

THE
CHURCHMAN

DECEMBER, 1898.

ART. I.—THE SACERDOTIUM OF CHRIST.

PART II.—THE TYPICAL SHADOW IN RELATION TO THE
GREAT REALITY.

IN the Introductory Paper I endeavoured to show that there must be a mistake in the attempt to fasten on the *sacerdotium* of Christ a doctrine concerning the Saviour's work in heaven, which is no part of the faith once delivered unto the saints. Even if such a doctrine might seem to derive support from a *primâ facie* view of certain typical teachings of the Ceremonial Law, we are to remember that the types and shadows of the good things to come are not our only informants concerning the realities they signified; and interpreting light is rather to be thrown on the types from the revealed truth which they typified, than on the revealed truth from foreshadowing types.¹

But this fact need not stand at all in the way of a very full appreciation of the inspired instruction conveyed in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In that Epistle, indeed, the careful student will hardly fail to observe how in the introduction, including the whole of the first chapter and a great part of the second, we have contained as in a germ the whole doctrine of the

¹ Important, therefore, is the following caution: "As He voluntarily offered himself up, He is styled our High Priest. . . . The doctrine of this Epistle, then, plainly is that the legal sacrifices were allusions to the great and final Atonement to be made by the blood of Christ; and not that this was an allusion to those" (Bishop Butler, "Analogy," p. 208; Oxford, 1844).

Dr. Owen has well said: "The excellency of Christ's person and priesthood freed Him in His offering from many things that the Levitical priesthood was obliged unto. And the due apprehension hereof is a great guide unto us in the consideration of those types" ("On Heb. vii. 27," Works, vol. xxii., p. 573; edit. Gould).

On this subject see especially Magee "On Atonement," Diss. No. LXIX.
VOL. XIII.—NEW SERIES, NO. CXXIII. 9

Epistle. We have there: the Divine nature of the Messiah (i. 2), His atonement for sins (i. 3), His victory by death (ii. 14), the day of His being begotten from the dead (i. 5), His throne above (i. 8), His session at God's right hand (i. 3, 13).

And yet not a word about our Lord's *sacerdotium* (except as implied in ii. 10, 11) till we reach chap. ii. 17, which is the connecting link between the teaching of these revealed truths of the Christian faith and the interpretation of the typical shadows which were preparatory to them.

Nevertheless, we may thankfully recognise in the subsequent teaching of this Epistle, as bearing on the relation of the imperfect shadows to the perfect reality, that which may be said to give a certain crowning completeness to the truth of the Gospel. And very profitably we may study in detail its witness to the *sacerdotium* of Christ—as to the reality of that which was imperfectly represented in the typical signs which were ordained to educate the human mind in preparation for the glad tidings of the Kingdom of Heaven.

It has been well said: "The doctrine concerning the priesthood and sacrifice of the Lord Christ hath in all ages, by the craft and malice of Satan, been either directly opposed or variously corrupted; for it contains the principal foundation of the faith and consolation of the Church, which are by him chiefly maligned" (Owen, Works, vol. xix., pp. 5, 6; edit. Gould).

We proceed accordingly, in the present paper, to fix our attention on certain earthly types of the old dispensation—desiring to view them in relation to the Great Reality to be found in "the good things" which then were, and still, in their fullest sense, *are* "to come"¹ in the future. Afterwards, we shall have to regard the Heavenly Reality in relation not only to these earthly shadows, but to these, as a part only of the unfolding of the eternal purpose of God's infinite wisdom.

Let us, then, draw on our way towards our present subject by observing that, in the school of Divine teaching, God's people of old were taught to know their need of altar, and sacrifice, and priesthood. The altar is to receive what by man is offered to God. The altar is most holy (Exod. xxix. 37; xxx. 29; Lev. viii. 15). May we say reverently it is as the hand of God held out to receive gifts and sacrifices for

¹ See Westcott on x. 1, pp. 304, 305. In ix. 11 Westcott accepts the reading τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν (now abandoned by Tischendorf and Hofmann), though there is good MS. authority for μελλόντων, which has been followed by the Revised Version.

