2</sup> Young & Co., Edinburgh.

<sup>3</sup> Longmans & Co., London.

<sup>4</sup> Gall & Inglis, Edinburgh.

<sup>5</sup> Tauchnitz, Leipzig.

on page 587 he would find there, along with other passages, Gal. ii. 18 and James ii. 9, 11.

If he was reading Acts, by looking in the English index for the word "wicked" he would see that there are *four* Greek words so translated, and he would find his passage (chap. ii. 23) in the second on the list (*ἀνομος* page 55). If he wanted to find "without law," by looking under "law" he would find "law (without)" *ἀνομος* page 55, and *ἀνόμιος* page 55. For "lawless" and "unlawful" there is only the one word quoted above, though there is another for "unlawful thing."

From the above it will be seen how the word in the Greek may be found which corresponds to any important word that occurs in the Authorised Version. The mere English reader might have to look in several different places in the body of the work (when several Greek words are translated by the same English word) before he found the passage he wanted; but when he did find it he would have before him every place where that Greek word is used in the New Testament.

Hudson's Concordance is on the same principle, but without quoting the passages. It is a useful condensation of the above. The Editor tells us that "one drizzly day beneath the shelter of the Bethel Tent . . . the thought arose, 'I wish I had my Englishman's Greek Concordance here, so that I could see how this word is rendered in the English Testament in all the places where it occurs.'" This led to the work being "so condensed that it can be made a constant companion of the Bible student in all his travels" (Preface). In Hudson's the above example stands thus,

*ἀνομος*

without law, 1 Cor. ix. 21 *f*.<sup>1</sup>

unlawful, 2 Pet. ii. 8.

lawless, 1 Tim. i. 9.

transgressor, Mark xv. 28. Luke xxii. 37.

wicked, Acts ii. 23. 2 Thess. ii. 8.

Many Greek scholars also use these books, for, without referring to the English index, the Greek Testament shows them at once the required word. Some scholars prefer a

<sup>1</sup> The *f* stands for "four times."

book in which the *quotations* are given in Greek. These could use Bruder's Greek Concordance. Under *ἀνομος* are given the same ten references; but to Mark xv. 28 is added a reference to Isa. liii. 12, giving the corresponding Hebrew word and the word *ἀνομος* as used by the LXX. It also marks Acts ii. 23 and 1 Cor. ix. 21 (first, second, and fourth times) as referring to the Gentiles. The reference to the Old Testament is useful, but referring texts to the Gentiles partakes more of the character of a Commentary, and such additions need to be received with discrimination.

In the list, No. 7 is a condensed reprint of Schmid's Concordance in a pocket size, and which can be bound up with a Testament. This also gives the quotations in Greek.

There are advantages to a Greek scholar in the two last-mentioned books, inasmuch as they give, not only the sentence in which the word occurs, but show the *position* of the word in the sentence and its actual *inflection*, and if a noun whether it has the *article* or not.

To return to the list of Concordances, there are still some of another class to be referred to. Those numbered 3, 4, 5 are for English readers. They may be said to be based upon *the English* instead of the Greek, and are all similar in plan. To use these books the student refers at once to the body of the work and finds any English word in question. Let us suppose the word to be "transgressor." He would not find a Greek heading except under the English word. In Gall's Concordance, in which the Greek words are written in English letters, it stands thus,

Transgressor

*parabatēs*

Gal. 2. 18 destroyed, I make myself a t.

Jas. 2. 9 are convinc. of the law as t-s.

11 art become a t. of the law.

*anomos*

Mar. 15. 28 numbered with the t-s; Lu. 22. 37.

Young's Concordance and Bullinger's give the same information, with the Greek words in Greek letters, but Bullinger gives references only without the quotations.

It will be noticed that here there are only *two* references under *anomos*, because in the other eight passages where the same Greek word occurs it is translated differently. Thus under "wicked" will be found *anomos* with Acts ii. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 8, along with other Greek words and other references. Under "law (without)" will be found the four references in 1 Cor. ix. 21; under "lawless," 1 Tim. i. 9; and under "unlawful," 2 Pet. ii. 8. These works are supplied with indexes to the Greek words, and on referring to *ἀνομος*, *anomos*, the *five* English words would be found given.

It is hoped that it has been made plain that both classes of Concordance for English readers give the same information, but in a different way. If a Greek word is started with, every reference to that word will be found in *one* place in the Concordances based on the Greek; whereas, for the same information a student may have to look in many different places in Concordances based upon the English. On the other hand, if an English word is started with, every reference will be found in *one* place in the latter, but may have to be searched for in many places in the former. It is hoped that a careful study of the specimens given will make all this plain.

It is evident that *both* classes of Concordance are useful. What is searched for may be more easily found sometimes in one, and sometimes in the other. Doubtless, those based on the Greek must have the preference, for the Greek words cannot be changed; whereas the English, being a translation, may be altered, as indeed it is in the Revised Version.

To gather how these works may be profitably used, the example given may be again referred to. It has been seen that one Greek word is translated five different ways, and a student may wish to know whether these are all correct translations; what is the literal meaning of the word in question; and can that meaning be traced in all the passages. How can he arrive at this information? If he has no other resource, let him take some other translation and compare it with the Authorised Version. The writer would take the book he commonly uses, the Englishman's Greek New Testament, which has an interlinear translation; but as many may not

have that he will compare also the Revised Version. They stand thus:—

	<i>Authorised.</i>	<i>Revised.</i>	<i>Greek Testament.</i>
Mark xv. 28	transgressors	<i>verse omitted</i>	lawless
Luke xxii. 37	transgressors	transgressors	lawless
Acts ii. 23	wicked	lawless men	lawless
1 Cor. ix. 21	without law	without law	without law
2 Thess. ii. 8	Wicked	lawless one	lawless [one]
1 Tim. i. 9	lawless	lawless	lawless
2 Pet. ii. 8	unlawful	lawless	lawless

The five renderings of the Authorised Version are reduced to *three* in the Revised Version, and to *two* in the Greek Testament; and the student will begin to see that one of the two in the last-named will well agree with all the passages. He will also see that the word "law" is embraced in the two meanings, and if he turns to the word "law" in his Concordance he will find that the principal word is νόμος, *nomos*, and may see that the word ἀνομος is derived from *a* negative, and νόμος, law: with which both "without law" and "lawless" agree.

This may seem to have been a long process by which to arrive at the meaning of a word, but it has been gathered from the Scripture itself; and if it is followed up by examining kindred words, a student may obtain a much clearer understanding of the words of Scripture than as a mere English scholar he can get in any other way. Indeed, this very word followed out (though it was not chosen for that purpose) shows the true interpretation of a very important passage, which the writer cannot forbear to show. ἀνομία, *anomia*, is a kindred word. In the Authorised Version it is translated "iniquity" twelve times; "unrighteousness" once; "transgression of the law" once; and (with ποιέω) "transgresseth the law" once.

The important verse alluded to is 1 John, iii, 4, which gives a definition of sin. The Revised Version reads, "Every one that doeth sin doeth also *lawlessness*; and sin is *lawlessness*." The Englishman's Greek Testament has, "Every one that practises sin practises also *lawlessness*; and sin is *lawlessness*" (and indeed translates the word "lawlessness" in all the fifteen places). And seeing that the Authorised Version translates

the word differently in the verse in question from every other place, may we not conclude that it is not correct here, and that "sin is the transgression of the law" is not God's definition of sin; but that "sin is lawlessness?" This is further confirmed by reading elsewhere that "as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law."

Some of the above labour might have been saved if we had referred to a Concordance that gave the literal meaning of the Greek. In Dr. Young's Concordance the meaning of *ἀνομος* is given "lawless, unlawful;" and for *ἀνομία*, "lawlessness."

Dr. Bullinger's is a Lexicon as well as Concordance, and the definition of the Greek words naturally takes a more prominent place. This is a specimen:--

Ability

1. *δύναμις*, capability, power (*regarded as inherent and moral*)
2. *ἰσχὺς*, strength (physical), force, vigour (*regarded as an endowment*)
3. *εὐπορέομαι*, to prosper, abound in, to possess abundance; *hence*, to be able to afford

1 Matt. xxv. 15.

2 1 Pet. iv. 11.

3 Acts, xi. 29.

Another use of a Concordance must be alluded to, namely, the facility it gives for studying any subject *fully*. Many errors of the day are the result of drawing a conclusion from, or basing a theory upon one or two texts of Scripture, and neglecting other passages that would at least have greatly modified the said theory. The only true path is to examine *every passage* that bears upon a subject. For this purpose alone Concordances are invaluable.

One more use of the Concordance must be touched upon. Suppose John xiii. 10 is being read, "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet; but is clean every whit." Questions naturally arise: Is the sense of "wash" the same in both places? Is it the same word in the Greek? For this enquiry, let one of the Concordances that is based upon the English be taken. Under the word "wash" will be found

eight Greek words, but John xiii. 10 occurs under only two of them, and the passage is found to be, "He that is washed (λούω, *louō*) needeth not save to wash (νίπτω, *nīptō*) his feet." The Concordance shows that the first word is used more of washing the body, and the latter of the hands and face. This is confirmed by the Revised Version, which has "He that is *bathed* needeth not save to *wash* his feet." We learn from this that there is a sense in which Christ cleanses *the person*, and declares of such a one, "Ye are clean," "clean every whit," and need only to have the feet washed because of the defilement of the way. We are at once reminded how Aaron and his sons in the Old Testament were *once* washed (Ex. xxix. 4), and we do not read of its being repeated; but there was the laver of brass at which they must wash their hands and feet before they entered the tabernacle that they die not (chap. xxx. 18-20). Surely this is a valuable lesson in theology. There is a washing that never loses its virtue, but this does not render unnecessary the washing by the way. Will this throw any light upon that difficult passage, "That the worshippers *once* purged should have had no more conscience of sins (Heb. x. 2)?"

There are many other synonyms that can be studied by comparing the use of each word in Scripture, and be thus more efficiently learned than by a Lexicon.<sup>1</sup>

Another branch of the subject must now be considered, namely, the question of VARIOUS READINGS. This has been forced upon the general reader by the Revised Version, on account of the changes in the text and the notes in the margin. It has already been noted that on referring to Mark xv. 28 the whole verse was found to be omitted from this version. Now suppose a teacher was attempting to enforce a lesson from that verse in a Bible-class, judge his surprise and vexation if he were asked by one in the class if there was any foundation for his lesson, seeing that the Revisers had omitted the verse. In this particular case the same could be found in Luke xxii. 37, but in other instances there might

<sup>1</sup> Grimm's "Greek—English Lexicon of the N. T." J. H. Thayer's, D.D., ed. (T. T. Clark) is practically a Concordance as well as a Lexicon.

be no corresponding passage. The question arises, How can one be armed against such a dilemma?

