

NOTES ON GENESIS.

26. *Let Us make.*—I have already commented on the use of the plural. It must be confessed that it is difficult to understand why the plural should be used in only a few passages in the O.T., and why it should occur in the particular passages in which we meet with it. Here indeed the solemnity of the occasion may account for its use. The creation of man is not only the last in an ascending series of creative acts, it is something more: it is the meeting-point between the world and God, between the intelligent creature, as the representative of all created things, and the Creator. Man, in the words of Theodoret, is the connecting link, the bond which ties together all creation (*σύνδεσμος πάντων*). Hence now for the first and only time in the narrative the Creator speaks of *Himself*. Before it is always "Let some *thing*—light, vegetation, animals,—come into being"; now it is God taking counsel with Himself. "Let Us make."

Of the passages already quoted in which the plural form occurs, chap. iii. 22 presents the most difficulty. I hope to discuss it in the note on that verse.

Man (Heb. *adam*), the genus *homo*, the race as such, not the individual man, as is plain from the plural which follows, "let *them* have dominion," and again in the next verse: "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He *him*; male and female created He *them*."

In Our image.—See excursus below. The rule and lordship here given to man over all the other creatures of God's hand, though not the very image itself, are an immediate consequence of his bearing the Divine image. *Let them have dominion*: literally, "let them trample upon." The word is a genuine old Hebrew word, and in the sense of "ruling" is unknown in Aramaic, and is only rarely found

in the later language of the Targums and the Talmud. In the enumeration which follows of the different classes of creatures, tenants respectively of the water, the air, and the earth, the insertion of the words, "and over all the earth," between "the cattle" and "the creeping things" is certainly strange; and it has been conjectured that the word *chayath* has dropped out, and that we ought to read "over all [the beasts of] the earth." The emendation is plausible, though it has not the support of any of the ancient versions, except the Peshito. It has been urged indeed that the words are necessary to denote [that man's lordship is over inanimate as well as animate nature; but if this is intended, it is difficult to understand why they are interposed between the cattle and the creeping thing; they would more naturally have stood at the end of the verse.

27. *So God created man in His own image,
in the image of God created He him ;
male and female created He them.*

The outburst of joy in the thought of man's creation, and high destiny and sovereign power, the crown on his head, and the sceptre in his hand, and royalty on his brow, in his look, and in his gait, finds expression in rhythmic cadence. The language falls into a triplet, with the repetition characteristic of Hebrew poetry, though what we have here is not formal poetry, but the involuntary, spontaneous poetry of exalted religious feeling.

Compare the similar statement in chap. v. 1, 2, where the Elohist writer resumes his narrative :

"In the day that God created man,
in the likeness of God made He him ;
male and female created He them."

Nothing is said in these verses to indicate what the view of the sacred writer was as to the number of human beings originally created. He makes no direct statement on the subject. They may have been many pairs, or a single pair.

The expression, "male and female created He them," may refer only to the distinction of sexes, and not to the fact that only a single pair was created. The next document however clearly implies the creation of a single pair and the descent of the human race from them, and there is nothing here to contradict the inference. In fact, as all the ancient cosmogonies represent mankind as descended from a single pair, it is natural to suppose, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that this was the writer's belief. But his object is not to insist upon this, which would probably be taken for granted, but rather on the fact that man is created in the Divine image, and with the original differences of the sexes (see Matt. xix. 4), in opposition to some of the heathen cosmogonies, which taught an androgynous, or hermaphrodite, origin of the race; and that consequently in their relation to God, and as partakers in likeness to Him, all men are equal. It has been argued that, in the case of the lower animals, at all events, the creation of more than a single pair may not only be gathered from the narrative, but was imperatively necessary for the preservation of the species, inasmuch as they prey upon one another, and would infallibly have destroyed one another, unless the numbers of the different species had been sufficient to insure their preservation. But this consideration did not exist in the view of the writer. According to him, animals were not carnivorous in their primitive condition (see ver. 30). They lived, like man himself, on vegetables; and consequently there was no risk of the extinction of the different species.

