

### The Preface.

1. For many Years I have had an inward Desire of writing something in order to help serious Men, who have not the Advantage of Learning, more throly to understand of new Testament. But I have been continually deterr'd from Accepting any Thing of this kind, by a deep sense of my own Inability, of my Want not only of Learning sufficient for such a Work, but much more of Experience. This has often occur'd and my quite laying aside the Thought, wholy by much Impediment I have been perswad'd upon to resume it, that I determin'd to delay as long as possible, that if it should please God, I might finish it with my Life together.

2. But having lately had a loud Call from God, to arise & go hence, I am convinc'd, if I attempt any Thing of this kind at all, I must delay no longer. And I am further induc'd to do now, w<sup>ch</sup> little I can, because I can do nothing else: Being prevented by my present Weakness, from either travelling or preaching. But blessed be God, I can still think, and read, & write. O, if it may be to His glory!

3. It will be easily discern'd, even from what I have said already, that I do not write for Men of Learning: Much less for Men of deep Experience in the Ways & Work of God. I desire to sit at their Feet, & to learn of them, if

PAGES 1 AND 3 OF  
WESLEY'S DRAFT  
PREFACE  
TO THE  
NOTES UPON THE  
NEW TESTAMENT.

Photographs by  
Rev. N. Curnock,  
by permission of  
Rev. J. Alford Sharp.

the Spirit requires. And even <sup>many things</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>as men who have not tried it; w<sup>ch</sup> hadly</sup> ~~hadly~~ <sup>conceive.</sup>

6. Those to whom I am chiefly indebted in following Work, are Dr Gill, the Deaf and Deaf, of late years and learned & devoted, and of great Light of World, Regardful. May the Father of Lights, the Giver of every good Gift open the Eyes of our Understanding, and cause the Light of His glorious Gospel of His Son, to shine in all our Hearts!

Jan 6. 1754

Not Well near Bristol.

Notes upon the New Testament

To the Italian Reader.

1. The Word of a living God, such directed by first Patriarch also, who is of some of the committed to Writing. So it were added the Writings of other Prophets. Afterward the Word of God had preach'd, and of Holy Ghost spake by a Prophet, of Apostle, & Evangelist wrote. This is not we while it Holy Scripture (or Writing) This is of Word of our God not remaineth for ever (Is. 40.) If such one doth little shall not pass, kill Heaven and Earth pass away. The Scripture therefore of the New Testament is a most solid & precious System of divine Truth; and every Part thereof is worthy of God; and all together are one entire Body, whose in is no defect.

## "MR. WESLEY'S NOTES UPON THE NEW TESTAMENT."

---

In the provisory clause concerning doctrine in the "model deeds" published during Wesley's life-time, one of the two "standards" is invariably described as "Mr. Wesley's Notes upon the New Testament." When the present Chapel "model deed" was prepared the clause concerning doctrine was considerably altered. The "Notes" were described as "certain Notes on the New Testament commonly reputed to be the Notes of the said John Wesley." The latter description is the better. Those who know the "Notes" best are aware that the book illustrates Lecky's meaning when he said, "Wesley was a voluminous writer, and a still more voluminous editor."

Wesley is not to blame for the "common repute" concerning the authorship of the "Notes." In his "Preface" to the book he frankly confesses his obligations to John Albert Bengel. He says, "Many of his excellent Notes I have translated; many more I have abridged, omitting that part which was purely critical, and giving the substance of the rest. Those various readings likewise which he has showed to have a vast majority of ancient copies and translations on their side, I have without scruple incorporated with the text." (*Pref.*, iv. v. First ed). He also mentions Dr. Heylin,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Guyse and Dr. Doddridge as writers whose writings have given him considerable assistance. He further says that for some time he thought of appending the names of the authors to the notes he had taken from them. This design he abandoned for reasons he assigns. If the energy of mankind were equal to the task of reading "Prefaces," some

---

1. JOHN HEYLIN, D.D., d. 1759. "The mystic friend of Butler." Preb. of Westminster. Rector of St. Mary-le-Strand. Author of *Theological Lectures at Westminster Abbey, with an interpretation of the New Test.* Vol. I, 1749, contains notes on the Four Gospels. Vol. II was not published until 1761. The Lectures were to the King's Scholars of Westminster School. See Wesley's *Journal*, Ap. 27, 1754. JOHN GUYSE, D.D., Calvinist-Independent-Minister of New Broad St. Chapel, 1732. Died 1761. Author of *The Practical Expositor*, 1739-1752, 3 vols. T.E.B.

of the mistakes concerning the authorship of "Mr. Wesley's Notes upon the New Testament" would have been avoided.

In dealing with the "Notes" it is not our intention to touch on the subject of the "text" used by Wesley in composing the book. That part of the subject is in the competent hands of Mr. Harrison. Neither shall we concern ourselves with Heylin, Guyse and Doddridge. Wesley's chief literary benefactor was Bengel, and on him we concentrate our attention. His contributions to the "Notes" are very numerous. We have closely compared the book with the five volumes of Fausset's English edition of Bengel's *Gnomon of the New Testament*, and have marked the passages in the "Notes" which are taken from Bengel. The only book exempted from our inquisition is the *Revelation*. Anyone who reads Wesley's own introduction to that book will see why it was not necessary to proceed with our marginalia. The notes appended are almost all taken from Bengel; but even, when so taken, Wesley is not confident of their correctness. There can be little doubt that the notes on the *Revelation* possess small "standard" value, see *Journal*, 6 Dec. 1762. Glancing over the result of our comparison of the "Notes" and the "Gnomon" we see how large a proportion of the former is contributed by Bengel.

In this article we wish to provide material for arriving at a correct estimate of the origin, character and value of "Mr. Wesley's Notes upon the New Testament," keeping the fact steadily in view that it is one of the "Standards" of teaching in the Methodist Church.

