
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. IV.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1881

PREFACE.

THE condition of affairs ecclesiastical, it is said, has become more promising. When matters are at their worst, one knows, they sometimes begin to amend. Just now there are signs—slight, no doubt, yet significant—which to hopeful watchers indicate a return of law-abiding peace. Resistance to Episcopal authority, it is true, yet remains; and the plain decisions of Ecclesiastical Courts, within one section of the Church, are still flouted. But the barometer is not so stormy as it was. The mass of devout and thoughtful Church folk, especially among the Laity, but also in Clerical circles, are beginning to realize how precious is the principle, and how deep-reaching the issues, of "Church and State." The appeals of the Bishop of Manchester in regard to the real needs of the country, and the protest of the Dean of Chichester against Ritualistic sectarianism, have not been made in vain. The Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, "appealing to all Englishmen" concerning Church Defence, and showing "the destructive theories" of the "Liberation" Society, has arrested attention throughout the land. Among our Nonconformist brethren, it is also said, many representative men appreciate duly the work which is quietly being done for Christ in thousands of parishes; and Churchmen who are faithful to the principles of the Reformation seem to be, in one way or another, drawing more closely together.

Foretokens of this sort, it may be, are of small importance. The perils of the Established Church, perhaps, remain unqualified, although they seem less threatening. The spread of sceptical, and even of Materialist, opinions, is undoubtedly most

serious. The statistics as to the absence of working-men from public worship "at church" or "at chapel" in the metropolis, and in other great towns, cannot be weighed by any true Christians without feelings of sorrow and alarm.

For the National Church, as it seems to us, a special need, at the present moment, is the gathering of the opinions and enlisting the services of earnest laymen. The well-matured opinions of the Laity, presented with some authority, and organized—in some sort, "official"—action, in every diocese, what may not be reasonably expected from these? Diocesan Conferences, under God, may do for us great things. The parochial use of a Bidding Prayer with particular references to the diocese might, in many ways, prove a blessing. Prayer for the rulers of our Zion is a real need.

For ourselves, in THE CHURCHMAN, we desire and trust, while maintaining Protestant and Evangelical principles with unswerving fidelity, to be of service in bringing together those, whether or no they rank with us, who loyally love the good old Church, and sound their Churchmanship by the supreme standard of the Word of God.

THE

CHURCHMAN

APRIL, 1881.

ART. I.—THE REVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I.

THREE hundred and fifty years have elapsed since Bishop Tonstall, in the presence of a large assemblage of the citizens of London, committed to the flames a considerable number of copies of Tyndale's New Testament, which he had recently procured from Antwerp.

"This burning," says Bishop Burnet, "had such a hateful appearance in it, that people from thence concluded there must be a visible contrariety between that book and the doctrines of those who handled it." In a document issued shortly afterwards, under the authority of King Henry VIII., Archbishop Warham, and several of the Bishops, it is stated that the King, "taking into consideration all circumstances, thinketh in his conscience that the divulging of the Scripture at this time in the English tongue to be committed to the people, should rather be to their further confusion and destruction than the edification of their souls."

Undeterred, however, by the opposition of his powerful enemies or by the dangers which threatened his own life, Tyndale persevered, alike through evil report and good report, in the noble task to which he had consecrated his life; and he lived to complete a translation of the Pentateuch, the Book of Jonah, and the whole of the New Testament, before he was called to seal his testimony with his blood at Vilvorde, near Brussels, in the year 1536.

The dying prayer of Tyndale: "Lord, open the eyes of the King of England," was registered on high. It seems, indeed, that we may regard that prayer as an apt illustration of the fulfilment of the words of the inspired prophet: "Before they call I will answer, and while they are yet speaking I will hear." For it is evident, from some of the title-pages still extant, that

Coverdale's Bible had already issued from a press at Antwerp, previously to the death of Tyndale; and although there is no sufficient evidence that it received any distinct royal sanction, nevertheless, between 1535 and 1537, three editions of the English Bible appeared in England with a dedication to King Henry VIII., and on the title-page of the edition of 1535 the King is depicted receiving the Bible from the Bishops and nobles who are kneeling before him.

Coverdale's Bible did not profess to be a translation from the original languages. On the contrary, it is stated, on the foreign title-page, to have been "faithfully and truly translated out of Dutch (German) and Latin into English;" whilst on the title-page, which is printed in English type, it is merely said to be "faithfully translated into English."

There has been considerable difference of opinion, in regard to the translations of Tyndale, as to the extent to which they were derived from original sources. Professor Westcott, who has examined the evidence which bears upon this question with much care, arrives at the conclusion that "all external evidence goes to prove Tyndale's originality as a translator;" a conclusion which he supports by the external evidence of Spalatinus and of Tyndale's opponent, Joye, and also by the steady confidence with which Tyndale himself deals with points of Hebrew and Greek philology.[1]

From the time of the appearance of Coverdale's Bible, in 1535–6, the history of the English Bible is a history of successive revisions. Our space will not admit of our dwelling at any length upon details respecting Matthew's (Roger's) Bible, the Great Bible, that of Taverner, the Genevan Bible, and the Bishops' Bible, all of which appeared between that of Coverdale in 1535 and the so-called Authorized Revision of 1611. The point with which we are mainly concerned in the present article is to trace the gradual approximation of the successive Revisions to a faithful translation from the original sources. It was commonly believed that, in addition to the Pentateuch, the Book of Jonah, and a few detached pieces from other parts of the Old Testament, Tyndale had left behind him, in manuscript, a version of the books from Joshua to 2 Chronicles inclusive, which came, as Professor Westcott tells us, into the hands of his friend, John Rogers. Rogers, with the help of Thomas Matthew, who probably furnished money for the work, put together a composite Bible, made up partly of Tyndale's translations from the original Hebrew and Greek, and partly of one of Coverdale from the German and Latin. This work appeared in 1537, with a dedication to Henry VIII. and the Queen Jane; and at the

[1] See "History of the English Bible," p. 173. Macmillan & Co. 1868.

bottom of the title-page are found the following words: "Set forth with the King's most gracious license." In the early part of the year 1538 Crumwell appears to have applied to Coverdale to undertake the charge of a new edition, with a more complete critical collation of the Hebrew and Greek texts. This Bible, commonly known as the Great Bible, was finished in April, 1540, and two other editions followed in the course of the same year. It is worthy of observation that no attempt appears to have been made to substitute the Psalter of the Bishop's Bible for that of the Great Bible, which appeared in the first Prayer-Book of King Edward VI.; and when, at the Revision of the Prayer-Book in 1661, it was agreed that the Epistles and Gospels should be taken from the Authorized Version of 1611, a special exception was made in regard to the Psalter.

Although the constitution of the English Church and the remoulding of her service books appeared to be of more urgent importance during the reign of King Edward VI. than a further revision of the Bible, the latter object did not escape the attention of Archbishop Cranmer; and after the appointment of Fagius and Bucer to professorships in the University of Cambridge, they were charged by that prelate to devote their attention to a "clear, plain, and succinct interpretation of the Scripture according to the propriety of the language," Fagius being charged to undertake the Old Testament, and Bucer the New. Although nothing was said expressly of an immediate revision of the Great Bible, it is obvious, from the tenor of their instructions, that the thoughts of the Archbishop were turned in this direction.

The death of Edward VI. changed the whole of the ecclesiastical condition of the kingdom. During the reign of Queen Mary no English Bible was printed in this country and, although no special measures appear to have been adopted by authority for the restriction of the private use of the Scriptures, their public use was necessarily forbidden, and copies of the Bible which had been set up in churches during the previous reign were burnt. In the year 1557 the Genevan version of the New Testament appeared, which was the work of some of the English exiles who had fled to the Continent during the reign of Mary. A thorough revision of the whole Bible was shortly afterwards taken in hand by these exiles, and continued for the space "of two years and more, day and night;" and although the accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558 partly broke up the English Society at Geneva, the work was still carried on, and the whole Bible appeared in 1560 with a dedication to the Queen.

The Genevan Bible was, in many respects, much better adapted for common use than any of its predecessors. It ap-

peared in the shape of a quarto volume of moderate dimensions, instead of the unwieldy folios which preceded it. The text was printed, for the first time, in Roman type; and the division of the chapters into verses, which was marked in the margin of Stephens' Greek Testament of 1551, was now first introduced into an edition of the English Bible.[1]

The basis of the Genevan Bible, as regards the Old Testament, was the Great Bible. It seems to have been the object of the revisers to alter the rendering as little as possible, but, as Professor Westcott has observed, "there is abundant evidence to show that they were perfectly competent to deal independently with points of Hebrew scholarship;" whilst, in regard to the New Testament, "it is little more" (as the same writer observes) "than the record of the application of Beza's translation and commentary to Tyndale's Testament in three successive stages: first in the separate New Testament of 1557, next in the Bible of 1560, and lastly in the New Testament of L. Tomson in 1576."[2] Amongst other indications of the scholarly instinct of the Genevan revisers, reference may be made to the fact that, in the edition of 1560, there is not only a conformity to the Hebrew in the spelling of the proper names, but the Hebrew accentuation is also noted—as, *e.g.*, in the words Jaakób (Jacob), Izhák (Isaac), Abimélech.[3]

Shortly after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, royal injunctions, similar to those of King Edward VI., were issued, in which it was ordered that every parish church should be provided with a copy of the Bible of the largest volume—*i.e.*, the Great Bible. Soon afterwards the Queen granted a patent for seven years to John Bodley for the printing of the Genevan Bible; and whilst the Great Bible remained upon the desks of the parish churches the Genevan Bible became, for the most part, the household Bible of the land.

---

[1] The division of the Old Testament into chapters appears to have been introduced in the thirteenth century, and is traditionally ascribed to Stephen Langton and to Hugh de St. Cher. It was introduced into the printed Bibles by Felix Pratensis, the editor of Bomberg's first Rabbinic Bible, which was printed in Venice in 1516-17. The division into verses was of a much earlier period, inasmuch as the Talmudic versicular division corresponds with that of the Masorah. As regards the New Testament, the division into chapters was that which was introduced in the thirteenth century, as above; whilst as regards the verses, the division now adopted was introduced by the elder Stephens, who is said by his son, Henry Stephens, to have accomplished the work *inter equitandum*. It was first introduced into the Greek Testament of 1551.

[2] "History of the English Bible," pp. 287, 288.

[3] This peculiarity was pointed out to Professor Westcott by Dr. Aldis Wright, the learned and accomplished scholar who has acted throughout as the Secretary of the Old Testament Revision Company.

Early in the reign of Queen Elizabeth a bill was drafted for reducing of diversities of Bibles "to one settled vulgar, translated from the original."[1] This work was undertaken by Archbishop Parker, who allotted it to some of the bishops and other learned men—amongst whom were Sandys, Bishop of Worcester, and Guest, Bishop of Rochester.[2]

This revision appeared in 1568 with a Preface, in which the revisers expressed their sense both of the importance of their undertaking and also of the provisional character of the work. The popular title of the work, "The Bishops' Bible," appears to have arisen from the fact that eight of the revisers were bishops, and that Archbishop Parker was the person mainly responsible for the revision. There is no direct evidence that the Queen gave her license, or any public recognition to this revision; but it was ordered in the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical of 1571 that "every archbishop and bishop should have at his house a copy of the Holy Bible of the largest volume, as lately printed in London;" and it was also enjoined that each cathedral should have a copy; and the same provision was extended, "as far as it could conveniently be done," to all churches.

The history of the Rhemish New Testament and the Douay Bible must be dismissed in few words. The translators professedly adopted the current Latin Vulgate, not the original Hebrew and Greek, as the basis of their translation; and they did not hesitate to express their conviction, in regard to the New Testament, that the Vulgate was "not only better than all other Latin translations, but than the Greek text itself in those places where they disagree." The same view is adopted in regard to the Old Testament, the Hebrew text of which is alleged to have been "foully corrupted by the Jews." The New Testament was printed at Rheims in 1582, and the Old Testament at Douay in 1609.[3]

---

[1] See Dr. Stoughton's "Our English Bible," p. 208, an admirable work, of which free use has been made in this Article.

[2] It will appear, from two incidents recorded by Professor Westcott, how little the duties of a faithful translator were understood at this time by some of those who were engaged in this undertaking. In returning the Book of Psalms which had been sent to Bishop Guest for correction, he wrote to the Archbishop in the following terms:—"I have not altered the translation but where it gave occasion of an error. As at the first Psalm, at the beginning, I turu the præterperfect tense into the present tense, because the sense is too harsh in thc præterperfect tense. Where in the New Testament one piece of a Psalm is reported, I translate it in the Psalms according to the translation thereof in the New Testament, for the avoiding of the offence that may rise to the people upon divers translations." In like manner Bishop Cox writes thus, "The translation of the verbs in the Psalms to be used uniformly in one tense."—WESTCOTT, *History of the English Bible*, pp. 132, 133.

[3] This revision, notwithstanding its secondary character as not being made from original sources, is nevertheless, as Professor Westcott has

Shortly after the accession of King James I., and before he had been recognized as king by Parliament, he summoned a conference on ecclesiastical matters at Hampton Court, on which occasion the Authorized Version of the Bible was brought forward as one of the things "amiss in the Church." Although this conference proved ineffectual in all other respects, it is to it that we owe the present Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures. The result of the conference, as regards this subject, was that His Majesty expressed his wish that "some special pains should be taken for an uniform translation," in order to which end he desired that the work should be taken in hand "by the best learned in both Universities, after them to be reviewed by the bishops and the chief learned of the Church; from them to be presented to the Privy Council, and lastly to be ratified by his royal authority, and so this whole Church to be bound unto it and none other." It is not known in what manner the scholars who engaged in this work were selected. On the 22nd of July, 1604, however, the king wrote to Bancroft, Bishop of London, stating that "he had appointed certain learned men, to the number of four and fifty, for the translating of the Bible," and requiring the bishop to take measures whereby he might be able to recompense the translators by Church preferment.

When the necessary preliminaries were arranged, the translators, who appear to have been only forty-seven (not fifty-four), in number, were divided into six companies, of which two met at Westminster, two at Cambridge, and two at Oxford; and the whole of the work, including the Apocrypha, was divided into six portions, in such manner that the two Cambridge companies undertook the middle portion of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha; the two Oxford companies the latter portion of the Old Testament and the Gospels, Acts, and Apocalypse; and the two Westminster companies the early portion of the Old Testament, and Romans to Jude inclusive of the New Testament. It has been noticed by Professor Westcott as one of the indications of the extent to which Hebrew learning was cultivated at this time, that Boys, who was especially famous for Oriental learning, was originally employed upon the Apocrypha.

Bishop Burnet, in his "History of the Reformation," gives the fifteen rules which are said to have been laid down for the guidance of the revisers. It is impossible to say to what extent these rules were adhered to, except in so far as internal evidence

---

remarked, "of considerable importance in the internal history of the authorized text, for it furnished a large proportion of the Latin words which King James' revisers adopted; and it is to this rather than to Coverdale's Testaments that we owe the final and most powerful action of the Vulgate upon our present Version."—*History of the English Bible*, p. 321.

is afforded in the revision itself. It is important, however, to take notice of the following points—viz., (1) that the Bishops' Bible was to be followed, and "as little altered as the truth of the original will permit," but that the following translations—viz., "Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitchurch's, Geneva"—were to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible; (2) that when any one company had despatched any book, after separate translation and emendation by each of the members, and common deliberation and agreement thereon, they were to send it to the rest, "to be considered of seriously and judiciously;" and (3) that when "any place of special obscurity" was doubted of, "letters were to be directed by authority to send to any learned man in the land for his judgment of such a place."[1]

Little need be said on the present occasion as to the manner in which the important work thus undertaken was carried out, and, after an interval of seven years, published in the form of a well-printed but somewhat ponderous and unwieldly folio volume.

However violent the attacks which were made upon the Authorized Version of 1611 by Broughton and others, at the time of its publication, the sound scholarship of King James' revisers is now almost universally allowed by all competent witnesses. It is not too much, we think, to allege that it is called in question by those only who are unable to form any just estimate of the difficulty of the task, or of the qualifications necessary on the part of those who were engaged in it. It must be remembered that the revisers of 1611 were destitute of a large number of those appliances which are within the reach of modern scholars, and that whilst the defects and inaccuracies which undoubtedly exist in their work are due, in great measure, to the peculiar circumstances of their position and to the prevailing state of learning in the age in which they lived, the vast superiority of their revision over that of any of their predecessors entitles them to the just homage and to the unfeigned gratitude of the English-speaking people of all after time, and, we may add, of those numerous races, belonging to distant parts of the world, to whom the knowledge of the Holy Scripture has been imparted by translations which have been made chiefly or exclusively from the Authorized Version of 1611.

In the immediate prospect of the publication of the Revised

[1] "These directions will be read with additional interest when they are compared with the resolutions which are said to have been adopted by the two Revision Companies which have been engaged for the last ten years and upwards in a similar undertaking."—See Dr. STOUGHTON'S *Our English Bible*, p. 293.

New Testament, which has been the result of the combined labours of many accomplished scholars during the last ten years it may be well to state briefly the chief causes of the imperfections of the present Authorized Version of the New Testament, and the grounds on which it may reasonably be anticipated that the new Revision should be found to be in closer conformity than any of its predecessors to the original text.

And (1) as regards the state of the Greek text. It is well known that the revisers of 1611 had no trustworthy Greek text before them. The principal editions which had then been published were those of Erasmus, which were five in number (1516–1535 A.D.); of Robert Stephens, four in number (1546–1557 A.D.); of Beza, four editions in folio, and five smaller editions (1546–1598 A.D.); and the Complutensian Polyglot (1522 A.D.). The edition which the revisers of King James followed appears to have been the fourth edition of Beza, which was published in 1598, an edition which varies but little from the fourth edition of Stephens, which was published in 1557, and of which a nearly exact reprint was published by Mill in 1707.

It is true that Erasmus and Beza had some early and valuable MSS. which they might have followed, more especially that which is known as D, or the Codex Bezæ of the Gospels and Acts, and the Claromontane MS. of the Pauline Epistles, but of these they appear to have made but little use. It is worthy of remark that in regard to the Apocalypse Erasmus had only an inaccurate transcript of a mutilated MS., and that he actually supplied its defects by translating from the Latin Vulgate into Greek.

At the present time we have many MSS., varying from the fourth to the tenth century, of the highest value, one of them, the Sinaitic, containing the whole of the New Testament, and another, the Vatican, containing the greater part of it, both of which may be assigned to about the middle of the fourth century. In addition to these we have the Alexandrian MS. and the Codex Ephraem, which probably belong to about the middle of the fifth century, and a very large number of other MSS. of later date, some of which, by reason of their agreement with the most ancient authorities, are entitled to be regarded as of equal or even greater value than those which are anterior to them in point of date. After an enumeration of ten of the most ancient and important MSS., of which eight have been published "in such a manner as to make it not only possible but easy for the student to read and study the text *in its sequence and connection*," Bishop Ellicott remarks as follows:—

When we pause to think of our present critical treasures, and the easy access that is thus afforded to them, and remember that of the

great manuscripts above alluded to, only one was in any degree used, and that in the most imperfect manner, by those on whom our revisers had to rely for their text, it would seem impossible to doubt that, even if we had no additional reasons, it is now an imperative duty on all faithful scholars to combine in making available to all, the results of a cautious and intelligent revision of the text of our English Testament.[1]

(2) In regard to the ancient versions. It is true, as Bishop Ellicott has observed, that we still lack a full knowledge of the ancient versions. On the other hand, "great advance has been made," as the same writer observes, "in our knowledge of the Latin versions, whether the old Latin or Vulgate, by the publications and collations of Tischendorf and others. In the Syriac versions a great and critically important addition has been made by the discovery and the publication of the singular, and sometimes rather wild, Curetonian Syriac version."[2] Other versions—as, *e.g.*, the Gothic, the Coptic, the Ethiopic, and the Armenian—have also been to a greater or less extent laid under contribution; and although much yet remains to be done in regard to all of these, it cannot be denied that the revisers of the present time are placed in a very different position in respect of versions as well as of MSS. from that of their predecessors in the days of King James.

(3) In regard to critical apparatus. A glance at any comprehensive catalogue of theological and critical works bearing upon the study of the Greek language generally, and of the criticism of the New Testament in particular, will suffice to satisfy the inquirer that almost every important work of reference which is now in the hands of the New Testament scholar has been published within the last two hundred and fifty years, and the greater part of them in the course of the present century. As regards the New Testament itself it will suffice to refer to the critical editions of scholars such as Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; whilst, as regards grammars, lexicons, concordances, and critical commentaries, it would be difficult to name many which were published above fifty years ago—we might almost say to name any which much exceed that date—which are still in general repute amongst Biblical students at the present time.

It will be obvious from the facts which have been now alleged that it is but reasonable to expect that we should find a closer approximation to the original text in the Revision which is about to be put forth than in any of its predecessors. Those who are acquainted with the vast strides which textual criticism has

[1] "Considerations on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament," p. 41.

[2] *Ib.* p. 41, 42.

made during the last twenty years, with the increased attention which has been directed to the subject of philology generally, and with the fact that amongst the body of men who have been engaged upon the work of the New Testament Revision during the last ten years, there are scholars who are confessedly entitled to rank amongst the most distinguished textual critics and philologists of their age, will take up the volume which will shortly be put into their hands with a conviction, amounting almost to certainty, that the high expectations which they have been led to form are not doomed to meet with disappointment.

Before we conclude it will be desirable to add a few words which may help to dispel the anxiety which many devout students of God's word are known to entertain, lest the changes which must necessarily be found in any future Revision of the English New Testament should tend to weaken its authority, or to throw doubt upon any of those fundamental doctrines of Christianity which have been the common heritage of the faithful in all generations.

We will not attempt to disguise the fact, that the result of the careful collation of the numerous MSS. which have already come to light has been the discovery of variations of the text, which are reckoned not by hundreds, but by thousands. Neither will we contest the truth of the assertion that this discovery is, at first sight, calculated to awaken within the mind of the Christian a certain amount of apprehension. He may not unreasonably fear that this great variety of readings may affect some important doctrine of our common faith, or may tend to excite doubts and misgivings whether words which have been commonly regarded as inspired by the Spirit of God may not prove to be nothing more than the words of weak and fallible men. Now it may be well, in the first instance, to remind those who are exposed to this temptation of the words of one of the most distinguished scholars and critics of a past generation (we mean the illustrious Richard Bentley) as being equally applicable—perhaps even more so—to the results of the far more extensive and more elaborate collations of the present time. That distinguished scholar and critic did not hesitate to express his conviction, in regard to the various readings which had been discovered in his own time, that not "one article of faith or moral precept is either perverted or lost in them—choose as awkwardly as you will, choose the worst by design—out of the whole lump of readings."

It would be easy to show, by various illustrations, that if, by its removal from its place in the text of a passage such as 1 St. John v. 7, the upholders of the doctrine of the Trinity may be deprived of an argument which has been employed in

its support, additional evidence of the truth of that doctrine is furnished by readings which were unknown to the revisers of 1611, and which are equally, or better, entitled to a place in the text than those which were then received. But whilst it would be quite competent for us to fall back upon this ground in reply to those who allege that the foundations of the faith are jeopardized by the results of modern textual criticism, we should betray a lamentable ignorance of the real strength of our position were we to rely for its defence on so insufficient an allegation. For, independently of the consideration, which should be ever present to the mind of the believer, that the glory of God can never be promoted by our lie, and that we are alike guilty of unfaithfulness to the deposit which has been committed to our guardianship, whether we consciously add to, or whether we consciously take from, the words which are written in the Book, the real fact is, as Professor Roberts has observed, "that it constitutes the security of our faith as Christians, that such a vast collection of various readings could possibly have been formed."[1] This statement may at first sight appear to savour somewhat of paradox. It will be found, however, on reflection, to have a firm basis of truth.

