

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

APRIL, 1896.

---

ART. I.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

NO. V.—THE SUPPOSED JEHOVISTIC ACCOUNT OF CREATION.

THE priestly account of creation is supposed to end in the middle of Gen. ii. 4, at the word "created." Then the redactor is supposed to have turned from his priestly (P) to his prophetic guide (JE), and to have copied out a long passage from this last author, beginning at the words "in the day that Jehovah Elohim made the earth and the heavens." Before finally leaving P's account, we may briefly observe that the allusion to the Sabbath in connection with the work of creation, so rare in the other books of Scripture, seems rather to point to identity of authorship between P and the author of the Fourth Commandment, than to a period of from eight to ten centuries having elapsed between the giving of the commandment and the reference to it, especially as such reference is altogether foreign to the practice of the Hebrew writers, who hardly ever mention the Sabbath. It is generally admitted that the Decalogue, "in its original shape," whatever that might have been, is from the hand of Moses.<sup>1</sup> We have thus a presumption in favour of the theory that P was also from his hand.<sup>2</sup>

When we come to the Jehovistic section which follows, we are struck by the fact that the extract appears to have been begun in the middle of a sentence. Why this should have been the case it will be found hard to explain. Next, the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Sabbath, as we learn from the monuments, is also a Babylonian institution. But the form it assumed in later Babylonian history is very different from the form which meets us here.

<sup>2</sup> A consideration of the difference between the Hebrew and Babylonian conception of the Sabbath will suggest that here, as elsewhere, the author is refashioning the ancient traditions of his race in harmony with Mosaic institutions.

portion of the sentence which has been thus detached fits in very well with the passage from the priestly writer which precedes, but does not fit in with verse 5 which follows, if properly translated. The sentence, as severed from the context by the critics, runs thus: "In the day that Jehovah Elohim made the heavens and the earth. And every herb of the field was not yet in the earth, and every herb of the field was not yet grown up," etc.<sup>1</sup> To what do the words "in the day . . . earth" belong, if not to what precedes? Or if these words are due to the redactor, why has he written "Jehovah Elohim" here, and here only? Moreover, we find precisely the same construction, "These are the generations of . . . In the day when," in chap. v. 1, specially assigned to P. In each case we have בְּיוֹם, followed by an infinitive construction. This is, to say the least, a curious coincidence. We may fairly infer that the whole of chap. ii. 4 and chap. v. 1 are by the same hand. Another point is that P is as often accustomed to precede his remarks by the words אֱלֹהֵי תַלְדוֹת (these are the generations), as to follow them by these words, as may be seen in chap. v. 1.<sup>2</sup> Besides, as we have seen,<sup>3</sup> the Jehovist is here quoting a Sumerian hymn, thus displaying his acquaintance with pre-Abrahamic Babylonian tradition. Nor is this all. The critics have asserted the passage which follows to be from the Jehovist, partly because the style of the narrative is different, and partly because of the use of the words "Jehovah Elohim" here instead of "Elohim," as in Gen. i. 1, ii. 4. But criticism has utterly failed to explain why in this narrative in Gen. ii., iii., and *only* here, we have "Jehovah Elohim." Elsewhere we have Jehovah or Elohim, but never in the Pentateuch, if my memory does not deceive me, have we both combined, as used absolutely, except here. The real truth is, that the critics are quite right as to the style of this narrative being different from what precedes; quite wrong in their explanation of the phenomenon. The author has given the account of creation in Gen. i. in a shape which is mainly his own; in Gen. ii., iii., his account is mainly in the shape in which it has come down to him. As to the use of Jehovah Elohim, it sometimes had a purpose and sometimes not, exactly in the same way as the use of "Jesus" and "Christ" in St. Paul's Epistles or in a modern

<sup>1</sup> If, with A.V., we translate טָרַם, "before," the incoherence is just as great, as will be found by substituting "before" for "not yet" above.

<sup>2</sup> The words in chap. v. 1 are זֶה סֵפֶר תּוֹלְדוֹת (this is the book of the generations). But this, of course, does not affect the argument, as these words, as well as those in chap. ii. 4, are supposed to be characteristic of P.

