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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

FEBRUARY, 1884.

ART. I.—THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT AGAINST THE NEW MARRIAGE LAW.

THE advocates of the Bill, which so nearly passed the House of Lords last year, would fain believe that the Scriptural argument against it is abandoned: and it is true that it is too often postponed to social and domestic objections, which are thought better suited for Parliamentary and public discussion. I am persuaded that this is a great mistake. The Scriptural argument is never abandoned by the friends of the Bill: they never cease to assert that "there is nothing in the Bible against it;" that thousands of good Christians believe these unions to be Scriptural; that men and women of unblemished life have conscientiously contracted them, and the law has no right to stigmatize them and punish the innocent offspring. To these assertions, disingenuously repeated, the Bill is indebted for the position it has attained in public favour. Numbers who seriously disapprove of these unions are unwilling to restrain the rights of conscience. The Nonconformists are in arms against the bigotry of the Bishops who vote against private judgment. Many begin to doubt if the Scriptural argument is really tenable. They do not see that the Bill seeks to establish by law a construction of Scripture which the Church denies, and which is utterly at issue with the recognised principles of Holy Matrimony. In point of fact, the whole fabric of our Marriage Law is based upon Scripture, and we cannot abandon the argument without subverting the institution.

The Act 32 Hen. VIII. c. 38, on which the Table of Prohibited degrees is framed, declares "all persons to be lawful that be not prohibited by God's law to marry;" it enacts that "no reservation or prohibition, God's law except, shall trouble or

impeach any marriage without the Levitical degrees." In two previous Acts the degrees are enunciated, and the wife's sister is among them. These two Acts are, perhaps, not now in force; but the Levitical degrees being thus made part of the Statute Law, the Church Courts became subject to prohibition from the temporal judges in respect of them; and the wife's sister has been adjudged to be within the prohibition by the Court of King's Bench. Similar judgments have been given on other degrees, and in all the courts of the realm, civil and criminal, as well as ecclesiastical, this is the settled law of the land. The learned baron who assured the House of Lords that there was nothing in the Bible against the Bill, would have told them the contrary in their judicial capacity. Sitting as a law lord, he must have pronounced a marriage with the sister of a deceased wife null and void, by reason of its being within the Levitical degrees, which the law of England receives for the law of God.

Of course there are persons who do not agree with the law. Some insist that a wife's sister is not within the Levitical degrees, and others that the Levitical degrees are not binding upon Christians. The Mormonites defend and practise polygamy. Men and women of high culture have been known to profess themselves "married in the sight of God," though one, or both, were legally married to another. Many deny that there is any law of God on the subject; and not a few are now saying there is no God. These opinions may be all equally "conscientious;" but why is one more than the rest to arrogate a right above the law? No man pretends to be under a religious obligation to marry his sister-in-law; consequently the part of conscience is to obey the law of the land, especially when the penalty of breaking it falls upon others.[1] An illicit union is necessarily immoral: parties who can separate at will, and be lawfully married to others, are not man and wife. The children suffer for the sins of their fathers. This is not peculiar. The peculiarity is, that an illicit union, which is

[1] "Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren."—Art. xxxiv. It is pleasant to know that Mr. Bright's menacing conscience is not sustained by the authority of his denomination. The Society of Friends, recognising "the principle of compliance with the laws of the land, in cases where conscience is not aggrieved, forbid all marriages 'within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity prohibited by law.'"—*Book of Christian Discipline*, London, Harris, 1883, p. 260.

also incestuous, is thereby raised to the dignity of suffering for conscience' sake, and becomes dentitle to judge the law it has violated!

I remember a much injured lady who was compelled by conscience to separate from the Duke of Sussex, when their marriage—otherwise unimpeachable—was set aside under the provisions of an arbitrary and very unscriptural Act of Parliament. No peers or princes then rushed to the rescue. Sympathy is now shown for the conscience that first knowingly drags the innocent objects of affection into the penalties of the law, and then reviles the law. That women, otherwise respectable, have been induced to compromise their reputations, and become mothers of illegitimate offspring, is a proof of the pressure which an unscrupulous man can bring to bear on a defenceless sister-in-law. It is no argument for abolishing the prohibition, which in better regulated consciences guards the domestic circle from impurity. The legislature, which indulges the Royal Family with a prohibition of the rest of mankind, is not to break down the barriers which the law of God has set around other families, for the moral elevation of society.

In charging the advocates of the Bill with disingenuousness, I mean that they raise a cloud of inconsistent objections while carefully evading the issue upon any one. In a *Summary* just issued by the Marriage Law Reform Association, the statement that the intercourse prohibited by the Levitical degrees is impure and morally wrong is traversed by the following reply:

> This inference is directly negatived by fact. Some of the connexions prohibited in Leviticus are clearly *not* naturally impure, morally wrong. One, a marriage by Leviticus first prohibited, had been contracted by faithful Abraham without reproach. Another is a marriage forbidden under certain circumstances, and in different circumstances commanded. Moreover, marriage with a *deceased wife's sister* is not prohibited at all in Leviticus. Marriage with "near of kin" is undoubtedly forbidden; but a wife's sister is *not* "near of kin;" is not of *any* "kin" to the *husband*.[1]

This is a very pregnant passage. The argument which takes with the public—the only argument for the Bill *as it stands*—is that the wife's sister is not prohibited in Leviticus. But this is a small thing in the view of its framers. They insist that affinity is not kindred, and therefore no bar to marriage, though prohibited in Leviticus. It is an obstacle under certain circumstances, and a duty in others. Further, consanguinity itself is no *moral* impediment, seeing that "faithful Abraham" married his half-sister "without reproach." The inevitable conclusion is that the Levitical degrees belong to the Ceremonial

[1] *Summary of the Chief Arguments for and against Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister* (Marriage Law Reform Association).

Law, which does not bind Christian men, and are no part of the moral commandments from which no Christian man is free.[1]

That this is the true principle of the reform initiated in this "small measure" is clearly indicated further on:

> The Reformation swept away the prohibition of cousins and others, but retained this marriage with sisters-in-law, *because* it was necessary to Henry's passions and the state purposes of Cranmer and Parker. The Church of England differs from the Church of Rome, and from nearly every Protestant Church in the world, in her Scriptural view of these marriages; and to what is this to be attributed? What, but the *gratification of Henry's lust, and the subsequent necessity of supporting Elizabeth's title?* The dealings of the Reformers with Henry's various marriages are the greatest blot of the Reformation; and the very last thing a true Churchman would wish to defend (p. 12).

Here, again, the italics are the writer's own. He knows that the "sister-in-law," repudiated by Henry VIII. is prohibited by name in Leviticus; and, by using the common term, he admits the wife's sister to be virtually included in the prohibition. He would not like the violation of the prohibition to be ascribed to the cause which he assigns for enforcing it. But what else is ever the object of an illicit union? Certainly no State purpose is to be served by removing the prohibition; and the legitimacy of Queen Elizabeth may be quite as important as that of the "innocent offspring" now commended to compassion.

Where our Church differs from Rome, and German Protestantism, is in accepting the Levitical degrees for God's law immutable by human authority. If this be a "blot on our Reformation," no loyal Churchman will consent to efface it by a dispensing power in Parliament, which the Reformers refused to allow in the Pope. The laws of marriage are much oftener violated beyond the prohibited degrees than within them. Moreover, the wife's sister is only one of thirty degrees of affinity in the authorized Table; and something more than the wishes of the parties is required to distinguish this case from the others. It is not a question of the Church Canon only. At the Reformation the law of the land accepted the law of God in this particular; and the Legislature has a conscience of its own to satisfy. The Divine prohibition is clear enough to all who will take the Scripture without the "private interpretation." In the Bible the Levitical degrees are as plain as the Ten Commandments, to which they bear a striking resemblance. The preamble is in the same spirit, only more explicit. There is a solemn warning against the sins of Egypt and Canaan—the house of bondage, from which they were delivered, and the enemy from whom they were to conquer the

[1] Article vii.

Land of Promise. Three times the Holy Name is repeated in this exordium; then the commandment comes, under the broad seal of Heaven, "*None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin unto him.* I THE LORD,"—and countersigned at the end, "*it is wickedness.*"[1] This was no new commandment. It is evident that marriage with a sister was unlawful before the call of Abram.[2] His gloss of the half-sister was new to Pharaoh and Abimelech, and is emphatically rejected in the Mosaic Reformation. His marriage, contracted among the idolatrous Chaldæans, was so far from being "without reproach," that it suffered the recognised mark of the Divine displeasure in being childless[3] till the parties were both "as good as dead" (Heb. xi. 12).

The words translated "near of kin" (Marg., "remainder of his flesh") mean, without question, the next blood relations: the mother, of whom the flesh is born; the sister, who shares the birth; and the daughter, to whom the flesh is transmitted. These are primarily the remainder, or remnant, of a man's flesh. But the primary sense is not all; the same word is used in the Divine law of marriage, "They twain shall be one flesh;" and this oneness of flesh, rather than natural consanguinity, is the root-principle of the Levitical prohibition. Thus, the mother is prohibited, not because of her consanguinity with the son, but because of her marriage with the father; and accordingly the prohibition extends to a second wife of the father's, though a stranger in blood to the son.[4] In like manner, a half-sister on the father's side is placed under the same ban as the child of the same mother, in marked reprobation of Abram's precedent. The principle comes out still more clearly in the case of the daughter. Some suppose

[1] Lev. xviii. 17; compare 2 Tim. ii. 19. The Hebrew *Zimmah*, signifying, literally, man's device or imagination, is used in Gen. vi. 5, and generally in the evil sense. The LXX. here render it ασέβημα, "not having the fear of God before his eyes," as our old law language ran.

[2] The fifth of the "Seven Precepts of Noah" is entitled, in the Talmud, "*El galavi orvat*," the *same words* that occur so often in Lev. xviii. They comprehend (like the Seventh Commandment) all illicit unions; and the same extent is probably to be ascribed to πορνεία in Acts xv. 20. It has been observed that the Apostolic decree agrees in substance with the precepts of Noah, which are declared in the Talmud itself to be sufficient for the Gentiles. The Decalogue and the Levitical degrees are only clearer definitions of this primæval moral law. The Jewish commentators say that the Noachic forbad only three degrees—mother, father's wife, and uterine sister, and that fifteen were added in Leviticus, among which is the wife's sister.

[3] Lev. xx. 20.

[4] It is this last case, the sin of Reuben against the primæval law, which St. Paul reprobates as "not so much as named among the Gentiles" (1 Cor. v. 1). Yet the Magi married their mothers, and the Græco-Egyptian princes their sisters, showing that the interdict is not natural but religious.

the daughter to be omitted in Leviticus as too unnatural to be thought of; but this would equally apply to the mother. A more intelligible reason would be that a prohibition on the mother and son applies, by parity of reason, to father and daughter. In truth, however, the daughter is *not* omitted; she is prohibited as directly as any other; only it is as her *mother's* daughter, and in the same words with a daughter by a different father. The prohibition is extended to the offspring of the step-children; and the reason is subjoined, "for they are her near kinswomen," or "remainder" (the same word as in ver. 6); "it is wickedness." The "wickedness" of the second union is clearly not in the consanguinity of the parties, for they are absolutely strangers in blood, but in the affinity arising out of the first marriage. The sin is distinctly placed in marrying the remainder of the first wife's flesh; an expression which includes her sister as much as her mother and daughter, and in a nearer degree than her grand-daughter. To argue that a sister is "near of kin" to a man and not to a woman, is inconsistent with any respect for the Word of God.

The same principle is apparent throughout. The brother's wife is prohibited for her husband's sake, not her own; a reason equally applying to the wife's sister. The interdict on a father's or mother's sister, grounded, as before, on their "near kindred," is extended to the uncle's wife, with the express affirmation, "she is thine aunt"—*dodath*, the word translated "father's sister" in Exod. vi. 20: thus at once branding the transgression of Amram in the house of bondage, and directly affirming that, in the view of these prohibitions, affinity is identical with consanguinity. To the same purport is the case of the "daughter-in-law;" a name of special endearment, only used of a son's wife. Altogether, fifteen examples are given:

Mother,	Father's wife,
Sister (full or half),	Uncle's wife,
Daughter,	Son's wife,
Son's daughter,	Brother's wife,
Daughter's daughter,	Wife's mother,
Father's sister,	„ daughter,
Mother's sister,	„ son's daughter,
	„ daughter's daughter.

Of these, the first seven are related by blood, and the other eight by marriage. There is really no shadow of doubt that in Leviticus consanguinity and affinity are equally impediments to marriage, as they are in our own Table of Prohibited Degrees.

Apart from Leviticus, there is not a word in the Bible to forbid a man's marrying his half-sister, as Abram did, or his

full sister, as Cain and Cambyses did; or his own mother, as the Magian priests were required to do. It is true that the Levitical prohibition, like the Decalogue and other general laws, is expressed in the masculine gender; consequently, no woman is directly forbidden to marry any one. Unless, however, we are prepared to admit that the Tenth Commandment permits a woman to covet her neighbour's husband, we must hold the Levitical interdict to be binding alike on both sexes.[1] If a man may not marry his granddaughter, or aunt, a woman may not be married to her grandson, or uncle. So, if it is "wickedness" for two brothers to marry the same woman, it is no less for two sisters to be married to the same man.

On these examples in the text it is further to be observed, that none of them carry the restriction beyond the third degree, *i.e.*, two steps up to the common ancestor and one down, or *vice versâ*. Here, then, is the scriptural limit: all within these degrees are prohibited; all beyond them are free.[2] The ecclesiastical canons, which extended the bar to the seventh degree, were always dispensable; and at the Reformation they were entirely swept away. The two rules then established, in exposition of "God's law," are thus expressed in the "*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*": "(1) That the degrees laid down as to men will hold equally as to women, in the same proximity; (2) that the husband and wife are but one flesh; so that he that is related to the one by consanguinity, is related to the other by affinity in the same degree." The result, as shown in the authorized Table, extends the prohibition to 30 cases in each sex, of which 10 are related by blood and 20 by affinity. Among the latter are the wife's *mother*, grandmother, aunt, sister, *daughter*, *grand-daughter*, and niece; that is to say, the whole "remainder of her flesh," though only the three in italics are expressly named in Leviticus. Now it would be intelligible to strike out *all* these, as not being near of kin to the husband; only then we should contradict the Levitical exposition, destroy two-thirds of the authorized Table, and leave the rest without any scriptural authority. Again, there would be an intelligible principle in confining the prohibition to the connexions forbidden by the letter of Scripture. But this would require the repeal of more than half the existing degrees, without removing the twofold foundation on which they rest. But on what principle can the prohibition be

---

[1] Throughout the Decalogue the pronoun "thou" is in the masculine gender.

[2] The construction of the law forbids marriage in the *right line* upward and downward, however remote the degree; but this is not expressed in Leviticus or in our Table of Prohibited Degrees.

removed from a wife's sister, and retained upon her aunt and niece who are a step further off? How could the bar of affinity be maintained in any case if this one were exempted? And if affinity be discarded, where is the scriptural authority for the impediment of consanguinity, and what are its limits? The prohibited degrees, as they stand, are a complete and consistent application of the twofold prohibition of Leviticus. As amended by this "reform," they would rest on no principle of law, nature, or religion. The laws of marriage would become a question of demand and supply. The wife's sister is wanted to-day; to-morrow it may be the niece, or any other object of desire, for which an "ugly rush" can be arranged in either House of Parliament. But marriage is prohibition, not liberty. Every breach in the outward barriers tends to give up the sanctuary to desecration.[1]

After this sketch of the scriptural argument against the Bill, it is time to inquire what can be found in the Bible in favour of it. A single verse is all that can be produced, and that of doubtful translation: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister" (marg., "one wife to another") "to vex her, beside the other, in her lifetime" (Lev. xviii. 18). This, we are told, is a "clear permission to marry the sister after the wife's death; the prohibition being, in direct and unambiguous terms, limited to the wife's life."[2]

It would be as reasonable to say that St. Paul's requirement that a bishop or deacon should be the husband of one wife is a "clear permission" to a layman to have two or more! The existence of polygamy is implied in both injunctions, but it is not allowed or permitted in either. Each is directed to a special purpose, and no permission can be extracted for anything outside it. The Levitical prohibition is not simply limited to the wife's life; but "to *vexing* her in her life-time." It is, on the face of it, a provision against a wrong to the first wife, without the remotest allusion to anything after her death.

The passage evidently refers to the example of Jacob, and is another warning against imitating the misdeeds of the patriarchs. Jacob would have been fully justified in disowning a wife imposed upon him by fraud; but in confirming the marriage as the condition of obtaining the object of his long-tried affection, he complied with the heathenish customs of the

[1] When the example of "other Protestants" is pressed upon us, it is well to remember the general laxity of the marriage bond, and the freedom of divorce, which prevail where the prohibited degrees are disregarded. Polygamy itself might be successfully defended on the "liberty of conscience" alleged for this measure; just as the admission of atheists into Parliament is actually made the crown of civil and religious liberty.

[2] *Summary*, p. 5.

country, against the tradition of his father's house.[1] Abram suffered for his complicity with his wife's degrading impatience for an heir, and Jacob paid the penalty of adding injustice to impurity in the jealousies of his distracted household. Leah, vexed and humiliated by a rival placed beside her, yet became the mother of the promised Seed, and was buried in the sepulchre of the patriarchs. The domineering beauty, long childless, was thought of in her untimely grave as weeping for children who are not. In Eastern harems the first wife often suffers cruel indignities from an imperious favourite, put over her head on the score of birth or beauty. In the interest of humanity Moses "suffered them to put away their wives;" but there is not a word in the law to sanction a plurality. To the Kings the harem was part of their Oriental pomp; in private life the license rarely went beyond a second wife, and then the law forbad any unfair preference of the children.[2]

The verse in question has clearly a similar object in view. If the first wife is not "put away," which implied the return of her dowry with the entire dissolution of the marriage tie, she is not to be kept at the husband's caprice with a rival "beside her to vex her in her life-time." A sister, it may be thought, would be less offensive than another:[3] which is strongly in favour of the marginal reading—a variation of the Karaites, who were opposed to polygamy. The Masoretic text may be suspected of seeking to justify that undoubted departure from the original law of marriage; or, as some of the greatest Hebrew scholars maintain, "sister" is here used in the sense of a *match* or pair, as in Ex. xxvi. 3, 5, 17, where the curtains coupled "one to another," and "the tenons" of the boards set "one against another," are said in the original to be "each to its *sister*, and against its *sister*." The same expression is used of the wings of the cherubim in Ez. i. 11, and "a man to his brother" is a well-known idiom for a man and his fellow.[4] In the same way, to "take a wife to her sister" is to have two wives on the same level, one against another, as Jacob had, in excess of the precedent set by Abram, without respect to their consanguinity. But whatever be the exact meaning of this obscure text, it has certainly no bearing on the prohibited degrees, or the laws of Christian marriage.

[1] The Hindu Shasters forbid the marriage of a younger sister before the elder.

[2] Deut. xxi. 15.—The most that can be said is what the Apostle says of idolatry, that "the times of this ignorance God winked at."

[3] I remember hearing at Mysore that the Rajah had married the sister of a favourite wife at her own entreaty, that she might retain the companion of her childhood.

[4] Compare Isa. xix. 2, xli. 6; Jer. xxxi. 34 (Heb. viii. 11); Ez. xxxiii. 30; and Matt. xviii. 35, referring to the "fellow-servant" of the parable. We use the same idiom in speaking of a *sister* ship.

The only other argument adduced from the Bible is an *anti*-scriptural one. It is affirmed that "the prohibition of the brother's wife is certainly not grounded on anything incestuous in the marriage, for, in Deut. xxv. 5, it is commanded if the brother died childless." Hence there is nothing "impure or morally wrong" in the union, and therefore not in the corresponding degree of a wife's sister: in other words, the Levitical prohibitions are no part of the moral law. It is of no consequence whether the union is prohibited in Leviticus or not; if it is, it is not immoral, nor incestuous, but only a Levitical and temporary regulation. This is to imagine a standard of morals apart from the Divine command, whereas, in truth, the moral law is simply the will of God. What He commands is right, and what He forbids is wrong.

The prohibition in Lev. xviii. 16 is absolute and unconditional; the thing is "wickedness." The command alleged to the contrary is brought from another part of the law, and primarily dealing with a right of property. If it were true that the two provisions were verbally in conflict, they would be easily reconciled by understanding the "brother" of Deut. xxv. in the larger sense of "kinsman," given in the margin. This is quite a familiar use of the word in Scripture, especially when, as here, opposed to "stranger." The truth, however, is that "husband's brother" is a wrong translation: the word "brother" is not in the original at all. The original word *yibâm* occurs only in this place; the feminine form is rendered "sisters-in-law" in Ruth i. 7, 15, but it has no etymological connection with "brother" or "sister." It denotes the woman's next kinsman on her husband's side: accordingly Coverdale renders it "hir kynsman," Diodati "il suo cognato," and Proop, a great authority, "su cunano." The term unquestionably proves that the husband's relations were the wife's relations under the law, and so far is quite in accordance with the Levitical prohibitions. The kinsman could not refuse the widow without infamy, *i.e.*, if he had no sufficient cause. It is not to be presumed that any one to whom the marriage was *prohibited* could suffer any further penalty than the loss of the land, which would go to the next heir capable of fulfilling the duty.

It is not true, then, that the law of Moses commands, or permits, a man to marry his brother's widow under any circumstances whatever. This may be the law of the Talmud, but certainly not of Moses. It rests upon a widely spread heathen usage, termed the law of "Levirate," from the Latin *levir*, a brother-in-law. The only trace of this usage in the Bible is in the shameful story of Judah, who learned it from the polygamous Syrians. As there exhibited, it required the husband's next brother, absolutely and without excuse, to marry the widow:

there is no hint of the obligation passing to any other kinsman. To glorify Judah, whose morals were little, if at all, better than his brother Reuben's, the Talmudists ascribe his depravity to a Divine inspiration, and concoct a modified law of Levirate, which they have foisted on their Christian students as part of the Mosaic code. According to the Rabbis, the kinsman's office devolved first on the brother, and then on the other relations in order. They allow that a brother already married to the widow's sister was excluded by the Levitical prohibition; manifestly, then, the other Levitical prohibition would exclude an own brother altogether: and this is said to be acknowledged in the Mishneh.[1] But whatever the Rabbis may say, the place in Deuteronomy has not a word about a brother, and there is no example of such a marriage in all the Bible, except that old Syrian enormity, which was one of the corruptions that called for the Mosaic Reformation. The only reported case is that of Ruth, and it supplies a clear exposition of the law. Naomi, being a widow past childbearing, proposes to *sell* her interest in her husband's land to his "brother" (iv. 3), who is apparently in possession. He agrees to pay the price, but on learning that a young widow is also in question, he declines, for fear of "marring his own inheritance." Josephus says he already had a wife and children; and even the Rabbis did not make polygamy compulsory. Whatever the excuse, it is allowed by the elders of the city, and he is released without opprobrium;[2] Boaz, who had evidently anticipated the result, succeeded to the obligation and gladly performed the part of *yibâm*. It is disputed among the learned that this was a "Levirate" marriage, inasmuch as Boaz was only a cousin. Selden thinks the sacred writer has *confused* the laws of the Levir and the Goel; and Josephus is accused of the same mistake.[3] The confusion, however, is with those who seek to interpolate the *levir* into a law which simply prohibits him. Ruth's marriage was unquestionably conducted according to Deut. xxv. 5; if it was not in accordance with "the law of the Levirate," that only proves there is no such law in the Scripture.

