

Persuade him to prune his trees, or water his flowers, or, best of all, to get to his parlour or his greenhouse, or to that tiny box, the still existing summer-house, and write. The results will very possibly be immortal, living on when the suffering writer shall have long "outsoared the shadow" of that mysterious night.



The Baptismal Controversy.—II.

A PLEA FOR CAREFUL DEFINITION.

BY THE REV. N. DIMOCK, M.A.

LET us turn for a few moments to look at the teaching of our Articles: "Baptism . . . is a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly (*recte*¹ baptismum suscipientes) are grafted into the Church: the promises of the forgiveness of sins and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed² (per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur³)."

Here certainly we have the efficacy of baptism put into its

¹ The word *recte* does not refer merely to the proper *matter* and *form* of the sacrament. In this it differs from *rite*, having a wider and fuller sense, which includes moral and spiritual qualifications (see Drury's "Confession and Absolution," p. 269).

² So the MS. of 13 Queen Elizabeth, 1571. The punctuation was altered in the printed copies, though not in one of the oldest English editions. See Archbishop Lawrence, "Doctrine of the Church of England," Part II., p. 79, note; and Dr. Burney's "Collection" of Documents (privately printed), pp. 42, 43.

³ So the Latin of 1571, as also of 1553 and 1562 MS. and 1563. Jewel writes: "In precise manner of speech salvation must be sought in Christ alone, and not in any outward signs. . . . St. Cyprian saith: *Remissio peccatorum, sive per baptismum sive per alia sacramenta donetur, proprie Spiritus Sancti est; et ipsi soli hujus efficientiæ privilegium manet* [De Bapt. Christ.] . . . Likewise saith St. Hierome: *Homo aquam tantum tribuit: Deus autem [dat] Spiritum Sanctum, quo . . . sordes abluuntur* [In Isai. Proph., Cap. IV.]" (Works, "Apol. and Defence," p. 463, P.S.; see also Cranmer's Works, vol. iii., p. 553; edit. Jenkyns.) Hooker says: "The grace of baptism cometh by donation from God alone" ("E. P.," Book V., chap. lxii., § 19; see also Book VI., chap. vi., § 1). "*Remissio peccatorum, sive per baptismum, sive per alia sacramenta donetur proprie Spiritus Sancti est*" (Arnald, Abbas Bonævallis; see Ussher's Works, vol. iii., p. 143; edit. Elrington).

right place. It is set before us in relation to the forgiveness of sin, and our consequently being made (being by nature children of wrath) to be God's children by adoption and grace. Is not this the very gift of the Gospel—the very free gift, the doctrine of which is the power of God unto salvation?

And if this visible sealing is an ordinance of Christ, ordained for the very purpose of the making over to us of this gift in covenant possession, how shall baptism not be the very opening of the door for us to enter into the very power and the life of the new covenant; in a word, to be begotten again by a true regeneration, just because, if we would have the new power of the new life and the new creation which belongs to the blessing of the new covenant, we are bound to seek and to lay hold on the free gift of remission and reconciliation in the ordinance appointed for its covenanted donation? The starting-point of our new life is our faith's apprehension of a free justification—justification freely given even to condemned sinners through the one perfect atonement of Christ.

To be brought out of the surroundings of sin's awful condemnation to breathe the clear atmosphere of perfect reconciliation and peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ—this is to pass from death to life, from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God. Why, then, should not the one baptism for the remission of sins be *therefore* the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, just because it is the sacrament of “the saving grace of imputation, which taketh away all former guiltiness”? (Hooker, “E. P.,” Book V., chap. lx., § 2). Does it not bring us immediately into a position in which we are to realize the true blessing of which the Apostle speaks: “If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new”? And what are these “all things”?¹ They are the new things of

¹ ἀνακαινίσας ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. (Barnabas, Ep. VI., § 11. See “N. T. in Apostolic Fathers,” p. 4).

λαβόντες τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐλπίζαντες εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου ἐγενόμεθα καινοί, πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτιζόμενοι (*ibid.*, XVI., § 8. See also X., § 1, and Cunningham's Note, pp. 52, 53).

this new creation ; and all these, the Apostle goes on to tell us, "are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us the ministry of reconciliation—to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." "Now, then," he adds, "we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us : we pray you in Christ's stead (*ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ*), be ye reconciled to God. For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. v. 17-21).