<sup>3</sup> CHURCHMAN for January, p. 195.

sermon. The author of this narrative, it is reasonable to suppose, had a purpose here. There is a transition in Gen. ii. 5, from creation as it came forth from the hand of God, to creation as it affected man. And so the author reminds those he is addressing that the great Force or Power which lay behind all that is, was also the eternal pre-existing One, the Covenant-God of Israel, who had revealed Himself to His servant Moses in the wilderness as the Guide and Protector of His chosen people. He it was who had made man, and His care and love for those whom He had made, as well as their ingratitude to Him, is carefully depicted in the narrative which follows. But whereas in chap. i. the account of creation, whether in accordance with ancient tradition or not, is cast into the form in which we have it by the author himself; in Gen. ii. 5 to xi., he is relating *the primitive tradition handed down among the descendants of Abraham*.<sup>1</sup> Whether that tradition was oral or written, whether it was the work of Abraham himself, or a half-forgotten tradition among the moon-worshippers of Ur, rescued by him from oblivion, is a question which may be debated. The latter seems at least a reasonable theory. There is an old Rabbinic tradition that Abraham was driven from his native land in consequence of his hatred of idolatry, and it may well have been a true one. For we now know that the statement in Josh. xxiv. 2, 14, is correct, that the inhabitants of Ur were idolaters. The inscriptions in the temple of the Moon-god have been discovered, and date from a time anterior to that of Abraham. But as the best authorities are usually of opinion that the religious ideas of primitive man were monotheistic, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Abraham may have been a religious reformer who desired to return to the earlier and purer worship of his forefathers, and that he was expelled from his home by the party of superstition.

This view is corroborated by the tone of the earlier chapters of Genesis. There is a childlike simplicity about them which points unmistakably to the infancy of the race. They are not the utterance of civilized, but of uncivilized, though not of course of savage, man. They recall the stories told by the inhabitants of Central Africa at their camp-fires, as recorded by Mr. H. M. Stanley in his recent work "Our Dark Companions," and may be paralleled in the case of many other barbarian tribes with whom explorers have come into contact. All such stories are not, of course, on a level in *tone*. But their character is precisely similar. They are the utterances of

---

<sup>1</sup> It is not contended that the choice of the words is not very often the writer's own. But he certainly reproduces the ancient traditions with scrupulous, and often even with verbal, accuracy.

men to whom abstract ideas are unfamiliar. Their notions of God are anthropopathic, and their conceptions are cast in the form of allegory or imagery.

This will be abundantly evident if we carefully examine the passage before us. We will pass by the second narrative of creation with the remark that it simply turns from the ideal to the practical side of the question. It supplements the account of the creation of things by one relating to their appearance and growth. It speaks of the way in which the things which had been brought into being manifested their existence.<sup>1</sup> And it concerns itself with the moral and spiritual condition of man rather than with the fact of his existence. Hence its unquestionable change of tone.<sup>2</sup>

We proceed to notice a few points in the rest of the story. First of all, the existence of the fertile country of Mesopotamia, in which nearly every account agrees in placing primæval man, is described in childlike phrase in the words "God planted a garden in the East." Then the gradual invention of language, as man's needs involved the coining of words to describe the phenomena with which he came into contact, is indicated by the simple words, "God brought them to the man to see what he would call them, and whatsoever the man called each of them, that was the name thereof." The invention of clothing is described in equally childlike phraseology: "The Lord God made coats of skins and clothed them." The earnest but as yet uncultured piety of the authors of the story displays itself in its custom of attributing directly to God every incident in human development it had to relate.<sup>3</sup> And

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Stanley, in his article in the *Fortnightly Review*, June, 1893, says: "An African legend describes the earth as at first covered with sweet water, but the water dried up or disappeared somewhere, and the grass, herbs, and plants began to spring up above the ground, and the water was confined into streams and rivers and lakes and pools." According to these legends, the herbs and plants were, as Gen. i. and ii. assert, created before they sprang up and became visible facts on the earth's surface.