In passing we have made a reference to "Prefaces." Wesley's should never be skipped. In the case of the "Notes" the interest of the "Preface" is increased by the fact that, as it appears in the first and subsequent editions, it differs from the "Preface" which Wesley originally prepared. Mr. Curnock has increased our personal obligations to him by pointing out this fact. He has among his temporary possessions a valuable notebook. It is "in its original binding, repaired, rebacked with new leather on which a title has been stamped in gold: 'John Wesley's M.S.S Sermons and Introduction to the New Testament.'" He has not satisfied himself as to the time when Wesley began to use this book, but he is inclined to refer a considerable portion of its contents to his Oxford days. Among these earlier contents are a number of critical and expository notes which may have been prepared for the meetings of "the Holy Club." The book was, evidently, laid aside for some years. Then Wesley

## PROCEEDINGS.

began to use it again. Among its later contents there is, what Mr. Curnock tentatively calls, the "first draft" of the "Preface" to the "Notes upon the New Testament." He has sent us a carefully written copy of this "first draft," and also photographs of the pages of the note-book in which it appears in Wesley's handwriting. It is well that this important document should find a place in the *Proceedings* of our Society. It is as follows :

### THE PREFACE.

1. For many years I have had an earnest desire of writing something in order to help serious men, who have not the advantage of learning, more thoroughly to understand the New Testament. But I have been continually deterred from attempting anything of this kind, by a deep sense of my own inability. Of my want not only of learning sufficient for such a work, but much more of experience. This has often occasioned my quite laying aside the thought, and when by much importunity I have been prevailed upon to resume it, still I determined to delay as long as possible, that (if it should please God) I might finish this work and my life together.

2. But having lately had a loud call from God, to arise and go hence, I am convinced that if I attempt anything of this kind at all, I must delay no longer : and I am the rather induced to do now what little I can, because I can do nothing else : being prevented by my present weakness, from either travelling or preaching. But blessed be God, I can still think, and read, and write. O that it may be to his glory !

3. It will be easily discerned, even from what I have said already, that I do not write for men of learning : much less for men of deep experience in the ways and work of God. I desire to sit at their feet, and to learn of them, if haply they may count me worthy of instruction. But I write for plain unlettered men, who understand only their mother-tongue, and desire to save their souls.

4. In order to assist these, in such measure as I am able, I design first to set down the text itself in the common English translation, which in general is far the best that I have seen either in any ancient or modern language. Yet I do not say it is incapable of being brought in some cases nearer to the original. Neither will I affirm that the Greek copies from which the translation was made are always the most correct. And therefore I shall take the liberty as occasion may require to offer here and there a small alteration : though not taking upon me to dictate

to any ; but simply to propose what appears to me either certain or probable.

5. To the text will be added, a few short explanatory notes: as few as possible ; it being not my view, to swell the book, but to contract it ; not to make it as large, but as small as I can : and as short as possible, that the comment may not obscure or swallow up the text. And these few short notes, will be explanatory only, not curious or critical: In pursuance of my great design, of making the Scripture more intelligible to the unlearned reader. Agreeably to this design, I shall (together with the common division into chapters and verses) divide the text all along, according to the matter it contains, after the manner of the great *Bengelius*: making a small, or a large pause, just as the sense requires. And even this is such a help in many places as one who has not tried it, would hardly conceive.

6. Those to whom I am chiefly indebted in the following work, are Dr. Gell,<sup>1</sup> the Oxford Divines, the late pious and learned Dr. Doddridge, and that great light of the world, *Bengelius*. May the Father of Lights, the Giver of every good gift, open the eyes of our understandings, and cause the light of the glorious gospel of his Son to shine in all our hearts !

Jan. 6, 1754.

Hot Wells near Bristol.

It must be noted that the "first draft" is dated Jan. 6, 1754, and the printed "Preface" two days earlier. We will deal with that point at a later stage.

If we collate the "first draft" in the note-book with the "Preface" in the first edition of the "Notes," we shall see the reasonableness of Mr. Curnock's conclusion that the note-book draft should be accorded priority in time. The late Rev. Richard Green's suggestion in his *Bibliography* that Wesley was accustomed to write his "Prefaces" "in anticipation of the work" (p. 91) is probably correct. Wesley began writing the "Notes upon the New Testament" on January 6, 1754, the date of the "first draft" in the note-book. Having written the "Preface" he found himself confronted by a heavy task. As it defined itself more clearly before him he seems to have perceived with greater clearness the exceptional value of the *Gnomon*, and the help he might derive from it. We can follow the movements of his mind in the note-book. Immediately after the "Preface" an "Address to the Christian Reader" appears. But that is a translation from

---

ROBERT GELL, D.D., died 1665. Author of *Essay toward the amendment of the last English translation of the Bible, 1659*. Wesley read this in 1777. But the work referred to in 1754 would be Gell's *Remains: Select Scriptures of the N. T. explained . . . learned notes thereupon*. 2 vols., folio, 1659. T.E.B.

Bengel's own *Preface* to the *Gnomon*, with a paragraph taken from the note which Bengel prefixes to his *Annotations on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*. If we look at Wesley's "Notes" we shall see that this "Address to the Christian Reader" is made part of his printed Preface. It is found in paragraphs 10-13. Having received so much help Wesley continued translating. He renders Bengel's "Introduction" into English, and then writes in the note-book a translation of Bengel's elaborate analysis of the contents of the Gospel. He must have felt relief when he found so much of his work ready to his hand, but he must also have seen that his acknowledgment of his indebtedness to Bengel contained in the "first draft" of the "Preface" was quite inadequate. During the two years he spent on the "Notes" his indebtedness to Bengel went up by leaps and bounds; and, at some time before the close of 1755 he must have re-written the "Preface." His own account of his obligation to Bengel is worth recording. In what we may venture to call the "New Preface" he says—"I once designed to write down barely what occurred to my own mind, consulting none but the inspired writers. But no sooner was I acquainted with that great light of the Christian world (lately gone to his reward) *Bengelius*, than I entirely changed my plan, being thoroughly convinced it might be of more service to the cause of religion were I barely to translate his *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*, than to write many volumes upon it" (*Pref.* par 7). He did not take the course of "bare translation," but chose "the middle path." Mr. Green sums up the case with his usual accuracy. Speaking of Wesley he says, "for the correction of the Greek text, as well as for most of his notes, particularly those on the Apocalypse, and for the analyses of the several books, he is chiefly indebted to the *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* of Bengel" (*Wesley Bibliography* p. 91). When dating the "new preface" Wesley affixed to it the date when he went into lodgings and "began drinking the water at the Hot Well"; that is January 4, 1754, and not January 6, when he commenced writing the "Notes upon the New Testament."

We do not regret that Wesley abandoned his original design and took Bengel for his guide. By so doing he produced a work of great expository value. The incorporation of so much of the *Gnomon* in his book gives it exceptional value. Fausset, writing in 1857, says—"It is quite superfluous to write in praise of the *Gnomon* of Bengel. Ever since the year it was first published, A.D. 1742, up to the present time, it has been growing in

estimation, and has been more and more widely circulated among the scholars of all countries. Though modern criticism has furnished many valuable additions to our materials for New Testament exegesis, yet, in some respects, Bengel stands out still 'facile princeps' among all who have laboured, or who as yet labour, in that important field. He is unrivalled in felicitous brevity, combined with what seldom accompanies that excellence, namely, perspicuity. Terse, weighty, and suggestive, he often, as a modern writer observes, 'condenses more matter into a line, than can be extracted from pages of other writers.' (Fausset's English ed. of the *Gnomon*, vol. i. Preface, p. v.).