Is an apology needed for this long quotation? Let it be well observed what an important bearing it has on the subject before us. Superstitious views of sacramental efficacy cannot stand before this clear unveiling of the true embassy of the Gospel of Christ. What a witness is here to the supreme importance of the personalities of Christian religion! The whole force of the Atonement is thrown into this Divine pleading for personal reconciliation with the sinners for whom Christ died. In this reconciliation is the true conversion which brings sinners from lying "in the wicked one" to be "in Christ." And in this being "in Christ" is the new creation. And where, then, is the place for the Sacrament of Baptism? It must stand in the subordinate position of a sign or seal,¹ sealing to us the gift which

¹ But not a bare sign nor ineffectual seal (see Jewel, "Apol. and Defence," P.S., pp. 460 *et seq.*; and Archbishop Lawrence, "Doctrine of the Church of England on Efficacy of Baptism," pp. 28, 38-45, also pp. 80, 81). The seal is not to be despised or lightly esteemed because God's grace is not tied to sacraments (see Jewel, "Apol. and Defence," P.S., p. 463; and Waterland's Works, vol. vi., pp. 12 *et seq.*; see also quotations in Bishop Harold Browne "On Articles," p. 597, eighth edition).

Hooker could ask, as if anticipating an answer of assent even from the Puritans of his day, "Are not sacraments signs of grace given?" (MS. note in "Chr. Letter." See Works, edit. Keble, vol. ii., p. 256; see p. 267; see also vol. iii., pp. 88, 89).

Calvin says: "Si in Baptismo figura aquæ oculos falleret, nobis certum non esset ablutionis nostræ pignus: imo fallaci illo spectaculo vacillandi nobis occasio deretur" (Inst., Lib. IV., Cap. XVII., § 14).

"Ursinus truly saith, 'Baptismus et cœna Domini sunt sacramenta, — quia sũnt opus Dei, qui aliquid in iis nobis dat, et se dare testatur'; and he hath many speeches to this purpose. . . . So that instrumental conveyance of the grace signified, to the due receiver, is as true an effect or end

underlies our reconciliation. And is not this subordination clearly to be seen in St. Paul's words, "The Lord sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17); and not less clearly in the words of St. Peter concerning the converts at Cæsarea, when "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord"? (Acts x. 48). Give the sacrament an independent effect *ex opere operato*, and who would think it suitable to use such language as here is spoken by Apostolic lips?

Reconciliation—the personal reconciliation—of a sinner's soul to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; conversion—the true conversion of a wandering heart, which makes it say, "I will arise and go to my Father"—the conversion of which St. Peter says, "Ye were as sheep going astray, but are now returned [*or*, were converted—*ἐπιστράφητε*] unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls" (1 Pet. ii. 25)—these things are not the effect of any power lodged in an ordinance.¹ The ordinance must derive its power from its relation to the Divine embassy, from its being an appendage to that message of peace and salvation which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.

In truth, the Divine prayer which, in the Apostle's view, comes down from the highest heaven to speak to the hearts of poor outcast sinners on earth, this litany from the heart of the High and Holy One who inhabiteth eternity, this wonderful beseeching which is committed to the ministry of Christ's ambassadors on earth, entreating wandering souls to be reconciled to God—this surely teaches a truth which should not only enable us to throw aside the superstitious accretions which in the atmosphere of human thoughts are constantly tending to

of a sacrament, when it is duly administered, as oblation" (Dr. Ward, in *Ussher's Works*, vol. xv., p. 506; edit. Elrington (see p. 510); see also Prebendary Gee in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. viii., pp. 163 *et seq.*; edit. 1848; and Goode "On Infant Baptism," pp. 164, 166, 168, 418).

¹ "Certi estote, quoniam Deus noster Jesus Christus, quando quisque se converterit ad fidem ipsius, a via sua vel superflua vel nequissima, omnia illi præterita demittuntur, et omnino, tamquam donatis debitis, fiunt cum illo tabulæ novæ" (Aug., Sermo LXXXVII., de verbis Ev. Matt. xx., § 10).

corrupt the purity and simplicity of the Gospel of Christ, but which also should avail to be an effectual test by which to try the claims of novel doctrines, whether they are of human conception or of Divine revelation. Whatever will not harmonize with the doctrine of justification by faith—justification by the mere grace, the free gift of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus—is a parasite which, however close it may cling to a revealed truth, is to be removed from the Christian faith. Here we must draw the line to mark the true *status controversiæ*. Here is a rule the wise application of which will save us from the error of condemning what is true on account of its having been made to harbour what is false, and cutting off a branch of the true faith because it has been laid hold on by parasites of superstition.