28. The blessing here pronounced on man runs in very similar terms to the blessing pronounced in ver. 22 on fishes and birds; only here man is not merely to *fill* the earth, as the fish are to *fill* the sea, he is also to *subdue* it, and to have dominion over all the other creatures of God's hand. "The earth hath He given to the children of men" (Ps. cxv. 16).

This the first commandment to man is given in the form of a blessing. "Hereby this became the primary law of man's condition upon earth, a law which, like the other laws of Nature—the Lawgiver being Himself the Maker and Fashioner of that to which the law was given, fulfilled itself; so firmly and indelibly was it wrought into the essential instincts of man's being, and into the permanent necessities of his condition."

29. Following the Divine command to "replenish the earth," there comes the Divine provision for human sustenance. This Divine word does not, like those that went before, introduce a creative act. *Behold*. Attention is drawn to a new circumstance. God is not the God of creation only, but the God of providence. *I have given*. Man's life and destiny are not at the mercy of chance or fate, they are part of a Divine order. The food assigned to men (ver. 29) and to other animals (ver. 30) is entirely vegetable. To men are given as their food all plants bearing *seed*—i.e. cereals and leguminous plants—and all that bear *fruit*; to the other animals "every green herb," an expression which seems to be the equivalent of the word rendered "grass" (ver. 12), which however, as we have seen, has a much wider meaning, including all vegetation not comprised in the enumeration of ver. 29. The phrase "green herb" (lit. "greenness of herb") only occurs once again (chap. ix. 3). Nothing is said of other kinds of food which did not involve the taking of life, such as milk and honey for men, and grain for birds and beasts, the object being merely to show that the original order did not contemplate the use of animal food.

It must be confessed that it is very difficult to reconcile the statement in ver. 30, in its plain and obvious sense, with our knowledge and observation. Whatever may have been the case with man, who may have subsisted originally only on vegetable diet, it is certain that there were carnivorous

animals in the geological periods, and that these preyed upon one another precisely as the same species or their successors do now. Their very conformation, the structure of their jaws, teeth, stomach, etc., shows that this was intended in their creation; and the destruction of some species would be necessary for the preservation of others. But the truth is, the writer's point of view is ideal. He has no concern with a state of things of which he could have had no possible knowledge. His eye is fixed on the original paradisaical condition of things, when man and the inferior animals lived in perfect harmony and peace together. To him it did not seem that the dominion given to man implied that he was at liberty to take the life of the animals he ruled, for his own subsistence or enjoyment. This is the important matter. Animal food can only be had at the cost of animal life, and the taking of animal life was a breach of the Divine order, which from the beginning provides only for the continuance and sustenance of life. No hint is given anywhere in this majestic story of creation of any possible interruption of its course; there is no jarring note of discord, there is no vision, no shadow of death. Life, love, peace, order, perfection—this, according to the earliest records (Gen. i. and ii.), was the original constitution of the world. "And it was so," says the writer (ver. 30) as if to emphasize this original condition of things, as if to mark it as a Divine ordinance.

Immediately after the Fall however we meet with the taking of animal life: first, as a Divine act for the clothing of Adam and Eve (chap. iii. 21); and again as offered in sacrifice by Abel with the Divine approval. But it is not till much later, in the covenant with Noah after the flood, that the use of animal food is expressly permitted. "Every moving thing that liveth shall be food for you; as the green herb have I given you all" (chap. ix. 3): the only restriction put upon the use of meat being that the blood

is not to be eaten : " But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat " (chap. ix. 4).

This primitive abstinence from animal food is in accordance with the traditions of other nations. So Plato (*Legg.* vi. 782) speaks of a time when animals did not devour one another, as they do now, when beef was unknown as an article of food, when no animal was even offered in sacrifice to a god. Then men fed on fruits and cakes and honey, and brought them as pure sacrifices to the gods ; when they considered it a sin either to eat flesh themselves or to pollute the altars with blood ; when they partook freely of things without life, but abstained from things with life. Similar testimonies will be found in Diog. Laert. viii. 1, 12; Plut., *Symph.* viii. 8, 3 ; so too Ovid (*Met.* i. 103-106 ; xv. 96, etc ; *Fasti* i. 337, etc.) speaks of a golden age when men lived only on fruits and vegetables, and offered only unbloody sacrifices to the gods ; and Virgil (*Georg.* i. 130) represents even the beasts of prey as not originally carnivorous. Compare Pope's *Essay on Man* iii. 152, etc. :

" Man walk'd with beast, joint tenant of the shade ;
The same his table, and the same his bed ;
No murder cloth'd him, and no murder fed.