Let us take, by way of illustration, one or two of the various readings to which Bishop Lightfoot has directed our attention in the valuable work to which previous reference has been made, "On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament." Now one of the divergent readings which occurs in St. John's Gospel (i. 18), and which appears to have existed as early as the second century, and soon after the middle of that century, is that of the *only begotten God* in the place of the *only begotten Son*. We do not refer to this various reading in support of the remark which we made above in regard to the counterbalancing effect of divergent readings on the doctrine of the Trinity, valuable as it is when thus considered. Our reference to it, in the present instance, is made with a different design. It is well known that some of the most powerful assaults of modern scepticism have been directed against the genuineness and the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, to which a date is assigned much later than that of the most advanced period of the life of St. John. Now it is a fact which admits of no dispute, that the existence of divergent readings is, of itself, a proof of a certain amount of antiquity, as belonging to the writings in the various copies of which those readings are discovered. If, then, divergent readings existed in different copies of the Fourth Gospel soon after the middle of the second

[1] "The Words of the New Testament," Milligan & Roberts, p. 22. T. & T. Clark. Ed. 1873.

century—as Bishop Lightfoot tells us was actually the case in regard to St. John i. 18—the date of the composition of that Gospel is carried back, by an almost irresistible weight of evidence, to a period earlier than that to which modern scepticism has assigned it.

We will refer to another illustration of our position, for which, as in the previous case, we are indebted to Bishop Lightfoot. The genuineness of the Epistle to the Ephesians, which has been received from the earliest times as one of the undoubted productions of the Apostle Paul, has been called in question during the present generation; and there is, in Bishop Lightfoot's opinion, "one formidable argument, and one only," in favour of the view which it has been reserved for modern scepticism to propound. The Church of Ephesus was one of those churches towards which the Apostle Paul stood in a peculiar and unique relation. He had resided in the city of Ephesus for about three years; and he had lived on terms of the closest intimacy with its members; and when we recall to mind the local allusions which we find in other Pauline epistles, and the special salutations which are addressed to the individual members of the churches to which the Apostle wrote, it seems strange, and to some almost incomprehensible, that there should be nothing definite and personal in this Epistle, but that, on the contrary, it should be the most colourless of all the Epistles which the Apostle wrote.[1] Now it is here that textual criticism comes in to our aid, and is found not only effectually to meet and remove that objection to the Pauline origin of the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians, but also to afford a probable key to the solution of the difficulty which has perplexed many Biblical students respecting the "Epistle from Laodicea" which the Colossian Church was enjoined to read (Col. iv. 16). This Epistle has been commonly supposed to have been lost; whereas it seems to be a fair inference from the omission of the words *at Ephesus*, and from the fact that the preposition employed is *from*, not *to*, Laodicea, that the reference of the Apostle is not to some Epistle which has been lost, but to that which is now known as the Epistle to the Ephesians. The facts are as follows.

---

[1] We are not disposed to attach the *same* amount of importance which Bishop Lightfoot does to the absence of personal references in this Epistle, inasmuch as whilst the Epistle to the Romans, a Church which the Apostle had never seen, abounds most in personal greetings, we find no such salutations, as Dean Alford reminds us, in the Epistle to the Philippians, who were "the joy and crown" of the Apostle; nor in that to the Galatians, of whom he was in labour till Christ should be formed in them, nor in those to the Thessalonians, who were patterns to believers in Macedonia and Achaia. At the same time we attach a greater amount of weight to it than is allowed by Dean Alford.

We find that in the two oldest MSS.—*i.e.*, the Vatican and the Sinaitic—the words "at (or in) Ephesus" (Ephes. i. 1) are wanting. They do not appear to have existed in the copy which was used by Tertullian; and Basil the Great, writing in the fourth century, tells us that they were not found in the oldest MSS. in his time. This testimony is confirmed by that of Jerome. "The circular character of this letter," writes Bishop Lightfoot,

"fully explains the absence of personal or historical allusions. Thus textual criticism in this instance removes our difficulty; but its services do not end here. It furnishes a body of circumstantial evidence which, I venture to think, must ultimately carry irresistible conviction as to the authorship of the letter, though for the present some are found to hesitate. For these facts supplied by textual criticism connect themselves with the mention of the letter which the Colossians are charged to get from Laodicea (Col. iv. 16), and this mention again combines with the strong resemblances of matter and diction, so as to bind these two Epistles inseparably together; while again the Epistle to the Colossians is linked not less indissolubly with the letter to Philemon by the references to person and place and circumstance. Thus the three Epistles form a compact whole, to resist the assaults of adverse criticism."[1]

It must be observed, further, that whilst, on the one hand, textual criticism brings to light the fact that some passages which were originally inserted, as seems most probable, as marginal glosses, have in the course of time crept into the text, it serves to establish the genuineness of words which were previously deemed doubtful or spurious. Thus, *e.g.*, it is found that the second clause of 1 St. John ii. 23—[*but*] *he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also*—are printed in the Authorized Version in italics, as resting upon doubtful or insufficient authority. Now these words, though omitted in some uncial MSS., are found in the three oldest and best MSS.—viz., the Vatican, the Sinaitic, and the Alexandrian; also in the early versions and in the writings of several of the ancient Fathers. The cause of their omission also in some MSS. is accounted for in a satisfactory manner. Both clauses of the verse end with the same three words in the Greek. The eye of the scribe doubtless caught the three words of the second clause, and finding that the same three words were already transcribed, thought that he had copied the whole of the verse; and instead of transcribing the second clause proceeded at once to the verse which follows.

We have endeavoured to show that if, on the one hand, a new Revision of the New Testament may excite some natural apprehensions lest the hold which our own Authorized Version has

[1] "On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament," pp. 21, 22.

taken upon the national mind should be, in any measure, relaxed; we must not lose sight, on the other hand, of the counterbalancing gain which will accrue to the cause of Christianity by the removal of the stumbling-blocks which unauthorized insertions or omissions cast in the way of the candid inquirer, and of the occasion which they supply to the unbeliever of calling in question the genuineness and the authenticity of writings for which a divine original is claimed.

We may reasonably hope, moreover, that although for a time some may be perplexed by finding that words which they have been accustomed to regard as divine can no longer be regarded in any other light than as marginal glosses which, at some remote period, crept into the text, either through the inadvertence or through the pious but indiscreet zeal of early transcribers, and also by finding that the meaning which they have hitherto been accustomed to attach to some passages is not that which the words of the original were designed to convey, the result will be to awaken the dormant energies of slumbering minds to break through the crust of that dry formality with which the Bible is too often read, as though the very act of reading operated like some magic spell, and to excite a more earnest and intelligent desire to grasp the hidden meaning which the outward covering of words was designed to convey; remembering always the solemn warning of St. Paul, "The letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life" (2 Cor. iii. 6).

The history of past Revisions abundantly justifies this anticipation. Those of our readers who are familiar with the history of the great work of Jerome will not need to be reminded of the great and apparently insuperable obstacles which were thrown in his way, and that, not only by the unlearned and the narrow-minded, but by men possessed of piety at least as fervent as his own, and of equal or greater theological attainments.[1]

And although the fact that for the last two hundred years and upwards the Revision of 1611 has been identified with all that is best and greatest in our history as a nation, and with all

[1] Nor is it uninstructive (as Bishop Lightfoot has reminded us) to observe that the very point on which his contemporaries laid the greatest stress in their charges against him, has come to be regarded by ourselves as his most signal merit. To him we owe it, that in the Western churches the Hebrew original, and not the Septuagint version, is the basis of the people's Bible; and that a broad and indelible line has been drawn once for all between the Canon of the Old Testament as known to the Hebrew nation, and the later accretions which had gathered about it in the Greek and Latin Bibles. . . . . The Articles of the English Church still continue to quote St. Jerome's authority for the distinction between the Canonical and Apocryphal books, which the Council of Trent did its best to obscure.—*On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, pp. 15, 16.

that is highest and holiest in the lives of its individual members, it well behoves us to remember that that Revision did not attain all at once to its high standard of excellence, but was itself, as has been already pointed out, the result of many successive Revisions.

The object proposed in the Revision which is now being carried on is identical with that which was proposed by the revisers of King James, and which is expressed in the following words:—

> Truly (good Christian reader) we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one; . . . . but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavour, that our mark.

In exact proportion, then, as we prize the Bible as the message of God to man, should we labour to possess it ourselves, and to present it to the eyes of others, in its purest form, and purged, so far as in us lies, from all extraneous accretions. The debt of gratitude which we owe to the untiring zeal and energy of those who have gone before us should stimulate us to carry on, and, so far as may be, to bring to perfection the work in which they so nobly engaged, and to which they were content to sacrifice not only their time and substance, but, if God so willed, as in the case of the illustrious Tyndale, their own lives also. Some temporary inconveniences may, and doubtless will, be the result of the general adoption of any other than that (so-called) *Authorized* Version of the Bible which is now in use: but if the forthcoming Revision shall prove to be a more faithful exponent of the mind of the Inspiring Spirit, if it shall be purged from some of those errors, whether of greater or lesser importance, which have crept into the text in the course of successive generations, if it shall be found to present more correct renderings of many obscure and difficult passages, and to substitute words and phrases which shall be understood by the people in the place of those which are now almost universally unintelligible, or which convey an erroneous meaning; that Revision will, we submit, have a substantial claim upon the gratitude, not only of our own nation, but of the whole English-speaking people, and will form, as Archbishop Trench foretold respecting any future Revision which should combine these results, "riches and strength to the end of time."

ART. II.—THE SOUTH AMERICAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

THE South American Missionary Society is eminently a work of faith, and, we may confidently add, a labour of love. It owes its origin to the unwearied exertions of Captain Allen Gardiner, of the Royal Navy, whose memory is still fresh and green in the hearts of many; and its very groundwork, as it is at present constituted, was prepared from plans which had been elaborated by himself. Commenced as the Patagonian Mission, it has since expanded into a Society which combines within itself the three great branches of mission work—namely, work among the heathen, among our own fellow-countrymen scattered abroad, and among the Roman Catholic population, in South America. A golden thread of continuity runs through its history, connecting the chivalrous and almost desperate enterprises of Gardiner and his companions with the later work of the present labourers in the field.

In the year 1844 a committee was formed at Brighton, and founded the Patagonian Mission. Mr. Hunt was sent out to Patagonia as the first agent of the Society, and Captain Gardiner accompanied him. After a brief residence on the coast, however, the demeanour of the natives was so threatening that they considered it absolutely necessary to leave them, and taking advantage of a passing vessel, they returned in her to England. The supporters of the Society were completely disheartened by this apparent failure; but Captain Gardiner's determination never wavered, and his faith never flagged. "I have made up my mind," he said, "to go back again to South America, and leave no stone unturned, no effort untried, to establish a mission among the aboriginal tribes. They have a right to be instructed in the Gospel of Christ." These memorable words were the key-note of his life-work. At his urgent request the money still in hand was invested, and the committee agreed to await his further research. With indomitable perseverance he travelled abroad, with persistent earnestness he pleaded at home. In 1850 a generous lady gave him £1,000. With this sum, two launches, well equipped, but too small for the purpose for which they were intended, were built under his own superintendence. A party, consisting of a surgeon, a catechist, a carpenter, and three seamen, under his command, left England, with the launches, on board a fine barque bound for Picton Island. Thence they sailed to various parts of the coast of Tierra del Fuego, where they hoped to fall in with a certain native who knew a little English, and from whom they thought they might

acquire some knowledge of the language of the country. The means at their disposal, however, were inadequate. One of the launches was injured in a gale, and afterwards was wrecked. They had failed to discover the friendly native of whom they were in search. It was therefore determined to remain in some convenient harbour, and await supplies from England or the Falklands. The place selected was Spaniard Harbour. Here they remained more than seven months, hoping against hope for succour to arrive. Everything seemed against them, but their faith and patience burnt, like beacon lights, unwavering and clear. The second boat was disabled. The fishing-net on which they chiefly relied for sustenance was carried away. Their scanty store of provisions failed. One by one the brave little band sickened and died of privation and hunger. Captain Gardiner was the last to lie down and die. Patient and trustful to the end, the last words he wrote in his journal were: "Great and marvellous are the loving-kindnesses of my gracious God unto me. He has preserved me hitherto, and for four days, although without bodily food, without any feeling of hunger or thirst."

When the news of this terrible event was received, a thrill of sympathetic sorrow ran through England. The friends of the mission remained, however, undismayed. They felt that, though mistakes might have been made, and want of prudence, verging, perhaps, even on temerity, might have been exhibited, a Christian heroism had been shown which could have been the result only of the most enthusiastic love to the Lord who had bought us with his own precious blood. It was resolved that it should be followed up as quickly and as heartily as possible. The Rev. George Pakenham Despard was the life and soul of this resolve. He had for some time been the honorary Secretary of the Mission, the head-quarters of which had been removed to Clifton. The plan adopted was that which Captain Gardiner had indicated. One part of this plan was to build a strong schooner, of a hundred tons burden, as a missionary vessel, and another was to found a station on one of the Falkland Islands, whither some of the natives of Fuegia could be brought with their own free consent, and there educated and trained, before another attempt should be made to establish a settlement in their country. This plan was zealously carried out. The vessel was built, launched under the name of the *Allen Gardiner*, and sailed from Bristol for the Falklands on October 24, 1854. Mr. J. Garland Phillips went in her as catechist, and Mr. Ellis, a surgeon, was to be in charge of the new settlement. Keppel Island, to the north of the West Falklands, a small rocky and mountainous isle, was granted by the English Government at a nominal rent, and the new station on it received the name of

Cranmer, after the English martyr. Here Mr. Ellis and Mr. Phillips lived for nearly two years, labouring with their own hands, sometimes assisted by the crew of the schooner, to make the settlement habitable and serviceable. During this period Mr. Phillips paid a visit to Tierra del Fuego in the mission vessel, where the party visited the scene of Captain Gardiner's death, and likewise some places where, it was hoped, missionary labour might ere long be commenced. Among other places, Button Island was visited, where they found the native of whom mention has already been made, and who was known by the familiar soubriquet of "Jemmy Button." This man had been brought to England in his boyhood by Captain Fitzroy, of H.M.S. *Beagle*, and had been educated here for two years under careful supervision. Though he had by this time completely returned to his native habits, he had retained a vivid recollection of English ways, and still remembered some English words. The history of Jemmy Button and his family forms some of the most remarkable strands in the thread of God's providential dealings with regard to this Society. It was not considered advisable to take any of the native children to Cranmer until that station should be completely organized and settled, though one man did express his willingness to entrust two of his children to Mr. Phillips' charge. Though this restraint was very trying to the spirit of Christian eagerness and zeal, it can now be seen, on looking back over the intervening years, that this time of waiting was of great service.

In October, 1856, the Rev. G. P. Despard arrived at Keppel as the Superintendent of the Mission. Finding that no suitable man would come forward for this position, he himself volunteered to leave the Church at home for service abroad. He was accompanied by Captain Gardiner's only son, then just leaving Oxford, by Mr. Turpin as catechist, by Mr. Thomas Bridges, then a boy thirteen years of age, and by Mr. Bartlett and his wife. Mr. Bartlett has continued there ever since as manager of the Mission farm. Life and vigour were imparted to the work by the fresh arrivals. The little settlement soon assumed a bright and cheerful appearance. Situated on the slope of a hill at the head of a picturesque bay, the cottages and storehouses and gardens gradually became homelike and inviting.

Mr. Despard's energies were in the first instance applied to the task of obtaining a fresh crew for the vessel, and he was obliged to be absent for this and other purposes at Stanley and on the coast of South America. The mission party left at Keppel were a united and happy band. Every day regular manual work alternated with prayer and study; but this was merely preparatory, and the most hearty desire was felt for more direct missionary work.

Towards the close of the year 1857 Mr. Phillips returned to England for a season, and in the following January Mr. Despard took his family to reside at Keppel, Mr. Gardiner proceeding to Tierra del Fuego on an exploring expedition, and visiting those parts of the country where he hoped to have most opportunities of intercourse with the natives. At Woollya he had an interview with Jemmy Button, who, after very little persuasion, agreed to accompany him to Keppel with his family. Others also would have gone if they had been allowed. With the assistance of Jemmy Button's broken English some progress was made in acquiring the difficult language of the Fuegians. It was, however, very uphill work. They were most reluctant to speak in the presence of their English friends, and usually conversed with each other in whispers. Their eldest child, a boy of eight or nine, who answered to the whimsical name "Threeboys," seems to have been of a peculiarly engaging disposition, and soon won the affections of those with whom he was living. The greatest kindness was shown to the whole family, and they seemed to be satisfied and contented in their new position.

This family remained at Keppel from June to November, 1858. Mr. Despard, accompanied by the two catechists, took them back to their native place in the latter month. The mission party, after a brief sojourn there, returned to Keppel with three Fuegians and their wives and two boys, named Lucca and Okokko, who all belonged to the same tribe as Jemmy Button himself. Nine months' patient training did them real good. They became clean and tidy. The boys were particularly obedient and docile. They lived with Mr. Phillips and his wife, for he had returned from England married. They acquired a very tolerable knowledge of English, and learned a few simple words of prayer. The whole party indeed appeared to be so well disposed and friendly that it was unanimously decided the time had arrived when direct mission work might be attempted in Fuegia. Woollya, on Navarin Island, opposite James Button's native place, was the spot selected. The party consisted of Mr. Phillips, Captain Fell (in command of the schooner), two mates, four seamen, and the cook. The parting instructions given to Mr. Phillips were: "Spend every day with the natives. When the weather allows you should have Sabbath morning and evening service on shore, that the natives may attend and be roused to inquiry. I pray God may give you wisdom, kindness, and courage from Jesus Christ for your work."

The party arrived at their destination in excellent spirits and animated by Christian hope. Woollya was a charming spot. The site intended for the mission-house was on a small turfy plain. A green slope ran gently to the water's edge, and on

either side were beautifully wooded hills, which were watered by sparkling brooks. The *Allen Gardiner* anchored at Woollya on November 1, 1859. The natives from Keppel were landed, but it was considered necessary to search their bundles, as they were suspected of having purloined some of the sailors' property. Few natives were to be seen at Woollya, but about three hundred assembled so soon as the news of the schooner's arrival had spread. The mission party occupied themselves at first in felling timber and in making additions to a building which had been begun during a former visit. On the morning of Sunday, November 6, all, with the exception of the cook, who remained on board the vessel, landed for the purpose of holding divine service in the unfinished building. Soon after the service had commenced, the natives suddenly surrounded them, and savagely attacked them with their clubs. The whole party were massacred as they were endeavouring to escape to the beach. The solitary survivor, after witnessing the scene from the deck of the schooner, made his escape to shore, and was kindly treated by some of those who had been at Keppel.

Not having received any tidings, Mr. Despard, after waiting three months, felt so uneasy that he despatched a vessel to make inquiries. The commander of this vessel returned with the distressing intelligence of the massacre. He brought with him Okokko, one of the young men who had formerly been at Keppel, and who, it was reported, had showed his sorrow at the time of the catastrophe by the only means in his power. He and his young wife, Camilenna, were for some time the only natives at Keppel. The days there passed quietly and uneventfully, and for a season no further communication was maintained with Fuegia; but it was the steady resolve of all that another attempt to form a settlement there should be made so soon as the paralyzing effect of this appalling disaster had passed away.

Two years after this sad event Mr. Despard returned to England. He arrived early in 1862, and in the same year the Rev. W. H. Stirling, who had during his absence acted as Secretary of the Society, went out to take his place as Superintendent of the Mission. He went out in the *Allen Gardiner*. She had been plundered and disabled by the murderous natives at the time of the massacre, but had remained substantially uninjured. She had been taken to England for repair, and had been lengthened and thoroughly refitted. Her departure with Mr. Stirling was hailed with enthusiasm by the Society's many ardent supporters. Meanwhile Mr. Bridges had been left in charge at Keppel. He had applied himself to the study of the language spoken by Okokko and his wife, and it may here be added that, from long intercourse with the people, he is the only one thoroughly acquainted with that very difficult tongue.

Mr. Stirling reached Keppel on January 30, 1863, after a long but profitable voyage, during which, among other places, he visited the north coast of Patagonia, where mission work had been commenced by agents of the Society. In the following March he considered it advisable to go to Fuegia with the object of re-opening the severed communication with the natives. Okokko accompanied him, and rendered essential service by his endeavours to press on his fellow-countrymen the truths which he himself had learned. On his return to Keppel, Mr. Stirling was able to report that he had, as the result of this visit, eleven natives under training, several of the Fuegians having entrusted their children to his care; Keppel Island had again become, what it was always intended to be, a nursery and a training-school for the Fuegians hereafter to become the instructors and exemplars of their fellow-countrymen. The following year Okokko returned to settle in his native land, as it was considered he had been sufficiently long under Christian instruction, and that the time had arrived for him to live among his own people. On arrival at Woollya it was found that a terrible epidemic had made havoc among the people; James Button, one of whose sons was of the party, and several relatives of the returning natives, being among those who had died. On this occasion a deeply affecting ceremony took place. The remains of those who had been murdered there were discovered. They had been concealed with stones heaped over them, and they were now reverently interred, the solemn funeral service of the Church of England being read over them. A crowd of the Fuegians circled round during the ceremony, and some seemed evidently touched; and the forgiving spirit shown on that occasion was not without a deep effect in softening the hearts of the natives, and in drawing them towards those who could not only thus forgive, but show kindness in return.

Fuegia and Keppel were now in friendly relations with each other. The mission station was in full working order. Little companies of natives were taken thither from time to time, and returned, when they desired, to their own country, taking advantage of the opportunity of the mission vessel going there. In the year 1865 the experiment was made of bringing four Fuegian youths to England. One of these was Threeboys, already mentioned as the son of James Button, and his visit to England was, like his father's, another link in the chain of the providential history of this Society. These youths took kindly to English ways, and they appear to have charmed those who met them with their unaffected manners and simple demeanour. Though not baptized, they were very thoughtful and devout. They seemed to be not far from the kingdom of heaven. After a sojourn in England of sixteen

months, Mr. Stirling re-embarked with them on board the *Allen Gardiner* in December, 1866; but one of them, named Urupa, did not live to see his native land again. He fell into a decline, which made rapid progress during the long voyage. He had made great advance in grace, and, at his urgent request, Mr. Stirling baptized him. A day or two before the vessel reached Keppel he died, not, however, before he had given manifest tokens that his heart had been fully given to the Lord. He was the first baptized Fuegian.

On his return to Keppel Mr. Stirling was anxious to make a more vigorous effort to establish in Fuegia some of the natives who had been under training. We have already mentioned the attempt of Okokko to live at Woollya; but his house and property were burnt by some vindictive men, and he had returned with his family to Keppel. Another site was now selected at Liwya, to the south of Beagle Channel. Okokko and four or five others were placed there, a log-house having been built for their accommodation. This experiment having proved partially successful, it was followed by Mr. Stirling himself going in January, 1869, to live among them; Ushuia, the place selected for his residence, being, however, on the opposite side of the channel in a most favourable and fertile situation. The settlers at Liwya moved across the water to be near him, and to give him the advantage of their support in his novel and somewhat hazardous position. He remained here seven months, sometimes being in danger from the evil-disposed and jealous, but always trusted and protected by those who had experienced his kindness and profited by his teaching at Keppel. Ushuia has since been the permanent mission station in Tierra del Fuego, while Keppel Island has still been retained as the base of missionary operations and of supplies. While at Ushuia, Mr. Stirling was summoned to England to be consecrated bishop, and after a brief interval he was succeeded by Mr. Bridges, who had been ordained on Trinity Sunday, 1869, and was fully prepared to carry on the work which had been so prosperously begun. For ten years Mr. Bridges remained steadfast at his post as the friend and pastor of the settlement; but in 1879 broken health compelled him to return to England to recruit his strength. While at home he has used his knowledge of the Yahgan language in translating the Gospel of St. Luke into it, and he has just returned to his beloved people in restored health and with heightened hopes, and with the good wishes and prayers of all who take an interest in the spiritual welfare of Fuegia. Without placing any undue value on numbers, we think it right to state that forty adults have been baptized since the year 1866, and that twenty-five persons baptized in their infancy are now leading consistent and, in many instances, really

godly lives, while the total number of baptisms, including those of children, amounts to about 180. The clear light of Christian influence has, moreover, shed its beneficent ray over the neighbouring people, which has been manifested in kindness to shipwrecked mariners, and in an amenity of life and manners that was formerly unknown.

