

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1924

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

Prayer Book Revision—Latest Developments.

SINCE the last issue of THE CHURCHMAN several important decisions have been made by the House of Clergy in connection with the Revision of the Prayer Book. The chief of these is in regard to the Reservation of the Elements. The Committee which drew up the Report on Revision for the Church Assembly (N.A. 60) was very sharply divided on this question. A strong minority, consisting of Sir Edward Clarke, Mr. H. C. Hogan, Sir G. A. King, Mr. Albert Mitchell and Dr. Eugene Stock, made a strong stand against the introduction of rubrics permitting Reservation on the grounds that "Notwithstanding the care with which those rubrics had been settled, we do not think that it is possible adequately to safeguard the practice from abuse. We do not admit that the practice of Reservation is either primitive or catholic; and we believe that the teaching associated with it is not conformable to Holy Scripture." In spite of this protest a rubric was inserted in the form for the Communion of the Sick, providing that "when the Holy Communion cannot reverently or without grave difficulty be celebrated in private, and also when there are several sick persons in the Parish desirous to receive the Communion on the same day, it shall be lawful for the Priest (with the consent of the sick person or persons) on any day when there is a celebration of the Holy Communion in the Church to set apart so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as shall serve the sick person (or persons), and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any). And the open Communion ended, he shall, on the same day, and with as little delay as may be, go and minister the same. If the consecrated Bread and Wine be not taken immediately to the sick person,

they shall be kept in such place, and after such manner as the Ordinary shall direct, so that they be not used for any other purpose whatsoever."

When the subject came before the House of Clergy one of the chief features of the discussion was the frank avowal, by Dr. Darwell Stone, on behalf of the Anglo-Catholics, that they desired Reservation not merely for the Communion of the Sick, but as a help to prayer and devotion. The Reserved Sacrament should, in their view, be the centre not only for private prayer, but for such forms of service as might seem right to those desiring to engage in them. In answer to direct inquiry, Dr. Stone said that although he had not used the word "Adoration" it exactly expressed their wish in regard to the Reserved Sacrament.

Notwithstanding this clear avowal of the ultimate aim of the Anglo-Catholic section, the House of Clergy passed the following rubrics which are to take the place of the sixth rubric after the Communion Service :

"According to long existing custom in the Catholic Church, the Priest may reserve so much of the Consecrated Gifts as may be required for the Communion of the Sick, and others who could not be present at the celebration in Church ; and for this purpose only."

"The Consecrated Bread and Wine so reserved shall be reserved, kept and administered in all respects in accordance with such rules as shall be framed from time to time by the Archbishops and Bishops of the Province or with Canons lawfully passed by the Convocation of the Province, and (subject to such Rules and Canons) with the directions of the Bishop ; nor shall any part of the Consecrated Bread and Wine be reserved, kept, or administered otherwise than as may be prescribed by such Rules, Canons and Directions."

Can Reservation be Safeguarded from Abuse ?

Some have expressed satisfaction with this decision on the ground that it confines Reservation to the purpose of communion, and excludes any other use, and that the reservation is to be controlled by the Bishops acting as a body and not individually. This, they think, will be in harmony with the practice of the Primitive Church as indicated in the often-quoted passage from Justin Martyr ; it will make adequate provision for the need that some assert exists for Reservation in large poor parishes, and it will preclude the introduction of the cultus of the Sacrament and the distinctive devotions

of the Roman Church. If the decision of the House of Clergy is accepted by the whole body of the National Assembly and adopted by the House of Bishops, the Church of England will for the first time since the Reformation allow a practice for which there is little evidence during the first thousand years of the Church's life, and was developed with the doctrine of Transubstantiation (cf. Mr. Albert Mitchell's pamphlet on Reservation).

But the practical question which the Church has to face at the present time is—Can the Reservation of the Elements be safeguarded from abuse? Can it be confined solely to the purpose of the Communion of the Sick? Experience already shows that where the practice has been illegally introduced, it has always been accompanied by this use for purposes of devotion. It was asserted during the discussion in the House of Clergy that "private devotions" before the Reserved Elements cannot be controlled. Those who desire to say their prayers before the Tabernacle cannot be forbidden. Since the discussion an attempt has been made to draw a distinction between "private and public veneration." It is said that it may not be possible to interfere with the private practice of individuals, but that public or corporate acts of devotion can be forbidden. Are we seriously asked to believe that if it is the practice of members of our Church to offer their prayers privately before the Elements, it will be possible for long to resist the demand even already being made for public services such as those of Exposition and Benediction in the Church of Rome? That is a slope upon which there is no resting-place. Concede Reservation for the Communion of the Sick, and the Reserved Elements will be used for private devotion, and soon no distinction will be drawn between private and public devotion. No case has been made for Reservation for the sick, and in our opinion the Church will be wise to maintain its present practice, and refuse to authorize Reservation for any purpose whatever. In view of the demands of the extremists this is the only practicable course.

The Chasuble and the Doctrine of Sacrifice.

Another important decision of the House of Clergy at the July Session was the permission to use the Chasuble in the celebration of Holy Communion. If this change is confirmed by the Church Assembly it will mean a definite alteration in the attitude of the

Church of England in regard to the nature of the sacrifice in the Holy Communion. Professor Burkitt, in his valuable pamphlet on Eucharist and Sacrifice, showed clearly that the only sacrifice recognized in our Communion Service is "that the congregation, having confessed, been shriven, having 'assisted' at a due consecration of the bread and wine, and finally having received their own portion, do then and there offer unto God themselves, their souls and bodies, to be a reasonable sacrifice."

The use of the Chasuble is sought by those who freely proclaim that they are not satisfied with this view of sacrifice. They teach that in the Communion Service there is an offering of Christ present in or under the forms of Bread and Wine as a propitiatory sacrifice to God the Father. This is the teaching of the Roman Church, which holds that the sacrifice thus offered is available for the dead as well as the living, and that the Priest has thus the power of releasing souls in Purgatory on whose behalf Masses are offered, from the pains that they are suffering. This doctrine of sacrifice leads on inevitably to Masses for the dead.

The Chasuble as the Symbol of Charity.

Sir William Joynson-Hicks in a letter to *The Times* pointed out this distinctively Roman significance of the use of the Chasuble. He was taken to task by the Bishop of Ripon, who maintained that the Chasuble was not "definitely and specifically characteristic of the Church of Rome." The *Guardian* also endeavoured to represent Sir William as ignorant regarding the significance of the Vestment. It said: "There is nothing sacrificial about the Chasuble. The symbolical significance attached to it in the Latin form of ordination is that it represents charity." This is a plea frequently put forward. Recently Dr. Strawley has brought it forward on several occasions, but the misrepresentation contained in it has often been exposed. Several Roman Catholic authorities can be quoted to show conclusively that the Chasuble is given to the priests of that Church at their ordination solely to signify that they have had conferred on them the power of offering the sacrifice of the Mass, and that they are to wear it only when engaged in offering that sacrifice. There is also abundant testimony that those who have introduced the use of the Chasuble into our Communion Service have intended to symbolize by it the Eucharistic sacrifice. If "charity" were alone

symbolized we might well ask with one speaker in the House of Clergy: Why disturb the peace of the Church and cause divisions to introduce a garment intended to symbolize "Charity"?

Great Issues involved in Small Decisions.

There are, of course, some in the Church who regard it as "small minded" to raise objections to such things as the wearing of a particular vestment or the Reservation of the Elements. We would, however, remind them that some of the greatest issues in the history of the Church have depended upon decisions relating to apparently trivial matters. We need only recall the sneer with which some have spoken of a controversy over a diphthong, yet on the difference between "oi" and "ou" depended the whole Catholic faith as to the divinity of our Lord. In the present instance it is the whole conception of God and His worship that is at stake. If we believed that these changes meant a loftier conception of God, or a higher ideal of worship, we should give them our hearty assent. But on the contrary we believe that they represent a falling away from the true conception of God that our Church has maintained for several centuries. The Reformation meant a completely new and nobler idea of God and of man's relation to Him: the present changes reveal a tendency to sink back to lower, and we may add medieval, views. The study of personality—human and divine—which has been so greatly emphasized in recent years, ought to have saved us from such retrogression. But religion, like everything in which the human element plays a part, is subject to grievous reactions.