Let us in thought stand together for a moment among the multitude who are listening to the Divine Sermon on the Mount. How does the Son of God address them? He speaks to them as the children of His Father above. He would have them regard themselves as of the family who know that they have a Father in heaven. Why is this? The answer is easy. These hearers are Abraham's seed. They are children of the patriarchal covenant. They have been brought into the family of the covenant by the seal of the covenant. They are Israelites. To them pertaineth the adoption, and the Shekinah, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the worship of God, and the promises. Theirs are the patriarchs, for them is the coming of the Messiah. No wonder that the Son of God should speak to them of their heavenly Father.

But doubtless there may have been in the crowd some who had come from another stock; some who had come perhaps from Tyre and Sidon; some who were born sinners among the Gentiles—heathens who, in the sight of the Jews, were to be regarded as vile outcast dogs, to one of whom were spoken the words of the compassionate Saviour: "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to dogs." Were there among the hearers of the Sermon some who had come out from these

outcasts to be proselytes in the family of God? Were these also spoken to as having a heavenly Father?¹ No doubt they were. They had been brought out from their old surroundings, and brought into a new relationship by a new birth, by a regeneration² (in which, we need not doubt, was included a

¹ Mr. Wharton B. Marriott has brought together some very important quotations, "showing that in the traditionary language of the Jewish rabbinical schools terms of regeneration are associated with the thought of any marked change in spiritual condition, whether in reference to *admission for the first time* into covenant with God, or of *restoration to God's favour* of one who had been alienated from Him by grievous sin, or to any marked change in the conditions of a man's life brought about by the present power of God" (*Εἰρηνικά*, p. 189; see also pp. 180-183). He points also to a passage from Josephus illustrating "a wider extension of the term, in reference to deliverance from a state of temporal misery and oppression."

By the anointing oil the priest is said to have become "a new creature." And Abraham, by God's call is said to have been made "a new creature." And the commission given to Moses (with the promise of Divine assistance) is regarded as making him "a new creature."

But the traditional expression, "A Gentile becoming a Proselyte, and a slave obtaining manumission, are like children newly born," does not appear to be undoubtedly traceable to "any very ancient source."

² See Edersheim, "Life and Times of Jesus," vol. ii., pp. 475-477, who, speaking of the baptism of a proselyte, observes (p. 476): "This new birth was not 'a birth from above' in the sense of moral or spiritual renovation, but only as implying a new relationship to God, to Israel, and to his own past, present, and future" (see Ball's "St. Paul and Roman Law," pp. 10-12).

It has been argued that the baptism of proselytes is probably later than the fall of Jerusalem, "as it is not mentioned by Philo, Josephus, or the Talmud" (see *e.g.*, Gasquet, "Studies," p. 212). But "the frequent washings prescribed by the Old Law" (see Mark vii. 4), to which Gasquet refers, seem to make it highly improbable that the admission of proselytes was altogether without a baptism (see "Doctrine of Sacraments," pp. 50, 51, 135, and Dr. Currey on Ezek. xxxvi. 25 in "Speaker's Commentary"). And there is at least some presumption against the adoption by the later Jews of a practice known to them chiefly as a prominent Christian ordinance. Nevertheless, the question whether or not a baptism accompanied the reception of proselytes in pre-Christian times is not one of primary importance. It is remarkable that as there was sometimes a tendency among Christians to assimilate somewhat from pagan mysteries (see Adamson's "Christian Doctrine of Lord's Supper," p. 45), so there seems to have been a tendency in non-Christian systems to borrow from the Christian Church, as may probably be seen in the worship of Isis and Mithra (see Bigg's "The Church's Task under Roman Empire," pp. 54, 56). In the religion of Isis there was a baptism in the rite of initiation. There were also those who acted as godfathers, and the initiated were regarded as "regenerate" (Bigg, pp. 42, 43). So it may be held, perhaps, not altogether improbable that there should have been a reflex action in this matter from the Christian upon the Jewish Church (see Dean Plumpton's article "Proselytes" in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. ii., p. 944). Indeed, it appears that, in spite of opposition from the "more orthodox" on account of its Christian origin, a rite of "Confirmation" is now administered both in Europe and North America in all the "progressive Jewish congregations" (see Review of Jewish Encyclopædia in *Guardian* of

baptism of water)—a regeneration which had been prophesied of in Ps. lxxxvii., the psalm which tells of the glorious things of the city of God, and tells how from the heathen they should come to be born there: "Of Zion it shall be said, This one and that one was born in her."¹ "The Lord shall count, when He writeth up the peoples, This one was born there."

