

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1888.

ART. I.—EVOLUTION: THE LIFE ASPECT.

ORIGIN AND ACTION, FORMATION OF THE BODY,
NATURAL HISTORY.

THE former article in THE CHURCHMAN of May, "Evolution: A Research in Amendment," was favourably noticed by not a few of the most eminent scientific men. Their remarks and criticisms are reserved for some more comprehensive work. Only a little need now be stated concerning that article.

The remark concerning matter is accepted: matter seems due to pressure; take away the atomic and molecular forces, then every known substance will cease as to any known or visible form.

Forces are probably reducible to one, "Push." Professor Hull, F.R.S., prefers calling it "Pull."

A correspondent remarks that Evolution not only means to roll out, roll forth, unroll, unfold, but to draw forth, bring out; indeed, everything that advanced use of the word and necessities of the theory require. We are to accept it as containing all that not only Evolutionists but Christians put in. It may be the mode which believers regard as the intelligible work of God, or that natural process which atheists assert renders any thought as to a Divine Being not only useless but hurtful: such a nose of wax cannot be accepted as a scientific theory.

We are asked to receive it, not as an unfolding or revelation of the work of God, but as showing how Nature is Nature, apart from God, and does all things of herself. We have to conceive, with Herbert Spencer, that "every kind of being is a product of modifications wrought by insensible gradations on a pre-existing kind of being." This means—The beginning

was as from nothing by a development of things so slow that no advance could be perceived. We have no proof, nor is any proof possible. Professor Huxley asserts—"The whole world, living and unliving, is the result of the mutual interaction, according to laws, of the forces possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe was composed." Put it this way—The molecules were made up of atoms—how made up is a mystery—and then they became the constituents of all material forms, and the physical basis of life. For a scientific man to assert that the atoms contained all the forces exhibited by the molecules, and the molecules possessed all the forces, living and unliving, which are now displayed in a state of things wholly different from that in which it originated, is to speak without warrant. No one is able, with accurate science, to explain in terms of chemical and physical forces one single phenomenon of life in one day's growth of the meanest fungus. It is a shame to juggle, to make us believe that everything which is now was in some shape and somehow in the primitive nebulosity, and that God never did, and never will, differentiate, intensify, or weaken the primal forces; would not and could not either create or destroy. It is like saying "God did all His work at once." The Rev. Thomas Penyngton Kirkman, F.R.S., aptly calls such philosophy "a mess of dark clouds and chopped moonshine."

One correspondent thought that the previous article was too greatly metaphysical, and that as Evolution is mainly supported by arguments drawn from biology, correction should be given by facts derived from organic research. This we now undertake.

LIFE: ITS ORIGIN AND ACTION.

The essential principle of the theory of Evolution is that all organized beings were evolved from inferior forms. Physicists and astronomers show this to be impossible; that for untold ages the earth was in a molten incandescent state, during which no life—with which we are acquainted—could exist. It is certain that the first life in our planet was not evolved from any inferior form in the planet.

Bioplasm, or protoplasm, is the fluid substance in which living particles exist. It does not evolve life as from an inner potentiality; you may have bioplasm, but be as far from life as from the moon. The living particle does not evolve nor create new life nor new substance; but the forces of the universe combine in making the surrounding dead bioplasm tend to the living particle. This dead substance enters the living, and when the mass attains about $\frac{1}{1000}$ of an inch in diameter

it separates into two or more parts. The microscopic mass is not full of germs; not like a Chinese box, full of other little boxes; nor the source of life and power to all other life and power. The life-power began by an entrance, probably sudden and abrupt, of some special force into the already existing bioplasm. Clothing itself, generally as a nucleus with an outer film, the nucleus contains an inner centre. The process has nothing to do with Evolution. The bioplasm did not make itself, the life-power did not make itself. They are due to something not less essential to the living creature than are the arrangements of metals and solutions in a voltaic cell for establishment of a current. The Eternal Power, Who is behind all things, the Power recognised by all men of science, differentiated the operation of force; gave it a new form, effected a novel distribution of matter; and thus the life-power, clad with a garment, became a visible living thing.

We are not to think of the primeval life as itself from a little strength making the great strength of all life; nor of one sort of matter making all matter; nor of one star making all the stars; nor of one universe making other universes. Eternity and infinitude, in their finite aspects, are represented by the movable figures of time and space. Science and philosophy regard eternity and infinitude as the only and transcendental measure and habitation of Eternal Power. This Eternal Power so occupies all space, all time, that there never was, nor is, nor will be, any time or space without Him. Time reaches back and advances to the future, only limited by the embrace of Eternity. Space extends on every side, containing all depths and heights, with no other surrounding or restriction—if it be restriction—than girdling by Infinitude. Manifestations of force, of matter, of life, of intelligence, in things and localities, are not limitations separating, as by deprivation of other time, of other space, rendering them empty; but a bringing into definite and special operation that force, that matter, that life, that intelligence, which not less have their habitation in immeasurable expanse, where nought is felt or seen, than in the splendour of Sirius, the sweet influences of the Pleiades, and the warm sensibilities of our earth. This manifestation of force, of matter, of life, is not an evolution of finite things by the finite; it is that differentiation of operation by the Eternal Power, which from time to time, from space to space, by re-distribution of matter, made all worlds the expression of God's thought. We ought not to allow incapacity for higher scientific and philosophical research to conjure up the demon of unbelief, and be chilled to death by his embrace. Those who habituate themselves to the dark base things of a false and godless denial of true science,

consent never again to be wholly reconciled to honour. Scientific men, rightly so called, deserve highest reverence. They add many graces, and take not one enjoyment away from life. They endeavour to counteract all that is pernicious in our daily work; and, when they discern the snake in our Garden of Faith, kill the snake—not uproot the flowers, nor destroy the fruit.

FORMATION OF THE BODY

is due to changes, wrought in the bioplasm, before the various characteristics of the body are manifested. Life-power takes plastic substance, it seems all of one kind, differentiates it to form the different tissues, and with it constructs every organ. This differentiating formative power is not so much controlled by the surroundings, as controls them; and is not subject to but rules the chemical composition of every part in the organism. In some creatures it serves apparently trivial and temporary purposes; in man, unless aborted, it becomes that which accomplishes the longings of a pure heart, and the enlightened aims of a true intellect. As a differentiating formative principle it constitutes all that is so various in the tiny moss and noble cedar, in the crawling worm and the flying bird, in the mouse and the man. It builds up that which ministers to the sensational, the intellectual, the emotional, whether humorous or pathetic; and we see its work in those sundry satirical devices which exhibit life in quaint arabesques of joy and sorrow. Cupid, trundling a wheelbarrow, selling feminine hearts to Plutus, a rich crabbed old fellow; Diogenes, with light of lantern, searching human haunts in clearest sunshine to find an honest man; a lion in fox's hide; a wolf in lamb's skin; and man as pilgrim bound to the earth with many ligaments, while the nobler part of him, like an angel, hastens onward and upward. The mystery of the body—whether we think of physical characteristics exhibited in stately natural manners, or of that, more profound and strange, which constitutes the inner peculiarity and excellence of every man—is found most divine in the power of human life.

There is no reason why we should account the first Adam as an unnatural natural progeny from a meaner creature. We cannot rid ourselves of the miracle by assuming a sort of transcendental birth for Adam to match the Romish invention of an immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. Neither biology nor theology is made more reasonable by assuming that Nature and God always begin with little things.

Viewing the body in parts, we find a development of tissues preceding the temporary tooth; followed not by conversion of

that, but of new bioplasm, into the permanent tooth's substance. The eye, as a whole and as to every one of its tissues, say the nerve-fibres of a nerve plexus, is not by evolution of one substance into another, but by weaving of newly-quickenened bioplasm into the special matter of which the several parts are formed. The construction of cartilage, bone, nerve-tissue, glandular and other organs illustrates this fact. The characteristics of every part and of the whole are prepared for and arranged by life-power in the bioplasm; the brain and the heart, a crab and a whale, a butterfly and a tortoise, an oak-tree and a man. Life, as Balfour Stewart, F.R.S., wrote, is a commander who, say from the mysterious, well-guarded brain-chamber, gives that delicate directive touch which determines our formation and every movement. The differences in the parts Lionel S. Beale, F.R.S., finds not due to complexity of the bioplasmic substance, but to degrees of power in that form of vital energy which obtains noblest manifestation in intellectual and moral rule. The bioplasm used in highest mental acts of the brain is not more elaborated than the lymph corpuscle or white blood corpuscle.

Credulous idolaters of enlightenment forget that Nature, whether viewed physically or spiritually, has always had times of refreshment, when, old animals becoming extinct, others were new born. Individuals make advances, and some men emerge as intellectual and moral giants. These forgetful ones do not take due nutriment from the heart while building up the mind. Abiding by the graves of dead animals, whom they call fathers, their flesh and sensual intellect are from the charnels whence they profess to have been bred. The intellect thus attained, stripped of beneficence, of reverence to God, of hope and sentiment as to immortality, resembles, as Lord Lytton said, "only one being—the Principle of Evil." At best, considering the little good they do, and being neither Jews nor Christians, they are—we use Sheridan's simile—as the blank page between the Old and the New Testament. They have very much in common with the insane: over-cunning and irritable restlessness. Under profession of very refined intellect, they disown the nature God gave them, use unnatural, far-fetched arguments which end in atheism, talk of their origin as monads, until their poor little souls, not half souls, are unable to see the splendours of the Infinite, and, if they arrive at thoughts of the stars, find no vocation there. Why, those brilliant butterflies, unseen in summer, coming in autumnal days to sport around us, when we step on to winter, may be taken truly—we are told it in romance—for types of the bright thoughts which seem as messages from the sun to tell of life that succeeds the winter. Those flowers, on the surface of

the earth, dropping seeds that sink out of sight below, come again beautiful and new. We have not yet heard all the great hymn chanted by Nature; but the long centuries of patient waiting enabled our great men, our good men, to know that the strains are part of a wonderful harmony yet to come, in which everything, and specially the human race, will possess delight beyond all present thought.

NATURAL HISTORY ASPECT.

Man is not altogether an example as to survival of the fittest. His muscular movements are not so varied, nor so powerful, nor so rapid, as those of many of the lower animals. The gannet has in its body the most perfect aeronautic machinery we can conceive. Man's senses of touch, of sight, of hearing, of smell, of instinct, are vastly inferior to those of many other creatures—rather a descent than an ascent—he is helpless for many years, and of insufficient clothing. Men who tell us “they have smelt out the true scent of the ape,” and know how the tract was lost more and more, are instructed by Professor Virchow that the old troglodytes, pile villagers, bog people, had heads so large that many living people would be glad to possess their like. Among living individuals is a greater number with relatively inferior type of head than has hitherto been found amongst the fossils: yet no discovered skull of an anthropoid ape could have belonged to a human being. The savage may become a philosopher; the ape never becomes even a savage; nor, from the beginning of the world, did one of them light a fire, cook its food, or make a bow and arrow. Foxes become more wary where they are greatly hunted, the chimpanzee cracks nuts with a stone, some apes build temporary platforms, and birds construct nests; but only man calculates an eclipse, and measures his distance from the stars. Ruskin says of those who know all this, and yet will have it man is a beast, they are “like a dim comet wagging its useless trail of phosphorescent nothing across the steadfast stars.” Again, he says: “If you fasten a hair-brush to a mill-wheel with the handle forward, so as to develop itself by moving always in the same direction, and within continual hearing of a steam-whistle, after a certain number of revolutions the hair-brush will fall in love with the whistle; they will marry, lay an egg, and the produce will be a nightingale.”

Professor Phillips has stated: “The human mind could not, even with the materials, have predicted the complete arrangements we find in such adaptations as the various kinds of tails we find in the falcons and the swallows, the woodpeckers and the divers;” yet, we must add, the capability for development

of all rests in the life-force of these creatures. It is not heredity merely, or how could things once the same develop into a crab, a butterfly, a tortoise, a man; male or female, from that which was not one nor the other? To talk of "potentiality" is really to say, "I don't know." In no family is strength, beauty, talent unfaithfully perpetuated. Shakespeares and Newtons do not run in one line, so how comes a well-developed tail from an ancestor without a tail?—a fish without a tail is a queer fish. If tails are a product of the needing to turn, why does the hare double well enough with hardly any tail? If tails are wrought in hot countries by the need for fly-flappers, how is it that sheep, whose heads are greatly attacked by flies, have tails which cannot be used for any such purpose? If the drooping of ears in domestic animals is due to disuse of the muscles, not being aroused by danger, why is the horse with erect ears, and the hare and rabbit with ears very drooping? If monkeys could speak, they would not say sillier things than do some men who would look very wise.

A few birds lay their eggs in other birds' nests. An Irishman said, "Why don't they all do it?" If advance is the rule for all creatures, and only the fittest survive, how did the rule become the exception, seeing that far the greater number of organisms have made no progress at all? If every monad was adventurous, or ought to have been, why were so many without adventure—did not become fish, nor amphibian, nor thence ascend to be reptile, bird, and man? Natural selection was very unnatural, and divergence of character irrational, or why was there not a general levelling up, rendering the world very wonderful? The extinct rhinoceros and many others of his day were better than the existing ones. If the strong survive and the weak go to the wall, why do the weak push them over the wall, and herrings survive in countless numbers? If one or two bears—strange fishes—became whales, why did they not all learn? Would it not advantage the worm to become more highly organized, and the camel to find rich pasture and be a horse? Gorgeous colouring, pleasant sounds, sweet scents are for ornament and delight, not because some chose to be fair: no he or she would prefer to be uncomely. It was not because a new feather was greatly attractive to the lady bird that the egg she laid contained an improved peacock. If by choice the donkey chose his song, and pussy her caterwaul, was bad taste their disqualification for high mental and moral qualifications? The sterility of hybrids, a well-known fact, is no advantage, but a great hindrance. By the theory of evolution they ought to be most fertile of all, for the combination of many advantages is surely a certain gain. Why does not the ostrich lengthen its wings by use, hunted as it is? and how

did the birds which get their living by flying manage without wings, as we are told "once they did"? If the spider was not a spider, why should he spin? and could he wish for a web fashion its wonderful weaving apparatus? If species are comparatively fixed, and animals placed in the Pyramids thousands of years ago were precisely as those of to-day, how many millions of years were occupied in making any change at all? Some men believe so many strange things that charity even cannot wish their faith to be increased.

There are living creatures with eyes of some 4,000, 12,000, 17,000, 24,000 lenses: did cleverness enable these creatures to grow, use, perfect them out of some transparent tissue which did not see? Did the nerve sensitive to light place itself by natural selection in the right place to turn the light into sight? The trilobite long ago had a perfect eye: did he very early make millions and millions of experiments without knowing how or why, and direct them, without direction, to a good result? How did he compute the true distances of the refracting surfaces, assign their proper density, and precisely fix the required mechanism for instantaneous adjustments to changes of form and distance? Had he naturally, without anyone to give it, or did he obtain without any learning, a power of mathematical analysis never yet possessed by any human mathematician? If so, men have evolved the wrong way.