The sub-Christian Level.

Some of these facts were well brought out by the Dean of Bristol in a letter to *The Times* on the Reservation discussion. He emphasized the "Scripturalness" of the Church of England, and the fact that the presence of Christ is in the Communion, and that it is as Communicants we offer the only "eucharistic sacrifice" which is "ourselves, our souls and bodies." His chief point is that "with fidelity to the original conception of the Holy Communion is bound up the Christian conception of religion, because any other undermines the Christian conception of God." He refers to the danger of a relapse to a sub-Christian level in the devotional standards of the Church of England. That is the great central fact of the whole

problem to many to-day. The Church of England appears in the face of the light of centuries, of the experience of generations of Christians of the highest type, to be willing to relapse to a sub-Christian level, and to depart from the purity of the faith won at so great a cost in the ages past. We are not surprised that the Dean of Bristol speaks of such a relapse as "treason to far more than even national interests." The highest interests of morality and truth are at stake. We are eager that the Church of England should take its place in the van in the forward march, but this cannot be if it is willing at the dictation of a small minority to relapse into Medievalism.

Looking to the Bishops.

We look to the Bishops to save the Church from this fate. On them will shortly rest the responsibility of deciding the final form of our revised Prayer Book. If they accept these alterations a cry of disappointment will go up from the lips of hundreds of thousands of loyal Churchmen. Have the Bishops the courage to maintain the old truths of our Church? Some seem to think that they are terrorized by the Anglo-Catholic section; that the policy of "squeezing the Bishops" taught by a distinguished member of that order has been carried out so effectively that each individual Bishop dare not face the pressure of organized opposition in his own diocese. We do not believe this of the Bishops. No doubt they are willing to make compromises for the sake of peace, but where fundamental truth is concerned they will surely stand firm at all costs. It is not for us to suggest the proper line of action for them to adopt, but it has been suggested in high quarters that it is time that they gave up individual efforts in dealing with these matters, and arrived at some decision as to their corporate action. The decisions thus arrived at should be impartially but firmly enforced so that some measure of order may be restored in the Church. Those who are unwilling to submit should then have no alternative but to join another communion where they would be more at home.

Truth and Unity.

Sooner or later our Church will be faced by the problem of deciding for Truth or for Unity. The idea entertained by some that the unity of Christendom can be achieved by the inclusion of contradictory doctrines and conflicting ideals is impracticable. We are

anxious to go as far as any in widening the comprehensiveness not only of the Church of England, but of the great world-wide communion embraced in the vision of a reunited Christendom. But the claims of Truth are insistent and must be respected. At present there seems to be a tendency to regard compromise as the chief means of unity. This can only arise from a loose hold on principles, and a failure to realize the importance of fundamental truths. Free play may be readily accorded on all points that are matters of speculative interest, but below all these there is a basis of belief necessary for the very existence of the Church. We cannot on the one hand allow Rationalism to explain away the Resurrection, nor on the other permit a false Catholicism to fetter reason by the claims of an infallible Pope, and a Church organization based largely on forged decretals. The Church requires a simple faith in the fundamental truths of Christianity, and an adequate organization untrammelled by obsolete theories, and capable of expansion and development in order that the truth may be passed on pure and unsullied.

The Alternative Communion Offices.

Very few people are able to carry in their mind the various proposals put forward in C.A. 84 and by the House of Clergy for the Revision of the Communion Office as compared with our existing Office. They need a conspectus that will enable them to see for themselves by comparison the real character of the changes and how far doctrine is involved in the alterations. Changes are not proposed in such a solemn rite for the mere sake of change. Something much deeper is at stake and every word tells. Dr. A. C. Downer has conferred a boon on Churchmen by setting forth in *The Alternative Communion Offices* (Church Book Room, 2s.) the proposals made in C.A. 84 and those put forward by the House of Clergy. He has added to their indebtedness by appending a number of Notes that make plain the issues involved in the changes. He calls attention to much that has been overlooked and shows that conceptions absent from our Book of Common Prayer but present in the Medieval Service Books are found in the new proposals. Bishop Knox in a suggestive Preface states that while the proposals for a new consecration prayer in C.A. 84 might have been welcomed by some High Churchmen in the seventeenth and

eighteenth centuries, they are now accompanied by other changes which give the prayer a meaning that would have been repudiated by these divines. It is not by piecemeal consideration that the proposals must be judged. When taken as a whole their seriousness is so great, that they constitute a revolution in our conception of the doctrine of the Holy Communion. We hope that this book will have a very wide circulation.

The New Bishop of Birmingham.

It would be interesting to know what influences were brought to bear upon the Prime Minister to induce him to nominate Canon Barnes for the Bishopric of Birmingham, for it can hardly be supposed that Mr. Ramsay MacDonald made the appointment on his sole initiative. But then it is very rarely that Prime Ministers do so act in the matter of Crown appointments, although some have proved themselves much less pliable than others. It will be recalled that when the method of appointment of bishops was under discussion in the Church Assembly, the Archbishop of Canterbury playfully remarked that if a burglar broke into Lambeth Palace and opened a certain drawer, he, at least, would soon see that the Prime Minister was by no means the only person concerned in the appointments to the Episcopal Bench, and it can hardly be doubted that the Primate is the one man in all England whom Premiers would most desire to consult. How far his Grace's hand can be discerned in the appointment of Canon Barnes to the Bishopric of Birmingham must, of course, be purely a matter of conjecture. It would be idle to pretend, however, that the elevation of Canon Barnes to the Episcopate has won anything like general approval among Churchmen. The *Church Times*, on first hearing the rumour, was singularly outspoken in its opposition, and, although in a subsequent leader it somewhat modified the strength of its language, there can be little doubt that the appointment is not at all to the mind of Anglo-Catholics. It would be surprising if it were, for the new bishop has more than once publicly expressed views which are not at all favourable to their distinctive teachings. Nor is the appointment one which satisfies the general body of Evangelicals, a large and important section of whom view with the utmost dismay his Modernist tendencies. It has been affirmed that he is not an "advanced" Modernist, and that is probably

true, but his sermon at this year's gathering of the Modern Churchmen's Conference, preached after his appointment to Birmingham, and some other later utterances, make it plain that his views on the story of Creation and his general attitude towards the Holy Scriptures are not those which find favour with the great majority of Evangelicals. It must readily be admitted, however, that he is a man of great learning and capacity and that, personally, he has great charm of manner, but how far these qualities will make up for the absence of any wide parochial experience such as ought to be, at least, one of the qualifications of a Bishop, remains to be seen. Those who know him best are assured that he will make a good bishop, and there seems every indication that Churchmen in Birmingham will offer him a cordial welcome. Whilst on the subject of appointments to Bishoprics, we take leave to remind the powers that be that the Evangelical section of the Church has claims to recognition which are not sufficiently realized. Evangelical Churchmen have a distinct and very important contribution to make to the thought, life and work of the Church, and they ought to be represented among the Bishops in both the Southern and Northern Provinces in sufficient numbers to make that contribution effective.

"English Modernism."