We must now turn from the historical setting, and the question of the composition of "Mr. Wesley's Notes upon the New Testament," and record some of our impressions, while re-perusing the book and regarding it as one of the standards of Methodist doctrine and practice. There are certain aspects of the "Notes" thus viewed which need not be discussed in these pages, but there are others which will repay attention.

When we consider the circumstances under which the book was written, its various authors, and the innumerable topics treated in its pages, it is clear to us, that, when applied as a doctrinal test, it needs to be handled with great discrimination. Such application calls for the exercise of the highest powers of the judicial mind. It is not enough to pick out a sentence from the "Notes" and make it a weapon of attack or defence. We have to examine the sentence, compare it with other opinions expressed in the book, and, especially, to find out whether it has a history. We will illustrate our meaning by two examples.

Wesley first wrote the "Notes" in "rough draft," and then revised what he had written. The work was carefully done but with all his pains certain sentences were left which needed to be chastened by his pen. For instance, on June 28, 1755, he writes to Mr. Richard Tompson acknowledging a letter he had received from him. He says it "came exceeding seasonably, for I was just revising my Notes on the fifth chapter to the Romans: one of which I found, upon a closer inspection, seemed to assert such an imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, as might make way for the 'horrible decree.' I therefore struck it out immediately" (*Works*, vol. xii., p. 451, Third ed.). It is legitimate to say that if it had not been for Tompson's letter this unguarded note would have been sent out to the world. The "Notes" were published at the close of 1755. When the first edition left

the press, was it perfect? Wesley had cause to answer that question in the negative. During the years 1760, 1761, and 1762, he issued an edition of the Notes in three volumes. The title page of each volume bears the words "Third edition corrected." The last word is significant. As this edition is the book mentioned in the "Model Deed" of 1763, it possesses unique value. Was it perfect? They can answer the question who are acquainted with Wesley's pamphlet entitled "Some Remarks on Mr. Hill's 'Review of all the doctrines taught by Mr. John Wesley.'" The pamphlet was issued in 1772, ten years after the last volume of the Third edition of the "Notes" was published. Hill, in attacking what he supposed to be Wesley's doctrine of "Sinless Perfection" brought his artillery to bear on a sentence in the "Notes." He quotes the comment on 2 Cor., v. 4, "We are here burdened with numberless afflictions, infirmities, temptations, sins," and he fastens on the last word. Wesley acknowledges that this shot "one in a hundred, had hit the mark." Speaking of the comment he says, "This is wrong. It is not the meaning of the text. I will put it out, if I live to print another edition." (*Works*, vol. x., p. 398, Third ed.). In his last edition he omits the word "sins," but seems to have forgotten that he had said the note was wrong and ought to be "put out." As a matter of fact Wesley's words in his note on 2 Cor. v. 4, were interpolated in a paragraph taken from Bengel, and his temporary abandonment of his guide was fatal to his peace as a controversialist.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. An illustration of Wesley's change of opinion is found in connection with his comment on Heb. xii, 9. It deals with the highly speculative question of "the propagation of souls." The "note" in the first edition called forth a closely reasoned letter from a correspondent in which Wesley's suggestion is keenly criticised. See *Standard Journal*, V., pp. 37-39. The letter is not dated. Wesley says that he received it "about this time," that is, Oct. 1763. In the third vol. of the "corrected edition," published in 1762, the "note" had been somewhat altered, but the suggestion was perpetuated that the expressions used in Heb. xii, 9, "perhaps . . . intimate that our earthly fathers are only the parents of our bodies," etc. On Nov. 7, 1770, Wesley read and abridged an old treatise on "The origin of the soul," and published it in twelve short sections in the *Arm. Mag.* in 1783, beginning on p. 41. Of the treatise he says, "I never before saw anything on the subject so satisfactory. I think it proves to a demonstration that God has enabled man, as all other creatures, to propagate his whole species, consisting of soul and body" (*Standard Journal*, V., pp. 395-6). Notwithstanding this "proof to demonstration" the comment in the "corrected edition" of the "Notes" remains to the present time. Due emphasis should be laid on Wesley's "perhaps;" but it would have been safer if he had not abandoned the guidance of Bengel, who says in his "note" on Heb. xii, 9, "Here the propagation of the soul by parents is not denied, even as by mentioning spirits it is not denied that our flesh, i. e., our nature is formed by God" (*Gnomon*, vol. iv, p. 464, Fausset's ed.).



We have given these instances to show the necessity of taking care when selecting a sentence from the "Notes" for use in a case of discipline. We think, in the next place, it is obvious that, inasmuch as we have two standards, equal care should be taken to ascertain that the doctrine of the "Sermons" and that of the "Notes" is in agreement on the subject under consideration.

Wesley's sermon on "Justification by Faith" is well known. It was prepared under the conviction that the teaching it contained was in strict harmony with the doctrinal standards of the Church of England. At one point the character of "Works before Justification" is discussed, and Wesley accepts the declaration of Article XIII, that inasmuch as those works "are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but that they have the nature of sin." He admits that the statement "may appear strange to some," but he constructs a syllogism and proves its correctness. (*Works*, vol. v., p. 59, Third ed.) Let us now turn to the "Notes" and see what is the comment on Acts x., 4. In that place it is said of Cornelius, "Thy prayers and thy alms are come up for a memorial before God," and Wesley's note is—"Dare any man say, these were only splendid sins; or that they were an abomination before God? And yet it is certain, in the Christian sense, Cornelius was then an unbeliever. He had not then faith in Christ. So certain it is that everyone who seeks faith in Christ should seek it in prayer and doing good to all men; though, in strictness, what is not exactly according to the divine rule must stand in need of divine favour and indulgence." The casuist may strive to reconcile the "doctrine" of the "Sermons" and the "Notes," but it is interesting to observe that when Wesley prepared his "Articles of Religion" for the "Sunday Service of the Methodists," published in 1784, he omitted Article XIII of the Church of England.

Another point is worth considering. The "Notes" contain no detailed and complete "system" of Christian doctrine. It is therefore, necessary to ascertain all that the book contains on a great doctrine before we speak decisively of Wesley's opinion concerning it. When, for instance, the subject of the Inspiration of the Scriptures is raised it is not enough to quote the paragraphs in the Preface to the "Notes" which were translated by Wesley from Bengel. With these should be collated the Notes on Matt. i, 1; ii, 6, 15; viii, 17; John xix, 24; 1 Cor. ii, 13; vii, 25; Eph. v. 19; 2 Tim. iii, 16; Heb. ii, 7; and others dealing with this important question.

