

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE simultaneous issue of a new Concordance to the Septuagint and a new Concordance to the Greek Testament is an event of more than ephemeral interest. This month the Clarendon Press has issued the last part of Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. And this month Messrs. T. & T. Clark have issued Moulton and Geden's *Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and the English Revisers*.

Both books carry two names on their title-page, and in both cases the burden of the work has fallen on the younger man. Mr. Redpath's Preface, which is issued with the sixth part, is a model of modesty. The design and plan of the present work are wholly due to Dr. Hatch, he says. He says that about half the materials were gathered, and a few sheets actually in print, before Dr. Hatch's death. And then he adds in a sentence: 'the present editor undertook the revision of what already existed, and the completion of the work.'

Mr. Geden is just as modest, for it is the badge of the scholar as truly as of the warrior. But he is far more fortunate than Mr. Redpath. He

does not need to say what Dr. Moulton did or left undone; Dr. Moulton is happily with us still to say it for himself. And Dr. Moulton makes as little of his work as Mr. Geden would appear to make much. One fact, however, Dr. Moulton cannot conceal, and Mr. Geden is forward to proclaim it,—the Rev. J. H. Moulton, M.A., late fellow of King's College, Cambridge, has read the sheets throughout, in company with his father: 'his scholarly care,' says Professor Geden, 'has borne fruit on every page of the work.'

Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance* covers the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, the Greek text of the Apocryphal books, and the remains of the other versions which formed part of Origen's *Hexapla*. Four great texts are represented, and in the following order of preference—A, the *Codex Alexandrinus*; B, the *Codex Vaticanus*; S, the *Codex Sinaiticus*; and R, the *Sixtine Edition* of 1587. Except proper names, personal pronouns, and a few of the commonest words, 'it is hoped that no word has been omitted which occurs in any one of the four texts.' The object aimed at in the quotations for each word has been to give, as far as possible, enough of the context to show (1) the grammatical construction of the word, and (2) the words with which it is

ordinarily associated. Finally, the *Concordance* gives the Hebrew equivalent of every Greek word in each passage in which it occurs, without, however, making the assumption that the Greek is a word-for-word translation of the Hebrew.

Moulton and Geden's *Concordance* also includes more great texts than one. 'Westcott and Hort' is soundly assumed as the standard. But wherever Tischendorf in his *Editio Octava*, or the Revisers of the English New Testament, vary from Westcott and Hort, the variation is immediately noted. 'Thus the method employed, it may fairly be claimed, precludes the omission of any expression which, by even a remote probability, might be regarded as forming part of the true text of the New Testament.' Wherever the Greek quotation is evidently, or even probably, taken from the Old Testament, its Hebrew equivalent is added. And by a simple arrangement of asterisks, the important information is always given, whether the word before us is found in classical writers, in the Septuagint, or is original to the New Testament itself. Lastly, the leading phrases in which each word occurs are gathered together at the beginning and then carefully noted on each occurrence. Moulton and Geden's *Concordance* records the examples of every word in the New Testament, proper names and common words, except the particles $\delta\epsilon$ and $\kappa\alpha\iota$.

Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint* contains 1504 pages, each divided into three columns, and measuring $13\frac{1}{2}$ by $10\frac{1}{2}$ inches. It may now be obtained in six parts at one guinea apiece, or in two volumes at six guineas in cloth. Moulton and Geden's *Concordance to the Greek Testament* is issued in a single volume of 1037 pages, each measuring $10\frac{1}{2}$ by $7\frac{1}{2}$ inches, and divided into two columns. It costs 26s. net, in cloth; or 31s. 6d. net, half bound in calf. Their simultaneous publication gathers its significance from the fact, which no one will seek to contest, that both will at once supersede all their predecessors, and take their place as the standard

Concordances in Greek for the Old Testament and for the New.

Many notices have already appeared of Harnack's new book. But for the most part they are tentative and general. The exceptions, so far as we have seen, are the brief notices in the *Guardian* of 20th January by Dr. Sanday, and in the *Record* of the same date by Professor Armitage Robinson, and especially a popular article by Professor Gwatkin in the *Contemporary Review* for February.