---

[1] *Yebamoth* 2, s. 3, quoted in Smith's "Bible Dictionary," ii. 247.

[2] Josephus will have it that Ruth loosed his shoe and spit in his face, according to the law; but this was not so. There was no spitting, and the man loosed his shoe himself, and gave it to Boaz in sign of livery and seizin. It appears from iv. 7 that this custom was obsolete at the time the book was written; and as no later instance of *Yebamoth* is recorded, it is not improbable that the law ceased to be observed from the time of the Kings. At all events, the particulars insisted upon by the Jewish Rabbis must be purely imaginary.

[3] Smith's "Bible Dictionary," ii. 247, note.

The Scriptural argument for the Bill, then, may be summed up in this way:

(1) The wife's sister is not within the prohibition of "near of kin," because she is no relation by blood. But this is equally true of the majority of those whom the Scripture expressly declares to be "near of kin."

(2) There is no such express declaration of the wife's sister. But there is of her mother, daughter, and grand-daughter, and the sister is in the same category. Moreover, the brother's wife is named, and the wife's sister is in the same affinity.

(3) The prohibition of the brother's wife implies nothing incestuous, impure, or morally wrong, because such a marriage was commanded in certain circumstances by the Mosaic law. But the command is a Rabbinical fiction: there is not a word of it in the Scripture, nor a single example under the Mosaic code. If it were true, the union would still be incestuous when *not* commanded, and no command is pretended for the wife's sister.

(4) The law against marrying two sisters at once is a clear permission to marry them in succession. But there is another and more intelligible reading of this law. In any case it is doubtful and obscure; it is not in connection with the prohibited degrees,[1] and, being obviously a check on polygamy, has no bearing on the law of Christian marriage.

(5) Many persons conscientiously hold there is no scriptural prohibition, and the law ought not to enforce a disputed interpretation of the Bible. But this is exactly what this measure would do. The law, as it is, does not oblige any one to accept the scriptural view on which it is based, because no one is bound to contract a prohibited marriage, and many other causes prevent a man from marrying the woman he prefers. But this Bill would *enforce by law* a construction of Scripture which is conscientiously denied by vast numbers of religious persons. It would bind the clergy of the Established Church, under legal penalties, to recognise, as lawful marriage, unions which the Church affirms to be unscriptural and incestuous. In short, this "small measure" must either establish a new construction of the Scripture, or subvert the scriptural basis of marriage altogether; and then the law would have no right to prohibit polygamy, or divorce, or any union, permanent or transient, which the parties might choose to contract.

GEORGE TREVOR, D.D.

---

[1] The prohibition of the near of kin closes with the moral anathema in v. 17.

Art. II.—MY JOURNEY IN AFRICA.

Part III.

UYUVI, October 16th.—By this time I was able to walk from one room to the other, and had had a trial trip in my hammock from the mission station to the camp and back. I bore this journey well, and although unable to sit up at the end of it, I deemed that the time had come for me to make a start for the lake. That very morning news was brought us that fifty of our porters had deserted, the result being that all was thrown into confusion. However, it never does to be downhearted at misfortunes, so we decided to start and leave Raschid to follow with the boat and a few odd loads. Stokes asked me to be down at camp at two p.m., and promised that I should have six porters told off to carry me. I made this a stipulation, as I had already experienced the trial of being dragged along by tired, ill-tempered men.

In spite of much weakness, I sat up the whole morning and wrote to as many friends at home as possible, for all here felt that the experiment I was about to make was not unlikely to terminate fatally. At twelve o'clock we lunched, and at two I entered the hammock and proceeded to the camp, where all was noise and excitement, for the question had to be faced what loads should be taken and what left? I saw that a start was for the present impracticable, and so was carried beneath the shelter of a great rock, and there left until 4·30 p.m., at which time a start was finally made. When the men came to fetch me, I was too tired to think how many or who they were, but before very long I discovered that I had only one relay, namely, four men in all, and that these, while at Uyuvi, had been going through a course of dissipation, and had neither power nor inclination to carry me properly.

I had not gone very far when a large green snake, about eight feet long came out of the grass and drew himself up in a defiant way, plainly declaring that if we attempted to pass it would be at our peril. My men prepared to drop me and bolt, so I jumped from my hammock and called for my gun, but was not allowed by Gordon to have it, as he thought me far too weak and ill. Another then fired a bullet from a very respectful distance without any effect; and, wonderful to relate, one of the Wanguana was found brave enough to advance upon the venemous reptile with a stick, whereupon it retreated, fleeing into a hole.

After about an hour and a half, my men began to show signs of utter collapse, and jerked and shook me most painfully. By-

and-by a stumble, and down they both went. I had been looking out for this, and so broke my fall; but it is very dangerous to be thus dropped, nothing being more likely to injure the spine. I gave them a long rest, but it was of no avail; finally, for safety's sake, I was compelled to abandon the hammock and walk for two hours. How I managed it I scarcely know. I had been in bed the best part of six weeks, had persuaded myself that I could only crawl from one room to another, and sit up for an hour at the time; now I had to walk six miles, or even more. It only proves what one can do if an effort has to be made. I got into camp at eight p.m., where sad confusion prevailed. Stokes had remained to see about the loads we had been compelled to leave behind; the consequence was, the men, being tired, took advantage of his absence and threw their burdens down anywhere. The grass was long, the night pitch dark, and thing after thing refused to be found. In my exhausted condition I had to do without bedding, and worse still, without food, for we had encamped in the Pori with neither village nor water at hand; and daylight scarcely mended matters, for there could be no breakfast. I refused to start until I had more men to carry me than the previous day; but although six were got together, yet they were not regular carriers, and I was worse off than before. The scenes of the past afternoon were painfully repeated, with the additional distress of want of food. At 1·30 p.m., five-and-twenty hours after lunch at Uyuvi, we sat down to a meal of pea-soup without stock, and flour and water dumpling without suet. The next day I declined to stir an inch until I had six good men allotted to me, for my life absolutely depended upon it.

The halt that night was by a river, the banks of which were covered with luxuriant vegetation. On entering camp, the men killed a wild boar, and my boys caught me some fish, varieties of silurus, carp, and gudgeon. I should have liked to have preserved them, as the two latter were probably new, but I had no means of doing so.

October 19th.—Arrived at the village of Mirambo's brother. This spot, according to their historical traditions, was the original settlement of the now widespread Wanyamwezi race. It was a long time before we were able to induce the cooks to prepare us a meal. When it came, it was the usual chicken and some very heavy dumpling fried in lamp-oil, which speedily proved too much for me in my then weak condition. The Sultan shortly paid us a visit. He was very jealous of anything being said in his presence that he could not understand. If we spoke to one another in English, he at once said: "I have not yet heard what you are saying;" which is the Kinyamwezi

mode of expression for "I have not understood you." I presented him with two or three pictures-books in which he had been greatly interested; however, they were soon sent back, with a message that he feared they were bewitched and would do him mischief.

October 22nd.—Arrived at the Pero (frontier town) of Mirambo, and received a kindly message assuring us of his friendship, and promising a guide to accompany us to the lake. I was too ill to go over and pay my respects; but the others, with the exception of Wise, who was also ill, immediately proceeded to the capital.

October 25th.—Started for the comparatively new country of Msalala; the only other white man who has passed this way was Speke, and he just touched our route at one or two of the earlier stages, so that there was an extra amount of interest and excitement in the journey.

Soon after arriving in camp a perfect deluge of rain came on, accompanied by thunder and lightning. The cook's fires were entirely extinguished, so those worthies were compelled to take shelter in the village and commence operations a second time; thus breakfast was delayed until evening hours. When relating how irregularly one was compelled to live on the road, friends have often implied that blame attached itself to some of us; but it was mostly through something quite unforeseen occurring to prevent matters going as we expected. It is just these circumstances that make the missionary's life so trying, both physically and spiritually, and we narrate them to show how much those travelling by land and by water stand in need of the prayers of those remaining at home.

In spite of every precaution the rain found its way into my tent: it beat underneath the sides, it filled the trenches and flowed in on the ground, and was so heavy that notwithstanding the double canvas a kind of sifted damp found its way through and wetted bed and bedding and the clothes I had on. A tree close to our tent was shivered to pieces. Then, a few minutes after, all was as bright and calm overhead as if nothing had taken place. The Kilangozi (guide) sent by Mirambo, arrived: a fine-looking elderly man, of majestic presence and of but few words. He related his orders, told off each camp with a determined snap of his fingers, as though there was no Court of Appeal, and then retired to his quarters.

The country in these parts was very picturesque. At times it looked so much like English park land, with the South Downs for a background, that it made me feel home-sick. At one spot I sat in my tent door and could not take my eyes from the view. Mostly, however, the scenery consisted of

wide plains, thickly scattered with well wooded villages and fine isolated trees. These plains were bounded by low mountain ridges, which were sometimes thickly wooded, at others, very rugged and bare. Often they were crowned by magnificent groups of rocks which have assumed the most fantastic shapes. Many of these rocks are supported and balanced in a marvellous way, like so many Druidical Temples or "Loggan" stones. Their size and position demands for them that they are natural, nor could I discover that the natives, who venerate cross-roads, gnarled and lightning-struck trees and spots, have any reverence for these weird and striking pinnacles of granite.

November 1.—Encamped near the village of a great chief called Shimami, great in possessions, stature, and power. He was considerably over six feet, and robust, although not over corpulent. A man of remarkably fine points. His first overture was the present of a very fine goat, which was followed by some milk, after which came two oxen; then, having prepared the way in a right royal manner, he came himself to see and to be seen, and to pick up any little treasure that might be presented to him.[1]

I gave Shimami a few small presents, and among them a pair of blue spectacles; he then departed to the other tents, where he seemed inclined to spend the rest of the day, and so, as his room was rather to be desired than his company, I arrived on the scene and suggested that he should take me to see his village, and there I would present him with an English hat, which he greatly coveted. To this he readily assented, and we marched off in correct order, namely, in single file, the chief leading, the guest following, then the Kilangozi and officers according to rank. When we approached the village, Shimami produced the blue spectacles and said he must put them on. It struck me that this was the right moment to bring out the hat, for I had now accomplished my object and drawn him away from the camp; accordingly I presented him with it. His delight knew no bounds; he put it on, and—spectacles and all—strutted off as proud as a peacock. His chief minister discovered that the crown was flattened a little: in the fashion we generally wear our wide-a-wakes. So it was taken off and erected in a sharp peak; then its rim was bent up *au* brigand, and altered yet again and again. I was immensely amused; but my mirth only caused greater de-

[1] In Africa the most scrupulous etiquette is maintained. So the first visit was always paid to my tent as the senior, by courtesy, for Stokes was both senior in reality and caravan leader; but I having been appointed to take charge of the expedition, he was always most kind in pointing this out to the chiefs. I mention it, not to state my position, but to pay tribute to his unvarying kindness.

light, for in Africa laughter is seldom expressive of ridicule Though this scene was otherwise ludicrous, the magnificent presence of my newly made friend, with his bright-coloured clothes elegantly thrown round him, was most effective. When we entered the village, every corner had to be explored and every subject had to be interrogated, in order that they might gaze upon the new costume. I felt quite sorry for the poor man that, in spite of all his grandeur, the white man was the chief object of attraction. The royal hut was very ordinary in appearance. I was proudly seated on the throne—a low stool with a wooden hood over it, rudely cut from a single block, joinery being unknown amongst the Wanyamwezi: any ethnological collection would be as proud to possess this rough seat as was Shimami. After sitting a short time I suddenly took my leave before his Majesty could even rise from the ground, and I slipped round the corner and out at the gate of the village, opposite to that by which I had entered. Can you believe it?—when I came round the camp side of the Tembe, I saw the same pompous procession, only altered in two respects —its face was turned the other way, and it lacked my figure, for that was at that moment hiding behind a bush. My object was hopelessly defeated.

Every day, for a week after this, we had interesting marches, and my health improved sufficiently to allow me really to enjoy life.

November 6th.—I deemed myself well enough to attempt an ascent of some mountains near at hand. I started on this expedition quite alone, and soon had a real precipice to scale. This I effected by clinging to rope-like creepers growing in the crevices of the rock. Above this I entered into dense jungle, through which there was a narrow track leading to some abandoned huts, which had the appearance of a robber's hold, and I believe some thoughts about a speedy return entered my head. However, the idea of fresh botanical treasures tempted me onwards. Beyond this settlement there was no definite path, and so I continued the ascent, going wherever the jungle was thinnest, ofttimes crawling on hands and knees; but at length growing weary of this arduous mode of proceeding, I determined to retrace my steps: as I turned I heard an ominous rustle, and the first thoughts that entered my head were that I had come upon a lion, and alas! I was unarmed. I stood peering into the dense tangle, expecting all manner of horrors. Then, as I was listening with bated breath, I heard a whisper that I felt sure was human, and my thoughts returned to the abandoned huts, and robbers with murderous intents were at once pictured by my vivid imagination. I cautiously proceeded a step or two further, each moment ex-

pecting to be pounced upon, when, to add to my discomfort, beheld the form of a man with a pistol in his hand lurking i the bushes; then I saw another with a bow and arrow, and y another, and how many more were at hand I could not tell. stood perplexed. I looked at the hill and the jungle, an measured my chance of flight, and saw how small it was besides, men might be above as well as below: I then said t myself, "I will face death as a Christian ought to do, I will no attempt to flee;" so, pulling myself together and expecting th worst, I called out "*Wadela*," Kinyamwezi for "good afternoon," and then descended right upon them. If the answer had been a bullet, or an arrow, by way of saying "Pretty well, thank you," they, at all events, would not have had the excuse that I had been uncivil; but no such rough reply was returned. It proved to be three natives, who had been dogging my steps on hands and knees for the last hour, to see what I was about.

On arriving at this place, the chief and others had come to me and asked me to create water, for their supply was short. I told them that only God could create; white men had no such power, but sometimes white men could tell, by plants and other such signs, where water might be found. They had not believed my denial of power, and so these three had been sent to crawl after me to learn my secret. No doubt they disbelieved me still, for what could a man be doing who kept picking little pieces of moss and examining them through a magnifying glass, occasionally cutting off bark from a tree, or turning over a stone for a beetle? Why, even in the west of England, two very eminent botanists were regarded as old herbalists, and were not altogether beyond the suspicion of necromancy; but here, where witchcraft is the religion of the country, I am sure that no words of mine ever persuaded them that I was not a powerful magician, though unwilling to exert my power. Speaking about my botanical pursuits, which were always more directed towards cryptogams, especially mosses, the porters and my hammock-carriers used to believe that I wanted moss to make cloth with, although I think I satisfied them at last that I used to collect only different species in order to show Watu Ya Ulia (the people of England) what grew in Africa.

November 8th.—After a twenty miles' march we arrived at Kwa Sonda, the last village under Mirambo's jurisdiction, and the long-promised spot where we were to see the mighty Nyanza and found a new station. The first impression was one of utter disappointment; we expected to see a grand expanse of water and luxuriant foliage, instead of which there was a sandy plain, and in the middle of it, for these parts, a singularly

unpicturesque village. After being introduced to the chief, and being assured that water was not far off, I crept silently away, but was discovered and followed by the others. Soon a drenching shower overtook us, which would have damped the ardour of most men, but not of those who had tramped nigh a thousand miles to reach their sphere of work at the sources of the Nile. We crept beneath a gorgeous jessamine-bush, and there sheltered until the worst of it had passed. On we went, and yet onwards; and though the aspect had entirely changed, and the scenery had become very beautiful, yet no lake was visible. By-and-by, from the top of a high rock, a swamp of grass and reeds appeared, looking in the distance like a well-mown cricket-field, but not a drop of water was to be seen. Hearts sank, and with weary tread we returned to the camp, to answer the eager inquiries of the men with "Maji Hapana"—"There is no water." I implored the brethren to reserve all remarks until after they had been refreshed by food; for not only had we had a very long march, but also a fatiguing search and bitter disappointment. After dinner, just as we had opened the books for prayers, in came the chief, and asked what we were about; when we told him we were going to pray to our God; he replied, "Then you must teach me." This seemed to come to us as an immense comfort when we were all depressed, for although we were in most places asked to remain permanently and form a station, yet nobody had directly requested us to teach him to pray.

The next morning, before the sun was up, I had started; but was soon out-distanced by Stokes and a troop of men. In spite of the noise these made, a good bit of game was seen; at last, the party ahead set up a tremendous firing. I jumped to the conclusion that they had overtaken a "hippo" on land, and, seizing my rifle, began to run, but discovered, to my great regret, that I was quite unable to continue. I was now strong enough to walk a few miles, but not twenty yards could I run. Handing back my gun to my boy, I gave him permission to go; nor was my mortification diminished by the way he dashed off. I watched him disappear, wishing heartily that he would move like that when I was in a hurry, and secretly resolved that he should. Alas! how often good resolutions are vain. By-and-by he returned, saying that they were firing, not at game, but for joy; they had arrived at the lake. I brisked up once more, and soon reached the mighty Nyanza, here but a duck-pond. The nullah cannot be in this part quite a mile across, for some natives came rushing down on the opposite bank to see what was the matter, and we could distinctly hear their voices.

On my way back I had the good fortune to secure a blue

buck at 150 yards' distance; the bullet passed through the vertebra of the neck, and it fell almost motionless; it was about the size of a cow, and afforded us a considerable supply of meat. After breakfast we had a palaver as to future movements. There was but little to be said; for there we were, cloth short, a caravan still behind us, nothing before us but a swamp and the wet season, and we could learn from the natives very little of our whereabouts. Stokes, our caravan-leader, had made up his mind to return as quickly as possible; nor can anybody wonder at it, although we should have been glad of his experience a little longer. But I will say nothing about this beyond that, if we were not then capable of shifting for ourselves, it was quite time we were; and every day that Stokes and his men remained with us, it was a further drain on our already narrowed supply of cloth. The only thing we could do at present was to stop where we were and build huts just sufficient to protect us during the rainy season. As soon as we had come to this determination, I went out and, with Gordon, chose a fresh site for our tent, some miles from the village, and then moved to it.

He and I spent the night in the heart of the forest alone; nor did we feel nervous, although many lions roared close round the tent, and rather broke our rest; mosquitoes swarmed; three or four tarantulas dashed wildly about the roof; a few long, black millepedes and a snake paid us a visit; four different kinds of ants made themselves quite at home; and in the morning, an army of the kind they call out here *chunqu* ("bitter") ants advanced against us. There was nothing to be done but to light a fire, and regularly drive them out. In spite of these one or two small drawbacks, we congratulated ourselves upon having pitched upon an exceedingly pleasant spot, and determined as soon as possible to hedge ourselves in with a fence of thorns, to prevent a buffalo or a stray rhinoceros from charging the tent, or a lion from slipping his paw under the curtain and clawing one of us out of bed.

November 13th.—After we had enlisted a sufficient number of volunteers from the porters to remain and do our work, the rest returned to the coast with Stokes. We did not get up a parting scene when he started, although we were exceedingly sorry to wish him farewell. Let me raise my testimony to his unceasing kindness, and his ability in managing the men. After he had gone, a slight feeling of loneliness crept over us. We seemed rather like men with empty pockets turned adrift in the wide, wide world, not knowing exactly where we were, nor what to do next. Our instructions, in rough outline, were these: "Ashe and Wise to form a station somewhere at the end of the lake; and Gordon and myself to proceed, as speedily

as possible, to Uganda." Very good; but the difficulty as to supplies for necessary exploration we felt to be very great, and the horrors of the rainy season, now commencing, we believed to be yet greater.

The next day I dug a well with my own hands, Gordon being too ill to help me; then, in order to let no opportunity be wasted, I persuaded the chief's brother to come to me to learn the alphabet. How one longed to be able to talk sufficiently well to teach them the way of life everlasting.

The natives seemed to be very well disposed towards us, but most of them were grasping beyond measure, and food being scarce in the district, we found it expensive living here; so when health and study would permit me, I used to go out with my gun to try and secure some game. I could relate many strange adventures, but space will not allow. I started one morning at daybreak, and had not gone far before I sighted a fine herd of antelopes, but, as they were out of the track I wanted to follow, I passed on without going in pursuit. Presently I came across a herd of "pongo."[1] These are always very shy; and sighting me before I was within range, they made off. Next two blue buck put in an appearance on the further side of a grassy plain. Down we went on hands and knees, unmindful of snakes and such trifles, and were getting fairly close to them, when I said to my boy Duta, "Is that a rhinoceros, or is it merely a clump of bushes?" Just at that moment it moved a step or two, and I saw, for the first time in a wild state, a black rhinoceros. Back we darted into the thicket, and took a large circuit, coming out again on the edge of the plain, just in time to see a cow and calf retiring slowly into the jungle. Quietly did we creep back, and again came out about twenty yards from her. She stood with her head turned the other way, and on her back were a number of yellow "rhinoceros birds." These flew up with a screech; and thus, as is their wont, apprised her of an enemy. I had a capital shot at the calf, but had I killed it the mother's fury would have known no bounds, so I preferred an uncertain shot at the cow. As the bullet struck she uttered a fierce scream-grunt, and in a moment, about ten yards from where I stood, there rushed from the jungle a bull and another cow rhinoceros, bellowing most fiercely. Fortunately for us, they did not perceive us until they had got about thirty paces from where we stood. Then, either winding or catching sight of us, they all three wheeled round and charged impetuously. "Fire, master—fire!" excitedly cried my boy; and as he ceased speaking, I could hear his heart thumping loudly. "Be still,"

[1] *Pongo*; the native name of a variety of Antelope.