The attention of Captain Gardiner was early directed to Patagonia, and his first efforts in connection with this Society were made in that country. Though his attempt was unsuccessful, the desire to benefit the Patagonians was not abandoned. A young German named Schmidt, who was afterwards joined by Mr. Hunziker, threw his whole heart into this endeavour. Residing first at Sandy Point, and afterwards at Port Santa Cruz, where an experimental station was established in 1862, they tried to gain the attention and to win the confidence of this restless and roving people; but traders soon came amongst them, bringing the fatal traffic in ardent spirits. It seemed at last quite hopeless to struggle against such demoralizing agencies, and the mission station at Santa Cruz had reluctantly to be abandoned. Another attempt was subsequently made on the northern coast at Patagones, or El Carmen. For the last sixteen years a medical missionary has been quietly labouring there, attending to the sick and wounded Patagonians, for they frequently suffer from accidents and are injured in affrays. While we sincerely deplore the fact that so little encouragement has been vouchsafed among this high-spirited race, we must bow submissively to the unerring will of him who alone can give the hearing ear and the believing heart, who "openeth, and no man shutteth; and who shutteth, and no man openeth."

In 1873 direct missionary work was undertaken amongst the heathen in the opposite quarter of South America. After a preliminary exploration it was resolved to send a mission to the Indian tribes inhabiting the regions through which the upper waters and tributaries of the Amazon flow. It commenced with trial and disaster. The first ordained missionary, the Rev. D. J. Lee, M.D., was drowned by the sinking of the vessel in which he was sleeping. In 1876 the Rev. W. T. Duke took charge of the mission with Mr. Resyek Polak, who had formerly been in Keppel, and Mr. and Mrs. Woods. The latter soon succumbed to the exhausting climate, and returned to England. The work is now facilitated by a steam-launch named the *Pioneer*, which, like the mission vessel in the south, is intended to assist the missionaries in their intercourse with the Indians and in reaching the more distant Indian settlements. Eleven children have been entrusted to the missionaries' care. Four of these have been baptized, and one, now sixteen years of age, has paid a visit to England, and has since been of great service

in the mission. A station has been established at San Pedro, on the river Purús; the Indian language is being acquired, and friendly intercourse has been opened with several of the Indian tribes, who seem to be peculiarly sensitive and shy. One of the boys recently under training has returned to his own people, and the same system being followed as in the southern mission, it is hoped that the same happy results may be vouchsafed in the north; but the undertaking is difficult and vast, and requires more volunteers to come forward for it, in order that it may be carried on effectively. Last autumn, Lieutenant Jones, of the Royal Navy, and his wife, embarked for San Pedro.

In the year 1864, in consequence of the wider scope of the Society's operations, which by that time had embraced the whole continent of South America, it was determined to drop the title that was originally assumed, and the present name, the South American Missionary Society, was adopted. As has been already stated, the design of Captain Gardiner was that the mission should extend over the whole continent of South America. His large heart was filled with large schemes of usefulness and love. The native Indians of the prairies first attracted him, and took the first place in his plans; but in the latest expression of his ideas there was a clear indication of the very course which has since been taken by this Society, of labouring among our own fellow-countrymen. Almost the last words he wrote were an affectionate exhortation to his son, that, in the event of his dedicating himself to the office of the ministry, he would either devote himself to missionary work among the Araucanian Indians in Chili, or among our fellow-countrymen who were living in the Buenos Ayrean provinces, and to Bible distribution. In another memorandum he expressed the hope that the claims of the Spanish-speaking population might not be overlooked.

With the object of fulfilling his father's dying request, the Rev. A. W. Gardiner, who had for two years cheerfully given his services to the Society as a catechist at Keppel, and had since been ordained, went in the year 1860 as its first chaplain to Lota, in Chili. His earnest hope was to approach the Araucanian Indians from that place; but his efforts were not successful, and the experimental stations which he established on the border of their territory had to be abandoned. The chaplaincy at Lota, however, led to the establishment of other chaplaincies, which in the present day form a goodly network of spiritual and evangelizing efforts among our countrymen, whether miners, or farmers, or merchants, who are scattered in large numbers throughout that wide continent, who would otherwise have been left entirely without the means of grace, and who, in too many instances, fall, on account of their sad isolation, into appalling indifference and ungodliness. This

branch of the Society's work is by no means so popular as the more direct missionary work among the heathen; but notwithstanding its lack of popularity and the very great difficulty in carrying it on, it has been, and still is, the instrument of doing equal, and, we may perhaps say, even greater good in advancing the Redeemer's kingdom and in promoting his glory.

The Society has now several ministers of the Gospel, lay agents, and schoolmasters in various places throughout the country, the custom being to give grants-in-aid to supplement the exertions of the English inhabitants to supply their own spiritual necessities. In addition to the benefit, both reflex and direct, which has thus been conferred on the Spanish-speaking population, Bibles or Scripture portions in Spanish have been sold or distributed amongst a people who have hitherto been totally deprived of the Word of God, and a distinct protest has been made against the errors of Rome. Several schools are maintained, and mission work has been undertaken among the seamen in some of the harbours. In these various ways good is being done; but when the depressing nature of the tropical climate, the deadening influence of a formal religion, the constant contact with the most disheartening carelessness in spiritual things, the precariousness of local support, the difficulty of obtaining the services of suitable men, and many other adverse circumstances, are taken into consideration, we may well rejoice over the good which has been achieved, rather than indulge in vain laments over the failures which, in this as in every work for God, have unhappily occurred.

Not having sufficient space to dwell on the details of the work among the Spanish-speaking population, we will simply mention one or two instances of cheering results during the past year. Mr. Lett wrote last May:—

> Yesterday I had my second public Spanish service. I preached, and there was an offertory for the charity fund. It was quite a pleasant service. A good deal of interest is shown by some of our English people in this missionary work, which is primarily intended for Protestants of all kinds and nationalities who do not speak English, but which will extend, as a matter of course, to the general population. I am now beginning to enrol those who wish to form a Spanish congregation, taking the Apostles' Creed and the Sixth Article as the basis of profession, and we have received eight names already.

Mr. Shimield writes:—

> In Salto I have had the happiness of seeing Sunday evening services in the Spanish language inaugurated with very encouraging success. From the first there has been a steady increase, and now the seats are well filled.

In consideration of the wider sphere of action opening out before the Society, and of the increased support being given to it, it was thought advisable to remove the office from Clifton (where it had been for many years) to London. This was accordingly done, and the office was transferred thither on New Year's Day, 1866. The committee was enlarged, so that those who were most deeply interested in the spiritual welfare of South America, both in London and other places, might be represented; and the management of the Society's affairs has since been conducted in the great city in which the influence and energy of England are chiefly centred.

In 1869 another most important event in the history of the Society took place. It was felt that the increasing number of the clergy of the Church of England in America required episcopal supervision, and it was considered that no one could more appropriately be called upon to fill the responsible position of bishop than the Rev. W. H. Stirling, who had been connected with the Society for so many years, both as Secretary and as missionary, and who was at that time occupying the most prominent post of danger and of honour in the Mission. He was summoned home for this purpose, and was consecrated Bishop of the Falkland Islands on December 21, 1869. He has since acted as the Society's Superintendent, and, ever true and faithful as he has proved himself to his solemn trust, the words which the great Apostle wrote regarding his own unwearied labours may be truly said of him—he has been "in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils in the sea, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often. Beside those things that are without, that which cometh on him daily, the care of all the churches."

The organization of the Society's foreign work being thus consolidated under an ecclesiastical head, the outward machinery appears to be complete. The one desire of those who have the management of its affairs is, that more heavenly zeal and hallowed energy than ever should be thrown into the working of every part of the spiritual machine. They are fully resolved, by the grace and help of God, to maintain, in all their freshness and vigour, the grand principles on which the Society was founded, and heartily trust that the Holy Spirit will graciously pour renewed life and earnestness and power into all their proceedings. They adhere tenaciously to the pure doctrines of the Reformed English Church. The Society was the result of one remarkable man's personal influence and exertions, but it is not dependent on man. Though the flush of the first love and devotion may have passed away, it has entered on a new and greatly extended phase of existence and of work; and it is confidently expected that the Christian zeal and enthusiasm and faith of a new generation will carry it forward in the same

loving and self-denying spirit which gave it birth. Its supporters look onward with unabated courage and hope, believing that, if they continue their work in humility and faith, the great Head of the Church will not fail to own and prosper their labours.

HENRY MORRIS.

ART. III.—THE LIFE OF LORD CAMPBELL.

Life of John, Lord Campbell. By his Daughter, the Hon. Mrs. HARDCASTLE. 2 vols. John Murray. 1880.

THE biographies of successful lawyers generally follow on the same lines, and seldom drop out of the ordinary high road which leads to forensic triumphs. From start to finish the details of the race rarely vary. Early years of study and obscurity, more or less long according to the talents and opportunities of the young candidate for the woolsack; some important case well conducted, which causes briefs to pour in; a rapidly rising name at the bar; a seat in the House of Commons, to be followed by the posts of Solicitor-General and Attorney-General; and then, in the natural order of things, the prizes of the Bench. Yet, monotonous as is the history of their pursuit after fame, the lives of great lawyers are among the most interesting of all the subjects that engage the attention of biography. A famous barrister has necessarily to see much of the world, he is the leader in many a *cause célèbre*, he combines politics with a study of the law, he is a statesman before he is a judge, and his letters and comments often throw much light upon the secret history of the times; whilst as a judge the revelations disclosed as to the life behind the scenes of the judicial career are always full of novel interest. Take the biographies of the Bench from the days of Sir Thomas More to our own time, and there is not one which is not eminently readable; whilst amongst their number they include the chattiest and in its own way the best biography ever written—the "Life of Lord Eldon," by Twiss. The work before us is no exception to the rule. Mrs. Hardcastle has performed her editorial duties in excellent taste and with a touch loving yet critical; she writes in graceful English, and she has exercised no little skill in manipulating the mass of matter with which she was entrusted so as to render it compressed and coherent. Still, in spite of this full and careful biography, we doubt whether it will cause posterity to alter its verdict as to the character of the quondam Lord Chancellor. Lord Campbell was one of the best exponents of the gospel of "getting on;"

to arrive at the goal he set before him was the one aim of his life; he was indifferent to what course he pursued, provided it led him on to success; he worked, he flattered, he humoured the useful, and dropped them when no longer necessary; he was eminently good-tempered and genial, though even in his merry moments he was keenly alive to his own interests. In his character there was nothing great and noble beyond his industry; his life is the record of success won by toil, by tact that never loses an opportunity, and by that ken which harshly limits its vision to the main chance. If the one end of life is to get on and prosper, no better example can be followed than that set by John, first Lord Campbell.

Like so many men who have climbed to the woolsack—Eldon, Thurlow, St. Leonards, Westbury, and their predecessors—"Jock" Campbell was of humble origin. The son of a poor Scottish minister, he saw that his future entirely depended upon himself, and that he owed little to the favours of fortune. He read hard as a boy, and took to his books kindly. His father hoped that the lad would enter the ministry and develop into one of the celebrities of the Established Church north of the Tweed. But as young Scott, afterwards Lord Eldon, dreamt of higher things than going into the coal trade, so the boy Jock declined to content himself with a future limited to a greystone manse and a church in some Highland village. Dr. Johnson has said that the finest view in Scotland is the high road to England, and young Campbell was somewhat of the same opinion. In his own poor land, with its few prizes and crowds of competitors, he saw that he had no career. He wanted a wider arena for his abilities; so he turned his eyes south, and saw in the wealth and intellectual activity of London the promise for reward to cheer his hours of industry. After a journey of six-and-thirty hours by coach, he reached the metropolis half dead with fatigue and hunger. For the first few months he eked out a scanty livelihood by teaching a little boy the rudiments of Latin, and by scribbling paragraphs for the *Oracle* newspaper, and hack work on the *Annual Register*. From his humble garret he gazed upon the gardens of the Temple, and longed, with the ambition that refuses to be thwarted, to be enrolled as a law student. But unfortunately there were fees to pay and dinners to be eaten, and the penniless youth had enough to do with the few coins that found their way into his pocket, without parting with any of them to pay the demands of one of the Inns of Court. He had, however, a ready pen, and the year after his arrival in London he was fortunate enough in obtaining an engagement upon the *Morning Chronicle* as one of its permanent staff. Newspaper work is now-a-days a lucrative profession, and many a struggling barrister has found himself

indebted to "copy" during that dreary interval when attorneys' clerks refused to run up his staircase with the welcome briefs. But in the time of Campbell's youth journalism was a poorly-paid calling, fit mainly for Grub Street hacks and miserable wretches who had no alternative between the press and the debtor's prison. The future Chancellor saw, however, that it was a means to an end, and wrote his articles, paid his student's fees, and kept his terms, but preserved his connection with the *Morning Chronicle* a rigid secret. The young men he met in hall and in chambers would have shunned him, and treated him as a pariah had they known that one of their order had sunk so low as to write newspaper articles for money. They, however, unconsciously often criticized his articles, and made him start "like a guilty thing." "I am terribly alarmed," he writes, "when there is any talk about newspapers or reporters, and on one or two occasions my confusion might easily have been discovered."

Thanks, however, to his pen, he managed to scrape enough to pay his way, and to live without absolute privation. It is said that men in whom the workings of genius are strong, predict the future they are one day to command. The child we know is father of the man, and the subjects which gravely interest his youth often lead him on to that after study which secures fame for his ripening years. We are told that Petrarch, when a boy, was ever beating a retreat to silent haunts in order to scribble sonnets to certain of his gentler playmates. The early days of Sir Joshua Reynolds were spent, much to his father's disapproval, in sketching the faces of the different visitors who called at the house. Bacon, when scarcely out of the nursery, was so noted for thoughtful observation, that Queen Elizabeth nicknamed him "the young Lord Keeper." Some of the finest passages of Racine were composed when the future poet was but a pupil at Port Royal. Milton has sung to us in memorable verse what were his aspirations as a lad:—

> When I was yet a child, no childish play
> To me was pleasing: all my mind was set
> Serious to learn and know, and thence to do
> What might be public good; myself I thought
> Born to that end, born to promote all truth,
> All righteous things.

Some such indications of the bent of his genius young Campbell now displayed. He felt that his calling was for the profession of the law. He was a glutton at work, he had that peculiar gift which out of a mass of irrelevant matter picks out the salient points, with him the grasp of the subtleties of a question was almost an instinct, he wrote and expressed himself

well, and he had a natural liking for legal studies. He was sure that he had within him the making of a lawyer. Writing to his sister when only nineteen, young Campbell says: "I do not think that Lord Thurlow, Lord Loughborough, Lord Kenyon, or Lord Eldon, had a better chance at my age of filling their high offices than I now have of succeeding them. There is nothing like aiming at something great." His father, however, still wanted him to come north and forsake the Bar for the Scottish Communion; but the son, true to his genius, declined to swerve from the path that lay before him. "When I am in low spirits," he writes to his parents, "and sitting alone in my gloomy garret, I contemplate with pleasure the idea of being licensed and procuring a settlement in the Church. I spurn it when I hear the eloquent addresses of Law, of Gibbs, of Erskine; and while my whole heart burns within me, a secret voice assures me that if I make the attempt I shall be as great as they. Whether this impulse is the admonition of God or the instigation of the devil, we shall discuss at length when we meet."

He was called to the Bar in 1806. He took chambers in the Temple, and became the proud possessor of a clerk, "a scrubby boy, nine years old, the son of my washerwoman." Like his master, the clerk might have or might have not a future before him. "He can scarcely read," says the young counsel, "and far less write; but he blacks my shoes in the morning, brushes my coat, carries down my wig to Westminster, and goes errands for me to all parts of the town. The only use I have for a clerk is to keep the chambers open, and this he can do as well as if he had taken his degree at Oxford. When I am Attorney-General he may perhaps, like Erskine's clerk, be worth £20,000, receiving £5 per cent. on all his master's fees; but at present he is satisfied with being clothed from my old wardrobe and receiving five shillings a week." At first the future of this mixture of clerk, valet, and porter did not seem promising. Briefs were painfully conspicuous by their absence, and Campbell was forced, to maintain himself, to continue his connection with the press, and to make out by leading articles, dramatic criticisms, and reports of Parliamentary speeches, for his temporary repudiation by the attorneys. His life was not extravagant, and reminds us somewhat of the days when the afterwards Lord Eldon, then an almost briefless barrister, used to visit Fleet Market and buy a pennyworth of sprats for his supper. "I dine at home for a shilling," writes young Campbell to his brother, "go to the coffee-house once a day, fourpence; to the theatre once a week, three-and-sixpence." His progress was slow, and nothing but his economy, his perseverance, and above all his sincere belief in himself, could have supported him during this period of struggle. Now and then briefs came to his lonely chambers, but, they

were few and far between. He was a Whig, and the Tories were then in power, and he could therefore hope for nothing from the Government. "Third circuit without a brief," he mournfully enters in his diary. To make matters worse, he was now deeply in love with Miss Scarlett, a daughter of Sir James Scarlett, afterwards Lord Abinger; he proposed, but was not accepted. "What is to become of me?" he cries. "I know not. I am at this moment wholly unfit to perform the duties of life. I most sincerely believe that it would be the best thing for myself and my friends if I were at once released from them." Fortunately, however, the young lady was not very cruel, and, true to the responses of her sex, her No turned out afterwards to mean Yes; she encouraged him still to hope; she named the happy day, and they were made man and wife at the parish church of the pleasant little village of Abinger in Surrey.

Professional success now followed in the wake of his marriage, which was in every respect a happy one. Attorneys at first slow to recognize his abilities, now began fully to appreciate the judgment and care he bestowed upon a case. Briefs crowded the tables in his chambers, and the quondam idle clerk was pressed on all sides by anxious queries and frequent visitors. The reign of the Tories was on the wane, and the burning question of Reform was propitious to the Whigs. In 1830 Campbell was returned to Parliament as member for Stafford, and once in the House his rise was rapid. Two years later he became Solicitor-General, and in 1834 Attorney-General to Lord Grey's Ministry. He was now elected member for Edinburgh, which city he continued to represent till 1841. On the dissolution of the Melbourne Cabinet he was raised to the Bench. "Lord John Russell and Lord Melbourne," he writes, "spontaneously intimated to me that they wished me to hold the Great Seal of Ireland as successor to Lord Plunket, and to take my place in the Upper House, which would create no permanent addition to the peerage: I accepted the offer." He took the title of Baron Campbell, his wife having previously been created a peeress in her own right with the title of Baroness Stratheden. On taking his seat in the Upper House he was greeted by his old rival Brougham, who came forward and said, "How do you do, *My Lord*—Jack no longer?" The new Baron begged the questioner not to remind him of his misfortunes. "Well, there is one consolation for you here," said Brougham, "that you may speak when you please, and as often as you please, and on what subject you please, and you may say what you please." "I suppose," replied Campbell, "you lay down the rule of the House from your own practice, but it will only suit *you*. None but yourself can be your parallel." In 1850, on the resignation of Lord Denman, Campbell was

appointed Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench. We know how he passed his days as a briefless barrister; this is how he spent them when transferred to the serene heights of the Bench.

I never rise in the morning to study (he writes) but get up to read the newspaper. By half-past eight we have prayers, and all breakfast together. Next I mount my horse to ride down to Westminster through Kensington Gardens, Hyde Park, Constitution Hill, the Mall or Birdcage Walk, my dear daughter Mary generally accompanying me. I am the first in the judges' robing room. In drop my lagging puisnes, and, after a little friendly gossip, we take our places on the bench. Here we sit from a few minutes past ten till about half-past four. I go to the House of Lords when it sits, continuing there till between six and seven, when their lordships generally adjourn. I walk or ride home, and have a mutton-chop or some such repast ready for me, never taking above two glasses of wine. About eight the whole family meet at tea, a most delightful meal. I hate great dinners, although I am obliged to submit to them sometimes, both at home and abroad. In the evening I write judgments or look into the Crown or Special papers for the following day, and go to bed about one."

Nine years after his appointment to the Queen's Bench, he held the seals as Lord Chancellor in the Palmerston Administration. He died suddenly, June 23, 1861.

Lord Campbell will chiefly be remembered as the author of those two chatty, gossiping books, "The Lives of the Lord Chancellors," and the "Lives of the Chief Justices." He makes no pretence to originality of research, his authorities are those that are readiest to hand, nor does he bore us with grave reflections and dissertations; but he is eminently readable, and his pages, if deemed superficial and incorrect by the antiquary and historian, will always be a welcome addition to the circulating library. To those who wish to know both the man and his work, these volumes of Mrs. Hardcastle will well repay perusal. They are full of anecdote and of interesting accounts of Lord Campbell's more distinguished contemporaries.

Art. IV.—THE STRUGGLE FOR THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

A Retrospect.

IT must be patent to everybody that though the crisis through which the English Church is passing is not nearly over, it has at all events entered upon a different phase. The object of our hopes and fears is no longer the ascertaining of

doubtful law, but the enforcement of ascertained law; and this change in the character of the questions at issue affords a good opportunity for taking a retrospect of the questions which have been settled. As he who would thoroughly understand some great war must wander over the theatre of the campaign, noting the progress of the sieges and the battlefields: so it will not be otherwise than instructive to present a short sketch in order of time of the various pitched battles which have taken place in this struggle for our old Church. For battles they undoubtedly were, and are, though waged in the law-courts instead of in the field; and, considering the feelings excited in the course of the contest, civilization may take considerable credit for the change of *venue*.

The struggle has been, like Inkerman, a soldiers' struggle. Our Episcopal generals, our clerical officers, have, indeed, been present at the fighting, but no skill or generalship on their part would have sufficed to win the victory if it had not been that the troops they commanded were of the stuff by which such battles are won. The bishops, indeed, candidly confessed their inability to cope with the danger. However it came about, circumstances had deprived the Church for the time of the active assistance of its official leaders; but, like the famous Ten Thousand when they had lost their generals, Churchmen rose to the occasion. Let us at once admit that it could not have been expected that our bishops should undertake the duties for which in former times it might have been not unnatural to look to them. A glance at the enormous diminution in the Episcopal incomes which took place under the Legislation of 1836, will show how absurd it is to expect the bishops of to-day to undertake what their predecessors could scarcely have afforded to do.

Nor, indeed, is it desirable that the Protestant Reformation should even appear to have left us in the same state of helpless dependence on our clergy which we commiserate in the members of churches not blessed with the same healthy individuality and vivifying self-reliance as ourselves.

The first case brought before the Courts relating to the Ritualist controversy was the case of *Faulkner v. Litchfield*, commonly known as the "Stone Altar" case. It was an application for a faculty to allow in the Round Church at Cambridge an immovable stone altar, weighing about 1¾ tons, in the place of the old Communion Table, which for this purpose had been removed, and as it seems (without much of that excessive reverence which Ritualists now profess for such things) broken up. The nominal applicants were two churchwardens; who were, however, but the catspaws of a society which, in this respect, undertook the functions now devolved on the so-called English

Church Union. Judgment was given by Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, the then Judge of the Arches Court, deciding that the proposed structure was not a lawful Communion Table for which a faculty could be granted.

In this case a stone altar was not the only thing involved. A stone credence table was also applied for, and also refused; but this part of the decision was reviewed subsequently, as we shall presently see.

The cases of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas, Pimlico (*Liddell v. Westerton* and *Liddell v. Beal*) were decided in the years 1855–1857. In St. Paul's there was a wooden cross fixed into a ledge or super-altar; in St. Barnabas there was a cross on a rood-screen, and a jewelled cross upon and fixed to a stone altar.

