

MAY-JUNE 2011

The Gospel Magazine

CONTENTS

Editorial: • 73

A Sermon: The Editor • 75

For Younger Readers:
C. MacKenzie • 78

A Sermon: Rev. J. Vermeer • 80

Studies in Ezekiel (Chapter 18):
P. King • 82

Early English Monasticism
Part II: E. J. Malcolm • 83

Strength, Song and Salvation:
M. Handford • 86

The Confessional Part V:
D.A. Doudney • 88

How We Got Our Authorised
Version: R.T. Beckwith • 93

Puritan Preaching Topics:
J. Davison • 100

Book Reviews • 104

Publishing the Truth since 1766

THE GOSPEL MAGAZINE

Editor

EDWARD MALCOLM

15 Bridge Street • Knighton • Powys • LD7 1BT

edward@revmalcolm.freemove.co.uk

www.gospelmagazine.org.uk

Incorporating the Protestant Beacon and The British Protestant

New Series
No. 1678

MAY — JUNE 2011

Old Series
No. 2678

• EDITORIAL •

*Happy are those whose greatest desire is to do what God requires
(Matthew 5:6)*

YOU may recognise this *Felicitude* as the Beatitude “Blessed are they that do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled”. Dr. Eugene A. Nida, commenting on this, states “that some of the idioms of Scripture are . . . lost in the process of translating (e.g. “hunger and thirst after righteousness” may become “desire righteousness very much”). He says the reaction to this will be “. . . they feel that the Scriptures are being robbed of some of their meaning. In reality there is little loss of referential meaning, but there is loss of impact, and this loss should be kept to a minimum.” Before proceeding, please note this whole critique is taken from, *Who Killed the Bible?*, by Ian Robinson.

Dr. Nida, a most able and distinguished scholar and former head of the American Bible Society, wrote very influential books in the mid 20th century making Bible translation a science. Virtually all modern versions since Dr. Nida’s time are ruled by his method, including many versions in other languages. It is this word “science” we disagree with, for Bible translators like Jerome in the fourth century, or Tyndale or Carey, simply got on with the job. To them it was an art, not a science. They had no rule book of laws governing translation.

Dr. Nida says that words are a surface matter in any language, but what is important is the *message*, or entire meaning of that part of Scripture. Thus Dr. Nida discounted *formal equivalence*, which we would call a literal word-for-word translation, like the Authorised Version. Of course he is right in extreme cases. He criticizes the Revised Version as a “pernicious” example of what

Spurgeon called on being shown a copy, "Greek good. English poor." Dr. Nida calls the AV translation of Mark "childish", as it keeps the frequent "and" found in the original.

The problem is that words accurately convey not only a message, but the emphasis the writer wished to get across to the receptor. However, Dr. Nida holds that we must shift the form of the "message" to the response of the receptor, saying "the way in which the original receptor *presumably* reacted to the message when it was given" (italics not Dr. Nida's). We ask, how can we be sure? And was the receptor correct in the message he received? Take a Messianic prophecy in the Old Testament, and it meant something entirely different to the original hearer. The New Testament brings out the real "message". Dr. Nida says that in translating the important thing is to make the modern man react as the original hearer would ("presumably", to use his caveat) have done. Thus one translation, following his method, translates Psalm 110:1 as "The Lord said unto my Lord the King". Yes, that is perhaps the message of the original statement, but a cursory glance at Matthew 22:43-46, will show that the "message" method produces an incorrect result.

Dr. Nida then speaks of the *kernel*, which he defines as the simplest possible structure of a language, characterized by the simplest possible form, the least ambiguous expression of relations, and the explicit inclusion of all information. He says each language has only 6-12 types of kernels, and these are discovered by back-transformation, and converted into a surface structure by transformation. Being "the simplest possible form", kernel sentences are felt to be a more accurate representation of the meaning than what the authors wrote. This is "dynamic equivalence" and is a science of how translation must be done. It is followed today by virtually all Bible translators, and the resultant "dynamic translation" need have no formal resemblance to the original.

Thus kernel sentences are, as Dr. Nida says, "*paraphrases* . . . a technical term from linguistics", adding that "What makes *Today's English Version* (Good News Bible) . . . so popular and so helpful to translators is that it is frequently restructured in the direction of kernel expressions, and is thus more readily understandable". The problem is, how do we perform this analysis and transfer the meaning? This process of analysis and transfer is not explained, but what can be seen is the devastating effect it has had on translation.

In the Contemporary English Version, *grace* becomes *kindness*, as "a more meaningful and generally more expressive form for modern readers". The Bible's meaning for *grace* is not *kindness*, which can be shown to both the deserving and undeserving, but *grace* is the action of a great king in pardoning an undeserving rebel subject. It is the grace of God to those who have nothing to recommend them to God's mercy. Other examples of this method are John the Baptist called *the Baptizer*, and even *the Dipper*. Are those more relevant and contemporary? Take *tax-collector* for *publican* – they are two different concepts. A publican was the worst form of oppressor, tax farming for himself and the occupying power and

extorting money by any means. Our tax collectors are not doing that, unpopular as they may be.

The effect of Dr. Nida's well-meant reform is that the Bible is less relevant than ever to our countrymen. The world can see this much better than us. It has left the Moslems saying they were quite right that the Jews and Christians had changed and falsified their Scriptures, and that the Quran was sent as God's last Word to replace these corrupted documents. You may feel that is going too far, but ordinary people think that if you have over 106 different translations in print something is wrong, and lose interest.

Our plea is for a change of method in translating, not an end to it. Let it be an art again.



• A SERMON •

BY THE EDITOR

"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Romans 5:12)

SIN is a fact in us. This verse clearly states sin came by one man, Adam. Jesus taught that Adam was a real man who actually lived when, in teaching about divorce in Matthew 19, He said, "He which made them at the beginning made them male and female". The Apostle also taught this in 1 Timothy 2:13: "For Adam was formed first, then Eve." Here Paul contrasts the bad results that came to us from Adam's sin, with the good results from Christ.

That is the only explanation the Bible gives of the origin of sin. It entered through Adam, an actual man who lived in history. An actual serpent spoke to Eve, but behind the serpent was the evil power of Satan, who was a liar and a murderer from the beginning. He murdered Adam and Eve. The results of sin showed at once, making Adam deeply ashamed, fearful of God's displeasure, and an evader of responsibility. He would not willingly own up to sin as his responsibility. Mankind has been the same ever since. The result was that God put enmity between the seed of the serpent and that of the woman. Christ said to those opposing Him, "Ye are of your father the devil", in John 8:44.

We are as a result totally depraved. Scripture says human nature is totally corrupt for, as God said to Noah in Genesis 8:21 after the flood, He would not send another worldwide flood, "for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth". The Bible says we went astray as soon as we were born in Psalm 58:3: "The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they are born." We inherit this from our parents, Psalm 51:5: "Behold! I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Thus from birth we have a bent to rebellion and disobedience, and this universal fact is called "Total Depravity".

It means we lost our original righteousness. Adam and Eve were born actually righteous, although they were able to sin, having true free-will to choose. But the Fall of Adam perverted God's ways in us, as the 9th Article of the Church of England Articles says, "Man is of his own nature inclined to evil". However, total depravity does not mean we are as bad as bad could be, and could not be worse. You and I are in the image of God.

You and I are of worth to God. This is of extreme importance today when so many feel utterly worthless. They come from broken and godless homes, full of modern anthropological teaching about descent from apes that lived in trees in South Africa, who had evolved from a universe that made itself. The result is they feel without worth. The explanations on offer for man are the Communist one, that we are workers building a better future, individually expendable in "the cause", and Hitler's one, that our only value is power. There are many suchlike, but they have one thing in common – all are wrong.

We are of worth. Even after sinning Adam was conscious of what he had done and the enormity of it. We, like Adam, can hear God's voice, and prayer to God, however debased, is shared by all races. All long for communion with God. Augustine said of man that he cries out, "Thou hast formed us for Thyself and our hearts are restless till they find their rest in Thee".

Above all, God is able and willing to make us His sons and His daughters. So Christ stooped so low to save us. God would not save something that was not worth saving. We can be born again and be "partakers of the divine nature". Jesus said, "Ye are of more value than many sparrows", and that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. He said, What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? He taught you are of more value than the whole world. He said, "How much more then is a man of more value than a sheep?". He said that the very hairs of your head are all numbered. He took the most beautiful things in nature, and said, "Are ye not much better than they?". You are priceless to God.

The whole world is of infinite value to God. The Bible teaches that no man liveth unto himself. There is a real and actual brotherhood of all men. So salvation is not a merely individualistic. We come from a community, being translated out of the kingdom of darkness, from the kingdom of Satan. That means all men have a solidarity together, even outside Christ. And we are now brought into a community, the kingdom of God, "the kingdom of his dear Son". Man is part of a race of great value to God, even though totally depraved.

Total Depravity means Total Inability. Man cannot put himself right. There is no way man can alter his human nature. Oh yes! We can obey human laws, for it is God's will that unsaved mankind should live on earth, and that means living in a community. We can obey man's laws and government, and be religious and very respectable. Atheists are some of the most respectable men. Generosity and kindness, even giving up life for another, are all in the fallen image of God still possessed by even the worst of men.

But there is a fatal defect. None of this comes from love of God, wanting to do His will or obey Him. No sinner on his own, without God's grace, can do anything, however insignificant, which meets God's ultimate approval and obeys His laws. No sinner can change his deep-seated aversion to God or really love Him. They say they do, but just show them the God of the Bible, who ordered the Israelites to exterminate the Canaanites and, above all, who died on a Cross for us, and they will refuse and argue. They think they love God, but it is really a god out of their own minds, their own invention.

In all, man in sin is not able to do any spiritual good. Jesus said in John 8:34: "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." And Romans 8:7-8 puts it: "For the carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

We are guilty, and deserve punishment, and are worthy of stripes, many or few. Justice must be satisfied by our punishment. Take the word *guilt*, which we have all incurred by disobedience to God. In Anglo Saxon the word meant "to pay". So guilt is a liability. How do we become guilty before God? Here in Romans 5 the Apostle is teaching that we were in Adam, that is in his loins when he sinned, and although we have not sinned in exactly the way he did, nevertheless we were in Adam. Then Paul contrasts this with our standing in Christ. His righteousness is imputed to us, so because we are in Christ we are reckoned entirely righteous. Thus we are guilty of Adam's sin, because he is the head of the human race, so all humans born from Adam are guilty sinners.