The views of the new Bishop of Birmingham are sufficiently set out in the essay he contributed to the volume *Liberal Evangelicalism*, and more recently he has contributed articles on "English Modernism" to the *St. Martin's Review*. It is, perhaps, only fair to him that we should quote the closing words of his concluding article in the September issue. After affirming that "as Christianity becomes once again intellectually respectable, the main hindrance to its revival will be removed"—a highly controversial proposition, but let that pass—he goes on to defend the position of "English Modernists" as follows:—

It is sometimes suggested that Modernists are engaged in the placid enjoyment of religious puzzles with aloof indifference to the needs and trials of common men. It is true that in Holland, America and elsewhere there are some modernist theologians who seem to delight in destructive theories that are often fantastic. But English Modernism has a different character. Of all our leaders it may be fairly said that they seek so to present the gospel

of Christ that it may be re-established as the basis of our civilization. They preach God, as Christ revealed Him; the Creator Whose plan and rule of the world perplexes us and—yet—our Father. They bid men be loyal to the Spirit of Christ, for only by such loyalty can man be completely true to the purpose for which he was created. And they give substance to the hope of everlasting life; for, unless this hope be sure and certain, earth's evolutionary history is unintelligible and man's spiritual consciousness is the gift of a merely freakish Giver. Such teaching is both coherent and rational. Far from being a mere tissue of negations, it is a positive and inspiring faith. Those who formulate it differ in many details of belief. Some, more than others, are agnostic with regard to questions of subsidiary importance. But, as Lightfoot used to say, it is enough to be sure of a few great truths. Men of little minds crave for unattainable certainties because their grasp of essentials is weak. The great man, like Newton, is always humble in the presence of Nature and of God. Our men of science can teach us many things and, not least among them, to recognize with humility the extent of our ignorance and to have faith in truth.

“Inconceivably Irreverent and Foolish.”

These words “inconceivably irreverent and foolish” are applied by the Rev. F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E., in a letter which appears in the August number of *Theology* addressed to “Dear Mr. X,” who asked his opinion on the practice of Communion under one kind only. The letter is one of great interest and is absolutely fatal to the contention of those—and unfortunately they are many—who are pleading for administration of the Bread only, and not the Bread and the Wine, in the Holy Communion. The practice prevails in the Church of Rome, and members of the school of English Churchmen so-called, whose one ambition seems to be to follow Rome as closely as possible, are seeking to introduce the practice amongst us. The present writer once saw administration in one kind at a week-day service of Holy Communion, and if we may judge from Mr. Puller's letter, the practice is much more common than it is generally supposed to be. But, whatever may be the case in public services, there seems reason to fear that it is becoming increasingly the case to “reserve” one only of the two Sacramental Elements, with the result that in communicating the sick with the “Reserved Sacrament” only one kind is administered to the patient, even though he may be physically fit to receive in both kinds. Mr. Puller admits that he would be ready himself “to communicate people

under one kind, if they were physically incapable of receiving under both kinds, but *could* receive under one kind " ; for the rest, however, he is strongly opposed to the practice. His words are so striking that it will be convenient to quote them, even though the passage is rather long :—

The Holy Eucharist is the central Mystery of the Christian life during the present dispensation. Everything connected with it is enveloped in Mystery. Some of its effects are indeed more or less clearly revealed, but there must be a great deal which will not be known until after our Lord's return. In the meantime, the only safe course for the Church is to adhere strictly to what our Lord has taught us about it by His words and by His actions. Any attempt to apply human logic to something so far beyond our ken, is to court disaster. For example, to say that there can be no need for priests who are not celebrating, and for other clerks and all lay people, to receive the Chalice when they communicate, because the precious Blood is present by concomitance with the Lord's Body in the sacred Host seems to me *to be inconceivably irreverent and foolish*. (*Italics are ours.*) I am referring, of course, to the opinion which has become common among Latin theologians since the latter part of the eleventh century.

During the first thousand years and for some time later, the Church faithfully adhered in the Celebration and Administration of the Eucharist to our Lord's teaching and practice. Early in the twelfth century some few Bishops began to introduce a new custom of communicating the laity with a Host which had been dipped in the Chalice, instead of allowing them to drink from the Chalice. Paschal II, who was the Roman Pope from 1099 to 1118, hearing of this novelty wrote to Pontius, the Abbot of Cluny and Superior-General of the whole Cluniac Order. He begins by quoting a passage from St. Cyprian's letter to Cæcilius, another North African Bishop, in which St. Cyprian teaches that in the Celebration of the Eucharist nothing should be done which should be different from what the Lord first did for us. Having quoted the words of the illustrious Bishop of Carthage, Pope Paschal goes on to say : " Therefore, in agreement with the teaching of Cyprian, let the tradition established by the Lord be adhered to, when His Body and Blood are being received, and let no man-made novelty bring about a departure from that which Christ our Master both commanded to be done, and Himself did. For we know that our Lord delivered first the Bread and afterwards the Wine ; and we teach and command that that custom should always be observed in Holy Church, excepting only in the case of infants and persons in extreme illness, who may be totally unable to swallow the Bread " (*Migne's Patrologia Latina*, vol. clxiii., col. 442). I quote this passage, not because its main argument bears directly on communicating people under one kind, but because Pope Paschal bases his argument on the wrongness of departing in any degree

from what our Lord Himself did and commanded to be done, when He was instituting the Eucharist.

These are wise and weighty words, and we trust they will have influence with pro-Roman Churchmen, who, whilst they are impervious to all outside influences, may yet take heed to the words of a friend. It will be an intolerable scandal if "communion under one kind" ever find a place within the Church of England.

"The Church of To-morrow."

The Church Congress at Oxford—a re-visit after an interval of sixty-two years—opened on September 30 and is being continued during the first three days of this month. The title of the subject of the discussions, "The Church of To-morrow," has mystified some people, but a little reflection will show how eminently useful the careful consideration of such a problem might be. Whether the papers at Oxford will fulfil all that is expected of them cannot yet be determined, but judging from the names of the appointed readers and speakers, the Congress should be a useful one. The programme is on the whole a bold one, and it should be extraordinarily interesting to hear what is said on such subjects as "What Youth asks of the Church" and "What the Church asks of Youth." Another subject of great importance which will be discussed at length is "Children and the Church," for the children of to-day will be or should become the Churchpeople of to-morrow. The weightier matters to be discussed include "Problems of Faith; Worship and Conduct"; and "The Appeal of the Faith—Re-affirmation and Re-Statement." "The Hope of To-morrow" will be centred on "Christ the Saviour," and "Christ the King"; and "The Church of To-morrow" will give opportunity for dealing with its world-wide extension and its ultimate unity.

* * * * *

The Rev. G. T. Spriggs, Box 66, Kensington, P.E.I., Canada, writes to the National Church League that some unknown friend is sending some copies of the *Church Gazette* and the *Churchman* to his old address, Alberton, P.E.I., and he would be grateful if the League would draw the donor's attention to the fact that he has left his old address. He adds that he appreciates very much receiving the literature and wants to thank the friend. Will the kind donor please note the change of address?

THE REAL PRESENCE.

BY THE REV. THOS. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A., Vicar of
St. Paul-at-Kilburn, N.W.6.

PERSONS or things may be present. They may be present separately or together. A person differs from something material by its power of interpenetration. Matter cannot interpenetrate matter, but personality is interpenetrative. To love is to go out of oneself and dwell in another. Lover and beloved interpenetrate. We all know how the presence of a person we love has changed our whole internal state of being. And we know more intimately personality than we know the external world. Our personality is ever with us. It is ourself in the last analysis and however much we may know about it, we have to confess that its analysis baffles our intellect and we are face to face with abysmal depths that we cannot fathom, *Omnia exeunt in mysterium*, and this is true of personality as well as of everything else.

God is transcendent and immanent. He is above all things and sustains all things. He is everywhere and we cannot visualize His personality any more than we can our own. We have to avoid the danger of Deism as well as the more subtle danger of Pantheism—a conception of the Universe which ultimately identifies it with God. The progress of scientific thought on the constitution of matter makes thinkers see that matter with all its solidity and impressive vastness may or may not be centres of electricity and so “immaterial” from the ordinary point of view that it is hard to understand how it can possess the qualities we associate with it. The further our investigation proceeds the more difficult it is for the average man to grasp the ultimate character of the constituents of the atom and to dogmatize on the possibility or impossibility of even the most surprising contentions as to its character.