As to the crosses, the Court decided that an architectural decoration was not illegal simply because it consisted of a cross; and that consequently the cross on the screen was not illegal. In the reasoning which led to this conclusion the Court had incidentally to consider and discuss the meaning of the "ornaments" rubric; and they came to the conclusion that by the word "ornaments" were meant utensils and things to be used in the services, such as cups, patens, &c., and not mere decorations or adornments. They were asked to hold that the cross on the screen at St. Barnabas was illegal because not allowed by the "ornaments" rubric; but they refused to accede to the application, on the ground that, whether legal or illegal on other grounds, the "ornaments" rubric at least did not make it illegal, inasmuch as mere architectural decorations or adornments were not "ornaments" within the meaning of that rubric. In order to arrive at this conclusion with regard to the meaning of this word "ornaments," they passed in review the several rubrics and directions on the same subject which had been in force previously to the year 1662; they showed how in previous rubrics the word "ornaments" must have meant "things to be used in the service," and not "decorations," and still meant *the same thing*, notwithstanding variations from time to time in the rubrics; and notwithstanding that the rubric of 1604 adopted the language of Queen Elizabeth's Prayer-Book, while the rubric of the present Prayer-Book adopts the language of Queen Elizabeth's Statute of Uniformity. "They all," said the Court, "obviously mean the same thing, that the same *dresses*, and the same *utensils or articles which were used* under the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI., may still *be used*."

Unfortunately, in printing the above passage the editor or the printers forgot to print in italics the words which we have italicized. The reader will not have failed to perceive that the question the Court was considering when it uttered these words

was whether a mere architectural decoration, such as the cross on the screen, was or was not one of the "ornaments" spoken of in the rubric; and the meaning of the rest of the rubric was perfectly irrelevant as soon as the Court had come to the conclusion that the rubric was not intended to apply to anything but "things *to be used*." This is the celebrated passage which the Ritualists quote as legalizing the Edwardian vestments. Any one can see that it really does nothing of the kind when the context is considered; and if the words had been italicized, the Ritualists could not even pretend to have been mistaken, or to have been led to think that Edwardian vestments were under discussion in the Knightsbridge cases.

After dismissing the "ornaments" rubric as inapplicable, the Court went on to consider whether the cross on the screen was illegal on any of the other grounds which had been urged against it, and finally decided in favour of the cross as a mere architectural adornment not in danger—as their lordships thought—of being abused.

The stone altar at St. Barnabas, with the cross upon the super-altar, was declared illegal, and the decision in the Cambridge case on this point was expressly approved. The table must be of wood and movable. It must also be flat, so that a cloth may be thrown over it; and, therefore, the cross affixed to the table at St. Paul's was declared illegal. But the credence tables were declared legal and even proper. And, with regard to the altar-cloths, it was held that although only one at a time was lawful, it did not follow that it might not be from time to time changed. But embroidery and lace were held to be inconsistent with the fair white linen cloth to be used at Communion, and consequently to be illegal.[1]

Such were the decisions of the Judicial Committee on the points brought up to it. Other points had been decided in the previous stages of the litigation, but did not come up before the Lords of the Council—viz., that candlesticks with unlighted candles might stand on the Table, because they might be lighted if required to give light; that a chancel screen was not in itself unlawful, although the brazen gates therein were disapproved of; and that the Ten Commandments ought to be set up on the eastern wall.

We now come to the cases of *Simpson v. Flamank*, a case from the diocese of Exeter, and *Martin v. Mackonochie*. And it is

[1] The case of St. Barnabas came up again in 1860, upon complaint made that the former judgment had not been obeyed; and on that occasion the Court expressed an opinion that it was not unlawful to place a movable block of wood at the back of the table for the candlesticks to stand on, provided it could be removed for the purpose of laying the cloth.

desirable to go somewhat into detail in narrating the progress of these and other suits, because a little attention to the dates of the proceedings will effectually vindicate the Church party from the imputation of any undue haste or vindictive urgency in pressing for what is now admitted to be their undoubted right to their old services.

The suit against Mr. Simpson was instituted in the year 1866, and related to the offences of mixing water with the wine at consecration; the elevation of the elements; using lights on the Communion Table when not required; and placing the alms not on the table but on a stool beside it.

The trial was delayed till the end of the year 1867 by preliminary difficulties raised by Mr. Simpson, both in the Arches Court and also, by way of appeal, before the Privy Council. These difficulties were so frivolous that on the appeal the Archbishop of York, in delivering the judgment of the Court, declared that their lordships were unable to look upon the objections raised as otherwise than groundless, and made only for the purpose of delay.

However, in December, 1867, the suit of *Simpson v. Flamank* came to a hearing before the Court of Arches, together with the first suit of *Martin v. Mackonochie*, and judgment in both suits was given in March, 1868. The charges against Mr. Simpson we have already described. Those against Mr. Mackonochie were elevation, lighted candles on the table, the use of incense, the mixing of water with the wine during the service, and kneeling during consecration. The Court of Arches held that the lighted candles and the kneeling at consecration were lawful, but the rest of the above-mentioned charges in both cases were held to be offences. Mr. Mackonochie did not appeal from this judgment, having, doubtless, good reason for supposing that it was as favourable to him as he could possibly expect; but the decision on the kneeling at consecration was so startlingly opposed to a common-sense view of the law and practice of the Reformed Church of England, that the promoter appealed to the Privy Council, and obtained a reversal of the decision of Sir Robert Phillimore, on both the points upon which that judge had been in favour of Mackonochie; so that the illegality of kneeling at consecration, as well as of the lighted candles on the Communion Table, when not wanted for the purpose of giving light, was established; and the defendant adjudged to have been in the wrong on all the charges. So well did the event justify the suit and vindicate the old practice of the Church.

It will be observed that the charge against Mr. Mackonochie as to kneeling at Consecration related to his *posture* merely; not to his *position*. No question was then raised as to *where* he was to stand or kneel, as the case might be; but only

whether he was to stand all through the prayer of Consecration, or might kneel down in the course of it. Both questions, no doubt, depended for their answer on the rubric before the prayer of Consecration; but only the question of *posture* was before the Court in this case. The question of *position* was not argued by the counsel engaged, nor adjudicated by the Court. But because the Court in giving judgment on the one point let fall an expression apparently applicable to both points, it has been most unfairly contended by the Ritualists that *both* points were settled in this case, and that the subsequent cases in which the question of *position* was really discussed and decided are contradictory to this case of *Martin v. Mackonochie.*

We give the passage, italicizing the words fixed on by the Ritualists. The reader will observe how casually the words in question were introduced; and perhaps he may wonder by what process of reasoning they could be twisted into a solemn decision in favour of the eastward position:—

> The Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration then follows, and is in these words:—"When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the bread and wine that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the prayer of consecration, as follows." Their Lordships entertain no doubt (on the construction of this rubric) that the Priest is intended to continue in one posture during the prayer, and not to change from standing to kneeling, or *vice versâ;* and it appears to them equally certain that the Priest is intended to stand, and not to kneel. *They think that the words "standing before the Table" apply to the whole sentence;* and they think this is made more apparent by the consideration that acts are to be done by the Priest before the people, as the prayer proceeds (such as taking the paten and chalice into his hands, breaking the bread, and laying his hand on the various vessels), which could only be done in the attitude of standing.—*The Law Reports, Privy Council,* vol. ii. p. 382.

Up to this point the litigation had been conducted as if the only object had been to determine the law; not to enforce it. The sentences had not been penal, but declaratory of the law; and nobody supposed that any more was required than a mere monition. "You are wrong; don't do it again, and pay the costs," seemed quite enough to meet the case. But, towards the end of 1869, complaint was made that Mr. Mackonochie was repeating the forbidden practices. There was evidence brought before the Privy Council that Mr. Mackonochie continued to elevate the elements, to kneel or prostrate himself before the consecrated elements, and to use lighted candles on the Communion Table when they were not wanted. Mr. Mackonochie appeared in person; was it because he could get no lawyer to degrade himself to the point of arguing for the defence set up?

Mr. Mackonochie *swore that he had endeavoured to obey the monition, and had never intentionally or advisedly in any respect disobeyed it.* But what had he done? He had elevated the elements, but only to a level with his head; he had used lighted candles, but had blown them out just before the Communion service began; he had bent his knee as if in the act of kneeling, but had not, as he said, allowed his knee actually to touch the ground, although nobody in the Church could tell whether it did or did not touch the ground. The judgment of the Privy Council on the matter is one which should be written in letters of gold, as a perpetual witness to future ages of the impartiality of the Ecclesiastical Courts of the Established Church of England. If their standard of morality ever permitted them to warp the law in the slightest degree, it would have been justified in this case by the wrigglings of the priest before them. What he had done was clearly illegal; they had no doubt of that: but he was brought before them not for illegal practices, but for *breach of the monition;* and consequently they had to look to what the monition had forbidden. It turned out that what he had been charged with, and what the monition had forbidden him to repeat, was elevation *above the head,* and the use of lighted candles *during the Communion service,* and consequently he had not disobeyed the monition in those respects. That the decision favourable to Mr. Mackonochie in these respects was not due to any of that sentimental limpness which some clerical and episcopal minds are so apt to mistake for impartiality, is shown by the judgment of the Court on the kneeling. The acts of the defendant were of course substantially kneeling, and the Court had no hesitation in so holding. But they gave credit, generously enough, to Mr. Mackonochie's oath that he wished to obey the monition, and let him off on his paying the costs.

In November, 1870, however, application was again made to the Privy Council alleging a breach of this monition. The acts were done not by Mr. Mackonochie himself, but by three other clergymen in his presence and with his sanction. Two of them denied on oath that they had elevated the paten or chalice above their heads during the prayer of consecration; the third only denied that he had done so intentionally. Their names should be known: they were Messrs. Howes, Stanton, and Willington. The Court had already had some experience of the necessity of carefully scrutinizing Mr. Mackonochie's evidence; and this is what—it needs no comment—they said: "These affidavits might, according to a possible view entertained by the reverend gentlemen, be regarded by them as literally true, because the paten was not elevated by them but a wafer bread, and *the whole of* the cup was not raised

above the head, but only the upper part of it." We need scarcely add that the Court believed the witnesses on the other side; and they suspended the reverend gentleman for three months.

A little before this—that is to say, in February, 1870—the suit of *Elphinstone v. Purchas* came before Sir Robert Phillimore in the Arches, and related to a perfect multitude of innovations. All of them, except two minor points, relating to flowers on the Communion Table and a marked pause in the prayer for the Church militant, were ultimately decided against Mr. Purchas, although there were a few points on which the promoter was obliged to appeal from Sir Robert Phillimore to the Privy Council. However, Sir R. Phillimore condemned as illegal certain processions, the having an attendant holding up a crucifix while the Gospel is being read, the smearing of ashes on people's faces during Communion service, the censing, and sprinkling of water over candles, the ringing of a bell during the Consecration prayer, the Agnus Dei, announcing during the service a "mortuary service for the repose of a sister," the ceremonial admission of an "acolyte," censing a crucifix, censing persons and things, elevation of the offertory alms and putting them on a side-table instead of on the Communion Table, the ceremonial use of lighted candles in different parts of the church, the ceremonial use of a crucifix on the Table, veiling and unveiling it, bowing to it, swinging a stuffed dove over the Table, leaving the Table sometimes bare altogether, using the sign of the cross, kissing a book as part of the service, elevating the chalice during the prayer for the Church militant, reading collects with his back to the people, announcing the celebration of the Holy Communion after a fashion of his own, announcing unauthorized festivals, and the wearing of tippets, scarlet stoles, dalmatics, girdles, amices and maniples. On every single point in this long list the promoter was held to be perfectly right, even in the Court of Arches, besides other points which we have not mentioned because they had been decided previously in other cases. The points decided by Sir Robert Phillimore in favour of Mr. Purchas, and on which the promoter appealed to the Queen in Council, were the administering of water mixed with wine, the eastward position at consecration, the use of wafer bread, the use of holy water, the wearing of a chasuble, alb, and tunicles, and carrying a biretta. The appeal was decided in February, 1871, and condemned the chasubles, albs, and tunicles, the wafer bread, the mixed chalice, and the eastward position; but decided that it was no offence to *carry* a biretta without wearing it; and the charge as to the holy water was held not to have been proved by the evidence. Mr. Purchas did not choose to appear on this appeal, so that his side was

not represented in argument except so far as the judgment of Sir R. Phillimore in the Court below answered the same purpose.

The case of *Sumner v. Wix*, decided together with *Elphinstone v. Purchas* in the Court of Arches, condemned Mr. Wix for having candles held up before him when reading the Gospel, using lighted candles in a retable just over the Communion Table, and others on each side of the table, and for using incense.

In March, 1871, Mr. Purchas applied to the Privy Council to re-hear the appeal in his case, which had been decided in his absence as we have already mentioned, alleging that then, for the first time, he had been put in possession of pecuniary assistance for the purpose. But the Court, of course, held that a man could not be allowed to take his chance of an appeal being unsuccessful, and afterwards, when it has gone against him, come in and ask for a re-hearing; and they dismissed Mr. Purchas's application.

But more serious matter than mere ceremonial was in the air. The doctrines of Mr. Bennett, of Frome, on the Real Presence were called in question, and came before Sir R. Phillimore in the Arches Court, in July, 1870. The doctrines of Archdeacon Denison on the same subject had been challenged so long ago as 1854, and he had been condemned for heresy; but on a technical objection to the jurisdiction, a side issue, such as that which sheltered the Bishop of Natal, the proceedings against him had been quashed. Mr. Bennett's case was decided in his favour in the Arches Court, and at the end of 1871 this decision was affirmed by the Queen in Council. It is unnecessary to explain how this decision was arrived at; suffice it to say that Mr. Bennett got off, as the expression goes, by the skin of his teeth. One example will show how subtle were the distinctions raised. Mr. Bennett had published three editions of a certain work; in the two first he had declared for adoration of the consecrated elements, but in the third edition he had altered this to adoration of Christ present in the Sacrament. Both Courts said he might have the benefit of the alteration, but both Courts would have condemned him if he had not made the alteration. And it cannot be too often impressed upon the public mind that it was not decided that Mr. Bennett's doctrines were the doctrines of the Church of England; it was not even decided that Mr. Bennett's doctrines were not forbidden by the laws of the Church of England; the decision was simply that such of the doctrines of Mr. Bennett as were alleged by the promoter to be heretical, were not forbidden by those particular articles and formularies which the promoter quoted for that purpose. There is the more need for calling attention to this

circumstance just now, with reference to the ridiculous complaint that lawyers decide what are the doctrines of the Church of England; whereas they only interpret the language in which the Church of England has expressed so much of her doctrine as she has thought fit to put into writing for the very purpose of being enforced by lawyers; and only so much of that language as the promoter has chosen to bring before their notice.

In July, 1872, it was again necessary to apply to the Court to enforce the monition obtained against Mr. Purchas. He was proved to have continued his illegal practices in spite of the monition, and was suspended *ab officio et beneficio* for one year. The power of the Court, however, to enforce the monition in this way, without a fresh suit, is one of the points contested in the common law proceedings now pending in the House of Lords.

In 1874 a second suit was commenced against Mr. Mackonochie, charging him with what we may now call the usual illegalities. This suit came to a hearing in December, 1874, when Sir Robert Phillimore thought it consistent with his duty to sentence Mr. Mackonochie to suspension *ab officio* only for a period of six weeks, with a monition to abstain for the future from his illegal practices.

It will be convenient to give a short notice here of the various other points decided as to the furniture and architectural adornments of the Church, especially of the chancel and Communion Table.

In December, 1873, a baldacchino or marble canopy erected over the Communion Table was decided to be an unlawful ornament, in the case of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, *White v. Bowron*, in the Consistory Court of London. And the case of *Durst v. Masters*, decided by the Privy Council in July, 1876, is an additional authority, confirming the decision in the Knightsbridge cases, for saying that it is illegal to have a movable wooden cross on a retable or wooden ledge at the back of, and immediately above, the Communion Table. This case is remarkable for the circumstance that it was the offending clergyman himself who was the prosecutor, or persecutor as the Ritualists call it.

The Exeter reredos case, after having been heard before the Bishop of Exeter at his visitation, and afterwards appealed to the Arches Court, was again appealed to the Queen in Council, who, in February, 1875, decided that the reredos in question was not illegal. It consisted of sculptured representations in high relief of the Ascension, the Transfiguration, and the Descent of the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost, with angels as finials; and there appeared no likelihood that it would lead to superstition or be abused. In a subsequent case of St. Ethelburga's,

Bishopsgate, in 1878, Dr. Tristram refused a faculty for a wooden carved reredos with thirty figures—five of our Lord—in relief, painted and gilded.

In the Denbigh case, in June, 1877, the Court of Arches allowed a reredos, of which the central compartment consisted of a sculptured panel representing the Crucifixion, having the figure of our Saviour on the cross, and the figures of St. John and the three Maries on either side, all such figures being in high relief.

In the Hatcham case, in 1878, the same Court ordered the removal of (among other things) a *confessional box*, chancel gates, and some stone steps by way of a pedestal to the Communion Table; the last of which was ironically attempted to be justified as helping the congregation to see the manual acts.

The illegality of celebrating the Communion when less than three or four communicate with the minister, came up in 1874 before the Privy Council, in the case of Mr. Parnell. The effect of the decision, which affirmed that of the Chancery Court of York, was that the mere fact of so few persons communicating was in itself an offence, unless the minister could show that it was unexpected or unintentional on his part. The point arose on a mere question of pleading; but it deserves to be noticed that it was Mr. Parnell himself who appealed to the Privy Council (there being in those days no conscientious objection to doing so), and in giving judgment the Court said:—

> Their lordships cannot but regret that upon what is merely a question of technicality in pleading, the great, and as they think the unnecessary, expense has been incurred in bringing the case at this stage before this tribunal.

We now come to the celebrated Ridsdale case. Proceedings against Mr. Ridsdale were commenced in March, 1873, by the Archbishop's secretary, for the purpose of getting rid of some illegal and offensive representatives of figures in coloured relief, of plastic material, representing scenes of our Lord's passion, which Mr. Ridsdale had set about his church for the purpose of certain ceremonial observances which he practised towards them, and called Stations of the Cross and Passion. These proceedings were of a civil and not a criminal character, so great was the consideration shown to Mr. Ridsdale, but he took advantage of this circumstance to overthrow them on a technical ground.

Meantime, the Public Worship Act had become law, and it was under that Act that, in February, 1876, Mr. Ridsdale was brought before Lord Penzance, who had succeeded Sir R. Phillimore as the Judge of the Arches Court. We need not specify the whole of the charges. There was one of administering the

Communion to less than three persons, upon which the Court followed the decision above-mentioned of *Parnell v. Roughton*. The "Stations of the Cross" were of course condemned. A crucifix with lights over the screen was held unlawful, on the ground that under the circumstances there was danger of its becoming an object of superstition. Upon this last point, and also upon the use of wafer bread, the wearing of an alb and a chasuble, and the eastward position, Mr. Ridsdale appealed to the Queen in Council. On this appeal the decision as to the unlawfulness of the vestments and of the crucifix was confirmed. As to the wafer bread, the charge had not complained of the use of a wafer properly so called, but charged the use of "bread made in the form of circular wafers instead of bread such as is usual to be eaten;" and the Court said that if Mr. Ridsdale had used bread such as is usual to be eaten, but had had *such bread* cut *in the form of* circular wafers, he would have committed no offence; and that the language of the charge was not inconsistent with this, and consequently not inconsistent with Mr. Ridsdale's having committed no offence. It followed that this charge did not allege any offence, and that Mr. Ridsdale ought not to have been found guilty upon it; and the judgment below was accordingly reversed on this point. But it was admitted by the Court that the use of wafers was illegal. With regard to the eastward position at Consecration, the Court held that it was not illegal to consecrate standing on the west side, although it would be illegal to consecrate standing on the west or any other side *so that the people generally could not see the manual acts;* that though Mr. Ridsdale had stood on the west side, it was not proved that he had stood so that the people generally could not see the manual acts; and consequently that no offence in this respect had been proved against him, and the judgment below was accordingly reversed, so far as it related to this point.

Here we may conveniently bring our story to a close for the present. By this time all reasonable excuse for maintaining that there was any doubt as to the law of the Church had ceased to exist, and the Ritualists were obliged before the whole nation to choose between obedience and defiance. Litigation assumed an altogether different appearance, being no longer directed to ascertaining the law but to upholding it. No longer were the defences of the Ritualists grounded on high matters; they began to plead for "toleration;" and, following the inevitable degradation with which a false position had infected their moral standard, their arguments descended to legal quibbles about the opening of a writ or the place where the judge ought to sit.

ART. V.—A COLONY IN GILEAD.

SHORTLY after the conclusion of the Treaty of Berlin the idea occurred to Mr. Laurence Oliphant, as a friend of Turkey, that a colonizing experiment should be made in the dominions of the Sultan. By an experiment on a small scale evidence might thus be afforded to the Porte of the advantages which would attend the development of a province under conditions which should increase the revenue of the empire, add to its population and resources, secure protection of life and property, and enlist the sympathy of Europe, without at all affecting the Sultan's sovereign rights. A scheme which should bring foreign capital with it to carry it out would, probably, be favourably regarded at Constantinople; and it appeared to Mr. Oliphant that by means of a Colonization Company one of those rich and unoccupied districts which abound in Turkey might be developed with signal success. The two questions which presented themselves to the mind of Mr. Oliphant were: first, what locality should be selected for the experiment, and, secondly, what class of people should be invited to come as colonists. Mr. Oliphant's conclusions, after duly considering these points, are thus given in his own words:—

There was only one race in Europe who were rich, and who did not, therefore, need to appeal to Christian capitalists for money to carry through the whole undertaking: who were not Christians, and to whom, therefore, the objections of the Porte to the introduction of more rival Christian sects did not apply; who had never alarmed the Turkish Government by national associations, but, on the contrary, had always proved themselves most loyal and peaceable subjects of his Majesty; who were, nevertheless, strongly attached by historical association to a province of Asiatic Turkey, and to whom the inducement of once more becoming proprietors of its sacred soil might prove strong enough to tempt them to comply with the probable conditions of the Turkish Government. . . . . It was thus that I found myself, by a process of deduction, compelled to turn for the locality of the colony to Palestine, and for the colonists to the Jews. The more I examined the project from this point of view the more desirable on political grounds did it appear. . . . . That the Jews would respond to an invitation from the Sultan to return and take possession of the soil in a district of their own ancient heritage, I did not doubt. . . . . The total number of the Hebrew race to-day is between six and seven millions; in Europe, about five millions. . . . . As the area of land which I should propose in the first instance for colonization would not exceed a million, or, at the most, a million-and-a-half, of acres, it would be hard if, out of nearly 7,000,000 of people attached to it by the tradition of former possession, enough could not be found to subscribe a capital of £1,000,000, or even more, for its purchase by

settlement, and if, out of that number, a selection of emigrants could not be made, possessing sufficient capital of their own to make them desirable colonists. . . . . It is true that there are about 25,000 Jews there already; but they are, for the most part, of a mendicant class, and are deprived of that protection which they would enjoy under the auspices of a company and a charter securing them a certain amount of self-government.

In order to decide whether this scheme was a practicable one or not, Mr. Oliphant found that it would be necessary to visit the Holy Land, with the view of selecting the district and examining the local conditions. Before he set out, he communicated to the Prime Minister (Lord Beaconsfield) and Lord Salisbury the outline of his project; and he received from them the kindest encouragement and assurances of support, so far as it was possible to afford it without officially committing the Government. About the middle of February, 1879, he left England for Syria. Of his travels, researches, and diplomatic inquiries, we have an exceedingly interesting account in a recently published volume—"The Land of Gilead."[1]

In the Introduction to this volume, from which we have already quoted, Mr. Oliphant gives some information as to the results of his labours. He says:—

It is only since my return to England that I have become aware how deep and widespread is the interest which has been felt in the successful issue of an undertaking which involves such important philanthropic and political results.[2] If the preliminary stage of negotiation with the Turkish Government was not crowned with the

[1] "The Land of Gilead." By Laurence Oliphant, author of "Lord Elgin's Mission to China," &c. pp. 540. Edinburgh: Blackwood and Sons. 1880.

