

that every forbidden degree is not plainly and expressly indicated, but that we are left to argue by obvious analogy, to other like degrees, which are no less forbidden. Under this head is mentioned the primary instance of the marriage of a father with his own daughter not expressly forbidden, but forbidden by implication, in the prohibition of the marriage of a son with his mother. We mention this because, in reply to the citation of this instance by Professor Gregg, the *Globe* has affirmed that the marriage of a father with his daughter is expressly forbidden in Leviticus XVIII. 7. Such an assertion we may safely say would not have been so regarded by a writer conversant with the original. We trust that the writer may receive a reply from the gentleman whose argument he has impugned, meantime we must be content to observe that learned and intelligent men have for ages studied that verse, and arrived at a conclusion contrary to that which the *Globe* maintains. We may mention here St. Augustine in his *Questiones in Leviticum*, Rosenmüller, in his *scholia* on the Old Testament, who states exhaustively the many reasons which preclude this interpretation of the verse. Keil, in his commentary on Leviticus, and the writer in the Speaker's Commentary, who, although he does not agree in the main point with the opposers of the proposed change, concurs in the view of verse 7, which is adopted by the authors above mentioned, and distinctly says that marriage with a daughter is only indirectly forbidden. We may hereafter notice more fully the importance of this point. Again the "Reformatio Legum Eccl." Chapter I, observes on the absolute necessity of supplying in the case of women degrees corresponding to those degrees which are forbidden in the case of men, in order to give any due symmetry and completeness to the law, and next observes that "a man and his wife are considered to have one and the same flesh one with another, and that thus, in whatever degree of consanguinity a person is related to any man, in that same degree of affinity does he stand related to the man's wife." The whole subject was carefully studied by our Reformers, following in the footsteps of early writers, and fixing their devout regard upon the pages of Holy Writ; their witness has been amply confirmed in later days by men of learning and ability. Are we then prepared to renounce their authority and to reject their teaching, at the bidding of self-confident writers, "understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm?"

The adoption, almost unanimously, of a resolution to petition the Legislature against any change of the existing law, by the Provincial Synod at its session in September last, is a very cheering indication of the feeling of the members of our Church on this important subject. In the Provincial Synod eight Dioceses are represented, in the Upper House by their respective Bishops, in the Lower House by an equal number of Clerical and Lay Delegates, twelve of each order from each Diocese. Those who were present at the meeting, or who read the reports of the debates in the papers, will be aware that, not only did the Laymen concur with the Clergy in the vote, but that some of the most able and most uncompromising opponents of any change in the law were found among the Laity, who took a very leading part in the debate. It is therefore a matter of regret that the *Globe*, both in presenting to its readers the text of the petition, and also in a leading article on the subject, should have persistently attempted to misrepresent the petition as proceeding from "the Anglican Clergy." Fair play is a jewel, even when one has to deal with persons so

wrong-headed as to object to marriage with a deceased wife's sister. However it is satisfactory to know that misrepresentations so glaring can do no lasting or serious injury to those who are the objects of it. We hope to return to this subject at an early date, and meanwhile we would most strongly urge upon our readers, both in town and country, the great importance of forwarding, without delay to both Houses of Parliament petitions against a change of the law; and we will venture to add that, as this is a question in which women have a special interest, we are satisfied that they should not be content to stand aloof, and that may without in any degree trespassing beyond their proper sphere of action, appeal to the Legislature of their country to protect the sanctity and purity of their domestic relations.

BOOK NOTICE.

MacMillan & Co., New York, will publish immediately the Archbishop of Canterbury's new book, under the title of "The Church of the Future." The subjects discussed are:—Its Catholicity.—Its Conflict with the Atheist.—Its Conflict with the Deist.—Its Conflict with the Rationalist.—Its Dogmatic Teaching.—Practical counsels for its works.—Its Cathedrals.—Appendices, etc., etc. The price will be one dollar.

AN AMERICAN BISHOP ABROAD.

Bishop Littlejohn, who lately went to England to deliver the annual course of sermons before the University of Cambridge, is evidently having no holiday trip. In addition to preaching three sermons before the university, he has already preached in the Lincoln Cathedral and also before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The latter sermon, delivered at Lincoln on Nov. 8, is the only one of which a full report has as yet been received on this side of the Atlantic. No American Churchman, whatever may be his party affiliations, can read it without being grateful to the Bishop for the admirable way in which he has illustrated and sustained the reputation of the American pulpit, and no American, whether Churchman or unbeliever, can feel otherwise than proud that the intellect and culture of America have been so worthily represented by Dr. Littlejohn.