Behold, then, the multitude of hearers—all taught to look up to a Father in heaven, all to know themselves regenerated into a chosen peculiar people, into a covenant relationship full of responsibility. But shall we say all born again in the full sense

January 20, 1904). The case of the Jewish Church, however, can hardly be regarded as parallel with the cases of Isis and Mithra. And Dean Plumptre remarks: "The tendency of the later Rabbis was rather to keep together the customs and traditions of the past than to invent new ones." Indeed, he considers that the history of the New Testament itself suggests the existence at that date of such a custom as the baptism of proselytes—appealing to the question of the priests and Levites, "Why baptizest thou then?" (John i. 25), as well as to the words of our Lord to Nicodemus (John iii. 10). In the Ethiopic version of Matt. xxiii. 15 we find the words, "Compass sea and land to baptize one proselyte" (p. 943). This version, however, can make no claim to any great authority. Dr. F. C. Porter says: "There seems no longer room for serious question that a bath of purification must have followed [circumcision], even though early mention of such *proselyte baptism* is not found. . . . One who came with the deep impurity of a heathen life behind him could not have entered the Jewish community without such a cleansing" (in Hastings' "Dictionary of Bible," vol. iv., p. 135). "The Mishna presupposes it" (*ibid.*). See also article "Proselytes" in Schaff Herzog's Encyclopædia.

Dr. A. Edersheim says: "The silence of Josephus and Philo can scarcely be quoted in favour of the later origin of the rite. . . . If a Jew, who had become Levitically defiled, required immersion, it is difficult to suppose that a heathen would have been admitted to all the services of the sanctuary without a similar purification. But we have also positive testimony (which the objections of *Winer*, *Keil*, and *Leyrer*, in my opinion, do not invalidate), that the baptism of proselytes existed in the time of Hillel and Shammai, for whereas the school of Shammai is said to have allowed a proselyte who was circumcised on the eve of the Passover to partake *after baptism* of the Passover, the school of Hillel forbade it. This controversy must be regarded as proving that at that time (previous to Christ) the baptism of proselytes was customary" ("Life and Times of Jesus," Appendix XII., vol. ii., p. 747).

¹ Augustin's singular interpretation of these words—applying them to the birth of Christ—will be found in Enarr. in Ps. lxxxvi., Op. Tom. IV., Par. II., c. 923; edit. Ben., Paris, 1681. Other ancient varieties of interpretation may be seen in Neale and Littledale's "Commentary on Psalms," vol. iii., pp. 86, 87. Of the sense of the Hebrew there can be little doubt (see Canon Cook in "Speaker's Commentary," p. 365). It may apply either to proselytes to Judaism before Christ, or to converts to the Christian Church afterwards. Dr. Kay observes (p. 284): "The thrice-repeated 'born' emphasizes the fact that the privileges of the city of God can be obtained only by a new birth."

of the word? Oh no!¹ For hear how the preacher—the Divine preacher—has to teach them the way by which they *may be*—or, rather, *may become* (ὅπως γένησθε, ver. 45)—the

¹ Waterland well distinguishes between the *stricter* and the *larger* sense of *regeneration* (see Works, vol. iv., pp. 436, 437, 444). He says: "St. Austin followed the *stricter* sense when he said, *Simon ille Magus natus erat ex aqua et Spiritu*, Tom. IX., p. 169. In another place, he followed the *larger* sense, which takes in *renovation* to complete the notion of regeneration considered as *salutary*" (see "Summary View of Justification," iii., § 2; Works, vol. vi., p. 8, note; see also Bishop Bethell on "Regeneration in Baptism," Preface, p. xxix).

This distinction of senses of the word "regeneration" is not unimportant, and it is certainly no modern invention (see "Doctrine of Sacraments," pp. 140 *et seq.*). It has been recognised clearly by English divines (see Goode, pp. 405, 472-475; also pp. 456, 489-503, 526). By none, I think, has it been more strongly insisted upon than by the learned Bishop Davenant. Some of his teachings on the subject may be seen brought together in Dean Goode's instructive work on the "Effects of Infant Baptism" (see pp. 303, *et seq.*). The Bishop holds that "Omnes infantes baptizati ab originalis peccati reatu absolvuntur" (p. 304). But he says further: "Nec quæ dicitur Regeneratio parvuli est ejusdem speciei cum hac nova creatione, sive spirituali renascentia adultorum" (p. 305).