Why talk of bees and birds, or of the ten thousand times more marvellous things than they? "We know nothing, or next to nothing, of the ultimate structure and properties of any one thing, whether organic or inorganic;" yet these "know-nothings" would dethrone God and make religion impossible. They say, "There is a transparent absurdity in the thought that a man may be able to calculate his own movements, or even those of his fellow," and so they refuse all prophecy; yet profess to explain all the movements of the universe. They solemnly declare, "Physical science cannot inform us what must have been before the beginning, nor what will take place after the end;" yet declare that before the beginning was a something, like nothing at all, out of which "what is was made of what was then." They cannot tell us what life is, nor what an atom is, nor why one differs from another; nor why stars seeming alike are not alike; nor why there are great mysteries in the little things you cannot see; nor why the motions of the planets are what they are, there being, if we take the universe as a whole, more probabilities than a finite mind can reckon against their present arrangement apart from a First Great Cause. It is time to refuse the cant words that confuse knowledge. The features

of a beast are not writings on the rocks to tell of Israel passing by. There is a musing do-nothingness that dawdles, and then, tempted by the devil, is active with a sort of have-at-everythingness, to the neglect of noble duties and toils.

He who has true genius, enthusiasm for self-improvement, discerns in the organs and functions of the lower animals, in forest sounds and wave music, that preparation by the Almighty Father which pointed onward to human life. He will recognise that past and present melodies are preludes to a greater harmony, and not one note but is a preparation for the Great Peacemaker Who opens wide the gates of heaven. Like can only come from like, and evens from evens; but everything is so different that no two things are quite the same. Yet all are so related that the far-off and near, the similar and the diverse, are in such degree akin that everywhere is the inscription, "One Mind contrived, one Hand did the work." There was a vast previous work of God amongst lower creatures in arranging for Adam the first. There was a more wonderful preparation amongst men for Adam the Second. Now the fulness of time is being occupied in making the descendants of the first Adam brothers and sisters of the Second Adam, that they may dwell above the stars in the nearer glory of God for ever.

JOSEPH W. REYNOLDS.



ART. II.—THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF 'ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙΟΣ IN THE LORD'S PRAYER.

A DEEPLY interesting paper by the Rev. A. H. Wratislaw appeared in the pages of THE CHURCHMAN of July on ἐπιούσιος, which produced further evidence in support of the view maintained by the learned Bishop of Durham in his well-known essay on the passage. Feeling sure that all true students of Scripture always welcome the *audi alteram partem*, I venture, with all respect for the learning and painstaking investigations of the great scholars who support the derivation of ἐπιούσιος from εἶναι, to advance some arguments in behalf of the alternative derivation from εἶναι (οὐσία).

The preliminaries of the discussion are already before our readers, and need not be repeated; it will be enough to recapitulate for the sake of perspicuity the cardinal points on which the question hinges, and then submit them to a fair examination.

The word ἐπιούσιος stands in utter solitude. It is nowhere else found, either in classical or Hellenistic usage, except in the

two places in the Gospels and, of course, in Patristic quotations of these passages. Its derivation is uncertain, and hence its precise meaning also. It may be derived from *ivai*, and refer to the future in *time*, or from *ivai*, and refer to the supply of our *wants*. The first step in our endeavour to arrive at a decision will be to investigate how the word was represented in the early translations of the Gospels. The Syriac testimony claims the first place in evidence, as it was in that language (as most scholars are of opinion) that our Lord conversed with His disciples, and revealed to them the great lessons of His mission. The Syriac Gospels are of the highest value in this point of view, because they must either retain the very words which the Divine Teacher uttered, or else, if translated back again from a Greek copy, would recall the original words, or give a rendering which we cannot doubt, at that early age, while the language was a spoken one, would be known to be a proper equivalent. But here a difficulty meets us at the outset. There are two very ancient Syriac texts, the one known as the Peshito, which may be called the Authorized Syriac Version, and the fragments of the Gospels known as the Curetonian, so called after the name of their learned editor. Much controversy has gathered round these documents as to the priority and purity of their respective texts. No one can read these two authorities side by side without seeing, I think, that they come from separate sources, and that one could not be an edition of the other; among the many differences that distinguish these versions our word is one. In the former it is represented by *d'sunkonan*, "of our necessity," and in the latter by *amino*, generally rendered "continual;" the later Syriac versions follow the Peshito. In the Gospel according to the Hebrews St. Jerome tells us, in his Comm. in Matt. vi. 11: "Instead of *supersubstantial* bread I found *מחר*, that is to say, *of the morrow*; making the sense, "Our bread of the morrow" (that is, of the future) "give us to-day."¹ This strange rendering seems to be preserved in the Memphitic version, and the Thebaic gives also a future sense. The old Latin versions appear to have translated the word by *quotidianum*, "daily," but in St. Matthew's Gospel, St. Jerome, in his revision, changed this into *supersubstantialem*. It will thus be seen that the Peshito, and later Syriac and St. Jerome favoured the derivation from *ivai*, *subsistence*, and the Curetonian Syriac, the Hebrew Gospel, the two Egyptian versions, and the old Latin the derivations from *ivai*; the one class regarding the *need of food*, and the other the *time of its supply*. Can we trace with any probability the sources of this dif-

¹ See Nicholson's "Gospel according to the Hebrews," p. 44.

ference? The original word which fell from the lips of the Lord we cannot decide, but it would seem that the compilers of the two Syriac versions, probably finding a difficulty in the word, traced its supposed connection to two distinct sources. What are they? As we find the adverb *aminoith* in Numb. iv. 7, in the Syriac, as a translation of the Hebrew תמיד ("the *continual* bread"), it has been thought that there is good ground for supposing that the Curetonian translator derived his rendering, *amino*, from that source, and identified the bread which we ask for *continually* with that bread which was *continually* set before the presence of God (see Lev. xxiv. 8). Can we trace with any probability the origin of the Peshito interpretation? Perhaps only approximately—still, I think we can approximately. In Prov. xxx. 8, as we have seen, there is a prayer that has direct reference to our temporal wants; the petitioner asks for neither poverty nor riches, and adds, לחם חקי, *feed me with food convenient for me*—literally, *bread of my statute*, or of my appointment, *i.e.*, the bread which Thou hast appointed for me. The LXX. rendered this, לחם חקי by τὰ δέοντα καὶ τὰ ἀράρη, *the things necessary and the things sufficient*. Aquila, in his translation, gives ἄγρον ἀκριβασμῶν μου, "bread of my strict observance;" Symmachus, διαίταν ἰκανήν, "sufficient maintenance;" and the Latin Vulgate, *victui meo necessaria*. The Peshito-Syriac renders by *umro mesti*, "habitation of my sufficiency," *i.e.*, sufficient shelter. When we compare the language of the Lord's Prayer with that of the prayer in the Proverbs, it is true that we do not find the same word used, but the meaning is so near, and the sense in which the passage in Proverbs was understood by the various translators so entirely corresponds, that we may well suppose that our Lord, Who made many tacit references to the Book of Proverbs, had this prayer in His mind. At all events, the similarity in meaning forms a link between the two prayers, and will probably account for the interpretation of ἐπιούσιος in the Peshito version of the Gospels.

We now turn our attention to the word itself. Ἐπιούσιος is an adjective derived either from ἐπι and ἵνασι, and has a future sense, or from ἐπι and ἵνασι (οὐσία), and signifies *for subsistence* or *livelihood*. We have seen that translators in ancient days were divided on this subject. Let us examine the claims of each derivation. For the first the authority of the Curetonian Syriac is specially pleaded; it is, indeed, the sheet-anchor of this interpretation. It is claimed for this document that it is more ancient and reliable than the Peshito as we now have it.

The old Latin is urged on this side, though the interpretation is different; all that can be said is that it refers to *time*, and not to *need*, and the other early Oriental versions seem to favour the Curetonian traditions. But the crowning argument which was advanced by Canini and Grotius, and recently has been enforced with great learning by the Bishop of Durham, is that the first *iota* in the word must be elided if the second derivation is maintained; the word must be *επιούσιος*, and not *επιούσιος*. The Bishop shows by several examples that where *επι* in composition retains the *iota* before a vowel, the word with which it is compounded had originally the *digamma*, and therefore elision could not take place. Hence it must be derived from *επιέναι*, the *iota* belonging to the verb, and not to the preposition. 'Η *επιούσα* is constantly used for the *morrow*, or it may be for the *coming day* viewed from an early hour in the morning; and so our word will be an adjective formed from this phrase, and the prayer will mean, "Give us this day our bread of the morrow," or "of the coming day."

It is at this point, I conceive, that Mr. Wratismaw's additional evidence and arguments should be noted. It appears that he practically discards the interpretation of the "morrow," and insists on *η επιούσα* signifying always the *on-coming day*—that is, the day which has already commenced. In proof of this he produces a passage from Aristophanes and another from Plato. These instances are of great interest, and it may be conceded that a fair and potent argument may be reared upon them as examples of classical usage. If not fully and finally convincing, they are, we admit, strong. But what concerns our inquiry most is the Hellenistic and Biblical usage. Here, I think, the argument entirely breaks down. The instance advanced by the learned writer is Acts xx. 15. His critical remarks upon it are fresh in the minds of our readers; but let it be remembered that this passage does not stand alone in this book. If the meaning of *η επιούσα* is restricted to the *on-coming day* in this place, it must have the same meaning in other places—at least, this seems to be the argument before us. We will submit this passage first to the test of the Syriac version. We find here all three of the words, *επιούση*, *ετέρα*, and *εχομένη*, rendered by *achrino*—i.e., *another day*. All we plead for is this—that if *επιούση* was the *same day*, it could not be *another day*. What says the Vulgate? The three words in question are rendered respectively, *sequenti*, *aliā*, and again *sequenti*. Let us turn to the other examples. In chapter vii. 26 we have the same phrase, *επιούση ημέρα*. Now, this is a quotation, and hence a translation, of Exod. ii. 13. What is the original? *ביום השני*, "on the *second day*," and it is translated by the LXX. *επι δευτέρα*, by the Syriac, as

above, by *achrino*, and by the Vulgate *sequenti*. The original Hebrew and the LXX., the Syriac and Latin translations, made direct from the original, make the meaning to be *the morrow*, and surely St. Stephen must have meant the same in his quotation of the passage.

Again, in chapter xvi. 11 we read, τῇ ἐπιούσῃ εἰς Νεάπολιν κ. τ. λ. Here the Syriac and Vulgate present the same renderings as before. Once more, in chapter xxi. 18 the word is found where there can be no doubt that the morrow is intended, and here the Syriac and Latin use the same equivalents. There is only one passage in the Acts that furnishes a shadow of support—chapter xxiii. 11., τῇ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτί, which, viewed from the day then present, occasions no difficulty. Ἡ ἐπιούσα may mean, possibly, in some places the *on-coming* day, and does mean the *after-coming* day; but certainly not the former only, to the exclusion of the latter. Moreover, it is a long step to take in the argument, that because ἡ ἐπιούσα may mean the *on-coming* day, that therefore the adjective ἐπιούσιος must be *derived* from this word and have this meaning, and that, too, in the face of other words which we shall produce. This derivation, at all events, must remain as yet unproven. Before closing this part of the subject it may be well to refer to the two places in the LXX. where this participle is found. In Deut. xxxii. 29 εἰς τὸν ἐπίοντα χρόνον is the translation of the Hebrew לְאַחֲרֵיתָם, “their latter end” (A.V. and R.V.); and 1 Chron. xx. 1, τῷ ἐπίοντι ἔτει, which is the translation לְעַת תְּשׁוּבַת הַשָּׁנָה, “after the year was expired” (A.V.); “at the time of the return of the year” (R.V.). The latter is the literal rendering; it must mean the beginning of the next year, the spring-time. Neither of these places lends any support to the theory advocated by Mr. Wratistlaw.

We may now resort to the other arguments which have been advanced in favour of the derivation from *ἵνα*. It has been the fashion of late with some of our most learned critics at home and abroad to assume a recasting of the Greek text of the New Testament in the fourth century. They throw aside or undervalue the traditional text of Antioch, and set up that of Alexandria as supreme. The documentary evidence, however, of the former line has a connected history, and the latter has none. Its authority is based upon a theory derived from internal and comparative evidence. If such a revision took place, it must have been mentioned by some of the writers of the period, among whom were some of the greatest lights of the Church; and even if it were granted that such a revision did take place, the noted scholars of that day, who had before them all the testimony to be advanced for both, elected that text which finds so small favour in our times.

But the Peshito-Syriac belongs to this family, and so to account for this perplexing agreement the theorists proceed to assert that a contemporaneous revision took place also in the Syriac text. Of this, again, there is not an atom of historical evidence; and is it likely, we may ask, that two distinct branches of the Church, influenced hitherto by independent traditions, would not only revise the text in unison, but leave out passages and alter most important words without much debate and disagreement? Could such a revolution occur in days of controversy and mutual jealousies, and no trace of the struggle be recorded for after ages? Such a proceeding is in itself morally impossible, and the contemporaneous silence is inexplicable. The revision of the Latin text has transmitted its record of strife, why have not the Greek and the Syriac? Moreover, we have no proof that the Peshito gives a text posterior to the Curetonian. The two texts, as we have observed, are independent witnesses; the Peshito could not be derived from, or be a revision of, the Curetonian. Words and phrases embodying the same teaching are quite different, and there could be no purpose in wilfully changing the one for the other. They occupy the same position relatively to each other that the *textus receptus* of the Gospels does to the Manuscript of Beza. Further, it has been all but conclusively shown by Mr. Gwilliam, in his essay in the Oxford "Studia Biblica," that the Peshito text is the earlier one. No reliance can therefore be placed on the supposed superiority of the Curetonian fragments. To the Latin testimony we shall refer hereafter. But by far the most important feature in this inquiry is the presence of the *iota*. We may grant at once the force of the argument that words beginning with the *digamma* would retain, and words not so beginning would elide, the preceding vowel in ancient and classical Greek; but this rule may be considered capable of modification, if we remember that the word *ἰσθλα* was coined for this very place. It is a word without a preceding history. Who were the inventors of it? Were they learned grammarians? Could they be esteemed as philologists? St. Matthew, in whose Gospel the word originated, was a Jew and a tax-gatherer, and his companions, who with him used the prayer, were Galilean fishermen. What would they know about the *digamma*? Little is really known about it now, what should they have known about it then? What so natural that illiterate men, familiar with Syriac as their vernacular tongue, and having some acquaintance with Greek from their admixture with the Gentiles round them, should compose a word in the simplest form they could frame to embody the meaning they desired to convey? *ἰσθλα* is properly "being," a word which is in common

use among ourselves for the means of life and the necessities of life. Οὐσία appears in the Gospel of St. Luke (xv. 12, 13) in this sense, though it may be observed that in both Syriac versions it is represented by a different word altogether from those under discussion here, but it will serve to show that the word was known and so used in Apostolic times. But on the other hand, let us suppose that the word which our Lord employed was quite lost to memory, and that the Greek one only survived, then it will follow that the framers of a Syriac version would do their best to represent ἐπιούσιος in their language. They must have known what sense was attributed to the word traditionally among Christians; and the Peshito rendering has, as we have seen, quite as good, if not a better, claim than its rival, and we hold it to be most improbable that the Curetonian reading should be changed in both Gospels into that which now stands in the Peshito.