We have ventured to utter words of caution concerning the indiscriminate use of the general contents of the "Notes" for disciplinary purposes. Our re-perusal of the book has deepened the impression that when Wesley "legalised" it as a standard, he did not do so to preserve his opinions on religion in general, but to secure the preaching of the characteristic Methodist doctrines in perpetuity. When he speaks in the "Notes" of the doctrines that are so conspicuous in the "Sermons," we are conscious of a new tone in his voice. He is himself, and Bengel is almost silent. In making our comparison between the *Notes* and the *Gnomon* we have often said to ourselves "There speaks Wesley!" We have seldom been mistaken. The "Wesley touch" is evident in the notes on John iii, 3; Acts iii, 19; v. 31; xiii, 39; Rom. iii, 24, 26; iv, 5, 9, 24; v, 21; vi, 6; viii, 16, 28; ix, 5, 32; xii, 6; xiv, 17; 1 Cor. ii, 8; vi, 11; 2 Cor. v, 19; viii, 12; and Heb. vi, 11. The comments on these passages are invaluable; they put "our doctrines" in a clear light. That "grand scheme of doctrine" contained in "the oracles of God" is a treasure the Methodist people should guard with invincible courage and wisdom.

JOHN S. SIMON.

---

## THE GREEK TEXT OF WESLEY'S TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

---

The claim has often been made that Wesley, in his *Notes upon the New Testament*, produced a *Revised Version* of the New Testament more than a hundred years before our present R.V. was published, and in many important passages gave a new translation which only appeared in English Bibles after the Revisers had done their work. In some cases this was due to the choice of a word which more accurately translated into current English the corresponding Greek word. For instance he did not hesitate to speak of the "robbers" who were crucified with Christ, nor to change "charity" into "love" in I. Cor. xiii. The outburst of indignation over the phrase "the penitent

robber," which assailed the R.V. in 1881, might very well have spent itself on Wesley's translation of 1754. Much more frequently, however, the changes he makes from A.V. are due to the use of a Greek Text which differed from the Received Text used by King James's translators and resembled that adopted by the Revisers. It is interesting to notice that Wesley's translation appeared about half-way between the two great English versions, and at a period when a series of great scholars were beginning their work on the Text of the N.T.. The question that we have to examine is this: how far did Wesley enter into the labours of his contemporaries on the Greek Text of the N.T., and what were his principles of Textual Criticism?

Can we gain any light from his interesting preface to the *Notes on the New Testament* dated from Bristol Hot-Wells, 4 January, 1754. This was written before he began his book in accordance with his usual custom (see Green's *Wesley Bibliography* p. 91). In all probability Wesley's original design was to use his own comments and expositions which had been gradually accumulating since the days of the Holy Club. He decided, however, to put that material aside and to follow chiefly Bengel's *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*, which had been published twenty years earlier. Dr. Simon has shown in detail what Wesley's plans probably were and how he carried them out. The discovery of the original draft of the *Preface* has made this alteration of design clear. Was there a similar alteration with regard to the Greek text which Wesley used? Mr. Curnock states that the passage "Neither will I affirm, that the Greek copies from which the translation was made, are always the most correct," is, in the original draft, an interlineation written by a different pen and therefore at a different date. It would seem, then, to be probable that the paragraph in the *Preface* which concerns our present inquiry originally read in this way: "I design, first, to set down the text itself, for the most part in the common English translation" (i.e. the A.V.), "which is, in general (so far as I can judge) abundantly the best that I have seen. Yet I do not say it is incapable of being brought, in several places, nearer to the original; and therefore I shall take the liberty, as occasion may require, to make here and there a small alteration." If this assumption is correct Wesley had no intention originally of going behind the Received Text, and only decided to do that as an afterthought.

What was the Greek Testament which John Wesley used? What text was the basis of the discussions of the Holy Club? It

seems more than probable that it would be the *Textus Receptus*. Dr. Adam Clarke says that Wesley used the *O Mirificam* edition of the Greek Testament, printed by Stephens, at Paris, in 1546. Charles Wesley's Greek Testament is now in the possession of Mr. Stampe. It is a 12mo. of the Plantin Press of Leyden, 1591, and the text is that of Stephens, revised by Beza; in all essentials the Received Text. With the 17th century began the work of collating new MSS which were coming to light. Brian Walton (afterwards Bishop of Chester) published a Polyglot Bible in 1657, in which fifteen new authorities for the Greek text were used. Eighteen years later, John Fell (afterwards Bishop of Oxford) published a Greek Testament with a critical apparatus which claimed to use more than one hundred variant MSS. He also encouraged Dr. John Mill in his much more extensive work on the text of the N.T. which included references to further Greek MSS, all the Versions then available and Patristic Quotations of Scripture. This epoch-making book was not issued until 1707. Mr. Brigden has in his possession a small 8vo. edition of this work which was published at Amsterdam in 1711. An alert student would find this an excellent manual for daily use, but the Canons of Criticism suggested by Mill were hardly a sufficient guide to the discovery of a more perfect text. The interest of this problem brought into the field the greatest classical scholar of the day, Richard Bentley, and through him Continental scholars took up the subject. Bengel's edition of 1734 was based on the work of Mill, and suggested the principle of dividing the MSS into African and Asiatic groups, which still controls the operations of the lower critics. J. J. Wetstein followed in 1751-2, and in Wesley's lifetime appeared the work of Semler, Griesbach, Matthaei and Alter, in which the methodical Teutonic mind explored the whole field of the N.T. text so far as it had been opened up at that time.

Is it possible that when Wesley decided to follow Bengel in his exposition of the N.T., he also turned to his work on the Greek text? An examination of the old quarto of 1734, in which Bengel investigated the latter problem, makes it seem probable that Wesley worked with this book before him. Bengel prints a text which is the *Textus Receptus*, but puts into the margin various readings and his preferences with regard to them. As indicating his own views in the readings he uses in the margin the first five letters of the Greek alphabet.

α means margin certainly preferred to text.

β „ margin has better authority than the text but not certain.

WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY,

- γ „ margin is equal to text. Reader must decide.  
 δ „ margin is weaker than text.  
 ε „ margin is rejected although numerously supported.  
 ζ „ turn to the apparatus criticus.

The long apparatus criticus is printed in the appendix and is based on the work of Mill.

If we follow Bengel's *α* readings then through the margin, we shall see what changes he would certainly have made in the received text of the N.T. Further by comparing these with Wesley's translation, we shall see how Wesley and Bengel agree.

