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 Turretin[3] among the Calvinists, or even of Howe[4] 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. Westcott[5] of to-day, that man has not the powers which are needed for the answer. Archbishop Leighton[6] 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 Hopkins[7] and Bishop Reynolds[8] 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 Bull[9] 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-place[2] and instrument of those who were created in the image of God. He would assent with Turretin[3] to the dignity expressed in the pagan poet's[4] 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 Lombard[7] 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 ψυχή of St. Paul, as men so different in many ways as Bishop Reynolds[9] and Henry More[10] 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. Included[3] often under the wider term ψυχή or soul, this πνεῦμα or spirit is often also named apart[4]—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 quickening[7] 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 unique[1] 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 Preacher[1] 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. John[2] 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 seraphs[4] and the living creatures[5] 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 image[6] 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 sinlessness[7] 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 Aquinas[4] 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 Aquinas[5] 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 original[3] 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 Jackson[5] most earnestly protests against it. On the other hand, so strong an anti-Romanist as Bull[6] 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. 1*a*, 2*ae*, 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 pecular 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 disputes[3] 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 lordship[1] over all the animal creation which made him God's vicegerent upon the earth. This was the consequence[2] 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. Paul[3] speaks; but he is, as St. Peter[4] 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; Psa. ciii. 13; Isa. v. 3, 4; Matt. vii. 11; Luke xi. 4*a*, 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 writers[3] 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).