But when the last word is said, the contrast between Personality and Materiality is complete. As we know Personality among men it is always associated with matter, but we can very easily conceive of Personality divorced from matter. For our identity here in earth there is a necessary connection between Personality and Matter—the character of the individual depends on the interaction of Personality and its material home and environment. When we

talk of the Divine personality we are in the presence of Personality that is not limited. But His personality possesses the power of interpenetrability, and we express this when we say that God dwells in us and we in Him. The very essence of all religious experience is communion with God who deigns to dwell in our hearts, and by His grace we are enabled to dwell in Him. His Person comes in contact with our person and, what is more, becomes part of us by the indwelling Spirit, and we are united to Him by faith. Without this fundamental fact religion would be meaningless. Union with God through Christ is the very central fact of Christian experience—it is at once the starting point of the Christian life and the ideal to which we aspire. Our Lord was one with God. As He said, "All things are delivered unto Me of My Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." The interpenetration of the personality of the Son and the Father was perfect, and we, in our striving after holiness, endeavour to dwell in Him and to have Him dwelling in us.

Our Lord has declared, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." He has also stated, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." The meaning is plain. His Person is with His people who meet in His name, and He is pledged to be with them individually and collectively unto the end of the world. His Spirit fills the Church and dwells in the individual member. The Church is His body—not a physical Body. But as our personality exists in space and is united with our body, so in the community that is beloved by Him, His Person fills the body consisting of men and women united to Him by living Faith. Life is always connotative of the Presence of Christ. "This is life eternal to know Thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." It is personal life, and the man who possesses life eternal shares the life of the Eternal God. This life persists so long as union with Him is maintained. He is our life and we owe it to His Personality interpenetrating ours.

These thoughts are regulative of all Christian communion with God. They may appear abstract and difficult to grasp, but it will not be denied that the fact of our life being hid with Christ in God carries with it conceptions that involve the fundamental relation

of person with person and a mystery that words cannot describe, but experience knows to be a realized fact in our life of communion with God. As in every other department of our conscious life, we cannot get rid of mystery, why should it be extraordinary that human thought cannot probe the secrets of the deepest facts of our spiritual life? We live in the midst of mysteries, and a mystery is neither irrational nor unintelligible when it means that we cannot place experience under an analytical investigation that will make everything plain.

The Sacrament of the Death of Christ was instituted on the eve of His Death. The disciples met together for the Paschal feast. Their minds went back to the deliverance from Egypt. They were Jews and their memories were full of what God had done for their ancestors. Their fathers had been delivered from bondage through the grace of God. He who came to show them the Father and to seal their redemption by His death was to be for them the true Passover Lamb, "The Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." The bread that He broke and distributed, for those who trusted in Him, was representative of the Passover flesh, and the wine which was drunk by all represented the Passover blood—sprinkled as it was in the past on the lintel. He was the true Passover Lamb—the fulfilment of all that was typified in Egypt. "Take eat—this is My Body; drink ye all of this cup; this is My Blood." A new covenant was made, and in remembrance of Him who made it by His blood, they were to do as He did, and as oft as the bread was eaten and the wine drunk the death of the Lord is shown forth until He come again. He who said, "This is My Body" and "This is My Blood" had in His hands the bread and the cup. His Presence was with them in the form that they had known during their intercourse with Him. There was a clear distinction between the elements He held and they consumed and His present body and blood which they knew to be the robe of His personality. After His Resurrection and Ascension they obeyed His dying command and found in obedience His Presence with them.

The Apostolic Church fed by faith upon the Christ who in bodily form was absent from them, but in the deepest experience of their Christian life was always with them, and in obedience to His command they fed upon Him by faith as they received the elements

that had been sanctified by His use and set apart solemnly in obedience to His command as a remembrance of Him. The Lord's Supper was a feeding upon Christ by Faith and a looking forward to His coming again. Of the reality of His Presence in their midst collectively and in their hearts individually there was no manner of doubt. They knew it in experience, they had His word that He would be with them. The Presence in the Supper of the Lord was part of the fulfilment of His promise to be with them, and in experience He met them as they did what He commanded in living faith that He would dwell with them as they dwelt with Him. Those who met at His Table gathered together to meet Him and He fulfilled His promise which He has never failed to do, as His children gather together to show forth His death till He come and feed on Him by faith as they receive the Bread and Wine.

The late Bishop Moule, of Durham, thus describes the character of our Lord's Presence in the Holy Communion : ¹

“ I believe that if our eyes, like those of Elisha's servant at Dothan, were opened to the unseen, we should indeed behold our Lord present at our Communion. There and then, assuredly, if anywhere and at any time, He remembers His promise, ‘ Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.’ Such special presence, the promised congregational presence, is perfectly mysterious in mode, but absolutely true in fact ; no creation of our imagination or emotion, but an object of our faith. I believe that our Lord, so present, not ON the Holy Table, but AT it, would be seen Himself in our presence, to bless the Bread and Wine for a holy use, and to distribute them to His disciples, saying to all and each, ‘ Take eat, this is My Body which was given for you : Drink ye all of this ; this is My Blood of the New Covenant which was shed for you for the remission of sins.’ I believe that we should worship Him thus present in the midst of us in His living grace, with unspeakable reverence, thanksgiving, joy and love. We should revere the Bread and Wine with a profound sense of their sacredness as given by Him in physical assurance of our joyful part, as believers in Him, and so as members of Him, in all the benefits of His passion. Receiving them while beholding Him, we should, through them as His equivalent signs of His once sacrificed Body and Blood, take deep into us a fresh certainty of our perfect acceptance in Him our Sacrifice, and also of our mystical union with Him as He, once dead, now lives for us and in us, thus feeding on Him in our hearts, by faith with Thanksgiving. Receiving His signs, we should look up with renewed and inexpressible confidence through Him to the Father.”

¹ Fulham Conference Report, pp. 72-3.

These carefully chosen words put clearly the Scriptural teaching on the Presence of our Lord in the Holy Communion. They meet all the requirements of the words of Holy Scripture, summarize the facts of experience and emphasize the fact that the Presence of our Lord in the Sacrament is a special fulfilment of His promise to be with His people. He is present in Person to the eye of faith, and His followers feed upon Him by a living Faith shown in obedience to His command.

There are many other views as to the nature of the Presence of our Lord. Bishop Gore says that the Church has believed from the first that :—

“By consecration of the portions of bread and wine which have been solemnly set apart or offered, the spiritual gift of Christ's body and blood is, in some way, attached to these elements (however the relationship is to be described) before they are eaten and drunken, and independently of such eating and drinking.” . . . “Prior to reception and independently of the faith of the individual, the body and blood of Christ are made present ‘under the forms of’ bread and wine, or in some real though undefined way identified with them.” (*The Body of Christ*. Fourth Ed., pp. 71 ff.)

“It does not seem to me open to question that St. Paul takes it for granted that there was a real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements blessed in the Eucharist, such as should strike his converts with an awful dread of a careless approach to them.” (*The Holy Spirit in the Church*, pp. 134-5.)