Several of the Concordances aim to supply the needed information. An appendix to the Englishman's Greek Concordance has the fullest list of various readings. It gives the variations adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers, bringing the readings fairly up to date, and giving them in Greek, and also in English where the sense is affected. On referring therein to any important word in Mark xv. 28 we find "omit the verse T [T<sub>r</sub>] A W H R": that is, besides the Revisers, three editors omit the verse, and Tregelles marks it as doubtful; but Griesbach, Lachmann, and Wordsworth retain the verse. So that it is not an instance of a reading in which all the principal editors are agreed. It is doubtful, therefore, whether the Revisers were wise in omitting the verse. Indeed, what appears to some as rashness on the part of the Revisers in altering the text (in which, according to Dean Burgon, they "violated the spirit as well as the letter of their instructions") and in throwing needless doubt upon many passages by such notes as "some ancient authorities read," has damaged their work—a work that should have been such that would have been gladly hailed by every sober-minded Christian.

Other Concordances give more or less of various readings. Hudson, to Mark xv. 28, has "omit the verse G<sup>o</sup>TT<sub>r</sub><sup>b</sup> S." This, as far as it goes, virtually agrees with the above, with S added for the Sinaitic manuscript. This Concordance gives the readings of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf's 7th Edition (with the readings of the 8th Edition in a Supplement), and Tregelles in the Gospels and the Revelation (being all this editor had published when the Concordance was issued), so that the book is far behind date as to various readings.

Bruder's Concordance also gives various readings, but, except Lachmann and some earlier editors, confines his readings mostly to manuscripts. At the first (not at *every*) important word in Mark xv. 28 (πληροῦν) there is ABCDX al. om. h. v. (omit this verse).

Bullinger's Concordance gives various readings from Griesbach to Alford, and the readings of the Cod. Sin. It will therefore be seen to be somewhat behind date in this respect.

Young's Concordance professes to give various readings; "30,000 in the New Testament," says the title page. But any one attempting to learn what the variations are will be grievously disappointed. In every variation the words are merely put in brackets without the least intimation as to what the change is, or by what editors or manuscripts.

Some persons do not go to a Concordance for various readings, but to their Testaments. Thus Dr. Scrivener's Greek Testament gives variations up to the Revisers. The Englishman's Greek New Testament up to Wordsworth; several English Testaments give them more or less fully.

Happily various readings do not seriously affect any of the great foundation truths of Christianity, and some have paid but little attention to them, and would doubtless, except for critical study, have continued to pass them by had they not been brought into prominence by the Revised Version.

Comparatively little need be said in reference to the Hebrew Concordances; their construction will readily be seen by comparing them with those already described for the New Testament. There may be named:—

1. "Taylor's Hebrew Concordance" (after Buxtorf), 1754.
2. "Fürst's Hebrew Concordance." <sup>1</sup>
3. "Davidson's Hebrew Concordance." <sup>2</sup>
4. "A Handy Hebrew Concordance" <sup>2</sup> (formerly called "The Hebraists' *Vade Mecum*.")
5. "The Englishman's Hebrew Concordance." <sup>2</sup>
6. "Wilson's Lexicon and Concordance." <sup>3</sup>
7. "Young's Analytical Concordance."
8. "Pick's Bible Student's Concordance." <sup>4</sup>

The first four differ from the Greek Concordances which are similar in construction, inasmuch as they divide each Hebrew root-word into its various inflections. No. 4 does this more fully than the others, absolutely dividing each word

<sup>1</sup> Tauchnitz, Leipzig.    <sup>2</sup> Bagster & Sons, London.    <sup>3</sup> Macmillan & Co., London.    <sup>4</sup> Hamilton & Co., London.

into *every* form found in the Hebrew Bible. The other three do not go quite so far. This specimen is from No. 1 :—

	בָּתַר	
	<i>Dissecare.</i>	To cut in two.
	A piece so cut.	
	<i>Dissecuit</i>	בָּתַר 1.
divided he	Gen. 15. 10	
	PIH. <i>Et dissecuit</i>	וַיִּבְתַּר 2.
and divided	10	
	<i>Dissectio</i>	בָּתַר 3.
of Bether	Can. 2. 17	
	<i>Partem suam</i>	
each piece, <i>each</i> his piece	בָּתַר 4.	
	Gen. 15. 10	
	<i>Sectæ partes</i>	בָּתַר 5.
the parts	Jer. 34. 19	
	<i>Partes ejus</i>	בָּתַר 6.
the parts thereof	18	

At the end it gives an Index, Vocum Hebraicarum Defectivarum et Anomalarum, and Easy Rules for Reading Hebrew. The work forms two volumes folio.

Fürst's is a noble but ponderous book of over 1,400 folio pages. It gives a quotation in Hebrew for every text. Each root-word has an introduction in Hebrew and in Latin. It has eight appendixes. 1. Index Etymologicus, a list of the Latin definitions given in the body of the work. 2. Onomasticum Sacrum, giving the signification of the proper names *in German*. 3. Lexicon Aramaicum et Neohebraicum. 4. Tabula Etymologica particularum Hebraicarum et Aramaicarum. 5. Systema formarum Nominalium. 6. Propylæa Masoræ. 7. ספר זכרונות לשון קדש וספור דברי ימיה מיום הזה. החלה להראות בכתב רשום בספרי קדש עד היום הזה. 8. Tabula Comparativa, comparing the Hebrew words with Arabic, Syraic, and Aramaic.

Davidson's is in 4to, also giving quotations in Hebrew. It has at each root-word its meaning in English. An appendix gives a list of Hebrew and Chaldee particles and their equivalents in English.

The Handy Hebrew Concordance is on the same prin-

ciple, but gives references only. It gives the meaning of the Hebrew roots in a word or two of English, and has full lists of particles, and of every other word.

The Englishman's Hebrew Concordance, two vols., large 8vo., is on precisely the same principle as the Englishman's Greek. It gives a Hebrew word, and every passage where that word occurs, putting in *italic* the word or words that correspond to the Hebrew root. It gives the proper names in full, and has indexes both Hebrew and English.

Wilson's Hebrew Lexicon and Concordances is based upon the English Authorised Version, and is on the same plan as has already been explained for Bullinger's Greek. It has the disadvantage of including several words under one heading: thus, under the heading "hate," would be included to hate, hater, hatred, to be hated, hateful, and hatefully. Also, in some places, where the references to a Hebrew word are very numerous, all are omitted, the reader having to conclude that if the reference he seeks for is *not* in the list given, it must belong to that word. It gives a notification as to what *part* of the verb is used in each passage.

Young's Concordance is based on the English. It gives in short the meaning of each Hebrew word, and quotes the passages. In the verbs, it separates the *kal* from the *niphal*, &c. This work has the advantage of having the Old and New Testaments under one list of words, and is a useful book; but one is sorry to have to add that omissions and errors occasionally lessen its value.<sup>1</sup>

Pick's Concordance is on the same plan as Wilson's, but gives the meanings of the words in a word or two only. There may also be mentioned a *Dictionary and Concordance of Scripture Proper Names*, by W. Henderson, M.D. (T. & T. Clark). This work differs from the other Concordances based on the English (except Dr. Young's) in that it *quotes* a sentence for each passage. It also gives a short introduction to the names of places with intimations as to their identification. It avoids giving the *signification* of names, acknowledging the difficulties. A work on this branch of the

<sup>1</sup> The edition examined is the "Fifth Thousand—Stereotype."

subject is still a desideratum, since Fürst has upset so many of the old familiar and favourite significations.

To complete the list of Concordances those for the Septuagint need to be named. They are two :—

1. Tromm's Concordance to the LXX, in two vols., folio, 1718. It gives a Greek word with its meaning in Latin, and quotes every passage where that word occurs, but ranges the passages under the various Hebrew words so translated, and gives in short the meaning of each Hebrew word. It has also occasional references to Origen's Hexapla. It is supposed to include the Apocrypha, but this has been only partially given. It was made from the Aldine text, 1597, which has long since given place to the Vatican text. This makes it tedious to use the Concordance, for many of the verses do not agree in the two texts. It has a Hebrew index, and a "Greek Lexicon to the Hexapla."

2. A handy Concordance to the LXX,<sup>1</sup> in one vol., small 4to. It ranges the references under the Greek words, but does not give the Hebrew equivalents. It is based on Tischendorf's edition of the Vatican text, and gives readings from Codices Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, and Ephræmi. Its references extend to the canonical books only. It has an appendix of words from Origen's Hexapla, &c., not found in the above manuscripts.

This completes the writer's task. He has endeavoured to show what appliances there are in the form of Concordances for the study of the Word of God, and to give some idea of how they may be used to advantage. He has had chiefly in view the English student who is acquainted with his own language only, though he hopes that the information given may be useful to others more learned, and enable them to choose the books they think most likely to help them. A study of the Scriptures themselves, and pondering over the words which God has caused to be written, seeing their connection, will, under the blessing of God, be a great protection against falling into error, and will lead to our building up ourselves on our most holy faith.

G. MORRISH.

<sup>1</sup> Bagster & Sons.

## THE AORIST OF RECURRENCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

EVERY tyro knows the normal sense of the Greek aorist; but there is one use of it which even scholars sometimes overlook, or but partially recognise; and as the sense of some important passages of the New Testament is affected by it, the object of this paper is to discuss some of these, with the view of shewing what light is thrown upon the sense of them by proper attention to the tense used in them. But first let the reader note how the aorist comes to have a frequentative sense. In its proper sense it denotes an action *simply past* (corresponding to the English preterite); but by a natural process of thought it comes to express an action which took place repeatedly in past time, or some *ever-recurrent* action, and so some *general principle* or *law* in the matter referred to.<sup>1</sup> The German grammarians call this the *gnomic* aorist, or the aorist of *habitude*. In English it is best rendered by the present tense. Thus (Luke iii. 12), "This is my beloved Son, in whom (literally) I was well pleased" (*ἠὺδόκησα*); but since the meaning is, "I was, and ever have been, and will be pleased"—an 'eternally recurrent complacency'—it is rightly rendered by the present tense, "I am well pleased."