<sup>2</sup> The use of the word יצר in the Jehovistic narrative of the creation of man may be explained by the fact that the object of the writer is to view the work of creation from man's side, as Gen. i. had viewed it from God's side. The use of the various words will be found to have been guided by a delicate discrimination. ברא refers to the archetypal conception in the mind of the Creator, עשה to the creative act, יצר to the "fearful and wonderful" nature of the human organism the creative act had called into being.

<sup>3</sup> The author of the account of creation in Gen. i. follows this precedent, it is important to notice. Writing for a people whose ideas were still primitive, he speaks of the Hebrew names for day, night, heaven, earth, seas, as given by God. This is hardly consistent with the idea of the post-Exilic origin of Gen. i., unless we consider that he designedly imitated the language of JE. But, *ex hypothesi*, the difference of style is so great that it can be recognised without any difficulty.

nothing is more in accordance with probability than the significant hint of these early traditions, that the use of clothing was in some way connected with the consciousness of guilt—of the abuse of those laws which God had implanted in the conscience of primitive man—of the fact that man had deliberately chosen to have experience of evil as well as of good. Nor need it for a moment be supposed that the Christian is bound, in these days of scientific investigation, to believe implicitly in the literal truth of the account of the creation of woman. The form the story here assumes is simply the mode in which primitive culture, in its habit of personification of abstract truths, expresses the fact of the intimate union between the sexes which God has ordained in holy matrimony—a tie like in kind, but how infinitely higher in degree, to that which unites the rest of the animal creation!—a tie fitly described in those noble words, whether penned by Moses himself or handed down by him from the remotest antiquity: “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh.” Which is more likely, that this noble and withal truly scientific passage was evolved, no one knows by what process, in the period between Jehoshaphat and Jehoash, or that it was an expression of the idea embodied in a sacred tradition, handed down by God’s providence from very early times—an idea placed by Moses in the forefront of his system, as marking the consecration of family life?<sup>1</sup>

The account of man’s fall is obviously allegorical. There are no such trees in existence as the tree of knowledge of good and evil and the tree of life, and their mention among the trees of the garden is merely the way in which the primitive tradition before us describes the truth that God had given life to man, and that experience of evil formed one of the facts of his life at this period. Nor need we insist on the personification of the serpent, or the literal accuracy of the language supposed to have been used by Adam, his wife, and the tempter. We may regard the curse pronounced on the serpent as in keeping with the allegorical description of the knowledge of good and evil as a tree, and see in it a vivid description of the degrading effects of sin. We may even claim the liberty to suppose that Adam and Eve themselves (“the man” and “living,” as their names imply) need not be literally the very first man and woman who were placed on the earth, but simply personifications of the human race in those prehistoric times. The

---

<sup>1</sup> It may be observed that family life, as described in Genesis, is held from the first to involve this principle of consecration, though no doubt, to some extent, cast in the shade by the growing practice of polygamy.

literalists have most irreverently—I will venture even to say profanely—substituted here an apple for the words of the sacred historian, the “fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil,” and have thereby wrought far more harm than has been wrought by any other single misstatement known to me. They have given point to the cheap sneer of every infidel who desired to throw discredit on the first principle with which Holy Scripture starts, namely, the fact that man has fallen.<sup>1</sup> Nor can we fail to observe how primitive were the conceptions of God, as Dr. Watson has also observed,<sup>2</sup> in Genesis throughout, and especially in these early chapters of Genesis, and how strongly they contrast with the conceptions in the later books of Moses, where we are told that none can look on God and live.<sup>3</sup> Here God speaks familiarly with man as with a friend. He is said to “walk in the garden in the cool (or breeze) of the day.”<sup>4</sup> The idea of a plurality in the Godhead, again, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, is confined to these early utterances,<sup>5</sup> suggesting the idea that,

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Pinches, of the British Museum, in a paper read this year before the Victoria Institute, speaks of an early Babylonian tablet, relating to a tree of life, in which the following words occur :

“In Eridu there grew a dark vine—in a glorious place was it brought forth.

Its form bright lapis-stone, set in the world beneath.

The path of Ea in Eridu is filled with fertility.

His seal is the centre-place of the earth.

His couch is the bed of Nammu.

To the glorious house, which is like a forest, its shade is set—no man enters into its midst.