The shrine with gore unstain'd, with gold undrest,
Unbrib'd, unbloody, stood the blameless priest ;
Heaven's attribute was universal care,
And Man's prerogative to rule, but spare."

The Brahmans, the Buddhists, and other Eastern sects, were strict vegetarians (Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* i. 788-793) ; and Pythagoras enjoined a vegetable diet upon his disciples, forbidding them to take animal life under any pretence, except for their own safety when they were attacked by wild beasts. (See Ovid, *Met.* xv. 75-142.)

In the Old Testament Scriptures themselves a return to the primitive condition of perfect harmony and peace is to be the blessing of the Messianic age. In the glowing

language of the prophets, then too, as at the first, "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; . . . and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. . . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain" (Isa. xi. 5-9; lxxv. 25).

31. As before (vers. 10, 12, 18, 21, 25), we have the expression of the Divine satisfaction at several stages of the creative work, so now in the survey of the whole, "God saw everything that He had made"; and instead of the simple expression, "God saw that it was good," we have now the more emphatic, "And, *behold*, it was *very good*." (On "behold" see above, ver. 29.) It is a little remarkable that the words of approval do not follow the creation of man, but are reserved for the final retrospect. Thus the sixth day ends. The note of joy which has sounded all through the chapter swells at the close into its richest, fullest expression, because now in all its parts and in their marvelous combination and mutual adaptation the beauty and perfection of the whole, as revealing and reflecting in the highest degree the wisdom and love of the Creator, are seen. "Jehovah rejoiceth in His works"; and the creation mirrors His joy. So of the eternal Wisdom it is said (Prov. viii. 30) that it was

" Rejoicing always before Him ;
Rejoicing in His habitable earth."

In the lyric echo of this story in Psalm civ. there is the same note of gladness and exultation, as though even sin (ver. 35) and death (vers. 29, 30) could not mar or dim the glorious harmony of God's world as it presented itself in its untroubled beauty to the poet's eye.

Taylor Lewis, in his note on Lange's *Commentary*, refers to a passage in Plato's *Timæus*

"so remarkable, that it is no wonder that some should have regarded it as a traditional echo of this old account. At the completion of the

great cosmical ζῶον, the animated universe, with its body and soul (its nature), both of which Plato represents as the works of God, He (God) beholds it moving on in its beautiful constancy, an image of the eternal powers or ideas. At the sight of this, the everlasting Father (ὁ αἰδιος πατήρ) is filled with joy and admiration (εὐφραυνθεὶς ἠγάσθη)—the strongest terms to express such an emotion that could be found in the Greek language. There seems too to be implied in both expressions, the Hebrew and the Greek, the emotion of love, and this as it were reciprocal—the kosmos responding and moving on through a principle of attraction rather than of projection or outward mechanical forces.”

He quotes also the κωεῖ ὡς ἐρωμένον of Aristotle (*Metaph.* xi. [xii.] 7), describing the first principle of motion in the heaven, as it proceeds from the first mover. And he justly observes that :

“with all the splendour of Plato’s language in the *Timæus*, there is still lurking about it his besetting inconsistency—the thought of something evil, eternal in itself and inseparable from matter and from nature. It may be said that the great problem of evil seems to haunt some of our best commentators in their exegesis of this passage. They find here an implied reference to future evil. All is *yet* good, they would have it to mean; and so they regard it as a *Verwahrung*, or defence of God against the authorship of evil (see Delitzsch). This mars the glory of the passage. It is simply a burst of admiration and benediction called out by the Creator surveying His works. The anthropomorphism is for us its power and its beauty, which are lessened by any such supposed hint or protestation.”