Let us now see how, by observing this feature of the aorist, light is thrown upon such passages as the following.

1. In the *Magnificat*—the Virgin's song—(Luke i. 46-55), she first praises the Lord for what He *had done* for herself, and then expatiates on this as but a *principle* of the Divine procedure, a 'law of the kingdom,' examples of which are continually to be seen. Accordingly we have a succession of *aorists of recurrence* (seven in number), which it is a pity that neither the A. V. nor the R. V. have rendered in the present tense, as follows: "He *sheweth* strength with His arm; He *scattereth* the proud in the imagination of their

<sup>1</sup> Winer, supplemented (and to some extent corrected) by Alexander Buttmann and our own Donaldson, Jelf, &c.

heart; He *putteth down* princes from their thrones, and *exalteth* them of low degree; the hungry He *filleteth* with good things, and the rich He *sendeth empty away*; He *helpeth* Israel, His servant."

2. In that invaluable record of our Lord's dialogue with Nicodemus (John iii.), He chides that ruler of the Jews with knowing nothing about that elementary truth of His own Scriptures—*regeneration*—and goes on to ask how he would be able to take in far higher truths which He had yet to teach, about Himself as the Uplifted One, on faith in Whom would hang the eternal life or the perdition of men. Then followed a general reflection on the reigning aversion to spiritual light in a carnal world, which I wish that the New Testament Revisers had rendered thus: "And this is the condemnation that the light is come into the world, and men *love* the darkness rather than the light, for their deeds are evil; for every one that doeth evil hateth the light, and cometh not to the light lest his works should be reproved." The whole statement is, on the face of it, the expression of a principle in continual operation, and therefore the aorist should be put not in the *past* tense, but in the present.

3. In James i. 11 the general principle of the statement is so obvious that the A. V. has, by the instinct of its translators, rendered the *four aorists* which are used in it by the present tense: "For the sun *is* no sooner *risen* with a burning heat but it *withereth* the grass, and the flower thereof *falleth*, and the grace of the fashion of it *perisheth*." The Revisers have here preserved the present tense. But they have not been always consistent, for

4. In 1 John v. 4 the aorist should be rendered in the present tense: "For whatsoever is born of God *overcometh* the world: and this is the victory that *overcometh* the world, even our faith." The Revisers render the aorist here by the *perfect* tense ("hath overcome"), possibly thinking the Apostle was referring to the victories already achieved. But this, I think, is unnatural, and I cannot doubt that the A. V. rightly

expresses the sense of the statement (as does the Vulgate of Jerome—*vincit*).

But the most valuable improvement which recognition of this use of the aorist would yield is, in my judgment, in

5. Rom. viii. 29, 30, where no fewer than eight of these aorists occur in the expression of *the great principles of God's procedure* towards all His people: "For whom He *foreknoweth*, He also *foreordaineth* to be conformed to the image of His Son . . . and whom He *foreordaineth* them He also *calleth*; and whom He *calleth*, them He also *justifieth*; and whom He *justifieth*, them He also *glorifieth*." By rendering all this in the past tense, expositors are divided among themselves as to what time is here meant; whereas it requires only that the context and whole tenor of the passage be grasped to satisfy one that no time at all is meant, but a principle of action in the Divine administrations of the Kingdom of Grace.<sup>1</sup>

I have said enough, I hope, to shew that a good deal is lost by overlooking this sense of the aorist in the New Testament, and several more might have been added to the five examples here given. In such a book as the New Testament every effort should be made to convey in the translation as much as possible of the sense of the original. This, however, may be overdone; and the Revisers have carried this so far, in the opinion of the public, that they will not allow the Revised to supersede the Authorised Version. Some of those who had to do with that work predicted this result, but they were in a minority. Yet, not only in every chapter, but almost in every verse, the close student will find real improvement. The more, then, is the pity that the Revisers lost their chance of superseding the Authorised Version in public use. For they often destroyed the exquisite ring of the old Version by a determination to extract the last shred of the sense of a verse, and even then have not made it a bit clearer, and a good deal harsher.

DAVID BROWN.

<sup>1</sup> See the writer's *Handbook on the Epistle to the Romans*, p. 91 (Clark). 1883.

## PROFESSOR MOMERIE ON INSPIRATION.<sup>1</sup>

ONE of the greatest evils in the chief departments of thought in the present age is the inordinate love of generalisation, which leads its votaries to generalise on the basis of narrow inductions. It would be difficult to find a more striking illustration of this vice of our times than we have in this little volume of Professor Momerie's. So far as it deals with the subject of inspiration, it consists of hasty conclusions and sweeping, wholesale generalisations based on the most palpably inadequate premises. The aim of the author is to overthrow the immemorial doctrine of Christendom, regarding the nature and extent of the inspiration of the sacred writers, and to establish in its stead the doctrine of a universal inspiration, of which all men are partakers in a greater or less degree. He considers it inconsistent with the relation of God as the Creator of the world to hold that He has limited the gift of inspiration to some while withholding it from others; or to hold that inspiration "has nothing to do with the productions of art, with the discoveries of science, with the meditations of the philosopher, with the labours of the philanthropist." He represents the advocates of a genuine, distinctive inspiration, as believing that God "is a religious Being only, and never influences men except for the purpose of conveying religious instruction."

On reading these statements one is at a loss to imagine on what authority they are made. Can their author point to any theologian of repute who entertains such views, or to any of the historical Churches of Christendom, Greek or Latin, Lutheran or Reformed, whose Creeds can be adduced in justification of such charges? On the contrary, they hold and insist on all that Professor Momerie here charges them with denying. They hold that the Divine Logos, who under the economy of Grace has been ordained as the Prophet of the Church, and specially anointed of the Holy Ghost for the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Inspiration, and other Sermons*, by Professor Momerie, M.A., D.Sc., LL.D.

execution of His prophetic functions, is also the source of light to "every man that cometh into the world," and to the whole angelic host. He is the author of Gabriel as well as of Adam ; and there is no true wisdom now possessed by man, or possessed by the sages of antiquity, which has not come from Him "in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

Professor Momerie endeavours to represent the orthodox view as the offspring of a narrow-minded, one-sided, illiberal, selfish, and self-conceited conception of the Divine character and relations ; but the image he has conjured up has no existence save in his own imagination. It is true in this case, as it is in all others, that the orthodox view can embrace all that is true in the rival theories advanced by its opponents, while it adds to them elements without which they cannot be accepted as adequate accounts of the facts with which they profess to deal. The advocates of the orthodox view of inspiration are under no necessity to deny the doctrine of the Divine immanence, or to deny that it is by the presence and agency of Him who created all things, visible and invisible, that all created things consist. This they hold, but at the same time they hold that above and beyond all this the Scriptures, which are the only reliable source of information on this subject, teach that God sustained a relation to the sacred writers which He sustained to no others. They teach that having bestowed upon them those gifts which He regarded as necessary to fit them for His gracious purpose, He, by His Holy Spirit, took possession of their entire spiritual being, utilising all these gifts for the communication of His will to men, so that what they wrote or spoke God spoke, for they spake as the Spirit gave them utterance. This fact is a sufficient answer to the argument against verbal inspiration from observed diversity of style, which Professor Momerie has here resurrected once more. It is just because the Holy Spirit took full possession of the men whom God had previously endowed with the peculiar gifts requisite for His purpose, and brought these qualities into action in the production of the sacred record, that the styles of the sacred writers are marked

by the diversity which has been urged as an argument against a plenary inspiration, extending to the language employed. Those who advance this argument overlook the fact that these writers were created and endowed and trained by God with a view to the work they were to accomplish. Surely it must be manifest, on the slightest reflection, that in bestowing upon them diversity of gifts His design was to produce diversity of style, and that uniformity of style, under such an arrangement, was intentionally rendered impossible.

But let us look more closely at our author's theory, and at the arguments he advances in support of it. Strange to say, he finds the key which is to unlock the mystery of inspiration in the account given of the Divine action in the impartation of life to Adam. In that account we are told that God breathed into Adam's nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul. "What the old Hebrew writer meant," Professor Momerie says, "was simply that our being was derived from God's—that it was in kind identical with God's. Every man," he says, "is inspired; every man is himself an inspiration; he has been, so to speak, begotten by God; he is the outcome of God; his real nature is in germ Divine."

In order to reconcile this theory of man's nature and origin with "the fact that there is such infinite diversity observable among men" our author emphasises the phrase "*in germ Divine*." The mind which any one possesses to start with," he alleges, "is but the germ of what it may eventually become. Its development is different in different individuals, so different that we are apt to forget their common origin. When compared with men of genius, average men seem commonplace and undivine. It is the former only whom we should generally speak of as inspired. And even in their case we should not apply the word indiscriminately to all they said and did, but we should restrict it to the most remarkable of their achievements" (p. 2).

These sentences put us in possession of their author's theory of inspiration, and place us in a position to judge of its claims. There is no mistaking of his idea, either as regards the origin or the extent of it. It has its well-spring in man's

nature, and is as wide as the human race. Man, as man, is inspired because he is, in virtue of his origin and his relation to the fountain whence his being has flowed, himself an inspiration of the Almighty.

Such is the theory; what about the basis on which its author has founded it? Its sole foundation is, as already intimated, the passage in Genesis which represents God as breathing into man's nostrils the breath of life, and thus constituting him a living soul. It is true there are three additional passages placed alongside of it as constituting with it an apparent warrant for the doctrine avowed. It is, however, also true that the text from Genesis, as interpreted above, rules the other texts, and the ruling is such as to neutralise and set at naught their testimony—a testimony which, on any fair interpretation, is absolutely subversive of the author's doctrine.