But here a question of a totally different nature is suggested. What is the meaning of *amino*, the Curetonian equivalent of ἐπιούσιος? Let us remember that the utmost that can be asserted is that it means *continual*, in *constant succession*. There is nothing about "to-morrow" or "the coming day," as such apart from the general idea of futurity. We may pass over the difficulty of praying for to-morrow's food on the previous day, and confine ourselves to the lesser difficulty of interpreting the word as referring to the day on which the petitioner has entered. The request for food for the coming day could only be made in an early morning prayer, but in the Gospels the form is prefaced by *ὅταν*, *Whenever thou prayest* (St. Matt. vi. 6), and *Whenever ye pray* (Luke xi. 2), which seems to forbid such a limitation. We are led on thus to examine whether there exists a real and substantial difference between the words found in the Peshito and the Curetonian in their respective meanings. It is true that the adjective found in the other passages where we meet with it in the New Testament bears the sense of "continual" and "constant" (see Rom. xii. 12; Phil. i. 3; 1 Tim. v. 23; and Acts xii. 5; 1 Tim. v. 5); but this meaning is mostly associated with *perseverance*, and both rest on the fundamental meaning of *trustworthy* and *reliable*. If we compare the Hebrew root, we shall find that **בָּנָה** signifies to make fast, or strong, to build, to maintain, foster, and bring up, and in the passive to be supported and made firm, and hence to be true and trustworthy. And the cognate adjective signifies sure, true, and firm. The Syriac verb, from which our adjective is derived, means to persevere and be *constant*, and in *Aphel* to trust and believe, and thus it will appear that the primary sense of our word is *certainty*, and that *continuance* is a secondary and

derived meaning. The Curetonian rendering therefore may imply nothing more than "Give us to-day bread on which we may rely." Thus the idea of *time*, as such, will vanish, and that of *certainly* of a supply of our wants take its place. Thus interpreted, the two witnesses will be found not to be at great variance with each other, and the Curetonian adjective will fail to supply a foundation for the superstructure that has been reared upon it. It may be, indeed, that from this double meaning of the Syriac word the confusion originally arose.

Another class of facts now calls for consideration. How was *ἐπιούσιος* understood by the Greek Fathers? Origen mentions both derivations, but prefers that from *οὐσία*, and interprets it mystically of spiritual food. It has been advanced that Origen invented this derivation from *οὐσία*, and that it obtained favour afterwards through his great authority; but the Peshito rendering existed long before Origen. Moreover, Origen's *mystical* interpretation severs him from the writers of the line of Antioch, who interpreted the word of our *bodily* wants. Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and other Greek writers, favour the same derivation. The chief point to be observed here is this; that it cannot be supposed that men of such attainments as these Fathers were, who were well versed in Greek as their vernacular tongue, and some of whom lived in the city which was so famed for its Greek grammarians, could have derived a word in an illegitimate manner. If the composition of the word from *ἐπι* and *οὐσία* had been so flagrantly wrong and untenable, they must have known it, and could not have built up their teaching on a patent error. The adjective *περιούσιος* appears to have been brought into use, perhaps coined, by the LXX., though the cognate noun was in classical use, and *ἐτερούσιος*, *ὁμοούσιος*, *ὁμοιούσιος* and *συνούσιος* (the corresponding noun of the last-named was in use, but in a different sense) were invented and introduced by the Church. These are all clearly derived from *οὐσία*; why should not the Evangelists, who chronologically stood midway between the two, have also introduced a like compound of *ἐπι* and *οὐσία*?

This may be the fitting place to suggest, as subsidiary to our argument, some probable references in Scripture. St. Paul seems to have in mind a kindred line of thought to this petition, and, if so, to support the meaning we are advocating, when in 1 Tim. vi. 8 he speaks of *εὐσέβεια μετὰ ἀνταρξίας*, and connects this *ἀνταρξία*, *sufficiency* or *contentment*, with *διατροφῆς καὶ σκεπάσματα*. And some further light may be gained from the high authority of St. James (ii. 15, 16), when he interprets *τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς* by *τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος*. The reference is unmistakable to the Lord's Prayer. There is some ground

for believing that St. James wrote his Epistle in Syriac, and the last phrase in the Peshito version of this Epistle is identical with the word in the Lord's Prayer, the difference being only one of gender. The Latin renderings are of secondary importance. There may be some difficulty in accounting for the old Latin *quotidianum*; at the best it must be a loose rendering. If the translator had understood ἐπιούσιος, as St. Jerome tells us the Hebrew Gospel did, as referring to the "morrow," why did he not render it by *panem crastinum*? Or if as referring to the "on-coming day," why not by *hodiernum*? *Quotidianum* is "daily" in the sense of as often as one day succeeds another, and if this simple continuance were only intended, why did not *futurum* serve his purpose? *Quotidianum* is certainly not a strictly literal translation of ἐπιούσιος, or of either of the Syriac words. With regard to *supersubstantialem*, which St. Jerome introduced in St. Matthew's Gospel, perhaps it has not been borne in mind that his intercourse with his first teacher in Hebrew, a Jewish convert, may have influenced him in this interpretation, as well as the opinion of Origen and others on the subject. It savours of an Oriental mode of thought, and may be compared with the "true bread," a meaning which borders close upon the Curetonian epithet, and the spiritual signification of the manna given "day by day" might contribute to this interpretation; as an exact translation it has but small claims.

It is worthy of notice that modern scholars of the highest rank have found no difficulty in deriving the word from οὐσία, though some have called attention to the objection presented by the *digamma*. Among these may be reckoned such names as Olshausen, Tholuck, Stier, Godet, Wordsworth, Alford, etc. Delitzsch, in his note on Prov. xxx. 8, maintains this derivation, and in his Hebrew New Testament renders ἄρτον ἐπιούσιον

of the Evangelists by לֶחֶם חֲקֵנו ("bread of our allowance"), evidently connecting it with the prayer of Agur. The translators of the Prayer-Book of the English Church into Hebrew for the use of Jewish Christians present the same rendering. Strange to say, Dr. Lightfoot, the author of the "Horæ Hebraicæ," adopts the derivation from ἕναι, but quotes a passage from the Talmud which evidently favours the other view: "The necessities of Thy people Israel are many, and their knowledge small, so that they know not how to disclose their necessities; let it be Thy good pleasure to give to every man כְּדֵי פִּרְנָסָתוֹ, what sufficeth for food, etc."¹

Lastly, is not internal evidence against the derivation from ἕναι, and in favour of that from οὐσία? Whatever may be said

¹ See Gandell's edition, vol. ii., p. 151.

to the contrary, is it not clear that the morrow is to take care of the things of itself? And can we believe that the petition should be read, "Give us this day the bread of the morrow"? or, as has been said above, could we restrict this prayer to early morning use only, "Give us this day bread for the coming day"? Or, if we could bring our minds to admit such a limitation, would it not be a tautology in so brief a sentence to have "this day" "for the coming day" thus crowded together? Again, "daily bread" can only mean the bread given us each day, as it comes, and is not the same tautology evident?

But derive the word from *οὐσία*, and all falls into order and good sense: *Give us this day bread for our being or support; supply our necessities.* The internal evidence counterbalances the external difficulties, which have been magnified. Before such an interpretation the question of a digamma on the lips of Galilean peasants surely vanishes.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

DULVERTON VICARAGE,
July, 1888.



ART. III.—"CLERGY AND THE MASSES."—THE CURATE QUESTION.

PART II.

WHATEVER may be said to the contrary, it is a fact, nevertheless, that the best interests of the Church of England, and of religion in general, are clearly associated with all questions touching the present and future supply of candidates for holy orders, and the position and prospects of the present assistant curates. We already number 7,000 licensed curates, and it is estimated, by those well qualified to form an opinion on the subject, that we ought to have almost double that number, in order that all parishes may be fairly supplied; but it has been pointed out, and it will be readily seen, that as the numbers of curates are increased in the Church, so are diminished the hopes of preferment of those who are now in the profession, because the increase in the number of benefices is not proportionate to the number of men ordained each year.

It may be said that, as a rule, if a man does his work fairly and honestly, if he is a man of fair average ability and shows an aptitude for parochial work, if he is a decent preacher, and if he is worth anything at all, he is sure to get preferment in no great length of time. This statement can be easily disproved. The time at which, upon an average, an un-

beneficed man receives preferment depends entirely upon the proportion the number of unbeneficed clergy bears to the total number of clergy. If with a given number of clergy the number of livings be increased, the rate of preferment is accelerated; if it be decreased, the rate is retarded. To take the actual case: when the number of both beneficed and unbeneficed clergy have advanced, if the proportion the number of unbeneficed clergy bears to the whole number be less than before, the time at which each unbeneficed man may expect a living will be shortened, and if that proportion be greater than before, the time will be increased.

Let us take one Diocese, viz., that of Manchester. When this Diocese was formed in 1847, out of every 20 clergymen in the Diocese 4 were curates, or one-fifth of the whole number; while in 1887 the proportion was 13 out of 20, or more than three times as great. Now, if we combine these figures with the fact that the beneficed life of each incumbent lasts about twenty-eight years, we find that on an average a curate received a living in 1848 at the expiration of seven years, while at the present time he must be content to wait eighteen years on the average; *i.e.*, there are now 506 benefices, and 357 unbeneficed clergy, 303 of whom are assistant curates, in the Diocese of Manchester. There will, therefore, be eighteen vacancies on the average each year, and there are 357 unbeneficed clergy for them. This calculation is based on the theory that none but clergy in the Diocese are promoted.

In looking at this subject of preferment, and the position of the unbeneficed clergy, and in estimating the prospects which the Ministry, viewed as a profession, holds out, we must take into our calculations that the largest number of livings, and some of these the most attractive and lucrative, are the benefices vested in (1) private hands, forbidden ground to those who have neither wealthy relatives to purchase preferment nor interest with the patrons. These, therefore, are not open to unprivileged aspirants. We may say the same of the majority of these in (2), the gift of colleges and cathedral chapters. And of those in (3), the gift of the Crown, and these are not a few, they are only open to those who have the master-key of political influence. (4) Lord Chancellor livings are proverbially small in value, but the best are given to friends of the Government for the time being. Another set is in the (5) gift of Bishops and ministers of mother churches (but only some 2,500 out of 14,000), and it is to this quarter that the unbeneficed, and deserving, and friendless, and un-influential clergyman may fairly look for a recognition of his long and faithful services, of his patient self-denial and hard work. Yet of these “loaves and fishes,” it may be said, “What

are they among so many?" Far too few to satisfy the many urgent and strong claims which every Diocese presents.

Then it must be borne in mind, too, that of these 14,000 livings, only 8,300 are of the value of £200 a year and upwards. And when a vacancy occurs in any of these, the selection must, for the most part, be amongst the following, viz., 5,700 incumbents of smaller livings, 7,000 assistant curates, and 4,000 other clergy, who, though not engaged in parochial work, do for the most seek preferment. It will at once be seen that, even if Church patronage were administered solely with regard to meritorious service, the chances of a man obtaining a fair income are very remote indeed. But when it is further remembered that a goodly number of livings, which for one reason or another are filled up with young men with undeveloped theological opinions, with "scanty knowledge" and "no experience" ("raw recruits and untrained levies," as Bishop Selwyn called them), it is evident that the chances of a man without interest and influence, political, family, commercial, and otherwise, are infinitesimally small.

We can point to instances where young men of less than eighteen months' experience in holy orders have been presented to livings of £1,000 a year and upwards. Such a state of things would never be tolerated in other walks in life. At the Bar, a barrister of seven years' standing is the minimum standard for almost all appointments. In the Army, the captains commanding a company must be more than three years in the service, and no one would ever dream of appointing an officer of three years' service to command a regiment or take charge of a ship. No man should be appointed an incumbent who has not been at least five or seven years in orders, three years of which he should be effectively employed as a curate in parish work.

It is arithmetically impossible to give all men livings of any kind, and it is arithmetically impossible that existing benefices can afford decent maintenance within a reasonable time for more than one-third of the clergy ordained, there being upwards of 21,000 parochial clergy and some 25,000 clergy altogether, and only some 8,300 livings of £200 a year and upwards. What said Lord Hatherley? "In four years, when Lord Chancellor, he had 127 pieces of preferment at his disposal, half of which were of less value than £150 a year, and for these he had no less than 3,000 applications." The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol said in three years he had nine vacancies, and for these vacancies he had between 50 and 60 curates in his own Diocese. The late Bishop of Ely said he had no vacancy for two years. The Bishop of Winchester

said "the clergy were rapidly exceeding in numbers the possibility of provision being made for them by livings. In his own Diocese he generally ordained 30 curates a year, while not more than 20 livings fell in during the same period."

Another very important question arises, Are the prospects for promotion better or worse of late years? They can scarcely be better, when we consider that the number of clergy ordained in each year, after deducting those required to fill death vacancies, is greatly in excess of the number of new livings created each year (three to one). But in ascertaining this point more particularly we require to know,

- (a) The total number of benefices in each period.
- (b) The total number of clergy.
- (c) The total number of unbeneficed clergy.
- (d) And the length of the beneficed life on the average, or the number of vacancies each year.

We can arrive at all these with a tolerable degree of accuracy. The average length of the beneficed life is, as we have said, about twenty-eight years. Now let us take representative periods since 1851, for it was about that time the Plurality Act had almost ceased to have effect. In 1851, the total number of clergy was 17,621; the total of benefices, 12,700; and the total of unbeneficed clergy, 4,700; there would be some 450 vacancies in that year, and it would, therefore, take eleven years on the average before all could be promoted.

Calculating in this way, it would take $13\frac{3}{4}$ years in 1861, 16 years in 1871, 17 years in 1875, 18 years in 1880, 20 years in 1882, and upwards of 21 years in 1887, before the whole of the unbeneficed clergy in these respective periods could be promoted. This is taking the Church as a whole; but if we come to particular Dioceses we shall find that at the present time the period required would be upwards of 35 years in the Diocese of London, 14 years in Canterbury, $23\frac{1}{2}$ years in Rochester, 21 years in Winchester, 19 years in Liverpool, $16\frac{1}{2}$ years in Ripon, and 15 years in Durham.