In *The Body of Christ* Dr. Gore devotes very small space to the discussion of the New Testament evidence for the belief in the Real Presence identified with the elements. He dwells on St. Paul's language (1 Cor. x.) and concludes, “The New Testament at least confirms the Church's belief.” If we read St. Paul's statement we find that he sums up the meaning of the rite in the words, “This do in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew forth (proclaim) the Lord's death, till He come.” St. Paul in the last sentence adds to the Gospel narrative and by so doing teaches that he considers the Holy Communion to be a memorial of our Lord's death and means of proclaiming it until He come again. He saw the Corinthian observance disgraced by gross moral abuses and without understanding of what the solemn service really involved. He wished them to fix their attention upon the sacrificial death of our Lord. He came among them

determined to know nothing " save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." Corinthian Christians failed to " discern " in the Supper of the Lord the broken body and blood shed for their redemption. Had they done so they would not have been guilty of the gross irreverence that called forth the Apostle's stern reproof. They were really guilty of the body and blood of the Lord when they closed their eyes to, and in fact made light of, the eternal realities that should be the very centre of their thought and devotion during the solemn service. Instead of confirming the objective Presence of our Lord with the elements, the words of St. Paul have an entirely different signification, and Dr. Gore reads into them teaching later than that of the New Testament.

The conception that our Lord is objectively attached in some form or other to the consecrated elements received its mediæval development in the doctrine of Transubstantiation which had its foundation in the philosophical view of the nature of matter as consisting of substance and accidents. The substance was the hidden entity that made a thing—the accidents were the outward sensible accompaniments of the invisible substance. It is unnecessary to discuss this philosophical conception, for in spite of the adhesion of the Roman Church to it as truth, and the strange acceptance of it by a number of Anglo-Catholics, this view of the nature of matter is universally surrendered. But it lies at the very basis of Transubstantiation which can be understood from the words of the Council of Trent: " If anyone shall say that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remains together with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body and of the whole substance of the Wine into the Blood, the appearance only of the bread and wine remaining, which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most fittingly calls Transubstantiation, let him be anathema."

This remains the doctrine of the Roman Church and our Articles declare that " it cannot be proved by Holy Writ ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." Dr. Gore rightly says " nothing in the New Testament suggests transubstantiation . . . St. Paul has no hesitation on calling the bread, after it

had been blessed 'this bread'—or saying 'there is one bread.'"

The late Rev. W. J. E. Bennett wrote: "Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore, the consecrated elements," but he afterwards altered the words into: "The real and actual Presence of our Lord under the form of Bread and Wine upon the altars of our Churches," and "Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore, Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of Bread and Wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The words were the subject of prolonged judicial proceedings, which resulted in the acquittal of Mr. Bennett. Two comments on the acquittal deserve attention. The author of *The Life of Mr. Bennett* writes: "The doctrines for which Mr. Bennett was prosecuted not being so excluded" (by the barriers against Roman additions) "must therefore be the doctrines of the English Church, and one can only commend the honesty and logic of those who in consequence of the Bennett judgment, being unable to accept these doctrines, left the Church for dissent." This is a plain claim that the doctrines set forth in the above words are the doctrine of our Church and none other can be honestly held within the Church. On the other hand the Royal Commission in 1906 reported:

"The judgment of the Judicial Committee in the Bennett case laid down certain principles which may be here fitly considered. They can and must be clearly distinguished from the findings of the Court with regard to the clergyman then under prosecution. His words were held to be 'rash and ill-judged' and 'perilously near a violation of the law.' He was acquitted, because the Court, having regard to the penal character of the proceedings, and to the defendant's right to the 'benefit of any reasonable doubt,' thought his words capable of a construction which did not call for judicial condemnation. The real relation of the judgment to Mr. Bennett's teaching has been frequently misunderstood. His language has been taken in the sense which the Court held it narrowly avoided; and his acquittal has been treated as establishing the legality of doctrine which his language was held not to express."

The theory that the repetition of the Words of Institution by a duly ordained Priest and by no one else at the Holy Communion brings the Presence of Christ to the Elements locally is now widely held in the Church of England. Most of those who teach the doctrine assert their disbelief in the Roman explanation of the mystery, but some are bold enough to claim that the Roman view

is that of the Catholic Church, and therefore must be held by the Church of England as part of the Church of the West. This carries with it the repugnant doctrine that after the bread has been received the process of digestion causes the presence of Christ to be withdrawn in quarter of an hour. This involves the desire to have the Presence more permanent and leads to Reservation with Adoration in the Roman Church.

Dr. Darwell Stone in *Congress Book No. 28*, writes :

“ There is a further consequence of the truth that the reserved Sacrament is the body of Christ. Wherever the Lord manifests His presence He makes a demand. The soul of the Christian can at all times and in all places worship the incarnate Lord in his heavenly glory on the throne of God, just as at all times and in all places there can be worship of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. But the sacramental presence is a special manifestation of the Lord, and calls for a special response. Such a response is to be made by the worshippers at the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice ; it is to be made also by any who draw near to the reserved Sacrament.”

“ When it is acknowledged that the Sacrament is not only a symbol but also the living presence of the Lord himself, then there is a special claim on the soul's allegiance and a special gift to the soul's life. Prayer to the Lord in the reserved Sacrament has its own meaning for the servant of God.”

Accordingly we have services arranged for the adoration of the Sacrament and the Benediction of the people practised by the priest holding the monstrance containing the Sacrament.

Whatever view of a permanent presence localized in the elements be held, it is impossible to avoid the adoration of the Sacrament and the superstitious uses to which it has been put by the Church of Rome. Man is always prone to localize the Deity either in a shrine or in matter. The whole history of religion bears testimony to this tendency of human nature. What may from one point of approach be considered a means to an end becomes in time an end in itself and the worship of the Presence in the elements cannot sharply, or even broadly, in the minds of the majority of worshippers be distinguished from worship of the Elements themselves. The Roman view developed slowly, but when once it became the accepted view of the Western Church the practice of Reservation and Adoration rapidly spread. Its influence on our own communion is manifest. There has been no Eucharistic excess in the matter of Adoration that has not found its way into our Church, and has not been defended

as a legitimate extension of principles involved in the doctrine of the localized Presence. The words of Cardinal Newman are frequently quoted in justification of the localized Presence.

“The visible species change their position, but He does not move. He is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of a spirit, we do not know how; we have no parallel to the ‘how’ in our experience. We can only say that He is present, not according to the manner of bodies but *sacramentally*. His presence is substantial, spirit wise, sacramental; an absolute mystery, not against reason but against imagination and must be received by faith.”

These words when analysed are in direct contrast to the practices associated with the adoration of the Presence in the Elements. They are in contrast with the Benediction by the Elements in the monstrance. If our Lord be equally present everywhere and His presence is not determined by the movement of the Sacrament, how then can communication with the Reserved Sacrament be otherwise than a removal in space that is brought to the mouth of the recipient? It is impossible to reconcile the higher sacramental Presence, as expressed in these words of Newman and approved by many in our Church, with the practices that spring from them. “God is Spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth,” but human nature sees in the consecrated Elements when reserved the localized Presence associated with the Elements, and it is impossible if the teaching be true to abstain from adoration and the consequent superstitions. History proves this and contemporary practice in our own Church proves that the danger is one that must be avoided.

But what is the true view of the Presence? The teaching of the Church of England is set forth in the Articles of Religion, and we are convinced that in this respect her doctrine is that of the primitive Church and of the New Testament. It must be remembered that the men who drafted the Articles were experts in the Roman position. They knew what Rome taught and the doctrine that needed Reform. And it is a great advantage that the passages referring to the Presence are positive and not negative. They show the mind of the Church as to the manner of Presence in the Holy Communion that commended itself to the Reformers. “Inasmuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same (the Supper of the Lord) the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is

a partaking of the Blood of Christ." "The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." Article XXIX declares that the wicked and such as be void of lively faith, although they receive the Sacrament, are in nowise partakers of Christ. Emphasis is placed on Faith. This means that the man who receives Christ in the Sacrament receives Him through personal communion with Him by Faith. The relation is intensely personal. What God gives He gives through the believing faith of the communicant. Once more we return to the fact that all Christianity depends for its reality on the interpenetration of the Divine and human personalities. This is conditioned by Faith—by Trust in the Redeemer, and the recipient of the Lord's Supper owes the blessing he receives to his personal communion. Christ gives Himself to him who receives, faith is strengthened and grace is bestowed.