Here then is the first illustration of the vice of a narrow and exceedingly misleading induction. He has taken a passage from the second chapter of the first book in the Bible—a passage, too, in which the subject he is treating of is manifestly not before the mind of the sacred writer, and he insists on making it the standard by which other passages in which the subject he professes to be discussing holds a foremost place shall be interpreted. It is surely unnecessary to criticise the exegetical principle underlying this procedure. The author speaks of "the evolution of the Bible." It may be asked, is it in accordance with the theory of evolution to form our conception of the mature organism from what we know of the mysterious undeveloped germ? Is it by studying their primary life-cells, that biologists manage to describe with accuracy, and classify the different forms of earth's *fauna* and *flora*? Are we accustomed to proceed as our author has done in this case, in the case of any other doctrine of holy writ? Do we frame our views of the Godhead by what is revealed regarding the Divine nature in the first or second chapter of Genesis? It is one of the strongest proofs of the inspiration of the sacred writers that there is nothing on record in the earlier books of the Bible—books composed in the very dawn of revelation—which is not found to be in

harmony with the fullest disclosures of the subsequent books. We do not, however, begin with the earlier and obscure, and make them regulate our interpretations of the later and more lucid. A competent exegete will begin at the other end ; he will take up those portions of Scripture in which the subject of his study is formally treated and expounded, and he will base his doctrinal conclusions on these. Having done this, he will take their clear utterances as guides in the interpretation of such references to the same subject as he may find in the earlier revelation.

This is just what our author has not done. He begins with Genesis—with the earliest sacred writing in existence—and from it, in the face of his own evolutionary principles, formulates his theory of inspiration. He makes Genesis regulate all that the New Testament writers have placed on record regarding the subject he has chosen to discuss.

But what are we to think of the theology evolved from this "old Hebrew writer" by such exegesis? According to our author, it was no mere breath of his lungs that Adam received from his Creator. His being was derived from God's being, and was identical in kind with it, and was truly Divine in germ. This is certainly an exalted view of man's nature ; a little too exalted for acceptance by those who have anything like just conceptions of the Divine nature and who take into account the history of our fallen race. It is true the author says that man's nature is only the same *in kind* with God's ; but if, as he says, man's being was derived from God's being, it must be the same *in substance* with the Divine essence. It cannot be regarded, if we are to accept our author's account of its production, as simply *homoiousios*, but must be recognized as *homoousios*, with the fountain whence it flowed. If we accept this account of man's origin, we must believe that the Divine essence is capable of *fission* or *segmentation*, or that it can be broken up in portions and distributed among finite moral agents ; and that, as this process is still in progress, the Divine essence is undergoing perpetual and incessant curtailment. Surely no one possessed of just views of the Divine nature, and of the relations which God sustains to the

creatures of His hand, will entertain any such theory when its irreverent implications are understood. The transformation or the transfusion of the Divine essence into a finite moral nature must be regarded as an impossibility, and is beset with all the insurmountable difficulties which attach to the doctrines of consubstantiation or transubstantiation.

Viewed in the light of human history, the theory wears a very offensive aspect. The portion of the Divine essence imparted by the creative act to Adam rebelled against its fontal source, and from him have sprung a race of moral agents who, although possessing portions of that same essence as truly as Adam did, give evidence of like alienation from God. Are we to believe that all are simply so many incarnations of portions of the Divine essence and inspirations of the Almighty?

Our author, as we have seen, has only reached his second page when he feels constrained to abate and modify his theory. "When compared with men of genius," he says, "average men seem commonplace and undivine. It is the former only whom we should generally speak of as inspired. And even in their case we should not apply the word indiscriminately to all they said and did, but we should restrict it to the most remarkable of their achievements."

Well, these are considerable abatements of the claims advanced for humanity. In the first place, while, according to the interpretation given by our author to his normal, regulative text, every son of Adam, as truly as Adam himself, is possessed of a portion of the Divine essence which constitutes him an incarnate Divine inspiration, it is only a certain select few, styled men of genius, "whom we should generally speak of as inspired." And, in the second place, "even in their case," we are to exercise caution, and restrict the word inspired "to the most remarkable of their achievements!"

Now these abatements are manifestly devised to help the theory through the ordeal of the crucial text of fact which the author must have seen looming even through, and in despite of, the haze of this semi-pantheistic speculation. We cannot, however, allow our theorist to subject his theory to such illogical shrinkage. He has laid down his funda-

mental principle in a literal interpretation of the Divine action in the creation of man, and by that principle, with all its legitimate consequences, he must abide. That principle may admit of a greater or less degree of inspiration (if we can imagine one portion of the Divine essence as better informed than another), according to the measure of the Divine essence imparted in the particular case ; but in every case, wherever that essence is, and in whatever measure possessed, there inspiration is, and cannot, without doing despite to the divinity enshrined within, be treated with indifference as unworthy of recognition, or hearkened to in some of its utterances or doings, while in its other activities no account whatever is to be taken of anything it says or does ! Having got hold of the principle that inspiration implies the possession of the very essence of God, and having seen that our author not only holds this, but claims that man, as man, possesses this essence, we must go through with these inseparable cognate principles, and hold that every individual of the race, in all lands and in all times, has been possessed of the great gift of a portion of the Divine essence—a portion constituting his personal being—and of its necessary adjunct, a truly Divine inspiration. Our author must admit this or abandon his theory. He cannot be permitted to make his own selections out of the human family and claim that the word “inspired” is to be restricted to these. His fundamental is irreconcilable with any such restriction, and, of necessity, carries with it the doctrine of a universal inspiration—the inspiration of the most degraded tribes of “the dark continent” as truly, though not in the same degree, as the most enlightened nations of the earth.

But even with the limitation of the term “inspired” to men of genius, there is still a grave difficulty to be encountered. The men who have been recognised as men of genius, whether in ancient or in modern times, have not been of one mind in regard to things which it most concerns man to know. On the contrary, their speculations respecting the soul, the universe, or God have been of the most conflicting character. Not only of the sages of Greece or of Rome, but

of the philosophers of modern times, even up to our own day, may it be said, that by their wisdom they knew not God, and have been in irreconcilable conflict with one another. Is it not manifest that these great facts which are engraven as with a pen of iron on the face of human history warrant us in rejecting the theory which claims for men of genius the high prerogatives of a Divine inspiration?

There is, besides, a still more serious aspect of this theory which must not be overlooked. If all men are partakers of a portion of the Divine essence, or of a "*Divine germ*" as our author puts it, the question very naturally arises, how comes it to pass that in every instance in the history of our race, with the one exception of our Divine Redeemer, this germ develops in a woefully wrong direction. Even the author of "*Ecce Homo*," who certainly cannot be charged with any peculiarly orthodox leanings, acknowledges that holiness is so rare a characteristic of man that, in the whole history of the race, there have not been more than one or two, if any, instances of what could be regarded as genuine holiness.

Now this one fact is fatal to the theory. A germ that uniformly develops in an evil direction must in its native character be evil, and consequently cannot, without grave offence against the Most Holy, be regarded as a portion of His essence. Our author seems to overlook this great and awfully momentous fact—a fact to which the Word of God bears constant testimony—that man "is indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all spiritual good," and is as the Articles of the Church of England put it, "very far gone from original righteousness (*ab originali justitia quam longissime distet*), and is of his own nature inclined to evil." This could not be said, in truth, if man in his very essence were neither more nor less than a portion of the immaculate essence of Deity. Had our author kept this teaching of the Bible and of all human history before his mind, he would never have thought of exalting our fallen nature into the exalted position claimed for it in this volume. He would have seen that men whose hearts are at enmity against God, and are not subject, and cannot be subject to His law, are not in a

position to think rightly of Him, or to instruct others in regard to His attributes or His relations to men. Any one who will accept what the Scriptures and all human history teach regarding the native darkness of the human mind respecting Divine things, must be constrained to confess that, apart from a supernatural revelation, such as this author utterly ignores, and apart from a supernatural agency put forth on the original recipients of it in communicating the revelation received by them to their fellow-men, there had been no true knowledge of the one only living and true God possessed by our race.

Indeed, the fact is that although men entered originally upon their career with accurate conceptions of God, they did not like to retain God in their thoughts, and changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator who is blessed for ever. The Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, gives a full sketch of the process of degradation through which men passed in their conceptions of God, and he assumes that his sketch was true, not only at Rome, but throughout the Gentile and Jewish world—true of all nations however cultured; and, on the face of it, the verdict it gives out is that there is no recuperative spiritual capacity in men to recover the knowledge of God once possessed by them, but which, because they did not like to retain it, they have cast behind their backs or trodden under foot. It is idle to glorify human nature as our author has done, and to claim for it an inspiration as extensive as the race itself. No man can hold with Paul in his estimate of man, and at the same time accept Professor Momerie's estimate. Holding as Christian men must with the great Apostle of the Gentiles, they must reject the speculations of any man who claims for human nature, in its fallen estate, and apart from the immediate and supernatural agency of the Holy Ghost, capacity to acquire such knowledge of God as will make its possessor wise unto salvation or fit him for communicating infallibly that knowledge to others.

In these sermons, which are simply an attack upon the

Word of God, Professor Momerie adopts the usual very unfair and utterly unphilosophical method of discussion. He begins with the objections commonly urged against the orthodox doctrine, and from these he constructs his theory. Instead of collecting together and analysing the great facts presented in the Scriptures, and the claims advanced by the sacred writers themselves, he culls out such apparent discrepancies as he thinks most striking, and parades these as proofs of the fallibility of the sacred record, and consequently of the lack of inspiration on the part of its authors. A scientist or a philosopher who would proceed in this fashion in dealing with the phenomena of matter or of mind would be disowned by the science of the age, and would find himself treated as a mere sciolist. Common sense as well as common honesty, not to speak of science, demands a very different course. A truly scientific mode of procedure will take all the facts into account, and from these, fully and fairly considered, will evolve its theory. When this has been done it will take up those incidental features of the phenomena which seem at variance with the conclusions reached, and will weigh and estimate them at their proper value ; but it will never allow the incidental, however unaccountable it may appear in the present state of knowledge, to overbear the concurrent testimony of the great body of facts by which the theory evolved has been suggested, and by which it has been confirmed and justified. The reverent student of the Word will feel greatly strengthened in his conviction regarding the wisdom and the righteousness of this course when he calls to remembrance the numerous alleged irreconcilable discrepancies that have been satisfactorily explained by the progress of scholarly investigation. As it has been in the past, he will naturally conclude, so it may be in the future : increase of knowledge may solve problems over which a less competent scholarship has laboured in vain.

As specimens of the discrepancies selected, or, as the author calls them, palpable contradictions, the following from the first two chapters of Genesis may suffice. "In chapter first the birds and beasts," he says, "were created before man.