So that the prospect of preferment is more remote in 1861 than in 1851, more remote in 1875 than 1861, more remote in 1882 than 1875, and more remote in 1887 than in 1882. The rate of promotion is, therefore, slowly but surely becoming more and more tardy year by year. And if we go on multiplying clergy during the next twenty years at the rate we have been doing during the last twenty years, then the prospects for promotion must be very remote indeed and more tardy still. Neither must we overlook the supposition upon which these calculations are based; viz., that preferment was distributed either by seniority or by rigid impartiality;

and to this we ought to add another concession—that all livings are of such a value that a man without private means could afford to take whatever was offered to him. All must know that, as a fact, in a multitude of instances preferment did not go by merit and seniority; it was frequently the offspring of political, family and commercial influence, of wire-pulling, and in many instances of purchase. We should be sorry to see preferment go by seniority, but surely parochial experience, work, long service, probity of conduct and age ought to count for something and ought to be recognised sometimes.

Not much has been said upon the pecuniary question except in general terms. We have 14,000 beneficed clergy partly provided for by the ancient endowments of the Church, but there are these other parochial clergy—the assistant curates—who devote all their time, thoughts and energies to their respective parishes, and for them we have no fixed and certain provision; *i.e.*, we have one-third of the whole body of parochial clergy unprovided for. The clerical profession is not like other professions. A curate is not permitted to improve his income by doing other work outside his parochial duties. Public opinion is against this, and the laws of the Church will not permit it. These curates are paid in two ways: (1) By stipend, which they receive from their respective vicars; (2) By prospect of obtaining a benefice. Now, the average stipend of all curates is about £130 a year, but after working for twenty-five years it is only £119 a year; and after this he begins to decrease in marketable value at the rate of £5 every five years, and when he is sixty to sixty-five years of age he may think himself very fortunate if he can get a curacy at all. Again, after a certain time in life his prospects grow worse; for, in the first place, as a rule an old incumbent does not want an old curate as his colleague; secondly, a young incumbent does not want an older curate than himself as a colleague; and thirdly, in large parishes, particularly in large towns and manufacturing districts, incumbents want young men full of vigour, strength, energy, and enthusiasm; the consequence being that the older men have to drift away into the country districts, where the work is not so great, but where, unfortunately, the income is not so great either. With such an array of facts before us, is it not the bounden duty of our fathers-in-God to take the subject up vigorously, and point out to the laity of England their duty towards this new class of Church-worker? Might this not be made one of their diocesan subjects?

We have been committing two mistakes in this century: (1) We have multiplied the clergy more rapidly than we have

multiplied the benefices; hence we have upwards of 10,000 unbeneficed clergy. (2) We have spent more money upon buildings than upon men and the due provision for these men in the ministry; *e.g.*, we have spent some £45,000,000 sterling on buildings during the last forty-five years, and we have done comparatively little for the living element of the Church. The consequence is we have exhausted our resources to a great extent on bricks and mortar, and we have neglected the flesh and blood; hence we have such a large body of men totally unprovided for—a body which the Church cannot possibly do without. We have done a great deal for Church fabrics; we ought now to do something substantial for those who are to minister in them. It would be a fatal mistake to have grand, noble, and magnificent churches, and at the same time have a feeble and weak-kneed ministry to officiate in them. It is not the case yet, but if we do not look ahead it will be the case. Then our intelligent and educated laity would despise such feeble ministrations; they would cease to attend public worship; the religious tone of the country would sink; irreligion and scepticism would abound; and worse results would soon follow.

It may well be regarded as the weak point of our Church's system that it entirely overlooks what should be the obvious necessity of maintaining something like a due proportion between the permanent posts which she has to offer and the increased number of clergy whose services she requires. For years past our whole energies have been spent on building grand churches and providing more curates, without any reference to what was likely to become of those curates in the long-run. Many and many a parish send their £50, £60, £80, and £100 a year to multiplying curates, but do not give one guinea towards keeping up their incomes, when, by reason of age and long services, their stipends are getting beautifully less. Many and many a parish send their £20, £30, £40, £50, £60, and £70 a year to either the S.P.G. or C.M.S., and whose missionaries get their £300 a year and upwards, and yet the self-same parishes do not contribute £1 a year towards making the stipends of curates at home, who have worked twenty-five years and more, equal to those just entering upon their work. We do not desire that less should be given to foreign missions, but we do desire that more should be given to home missions. Men cannot do their work as they ought to do if they are hampered and harassed with worldly cares. It is the most short-sighted policy to have an ill-paid and crippled clergy, and it is only repeating an oft-told maxim, that the more money a faithful, earnest, zealous, and hardworking clergyman has at his command, the greater the amount of work he is

able to carry on, the greater the influence he is able to exert, and the greater the amount of parochial machinery he is able to put into his parish. Additional curates, rather than additional means of supporting them, has been the cry for many years past, and the clergy themselves are not the least offenders in this respect. It would almost seem that we had more confidence in working the Church by means of assistant curates than we had by incumbents. One reason is, curates are cheaper than incumbents. Let us get this fact thoroughly impressed upon our minds; viz., "more unbeneficed clergy" is synonymous with "slower promotion," and "slower promotion" means a larger number of old curates whose incomes and prospects get worse as they grow older.

From what has been said, we may fairly draw the following conclusions :

1. That the existence of a large body of unbeneficed clergy, many of whom have been more than twenty years in orders, is not due to the shortcomings of either patrons or curates.

2. It is not due to patrons, who can only make promotions as there are vacancies. It is not due to curates, for if each deacon who has been ordained during the past forty years had been a parish priest like Dean Hook, and possessed his organizing power, or a preacher like Wilberforce, Magee, or Liddon, the proportionate number remaining as curates would have been precisely the same as now.

3. It is due to one cause alone; viz., to the change that has taken place in the relative numbers of the beneficed and unbeneficed clergy; and for this the Church as a corporate body is solely responsible.

4. This being the case, it is clearly the duty of every member of the Church to seriously consider the position and prospects of the unbeneficed clergy, and make some better provision for them; and this can be done in the following ways :

(a) Take measures for the increase of permanent posts in populous districts, to which curates may be promoted; spend less money upon building fine churches, and a little more on endowments; raise up good, plain, churchy-looking mission chapels, and with this have a great national fund—national and yet diocesan—for the purpose of giving at least moderate fixed incomes to the fresh incumbents in our great towns. Again, some better provision for the retirement of the old and infirm beneficed clergy is greatly needed; better than what is given by the Resignation Act, which may only be a third of the income of the living. This does not afford, in the majority of instances, sufficient to live upon; while at the same time it is a

great tax upon the successor, and tends to cripple him in his work.

(b) Stop the sale of next presentations altogether; for, whatever arguments may be used in its favour, there is one argument conclusive as a reply to all others—that it withdraws yearly, from the already too narrow list of preferments to which an unfriended yet deserving man may reasonably aspire, an alarming number of benefices, and throws them upon the market to be scrambled for by the highest bidder, who succeeds more by the weight of purse than keenness and strength of conscience. No wonder that now and again, if not very often, a very awkward, square man gets in a round hole.

(c) Another most important reform would be an Act of Parliament making it illegal to appoint a clergyman to any benefice, either in public or private patronage, until he had been five or seven years in orders, and thus have served a kind of apprenticeship to his work, and have become fairly acquainted with his business. It is a most astounding thing, and one difficult to understand, why in all other departments of knowledge and practice lessons must be learned and experience must be gained, whereas in the Church of England, by some mysterious process, a man is fit to take charge of a parish and a cure of souls immediately he has received priest's orders, simply because he happens to be the son of his father. When young men of little or no experience are preferred to livings, it is hard to say where most injury was done and who was the greatest sufferer—whether to the Church at large, the particular parish, or the incumbent himself.¹

(d) Under the influence and example of the Episcopate, a considerable number of both public and private patrons might probably be induced to set apart livings exclusively for curates who for a given number of years may have borne the burden and heat of the day in our great towns.

(e) Last, but not least, promote a sustentation fund, to supplement from public liberality the wretchedly insufficient

¹ Chancellor Espin in a very able article on the Church Patronage Bill, in the *CHURCHMAN* of May, 1887, says: "A very young clergyman ought not to be allowed to occupy a position which requires qualifications scarcely ever to be found in the very young. There is no one result of the existing system of purchase which has been more often complained of than the facilities it is found to afford for placing a young man with command of money in preferment which is beyond the reach of men who have served the Church nobly for years. The proviso that a presentee should be at least five years in holy orders would have done something to abate a galling sense of injustice in some good men's minds, and would, moreover, have given some of them somewhat better chances of promotion than they now have."

stipends upon which senior curates are supposed to exist, such increase of stipend to take effect after twelve or fifteen years' service; and for such an object why not through every Diocese have a special Sunday set apart for special collections? and why should not such an object form one of the special subjects recommended by our Bishops in their lists of diocesan institutions to be supported?

If we had such means of guaranteeing our assistant curates a stipend of £200 a year when they had been twelve years in orders, with an increase of £10 a year till they reached £300, we should have a sufficient supply of good and suitable men, and the Bishops might raise, instead of being compelled to lower, the standard of fitness, and the Church would command the services of a large proportion of the highest and best intellects of the time, and men would be content to work on almost regardless of preferment. One of the most singular anomalies connected with the curate system is the entire absence of any progressive increase of stipend corresponding to more matured experience and more lengthened service. In point of fact, there is not only no increase, but there is an actual decrease. It does seem a scandalous thing that men who have been working for twenty-five years and upwards should be receiving stipends of 30 to 40 per cent. less than those who are just entering on their work.

Of all the schemes for securing a good supply of efficient and suitable candidates for the ministry, of paying the older servants of the Church better, and of ensuring them some adequate means of support, there are none better calculated to do this great work than the Curates' Augmentation Fund, but, sad to say, it is not supported as it ought to be, and this is partly because its aims and objects are not sufficiently known, and they never will be, unless our Bishops take the matter up more vigorously, and unless more of the beneficed clergy will allow the cause to be pleaded from their pulpits, and unless the clergy in general make the laity more thoroughly acquainted with the position and prospects of curates. This Society is the only one of the kind in England, and therefore it has a strong claim upon the sympathies and support of both the clergy and laity.

J. R. HUMBLE.

ART. IV.—THE DIVINE IMAGE IN WHICH MAN WAS CREATED.

IT would not be easy to weigh too keenly the Mosaic statement that man before the Fall was created in the image of God. Whether it be used to throw light on the purpose and

character of the Creator, or as a guide to the nature and destiny of His creature, it is equally worthy of attention. Probably the truth which it announces was one of the first which God made known to man, and in any case it had doubtless been revealed many centuries before the time when it is found embedded in the opening of the Book of Genesis.¹ It is, therefore, a little strange to learn how slight is the notice paid to it in the standard divinity of the English Church. Among our own divines there is nothing in fulness or exactness which at all equals the treatment of this subject by the great scholastic writers of either the Roman or the Reformed communions, nothing which equals that of Aquinas,² for instance, among the Romanists, or of Turretin³ among the Calvinists, or even of Howe⁴ among the Puritans. Such men as Hooker and Taylor, Pearson and Barrow, Waterland and Horsley, seem to leave the question of the nature of God's image in man all but, if not quite, untouched, thinking, perhaps, with Dr. Westcott⁵ of to-day, that man has not the powers which are needed for the answer. Archbishop Leighton⁶ gives to it a single lecture only, and treats it in his matchless way from a spiritual far more than from a critical standpoint. Bishop Hopkins⁷ and Bishop Reynolds⁸ discuss it—the first with all his trenchant force, the second with less of force, but more of learning—but each of them briefly and by the way. Bishop Bull⁹ alone can be said to have entered into the subject at length; yet though his Discourse on the State of Man before the Fall is full of learning from the Fathers, it lacks exactness of expression, assumes on one point that which needs to be proved, and rests throughout on only a meagre argument from Scripture. Yet it is to Scripture clearly that we must chiefly go for light. Since the Fall it is no longer safe to reason simply from the nature of man, and from this to infer the probable nature of God; and even if it were safe to reason thus, the teaching of Scripture is in many ways more full than that which the most careful study of human nature only can supply.

At the outset, therefore, we may at once dismiss the view that would find the image of God either chiefly or at all in the bodily structure of man. "God is Spirit,"¹⁰ said the Lord

¹ Gen. i. 26, 27.

² "Summa," P. i., Qu. 93-100.

³ "Instit. Theol.," Loc. v., Qu. 9-14.

⁴ "Principles of the Oracles of God," Pt. ii., L. 16-20.

⁵ "Gospel of Creation" in Epp. of St. John, p. 306.

⁶ "Theol. Lect.," L. xii.

⁷ "The Nature of Regeneration" (Works, vol. ii.).

⁸ "The Soul of Man," chaps. xxxii.-xxxvi. (Works, vol. vi.).

⁹ Discourse V. in English Works. ¹⁰ John iv. 24, R. V. marg.

Jesus to the woman of Samaria, and spirit, whatever it may in itself exactly be, stands opposed to body alike in Scripture and in the common thoughts of men. Aquinas,¹ accordingly, is quite right when he sees in the human body only what he sees in all the other creatures of God's hand—the marks of the Creator's workmanship but not the image of Himself—*vestigia non imaginem Dei*. At the same time, with thoughtful writers of all other schools, he is fully conscious of the intrinsic perfection of the body, its eminence above the bodies of all other creatures, and its consequent fitness to be the earthly dwelling-place² and instrument of those who were created in the image of God. He would assent with Turretin³ to the dignity expressed in the pagan poet's⁴ well-known lines :

Pronaque cum spectent animalia cætera terram,
Os homini sublime dedit, cœlumque tueri
Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus.

But this dignity is the consequence, rather than the expression, of man's relation to God—save, no doubt, on the strange and, as it seemed to Calvin,⁵ the truth-inverting view of Osiander.⁶ Rejecting the common, though as Lombard⁷ says the improper, sense of the word "image" as expressive of the character of God, this famous Lutheran found in Christ, the Incarnate Son and Image of God, the true archetype of the first-created man. If this be so, the body and the soul as well as the spirit of Adam were framed, of course, after the pattern of the yet unborn, though fore-ordained, humanity of Christ.⁸

Leaving, however, this as doubtful, and guided again by the same emphatic statement of the Saviour, we may with nearly equal certainty reject the view that would find God's image, in at least its deepest meaning, in even the noblest portion of the merely psychical life of man. Lofty as is the human mind and varied as are its wondrous powers, it is still part of the merely natural man, a function of the soul or $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ of St. Paul, as men so different in many ways as Bishop Reynolds⁹ and Henry More¹⁰ both teach. Not only, therefore, are its powers

¹ "Summa," P. i., Qu. 93, Art. vi.

² 2 Cor. v. 2, Gk.; Job iv. 19. ³ "Instit. Theol.," Loc. v., Qu. 10.