With this story of creation should be compared more especially Psalm civ., together with Psalms viii. and xix., and many passages in Psalms xxxiii., cxlv., cxlvi., cxlvii., cxlviii. ; Job xxvi., xxxviii., xxxix. ; Prov. viii. 22–31.

CHAPTER II. 1–3.

It was an unfortunate division of chapters which separated these verses from the first chapter, to which they properly belong. The seventh day of rest cannot be separated from the six days of creative labour. They are closely united by the continuance of the narrative with the

simple copula, "And the heaven and the earth were finished."

1. *All the host of them.*—In this passage only is the word "host" applied to the earth; elsewhere it is used of the heavens as denoting either the stars or the angels (1 Kings xxii. 19; Josh. v. 14, 15; cf. Ps. ciii. 21). For "host" of the earth, we find in other places "the earth and the fulness thereof" (Ps. xxiv. 1); or as in Nehemiah ix. 6, "the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all things that are therein."

2. *Ended*, better "finished." It is the same word as in the previous verse.

On the seventh day. For this the Samaritan, the LXX., and Peshito have "the sixth day," a reading which is found also in the Book of Jubilee and Bereshith Rabba, cap. 9, and which Jerome notices, no doubt a correction intended to avoid the difficulty of supposing that the creative work extended into the seventh day. If God finished His work on the seventh day, that day could not have been a day of absolute rest. Others would render the verb in the pluperfect, "On the seventh day God had finished His work"—a very doubtful rendering. Others again take the verb in a somewhat different sense from that which it has in ver. 1, and render, "God came to an end with His work," *i.e.* ceased from it,—a sense which the verb has, though with a different construction, in Exod. xxxiv. 33, 1 Sam. x. 13. But the truth is, the writer merely regards the rest and the completion of the work as one and the same thing.

God rested from His work.—From the word here rendered "rested," lit. *ceased* (from labour), comes our word "sabbath." Words still more expressive of rest are used in Exodus xx. 11 and xxxi. 17, "rested and was refreshed," a striking anthropomorphism. Dillmann argues that this seventh day cannot mean the whole period extending inde-

finitely from the original six days of creative activity to the end of the world. God is still working, still upholding all things by the word of His power, still actively engaged in the administration of the world, and therefore not still enjoying His sabbath rest; and he contends therefore that the writer supposes God's sabbath to have intervened between the two periods of creative activity and providential activity, between the original creation of all things and the present ordering and administration of the same. But this does not explain the remarkable circumstance that the seventh day, unlike the six days, has no close; it is not said, "There was evening and there was morning, the seventh day";¹ and the words of our Lord (John v. 17) clearly point the other way. His argument is that good works may be done on the sabbath by man, because God works on His sabbath. (See my notes on ver. 5.) This is the noblest conception of rest, not a dull stagnation, but a happy employment, without effort and without weariness, of all our powers and capacities; as Aristotle finely says: *ἡ τελεία εὐδαιμονία θεωρητικὴ τις ἐστὶν ἐνεργεία*, "the perfect blessedness is a contemplative energy" (*Ethic. Nic.* x. 8, 7). Such surely is "the sabbath keeping" which remaineth for the people of God (Heb. iv. 9): a rest from wearisome toil, but not from joyous, beneficent occupation.

3. *Blessed the seventh day.* "The perfecting of the work on the seventh day is something positive; namely, that God celebrated His work (kept a holy day of solemn triumph over it), and blessed the sabbath. To *celebrate*, to *bless*, to *consecrate*, is the finishing sabbath-work—a living, active, priestly doing, and not merely a laying aside of action" (Lange).

¹ Dillmann tries to account for this by saying that the sabbath being reckoned from evening to evening, the formula would not be suitable. He forgets that in the case of the other days he has himself argued that the Jewish mode of reckoning the days is not employed here, but the Babylonian, which reckoned from morning to morning.