There need, then, assuredly be no question made of the view that the full teaching of such expressions as "begotten of God" (see Mozley, "Review of Baptismal Controversy," pp. 58, *et seq.*), introduces what may be called a new idea as specially pertaining (in some sense) to the New Covenant, and specially adhering to the doctrine of the Incarnation (see Rom. viii. 29; John i. 12, 13) and to the recreating power of the Holy Ghost (John iii. 6). But it need not be inferred that this idea stands isolated and altogether dissociated from the calling and the privileges of God's ancient people (see especially Deut. xxx. 6; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27). Might it not much rather be regarded as a true *evolution* (as of a flower from an opening bud) in "the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. iii. 10) according to His "eternal purpose" in Christ (ver. 11), from the *viðeivía* of St. Paul (Rom. ix. 4 with viii. 14, 15; see Waite in "Speaker's Commentary" on 2 Cor. vi. 18), as seen in connection with such texts as Exod. iv. 20, 23; Isa. i. 2, lxiii. 16; Jer. xxxi. 18, 20; Hos. xi. 1, 3, i. 10 (with Rom. ix. 26, viii. 15); Jer. iii. 19 (with iv. 4 and xxxi. 33 specially), and with John viii. 41, *et seq.*? It should never be forgotten that there is a sense in which the New Covenant may be truly said to be older than the Old. It would certainly be doing violence to the meaning of language to insist that in giving supreme prominence to the new idea, the New Testament has altogether ignored the older blessing which may be said to have given it birth, and on which it still rests for support (Gal. iv. 5, 6; 2 Pet. i. 4, 9; see Comber "Companion to Temple," vol. iii., p. 419, and Procter "On P.B.," p. 374, note). It is well said by Archbishop Trench, *παλιγγενεσία* "is one among the many words which the Gospel found and, so to speak, glorified . . . made it the expression of far deeper thoughts, of far mightier truths, than any of which it had been the vehicle before (see my "Doctrine of the Sacraments," pp. 63, 64, and 140, *et seq.*; also p. 135).

Does not the relation of the *new* idea to the *old*, as seen in the unfolding of the Divine revelation, serve very strongly to emphasize the supreme need which belongs to the corruption of fallen human nature—a need which cannot be met by any calling, or privilege or power short of the Almighty work of

children of their Father in heaven. Oh no! For they are not all Israel which are of Israel. "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the

the Spirit of God, making in each man a *new heart* by the faith of the Cross of the Son of God? Of the true τέκνα who *receive Him*, Christ said, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John xvii. 14, 16), words which were certainly not true of those whose sonship was *only* that of federal privilege, or of patriarchal and hereditary adoption. Yet even of *these* we know that they were of "His own," though of "His own" who "received Him not" (John i. 11; see Westcott *in loc.*). Moses was instructed by God to say to Israel, "Ye are the children of the Lord your God" (Deut. xiv. 1; cf. xxxii. 5, 19). As His children He had "nourished and brought them up" (rather "set them on high," as in Ezek. xxxi. 4; see Kay "On Is. i. 2"). But this federal regeneration, this calling into the very family of God—how strikingly it served to make manifest, in their going away backward, the terrible lesson of the leprosy of the human heart (like the leprosy of the out-cast Uzziah), full of wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores! Here is that which is to lead them to the healing power of their Father, to turn to Him for a new regeneration, a Divine gift of a new birth indeed, a fulfilling of the gracious promise, "I will give them a heart to know Me." "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you" (Ezek. xxxvi. 26). "I will put My Spirit within you" (ver. 27). And does not this relation at the same time serve also to manifest the dependence of the inward, converting, enlightening, sanctifying grace of the Spirit on the sinner's acceptance of the free gift of the justifying and adopting grace which is brought δωρεάν to the "ungodly" heart by the Gospel of Christ (Rom. iii. 24, iv. 5, viii. 15)? It is, in fact, simply belief in regeneration in the lower sense which, by the grace of God, brings forth its true fruit in the true regeneration of the spiritual new creation in Christ Jesus (see first part of Homily for Whitsunday). And it is simply unbelief, want of faith, in the regeneration of baptism (viewed in its relation to the doctrine of the Gospel) which hinders its proper effect in the new life which belongs to those who are indeed, in the truest and highest sense, begotten of God. The hindrance is simply the lack of the "faith whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament" (see Goode, pp. 464-469). The fruits of the Spirit grow upon a tree which is "rooted and grounded in love" (Eph. iii. 17), even the Divine love which says, "I have blotted out as a thick cloud thy transgressions and as a cloud thy sins; return unto Me, for I have redeemed thee" (Isa. xlv. 22); "Thou shalt call Me, My Father; and shalt not turn away from Me" (Jer. iii. 19); even the same Divine love which hearkens and hears, yea, hears the voice of the new-born, beloved, and converted soul, saying, "Turn Thou me, and I shall be turned, for Thou art the Lord my God" (Jer. xxxi. 18). "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God" (1 John iii. 1). This is the love which passeth knowledge, the knowledge of which leads up to the being "filled into all the fulness of God" (Eph. iii. 19). The Spirit in which we mortify the deeds of the body is the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father (Rom. viii. 13-15).