In the second, man is created before the birds and beasts. . . . In the first, man and woman are created together, as the closing and completing work of the whole creation; created also, as is evidently implied, in the same kind of way, to be the complement of one another; and thus created, they are blessed together. In the second (ii. 7, 8, 15, 22), the beasts and birds are created between the man and the woman. First the man is made of the dust of the ground, and is placed by himself in the garden; then the beasts and the birds are made, and the man gives them names; and lastly, after all this, the woman is made out of one of his ribs, not as the complement, but only as a helpmate for the man. The Biblical account of the creation, therefore, is erroneous, not only because it contradicts the teaching of science, but because it contradicts itself."

Now it is a canon of fair criticism that a writer be credited with the measure of intelligence which his work displays. It is also universally acknowledged that the writer, or, if you choose, the writers, of these two chapters must be credited with no ordinary measure of intelligence. The subject dealt with is one of the sublimest ever touched by man—the origin of the universe—and it is confessed, as confessed it must be, that although the account was penned away in the dawn of letters, there is not a sentence that is not in keeping with its august theme. Its merits and native grandeur can only be seen in its unapproachable majesty when it is placed side by side with the crude kosmogonies of the heathen, or the kosmogony of Professor Huxley, who evolves out of blind force the conscious intellect and will of man.

Bearing these facts in mind, are we to believe that a writer possessing the range of intelligence revealed in this narrative of creation would contradict himself within the compass of these two brief chapters, or that even a "redactor" gifted as this one must have been, would be guilty of placing two contradictory narratives in such close connection that their incongruity and mutual antagonism, if we are to credit Professor Momerie and Dr. Dods and Professor Huxley, must stare the reader in the face? Surely it is but due to the

record to seek some explanation which may save the intelligence of the sacred writer from being sacrificed at the shrine of such ruthless, unbridled criticism. Such explanation is not far to seek. In the first place, as has been pointed out again and again, the account given in the first chapter is generic, while that given in the second is specific and detailed. The first tells us that God created man, male and female, after His own image, and blessed them, the man and the woman. Here we have the general statement without any attempt at detail. We are not told, as Professor Momerie alleges, that He created them together, nor are we informed regarding the material out of which either of them was fashioned. For aught that this account states, they may have been created separately, and formed out of different materials. If any other account says they were so created, there is nothing in this account to contradict it. In the second chapter the details, for which the general statement leaves ample room, are given, and we are informed that the man was created from the dust of the ground, and that the woman was formed out of a rib taken from his side; just as Paul put it, the woman is *of* the man and *for* the man (1 Cor. xi. 8, 9).

But how are we to reconcile the account which represents the birds and beasts as created before man with the account which represents man as created before the birds and beasts? In view of the manifest intelligence of the narrator, we are certainly justified in seeking and accepting any reasonable explanation before charging him with what Professor Momerie calls "a palpable contradiction." This explanation is at hand and is very simple. The ground of the apparent discrepancy is in the English translation, and not in the Hebrew original. If instead of rendering the verb יָצַר in the imperfect, as our translators have done, we render it in the pluperfect, the discrepancy disappears, and the two narratives are in perfect accord. Instead of representing the narrator as saying that "The Lord God created every beast of the field and every fowl of the heavens, and brought them to the man," the passage would then read, "Now the Lord God *had* created every beast of the field and every fowl of the heavens,

and he brought them to the man." This passage is so rendered in Rabbi Leeser's translation of the Old Testament, and such change of tense in translating it is recognised by Bush and Delitzsch as grammatically just.

We have, moreover, an analogous case in the accounts given of the recovery of Hezekiah in 2 Kings xx. 7 and in Isaiah xxxviii. 21. In the former passage Isaiah is represented as giving instructions about placing the figs on the boil before the king's recovery, while in the latter the prophet's instruction about the figs is not mentioned until the narrative of his recovery, together with a copy of his song of thanksgiving, has been placed on record. This apparent discrepancy in the order of these incidents has been obviated by our translators, who have rendered the same Hebrew verb *וַיִּטֵּן* which occurs in both passages in the same Hebrew tense by different tenses in English. In Kings the translation is, "And Isaiah *said* take a cake of figs, and they took and laid it on the boil, and he recovered." In Isaiah the rendering is, "Now Isaiah *had* said, let them take a cake of figs and lay it for a plaster upon the boil, and he shall recover." Indeed, in these two narratives we have a twofold illustration of the way in which our translators have proceeded in turning Hebrew tenses into English. In Kings, as rendered by them, the 8th verse reads, "And Hezekiah *said* unto Isaiah, What shall the sign be that I shall go up unto the house of the Lord?" In Isaiah the same verse with the same verb *וַיִּטֵּן* in the same tense is rendered thus, "Hezekiah also *had* said, What is the sign," &c.

Now by this simple and truly grammatical expedient our translators have avoided the creation of an apparent discrepancy in these narratives of Hezekiah's recovery, and we have never heard of a Hebrew scholar who has ventured to question the grammatical propriety of their procedure. Their solution of the apparent discrepancy of these two narratives is ours in regard to the discrepancy which Professor Momerie has charged upon the accounts of creation as given in the first two chapters of Genesis. A change of tense in the translation is all that is needed.

ROBERT WATTS.

## CHRISTMAS CAROLS.

IT would be impossible to treat adequately of Christmas carols without saying something of Christmas itself, with the observance of which they are so intimately associated.

Festivals and festivities at this time of the year are very much older than the Christian period. They had their origin in the ancient worship of the Sun, who was specially adored at this time, because the shortest day being past, he turned his chariot back in the direction of summer, and began to rise earlier and set later. Hence comes *Yule-tide*, one of the ancient names for Christmas, from the word *Iul*, meaning "wheel" or "revolution," referring to the return of the sun.

The Druids in Britain kept this season in honour of the deity Thor, who gives his name to the fifth day of the week, Thursday or *Thor's day*. The mistletoe was used by them in these festivities, but I do not know whether the pleasant custom now associated with that plant existed then, or originated with them.

The Roman *Saturnalia* also took place at this time of year.

The observance of the Feast of the Nativity at this season was enjoined upon Christians as early as the first and second centuries. The exact date of our Lord's birth is not certain, and in this instance, as in many others, the rulers of the Church may have sought to wean newly converted people from idolatrous practices by appointing for a Christian festival the day or season formerly devoted to heathen worship.

In the 11th and 12th centuries the doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ was in danger of being forgotten through the prevalence of a widespread heresy called Manicheism, upon the peculiar tenets of which I will not

dwelt. St. Francis of Assisi—the founder of the famous Franciscan Order of Monks—in the winter of 1223 obtained permission from the Pope to introduce into the churches where he had influence certain ceremonies at Christmas, which he thought would impress upon the uneducated and others, who had not taste or understanding to follow abstruse theological discussions, the great truth then being obscured by Manichean teaching—that “the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us”—the weighty fact expressed in the word “*Emmanuel*.”

Mrs. Oliphant, in her biography of St. Francis, thus relates his proceedings :—

“When the eve of the Nativity approached, Francis instructed a certain grave and worthy man, called Giovanni, to prepare an ox and an ass, with a manger and all the common fittings of a stable, for his use in the church. When the solemn night arrived, Francis and his brethren arranged all these things into a visible representation of the occurrences of the night at Bethlehem. The manger was filled with hay, the animals were led into their places; the scene was prepared, as we see it now in the churches of Southern Italy—a reproduction, as far as the people knew how, in startling realistic detail, of the surroundings of the first Christmas—the friars sang new canticles, which were listened to with all the eagerness of a people accustomed to the jongleurs and wandering minstrels, and to whom such songs were all the food to be had for the intellect and imagination.”

With this *Præsepio*, Krippe, Crèche, or Crib of St. Francis commenced the hymns of the Nativity, which are so favourite a part of Christian worship, and from them Christmas carols sprang, of which, while some might be classed with hymns, though they follow perhaps too much the narrative form, others, even when serious in their meaning, are of too secular a character to be sung with profit during Divine service.

Carols arose thus in Italy, but the best authorities assign to France and Burgundy the credit of their origin. They are there called *Noëls*, which Sir George Grove, in his *Dictionary*

of *Music*, defines as "a peculiar kind of hymn or canticle on the Nativity, of mediæval origin."

But Jeremy Taylor tells us when and where the first carol was sung: "After the angel had told his message in plain song, the whole chorus joined in descant, and sang an hymn to the tune and sense of Heaven, where glory is paid to God in eternal and never-ceasing offices, and whence good-will descends upon man in never-ceasing torrents. As soon as these blessed choristers had sung their *Christmas carol*, and taught the Church a hymn to put into her offices for ever, the angel returned into heaven."

The carol says :

"The first Nowell the angels did say  
Was to certain poor shepherds in fields as they lay."

So this was not an original idea of the great divine.

There are two derivations given of the word *Noël*, either of which is sufficiently expressive and satisfactory. One is the French *nouvelle*, or "news." This fits very well the angelic message, "Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy." The other is the Latin *natalis*, whence comes our word "natal," or birth-day, which accords with the event commemorated.

Carol has also more than one derivation. Some think it comes from *ceorl*, an Anglo-Saxon word, afterwards spelled and pronounced *churl*, which now means a rude, surly fellow, but originally signified a rustic or countryman. The idea was that carols were sung more in villages than towns. This seems rather a far-fetched derivation. Others derive it from the Italian *carolare*, to sing joyously; and Baretti, in his Dictionary, explains carol to be a dance accompanied by singing. Others say its root is the same as *quadrille* or *carillon*, a song or dance for four persons.

It seems incongruous to us now to couple sacred themes with dancing and dance music. But they were not always considered incongruous. David danced before the Ark. In Ps. cxlix. 3, we read, "Let them praise Him *in the dance*; let them sing praises to Him with tabret and harp."

Dante writes (*Paradise*, Cants. xxiv. v. 17):—

“Even thus their carols weaving variously  
They by the measure paced, or swift or slow,  
Made me to rate the riches of their joy.”

In Chaucer's *Dreame* he says:—

“I saw her daunce so comely,  
Carol and sing so sweetly.”

The Mummers who used to go about carolling no doubt danced to the music too. Dancing being looked upon, like singing, as a mode of expressing joy, and joy being the leading thought in the ancient carols.