Let it be remembered that, while Harnack describes his book as *The Chronology of Early Christian Literature as far as Eusebius*, he has yet published but the first volume, carrying the subject down only to Irenæus. Now the most questionable conclusion which Harnack has reached within that period is probably on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. So Professor Gwatkin addresses himself to that conclusion, and to that conclusion only.

The Fourth Gospel, says Harnack, cannot be earlier than 80 A.D., nor later than 110 A.D. He admits that the Church of Asia Minor generally, and Irenæus in particular, believed, at the close of the second century, that it was written by the Apostle John. It is probable, he acknowledges, that Apollinaris held the same opinion about 170 A.D., and possible that even Justin Martyr was of the same mind as early as 155 to 160 A.D. Nevertheless he himself declines to recognise St. John as the author. Traces of the apostle are clearly discernible in the Fourth Gospel, but the author was John the Presbyter. And he proposes the new title: 'The Gospel of John the Presbyter according to John the son of Zebedee.'

To that conclusion, then, Professor Gwatkin addresses himself. He sees that the key of the situation is in the hands of Irenæus. If Irenæus is to be trusted in what he says about Polycarp, then we have unhesitating testimony that the

Apostle John, and not another, wrote the Fourth Gospel. If Irenæus is not to be trusted, we still have the general belief of Irenæus' own day, but we lose the early and practically conclusive testimony of Polycarp, his teacher. Now, it cannot be denied, Professor Gwatkin has no temptation to deny, that Irenæus has made blunders, and that some of them are serious. He has very likely blundered in what he says about Papias. For it is most probable, in Professor Gwatkin's judgment, that Papias was not a disciple of the Apostle John, as Irenæus affirms, but of John the Elder. Did he blunder in the same way about Polycarp?

There was a Presbyter at Rome, named Florinus, who fell into heresy. Irenæus wrote him a letter. That letter contains much of what Irenæus has to tell us of Polycarp. He says: 'I saw thee when I was still a boy in Lower Asia, in company with Polycarp, while thou wast faring prosperously in the royal court, and endeavouring to stand well with him. I distinctly remember the incidents of that time better than events of recent occurrence; for the lessons received in childhood, growing with the growth of the soul, become identified with it; so that I can describe the very place where the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people, and how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord and about His miracles and about His teaching, Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, would relate altogether in accordance with the Scriptures.'

Thus Irenæus clearly states that he was, 'when still a boy,' a hearer of Polycarp, and that Polycarp had once been a hearer of the Apostle John. But, since Irenæus is probably mistaken in saying that

Papias was a disciple of the apostle, has he made the same mistake about Polycarp?

'Nothing more likely,' answers Harnack. 'It is most improbable,' replies Gwatkin. For there is no reason to suppose that Irenæus had more than a trifling personal acquaintance with Papias, if the dates will allow even that. Papias' book is much, but Papias himself is no more than 'a companion of Polycarp.' That very phrase reminds us how different it was with Polycarp himself. He was born about 69 A.D. He had held familiar intercourse, says Irenæus, with John, and with many others who had seen the Christ. He used to tell 'the stories he had heard from them about the Lord, and about His miracles, and about His teaching.' Is it probable that Polycarp's discourses failed to distinguish, or make distinct in his hearers' minds, the difference between the Apostle John and the Elder of the same name?

But Harnack has objections. In the first place, the memories which Irenæus records are of his childhood. True, but he says they are the memories he remembers best. Moreover, in writing to Florinus, these are the things he would recall, though he had later memories of his own, because they were the things that would waken the dearest memories in Florinus' own breast. And, finally, was Irenæus such a child then, after all? The words are *ἔτι παῖς ὢν*, 'while still a boy.' But the word *παῖς* is not the same as 'boy' or *Kind*. Lightfoot quotes cases where it is used more loosely for a man of thirty or even older. There is nothing in the word to forbid us supposing that Irenæus was a youth of eighteen or twenty before his intercourse with Polycarp came to an end. And this agrees with the phrase which he elsewhere uses, 'in our first youth' (*ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ*).