In its interior is the Sun-god, Tammuz,

Between the mouths of the rivers which are on both sides.’

The antiquity of the legend handed down in this tablet is evidenced by the fact that it is bilingual, and therefore dates from the earliest times. The author of Genesis has apparently deliberately spiritualized this legend, so familiar to his race. The vine of the tablet has become with him a fundamental spiritual fact, man’s knowledge of evil as well as good, and the dire results of that knowledge on his spiritual, moral, and even physical well-being. It is odd that modern so-called orthodoxy, in substituting the apple for man’s spiritual experiences, has returned to the mythological and polytheistic teaching of pre-Semitic times, with considerable injury to the faith of many in these days of universal inquiry. In Professor Sayce’s translation in “The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments,” p. 61, the vine becomes a palm-stalk, and there are many other variations. But Mr. Pinches claims to have deciphered another line, which brings in the rivers of Gen. ii. 10, 11.

<sup>2</sup> “The Book Genesis,” chap. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Exod. xx. 20; Deut. iv. 33; *cf.* Gen. xxxii. 30.

<sup>4</sup> “Auram post meridiem.”—Vulgate.

<sup>5</sup> Gen. i. 26, iii. 22, xi. 7. There is no reason to doubt that we have here an indistinct shadowing forth of the great truth of the Trinity in Unity.

even in his opening account of creation, Moses is embodying earlier tradition. And the dire consequences of sin in making labour, which once was a joy and a pleasure,<sup>1</sup> to become a sorrow and a cause of misery,<sup>2</sup> are declared in simple yet pregnant phrase to have been stamped on the whole life of man after the Fall. Moreover, in the pangs of child-birth, which may reasonably be believed to have grown more acute as the race departed more and more widely from primitive innocence, we are taught to discern another of the sad results of sin. And its last result is to make the earth no longer a garden of God in the land of delight (Eden), but a place of exile from man's true happiness.<sup>3</sup>

I pass over the narrative in chap. iv., which seems to indicate that antediluvian mankind were divided into two classes: primitive and pastoral man, who retained some of his primæval innocence; and selfish and aggressive man, whose selfishness made him turn his abilities to the best account, though he sadly misused his knowledge. And I come to chap. v., which appears to me to be an integral part of these early traditions. It cannot possibly have been an invention of the priestly writer in post-Exilic times. Such an invention would have found no favour with the Jews after the Captivity. And if it be contended that it is not an invention, but that it was copied by the author from primitive records, which have since perished, then it is certainly not the work of a post-Exilic writer, but that of some ancient author no longer extant. And it is sheer absurdity to pretend that there can be anything in the style of a genealogy which stamps it as the writing of any particular author. The genealogy in chap. v., then, was either invented by the post-Exilic writer, or the matter of it is not his at all. The critical analysis of this chapter, moreover, is as careless and one-sided as it will very frequently be found elsewhere. First of all, the genealogy in chap. iv. is assigned to JE, and that in chap. v. to P. Consistency would require that they should be assigned to the same writer. And certainly if we are to sever chap. v. 29 from P, in which it is imbedded, we ought, on like principles, to sever chap. iv. 18 from JE, and assign it to P. Genealogies are certainly "juristisch, pünktlich, und formelhaft" enough, and the most rigid critic in style would be disposed to admit that if that be the ground on which criticism proceeds, they ought all to be assigned

<sup>1</sup> Gen. ii. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. iii. 17-19.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. iii. 24. Can it be possible, as has sometimes occurred to me, that in Gen. iii. 10 man's early dread of the thunderstorm is regarded as a consequence of his consciousness of sin? The thunder is called the "voice of God" in Exod. ix. 28 and in Ps. xxix.