On the sense of μελλόντων, see Delitzsch, "On Heb.," vol. ii., p. 76, E.T.

sin?¹ It is the altar that sanctifieth the gift (Exod. xxix. 37). And on the altar of God must be offered to God that which God will vouchsafe to accept of the sinner that offers. And it must be offered on the altar by one whom God will accept to come near to minister to Him on behalf of His people.² This is the nearness of *sacerdotium*. The Levites were separated from the people of God's inheritance to come *near* to Him so far as to do the service of the tabernacle (Num. xvi. 9), but *their* nearness was quite at a distance from the *nearness* of those who were to be God's holy ones, chosen of Him to come near (not to the tabernacle, but) unto Himself (v. 5). This was a nearness which ordinarily none but the priests might presume to claim for themselves.³ And there was the privilege of a greater *nearness* still which belonged only to the representative of Aaron, or the High Priest on the great Day of Atonement.⁴ Awful, indeed, was the history of the judgment whose memorial was to testify "that no stranger, which is not of the seed of Aaron, come *near* to offer incense before the Lord" (Num. xvi. 40).⁵

And we need not go far to see evidence of the *felt* need of such a mediatorial *nearness*. "Go thou *near* and hear," is the voice of the people, sensible that there is a nearness to the glory of their God which is too awful for them (Deut. v. 27).

It is this need which is met by the merciful provision of a

¹ Thus, by Rabbinical writers the altar was regarded "as a symbol of mediation," "as a centre for mediation, peace-making, expiation, and sanctification." See Canon Girdlestone's "Old Testament Synonyms," p. 194.

² See 1 Sam. ii. 28, where the Hebrew warrants "to go up unto Mine altar," as the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Revised Version. Cf. Heb. vii. 13, 14. See also Exod. xxviii. 1, 43; xl. 32; Ezek. xlii. 15. "The stranger that cometh nigh" was to be put to death. See Num. iii. 10; xviii. 7. Cf. Num. xvi. 40.

³ See Exod. xxviii. 1: "Take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto Me in the priest's office, even Aaron, Nadah and Abihu, Eleazer and Ithamar, Aaron's sons"; and xxix. 9: "The priest's office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute." Compare xxviii. 41 and xxix. 44.

⁴ It is, I think, truly said: "The only distinction between Aaron and his sons was that Aaron, as head of the family, came to be regarded as high priest, and therefore certain *special* 'priestly' acts, on certain *special occasions*, were assigned to him. . . . On *one day in the year* the priesthood was practically reduced to *one man*. . . . It is important to notice this, because, when the inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews is showing how the man Christ Jesus, as the priest of the New Covenant, fulfilled the proper work of a 'priest unto God,' he shows how He fulfilled *not so much the daily work* of the priests, as the *special work* of the Levitical high priest on the great Day of Atonement" (Heb. ix. 7, 11, 25, 26).—Soames's "Priesthood of the New Covenant," p. 14. See Perowne's "Our High Priest in Heaven," pp. 19, 20, second edition.

⁵ See Cave's "Doctrine of Sacrifice," pp. 94, 95.

sacerdotium—the calling and appointment of a separate class—a priesthood who (representing¹ the people) shall do priestly service before the Lord, shall burn incense, and offer sacrifice on God's altar which God will accept on behalf of His elect.

Not that all the offerings they offer are sacrifices for sin. It may be said, indeed, that atonement for sin lies, in some sense, at the basis of all.² But some offerings may be said to be *in order* to reconciliation to be made—and some rather *because* of typical reconciliation already effected for a time.

We know well that these are shadows—teaching shadows. And we know, also, that the ideas educated by them are to be transferred to realities. To what realities? To the supreme reality of the ONE real Sacrificial Atonement for sins—*once offered*—and the reality of the ONE High Priest of our profession, who has entered into Heaven itself now to appear in the presence of God for us. So much as this is acknowledged. There will be no question, we may hope, about the truth of this. And yet not the acknowledgment merely, but the Spiritual apprehension of this truth in its tremendous reality, in its sublime magnificence, in its ineffable grandeur, and its Divine blessedness, must surely have a power to dominate our decisions as regards some of the chief ruling questions which underlie a vast majority of our present controversies. But in transferring our ideas from the typical shadows to the substantial realities of the New Testament, it is obvious that we are not to look for an exact correspondence between the earthly and the heavenly. This truth needs to be emphasized. It may seem obvious, but it is very essential. This want of perfect likeness is in part the necessary result of the imperfection of the earthly typical representation. It is important for our purpose that we should mark this in certain particulars.