But, says Harnack, the very place where that phrase 'in our first youth' appears (it is *Haer.* III. iii. 4), shuts out all possibility that Irenæus was

a disciple of Polycarp after he became a man. Well, even if it did, it leaves these early memories good and true. But if the context is taken into account, Professor Gwatkin cannot see that even that conclusion is inevitable. Polycarp was just the man to impress youth most deeply. He is one of the least intellectual of writers. His letter to the Philippians is as commonplace as it well can be. His influence was the influence of saintliness, not of intellect; and thus Irenæus has nothing to record but vivid impressions, and these most vivid the earlier they were received.

So the facts and the inferences are these. All agree that Irenæus wrote a letter to Florinus, in which he spoke of Polycarp, and that he wrote that letter soon after 189 A.D. All agree that in that letter he states that Polycarp was a hearer of the Apostle John. Now Harnack admits that Polycarp was born about 69 A.D. and burnt in 155. It is, therefore, possible that Irenæus is right. But Harnack and Gwatkin both agree that there was another John in Asia, whom Papias distinguishes as the Elder, and whom he also calls the Lord's disciple. Harnack holds that in his recollections of Polycarp, Irenæus confused these two, saying that Polycarp had been the disciple of the Apostle, when he had really only been the disciple of the Elder. Gwatkin holds that Irenæus made no such confusion, and that if Harnack would only look up sometimes from his wilderness of papers to the world around him, and take fuller account of the elementary feelings of human nature, he would cease to charge Irenæus with a blunder so incredible.

We are obliged to the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of April for republishing a short article from the *Advance* of 7th January on the Hebrew word *Nēbhēlah* (נְבִילָה). President Bartlett, the writer of the article, had found in some American journal a grievous charge made against the morality of the Mosaic Code. The charge was stated with all the confidence of everyday American journalism. 'It may be,' the words are quoted by Dr. Bartlett, 'it

may be that many believe that the Law of Moses in Deut. xiv. 21, *permitting diseased meat to be sold to foreigners* was the Law of God; but if any one in this country should be caught acting on the provisions of that Law he would soon find how decided is the disapproval of it by courts and people.' The word there translated 'diseased meat' is the Hebrew word *nēbhēlah*, and he answers that crude and confident statement by explaining what *nēbhēlah* is.

First he points out, however, that the charge of inhumanity is a novel one to bring against the Law of Moses. It is the Law of Moses that forbids the muzzling of the ox when he treadeth out the corn, the ploughing with an ox and an ass yoked together, and even the capture of a mother bird from her nest in the tree or on the ground. So, 'it would be a very singular conjunction of incongruities,' says President Bartlett, 'if the same humane code should encourage the Hebrew to sell diseased meat to the foreigner, and even expressly command him so to do.'

And the clever journalist himself might easily have guessed his mistake, if he did not deliberately make it. For the verse in which he finds his diseased meat contains three clauses. Out of the first clause he picks one word (and gives it this false translation), the second he passes by, and then he fixes on the third. The whole verse reads thus: 'Ye shall not eat of any *nēbhēlah*; thou mayest give it to the stranger that is within thy gates that he may eat it; or thou mayest sell it to the foreigner.' Now it appears that not only might the Hebrew sell the 'diseased meat' to the foreigner, he might also offer it to the stranger that is within his gates. But in this same chapter, only eight verses later, we find that the stranger that is within the gates is bound to receive the kindest treatment at the hands of the Hebrew resident. He is classed with the Levite, the fatherless, and the widow; he occurs in the very midst of them. What is due to them is equally due to him. 'The Levite, because he hath no

portion nor inheritance with thee, and the fatherless, and the *stranger*, and the widow, which are within thy gates, shall come and eat and be satisfied; that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hand which thou doest.' And in the tenth chapter (vers. 18-19) it is still more strongly said that God doth 'execute the judgment of the fatherless and the widow, and loveth the *stranger*, in giving him food and raiment. *Love ye therefore the stranger*; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.'

The foreigner (*Nokhri*) is not the same as the stranger (*Gêr*). He is but an occasional visitant to the land, perhaps for the purposes of trade and commerce, while the stranger is a resident in it now, though one of alien blood. But so far as the *Nôbhêlah* is concerned, the treatment that is due to the one is due to the other also. It is incredible that diseased meat should be offered to the stranger that he may eat it; it is impossible that it should be sold to the foreigner.