Are depravity and guilt the same? No, for our Lord Jesus did not have our depraved nature, but on the Cross He bore our guilt, our liability to satisfy the demands of God's justice. Guilt is only partly "a guilty conscience", for a man may be guilty even when his conscience excuses him. We preach to make men guilty, "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God". So guilt may be great without the man knowing he is in that state. Further, there are degrees of guilt. True, "there is no difference, for all have sinned" (Romans 3:22-23), but then James says in chapter 2 verse 10, "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all". It is perfectly possible to sin in sleep, in ignorance, by failing to do something we ought to have done, and to have greater and lesser degrees of guilt. Jesus spoke to Pilate of "the greater sin". Ignorance is no excuse.

We are all paying the penalty. I do not just mean in the very constitution of the world, that if we disobey the laws of the universe we suffer, like building nuclear reactors upon the most dangerous and unstable fault lines in the world. But God said to the Jews through the prophet, after promising to forgive them, "I will not leave you altogether unpunished". A man saved from a lifetime of drink may be left with a ruined constitution. We leave aside trying to apportion blame as we see a person suffer. Job's friends made that error. Jesus was asked about a blind man, as to who had sinned, the man or his parents? He replied, "neither hath this man

sinned, nor his parents". God's dealings with individuals are partly seen here, partly hidden from us beyond the grave.

But we trace the hand of God in his dealings with nations, for there is no nationhood beyond the grave. All national blessings and punishments occur on earth. How the Jews have suffered from their cry to Pilate "his blood be on us, and on our children". The cruelty of the Roman legions towards the Jews in the taking of Jerusalem in AD 68 was terrible. God raised up the Romans to punish the Jews, but then He punished them. Years later Vesuvius erupted, and the properties that were wiped out had been awarded to the retired soldiers from those legions. At the end of the war the Russians took Berlin and issued an order that no German could lock his doors for three days. The suffering of the women and girls, the pillaging, was done by the shock troops – they were Chechins. How their land has suffered since. Sunamis have connections with vast cruelties practiced in the last war. Our present state as a nation is not unconnected with slaving in the past. And we would be wise to watch our attitude to the Jews, for "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee" is God's promise to Abraham. God says of Himself to idolators of all sorts, "For I the Lord am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me". My daily fear as I watch this land sinning away grace, and especially the outward Church doing so, is that we are coming to resemble France more daily, and France is a land which sinned away grace many years ago. God has few dealings with the land, and fewer as each day passes with ours, who so much admire the godless over the Channel.

So even when saved we are not entirely delivered from the penalty of our guilt for our past lives. Then what punishment are we released from by the death of Christ? It is the final and most terrible punishment for breaking God's laws, the second death. We shall pass through that unscathed. It can look as grim as it will, but it cannot touch us, for Christ conquered death and hell and the grave.

• FOR YOUNGER READERS •

CARINE MACKENZIE

HONOUR YOUR PARENTS

WHEN a guest comes to your home, how do you treat him? Do you usher him to a comfortable chair or do you make him stand or perhaps perch on a stool? Do you listen to what he says or would you ignore him? Would you speak pleasantly to him or would you be rude? God, in His Word, the Bible, teaches us to show respect to people, whether they are family, guests, schoolmates or strangers. The first people we learn to show respect to are our parents.

Children are to obey their parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing to the Lord (Colossians 3:20). Children should obey their parents in the Lord, obeying only if what our parents require of us is in accordance with God's law. We should obey God rather than men (Acts 5:29). From obeying and honouring our parents we learn to pay respect to others in authority and to deal wisely with other people.

Hophni and Phinehas were wicked sons of Eli the priest in Shiloh. They showed contempt for God's worship and lived immoral lives. When their father tried to warn them, They would not listen to him. They did not show respect to their father. This led to disaster for them and for the nation of Israel. Today we still see many people ignoring and disobeying their parents. This leads to the breakdown of the family and trouble for our nation too.

Joseph is a good example for us in showing respect for his father. He showed concern for him and lovingly provided for his needs when he settled in the land of Goshen.

Timothy listened carefully to his mother and grandmother as they taught him the Scriptures and this led him to salvation through Jesus Christ. He became a great blessing to Paul, whom he helped on his journeys, and to the many people to whom he preached the Gospel.

But the Lord Jesus Christ is our best example. He honoured his parents perfectly. As he grew up in Nazareth He was subject to His mother and father (Luke 2:51). Even as He died on the cross, He showed concern for His mother, ensuring that His friend and disciple John looked after her in his own home (John 19:26-27). We learn from Jesus too that the honour we give to our parents is a reflection of the honour we ought to give to our heavenly Father. He is worthy of all honour and glory for ever.

BIBLE SEARCH

Find the missing words. The initials of the correct answers will spell out a word from the story.

1. A foolish son is the _____ of his father (Proverbs 19:13).
2. A wise son makes a glad father, but a foolish son is the _____ of his mother (Proverbs 10:1).
3. Now unto the King eternal, immortal, _____, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever (1 Timothy 1:17).
4. Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be _____ upon the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee (Exodus 20:12).
5. Render therefore to all their _____ : tribute to whom tribute; custom to whom custom: fear to whom fear: honour to whom honour (Romans 13:7).
6. Children obey your parents in the Lord: for this is _____ (Ephesians 6:1).

7. Ye shall fear _____ man his mother and his father, and keep my Sabbaths: I am the Lord you God (Leviticus 19:3).
8. And ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the _____ and admonition of the Lord (Ephesians 6:4).

— • —

• A SERMON •

REV. JUSTUS VERMEER

Supplied by A. W. DE LANGE (Scherpenzeel, The Netherlands)

A NATURAL man can make much work of his religious duties, as is shown in that Pharisee who said, "I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess." But see, what a contrast with the publican, who stood "afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner" (Luke 18:11-13). We often see the heathen come far regarding modesty and righteousness in their deeds towards their neighbours. What man is able to attain to outside of Christ and outside of truth in the inner part is demonstrated by the rich young man who came to Jesus and asked, "Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" (Matthew 19:16). If a man saw one of the richest and most respectable men come to any of that poor and despised multitude of God's people, crying, What one good thing must I do to have eternal life?, how high a value would be put on this? But Jesus demanded only one thing of this young man; namely his heart, which of all the things which he possessed was to be given to Himself and only then could he follow Him thus. But what follows is that the young man went away sorrowful because he had many possessions. And what exceeds even this, that a man can have or do? Paul speaks: "And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing" (1 Corinthians 13:3).

See here how far a man can come, and what he can have, outside of Christ. Let the seed which fell in stony places be the evidence. How quickly can a man show some sign of change but when the sun rises, the growth withers because it is without a root; so that it is clear that, when oppressions and persecutions come, he falls away. This can be read in Matthew 13:20-21 and in 28-30 Jesus commands that the weeds are not to be pulled out until the harvest is come.

Many have gifts of knowledge of God's holy Word, understanding of the work of grace, a talent to work with and, amongst others, an appearance of profitability. This is clearly seen in the parable of the wise and foolish virgins (Matthew 25). Both groups had oil-filled lamps that gave light and both awoke when the

bridegroom came in the middle of the night. The only distinction was that the foolish virgins did not have vessels with oil in. They had missed the Fountain where they might have filled their vessels and then it was too late to seek, for the door was locked (verse 15).

Talents were given to all and how many must the traitor Judas have had in his best times? It seems that the apostles were without light about Judas's unrighteousness, as is shown when Jesus said: "Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I?" (Matthew 26:21-22). Jesus also commanded (Matthew 23:2-3) that they should do according to the commands of the Scribes and Pharisees, who sat on the seat of Moses, but not follow them according to their works. What is more, Paul says: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith [namely that of miracles], so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing" (1 Corinthians 13:1-2). This saying of Paul presumes man can have all these things but be without charity and speaks of some, "enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come", and then fall away (Hebrews 6:4-6). This presumes that a man can have all these things and yet be outside of Christ, because otherwise he would not fall away.

Some may be outside of Christ and yet do good deeds and bear some fruit. The Lord Jesus gives the reason for this in John 15:2, where He speaks of bearing fruit, saying: "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away". This presumes that much can be done and much professed outside of Christ. "Joash did that which was right in the sight of the Lord all the days of Jehoiada"; but it follows that "after the death of Jehoiada came the princes of Judah, and made obeisance to the king. Then the king hearkened unto them. And they left the house of the Lord God of their fathers, and served groves and idols," etc. (2 Chronicles 24). In Mark 6:20-21 it is written that Herod feared John the Baptist and, after he heard him gladly, did many things, but when a convenient day came he fell away.

Balaam seemed to have had an impression of God on his heart as he blessed the people, saying: "How shall I curse, whom God hath not cursed? or how shall I defy, whom the Lord hath not defied? For from the top of the rocks I see him, and from the hills I behold him" (Numbers 23:8-9). And he told Balak that he would take heed to speak only that which the Lord had put into his mouth (verse 12). Moreover, he had told the messengers of Balak: "If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do (i.e., to curse) less or more" (Numbers 22:18).

• STUDIES IN EZEKIEL •

P. KING (Hailsham)

Chapter 18

THE exiles were a self-righteous group of people, even in their extreme circumstances. They were 1,000 miles from home, told over and again it would be a long haul, and that it was their own fault, yet after all this they try to blame everyone but themselves – a bit like us, maybe, when we are in a tight corner. Damage limitation had kicked in, and Ezekiel was told to disillusion these rebels. They suffered because of their own sin not their father's or grandparent's.

1. The righteous person (verses 1-9). There was a saying in Israel, which meant that because the parents did wrong the children would suffer. "Not so," says God, "stop talking like that." Everyone is responsible for their own actions, and the souls that sin will die (verse 4). Notice that a high standard is set for the righteous man and the guaranteed result is LIFE. If you look at your life you will see the failures, but look to Christ to see the perfection! The summary is that if a person lives an upright life he will benefit from it and not suffer because of another person's sin.

2. The sinful son (verses 10-13). The second example is the son who is a robber and a murderer. This son cannot hide behind his father and plead mercy. He must stand on his own and take the punishment. Let no one think they can gain everlasting life because they had Christian parents. It is a great blessing to have believing parents but it does not bring eternal life, for you must repent of your own sin and turn to Christ yourself.

3. The righteous grandson (verses 14-17). The third generation in this example is a good son, like his grandfather, despite seeing all that his father did. Because he has lived an upright life he will live, but this is not because he had a godly grandfather. Equally he will not suffer because he had an ungodly father. We all have to stand on our own two feet at the time of judgement.

4. Conclusion. The people insisted they were in exile because of what their forebears had done. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." God makes the point that we will only suffer for the sins we commit, our own sin, and if we repent those sins will be forgiven (verse 27). "Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions," says God, but the people kept looking back to find a scapegoat.

LESSONS FOR TODAY

(a) *Don't blame someone else*, but rather consider others better than yourselves. Blaming someone else started in the Garden of Eden! There are too many Christians in churches who are looking at other people's faults rather than repenting over their own.

(b) *We suffer for our own wrongs not another person's*, and this means we will bear the consequences of our own sin. If someone has wronged you pray for him/her that he/she will repent and so receive God's forgiveness.