[2] Mr. Oliphant makes it evident that his interest in this colonization scheme is political rather than religious. He says (p. xxxii.), "It is somewhat unfortunate that so important a political and strategical question as the future of Palestine should be inseparably connected in the public mind with a favourite religious theory. The restoration of the Jews to Palestine has been so often urged upon sentimental or Scriptural grounds, that now, when it may possibly become the practical and common-sense solution of a great future difficulty, a prejudice against it exists in the minds of those who have always regarded it as a theological chimera, which it is not easy to remove. The mere accident of a measure involving most important international consequences having been advocated by a large section of the Christian community, from a purely Biblical point of view, does not necessarily impair its political value. On the contrary, its political value once estimated on its own merits and admitted, the fact that it will carry with it the sympathy and support of those who are not usually particularly well versed in foreign politics is decidedly in its favour. I would avail myself of this opportunity of observing that, so far as my own efforts are concerned, they are based upon considerations which have no connection whatever with any popular religious theory upon the subject."

success which I had anticipated, it must be remembered that I attempted it alone and comparatively unaided. So far from being discouraged, my late experience more than ever convinces me that the scheme is in all respects practicable, and that it is only necessary for the public to take it up, supported by the Government, in order to overcome the resistance which I encountered at Constantinople, and which was due to an altogether exceptional combination of adverse influences.

Under any circumstances, says Mr. Oliphant, the region which comprises within its limits the luxuriant pasture-lands of Jaulan, the magnificent forest-clad mountains of Gilead, the rich arable plains of Moab, and the fervid sub-tropical valley of the Jordan,[1] cannot remain much longer neglected. Will England undertake the task of developing its resources?

Mr. Oliphant's narrative is ably written, and supplies much interesting information.

In chapter ix., where appears a description of the ruins of Ammon,[2] we read as follows:—

While sitting at the door of our tent, surrounded by Circassians, two Arabs arrived with a couple of camels, each bearing a millstone. They were on their way to Heshbon from the Lejah, where the people make a special trade of millstones, the irregular surface of the basaltic trap, of which the whole region is composed, being peculiarly adapted to the purpose. They were evidently inspired with a wholesome dread of the Circassians, and seeing us on such good terms with them, encamped unpleasantly near us for protection; though if there is a difficult thing for one man to steal from another I should have said it was a millstone so large that a camel could barely stagger under it. It is an evidence of comparative civilization that Arabs should want millstones; but I afterwards met a Christian peasant from Palestine

[1] "The valley of the Jordan," writes Mr. Oliphant, "would act as an enormous hot-house for the new colony. Here might be cultivated palms, cotton, indigo, sugar, rice, sorghum, besides bananas, pineapples, yams, sweet potatoes, and other field and garden produce. Rising a little higher, the country is adapted to tobacco, maize, castor-oil, millet, flax, sesamum, melons, gourds, cumin, coriander, pomegranates, oranges, figs—and so up to the plains, where wheat, barley, beans, and lentils of various sorts, with olives and vines, would form the staple products. Gilead especially is a country of wine and oil; it is also admirably adapted to silk culture; while among its forests, carob or locust-bean, pistachio, jujube, almond, balsam, kali, and other profitable trees grow wild in great profusion." All the fruits of Southern Europe grow here to perfection; and on the more extreme elevation might be cultivated the fruits and vegetables of England. The inclusion of the Dead Sea, adds Mr. Oliphant, would furnish a vast source of wealth: 200,000 tons of chorate of potassium are annually consumed in England; and the supply is practically inexhaustible. Petroleum and bitumen also can be procured in great quantities on the shores of the Dead Sea.

[2] Canon Tristram discovered here, a few years ago, a very interesting specimen of Byzantine architecture.

who made a very good livelihood by going about grinding corn for the Arabs. The only permanent erections in the country, and they are few and far between, are occasional mills, each consisting of one very small room and a very big overshot wheel. There were three or four close to Salt, and I had seen one near Gadara; the Adwan have one near Heshbon, and there are two or three more between that place and Kerak.

We had dined off Sheikh Diab's lamb, and were just composing ourselves to sleep, when the rain, which had been threatening all day, came down in torrents. Our tent soon became a shower-bath, as it was only adapted as a shade from the sun; and we put up our umbrellas inside it in the vain attempt to keep our beds dry, as these were spread on the ground and occupied the entire limited area of the tent floor. Our efforts were perfectly futile; the water soaked in all round below, and collected in the hollow of the canvas above, which formed a sort of reservoir, requiring every few minutes to be emptied by a poke upwards with a stick, when it rushed in a cascade over the tent-side. Our servants were crowded together outside, under a waterproof sheet, and I do not think suffered so much as we did. We now regretted that we had not chosen the alternative of the fleas, and seriously considered the expediency of trying to make for a cave; but the night was pitch dark—the nearest cave was half-way up a cliff, and about a quarter of a mile off, and, even if we could find our way to it, we should be wet through by the time we got there. Moreover, it was impossible, under the circumstances, to pack up and carry our bedding without its becoming even more soaked in the process than it already was; so we put on our waterproofs, squatted under our umbrellas, and listened to the occasional grunt of the camels, with the millstones in close proximity, who seemed as much disgusted with the state of things as we were.

When day broke the weather was as bad as it was possible to be. The heavy rain was being driven by a bitterly cold wind down the valley, and there was not a break in the clouds to indicate a possible change for the better. The Zaptiehs were triumphant; they had predicted a week's rain, and their predicting was likely to be verified. The spring equinox had burst upon us prematurely, and it was useless to think of visiting Arab encampments, and living with nomads in their tents, under these circumstances. All tents are disagreeable in bad weather; but an Arab tent with one side partially open, through which the rain drives, and with vermin of all sorts seeking shelter from the wet next one's skin, is the most disagreeable of all.

From their position, Heshbon lay about sixteen miles to the south-west, while Salt was the same distance to the north-west. They decided to return with all speed; so, leaving servants and baggage to follow, off they started at a gallop:—

Our way led across undulating plains, waving with luxuriant herbage: here and there we came across wheat-fields planted by the Arabs. Once or twice we passed heaps of stones which indicated the site of a ruined village; one of these was Jubeihat, the ancient

Jogbehah; and another, Fuheis. Then we came into wooded wadies, where they begin to break the high plateau, and form gorges which descend to the Valley of the Jordan, just above the Dead Sea. We could see little of the country, for the rain was pelting in our faces. The wind sweeping over these elevated plains was bitterly cold, and the weather was altogether much more like what one would expect in the Highlands of Scotland in November than on the plains of Moab in April—for we were now on the northern verge of that country. From here southward those plains extended from which the Moabites drove the giant race that occupied them in primitive times; thus coming into possession of one of the richest and most fertile plateaux in the world, and which stretched from the border of Gilead for about fifty miles southward. From the northern and finest section of this region, usually called, *par excellence*, "the land of Moab," they were driven out by the Amorites, and their northern frontier then became the Arnon, while their more circumscribed area, the home of Ruth, seems to have been known as the "field of Moab." The Reubenites took possession of the "land of Moab," to the north of the Arnon: this is the land which is now included in the modern Belka, and which affords, without doubt, the finest territory for agricultural and pastoral purposes in the whole of Palestine, while it is the only province where there are no legal occupiers of the soil and no settled population.

The country became more broken and hilly as we approached Salt, and about an hour before arriving at that town we joined the road by which we had left it two days before, and, making a steep descent into the Wady Shaib, we reached it, dripping wet, about mid-day.

In Salt they were storm-stayed several days. They congratulated themselves on being in a comfortable house instead of under goat-hair tents. And here they heard for the first time of a settler in Moab—Abou Jabr, a Protestant Syrian—who could have given them much valuable information. Abou Jabr, it appears, has a farm about two hours' distant from Ammon:—

He farms about sixty *feddans*—in other words, an area of land which sixty yoke of oxen could plough in a day—for which he pays the Government an amount equivalent to £20 sterling a-year as his tithe. He has no title-deeds or other proof of legal possession; but seems to take as much land as he likes, securing himself from aggression from the Arabs by payment of a certain proportion of his crops; they acting the part of landlord, and reserving to themselves the right of quartering themselves upon him *ad libitum*. He stores his grain away in the large underground vaults which were used for the same purpose in ages gone by, and either sells it at Jerusalem, transporting it there himself on his own camels, or to travelling merchants, who come and buy it of him. His agricultural operations are already so successful that he is enabled yearly largely to increase his property, and in spite of the exactions of the Arabs he has succeeded in accumulating great wealth. He employs as labourers *fellahins*, or peasants, from Western Palestine, to whom he gives one-fourth of his crop in return for their labours.

That Abou Jabr should have been able to build him a house, and to live in it unmolested, in the heart of the Beni Sukhr Arabs, and distant a day's journey from Salt, is a fact of some significance. Mr. Oliphant points to it as an evidence of the rapid strides which the country is making towards order and good government. At present, excepting the inhabitants of the town of Salt, Abou Jabr is the only man in the whole province of the Belka, who lives in a house.

In chapter x., treating on the fertility of Gilead, Mr. Oliphant gives a map, showing the proposed railways and the site of the proposed colony. He quotes Canon Tristram—"Topography of the Holy Land," p. 312—as to the luxuriant exuberance of Gilead;[1] and he complains that this rich and luxuriant country should be only sparsely inhabited by a wandering population, possessing no legal title whatever to the soil. The Rev. Mr. Neil, a Protestant clergyman formerly resident in Jerusalem, is quoted as one of the many authorities showing that farming even to the west of the Jordan is a really profitable occupation. Lieutenant Conder, R.E., late on the Palestine Exploration service, who warmly advocates the establishment of a Jewish colony in Palestine, and the employment of *fellahin* labour, did not examine the lands to the east of the Jordan; but of Western Palestine he says that "the hills might be covered with vines and the valleys run with oil, the plains might be yellow with corn and the harbours full of ships, but for the greedy pasha and the unjust judge."

ART. VI.—REMINISCENCES BY THOMAS CARLYLE.[2]

"THOU dear father." "Thou dear good father! 'Man's chief end,' my father could have answered from the depths of his soul, 'is to glorify God and enjoy *Him* for ever.' By this light he walked, choosing his path, fitting prudence to principle with wonderful skill and manliness; through 'the ruins of a falling era,' not once missing his footing. . . . . Every morning and every evening, for perhaps sixty years, he had prayed to

[1] Mr. Oliphant refers his readers to Canon Tristram's book, "The Land of Moab" (published by Mr. Murray in 1873), a deeply interesting work, which in many respects is unique. Canon Tristram is now, while we write, paying another visit to the land of Moab; and we shall receive, it may be hoped, some further information concerning that region.

[2] "Reminiscences by Thomas Carlyle," edited by James Anthony Froude. Two volumes. Longmans, Green & Co. 1881.

the Great Father in words which I shall now no more hear him impressively pronounce: 'Prepare us for those solemn events, death, judgment, and eternity.' He would pray also: 'Forsake us not now when we are old and our heads grown grey.' God did not forsake him."

So wrote Thomas Carlyle nearly fifty years ago, as we learn from his "Reminiscences" now published. On January 26, 1832, Thomas Carlyle received tidings that his "dear and worthy father" was departed. He was, at the time, in London, and he determined, as soon as he heard the news, to pass the next few days, until the funeral was past, with his wife only, all others being excluded. He considered about many things if so that he "might accomplish the problem" to see clearly what his present calamity meant—what he had lost and what lesson the loss was to teach him. And while the impression was more clear and pure within him he resolved to mark down the main things he could recollect of his father.

"To myself," he wrote, "to myself, if I live to after years, it may be instructive and interesting, as the past grows ever holier the farther we leave it. My mind is calm enough to do it deliberately, and to do it truly. The thought of that pale earnest face which even now lies stiffened unto death in that bed at Scotsbrig,[1] with the Infinite of all worlds looking down on it, will certainly impel me."

The opening chapter of the "Reminiscences," from which we have quoted, shows the wonderful contrast between Mill and Carlyle. An autobiography which begins with so tender and so reverent a note has an interest which far surpasses the mere literary and intellectual.

From this touching *In Memoriam* which, after a lapse of fifty years, sees the light, we quote a few passages.

Thus the son begins:—

As for the departed, we ought to say that he was taken home, "like a shock of corn fully ripe." He had finished the work that was given him to do, and finished it (very greatly more than the most) as became a man. He was summoned, too, before he had ceased to be interesting—to be loveable. (He was to the last the pleasantest man I had to speak with in Scotland.) For many years, too, he had the end ever in his eye, and was studying to make all preparation for what, in his strong way, he called often "that last, that awful change." Even at every new parting of late years I have noticed him wring my hand

[1] Scotsbrig was a farm near Ecclefechan occupied by James Carlyle during the last six years of his life. His daughter Jane wrote, in his dying hour, that he offered up a prayer "in such accents as it is impossible to forget." Mrs. Carlyle added, in her own hand, "It is God that has done it. Be still, my dear children. Your affectionate mother. God support us all!"

with a tenderer pressure, as if he felt that one other of our few meetings here was over. Mercifully, also, has he been spared me till I am abler to bear his loss; till by manifold struggles I, too, as he did, feel my feet on the Everlasting Rock, and through time, with its death, can in some degree see into eternity with its life. So that I have repeated, not with unwet eyes—let me hope, likewise, not with unsoftened heart—those old and for ever true words: "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord; they do rest from their labours, and their works follow them."

From his small hard-earned funds his father sent Thomas Carlyle to school and college, and made him whatever he was or might become. While dwelling on James Carlyle's character with pride, the son says:—

I call him a natural man, singularly free from all manner of affectation; he was among the last of the true men which Scotland on the old system produced, or can produce; a man healthy in body and mind, fearing God, and diligently working on God's earth with contentment, hope, and unwearied resolution. He was never visited with doubt. The old theorem of the universe was sufficient for him; and he worked well in it, and in all senses successfully and wisely—as few can do. So quick is the motion of transition becoming, the new generation, almost to a man, must make their belly their god, and, alas! find even that an empty one. Thus, curiously enough and blessedly, *he* stood a true man on the verge of the old, while his son stands here lovingly surveying him on the verge of the new, and sees the possibility of also being true there. God make the possibility, blessed possibility, into a reality.

I can call my father a brave man, wrote Carlyle; "man's face he did not fear; God he always feared." "All his strength came from God, and ever sought new nourishment there, God be thanked for it." Again:—

On the whole, ought I not to rejoice that God was pleased to give me such a father; that from earliest years I had the example of a real man of God's own making continually before me? Let me learn of *him*. Let me write my books as he built his houses, and walk as blamelessly through this shadow world; if God so will, to rejoin him at last. Amen.

Of his father's education he writes:—

Greatly his most important culture he had gathered—and this, too, by his own endeavours—from the better part of the district, the religious men; to whom, as to the most excellent, his own nature gradually attached and attracted him. He was religious, with the consent of his whole faculties. Without religion he would have been nothing. Indeed, his habit of intellect was thoroughly free, and even incredulous. And strongly enough did the daily example of this work afterwards on me. "Putting out the natural eye of his mind to see better with a telescope"—this was no scheme for him. But he was in

Annandale, and it was above fifty years ago, and a Gospel was still preached there to the heart of a man in the tones of a man. Religion was the Pole-star for my father. Rude and uncultivated as he otherwise was, it made him and kept him "in all points a man."

"I have a sacred pride in my peasant father," said Carlyle. "God give me to live to my father's honour and to His."[1]

Of the second volume of the "Reminiscences," the greater portion is occupied with a pathetic idyl of domestic life. The heroine is Jane Welsh Carlyle, as Mrs. Carlyle was in the habit of signing herself. Jane Baillie Welsh was born in the ancient county town of Haddington. "In 1801, when she was born," wrote the bereaved Carlyle, "I was then in my sixth year, far away in every sense, now near and infinitely concerned, trying doubtfully, after some three years' sad cunctation, if there is anything that I can profitably put on record of her altogether bright beneficent and modest little life, and *her*, as my final task in this world." With these words Mr. Carlyle, in the year 1869, commenced an intended sketch of his wife's history (she had been taken from him in the year 1866); but he found the effort too distressing, and in the present work we have only the notes and recollections which he wrote down immediately after her death.

Craigenputtoch, which Mr. Carlyle devised to the University of Edinburgh for the endowment of bursaries in honour of his wife's family, was hers by her father's disposition, but she had transferred the life interest to her mother. As Mrs. Welsh's tenants Mrs. Carlyle and her husband occupied it on their removal from their cottage near Edinburgh. It was fourteen or fifteen miles from a town, Dumfries, and letters came once a week. Moorland, with rocks, surrounded it. So unfrequented was the district that "once in the winter time I remember," says Carlyle, "counting for three months there had not been any stranger, not even a beggar, called at Craigenputtoch door." According to a friend, the years of solitude at Craigenputtoch, though

---

[1] In regard to religion there is a difference of tone in some portions of the "Reminiscences." We do not touch upon this now, however, but content ourselves with giving a sketch of Carlyle's life after marriage.

It may here be mentioned that Thomas Carlyle, son of a village mason, was born at Ecclefechan, in Annandale, in 1795. In 1806 he was sent to the Grammar School at Annan, and in 1809 to Edinburgh University. In 1814 he was appointed mathematical usher at Annan, and in 1816 schoolmaster at Kirkaldy. In 1818 he began to take pupils in Edinburgh. In 1822 he became private tutor in the family of Mr. Charles Buller—Charles Buller the younger—who was afterwards brilliantly distinguished in Parliament, being his pupil. In 1826 he married. After eighteen months he removed to Craigenputtoch, where he remained seven years. In 1834 he left Scotland, and settled in London.

the young wife bore them "cheerfully and willingly," were "undoubtedly a great strain upon her nerves, from which she never entirely recovered." According to Mr. Carlyle, "We were not unhappy; perhaps these were our happiest days." Happy they seemed to him, however, because he could do "fully twice as much work in a given time there as with my best effort was possible in London." Between such happiness and the strain upon Mrs. Carlyle of which the friend speaks there is no contradiction. "Hers was no holiday task of pleasant companionship; she had to live beside him in silence that the people in the world might profit by his full strength and receive his message."

Not from Mrs. Carlyle's suggestion came the migration to London. "Had the perpetual fluctuation, the uncertainty, and unintelligible whimsicality of Review Editors not proved so intolerable, we might have lingered longer at Craigenputtoch." But between January and August, 1830, "Sartor Resartus" was written —nine months it had cost him in writing—and its author decided to visit London to sell the book; but "poor 'Sartor'" was bandied ineffectually "among the blockheadisms."[1] This second visit to London made Craigenputtoch henceforth impossible for a permanence. Carlyle mooted the plan of residence in London, and, "though till then her voice on the subject had never been heard," she was very hearty for it.[2] Mrs. Carlyle

[1] The beggarly history of poor "Sartor" among the blockheadisms is not worth recording. In short, finding that whereas I had got £100 (if memory serve) for "Schiller" six or seven years before, and for "Sartor," at least thrice as good, I could not only not "get £200," but even get no "Murray," or the like, to publish it on "half-profits" (Murray, a most stupendous object to me; tumbling about; eyeless, with the evidently strong wish to say "yes and no;" my first signal experience of that sad human predicament); I said: "We will make it no, then; wrap up our MS.; wait till this Reform Bill uproar abates; and see and give our brave little Jeannie a sight of this big Babel, which is so altered since I saw it last (in '1824–25')!" She came right willingly, and had, in spite of her ill-health, which did not abate, but the contrary, an interesting, cheery, and, in spite of our poor arrangements, really pleasant winter here. We lodged in Ampton Street, Gray's Inn Lane, clean and decent pair of rooms. . . . . Visitors she had in plenty; John Mill . . . . Mrs. Basil Montague . . . . Jeffrey, Lord-Advocate . . . . Charles Lamb and his sister. . . . . News of my father's death came here; oh, how good and tender she was."

[2] In the year 1852 Carlyle lost his "dear old mother." She was eighty-three years old. She had often said, writes her son, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come." "The most beautifully religious soul I ever knew." "On the religious side, looking into the very heart of the matter, I always reckon her rather superior to my Jane, who in other shapes and with far different examples and conditions, had a great deal of noble religion, too." Carlyle was fifty-eight years of age when he lost his mother; when he wrote these "Reminiscences," "her memory still lies in me—sacred and tender."

advised that they should dismantle the farm-house, and carry to London all their furniture, "mostly all of it her father's furniture, whose character of solidly noble is visible upon it." "I was Thomas the Doubter," says he, "the unhoping;" but she, bright and brave, quickened his "desperate hope." From the first beginning of their two-and-thirty years in London (5, Cheyne Row, Chelsea), her loving care shielded him:—

> Years of hard battle against fate; hard, but not quite unvictorious, when she left me, as if in her car of heaven's fire. My noble one! I say deliberately, her part in the stern battle, and except myself none knows how stern, was brighter and braver than my own. Thanks, darling, for your shining words and acts, which were continual in my eyes, and in no other mortal's. Worthless I was your divinity, wrapt in your perpetual love of me and pride in me, in defiance of all men and things. Oh, was it not beautiful, all this that I have lost for ever!

Their income was very small; but she somehow contrived to "beat out these exiguous resources into covering the appointed space." In that, "as in her other tasks, she was silently successful always, and never, that I saw, had a misgiving about success." For himself, after writing his daily four or five pages of print, he would walk out at about 2 P.M., "always heavy laden, grim of mood." "Once or twice," when writing his "French Revolution,"[1] with nervous system irritated and inflamed, he found himself among the flood of equipages at Hyde Park Corner:—

---

[1] We have now an account of the way in which the Carlyles received the news that the MS. of his first volume of the French Revolution had been burnt by a housemaid. He writes:—"How well do I still remember that night when he came to tell us, pale as Hector's Ghost, that my unfortunate first volume was burnt. It was like half-sentence of death to us both, and we had to pretend to take it lightly, so dismal and ghastly was his horror at it, and try to talk of other matters. He stayed three mortal hours or so; his departure quite a relief to us. Oh, the burst of sympathy my poor darling then gave me, flinging her arms round my neck, and openly lamenting, condoling, and encouraging, like a nobler, better self! Under Heaven is nothing beautifuller! We sat talking till late; 'Shall be written again,' my fixed word and resolution to her. Which proved to be such a task as I never tried before or since. I wrote out 'Feast of Pikes,' (vol. ii.) and then went at it. Found it fairly impossible for about a fortnight; passed three weeks (reading Marryat's novels), tried cautious-cautiously, as on ice paper-thin, once more, and in short, had a job more like breaking my heart than any other in my experience. . . . Mill was penitently liberal; sent me £200 in a day or two, of which I kept £100, (actual cost of house while I had written burnt volume); upon which he brought me 'Biographie Universelle,' which I got bound and still have. Wish I could find a way of getting the now much macerated, changed, and fanaticized 'John Stuart Mill' to take that £100 back; but I fear there is no way."

I recollect sternly thinking, "Yes; and perhaps none of you could do what I am at!" But generally my feeling was, "I shall finish this book, throw it at your feet, buy a rifle and spade, and withdraw to the Transatlantic wilderness, far from human beggaries and basenesses!" This had a kind of comfort to me; yet I always knew, too, in the background, that this would not practically do.

When he foreboded that even this book, though "from a man's very heart," would be trampled under foot and hoof, "'Pooh, pooh! they cannot trample that,' she would cheerily answer." At this time he gave monthly courses of lectures, "detestable mixture of prophecy and play-actorism." Edward Street, or Willis's Rooms, was the "place of execution." Often Mrs. Carlyle could not accompany him, when asked out, because they could not afford a fly. He remembers remorsefully his impatience at having one muddy night on their way to a soirée of Miss Martineau's to clasp one of her clogs which had come loose. "I cleaned my dirty fingers," he says, "in some handy little rain pool in the Park with diligent wiping." Cabs he avoided, dreading "a quarrel about fare, which was always my horror in such cases."

In 1842 Mrs. Welsh died, and the Carlyles came into possession of £200 a year from Craigenputtoch. That "to us was a highly considerable sum," and from this date "the pinch of poverty, which had been relaxing latterly, changed itself into a gentle pressure, or into a limit and little more." His literary income was "not above £200 a year in those decades, in spite of my continual diligence day by day." "'Cromwell,' written, I think, in 1844," a toil and misery to him for four years, was estimated on a scale more liberal "considerably than in any previous case," but it left their income unchanged. "Honour to her . . . . and thanks to poverty that showed me how noble, worshipful, and dear she was." He criticises "the singularly dark and feeble condition of public judgment," which, stimulated by his Rectorial Address, without "an idea or shadow of an idea in it but what had been set forth by me tens of times before," runs to buy his works in 1866. He calls to mind their poverty in 1842, and regrets that prosperity came too late for her to share it. "If they would give me £10,000 a year, and bray unanimously their hosannahs heaven-high for the rest of my life, who now would there be to get the smallest joy or profit from it? To me I feel as if it would be a silent sorrow rather." That he bought a brougham at last, "in spite of all Friedrichs and nightmares," is "a mercy of Heaven to me for the rest of my life!"