And sanctified it.—Set it apart for holy uses. It is the same word which is used in both versions of the ten commandments (Exod. xx. 8, 11; Deut. v. 12). In Exodus xx. 11, this the original setting apart of the day is referred to as the ground of the Mosaic institution: “Wherefore Jehovah blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it” (A.V. by an unnecessary change, “hallowed”). Without entering into any discussion of the large and vexed question of sabbatical obligation and observance, it must be admitted that the setting apart and consecrating of a seventh portion of time is part of a Divine order, and has its root in the very constitution of the world. Man can have no higher example than that which is to be found in the Divine nature itself.

EXCURSUS ON THE CREATION OF MAN IN THE IMAGE OF GOD.

WHAT are we to understand by this “image” and “likeness” of God after which man is created? Wherein does it consist? The Greek Fathers, misled probably by the rendering of the LXX.—which by inserting the copula made a distinction between the “image” (*εἰκών*) and the “likeness” (*ὁμοίωσις*) which as we have seen does not exist in the Hebrew—interpreted the former of the physical being of man, his natural qualities and endowments; and the latter of his moral and spiritual nature, or, rather, of superadded gifts of grace, the original righteousness which was lost by the Fall. Augustine and others of the Fathers following him have developed this notion. Retaining the Aristotelian division of a tripartite nature in man, they hold that the “image” of God is to be sought in the powers of the mind, the memory, the understanding, the will. Even those natural faculties which are to be found in all men have their counterpart in the relations which

subsist between the Persons of the blessed Trinity.¹ But the "likeness" is a kind of perfecting of the "image," a work of grace that crowns and completes nature. Thus the memory is adorned by hope, the understanding by faith, the will by love. Others again make the memory the image of God's power, the mind of His wisdom, the will of His righteousness, etc. There is however no ground for the subtle distinction between the two words "image" and "likeness," or for the doctrinal system which has been built up upon it. But if we are to seek for a trinity in man which shall in any way correspond to, or be an adumbration of, the Divine Trinity, it would be better to say that the image and similitude of God consists (1) in the power of originating, in the power to will, and the power to act, not merely from lower impulse, but with deliberate forethought and adaptation of means to ends, the power which corresponds most nearly, though of course in an infinitely lower degree, to the creative will in God; (2) in the faculty of articulate speech, the utterance of the will, the communication of thought to others, the expression of counsel, purpose, and the like, which answers to the creative word of God, the *λόγος προφορικός*, as distinguished from the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*; (3) in the power of influence, subtle, far-reaching, mysterious, inexplicable, but real, corresponding in its measure to that of the eternal Spirit.

Thus it may be said that the image and likeness of God in man is a veritable adumbration of the ever-blessed Trinity; of the creative energy and will of the Father; of

¹ Augustine, *De Trinitate*, lib. x.: "Hæc igitur tria, memoria, intelligentia, voluntas, quoniam non sunt tres vitæ, sed una vita; nec tres mentes, sed una mens: consequenter utique nec tres substantiæ sunt, sed una substantia" (§ 18). In the previous book he had made a different suggestion. He finds there the trinity in man which is God's image to consist in the mind, the knowledge which the mind has of itself, and the love wherewith it loves itself and the knowledge of itself.

the mediating Word, in whom and by whom all things have their being; of the all-encompassing, all-pervading Spirit, whose secret impulses sway human hearts and wills.

Perhaps however this is to refine too much, and Luther may be right when he says, referring to the patristic speculations: "Sicut autem hæ non injucundæ speculationes arguunt acuta et otiosa ingenia, ita minime faciunt ad imaginem Dei recte explicandam." It is perfectly certain that the Hebrews did not suppose this likeness to God to consist in any physical qualities. It is the doctrine of the O.T. as well as of the New that God is a spirit; and, although He may have manifested Himself to men in human or angelic shape, He has no visible form, and cannot and must not be represented by any. "Thou sawest no form or similitude" (Exod. xx. 4; cf. Deut. iv. 12, 15; Isa. xxxi. 3). The image does not, directly at least, denote external appearance; we must look for the resemblance to God chiefly in man's spiritual nature and spiritual endowments, in his freedom of will, in his self-consciousness, in his reasoning power, in his sense of that which is above nature, the good, the true, the eternal; in his conscience, which is the voice of God within him; in his capacity for knowing God and holding communion with Him; in a word, in all that allies him to God, all that raises him above sense and time and merely material considerations, all that distinguishes him from, and elevates him above, the brutes. So the writer of the apocryphal Book of Wisdom says: "God created man to be immortal, and made him an image of His own eternity" (ii. 23).