(c) *If we repent God will forgive: if we do not He will require justice.*

(d) *Owning up and turning to Christ keeps us close to the Lord*; the alternative is to be at variance with Christ forever.

(e) *Few people are prepared to humble themselves before the Lord*, for it takes a lot of grace to admit mistakes, but the result is a clear conscience. It is better to be humble on God's side than proud on Satan's!

**HUMBLE YOURSELVES THEREFORE UNDER THE
MIGHTY HAND OF GOD**



• EARLY ENGLISH MONASTICISM •
Part II

EDWARD J. MALCOLM (Reading)

2. THE GREAT FIGURES OF EARLY ENGLISH MONASTICISM

WE turn now to consider three leading figures of early English monasticism.

(a) *Hilda*

Hilda, or Hild, the early English form of her name, is known to us already through her involvement in the Synod of Whitby. She was born c. 614, great-niece of King Edwin of Northumbria, sister-in-law to the brother of Anna King of the Eastern Angles. Though she would not herself be classed as royal, she was certainly of noble blood.

While an infant her father, Hereric, was poisoned, and she seems to have been brought up in the court of King Edwin in Northumbria. She was one of those who was baptised on Easter Day, 627, by Paulinus, along with Edwin, his family and his court. We hear nothing more of Hilda until 647, when she was about to travel to Gaul to enter Chelles Abbey, but we find that instead she answered the call of Aidan and returned to Northumbria. The site of her first religious house is unknown, but it was on the northern bank of the River Wear. This fits the known pattern of Celtic minsters, which were built in strategic positions, often ports, often easily defended, and near other settlements. A year later she was appointed by Aidan to the monastery at Hartlepool, to succeed the first abbess. Again, the building has disappeared, but the nearby church of St. Hilda turns out to be built right next to the monastic cemetery.

Ten years after taking up the religious life Hilda became the founding abbess of the monastery at Whitby. Archaeological evidence shows it was, unsurprisingly, Celtic in design, with a larger number of men or women living in small houses of two or three inhabitants, and with a church where both sexes met for worship. If we rely on Bede's description of monastic life under Hilda we find that it fitted the pattern he advocated to a remarkable degree. We must exercise caution, therefore, in assuming he was being entirely accurate, not having been born until eight years after Hilda died. During the last six years of her life Hilda seems to have suffered from fever, though she had the strength, aged about sixty-five, to found another monastery, this time at Hackness, fourteen miles from Whitby. She died in 680. Whitby Abbey would stand for another 187 years, before being destroyed by the Vikings.

That Hilda was chosen to take such a prominent part in monastic life is surely testimony to her character. She was reputed to be an able organiser and administrator, which would have endeared her to the Roman party in the English Church. The Celtic Church, while by no means devoid of organising talent, was probably closer to the Eastern Greek or mystical, approach. The Roman, or Western Church, favoured a legal approach to doctrine, organisation and practice. This is why we find the most complete monastic Rules coming from western monasticism rather than eastern. It is also probably why Hilda was chosen to host the seminal Synod of Whitby, being trusted as she was by both sides in the debate. We note that she both accepted the ruling of Whitby on the dating of Easter and other matters, and retained her headship over the house she had founded. Clearly she sided with the right side, humanly speaking. How much of this was from conviction, how much from pragmatism, is impossible to say. Bede, of course, considers her to have submitted to the divine choice.

(b) Cuthbert

Another great character of early English monasticism is Cuthbert, who was contemporary with Hilda though younger, living as he did from 634 to 687. His importance includes, though is not limited to, the combining of Celtic and Roman episcopal ideas in his own bearing of the office.

Cuthbert was again related to a royal house, being second cousin to King Aldfrith of Northumbria. Yet his youth was spent as a shepherd on the Firth of Forth, in the region of Dunbar. One night he reputedly had a vision of Aidan's soul ascending to heaven, and determined there and then to embark on the religious life. The year was 651, and Cuthbert entered the monastery of Old Melrose, aged seventeen or thereabouts. He accompanied a party of monks who moved to Ripon, and under the influence of Wilfrid they adopted the Roman tonsure. There Cuthbert quickly gained a reputation for piety and diligence. Aged about thirty, and following the Synod of Whitby, he was appointed prior of that abbey. Before ten years had elapsed he was living the life of a hermit on Farne Island, and by the time he was fifty he had been appointed Bishop of Lindisfarne. He died some

three years later in 687. Bede records that his body, buried at Lindisfarne, was dug up some eleven years later, for reasons he does not make clear. However, he records with relish that the body and its clothes were found to be uncorrupted. Cuthbert was established as a worker of miracles.

Cuthbert's significance is seen in the way in which Bede draws so much attention to him. Given that Bede had an agenda, namely to demonstrate the virtue of the Roman system over the Celtic, and humble obedience over pride, it is no surprise that he should make so much of Cuthbert. It is therefore hard to separate the truth from the hagiography. We can, though, say a couple of things about Cuthbert.

The first was that his life followed a pattern which owed more to the Roman than the Celtic expectation for a monastic. True, he had a Celtic way with nature, but in terms of his views of authority, he was Roman. Though not given to riding on horseback he had no objection to so doing, unlike Aidan or Chad. He did not dress in monastic clothing, but wore ordinary ones. These were neither rich nor poor, but the average clothing of the average man. Yet his pectoral cross, which we think we have today, is richly decorated and would have been of high value in its day. This suggests that he took his episcopal authority seriously. He did so in a way which drew together the different strands of Celtic and Roman episcopacy; he travelled to out-of-the-way places in his diocese, in the Celtic fashion, but ruled with authority in the Roman. In Cuthbert's day Christianity was to be found in the houses of kings, but the local populace was often still steeped in paganism. Any event which brought suffering to monastics was viewed by some as evidence of divine judgement for turning aside from the old ways. Cuthbert had to contend with people who rejoiced to see monks suffer, but, according to his biographer, was able to do so in a way which won over many pagans. On points such as the dating of Easter he took the Roman line without wavering, and exhorted all he met to adhere to that pattern.

One other thing needs to be added about Cuthbert. During his time at Lindisfarne the famous Gospels were written out, which bear the name of the place. Those who have analyzed them say that they are the acme of Celtic calligraphy, and have calculated that the red dots on one of the title pages – 10,600 dots in all – would have taken not less than six hours to put in. It is a labour of love, an indication of the value of God's Word to the monks of that place, and to the monk whose work it was. But above all things, the Lindisfarne Gospels testify to the high regard the monks of that place had for their abbot, Cuthbert, to whom the book was presented.

(c) Bede

Much has been said about Bede during the course of these lectures, and I want only to add one point, which is illustrative of the wider monastic scene.

Bede was reputed in his day to be the leading scholar in Europe. As a youth he read and re-read the few manuscripts held in the library at Jarrow, where, since the

age of seven, the orphan had found his home. Abbot Biscop, desiring to further the lad's education, and knowing the limited availability of suitable material in England, travelled through Europe and into Greece, searching out manuscripts he could buy to add to the Jarrow collection. It is worth noting that Biscop had access to large funds, for manuscripts were exceedingly valuable, owing to the fact that each was hand-written, on velum, and often decorated to a very high degree.

What is perhaps most interesting is that, aside from the obvious Latin scripts, Biscop was keen to find Greek manuscripts. He was successful, and returned after a journey lasting more than a year. In time Bede's reputation as a scholar grew to such an extent that the monastery at Wearmouth housed 600 pupils, the sons of the leading royal houses and noble families of Europe. Bede's ability in the classical languages set him above his contemporaries, and made his name for him around Europe.

Yet Bede, it is recorded, did not consider Greek and Latin to be everything. He wanted more than anything for the common people to have the Scriptures in their own language. He is said to have translated the Gospels in the latter months of his life, with a scribe writing down his words. It is further recorded that he finished the task, uttering the closing words of John's Gospel in English, almost with his last breath. Of course, the Viking invasion was not far off by then, and it would not be long before the treasures of the monasteries, and the Old English language itself, would be stripped away by the invaders. Yet, so far as we can ascertain, Bede had a genuine desire to see the Scriptures made available to the common people.

• *TO BE CONTINUED* •

— • —

• **STRENGTH, SONG AND SALVATION** •

M. HANDFORD (Poynton, Cheshire)

THE believer finds in God three things – strength, song, and salvation (Isaiah 12:2). Everything is here that we can need for life: Strength, to meet life's problems; Song, the result of grace in the heart; and Salvation, the greatest need of all.

Strength

Our natural weakness needs to be transformed. We need resources other than our own. We can through the grace of God be "strengthened with all might by his Spirit in the inner man". The strength He gives is continuous. We are assured that "as our days so shall our strength be". Our sufficiency is of God. The Apostle Paul said "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me". He was master

of every situation and equal to every emergency. In Christ there is all the strength we can possibly need. No situation can be too trying, too baffling, perplexing or disturbing.

We cannot surmount the problems of life ourselves; we have, as the Collect of Lent ii puts it, "no power of ourselves to help ourselves". The Bible abounds in promises regarding the bestowal of strength. For instance, Isaiah says "they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength". Christians have frequently proved in times of dire trouble or bodily weakness that the Lord has been their strength and brought them through. The almighty power of an omnipotent God is exercised on behalf of His people. He will never forsake His people, however difficult the days may be or how long the night.

Song

It is when strength is abounding that men have full song. The Bible has a good deal to say about songs and singing. The Psalmist, when he reviewed God's dealings with him in bringing him up out of a horrible pit and the miry clay, says "He has put a new song in my mouth" (Psalm 40:3). Fresh mercies call for fresh songs of praise. There are times when it is difficult to sing. When Israel was in captivity they felt unable to sing, and said "How can we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" (Psalm 137).

In the Upper Room after the institution of the Lord's Supper and before the agony of the garden we read that "after they had sung an hymn they went out". In the early days of the church, Paul and Silas, having been cruelly treated and imprisoned, refused to be cast down and at midnight they "prayed and sang praises unto God" (Acts 16).

We are to admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in our hearts to the Lord. The songs of Zion ought to cheer and refresh us – they are fragrant with the devotion of other generations. The Christian has something to sing about.

"Come thou fount of every blessing,
Tune my heart to sing Thy praise,
Streams of mercy never ceasing,
Call for loudest songs of praise."

Salvation

This word speaks of man's deepest need and God's greatest gift. It throbs with spiritual truth. The Lord Jesus during the course of His ministry declared that He had come to seek and to save that which was lost. He procured this salvation at tremendous cost. We have been redeemed, says the apostle Peter, "not with silver and gold but with the precious blood of Christ". Salvation speaks of deliverance, safety and preservation; this is the great inclusive word of the Gospel and speaks of justification, redemption and glorification. The salvation He bestows is

complete and lacks nothing, for "He is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God by him, seeing that he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Hebrews 7:25). Salvation is something personal, so Isaiah speaks of "my salvation". David, too, speaks in similar vein, "the Lord is my light and my salvation". Salvation is by grace through faith – it cannot be earned or merited in any way.