Singing and dancing in churches on special occasions was common in the middle ages, but led in the course of years to great irreverence. There was great difficulty in suppressing it on the continent, and in England too, though it did not exist here to the same extent. As late as the 17th century the apprentices and servants of the city of York used to have a dance in the Minster on Shrove Tuesday, and Dean Lake was almost killed by the apprentices for trying to keep them out. There was also an annual dance at Salisbury Cathedral. At Echternach, in Luxembourg, there is a dancing procession from the bridge to the cathedral, round the altar and out again to the cemetery, where the performers separate. In 1869 there were 8,000 persons in this procession. The *Daily Telegraph* of February 22nd, 1875, gives an interesting account of a ceremony which takes place on Shrove Tuesday, Corpus Christi Day, and the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, in the Cathedral, at Seville. Twelve of the choir boys sing a joyful carol, and dance to the music of a band. After the dance, they play a castanet *obligato* to the tune. This is done thrice. The ceremony is witnessed by a large congregation sitting, and the writer says there is no appearance of irreverence or levity. There is no doubt that sacred music was associated with solemn and stately dancing in former times; and, like many other ancient practices, degenerated into abuse, and was then abolished.

Carols were sung in the Mystery Plays or Sacred Dramas

so popular in the middle ages. As an instance of the familiar way in which Scriptural subjects were handled in those compositions, there is one on the deluge, in which Noah's wife refuses to enter the ark, because she will not leave her gossips behind. Her sons at last push her in by force, when she relieves her wounded feelings by giving Noah a sounding box on the ear.

Marguerite de Valois, Queen of Navarre, was the author of a Mystery Play, entitled *Le Comedie de la Nativite de Jésus Christ*, in which one of the songs commences "Dansons, chantons." So the carol and the dance went together at Christmas time.

Most writers then attribute to the 12th century the beginning of Christmas carols, but many authorities assign to the 11th "From Church to Church," and that magnificent song "Royal Day," which is common to the whole of Europe, and which Luther declared to be all but inspired.

If we do not admit the great antiquity assigned to those two carols, undoubtedly the most ancient and interesting is the famous "Prose de l'Âne." At Beauvais and Sens, in France, there is a religious festival called *Fête de l'Âne*, illustrating the Flight into Egypt. A maiden is seated upon an ass, richly caparisoned, bearing a babe in her arms, representing the Virgin and the Infant Jesus. A man representing Joseph leads the ass through the city till they arrive at the cathedral.

The procession takes place on the Feast of the Circumcision, and is very popular.

They sing :

Orientis partibus  
 Advantavit asinus  
 Pulcher et fortissimus  
 Sarcinis aptissimus  
 Hez, Sire asnes, Hez !

The music of this carol is quaint and rude in style, and something like a plain-song chant.

Christmas carols may be divided into two classes, *serious*

and *secular*. I do not, as would seem to be the proper word, call the former "sacred," because there are a great number which are not founded on Scripture, but on legends, though their tone and treatment are serious and reverential.

The second class, as appears from this which I quote a few verses (date 1700), were generally sung at home, to "dance music," Mr. Chappel says, on Christmas Eve.

" Now that the time is come wherein  
Our Saviour Christ was born,  
The larders full of beef and pork,  
The garners filled with corn.

" With mutton, veal, beef, pig, and pork  
Well furnish every board,  
Plum-pudding, furmity, and what  
Thy stock will then afford."

The *serious* took the parts of psalms and hymns in the service on Christmas Day. In rural England it was customary for the parish clerk at the end of the service to wish the people a "merry Christmas and a happy New Year." Some people seem to think now that merriment, in the ordinary sense, is out of keeping with religious feeling. But "Wisdom is justified in all her children."

In the 14th century were produced two fine and well-known carols, "Christ was born on Christmas Day," and the "Seven Joys of Mary." The former will be noticed presently under another heading, and the second is an example of the continued life of a tune for upwards of four hundred years, adapted during that period to all sorts of words.

In the 15th century we find carols composed to be sung to children with a lullaby. Herod and the Slaughter of the Holy Innocents were favourite themes for these sacred songs. Some, too, have a chorus or refrain, like many of the, happily, obsolete comic songs, which read like nonsense, but which originally had probably a meaning, the words being perhaps a corruption of familiar expressions.

“ As I rood out this enderes (last) night,  
 Three jolly shepherds I saw a sight,  
 And all about their fold a star shone bright.  
 They sang ter-li-ter low.  
 So merrily the shepherd's their pipes can blow.”

The famous Coventry carol is a well-known example of the lullaby ; it commences thus :—

“ Lul-lay, thou little tiny child,  
 By, by, lul-ly, lul-lay.”

I will quote another carol, because it will serve a double purpose, not only being an example of the lullaby class, but also introducing us to others very popular in the time of Henry VI., in which Latin phrases were mixed with the English words :

“ There is a Child born of our Blessed Virgin ;  
 I heard a Maid lullaby to sing ;  
 ‘ Peace, my dear Child, of Thy weeping,  
 For Thou shalt be our heavenly King.’  
 Now sing we, and now sing we,  
 To the *Gloria tibi, Domine.*”

A noble specimen of this description of carol is “ Christ was born on Christmas Day.” It shows how the holly and other evergreens were used always in Christmas decorations :

“ Christ was born on Christmas Day,  
 Twine the holly, wreathe the bay,  
*Christus natus hodie.*”

The occurrence of these Latin sentences arose from the Church Services being in the Latin language, as they are now in the Roman Catholic Church. These words were portions of the Liturgy or of Latin hymns familiar to the people.

Hullah has copied this fashion in his fine and popular song of “ The Storm.” The refrain is *Miserere, Domine*, and in the last verse it is *Gloria tibi, Domine*, as in the carol quoted above.

To the 15th century belongs the "Cherry-tree Carol," which is one of the best known of the legendary carols.

"Joseph was an old man,  
And an old man was he  
When he married Mary,  
The Queen of Gallilee."

"Joseph and Mary walked  
Through a garden gay,  
Where the cherries they grew  
Upon every tree."

Joseph refuses to gather cherries for Mary at her request, when the cherry-tree bends down that she may pluck the fruit herself.

To the 16th century belongs "I saw Three Ships."

"I saw three ships come sailing in  
On Christmas Day, on Christmas Day ;  
I saw three ships come sailing in  
On Christmas Day in the morning."

"Jesus Christ and our Lady" were in the ships, and "they sailed into Bethlehem."

Some attribute this strange feat to the author's ignorance of geography ; others interpret the ships as camels, called the "ships of the desert." Whether this designation belonged to them at so early a date I do not know.

We come now to the 17th century, when contemporary musicians composed new carols, properly harmonised and arranged for the voice as we have them now. The credit of having made this new departure is claimed for France and Italy respectively, as the credit of originating them was claimed. François Eustache du Courroy, Maître de Henri IV., published a collection at Paris in 1610 ; but, to quote Sir George Grove again, "Giovanni M. Nanini, who died at Rome in 1607, has left us a magnificent example in the form of a motif, 'Hodie Christus natus est,' in the course of which he introduces the exclamation *Noé* with striking effect."

Far be it from us to attempt to argue the claims of these rival musicians. We must state, however, that the Italian

composers did not follow to any great extent Nanini's example, while the French have produced collections of carols of great merit from time to time since that date. In England, William Byrd, whose works are in the possession of the Royal College of Music, composed a number of what he spells "*carowles*," one of which is a lullaby like those I have already alluded to. It is taken from a book the title of which is, "Tenor Psalms, Sonets, and Songs of Sadness and Pietie, made into musicke of five parts, by William Byrd, one of the Gentlemen of the Queen's Majestie's Royal Chappell, London, 1587."

At this period, in carol singing the air was given to the tenor, and not, as is usual now, to the treble. To this century belong two very beautiful legendary carols, "The Seven Virgins" and "The Holy Well."

The former refers to the sufferings of Jesus as an incitement to charity, and to pray even for our enemies; and the latter is a legend of His childhood, borrowed, most likely, from some of the Apocryphal Gospels.

"All under the leaves and the leaves of life,  
I met with virgins seven;  
And one of them was Mary Mild,  
Our Lord's mother of heaven."

Thomas asks them what they are seeking for, and they tell him for Jesus Christ.

"Go down, go down to yonder town,  
And sit in the gallery;  
And there you'll see sweet Jesus Christ  
Nailed to a big yew-tree."

"The Holy Well" is simple and quaint, and runs thus:

"As it fell out one May morning,  
And on a bright holiday,  
Sweet Jesus asked of His dear mother  
If He might go to play."

\* \* \*

“ Sweet Jesus went down to yonder town,  
 As far as the Holy Well,  
 And there did see as fine children  
 As any tongue can tell.”

He asks them to play with Him, but they refuse, and He returns to tell His mother :

“ I bid God bless them every one  
 And Christ their bodies see ;  
 Little children, shall I play with you ?  
 And you shall play with me.

“ But then they answered me ‘ No,’  
 They were lords’ and ladies’ sons ;  
 And I, the meanest of them all,  
 Was born in an ox’s stall.”

Mary wishes Him to go back and revenge himself upon them, but “ sweet Jesus ” says :

“ ‘ Nay, nay,’ sweet Jesus mildly said,  
 ‘ Nay, nay, that must not be,  
 For there are too many sinful souls  
 Crying out for the help of Me.”

The Nativity and the visit of the Magi seem to have been popularly blended together, though the latter belongs to the Feast of the Epiphany. It is this confusion of thought and the presenting of gifts to the infant Christ by the Magi which gave rise to the presents, usual at this season, called Christmas-boxes. The underlying idea, I suppose, should be, “ Inasmuch as ye have done to the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me.”

“ We Three Kings of Orient are ” is a very fine carol. The Magi are identified with the “ three kings of Cologne ” thus. Sir Thomas Browne, in his work on *Vulgar Errors*, clears up the matter : “ These wise men or kings,” says he, “ were probably of Arabia, and descended of Abraham by Keturah, who, apprehending the mystery of the star, were by the same conducted into Judæa, returned into their own country, and were after baptised by Thomas ; thence, about three hundred

years after, by Helena the Empress, their bodies were translated to Constantinople ; thence by Eustatius into Milan, and at last by Renatus the Bishop into Cologne (1170), where they are believed at present to remain, their monuments shown unto strangers, and, having lost their Arabian titles, are crowned kings of Cologne."

Many carols are based upon the visit of the Magi, whose legendary names are Melchoir, Balthazar, and Gospar.

The second division of carols, which I have called "secular" by way of distinction, though in many of them sacred allusions occur, may be divided into "festive," like the boar's head and wassail carols, and "miscellaneous," including holly and ivy carols.

Carol-singing has always been associated with Christmas festivities since the Anglo-Norman period, as this verse testifies :

"Not a man here shall taste my March beer,  
Till a Christmas carol he doth sing ;  
Then all clapped their hands and shouted and sung,  
Till the hall and the parlour did ring."