Bishop Gore says : ¹

"It appears to be certain that Hooker would still be justified, as far as Anglican standards taken by themselves are concerned—even since the revision of the Prayer Book in 1662—in seeking to shelve the question of any presence in the Elements apart from the act of receiving ; and that Waterland in going further and denying any such presence, was not transgressing the limits of allowed opinion; but no one, on the other hand, is justified in denying to others the right to hold and teach what is the accepted doctrine of the ancient Church as to an objective presence, prior to the act of reception and independent of it."

We have seen that the New Testament offers no evidence for this objective presence. The end of the Sacrament is communion with Christ, and it is essential that the Elements be received. The silence of the New Testament on any other purpose of the Sacrament is not an ordinary silence. The character of the Sacrament is laid down, and we have not the slightest proof of any blessing attending any use of the Sacrament, than that instituted by our Lord and practised by the Apostolic Church which knew nothing of the Supper of the Lord apart from the participation of the Elements.

Bishop Moule rightly says that in the sacred procedure of administering the Communion is not involved any "special attach-

¹ *The Body of Christ*, p. 233.

ment of His Presence to the sacred Signs, albeit called the Body and Blood by reason of their equivalence as Divine tokens." The Scriptures know nothing of this attachment, and it is in no way strange that the blessing of the Sacramental Presence should be confined to the eating and drinking the Elements, faith is quickened by obedience, the person of the recipient is brought into communion with the Person of Christ, and there is the interpenetration of Personality.

The sacramental Presence is in the Service and the Reception—not in the Elements. It is contrary to the whole genius of Holy Scripture, and the nature of the communion of spirit with Spirit that a material Element should be made the seat of the Presence. To do this involves a conception of the relation of man to God which finds no place in the New Testament, and is opposed to the whole of the teaching of the spiritual character of God, and His dealings with human spirits. The Elements are signs and tokens. We cannot define the relation of the spiritual blessing we receive to the consecrated elements. The service is one—consecration and reception by living faith. As we enter into the spirit of the Upper Room, and share the thoughts of Him who presided at the first Eucharist, we see an absence of all the theories that find expression in the practices associated with the doctrine of a localized Presence of the Redeemer, who Himself blessed the Elements which He distributed. There is no magic of any kind in the service, which is entirely on a spiritual level, and has to do with the personal relations of recipients and the Giver of the gift. We receive as our faith warrants our receiving, and as we receive Him, not in the Elements but in communion with Himself, we obey His command as He ordained, and our Faith is strengthened for we receive Him who is "the Lord of our Life and God of our salvation." Our reception is spiritual and the mean by which we receive is faith. The Master is really outside us and within us, for we dwell in Him and He in us. Here is mystery indeed that God should deign to dwell in the hearts of men, and we thank Him for the unspeakable Gift of the Christ that dwells in us as we take and drink what He commanded us to receive, for with the reception He comes to us and draws us closer to Himself.

DID ST. PAUL USE A WRITTEN GOSPEL ?

BY THE REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.,
Tolleshunt Knights, Maldon, Essex.

IT is generally believed that the Pauline Epistles, written roughly speaking between 51 A.D. and 67 A.D., were earlier than the Gospels.¹ It is, however, clear from St. Luke's preface that many had attempted to draw up a systematic narrative of what had been told to them by those who had been "from the beginning (*ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς*) eyewitnesses and ministers of the word." The question to be determined is to what extent, if any, St. Paul directly or indirectly laid under contribution the original material of the evangelical writings. It would seem that notes were made and narratives kept from an early period. This would be rendered necessary by the existence of two practically irreconcilable bodies in the Church, the Hebrew and the Hellenist. Those who build upon oral teaching alone will have to explain how educated men like Stephen and Barnabas, on their assumption, could not or did not write, especially with the example of the historians and prophets of the Old Testament before them, not to mention the Greek philosophers. They were well aware of the danger of entire extinction which faced the gospel and the Church if the catechists were killed unless the former was preserved in a written form. Memories, however retentive, could never reconstruct it, as they knew. Persecution came very early upon the Church, and the scattered members (Acts viii. 2) had surely more than their memory of the doctrine to carry away with them. If not, there was bad management somewhere. The public reading of the Pauline letters, which began to appear in 51 A.D. in the churches of Paul's foundation, and perhaps in others, would have opened the eyes of Church leaders to the value of the written document, to which they had been as Jews always accustomed; and to its superiority to oral instruction or tradition. Those who had been eyewitnesses from the beginning² of the facts recorded, and ministers

¹ The dates of these Epistles can only be approximately settled. *Hastings' DB.* i. 423, iii. 527, dates 1 and 2 Thess. 51-53 A.D., Gal. 53 A.D., 1 and 2 Cor. 55 A.D., Rom. 55-6, Phil., Col., Eph., Philemon 59-61 A.D. (C. H. Turner). The Pastorals if genuine (as this writer believes) before 67 A.D. Some writers place Mark 65-70: others earlier, others later. See Moffat, Introduction, p. 213.

² Cf. John xv. 27, "You bear witness because you are with me from the beginning (*ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς*)."

of the word or doctrine were led by the Spirit to have carefully written statements made of their experiences of the Lord's life and teaching drawn up by trustworthy men for the use of future adherents. The "word" here does not refer to the Logos, as Athanasius held. But may it not imply a written as well as a spoken word? It is frequent in the Acts, and it would appear improbable that the early Christians even in apostolic days were without documents of the facts of some kind, and that the apostles themselves had only the spoken word to serve. The following passages suggest something more than the spoken word. "We shall continue in *the* prayer and the ministry (*διακονία*) of the word" (Acts vi. 4). Compare the Lukan "ministers (*δπηρέται*) of the word."¹ The chazzan (Luke iv. 20) had the charge of the rolls of scripture. He also taught the children to read them and accordingly was called "the minister" (*δπηρέτης*). The Christians, well acquainted with the implication of such a term as "minister of the scriptures" among the Jews, would have used the terms "minister of the word" and ministry of the word in a similar sense. The eyewitnesses (*ἀπόπται*), personal witnesses and followers of the Christ, among whom members of the body called "The Twelve" would stand first, assumed the right of treasuring any records there might be, of drawing up the system of oral instruction, and of superintending the compilation of the memoirs of the Christ and the notes of His doctrine. They also arranged the prayers which the Christians used "adhering to *the* teaching (*διδαχή*) of the Apostles, and *the* breaking of the bread and *the* prayers," (*αὶ προσευχαλί*) a passage in Acts (ii. 42) which implies the beginning of a written liturgy, as well as a settled form of religious instruction, which all their previous experience would urge the apostles to fix in writing and not leave to the caprice of individuals.

St. Luke's preface supports this view. "Many attempted or took in hand (*ἐπεχείρησαν*) to draw up a narrative just as (*καθώς*) the original eyewitnesses (of the facts) and ministers of the word delivered (*παρέδωσαν*) them to us." A glance at this sentence will show that the latter verb precedes the former in time. Because the words "they took in hand" precede the words "they delivered," it is assumed that the "many" drew up these narratives on their

¹ *δπηρέτης* (under rower), term for any kind of servant. St. Paul used it of himself, 1 Cor. iv. 1; Acts xxvi. 16. It is used of the *chazzan* in Luke iv. 20 whose duty it was to look after the rolls of the Scriptures. (See Plummer, *Luke*, p. 123 for authorities.) "Word" here not the Christ, but doctrine.

own initiative. But the real emphasis of the sentence seems to rest on the words "just as they delivered." Such emphasis transfers the initiative to the original personal witnesses of the facts who arranged that these matters should be put down in writing *exactly as they delivered them*.¹ The words "to us" includes Luke among the "many" who received the facts from the original eyewitnesses. This shows that "the Twelve" did, indeed, take the necessary precautions against the possibility of error being mixed with truth in the gospel of the Christ, and that they did give instructions that their statements should be faithfully adhered to. The Greek word rendered "attempted" or "took in hand" (*ἐπεχέλησαν*) does not, by itself, imply initiation. In classical Greek it is used of doing things at the bidding of others.²

We shall now mention ten lines of argument to prove that there was at least a written basis of the gospel Paul preached.