The outcome

"Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation" (Isaiah 12:3). This is a joy deeper and nobler than anything offered by the world. The believer possesses a joy which is independent of circumstances – see Habakkuk 3:17-18. The New Testament rings with joy, the music of heaven is heard throughout its pages. The early Christians were so full of joy, they were so whole-hearted, their faith so simple.

How thankful we should be that we have a source of joy frozen by no winter's frost nor dried up by a summer's drought. "With thee is the well of life and in thy light shall we see light." We can draw continually without fear of exhausting the supply.

— • —

• THE CONFSSIONAL: ITS TREACHERY AND TYRANNY • Part V

D. A. DOUDNEY

(Past Editor of the *Gospel Magazine*, 1877)

"I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin" (Psalm 32:5)

SPEAKING of *The Priest in Absolution*, the *London Times*, of 25th June, says: "The public will have as little difficulty in pronouncing on such a book as they had in pronouncing on the book published by Mr. Bradlaugh. . . . If the Society cannot be suppressed among the clergy, rough times may be expected for the Church of England. . . . Mr. Mackonchie and his friends must go, or the Established Church must go with them. As illustrated by this Revelation, Ritualism as represented by the Members of this Society is nothing less than a conspiracy against public morals, and is the first duty of all friends of the Church to purge it of such a poison."

In proof of the truth of this statement of the *Times*, what will the reader say of a remark made by the Rev. R. N. Shutte, Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels,

Landport, Portsmouth? In an extract from one of his sermons, the *Record* of 29th March says: "When a poor penitent comes to me and confesses his sin, I believe that when I absolve him, he rises as pure and as white as snow, and as if our blessed Lord had uttered the absolution Himself."

This, I affirm, is blasphemy. It is "the blind leading the blind". Where, in the Bible, is there a single instance of any man attempting to forgive sin? Was not this one of the charges brought by the Jews against the Saviour Himself, "Who can forgive sins but God only?" As in an earlier page I have sought to show, the passage these presumers quote as their authority for remitting or retaining sins gives them no such license whatever. It is a gross abuse; it is a lying perversion.

In the same sermon by Mr. Shutte, the *Record* states, that he continued: "Many left confession till their death-bed, and they then sent for the priest: but he strongly advised doing it at once. Let them come boldly to God's appointed priest and receive the absolution; and they did not know what a tender tie would soon spring up between themselves and him – a tie more tender than even existed between husband and wife, or any other relationship."

Husbands! hear this! Wives! listen! Children! what think you of a third party stepping in between a union so close – a tie so dear – as that sacred bond which exists between husband and wife – father, mother, and child? Think of a man entering a family to usurp the highest, dearest, most sacred and responsible position in that family!

In the House of Lords the Archbishop of Canterbury declared, that the husband or the father who was aware of such questions being put to his wife or his daughter as were contained in this filthy, beastly, abominable book, *The Priest in Absolution*, was bound to forbid him entering his house. After the disgraceful book has so loudly and so justly excited the ire of the public Press, and has been denounced, on every hand, in the very strongest terms, I maintain, as I have already stated in print, that the husband or the father who admits one of these Ritualistic priests – one of these subtle men – to his house and his home – is thereby compromising his wife or his daughter. As the public are no longer left in doubt as to what passes between the confessor and the confessing one, to say the least, the husband or the father who permits (not to say, sanctions) such a state of things, by so doing most certainly renders his wife or his daughter an object of suspicion. With all the warnings and cautions he has had, if he perseveres in countenancing these wolves in sheep's clothing, he will have himself, and himself only, to blame for whatever consequences may follow.

Speaking as far back as October 1874 of this accursed book to which reference has been made, well did the *Rock* newspaper say: "English men who have been educated amid the wholesome surroundings of biblical teaching and the pure atmosphere of the *Book of Common Prayer*, are unwilling to tolerate the picklock system of probing the consciences of women and children by what the Bishop of Peterborough once termed 'an Infernal Catechism of Iniquity'." Furthermore, the

Rock of the same date, said: "This manual for Ritualistic priests contains such disgusting details, especially as to the examination of women and children, that no publisher nor printer dare attach their names, lest they should be dealt with according to the regular process of law. It is therefore (continues the *Rock*) wisely and cautiously "printed privately". In reference to that Latin mnemonic already quoted, the "Manual proceeds to expound the meaning of each word; and we trust we shall for the present, have said enough to our readers of the horrible filth through which both priest and penitent are doomed to wade, when we have quoted the explanation which is subjoined". "*Quis*, we are told, marks the quality of the penitent"; "*Quid* the amount and kind of sin"; "*Ubi*, whether the place were sacred or otherwise, public or private"; "*Quibus auxiliis*, the quality of persons, instruments, and means, made use of by the penitent to effect his sinful object"; "*Cur*, the end for which the sin has been committed"; "*Quomodo*, manner of the act"; "*Quando*, whether in the day or night time, on a festival or week-day"! "All these circumstances (we are informed) tend to create three different effects of sin." What physician ever dared so to scrutinize the life and character of his patient? The whole process through which a woman is obliged to pass, when in the hands of a Ritualistic priest in confession, constitutes an ordeal most humiliating to contemplate. No other man on earth ever did or could put such minute, curious, and prurient questions as those which these clergymen who are called (as the book says) "unto the higher ministries of the English Church" are bound by their instructions in this treatise to put to those who have recourse to them for absolution. The man who accepts the terms of this book is, at one and the same time, physician, metaphysician, father, priest, and judge – a combination which involves a decree of "spiritual pathology", the discussion of which is injurious to the moral nature of the penitent, and (as we shall show on another occasion), by the admission of the unknown author of this book, eminently dangerous to the purity of the priest himself. If Englishmen can tolerate such a system of theology as that which is discussed in this book, then the boasted purity of English homes will ere long be a thing only to be remembered as having once been." The *Rock* continues:

"We dare not publish the details in the manual before us – we should be liable to legal prosecution. But a higher motive constrains us; for we should be unwilling to pollute the columns of our journal by transferring to it such unmanly, such filthy literature as that which in this book is prepared with such a vast expenditure of time and trouble for the special benefit of a distinct caste. It is next to impossible to obtain a copy of the book. The utmost secrecy is adopted, and every possible precaution is taken to prevent it from falling into the hands of any, except the recognized Ritualistic priest. And but for Lord Redesdale bringing the subject before the House of Lords, and thus rousing the country at large to a sense of its danger, there is no knowing to what fearful extent this crafty system, and insidious and underground plotting against the purity and peace of our English homes might have gone."

I might have added more extracts, but I will conclude by quoting from a little work entitled, *What is a Ritualistic Priest? A Question answered from the Bible.* By John Thoronton, M.A., Vicar of Aston Abbotts.

"I pray you," says the author, "go to the fountain of Ritualism. In Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, Cootes' edition, vol. iii., p. 216, we have the following account of the establishment of the Ritualistic doctrines of the Real Presence and Confessional. "In the 4th Lateran Council, convoked by Innocent III, in 1215, and at which an extraordinary number of ecclesiastics were assembled, that imperious Pontiff, without deigning to consult anybody, published no less than seventy laws or decrees, by which, not only the authority of the popes and the power of the clergy were confirmed and extended, but also new doctrines, or articles of faith, were imposed upon Christians. Hitherto the opinions of the Christian doctors concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the Eucharist were extremely different; nor had the Church determined, by any clear and positive decree, the sentiment that was to be embraced in that important matter. It was reserved for Innocent to put an end to the liberty, which every Christian had hitherto enjoyed, of interpreting this presence in the manner he thought most agreeable to the declarations of Scripture, and to decide in favour of the most absurd and monstrous doctrine that the phrensy of superstition was capable of inventing. This audacious Pontiff pronounced the opinion, which is embraced at this day in the Church of Rome with regard to that point, to be the only true and orthodox account of the matter; and had the honour of introducing and establishing the use of the term Transubstantiation, which was hitherto absolutely unknown. The same pontiff placed, by his own authority, among the duties prescribed by the divine laws, that of Auricular Confession to a priest; a confession that implied not only a general acknowledgment, but also particular enumeration of the sins and follies of the penitent. . . . These two laws which, by the authority of Innocent, were received as laws of God, and consequently adopted as laws of the Church occasioned a multitude of new injunctions and rites, of which not even the smallest traces are to be found in the sacred writings, or in the apostolic and primitive ages; and which were much more adapted to establish and extend the reign of superstition, than to open the eyes of the blinded multitude upon the enormous abuses of which it had been the source." Such is the account which the ecclesiastical historian gives of the origin of these two doctrines, which may be considered as the hands of practical popery. A person who has not attended much to such subjects, nor read history with any special view, may perhaps, on reading this extract, be led to inquire into the character and acts of this prelate and their results. It is utterly impossible however, for me, in the limited space to which I intend to restrict this tract, to give even a slight sketch of the misery and wretchedness, the political feuds, the national wars, the private and public treachery and fraud, the domestic quarrels and horrible persecutions,

which sprang entirely from the spirit, tyranny, and arrogance of the misnamed Innocent the Third. We might almost fancy that God intended by these things to show that national distress was the sure lot of every kingdom that dared to countenance his blasphemous assumptions. Let those who are now coquetting with the revival of them in England, who consider it merely a matter of ornate churches, liveried priests, gaudy processions, and charming music, study a little what followed the promulgation and enforcing these two doctrines, and they will alter their opinion as to their results and tendencies. At least, within their own circle, they will be influential in saving their sentimental female relatives from the traps that are laid for them; will open their eyes to the fact that the soft confession of their peccadilloes into the indulgent ears of crafty priests, are but the sighings, through the myrtles and rose bushes, of the freshet [a spring] that preludes the storm. That if they listen to these spiritual guides they will soon find themselves shorn, degraded, friendless, and betrayed, in one of those Satanic dens where even English law is powerless. England has unlocked the chain of slavery from all except her daughters. Shall we rest, then? Never till these Romish dungeons are abolished. It was this Innocent who caused all the miseries, rebellions, and wars, which convulsed England during the whole of John's wretched reign. But that which will render the name of this man a bye-word through all ages is the installation of that fiendish organisation, the Inquisition. Our hearts sicken on reading the history of that horrid tribunal, by whose condemnation to the torture, the rack, the faggot, and the slaughter, at least one million victims perished in about thirty years. Such is the man who originated the dogma of the corporal presence on the altar and auricular confession; and such the consequences. We may at once conclude that doctrines invented by such a tyrant, and established at such a cost, had been deeply considered, and are, consequently, well adapted to establish Rome's priestly power. Transubstantiation, confession, and the Inquisition, are three sister furies, offspring of one father. If two of these three have made their appearance in the Church of England, we know their origin. They are not her doctrines, but directly opposed to her dogmata and her spirit. Hence they who are introducing and promoting them are not of her, but are traitors within her citadel, sent in to betray it to the enemy.