Perhaps from this custom arose the saying, "No song, no supper."

There is a story told of a jovial knight who challenged his guests in this fashion one evening, declaring that no drink should pass round the table till every man, *who was master of his wife*, sang a carol. A profound silence ensued, broken at last by an old gentleman (probably a widower) who feebly commenced his song. But he broke down at the first verse, so dismayed was he by the stillness which prevailed. But there was a wonderful difference when the jovial knight challenged each lady to sing who was *mistress of her husband*. Every lady in the room immediately struck up her favourite carol, and as few of them agreed in choice, such joyous caterwauling was never heard before.

The wassail bowl was an invariable adjunct to the Christmas feast. This favourite beverage was made of hot ale, nutmeg, sugar, toast, and roasted crab-apples. It must have

been drunk in Dickens' younger days, for in *Pickwick* he alludes to it. The scene is at the house of Mr. Wardle, of Dingley Dell, an old-fashioned gentleman.

"When they were all tired of 'Blind-man's Buff,' there was a great game at 'Snap-dragon,' and when fingers enough were burned at that, and all the raisins were gone, they sat down by the huge fire of blazing logs to a substantial supper, and a mighty bowl of wassail, in which the hot apples were hissing and bubbling with a rich look and a jolly sound that were perfectly irresistible.

"'This,' said Mr. Pickwick, looking around him, 'this is indeed comfort.'

"'Our invariable custom,' said Mr. Wardle; 'everybody sits down with us on Christmas eve, as you see them now—servants and all; and here we wait till the clock strikes twelve to usher Christmas in.'"

In the monasteries the wassail bowl was placed before the Abbott with great ceremony, and was called *poculum caritatis*, the "cup of charity" or "love."

In the ancient universities, and at the Lord Mayor's banquets, and those of the old city Companies, a great silver tankard filled with wine is passed round. Every one takes a sip, wipes it with a napkin, and hands it on to his neighbour till it makes the circuit of the table. This is most probably a survival of the wassail bowl at the monasteries, and is called by almost the same name, the "loving cup."

In the country the wassailers went from house to house, receiving money, food, and drink, as in more modern times the Waits used to do on Christmas Eve.

"Our wassail we do fill  
With apples and with spice,  
Then grant us your good-will  
To taste here once or twice  
Of our wassail.

\* \* \*

"And now we must be gone  
To seek out more good cheer;  
Where bounty will be shown  
As we have found it here  
With our wassail."

"The Wassailer's Carol" is very pretty and simple.

"Here we come a-wassailing,  
 Among the leaves so green ;  
 Here we come a wandering,  
 So fair to be seen.  
 Love and joy come to you,  
 And to your wassail too ;  
 And God send you a happy New Year,  
 A New Year ;  
 And God send you a happy New Year.

"We are not the daily beggars  
 That beg from door to door ;  
 But we are neighbour's children,  
 Whom ye have seen before.

\* \* \*

"We have got a little purse,  
 Made of stretching leather skin ;  
 We want a little of your money  
 To line it well within.

\* \* \*

"God bless the master of this house,  
 Likewise the mistress too ;  
 And all the little children,  
 That round the table go.

"Good master and mistress,  
 While you're sitting by the fire,  
 Pray think of us poor children,  
 Who are wandering in the mire."

The antiquity of the word and the origin of the custom are shown by the fact that Rowena, daughter of Hengist, presented Vortigern with a cup of wine (or drink of some sort), saying, "Lourde King, wassail," meaning "good health" in Anglo-Saxon. Let us hope the King was polite and made the proper reply, "Drinkhail," "I drink health." Both words occur in a carol of the 13th century, said to be the oldest in this country. It is written in Anglo-Norman, and was discovered on a blank leaf in the middle of one of the MSS. in the British Museum. It is supposed to be one of those sung

by the Troubadours in Normandy. Its French origin appears from one of the verses I extract :

“ Lordlings, listen to our lay—  
 We have come from far away,  
 To seek Christmas.  
 In this mansion we are told  
 He his yearly feast doth hold,  
 ’Tis to-day!  
 May joy come from God above  
 To all those who Christmas love.

\* \* \*

“ To English ale, and *Gascon wine*,  
*And French*, doth Christmas most incline—  
*And Anjou’s too!*”

\* \* \*

“ Lords, by Christmas and the host  
 Of this mansion hear my toast—  
 Drink it well.  
 Each must drain his cup of wine ;  
 And I first will toss off mine ;  
 Thus I advise.—  
 Here then I bid you all *Wassail*,  
 Cursed be he who will not say, *Drinkhail*.

The other festive carols are those in honour of the boar’s head, which, treated with scant courtesy during his life, was much honoured after death at Christmas time. On the occasion of the son of Henry II. being recognised as Heir Apparent, the King himself with great pomp brought in the boar’s head, preceded by trumpeters, who announced the coming dish with joyous blast from their instruments.

Since the year 1340 the boar’s head has been the Christmas dish at Queen’s College, Oxford, and is carried in with much state and ceremony. The ancient carol being sung as the procession moves on :

“ *Caput apri deferro,*  
*Reddens laudes Domino.*”

The origin of this custom is said to be as follows. A student of Queen’s strolled out one day as far as Shot-over Forest, some four miles from Oxford, and sat down

under a tree, to study the works of Aristotle. Looking up from his book reflectively, to ponder on the meaning of a difficult passage, he, horror-stricken, saw a wild boar charging down upon him with open mouth. Starting to his feet as the boar's tusks were just touching him, he thrust his Aristotle down the animal's throat, and fled, shouting "*Grecum est!*" Whether he uttered this exclamation from the conviction that the boar would find the author as tough and difficult of digestion as *he* had found him, or whether having, from perusal of the book, assimilated Greek prejudices, he simply meant to convey to the boar that he looked upon him as a barbarian, or, indeed, what became of the boar is not recorded; but the commemoration of this great deliverance takes place every Christmas at Queen's, and a member of that College informed me that in his experience, though he could not say it was always done, the boar's head was borne into dinner with a volume of Aristotle in his mouth.

But, alas! the archæologists will leave us no romances. They assure us that, though this incident may have occurred at Oxford, the eating of the boar's head, like the Yule log and other Christmas customs, is of great antiquity, and is a survival of the ancient worship of the sun, as I have already mentioned, transmitted to us from the Persians, through the Scandinavian nations, by the Druids.

At the *Yule-tide* Feast a boar was sacrificed and eaten, and we have no reason to suppose that the taste for brawn is modern.

How wonderful is the conservatism of social customs! Empires vanish; forms of government change; generations pass away; savage countries are conquered and re-peopled by civilised men; heathenism gives place to Christianity; but the holly and ivy still decorate our churches; the mistletoe hangs in the hall, though the songs of the idolaters have long given place to Christmas carols.

Of the "miscellaneous" carols, the most interesting are those which speak of the holly and the ivy, their merits and contests, and in which the holly is invariably preferred and always victorious.

“Holly and Ivy make a great party,  
 Who shall have the mastery  
     In lands where they go.”  
 Then spake Holly, “I am fierce and jolly,  
 I will have the mastery  
     In lands where we go.”

And another says :

“Nay, Ivy, nay, it shall not be, I wis,  
 Let Holly have the mastery as the manner is.”

Stowe, in his History, alludes to the custom of Christmas decorations, which was evidently ancient when he wrote. “Every man’s house of olde time was decked with holly and ivy in the winter, especially at Christmas.”

Shakespeare, in his beautiful lyric “Blow, blow, thou Wintry Wind,” uses a refrain which probably belonged to a holly carol, as it does not seem to have much connection with the sentiment of the song.

“Heigh, ho ! sing heigh, ho ! unto the green holly !  
 Most friendship is feigning, most loving mere folly ;  
     Then, heigh, ho, the holly,  
     This life is most jolly.”

Of modern carols I will not speak, for though their theme is the same, they have no memories of merry gentlemen and rustic singers ; no smack of boar’s head and wassail bowls ; no hob-nailed boots and the clay of the miry roads clinging to them. They are smoothly written, accurately harmonised, and many of them very beautiful. But they suggest the carpeted drawing-room rather than the sand-strewn or rush-covered hall—the frozen door-step or snowy lawn ; and they lack, in words, the simple inculcation of Christian charity and expression of Christmas joy, and, in music, the feeling of the “wintry wind” and the wild cadences, which, as in “good King Wenceslas,” remind us of its “keen tooth.”

E. BRAY

NOTE.—Collections of Carols, Words and Music. Neale and Helmore (Novello) ; Bramwell and Stainer (Novello) ; Chope and Irons (Metzler). A very good collection of Words alone, by Sylvestre (Chatto & Windus).

## CURRENT LITERATURE.

**Books for Devotional Reading.** *Our Present Hope and Our Future Home* (1) consists of fifty-two short papers, in which Mr. Sturrock treats of a variety of religious subjects. The title is arrived at by combining the headings of the last two articles, and is rather misleading, because those articles are not of any more importance than the others, and, indeed, strike us as being meagre. Many of the papers, however, are good, and they will probably serve a useful purpose as fireside reading which can be taken up at odd moments. There is nothing novel in the manner or method of the work, but it is conceived in a godly spirit; and we can recommend it for the purpose for which it was designed.

In *Seven Promises Expounded* (2) Dr. Fraser presents his readers with an exposition of the seven promises contained in the Epistles to the Church of Asia. The principles he considers common to them all are: 1, The reward is promised to an individual; 2, In every case there is an ordeal to be endured; 3, There is always a relation between the character of the victory and the reward; 4, The promises are in an ascending scale. The expositions are interesting and instructive; they are popular rather than learned; and at the end is added a chapter entitled "Overcoming the Accuser: the Victory of the Saints over the Dragon." The little work closes with "two earnest counsels in this time of the Church's trial and of the dragon's great wrath:" 1, Have faith in the Blood of the Lamb; 2, Maintain the testimony of the Gospel.

*Our Future* (3) is called an Easter offering, and contains extracts from a variety of authors with regard to a subject that must always be extremely interesting. The extracts are partly prose and partly poetry: there are English extracts and French extracts—and it is difficult to see what particular order they are arranged in. We observe that the author quotes from the Psalms and other parts of the Old Testament; but the extracts from the New Testament, except in one or two instances, are given through the medium of Archbishop Whateley and others. *Our Future* is a pretty little book which will do nicely for a present.