I said; "stand perfectly still;" and the lad, all honour to him, was brave enough to obey. After they had advanced about ten paces, seeing I remained motionless, they came to a halt and eyed us fiercely, pawing the ground and snorting in a most defiant manner. It was an embarrassing situation, and one in which I suspect very few have found themselves. The eye wandered restlessly round for a tree up which to climb, but there was nothing available. We were standing in dense mimosa tangle, about chest-high; flight through this was impossible. To the right was the rough plain, where I had first seen the cow and calf; if we could have reached this, there might have been a chance of safety in flight; but I did not entertain the idea. Then there was the question, should I fire? This I determined not to do; for if, by the greatest slice of luck, I brought one to the ground, there were still the other two. They themselves took the initiative. The cow that I had shot at stole away across the plain, and I decided to follow her, to endeavour to get another shot; the other two stood gazing at us until they saw that she had out-distanced us, and then they quietly turned round and strolled into the jungle.

The keen sportsman who has had plenty of experience with these savage beasts may blame me that I did not bag all three, but this I was far from wishing to do; for I was by no means a hunter, though often in pursuit of game for food. When it is remembered how notedly fierce the black rhinoceros is, and what tales one has heard, even from men like Livingstone, about them, and that I was standing face to face at a few paces' distance, not from one, but three, and these protecting a calf, the more cautious of my readers will agree with me that I was right not to risk a shot, and will congratulate me on so narrow, yet good, an escape.

Fever soon began to attack us all in turns. Gordon and I were often down together, and the fever with him took such a form that he was unable to do anything. So, with temperature at times as high as 106°, I had to crawl out and see after the men, and plan the hut we were building. On Sundays we usually dined together, and, if possible, had morning and evening services; while Ashe had Kiswahili services for the boys and men. Amongst the natives little could be done, for their knowledge of Kiswahili was small, and their dialect appeared to be a compound of Kinyamwezi and Kizinja.

December 8th.—News came that Raschid, with the poor unfortunate boat, was again delayed for want of cloth at Kwa Sundi. What a blow to us: we were expecting a fresh supply of stores when he should arrive, and now he was about to draw upon our already diminished stock. Ashe and Gordon decided

to start at once and meet him, I at the time being far too ill to move.

After they had left me I determined to send two of my men to Romwa, King of Uzinja, to find out his character and view the country, and this because our cloth was getting so reduced that with much further delay a move would be utterly impossible.

19th.—Gordon and Ashe returned, both very ill. I will relate Gordon's tale, as it is typical of African travel. It ran thus:

On reaching the village before the great plain I failed with fever, and with difficulty tottered on to the next camp. I was there taken worse and was unable to proceed, so Ashe went on to Kwa Gargi alone and met Raschid. There the natives demanded from him a heavy hongo of fifty cloths, guns, and powder; but upon his stating that he would instantly return to Mirambo this insolent demand was withdrawn. Next morning he started to return; when about six miles on the road a message came from Sundi, whose men Raschid had hired for porters, that he wanted them for war, whereupon they threw down their loads in the open, and were on the verge of departing, when Ashe with difficulty persuaded them to carry them to the next village. He then returned twenty-six weary miles, and had an interview with Sundi, discovering that it all resulted from the scamp Raschid having cheated this powerful chief. After arranging matters satisfactorily, he again returned to where he had been compelled to leave the loads, and there a letter awaited him from me, stating how dangerously ill I was, so at once he posted on, leaving the men to follow. The day after they reached us, and we were about to proceed when Ashe failed with fever, but, nevertheless, managed to complete the march. We were no sooner in camp than Raschid came to say that the men had all refused to carry on their loads unless they received an extra four yards of cloth per man more than they had originally agreed to. After a long and tedious palaver we gave them two yards, and again we made a start, Ashe very ill, I unable to walk. When my porters reached the big village a few miles from here they put me down and ran away, and my boys had to carry me on. On reaching this village late last night, our own men, according to custom, fired their guns to announce our arrival. The natives, thinking it was an attack, answered by bullets, which whizzed over my head, and then they rushed out upon us with spears and bows and arrows, but soon perceived their mistake.

When he had ended his tale I perceived that he was very ill, and had several nasty boils about him, which greatly added to his suffering. On going across to Ashe I found he was even worse; and not long after I had returned to my tent, scarcely able to crawl about myself, I was again hurriedly summoned to his bedside, and found him in a very dangerous state. I was next called to Wise, who had also failed; and, added to this, there was the recently arrived caravan (with all its bustle and excitement) depending upon me to give orders and instructions as to where and how goods were to be stowed away, and it must be remembered that the every-day work was in no way diminished. One had to see to boys, men,

food, cooking, and natives, who, as ever, were coming and going, buying, selling, and begging, from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., and the more so as they found the white men at the other tents too ill to attend to them. I got through the day, for grace was sufficient.

The next morning found all slightly better; but before I could get to Ashe he had crept over to me, full of perturbation at news he had just received. Raschid and the other head-men had been to him, and stated their intention of immediately returning. What did this mean? Starvation! It would throw us on exorbitant natives, to whom we must pay ready money in the shape of cloth, instead of having the help of the coast-men, whom we could always pay with promissory notes at Zanzibar. The men had been promised over and over again that they should return when Raschid went back; but we had anticipated his waiting until our winter huts were finished and a temporary station formed. I pleaded, and put it on every ground I could, but no avail. They thought they had us in their power, and in African fashion they meant to use it. "Will you go?" "Yes." Suddenly I bounded from my seat, and said, "Then go—go at once—instantly leave my presence and go; but you go as runaways!" The afternoon brought messages that they did not exactly wish to leave on these terms, and they supposed they must stop.

An interview with the men settled this matter satisfactorily, they consenting to remain without Raschid and the discontents, so we despatched this villainous crew as soon as we possibly could. The same day my messengers from Romwa returned, with news that I at once declared to be far too satisfactory to be true. "He had thirty canoes. He was Mtesa's friend. He would send us, not to Kagei, but to Uganda. He had sent two oxen and some men for our journey. We must come soon. At Makola's, a few hours from here, were two Uganda canoes, which, for a price, would take us to his capital." However, after a long consultation, we decided that Gordon and I should proceed, and Ashe accompany us *pro temp.*, to see if Romwa's land would do for a station.

Christmas Day found us as follows: Gordon very ill in bed; Ashe and Wise tottering out of fever; I just about to totter in. We had an early Communion, and thought much of the dear ones at home thinking and praying for us and wishing us true Christmas joy. In spite of our poor plight we determined to celebrate the day; so I killed a kid, and Ashe undertook the pudding. I am sure that many a cottager had a better and a richer one, but I doubt if any enjoyed theirs much more than we did ours. It had its drawbacks, nor were they few: for the flour was both musty and full of beetles and their

larvæ; the raisins had fermented; the pudding was underboiled, and yet boiled enough to have stuck to the bottom of the saucepan, whereby not only a big hole was burnt clean out of the cloth in which it was tied, and saved us the trouble of cutting the string, but also its lower vitals had suffered considerably; and yet a musty, fermented, underdone, burnt pudding was such a real treat to African wanderers that we enjoyed it more than I ever before remember enjoying a Christmas pudding, and very cruel did we feel denying a slice to Gordon.

December 30th.—Sent the greater part of our baggage on to the canoe early in the morning; and when I had finished packing the remainder, I started and walked to Makola's, leaving Gordon and Ashe to follow me. The journey was an uneventful one. The only excitement I had was seeing three ostriches, and meeting a party of very rough-looking natives, who, however, proved to be friends of the white men. When I reached this village it was only to find that our baggage had been carried further on, so I thought better to proceed to the next village, and was soon followed by Gordon in his hammock, and the men carrying our beds. Ashe, he said, and the tent and food, were coming. But after waiting a long time we were forced to the conclusion that they were lost. It now began to pour with rain, and we had no refuge better than a tree, no food, and no cloth. I tried in vain to purchase something to eat, but could only succeed in getting an old woman to trust us with a little milk, which we shared. I then found for Gordon, at his express desire, shelter under the veranda of a hut; while I, dreading the mosquitoes and the cold night air, bargained to sleep inside another. Gordon was wise, I was foolish.[1]

As soon as daylight dawned, we despatched a runner to look for Ashe, but no news could we hear of him. We were utterly bewildered and exhausted, for we had had no food for eighteen hours. Before following any decided course of action, I said I would take my bed under a distant tree and get a little rest, for my soul fainted within me. I had scarcely composed myself when my boy Duta came from Ashe, saying that they had mistaken the road, and were some miles ahead;

[1] On entering I found a large fire burning on the floor, no chimney, and the door shut. My eyes began to smart; then I discovered that beside my boy and myself four more intended occupying it. This was too much, so I set to work to persuade them to let me have it to myself, and after much bribery I got the owners to decamp; and what a mistake I had made ever to enter! In less than an hour I was a moving mass—seven different sorts, and each species represented by hundreds, had besieged me. My boy was nearly frantic, and said, "It is impossible, master, for us to sleep here; I will take your bed outside." Alas! it was too late—I never got a wink of sleep all night.

would we come to him or should we return? I answered by giving orders at once to start. A rhinoceros, dashing across my path, rather revived me; and in about two hours we reached Ashe, who was ill, but comfortably encamped by the water's edge; and soon had our first boiling of anything like drinkable water since leaving Uyuvi, about the middle of October. I found on looking round that many things which we especially needed had been left behind; for instance, we found ourselves with only one cup, fork, spoon, and knife between three of us, so we sent off men to fetch the remainder of our baggage, and spent the rest of this solemn day—the last of the year—in peace and happiness, praising our loving Father, who had strengthened and protected us thus far.

January 1st, 1883.—We were to have started to-day, but the porters did not arrive in anything like time, and when they reached us, they had left many loads behind them, Wise having been too poorly to go down and look after them. Thus for a third time I was compelled to send back. The captain of the canoe now began to make a fuss about the amount of baggage. He refused to go at all unless I paid him extra, and protests were not of the slightest avail.

January 2nd.—Things arrived early, but one load, the most important of all, was left behind, and yet again I had to send back. The old man of the sea refused to start, saying his canoe leaked; but the fact was he had had an unusually good take of fish, and wanted to run about the country to sell it. I had an attack of dysentery, but Ashe and Gordon were both so enfeebled with illness that they were incapable of action, and everything fell on me. I selected a few packages, and had them stored in the canoe, at the same time cautioning Mzee[1] that I had ten more to come. At 2 a.m. he called me up and said we must start. Well, unearthly as the hour was, I got up, saw to everything, cooked my brethren some food, had the tent packed and taken down to the boat, when Mzee turned round and said that he had no room for the luggage, and refused to start till daylight. This meant that my poor suffering companions would have to sit about in dewy grass, bitter cold and mosquitoes for three full hours. I resolutely answered "We *must* start." Hereupon he and his crew rushed to the boat and began tearing out the baggage. A fearful scrimmage ensued, during which time I trod in a colony of biting ants and was wofully punished. Things got in such a pickle that I did not know what was taken and what left, and many packages we could ill spare were left behind—for instance, Gordon found

[1] *Kiswahili* for "old man." The captain of the canoe was always called *Mzee*. I translated this somewhat freely "the old man of the sea" as he was so excessively troublesome.

himself left with only the clothes he had on. At 4 p.m we got off, a hippo blowing a salute as we started. We had not gone far when a loud explosion startled us, and looking up I saw two legs of my only chair flying upwards. My stupid boy had put his gun loaded and full cocked into the boat and the jarring fired it off. A new rug was cut in half, the side of the canoe broken, and my poor chair spoilt. Yet how much worse this accident might have been!

Our next escapade was to rob some natives of a goat. And thus it came about. The old man of the sea spied a boat and rowed after it to shore. I thought they were simply having a chat or friendly barter, for the goat was handed over as quietly as possible, and on we went. It was not until some time after that it came out that it had been forced from its owner. At my expressing horror, I was quietly informed that Mtesa's men are accustomed to act in this manner. The scenery soon became very varied and beautiful. Cormorants, darters, belled kingfishers and a very small dark blue variety with a robin breast, constantly crossed our track. Many crocodiles and hippos floated lazily on the surface, and o'er the purple hills the sun rose in golden glory. We landed on the Uzinja side for lunch. The people had never seen a white man before, and their astonishment was beyond bounds; they pulled my hair and beard, and roared with astonishment when they found they were not stuck on, but grew. They asked if my boots were my feet; then if they grew to my feet; and as I deliberately drew one off and they saw my blue sock, they thought my feet were blue and toeless. Then when they finally saw my foot, their surprise was great, for they had imagined that only my face and hands were white. The canoe men were too wise to misbehave themselves in the face of such numbers, so the visit passed off auspiciously. At sunset we camped for the night. Gordon had to be lifted from the boat. Ashe crept out and at once went to bed. I had the tent pitched; then I discovered there was no firewood. After an hour's search I found a little, and finally bought some more and superintended the cooking, for the boys were worn out. Then Mzee came and said I must get the things out of the canoe, for it leaked; and I found most of our goods wet. It was very dark, and the air was so thick with mosquitos, they were like the plums in a rich Christmas pudding.

As I was sitting down to enjoy a well-earned meal, Duta came and called me from the tent, and told me that the men had refused to go on unless I would pay them extra cloth, and from what he overheard he believed that they intended deserting us. I went down to see what could be done, but we could arrive at no agreement. I kept silence, sparing my

brethren any extra anxiety. I slept little that night, fearing the men would desert and steal some of our loads, but daylight found them still there. Three valuable hours were spent in haggling, which resulted in my having to pay yet more cloth, and a start was not made until 11 a.m. We had not paddled far when a storm gathered and we had to put into port; and only just in time, for a fearful hurricane burst upon us. "Down rushed the rain terrific," and large waves beat upon the shore, washing up shells and weed. I should have liked to have slept here, as the day was wearing, but no! onwards was the word. Three hippos pursued us, and the hippos of the lake are very savage and dangerous; but the men managed to out-distance them. Vast numbers of crocodiles appeared on the surface of the water: I think I saw as many as a dozen in a shoal. I felt no temptation to have a swim. The sun then sank into the west and we were still at sea. I looked at the pale faces of my invalids, and I looked at the luggage, the tent, my helpless boys, and the savage ruffians in the canoe, and my heart trembled. It was not until 8 o'clock that we arrived at the place where the boatmen intended us to sleep. It was so dark that it was a long time before we could find a break in the reeds through which we could wade ashore; and when we landed we found we were in a place that was so rough and damp that there was no possibility of pitching the tent. We crept on some half a mile until we reached a native hut. Fancy the good man of the house, having retired to rest, and being disturbed by a ghost in the shape of the first white man he had ever seen. Fortunately, he was not tempted to try my ethereal qualities with a spear, but most liberally said we might occupy the goat-house. "Impossible!" I ejaculated, with something more than emphasis, as I gazed upon a thatched manure-heap ankle deep in mire. "If you will kindly allow us to sleep within your fence, for fear of leopards, we shall be content." Having agreed to this, I hastened to my companions, and with great difficulty got them over the rough ground and had their beds put up in the open. The native, beholding their sad plight, generously vacated his hut, but after my recent experience I strongly recommended that we should remain in the open until rain came on. The instant the canoe touched the shore, the men made off, leaving us to do the best we could while they seized upon all the firewood. Our boys, on an occasion of this kind, always became useless, so that everything fell upon me, and it was some time before I could manage to get a little food ready.

Two a.m. it came on to rain and the invalids took to the hut, but I preferred wrapping myself in my waterproof and facing it. When daylight dawned I found, to my utter despair, that

the canoe had sunk during the night, and that almost everything we had was drenched. It was hard to think of one's note-books, barometers, botanical specimens, etc., in this condition. But the man who goes to Central Africa must be prepared "to take joyfully the spoiling of his goods," and to bear the reproach of incompetence. Almost superhuman strength at times, I fully believe, was given me, but even that had its limit. After a sleepless night, then travelling from 5.30 a.m. till 11 o'clock at night, I was unable to unload that canoe, and so it sank. The old man of the sea and his crew refused to bale it out, so I and the boys set to work in pouring rain, and by eleven o'clock the weather broke, and I got my friends into the canoe and started. Soon dark clouds began to gather, but evidently only for soft rain. Accordingly, I insisted on the men proceeding; and they informed me afterwards that they were very glad I had done so. I now grew generous, and promised them a goat on arrival if they made no more ado. The offer was received with joyous acclamations, and we paddled into shore for lunch in glee, thinking all trouble over. Lunch finished and a start made, they coolly turned on me and said they would only go to the next village and then leave us. I made no comment, thinking I would get there first. To my great joy, when I landed, I found that the men whom I sent overland had hit upon this spot, so now I had a small army of ten to help us dry our goods, pitch tent, and get in order. I further discovered that Romwa's capital was only a short distance from us. A runner from thence brought word for us to proceed to a certain spot next morning, and there to await a canoe from Romwa. "Trouble surely is ended!" we cried, but was it? No. I wish I had space to relate fully all we passed through before we finally reached this part of our journey. After being detained two days, while Romwa made medicine and consulted oracles as to whether the white men would harm him, the Delphian reply was, "The white men are good for you and your people, but injurious to medicine-men." During this delay, I failed with severe fever, but could not give way to it, for somebody must see the matter through. I only once remembered suffering more pain, but I buckled myself together, saw the canoe loaded, and made a start. No sooner had we got fairly off than I perceived that there was a terrible leak in the canoe, and that the canoemen were drunken. We landed. I repaired the mischief, and the men plied themselves to some *pombe* (native wine) which they had brought with them. The consequence was, when we started, they were worse than ever, and yelled and screamed till my poor companions felt overcome by the fearful noise. The captain then stood up and executed a war dance on a bale

of goods, ending by falling on me. This was more than I could stand, so I gave him a needed warning, and said next time he should have a cold bath. Thereupon he grew wrathful, and ordered the canoe-men to land us on a desert shore. This they refused, fearing Romwa, and perhaps my wrath more than their captain's. Then a free fight commenced, which ended in the captain falling overboard. He climbed in, and in a dreadful rage seized a paddle, and, as I thought, aimed a tremendous blow at Ashe, which fortunately just missed, but shivered the paddle completely. Befevered as I was, I bounded from my seat, seized him, dragged him into his seat, and defied him to move. I was proceeding to arm myself for protection, if necessary, when one of the men took me and gently forced me into my seat, and then proceeded to pat me on the back and talk in this fashion: "White man, be calm, be calm; gently, gently; don't disturb yourself. We will go on, indeed we will. White man, be calm; quietly, quietly, quietly;" with each word administering a gentle pat, until at last I fairly burst out laughing, and the April shower of wrath fled before the sunshine of mirth.

January 9th saw us settled at Romwa's. Fever continued on me with its worst symptoms—a succession of fainting fits; but it was no use to give in to it, for Romwa sent down word he was coming to see us. Presently a great noise was heard, and looking out, we saw a long procession of medicine-men carrying horns full of rancid butter, probably mixed with blood; then came Romwa himself, at least a head and shoulders taller than his people, being very little short of seven feet; then came wives, councillors, and medicine-men *ad libitum*. We were asked to place his chair in the centre of the tent; and as soon as he had seated himself the horns were planted in the ground all round him to keep off the witcheries of the white men. Nor was this enough. To make matters quite safe, the monarch had anointed himself with castor-oil from head to foot. Never had we been witness to such a scene of superstition; nor, I think I may add, smelt such a perfume. Romwa was very anxious for us to remain and build in his country, but he soon entered on the universal subject of GIVE; and when we refused guns, he rose in a violent passion, and stalked off, saying he was a great chief, and would have a great present. We were betrayed; instead of the mild sage we had had represented to us we saw the royal savage in his true character. And yet, in spite of his being one of the worst men I had to deal with, there was something in him that I loved. When alone and free for a few minutes from the influence of his medicine-men, he grew kindly, would feel my pulse and pat my fevered brow.

For some time, at Romwa's, we seemed to be State prisoners, and could not tell when he would permit us to leave. However, at length he consented to my proceeding providing the others remained. I accordingly started (January 22nd), with two boys. I had had severe fever the day before, and did not feel up to much fatigue; however, I got up early and went down to the royal hut, and was kept waiting for an hour while I was inspected by the king's wives; then another hour was spent at the water's side, so that it was not until 11 a.m. that a start could be made. Then hindrances arose, and we had to put into shore. Then came a storm, and the canoe sprang a leak, so that by 5 p.m. we had only accomplished an hour's work. Once more we put to sea, and encountered another storm, which drenched all my blankets. At midnight we crept quietly ashore, uncertain whether the natives were friendly or not. I had my wet bed and blankets conveyed a little away from the swamp belt of the lake. The boys and men feared to remain with me thus far from the canoe, so I laid my weary frame to rest under my umbrella, for it was raining, and unmindful of natives or beasts of prey, I commended myself to the care of the Almighty and fell asleep. Soon a tremendous roar close to me caused me to start in a way that no nightmare has ever accomplished. What could it be—a lion? No; lions are not so noisy. It was only a hippopotamus. He had no doubt come up to feed, and stumbled nearly on top of this strange object, a white man with an umbrella over his head, fast asleep; so, bellowing out his surprise, he turned round and ran to the lake.

Before daylight dawned we were off, and soon after reached Kagei. I was welcomed by the Arab chief, Sayed bin Saif, and as I was seated, sipping some delicious coffee, a strange white man stood before me. I sprang to my feet, only to hear "Bon jour, monsieur;" and then I knew that I was in the presence of one of the French Jesuit priests. They had recently abandoned Uganda, and had much news to tell me of the brethren at Rubaga, who were anxiously expecting my arrival. I now began to arrange for the journey onwards. Resolving not to return to Romwa's, I sent boats to try and get Gordon and Ashe to leave, and if necessary by stealth; however, in a favourable mood Romwa consented to their leaving, so Ashe returned to Msalala, and Gordon joined me. We then agreed that I should go down overland to Msalala, and fetch up the remainder of our things; after which we hoped to proceed to Buganda.