Conclusion

I have already stated, that, when Ritualists appeal to holy Scripture, they commonly pervert its true meaning, and merely refer to it, in order to serve their own ends. Now, here is an example of this perversion. In a little work entitled, *Pardon through Precious Blood; or, the Benefit of Absolution, and how to obtain it* (edited by a committee of clergy), we meet with this comment upon the 10th verse of the second chapter of the second Epistle to the Corinthians: "To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also: for if I forgave any thing, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ." "Can anything be stronger?"

says the book. "In the Person – that is, in the character of Christ, as His Representative, having authority from Him for the purpose."

Now, this we declare to be a gross perversion of Scripture. The margin of our Bibles explains the meaning: "in the sight of Christ." That is, as one of our greatest scholars renders it, "before His eyes, so that Christ is witness to my forgiveness".

Commenting upon the case to which the Apostle refers, that of the man who had been guilty of incest, says Matthew Henry: "He tells them that the punishment which had been inflicted upon this offender was sufficient. The desired effect was obtained, for the man was humbled, and they had shown the proof of their obedience to his directions. He therefore directs them, with all speed, to restore the excommunicated person, or to receive him again to their communion. He beseeches them to forgive him, that is, to release him from Church censures, for they could not remit the guilt or offence against God." By no means, for,

"WHO CAN FORGIVE SINS BUT GOD ALONE?"

Mark 2:7; Luke 5:21

— • —

• HOW WE GOT OUR AUTHORISED VERSION •

R. T. BECKWITH (Oxford)

FOR over 70 years, owing to the invention of wireless and television, it has been possible for the monarch in this country to speak directly to his or her subjects, both those at home and those throughout the Commonwealth. Our present Queen, conscious no doubt of her role as supreme governor of the Church of England (see Article 37 of the 39 Articles), and conscious also of the continuing decline of the practice and teaching of the Christian faith in this country, has of recent years seldom failed to express her own Christian faith in her Christmas broadcast, or to invite her subjects to share her faith themselves. The Christmas just past was no exception. Nearly all the commentators in the media said that her broadcast was about sport, which did get a fairly brief mention (less than three minutes out of more than seven), but, as Charles Moore said in a piece in the *Daily Telegraph* entitled "What the Queen's message was really about", all the rest of her broadcast was about the Authorised or King James translation of the Bible, which has its 400th birthday this year. The Queen took the unusual step of travelling to Hampton Court Palace this time to make her broadcast, because that was the place where the Hampton Court Conference took place, at which the decision to produce the Authorised Version of the Bible was made. This was in 1604, and

seven years later, in 1611, after a very busy time for scholars and printers in between, strongly urged on by the King, the new translation was published.

The Hampton Court Conference

King James I had been king of Scotland since the abdication of his mother Mary Queen of Scots in 1567, when he was still an infant, but in 1603, on the death of Queen Elizabeth, he had become king of England as well. His first task, then, was to unite successfully the crowns of England and Scotland, despite a history of conflict between the two nations, and a lack of harmony between them over religion. Both countries had participated in the Protestant Reformation, but they differed over church government. Scotland was Presbyterian and England Episcopalian. Even in the Church of England itself there was a body of Puritans who had no love of bishops and would have favoured Presbyterianism for England too, and who also wanted changes in Cranmer's *Prayer Book*. One of the first events after James came to England in 1603 was that the Puritans presented him with the Millenary Petition, supposedly carrying 1,000 signatures, and calling for these changes. James brought together leading bishops and Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference the following year, 1604, but it resulted in no change in church government (which was hardly discussed) and only one important change in the *Prayer Book*, the addition of the section on the Sacraments at the end of the Catechism. The other significant decision of the Conference (one which was not on the agenda, but was proposed by one of the Puritans present, John Rainolds) was to sanction a careful revision of the English translation of the Bible. As James wisely saw, an agreed translation of the Bible might reconcile the two parties in the Church of England, and could also form a powerful link between the Church of England and the Scottish Kirk.

Laying the foundations

Prior to this, the English Bible had either been the Great Bible of 1539 or a revision of it. The Great Bible had been authorised by King Henry VIII, at the urging of his vicar-general Thomas Cromwell and his archbishop Thomas Cranmer, and was mainly the work of William Tyndale, who translated the New Testament and much of the Old Testament (and suffered martyrdom for his pains) and of Miles Coverdale, who translated the remaining books. Tyndale was learned in biblical languages, and translated directly from the original Hebrew and Greek, but Coverdale worked from modern intermediate translations into German and Latin. Some of Coverdale's part has worn well, and his Psalter is still appreciated, so much so as to remain a part of the *Book of Common Prayer*; but Tyndale's part is the work of a master, and had such influence on the translators of the Authorised Version that their version is said to be in the Old Testament seventy-six per cent the same, and in the New Testament eighty-three per cent the same, as his. The Apocrypha was included in the translation, but its books were grouped separately from the Old Testament proper.

The most important revision of the Great Bible, prior to the Authorised Version, was the Geneva Bible of 1560, produced by members of the English-speaking congregation in Geneva, and manifesting the direct knowledge of Hebrew which Coverdale's part of the Great Bible lacked. This translation became very popular in England and especially in Scotland. Because of its impressive scholarship, it showed up the weaknesses of the Great Bible, and convinced the bishops of the need for it to be revised. As a result, the Bishops' Bible was prepared, under the general editorship of Archbishop Matthew Parker, and it appeared in 1568. This is the English text which the translators of the Authorised Version were told to take as the starting-point for their own work. And they were to add no explanatory notes, as had often been done in recent English versions, the King having taken offence at some antimonarchist notes in the Geneva Bible.

The work of translation

Six companies of translators were forthwith set up, two each at Westminster, Cambridge and Oxford (Cambridge and Oxford being the seats of the two Universities, and Westminster, presumably, that of the House of Lords and the Canterbury Convocation), and 47 men were named to be members of these companies. One company in each place worked on the Old Testament and one on the New, but the assignment of the Apocrypha is less clear. Perhaps the decision was influenced by the fact that the Apocrypha, like the New Testament, needed to be translated out of Greek, no Semitic texts of any of the Apocrypha being at that date available.

Relations with Scottish Presbyterians may not have been warm enough to allow companies to be set up at one of the Scottish universities (James, a scholar himself, would have known well about this), but it is perhaps more surprising that they were not set up at Queen Elizabeth's Protestant university in Ireland, Trinity College Dublin, where James Ussher was a fellow and was already a monument of learning. It is tempting to spend time on what was not done rather than what was, but the decisions made were not in general exclusive. Ussher followed the work with interest; scholars who were not translators were invited to send in suggestions about the translation in general and about particular passages; and the only scholar whose co-operation seems not to have been welcomed was Hugh Broughton, who was a rival translator and who afterwards denounced the Authorised Version. The setting up of companies in different places was doubtless inevitable at a period when the roads were so poor, and the telephone and other modern means of communication had yet to be invented.

Fifteen rules were drawn up for the guidance of the companies, and eight rules or principles were afterwards, in 1618, reported by one of the translators, Samuel Ward, to the Synod of Dort in Holland, to which the Church of England sent delegates. Notionally, under rule 13, the directors of the six companies were to be the deans of Westminster and Chester and the Regius Professors of Hebrew and Greek in the two Universities, but in practice Lancelot Andrewes, who was a great linguist, became the director of the Westminster Old Testament company, and

John Rainolds the director of the Oxford Old Testament company. The report to the Synod of Dort said that after each company had finished its work, twelve delegates, chosen from them all, met together to review and revise the whole work, and that the finishing touches were put to it by Thomas Bilson, bishop of Winchester (a learned theologian), and by Miles Smith (a distinguished oriental scholar, and afterwards bishop of Gloucester).

Clearly, we do not know all that we would like to know about the preparation of the Authorised Version. The fullest account to date is that given by David Norton in his book *A Textual History of the King James Bible* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005). A study of the names of the 47 translators would no doubt be illuminating, but the very date when they did their work was significant. It was early in James I's reign, before the bishops and Puritans came into such open conflict as they did in his son Charles I's reign, and before the Church of England had been affected by the novel Dutch theory of Arminianism, which afterwards had such influence on it. The Church of England at this period was firmly biblical, liturgical and episcopal, it was unashamedly Protestant, and on the doctrines of grace its prevailing theology, as in the previous reign, was moderately Augustinian (or Calvinistic). The Archbishop of Canterbury at the time was Richard Bancroft, a stern opponent of Puritans, but he was succeeded in 1611 by George Abbot, one of the Oxford company of New Testament translators, and a man much more tolerant of the Puritan outlook.

The Authorised Version as Literature

The Authorised Version needs to be considered both as a piece of English literature and as a translation of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. As a piece of English literature, it is arguably the supreme masterpiece our language can display, and it has had profound influence on English literature since. If one looks for the most thrilling passage, or the most moving passage, or the most challenging passage, or the most comforting passage, which our literature contains, one will probably find it in the Authorised Version of the Bible. It was produced in one of the great ages of our literature, and it benefited both from the pioneering skill of Tyndale in English composition, and from the central place the Bible had in the life of a Christian nation – in its regular worship and in its education of the young. As a recent writer has said, “For centuries the Authorised Version was the essential, often the only book in the house, and it would be read aloud”. And though Christian practice has so declined of recent years in this country, and though many rival attempts to translate the Bible into English have recently been made, the Authorised Version remains a permanent bestseller. It now shows some marks of its age, but its popularity is little affected. The antiquarian terms and phrases which it contains, though they may not be immediately comprehensible, only add to its charm. To explain them and to learn what they mean is an enjoyable task and not an irksome one. The unusual word order that we sometimes find is also pleasing.

This is not just the case in the Church of England. The Authorised Version has been almost equally as much appreciated in the Free Churches. Even in Scotland it soon replaced the Geneva Bible. It has had a great following in America, and the same is true in the many English-speaking parts of the British Empire and Commonwealth.

The Authorised Version as a Bible translation

As a translation of the Scriptures, the Authorised Version is marked, above all, by faithfulness and reverence. Its language is dignified, and it is as near to being a word-for-word translation as respect for the differences between English and the original languages, and the demands of intelligibility, allow it to be.