It may be well to observe that the words of our Lord in Luke xi. 13 clearly imply a filial relation (Mark ὁ υἱὸς in ver. 11, as well as τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν in ver. 13) and a position as in a family of Divine parental affection, antecedently to the asking and receiving of Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Compare

flesh : but he is a Jew which is one inwardly ; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter : whose praise is not of men, but of God " (Rom. ii. 28, 29). Oh no !¹ For it is a word for the baptized : " To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." " If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His."

Gal. iv. 6, where the mission of τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ is consequent upon the receiving of the υἰοθεσία.

In this connection it may be interesting to note that in the Eastern Liturgical formula of *adoption* (as given in Goar, "Euchologion," p. 562, Venice, 1730) the adopting party addresses the adopted, before raising him from the ground, in these words: Σήμερον υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκά σε (see Goar's Note, p. 564). So "Lavacrum Dionysius vocat τὴν μήτερα τῆς υἰοθεσίας" (see Comber, "Companion to Temple," vol. iii., p. 418, Oxford, 1841). And so in the Eastern Baptismal Office there is a prayer that the water may be made λούτρον (lavacrum) παλιγγενεσίας . . . υἰοθεσίας χάρισμα (Goar, p. 289). It may be observed that the codices of the "old Latin" version mostly agree against other authorities in substituting the words, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee," for the words from heaven at the baptism in Luke iii. 22 (see Burkitt in "Texts and Studies," vol. iv., No. 3, p. 5). Compare the words of Bucer's formula, "this most holy Sacrament of Baptism, which is the first adoption, receiving, and entering into the Kingdom of Christ" (see Goode, p. 444). Compare also the following from the earlier Helvetic Confession: "In Baptismo aqua signum est, ac res ipsa regeneratio, adoptioque in populum Dei" (in Harmonia "Confessionum," Part II., p. 74); and this from the Belgic Confession: "Sanguis Christi animam abluens, a peccatis illam emundat; nosque filios iræ in filios Dei regenerat" (*ibid.*, p. 96), and the following from the "Reformatio Legum Eccl.," Cap. 18, "De Baptismo": "Salus animarum instaurotur Spiritus, et beneficium adoptionis quo nos Deus pro filiis agnoscit, a misericordia Divina per Christum ad nos dimanente, tum etiam ex promissione sacris in Scripturis apparente proveniunt" (Cardwell's edition, p. 17). See Context. So Bradford speaks of baptism as "a Sacrament of regeneration and adoption into the children of God" (Works, vol. ii., p. 92, P.S.). With this may be compared our Collect for Christmas Day, which we owe, not to any ancient sacramentary (as in the case of most of our Collects), but to the *work of our reformers* (see some valuable observations in Dean Goulburn's work on "The Collects," vol. i., pp. 141, 144, 145). The words, "that we, being regenerate, and made Thy children by adoption and grace," are not without their value as serving to illustrate and interpret our baptismal formularies, for which we are indebted to some extent, no doubt (see Swete's "Services before Reformation," pp. 143, 145, 146), though perhaps indirectly, to ancient forms (see Hardwick, "History of Art," p. 95. Procter "On P.B.," p. 362, 4th edition), mainly to a service drawn up by Bucer, but, as regards the parts to which objection is commonly taken, *wholly* (I believe) to the *work of our reformers* (see my "Doctrine of the Sacraments," p. 35, and Procter, pp. 373, 374). Indeed, these parts were, for the most part, added, in the review of 1552, which gave to our Prayer Book its thoroughly "reformed" character.

¹ See Augustin in Ps. lxx., Enarr., § 6; see also Philpot, p. 286, P.S.

(To be concluded.)