⁴ Ovid, "Metamorph.," Lib. i. 84-86. ⁵ "Instit.," Lib. i., c. 15, § 3.

⁶ See Westcott, "Gospel of Creation," § 2, in Epp. of St. John pp. 300-302.

⁷ "Sententiæ," Lib. ii., Dist. 16.

⁸ The thought is as old as Philo, as quoted by Bishop Lightfoot on Col. i. 15, iii. 10, and as Tertullian, as quoted by Westcott as above, § 3, pp. 307, 308, note 3. Cp. Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. xv. 49; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Phil. iii. 21.

⁹ "Animalis Homo," (Works, vol. iv.).

¹⁰ "Mystery of Godliness."

in kind akin to corresponding powers in the brute creation, but in its slow, painful and mediate processes it is parted by a vast abyss from the painless, immediate, and synoptic reason of the Most High. Unless, therefore, in his use of the term "mens," as in the Scriptural use of the term ψυχή, the spirit as well as the reason of man is included by Aquinas,¹ it is to be regretted that he should have fixed upon the "mens" as that part of human nature whereon the image of God is specially stamped. Misled in part he seems to have been by the Apostle's charge to the Ephesians,² to be "renewed in the spirit of" their "mind," where the emphasis is rather on the word "spirit" than on the word "mind;" in part, too, by the Aristotelic leanings of the scholastic theology, and still more, perhaps, by his probable ignorance of the modern science of Biblical psychology. In any case, the use of such a term tends to endow the nature of God and His image in man with the coldness of mere abstract reason, instead of with that warmth of spiritual beauty on which Scripture and the mystics love to dwell.

The Saviour's teaching, however, is more than thus negatively useful. It is as clear in that which it affirms as in that which it denies. It suggests, therefore, at once that the spirit of man, self-conscious and for all the needs of moral trial self-determining, is that portion of his complex nature in which the true image of God is strictly to be found. Included³ often under the wider term ψυχή or soul, this πνεῦμα or spirit is often also named apart⁴—in the Old Testament in special connection with the direct working of God's creative power,⁵ and in the New as the sphere wherein the new life of the Christian believer on his conversion finds its most vivid and characteristic exercise.⁶ It is not, however, that this spirit is an entirely new gift to the believer on his conversion by the way of an immediate creation or evolution, nor yet, of course, that it is the same as the Holy Spirit of God, though it is on this part of our nature that the Divine Spirit more eminently works. From the first the spirit has been a true member of the original constitution of man, though the Fall destroyed its life as distinct from its existence; and hence it needs the quickening⁷ power of God's Spirit of life

¹ "Summa," P. i., Qu. 93, Art. vi.

² Eph. iv. 23. Cf. Delitzsch, "Biblical Psychology," iv., § 5.

³ See Matt. x. 28; xvi. 26; Acts ii. 41, 43; xiv. 22; Rom. ii. 9; Heb. vi. 19; x. 39; 1 Pet. i. 9, etc.

⁴ Luke x. 21; John xiii. 21; xix. 30; Rom. i. 9; viii. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 11; v. 5; 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12, etc.

⁵ Eccl. xii. 7; Isa. xlii. 5; lvii. 16; Zech. xii. 1; Numb. xvi. 22; xxvii. 16; Heb. xii. 9.

⁶ John iii. 6; iv. 23, 24; Rom. viii. 5, 6; 1 Cor. iii. 1; ii. 14, 15; v. 5; Eph. iv. 23, etc.

⁷ See John v. 24, 25; Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13. Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 18, R.V.; 1 Cor. xv. 45.

in Christ Jesus, exactly as hereafter, by the same power, the Christian's mortal body will be raised to immortality and glory. In any case, the use of the same term to express the nature of God and the inmost part of the nature of man is full of meaning. It proclaims, not indeed a sameness of essence between the two, but such a likeness of nature as justifies the use of a common term. Allowance being made for the impassable gulf which parts the Uncreated from even the noblest of created natures, the one may so far fitly image forth the other. In this spirit, accordingly, with all the unknown powers which belong to it, the unique¹ possession of angels and of men, and not in the animal soul, is to be found the true basis for the natural immortality of man—a basis which, like the physical presence of God Himself, escapes the crucible of the chemist and the knife of the physicist, and which admits of no destruction by other hands than those of its Creator. In this relation, further, men can never wholly cease to reflect the Divine image in which they were first made. By no form of moral sin can either they or the fallen angels,² the sharers with them of a kindred nature, strip themselves of this physical resemblance which God has stamped upon them. It is no wonder, therefore, that even after the Fall man is spoken of as still in some sense made in the image of God.³

The first man, however, in his sinless state, must needs have had far more than this. Had this been all, it would be hard to see why the Divine and Co-eternal Three should be revealed as though in consultation, before They at length decide to bring to pass his actual creation. A merely physical likeness, which had been given already to the angels, and which, so far, must be shared alike by fallen and unfallen, by sinners as well as by saints, seems hardly of moment enough to satisfy the solemn announcement of the Mosaic narrative. It is true, indeed, that in this primitive record no hint is given of the nature of that Divine image whose reproduction it nevertheless records. But we need not on that account remain in perfect ignorance of much, at least, of what the statement means. Three lines of Scripture teaching yet remain to carry us some way beyond the point which we have reached already. Distinct from one another in their course, they lead at length to one and the same result. This is, that in his innocence

¹ Heb. i. 13, 14, etc. This is not really opposed by the text Eccl. iii. 21, where the seeming force of the common term is really cancelled by the difference of the announced result. Cf. Eccl. xii. 7, and see the excellent discussion by the subtle metaphysician, Bishop P. Browne, "Procedure, etc., of the Human Understanding," Bk. ii., ch. 10.

² See Matt. viii. 16, xii. 43, 45; Mark i. 26; Luke iv. 36; vi. 18; Eph. ii. 2, etc.

³ Gen. ix. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 7; James iii. 9.

from moral guilt and spotless moral perfectness was that wherein the protoplast reflected chiefly the image of his Maker—that uprightness to which the Preacher¹ refers when he declares that “God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions.”

God, then, in the first place, is not pure spirit only. As St. John² asserts with equal breadth, He is Light and Love as well. His physical Being supports and is bound up with an intellectual and moral glory quite as real and full as wondrous as itself. Nay, albeit that in the Divine Essence all its attributes are harmoniously blended in a consummate and inseparable unity, God has Himself taught us to find in His moral beauty the chiefest splendour of His character. The proclamation of His pardoning mercy, His long-suffering and His grace, was the answer which He gave to Moses when Moses sought to see His glory.³ Not His power or His wisdom—though each of these be boundless and beyond the mind of man to fathom—but His holiness is that at which the seraphs⁴ and the living creatures⁵ gaze with soul-entrancing awe, and which they celebrate with ceaseless praise. So much, indeed, is this the very life of God, that in thought He might be stripped of power and wisdom, and yet remain a glorious Being. Stripped, however, of His holiness, He would cease to be glorious, and might become, if we may dare to say so, a devil on a boundless scale. The image, therefore, of God would have been shorn of the noblest attribute of its original if some likeness to God’s spotless holiness had not been found in man.

The Lord Jesus, secondly, in His human, no less than in His Divine nature, is made known to us as the image⁶ of the invisible God—revealing perfectly as the Second Man what sin had marred in the first. When, therefore, we scrutinize His life, as it is mirrored faithfully in Scripture, to learn what kind of God He represents, we are struck at once by that faultless sinlessness⁷ in which neither the justice of God nor the envy of man could find a single flaw. He spake in words of more than human wisdom, and wrought in works of more than human power—but as with the Father so with the Son, as with God so with His image, wisdom and power were not

¹ Eccl. vii. 29.

² 1 John i. 5; iv. 8, 16.

³ Ex. xxxiii. 18, 19; xxxiv. 5-7. See the exhaustive discussion by the great Puritan, Dr. T. Goodwin, “Object and Acts of Justifying Faith,” Bk. i. chaps. 3-11, and cf. Isai. xl. 5; Jer. ix. 23, 24; John i. 14; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Eph. i. 6, etc., etc.

⁴ Isa. vi. 3.

⁵ Rev. iv. 8.

⁶ 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15. Cp. John i. 14; xiv. 9.

⁷ John viii. 46; 2 Cor. v. 21; Heb. iv. 15; vii. 26; 1 Peter i. 19.

His chiefest glory. Of these the exercise was often in abeyance. He often seemed as though He had them not. But that which was always active and never dormant, which was so woven into the very substance of His life and Being that the loss of it would have wrought immediate ruin, was His spotless holiness of thought and word and act. The first man, therefore, till he fell, at least generically was doubtless like the second.

St. Paul, finally, in more than one passage guides us in the same direction. Not merely does he imply that one of the ends of the Christian's regeneration is to replace the Divine image which sin had sorely marred, but he teaches further—in part, at least, in what this image lay. "Put on," he writes to the Ephesians,¹ "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness"—"which is renewed in knowledge" he writes to the Colossians,² "after the image of Him who created him," where the knowledge of which he speaks implies a spiritual rather than a mental endowment. From that, therefore, which grace gives back, we may reason justly to that which sin removed.

Accordingly, from Justin downwards, the Fathers recognised, with more or less precision, this state of moral uprightness, with its indefinite capacity for onward growth, as that from which the first man fell. The meagre view of the older Socinians seems quite unknown to them, as anyone may see who reads with care the many passages which Bull has brought together in his long Discourse,³ and of which they form at once the largest and the most important portion. The writers of the Reformation and yet later times support, of course, the same view, though, as might be expected, their treatment is both fuller and more precise than that which the Fathers on this point commonly present. So far, too, the teaching of Aquinas⁴ is substantially the same, when he defines the rectitude of man's first estate to have been such that his reason was subjected to God, his lesser powers to his reason, and his body to his soul—if, at least, we remember that this reason of Aquinas⁵ is not a naked mental process, but that it is perfected in its Godward subordination by such virtues as those of righteousness, of faith and hope and charity, whose presence, in his view, is at the least potentially bound up with the perfect rectitude of man's first estate.

Aquinas, however, goes beyond this. He affirms that that rectitude which he describes was not the fruit of nature only, but the result, as well, of a supernatural gift of grace.⁶ Further on

¹ Eph. iv. 24.

² Col. iii. 10.

³ Discourse V., as above.

⁴ "Summa," P. i., Qu. 95, Art. i.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Art. iii.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Art. i.

in his discussion he maintains, with even greater plainness, that the original righteousness of man was only the accident of his nature—that it did not spring from its proper principles, but was only a kind of gift Divinely granted to a nature which, he seems to hold, was so far quite complete without it.¹ Following in his steps come many (if not all) of the later schoolmen, till in the catechism of the Council of Trent directly, and indirectly in its canons, this view is formally accepted as the teaching of the Roman Church.² The direct result of this is to extenuate at once the direful evils of the Fall, and by consequence to weaken the value of our Lord's atoning work, and lessen the need of His renewing grace. Against all experience and the clearest teaching of Scripture, the fruit of original³ sin on this view ceases to be the corruption of man's nature in the fulness of his being; it is transformed into the loss of an ornament, precious indeed, but as merely adventitious as a bridal coronet is to the head and character of a bride.⁴ With great reason, therefore, the Reformed divines have commonly opposed the view, and in our own Church the once famous and very able Jackson⁵ most earnestly protests against it. On the other hand, so strong an anti-Romanist as Bull⁶ seems at any rate in terms to plead for it, for again and again he speaks of the supernatural endowments of unfallen man. It is not certain, however, that this Roman view is what he really meant to teach. With him, as well as with others, it may be that the question turns upon the use of words. Most men, for instance, will admit that Adam in his innocence enjoyed the strictly spiritual as well as the merely physical influences of God's Holy Spirit. God, that is, sustained him fully in all the varied workings of his new-created sinless life. In this sense doubtless, and in comparison with his present state of sin, man's state before the Fall might well be called a supernatural state—a state, that is, above that sin-stained state which is all we now inherit.

If, however, more be meant than this, and the scholastic view be taken in its rigid letter, it is hard to know on what grounds of Scripture or of reason it can rest. Man in

¹ "Summa," P. i., Qu. 100, Art. i.

² "Cat. Conc. Trid.," P. iv. in orat. Dom., P. i.; Art. i. § 22.

³ See Aquinas, "Summa," P. 1a, 2ae, Qu. 85, Art. i., ii., and for many further illustrations of the scholastic view Archbishop Laurence, Bampton Lecture, notes on Sermon 3.

⁴ So Luther, "Opp." vol. vi., p. 38, quoted by Laurence, as above, and from him by Bishop Harold Browne, on Article ix.

⁵ "On the Creed," Bk. x., chaps. 1-3 (Works, vol. ix.). But see Wilberforce's comment in his "Doctrine of the Incarnation," chap. iii., note 30.

⁶ Discourse V., as above.

his "pure naturals," as the schools speak, and without any original righteousness, would have been but half a man; and, Scripturally speaking at least, it seems a grave psychological error to assume in the original constitution of man the absence of the spirit with the accompanying influences of the Holy Spirit of God. In God, moreover, after Whose image man was formed, holiness is not a separable accident, but of the very essence of His character. In Christ it is the same. In the regenerate Christian it is again the same within the limits of his growth in grace. Could it have been less connatural at least to the perfect character, though not essential to the naked being, of unfallen man?¹ In any case, in spite of Bull's implied assertion to the contrary, the Fathers speak to demonstration in favour of the Reformed and English view. With the exception of a single difficult phrase in Athanasius,² not a single passage which Bull quotes gives any hint of the notion which is peculiar to the schoolmen, that original righteousness was an accident of Adam's nature, and above the powers which, even in its sinlessness, it could be strictly said to possess.

Waiving, however, the merely theoretical disputes³ which have gathered round this subject, it is right, though it be but for a moment, to turn to one or two points of practical interest and importance. So far, moreover, as these are concerned, it is of no moment to discuss the precise methods by which Almighty God brought in upon the earth the primitive ancestors of the Adamic race. The reality of the Divine image He bestowed is wholly independent either of the antiquity of the first man, or of the varied processes by which his bodily and merely psychical organization may have been gradually brought to perfection. On Adam's original righteousness, with whatever preparatory steps the gift may have been connected, and whether it be called natural or supernatural,

¹ So Howe adjusts the dispute, with his usual wisdom of statement, in his "Man's Creation in a Holy but Mutable State"—a discourse on Eccl. vii. 29, in which he adopts in general Bishop Davenant's view of the nature of man's state before the Fall, as given in his work on "Justification." But these writers, with South (Sermon on Gen. i. 26, 27) and many others, dwell perhaps too much on the first man's mental and moral possessions, as distinct from his full capacity for knowledge as God should gradually give it.

² "De Incarn. Verb.," c. iii. (tom. i., p. 56). Bull's translation of this passage is loose and almost disingenuous.