For the *Nôbhêlah* is not diseased meat. Literally a *carcase*, it is used specifically here for an animal that has not been properly slaughtered for food, but has died a natural death. And, as anyone may see who reads the early verses of this same chapter, or even the parallel passages in Exodus and Leviticus, the point of the prohibition of such a carcase for food to the Israelite was not because it was diseased, but simply because its blood had not been removed from it. Says Dillmann (on Lev. xvii. 15): 'From the prohibition of blood it follows also not to eat the fallen or torn, of which the blood is not drawn off.' Says Strack: 'In case of the fallen and torn the blood is not duly poured out.' Says Kalisch: 'Such flesh was partially, if not chiefly, interdicted because it allowed but an imperfect removal of the blood.' Says Driver (on Deut. xiv. 21): 'The ground upon which their flesh was prohibited was, doubtless, partly because it might be unwholesome, but principally because it would not be thoroughly drained of blood.'

Now, the only thing that can be said in favour of the American journalist is this, that the English translation of *Nôbhêlah*, 'that which dieth of itself,' is loose and perhaps misleading. But the difficulty is all in the English tongue. We do not seem to have an expression, not to speak of a single word, that covers the meaning and no more. The older versions have 'that dieth alone,' except the Douay, which gives 'whatsoever is dead of itself.' And the modern editors have nothing better to offer us. But the man who charged the Mosaic Code with selling diseased meat to the foreigner ought to have gone behind the English before he made it, and discovered the meaning of the Hebrew word.

Professor George Adam Smith sent to the last *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund a letter which he had received from Dr. Henry Bailey, late of Nâblus, on the quality of the water in Jacob's Well. The letter was quoted in 'THE EXPOSITORY TIMES' for March (vol. viii. p. 267). The question that had to be answered was this: Why did the woman of Samaria pass by the copious fountain (El 'Askar) at her door, and go so great a distance to draw water from Jacob's Well? And Dr. Bailey's answer was, that Jacob's Well had such a reputation on account of the 'lightness' of its water. Being dependent upon percolation and rainfall, it must have been much softer ('lighter' the natives call it) than the fountain at El 'Askar, which gushes forth from the very 'bowels of rocky (limestone) Mount Ehab, and is therefore particularly hard or "heavy."'

The *Quarterly Statement* for April has just appeared. Two letters are found in it on the water of Jacob's Well. They are both in criticism of Dr. Bailey. Dr. Ernest W. Gurney Masterman of Damascus, doubts if the water in Jacob's Well has any essential 'lightness.' He believes that its local reputation is due to the fact of its being Jacob's Well, not to the quality of its water. And while he admits that women will go long distances

to draw water, it is, as far as he knows, invariably to get *spring* water.

Dr. Masterman believes that in the East the quality of the water of a well is a trifling consideration to the natives in comparison with its sanctity. In actual fact, the water of Jacob's Well, he says, is not, and cannot be, 'lighter' than the water at El 'Askar, or any other, for it is not supplied by a spring, but percolates through layers of limestone. But that it was Jacob's Well was sufficient to give it virtue. 'A favourite wish here is: May God let you drink from the Well Zemzem. And yet the water of the Well Zemzem, which is at Mecca, has been scientifically examined, and proved to be full of decaying organic matter and swarming with bacteria.'

So Dr. Masterman thinks that the explanation of the woman's presence at Jacob's Well is to be found in the woman's own words: 'Our father Jacob gave us the well.' But Dr. Masterman starts one difficulty, which he does not wholly settle. He says: 'That the well was not the usual resort of the women is perhaps shown in the Scripture narrative by the fact that the Samaritan woman was alone there, and that our Lord was left alone talking to her so long.' But if this well was so famous on account of its sanctity, would not other women be as likely to come for their water as she? It is agreed on all hands that the well was out of the way: why was *she* attracted to it, and why did no other woman join her all the while she was there?