	Bengel's changes.	Wesley.
Matt. I, 18	Omit <i>Jesus</i> .	Yes. Not R.V.
V, 27	Omit "by them of old time" <i>⊗</i> B	Yes. R.V.
XXI, 30	"Other" for "Second" <i>⊗</i> *	Yes. Not R.V.
XXIII, 8	"Teacher" for "Master"	Yes. R.V.
Mark II, 17	Omit "To repentance" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
VII, 2	Omit "They found fault" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
Luke IV, 8	Omit "Get thee behind me, Satan" <i>⊗</i> B	Keeps it. Omits in 1790 Edition. R.V. omits.
VII, 4	"Thou shouldest" for "he should"	Yes. R.V.
XV, 19	Omit "and" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
John I, 29	"He" for "John" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
III, 2	"Him" for "Jesus" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
VIII, 20	"He" for "Jesus" <i>⊗</i> B	Yes. R.V.
XVIII, 20	Omit "the" before synagogue	Wesley keeps. R.V. omits.
Acts II, 30	Omit "According to the flesh he would raise up Christ" <i>⊗</i> AB.	Yes. R.V. omits.
III, 11	"he" for "the lame man which was healed" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V. omits.
X, 21	Omit "which was sent unto him from Cornelius" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
XX, 7	"We" for "the disciples" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
Rom II, 17	"But if" for "behold" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
XIV, 9	Omit "and rose" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
I Cor. I, 22	"Signs" for "sign" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
III, 2	Omit "and" <i>⊗</i> AB	Yes. R.V.
III, 14	"Shall remain" for "abide" (future for present)	Yes. R.V.

PROCEEDINGS.

V. 13	"Shall judge" for "judgeth" (future for present) $\aleph$ B	Yes. R.V. keeps [present.]
VI, 20	Omit "And in your spirit, which are God's." $\aleph$ AB	Wesley keeps. R.V.
VII, 3	"the debt" ("duty") for "due benevolence" $\aleph$ AB	Yes. R.V. ("due")
XVI, 24	Omit "Amen" B. So at the end of I, II Tim., ( $\aleph$ A), Philemon (A.), Epp. John, ( $\aleph$ AB)	Yes. R.V. keeps. Yes. R.V. except Philemon.
Gal. II, 14	"Kephas" for "Peter" $\aleph$ AB.	Keeps "Peter" R.V. "Cephas."
Eph. V, 9	"Light" for "Spirit" $\aleph$ AB	Yes. R.V.
Col. I, 14	Omit "through his blood" $\aleph$ AB Wesley keeps. R.V. omits.	
Heb. II, 14	"Blood and flesh" for "flesh and blood" $\aleph$ AB. W. "flesh and blood" R.V. marg. "Gr. blood and flesh."	
Heb. XII, 22	"An innumerable company, to the general assembly of angels" for "An in- numerable company of angels, to the general assembly." Yes. R.V. Mg.	
Jude, 4	Omit "God" after "Lord" $\aleph$ AB	Yes. R.V.
25	Omit "wise" $\aleph$ AB	Yes. R.V.

The general agreement between Bengel, Wesley and the Revised Version in these changes is very interesting. We are only concerned with R.V. to show how frequently Bengel had arrived at the Revisers' Text twenty years before Wesley made his translation. What, then, was the relation between Wesley's text and the new readings which Bengel placed in his *a* list? Out of thirty-seven changes Wesley agrees with Bengel thirty-two times. What is to be said of the remaining five passages? Three of these are changes of such a nature that we can well imagine Wesley would not think the alteration worth making. "Flesh and blood" is the same as "blood and flesh"; the R.V. agrees with Wesley in keeping the familiar order while showing by the margin which text it receives. "Cephas" and "Peter" are one and the same person, and the "plain, unlettered men" for whom Wesley was writing would find "Peter" a more

WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

familiar person than the stranger "Cephas." The phrase "in the synagogue" misses the point of the Greek that synagogues in Palestine were many in our Lord's day while there was but one Temple; we see, however, from Wesley's note on the passage that he overlooked this point himself. The only differences, then, between Wesley and Bengel that need examination are the two passages which Wesley keeps in I Cor. vi, 20 and Colossians i, 14 which are rejected by strong textual authority and by the R.V. Clearly the force of the combined readings of A and B and the older versions counted very little with Wesley. What was his reason for retaining the passages? Mill seems to have rejected the first and kept the second. The phrase in the latter is a gloss added from Eph. i, 7, a very similar passage. There is edification in both phrases and Wesley probably considered that of greater consequence than the pedant's toil to discover the authentic text. It seems probable that he framed for himself no principles of textual criticism at all. *As a practical man writing for unlettered people chiefly, he simply accepted Bengel's results unless the change made no difference to the sense or seemed to detract from the value of the translation.*

So far we have only dealt with Bengel's  $\alpha$  passages. A thorough inquiry would examine the readings which he labels  $\beta \gamma \delta \epsilon \zeta$  to see how Wesley uses his judgment on these. Shall we go a short distance with the  $\beta$  passages?

Bengel ( $\beta$ ).

Matt. III, 12	"the" for "his" wheat	Yes.	R.V. "his"
IV, 12	"he" for "Jesus" $\aleph B$	Yes.	R.V.
IV, 16	"walked" for "sat"	Yes.	R.V. "sat."
V, 22	Omit "without a cause" $\aleph B$	Yes.	R.V.
V, 47	"Heathens" for "Publicans" $\aleph B$	Yes.	R.V.
VI, 1	"Righteousness" for "alms" $\aleph B$	Yes.	R.V.
VI, 4	Omit "himself" $\aleph B$	Yes.	R.V.
VI, 6	Omit "openly" $\aleph B$	Yes.	But restores it 1790. R.V.
VI, 25	Omits "what ye shall drink" $\aleph$		Keeps it. R.V. keeps it.
IX, 8	"Were afraid" for "marvelled" $\aleph B$ Keeps "marvelled."	R.V.	"were afraid."
IX, 13	Omit "to repentance" $\aleph B$ .	Yes.	R.V.
XII, 28	Change in order of words	Yes.	R.V.
XIV, 14 22 25	"He" for "Jesus" $\aleph B$ .	Yes.	R.V.

PROCEEDINGS.