(1) The priesthood of the ceremonial shadows may be called a priesthood of genealogy. Each high priest must needs be *γενεαλόγητος*. Why? Because, being taken from among sinful men—the sons of death—each high priest, not able to continue ever in his office, must yield it to his successor, even as *he* himself received it from his father. His qualification by God's ordinary appointment is his genealogy. This is

¹ Philo says : τοῦ σίμπαυτος ἔθνους συγγενῆς καὶ ἀρχιστεῦς κοινὸς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐστὶ . . . εὐχὰς . . . καὶ θυσιάς τελεῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν καὶ ἀγαθὰ αἰτούμενος ὡς ὑπὲρ ἀδελφῶν καὶ γονέων καὶ τέκνων ("De Spec. Legg.," § 23, quoted by Westcott, "On Heb.," p. 196).

² There need be no question that the idea of expiation underlies that of the peace-offering. See Kurtz, "Sac. W.," pp. 73, 74, 90, 91, 263, 264, 365. So the idea of "sweet savour" is not absent from that of the sin-offering. See Lev. iv. 31, and note in "Speaker's Commentary" on Lev. i. 4 and 9. Cf. Eph. iv. 5.

an imperfection in the type which can have no place in the perfect reality of the heavenly Antitype.

(2) And because of this, the priesthood of the law may be said to be transferrable. Because it is a priesthood of genealogy, it must be *παράβατος*—subject to removal, or passing from one to another¹—a priesthood of succession, and, normally, hereditary. But over and beyond this, it is seen to be *παράβατος*

¹ "Leviticorum munus Sacerdotum *παρέβαινε*, transibat a decessore ad successorem. . . . Hujus autem *λερωσύνη* est *ἀπαράβατος*. . . . Theophylactus per *ἀδιάκοπον*, *ἀδιάδοχον* interpretatur. Eucumenius, per *ἀδιάδοχον*, *ἀτελεύτητην*, est que plane necessarium attributum sacerdotii æterni. . . . Est elegans vocabulum *ἀπαράβατος*, et in N. T. *ἀπαξ* λεγόμενον. Sensus habetur apud Daniele[m] vii. 14 : *Ἡ ξένουσία αὐτοῦ, ξένουσία αἰώνιος, ἥ τις οὐ παρελευσεται.*"—Carpzovius, "In S. Pauli Ep. ad Heb. ex Philone Alex.," pp. 341, 342; Helmstädtii, 1750.

² *Ἀπαράβατον ἔχων τὴν λερωσύνην . . . οὕτως ἐστὶν ἕτερον ἔχων τῆς ἀρχιερατείας.*—Cyr. Hier., Cat. x., § xiv., Op., p. 144; edit. Touttée; Paris, 1720.

Ἀαρὼν μὲν ἔσχε τοὺς διαδεχομένους, καὶ θῶς ἢ κατὰ νόμον λερατεία χρόνῳ καὶ θανάτῳ παρήμιεβε τοὺς προτέρουσ' ὁ δὲ κύριος ἀπαράβατον καὶ ἀδιάδεκτον ἔχων τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην πιστὸς γέγονεν ἀρχιερεὺς, παραμένων αἰεὶ, καὶ τῇ ἐπαγγελίᾳ πιστὸς γενόμενος, εἰς τὸ επακούειν καὶ μὴ πλανᾶν τοὺς προσερχομένους.—Athanasius, Orat. II., "Contra Arianos," § 9, Op., tom. i., Par. I., p. 377; edit. Ben. Patav., 1777.

³ *Ἐπειδὴ αἰεὶ ζῆ, οὐκ ἔχει διάδοχον.*—Chrysostom, "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. vii., Hom. XIII., § 3, Op., tom. xii., p. 133; edit. Montfaucon.

Δεῖκνύσθαι εἰς ἐστὶ καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἰς ἦν, εἰ μὴ ἀθάνατος ἦν ὡς περὶ γὰρ πολλοὶ λερεῖς, διὰ τὸ θνητοὶ εἶναι ὁὕτως εἰς ὁ εἰς, διὰ τὸ ἀθάνατος εἶναι.—*Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁴ *Ὁ γὰρ εἰς ἕτερον τοῦτον παραπέμπων τὸν κλήρον, δοκεῖ πως ἀφαιρεῖσθαι τὴν ἀξίαν ἄλλου τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἔχοντος.*—Theodoret, "Ep. Heb.," cap. vii., Op., tom. iii., p. 586; Halæ, 1771.