to the Priestly writer. But, instead of this, we are told that a "stylistic criterion" has been discovered, which makes a distinction necessary here. This criterion consists in the fact that, whereas the Prophetic writer (or JE, as he has been called) invariably uses יָלַד (beget) in the Kal voice, or the passive (Niphal) יוּלַד לְ (was born to), or the Pual, as in iv. 18, the Priestly writer (P) invariably puts the word "begat" in the *Hiphil* voice (הוֹלִיד). If so, no doubt a point is made. But let us further examine the matter. Gen. xlvi. 6-27, is assigned by the critics to P; but in xlvi. 20 יוּלַד לְ (was born to), the remarkable phrase which we have seen to be so specially characteristic of JE, occurs in a passage assigned to P. This is also the case in chap. xvii. 17, where יוּלַד לְ occurs again. *This passage, too, is assigned to P.* Once more, we have the same voice and sense, though in the plural, in Gen. x. 1. *This also is assigned to P.* See also Numb. xxvi. 60. Thus a word assigned by the critics to JE occurs *four times* in P to *once* in JE. Nor is this all. A more careful study of the matter shows that the use of the causative voice (caused to be born—begot) is more reconcilable with the sense of יָלַד involved in the Niphal or passive when translated *to be born*, than is the use of the active voice יָלַד in the sense of "to beget."<sup>1</sup> In other words, P's use of the verb is more reconcilable with JE's than JE's with itself. And there is even more to be said. JE in chap. iv. uses *two* forms of the passive (to be born), the Pual as well as the Niphal. The former occurs in chap. iv. 26. It occurs again in chap. xxiv. 15, also assigned to JE. Moreover, chap. iv. 26 is said to be stamped unmistakably as belonging to JE by the words גַּם הוּא (he also), which the critics tell us is one of the most marked characteristics of JE. We might take it, therefore, that this indiscriminate use in one passage of two forms of the passive of this verb is a distinct characteristic of JE. Perhaps on the whole, however, it might be well to carry our examination a little farther. And if we do so, we shall find that this indiscriminate use of the same two forms of

<sup>1</sup> In P, יָלַד is used for the mother "she bare." The Niphal "to be born" is the ordinary passive of this, *i.e.*, P's, use. P has the Niphal *infinitive* with לְ in Gen. xxi. 5, and the *participle* in Gen. xxi. 3, and in this last case it is distinctly used *as* the passive of the Kal יָלַד. Moreover, in this passage, assigned to the post-Exilic writer, we have a remarkable instance of that repetition for the sake of emphasis, which the best authorities, and with reason, have regarded as characteristic of a very early date.

the passive also occurs in the passage Gen. xlvi. 6-27, which, as we have seen, *is assigned to P*. This double form of the passive occurs in *no other passage* in the Old Testament. And once more, neither of these forms is the passive of the Hiphil or causative voice, in which we are asked to see the hand of P in chap. v. Thus, then, we have made two discoveries: the one, that variety of expression does *not* involve diversity of authorship; and the other, that *the same peculiarities of construction are found both in JE and P, and nowhere else*, and thus tend to indicate *identity of authorship* between them, as far as these particular passages are concerned. It must not be forgotten, too, that the critics, as may be seen, have dealt most arbitrarily with the genealogies, assigning portions of them to JE, and portions to P, just as their preconceived theories appeared to demand. We are entitled to add at least as much as this, that a great deal more trouble will have yet to be taken with the analysis before the assignment of the various portions of Genesis to their respective authors can be regarded as satisfactorily established. Then the critics have once more arbitrarily separated verse 29 from the rest of chap. v. as containing a portion of narrative, and have assigned it to JE. They may have jumped to conclusions here again, as they have done about the form in which the genealogies are drawn up. The truth is that the author of Genesis, like almost every other author we know of, prefaces the mention of a person who is to play a considerable part in his story with a few words of introduction. The real reason for the introduction of this genealogy here would seem to be twofold. First of all, the author desires us to understand that Noah was descended from the family or community in which purity of faith and life were preserved; and next, to call our attention to the fact of the ravages of sin in shortening the duration of man's life. We need not insist on the literal accuracy of every word in this account. The numbers and dates in Scripture are a source of much perplexity. In this particular passage the numbers in the LXX., and in the present Hebrew text, do not always agree. And the LXX., we ought not to forget, represents the earliest direct evidence we have concerning the Hebrew text. The numbers in the Samaritan Pentateuch differ from the Hebrew in the opposite direction. If numbers were in very ancient times represented in Hebrew by signs, as they frequently are now, this would account for the discrepancies and improbabilities in numbers found throughout the Old Testament as we now have it. And the dim antiquity from which these traditions emerge may reasonably be held to preclude any certainty on our part that the details before us are historically correct in every particular. We may there-

fore venture here to prefer the spirit to the letter, and discern, not minute accuracy in detail, but the assertion, on authority of high antiquity, of a great and important moral truth, that the duration of human life will very largely depend on our observance of the laws which God has laid down for our guidance in relation to it.