I started with my two boys and six men, leaving Gordon in Kagei. Little did I think when I said farewell that it was a final farewell as far as Africa was concerned. I soon failed

with dysentery, and my liver was in such a state that I had to crawl along with my hands tied to my neck to prevent my arms moving, the motion giving me such intense pain. It was here that I concluded that to remain was but to burden my brethren and to die. Accordingly, when, after a week's travel, I reached Ashe, I spoke to him about it. His reply was, "Listen to a letter I have written to the Committee about you." It ran somewhat like this: "H—— is pressing on against all our advice: if he still lives I look upon it as your duty to recall him." On this, with a heart bowed with disappointment, I consented to leave those brave men to bear the heat and burden of the day by themselves; and though deeply thankful for a spared life, I have never ceased to regret that in a weak moment I looked back.

My journey homewards was even more fraught with adventure than had been the outward bound portion of it. I was passing for a long time through a country devastated by war, and many incidents befell me.[1]

February 28th.—I had previously thought myself too ill to walk, but to-day my porters ran away, and I had to crawl fifteen miles, which brought me to the London Missionary Society station at Urambo. Shaw kindly received me into his house, and Willoughby entertained Edmonds, who had joined me a few days before. Willoughby was not in when I arrived; he has since told me that Shaw came outside the house to tell him that he would find me very altered—dying, in fact—but he must not appear to notice the change, for fear of its having a bad effect on me. He asked my black men about me. They replied, "Master must die; he is sure to die; but how is it master is always so happy?"

Penry, one of the London Missionary Society's men, who had also been ill, finding I was returning, asked to join me, to which I consented. This delayed me a few days, during

---

[1] One night I had gone to sleep in a village, which was in the heart of the disturbed region, and had been told that a midnight onslaught might be expected—rather, I think, with the view of finding out whether I could be relied on to help in such an emergency. Towards the small hours I was awoke by a shot, and distinctly heard the whizz of the bullet; then some twenty bullets or more whistled through the air. "Am I to fight," I said to myself, "or not? am I to see this village burnt to the ground, my men killed, myself——?" Then I heard a laugh. "It is not war," thought I; "I will answer the question another time," and so turned over and went to sleep. The next morning I heard that it was a lion had sprang over the stockade and got into the cattle-pen, hence the commotion. Lions are dangerous sometimes. At Uyuvi, there was no door to the room I slept in; and the very day after I left it I was told that a lion killed a woman in broad daylight close by.

which time I had an interview with the celebrated King Mirambo. He was formerly a most blood-thirsty tyrant, inspiring terror for miles round; but now, though not a Christian, he has been much influenced by Christianity, and is most favourable to Missionaries.

March 5th started with Penry for Uyuvi at 10 a.m.

On the 7th I had a sharp attack of fever, and ought to have stopped; but onward was the word; and so, sometimes walking, sometimes being carried, I proceeded till about three o'clock, when I became worse, fainted, and seemed to be dying. However, by the mercy of God I came round, and the next day went on my journey.

March 9th.—Off before daybreak, and was carried on until 1 p.m., when I was taken desperately ill in the desert, and had another fainting fit. At four o'clock I endeavoured to stand, but was unable to do so, and asked to be taken to my tent, which was now pitched about ten yards off. My idle head man refused to have me carried, and said they would two of them hold me by the arms; the consequence was I again fainted.

March 10th.—At 1 a.m. woke, very ill, and for an hour I appeared to be gradually sinking. Scarcely able to whisper, I sent for Penry, and took leave of him. When daylight dawned, although I could not stand, and scarcely move hand or foot, I allowed myself to be lifted into my hammock, and carried on. The air revived me; but when I reached Uyuvi, about 9 a.m., I was again apparently in a dying condition. Blackburn, who had come to meet me, seeing how I was, ran to the house, prepared a bed, and revived me with strong stimulants. I was then moved into the schoolroom where I was so ill on my way up, and we agreed that my only chance was, humanly speaking, no return of fever. Before sunset it set in severely, and I was very delirious.

March 11th, Sunday.—As soon as fever passed my temperature sank very low, and the cold sweat of death seemed to stand on my brow. I desired them to have service in my room, and little did any of us think I should see the light of another Sunday. Two p.m.—Fever returned, and my dear black boy Backit stayed by my side twenty-four hours, while I was delirious, without leaving to eat a mouthful. I remained in this most critical state for five days, Blackburn watching by my bedside. At times I could not help smiling at his intense desire to save my life—it seemed such a hopeless struggle. On the fifth day I called my two boys to me, and with their help, to the utter amazement of everybody, I went out of doors for a short walk. The next day, March 17th, I was weighed—8 stone 6 pounds. I had lost four stone since leav-

ing England. On the 20th I superintended my packing, and started for the Coast at three p.m. Blackburn insisted on accompanying me.

From this time I began slowly to mend, and only had one more attack of fever, and a slight touch of dysentery. Penry remained much about the same until we arrived at Kisokwe, April 19th. Here Mr. and Mrs. Cole gave us a hearty welcome, though the joy of meeting was marred by our hearing of the sad death of Mrs. Last,[1] of Mamboia. Penry seemed very sleepy and strange all day, but retired to rest as usual; however, about 1 a.m. he called us up, and to all appearance was dying. I treated him as I had had myself treated over and over again, and towards daylight he appeared so much better that I hoped he would revive; however, during the day he grew weaker, and after a night to us fraught with anxiety, he quietly fell asleep in Jesus about 7 a.m., April 22. We made the coffin, and with our own hands lifted him gently into it, and buried him that same night by the grave of Dr. Mullens, Secretary of the London Missionary Society at Mpwapwa.

May 3rd.—I met with Dr. Baxter, who had gone down to Zanzibar for home, but hearing of my illness returned to meet me. What a noble act! It was in one way a great satisfaction to hear him, after he had gone into my case, declare that I had done right to return, and when I offered to remain in the country he straightway ordered me home. I reached Zanzibar May 9th, and the old country June 12th.

I close my narrative with an expression of regret that my short stay in the country has necessitated its being more a tale of adventure and travel than of Missionary enterprise. I am thankful, however, for experience gained, and that I have lived to plead a cause which is, in consequence, nearer than ever to my heart, for I have seen the need of the natives, and have realised the sufferings of their spiritual teachers. I am further comforted by the assurance that no white man whose course of life is straightforward passes through this country without exercising a strong civilizing, yea, and a Missionary influence. We have heard with gratitude to Almighty God that the fact that we were enabled to bear suffering with light hearts was much commented on by the natives, with whom we came in contact, the reason being ascribed to the help of our God.

There is much to tell about the natives; 'tis easy to plead their cause, did but space permit. Though they are ofttimes "hateful and hating," yet 'tis a true paradox, there is much to admire in them, much to love. Even those who, like Romwa,

[1] Mrs. Cole also died shortly after my return.

or the old man of the sea, lied, cheated, and extorted to the utmost of their power, still touched a tender spot in our hearts. With all their depravity and darkness, I fully endorse what Livingstone said of them, that there are excellent traits in their characters, that they compare favourably with the early history of the now civilized nations, that they are capable of a high degree of culture; and is it not manifest that, in spite of all difficulties, Providence has prepared especial openings and given especial calls to England to possess this Dark Continent for Christ?

Once more I bear the warmest testimony to the bravery and zeal of those whom I left behind. What I endured is but an example of what they are now enduring for Christ's sake in order to win souls for Him in this benighted land. Before a Native Ministry can be established to carry on the work much must yet be undergone. But we are encouraged to go on by the results on the West Coast, and we are the more encouraged because the early records of our Mission will bear most favourable comparison with the annals of all other fields of labour.

Forgive the one that turned back; remember with affection and prayer those who are labouring on—the unvarying kindness and love I received at their hands is one of the brightest recollections of my journey in Africa.

JAMES HANNINGTON.

ART. III.—OUR LORD'S PRESENT WORK AS HIGH PRIEST OF HIS CHURCH.

THE argument which we have pursued in three former articles on this subject has been as follows: In the first article we showed that the work of Christ, as it is now carried on in heaven for His Church, is properly sacerdotal. It is as her High Priest that He appears for her there. Passing in the second article to the manner and circumstances of His priestly intercession, and confining our attention to the typical institution of the Jewish economy, we were led to the conclusion that the teaching of the type plainly indicated that not with altar nor with sacrifice, but only with blood, and that not continually, but once only and once for all presented for us, has He now to do. In the third article we saw that the teaching

of the type in this respect is corroborated and confirmed by the inspired commentary upon it in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which contains at once our warrant for studying the type, and our key to the right interpretation of it.

In this last article we propose first to consider, in order to give completeness to our negative argument, a passage of the New Testament outside the Epistle to the Hebrews, on which great stress is laid by those who maintain the view of our Lord's heavenly ministry which we are controverting; and then, in conclusion, to show, so far as Holy Scripture enables us to do so, in what that ministry does really consist.

The passage of the New Testament to which we have referred is that in the Book of Revelation in which our Lord is described as "a Lamb as it had been slain"[1]: a description which is appealed to as intimating the perpetuation by Him of the "victim state" in heaven, and justifying the view that He is evermore presenting His sacrifice before the throne of God.

We cannot, however, enter upon the consideration of this passage without a clear understanding as to the relation in which it, or any other similar passage, must be held to stand to the general argument. For the purposes of our present inquiry, such passages can only be regarded as supplementary and subsidiary. In an investigation such as this, and indeed in any investigation, it is only reasonable to insist that the conclusions of an argumentative treatise, avowedly written in elucidation of the subject in hand, should regulate, and, if necessary, correct, inferences drawn from allusions to the subject in other writings, which are not composed with reference to it, and which are, moreover, of a highly figurative and mystical character. That view of our Lord's heavenly ministry and of our corresponding earthly ministry, to which we are taking exception, ought not to be accepted by the Church on the supposed authority of obscure passages in the Old Testament prophets, which are either not quoted at all, or are quoted in a different sense in the New Testament, or of passages in the difficult and metaphorical Book of Revelation, if it be not clearly and unmistakably supported by the plain teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In that Epistle, as we have seen, it is conspicuous by its absence. And yet it is not too much to say that, in that Epistle, if it had been true, it must necessarily have held a prominent place. The acknowledged object of the Epistle to the Hebrews is to reconcile Christian Jews to the approaching abolition of the Mosaic priesthood and ritual. It was composed with a view to fortify

[1] Revelation v. 6.

them against the shock which their cherished sentiments and prejudices were destined to undergo by the coming destruction of their city and temple. But if the worship of the Christian Church were indeed, as is alleged, the reproduction and the antitype of the worship which had for long centuries been offered on the holy hill of Sion, how better could the writer of the Epistle have quieted the apprehensions and restored the confidence of his Jewish brethren than by assuring them that this was really the case? Is it conceivable that if so weighty an argument had been within his reach he would have neglected altogether to avail himself of it? He might have said, we are told, "The priests of the order of Aaron are about indeed to pass away; but the Christian priests, who are their proper successors, minister in every Christian assembly. The one altar in Jerusalem will be overthrown, but an altar in every Christian church has arisen to supply, and much more than supply, its place. The sacrifices that can never take away sins will cease for ever, but the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, not indeed repeated, for that can never be, but represented, is 'done' for a memorial of Him, whenever the bread is broken and the wine poured out in obedience to His command." All this, it is asserted, could have been said, and yet so far from its forming, as, if it had been true, it must have done, the staple of the argument, we look in vain from one end of the Epistle to the other for a word or a hint upon which such a construction can with certainty be put. One doubtful and disputed expression is all that, on the most favourable hypothesis, can be found to support it.

Opportunities for introducing it—occasions on which, it is not too much to say, it must have been introduced if the writer had believed it—are passed over without a reference to it. Christian ministers are three times spoken of in the chapter in which the one disputed expression occurs; but each time they are called, not "priests," but "your leaders," "they that have the rule over you."[1] One only Priest stands forth alone in His ministry, like the Jewish high priest on the day of Atonement, "the High Priest of our profession," Jesus, the Son of God. Sacrifices are enjoined in the context in which the words, "we have an altar," occur. But they are not the celebrations of the Holy Eucharist, the sacrifice of Christ represented on the altars of the Christian Church, but "the sacrifice of praise to God continually,"[2] and the "doing good and communicating," with which and such-like sacrifices He "is well pleased."[3] The worship and the privileges of the

[1] Οἱ ἡγουμένοι. Hebrews xiii. 7, 17, 24.
[2] Hebrews xiii. 15. [3] Hebrews xiii. 16.

Christian Church are more than once alluded to in the course of the Epistle, but in no such allusion is the idea of Christ's priestly action in heaven being imitated and repeated by His priests on earth to be discovered.

"Seeing then"—it is the conclusion reached at the end of the second section of the Epistle—"we have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, let us"—Do what? Assemble round His altars on earth, and through the ministry of His priest, and the representation of His sacrifice, do here, and so claim our part in, what He is doing there? "No!" There is not a word of this, natural, almost necessary, as on the assumed premisses it would have been. "Let us therefore," so the exhortation actually runs, "come boldly to the throne of grace;"[1] not to the altar either on earth or in heaven, but to the true Mercy-seat, the throne on which, at the right hand of the Father, our High Priest is sitting, "that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

"Having then boldness"—it is the conclusion drawn from the now completed argument of the Epistle—"to enter into the Holiest by the Blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say His flesh, and having a great Priest over the house of God, let us"—again, we ask, *Do what?* And again we answer, that there is no allusion to what, if it were true, was most to be expected here. There is, indeed, a possible reference (and this makes the case still stronger) to both sacraments in the exhortation which immediately follows, "Let us draw near ..... having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."[2] But if holy Baptism be here described by its outward sign, the washing of the body with water, the other holy sacrament, if it be referred to at all, is described, not as a representing of the sacrifice of Christ, but by the Jewish symbolical action of sprinkling the blood of the victim on the worshipper, of which the spiritual counterpart is having "our souls washed through His most precious blood,"[3] whereby the heart is cleansed and pacified from the guilt and torment of an evil conscience. If the theory of representation were true—still more, if it held the place in Christian worship which its advocates claim for it—could it possibly have been unnoticed in such passages and throughout such an Epistle? Is not this negative argument, the argument from its absence, of itself fatal to its claims on the acceptance of the Church?

If, however, we thus maintain the paramount authority of the

[1] Hebrews iv. 14, 16. [2] Hebrews x. 19-22.
[3] Prayer of humble access in the Communion Office.

Epistle to the Hebrews in the argument we are conducting, it is not because we find any discrepancy between it and those other places of Holy Scripture to which we have alluded. So far from requiring manipulation to bring them into harmony with the teaching of the Epistle, they perfectly accord with that teaching, and serve to illustrate and enforce the view which the Epistle gives us of our Lord's priestly intercession.

Chief, as we have said, among such subsidiary passages, is the description, to which we now turn, of our Lord, as the Lamb slain, in the Book of Revelation. Rapt in spirit into heaven itself, St. John is permitted to see and to describe the things that are transacted there. The vision, as he first unfolds it to us, is not more remarkable for the transcendent glory which it displays, than for one notable omission which it contains. On His throne of ineffable majesty the Eternal Father is seated. By the seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, the Holy Spirit is represented. On surrounding seats, or thrones, the representatives of the Church appear. By the four living creatures of varied shape, redeemed Creation is depicted. One Form, expected and desired, the light of heaven as the stay of earth, in vain we look for. "At His own right hand, in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come," "the Head over all things to the Church," God "hath set Him."[1] And yet His place is vacant there. Without His name expressed, without His proper work alluded to —Creation, and not redemption, its theme, the anthem of heaven is uttered forth: "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power, for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are, and were created."[2]

But the second part of the vision, which should never be dissociated from the first, speedily and amply supplies the lack, and introduces,

"Made welcome by a brief delay,"

that Form which the vision is thus purposely contrived to magnify and honour. In the right hand of Him that sits upon the throne St. John sees a sealed roll, which no one in heaven, or earth, or under the earth, is found worthy to open or to look upon. And as he weeps at the loss which is thus occasioned to himself and to the Church, of the revelation which that unopened roll contains, he is comforted by the

---

[1] Ephesians i. 20-22. [2] Revelation iv. 11.

words, "Weep not; behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, overcame to open the book, and the seven seals thereof."[1] But when, following close upon this encouraging assurance, the fulfilment is vouchsafed, St. John sees not "the Lion of the Tribe of Judah" in terrible majesty, not "the Root of David" in human form, but a "Lamb as it had been slain," standing in the midst of the throne, and of the four living creatures (occupying the middle place in front of them, from the spectator's standpoint), and in the midst of the elders. He takes the book out of the hand of Him that sits upon the throne; and then to Him, as the Lamb slain, is rendered the adoring praise of the representatives of the Church and of redeemed creation, angels and archangels and all the company of heaven swelling the chorus of that mighty hymn, and all created things re-echoing it with their deep diapason. Very wonderful is the description. "Melodies" are these "of the everlasting chime," for which, that we might drink in their soothing, ravishing, spirit-stirring strains, we would fain shut out, not only "the loud stunning tide of this world's sin and crime," but the cold voice of criticism, and the jarring tones of controversy.

But what, since necessity is laid upon us to interpret it, is the bearing of this vision on the subject before us? What does it teach us, as regards our Saviour Christ's ministry in heaven, and the worship of His Church on earth? There can be no doubt that from this representation of Him, as "a Lamb standing as though it had been slain"[2] (and "as though to enhance still further the tenderness and the pathos of the image," the original word is "a little Lamb,"[3]) a Lamb, "alive not dead, standing not prostrate, and yet bearing marks as of recent slaughter,"[4] we are intended to gather that His character as a sacrifice for sin, and the sufferings and death which in that character He endured, so far from being obliterated and forgotten, live on in undying remembrance and perpetual manifestation, amidst the glories and the worship of heaven. As the Lamb slain, heaven adores Him and earth trusts in Him. As the Lamb of God, the Church prays to Him on earth, "O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father that takest away[5] the sins of the world, have mercy upon us."

---

[1] Revelation v. 5.

[2] Revelation v. 6. Revised Version.

[3] *ἀρνίον*.

[4] Dean Vaughan—Lectures on Revelation.

[5] In his recent charge (Sept. 6, 1883) Bishop Wordsworth, of St. Andrews, observes that, "Writers who maintain the doctrine of the continuous sacrifice, and endeavour to support it by the authority of our own Church, are in the habit of quoting the words which occur in the Litany, and also in the *Gloria in excelsis* of the Communion Office, 'O

As the Lamb He fills all her future in heaven. The song they sing is "the song of Moses and of the Lamb."[1] "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain"[2] is their everlasting theme. The robes they wear are "washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb."[3] The book in which their names are written is "the Lamb's book of life."[4] The city in which they dwell "hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it, for the glory of God doth lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."[5] No temple is seen in it, "for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the Temple of it."[6] All this, and more than all, is true of the ever-living and enduring efficacy of the one sacrifice, once offered, once presented.

But where in all this does it appear that Christ is continually presenting that sacrifice as High-priest in heaven? What countenance does it lend to the idea that, after His example herein furnished, His priests are continually presenting it on the altar in the Holy Eucharist? In which of all the places where He is spoken of in the Book of Revelation as "the Lamb," or as "the Lamb slain," is such priestly action attributed to Him? When, as the Lamb slain, He comes forth to take and to open the sealed roll, what direct or proper reference is there to His priesthood at all? If we read the vision aright, it is as the Prophet, and not as the Priest of His Church, that He then appears. It was because no one in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was found worthy to open or to look upon the book of God's revelation, the book of His counsels and purposes, offered for the instruction of the Church if only she could find an interpreter to unfold them, that the divine Seer wept much. It was by the assurance that "the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David," "overcame to open the book and the seven seals thereof," and so to give to the Church

---

Lamb of God, that *takest away* the sins of the world," and of laying stress upon the use of the present tense, as indicating an ever-present and continuous action; and so they add, not that *tookest* away, but still takest away: Agnus Dei, qui *tollis* peccata mundi. But the same writers," he adds, "omit to draw attention to the fact that in the proper preface for Easter Day, the great day of the Atonement itself, in the midst of the Eucharistic function, and *before* the consecration of the elements, our Church teaches us to 'praise God for the glorious resurrection of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord,' not as *taking away* the sins of the world through any continuous oblation of Himself, either in heaven or on earth, but because 'He is the very Paschal Lamb, which *was offered* for us and *hath taken away* the sin of the world.'"

It should be remembered, too, in weighing the force of the expression in question, that it is really a quotation of St. John i. 29, and that it would have been an anachronism for the Baptist to have spoken of Jesus as *having taken* away the sin of the world.

[1] Revelation xv. 5. [2] *Ibid.* v. 12. [3] *Ibid.* vii. 14.
[4] *Ibid.* xxi. 27. [5] *Ibid.* xxi. 23. [6] *Ibid.* xxi.. 22.

that revelation, that He was comforted. It was to loose seal after seal of the mysterious book, so that its contents might at length be known and promulgated, that "the Lamb as it had been slain" appeared upon the scene. Assuredly, then, it is of His office of Prophet and not of Priest that the vision primarily and pre-eminently reminds us.

We shall be told, no doubt, that we are ignoring the fact that it is "the Heavenly Temple and its altar, and in its midst the One everlasting Priest, the One everlasting Victim, Jesus, the 'Lamb as it had been slain,'—continually presenting Himself before God,"[1] that this vision avowedly depicts. But we answer, that thus to connect the "Lamb as it had been slain" of the Apocalyptic Vision with "the Heavenly Temple and its altar," and with the "One everlasting Priest, the One everlasting Victim," is not only to contradict, so far at least as altar and victim are concerned, the definite teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, but also to introduce unwarrantable and misleading confusion into the imagery of the vision itself. In the vision, so far as we have at present considered it, no altar at all is seen. It is true that in the next chapter, the sixth, which is in some respects a continuation of the fourth and fifth, an altar is introduced. But what altar? "The altar," it is called, without any explanation, either as to what kind of altar it was, or how it came there. It will, perhaps, be said, that by thus introducing it as a thing of course, though he had not mentioned it before, St. John makes good the point contended for, and teaches us, more forcibly than by a direct statement, that there is an altar before the throne of God. But does it not, we ask, remain to be accounted for if this be so, not only that a Jew using Jewish imagery should thus obviously contradict the earlier teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and violate the requirements of the familiar type which knew of no altar in its most holy place, but that one inspired writer should run counter to another? And what again are the concomitants of this altar which the holy Apostle sees? Does the "Lamb as it had been slain" stand by it, and there continually present Himself to God? So far from this, the altar is in no way connected with Him, or with His ministry at all. "Under the altar," this is all that is said of it, St. John saw "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held."[2] What has this to do, we ask, with "the One everlasting Priest, the One everlasting Victim?" It may well be doubted whether in this Book, which speaks in parable and teaches by metaphor

[1] The Church and the World. The Eucharistic Sacrifice, p. 339.
[2] Revelation vi. 9.

throughout, we have anything more here than a representation of the fact, that like victims offered upon an altar they had sacrificed their lives in the service of God.[1] But at any rate it is worse than precarious to build upon a description like this the theory that our Lord is ministering at a "heavenly altar."