³ See Trench ("N.T. Synonyms," § 15, end) on the distinction drawn by the Alexandrian Fathers between the words *εἰκών* and *ὁμοίωσις*. These words are the LXX. renderings of the words translated in Gen. i. 26 (A.V.) "image" and "likeness," and both are found in the New Testament—*ὁμοίωσις* in James iii. 9 and *εἰκών* in Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. xi. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 18, iv. 4; Col. i. 15, iii. 10.

was clearly founded that lordship¹ over all the animal creation which made him God's vicegerent upon the earth. This was the consequence² of the Divine image which he bore, rather than, as the old Socinians held, the point wherein that image lay. From the same righteousness, again, as it is increasingly renewed by the Spirit, the Christian believer obtains a true though faint perception of the moral attributes of God. The Divine wisdom he cannot fathom, the Divine power he cannot rival. Here he only uses that which God bestows, however mediately, and which from first to last belongs, in truth, to God. It is not exactly so, however, with the Divine holiness. Here the Christian is not only an imitator of God, as St. Paul³ speaks; but he is, as St. Peter⁴ writes, a true partaker of the Divine nature. The holiness of God is so woven into the Christian's being by the power of the Spirit that it becomes a part of his very self—not outside of him, as in a real sense his power and knowledge are, but as inseparable inwardly from his renewed nature as in its primal Fountain it is inseparable from the nature of God. He knows, therefore, by the growing experience of a personal resemblance to the moral character of God, what that character in some sort is. Within certain limits, too, he can reason justly, as he has been taught to do by Scripture,⁵ from his own instinctive feelings as well as from his calmer judgments, to the feelings and judgments of his great Creator. In proportion to his growth in grace he can understand, and feel yet further than he can understand, at once the blessedness and spiritual glory of that Divine Being Who has made him and redeemed him and fitted him for an eternal fellowship with Himself.

The development, accordingly, of the Christian's spiritual nature is the main purpose of all the varied means of grace, of the changing discipline of life, and of his own Divinely-kindled and Divinely-aided efforts. The fullest strength of natural reason and the keenest subtlety of natural sense may co-exist easily with a total want of all that is especially God-like. On the other hand, the growth of the spirit, with that training of the will which is its central point, fits the believer more and more not only for the enjoyment of the unclouded vision of God hereafter, but also for the sinless use of those higher powers of

¹ Gen. i. 28.

² So thinks Delitzsch ("Psychology," ii., § 2), and as it seems rightly. Yet Turretin, Reynolds and others look on this dominion as at least included in the image of God, and even Bishop Pearson in a passing statement ("Lectiones de Deo," etc., L. v., § 4) seems content to find here a sufficient explanation of the image itself.

³ Eph. v. i., R.V.

⁴ 2 Pet. i. 4.

⁵ Gen. xviii. 25; Ps. ciii. 13; Isa. v. 3, 4; Matt. vii. 11; Luke xi. 4a, xi. 8, 9, xviii. 1-7, etc.

thought and subtler faculties of sense which will complete the magnificent endowment of glorified spirits conformed in all their being to the likeness of their Maker. Perhaps, too, as Augustine,¹ Aquinas,² and far later writers³ have not unwisely taught, the Christian, in the special workings of his quickened spirit, as well as in the so-called trichotomy of his total nature, may bear some witness to that sublime mystery of the Trinity in Unity of which the earliest traces are to be found in the very record which announces first that man was created in the image of God.

ARTHUR C. GARBETT.

ART. V.—THE LECTIONARY OF 1871.

THE DEFECTS OF THE NEW LECTIONARY AND SOME PRINCIPLES FOR ITS AMENDMENT.

THE circumstances which attended the origin and preparation and enactment of the new Lectionary of 1871, which is in present use, are now almost forgotten. A casual admission of the late Archbishop Longley, in the House of Lords, led to the subject of an alteration in the Prayer-Book's Tables of Lessons being submitted to the Royal Commission, which was soon after appointed in order to inquire into the subject of ritual. And the draft of a new Lectionary was prepared and issued by the Royal Commissioners before they had completed their other and their legitimate work; and this, in defiance of the express terms of their own Commission, and under a protest from a distinguished legal member of their own body, the late Right Hon. Sir Joseph Napier, ex-Lord Chancellor of Ireland.⁴ The new Lectionary (so called), when issued, was silently submitted to, and enacted, almost without notice. Albeit, a few cautions and warnings were given in the pages of the *Guardian* by the late Archdeacon Harrison, and in the columns of the *Record* by the author of the present remarks, who was also enabled to promote and to send up a petition against its compulsory and

¹ "De Trinitate," in several places quoted by Lombard, "Sententiæ," Lib. i., Dist. 3.

² "Summa," P. i., Qu. 93, Art. 5, 7, 8.

³ Delitzsch, "Biblical Psychology," iv., § 4; Howe, "Oracles of God," Pt. ii., L. 20; Baxter, in many places of his "Catholic Theology"—a work of wonderful wisdom, learning and metaphysical depth.

⁴ For proofs of this the reader is referred to "The Lectionary as it might be," etc., by the Rev. C. H. Davis, ch. i., pp. 1, 2 (second edition, Elliot Stock).

permanent use.¹ In the year 1873, the general synod of the Church of Ireland considerably altered it, before adopting it for the use of that Church as a part of the Irish Prayer-Book of 1877. In 1874, the late learned Bishop C. Wordsworth, of Lincoln, in a published letter to the Prolocutor, urged its revision, and the adoption of some of the improvements contained in the Irish Lectionary. And in 1877, there appeared three papers, in one pamphlet, by Bishop Wordsworth and Deans Goulburn and Burgon, wherein the new Lectionary was severely criticized, and its revision was strongly urged.² In 1877, a revision of our present Lectionary was seriously undertaken by the Convocations of Canterbury and of York, and a "Report" of the Canterbury Convocation was published in 1878.³ And a memorial from the great combined meeting of "the Clerical and Lay Associations," held at Birmingham in June, 1878, was sent up, praying for a revision of the new Lectionary of 1871, and for an extension of the time allotted for the use of the old one.⁴

Now in any future revision of the present Lectionary, certain points should not be unheeded, as regards its many palpable defects. Among these defects, the following may be here mentioned.

I. The alternative Lessons for Evening Prayer are not constructed upon any systematic plan which would give an edifying and a consecutive series of Lessons for use, either at the Afternoon or at the Evening Service, if there be three services, or a complete series if there be only two services on the Sunday. But they are so mixed up, and so jumbled together, that if or when there may be only two services (as is generally the case, under sec. 80 of 1 and 2 Vic. ch. 106), one most important Lesson must often be omitted; as on Easter Day, and on the

¹ See "The Lectionary as it might be," p. 2.

² These two pamphlets were published by Rivingtons. See "The Lectionary as it might be," pp. 2, 3.

³ Rivingtons, at 6d.

⁴ The memorial is given at pp. 18-20 of the late Rev. W. F. Wilkinson's very able paper on "Revision of the New Lectionary," published at the unanimous request of the conference, by W. F. Bottrill, of Luttermouth, at 2d.—The memorial affirms of the present new tables, "that, in many instances, their distribution of the sacred text into lessons, is as prejudicial to the sense of Scripture, and therefore to edification, as some of the worst cases occurring in the capitular division."—Mr. Wilkinson argues at p. 3 that the almost universal adoption of the New Lectionary "may partly be accounted for by the extensive prevalence of the impression that the Act of 1871 was not merely of a temporarily permissive, but also of a tentative character, that the new tables were to be taken on trial, and would certainly be reconsidered before the use of them should become obligatory."

first and third and fourth Sundays after Easter, etc.; while the perplexity as to which Lesson of the two to select tends to the production of that double-mindedness which is a precursor to instability. (See James i. 8; iv. 8.)¹

II. Some glaring mistakes have been made in the arrangement of the present Proper Lessons, such as the following. (1) On the Fourth Sunday in Lent the removal of Gen. xliii., on Joseph entertaining his brethren, from the Morning, where it illustrated the Gospel of the day, about Christ feeding the multitudes,² to the Afternoon, where it may now be entirely omitted; and the removal of 1 Kings xiii. from the Morning of the Eighth Sunday after Trinity, where it illustrated the Gospel of the day about "false prophets," to the Evening of the Tenth, where it may now be entirely omitted, and where it *must* be omitted, *if* 1 Kings xvii. be read, without the reading of which the sequel of Elijah's history, contained in 1 Kings xviii., on the next Sunday's Morning is marred; and other like cases.³ (2) The removal of Jer. v. from the Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity, where its verses 23-25 always fell most suitably somewhere near to the harvest, to the Seventeenth, where it now always seems to fall too late; and of the short chapter, Ezek. ii. from the Morning of the Sixteenth, after a Communion Sunday, where Wogan states that it was meant to illustrate the September Ember-week, to the Afternoon of the Eighteenth; and other like cases. (3) The omission of Isaiah lviii. from the Sundays after the Epiphany, (and its beautiful verses 13, 14, about the Sabbath, even when it is read on Ash-Wednesday, where Isaiah lviii. 13, 14, and Matt., ii. 23-28, if

¹ "One *apparent* gain will, I think, be found in practice a very real and considerable loss, and that is the alternative series for 'Evensong.' The idea, I suppose, is to provide for those churches in which there are three services; but I apprehend there are very few people who attend three times; and of those who attend twice, very few attend Afternoon and Evening. Nor is there any great gain for the clergy; for generally, where there are three services there are at least two clergymen; so that the gain is very small indeed. On the other hand, there is a very considerable loss; for the alternative lessons are not an independent series, but come in the same course with the others; and very frequently the omission of the alternative lesson makes a serious gap in the continuity of the Church's instruction. So that for the sake of the very few who attend Afternoon and Evening, the great number who attend Morning and Afternoon, or Morning and Evening, suffer."—Rev. B. Kennion, of Acle, in 1874.

² Which is the alleged origin of "Mothering Sunday."—See Wheatly.

³ The Convocation Committee's Report, of 1878, would extend this mischief. Thus, on the Second Sunday in Lent, by a divorce of Gen. xxvii. from the Morning, where it illustrates 1 Thess. iv. 6, in the Epistle; and on the first Sunday after Easter, by a divorce of Numbers xvi. from this Sunday, where it illustrates the Gospel, about the re-appointment of the Apostles by Christ, etc.

not here omitted, would have mutually illustrated each other),¹ and the omission of Deut. viii. on Rogation Sunday; and the omission of verses 24-31 of 1 Sam. v. on the Fifth Sunday after Trinity. (4) The use of Job and of Proverbs after the Epiphany, instead of the "Evangelical" prophet Isaiah, as formerly, and of Proverbs as the former practical conclusion of the series of Proper Lessons: see Wogan. (5) The use of such a chapter as 2 Sam. i. for a selected "Proper" Lesson, so as to yearly invite attention to a case of suicide, in not the most repulsive form. (6) The crowding out of the important Lessons from the minor prophets, such as Micah vi., in years when there are only twenty-three or twenty-four Sundays after Trinity (as in 1878 and 1879), by the pushing on of the Lessons in order to make room for such Lessons as 2 Sam. i., and 2 Chron. i., and 1 Kings iii. (one of which two chapters might well have been spared), and 1 Kings x. 4.² (7) Also in the Calendar, the omission of nearly the whole of Elihu's speech in the Book of Job; and other anomalies.

III. On the great Christian Festivals, a neglect to bring out under notice with sufficient prominence the great *facts* commemorated thereon.

IV. The reduction of many of the Lessons to too small dimensions, and to a state of "scrappiness," seeing that the true object of the Lessons is something more than to *merely* set forth a few verses bearing on the topic of the day.

V. The arrangement of the Second Lessons in such a complex form that it is difficult to avoid mistakes in the portions to be read. (This may arise partly from the disuse of the old form of printing the Lessons; as for St. Stephen's Day, Acts 6 v. 8, & ch. 7 to v. 30.) Also on such a plan that during several months of the year it is not now even allowable to read any Lesson from the Epistles of the New Testament!

VI. The direct and formal sanction for the first time of the use of Apocryphal Lessons on Sundays, when the Festivals of St. Luke and All Saints' Day and Innocents' Day may fall on Sundays; which is quite contrary to the mind of the reformed English Church, as explained by Wogan and Wheatly and Bishop Mant, etc.³

¹ After the Epiphany, we might have had at least Isa. 58 v. 13 & ch. 59.

² Solomon's glory, as described in 1 Kings x. 13-29, was in direct disobedience to Deut. xvii. 10-20, which does not come before the congregation as a warning, and a corrective of our admiration.

³ In "the Revised Table of Lessons" of the Church of Ireland, (published at 1d. by Hodges, Foster and Co., of Dublin,) the English Church's Lectionary of 1871 has been so revised as to exclude all the Apocryphal lessons. Until the enactment of the New Lectionary of 1871, which allows the Apocryphal lessons of three of the Saints' Days to be read

Accordingly, in any revision of the Lectionary, the following principles would appear to be desirable, as the basis of its reconstruction, (for to attempt a revision without any definite principles would be like going to sea without a compass,) namely :

I. To secure a clear and full set of Sunday Proper Lessons for Morning Prayer and for Evening Prayer, quite independently of the middle or supplementary set.

II. To arrange a middle-column or supplementary set of Sunday Lessons for Evening Prayer of the same general tone and character as the others. Yet so as, (1) not to impair the effect of the other two sets by its omission; but rather, (2) to supplement them, if used in addition to them; or even (3) to somewhat supply their place to those who might fail to hear one or both of the other two sets; and (4) to be not an entire failure, if or when used as a substitute for the other or principal evening set.

III. To restore the chapters, as nearly as possible, to the same Sundays, and, where practicable, to the same times of the same Sundays, upon which they fell in the old Tables of 1662, so as to avoid a loss of connection with the Epistles and Gospels, etc.; any exceptional cases being such as where the shifting of a chapter would *not* impair the connection with the Epistle or the Gospel or other topic of the Sunday's services (as by the use of Deut. iv., v., and vi., on the third Sunday after Easter); or would by its transfer to another Sunday Morning secure its non-omission; as by a transfer of Isa. liii. to the Morning of the third after the Epiphany, and of Daniel. vi. to the Morning of the twentieth after Trinity. Yet in such a manner as to utilize the new matter and the substance of the new Tables of 1871, but in a rearranged form, so as not to disorganize or disturb the general features of the old Tables of 1662 in their revised form.

IV. In the selection of "*Proper Lessons*," to have regard, other things being equal (*ceteris paribus*), to chapters which contain some direct appeal to the heart and conscience, or some evident practical instruction; such as Joshua xxiii., an old Lesson for the first Sunday after Trinity, rather than Joshua v. 13 and vi. to 21, which is one of the new ones.