XIV, 28	Omit "him"	Yes.	R.V. keeps.
XVI, 13	Omit "I" etc. NB	Yes.	R.V.
XVI, 20	Omit "Jesus" NB	Yes.	R.V.
XIX, 3	Omit "unto him" NB	Yes.	R.V.
XIX, 17	"Why askest thou me concerning what is good?"	No.	R.V.
	He who is good is one" NB	Wesley keeps.	
XXI, 4	Omit "all" NB	Yes.	R.V.
XXI, 12	Omit "of God" NB	Yes.	R.V. keeps.
			Mg. omits.
XXIII, 8	Omit "even Christ" NB	Yes.	R.V.
XXV, 31	Omit "holy" NB	Yes.	R.V.
XXVI, 9	Omit "ointment" NB	Yes.	R.V. ital.
XXVII, 9	Omit "Jeremy"	Yes.	R.V. keeps.
XXVII, 42	Makes verse a question.	Yes.	R.V. Mg.
XXVIII, 9	Omit "As they went to tell his disciples" NB	Yes.	R.V.

Out of twenty-six changes in Bengel's  $\beta$  list, Wesley agrees twenty-three times. This agreement is too striking to be the result of independent work. We may be surprised that Wesley does not follow Bengel in Matt. XIX, 17, but he may have preferred the simple directness of A.V. It is unnecessary to go through N.T. with Bengel's  $\beta$  readings. It may be worth while, however, to give the changes in one of the epistles.

Romans I, 16	Omit "of Christ" NB	Yes.	R.V.
I, 29	Omit "fornication" NB	Wesley keeps.	R.V.
VI, 11	Omit "Our Lord" AB	Wesley keeps.	R.V.
X, 1	"them" for "Israel" NB	Yes.	R.V.
			Restores Israel 1790.
XI, 2	Omit "saying" AB	Yes.	R.V.
XII, 9	Omit "bear false witness" AB	Wesley keeps.	R.V.
XVI, 5	"Asia" for "Achaia" NB	Yes.	R.V.
XVI, 14	Changes order to "Hermes— Hermas" NB	Yes. But	restores A.V. in 1790, R.V.
XVI, 24	Omit verse NB	Wesley keeps except	"Amen" R.V.

The results here seem to be much less decisive as Wesley half agrees and half disagrees with Bengel. The changes made in 1790, however, give us light on the principles which governed Wesley's work. Why does he give up the better reading in two



cases where he had accepted it in 1754? He seems to keep "Israel" for the sake of the sense, and to go back to the A.V. in the order of the names in xvi 14 because it did not really matter in what order they occurred. The 1790 alterations therefore confirm our view of the reasons which influenced Wesley when he declined to follow Bengel slavishly. We can from that point of view appreciate his retention of the A.V. reading in i. 29, vi. 11, xii. 9 and xvi. 24.

It may add to the strength of the position to observe how Wesley treats some crucial readings. Following  $\beta$  he reverses the order of the verses in I John v., 7-8, agreeing with the special note which Bengel gives in this passage. So in I Tim. iii., 16, he adopts Bengel's division of the text which is neither that of A.V. nor R.V. This seems to us to be a decisive passage. Wesley's translation does not come from Textus Receptus nor Plantin press of Antwerp of 1574 which does not differ from A.V. Nor does it come from Mill; so far as we know, Bengel is the only probable source for such a striking alteration as we have here.<sup>1</sup>

R.V. and A.V.

... The Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness.

BENDEL and WESLEY.

The mystery of godliness is the pillar and ground of the truth, and without controversy a great thing.

Bengel and Wesley agree in keeping passages which have not strong MS authority such as Mk. xvi., 9-20; ix., 44, 46, Luke xxii., 43, 44; John viii., 1-11. We do not look for any radical treatment of such passages by either of these evangelical scholars. Bengel also rejects the reading *εὐδοκίας* in Luke ii, 14; so also Wesley.

It may be in the mind of those who have followed this

---

1. Is it not probable that Bengel was acquainted with the critical work of Joachim Camerarius of Leipsic (1500-1574), the friend of Melancthon, whose critical commentary on the New Testament, "unfolds the sense of each term and the spirit of each phrase by the rules of criticism, laying aside all debated points of doctrine," etc. English commentators of the 17th century quote him, and Atkinson, in continuation of Mat. Henry, 1714, says of this passage: "He joins this with what goes before. He supposes this mystery to be the pillar," etc. This anticipates Bengel's interpretation. Ellicott (*Par. Epp.* p. 51), also states that this was the construction advocated by Simon Episcopus (1583-1643), the leader of the Arminian party after the death of its founder. Bishop Ellicott fears that "polemical reasons" may have influenced Episcopus and others. Be this as it may, they preceded Bengel in his interpretation of this passage.—T. E. B.

analysis that there is an alternative suggestion. Wesley may have been following another edition of the Greek Testament, and the one that immediately suggests itself is the pioneer work of Mill, which is the real basis of Bengel's toil. We know that the members of the Holy Club were interested in Mill's work because Gambold published in 1742 a Greek text which followed Mill in the readings he preferred, while it adopted Bengel's punctuation and division into paragraphs. I have not made a thorough comparison of Mill's preferences with Wesley's translation but have gone far enough to satisfy myself that Wesley was not using Mill at all. In Romans ii, 17, Mill reads "Behold" with no alternative: Wesley, Bengel and R.V. adopt "But if," εἰδὲ for Ἰδὲ. Bengel's preferences are also so much more easily discovered, that a busy man would for that reason alone put him before Mill.

Mr. Bett in his interesting book on the *Hymns of Methodism in their Literary Relations* (pp. 20 and 21) has emphasized the scholarship of John Wesley as shown in his new translation. Wesley was an excellent Greek scholar, and was both accurate and courageous in his revised translation. He had a wonderful knowledge of the received Greek text. Indeed, he was more at home with it for the purposes of quotation than with A.V. All that an examination has revealed to us is that he was no expert in textual criticism. He accepted the findings of a man whom he could trust, and when he differed from him he did so not for any technical reasons but because of the possible effect of the change on the plain, unlettered men to whom his life-work was given.

A. W. HARRISON.

---

## THE ORIGINAL SETTLEMENT OF THE WESLEYS.

---

Your correspondent in *Proc.*, ix, p. 95, Notes and Queries, No. 484, is right in thinking that "When a family bears a place name, that place decides the original settlement of the family." He is also right in saying that there are several villages bearing the name of Westley, but he is wrong in concluding that the Wesleys were settled at, or that they took their name from any of these places. There is a good old

## WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

family of ancient lineage belonging to Essex, Suffolk, and Cambridgeshire, which rightly bears the name of Westley, derived no doubt from those manors, but it is in no way connected with the Wesleys whose home-place since about 1066 has been Somerset and Dorset. The arms of the two families also are different.