In the eighth chapter "the altar"[2] is again mentioned, and it is a Jewish altar now that is undoubtedly referred to. But it is not the altar of animal sacrifice, the altar of burnt-offering, on or at which the body of the animal was offered and its blood poured out, that is here reproduced. To make this clear, when it is again spoken of in the same verse, it is more fully described as "the golden altar," and that, we know, was the altar, not of sacrifice, but of incense, which stood within the Holy Place or first chamber of the typical sanctuary.[3] But what is specially noteworthy is, that neither as "the Lamb that was slain," nor under any other title, is our Lord ever associated in any way with this or with any other altar that is spoken of in the Book of Revelation. At this golden altar it is "an angel" that ministers, and his ministry is to "add" the "much incense that was given unto him, unto the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne."[4] The truth is, that even supposing the place to which St. John was admitted when it was said to him, "Come up hither,"[5] to have been identical with "the presence of God,"[6] of which the writer to the Hebrews speaks, the imagery employed to describe that place in the two Books is quite different. And it is confusing and misleading to treat it as the same. The "Heavenly Temple" is not the place in which the scene of the Apocalyptic visions is laid. The word "temple" occurs no fewer than sixteen times in the Book of Revelation,[7] and in every one of these cases the Greek word used is that which denotes the shrine,[8] or proper abode of

---

[1] "The representation here, in which they are seen *under the altar*, is simply symbolical, carrying out the likening of them to victims slain on an altar. Even as the blood of the victims was poured under the altar and the life was in the blood, so their souls are represented as under the symbolical altar in heaven, crying for vengeance, as blood is often said to do." Alford *in loc.*

[2] Revelation viii. 3.

[3] Exodus xxx. 1-10. Compare xl. 26, 27.

[4] Revelation viii. 3. The other places in which an altar is mentioned are ix. 13; xi. 1; xiv. 18; xvi. 7.

[5] Revelation iv. 1. [6] Hebrews ix. 24.

[7] The places are iii. 12; vii. 15; xi. 1, 2, 19 (*bis*); xiv. 15, 17; xv. 5, 6, 8 (*bis*); xvi. 1, 17; xxi. 22 (*bis*).

[8] ναός, not ἱερόν, which last is the common word in the Gospels and Acts

Deity, in contra-distinction to the whole building with its surrounding courts. But a careful examination of these passages lends no countenance to the idea, that the writer of the Book intends us to understand that what he saw and records took place within the precincts of this shrine or temple, of which he so frequently speaks. On the contrary, the special notice of its being "opened," as though up to that time it had been closed, and was generally kept so during the progress of the visions, appears directly to contradict such a supposition. Moreover, what was said just now with reference to the Apocalyptic altar is equally true of the Apocalyptic temple. In no one instance is our Blessed Lord associated with it, either as the victim offered in it or the Priest who offers. Any such association is altogether foreign to the Book of Revelation.[1]

But what then, it may fairly be asked of us, is in your view the force and significance of the appearance of "the Lamb as it had been slain" in the vision of St. John? The answer to this question will prepare the way for, as indeed it will in a measure anticipate, the general view of our Lord's present ministry, with which we are to conclude this paper. That general view is, that it is the intercession of a priest, not representing continually His sacrifice in priestly action at an altar, but dispensing in royal dignity from His throne the never-dying fruits of that sacrifice which He had once offered and once presented. And of this view the vision in question affords a particular example. The language of St. John, when accurately interpreted, proves that it was by virtue of His sacrifice, not as then represented to God, but as already and beforehand offered and accepted, that he obtained the right to open the book. He "conquered," or "overcame," are the words of the Elder to him, "to open the book." "Overcame," not in some recent struggle just completed, but in that one great struggle to which and His victory in it He Himself had referred by the same word and the same tense, when He said to the Church at Laodicea, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne, even as I also *overcame*, and am set down with My Father in His throne."[2] And then,

---

[1] Revelation xi. 19; xv. 5. So, too, angels came out of it, xiv. 15, 17, and a voice proceeds from it, xvi. 1, as from a building outside which the Seer was.

[2] Revelation iii. 21, where, as in verse 5, it is *ἐνίκησα*. The Revised Version, unfortunately as we think, renders the aorist in the latter place, "hath overcome." "The usual rendering," writes Dean Alford, "loses sight of the victory of Christ, and of the uniform sense in which the word *νικᾶν* is constantly used in this book. The aorist must not be resolved into a perfect, but points to the past event of that great victory, by virtue of which the opening is in His power." Similarly Dean

what had thus been conveyed to the ear is repeated and confirmed to the eye by the appearance on the scene of the "Lamb as it had been slain." What more fitting symbol could have been chosen to give expression to the spiritual truth which the Elder had just enunciated? How better could his plain words, He "conquered" in His victory over death, so as to obtain by virtue of it the right "to open the Book," have been translated into the symbolical language of the Apocalypse?[1] Our great High Priest, "when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."[2] There He "sitteth" still, as the New Testament throughout and the Creed of Christendom affirm. It was not to unteach the truth which His session implies, and to bid us regard Him as *standing* ministering instead, that the vision was so contrived that His place on the throne appeared to be empty, and He Himself at length stood in front of it as a Lamb that had been slain. The arrangement of the scene is purely symbolical, and is designed to give emphasis, by a crucial example, to the truth that His Intercession rests upon His Atonement, that the gifts which by means of that Intercession He procures for His Church are "the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood-shedding He hath obtained to us." Our view, then, is that of the three priestly functions, which, as Bishop Pearson reminds us, belong to our Lord as the Christ, or Anointed. The first, *oblation*, as the essential pre-requisite both of the second and of the third, He has already once for all discharged. The second, *intercession*, in the ever-living efficacy of the first and with large anticipations of the third,

---

Vaughan: "The glory of opening the book of God's counsels is the result of Christ's victory in redemption. To be the unfolder, the revealer, the expositor of God's counsels to God's Church and God's creatures, is one part of that mediatorial reign upon which the Saviour entered through sufferings."

[1] More than this we cannot find in the symbol. We cannot see that it warrants the belief that our Lord's glorified body bears still in heaven the print of the nails and the gash of the spear. "Calvary," says the late Dr. Pusey, "lives on in heaven and pleads for us still. . . . There on that once veiled brow of majesty, translucent with the light of Deity, are the marks of the thorns which pierced Him. There are the glorious scars which He showed to Thomas, now beaming with the light of love, pleading to the Father for us. There is that once rifted side, through which from His pierced heart gushed forth the water and the blood. There they speak for us sinners." But where is the authority for this, or for the statements of some of our hymns? *e.g.*:

> Oh joy, all joys beyond,
> To see the Lamb who died,
> And count each sacred wound
> In hands, and feet, and side.

[2] Hebrews i. 3.

He is discharging now. The third, *benediction*, growing out of and gathering up into itself the memories and the virtues of the first and the second, He will then discharge when "to them who are expecting Him, He shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation."[1]

But we also believe that while intercession is thus His priestly work for us now, it is the royal intercession of a priest upon His throne.

"He which was accepted in His oblation," to quote Bishop Pearson again, "and therefore sat down on God's right hand, to improve this acceptation continues His intercession, and having obtained all power by virtue of His humiliation, representeth them both in a most sweet commixture, by an humble omnipotency or omnipotent humility, appearing in the presence and presenting His postulations at the throne of God."[2] "Nor must we look upon this," he adds elsewhere, "as a servile or precarious, but rather as an efficacious and glorious intercession, as of Him to whom all power is given both in heaven and earth."[3]

Such royal intercession, not the pleading of a suppliant, nor the dealing of a priest with sacrifice, but the calm request as of an equal, the undoubting prosecution of a rightful claim, He predicated of Himself when here on earth, both by the word[4] which he used to describe His "asking" the Father on our behalf, and by the tone and language of the prayer in which He inaugurated His intercession for us before He suffered. Placing Himself by anticipation in that prayer beyond the cross and the grave, looking back, as it were, on the finished work on which His intercession is to rest, He says, "I glorified Thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which Thou hast given Me to do."[5] And then, in the expression of will founded on acknowledged right, He intercedes, "Father I WILL that they also whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am, that they may behold My glory."[6]

An intercession it is, as again He teaches us Himself, which encounters no obstacle, overcomes no difficulty, meets with no counteraction, in the perfect spontaneity of its unimpeded exercise; moving ever, living ever, being ever among the eternal harmonies of the nature and the will of God; flowing from and returning to, at once the consequence and the occa-

---

[1] On the Creed. Art. "Christ." Folio 1692, p. 95.
[2] *Ibid.* Art., Sitteth on the right hand of God, p. 285.
[3] *Ibid.* Art. "Christ," p. 96. [4] ἐρωτάω, not αἰτέω.
[5] St. John xvii. 4, Revised Version. "The historical mission of Christ is now regarded as ended; the earthly work is accomplished."—*Westcott.*
[6] John xvii. 24.

sion of, that Love which is of God and is God; not needing always to be insisted upon, lost sight of for the moment, as the part is included and merges in the whole, in that eternal love of the Father, of which it is a manifestation and a form, and from which the entire scheme of Redemption proceeds; yet even then most magnified and most triumphant, because by it, as the condition and the means, that free love of God is fully realized and enjoyed. "I say not unto you," these are the words, 'that I will pray the Father for you, for the Father Himself loveth you, because ye have loved Me, and have believed that I came out from God."[1]

It should not be lost sight of, for it has an important bearing on the place and the mutual relation of oblation and intercession in the sacerdotal ministry of our Lord, that in the comparison of Christ with Aaron in the Epistle to the Hebrews, no mention whatever is made of intercession. In the earlier chapters, where He is described generally as a High Priest, before any reference either to Aaron or to Melchisedek as types of Him has been made, His human sympathy, as a necessary qualification in an intercessor for man, is more than once insisted upon.[2] At the close of the argument, when both Melchisedek and Aaron have passed out of view, and all types are gathered up in their fulfilment in the "Great Priest over the house of God," the confidence of the human heart in His priestly intercession is virtually assumed in the invitation to "draw near in full assurance of faith."[3] But of the two intermediate sections in which His resemblance, first to Melchisedek and then to Aaron, is worked out, it is in the first alone, and not in the second at all, that intercession is spoken of. As the Antitype of Aaron He intercedes not at all. As the Antitype of Melchisedek He intercedes ever. In other words, it is in the discharge of that eternal and royal priesthood after the order of Melchisedek, in which the one great sacrificial act after the similitude of Aaron was an essential but a unique and single episode, that He ever lives to make intercession for us.[4] Of Melchisedek we read not that he offered any sacrifice.[5] On the ground, no doubt, of sacrifice already offered by him as a priest and accepted, as a priest he intercedes—stands, that is, between God and man, dispensing from God the benefits which the sacrifice has procured, receiving from man the thank-offerings which those benefits have evoked. Moving freely in the sphere of reconciliation already effected, meet type of the greater Priest who, after his order, should one day arise, he accepts of the faithful,

[1] John xvi. 26. [2] Hebrews ii. 17, 18; iv. 14-16.
[3] Hebrews x. 22. [4] Hebrews vii. 25. [5] Genesis xiv. 17-20.

in the person of Abraham their father, the tenth of all, and refreshes them with food and wine, and blesses them in the name of the Most High God.

Such then, however imperfectly we may have represented it, we believe to be the teaching of Holy Scripture on the subject which has been before us.

How far our representation accords with the teaching of Catholic antiquity, and of the great divines of the English Church, is a subsidiary question, the importance of which we have no desire to underrate, and on the consideration of which we should not fear to enter. But it *is* a subsidiary question. The first and the ruling question is, "What saith the Scripture?" To God's Word written our own branch of Christ's holy Catholic Church subordinates the authority of Creeds,[1] of General Councils,[2] and of the Church itself.[3] "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."[4]

Our conclusion, therefore, is that we find it impossible to accept that view of our Lord's Intercession which regards it as consisting in the continual representation of His most holy Body and Blood as a Priest before God in heaven; not only because we cannot bring ourselves to translate into literal language and clothe with material forms the fervid oratory and glowing imaginations of some good men who have been hastily claimed as holding it; not only because we see it leading around us to an undue exaltation of one of the two sacraments which Christ ordained—to the comparative depreciation of the other, which is of equal dignity, and of Common Prayer, to which He promised His special presence and blessing, and of the preaching of the Gospel, which He enjoined upon His Church to the end of time—and finding expression in a ritual which the eye can scarcely distinguish, and a doctrine which the mind can with difficulty dissever, from the ritual and the doctrine of the Church of Rome; but chiefly and above all, because when we bring it to the test of Holy Scripture, we perceive that it is neither written therein, nor may be proved thereby.

To the other view, which rests upon the Scripture, which cannot be broken, on those words which, though heaven and earth pass away, shall not pass away, we commit ourselves and are at peace. It reveals to us One Who, having once offered on earth and presented in heaven His one sufficient sacrifice for sin, ever lives and reigns, a Priest upon His throne, to

---

[1] Article VIII.
[2] Article XXI.
[3] Article XX.
[4] Isaiah viii. 20.

apply the virtue of that sacrifice to His Church below, and by the channels of holy ordinances, by prayer and meditation and preaching and sacraments, to bestow upon her "the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood-shedding He hath obtained to her."

T. T. PEROWNE.

ART. IV.—A DAY AT EISENACH.

PART II.

OUR subject being Eisenach, we must pass somewhat abruptly from the first period of Luther's association with that place to the second. In the time that intervened events had occurred of the utmost moment, both to his own biography and to the effect of that biography upon the world. These were the fixing of the Theses upon the church door at Wittenberg, the burning of the Pope's Bull, and the defence before the Diet of Worms. It must be added that these were the really romantic and attractive incidents of Luther's life, as, on the other hand, they contained the germ of all that followed in the ecclesiastical and theological history which is connected with his name. The short residence in the Wartburg marked the separation of two very different periods of his life. After his departure from that solitary place of constrained rest, all was storm and controversy and anxiety. The time of protest and of the mere proclamation of great principles was past, and the time both of new church-organization and of the difficult re-settlement of theology on a primitive basis was begun.

We cannot too carefully remember that the months spent in the Wartburg were intimately connected with the Diet at Worms. The crisis of Luther's departure from that place was the moment of the greatest peril of his life. He was under the ban alike of the Pope and of the Emperor. In these circumstances, starting in his waggon from that city by the Rhine, on the 26th of April, he took the usual road to the north-west, towards Wittenberg, through the country which has been slightly described. His first resting-place was Frankfort. Thence he wrote a characteristic letter to his friend Lucas Cranach, the painter who made the above-mentioned portraits of his father and mother. He relates in a few strong words what had happened at Worms. "My service to you, my dear Master Lucas. I expected his Majesty would assemble fifty learned doctors to convict the monk outright. Not at all.

'Are these books of your writing?' 'Yes.' 'Will you retract them?' 'No.' There's the whole history. How we Germans are duped by Rome! But the time will come when we shall sing 'Hallelujah!'" The next stages were Friedberg, Grunberg, and Hirschfeld. Then he came to Eisenach. D'Aubigné describes from Luther's letters an amusing scene which took place here in the home of a memorable part of his boyhood. All the people crowded round him and requested him to preach. The parson was afraid, and came attended with a notary and a witness, and with some hesitation protested. And now "through the crowded church rang the manly voice," which in boyish tones, some twenty-three years before, had sung in the streets of Eisenach. At the close of the service the parson came to Luther with the duly signed document in his hands, which was to secure himself from dismissal, and humbly said: "I ask your pardon; I have taken this course through fear of the tyrants who oppress the Church."[1]

Leaving Eisenach, Luther did not follow the direct route by Gotha and Erfurth, but, with a true Saxon home-feeling, turned aside to Möhra, his father's birthplace, that he might see his relations, and especially his grandmother, who died a few months afterwards. A sharper contrast can hardly be imagined than this quiet day at Möhra, compared with the recent turmoil and mental strain of the Diet at Worms. From Möhra, after having said farewell to his relations, he took the road towards Gotha. It was in the evening, at a spot well-known and now marked by a monument, not far from the Castle of Altenstein, about eight miles to the south of the Wartburg, that five armed horsemen attacked the waggon, dragged Luther out of it, placed him on a horse, and hurried him through the woods. They took first one direction and then another, so that the confused prints of the horses' feet might baffle any pursuers. There is a touch of humour in the description which Luther gave in a letter afterwards of his own discomfort and fatigue. "Longo itinere, novus eques, fessus," is his epitome of what he went through that evening. About eleven o'clock at night this strange party came to the base of a steep hill, which was slowly ascended. On the summit was the castle, the present appearance of which has been described, but which in Luther's time was far more isolated and more difficult of approach. It was a thoroughly strong, safe, and secluded fortress, which the Reformer's friend, the good Elector, had provided for him.

Luther's stay in the Wartburg includes two main topics—

---

[1] "History of the Reformation" (Eng. Trans.), vol. ii., p. 348.

his own personal experience, and his translation of the New Testament. A word must be written on each of these points.

Those who believe that the Reformation was a vast blessing to mankind, and that a Divine Providence guides the steps of those who are chosen to follow a difficult path at a perplexing time, must pause at the threshold of the Wartburg to consider what this imprisonment and seclusion meant for Luther himself. At the turning-points of religious history, great events are not accomplished by eminent men without some contemporary training (it may be a very severe training) for their own spirit. I may perhaps be allowed to repeat here some words which I used elsewhere on Luther's birthday. He was before long to be engaged in the task of organization amid a thousand difficulties, and for this he was to be prepared in solitude. For his own character, for self-discipline, for the learning of high spiritual truths, such solitude was required. We have sacred and lofty precedents which justify this view. Moses was on Mount Horeb before he grappled with the problem of reducing a horde of slaves into a nation. Elijah was in the same wilderness before his brave conflict with Ahab. St. Paul was in Arabia before his restless task of evangelizing the world began.[1] St. John was in Patmos before the ripe influence of his old age was given to the Church at the close of the first century. Luther called the Wartburg his Patmos. This time of constrained loneliness was a great opportunity—far greater than he knew himself; for among his other faults he was very impatient.[2] The great castle above Eisenach stands as a strong and permanent memorial of this phase in the Reformer's history, of his inner struggles, of his preparation for the future—not without useful lessons, possibly, for ourselves.

How great this impatience was, we can gather from his correspondence with his friends while he was in the Wartburg, and from his treatises on large religious questions which he wrote during that short time between the 4th of May, 1521, and the 1st of March, 1522. On this manifold work I must not touch, except to sum up in his own words the strong, overpowering feeling that lay at the base of them all. "For my Germans was I born; my Germans I must serve," is what he says in a letter written from the Wartburg to his friend Gerbell.[3] But Luther in this prison was to render to his dear

[1] Perhaps the imprisonments at Cæsarea and in Rome are instances more in point for the purpose of the present comparison.

[2] Address at the meeting held in London at Exeter Hall on November 10th.

[3] Those who were in Germany last autumn with their minds attentive to this general subject must have observed various little publications concerning Luther in the booksellers' shops. Among these may specially be mentioned "Luthers Aufenthalt auf der Wartburg," by Witzschel, published at Vienna.

Germans a greater service in his translation of the Bible. For this work he had signal gifts, in which we must recognise the indications of Divine purpose. First, he was a man of the people; he knew their heart, and he was a master of the language which moved their heart. Next, he was a man of genius; and genius often accomplishes what immense talent and immense industry fail to accomplish. A third qualification for this work, of even higher value, was this, that through the struggles of his own heart and conscience he had gained a true spiritual insight into the Word of God; he *knew* what *faith* meant. Once more, he was a well-trained scholar; his early teaching at Eisenach had been carefully followed up by subsequent learning and teaching; and he translated not from the Vulgate, but from the Hebrew and the Greek. Finally, he did this work alone. The result is not a compromise among a large number of well-instructed divines. The benefit of individuality is apparent in this case, as in the cases of Jerome and Tyndale. Thus it came to pass that, though there were earlier translations of the Bible into German, they all failed to touch the hearts of the German people, whereas Luther's translation may be said to have created the German nationality. I have heard the matter compactly stated thus: the nationality of Germany has been formed by its language; this language grew out of the German Bible; and this Bible was Luther's work. Some words from an American writer, in whose learned pages the Luther-spirit is a living power, may conclude this slight notice of the Wartburg: "Luther raised a barbarous jargon into a language which, in flexible beauty, and power of internal combination, has no parallel but in the Greek, and in massive vigour no superior but the English. The language of Germany has grown since Luther, but it has had no new creation. He who takes up Luther's Bible grasps a whole world in his hand."[1]

With the quitting of the Wartburg we enter upon a new and altogether different period of Luther's life. He was now face to face with terrible subjects—the war of the peasants,[2] the selfishness of the German princes, the wild fermentation of religious opinion, the necessity of re-organizing Church-order and Divine worship. These topics belong, for the most part, to other parts of Germany, and they do not in themselves fall within the limits of this essay. To one topic, however, of this period we ought to give a little attention; for it is closely connected with the growth and settlement of Lutheran theology, and with the special occupation of Luther's

[1] Krauth's "Conservative Reformation and Theology" (Philadelphia, 1871), p. 18. The earlier German Bibles are enumerated by this writer.

[2] For this aspect of the Reformation in Germany, see Seebohm's "Era of the Protestant Revolution," pp. 26-31 and 131-136.

mind, alike in the Wartburg and in the Castle of Coburg. This is the composition of his two Catechisms. Both belong to the same year, 1529. Both were written in German. It is, however, the "Enchiridion," or famous "Smaller Catechism," to which reference is here specially made. Luther himself regarded, and rightly, the smaller work as the full flower and ripe fruit of the larger.