It was, indeed, useful and necessary as a means of health; but still more precious, I doubt not, as a mark of my regard for her. Ah me!

She never knew fully, nor could I show her in my heavy-laden, miserable life, how much I had at all times regarded, loved, and admired her. No telling of her now. "Five minutes more of your dear company in this world. Oh, that I had you yet for but five minutes, to tell you all!"

As he recollects "the four years of abstruse toil, obscure speculations, futile wrestling and misery," over "Cromwell," and the "infinitely worse" thirteen years over "Friedrich," years worn out in "hugging unclean creatures (Prussian Blockheadism) to my bosom, trying to caress and flatter their secret out of them," he thinks these were the duties of his life; laid upon him, he had to work them out. He laments deeply that he never was grateful enough to his wife. The day's work over, and the evening ride done, she was ever waiting for him with "something bright and pleasant to tell me, the most foredone of men," grains as of gold extracted by an alchemy all her own out of every day. The half-hour before dinner in the room, which, out of the smallest materials, she had made a most daintily pretty drawing-room, as he sat on the hearthrug with a pipe of tobacco, which "I had learnt to take with my back to the jamb, and door never so little open, so that all the smoke, if I was careful, went up the chimney," was "the one bright portion of my black day." His talk, however, would still be of the Prussian slough of despond through which he had been "tugging and wriggling":—

I had at last conquered Mollwitz, saw it all clear ahead and round me, and took to telling her about it, in my poor bit of joy, night after night. I recollect she answered little, though kindly always. Privately she at that time felt convinced she was dying:—dark winter, and such the weight of misery, and utter decay of strength, and, night after night, my theme to her, Mollwitz! . . . Never in my pretended superior kind of life have I done for love of any creature so supreme a kind of thing. It touches me at this moment with penitence and humiliation, yet with a kind of soft religious blessedness, too.

Volumes I. and II. of "Friedrich," writes Mr. Carlyle, were published in the year 1858:—

Probably about two years before that, was the nadir of my wife's sufferings,—internal sufferings and dispiritments; for outward fortune, &c., had now, for about six years, been on a quite tolerable footing, and indeed evidently fast on the improving hand: nor had this, at any worst time since, ever disheartened her, or darkened her feelings. But in 1856, owing to many circumstances, my engrossment otherwise (sunk in "Friedrich," in &c. &c.; far less exclusively, very far less, than she supposed, poor soul!); and owing chiefly, one may fancy, to the deeper downbreaks of her own poor health, which from this time, as I now see better, continued its advance upon the citadel, and

nervous system, and intrinsically grew worse and worse;—in 1856, too evidently, to whatever owing, my poor little darling was extremely miserable!

In March, 1866, Carlyle went to Edinburgh, to deliver his address as Rector. When he left his wife he was "in the saddest, sickly mood, full of gloom and misery, but striving to hide it; she too looked very pale and ill, but seemed intent only on forgetting nothing that could further me." "Softly regulating and forwarding as was her wont," she bade him good-bye.

Monday, at Edinburgh, was to me the gloomiest chaotic day, nearly intolerable for confusion, crowding, noisy inanity and misery, till once I got done. My speech was delivered as in a mood of defiant despair, and under the pressure of nightmares. Some feeling that I was not speaking lies alone sustained me. The applause, &c., I took for empty noise, which it really was not altogether. The instant I found myself loose, I hurried joyfully out of it over to my brother's lodgings (73, George Street, near by); to the students all crowding and shouting round me, I waved my hand prohibitively at the door, perhaps lifted my hat; and they gave but one cheer more; something in the tone of *it* which did for the first time go into my heart. . . . . That same afternoon, Tyndall's telegram, emphatic to the uttermost ("A perfect triumph," the three words of it) arrived here [*i.e.*, reached his wife]; a joy of joys to my little heroine. . . . . I do thank Heaven for this last favour to her that so loved me.

After that Edinburgh Monday, Mrs. Carlyle lived nineteen days. On April 21, 1866, "suddenly, as by a thunderbolt from skies all blue she was snatched from me."

Reviews.

The Worship of the Old Covenant Considered, more especially in Relation to that of the New. By the Rev. E. F. Willis, M.A., Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College. James Parker & Co. 1880.

The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist Considered in Relation to the One Atoning Sacrifice upon the Cross. An Eirenicon by the Rev. E. F. Willis, M.A., Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College. Second Edition. James Parker & Co. 1879.

IT is an indisputable fact that the facility with which error is disseminated and the extent of its diffusion depend mainly upon the amount of truth with which it is combined. The history of modern Ritualism, from its origin in the Oxford Tractarian movement down to the period of anarchy which it has recently inaugurated, presents a striking illustration of this apparent anomaly. Amongst the numerous

works to which we might refer in support of our allegation, we know of none by which it is more conspicuously sustained than in the volume and the pamphlet to which we shall now direct the attention of our readers.

We desire to do ample justice to the good intentions of Mr. Willis; and we entirely acquit him of any design to impose upon the credulity of his readers by the illogical inferences which he has drawn from premises, the accuracy of which, will, for the most part, be readily admitted. Nay, more, we are quite willing to believe that he has insensibly brought himself into the belief that no other conclusions than those which he has drawn can be fairly deduced from the facts which he appears to us, in the main, to have correctly stated, and from the view of the sacrificial worship of the Old Covenant, which, as regards its most prominent features, he seems to us to have correctly expounded.

We are willing even to advance a step further, and to express our readiness to believe that Mr. Willis is so unable to perceive the possibility of the truth of any other system than that which he has adopted, that he is unconscious even of the most obvious misrepresentations which he has made of the views of others. Thus—*e.g.*, when he finds occasion, as he does very frequently, to refer to the authority of the present Bishop of Lincoln, Mr. Willis appears incapable of apprehending any distinction between the allegation of that able and learned prelate, that "the One Sacrifice of the Cross is continually *represented* in the Christian Church," and that which he has imputed to him—viz., that the Sacrifice of the Cross is "continually *re-presented*" in the Eucharist;[1] whilst he appears equally incapable of discerning the utter incompatibility between his own materialistic view of the continuity of the Jewish and the Christian Church, and the widely divergent view which Bishop Wordsworth has expressed in a passage which Mr. Willis quotes in support of his own—viz., that "the ministry of Christ's Church is the complete realization of all that was done in the offices of the high priest, the priests, and the Levites, in the tabernacle and the temple."[2]

We may take occasion from our reference to this quotation, to point out one of the very important points of difference which exist between Mr. Willis and ourselves in regard to the sacrificial worship of the Jewish Church. We entirely endorse the opinion which Mr. Willis has expressed respecting the "extreme importance of an exact and accurate knowledge "of the ritual and worship of the Old Covenant;" but we differ altogether from our author in our application of the knowledge thus obtained. We would maintain, with as much earnestness as Mr. Willis, the close and inseparable connection which exists between the Old and the New Testament. We agree with him that the latter cannot be rightly or adequately understood unless that connection be fully recognized. But instead of inferring from these premises that the "carnal ordinances" of the law "imposed until the time of reformation," are to be reproduced and perpetuated in the higher and more spiritual worship of the Christian Church, we maintain (in accordance, as it seems to us, with the passage which Mr. Willis has quoted from Bishop Wordsworth in justification of the positions which he defends throughout this volume), that the worship of the Christian Church is not designed to consist in the servile imitation of that of the Jewish Church, but in its *spiritual* realization.

If we rightly understand the meaning which Mr. Willis attaches to the words he employs in p. 19, we find there a key to the fundamental difference which exists between us. The assertion which Mr. Willis there makes is, that "what Moses saw of heavenly worship was embodied in

[1] "Worship of the Old Covenant," p. 17. [2] *Ibid.* p. 11.

"the worship of the Old Covenant; what St. John saw of heavenly "worship is related in the Book of the Revelation." We have designedly qualified the remarks which we shall make on these words by the *proviso*, "if we rightly understand their meaning," inasmuch as it is hard to suppose that Mr Willis really intended to express the view which his words naturally convey to the minds of his readers. We are assured, indeed, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (viii. 5), that the priests under the Levitical law "served unto the example (or pattern) and shadow (or outline) of heavenly things," by which we understand that the earthly tabernacle, with all its arrangements, was a copy made from a heavenly original. We are unable, however, to follow Mr. Willis when he speaks of what "Moses saw of heavenly worship," and much more when he asserts that that heavenly worship was "embodied in the worship of the Old Covenant." Such assertions appear to us not only destitute of scriptural foundation, but absolutely inconsistent with the whole line of argument which is pursued in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and more especially with the words which follow in the same and in the following chapter, in which we read of the "more excellent ministry," and the faultlessness of the *second*, as compared with the imperfections of the *former* Covenant.

We freely admit that the worship of the Old Covenant is employed by St. John in the Apocalypse, as supplying types and figures which are adapted to convey to the mind of the diligent student of the Old Testament Scriptures the most striking and impressive view which either Jew or Gentile can now form of the higher and more spiritual realities of the unseen world. It must never be forgotten, however, that the necessary imperfection of the conceptions thus conveyed, is clearly indicated by the solemn and emphatic asseveration of the beloved Evangelist and Seer, "And I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it" (Apoc. xxi. 22).

We do not, indeed, dissent from the opinion expressed by Mr. Willis, that it is but reasonable to believe that "the worship of the Church in the "present state of expectancy," was not designed to be "of a character wholly "dissimilar" to that of the Church "in its preparatory stage," or to "the "worship of the Church triumphant;" but as, on the one hand, we should hold it to be an illogical conclusion that because St. John saw no temple in heaven, therefore we are to have no house of God upon earth; so, on the other hand, we hold it to be an equally illogical conclusion, that because certain external rites and ceremonies formed part of the Jewish worship, therefore the same or similar rites and ceremonies are designed to form part of the worship of the Christian Church.

We shall not weary our readers by any lengthened remarks on those portions of the work before us, in regard to which the theories propounded by Mr. Willis appear to us to rest on no other foundation than the lively imagination of the writer, or of the author from whom they have been borrowed. Thus—*e.g.*, if it is any satisfaction to Mr. Willis to believe that "in its highest sense *five* speaks of a state as it were half-way "towards completion (p. 80), and that twelve is the number of the Incarnation," (*Ib.*), we should think our own time and that of our readers ill-spent in assigning reasons against the soundness of such conclusions. We may observe, however, in passing, that Mr. Willis appears to be sorely pressed in his endeavours to make up the numbers which are required in support of the positions which he maintains. For example, in order to show how the number *three* is impressed upon the Tabernacle and its furniture, he is compelled to dissociate the cherubim from the mercy-seat, of which they formed a component part, and of which we read in Exodus xxxvii. 8, that "out of the mercy-seat made he them." So again, in regard

to the furniture of the court, Mr. Willis is constrained to separate the laver from its foot, in order to complete the number which he requires. We are equally unable to follow Mr. Willis in his explanation of the colours of the Tabernacle. Thus—*e.g.*, whilst we have no desire to enter into the arena of controversy with him in regard to the mystical meaning of the *purple*, which, we are told, being "formed from the intermingling of scarlet and blue," "corresponds to twelve among numbers, which is the result of three multiplied into four, and is, therefore, the colour of the Incarnation," we are equally incapable of appreciating the force of his reasoning, even though his argument is enforced by a consideration which, we have no doubt, adds greatly to the strength of his own convictions—viz., that the "lesson taught by it is the same as that expressed by the mingling of water with wine in the Eucharistic cup" (p. 86).

But whilst we are perfectly content to leave Mr. Willis in undisputed possession of his theories, whether original or derived, in regard to the "mystic meaning of *blue* as the colour of heaven," and therefore "as speaking of God;" of *scarlet* or *red*, as the colour of blood, and therefore as denoting "creaturely life;" and of *purple* as "telling of the intermingling of the divine with the human," we find some of the positions which he maintains in regard to colours to be not only opposed, in our judgment, to historical facts, but to be made subservient to the support of some of those extravagances of ritualism which have involved the English Church in a long succession of troubles, from which we see, at present, but little prospect of deliverance. We meet with one of these positions at p. 225, where, in a quotation from Mr. Rolfe's book on "The Ancient Use of Liturgical Colours," and in close connection with a quotation from Bishop Wordsworth, which might with equal propriety have proceeded from the pen of Jewel or of Calvin, Mr. Willis appears seriously to endorse the statement that "if there is" (as Bishop Wordsworth justly alleges that there has been) "but one Church of God in all time, there "must of necessity be certain marks which, from time immemorial, "indicate the true principles of her ritual worship, and that these marks "are to be met with in the system of our grand old English Church, in "the colours of her sacrificial vestments, as in all else which affected her "holy worship."

In order to support the novel—we had almost said the monstrous—theory thus propounded, it was, of necessity, incumbent upon Mr. Willis to adduce some proof that these mystic colours to which he attaches so much importance, have been uniformly "retained and been in use" (to adopt the words of the much disputed Ornaments Rubric) in the Christian Church of all ages, as in the Levitical Church of old. We will assume for a moment, with Mr. Rolfe, that the "law with regard to the colour of "the sacrificial vesture to be worn in God's Church upon earth, is most "clearly set forth in the Sacred Canon;" and we will not press Mr. Willis for the reasons which have satisfied him (1) that the vesture of the *one* high priest, was designed to be a pattern for that of *all* "priests" in all ages; and (2) that whilst the *colours* of priestly vestments have been fixed by an immutable law, the Church has been invested with a discretionary power to deviate from the prescribed pattern in every other respect—retaining, *as it is alleged*, for all her "priests" the "*five* mystic colours" appointed for the high-priest alone, but dispensing, on her own private judgment or caprice, with the golden rings, the bells, the precious stones, and the pomegranates.

Having thus conceded to Mr. Willis, for the sake of argument (but, we must add, *without prejudice*), all that he can reasonably expect or even desire at our hands, we will now proceed to test the soundness of his position, not by the reckless assertions of those who have a foregone

conclusion to maintain, but in the sober light of the well-ascertained facts of the history of the early Church.

It is obvious that the theory to which Mr. Rolfe and Mr. Willis have committed themselves must inevitably fall to the ground unless the assertion of the former can be proved—viz., that "from the days of St. "John the Divine to the early years of the English Reformation, the "period to which the 'Ornaments Rubric' in our Book of Common Prayer "points, there are indications that the same five mystic colours were in "vogue, as in the Levitical Church of old" (p. 225).

We cannot but suspect that a cold shudder must have crept over the writer and the endorser of this passage as they reflected upon the history of the three centuries which have elapsed since the first introduction of the Ornaments Rubric into the Book of Common Prayer, and that they must be reduced to the stern necessity of tracing the continuity of the Christian Church during the greater portion of that period in some other community than that to which one at least, and, as we presume, both, of these writers belong. On this point, however, we do not propose to enter at the present time. The point with which we are now concerned is the historical evidence respecting the adoption of the "five mystic colours" of priestly vesture in the Christian Church, from the days of St. John the Divine, down to the time of the English Reformation. According to the statement of Mr. Willis, Mr. Rolfe has conclusively shown that "in "the best and purest ages of the Church, none but the divinely ordered "colours of the Tabernacle vestments were employed in the sacrificial "vestments of the Christian Church" (p. 224). Had such an assertion as this been made by one of the many superficial sciolists with which the present age abounds, we should have dismissed it from our minds with pity for the wilful ignorance which it betrays of some of the most notorious facts of early Church history. As proceeding from the pen of the Vice-Principal of a Theological College, we confess that we plead guilty to a considerable amount of perplexity as to the mode in which to deal with it. If Mr. Willis really intends to endorse the statement of Mr. Rolfe, we have no hesitation in expressing our conviction that he does so in defiance of evidence to the contrary of a nature which appears to us absolutely incontrovertible. To this we shall advert presently. On turning, however, to p. 222, we meet with a passage which seems to afford some clue to a solution of our difficulty. Instead of adducing, as we should have expected from one who quotes with approbation Mr. Rolfe's assertion that the "mystic colours" have been in "vogue from the "days of St. John the Divine to the early years of the English Refor-"mation," we meet with the very remarkable assertion—the truth of which we presume that none of Mr. Willis's most determined opponents would care to call in question—that "according to a belief dating back at "least as far as the *ninth century*" (the italics are ours), "the Eucharistic "vestments of the Christian priest were derived from, and were in imitation "of the sacrificial vestments of the older Church." Strong as the affection of our modern Ritualists is known to be for the corruptions of the mediæval ages, we can scarcely suppose that Mr. Willis seriously intends his readers to accept such a statement as that which is here made, in proof that "in the best and purest ages of the Church, none but the "divinely-ordered colours of the Tabernacle vestments were employed in "the sacrificial vestments of the Christian Church." Should we, however, be mistaken in this belief, and should Mr. Willis be serious in appealing to evidence derived from the history of the Church of the *ninth century*, we will content ourselves with reminding him of a passage which occurs in a work which, however ignored and depreciated by the Ritualists of the nineteenth century, has been solemnly affirmed by every ordained clergy-

man of the English Church to contain "godly and wholesome doctrine," and we may add doctrine necessary not only for the times in which the Articles of Religion were drawn up, but also for times like our own, when those Articles are alleged in support of doctrines and of practices which it was their primary object to condemn. The Second Book of Homilies appeared in the year 1563. Eight hundred years from that date carry us back to the year 763—*i.e.*, to a period considerably *earlier* than that to which the evidence referred to by Mr. Willis extends. Concerning the state of religion during this period, we read in the "Third Part of the Sermon against Peril of Idolatry," that "all the world, as it were drowned, continued until our age, by the space of above eight hundred years, in the pit of damnable idolatry." If, then, Mr. Willis is serious in appealing to evidence of the ninth century, as proving what was the practice of the Church in her purest ages, we content ourselves with observing that his appeal is made to a period at which, on the authority of the authorized Homilies of the Church to which he belongs, all the world had been drowned for about a century in the "pit of damnable idolatry."

We have referred to one possible solution of the very remarkable assertion which Mr. Willis has endorsed with all the authority which belongs to the office which he held in a Theological College. We will now test the truth of this assertion, as propounded in unequivocal terms by Mr. Rolfe, and as enunciated by Mr. Willis in terms which may fairly be regarded as identical with those employed by Mr. Rolfe.

The question before us is: What were the colours of the ministerial vestments which were adopted in the earliest and purest ages of the Christian Church? Now this is a subject which has been investigated with no ordinary amount of ability, of learning, and of impartiality by the late much-lamented Mr. Wharton Marriott. The result of the researches of that able and singularly candid writer are contained in a work entitled "Vestiarium Christianum; the Origin and Gradual Development of the Dress of Holy Ministry in the Church," which appeared in the year 1868. On the first page of the Introduction to this work, we meet with the following passage to which we think Mr. Willis would have done well to have given heed before he committed himself, in a rash and unguarded manner, as we would fain hope and believe, to the preposterous allegations of Mr. Rolfe. Mr. Marriott writes as follows: "There are those who believe that the dress of the Christian ministry was, from the first, under Divine guidance, and by Apostolic authority, modelled, in detail, upon the dress of the Aaronic priesthood. But, after all that has been written in disproof of this opinion of late years, especially by learned Roman Catholic writers, whose bias would naturally incline them to its support, this belief must be regarded as an opinion due to doctrinal prepossessions on the part of the few who maintain it, rather than one which admits of serious support upon historical grounds." It would obviously carry us very far beyond the limits within which the present Review must of necessity be restricted, were we to enter even on the most summary analysis of that portion of Mr. Marriott's exhaustive work which bears upon the question now before us. We must content ourselves with referring our readers, and more especially Mr. Willis, should these pages meet his eye, to the ample evidence which Mr. Marriott has adduced in the course of his work, and with laying before them in few words, some of the conclusions at which he arrived. Having assigned the reasons why coloured priestly vestments found special favour in the eyes of the heathen, and amongst these, why the mystic *purple*, to which Mr. Willis so fondly clings, was specially characteristic of the Priests of Bacchus or of Mars, and having also disposed in few but conclusive words of the argument derived from the "shining" garments of the

early liturgies (whether the passages to which reference is made are genuine or not), Mr. Marriott sums up the conclusions at which he has arrived respecting the ecclesiastical dress of the first four centuries in the following words: "On a review, then, of the whole evidence from early literature bearing upon this question, we should conclude, without doubt, that the dress appropriate to the most solemn offices of holy ministry, during the primitive age, was white." (Int., p. xxxiii.)

Before leaving this subject, we must direct the attention of our readers to the singular fact that the very period to which Mr. Willis refers as furnishing evidence of the types of priestly vestments which were adopted in the purest ages of the Church, is that which Mr. Marriott has shown to have been the commencement of a series of wide departures from primitive usage. Having stated the conclusion at which he had arrived, that of all the various types of ministering dress retained in different branches of the Church, the only one which approaches closely both in form and distinctive ornament to that of primitive Christendom, is "the "Surplice with Scarf or Stole now worn in the English Church," Mr. Marriott observes that some few additions, as the Orarium and Planeta, date from the fourth century, but that "by far the greater number date "from the ninth to the middle of the twelfth century, a period of darkness "both intellectual and moral (especially so at Rome itself), such as the "Christian world has never known either before or since" (Int., pp. lxxxii. lxxxiii.). We think our readers will agree with us that until the exhaustive evidence of Mr. Wharton Marriott has been examined and confuted, all further comment upon Mr. Willis's defence of the five "mystic colours," when regarded as tests of a standing or falling Church, would be a useless expenditure both of time and of labour.

We must now direct the attention of our readers to the larger and more important subject which forms the staple of the volume before us—viz., the sacrificial worship of the Jewish Church, and the inferences deduced therefrom in regard to the worship of the Christian Church.

It would occupy too much of our space to follow Mr. Willis throughout his examination of the ritual, the place, the ministers, and the times of sacrifice, and also of the nature and design of the various sacrifices appointed under the Levitical law. This examination has been made with care, and, *for the most part*, with accuracy; and Mr. Willis candidly acknowledges his great obligations to a valuable work by Mr. Cave, entitled "The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice," to which he is indebted for much of the material which he has incorporated into his volume.

It is in the application of the Jewish ritual to that of the Christian Church that we have occasion to express our entire dissent from the conclusions at which Mr. Willis has arrived. The fundamental principle upon which he proceeds is enunciated in the following words: "It is truly "said," Mr. Willis writes at p. 215, quoting the words of Mr. Rolfe: "The great test to be applied to everything in the system of the Catholic "Church appears to be this—does anything correspond to it under the "old dispensation? Here we have God's appointed rule of worship, to "which the worship of the Church in all ages must be referred as a "standard."

We shall not enter upon the discussion of the question whether every rite and ceremony of the older dispensation was, or was not, designed to have something corresponding to it in the Christian Church. We fully believe that the New Testament can be rightly understood and interpreted only when read in the light of the Old Testament; and we believe further that the more diligently the Book of Leviticus is examined, the more fully and clearly will it appear that the law of Moses, even in its minute details,

was designed to serve as "a schoolmaster unto Christ."[1] We are not aware, however, of any authority for the statement that we have here "God's own appointed rule of worship," to which that of "the Church in "all ages must be referred;" much less that we have any infallible mode provided in which this test is capable of application.

We will endeavour to illustrate our position by reference to some of the conclusions which Mr. Willis has drawn from the above premises. And first in regard to the threefold order of the ministry. Mr. Willis quotes in support of his theory on this subject a passage from the so-called "Apostolical Constitutions," in which, after a reference to the oblations which were presented by "holy bishops to the Lord God," the following words occur: "For these are your high priests, as the presbyters are your priests, and your present deacons instead of your Levites."