There may be some who will consider this handling of the early chapters of Genesis as too free, and will ask what is gained by rejecting the new criticism, unless the exact historical accuracy of the Old Testament down to the minutest detail is rigidly to be maintained at all hazards. I reply, first of all, that it seems to me unwise to invert the Christian faith, and to demand as implicit a belief in the assertion that Methuselah lived nine hundred and sixty-nine years as in the fact that Christ rose from the dead. The Scriptures were not given us to teach us astronomy, or geology, or even human history and chronology, but to testify of Christ. And so long as their main facts are unquestioned, and the great spiritual principles they enshrine are firmly held, there is no real danger in admitting in them a human element.<sup>1</sup> The *πρώτον ψεύδος* of the new criticism is that it represents the writers of the Old Testament as deliberately stating in the interests of religion what they knew to be false, and as entirely misrepresenting the facts which they had undertaken to hand down, and this not only in their secular, but in their religious aspect. We care comparatively little who wrote the Pentateuch, or when it was written, so long as it tells us the true history of God's dealings with His people Israel. But it is incompatible with common honesty and common-sense for a writer in the reign of Hezekiah or Manasseh to represent Moses as uttering words and giving precepts which he never dreamed of, or for a still later writer to pretend that institutions which were never heard of until after the Exile were given to the Israelites in the wilderness before they entered the Promised Land, and that God severely punished them for disobeying such statutes when they had never received them. If the critical theory be true, then the Old Testament Scriptures represent God as palpably and shamefully unjust, and their account of God's teaching and moral education of His people is a tissue of absurd fabrications. With whatever honesty and good faith such views are put

---

<sup>1</sup> The Rev. D. Greig, in an admirable paper on "Biblical Criticism," read before the mission clergy of the diocese of Ely, says: "All that is necessary to the Christian view is that *we have in the Bible an authentic record of this Divine history*" (i.e., of the special providential guidance of God's people from the days of Abraham onwards).

forth, it is certain that they will ultimately be destructive either of our honesty and good faith, or of our reverence for the Sacred Volume, the contents of which have been shown to be incompatible with those qualities. Men cannot pin their faith on pious frauds without injuring their moral sense thereby, as the history of the Roman Communion has very plainly shown. The alternative theory which I have suggested, while recognising the possibility that there may have been a measure of human infirmity in the transmission of records from a past which is practically at an infinite distance from us, nevertheless recognises the good faith of the writers, and the substantial accuracy of the accounts they have handed down. The Scriptures were given us to instruct us in the ways of God to man. And however much on other points they may have reflected merely the belief of their age, we may be sure that they have faithfully reported to us the dispensation of God, as made known to His servants the patriarchs, Moses and the prophets, and that they have truly unfolded to us the steps of God's spiritual education of the people He had chosen.

J. J. LIAS.

NOTE.—The above paper was written before I received from the Rev. A. Kennion a copy of his interesting volume entitled "Principia." He has, I find, anticipated me in several points.



#### ART. II.—CONCERNING THE LORD'S SUPPER, AND THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION THEREOF.

**B**Y whom was the Lord's Supper instituted? It was ordained by Christ Himself. What is the Lord's Supper? It is one of the two (two only) Sacraments ordained by Christ and declared to be *generally* necessary to salvation. What is the meaning of the word "Sacrament"? It means an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, *given* unto us, ordained by Christ, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof. It follows that in a Sacrament are two parts: the outward and visible sign and the inward and spiritual grace. This is the doctrine of the Church Catechism.

Two words require comment—the words "generally" and "given." "Generally" in olden times was frequently used in the sense of universally. It is therefore to some extent ambiguous; and there are some who contend that it is used in the latter sense in the Catechism. The ends of their contention are twofold: (1) They desire to maintain other five