

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

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

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

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

Reviews.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹ “Worship of the Old Covenant,” p. 17.

² *Ibid.* p. 11.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rambles among the Hills in the Peak of Derbyshire and South Downs.

By LOUIS J. JENNINGS, Author of "Field Paths and Green Lanes."
Pp. 300. John Murray. 1880.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Short Notices.

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

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

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

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