⁵ *Ὅτως δὲ ἀθάνατος ὢν εἰς ἕτερον οὐ παραπέμπει τῆς λερωσύνης τὸ γέρας.*—*Ibid.*, p. 591.

Westcott says: "There appears to be no independent authority for the sense 'untransmitted,' 'that does not pass to another.'" Yet there is great force in the words of Dr. Gouge, who says of the marginal rendering that it "is most proper and pertinent. It giveth proof that the priesthood of Christ is inseparably annexed to His own person. It cannot pass from Him nor be transferred upon another" ("On Heb.," vol. ii., p. 143; Edinburgh, 1866). See especially Owen's Works, vol. xxxii., p. 518; edit. Goold.

But Westcott's interpretation, "Christ's priesthood is His alone, open to no rival claim, liable to no invasion of its functions" (p. 190), might very well be accepted as conveying a sense almost equally cogent, in view of the point which we have here to insist upon.

Either view is fatal to the pretensions of a sacerdotal hierarchy. We have before us a transcendent priesthood "open to no rival claims." It is the priesthood of the order of Melchisedek. It is the priesthood *only* of the Son of God. Yet Durandus says of the Pope: "Hic est Melchizedec, cujus sacerdotium non est ceteris comparatum" ("Rat. Div. Off.," Lib. II., cap. i., § 17).

On the other hand, Cranmer truly says: "This is the honour and glory of this our High Priest, wherein He admitteth neither partner nor successor" ("On Lord's Supper," p. 346, P.S.). "Because Christ is a perpetual and everlasting Priest, that by His one oblation made a full sacrifice of sin for ever, therefore His priesthood neither needeth nor can pass to any other" (*Ibid.*, p. 363).

by special Divine appointment, by extraordinary Divine intervention.

Moses¹ himself officiates at the first consecration, and thus transfers his priesthood to Aaron² his brother (Exod. xxviii. 41, xxix. 9; Lev. viii. 30). Again, by reason of the sin of Nadab and Abihu, the high priestly succession passes to the family of Eleazar. And, before Aaron's death, Eleazar is solemnly invested with the sacred garments (Num. xx. 26). But the office appears to have been afterwards (we know not why) again transferred in Eli to the family of Ithamar.³ Does it abide there?

It should, indeed, have remained in that family in perpetuity.⁴ But the iniquity of Eli's sons caused another transfer. Zadok, whom King Solomon "put in the room of Abiathar" (1 Kings ii. 27, 35) was of the house of Eleazar (1 Chron. vi. 8). And in the house of Eleazar⁵ the high priesthood abides⁶—or is supposed to abide—till the end of the dispensation.⁷

But after this transfer, all through the centuries of their office, these sons of Eleazar minister under a prophetic word, which gives an assurance, assured by the very oath of God, that there is to be another transfer—a transfer which shall make an end for ever of all transference; a transfer which shall bring to an end the covenant to which transference belongs.⁸

¹ Ἰερεῖς δὲ ὁμοίως ἀμφοτέροι· Μωσῆς γάρ, φησι, καὶ Ααρὼν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροδοῖν αὐτοῦ· ὃ μὲν ἀρχῶν ἀρχόντων, καὶ ἱερεῖς ἱερέων.—Greg. Naz., Orat. XI., § ii, Op., tom. i., p. 242; Paris, 1778.

² The Rabbins regard Moses as *sagan* to Aaron. See Smith's "Dict. of Bible," vol. i., p. 808.

³ See Smith's "Dict. of Bible," vol. i., p. 809.

⁴ See Bishop Hervey in "Speaker's Commentary" on 1 Sam. ii. 30 and 35. On the "in sempiternum" of the earlier priesthood, see Augustin, "Quæst. in Exod. cxxiv.," Op., tom. iii., Par. I., c. 459. See also tom. iv., Par. I., c. 277; tom. iv., Par. II., c. 1241; edit. Ben., Paris, 1680.

⁵ "The Asmonean family were priests of the course of Joiarib; the first of the twenty-four courses (1 Chron. xxiv. 7), and whose return from captivity is recorded 1 Chron. ix. 10; Neh. xi. 10. They were probably of the house of Eleazar, though this cannot be affirmed with certainty" (Bishop Hervey, in "Dict. of Bible," vol. i., p. 812).