V. On the greater Festivals and Holy-days, to set forth more clearly the facts commemorated upon them.

VI. To restore the old mode of printing the references to the Lessons in Arabic figures; as, for example, "Acts 6 v. 8 & ch. 7 to v. 30," etc.; instead of "Acts vi. 8 to vii. 30," etc.

when they fall on Sundays, no formal sanction had ever been before given to the Sunday use of Apocryphal lessons

A Lectionary prepared on some such principles as the above would, it is believed, be more conducive to edification than the present one, which seems to have been prepared upon no definite principles whatever.¹ In the meantime, for discussion at Ruri-Decanal Meetings and Conferences and at Clerical meetings and Clerical and Lay Conferences, the subject might be presented in some such form as this: "The comparative merits and demerits of the Old and the New Lectionaries, and the proper attitude of Churchmen towards them."

And it is to be hoped that Parliament will grant a restoration of the now expired liberty to the clergy to use the old Lessons of 1662; to the use of "all" of which it had, since 1662 up to 1865, itself compelled the beneficed clergy to publicly declare their "*unfeigned* assent and consent." It might easily be accomplished by a short enactment, to the effect that: "The Tables of Lessons in lawful use before the passing of 'The Prayer-Book (Tables of Lessons) Act, 1871,' may at any time hereafter be followed in lieu of the Tables substituted for the same by the said Act, unless or until it shall be otherwise enacted; and the said Tables may [?] shall] be printed at the end of the Book of Common Prayer, as a lawful Appendix to the same."

It would also be desirable to obtain of the S.P.C.K. the issue of an edition of the old and of the new Lessons of 1662 and of 1871 in parallel pages, in a clear and legible type and in a portable form, together with the Lessons of the Irish Prayer-Book of 1877, which were prepared for it in 1873.

For details wherein the present Lectionary may be improved, the author may be permitted to here refer to his two works on the subject of this paper, viz., "The Lectionary as it might be" (second edition), and "Model of a Revised Lectionary" (second edition).

C. H. DAVIS.

¹ An influential member of the Royal Commission which prepared the New Lectionary of 1871, once described to the author their mode of proceeding as follows: "We followed our own instincts; if a proposal were sent to us, we did not read it; and if a man quoted it, it was quite enough to not attend to him." Could any procedure be possibly more presumptuous or preposterous?



ART. VI.—THE PROVIDENTIAL USE OF DREAMS.

And is there care in heaven? and is there love
 In heavenly spirits to these creatures base,
 That may compassion of their evils move?
 There is; but oh! the exceeding grace
 Of Highest God, that loves His creatures so;
 And all His works with mercy doth embrace,
 That blessed angels He sends to and fro,
 To serve to wicked man—to serve His wicked foe.

SPENSER.

WHAT is a dream? We are told that it is “a psychic phenomenon, in which the spirit with all its activities, transferred into a position of repose, as it were, represents the spectator; and which it annuls as soon as its will, appearing out of inactivity, begins to interfere either by way of restraint or stimulus.” Now in a dream the unconscious will proceeds out of itself as an impulse, which, according to the man’s disposition, expresses itself in various ways, but always more freely and more strongly than in waking life; and the impulse seeks for itself in the world of forms stored up in the waking life an object tallying with its own determination, in the representation of which idea and volition are concerned—a kind of birth-labour. This process is alluded to in Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 5: *ὡς ὠδινούσης φαντάζεσθαι καρδία*; i.e., “As the heart deviseth to itself forms in travail;” for, according to Scripture, the proper laboratory of the dream is the heart.

But the head is so little unconcerned in dreaming that in the Book of Daniel dreams are even called “visions of the head” (Dan. iv. 5, *visiones capitis*, or *αἱ ὁράσεις τῆς κεφαλῆς*), and therefore forms of the brain; but dependent upon the daily activity of the brain, this relation is somewhat secondary and passive. On the other hand, the activity of the heart is increased; and from the heart—where the roots of thought lie—spring forth dreams formed and coloured by sense. And the Shulamite expresses herself accordingly when beginning to relate a dream: “I slept, but my heart was awake” (Song of Solomon v. 2). So also the spirit of Clytemnestra, in the “Eumenides” of Æschylus, says to the sleeping chorus of furies: *ὁράτε πληγὰς τὰσδε καρδίας ἔθεν* (“See these sword-wounds of my heart, from whom they came”).

The dream is only a phantom of the waking life, and, according to Zophar, one of Job’s three friends, a shadow which flees when one awakes. And therefore Scripture writers often use the melting of a dream at awakening as a favourite image for destruction without trace. For example, Asaph (in Psalm lxxiii. 20: “Like as a dream when one awaketh, so shalt Thou make their image to vanish,” etc.),

and similarly Isa. xxix. 7, 8. And, moreover, emphatic warning is given against trusting in dreams; *e.g.*, Eccles. v. 7: "In the multitude of dreams and words there are divers vanities." The son of Sirach speaks exactly in the same strain when he says: "The hopes of a man void of understanding are vain and false, and dreams lift up fools. Whoso regardeth dreams is like him that catcheth at a shadow and followeth after the wind" (Ecclus. xxxiv. 1-3).

But this prevailing illusory character of dreams has its reverse side. The dream, after all, is a storehouse of experience to which is appropriated, firstly, an intellectual; secondly, an ethical; and thirdly, a spiritual significance far above the unimportance of either appearing or seeming.

I. We may safely say that when the man sleeps his spirit also sleeps, so far as it does not make itself manifest outwardly, as in waking life; just as we read in Scripture that God, as it were, sleeps (Ps. xlv. 23: "Awake! why sleepest Thou, O Lord?" and elsewhere) when He does not meddle in what is happening externally, as might be expected from His righteousness and truth. But, on the other hand, what the Scripture says of God (Ps. cxxi. 4) is also true of the spirit; *i.e.*, that He neither slumbers nor sleeps. As the activity of the soul and of the body only changes its character, and does not cease, still less does that of the spirit. This is forcibly expressed by Hamann in his "Exercitium:" "Uti conditor ab officio suo quievit: attamen pergit operari, æque ac vivere in somno haud cessamus, quamvis per quietam vitam non sentiamus." The only distinction is that in God there is no difference of the consciousness of day and night; whereas to the self-conscious creature its own nature is never so transparent as that of God is to Him. And especially we, who tabernacle in an earthly body, have, as the background of our being, a dim region, out of which our thinking works forth to the daylight, and in which much goes on (particularly in sleep) which we can only learn by looking back afterwards. So we find Wordsworth in his ode entitled "Imitations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood," giving expression to the same strain:

Hence, in a season of calm weather,
 Though inland far we be,
 Our souls have sight of that immortal sea
 Which brought us hither;
 Can in a moment travel thither,—
 And see the children sport upon the shore,
 And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore.

We are justified by experience in believing the statement of the Psalmist (Ps. cxxxvii. 2) that God giveth to His beloved in sleep.

The deep of man's internal nature, into which he sinks in sleep, contains far more than is manifest to himself. It is a general mistake to limit the soul to the extent of its consciousness, for it embraces a far greater abundance of powers and relations than can ordinarily appear in its consciousness. And the *faculty of foreboding* belongs to this abundance—that “*something*” which leads and warns a man, and even anticipates the future—a faculty also which, very often unshackled in the state of sleep, sees *far* in the distant future. This idea is very beautifully expressed by Æschylus in “*Eumenides*,” 104, etc.:

εὐδουσα γὰρ φρήν ὄμμασιν λαμπρύνεται
 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ δὲ μοῖρ' ἀπρόσκοπος φρενῶν;

i.e., “For in *sleep* the spirit is *clear-sighted*, though by *day* the fate of mortals is *hidden from their view*.” So again in the “*Choephoreæ*,” 280: ἰρῶντα λαμπρὴν ἐν σκότῳ—seeing clearly in darkness. With these we may compare Cicero “*De Divinatione*,” i. 39: “*Cur autem deus dormientes nos moneat, vigilantes negligat?*” *i.e.*, now why should God advise us in our sleep, and not instruct us when we are awake? and i. 30: “*Quum ergo est somno revocatus animus a societate et contagione corporis, tum meminit præteritorum, presentia cernit, futura prævidet. Jacet enim corpus dormientis ut mortui, viget autem et vivit animus.*” *I.e.*, When, therefore, the soul is freed from the company and influence of the body, it remembers events of yesterday, sees those of to-day, and foresees those of to-morrow. For though the sleeper's body is like that of a dead man, yet the soul is alive and active.

For examples of such dreams of presentiment I may mention those of Joseph in his father's house (Gen. xxxvii. 5), which, as became plain to him afterwards (xlii. 9), figuratively predicted his future eminence over the house of Jacob; also the dreams of Pharaoh's chief butler and chief baker (Gen. xl.), which, according to Joseph's interpretation, signified the fate of each; also the dream of the soldier in the camp of the Midianites in Gideon's day (Judges vii. 13). And for the expression “dreams of presentiment” we may refer to Wisdom xviii. 17-19: φαντασίαι ὀνείρων τοῦτο προσημνεύσαι.

We should be careful to note here that *not* one of these dreams is particularly noted as *divinely sent*; and we need no other origin for them than that natural gift of insight innate in the soul, so variously distributed to individuals and races, which slumbers when the man is wakeful and wakes up when he sleeps. As the Spanish physician Huarte rightly says: “As there are men who excel others in remembering bygone or past events, or in the perception of the present, so there are also men who excel others in representing to them-

selves the future." And as the representation of the future is often enigmatically expressed, Scripture recognises a science of dream-interpretation—of course bestowed from above. For instance, we learn from Dan. i. 17 that "God made Daniel understand all visions and dreams." (Cf. Gen. xl. 8: "Do not interpretations *belong to God?*" and Gen. xli. 16: "It is not in me; *God shall give Pharaoh an answer of peace.*")

II. The next important division of dreaming is the *Ethical*. According to the Preacher (Eccles. v. 3), "a dream cometh through the multitude of business;" and further, in the dream our subjectivity, innate and acquired, betrays itself in a natural *truthfulness*, which overpowers the restraint of outward impressions. And so the son of Sirach says (Ecclus. xxxiv. 3): τούτο κατὰ τούτων ὄρασις ἑνυπνίων κατέναντι προσώπου ὁμοιωμα προσώπου; *i.e.*, "The vision of dreams is the resemblance of one thing to another, even as the likeness of a face to a face." And not merely the constitution and contents of *the soul*, but also those of *the spirit*, come to view in the dream. What is the character of the dreamer? Is he of a fleshly or lustful tendency? Then we may say of him what St. Paul says of a dead man (so far as the actual sinning ceases) in his Epistle to the Romans (vi. 7): ὁ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας; *i.e.*, "The dead man has been *judicially* released—not from the charge or penalty—but from the power and capacity of sin." (Cf. Ecclus. xxvi. 29: οὐ δικαιοθήσεται κάπηλος ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας.) But as soon as ever the dreaming is made one with the sleep, *then* the spirit suffers and is degraded towards the soul; and from the soul's selfishness—selfish impulses—and unrest quickened by selfishness, all kinds of sinful images arise in it, which the dreamer is ashamed of when he awakens. And on account of them even the dreamer is sometimes disturbed by remorse on account of these images, and especially on account of those dreaming forms which emanate from sensual desires, which will be all the more unchaste and masterful the less the man strives against them in a waking state.¹ Our own consciences must agree with the judgment, and the whole of antiquity is unanimous in its condemnation of these filthy dreamers that defile the flesh (Jude 8). These lustful dreams show this very clearly—that the spirit has let go the reins of government over the body and its appetites.

III. The third important aspect of dreaming is the *spiritual*. Dreams may become the department and means of a direct

¹ Modern philosophy considers these lustful dreams as free from guilt; but Scripture unequivocally decides otherwise, and condemns the lustful dreamer as unclean for the ensuing day (Lev. xv. 16), and even banishes the soldier from the camp (Deut. xxiii. 10). Why? Because the spirit is disgraced in having lost its *royalty*.

and special intercourse between God and man; and in this view we may fairly divide dreams into (a) dreams of conscience and (b) dreams of revelation.

(a) *Dreams of Conscience.*—The witness of conscience may make itself objective, and in the dream-life may expand into inwardly perceptible transactions between God and man. For instance, we read in Genesis how God appeared threatening and warning Abimelech (xx.) and Laban (xxx.) by night in dreams; and the wife of Pontius Pilatus warned her husband against being concerned in the crucifixion of the Just One, by reason of the fright she had received in a dream: πολλὰ γὰρ ἔπαθον σήμερον κατ' ὄναρ δι' αὐτόν (Matt. xxvii. 19). Such an occurrence, with the purpose of settling the conviction of the sinfulness of man, is the vision of the night with the spirit's voice which Eliphaz the Temanite describes in Job iv. 12-21. And in chapter xxxiii. of that book, referring to Job's utterance in chapter vii., Elihu describes such experience of the sleeping man as may kindle repentance; e.g., "In a dream, in a vision of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, in slumberings upon the bed, then He uncovereth the ear of men, and sealeth warnings to them, to release man from crime, and to withdraw arrogance from man." Dreams, or even dreamlike visions, which overtake a man in the nightly perception, force upon him self-knowledge, self-consideration, and draw him back from the edge of the precipice. They stamp upon his heart indelibly the call to repentance, and seal the work of grace that brings him round by chastisement from destruction and ruin.

(b) *Dreams of Revelation.*—There are, moreover, dreams by which God's special will is made known to man by the voice of God Himself, or of an angel, in such a manner that it could not be known to him by God's written Word; and dreams, too, by means of which *future* events are made *present* to man; i.e., events, the foresight of which lies beyond the faculty of presentiment. But Holy Writ, which has throughout its pages and for its purpose a personal dealing of man with the personal God, lays claim to a recognition of such dreams of revelation as those in which God and man stand in presence of one another as *I* and *thou*. The Spirit of God, also, applies ideas and conceptions, which man has collected naturally during waking life, to give him a pertinent and forcible knowledge of the future, and even perhaps of eternity. The means of representation here is of course human, but the thing represented and its origin are divine.

Dreams which bear in themselves proof of their Divine origin are a link in the chain of the temporal working out of

the plan of redemption. Of such we find a great many in Scripture. For example, we may mention the dreams of Jacob in Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 12) and in Haran (Gen. xxxi. 10-13); the dream of Solomon in Gibeon (1 Kings iii. 5); the dreams of Joseph, the espoused husband of Mary (Matt. i. 2); the nightly visions of Paul (Acts xvi. 9; xviii. 9, etc.), if they were received by the Apostle during sleep. In those dreams that bear upon the manner of life, God is at times replying to sincere inquirers (1 Sam. xxviii. 6). And examples of dreams that concern the future are those of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel (Dan. ii., iv., vii., viii., x., etc.), and probably those of Pharaoh also (Gen. xli.).

No doubt waking visions must be distinguished from these prophetic dream-visions, since the seer—whether by day, as Ezekiel (viii. 1), or Daniel (x. 7), or Stephen (Acts vii. 55), or Peter (x. 9); or by night, as Zachariah (Luke i.), or Paul (Acts xvi. 9)—receives them in a waking state.