Up to the twentieth century, the Authorised Version set the standard for Bible translators. The Revised Version of 1881 is as close to a word-for-word translation as the Authorised Version is. The Revised Standard Version, in its original 1946 edition, did not move far from this, but other English translations had by then begun to appear, which worked on what has come to be called the “dynamic equivalence” principle, translating sentence by sentence, or even paragraph by paragraph, not word for word. There was also a growing desire to avoid looking old-fashioned, even at the expense of accuracy. The distinction between “thou” for the singular (and respectful) and “you” for the plural (and informal) steadily disappeared, and with “thou” went the corresponding verbal forms and pronouns. Paraphrase took the place of translation, even in the hands of Conservative Evangelicals, such as those who produced the New International Version. But, worst of all, concessions began to be made to contemporary pressure-groups such as Feminism, and, in deference to their prejudices, the Bible, which is the word of God, was made to speak the language of political correctness. The so-called New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) is a major offender here. It aims always to name women separately from men in passages where the Bible groups them together; and on almost every page of the NRSV there are footnotes telling you what the original Hebrew or Greek actually says, though something different has now been written in the text. Of course, when this version is read in church, as it often is, nobody hears the footnotes, but only the alterations of wording which the translators, so called, have thought fit to introduce.

Other pressure-groups, no doubt, will soon be calling for other concessions from Bible-translators. One can imagine what will happen to the Bible’s condemnations of homosexual practices, fornication and adultery, if such voices are listened to.

Some of the users of the old RSV, anticipating that, with the appearance of the NRSV, it might become unavailable, felt so strongly about what had been done to the RSV that they combined to produce a different new edition, without the politically correct deviations. This is a scholarly piece of work, and has been published by Collins under the name of the English Standard Version.

So much for methods of translation. But there is another reason why recent translations differ from the Authorised Version, which is that, especially in the New Testament, they are often translating from a different form of the original text.

Christians are taught by the Bible to believe that God both inspired the Scriptures and also providentially preserved them for the instruction of His people in all ages. This is clear from the way that Jesus and the New Testament writers constantly appeal to passages of the Old Testament, written centuries earlier, in proof of the teaching that they are giving. Think how Jesus and St. Paul argue from the Book of Genesis to prove the lifelong character of marriage or faith as the means of justification. But though it was God's will for the inspired Scriptures to be providentially preserved, it was evidently not His will to preserve them without any variation. The Greek manuscripts available to the early Protestant translators were in general agreement but not in total agreement. Where they differed, the translators followed the text which was found in the majority of manuscripts. This was a reasonable procedure, and agreed with the way that the rabbis had dealt with discrepancies between manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible.

In the 19th century, however, an alternative view arose, that it was better to follow not the text found in the *majority* of the manuscripts but in the *oldest* of the manuscripts. The oldest more or less complete manuscripts of the New Testament were two dating from the fourth century, called Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, one of them preserved in the Vatican Library at Rome and the other in the library of St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai. The Revised Version of 1881 was therefore based, in its New Testament books, mainly upon these, and later translations have tended to follow suit. If there had been no other evidence, this would have been a reasonable decision, even though the fourth century was about three hundred years after the New Testament books were written. But there *was* other evidence, even at the time, and more has accumulated since. There were the passages quoted from the New Testament in writings of the Christian Fathers, dating from the first three centuries. And since the 19th century, fragmentary papyrus manuscripts dating from the third century have been discovered, containing parts of various New Testament books. All of this is earlier evidence than that of the two famous codices, and what we learn from it suggests that we would be wise to think again.

Let me give you an example. The two fourth-century codices leave out what is sometimes called the Longer Ending of St. Mark. Their text of St. Mark's Gospel ends in a very abrupt way at chapter 16, verse 8, without the resurrection appearances of Jesus or His ascension, which occupy verses 9-20. It seems quite possible that the original ending of the Gospel may have got detached and lost at a very early period, before manuscripts of the book had multiplied, and that someone else, at a similarly early period, may have been moved by God to add a substitute ending, which is what we now have. If so, this would explain why copies without the ending came to exist in the fourth century. They would be derived from the manuscript which lost its ending. But they were certainly not the

only copies then in existence, for copies with the present ending are quoted by the Fathers as early as the second century. Thus Irenaeus, who migrated from the East and became a bishop in Gaul, writing towards the end of the second century, quotes the words of Mark 16:19 and explicitly states that they are words of Mark near the conclusion of his Gospel (*Against Heresies* 3:10:6). Evidently, the words had been attached to Mark's Gospel long enough for Irenaeus (though a learned man) to regard them as an integral part of it. And knowledge of the Longer Ending is also thought to be reflected in the writings of Justin Martyr and in Tatian's *Diatessaron*, which likewise belong to the second century.

In the Authorised Version, since it is translated from the text found in most manuscripts, the Longer Ending of Mark is included at the place we would expect to find it. In the Revised Version, since it is translated from the two fourth-century codices, the Longer Ending is included only after a gap, and with a questioning footnote. Now, if you are taking your stand on the oldest evidence, you certainly must not ignore evidence which is even older. Yet that is what modern textual criticism seems prone to do. I am not an expert in textual criticism, but it seems to be one of those sciences in which the experts disagree, even on their basic principles. Is it agreement between the manuscripts that matters most, as used to be thought? Or is it the oldest manuscripts that matter most? And which are the oldest manuscripts? Those which have survived from the fourth century, or those which, though now lost, we know were circulating in the second century? Instead of arguing about such points, would it not be better to concentrate our thoughts on the wonderful providence of God, which has preserved His inspired Scriptures in a usable form, or perhaps two usable forms, down to our own day, and still enables us, by His Holy Spirit, to learn from them, to act upon them, and to lift up our hearts to Him, in thankfulness for His goodness and in hope of heaven?

Forgive me, please, if I reminisce for a minute. When, in the 1950s, I was a student at Tyndale Hall, Bristol, that unique place, the "college of knowledge" as its founder Dr. Daniel Bartlett called it, we were taught to use the Authorised Version for devotion and the Revised Version for study, and I have continued to do so since. But I am beginning now, late in life, to use the Authorised Version for study also. The learning of its translators and the principles on which it was produced entitle it to that degree of respect. I will never despise the Revised Version, or the ancient codices on which it is based. It is a careful and scholarly piece of work. But I am coming to realise, like my late friend John Wenham, that it does not deserve the level of deference which we once showed it, and that the Authorised Version is quite equally worthy of esteem, for study as well as devotion.

I apologise for ending my address on a personal note, but I felt that I ought to be frank, in case I have left anyone with a different impression.

It is not gifts but graces which make a Christian.

Matthew Mead

• PURITAN PREACHING TOPICS •

JAMES DAVISON (Belfast)

“WHO were the Puritans?” and “What did the Puritans teach?” are two questions that are repeatedly asked. In an attempt to answer these questions many volumes have been written. Books like Benjamin Brooks’ *Lives of the Puritans?*, James Reid’s, *Westminster Divines*, Erroll Hulse’s, *Who are the Puritans*, and *Meet the Puritans* by Joel R. Beeke and Randall J. Pederson, go some way in answering the first question. But, thankfully, the Puritans themselves have left a great library of books that have enabled succeeding generations to not only examine what they preached and taught, but also know how they went about it.

Many of these Puritan books deal with doctrinal controversies, such as Popery, Arminianism, the Sabbath, and the true nature of the church, which were usually handled in a polemic or apologetic manner. The vast majority of these books, however, are sermons that deal with, not doctrine *per se*, but with the practical application of the doctrines expounded in the sermons. Such is the nature of these practical instructions that they have been, correctly, described as “a rich banquet table loaded with solid nourishment for God’s people”.¹

The reason for this emphasis on the practical aspects of doctrine is because Puritanism was, above all else, about life, a real, earnest, and practical life, which would bring glory to God and true happiness to man. This concern for practical godliness in all areas of the Christian’s life enabled the Puritan preacher to use a wide variety of topics, as a browse through Robert P. Martin’s book, *A Guide to the Puritans*, will show. All these topics were presented in such a manner as to exhort the hearers to “close with Christ” (to repent of their ungodliness), to the glory of God and their own eternal well being. Another specific aspect of Puritan ministry was as “physicians of souls” as they endeavoured to bring healing to consciences which were afflicted with guilt and doubt.

Four topics have been selected to illustrate how the Puritan preacher handled his subject, with the aim of encouraging modern preachers to do likewise. The four topics are: (1) the Person of God as revealed by his attributes; (2) the heinousness of sin, which separates man from God; (3) the all-sufficiency of Christ in reconciling sinners and God, were all important topics to the Puritan preacher; and (4) a topic, very seldom preached on today – the reality of Hell with all its terrors.

Why, it may be asked, these particular topics? Answer: The first topic is the foundation of all Puritan preaching, for it presents God all-glorious, the One who is to be worshipped and obeyed, while the second reveals the creatures’ failure, because of his sin, to obey and give all glory to his Creator, the all-glorious God. The third topic reveals the only remedy whereby the creature can atone for his failure to do what he was created for, while the fourth identifies, in very graphic terms, the eternal habitation, with all its terrors, of those who

die without “repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ” (Acts 20:21).

For the Puritan preacher a correct understanding of these topics would lead to a life of godliness, which in turn would bring glory to God and fulfil the purpose for which man was created. It can also be said that in preaching on these four topics in particular the Puritan preacher excelled!

The Person of God

In a series of sermons on *The Incomparableness of God*, George Swinnock makes this reference to the perfection of God: “a being is absolutely perfect, when nothing can be added to it, or taken from it, when it is incapable of the least accession or diminution. Now such a being is God, and none but God.” The reason for this perfection is because God’s “being comes from Himself. No being in the world, besides His, is its own cause or original.” Swinnock further comments that God is an independent being, for “none ever in heaven or earth contributed the least towards the maintenance or continuance of His being”. On the other hand, notes Swinnock, “all other beings are dependent; the highest, the strongest of them are not able to bear their own weight; but like the hop or ivy, must have somewhat to lean upon”.² Jeremiah Burroughs echoes the same sentiment when he says: “Whatever is in God is Himself.” This is so unlike the creature, for “one creature has one good in it and another, another [good], but God has all good in Him. . . . And all that is in Him is originally in Him. He is of Himself and from Himself and for Himself.”³

While it was not uncommon for Puritan ministers to preach on the Person of God they, importantly, proclaimed that the incomparable God could be understood by his attributes,⁴ as revealed in Scripture. “The attributes of God,” says Swinnock “are those perfections in the divine nature which are ascribed to Him, that we might the better understand Him.”⁵ Thomas Brooks shows the importance of having hearts that are “strongly affected with the greatness, holiness, majesty, and glory” of God, as a means of keeping the devices of Satan at bay. Brooks writes: “There is nothing that will contribute so much to the keeping out of vain thoughts as to look upon God as an omniscient God, an omnipresent God, an omnipotent God, a God full of all glorious perfections, a God whose majesty, purity, and glory will not suffer Him to behold the least iniquity.”⁶