In the same *Statement* there is a letter from Dr. Clay Trumbull of Philadelphia. Dr. Trumbull is known to many as the editor of the *Sunday Schools Times* of America. To fewer, he is known as a most accurate Palestinian observer. Dr. Trumbull has visited Jacob's Well. And when he visited Jacob's Well he had the same difficulty about the distance as other visitors have had. For, like all the rest, he supposed that the woman of

Samaria had come direct from her home to draw water and intended to return direct home again. But as he looked about him and saw that the well was on the edge of a great grain field, in which men were at work, he saw that it was natural to suppose that the woman drawing water at that well was doing it for the supply of the workers in the field. Then, as he read the gospel narrative on the spot, he was surprised to find that this explanation better accorded with the text than the popular idea, and that nothing there said involved the fact that she wanted the water for her own use.

The well was dug by Jacob for the supply of his own field. There were other wells or springs at hand, but they were not his. This well was dug that he might not be dependent on the wells which supplied other men's fields with water. The plain is called the Plain of the Cornfields still. From some distant part of that Cornfield came this woman for water to satisfy the thirsty workers. She would have gone back to the field with the water but for her interview with Jesus. But when she became interested in His words, she longed to go home first to tell her news. So 'she left her water pot (there by the well in the fields) and went her way into the city.'

It is the day of enormous circulations. In such a day it is something to come upon a book that refuses to circulate enormously. It is quite refreshing to make the acquaintance of an author who deliberately writes his book so as to make a great circulation impossible.

The author is Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, and the book is *The Spirit on the Waters*, which Messrs. Macmillan have recently published in a handsome octavo of 475 pages, at 12s. 6d. *The Spirit on the Waters* is the second part of a larger work which Dr. Abbott has in hand. It is the 'constructive and believing' portion. The other, which is yet to come, is to be 'critical, detailed, and mostly negative in its conclusions.' But

words like these are relative. To the majority of us this portion is quite sufficiently critical, detailed, and negative. And we cannot but think that Dr. Abbott, who has written it in what he calls an aphoristic style, 'in order to repel all but those who are genuinely interested in the subject,' might have run the risk of ordinary English.

For Dr. Abbott sets out, *after denying the miraculous*, to 'state his reasons for worshipping God as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and for accepting, in the fullest spiritual sense, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Atonement, and the Divinity of Christ.' The enterprise involves him in difficulties enough. He says that he has no objection to miracles as being essentially impossible. He rejects them one by one, and he rejects them every one, simply because he does not find sufficient evidence for them. And yet he retains the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Atonement, and the Divinity of Christ, and teaches that 'the Father is best worshipped by worshipping Jesus Christ.'

Now this enterprise needs a man that is in earnest. And Dr. Abbott is in earnest. He is both in earnest and most surprisingly clever. He deliberately adopts an aphoristic style to keep the casual reader off. But he is the master of one of the most successful devices of style, and he uses it with masterly success. Dr. Abbott takes the place of the anxious inquirer; leaves *you* to occupy the room of the scorner; and all the while he is sweeping the foundations of your historical faith away.

Take the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. When Dr. Abbott reaches that doctrine, which he has already assured you he believes in, he opens with a sentence, which gains considerable emphasis from standing as a paragraph alone: 'But some heterodox critics of the gospel, because they reject the miraculous, feel bound to reject the extraordinary, which is quite a different thing.'

Dr. Abbott is going to prove to you that our Lord was simply an extraordinary boy, who grew up to be an extraordinary man,—he says quite plainly, in fact, by and by, that He was extraordinary in *innocence*, as Shakespeare was extraordinary in *observation*,—but you see how adroitly he begins it. That opening sentence leaves you a simple alternative. Either you range yourself with the heterodox critics of the gospel, or you stand by the side of Dr. Abbott. Of course you stand by Dr. Abbott. And herculean as his enterprise is,—for he is to persuade you that Jesus was at once 'a mere man' and yet the Son of God,—it is half accomplished already.