Originally, in Saxon times, the Wesleys were settled in Sussex. At the battle of Senlac, all the male members of the family over sixteen years of age perished, and the widow with her young children fled into Somersetshire; no doubt in order to escape the fate of so many Saxon widows of good estate and lineage, viz., that of being compelled to marry one of the Conqueror's Norman Barons (a favourite expedient of Duke William's for settling his Barons peaceably on Saxon manors). The estate in Somersetshire upon which the widow took refuge was known as Welswe and this ere long was improved into Welslegh. Here the family flourished and abounded until about the end of 1420, when the estate passed by the marriage of Elizabeth de Wellesleigh (the only child and heiress of Sir Philip de Wellesleigh) into another family, Barnastre by name. A brother of this lady's father, however, continued to live in the neighbourhood, and it is from his sons that the Wesleys descend. The passing of the manorial estates into other hands soon resulted in an abbreviation of the family name, and ere long the family became known as Welsly, this again quickly passed into Wesley, and very soon, owing to mis-pronunciation of the name by ordinary folk and *phonetic* spelling, a T dropped into it.

The earliest registers still existing in the neighbourhood of Wells are those of the parish church of Glastonbury (date 1603), and in them is to be found the last entry with the name spelt Wesley, and it is coupled with the old family names of Walter and Walerand, dates 1606-1607, 1614. By 1620 Westley had completely supplanted the older spellings of Wellesley and Wesley in the English branch, though Wesley still continued to hold its own (sometimes alternately with Wellesley) in the Irish branch right down to 1805, when a return to the original spelling (Wellesley) was decided on by the Duke of Wellington and his brothers. The first known instance of the use of the abbreviated form of Wesley instead of Wellesley occurred in or about the year 1539 when Walter Wellesley, Bishop of Kildare, the son of Sir William de Wellesley and his wife Ismay, daughter of Sir Thomas Plunkett, of Rathmore, so used and

## PROCEEDINGS.

signed his name. Anthony Wood, in *Athenæ Oxonienses*, describes him as "Walter Wellesley commonly called Wesley, Prior of the Mitred Abbey and Bishop of Kildare." The Field Marshal Duke of Wellington was not really a Wesley. His grandfather (Richard Colley) assumed the arms and name on succeeding to the Wesley estates in Ireland in accordance with the will of his (maternal) cousin Garrett Wesley, of Dangan—an honour which Charles Wesley had declined. Oddly enough the Wesley arms assumed by Richard Colley and still borne by the Duke of Wellington are not true to the original arms. In 1760 the Duke's father was created Earl of Mornington, and having discovered from old documents and title deeds that the name had for many generations been written Wellesley, took that spelling for his second title (Viscount Wellesley) the family still spelling their name Wesley; but in or about 1805 (acting on the advice of their cousin Sir Chichester Fortescue, Ulster King at Arms) the Duke and his brothers reverted to the ancient and correct spelling. The writer possesses an original autograph of the Duke as Arthur Wesley, date 1794, also an official document (date 1793) in which the Duke's next brother is described as the Hon. and Rev<sup>d</sup>. Gerald Valerian Wesley, and a photograph of the Duke's autograph, A. Wesley, taken from the rate book of the Trim Lodge of Freemasons. The Duke nevertheless has Wellesley blood in his veins, through the female line, and he was also closely related to the family by frequent inter-marriages between the Wellesleys with the Colleys, the FitzGeralds, the Plunketts and the Cusacks. A few letters, more or less, to a name, in days gone by were matters of small moment but the introduction of a T into the name of the Somersetshire Wesleys is most unfortunate because it is misleading and confuses two perfectly distinct families.

There is in Laracor Church a Silver Altar Service engraved with the words "Presented to the Church of Laracor by Garrot Wesley of Dangan 1723." On his monument in the same church is engraved, "In memory of Garrett Wesley, armiger," &c., 1728. A silver altar service belonging to one of the churches in Wells is thus engraved: "Presented by William Westley Esqr 1701. On his memorial slab in the nave of the Cathedral he is described as William Westley armiger &c., 1719.

The knowledge that he was of the family of the Somerset Wesleys was no doubt the reason why John Wesley's father wrote his name Wesley, though in common with his father,

grandfather, and the family generally since 1620, he had previously signed himself Westley. Canon Overton was fully aware of John Wesley's blue blood, when he wrote "The Wesleys were an ancient Saxon family settled in the West of England from the time of the Conquest," and again "It was hardly to be expected that a scion of the Wellesleys and Annesleys should consider himself as an inferior being even to a member of the noble house of Shirley" *i.e.*, Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, and daughter of Earl Ferrers, of Staunton Harold. Vide *John Wesley*, by J. H. Overton, pp. 1, 189.

I may add, that little as some people would imagine it, John Wesley fully appreciated the fact of his illustrious descent. The Coat of Arms borne by him, though incorrectly drawn, was that of the Wellesleys of Wellesley and similar to a Seal of John, Baron de Wellesley, attached to a deed (1324) formerly in the possession of the Dean and Chapter of Wells.

For the above valuable paper the Editors are indebted to a member of the Wesley family.

See *Proc.* I, 67, 97. III, 131. IV, 197. IX, 95. The above article, and another, with a plate of the Wesley Arms (I, 97), cover the whole ground, and settle many confusing questions.

---

## SOME CLASSICAL ALLUSIONS IN HYMNS OF THE WESLEYS.

---

The Fellow of Lincoln and the Student of Christ Church were classical scholars, and it is therefore natural to look for the influence of the classics, especially the Latin poets, in their verse.

It would need a good deal of scholarship, and particularly a very wide knowledge of Latin literature, to explore this region as it ought to be explored. I do not make any pretence to such knowledge, but merely point out such allusions as I happen to have noticed.

In the nature of the case, these allusions must be almost entirely confined to single phrases. Considering the wide difference, both in subject and style, between a Christian hymn and the epic or the ode of a pagan poet, there cannot well be many examples of long parallel passages. I have already pointed out

in *The Hymns of Methodism in their Literary Relations* what are perhaps the most considerable parallels of this kind, where the hymn "Author of every work divine," paraphrases a dozen lines in Virgil (*Aeneid* VI, 724-729) and where the hymn "Stand the omnipotent decree!" is influenced by some lines of Horace (*Odes* iii, 3). But cases of this kind must be few. Generally, it will be merely in the turn of a phrase that one detects an allusion. And here a genuine difficulty is encountered. For eighteenth century English poetry was slavishly dependent upon the classics, and is full of echoes of the Latin poets. So that one can never be quite sure whether the Wesleys were directly recalling a classical phrase, or merely remembering a line in Dryden or Prior that was itself an echo of the classics.