Another important aspect of God’s attributes, according to David Clarkson, relate to the authority and power of God in “the actual ordering and disposing of all things as seems good to Him”. Clarkson also indicates that God rules by a supreme sovereignty, in an absolute manner, in an irresistible manner, perfectly and continually. God’s government is supreme for there is none above Him nor is any co-ordinate with Him, all are below God. God’s government is absolute and unlimited, as none can set boundaries beyond which His rule cannot go, and irresistible, for none can hinder or thwart the purpose of God. God’s rule is a

perfect rule, for as there is infinite wisdom and understanding with God so too there is infinite righteousness. God's government is also indefectible, without ceasing, without the least intermission.⁷

For the Puritans, God's awesomeness establishes Him as ruler over all, and therefore all "are to acknowledge Him as their sovereign and themselves as subject to Him". Furthermore, as God rules over all, "we should give up all that is within us, all that belongs to us, to be ordered and disposed of as He would have it". The great advantage of such a rule, says Clarkson, is that "you will be under the protection of God . . . who has provided such a guard for each of His faithful subjects as will secure them not only against all the force on earth, but all the power of hell". Clarkson notes also that God is willing to take care of all that concerns those who are His faithful subjects: "If you be willing to have all ordered by Him [God] is willing to take the care of all your concerns upon Himself . . . that thereby you have such tranquillity and quietness of mind and heart as will free you from all anxiety and trouble."⁸

For the Puritans, the practical outworking of the doctrine of God would recognise God's right to have the obedience of all to His rule. It would also bring all obedient subjects into a satisfying relationship with God. Jeremiah Burroughs, in his *Gospel Reconciliation*, refers to this twofold outworking of the doctrine in the life of Adam, the first man. Burroughs reasons that when God made man and stamped His own image of "perfect holiness and righteousness" upon him, "Man was the very complement of all the excellencies of God's work; for indeed he was the end of all His works". The purpose in this, says Burroughs, is that God "might by man have His glory from all the other creatures that were made – that He might in this world have a creature which might be able to know Him, worship Him, and serve Him, and to take notice of the lustre of His glory that arose from all His other works, and to reflect this glory upon his face". By this relationship, Burroughs argues, there was "a most blessed union and wonderful delight between God and man", evidenced by Adam's "walk and converse with God".⁹

Scripture, however, informs us of a terrible breach in this union, resulting in man becoming God's most deadly enemy, and "such enemies", says Burroughs, "are every one of us unto God naturally [for] there is an antipathy between our hearts and Him". For Burroughs man's disobedience brought about a radical change in his nature: "There was, by this sin begotten in the heart of man, an antipathy, a natural antipathy between him and God." By way of illustration Burroughs notes that while two sheep may fight and be enemies, they are not as the wolf and the lamb that have an enmity one towards the other, which is natural. "Their natures are opposite one to another. So the heart of man is opposite unto God even naturally."¹⁰

The Evil of Sin

The action of Adam brought about dire consequences for all mankind, for, in the words of Thomas Manton, it left man "destitute of all power and means of rising

again, or helping himself out of that misery into which he has plunged himself by sin".¹¹ As Edmund Calamy put it: "By nature we have dead souls, dead in sins and trespasses, void of spiritual life; as perfectly under the power of sin, as a dead man is under the power of death."¹² The imputation of Adam's sin, for the Puritans, brought the total corruption of all nature. Thomas Goodwin referred to the universal nature of sin when he wrote: "Other monarchs never subdued all; some outlaws and nations were not overcome; here not a man but falls under it."¹³ The fact that death is universal, argues Goodwin, is unquestionable evidence that sin too is universal and leaves man spiritually impotent.

For the Puritans, therefore, sin was "the evil of evils". "Sin truly is, and God's people apprehend it to be, the greatest evil in all the world."¹⁴ The reason for this, argues Samuel Bolton, is because "all other evils are only outward. They are only such as are on the body, the estate, the name, but this is an inward evil, an evil upon the soul." Edward Reynolds describes the inward nature of sin in stark detail in writing about the conscience, the heart, the will and the memory. Of the heart he writes:

Look into the heart, and you shall find a very hell of uncleanness, full of deep and unsearchable deceit and wickedness, full of hardness: no sins, no judgments, no miseries, no allurements, no hopes, no fears, no promises, no instructions able to startle, to awake, to melt, or shape it to a better image, without the immediate omnipotency of that God which melts mountains and turns stones into the sons of Abraham. [Likewise the heart is] full of folly [and] full of madness and rage. A heart that departs from God . . . is [that] forge, where all sins are framed in secret intents, desires, purposes, lusts, and from whence it springs forth into life; the flames of it breaking out into the tongue, and in every other member, in adulteries, murders, thefts, blasphemies, and every wicked word and work.¹⁵

Another reason why the Puritans regarded sin as evil and wicked is because it "opposes and fights against the greatest Good. . . . [It] strikes against the essence of God."¹⁶ This is evidenced by man's love of sin: "The whole strength of man goes that way which his love goes," and be sure of this, continues Obadiah Sedgwick, "sin has the whole man if it has won the love of his heart."¹⁷ Furthermore, "all other evils are only of a temporal nature. . . . Death puts a conclusion to them all. But this evil of sin is of an eternal nature that shall never have an end,"¹⁸ and it places the subject under the wrath and hatred of God. Joseph Alleine comments:

The infinite God is engaged against you. . . . His face is against you. . . . His heart is against you, He hates all the workers of iniquity. Man does not your heart tremble to think of your being an object of God's hatred? . . . All His attributes are against you. His justice is like a flaming sword against you. . . . The holiness of God is against you. . . . The power of God is

mounted like a mighty cannon against you. . . . The wisdom of God is against you. . . . The truth of God is sworn against you, [and] if He is faithful and true, you must perish if you go on.¹⁹

NOTES

1. Robert P. Martin, *A Guide to the Puritans* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1997), p. ix.
2. George Swinnock, *The Works of George Swinnock*, Vol. 4 (Rpt. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 19--), pp. 391, 388, 389, 390.
3. Jeremiah Burroughs, "The Incomparable Excellency of God", in *The Saints' Treasury* (Rpt. Logonier, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1991), p. 6.
4. The Puritans made a clear distinction between the incommunicable attributes of God (those attributes God does not share with others) and the communicable attributes of God (those attributes God does share with others, especially with man). The first category included all the "omnis" while the second category includes God's goodness, love, mercy, justice, wisdom). Importantly, the Puritans stressed that as man was finite the communicable attributes were not communicated in a perfect manner.
5. George Swinnock, *The Works of George Swinnock*, Vol. 4, p. 402.
6. Thomas Brooks, *The Works of Thomas Brooks*, Vol. 1 (Rpt. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1980), p. 86.
7. David Clarkson, *The Works of David Clarkson*, Vol. 2 (Rpt. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1988), pp. 455, 460-463.
8. *ibid*, pp. 467, 473, 477, 478.
9. Jeremiah Burroughs, *Gospel Reconciliation or Christ's Trumpet of Peace to the World* (Rpt. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1997), pp. 4-5, 4, 6, 7-8, 8.
10. *ibid*, pp. 4-5, 4, 6, 7-8, 8.
11. Thomas Manton, "Man's Impotency to Help Himself Out of that Misery" in *The Complete Works of Thomas Manton*, Vol. 5 (Rpt. Worthington, PA: Maranatha Publications, nd), p. 476.
12. Edmund Calamy, "Of the Resurrection" in *Puritan Sermons*, Vol. 5 (Rpt. Wheaton, IL: Richard Owen Roberts Publishers, 1981), p. 457.
13. Thomas Goodwin, *The Works of Thomas Goodwin*, Vol. 10 (Rpt. Eureka, CA: Tanski Publications, 1996), p. 5.
14. Samuel Bolton, "Sin the Greatest Evil" in *The Puritans on Conversion* (Rpt. Ligonier, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1990), p. 5.
15. Edward Reynolds, "The Sinfulness of Sin" in *The Works of Edward Reynolds*, Vol. 1 (Rpt. Ligonier, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1992), pp. 123-124.
16. Samuel Bolton, "Sin the Greatest Evil", p. 8.
17. Obediah Sedgwick, *The Anatomy of Secret Sins* (Rpt. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1995), pp. 167, 168.
18. Samuel Bolton, "Sin the Greatest Evil", p. 6.
19. Joseph Alleine, *An Alarm to the Unconverted* (Rpt. London: Banner of Truth, 1959), pp. 56, 58, 59, 60.

• TO BE CONTINUED •

• BOOK REVIEWS •

Firm in the Faith. Dennis D. Hustedt. EP Books. pp. 238, paperback. £8.99. ISBN 13 978 0 85234 737 9.

Described as "An exiting presentation of God's Word in fifty-two studies, for use at home or in church groups", this book should be a very helpful guide in the study of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, on which it is based.

John Calvin said to Oliver Cromwell: "Believe me, Monseigneur, the church of God will never be preserved without catechesis." Here we have a well set-up book, with a catechism question and

answer, and a memory verse for study during the year. There is an "Action" space for the purpose of writing in what "action" has been taken for each day in the week. The Contents are clearly set out and cover vital points of theology. The Preface has a most apt quotation from the Puritan, Thomas Manton, expressing his concern regarding "the decay of the power of godliness and especially of the great corruption of youth . . . we cannot blame so much their untowardness, as our own negligence in their education".

Ten years have gone since this book was first published, and they have been years of terrible moral and spiritual decline. Dr. Hustedt well says: "We can make no greater investment for the future than to point our young people to the God of the Bible, and to arm them with solid Biblical truth."

It is a pity that the Bible quotations are from the English Standard Version. Is it true, as we are so often told, "our young people are unable to understand the Authorised Version"? Are we to question the Holy Spirit's enabling power? A very thought-provoking and practical book. D.L.J.

The Doctrine and Practice of Holiness. Erroll Hulse. EP Books. pp. 367, paperback. £9.99. ISBN 978 085234 739 3.

A few weeks ago when with friends, the conversation turned to favourite (Christian) books. Someone said: "Mine is Bishop Ryle's book on *Holiness*," and the rest of us fully agreed that the dear bishop had written a book that had a great impact in Victorian times and, even now, should have a place in every Christian home. Pastor Hulse's book, on the same subject, is placed within a modern setting. It is easy to read, and understand, and will, no doubt, help readers to avoid (or be extricated from!) much of what is taught in Christendom's churches, in our present apostate age.

Pastor Hulse points out the impossibility for man to possess inherent holiness; the holiness is in Christ! The idea, of sinless perfection in this life, is impossible; for "indwelling sin always remains ready to launch another attack".

The doctrines of justification and sanctification, of vital importance, and very often misunderstood, are explained, and "windows" are used giving quotations from reputable theologians, as well as comments on modern errors, etc. "Eventual Perfect Sanctification" is one such "window" where the author suggests that sanctification is concluded "at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ". Prof. Louis Berkhof writes in his Systematic Theology: "The sanctification of the believer must, it would seem, be completed at the very moment of death, or immediately after death, as far as the soul is concerned, and at the resurrection in so far as it obtains to the body."