But Scripture is so fully conscious of, even in dreams, phantoms of the heart assuming the appearance of Divine revelation, that it distinctly warns us of them, and gives us the distinguishing criteria; (*e.g.*, Deut. xiii. 2; xviii. 20; Gal. i. 8). For that is the very blinding and deception of the false prophets, in whose dreams the fleshly wishes and hopes of the people whom they are beguiling are embodied (Jer. xxix. 8).

It is argued by Moses Amyraldus that all Divine communications by dreams carry with them their own authentication, as being self-discriminating from everything else. The dream and its Divine origin and sanction seem to have been given together in consciousness, so that there was no place left for the operation of the judgment—just as the wind and its direction are felt at one and the same time.

Again, it should be noticed that neither God nor good angel ever gave a dream which was not to answer some moral, didactic, benevolent, or grand economical purpose. The aimless prurience that would pry into futurity—the impertinent curiosity that irrationally set itself up as an end to itself, never received the slightest honour or encouragement, nor set in motion the meanest of the heavenly hierarchy. Amyraldus, paraphrasing and grouping together the tests given in the Bible, ruled that one proof of a dream's Divine origin was that it conveyed intimations of such things as it was competent for *God* only to know and to reveal. Of the aforementioned dreams it will be observed that they were not sent capriciously or without a purpose; and that, if not to the dreamer himself, then to some more worthy person, the solution of the dream was given at (for practical ends) the

same time as the dream itself. Further, they bore this Divine mark—that no rules of the *quasi-science* of interpretation could avail to detect their meaning. “God was His own interpreter,” and He Himself made clear their message and meaning.

And now, has God ceased to reveal Himself and His will by means of dreams? Of course, the question of power can only be answered in one way. The *unanimous* voice must be that He *could* so reveal Himself if He would. The *general* voice is that it is *possible* that He does. The *more restricted* opinion is that He *does*. And there is an inner circle of persons who profess to have personal evidence not of the possibility only, nor even of the probability, but of the actuality of such illuminations. And while in the endless and countless occurrence of dreams it would be strange if some did not come true—on the principle of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*—yet there is no room for the scorner to sit down and laugh at men who appeal to beneficial results in morals and religion as an evidence that dream-agency is not yet effete in the economy of God.

In conclusion, there may be—I believe there are—occasional dreams, which are specially sent for some purpose worthy of Him in Whose hands our life and all its operations are; but I feel persuaded that they are extremely rare, and when they come they carry with them their own *credentials*—their own convictions and their own lessons.

J. H. WHITEHEAD.

ALDERLEY EDGE,
MANCHESTER.

A Hymn of Patience.

JOB xxiii. 8-10.

STRANGELY He works ; I cannot trace
 His secret plan ;
 He hides it in some distant place
 From poor, weak man.
 Backward I look, or forward strain
 My weary eyes ;
 To right—to left—but all in vain ;
 No stars arise !
 'Tis dark behind me and before,
 Clouds ev'rywhere !
 My sorrow seemeth almost more
 Than I can bear :

But this of comfort have I still ;
 HE knoweth well
 The path I take ; good is His will ;
 I'll not rebel.
 Yea, as the gold through fire pass'd
 Doth brighter shine,
 And, dull at first, comes out at last
 Beauteous and fine,
 So is the soul, which God hath tried,
 No longer dim
 With earthly ore, but purified
 And fit for HIM.

W. S. S.

Short Notices.

Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion. Holden at Lambeth Palace in July, 1888. Encyclical Letter from the Bishops, with the Resolutions and Reports. Pp. 112. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

THE first six pages of this most interesting publication are occupied by lists of the one hundred and forty-five Bishops attending the Conference. Then follows the Letter, which opens thus: "To the Faithful in Christ Jesus, greeting,—We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church, in full communion with the Church of England, one hundred and forty-five in number, all having superintendence over Dioceses or lawfully commissioned to exercise Episcopal functions therein, assembled from divers parts of the earth, at Lambeth Palace, in the year of our Lord 1888, under the presidency of the Most Reverend Edward, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, after receiving in the Chapel of the said Palace the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, and uniting in prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have taken into consideration various questions which have been submitted to us affecting the welfare of God's people and the condition of the Church in divers parts of the world." The Resolutions and Reports we hope to notice hereafter.

Drake and the Dons. Stirring Tales of Armada Times, edited and arranged by RICHARD LOVETT, M.A., with portraits, maps and illustrations. The Religious Tract Society.

A good prize or gift-book.

The Last Journals of Bishop Hannington. Narratives of A Journey through Palestine in 1884, and A Journey through Masai-Land and U-soga in 1885. Edited by E. C. DAWSON, M.A. Seeley.

We heartily recommend this interesting book ; the "journals" are admirably edited. The illustrations are from the Bishop's own sketches, and there is a good Map.

Confirmation: its origin, history, and spiritual benefits, is a reprint (Nisbet and Co.) from Major Seton Churchill's "Church Ordinances from a Layman's Standpoint."

The Toleration Act of 1689, an historical essay, by Dr. Philip Schaff (Nisbet and Co.), is well worth reading.

We have pleasure in inviting attention to the *Forty-fifth Annual Report of the Church of England Sunday School Institute*. We quote one of the closing paragraphs. The *Report* says: "Taking, then, a wide survey of the whole Sunday-school field, at home and abroad, the Committee have been enabled to refer to many signs of encouragement which the outlook suggests. The Sunday-school has increased in popularity, much ground has been covered, large numbers have been brought under Sunday-school influence, the teaching has become more efficient, the literature and apparatus have improved, and an earnest and hopeful spirit continues to animate the workers all along the line."

The Power behind the Pope, by Dr. William Wright, author of "The Empire of the Hittites," a really interesting pamphlet (Nisbet and Co.), tells "a tale of blighted hopes." Reference was made in a recent CHURCHMAN to the fact that M. Lasserre's translation of the Gospels, to which the Archbishop of Paris had given his *imprimatur*, was condemned. About a year ago, the Pope had sent his benediction.

The frontispiece to the *Art Journal* of August is an original etching of Stirling Castle, by Mr. J. MacWhirter, A.R.A. "With the camera from Lechlade to Oxford" is very good, so is "Japan and its Art Wares;" but we are especially pleased with a well-illustrated article on Christ's Hospital.

In the *Church Worker* appears an article headed "The Church in the Village," by the Rev. Canon Overton. We quote a portion: "The 'battle of the Church,' it has been recently said, 'must be fought in our country villages.' Thirty or forty years ago the cry was, 'The battle of the Church must be fought in our great towns.' . . . I would submit that the very great difficulties which beset Church work in an average country village are not quite sufficiently appreciated. . . . The first of these difficulties is want of elbow-room. In many villages the supply of places of worship, such as they are, exceeds the demand, which is rarely the case in towns. The consequence is that there is a hot competition for the bodies, or perhaps I should rather say the souls, of individuals, which is terribly daunting to the poor parson. Then, again, want of sympathy is a hindrance which the clergyman feels much more in the country than he does in towns. In a town there will always be a certain number who will gravitate, as it were, towards the Church; but you cannot count upon this in a village. In fact, sometimes country villages seem to value the clergyman for everything except the one thing he is sent to the parish for. He is the first person to whom they have recourse in their temporal concerns; the last in their spiritual. . . . Another difficulty may sound paradoxical, but it is a very real one. It is want of occupation. The town clergyman has his work cut out for him, and is kept up to the mark by the mere force of circumstances; but the country clergyman cannot help having much enforced leisure, and there is consequently a terrible danger of his becoming secularized, to which he would not have been exposed if his lot had been cast in a larger sphere of labour. . . . I began by speaking of the altered conditions under which we have to work. In old times, in many cases the church was filled in this way: the landlord expected his tenants to go to church almost as a condition of their tenure; and farmers, in the curious phraseology of my old part of Lincolnshire, 'hired their labourers to go to church'! This, of course, was a patent way of manufacturing Churchmen by habit, but was it equally successful in producing Churchmen by conviction?—and this is surely what we want to aim at."

THE MONTH.

PARLIAMENT adjourned on the 13th until November 6th. Mr. Ritchie's Local Government Bill, a really great achievement, and Mr. Goschen's Conversion Bill, represent very successful labour. The three Special Commissioners appointed under the Members of Parliament (Charges and Allegations) Bill have met and settled the preliminary proceedings. Mr. Parnell is going to bring an action for libel against the *Times*, in Scotland.

The Oaths Bill has been read a third time in the House of Commons. Mr. Bradlaugh has shown readiness to meet reasonable objections.

The Royal Commission on Elementary Education has presented its final Report. The *Guardian* says: "Its appearance cannot, we fear, be regarded as marking in any sense the close of a controversy. Rather, it will hereafter be regarded as the beginning of strife. The assailants on opposite sides of the compromise of 1870 have now taken up their several positions, and it only remains for those who regard that compromise as on the whole the best that can be devised to make as stout a fight as they can in defence of it."

The third Lambeth Conference¹ was brought to a close by a special service at St. Paul's Cathedral. The sermon (of great power) was preached by the Archbishop of York.

To the See of Oxford, vacant by the resignation of Bishop Mackarness, has been translated Dr. Stubbs, Bishop of Chester.

The Bishop of Lincoln's case came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, Sir Horace Davey, Q.C., and Dr. Tristram, Q.C., appearing for the petitioners. The Lord Chancellor said their lordships were of opinion that the Archbishop had jurisdiction in the case. They were also of opinion that the abstaining by the Archbishop from entertaining the suit was a matter of appeal to her Majesty. They desired to express no opinion whatever whether the Archbishop had or had not a discretion whether he would issue the citation. Their lordships would humbly advise her Majesty to remit the case to the Archbishop, to be dealt with according to law.²

¹ The Bishop of Liverpool writes to the *Record* touching the Encyclical Letter. The Bishop says: "One glaring defect, however, in the Encyclical I cannot refrain from deploring. That defect is the conspicuous absence of any reference to the 'unhappy divisions' about the doctrine and Ritual of the Lord's Supper which are at this moment convulsing the Church of England, and will certainly bring on disruption and disestablishment unless they are healed. The existence and formidable nature of these divisions it is vain to deny. To my eyes they are of cardinal importance, and appear to require far more attention than the condition of the Scandinavian or Greek Churches, or the Old Catholic movement. Some expression of humble regret for these divisions, some strong desire for properly-defined conditions of peace, some proposal to attempt the restoration of godly discipline and the creation of satisfactory Ecclesiastical Courts, some bold declaration that, with the utmost degree of toleration, our Church will never re-admit the mass and auricular confession, or go behind the Reformation—a few plain statements of this kind would have immensely improved the Encyclical, greatly strengthened the Church of England, and cheered the hearts of myriads of loyal Churchmen."

² The assessors present on the second day were five (thus corresponding in number to the committee who were hearing the case)—namely, the Bishop of London (Dr. Temple), the Bishop of Ely (Lord Alwyne Compton), the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. Wordsworth), the Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Moorhouse), and the Bishop of Sodor

In an able article the *Record* says :

The decision of the Privy Council that the Archbishop of Canterbury has jurisdiction to entertain complaints of ecclesiastical offences made against Bishops, and consequently that he is bound to consider and deal with the representation recently preferred against the Bishop of Lincoln for superstitious practices, is without doubt the most important event in the long Ritual struggle which has happened for many years past. After very elaborate argument on behalf of the complainants, the Bishop of Lincoln declining to be represented and so not being heard, the Judicial Committee . . . have remitted the case to the Archbishop with a direction that it must be dealt with according to law. Their Lordships have followed what is practically the unique precedent of *Lucy v. Bishop of St. David's*. In that case, which happened soon after the Revolution, Bishop Watson was proceeded against for simony and other grave offences, and ultimately was deprived of his Bishopric by the Archbishop of Canterbury ; but before that end was reached, the Bishop tried every conceivable means of defence, and took every possible objection to the jurisdiction of the Court that tried him, appealing to the Common Law Courts, moving repeatedly for Prohibitions, and in fact anticipating completely the ingenious policy by which of late years the English Church Union has sought to procure immunity for illegal ritual. . . . It is being asked with some eagerness what is the next step? Has the Primate a veto? Can he refuse to issue the citation which would bring the suit formally before him? The veto is a statutory invention which does not apply to this jurisdiction over Bishops, but whether the Primate possesses any, and if so, what discretion to proceed or to refuse to proceed, is a matter on which it would be rash to speak hastily. . . . It seems most probable, therefore, that in one shape or another the merits of the case against Bishop King will be investigated, and that the long-deferred desire of the Church Association to make a Bishop amenable to law will be accomplished.

We record with regret the decease of the Very Rev. J. W. Burgon, Dean of Chichester. In an admirable sermon in the Cathedral, referring to the lamented Dean, the Bishop of Chichester said :

"I should deem it little less than presumption to say anything in the nature of eulogy towards one better than myself, but this I firmly believe, he lived very near to God. He was a faithful and most attached member of this branch of the Church, which, by the signal mercy of God, stands prominent and stable in the land. In this respect, as indeed in most other respects, he was in perfect accord with his predecessor, Dean Hook, whose name and services must be treasured with profit not only in this city and diocese, but throughout the Church of England at home and abroad. I do not compare the two men, for they had very different gifts and qualities, but they agreed in their views of the true position of the Church of England, which is at once Reformed, Protestant, and Catholic ; Reformed and Protestant as purged from error and superstition ; Catholic as adhering to the faith once delivered to the Apostles, and as reflecting the voice of antiquity. Both held this doctrine, not as a mere matter of speculation and opinion, but as a truth for which, if needs had been, they would either of them have bled and died. There could never be a doubt as to Dean Burgon's sincerity. It was written in his very looks, and it found expression in his words and in his writings on all occasions. . . . From the earliest days of his ministry he gave himself wholly to that great work ; he prepared himself by careful, unwearied, and methodical study to be a teacher of others. He had many tastes, many accomplishments which might have carried away a less resolute man, but with high ideas of duty he was content to use his life for this one thing, and, true to his course and to the service of his Lord, he lived laborious days—yea, and spent laborious nights—in the study of His sacred Word. No part of his character was more remarkable than his intense reverence for the Word of God. He might take to himself the words of David, when he said, 'Lord, what love have I unto Thy Word ; all the day long is my study in it.'"

The Dean's paper on "The Days of Creation," in *THE CHURCHMAN*, will be fresh in the recollection of many of our readers. He had promised us some recollections of Egypt, and a supplementary paper on the Revised Version ; but his health, owing to excessive application, had been for some time failing. We pay our tribute of deep respect.

and Man (Dr. Bardsley). The members of the judicial committee were the same as before—namely, the Lord Chancellor (Lord Halsbury), Lord Hobhouse, the late Lord Chancellor (Lord Herschell), Lord Macnaghten, and Sir Barnes Peacock.