⁶ Not without irregularities and depositions in the later period of the history. See Smith's "Dict. of Bible," vol. i., pp. 808, 812.

⁷ Hilkiah, the high priest in the reign of Josiah, was followed (according to Josephus) by Seraiah, who was killed by Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah (2 Kings xxv. 18, *et seq.*). His son Johozadak was the father of Jeshua. Jeshua opens the series of high priests in Neh. xii., which ends with Jaddua, who was high priest in the time of Alexander the Great. After Jaddua we have his son, Onias I., then Simon I., the Just; then Onias II., Simon II., Onias III. The last to bear the name of high priest was Phannias, appointed by lot by the Zealots (Josephus, "War," iv. 3, 8). See Delitzsch in Schaff-Herzog, Encycl., vol. ii., p. 991.

⁸ On the transference of the *sacerdotium* from the Old Covenant to the

This is to be a transference not from one family to another of the priestly house of the tribe of Levi. This is to take the priesthood from shadows to realities—from the typical office of dying men to One who shall have an eternal, untransferable priesthood. This transfer is to take the priesthood from the house of their father—yea, and from the family of Aaron, yea, and from the tribe of Levi—to the person of a priest of a higher order, an order higher in dignity even than Abraham the father of all—an order in which the priestly and royal functions are united—an order after the pattern of one in whose name and title righteousness and peace are made to kiss one another.

It has been well said, "Just when Abraham appears at the most ideal elevation, Melchizedek, the priest-king, stands beside and towers above him" (Delitzsch, "New Com. on Gen.," vol. i., p. 412, E.T.). This priest is one whose priesthood knows no succession, whose dignity knows no genealogy, whose record tells of no beginning and no end.¹ "Melchize-

New, as prefigured by earlier transfereces, see Augustin, "De Civit. Dei," Lib. XVII., cap. iv., Op., tom. vii., c. 458, 463, and chap. v., c. 464; edit. Ben., Paris, 1680.

In connection with 1 Sam. ii. 30, 35 may be studied Isa. xxii. with Dr. Kay's "Commentary," especially on verses 14, 15, 22, 24, 25. See also Birks on ver. 22. Compare also Zech. iii. 8, R.V., with vi. 12, 13.

¹ Professor Hommel supposes that in St. Paul's time a version of Gen. xiv. 18 contained the words "without father and mother," or that an ancient oral tradition applied the epithet "without father and without mother" to the ancient office of the priest-king ("Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 154).

But the evidence adduced appears scarcely conclusive on this point, The Greek Fathers appear to have known nothing of such a version or tradition.

There seems, however, some ground for supposing that the ancient office of priest-king "was elective, and not hereditary" (p. 153).

In Job xii. 19 ("He leadeth *princes* away spoiled") the use of the word *cohen* in this sense must be explained by the fact that in ancient times the head of each great family, and the chieftain of each tribe, was both *prince* and *priest*. "Government by a priest was a peculiarly Semitic institution. Assur, the primitive capital of Assyria, had been governed by high priests before it had been governed by kings, and so, too, had Saba, or Sheba, in the south of Arabia. There, as we learn from inscriptions, the Makârib, or high priests, had preceded the kings" (Sayce's "Early Hist. of Hebrews," p. 163. See also p. 219). See Canon Cook on Job xii. 19 in "Speaker's Commentary."

"The priest-king Melchizedek finds a parallel in his later successor, the priest-king Ebed-Tob, who, in the Tel el-Amarna letters, declares that he had received his royal dignity, not from his father or his mother, but through the arm of 'the mighty King'" (*Ibid.*, p. 128). See also pp. 28, 29, and Professor Hommel's "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 157.

2 Sam. viii. 18 (*cf.* 1 Chron. xviii. 17) may probably be explained as a survival of a sense of *cohen* derived from the ancient custom.

Jer. xxx. 21 is a prophecy of the revival of the ancient custom in the

dek," it has been said again, "is like the setting sun of the primitive revelation . . . the last rays of which shine upon the patriarch from whom the true Light of the world is in process of coming. This sun sets to rise again in antitype in Jesus Christ, when the preparatory epoch of Israel shall have passed"¹ (*Ibid.*).