There are twenty-four chapters containing such as: What is holiness?, Holiness and the Mortification of Sin, The New Birth (the author comments on the statements contained in the *Book of Common Prayer*), The Death and Burial of the Old Man, and other points connected with his subject. An index is provided for both Names and Subjects and Scripture References. Scripture quotations are mainly taken from that Bible printed and under copyright by the International Bible Society (the "NIV"). The print is of good size and well spaced. D.L.J.

Bootle Street Pulpit. Michael Pickett. Old Paths Gospel Press. pp. 166, paperback. £5.95. Obtainable from www.gospelmissionbooks.com

Mr. Pickett was the pastor at Ebenezer Chapel, Bootle Street Green, East Sussex, for eleven years (1991-2002) and these are a collection of Christ-exalting sermons preached by him between 6th October 1991 and 17th May 1992. Sixteen sermons are given, equally divided between the two Testaments. Three sermons (Hosea 2:14-15, Acts 16:30, 1 Peter 5:6-7) cover both the morning and evening addresses.

This is good, sound preaching, which, needless to say, is rarely heard in our churches. There is no watering down of the Truth, especially where the message of salvation is concerned. In speaking of the cry of the jailor in Acts 16 ("What must I do to be saved?"): "Here we trace a miracle of grace, and a miracle which is performed in the heart of everyone who comes to know the Lord. And if

we stand as believers in the Lord Jesus Christ today, then that miracle of grace has been performed in our hearts." The Holy Spirit will work (it is no work of ours; no "decision"!) by the foolishness (in the eyes of the world) of preaching. The power of the preached Word, under the power of the Holy Spirit will be increasingly evident. "There may not be an earthquake; there may not be a fire; there may not be imprisonment and bonds, in an open sense; but there will be these elements of repentance toward God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ."

Since the time of these addresses, the reviewer cannot help pointing out the worsening situation for Christians – "imprisonment and bonds" are ever nearer! The AV is used, the print is clear and on good quality paper.

D.L.J.

Ignatius of Antioch ISBN 978 1 84871 093 1; **Polycarp of Smyrna** ISBN 978 1 84871 092 4; **Irenaeus of Lyons** ISBN 978 1 84871 094 8. All by Sinclair B. Ferguson. The Banner of Truth Trust. pp. 40, hardback. £8 each or less if bought in a set.

The above are reviewed together as they form the first three titles in a series called "Heroes of the Faith". The type is large and printed on large pages, with colour illustrations. Bible quotations are from the English Standard Version, and the books are intended for parents and children.

The author has given himself a problem with the choice of size of print and the limited number of pages, being barely able to give more than an outline of each man and his contribution to church history. If the same restrictions are intended for a planned further 24 volumes, it is difficult to see how justice can be done to the intended heroes about whom so much more is known. Parents are likely to find the information in the books too sketchy to give much of a biography of each man.

R.S.

Candle Bible for Kids. Juliet David; illustrated by Jo Parry. Candle Books. pp. 400, hardback. £12.99. ISBN 978 1 85985 827 1.

This lavishly illustrated book, is described as a collection of best-loved Bible stories, so as a Bible many parts have been omitted. The early events of the Old Testament are covered, then we have selections from Samson to Noah. The New Testament covers our Lord's life and teaching, a few events in Acts and a brief history of Paul.

It is a very eye-catching book, due to the beautiful illustrations (sometimes taking up as much as two-thirds of a page), but small children may find it a bit heavy to handle as it weighs almost 2lb (900g), thanks to its sturdy covers and pages. The Bible stories have been carefully re-told in everyday English. The illustrations are aimed to appeal to children but some parents may have reservations as to how truly Scriptural the pictures are.

R.S.

Wait Till You See the Butterfly. Doreen Tamminga. The Banner of Truth Trust. pp. 246, paperback. £7.50. ISBN 978 1 84871 101 3.

The Canadian author is a teacher and editor of a magazine for 4-12-year-olds and her book is a collection of some 44 short stories with a Scriptural application previously published in a North American magazine. The stories are grouped for 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12-year-olds, and there is a two-page index of the topics covered in the stories.

These are stories to read to children or for older ones to read themselves and would also lend themselves to being read to Sunday School classes or similar. Most of them have an instant appeal, dealing with situations with which most children will readily identify; e.g. fear of dogs, getting separated from parents on a trip out, bullying at school. The Scriptural application generally arises quite naturally from the story and does not seem forced.

As the author is Canadian there is the occasional slight problem in vocabulary or idiom which is not everyday English to us, but the meaning can usually be worked out without much difficulty.

R.S.

Cara: A Hope and a Future. Rhona Tolchard. Inter-Varsity Press. pp. 184, paperback. £7.99. ISBN 978 1 84474 430 5.

Told by her mother, this is the story of Cara, a little girl born with severe disabilities, who died at the age of nine. Cara's death is recounted in the first chapter and the remainder of the book, as the preface says, "is an attempt to increase understanding about the effects of severe disability and about the issues facing the families of disabled children everywhere in this country at this time".

It is noticeable that such help as Cara and her family received came mainly from friends, the church, and non-governmental organisations. The author's ire is particularly reserved for the educational establishment, which makes it very difficult for parents to find suitable education for their disabled children, despite what the law says. At one point her husband confronted the professionals with a copy of the SEN *Code of Practice* and said to them, "This is a really good document. Trouble is, you don't do it, do you?"

There is a heart-rending account of the effects of heartless officialdom's insistence on a change of school: "From being a happy outgoing child, who squealed with pleasure when the taxi came to take her to school and was full of activity and smiles when she came home, Cara quickly turned into a quiet, resigned serious little girl who was not the child we had known."

Basically the problem seems to be society's rebuttal of the Christian view that "the incarnation of Jesus sends a message to all humanity that we are all valuable and, for Christians, disability has to be seen first and foremost in this context." The author says that "many people in official positions give a good impression of being unaware of this vision and unwilling even to look at a more humane approach." Quite. This book is a terrible warning of the way our society is heading. We have already aborted seven million babies and euthanasia is being touted for the ill and elderly. Will the disabled be next in line?

The people who should be reading this are the educational psychologists, social workers and education officials. Unfortunately its readership will probably be largely confined to Christians, which is a great pity.

N.M.M.

The Visitor's Book of Texts. Andrew Bonar. The Banner of Truth Trust. pp. 296, paperback. £6.50. ISBN 978 1 84871 071 9.

Andrew Bonar (1810-1892) was one of that illustrious band of ministers who were the founding ministers of the Free Church of Scotland after the Disruption. He ministered at Collace and at Finnieston Free Church, Glasgow. He is the well known author and editor of *The Life and Remains of Robert Murray M'Cheyne*. This volume was written for those who would undertake the pastoral visitation of the sick and sorrowful. The author seeks to impart instruction as to how to minister to those who are in such a condition. The book is divided into three sections; viz., "The Word Brought Near to the Sick"; "The Word Brought Near to Seven Classes Who May Be Found in the Sick-Room" and "The Word Brought Near to the Sorrowful".

The author imparts advice to the parish visitor for various situations and cases of conscience: the sick person is sorrowful, the sick person is a backslider, the sick person is indifferent, etc. Whilst such hand-books as this may be helpful in certain situations, there is the difficulty of stereotyping all situations and keeping too close to such "help" as is given by the author. The visitor may not find them to be helpful in an actual set of circumstances in the sick room. The one visiting the sick must always be able to assess the situation and the circumstances in which he is found. Following a hand-book of this nature is not realistic and has the tendency for the visitor to depend on both the instruction and experience of the author rather than the leadings and promptings of the Holy Spirit, to which all those engaged in any kind of pastoral ministry must always be aware. For this reason this book is to be used very carefully as a help rather than, as the publisher describes it, "a vital tool for pastoral visitation".

The version of Scripture used throughout is the Authorised Version. It is not an exact reproduction of an earlier volume, but the text has been slightly edited.

J.E.N.

My Beloved. Cathie MacRae. Copies of this 60 pp booklet are available at £2.00, post free, from Mr. Andrew Murray, 35 Crathes Gardens, Livingston, West Lothian EH54 9EN, Scotland, or Mr. William Murray, Lonemore, Dornoch, Sutherland IV25 3RW, Scotland.

This booklet has a very powerful story. It is a brief overview of Cathie MacRae's early life and her Christian awakening and maturing against the background of her TB infection and eventual death. Cathie went into hospital in 1932 and remained in hospitals until her death in 1948 with only a brief time back home. During this long illness we hear how her faith grew through reading God's Word, prayer, and speaking to others in the ward, both staff and visitors.

This booklet would be helpful for any suffering long-term illness. It is also challenging to hear how her illness affected her faith and witness to those around her. In the preface Rev. MacRury states that she was "a radiant Christian whose testimony was blessed unto many of those who came into contact with her" and that is abundantly clear when reading her story. Finally, it is good to be reminded that thanks to modern treatments we are able to cure this and other terrible diseases; however, we have a far better treatment for the illness of our souls in the Lord Jesus Christ.

V.J.L.

When Christians Suffer. Thomas Case. The Banner of Truth Trust. pp. 122, paperback. £9.25. ISBN 13 978 1 84871 042 9.

This is one of the books in the *Pocket Puritan* series. It is a version of Thomas Case's "Treatise of Affliction" drawn from his *Select Works*, published by the Religious Tract Society in 1836.

It commences with a most interesting letter to Mr. Case from one of the best and most well known Puritan writers, Thomas Manton, who wrote: "Good sir, be persuaded to publish these discourses: the subject is useful, and your manner of handling it warm and affectionate. Do not deprive the world of your experience."

Thomas Case himself suffered greatly, being imprisoned for the faith; he speaks from what he knows: "Discourses on affliction can never be out of season. In the following leaves are some prison thoughts."

Richard Rushing, the editor, has modernised the language. The print is of a good size. We are again, as Christians, beginning to experience persecution, and this valuable little book gives, as our author has stated, a word for the present.

D.L.J.

Please obtain any books reviewed or advertised from your local Christian bookshop, as we regretfully are not in a position to supply your requirements.

MATTERS TO DO WITH THE CONTENTS OF THE GOSPEL MAGAZINE SHOULD BE SENT TO:

**The Rt. Rev. Edward Malcolm, 15 Bridge Street, Knighton, Powys LD7 1BT
Tel. 01547 528815**

Only subscriptions and advertisements should be sent to the Secretary (details opposite).

FROM THE SECRETARY'S DESK

Where subscriptions are due a reminder is enclosed and prompt payment is appreciated. Cheques and Postal Orders must be made payable to "The Gospel Magazine" or the bank will not accept them. Please do not mail cash.

Philip Lievesley, Secretary