*Is there a Future Life?* (4) is a small volume, in which Mr Garrett Horder treats the same subject as the foregoing, but in quite a different way, although the book is adorned with many pieces of poetry, some culled from various authors, some apparently original but always appropriate. In the preface Mr. Horder surveys the present state of unbelief and unrest; in the introduction he gives some reasons for it; then in five chapters he discusses the "intimations of immortality in the human race, in human nature; intimations from the Christ, and from the unseen realm;" and in the last chapter he comes to the conclusion that the belief in immortality covers far more difficulties than its denial. The heart can rest more quietly in the hope of an eternal life than in doubt concerning it. The work has for a sub-title thoughts for the perplexed and troubled; and we can well believe that such, and others too, will find this work good and useful reading.

*The Four Gospels in One* (5) is a continuous Gospel narrative arranged chronologically; and as such forms a useful book for reading. There is a table of contents showing the order of the events, with locality and probable dates; and a list of Christ's Miracles and Parables. The book would be more useful if there were also a list of our Lord's discourses and an alphabetical list of places. If an index of topics were also added the work would gain additional interest.

*Eastertide* (6) is a volume containing sixteen rather long sermons. As they are not so much theological discourses as Gospel addresses they form very good reading, and may be as useful in that respect as they were for the purpose for which they were originally delivered. Mr. Aitken entitles them, "Thoughts on the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord," and very good and useful thoughts they are, and such as ought to set any one deeply thinking who reads them.

Although Mr. Graham calls his work a *Popular Commentary on the Book of the Revelation* (7) we have classed it a devotional work, because it partakes more of the devotional character than of what is commonly understood by a commentary. It has a preface by the Bishop of Liverpool—whose autograph is, in *facsimile*, appended—in which that prelate commends the book by pointing out the blessing promised to all students of the Revelation of St. John. He says Mr. Graham's book is not a critical commentary, but contains food for all classes of Christians; and we quite agree with the

Bishop in commending it, for we believe that it will be profitable to any one who peruses it. The work is carried out in a reverent and godly spirit ; and although there is in it very little that is new, it contains and suggests much that is both good and needful to be considered.

The volume of *Short Biographies for the People* (8) containing histories of the most prominent Reformers may fitly find a place under this heading ; for, though histories, they are well qualified to aid the sense of devotion in all who read them ; and to many, such histories contain the most palatable devotional reading. Such names as Luther, Calvin, Wycliffe, Melancthon, Erasmus, Huss, Knox, Latimer, and Tyndale will always be revered wherever true religion finds a place ; and no Christian should be ignorant of their actions ; hence the value of a work such as this, where their doings are succinctly told and their characteristics fairly set forth. The several accounts are not so long as to be tedious, but quite long enough for the purpose intended, and are all tolerably accurate. The portraits are characteristic, if not very beautiful.

*How are we Saved* (9) is a little work which many people will like to have by them to read now and then. There is not much of novelty in the treatment of a subject which is ever most deeply interesting to thoughtful Christians ; but the work is conceived and carried out in a reverent spirit, and we can commend it to anybody in need of a book of devotion.

*My Master and My Friend* (10) is another little work which can be recommended as useful for devotional reading. Mr. Everard's intention in this book is evidently to bring the believer nearer to Christ, and to make him live with the more conscious feeling of that allegiance and affection which the study of the Saviour's life should induce. We need hardly add that the tone of the book leaves little to be desired.

*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (11) is a volume of the *Expositor's Bible*, edited by the Rev. D. Robertson Nicol, and the author is Dr. Marcus Dods. While, no doubt, preachers and teachers may find in it much that is good and helpful, we cannot help thinking that it will find a larger circle of persons who will find the work most useful for devotional reading. It is not a commentary in the accustomed sense, nor a preacher's help like the *Sermon Bible*, and it is arranged on different lines from Dr. Parker's *People's Bible*.

The discourses which Dr. Dods here furnishes are full of sound sense and wise advice. They discuss with considerable fulness the various subjects treated of in Paul's famous Epistle, and any one who takes up the work and reads carefully one of the chapters may be sure to find food for fruitful thought, and will probably return to it with a re-invigorated mind. The book has an instructive introduction, and would be all the better for an index. It is well printed and handsomely got up.

*Christ and the Church* (12) consists of ten lectures by Dr. Adolph Saphir on St. Matthew xxviii. 18-20, in which he states his views on the Apostolic Commission. Dr. Saphir treats of such subjects as the omnipotence of the Risen Saviour, the omnipotence of Jesus on earth, the character of the Church, the relation of the Church to the world, and the Real Presence. "Man," says the learned author, "is created in God's image; the whole race is one family, fallen in Adam. Unto the whole race Christ is sent; He is given unto man as man; a new centre to the whole family of mankind. Now, Scripture, and Scripture only, teaches this grand truth about mankind. Here alone is the true idea of humanity; here alone is true catholicity. The foundation is in the five books of Moses and the prophets, the fulfilment is in Christ, as revealed by the evangelists and Apostles." It will thus be seen that Dr. Saphir is not affected in his teaching by the "new learning" of the present day; but he can, nevertheless, give a good reason for the faith that is in him. The work before us contains no support to those notions of sacerdotalism which finds advocates in some quarters; but it is a plain, sensible, and sound treatise on a subject which is of commanding importance, and it deserves to be widely read and deeply pondered.

As might be expected, the *Letters from a Mystic of the Present Day* (13) are written in a somewhat mysterious style, and the get-up of the work gives it an uncommon aspect. But the printing is good, and the thoughts and ideas contained in the book are worth considering. They are often put forward in a novel manner, and while we cannot agree with all, there are very many which are striking, original, and useful. The author is anxious to impress upon his readers the importance of the work of the Holy Spirit on the individual heart, and herein most people will agree with him; though whether they would also consent to his dicta about missionary meetings, London life, vicarious sacrifice, belief in Jesus Christ is another matter. There is much in the work to commend, a good deal to

instruct, much to give food for thought. It is a book which can be taken up at odd times, and then put down again; and we are tolerably sure that if taken up once, it will be taken up often.

After all the lives of Christ that have been written, and all the commentaries on the Scriptures that have been produced, it seems somewhat startling that a place could be needed or found for an apology for Christ. Yet such seems to be the case, and Mr. Ridgeway has attempted to supply it in a course of five sermons entitled, *Is not this the Christ?* (14). We can praise the little work. It is a little work in more senses than one; but it is an interesting little work, a useful little work, and one which many people will read with pleasure and profit. Mr. Ridgeway's sermons no doubt proved attractive to a large number of hearers, and we believe that in their printed form they will be attractive to a much larger circle of readers. As the writer says, he does not lay claim to any great novelty, but he reminds us of old truths, which should be known truths, in a way which gives them a renewed interest and power. The subjects of the sermons are: the Person of Christ, His Character, His Words, His Works, and His Kingdom.

- (1) *Our Present Hope and Our Future Home.* By Rev. James B. Sturrock, M.A. Paisley: Alexander Gardner, 1889. Price 3s. 6d.
- (2) *Seven Promises Expounded.* By Donald Fraser, M.A., D.D. London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1889. Price 1s.
- (3) *Our Future.* By M. M. G. Paisley and London: Alexander Gardner, 1889.
- (4) *Is there a Future Life?* By W. Garrett Horder. London: Elliot Stock.
- (5) *The Four Gospels in One.* By the Rev. J. Mostyn. London: A. Trenchard, 1889. Price 3s.
- (6) *Eastertide.* By W. Hay M. H. Aitken, M.A. London: John F. Shaw.
- (7) *The Book of the Revelation.* By Rev. T. Graham. Liverpool: J. A. Thompson & Co. London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1888.
- (8) *Short Biographies for the People.* Reformers. London: Religious Tract Society, 1889. Price 1s. 6d.
- (9) *How we are Saved.* Rev. James A. R. Dickson, B.D. Religious Tract Society.
- (10) *My Master and My Friend.* Rev. George Everard, M.A. Religious Tract Society.
- (11) *The First Epistle to the Corinthians.* By the Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Price 7s. 6d.
- (12) *Christ and the Church.* By Adolph Saphir. Religious Tract Society. Price 2s. 6d.
- (13) *Letters from a Mystic of the Present Day.* Second Edition. London: Elliot Stock. 1889.
- (14) *Is not this the Christ?* A course of Sermons by the Rev. C. J. Ridgeway, M.A. London: Skeffington & Co. 1889.

WHENEVER the history of the Oxford or Tractarian Movement comes to be written, the *Life of W. G. Ward* (1), and the account of his connection with it as given us by his son Wilfrid Ward, will be accounted a valuable contribution thereto. W. G. Ward was one of the prime movers in a matter which has had a considerable effect upon his own and the next generation. The Oxford Movement has set its mark on the ecclesiastical and national history of the century; and the labours of Mr. Wilfrid Ward have made us realise both the personality of a man who had a great influence over those with whom he came in contact, and also an epoch which is in many ways memorable. Mr. W. Ward has done his work well; his affection for his father is visible in the work, and yet that affection has not been allowed to becloud his judgment. The faults and failings of W. G. Ward's character are portrayed, as well as his virtues, which are by no means few or inconsiderable. The account given of the Oxford Movement shows clearly enough its Romanistic tendency: W. G. Ward, Newman, and others did not see their way to staying within the pale of the Church of England while they held all the Roman doctrine, so they went whither their propensities led them; Frowde, Clough, Pattison, and others were so dissatisfied with the ideas connected with the Movement, and yet made by those very ideas so dissatisfied with their old notions, that their faith "was weakened and destroyed, instead of being fortified." We expect that the life of W. G. Ward will be widely read, because it has so intimate a connection with much that interests everybody in some way or other. W. G. Ward was, from our point of view, mistaken; but he was, at least, honest. His mind was of such a nature as to drive him onward towards the logical conclusion of things, and that with an impetuosity which startled his companions. At first he seems to have been greatly under the influence of Arnold, and then of Newman; afterwards Newman seems to have been greatly under Ward's influence. We cannot look upon either Ward or Newman as successful men; if each of them had attached greater importance to God's Word written and less to Church authority than he did, we might probably have been able to claim both among the brightest and best of the sons of the Church of England.

(1) *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*. By Wilfrid Ward. London: Macmillan & Co., 1889.

Henderson & Spalding, Printers, Marylebone Lane, London, W.

(3) ✓  
8

110