Luther found in his visitations about this time the most deplorable ignorance and immorality, both in town and country, and alike among priests and people. He perceived that close and systematic instruction in religious truth was everywhere required; and he addressed himself to this task without delay and with characteristic vigour. Next after the translation of the Bible, the "Shorter Catechism" is probably the work that exhibits the most clearly his peculiar genius, his spiritual insight, and his power over the German people. No doubt there are things in this Catechism—in the manner and proportion of its presentations of sacred truth—with which we of the English Church cannot altogether agree; still this little book constituted an epoch—as no other book ever did—in the history of systematic religious instruction. It has been said that "to Luther belongs the glory of fixing the idea of the Catechism, as the term is now used"—that "he is the father of Catechetics proper;" and that "his 'Shorter Catechism' is really the most ancient now used in the world."[1] To the age of the Reformation it was "an incalculable blessing;" and no religious book, except the Bible, has been in such wide circulation and incessant use in Germany ever since. One German writer says, "It may be bought for sixpence; but six thousand worlds would not pay for it." Another says, "There are as many things in it as there are words; as many uses as there are points." A third says, "That if all faithful preachers, throughout their lives, should confine their sermons to the wisdom shut up in these few words, they could never exhaust it." But, perhaps, two remarks of Luther himself regarding this small volume are still more to our purpose. In one place he says that it is "a Catechism that can be *prayed*." Elsewhere he says, "I am a Doctor and a Preacher; yet am I a child that is taught the Catechism. I read and recite, word by word, in the morning, when I have leisure, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. I remain, and ever shall cheerfully remain, a child and pupil of the Catechism."[2]

It was said in the earlier part of this paper[3] that we must

---

[1] See Krauth, pp. 284-288.
[2] See Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," vol. i., pp. 247-253.
[3] See THE CHURCHMAN for January, p. 295.

combine Coburg in one view with Eisenach. This combination helps us, as was remarked then, to acquire a more correct appreciation of the topography and scenery of some of the most interesting passages of Luther's life. But the combination helps us likewise to bind together two parts of his biography which were very intimately connected in their meaning and in their effect upon the world. The Castle of Coburg is, in fact, in some very important respects, the complement of the Castle of the Wartburg in this exciting history. The months spent by Luther in these two fortresses were, in fact, so to speak, parts of our experience. To name only one subject, it was here that he completed that translation of the Bible which he began in the Wartburg. In his letter from the Castle of Coburg he tells his friends of the difficulties which he met in translating the Prophets, especially in the case of Ezekiel. In the recent commemoration of Luther in Germany it is probable that there was almost as warm a recollection of him here at Coburg as at Eisenach; and, in fact, I had last autumn some opportunity of observing that it was so: for on the very day when I went from the former place to the latter, there was to be a gathering of students, with the singing of chorales, and with a sermon by an eminent preacher in connection with this very subject.

There were picturesque circumstances connected with the coming of Luther to the fortress of Coburg, as there were with his coming to the fortress above Eisenach. These circumstances were indeed far less exciting than in the former case, and they were, to a great extent, free from immediate peril. Still, they are quite enough to invite us to a careful observation, so that we may have a vivid recollection of the place. We must above all things remember that Luther's constrained residence in the Castle of Coburg was as closely connected with one Diet of the Empire as his constrained residence in the Wartburg was with another. At Worms, indeed, the interest was concentrated in the incipient heroic struggle against that false system of the Papacy which, in the form of the sale of Indulgences, threatened to destroy Religion. At the Diet of Augsburg the questions at issue related to a mature system of theology. Yet in regard to this too, as well as the former, Luther was the great moving power of the time. He began his journey from Wittenberg towards Augsburg on the 3rd of April, 1530. Palm Sunday, the 10th, was spent at Weimar, where the Elector joined with him in the Holy Communion. On the 15th they arrived at Coburg; and there Luther preached on Easter Day, as also on Easter Monday and Tuesday. It was thought well that he should remain here behind, and not proceed further towards Augsburg. This

was against his own will; but probably the advice was good; and here he was within easy reach of the Diet, and could maintain perpetual correspondence with Melancthon and others while the struggle was in progress.

Coburg is a familiar name to us, through our loving and reverential memory of the Prince Consort. Not far off is Rosenau, his quiet birthplace. The Castle of Coburg, which is approached through a park sloping upward from the town, and which never can have had such a formidable relation to it as that in which the Wartburg stands to Eisenach, was a frequent home of his boyhood.[1] The far-reaching views from these bastions over the forests and cornlands of this part of Thuringia were in 1530 not less familiar to Luther. It seems natural to note one or two particulars of his residence there which bear a distinct impress of the place. It ought first to be carefully remembered that his famous hymn, "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," was written here. The association of this hymn with the great struggle of the Diet of Augsburg is very memorable; nor ought we to forget, as one of those picturesque helps which are full of reality, that when he wrote it he was *in a fortress!* Looking out from the castle window upon the entangled mass of thorns immediately below, and observing the incessant movement, and hearing the incessant noise of the birds among the branches, he writes: "Under my window is a wilderness of thorns, like a little forest, and these jackdaws and crows are holding a kind of *Diet*. Such coming and going! Such cries and caws—old and young all together! It is a marvel that their throats and their breath last out so long. I wonder whether anything of this kind is going on among you." It seems that it is with this outlook from the castle windows of Coburg[2] that another passage of his correspondence, written in a different spirit, is to be associated: "Looking out of the window, I have been watching two wonders—first, the glorious vault of heaven, with the stars supported by no pillar, and yet firmly fixed; the second, great thick clouds hanging over us, and yet with no ground on which they rested; then, when they had greeted us with a gloomy countenance, came the luminous rainbow, which itself, like a thin frail roof, bears the vast weight of water;" and he proceeds to compare those who, in the midst of the troubles of the day, were destitute of faith, to men seeking for pillars to prevent the heavens from falling.

But there are likewise incidents in this residence in the Castle of Coburg peculiarly attractive to us for their connection with

[1] See Sir Theodore Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort," vol. i., chap. i. ii. iii., comparing Mr. Rimmer's Book, chap. xii.

[2] Köstlin (p. 419) adduces it in this connection.

the personal life and character of Luther. It was from this place that he wrote that charming letter to his little son Hans which has been frequently quoted during the recent commemoration. It was here that he heard of his venerated father's death, an event which deeply moved him. And it is due to Luther's religious habit of life to record what was written to Melancthon by Dietrich, who was Luther's secretary in the Castle of Coburg. Passing through one of the corridors, he heard him praying in his chamber, and the prayer was on this wise: "I know that Thou art our Father and our God; all this matter is Thine; the danger is Thine as well as ours; it is only by Thy constraint that we have put our hands to it." The historians add that he spent daily three hours at least in prayer, and that those hours were some of the most favourable for study.[1]

Our main subject, however, is not Coburg, but Eisenach, and, in concluding, we must return to that place. There the memory of Luther is kept for ever fresh by the circumstances that have been related. At the same time, in justice to this dignified little capital of the Thuringerwald, it must be noted that it has two other biographical associations of great interest, namely, with St. Elizabeth of Hungary and with Sebastian Bach.

Charles Kingsley's "Saint's Tragedy" is a book which the traveller ought to have in his hands at Eisenach, not only because of the intrinsic merits of the poem, but because its publication marked the beginning of an eminent career. Both for biography, too, and for legend, the association of St. Elizabeth with the grim fortress of the Wartburg and the town at the base of its hill ought to be kept in memory. We can conjecture the place where, in a time of protracted famine, she "built a hospital at the foot of the Wartburg, wherein she placed all those who could not wait for the general distribution."[2] In one of the shaded pathways on the slope of the hill above is a broken fountain, which is the scene of a characteristic legend. St. Elizabeth was taking down, in a covered basket, dainties for the sick poor in Eisenach from the Castle, when her husband met her at this point and, speaking roughly and harshly, as he was wont, asked what she was carrying. In a moment of fright she said she was carrying flowers, on which he rudely removed the covering of the basket, when, by a miracle, there dropped out roses and violets. We need not stay to examine the morality, as to truth-telling, which lies embedded in this story; but we may so far moralize as to say, in Scriptural language, that husbands should not

[1] "Nullus abit dies, quin ut minimum tres horas easque studiis optimas in orationibus ponat."—See D'Aubigné, iv., p. 220.

[2] See Kingsley's "Poems" (Ed. 1880), note to p. 64.

harshly chide their wives, or be bitter against them, when they are engaged in deeds of charity.

The connection of Sebastian Bach with Eisenach consists simply in the two facts that he was born and spent his early boyhood there, and that up to the middle of the last century gatherings of the Bachs, all musicians, and sometimes numbering, it is said, as many as a hundred and twenty, were annually held there. There are some curious contrasts between the lives of Bach and of his contemporary Handel, who, in fact, was born in the same year. One of these contrasts was this, that there is no record of any member of Handel's family caring for music, whereas Bach belonged to a multitudinous family of musicians.[1] The exact spot where Bach was born is well remembered. Round the base of the hill of the Wartburg, on the north, there sweeps an open and pretty valley, with some cliffs of moderate height, named the Marienthal, which leads to the long winding gorge of the Annathal among the woods. It was in the Marienthal that John Sebastian Bach was born and spent his boyish days.

It was, however, the biography of Luther which gave occasion to the writing of these pages; and with one further word concerning Luther and Lutheranism I may now end. Severe remarks are often made by Englishmen, not always with full information, regarding the modern decay of religion in his land of Germany, accompanied by an assumption that this decay is in a great measure due to Luther. It must be conceded that there is in Germany a prevalent neglect of public worship; but, not to go into any further argument, it can be urged with perfect truth that there may be an ostentatious display of religious observance, with crowds in the churches, while there is very little real religion; and that, when churches are thinly attended for public worship, there may be a great deal of domestic religion, with modest and most fervent efforts for evangelization and charity.

Just one illustration of this view shall be given. It was my last impression of Eisenach. Immediately within the entrance through the tower gateway on the right, near the Nikolai Kirche, in an old house covered with creepers, is a Deaconess Institution. There I found, among a company of young crippled children, and with portraits of Luther and Melancthon upon the walls, some of those admirable women whom I have seen, not only in various towns in Germany, but in far distant places—at Alexandria, at Jerusalem, at Beyrout—exercising their loving care and trained skill in the nursing of the sick, the rescue of the fallen, and the training of children. It is

[1] See Hullah's "History of Modern Music," p. 130.

sometimes imagined that all these scattered Deaconess Institutions of Germany are affiliated to the one motherhouse of Kaiserswerth. This, however, is a mistake. The house of Deaconesses at Eisenach, for instance, is a dependency of a larger one at Hanover; and I had seen previously at Nuremberg some of the sisters of an independent house established in that city.[1]

Now what I have to remark is, that this invaluable establishment of Deaconesses is a distinct outgrowth of the religious system established by Luther. And other modern institutions in his country, of the most earnestly religious and most practical character, could be enumerated.[2] The principle of faith which he proclaimed has not been without its proper fruit of good works in the land of Germany.

J. S. HOWSON.

ART. V.—THE ECCLESIASTICAL SUPREMACY OF THE CROWN.

THE Report and Recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Ecclesiastical Courts have now been under anxious consideration for many months, and have met with both favourable and unfavourable criticisms. On the whole, however, it must be confessed that the criticisms which are favourable have predominated. It is thought by many that the Report is a fair compromise, and that without any sacrifice of principle it offers a *modus vivendi* between parties who are at variance on points of doctrine in the National Church. Whether such a *modus vivendi* is really desirable or not is another question.

There are many, however, on the other hand, who are unable to view the Report in this favourable light, and regard both it and the recommendations on the whole as nothing short of a complete capitulation to the party of innovation. They regard the Report as *wrong in principle*, the chief objection being that it seemed to them to conflict with, and, indeed, to be subversive of, the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown: the design of this article is to show that such is the case.

It is above all things important in the first place to state clearly what is meant by the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown. A few quotations will suffice to make this clear. It

[1] A proof of the strong power and wide usefulness of the Deaconess Institutions of Germany is afforded by the recent publication in three volumes of Schäfer's "Die weibliche Diakonie." (1879-1883.)

[2] See de Liefde's "Charities of Europe," 2 vols. (1865.)

is not necessary to go farther back than the Act of Elizabeth, 1559.

The 17th Section of the Act for restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State, Ecclesiastical and Spiritual, commonly called the Act of Supremacy, runs thus:

> That such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any Spiritual or Ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been, or may lawfully be, exercised or used for the visitation of the Ecclesiastical State and persons, and for reformation, order, or correction of the same, and of all manner of *errors, heresies, schisms*, abuses, offences, contempt and enormities, shall for ever, by authority of the present Parliament, be *united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm.* (Warren's Blackstone, p. 271.)

Now this was passed on the 28th May, 1559. In the previous reign, that of Mary, all Spiritual and Ecclesiastical power and authority, jurisdiction, superiority and pre-eminence, had been lawfully exercised by the Pope, the Papal Supremacy having been restored by Act of Parliament in 1553. But from the time when the Act of 1559 became law, all that power, jurisdiction and superiority, *Spiritual and Ecclesiastical*, which had been exercised by the Pope, whatever it was—and we all know the extent of his claims—was transferred from him and united to the Crown. Mark, not to the *person* of the Sovereign, but to the *office—to the Crown;* so that the Crown, the Sovereign, has Spiritual and Ecclesiastical Supremacy in and over the Ecclesiastical State and persons; *i.e., over the Church as such*, and over the Clergy.

The purposes and objects for which that Spiritual and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction is to be exercised are set forth in the section already quoted; viz., for the visitation of the Ecclesiastical State; *i.e.*, for inquiring, examination, and inspection, for reformation, order and correction of the same; and of all manner of *errors, heresies, schisms, and abuses.* In other words, it is for the Crown, in its office as *Supreme Ordinary*, to exercise all necessary power and authority for the correction of all abuses, Spiritual and Ecclesiastical, and to adopt all means necessary for the same.

Thus, in brief, the Papal Supremacy was abolished, and the Royal Supremacy was substituted for it.

From this it is evident that the Sovereign is not the mere Civil Ruler of the Church or Ecclesiastical State, but is also the *Spiritual* and *Ecclesiastical Ruler.* Not, indeed, with power "to minister the word or the sacraments," but to rule, reform, and correct, and by the due exercise of authority to "banish and drive away erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word."

We now turn to the 37th Article of Religion:

> The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England . . . unto whom the Chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain . . .
> When we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the Chief Government . . . we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's word or sacraments; but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself: that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God.

Here the *Chief Government* of the Ecclesiastical State is attributed to the Sovereign. Now this does not signify merely the civil government of Ecclesiastical persons, as of all other persons in the Realm, nor does it mean the government of the Church merely in the same sense as the Crown now governs other religious bodies. For, in point of fact, the Queen does not govern other religious bodies at all. The Crown claims no control over them *as such*. They are perfectly free to teach and preach what they please, without let or hindrance from the Crown, as long as they do not violate the civil laws of the land. They may govern themselves any way they please, and change their forms of worship as they like. It is only when they disagree among themselves, and civil rights are involved, or contracts broken, that they come before the Courts of the Realm for legal determination. Far otherwise is it with the National Church. The Church is not free to change her doctrine or her ritual. She has accepted the position of a national institution, and has to submit to all its necessary limitations. A Church not established is self-governed: governs itself by its own duly appointed representatives; but when that Church is in the main the nation, and receives legal recognition and advantages as the National Church, then it is no longer free, as it was before: the Supreme authority rests with the nation and its duly appointed representatives; in this case with the Sovereign acting according to the constitution, by the legally appointed Courts of the Realm, for the Church is the nation in its Ecclesiastical capacity. Hence the Supreme Spiritual and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction rests with the Sovereign; *i.e.*, with the nation; that is, with the body of the Church considered as identified or incorporated with the nation. This is the true idea of the union of Church and State. The Church is a society of men united together for *spiritual* purposes: the State, a society united for *civil* purposes. When these *two societies*, consisting of the same individuals, are united together *as such*, in one constitution, and the doctrines of the Church become the laws of the State, the Church is established, and the constitution is a mixed one of *Church and State*. This is our happy position.

The reference to the Old Testament in the 37th Article

plainly teaches us the nature of the Spiritual and Ecclesiastical authority claimed by the Sovereign. It is "that prerogative which we see to have been always given to all godly Princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself." What was that prerogative? We turn to the Holy Scripture, and there we see what David and Solomon did in the Ecclesiastical affairs of the nation. What, we ask, was the conduct of Josiah, Hezekiah, and Jehoshaphat? They put down idolatry, deposed the idol priests, and set up godly teachers, priests, and scribes in their stead; and in a word, they purified and reformed the Jewish Church, and that without seeking the consent of the Ecclesiastical Courts or the spiritual authorities—rather in spite of their opposition.

Once more: the first of the Canons of 1603 has for its title, "The King's Supremacy over the Church of England in causes Ecclesiastical to be maintained;" and the second Canon is to the following effect: "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the King's Majesty hath not the same authority in causes Ecclesiastical that the godly Kings had amongst the Jews, and Christian Emperors of the primitive Church . . . let him be excommunicated."

It is quite true that since the passing of the Articles in 1562 and 1571, and the Canons in 1603, the Toleration Acts have relaxed the one and virtually repealed the other as far as Nonconformists are concerned; but as far as regards the Church of England and the members of the Church, these statements are in as full force as ever.

The conclusion from all this is that in England the Sovereign is an *Ecclesiastical person*, the Supreme Governor of our mixed constitution in Church and State; that the Courts which are set up to determine Ecclesiastical causes owe their authority to the Sovereign; and that the appeal in the last resort is not to the Sovereign only in her civil capacity, but in her Ecclesiastical, and as having, by the law of the land, supreme "Spiritual and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction."[1]

This is the view taken by the late learned Dr. A. J. Stephens, who says: "Thus the Sovereign has been constituted the highest Ecclesiastical judge, and appeals from the Provincial Courts to the Sovereign in Council are appeals to *an Ecclesiastical, not to a Civil Court.*" "The Sovereign is Supreme Ecclesiastical Ordinary."

The Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown, then, consists in

[1] It is not necessary to repeat that when we say the Sovereign, we mean not the Sovereign personally, but officially, and as representing the nation, and that the claim we make for her is virtually the assertion that all Spiritual and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction belongs to the nation in its Ecclesiastical capacity; in other words, to the whole body of the Church.

this: that the Sovereign, acting for the nation, *i.e.*, for the body of the Church which is legally one with the nation, is supreme Ecclesiastical judge, as well as Supreme Governor of the Ecclesiastical State; and that by the Sovereign in Council, in the last resort, as the Final Court of Appeal, all doctrinal and ritual questions are to be determined; so that the *Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown is the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Church—acting by its chief ruler and representative.*

I now proceed to show how the Report and its Recommendations are opposed to the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown.

I. It concedes the principle that "Spiritual causes should be tried by only Spiritual Courts," *i.e.*, by the Bishops, or those appointed by them.

First, it is provided that the Bishop may, if he please, veto the whole proceeding, and thus put a stop *in limine* to any further action. It is absurd, in the face of this, to say that nothing should be allowed to bar the indefeasible right of the subject to appeal to the Crown in the last resort, if the very first step cannot be taken without the consent of the Bishop.

Secondly, it is recommended that the matter should be dealt with by the Bishop personally, if both parties agree; if not, then it must come before the Diocesan Court.

Thirdly, it may be carried further to the Provincial Court, also a purely Ecclesiastical Court; and last of all, it may come before the Court of Final Appeal, which is to be a purely Lay Court, and is not "in any sense to determine what is the doctrine or ritual of the Church."

Now here we have, as above stated, the principle conceded that "Spiritual questions should be determined only by Spiritual Courts." This is an assumption utterly unjustified by the New Testament, the standards of the Church, or the historical facts of the Reformation.

Who made the Bishops supreme judges in this matter? What is there in the New Testament to justify this assumption? When the New Testament was written, there was no such officer in the Church as our present Bishop. There were inspired Apostles, also presbyters or bishops, and deacons; but Diocesan Episcopacy, such as we now understand it, did not exist; although we freely admit and maintain that the traces and germs of our Episcopate may be found, but it was confessedly a later development, as proved by Bishop Lightfoot in his learned treatise on the Christian ministry.

Again, what does the Church say on the subject? Article XX. says: "The Church," not the Bishops, "hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and also authority in controversies of faith." The Church? What Church? Read Article XIX.:

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, etc."—no mention of Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, distinguished from the Church, though doubtless the Clergy, of whatever office, are included in the definition as members of the Church.

Once more, what of the facts of the Reformation? Why, that so far from questions of doctrine and ritual being decided only by the Episcopate, the Act restoring the Supremacy to the Crown, and the twin-sister to it, the Act of Uniformity, by which the Mass was abolished and the Reformation finally set up in the Church of England, were carried without the consent of Convocation, and in spite of the most active and determined opposition on the part of the majority of the Bishops! Fifteen out of sixteen on the Bench refused to take the Oath of Supremacy, and were summarily deposed by the Queen; and the Acts referred to were enacted by the Queen, with the assent of the Lords *Temporal* and the Commons in Parliament assembled. No mention of the Lords Spiritual in the Acts! Why not? Because the Acts were carried in defiance of their opposition. Again, then, we ask, what ground is there for the assumption that the Bishops alone are qualified or authorised by divine or human law for the determination of Spiritual questions? To say so is virtually to deny the Spiritual and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction which we have seen to be invested in the Crown.

II. The Court of Final Appeal, as recommended by the Report, also appears to many to be subversive of the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown. Here we are at variance with many able writers. The *Record* newspaper, referring to the fact that the Court of Appeal is to be a purely lay tribunal, asks confidently: "Is this a High Church triumph?" To this we reply, Most decidedly; and a very remarkable one too. A few words will be necessary to prove this, for at first sight it seems the very reverse.

The Commissioners tell us that the reason why they recommend that the appeal to the Crown should be heard by an exclusively lay body of judges learned in the law, is the fact that they had "provided in earlier stages for the full hearing of *Spiritual matters by Spiritual judges; i.e.*, by judges appointed under recognised Ecclesiastical authority." Pray what is this but to deny the Spiritual and Ecclesiastical competency of the Crown? If the Crown be, as we have proved, possessed of the highest Spiritual and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction (the Sovereign officially being the highest Ecclesiastical Ordinary), why should the Crown be deprived of its exercise in the Court of Final Appeal?

Further, the Report goes on to say that "the function of

such lay judges as may be appointed by the Crown to determine appeals is *not in any sense* to determine what is the doctrine or ritual of the Church." Again we ask, What is this but to deprive the Crown of its Ecclesiastical and Spiritual authority? Why is not the Crown to determine what is the doctrine of the Church? If not the Crown, who is to do so? The Bishops? And are we going to hand over to the Bishops the determination of this momentous question? Is it not the province of the Crown "to visit, and to reform and correct all heresies, schisms, and other abuses"? Is the Church going to take its doctrine without question from Spiritual judges? Why did it not do so in 1559, when the Bishops to a man were opposed to the Reformation?