We surely cannot fail to see that in this transfer the idea of priesthood educated in the shadows of the Law is to be transferred to² One, and only One—the One who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens.

All ideas of true (as distinct from typical and subordinate) priesthood are to cling to Him, and to be fully fastened on Him, and on Him alone, who now has and exercises His ever-enduring priesthood (*ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην*) at God's right hand. He has entered heaven for us, in virtue of His blood shed for us. And in heaven He now appears in the presence of God for us. There He ever liveth to make intercession for us—the all-prevailing intercession of Him who, having died for us, now lives for us, that we may live in Him. And we know that through Him, and Him alone, in virtue of His one perfect oblation and His eternal priesthood, we have access by One Spirit unto the Father.

But now, in transferring our idea—the typically taught idea—of priesthood from the Old Testament to the New, from the Levitical *sacerdotium* to the *sacerdotium* of Christ, there are certain specialities which demand very careful attention as we contemplate the New Object set before our view. They may be said to be the prominent features in the *differentia* of the great antitypal priesthood of the Gospel.

person of the Messiah (see Dean Payne-Smith in "Speaker's Commentary"). So also, and more distinctly, is Zech. vi. 13. See Wright's "Bampton Lectures," pp. 148, 151, 153, 155.

¹ "Mihi eximium in primis et insigne Christi symbolum visum est, quod Melchisedec nec regnum, nec sacerdotium ab alio quopiam accepisse proditur, vel alteri tradidisse; qua in re Christi regnum et sacerdotium perfecte absoluteque expressit. Unum enim est et singulare Christi regnum, et sacerdotium, quod utique nec unquam cœpit, nec unquam finietur; quoniam Christus est *Sacerdos in æternum*, semper offerens hostiam Deo Patri, orationes, illorum, qui in eum, et per eum crediderunt, eundemque perfecta puraque religione colunt."—Ephraem Syrus, in Gen., cap. xxi., Op., tom. ii., p. 68; edit. Ven., 1756.

² Mr. Soames observes: "No comparison is ever drawn between the *priests* of the Old Covenant and the *priests* of the New, but between the *many* priests of the Old Covenant and the *priest* of the New. . . . The Old Covenant 'priesthood' and the New Covenant 'priesthood' are often compared, but the comparison almost always points out this *fundamental difference* between them, that, whereas the *Old* Covenant priesthood consisted of *many* priests, the *New* Covenant 'priesthood' consists of *One* great Priest only" ("Priesthood of New Covenant," p. 18).

In viewing the office of the typical priests, we see the work of sacrifice as (in some sort) the *end* of their ministry. In the grand reality corresponding, we are to see the One perfect Sacrifice for sins as the very commencement—the starting-point of the priesthood. The priesthood starts from that because the expiatory work of *sacerdotium* is perfected in that one Offering. The Sacrifice can admit of no repetition or continuation. After It there is no more offering for sins.

This is a point too important to be lightly passed over. It asks for most thoughtful consideration from all devout students of God's Word. It needs to be insisted upon again and again. It is essential to the true view of the *sacerdotium* of Christ.

We must revert to this in our next paper.

N. DIMOCK.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—REMINISCENCES OF MOUNT CARMEL.

THE visit of the Emperor of Germany to the Holy Land has been attracting a good deal of attention from many quarters. It is considered by some to be significant, and that it means more than a mere religious pilgrimage. It has been reported that the Sultan will grant Germany the right to occupy and to fortify Haifa as a coaling-station. Be this as it may, he has already made an instalment by granting the Kaiser a valuable plot of land in Jerusalem, who, when he was taking possession of it, told his body-guard of German soldiers that it henceforth would be their duty to guard and defend it. This is somewhat significant. He has already got a footing in Palestine, which is the "key" to the Eastern Question, and will yet be found to be so. Amongst the natives there, the feeling has prevailed that the pilgrimage was undertaken with the object of spying out the land, and they have taken but little interest in it. Well, as the Sultan is anxious to have the Emperor as his friend, seeing that other rulers have no peculiar affection for him, he has done much to give the Kaiser a befitting reception. Cavalry and infantry have been placed at his disposal, and costly gifts have been presented. He has practically illustrated the language of Holy Scripture, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight." This is an allusion to the Oriental custom of preparing the way of princes in their travels by making the roadways smooth and suitable for travelling over. Just so