It can scarcely be needful to observe not only how utterly destitute is the theory thus propounded of any support from the New Testament Scriptures, but how entirely inconsistent it is with the argument of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews in which the *one* High Priest of our profession is alone presented to view as the antitype of Aaron in his priestly capacity. We might, indeed, advance a step further, and allege that so far as any analogy between the ministers of the Christian and of the Jewish Church is capable of being sustained, upon the principles involved in the above quotation, that analogy might, with much greater show of reason, be traced, in regard to the high-priest, in the organization of the Roman than of the English Church, whilst, waving altogether the vital question as to the strictly *sacerdotal* and *sacrificial* functions which are alleged to be discharged by the *priests* (*sacerdotes*) of the English Church, it would be difficult in regard to the Levites, who were appointed simply to wait upon the priests, and to whom no priestly functions belonged, to establish any real correspondence between the duties which were assigned to them and those which are discharged at the present day by the deacons of the English Church.

But the main object proposed by Mr. Willis in the volume before us is to establish the analogy between the sacrificial system of the Jewish Church and that of the Christian. We are far, indeed, from denying that sacrifice, in the rightful acceptation of the term, is one of the most distinctive elements of divine worship in all ages. Such is undoubtedly the place which it held in the estimation of St. Paul, when he besought the Roman Christians to present their "bodies as a living "sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God" (Rom. xii. 1); and such also was the place which it held in the estimation of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when he spoke of that sacrifice of "praise to God," and of those sacrifices of "doing good and communicating" with which God is well pleased (Heb. xiii. 15, 16). But when Mr. Willis applies this test to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and speaks of "the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice" as the Church's highest act of worship; of "the altar" as the chief object in all her houses of worship; and of "a daily celebration of the Holy Eucharist" as that which alone "can satisfy the ideal of worship held up before us by God Himself in the Mosaic law" (p. 216), we are compelled to express our conviction that the teaching of Mr. Willis is not only unsupported by any Scriptural warrant, but is altogether repugnant to the whole of the teaching of St. Paul and to the entire tenour of the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[1] "The pædagogus or tutor, frequently a superior slave, was entrusted with the moral supervision of the child. Thus his office was quite distinct from that of the διδάσκαλος .... As well in his inferior rank, as in his recognized duty of enforcing discipline, this person was a fit emblem of the Mosaic law."—LIGHTFOOT'S *Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 145.

We might, indeed, allege that not only are the inferences which Mr. Willis has drawn in this respect from the sacrificial worship of the Jewish Church wholly unsupported by warrant from Holy Scripture, but further, that they rest upon deductions which are altogether arbitrary, even if we were to admit the principles which he has himself adopted. For what warrant, it may be asked, does the *one* altar of Jewish sacrifice, coupled with the strict prohibition against offering sacrifices in any other place, afford for the *many* so-called *altars* of the Christian Church? Or again, what analogy is there between the position of the brazen altar of sacrifice in the outer court of the Tabernacle, where it was surrounded alike by priests and by people, and in close connection with which the latter, as well as the former, had important duties to perform, with a so-called *altar*, enshrined, as our modern ritualists would have it, in the holiest part of the sanctuary, and jealously guarded from the profane access of the laity? It was probably owing to the strange incongruity which exists between the description of the heavenly worship which is given by St. John and the modern ritualistic conceptions of what that worship ought to be, that both the late Archdeacon Wilberforce and Mr. Willis, who quotes his words with approbation, have fallen into the singular mistatement of representing the Lamb, "as it had been slain,"—not as standing (as St. John expressly declares) "in the midst of the Throne," but as standing "in front of the Throne, where was placed the altar on which the lamb of the daily sacrifice was perpetually presented,"[1] *i.e.*, at the brazen altar which was in the court. And further, it must, we presume, be attributed to the same cause that the explanation of the scene described by St. John in the fifth chapter of the Apocalypse, as given by some modern ritualists, presents an equally wide divergence from the actual statements of the beloved Evangelist himself, who not only describes the Lamb as *standing—i.e.*, in the attitude of a priest, not of a victim, but also *as one who had been slain*, not as one being slain, or as now offering Himself in sacrifice.

Mr. Willis's teaching on the subject of the Eucharist will be found more fully developed in the pamphlet entitled "The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist." In the first part of this pamphlet Mr. Willis adduces his reasons for believing that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice. Had the design of Mr. Willis been to show that the celebration of the Lord's Supper is, in a special sense, a Christian "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," a service in which we offer to God our alms, our prayers, our praises, and ourselves, we presume that no consistent member of the English Church would controvert the thesis which he undertakes to maintain. And if in the term *sacrifice* Mr. Willis thought proper to include the elements of bread and wine, as solemnly set apart for the service of God, and *in that sense* presented to Him, although we more than question whether in our own Communion office the elements are intended to be designated as *oblations*, or were included under that designation, still we should not deem it worth our while to contest, as a vital matter, a point on which men of equal wisdom and piety have held, and still hold, different opinions.

It is clear, however, that Mr. Willis holds the Eucharist to be a *sacrifice* in a very different sense from that in which we find the term used in our own Communion office, or in which it is so described by the great divines of the English Church. We shall not dwell upon the singular assertion that the Hiphil form of the Hebrew verb *karab* is the word "most commonly used in the Old Testament for 'to sacrifice,'" a rendering

[1] Wilberforce "On the Incarnation;" quoted by Mr. Willis, at p. 19, in a foot-note.

which we believe does not occur in one single instance throughout the inspired volume, nor on the conclusion which, as Mr. Willis assures us, follows from "the ordinary rules of textual criticism," that when St. Paul speaks of the things which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man," he must have quoted from one of the ancient Liturgies of the Christian Church, and not *vice versâ*. Still more strange and irrelevant is the argument derived from the eating by the Jews of the flesh of the Paschal Lamb and of the peace-offerings, as suggesting to the minds of the Apostles a *sacrificial* eating. Is Mr. Willis, we are tempted to ask, really unconscious of the difference between a *sacrifice* and a *feast upon a sacrifice*? or has he failed to observe that if the analogy to which he appeals holds good, as we think it does, it militates directly against the conclusion for which he contends; inasmuch as the sacrificial acts of the priest were altogether different from, and independent of, the so-called *sacrificial* eating of the worshipper? We shall not dwell any further on Mr. Willis's argument derived from the use of the Greek verb ποιεῖν, than to express our surprise that any one who is at all conversant with what has been so often and so well written on this subject, and more especially within the last few years, should have so far prejudiced his own cause as to attempt to resuscitate that which has been hopelessly slain.

We proceed to notice Mr. Willis's explanation of the word ἀνάμνησις as used in the words of Institution, "Do this in remembrance of Me," or according to Mr. Willis's rendering "for the memorial of Me." The first thing which strikes us in Mr. Willis's remarks on the meaning of the word ἀνάμνησις is, that whilst he refers to each of the four instances in which the word occurs in the *Old* Testament, as the equivalent of the Hebrew word *ziccaron*, he takes no notice of the use of the word itself, or of the cognate verb as elsewhere used in the *New* Testament. Now the word itself occurs three times in connection with the institution of the Lord's Supper—viz., in St. Luke xxii. 19, and 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. The only other place in which it occurs is Heb. x. 3, on which place Delitzsch observes that the word "may be understood of the *publica seu solemnis commemoratio* (the public or solemn commemoration of sins), made by the High Priest in the three formal confessions of the day of atonement;" but, he adds, "the other interpretation of ἀνάμνησις (*in memoriam revocatio*, the calling back to memory), as having a wider bearing, is certainly to be preferred, and may equally involve an allusion to those three liturgical acts of confession."[1] But although the noun occurs only in these four places in the New Testament, the cognate verb ἀναμιμνήσκειν occurs in the six following places—viz., St. Mark xi. 21; xiv. 72; 1 Cor. iv. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 15; 2 Tim. i. 6; Heb. x. 32, in each of which cases it has manifest reference to something which was to be kept in memory by men, and not to anything which was to be brought as a memorial before God. We now turn from the New Testament to the Old. The two words μνημόσυνον and ἀνάμνησις are used in the Greek version of the Old Testament as the equivalents of the Hebrew words *azcarah* and *ziccaron*—*i.e.*, *memorial*. The *former* of these two Greek words is used as the equivalent of the Hebrew words *azcarah* and *ziccaron* in passages such as Lev. ii. 2, 9, 16; v. 12; vi. 15; Num. v. 15, 18, 26—in all of which it occurs in its *sacrificial signification*, whilst of the four passages in which the word ἀνάμνησις is used as the equivalent of either of these Hebrew words or of the cognate verb—viz., in Lev. xxiv. 7, Num. x. 10, and in the titles to Psalms xxxviii. and lxix.—we find it, in the last two instances, clearly used in the subjective sense of calling to mind, *in rememorationem de sabbato*

[1] "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews," ii. p. 147, Clark's translation.

and *in rememorationem, quod salvum fecerit eum Dominus;* whilst in regard to one of the two remaining instances—viz., Lev. xxiv. 7, where the reference is to the shewbread—we will content ourselves with quoting the following extract from the writings of one to whose authority Mr. Willis makes frequent reference with apparent respect:—"The shewbread" (says Bishop Wordsworth in his commentary on Exodus xxv. 30) "represented the duty of the people on their part, to set themselves ever before God, and to set the Lord always before their face, and to remember His continual presence, and their own special duty to set themselves anew before Him on each succeeding Sabbath." We will only add to what has been now advanced on this point, that whilst in one of the three places in which the word *μνημόσυνον* occurs in the New Testament, it is used in the signification of a memorial presented before God (viz., in Acts x. 4), *ἀνάμνησις* is uniformly rendered *remembrance*, and can in no place be *proved* to have any other than a subjective signification.

We must now refer our readers to a specimen of special pleading and of paradoxical assertion to which it would, we think, be difficult to adduce a parallel either for the fallacy of the premises, or for the illogical character of the conclusions. Mr. Willis undertakes at page 21 to extract out of 1 Cor. x. 15, 21, a meaning not only consistent with, but in his judgment corroborative of, the sacrificial theory of the Eucharist for which he is contending. He expresses, indeed, his opinion with a *naïveté* which, considering the attention which this passage has received, is somewhat surprising, that "its bearing upon the question of the Eucharistic sacrifice is not generally appreciated as it deserves to be;" and truly, if the interpretation which Mr. Willis attempts to put upon it be the true one, we unhesitatingly endorse the propriety of this remark. In order, however, that we may do Mr. Willis no injustice, it is but fair to allow him to state his own case. "What," he asks, "is St. Paul's argument? It is "simply this—that if the Jews by eating of their sacrifices were par-"takers of the heathen altar, and had fellowship thereby with the devils "to whom in reality the sacrifices were offered; so Christians, by eating "of the Bread and drinking of the Cup which were the Communion of "the Body and Blood of Christ, were partakers of the Lord's table, and "thereby had fellowship with Him. . . . . But unless there is a Christian "altar and a Christian sacrifice, the whole argument falls to pieces: it "is necessary to the argument that altar should be opposed to altar, "sacrifice to sacrifice, the Christian altar to the altar of Jews and heathens, "the Christian sacrifice to the Jewish and heathen sacrifices. . . . . And "as by the table of devils St. Paul undoubtedly means the heathen *altar*, "so it is no less clear that by the table of the Lord he must mean the "Christian *altar*." We have quoted the words of Mr. Willis at considerable length, lest, inadvertently, we should misrepresent his meaning or detract one single jot or tittle from the strength of his argument.

Our first inquiry in regard to this remarkable piece of reasoning is: Does Mr. Willis really believe that the Jews were accustomed or permitted to eat of that which had been offered upon the brazen altar of sacrifice? If he does, he must, we think, have bestowed but little time or labour upon the ritual of the Levitical law. If, on the other hand, he is aware of the fact (as we cannot doubt, if his book represents in any adequate degree the results of original research), that that which was placed upon the altar was consumed by the sacred fire, then the analogy, so far as it is supposed to depend upon the thing—whether table or altar—upon which the offering was placed falls altogether to the ground.

Again, in the argument which Mr. Willis here employs he seems altogether to ignore the definition which, as he reminds his readers, he had already given of sacrifice—viz., "that it is a gift presented to a

person for the purpose of having communion with that person" (p. 22, *note*). Is Mr. Willis prepared, we may ask, in the face of this definition, to allege that fellowship with the true God, or fellowship with demons, could be maintained in no other manner than by participation in that which had been offered upon an altar; or—to employ his own words—is he still prepared to maintain, in spite of his own definition, that the whole argument of the Apostle "falls to pieces," unless there be (in his acceptation of the term) "a Christian altar and a Christian sacrifice?"

But this is not all. Mr. Willis is, undoubtedly correct in saying that there are places in the Old Testament in which the word *table* is used as synonymous with *altar*, although he is somewhat unfortunate in his appeal to Ezekiel xl. 39–43, where mention is made of the two, four, and even eight *tables* on which the offerings were *slain*, or the *flesh placed* —a passage in which we should have imagined that no one would be prepared seriously to maintain that *table* is equivalent to *altar*. But did it never occur to Mr. Willis that had St. Paul intended to enunciate the doctrine which is here ascribed to him, he would not have substituted the word *table* for *altar* in such a connection, and that by the very fact that the Lord's *table* is not here (or, as we maintain, in any other place of the New Testament) described as an *altar*, St. Paul has hereby conveyed a silent protest against Mr. Willis's allegation that *altar* is here opposed to *altar*, or in other words against the supposition that the Eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice offered to God, rather than a gift of God bestowed upon man, accompanied by solemn acts of prayer and praise offered by man to God?

It remains only that we add a few words in reference to Mr. Willis's explanation of the crucial passage contained in Hebrews xiii. 10–12, and to the extravagant theory which he propounds at the close of his pamphlet respecting the fulfilment in the person of the great Antitype of the two types contained in the Passover and in the sin-offering of the Great Day of Atonement. And here we may observe, in the first place, that we agree with Mr. Willis in the belief that the word *we* means *we Christians*, and that the writer of this Epistle does not speak as a Jew. We agree, further, with Mr. Willis that the writer has in view the sacrifices of the Great Day of Atonement in their typical relations to the Great Sacrifice of the Cross. And yet once more, we agree with Mr. Willis that the words which are here employed denote that we Christians do indeed eat of the sacrifice offered upon the Cross, even of Him who was at once the Priest offering and the Victim slain.

But here our agreement with Mr. Willis ends. For whilst we maintain that the whole drift of the passage excludes any reference to a material altar and to the eating of any material sacrifice offered upon it, we maintain that the reference is to that spiritual eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood of which our Lord himself spoke in the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. John, and to those spiritual sacrifices of prayer, of praise, and of oblation with which, when presented in humble reliance upon the efficacy of the *one sacrifice once offered on the one and only altar of Christ's Cross*, God is ever well pleased.

It now remains only that we briefly allude, as we have already intimated, to the theory which Mr. Willis undertakes to defend respecting the fulfilment of the two great types contained in the Passover and in the sin-offering of the Great Day of Atonement—viz., that the fulfilment of the former type was in the Upper Chamber, and that of the latter upon the Cross.

Before we proceed to point out in what respects we altogether dissent from the theory which Mr. Willis here propounds, we wish to state in the first place to what extent we agree with him. Mr. Willis observes

as follows :—"We naturally look to find these two pre-eminent sacrifices "fulfilled in a special manner in the great Antitype of all sacrifices; and "accordingly, we see the former fulfilled in the Upper Chamber, the latter "upon the Cross" (p. 45). If we substitute the word *types* for *sacrifices* in the former of the two clauses contained in this extract, we not only entirely agree with Mr. Willis, but we advance a step beyond him, by which advance we think that we shall somewhat impair the logical force of the word *accordingly*, by which Mr. Willis connects his conclusion with his premises. Be this as it may, we express our conviction not only that we *naturally* look to find the fulfilment of these two types in the great Antitype, but that, on the strict warrant of Holy Scripture, we look for the fulfilment not only of these, but of all the sacrifices of the Levitical law in the one "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world" once offered upon the Cross of Calvary. But what, we must inquire, is that course of argument by which Mr. Willis has satisfied himself of the soundness of the theory which he here propounds? First, he tells us that "among all the sacrifices "of the Jewish law, two stand out with peculiar prominence above the "rest." We shall not here pause to inquire how, in accordance with his former positions, Mr. Willis has satisfied himself that there can be a true (and that a propitiatory) sacrifice without an *altar* on which it was presented. We are quite content to accept thus far the conclusion at which Mr. Willis has arrived, and not to discuss its consistency with the arguments which he has elsewhere employed. He proceeds to observe that the sacrifice of the Passover, "in its first institution, was the means, and, in after celebrations of it, the memorial, of their salvation" (*i.e.*, of the salvation of the Israelites); and he takes occasion to observe, in a foot-note, that "we see here how a memorial of a sacrifice can be also itself a sacrifice." The design and application of the statement contained in this note is obvious. It does not appear, however, to have occurred to Mr. Willis to inquire whether he is not here, and more especially in the remarks which follow, confounding two things which essentially differ—viz., the sacrifice itself, and the feast upon the sacrifice. Be this as it may, we have no hesitation in affirming that when Mr. Willis proceeds to speak of our Lord offering Himself as the true Paschal Lamb at the Last Supper, he is not only wholly without warrant from Holy Scripture for such an assertion, but that he is propounding a theory which is wholly irreconcilable with it. Mr. Willis says indeed that "several things confirm this view." First, he appeals to the time of the institution. We shall not here enter upon the discussion of the much-vexed question whether our Lord did, or did not, anticipate the time at which the Passover was celebrated by the Jews. We believe, for our own part, that He did anticipate that time; and that it was at the time at which the Jews killed the paschal lambs, with a view to the after celebration of the paschal feast, that Christ, as the true Paschal Lamb, was sacrificed for us upon the Cross, and thus fulfilled the legal type, as well in the time of the offering, as in the design of the institution.

Mr. Willis alleges, as another reason in support of his theory, the circumstances and the language of the institution of the Lord's Supper in connection with the Passover. We think it is a sufficient reply to this argument to quote the words which our Lord then employed, "Do this in remembrance of Me," or to refer to those of St. Paul, "As often as ye "eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew (or proclaim, καταγγέλλετε) "the Lord's death till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26)—*i.e.*, just as the Jewish Passover was observed in commemoration of the deliverance wrought instrumentally by the shedding of the blood of the lamb, and its sprinkling upon the doorposts of the houses of the Israelites, so the

Christian Passover was to be observed in commemoration of the blood-shedding of the true Lamb of God upon the Cross, and as one of the appointed means whereby the efficacy of that blood-shedding is applied to the heart and conscience of the penitent and believing sinner.

But if all the other arguments adduced by Mr. Willis in defence of the theory that the type of the Passover was fulfilled at the Last Supper and not upon the Cross, tend rather to an opposite conclusion, what shall we say of the boldness of his appeal to words which seem to us to carry on their very surface the strongest and most conclusive contradiction of the theory in support of which they are adduced? They are these—"Christ our Passover is *sacrificed* for us." If Mr. Willis is serious in leading his readers to suppose that the *sacrifice* of Christ took place in the Upper Chamber and not upon the Cross, we feel that no words of ours can avail to dispel the illusion under which he labours. If, on the contrary, he adheres, as we presume that he does, to the view which is adopted by some writers, that the sacrifice was *presented* only in the Upper Chamber, but actually *offered* upon the Cross, then we urge that the words which he has quoted are absolutely fatal to the theory which he defends, inasmuch as the actual *sacrifice* itself, and not any previous presentation of it, is necessarily implied in St. Paul's words to have been the fulfilment of the type of the Jewish Passover. If any further proof were needed that this is the view which alone receives the support of the inspired writers of the New Testament, we may refer further to the very remarkable words which we find in St. John's Gospel, in which the type which is contained in the direction, "Neither shall ye break a bone thereof" (Ex. xii. 46), and also the prediction "They shall look on Him whom they pierced" (Zech. xii. 10), received their fulfilment at one and the same time—*i.e.*, not in the Upper Chamber, but upon the Cross of Calvary: "For these things were done that the Scripture should be "fulfilled, A bone of Him shall not be broken: And again, another "Scripture saith, They shall look on Him whom they pierced" (xix. 36, 37).

We have now completed the task which we proposed to ourselves in the examination of the book and the pamphlet which lie before us. We are ready to do full justice to the motives which have impelled Mr. Willis to put them forth. We have no ground whatever to doubt that he has a "zeal for God," though we believe that zeal to be "not according to knowledge." We give him credit for having examined the types of the Levitical law with a considerable amount of patient and praiseworthy attention; but we retain the strong conviction that he has carried on his investigation under the influence of invincible prejudice, and consequently that he has been absolutely blind to everything which runs counter to his foregone conclusions. We sincerely trust that he may be led, not to abandon the field of inquiry on which he has entered, but to retrace his steps, to discover what we believe to be his errors, and, as far as in him lies, to avert, as regards himself and those over whom he may exercise any influence, what we cannot regard in any other light than as the pernicious results of their adoption.

Rambles among the Hills in the Peak of Derbyshire and South Downs. By Louis J. Jennings, Author of "Field Paths and Green Lanes." Pp. 300. John Murray. 1880.

THERE are many strange people and odd scenes to be met with in England if a man goes about keeping his eyes open for them, and is prepared to enter into the spirit of the thing when accident throws them in his

way. As for the beauty of the country, no man will ever be capable of doing justice to it. Its endless variety astonishes the observant traveller the more he sees of it; travel as much as one may, there is always a pleasant surprise in store. Such, at all events, is the opinion of Mr. Jennings, to whom we are indebted for "Rambles" in Derbyshire and Sussex, a really charming series of pen and pencil pictures. With the author's "Field Paths and Green Lanes" we are not acquainted; but his descriptions of walks and rambles among the hills and downs now before us are not surpassed by anything of the kind so far as our knowledge goes. The style is unaffected, pleasing, and has a good deal of literary power.

We thoroughly agree with Mr. Jennings in his remarks on the beauty of England. He says :

I do not believe that there is any man alive who can say with truth that he has seen England thoroughly. One may have lived in much larger countries it is true, but there are none which it takes so long to get tired of as England. Let the reader give it a few trials, avoiding beaten tracks which are haunted by tramps and the fearful men on the bicycle; going always alone, and allowing himself plenty of time.

The first division of these "Rambles" relates to Chatsworth, Haddon, Hardwicke Hall, Matlock, Bolsover, and The Peak. In Part II. appear eleven chapters on the South Down Country : Petersfield, Midhurst, Steyning, Lewes, Beachy Head, and "the finest seven miles in England." Open where one may we find some pretty bit of scenery, or else some interesting chat—Mr. Jennings describes people as well as he does places—or some valuable hints for knapsack travellers.

We may give two or three specimen quotations. In the chapter Heathfield to Ashburnham," for instance, opening the book at random, Mr. Jennings says:—

The physical features of the country retain many of their old characteristics. Although the ancient forests of Sussex are gone, large tracts are covered with wood, without reckoning the remains of St. Leonards and Ashdown forests. Much of the soil is of very little use to the agriculturist, for it consists of a miserable sandy loam. Darvel Wood, near Brightling, is said to cover 1,100 acres, and there are large patches of similar woods to be seen from "Cross-in-Hand," or Heathfield, with broken ground between them, and a fair sprinkling of cultivated fields. The bye-roads are very bad, with ruts in them a foot and more deep. Even in May and June last (1880), after an unusually dry season, I found many of them heavy with mud. The main roads are better, but they are very trying to the patience of the traveller, for the twist and turn about like the paths in a maze. There is no end to them; you think you are there, when in reality you are still a long way off. The people have often made for themselves paths through fields and woods, but it is impossible for the stranger to find them out. There is no beaten track to be seen, and in the woods the paths are narrow and half grown with trees and ferns, so that it requires a native of the locality to pilot one through them. Leatherstocking himself would not have hit upon these trails. Throughout this part of the country, moreover, the inns, as a rule, are very bad—mere wayside beer-houses, without any of the arrangements for cleanliness or comfort which the least fastidious of travellers are accustomed to look for.

The new railroad from Tunbridge Wells to Polegate Junction, says Mr. Jennings, has opened a large section of this country, but it ceases at some distance from the primitive parts of the Weald, and scarcely touches the Forest Ridge. The highest point of the Ridge is found at Crowborough Beacon :—

On Beachy Head, Firle, Mount Caburn, Ditchling, Chanctonbury, and other lofty points of the Downs, large piles of wood and other fuel were once kept ready to be set on fire at any moment, and the arrival of the Spanish Armada off our coasts was one of the occasions when the whole line of signals was ablaze, from Land's End to Beachy Head. The last time the Sussex beacon fires were lit was on the 10th March, 1863, in honour of the arrival of the "Sea-King's daughter from over the sea," the ever-popular Princess of Wales."