The fact is, the Commissioners first make a purely lay Court for the final appeal to the Sovereign, so that it may not even appear to be an Ecclesiastical one, and then, to prevent all possible mistake as to the matter, proceed to muzzle the Court as it regards any doctrinal or ritual decision. If this is not in effect to destroy the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown it is difficult to say what is.

It may be asked, What, then, is the Final Court to decide, if not what is the doctrine or ritual of the Church? For, after all, that is the question at issue. A clergyman is accused, say, of doctrinal or ritual transgression. He is acquitted in the Provincial Court, the Final Ecclesiastical Court, according to the Commissioners. An appeal is now made to the Final Court. What is the question at issue? Evidently whether the accused has or has not violated the doctrinal or ritual law of the Church. How can this be decided unless they first know what is the doctrine or ritual of the Church? And if they sustain the judgment of the Court of the Province, will not that in effect be a declaration that the decision of the Provincial Court has been in accordance with the doctrine or ritual of the Church, and so put forth a determination as to the doctrine or ritual of the Church? According to the Report, the lay judges are only "to decide whether the impugned opinions or practices are in conflict with the authoritative formularies of the Church *in such a sense* as to require correction or punishment." In other words, the Crown is to be confined merely to the question of *the temporal* penalties which may be incurred, just as in the case of any Nonconformist litigants!

We have said this is a triumph for the reactionaries, whose avowed object is to "go behind the Reformation," and have done something to prove it; but more remains. It is a simple matter of fact that the extreme High Church party, as represented by Dr. Pusey and Canon Liddon, proposed to

expel the Ecclesiastical element from the Court of Final Appeal, in order that its decision, however binding in law, might not be binding in conscience. Dr. Pusey says: "The mischief in all these decisions has been the *quasi*-Ecclesiastical character of the Court given to it by the presence of Archbishops and Bishops." And Canons Gregory and Liddon expressly term the present Final Court of Appeal "The final *Civil* Court."

Well, these leaders have gained their end. Whether the Commissioners intended it or not, they have complied with the demands and wishes of the Ritualistic party—they have made the Final Court a purely Lay Court; they have debarred it from in any wise deciding what *is* the doctrine or ritual of the Church; and more, they have prevented it from delivering the sentence on the case. It is to be remitted back to the "*Church* Court," that sentence may be delivered there! Thus the Crown is shorn of all appearance of Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Supremacy, and reduced to the position of being a purely Civil Court. If this is not a triumph for the ultra-Church party, what is it? The Supremacy of the Crown is upheld in name, denied in fact, in that particular of which we are treating, viz., Spiritual and Ecclesiastical authority. The determination of Spiritual questions is handed over to Spiritual Courts, as demanded by the English Church Union, and the infliction of temporal penalties left to the Crown!

If there were any doubt as to the correctness of the views put forth in this article, one would think it would be thoroughly dissipated by the resolutions just passed by the President and Council of the English Church Union. They hail the Report of the Commissioners with *thankfulness*, as justifying their contention against the authority of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and as recognising the inherent right of the Spiritualty to determine questions touching the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Church. They submit, however, that the decision of the Final Court should avowedly affect only temporalities, which is indeed what the Commissioners appear to have recommended, only they did not like to put it quite so baldly; and that on all Spiritual questions considered by the Court, a reference to the Bishops of the Province should be *compulsory*, and that *their decision* should *be final*. The meaning of this plainly is that the judges of the Final Court should be compelled to take their decisions as to doctrine from the Bishops! Was there anything ever so presumptuous? They further submit that "no declaration of membership in the Church of England should be exacted from the judges of the Final Court." This, too, is in accordance with the views of Dr. Pusey, who, in his letter

to Canon Liddon (1871) said, "that it would not matter whether the judge was of some Dissenting body. Those without the Church are often better, because more disinterested, judges of the Church's doctrines than biased members of the Church."[1] True to the views of this Coryphæus of Ritualism, the members of the E. C. U. now demand that the judges of the Final Court of Appeal should not necessarily be members of the Church of England at all. Why not? Because it would thus more unmistakably appear that the decisions of this Final Court were in no wise binding on the consciences of Churchmen, except so far as they simply re-echoed the decisions of the Spiritualty.[2]

Now, we have no objection to the Final Court consisting only of laymen, if they are sufficiently learned in the law, though we think a mixed Court of lay and cleric, like the old Court of Delegates, more likely to give a satisfactory decision; but what we object to is, depriving that Court, that is, the Sovereign in Council, of her inherent and constitutional Spiritual and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and converting it into a purely Civil Court, having power merely to deal with the temporal accidents of spiritual causes. This is what the Commissioners have haltingly, and with doubtful voice, actually ventured to do. And the astute leaders of the E. C. U., keenly perceiving their advantage, now boldly demand that the Final Court shall be avowedly merely a temporal Court, bound to ratify, register, and carry into effect the decisions of the Bishops.

In conclusion, one can but express a doubt whether the Report is really calculated to promote the peace and well-being of the Church of England. It ought surely to awaken some misgivings in the minds of loyal and intelligent men to find that the Report is hailed with delight by such a body as the English Church Union. Let us hope that before it be too late the fuller investigation of the whole subject, both by friend and foe, will unite all true Churchmen who "have understanding of the times" in their firm determination to uphold, in its fullest sense, the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown.

W. F. TAYLOR.

---

[1] "Letter to Canon Liddon," p. 64. Rivington: 1871.

[2] So far from objecting to the Final Court of Appeal on the ground that it is to be a purely Lay one, the party of innovation even want it to be altogether free from any necessary Church character. It would appear that some of our unsuspecting friends who have defended the Report have a good deal to learn yet as to the tactics and ends of the Ritualists.

Reviews.

Heth and Moab. Explorations in Syria in 1881 and 1882. By CLAUD REIGNIER CONDER, R.E. Author of "Tent Work in Palestine," "A Hand-Book to the Bible," etc. Published for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Richard Bentley and Son, 1883.

NOT the least regrettable of the consequences of the troubles in Egypt was the compulsory cessation of the Survey of Palestine East of the Jordan, which was commenced in 1881 under the auspices of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Still, that the expedition was by no means fruitless in results is, pending the publication of the detailed Memoirs, abundantly shown by the present volume, in which Captain Conder relates very vividly the dangers and difficulties with which his party had to contend, and indicates what they accomplished in spite of these obstacles. It was in April, 1881, that Captain Conder arrived in Syria, and his first work in the field was a reconnaissance, in company with Lieutenant Mantell, of a tract of Northern Syria, in the hope of finding the site of the great Hittite capital—Kadesh on Orontes. This preliminary tour, it must suffice for us to say here, was conspicuously successful. It will be remembered that Egyptologists have fixed Kadesh at such various sites as Antioch, Homs, and on the island in the lake now called Baheiret Koteineh, situated near the latter town. Captain Conder, however, rejects all these suggestions, and fixes Kadesh at Neby Mendeh, a dark mound a little west of Kussir. He found the name Kades still well known, as applying to the ruins on the south slope of the hill, and this must certainly be regarded as a remarkable coincidence. Interesting fragments of pillars and statues are to be seen here; but there are no antiquities that can be called Hittite. The recovery of Kadesh is a noteworthy contribution to the study of this interesting tribe, the eldest of the sons of Canaan. But we cannot linger over these pages, although they tell us much that is new of the land of the Hittites. Very interesting, for instance, is the account of Homs, the ancient Emesa, the Hemesa of Pliny, and Hamatz of the Talmud, and said to have been the city of the Zemarites (Gen. x. 18), although this is a purely conjectural identification. Captain Conder's account of the performances of the Dancing Dervishes at Tripoli is, too, peculiarly graphic. We must also pass over the journey from Tripoli to Beyrout, through the Land of Purple.

At the very outset of their journeyings the explorers found that their task must either be wholly abandoned, or accomplished, so far as might be, in the teeth of the categorical refusal of the authorities to permit either survey or any kind of exploration. The Porte affected to attach political significance to the presence of two British officers upon its territory at such a time, and had already taken steps to stop the progress of the Expedition. It was soon apparent that there was no hope whatever of penetrating into the Hauran; and Captain Conder accordingly endeavoured to outwit the authorities by making a sudden descent into Moab. Very graphic and amusing is the account of the game of "hide and seek" which he somewhat rashly played with the bodies of soldiery sent to see him out of the country. Securing the services of an Arab chief named Goblan, of very shady character, but in his allegiance to his employers a worthy type of the traditional Arab, as guide, he suc-

ceeded in surveying five hundred square miles of country before he was obliged to retire from the field. The tract explored lies due east of Jericho and Jerusalem, and the work done includes surveys of Heshbon, Elealah, Madeba, Beth-Meon, Nebo, Pisgah, the hot springs of Calirrhoe, and Rabboth Ammon. At the same time 600 names have been obtained, 200 ruins examined, 700 rude stone monuments discovered, and many of them sketched, a number of Arab traditions have been collected and identifications proposed for the Field of Zophim, and the Ascent of Luhith, Jazer, Sibmah, and Minnith. Of these, perhaps the fixing of the Field of Zophim at the plateau of arable land which stretches along the south side of Mount Nebo is of the greatest interest to the Biblical student. It was discovered by the Survey party that even the name has been preserved—the modern Arabic Tal'at es Sufa being radically identical with the Hebrew Zuph, whence Zophim. But the whole ridge of Jebel Neba is full of interest. As the place whence Moses viewed the Promised Land it has always attracted travellers in Palestine. Captain Conder has a suggestion to offer with regard to the Biblical account of the view which lay before Moses, which we give in his own words :

" When we turn to the account of the death of Moses (Deut. xxxiv. " 1-3) we find a description which answers well to that given above. " The land of Naphthali (extending to Tabor) can be seen, and the " mountains of Gilead, the land of Ephraim and of Manasseh, of Judah, " with the Negeb (the dry or south country), are seen for more than a " hundred miles. Jericho, the city of palm-trees, and its plain, is at our " feet unto Zoar, which lies at the foot of the Moab chain. If we make " the simple change of reading 'towards' instead of 'unto,' in the cases " of Dan and 'the western sea,'—a change not forbidden by the meaning of " the Hebrew particle—the whole account reads as correctly as that of an " eye-witness ; but it is certain that Dan (if the site near Bâniâs be in- " tended) and the utmost, or 'hinder,' or most western sea, cannot be " visible from Nebo to any mortal eye."

Scarcely less interesting is the story of Nebo in its connection with Balaam and Balak. The three high places to which the prophet was brought by the king of Moab, that he might thence see and curse Israel, have all been identified. Of these, the first was Bamoth Baal, which lies south of Nebo ; the second was the Field of Zophim ; and the third was " the cliff of Peor," whence apparently the whole host of Israel was visible in the plains of Abel Shittim. This last summit has been identified with a ridge immediately south of Bamoth Baal, in the narrow spur which runs out to Minyeh, and which answers the necessary conditions in regard to prospect. But a discovery of still greater interest was to be made here. On the edge of the cliff were found "a line of seven monuments of large stones, concerning which nothing could be learned from the Arabs, save that they were very ancient." Viewed in connection with the Biblical account, which tells us how at each site seven altars were raised, this fact is of engrossing interest. May not these be identical with the stones which still stand here as mute monuments of the dead past ?

" Here, then," says Captain Conder, " we may picture Balaam standing " on the lofty knoll just south of the seven circles, setting his face to the " wilderness of Judah, beyond the Salt Sea (Numbers xxiv.). Hence he " saw the twelve black camps of Israel abiding according to his tribe, " spread out like the black groves which fringe the Jordan's tributary " streams. Hence, Moab, Edom, and David's city could alike be seen. " Here the rocky nest of the Kenite, never to be wasted till Assyria " carried him captive, appeared as a peak on the south-western horizon, " at the ruin of Yekîn, where, later, monks showed men the grave of

"Cain. Here was pronounced the doom of those children of Sheth "who adored, in Peor and Nebo, but other forms of the 'pillar' Set, so "sacred to the Hittites, and to the early Egyptians also."

It is perhaps in the light that it throws upon the stone monuments that the chief claim of the present volume to permanent value lies. And here again the value of the inquiry, as illustrating the Bible, cannot be overestimated. We find these stones just where we should expect to find them if we followed merely the sacred record. The Israelites carried out the Divine command wherever they had the power. There is not a single example of these altars in Judea, only one doubtful circle in Samaria, one dolmen in Lower, and four in Upper Galilee. In Moab, on the other hand, the surveyors found 700 examples in 1881. It is long since the travels of Canon Tristram made the existence of stone monuments in Moab so widely known; but they have never hitherto been satisfactorily examined. With regard to the dolmens, Captain Conder is decidedly of the opinion that they were altars, and in support of this theory he points to the hollows in the top stones. Again, the menhirs, or standing stones, are probably memorial pillars, and as such are found in nearly every country. There are abundant instances of such stones mentioned in the Bible. Thus, the witness-pillar, of Mizpeh; the memorial-pillar over Rachel's grave; Joshua's pillar under the oak at Shechem, in memory of the oath taken to serve Jehovah; the stones of Bethshemesh, Ezel, and Ebenezer, are familiar instances of memorial menhirs among the Israelites. But we must refer the student who is interested in this inquiry to the volume.

We have no space to give any of Captain Conder's illustrations of Syrian superstitions and contributions to Arab folk-lore. But it will readily be believed that these chapters, although somewhat fragmentary, are interesting. The paper on "The Future of Syria," which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review* a few months since, is also given in the volume, and in the Appendices is included, amongst other things, a very powerful protest against the Jordan Valley Canal, on account of its impracticability. The volume must certainly be regarded as an important addition to the literature of the Holy Land.

Glimpses through the Veil; or, Some Natural Analogies and Bible Types. By the Rev. JAMES WARING BARDSLEY, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Surbiton. London: James Nisbet and Co.

This is a very interesting volume; and the last pages are the best. It is not so brilliantly written or so highly scientific as Henry Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." But it is a much easier book to read; and, somehow, it inspires more confidence. Mr. Bardsley's processes can be followed, and his results easily verified, throughout. Mr. Drummond, on the contrary, makes such demands on our logical faculty and our knowledge of science, that, while our sympathies are with him, we feel as if we were travelling for the first time on wings, and are never quite sure, for many minutes together, that the fall of Dædalus will not be our lot—

> Expertus vacuum Dædalus aëra
> *Pennis non homini datis.*

Mr. Drummond's conclusions are almost too good to be true.

Mr. Bardsley, on the other hand, never takes up a position without immediately entrenching himself by the use of other pens, men, and dates (of course there is no allusion to Horace here); in other words, he quotes from standard authorities. Writers who not only read but condescend to quote, instead of always airing their own lucubrations (expertus *vacuum*

aëra), lay us under a peculiar obligation. So many books—even good books—are published in these days, which we really cannot find time to read (or even to review)! A self-denying writer, who will collect valuable paragraphs, and exhibit them in their proper places in an argument, deserves the thanks of his whole generation; especially of those among his contemporaries who are blessed—or cursed—with what they are pleased to call originality. Ordinary originality is only a compound of clever thieving and quick digestion. Quotation at least means industry. Apt quotation means industry and perception combined. There is one Bardsley who deserves to be immortalized as "Quotation Bardsley," for his marvellous power of giving page and paragraph, at a moment's notice, in the very nick of controversy. There is more than one Bardsley who reads, and gives other readers the direct benefit of his reading.

In this particular book, we rejoice most of all to be thoroughly at one with the writer on the authority of God's written Word. His last chapter, on "The Heavens and the Word," contains the substance of four sermons preached at Christ Church, Surbiton, in the spring of 1883. The congregation has, apparently, expressed a wish for their publication; at which we are not surprised. These were sermons on Psalm xix.; concerning which Mr. Bardsley well observes, that "the transition from the natural to the spiritual (in that Psalm) is so abrupt, that this very abruptness implies an analogy in the objects of contemplation." The heaven of God's Word is the "tabernacle" for the "Sun of righteousness." It is Christ, Whose going forth is from the one end of Scripture, and His circuit unto the other end of it.

From the universal prevalence of natural law throughout the heavens and the heavenly bodies, Mr. Bardsley argues, by a most forcible analogy, for the *plenary* inspiration of Scripture. "I believe," he says, "that the great danger of the Church of Christ in the present day, is not from the denial of revelation, but from the belief in the partial character of its inspiration." He also insists upon the analogy between our Lord's sinless humanity and the humanity of the written Word. All this is most important and most valuable. A good quotation is given from Dr. Chalmers at pp. 280, 281, bearing on the same point. The *historical unity* of Holy Scripture is urged as a proof of its divinity. And rightly so. How can there be an *historical human unity* between books of which the production ranges over two families of language and sixteen centuries?

Another interesting line of thought appears in the following passage. The idea is familiar, but we do not remember to have seen it so well expressed anywhere else:

"The river of divine truth ran for a time in a Jewish channel, but "even then there was a remnant from the Gentile world who drank of its "life-giving streams. When there was an Abraham, there was a Melchisedek" (which, by the way, should be "Melchisedec," or "Melchizedek" according to the Authorized Version); "when there was a Jacob, "there was a Job; when there was a Joshua, there was a Rahab; when "there was a Boaz, there was a Ruth; when there was a Solomon, there "was a Queen of Sheba; when there was an Elisha, there was a Naaman; "when there was a Jeremiah, there was an Ebedmelech; when there "were the shepherds, there were the Magi; when there was an Elizabeth "and a Mary, there was a mother of Canaan and a woman of Samaria; "when there was a John, there was a Roman centurion" (Mr. Bardsley is quite right, gentle reader; but *you* don't remember to what he refers!); "when there was a Philip, there was an Ethiopian Eunuch; when there "was a Peter, there was a Cornelius."

A similar thought is brought out of the list of "plants" in Solomon's garden (Cant. iv. 12-14): "Most of the trees named in this passage were

exotics—*not indigenous to the soil of Syria.*" But does the "Rose of Sharon" refer to Christ? What about the dialogue in this passage, and the genders in the Hebrew?

There is one other mistake in the book; but it is a mistake made by nearly every clergyman who preaches on Numbers xx., but cannot read Hebrew. "Hear now, ye rebels: must *we* fetch you water out of this rock?" is an instance of false emphasis. The emphasis, as all the Hebrew commentators know well enough, is on "*this Rock*," which is called "*Selagh*," not "*Tsur*," in Hebrew. Mr. Bardsley knows so much about "the Rock" already, that we are not going to tell him what the point is that he has missed here. He will find out for himself before long. As it is, he has argued most ably that the "Rock" in Matthew xvi. cannot be Peter, because "Rock" in Old Testament Scripture is a name of God alone.

His chapters on "The Sea" and on "Fading Leaves," on "Dew," on "Golden Bells," on "Evidences Sealed and Evidences Open," are most interesting. He has treated the "fading leaves" a little too kindly, perhaps; for he saves them from the "wind" of "iniquities" that "takes them away." But we are not going to let out any more of his secrets. And if you do not get the book and read it, after this notice, then we fear that there has been a slight waste of pearls in this review.

M. A.

Short Notices.

From Year to Year. Poems and Hymns for all the Sundays and Holy Days of the Church. By the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead, and Rural Dean. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington. 1884.

IT is more than half a century since "The Christian Year" was published; and during the last twenty years or so, many, we think, who regard that book as a sober standard of feeling in matters of practical religion, would have gladly welcomed the appearance of another work like it. Many Churchmen, again, while enjoying and duly esteeming Keble's verse, have felt that "The Christian Year" lacks certain qualities of no mean importance. For ourselves, without instituting any comparison between the book which has a history and that which is now published, or discussing the diversities, we must avow that, in some respects, at all events, we give the volume of 1884 a higher rank than that of 1827.

Our present object, however, is not to review at adequate length the really excellent work before us, culling a few of its choicest flowers, but to manifest how heartily we admire the garland which Mr. Bickersteth has woven for the Church. The characteristics of his poems (his "graceful and gracious muse" is the criticism of another poet) are happily well and widely known. His noble poem "Yesterday, to-day, and for ever"

is largely valued without as well as within the Church of England, and it has won its way, it may be added, in the United States. A "People's edition" of this first-class work (we may recall the fact) was recommended in a recent CHURCHMAN. Again, "The Hymnal Companion to the Book of Common Prayer" (of which the present writer ventures to remark in one of the first reviews published he predicted the success) has had, in two forms, the old and the revised editions, an exceedingly large circulation; and in that excellent Hymnal some of the choicest hymns, as everybody knows, had been written by the accomplished Editor. We were not at all surprised, therefore, to hear of Mr. Bickersteth's new Companion to the Prayer Book. The author of such hymns as—

"O God, the Rock of Ages,"

"Father of heaven above,"

and

"Till He come—oh, let the words,"

needs no apology for the publication of his present work. With the poetry of Heber, and Keble, and Monsell, and Chr. Wordsworth, will rank that of E. H. Bickersteth, in relation to the services of the Church's Year.

Several of the hymns or short poems in "From Year to Year," we may note in passing, appeared for the first time in THE CHURCHMAN. The verses for Whit Sunday, for example, will be found in THE CHURCHMAN, Vol. II., p. 355; and "Behold he Prayeth," written at Damascus, April, 1881, appeared in the July CHURCHMAN of that year. Others have been written from time to time during the last thirty years, and many are now published for the first time.

Among the poems on the season of Epiphany (mainly to be regarded, we think, as the Church's *missionary* season), we are glad to see

"Hark! hark! the voice of numbers,"

the stirring verses written at Delhi, in 1880. Two of the best pieces in the book are those for the Sunday after Ascension Day,

"O Christ, Thou hast ascended,
Triumphantly on high,"

and the Sixth Sunday after Trinity,

"Home, sweet home,—the many mansions of my Father's house above."

In such a hymn as that written for the centenary commemoration of Sunday Schools,

"From the heaven of heavens descending, stooping from the throne of God,"

intensity of the true devotional passion—evangelical and so evangelistic, *not* ascetic and mystical—has full swing.

But we must pause. In heartily recommending this volume we may remark that it is well printed and got up with taste; thus it forms a charming gift-book.

The Supernatural in Nature. A Verification by free use of Science. By J. W. REYNOLDS, M.A. Third Edition, 1883. Kegan Paul and Co.