We call that a trick of style. But Dr. Abbott is thoroughly in earnest, and always transparently frank. There are just two points he insists upon. Jesus was a mere man. He repeats that again and again. And it needs the repetition. For the second point is this, that Jesus was the Son of God. His words are: 'The manhood of Jesus was totally taken into God'; or again: 'We believe Him to be perfectly one with the Father and the Spirit, and perfectly divine'; or again, in the words which gather it all together: 'Jesus was a mere man, and yet His manhood was wholly taken into God, and so associated with the Father that the Father is best worshipped by worshipping Jesus Christ as His Son.'

How this mere man became God he does not clearly reveal. But his meaning seems to be that he was so extraordinarily good (as Shakespeare was so extraordinarily observant) that he was 'taken up into God.' And this was while he was upon the earth, so that this mere man, if he had not the powers, had at least 'the consciousness of powers of forgiving, healing the soul, suffering for sinners, dying for sinners, rising again, continuing for ever the work that the Father had given him to do.'

Now as to that, the Jews said plainly that any mere man who professed to be able to forgive

sins was a blasphemer. And the Jews did well to speak plainly, for they were right. The *Shorter Catechism* says that no mere man since the fall is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God. Dr. Abbott thinks the *Catechism* is wrong. But Dr. Abbott will not persuade one in a thousand of his readers that even the man who perfectly keeps the commandments of God, if

he is a mere man, is able to forgive men's sins. 'Who can forgive sins but God only?' said the Jews. And sin being sin, only because it is against God, the Jews were certainly right. Therefore, to give to any man the power to forgive sins is not to raise him up to God, it is to bring God down till He becomes 'a mere man.'

John William Burgon.

By H. W. YULE, B.D., D.C.L., WADHAM COLLEGE, RECTOR OF SHIPTON-ON-CHERWELL, CHERWELL,
AND G. H. GWILLIAM, B.D., FELLOW OF HERTFORD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

IT appears to have been the aim of the editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, from the first, to render the periodical acceptable to a very widely extended circle of readers by presenting them, month by month, with a great variety of spiritual and intellectual food. The editor is to be congratulated on the success of his plan, and certainly he has been true to his principles in the liberality he has shown in granting admission to the current series of 'Leading Theologians.' The writers and preachers who have already been commemorated, are representatives of views which, to say the least, are widely divergent; this month we are permitted to give some account of the 'personality and influence' of a theologian whose teachings are absolutely antagonistic to the utterances of some of the leaders in the series. And the antagonism is not simply in form and expression, it is real and essential. If the principles of Old Testament exegesis which are adopted by certain writers be sound and good, then the view which Burgon used to present of the origin and purpose of the Old Testament was illusory. If the Greek Text of the New Testament is to be read as some would read it, then the labours of Burgon, which resulted in uncompromising opposition to that form of text, were fruitless toils. If the teachings from the pulpit of St. Mary's on the Divine origin of the Christian ministry, the validity of the creeds, the authority of the Church, were scriptural and true, then the 'broader' views of those who declare that these tenets are matters of opinion, and not of the essence of the Christian Faith, are false and

dangerous. Here there can be no compromise, because principles are involved.

It is not our present purpose to defend the Anglican theology. Perhaps we might say (as a certain pious king is reported to have said of an *Apology for the Bible*), we are not aware that Anglicanism needs any apology. Perhaps we might go farther, and declare that our estimate of Burgon's position in the 19th century would be unaffected, even if the more enlightened 20th century should prove that another system than his more faithfully exhibits the truth of God, be it Roman Ceremonialism, or English Congregationalism, or Scotch Presbyterianism, or German Rationalism. We affirm that whether Anglicanism be right or wrong, Burgon, as a teacher, was a most faithful exponent of it. We even add, that those are the true children of the Church of England who would, in the main, accept Burgon's theology. This is not, in the language of Pearson, 'a private collection, or particular ratiocination,' but the necessary conclusion from the evidence of the language of the Church of England Prayer-Book and Articles. She, like her Divine Master, would gather many under her wings; nay, it is essential to her position as the Church of the nation that the conditions of membership should be broad and easy; but no authority from her can be claimed by those who rationalise the Bible or coquette with the exponents of other systems on the right hand, or on the left. Burgon, for good or for ill, was an Anglican to the backbone.

Although the editor has admitted accounts of