On the other hand, that this Divine image expresses itself and is seen in man's outward form cannot be denied. In looks, in bearing, in the conscious dignity of rule and dominion, there is a reflection of this Divine image. St. Augustine tries to make out a trinity in the human body, as before in the human mind, which shall correspond in

its measure to the Divine Trinity. Nevertheless he says modestly :

“Let us endeavour to trace in man’s outward form some kind of footstep of the Trinity, not because it is of itself in the same way (as the inward being) the image of God. For the apostle says expressly that it is the inner man that is renewed after the image of Him that created him; and again, ‘Though the outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day.’ Let us then look as far as it is possible in that which perisheth for a kind of likeness to the Trinity; and if not one more express, at least one that may be more easily discerned. The very term outward man denotes a certain similitude to the inward man.”

Augustine then elaborates the notion of a trinity in man’s body as well as in his mind at considerable length (*De Trin.* xi.). Subsequently however he says that “not only the truth of reason, but the authority of the apostle decides that man is made after the image of God, not in his bodily form, but in his reasonable mind; for it would be a degrading thought to suppose that God is limited and circumscribed by the configuration of bodily members.” And he quotes Ephesians iv. 22, “the new man which is created after God,” and Colossians iii. 9, 10, “the new man which is renewed after the image of Him who created him,” in proof that not in his body, nor in any of his mental faculties, but in the reasonable mind itself, in which he can know God, man is made after the image of Him who created him” (lib. xii. § 12).

But the truth is that we cannot cut man in two. The inward being and the outward have their correspondences and their affinities, and it is of the compound being man, fashioned of the dust of the earth and yet filled with the breath of God, that it is declared that he was created after the image of God. The ground and source of this his prerogative in creation must be sought in the Incarnation. It is this great mystery which lies at the root of man’s being. He is like God, he is created in the image of God,

he is, in St. Paul's words, the "image and glory of God" (1 Cor. xi. 7), because the Son of God took man's nature in the womb of His virgin mother, thereby uniting for ever the manhood and the Godhead in one adorable Person. This was the Divine purpose before the world was, and hence this creation of man was the natural consummation of all God's work.

This image of God is not limited to man's original condition merely as he came first from the hands of his Maker, nor has it been obliterated by the Fall. (In one sense likeness to God seems to have been the consequence of the Fall. "Behold, the man is become as one of Us, to know good and evil," chap. iii. 22.) The statement that man was created in the image of God is repeated when the Elohist narrative is resumed in chap. v. 1, 2, "In the likeness of God made He him," etc., and then we are told in the next verse that Adam begat a son "in his own likeness, after his image"; but that this does not mean that the Divine image is lost and the human image substituted for it, is plain from the statement in ix. 6, where sentence of death is pronounced on the murderer on the very ground that "in the image of God made He man."

The form of expression, "image of God," in the O.T. is confined to the Elohist. The same idea is differently expressed for instance in the eighth Psalm, "Thou hast made him little lower than God"; and there, in the same way as here, there follows the lordship over creation :

"Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of
Thy hands ;

Thou hast put all things under his feet ;

Sheep and oxen all of them, yea, and the beasts of the
field ;

The fowls of heaven, and the fishes of the sea," etc.

The apocryphal writers, the Son of Sirach and the author of the Book of Wisdom, have freely reproduced and com-

mented on the Genesis passage. See Wisdom ii. 23, ix. 1-3; Ecclesiasticus xvii. 1-4. The latter passage especially, "And (the Lord) made them (man) according to His image, and put the fear of man upon all flesh, and gave him dominion over beasts and fowls," is clearly based upon Genesis. In the New Testament there is the same acknowledgement of man's glory and prerogative as made in the image of God. See 1 Corinthians xi. 7 and compare James iii. 9, "men which are made after the similitude of God." Elsewhere however as in Colossians iii. 10, Ephesians iv. 24, St. Paul implies that the image, though not obliterated, has been marred and defaced, and that an inward renewal is necessary, a renewal "in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." So too in the First Epistle to the Corinthians xv., he introduces a contrast between "the image of the earthy" and "the image of the heavenly." The first is evidently, according to his view, the nature derived from Adam (see Gen. v. 3); the second is that of the new nature imparted through Christ and by virtue of union with Him.