This work has been reviewed in THE CHURCHMAN, and it is hardly necessary to say more than that we are pleased to welcome a new edition. "The Mystery of Miracles" and the present volume show a remarkable combination of research and originality, with a vigorous style. Few of our divines, perhaps, have the scientific knowledge which such a work as this requires. Whether or no one agrees with the author, one is sure to go on reading his pages. The chapters on "Man," on "Human Life,"

and "The Invisible," may be particularly helpful to certain inquirers. The note of the whole is one of confidence and hope. We thoroughly agree with his remark as to the Book of Revelation, that a far more searching test than the inspired writings have yet received will only serve to show how Divine they are, really the Word of God; and as to the Book of Nature, true Scriptural relations between man and God bring into the horizon of earthly existence the lofty proportions of that celestial fane which God has built:

> "There's not the smallest orb which thou behold'st
> But, in his motion, like an angel sings;
> Still quiring to the young-eyed Cherubims."

The Lord's Prayer. A Practical Meditation. By NEWMAN HALL, LL.B. Pp. 463. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1883.

This work will prove a help to many. Its devotional element is robust and practical. The thought is not thin; and the style is clear and unscholastic, the results of study, indeed, being presented in a form likely to be specially acceptable to the lay mind. Thoroughly a readable book, it is enriched by quotations from various authors and by telling illustrations. Of a minor matter, with an importance of its own, it may be remarked that the volume is printed in delightfully clear type. The first chapter is introductory, touching on Prayer; the second chapter is entitled "The Invocation;" then follow the seven petitions—each petition, of course, in its own chapter. Chapter x. expounds the doxology. With regard to the doxology, Mr. Hall rather agrees with the Revisers; and he quotes Dean Alford's *dictum* that "it must on every ground of sound criticism be omitted." For ourselves, we believe that on this, as on many a point, Dean Alford was too positive. From Mr. Hall's exposition in his closing chapter we may quote a few sentences:

> The doxology is not only in harmony with the general testimony of Scripture, but it is implied, if not expressed, in this very prayer; for His must be "the kingdom" Who is asked to do kingly acts; and He must possess adequate "power" Who is asked to accomplish what needs Divine strength; and to God alone must belong the "glory" of all His works. It is an offering of adoration to the Most High naturally arising from all devout hearts; it has been hallowed by immemorial usage in the Christian Church; we therefore feel justified in including it in our meditation on the Lord's Prayer. Let us consider it as a Confession of faith, a Plea in prayer, and an Ascription of praise.

The profession of belief, the argument in prayer, and the ascription of praise, are very well expounded. We may add that a few passages of this volume have a tincture of Maurice; and there are some expressions which we should not ourselves have used. For instance, Mr. Hall, in expounding "for ever," says:

> "Thine is the glory for ever." Not like earthly glory, whose emblems are the fading flower, the passing wind, the transient meteor. No additional knowledge of the past, no events in the future, can dim its radiance in the sight of the children of God. As it was in the beginning, so it is now, and so ever shall be. *The glory of God is His love*, and this endures. "I the Lord change not, therefore the sons of Jacob are not consumed." "His mercy endureth for ever."

The words which we have *italicised* are not, strictly speaking, correct; and they are not unlikely, in the present day, to lead to misunderstanding. The glory of God is His goodness; His mercy and pity? yes, but also His righteousness. It is of His *faithfulness*, as well as of His love, that the covenant ones are not consumed.

A Letter to the Archbishop of York on the Report of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts. By his Chancellor and Vicar-General, Sir EDMUND BECKETT, Bart., Q.C. Pp. 39. John Murray.

This is a pamphlet which should be read by everyone who desires to form, after worthy consideration of criticism from representative men, a fair opinion of the Report in a really practical sense. Sir Edmund Beckett agrees "generally with the criticism" of the Report in the October *Quarterly;* but he has "sundry things to say besides." The first is that he "can find no authority whatever, in the Commission, or the Address for it, or in the late Archbishop's speech in moving it, or the Lord Chancellor's in giving the assent of the Government, or anywhere else, for inventing any new judicature, or making any recommendations at all." Sir Edmund substantiates this from speeches in the House of Lords (it was a Commission of Inquiry), and proceeds as follows:

What was the cause avowed by everybody for having the Commission? Simply the rebellion of the Ritualists (as Archbishop Tait called them throughout) against the written law where it is too clear for any honest man to doubt, and against the decisions of the Courts where it was not.

"The Ritualists and all their adherents," continues Sir Edmund, "and "some others who do not deserve that name any more than that of "lawyers, are continually telling us that any Court which has to inter- "pret the law of the Church makes the law of the Church; and so it "does not lie in their mouths to deny that whoever is allowed to in- "fluence the Church Courts will be able gradually to alter the legal "doctrines and ceremonies of the Church, and make them what they "please; and moreover, their scheme at once alters the relations of the "clergy to the State; the very thing that the Puseyites and Ritualists "have been avowing, for just half a century now, that they intend. "Archbishop Tait gave some specimens of their sayings in his speech on "the Public Worship Regulation Bill in 1874, and they made no secret "of it in their evidence before you. In short, their object has long "been, and is, to undo the Reformation both theologically and politi- "cally, which concerns everybody in England, whatever may be his "creed. What else is the meaning of their animosity to the Luther "celebrations, under a variety of ridiculous pretences, while they are "trying to raise some enormous sum to celebrate Pusey and propagate "his anti-Reformation principles?"

The chief subject of visible division among the Commissioners was the Episcopal veto, "on the exercise of which there was such evidence that the Lord Chief Justice says it is '*fast becoming intolerable in practice, besides being indefensible in theory.*'" The Bishop of Winchester's action in regard to the veto is well known; and the exercise of the veto by the Bishop of Oxford was commented on severely "by one of the greatest and most good-natured of modern judges, Lord Justice Bramwell." These are the two Bishops in the majority of the Commission in favour of the veto.[1] Sir Edmund Beckett proceeds as follows:

It is not the least exaggeration to say that every question put by sundry other members, from one end of the 800 columns of evidence to the other, might have been put by counsel for the Church Union, with all sorts of interjections, sometimes rude enough when the answers did not please them. I make no objection, so long as they are only regarded as partizans bringing out the views of their own party, and exhibiting their own unfitness to invent new Courts to try them, or to

[1] See Sir E. Beckett's article in the *Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1881, p. 238; and "A Layman's" article in the November CHURCHMAN.

give an impartial account of the complaints against the present Courts, which were never heard of till the decisions against the Ritualists.

But why did the Archbishop of York (the Vicar-General's "*own* Archbishop") sign this very Report? The writer quotes the *Guardian*, that several of the Commissioners "must have made a *very large surrender* of individual preferences . . . and if their Report is in substance accepted by the clergy [the laity are of course ignored] their surrender will remain operative." This is the language of the *Guardian* of Oct. 17.

Much the same kind of language (says Sir Edmund) has been used at most of the Conferences; where the Report has been welcomed as at least a step in the right direction, and an instalment of the rights of the clergy, and so forth; and Mr. Beresford Hope, who is always playing the game of the Ritualists, and declaring that he does not even understand the name, boasts that they have "slain [the Jabberwok] the Judicial Committee," and have only to ride on and conquer, and "put on the coping-stone."

The Clericalists, in short, "only take this Report as an inadequate instalment, and in that sense complain of it."

On some strange mistakes and omissions the Vicar-General's criticisms are pungent; and Canon Stubbs will probably feel it his duty to reply upon certain points.

Assertions made nowadays by the aimers at clerical supremacy as to the claims of Convocation are without historical basis. "The Convocations were never recognised as representing the Church, but only part of it." High Churchmen, says Sir Edmund, may invent theories "which are all cunningly contrived to work out their own supremacy, just like the concessions they have got from this Commission. But Parliament has not abdicated yet, nor is going to undo the declarations of all the Reformation statutes at the bidding of the majority of this Commission."

We had marked several other passages in this ably-written and timely pamphlet, but our space is exhausted. We only add, *Read it!*

The Metaphors of St. Paul. By the Very Rev. JOHN S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester. Hodder and Stoughton, 1883.
The Companions of St. Paul.
The Character of St. Paul. The Cambridge Hulsean Lectures for 1862. Third edition.

We gladly call attention to these three works of the learned Dean of Chester (each of them now published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton), companion volumes, neatly bound and well printed, forming an attractive and really useful set. To many of our readers, no doubt, one at least of the series is already well known. We most heartily recommend the three volumes. Better books for the spare shelf of a clergyman's study, or that of a thoughtful layman, there can hardly be.

In the "Metaphors" are these four chapters: Roman Soldiers, Classical Architecture, Ancient Agriculture, and Greek Games. The illustrations are most suggestive.

Day after Day. Compiled by A. T. C. Pp. 188. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

This is a very pleasing little volume, tastefully printed; a gift-book which will be acceptable to many. Those who are much tried, and whose knowledge of spiritual things is small, may find it particularly useful. On each page there are thoughts for two days. Each day has its text, then a verse, and then a second text. The verses, as a rule, are very appropriate.

The Meaning of the Word "Oblations" in the Book of Common Prayer. By T. F. SIMMONS, M.A. E. Stock.
The Meaning of the Word "Oblations" in the Book of Common Prayer. By J. S. HOWSON, D.D. E. Stock.

These two pamphlets are reprints from THE CHURCHMAN. The article by the Dean of Chester appeared in the May CHURCHMAN, and the rejoinder by Canon Simmons in the number for August. We trust that in their present form each paper may be read by many who can appreciate so candid a discussion on so interesting a subject, between two such eminent men. In the Dean's pamphlet are four pages of preface. We may quote a passage which relates to the word *then:*

In his amicable rejoinder Canon Simmons desists exactly when he comes to a part of the argument which is of peculiar interest and importance—the question of such contemporary translations of the Book of Common Prayer as were published with a high degree of authority. Canon Simmons simply says here *Traduttori Traditori.* But the alliteration of an Italian proverb does not meet the stress of the argument at this point. It would be an extreme course to assert that Durel, Dean of Windsor, Duport, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, who executed the Latin, French, and Greek versions, and the five Bishops appointed to execute the Welsh Version, were "traitors." And Canon Simmons does not really mean to say this—but he buries a weapon which is very useful to me, and which I must take the liberty to disinter. As regards this word "then" in the rubric before us, I have quoted the Latin and French Versions. I will now simply quote the Greek. The direction runs thus: *ὅτε ἡ Σύναξις γίνεται, τοσοῦτον ἄρτον τε καὶ οἶνον τῇ τραπέζῃ ἐπιθήσει*—no such word as *τότε* or *ἔπειτα* occurring in the sentence at all.

If the word "then" in the Communion rubric is to be rigidly interpreted as a precise indication of time, it would seem to follow that the same rule ought to be applied to the Baptismal rubric, and that the Font ought to be freshly filled during the Service on every occasion of Public Baptism.

A very interesting book is *The Culture of Vegetables and Flowers from Seeds and Roots* (Hamilton, Adams, and Co.); helpful to those who find gardening a pleasant occupation, whether they work with (or under) a gardener, or "do the garden," except the digging and other such work, themselves. The title above quoted refers only to the first part of the book. At page 132 begins "A Year's Work in the Vegetable Garden." "Lawns," and the pests of plants and flowers, are treated in other chapters. The volume is issued by Messrs. Sutton and Sons, and is worthy of that eminent firm.

The new number of the *Quarterly Review* contains (*that* is a matter of course) several ably-written articles, and valuable withal, but as compared with some of its recent fellows, it is rather dry. "The Constitution of the United States," "The English Church in the Eighteenth Century," "Dwellings of the Poor," "The First and Last War of Troy," "The Statistics of Agitation," and "The Coming Session" may be named. The article on the condition of the Church in the eighteenth century is rather weak. What the writer contends for he should at least support by some historical basis; but his article is by no means fresh, or free from prejudice. To lay it down calmly that the Evangelicals "*disparaged good works*," is perhaps the most striking proof of his want of knowledge. The article on "Finanical Prospects," like the article on "Socialism" (which examines "The Statistics of Agitation"), is remarkably clear and vigorous. One portion of it we gladly quote; that which refers to Sunday closing, and the reduction in the drink revenue: "Sunday closing," says the *Quarterly*, "means to every

"member of the wage-receiving class a real practical inconvenience, a "sacrifice which the upper and middle classes would certainly refuse to "make: but it is the wage-receiver who calls for it. It is from the new "electorate, the great mass of whom live by weekly wages, that that "pressure has proceeded, which has made possible a kind of legislation "of which, prior to 1868, no practical statesman dreamed, which even "in 1875 seemed indefinitely remote. That nearly half the drinking "and three-fourths of the drunkenness of this country takes place on "Saturday evening and Sunday, is too notorious to need proof or illus- "tration. The demand for Sunday closing, then, means a demand to "curtail, by at least one-half, the period during which their habits and "the necessities of their daily work permit the wage-receivers to indulge "in their favourite vice; and such a demand argues a very great and "significant change of feeling among them. It implies that even among "those who are not and do not mean to be teetotalers—among those "who recognise in drink at once an indulgence, perhaps a necessity, "they will not forego, and a temptation which often leads them into "dangerous excesses—drunkenness has come to be extensively regarded "as an evil and a disgrace, from which they are willing to be shielded "and to shield their fellows, at the expense of a restraint against which, "twenty years ago, they would have indignantly revolted."

"Coupling, then," the *Quarterly* says, "the popular demand for re- "strictive legislation (even if it be, taking these islands throughout, the "demand of a minority), and the very great and rapid decline in the "consumption per head of spirits, or even of beer, it seems sufficiently "certain that a great change is taking place in the habits, and still more "in the feelings, of the class in question."

The *British Quarterly Review*, No. CLVII. (Hodder and Stoughton) is, as usual, readable, and of no mean literary power. The first article, on Mr. Gladstone, is by the Rev. J. Guinness Rogers: it is just what one would expect. The article on "Recent Theories on the Pentateuch" might have been strengthened by quotations from Mr. Sime's masterly work, "The Kingdom of All-Israel," reviewed in a recent CHURCHMAN. The best paper in the *British Quarterly* is "Palestine West of the Jordan," by Mr. W. Morris Colles,—clear and full, and we may add, fresh. We regret that from lack of time we are unable to give quotations from it.

From Messrs. Spottiswoode and Co. we have received, too late for notice in the present CHURCHMAN, the *Church Quarterly Review* (January 17th). "English Hegelianism and its Religion," "The Creed as the Basis of Apology" (based on Dr. Westcott's excellent book, "The Historic Faith"), "Phases of Christian Socialism Abroad," and "The London Poor," are articles which we can only mention without comment. The article on the Ecclesiastical Commission Report is very readable, and has noteworthy points; the writer has evidently taken a great interest in the subject. He quotes the "Layman's" article in THE CHURCHMAN. We cannot agree with all that the *Church Quarterly* writer advances; but our criticism must be deferred. One sentence is ominous:

> The Commissioners came . . . to the conclusion that it was better to strip the Final Court of all semblance of spiritual character. Anyhow, its decisions need not then "embarrass consciences." They could not even pretend to be the voice of the spiritualty. And that is something; yes, much.

The "embarrass consciences" is a quotation from Dr. Liddon; and the clericalist point is, of course, that the Final Court, "the Crown Court"—"in essence a *civil* court"—has no ecclesiastical authority.

A volume of Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton's series, "Men worth Remembering," is *Richard Baxter*, by Mr. BOYLE, Dean of Salisbury (who, it will be remembered, was for some time Vicar of Kidderminster). It is a readable and suggestive book.

For some of our readers a volume of extracts from Mr. Keble's poems and sermons may have an interest: *Selections from the Writings of John Keble, M.A.* (Rivingtons).

THE MONTH.

MR. MACKONOCHIE has at length admitted that the Law is too strong for him. The living of St. Peter's, London Docks, rendered vacant by the deprivation of Mr. Mackonochie, has been conferred by the patrons on the Rev. L. S. Wainwright, a curate who is described as the right-hand man of both the ex-Vicar and his predecessor, Mr. Suckling. No intimation has yet been given of the Bishop's intentions.

At an important Church-extension meeting held at Durham under the presidency of the Lord-Lieutenant, the Bishop's scheme for raising £60,000 in five years was adopted.

The annual gathering at Islington had some special points of interest. The subject is, at the present time, of the highest importance; and the readers and selected speakers handled it with power and judgment.[1]

[1] Canon BERNARD, in the course of his address, said: "It is evident, at first sight, that men who are sincere, and believing, and prayerful, and who honestly seek for the teaching of the Holy Ghost, do not always arrive at true views and trustworthy interpretations in regard to particular parts of the Divine Word on which their minds have been employed. We find men to whom such feelings and habits must be ascribed arriving at opposite opinions which cannot both be true. You may have, for instance, two persons, equally taking the Holy Scriptures as their guide, and praying for the light of the Spirit in their interpretation of those passages which bear on the constitution and life of the Church. The result is that one becomes a Plymouth Brother and the other remains in the Church of England, both feeling that they have been taught by the Spirit. Again, you may find two persons, sincerely prayerful, after studying the same texts of Scripture arriving at opposite conclusions as to the fact of sin in the believer, or his actual sinlessness. Now, on looking at instances of this kind, which are numerous and important, we find ourselves in the presence of a real and serious difficulty. We are taught that the Holy Spirit will lead us into all truth, and yet we see two persons like those I have just mentioned arriving at very different conclusions, which cannot both be according to the Divine intention. I want now to make a few remarks with reference to that point. I will take for illustration the metaphor which is adopted in the thesis—'the source of light.' What is to be understood by an 'infallible source of

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, at their general meeting, held on the 17th, sealed the certificate necessary to enable her Majesty in Council to found the new Bishopric of Southwell, as contemplated by the Bishoprics Act, 1878.

---

light'? Is the light which is communicated in itself infallible? Take the case of natural light. The sun is a perfect source of light; but the amount of light given on any spot is conditioned by many things. It is conditioned, in the first place, by the relative position of the person or object upon which it falls, whether the object is under the direct beams of the meridian sun, or whether it catches obliquely the slanting rays of sunset. Again, the amount of light is conditioned by the nature of the atmosphere, whether it is clear and absolutely translucent, or whether it is shaded by clouds or thickened by mists. It is conditioned, too, by the nature of the object on which it falls, in respect of its absorption or refraction of discriminated rays of colour, such as produce the shades and tints of the landscape 'with garlands gay of various green.' Let us apply this illustration to the case of spiritual light. This light is conditioned, first by the nature of the subject upon which it has to fall—I mean the Book of God. When we examine that Book we perceive that it makes the most various demands that are made by any book on the mind of man. Consider, in the first place, how much is called for in regard to the language. Who is to interpret it adequately unless he has adequate knowledge of the language in which it is written, either at first or second hand? Again, the whole of the Book was produced in the midst of human life and with the utterances of human voices, inspired but still human. We have to know the circumstances, the historical scenes, the customs, the ideas from which the expressions are derived, and to which they relate, and we can only accurately interpret the words used by the light of such knowledge. Then the Book itself is a great scheme. We have not merely to take a text here and a text there; there is a great scheme and plan of Divine teaching, so we have to compare one part with another, and one passage checks and balances or expands and completes another, in order to a full and safe interpretation. It is in this way that Holy Scripture makes such great demands upon our minds, and it is our proper occupation to apply them for these purposes. Then, I say that the light which descends is conditioned by the state of its medium—that is, of the mind that is applied to the interpretation of Scripture. We know the differences which exist in the powers of perception and insight, in clearness, accuracy, sagacity, and judgment. Again, what a number of influences there are which tell upon us, influences, perhaps, of which we are hardly conscious, but which are nevertheless telling upon us all the while; settled ideas, old associations with words and forms of speech, party predilections, personal prejudices and prepossessions, and the like. Certainly light passing through such a variously coloured and variously tinted medium will not be wholly unconditioned by it. Then, again, the light is conditioned by the sphere in which it finds us. I am not alone with the Bible, but I am in the Church of Christ, and the Spirit descends upon me as being in that Church. Illumination of the Spirit has come to others before and around me, and not only to individual minds, but also to the corporate Church, which is the witness for and the keeper of Holy Writ, and which has also authority for its exposition in virtue of that Divine illumination which has belonged to it in measure and degree from the first. We reject the Romish theory on that point, but we do not throw aside the idea that there is still an illumination of the Church separate from that

A meeting has been held in Bristol, the Mayor presiding, to consider the suggested scheme for the restoration of the Bishopric of Bristol. We hope the movement will soon be crowned with success.

The President of the English Church Union, speaking at Doncaster on the Ecclesiastical Courts Report, said that the one thing they insisted on was the determination of spiritual things by the Bishops and synods.

The Bishop of Chester, who has entered upon his eighty-first year, has intimated his intention of resigning.[1]

An appeal has been put forth for an English church in Copenhagen.

The state of things in Egypt is grave. It is not easy, indeed, to exaggerate the gravity of the situation. The Soudan, for which "Chinese Gordon" did so much, is to be abandoned.

The death of Keshub Chunder Sen, a few years ago regarded as a great religious reformer, has attracted little attention.

The compromise on the Ilbert Bill may be satisfactory. The Viceroy's explanations, however, do not justify the course which has been pursued by the Government.

At the annual dinner of the tenantry of the Hawarden estate, Mr. Gladstone made a very practical speech on eggs, vegetables, and fruit. Market-gardening, no doubt, has been too much neglected by agriculturists; and jam is cheaper than butter.

---

of the individual. We recognise it in the early ages in the establishment of the great fundamental mysteries of the Trinity and the Hypostatic Union, and at the Reformation in the recovery of the soteriological doctrine of St. Paul. We have in this case to consider not merely the illumination of our individual minds, but also the illumination around us which in God's providence we share."

[1] The *Times* says: "Dr. Jacobson belongs to the generation which witnessed the Tractarian movement from its earliest beginnings to its tragic catastrophe, and he is one of the few men who lived through that tremendous time without being perceptibly affected by its dominant influence. He became a Fellow of Exeter College as far back as 1829, within two years after taking his degree, and from 1832 to 1848 he was Vice-Principal of Magdalen Hall, a society of which he was the mainstay during the whole period of his connection with it. Dr. Macbride, a theologian of some note and weight in the Evangelical party, albeit a layman, was the Principal, but Dr. Jacobson was Tutor, and numbered some very distinguished men, including the late Mr. Delane and his brother-in-law, Sir George Dasent, among his pupils."

The *Daily News* says: "The charity of the Bishop of Chester was unobtrusive and unbounded. It was generally understood that of late years his lordship devoted nearly the whole of his salary towards struggling clergymen and causes needing pecuniary assistance."

It is well remarked by the *Record* that "Dr. Jacobson has won the respect and regard of those with whom he has been brought in contact. Although a High Churchman, his moderation and fairness have rendered his diocese one in which Evangelicals could work with satisfaction."