Thus, for example, when one reads the lines :—

" To Him mine eye of faith I turn,  
And through the fire pursue my way :  
The fire forgets its power to burn  
The *lambent flames* around me play,"

it is natural to think of Virgil's *lambere flamma*, in his description of the supernatural fire that played around the head of Iulus, at the sack of Troy, during the hesitation of Anchises. But then the very phrase is used by Dryden :—

" E'en Love (for Love sometimes her Muse exprest)  
Was but a *lambent flame* which play'd about her breast."

So one is tempted to think that phrases such as "Breathe unutterable love," "Fix, O fix my wavering mind," may be recollections of Virgil's *infandum amorem* (iv, 85) and *animum labantem* (the phrase so frequent in the *Aeneid*). Similarly, "Shall I, to soothe the unholy throng," "The greedy sea shall yield her dead," may perhaps recall Horace's *profanum vulgus* (*Odes* iii, 1) and *avidum mare* (i, 28). But probably each of these phrases could be paralleled in the English poets of the early eighteenth century.

We may feel a good deal more certain that there is an actual allusion to Horace in one of the Hymns written for the Thanksgiving Day, 20th November, 1759 :—

" Who rest beneath the Almighty's wing,  
May cast their cares away :  
Whate'er event tomorrow brings  
We live for God today."

For this is a deliberate improvement upon the sentiment of the Latin poet (*Odes* iii, 29) :—

WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

“ Ille potens sui  
Laetusque deget, cui licet in diem  
Dixisse, Vixi : cras vel atra  
Nube polum Pater occupato  
Vel sole puro : non tamen irritum,  
Quodcumque retrost, efficies : neque  
Diffinget infectumque reddet,  
Quod fugiens semel hora vexit.”

The Globe Edition of the *Works of Horace* translates these lines thus :—

“ He will live master of himself, and cheerful, who has the power to say from day to day, “I have lived ! tomorrow let the Sire overspread the sky either with cloudy gloom or unsullied light ; yet he will not render of no effect aught that lies behind, nor shape anew and make a thing not done, what once the flying hour has borne away.”

A verse of one of the “Hymns on the Earthquake” :—

“ In vain ye change your place,  
If still unchanged your mind :  
Or fly to distant climes, unless  
Ye leave your sins behind,”

is also a clear remembrance of the famous line of Horace (*Ep.* i, 11).

“Caelum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt.”

“They change their climate, not their dispositions, who run beyond the sea.”

And the lines in a version of Psalm cxxxiii :

“ On all His chosen ones  
The precious oil comes down :  
It runs, and as it runs  
It ever will run on.”

manifestly recall another famous line of the same poet (*Ep.* i, 2) :—

“Labitur, et labetur in omne volubilis aevum”

“It flows and will flow, ever rolling on.”

There are several references in the hymns to the beautiful tradition of “the golden age,” such as the lines in a hymn on Isaiah LX, 17-18 :—

“Your souls shall take a finer mould,  
The Jewish into Christian pass,  
The iron age be turned to gold,”

and in another hymn on Malachi 3, 4 :—

“ Returns the age of golden days,  
 The vigorous energy of grace,  
 That in Thine ancient servants shone,”  
 and in the hymn entitled “ Primitive Christianity ” :—  
 “ O what an age of golden days !  
 O what a choice, peculiar race ! ”

There are passages in several of the Latin poets which treat of the golden age, and *Astroæa redux*. As familiar as any is that in the famous Fourth Eclogue of Virgil :—

Iam nova progenies caelo dimittitur alto  
 Tu modo nascenti puero, quo ferrea primum  
 Desinet ac toto surget gens aurea mundo.

“ Now a new progeny is sent down from high heaven. O chaste Lucina, be propitious to the infant boy, under whom the iron age shall cease, and the golden age over all the world arise.”

In the lines :—

“ Garnish'd by Thee you azure sky,  
 And all those beauteous orbs on high  
 Depend in golden chains from Thee,”

there is apparently an allusion to the *σειρήν χρυσεήν* of Homer (*Iliad*, viii. 19) a passage translated by Chapman thus :—

“ . . . Let down our golden chain

And at it let all Deities their utmost strength constrain,  
 To draw me to the earth from heaven : you never shall prevail  
 Though with your most contention, ye dare my state assail.  
 But when my will shall be disposed to draw you all to me,  
 Even with the earth itself and seas, ye shall enforced be :  
 Then will I to Olympus' top our virtuous engine bind,  
 And by it everything shall hang, by my command inclined,  
 So much I am supreme to gods, to men supreme as much.”

The same passage is also recalled in some lines in Charles Wesley's “ Epistle to the Rev. George Whitefield ” :—

“ Fast bound with love's indissoluble chain  
 (That adamant which time and death defies  
 That golden chain which draws us to the skies !)”

There are a good many references to familiar classical myths and tales. Thus an Advent hymn alludes to the story of the infant Hercules strangling in his cradle the serpents which Juno had sent to destroy him :—

“ Those infant hands,  
 Shall burst our bands.  
 And work out our salvation.  
 Strangle the crooked serpent,



WESLEY HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Destroy his works for ever,  
And open set  
The heavenly gate  
To every true believer."

One of the "Hymns for a Family," which deals with the training of children, has an allusion to Ariadne's thread, which guided Theseus out of the labyrinth of the Minotaur:—

"Their selfish will in time subdue,  
And mortify their pride;  
And lend their youth a sacred clew  
To find the Crucified."

The fable that Amphion made the stones move, and built the walls of Thebes by the music of his lyre is referred to in the lines:—

"Ah, join me to Thy secret ones!  
Ah, gather all Thy living stones!  
Scattered o'er all the earth they lie,  
Till Thou collect them with Thine eye,  
Draw by the music of Thy name,  
And charm into a beauteous frame."

And more clearly still in the lines:—

"So shall I charm the listening throng,  
And draw the living stones along,  
By Jesu's tuneful name:  
The living stones shall dance, shall rise,  
And form a city in the skies,  
The New Jerusalem!"

The lines:—

"Show me the naked sword,  
Impending o'er my head;  
O let me tremble at Thy word,  
And to my ways take heed!"

recall the famous story of Damocles and the sword which hung over his head by a single hair, during his borrowed state.

And there is also at least one allusion to Roman history. Cæsar's famous despatch to the Senate after his victory over Pharnaces near Zela in Pontus, *Veni, vidi vici*, is recalled (with a difference) in the lines, in a version of Psalm xlvi:—

"Lo! their boast is turned to shame!  
Struck with sore amaze and dread,  
Marching towards her walls they came,  
They came,—they saw,—they fled!"

HENRY BETT.