It is not a little remarkable that St. Paul in one passage (1 Cor. xi. 7) seems to limit the assertion made in Genesis i. 26, 27, to one sex. According to him apparently, it is not the race, but the man, as distinct from the woman, who is the image of God. Speaking of the public worship of the Church, he says: "For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man." St. Augustine sees and deals with the difficulty, which is passed over by too many modern commentators. In Genesis, he remarks, it is human nature itself, which is said to be made in the image of God, which comprises both sexes, and not to the exclusion of the woman. For it is said, "He made him male and female," or, according to another pointing, "male and female made He them."

How is it then, he asks, that the apostle teaches that the man is not to veil his head because he is the image of God, whereas the woman is enjoined to do the contrary? And he argues, that the woman together with her husband is the image of God, and that the whole is one image; but that when she is regarded as occupying her subordinate position as a helpmeet, a position which is hers exclusively, she is not the image of God; whereas the man alone is the image of God as fully and perfectly as he is when united with the woman. And he draws an illustration from the nature of the human mind, which, so long as it is occupied with the absolute contemplation of the truth, is the image of God, but when it turns aside to contemplate inferior objects is not the image of God (*De Trinitate* xii., §§ 9, 10).

Again, quoting Colossians iii. 9, 10: "The new man which is renewed unto the knowledge of God, after the image of Him that created him," he observes that "by this renewal we are also made sons of God by the baptism of Christ and putting on the new man we now put on Christ by faith." Who then, he asks, could refuse to women any share in this blessedness, seeing that they are heirs together with us of grace? For the Apostle says: "Ye are all the sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For whosoever of you were baptized in Christ did put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

St. Paul however is not interpreting Genesis, though he seems to be alluding to it; he is only insisting on the relative position of the sexes, especially in the public congregation, and he regards the veil as a symbol of subordination; and he departs in two particulars from the language of Genesis: he does not say that the man is made *in* the image, but that he is the image of God; and, further, he

adds that he is "the glory" of God, a very remarkable addition. In the next clause, when speaking of the woman, he drops all reference to "the image," and merely says that the woman is "the glory" of the man. She is not man's "image," but, like man, was created in the image of God.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

SURVEY OF RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—To Introduction the chief contribution of the last few months is a second volume of the Oxford *Studia Biblica* (Clarendon Press). We are obliged to postpone fuller notice of this collection of papers, and to content ourselves with enumerating those which concern the New Testament. These are, "The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels," by Mr. F. H. Woods; "The Day and Year of St. Polycarp's Martyrdom," by Mr. C. H. Turner; "The Clementine Homilies," by Dr. Bigg; "The Evidence of the Early Versions and Patristic Quotations on the Text of the Books of the New Testament," by Mr. Bebb; "The Ammonian Sections, Eusebian Canons, and Harmonizing Tables in the Syriac Tetra-evangelium," by Mr. Gwilliam; and "On the Codex Amiatinus," by Mr. White and Prof. Sanday.

The Bampton Lectures for 1890 were preached by Archdeacon Watkins, of Durham. The subject he chose was *Modern Criticism Considered in its Relation to the Fourth Gospel*. The Lectures are now published by Mr. John Murray. The reader is rather prejudiced against the book by a prefatory note, in which the author's intimacy with Bishop Lightfoot is spoken of in terms lacking in dignity and reserve. But as a record of the criticism of the fourth gospel, not only in modern, but in primitive times, the Lectures are good, and fill a blank in our literature. Probably the judgment of those acquainted with the subject will be that Dr. Watkins has been more successful in arraying the patristic testimony in favour of the gospel than in exhibiting the course of modern criticism. The exhibition of the external testimony in favour of the Johannine authorship during the second century could not be more completely exhibited, and could not easily be