We may add that this book, well printed on good paper, has a very tasteful cover. There are several choice and interesting illustrations.

Short Notices.

The Church at Home. A Series of Short Sermons, with Collect and Scripture for Sundays, Saints' Days, and Special Occasions. By Rowley Hill, D.D., Bishop of Sodor and Man. Pp. 336. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co. 1881.

This is likely to prove a very useful book, and we heartily recommend it. "The Collects of our Church," writes the Bishop, "are short, and the prayers, which they contain are very beautiful. The Lectionary is admirably arranged for the daily reading of the Word of God. The course of devotional teaching for the Christian Year keeps the Life of Christ continually before us, and, at the same time, furnishes the most complete system of Christian doctrine. It is in accordance with this arrangement that these Short Sermons are prepared, and they will have answered their purpose if only they are the means of leading some to an appreciation of the fuller services and worship of God's House." We have quoted from the Preface, and its words, with those of the Title-page, clearly show the character of the work, which is ably-written, and supplies a want. The Sermons—some readers may complain—are short, but they are suggestive; the language is clear, pointed, and practical; the amount of doctrinal teaching is by no means small; for a Sunday evening's service in "the Church at home" we know nothing so good. We hope that from the leisure which his lordship must have in so small a diocese, other similar works will come forth for the benefit of the Church.

A Missionary's Dream: being a Discussion upon the Action of the Missionary Societies, the Clergy, the Universities, and the Church of England in the relation to Foreign Missionary. By A Missionary. Pp. 120. Rivingtons. 1880.

Many of the criticisms and suggestions in this little book are well worth studying. The argument in favour of *Church* control over missions, a Board instead of the Church Missionary Society Committee, we may simply pass by; it would be a waste of time to discuss it. A practical question, however, is the revival of the lay-diaconate, and, together with

this, the joining together small contiguous parishes. As to our large towns, the author's remarks upon the practical heathenism of England, are, alas! too true. On many a platform, year after year, the Earl of Shaftesbury has pointed to the condition of the masses, and spoken with power of the importance of lay co-operation. The noble Earl has pleaded for clergymen rather than for churches, the living agent rather than the building. In the towns are needed more men as Christian teachers and preachers, laity as well as clergy, and *working men* as well as doctors, lawyers and tradesmen. As to the country at large, the "Missionary" thinks that if the number of suffragan bishops could be increased great results would follow. We very much doubt it. We are quite at one with him, however, as to the lack of missionary zeal and self-denial in the Church of England. We quote his words in regard to small contiguous country parishes:—

> Deacons will cease to be apprentice priests, and will be taken from all ranks of the people. They will retain their secular occupation (if any), and will be under the charge of a priest, who, instead of having under his care merely one parish, will have a circle of parishes—say all the churches of such a town as this, of 20,000 inhabitants, and its suburbs. The deacons, who will, as a rule, belong to their own respective towns or villages, will receive little or no salary, but their working expenses will be defrayed from the church funds. They will not be admitted to the priesthood unless, indeed, like those who are especially trained for the ministry at the universities and theological colleges, they pass the required examinations and are ready to go wherever they may be sent. For the diaconate they will have to pass a bishop's examination, and they will receive as much special training as is compatible with the circumstances of their lives. Deacons *can* do much work,—let them do all they can to lighten the labours of the priest-in-charge. Stern necessity has in the mission field compelled our missionaries to adopt this plan, modified to suit the circumstances of the case. Were clerical power wasted in the mission field in the utterly reckless way that we see here in England, we should never have heard of 350 accessions to Christianity in Tinnevelly last year, much less of 35,000.

Pilgrim Lays for the Homeward Bound, and Words of Counsel and Comfort in Sunshine and Shade. Arranged by J. WILLIAMSON. Pp. 230. Hatchards.

An interesting book. Mrs. Williamson's poetical taste is well known.

The Brethren: their Worship and the Word of God at Open Variance. By ROBERT H. CARSON. Pp. 50. London: Elliot Stock. Dublin: Carson Brothers. 1880.

Of the writer of this interesting pamphlet we have no knowledge, save that he is described on the title-page as "Pastor of the Church of Christ meeting in the Baptist Chapel, Tubbermore, Ireland." We are bound to remark, however, that the pamphlet exhibits research, ability, and an earnest Christian spirit. With the doctrines of the Brethren, we read in the Preface, "the present publication has nothing whatever to do. It deals simply with their Worship, and with this *in contrast* with the teachings of the New Testament. Professing, as they do, a special attachment to the Word, and regard for its precepts, our friends in their services have yet renounced the rule of Scripture, and in its stead accepted their own inspirations. Not what an Apostle commands, or a church of the New Testament observes, but what 'it has been given' the assembled worshippers to do, *that* they do. Thus, outside and beyond itself a 'gathering' has absolutely no guide." To bring this out, and prove it, has been Mr. Carson's aim. His first section is "The meetings of the Brethren are not Churches." A Church, in the sense of Scripture, is an organized body; but "the Brethren" denounce and repudiate

the very idea of organization; they say "you must come out from *system*." Secondly, Mr. Carson shows that their Worship is without law. Brethrenism is either *anarchy* or *tyranny*. Thirdly, "the Brethren are without office-bearers." Fourthly, "Brethrenism, in its Services, is the substitution of a present and personal Inspiration for the Inspiration of Scripture." "In one or two ways, as we think, must the services of the sanctuary be conducted in any assembly—viz., either on the ground of *known and recognized law*, or on that of *immediate divine revelation*. Not to act on one or other of these principles, is to admit a worship at once lawless and irregular; for if guided neither by a written code nor by revelation from Heaven, we must be absolutely without a guide, and consequently without order. Unwilling to admit a state of lawlessness, and having at the same time disallowed the New Testament system, the Brethren have but one resource—*Worship by Revelation*. And this is now their known and acknowledged ground. Proceeding from the position that the church is in ruins and not to be rebuilt, as more than once before remarked, they denounce the adoption of the New Testament order, and rely simply on the presence and presidency (of course extraordinary) of the Spirit of God."

Hours with the Bible. The Scriptures in the Light of Modern Discovery and Knowledge. From Creation to the Patriarchs. By CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D., Rector of Christ Church, Neuilly, Paris. With Illustrations. S. W. Partridge & Co. 1881.

The eminent author of "The Life and Words of Christ," one of the most remarkable works of the period, has done well to bring out "Hours with the Bible," of which the first volume is before us. He desires to supply what Dr. Arnold used to long for, "A people's handbook to the Bible;" not a dry series of papers, but a pleasant, attractive illumination of its pages by the varied lights of modern research and discovery. And this task, we hope, he will be able to accomplish. Dr. Geikie is known as a divine in the highest rank; his writings exhibit profound learning; he has a graphic pen, and considerable literary skill. His "Hours with the Bible," therefore, are likely to be widely read; they are eloquent, vigorous, and attractive. Open this volume where one may, and we have read most of its pages, not a weak or uninteresting passage will be found. The most recent researches have been studied, and the results, if they are worth anything, unfolded. Truly conservative, Dr. Geikie's doctrine is Evangelical, and his tone is thoroughly devout. We may add that the book is well printed, and has many illustrations. Our notice of it in type last month was, by an accident, postponed. We are glad to see that a third edition is now issued.

The Life and Writings of St. John. By JAMES M. MACDONALD, D.D. Edited, with an Introduction, by the Very Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D. Second Edition. Pp. 436. Hodder & Stoughton. 1880.

The first edition of this ably written work appeared about four years ago, the author Dr. Macdonald, an American divine, dying while the sheets were passing through the press. The Introduction by the Dean of Chester added much to the interest of the book, which we read at the time with pleasure and satisfaction. Dr. Macdonald's plan was "to present in one view all parts of St. John's life in their connection with one another and with his writings, and also in their connection with the life of Christ and the founding of His church." The book is recommended by the learned Dean as a valuable addition to our religious and theological literature. To the new and cheaper edition, now before us, we gladly invite attention.

Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Epistle to Philemon. By H. A. W. MEYER, Th.D.

Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Thessalonians. By Dr. LUNEMANN, Professor of Theology in the University of Göttingen. T. & T. Clark. 1880.

These two volumes complete the Meyer series of translations—sixteen volumes—issued by the eminent Edinburgh publishers; we have here, that is, the last volume of Dr. Meyer's "Commentary" as written by himself, and Dr. Lünemann's work on Thessalonians, which forms part of the "Meyer series." Dr. Dickson, the general editor, has spent no small amount of time and labour on this undertaking during the last eight years. Professor Lünemann's Commentary is translated by Dr. Gloag, who gives it high but qualified praise; he does not forget to write a gentle caveat in regard to doctrine. Lünemann's remarks on the prophecy of the Antichrist—to which we may return—seem to us unsatisfactory in the extreme. To Meyer, in Dr. Gloag's opinion, the first place must be given among modern commentators, considering "his profound learning, his unrivalled knowledge of Hellenistic Greek, his exegetical tact, his philological precision, his clear and almost intuitive insight into the meaning of the passage commented on, and his deep reverential spirit."

The Pulpit Commentary. Edited by the Rev. Canon SPENCE, M.A., and the Rev. JOSEPH S. EXELL, Editor of *The Homiletic Quarterly.*

Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther. Exposition by the Rev. GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A.

First Book of Samuel. Exposition by the Very Rev. R. PAYNE-SMITH, D.D. C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

The special feature of this new Commentary is the unusual prominence given to Homiletics. "Biblical Exegesis is made the basis of Homiletical teaching." In each volume appears, first the Exposition; then come "Homiletics;" and thirdly we have "Homilies by various Authors." With the exposition by Canon Rawlinson and the Dean of Canterbury we are much pleased. The Homiletics by the Rev. W. S. Lewis are exceedingly good. And wherever we have examined these handsome volumes—about 400 pages each—we have been well satisfied. Judging from the volumes before us, "The Pulpit Commentary" is likely to prove a valuable work. They are well printed and cheap.

In the last two numbers of the *Foreign Church Chronicle* (Rivingtons), appears an article on the Protestant Church in Berlin. Special interest is attached to this article, inasmuch as the autumnal *Edinburgh Review* gave an exceedingly gloomy picture of the religious state of Protestant Germany. The writer in the *Foreign Church Chronicle*, the Rev. G. E. Broade, begins by remarking that in Berlin there are symptoms of awakening activity. "For the last two years the Superior Council has asked for a large subsidy for the relief of the spiritual necessities of Berlin; but owing to the breach between it and the Rationalist party, which is all powerful in two or three of the largest parishes, this subsidy has been refused. The Council has manfully stood its ground; and the reaction of late having been decidedly against the (liberal) aspirations, there is little doubt that the subsidy will soon be procured. Meanwhile, the Berlin religious papers give the freest ventilation to statistics of the Protestant position," and Mr. Broade makes a condensed statement of these deplorable statistics.

Amos Huntingdon. A Tale Illustrative of Moral Courage, with Examples taken from Real Life. By Rev. T. P. WILSON, Victor of Pavenham. Ppp. 920. T. Nelson & Sons. 1881.

This is a really good "story book." It shows what moral courage is, based on Christian principles; the examples are well chosen; and there is enough of incident to keep up the interest of the story. Mr. Wilson is known as the author of "True to his Colours," and other readable Tales. "Amos Huntingdon" has several engravings, and is got up, as are all Messrs. Nelson's gift-books, in an attractive way.

The Importance of Accuracy in the Study of Holy Scripture, illustrated by Stephen's Speech, and by the Divine Names and Titles of the Old and New Testaments, &c. &c. By the Rev. E. W. BULLINGER, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Walthamstow. 1880. Pp. 45.

Mr. Bullinger is known as the author of that laborious and valuable work, "The English Greek Concordance." The pamphlet before us will repay reading.

Church Pastoral Aid Society. Sketch of its Orgin and Progress. Pp. 235. Seeleys, 1881.

In a brief Preface, Mr. Speck, the esteemed Clerical Secretary, explains the nature of this publication. Many warm friends of the C. P. A., it appears, have expressed their need of an authentic narrative of the Society's proceedings, from the date of its institution; and Mr. Speck, accordingly, has made a selection from the Minutes and Quarterly Papers of the Society, supplying the thread of narrative necessary for connection and interest. His selection is judicious; and friends and foes, if so admirable a Society has any foes, may find in this little book, without much trouble, what was the design of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, founded forty-five years ago; what has been and still are its difficulties; what results, indirect as well as direct, it has brought about; and what are the grounds on which its ardent well-wishers plead for an increased support. We content ourselves in the present notice with heartily recommending this book. Recently we did ourselves the honour of requesting an eminent member of the Committee to contribute to THE CHURCHMAN some present-day statements as to the work and needs of the Society. We have always looked upon the C. P. A. as a most important Society; the influence for good which it has excited in the Church, particularly with respect to *lay* agency, has been by many churchmen altogether ignored; and even now the claims of the Society are by no means so well known, we think, as they really ought to be.

Index Rerum. A Ready Reference Register. By the Rev. JOHN TODD, author of "The Students' Manual." Edited, with additions, by the Rev. C. NEIL, M.A. C. Higham, 27*a*, Farringdon Street, E.C. 1881.

Well printed on good paper, with a strong cover, this Ready Reference Register or Common-Place Book will be found by many, probably, very useful.

The Crypt of Canterbury Cathedral: its Architecture, History, and Frescoes. By W. A. SCOTT ROBERTSON, M.A., Hon. Canon of Canterbury. Pp. 122. Mitchell & Hughes, 140, Wardour Street, W.

This ably written and interesting book, which has several illustrations, is designed mainly for the Antiquarian or Archæological student, but a section of the general reader class will not turn away from it. Canon Scott Robertson has done his work with the taste and judgment which might have been expected.

The Christian Leaders of the Last Century: or, England a Hundred Years Ago. By J. C. RYLE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool. T. Nelson & Sons. 1880.

In referring to the state of religion in this country a hundred years ago, we made mention, in a recent CHURCHMAN, of Dr. Ryle's ably-written work, "The Christian Leaders of the Last Century." It is with much pleasure that we have received a copy of a new edition of this work, and we gladly call to it the attention of our readers. The first edition appeared in the year 1868. The present edition is printed in clear type, on good paper, and is neatly bound. Such a volume should have a very large circulation, and yet we have an impression, somehow, that this, which some will deem Bishop Ryle's most interesting and important work, is by no means well-known, even in Protestant circles, whether Church of England or Nonconformist. The Bishop of Llandaff, a few weeks ago, quoted an anecdote from it, in a Convocation speech. The book has many striking anecdotes, and is very readable. The "Leaders" are Whitefield, John Wesley, Grimshaw, Romaine, Rowland, Berridge, Venn, Walker, Hervey, Toplady, and Fletcher of Madeley.

Common Praise. Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, for Use in the Church of England, Second edition, revised and corrected. Pp. 822. The Christian Book Society, 11, Adam Street, Strand, W.C. 1881.

The first edition of this book, which contains 822 Hymns, was published about a year and a half ago, and was recommended in THE CHURCHMAN. In bringing out a second five thousand, the first edition "being exhausted," the Compilers state that some verbal alterations have been made, and a few verses omitted; instead of the hymn "Blest be the dear uniting love," appears, "Blest be the tie that binds," and "Yon shining shore" has been substituted for "Yes, 'tis a rough and thorny road."

The Books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song, according to the Wycliffite Version. London: H. Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse, 7, Paternoster Row. 1881.

We have here a reprint from the Wycliffite Version made by Nicholas de Hereford about A.D. 1381, and revised by John Purvey about A.D. 1388, as edited by the Rev. Josiah Forshall and Sir Frederick Madden. The value of Madden and Forshall's great work, large quarto edition, four volumes, 1850, is well known. Side by side with Professor Lechler's recent exhaustive biography, it supplies all that most students need. The later Wycliffite version, that revised by Purvey, is not so rough or literal as the earlier, and has fewer unusual words; it is better suited therefore for general reading. A comparison with our Authorized Version is full of interest; and the likeness is sometimes very close, as in the following:

> Ps. iii. 4. With my vois Y criede to the Lord, and he herde me fro his hooli hil.

The 23rd Psalm opens thus:—

> The Lord gouerneth me, and no thing schal faile to me; in the place of pasture there he hath set me. He nurschide me on the watir of refreischyng; he conuertide my soule.

In the reprint before us a Glossary, mainly that of Forshall and Madden, explains the obsolete and unusual words; and the learned editor, Mr. Skeat, who has contributed an Introduction, has added an Index to the first and to the later Psalms. The book, it may be remarked, comes from the Clarendon Press.

Wives and their Husbands. By Mrs. George Gladstone. Religious Tract Society.

Printed in large clear type, with some woodcuts, this bright-looking book, with its story-sermons of working-class living, is likely to win its way.

Messrs. Ward, Lock and Co's. *Universal Instructor* keeps up its interest.

We have received the Religious Tract Society's Magazines for March. *Leisure Hour, Sunday at Home, The Boys' Own Paper, The Girls' Own Paper, The Childs' Companion,* form in themselves a little library for the family circle. *Friendly Greetings,* or "Illustrated Readings for the People," is exceedingly good. *The Cottager and Artizan* is welcome everywhere, so far as our experience goes, and we have circulated it for several years. From an article on Basutoland in the *Leisure Hour* we take the following:—

In 1875 a census was taken, when the official returns showed a population of 127,000 souls, possessing 217,732 horned cattle, 35,357 horses, 303,080 sheep, 215,485 goats, 299 wagons, 2,749 ploughs, the total value of which was estimated at £1,250,000. The exports of the year were 300,000 bushels of maize and 2,000 bales of wool, valued at £45,000, whilst the revenue was £16,523. No census has since been taken, but in 1878 the revenue had increased to £20,433. Ninety Government schools were in operation; a handsome building, with teacher's residence, to form the nucleus of an industrial institution, had been built; a Superintendent of Education had been appointed at a salary of £600 per annum, and the total expenditure for educational purposes for the year was £5,000. It would be difficult to cite an instance of more rapid progress from semi-barbarism to civilization.

In *Good Words* (Isbister & Co.) appears Part III. of Mr. Froude's interesting "Reminiscences of the High Church Revival." The sketch of John Henry Newman is very able. A common phrase of Oxford was *Credo in Newmannum,* "still unconsciously the faith of nine-tenths of the English converts to Rome."

From the Religious Tract Society we have received *The Story of Easter,* by the author of *The Story of Christmas,* recently recommended in these columns. It seems exceedingly good.

From Messrs. T. Nelson & Sons we have received a charming little book, *History of Good Dog Fanny,* several chatty short stories, "all true," by Mrs. Gaskell. A coloured frontispiece, neatly got up: a pleasing natural history gift-book.

An Elementary Manual for those who visit and nurse the sick poor, *The Nurse's Handbook,* (Elliot Stock) deserves to be made well known. Written by Mrs. H. Selfe Leonard, Hon. Sec. of the London Bible and Female Missions, it is very simple, and contains a good deal of sensible suggestion.

The Religious Tract Society has issued a packet of charming cards, *Easter Greetings.*

From Messrs. Hatchard we have received a second edition of *Short Sermons,* by the Rev. Francis Bourdillon, M.A., the second series. Mr. Bourdillon's works are well known: in their way they have few rivals. We most heartily recommend this little book.

From Messrs. George Bell & Sons (York Street., Covent Garden) we have received the second volume of Mr. Stewart's edition of *Plutarch's Lives,* with which we are much pleased. These books are very handy.

THE MONTH.

ON Sunday the 12th, at St. Petersburg, the Emperor of Russia was cruelly assassinated. Four determined attempts on his life had failed. Even on the present occasion he escaped unhurt from the first bomb, but a second did its terrible work. The Emperor had nearly completed his sixty-third year.

On the following morning a proclamation appeared in the Government journal, commencing:—

"We, by the grace of God, Alexander III., Emperor and Autocrat of All the Russias, Czar of Poland, Grand Duke of Finland, &c., hereby make known to all our faithful subjects that it has pleased the Almighty in His inscrutable will, to visit Russia with heavy blows of fate, and to call her benefactor, the Emperor Alexander II., to Himself. He fell by the hands of impious murderers, who had repeatedly sought his gracious life, and made their attempts because they saw in him the protector of Russia, the foundation of her greatness, and the promoter of the welfare of the Russian people."

Alexander Alexandrovich III., the new Emperor, was born in 1845, and was married in 1866 to Maria Dagmar, daughter of the King of Denmark, and sister of the Princess of Wales.

An armistice with the Transvaal Boers was concluded by Sir Evelyn Wood, with the permission of Mr. Gladstone's Ministry, Mr. Brand, President of the Orange Free State, acting as a negotiator with a view to peace. The war, happily, is now at an end.

A Court of Law has decided against the claim of Mr. Bradlaugh to sit and vote, after affirmation made in the place of an oath, as a member of the House of Commons. The decision may be reversed on appeal.

The Arms Bill, under the new "Urgency" regulations, passed through the House of Commons on the 11th. Mr. O'Donnell described the Arms Bill as "a bad, Bashi-Bazouk Bill, cursed with despotic Liberalism from beginning to end." An attempt to apply the new regulations to votes in Supply was resisted with success by the Conservatives. Under the Protection Bill several arrests have been made in Ireland.

The proposal of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords, that an Address be presented to the Crown praying for the nomination of a Royal Commission to inquire into the "constitution and working" of the Ecclesiastical Courts, was voted without a division.

A "Church Boards Bill" has been introduced in the House of Commons. The proposed Board is to be elected by "the same persons as would be entitled to vote for churchwardens in such parish if the same were an ancient parish."

The "Counter-Memorial" has received nearly 4,000 signatures.

In replying to some resolutions adopted by the Sheffield branch of the English Church Union, the Archbishop of York says :—

I should advise you, if you think well, to get put before the Commission which will be appointed your view of what the ancient position of the Convocations was with regard to 'ecclesiastical legislation.' If you suppose that it ever had such powers, you must have come across a different view of history from that with which I am familiar. Your second resolution, that there should be no resort to the Crown for appeals in ecclesiastical causes, would do away with the supremacy of the Crown, and would amount to disestablishing the Church. It is, of course, quite open to the members of the Church Union to promote disestablishment; but would it not be well, if this be so, to clear the ground by saying so? As to the proposal that Convocation should be made a court of appeal for ecclesiastical causes, I know that it has never had such power, and I think that it would not wield it well. This is on the supposition that the Church and nation would ever seriously take steps for such an end, which I do not at all expect.

At the annual meeting of the Church Association the chairman, referring to the work of now sixteen years, declared that the Association had been successful. He said :—

The Lord Chancellor of England, a most estimable man and a good Churchman, said from the Woolsack last week that the term of three years introduced by the Archbishop of Canterbury, or by some other member of the House of Peers, into the Public Worship Regulation Act ought to have been three weeks, or, at the most, three months. (Cheers.) Such an expression of opinion would never have been heard but for these imprisonments. Although a Commission is now to be issued—and I admit that the arguments of the Archbishop on this subject were to a Government unanswerable—yet if the Commission is intended merely to hang up our proceedings, and to keep this thing going for three or four years, they will do it with men in prison in order to cry out for their release. We are still prosecuting, and we intend to prosecute. (Loud cheers.) There will be no difficulty in the Lord Chancellor introducing, should he think fit to do so, a bill to alter the term from three years to three months. Then we should be nearly satisfied, for we should see that justice was within reach. But as long as the law remains as it is now, so long we shall say that the law must take its course. (Cheers.) We did not make the law, but we will enforce it.

The Earl of Dunraven brought forward in the House of Lords a motion for opening all public museums and art galleries on Sundays. The motion was lost by seven votes only. An amendment, proposed by Lord Shaftesbury, approving of a suggestion made some years ago by a committee of the House of Commons, that such institutions as the British Museum and the National Gallery should be opened to the public from seven to ten o'clock at least three evenings in the week, was unanimously carried.