(1) The word "delivered" (*παρέδοσαν*) is not to be confined exclusively to oral teaching, though doubtless the teaching might well include such. The cognate noun "deliverance" or "tradition" (*παράδοσις*) throws light on the subject. In the Pauline epistles it is distinctly used in 2 Thessalonians ii. 15 of literary communication, "Hold the *traditions* (*παράδοσεις*) which you were taught (*ἐδιδάχθητε*) either *by word* (*διὰ λόγον*) or *by my letter*" (*δι' ἐπιστολῆς*), a reference to 1 Thessalonians. 2 Thessalonians iii. 6, "not walking according to the tradition (*παράδοσιν*) which you received³ from us." Here the reception implies the same two methods. We can see the same two methods in 1 Corinthians xi. 2, where St. Paul praises the Corinthians, "just as I delivered (*καθὼς παρέδωκα*)⁴ to you the traditions (*παράδοσεις*), you keep them," for in 1 Corinthians v. 9 we have a reference to a previous letter and 2 Corinthians x. 10 implies that St. Paul had written several letters, and these like all the rest would contain instruction. The Christian teaching is not only called "tradition" (*παράδοσις*) but also "deposit" (*παραθήκη*), e.g., 2 Timothy i. 13, "hold fast the form of sound words⁵

¹ καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν. Cf. St. Paul's words, 1 Cor. xi. 2, καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν. An exact parallel, exactly as I delivered unto you.

² E.g. Eurip. Bacch. 819, "Shall I lead you and will you attempt the journey." (*κἀπιχειρήσεις ὁδοῦ*).

³ παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν.

⁴ Cf. Luke i. 3.

⁵ ἐπιτόπισις . . . ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων, cf. Rom. vi. 17. τόπος διδασχῆς. This word ἐπιτόπισις is the name of a book written by a leading teacher of the Sceptic School, Ænesidemus (80-50 B.C.) who taught at Alexandria.

which you have heard from me. Guard that good deposit." See also 1 Timothy vi. 20, "Guard the deposit, turning aside from the profane and vain babblings." Romans vi. 17 speaks of "a form (hypotyposis) of teaching." The "form" referred to may well have been a written summary of the Gospel with an outline of the things believed, or a creed. *Hypotyposis* (form) was the name of a book written by a sceptic teacher who taught 50 B.C. and may have been known to St. Paul. The programme of Christian instruction and the contents of Church teaching by that time must have reached a fixed form or standard in comparison with which "sound" and "unsound" words were sifted and tested and passed.

(2) They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word (Acts viii. 4), literally preaching the gospel of the word,¹ after the martyrdom of Stephen. Surely they had something in writing to give conformity and consistency to their teaching and preaching. They would have required a written programme or outline carefully drawn up by a mission board, especially when removed from the supervision of the apostles who remained in the city (Acts viii. 1). If they were to present a common front to Judaism and paganism they would require just such an authoritative basis of doctrine as is implied in the expression "the gospel of the word." Otherwise they would be inclined to follow their own individual methods which would foster such schisms and divisions as are condemned in 1 Corinthians i. 12. The "word" was doubtless originally the "word" which Jesus spake and preached. See John ii. 22, "They (the disciples) believed the *Scripture* (γραφή)² and the *word* (λόγος) which Jesus spake." This shows that they placed the spoken word of Jesus, the nucleus of the New Testament, on a level with the Old Testament, and they would not hesitate to give the former the same permanent form as the latter which was fulfilled, as they considered, by it.

(3) Paul and Barnabas must have followed some given line of doctrine and scriptural proofs. They spoke the *word* in Perga

Diogenes Laertius (ix. 78) mentions his *Introduction to the Pyrrhonic philosophy* (ὑπότιπωσις εἰς τὰ Πυρρόνια). D. L. says Ænesidemus showed how the *contradictions* (ἀντιθέσεις) in the arguments used by the Sceptics led to suspense of judgment. For the latter word ἀντιθέσεις see 1 Tim. vi. 20.

¹ εὐαγγελίζομενοι τὸν λόγον. This verb is frequently used by Luke in the Gospel and the Acts and by St. Paul with acc. of message and in some places with dative of persons addressed.

² Evidently Psalm xvi. 10. Cf. Acts ii. 27, 32; xiii. 35.

(xiv. 25) ; but were prevented from speaking the *word* in Asia (xvi. 6), and the Bereans received the *word* with all readiness of mind and searched the Scriptures (*αἱ γραφαί*) daily to see if these things were so (xvii. 11). The very act of verification shows that the lectures and addresses of Paul and Silas must have been deliberately and methodically planned and prepared, otherwise the others could not have remembered the salient points. It is clear also that they must have used scriptural proofs and appealed to the fulfilment of prophecies. These it would be difficult to retain in the memory and to quote with the appositeness and accuracy necessary, seeing that many of their audience were trained Jews who might quickly detect any error in the Hebrew or Greek and any lack of relevance. To refresh their memories and to safeguard themselves from mistakes they would surely have had carefully drawn up notes of these scriptural correspondences. John Mark's withdrawal may have seriously interfered with St. Paul's work of exposition. He would have been a useful "minister (*δπηρέτης*) of the word" had he remained. He afterwards became such (2 Timothy iv. 11) "useful for the ministry" (*διακονία*).

(4) Aquila and Priscilla and people like them must have had written documents for reference and reading. The old Testament was not their only study. In Acts xviii, we meet them and Apollos, in Ephesus. The latter is described as "powerful in the scriptures," i.e. the Old Testament (v. 24). He had been instructed in the *way* of the Lord. D.¹ reads "word" and adds "in his native land," i.e. Egypt. R.V.M. renders *κατηχημένος* "taught by word of mouth," but cf. Luke i. 4, *κατηχήθης*. In neither place does this text rule out the existence of notes or written material in the catechist's hands, while it implies systematic instruction by a catechist. "He (Apollos) began to teach *accurately* (*ἀκριβῶς*) the things concerning the Lord Jesus." Dr. Blass considers that this accurate information could have only one source, *videlicet non sine scripto Evangelio*, a written gospel. He may have had, Dr. Blass suggests,² some acquaintance with an early edition of St. Mark's gospel, without the ending which mentions Christian baptism, of which he was ignorant. Accordingly, Aquila and Priscilla took him (home) and expounded to him the way of God *more accurately*.³ These words

¹ *λόγος* for *ὁδός*, and adds *ἐν τῇ πατρίδι*.

² Blass would place written gospels before 50 A.D.

³ *ἀκριβέστερον*.