The sermon, which was mainly a sketch of the history, position, and prospects of the American branch of the Anglican Church, showed a much clearer appreciation than most clergymen appear to have of the tendency of the American life and civilization in relation to religion. The Bishop pointed out that democracy not only tends to loosen the restraints of firm and orderly civil government, but to weaken respect for authority in matters of Church government and creed. In the words of Dr. Littlejohn, "the democratic idea elevates the individual more and more above the sway of organic life and incorporated discipline as well in the Church as in the State," and "by necessary consequence it leads the individual first to depreciate more and more, and finally to forsake, as the foe of his liberty, all that is traditional and, by catholic consent, authoritative in the faith, worship, and order of the historic Church." No careful observer can doubt the accuracy of this assertion. Not only is the influence of democratic ideas hindered for many years the progress of the Anglican Church in this country, but the same influence is steadily integrating the Protestant sects. We see this in the growing complaint made against the permanence of creeds, and the demand, met in every denomination, for new and less rigid conditions of church membership. Men have not only refused to accept the claims of Churches which profess to teach by authority, but they are rejecting the creeds which have been made in part as protests against the catholic idea. The same spirit which grudges obedience to law-makers on the ground that "every man is as good as every other man,"

refuses to accept the interpretation of the Bible made by this or that Protestant reformer. The drift of the time is towards religious anarchy, and the Church which stands as the most conspicuous bulwark against this threatened anarchy cannot expect to win supporters when even the looser discipline of the sects is rejected.

Bishop Littlejohn not only clearly sees the modern tendency away from all ecclesiastical authority, but he also perceives the inevitable reaction which must, sooner or later, manifest itself. Already it is the Anglican Church to which men of thought and culture turn as with nature yearn they yearn for religious rest. While that Church makes no claim to infallibility, in the sense in which the Roman Church claims to be infallible, she represents more than any Protestant Church that which is orderly, fixed, and stable. She claims the possession of a ministry whose authority is derived from a higher source than the votes of pew-holders. She demands obedience to what she proclaims to be the truth, because it is the catholic faith, of which she is the witness, and not because it may be arrived at by the processes of the mathematician, the chemist, or the anatomist. Her position challenges the attention, and wins the approval of those who have found that to build a Church on the theory that every man is to be his own infallible Pope is a more hopeless undertaking than it would have been to finish the Tower of Babel after the builders were smitten with "impedency" of speech. The Church which Bishop Littlejohn represents is now drawing to itself the best thought and culture of the community, and there is certainly every reason to believe that when the inevitable reaction reaches the masses they will turn to what is, after all, the Church of their ancestors, whether their grandfathers left it for Puritanism, or their fathers wandered still further into the colder regions of New England Unitarianism.

Of course, ardent Presbyterians and Methodists will not coincide with the Bishop either in his analyses of the hindrances in the way of his Church in this country or in his expectations as to the future. There can, however, be but one opinion as to the ability and eloquence of his sermon at Lincoln, and it will be read with pleasure even by those who decline to accept its reasonings or its conclusions. — *N. Y. Times*.

BOSTON CHURCHMANSHIP.

AN ADDRESS BY THE REV. W. J. KNOX LITTLE.

The Rev. W. J. Knox Little having been invited by several of the Boston Clergy to deliver a lecture on "the meaning, drift, and place of Ritualism as a phase of modern Christianity," the invitation having been extended "in that spirit of Apostolic Christianity which bids us prove all things, hold fast that which is good," delivered a lecture in that city, on Dec. 6th, being introduced by the Rev. Dr. J. T. DRYE, who in his opening address said that Mr. Knox Little's claims upon the attention of the audience, were warranted by his reputation. It was quite proper, however, that those who had invited him to speak should explain their motives for doing it. Every new or fresh religious movement was of interest to the student of the moral and spiritual nature of mankind. If a movement was feeble and momentary it was simply a matter of curiosity; if it had power in it, and engaged profound, earnest, self-sacrificing, suffering men, and accomplished manifest and abiding good, it was a matter for sober and earnest enquiry. That which was called ritualism was such a movement. In its exterior aspects it was a mode of worship by means of symbolism, it certainly manifested a tendency of the human spirit, and had met a want of human nature under the inspirations of the spirit of God. They wanted an explanation for the revival, in the midst of Protestantism, among a people not oriental in their temper, not given to the service of the imagination, of a form of teaching and a mode of worship in which symbolism had become a prominent and distinctive feature. They desired to know what doctrinal truths underlay the symbols that were employed; in what manner the craving after this symbolism expressed a real want of human nature, and to what extent what had been furnished by the ritualists had supplied that want; and then what was the distinction between those doctrines and symbolical manifestation and that of the Romish church, and what was the tendency amongst those who accepted and enjoyed that system toward a more entire sympathy with the old system under the papacy. Where was the line to be drawn? He was glad that they had before