“accurately” and “more accurately” imply a correct source of such knowledge. Was it only oral tradition? These words are used by medical writers, Galen and Dioscorides, who had something more than oral tradition to go on. As Aquila and Priscilla must be included in “the brethren” who wrote recommendations of Apollos to the disciples in Achaia, these people could write letters (v. 27) and would be sure to value the written word as a more accurate, dependable and authoritative source than the spoken word. In Acts xxii. 3, St. Paul describes himself as having been trained up in all the *accuracy* (*ἀκριβεία*) of the Law, the basis of which was written. When there was no dearth of scribes and when the “brethren” in the various cities and centres were in the habit of writing letters of introduction¹ and recommendation to the disciples in other places, and when they must have felt the need of carefully drawn up statements to guide even brilliant converts like Apollos, and to serve them as a “form or outline of sound words” to safeguard them from doctrinal errors, such would have been provided by the “brethren” in Ephesus during St. Paul’s absence. Had such a written statement contained scriptural proofs, it would have assisted Apollos in his powerful demonstration from the scriptures² that Jesus was the Messiah, which he gave after he had left Aquila. It is also most improbable that St. Paul would have kept such teachers as Aquila and others whom he left behind him in his various stations, without some written directions and instructions about “the way of the Lord.” Such would have comprised some of our Lord’s sayings or *Logia*, one of which is given in St. Paul’s speech to the Ephesian elders (Acts xx. 35) where he appeals to “the words of the Lord Jesus,” “it is more blessed to give than to receive,” and also a brief account of his institution of the Lord’s Supper, of His Death and its meaning and of His Resurrection and expected *Parousia* or Advent. The compilation of such memoirs or notes would have received a fresh impulse from St. Paul’s example, for, when one inspiring writer appears, others follow. It was the expansion of the Church and its consequent needs that called the

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 1. *ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικαί*. These the Greek philosophers gave to their pupils (Diog. Laertius 8, 87). Cf. Acts xv. 25 (of Judas and Silas), Acts xviii. 27 (of Apollos), Rom. xvi. 1 (of Phœbe), 2 Cor. viii. 16-24 (of Titus, etc.).

² *διακατηλέγγετο δημοσίᾳ ἐπιδεικνὼς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν* (v. 28) strongly *convincéd* (not convinced) proving through the scriptures.

Gospels into existence. An oral tradition of greater or less fixity may explain the many variant readings and *agrapha*; but these may also be largely due to the conscious or unconscious alteration of passages one had frequently repeated through weariness or carelessness.

(5) 2 Thessalonians iii. 1, "pray for us that the *word of God may run* and be glorified" may be a reminiscence of Psalm cxlvii. 15, "His word runneth very swiftly"; where the Psalmist may be referring as in v. 19, "statutes and judgments," to written as well as spoken words. This saying which he has adapted is therefore in keeping with a written gospel.

(6) In the Acts and Pauline epistles we see something of the process by which the gospel teaching, the apostolical announcements and letters obtained the position of "scripture." One of the earliest Christian documents is the encyclical letter of the Council (Acts xv.) at which St. Peter said, "by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe" (v. 7). Here we have "*the word of the Gospel*" mentioned in connexion with a *letter* sent forth with apostolical authority to the Gentiles. The *Word of the Gospel* at least implies the substance of the Evangelical teaching of the apostles, and would include the great facts of our Lord's life, mission, Crucifixion, Resurrection and Ascension, as well as the institution of the Sacraments. St. James referred to the reading of the books of Moses in the Synagogue every Sabbath (v. 21), evidently desirous that equal authority should be given to the letter he decided should be sent (v. 20), by the reading of it at the meeting of the Gentile Christians. That letter went forth from the apostolical council with the authority of the Holy Spirit and the Church. "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us" (v. 28). This letter was duly read by Paul and Barnabas, Silas and Judas, to the brethren in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, and would be introduced by an account of the proceedings. It is dated 47 A.D. by Harnack, 50 by Ramsay, 49 by C. H. Turner, and 51 by Lightfoot. Some years after, when finishing 1 Thessalonians, he adjures them by the Lord that this Epistle be read to all the holy brethren (1, v. 27). To the Colossians (iv. 15), about 62 A.D. he writes that when this letter has been read publicly it should be read in the church of the Laodiceans, and that they should procure from Laodicea their letter and read it (iv. 16). Thus the various documents in the Acts and the Epistles also came

to be placed on a level with the Old Testament through being read publicly in the church as the Old Testament was.

(7) If the Apostles and first Christian teachers were so eager to have their communications placed on the highest level of authority, would they not have been more particular about the narratives of the Life, Death and Resurrection of the Founder of the Church? That they *remembered* His own words about these events is proved by John ii. 22¹ and xii. 16.² He told them that the Paraclete would remind them of all that He had said to them (xiv. 26). In 1 Corinthians xv. 3 St. Paul began a brief summary of the chief events of the gospel. His reference to the fulfilment of scripture in the Lord's Death, Burial and Resurrection was evidently based upon our Lord's own teaching.³ See especially Luke xxiv. 27, "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets he expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself," and v. 46, "Thus it is written that the Christ should suffer and rise again the Third day." This résumé of the chief facts of our Lord's incarnate life, Death, Burial, Resurrection, with the references to the scriptures, and of the chief *male* witnesses of the Resurrection would appear to be based upon some written notes or manual, being arranged in an orderly and precise manner, and being made by one who had such references either before him or ready to his hand.

It cannot be a mere coincidence that both St. Paul (Acts xiii. 35) in his speech in Pisidian Antioch and St. Peter (Acts ii. 27) appealed to the fact that Psalm xvi. 10 was fulfilled by our Lord's Resurrection. This was no coincidence, for both employ the same argument that as David was dead and buried, the passage "thou wilt not suffer thy holy one to see corruption" could not apply to him. This fact supports the theory that short manuals containing the principal historical facts of the Lord's life and the corresponding prophecies were in use at an early date. In fact, St. Paul was too much of a literary man not to have compiled one for his own use and for his catechists. The supreme importance attached to our Lord's death in his short summary (1 Corinthians xv. 3) is in harmony with the fact that a very large portion of the gospels is devoted to the events

¹ "When he was risen from the dead the disciples *remembered* that He said this."

² "When Jesus was glorified they *remembered* that these things were written of Him."

³ Mark xi. 12; Matthew xxvi. 54.

of our Lord's last mission and Passion. This summary may have been based upon one of the records St. Luke's gospel was intended to supersede. There was an Early Church tradition that Luke followed in his gospel the gospel preached by Paul.¹ There were many other gospels to Luke's hand: but this leads one to consider the emphatic manner in which St. Paul refers to his gospel.

(8) St. Paul speaks in a marked way of "our gospel," "my gospel," "the gospel which I preach." "Our gospel came not to you in word only," 1 Thessalonians i. 5. "The gospel which I preach (*κηρύσσω*)," Galatians ii. 2. "God shall judge the secrets of men according to *my* gospel," Romans ii. 16. "Remember Jesus Christ raised from the dead, of the seed of David, according to *my* gospel," 2 Timothy ii. 8. "According to my gospel and *preaching* (*κήρυγμα*) of Jesus Christ," Romans xvi. 25. These expressions of St. Paul imply the existence of other gospels or at any rate of other modes of presenting the gospel of Christ, of which some were surely in writing. In Revelations xiv. 6, "an angel having the eternal *gospel*" refers to a roll, like that in Ezekiel's vision (ii. 9 f.) of a hand holding the roll of a book. The word "gospel" occurs nearly sixty times in these letters, and stands for St. Paul's manner of presenting the facts of Christ and the principles of His Kingdom. It occurs twelve times in the gospels of Matthew (4) and Mark (8), (*not once in Luke or John*) of the good tidings connected with the Kingdom and Christ. Twice we have it in Acts.² The verb "to preach the Gospel"³ is, on the other hand, used ten times in Luke, fifteen times in the Acts, twenty-one times in these Epistles, and not once in Mark or John. In Galatians i. 23, Paul quotes the criticism of his opponents, "he is preaching (the gospel of) the faith which he was once destroying."⁴ There "faith" stands for the summary of the facts believed and opinions held by Christians, which would require to be drawn up in writing to be preserved accurately. That he sought verbal accuracy in his presentation of the gospel may be inferred from his submitting it for correction to the "pillars," James, Cephas, and John in Jerusalem (Galatians ii. 1-7), lest he should "be running in vain," but they added nothing to his statement. The same attention to accuracy is implied in 1 Corinthians xv. 1. "I made

¹ Iren., *Adv. Haer.* III, 1, 2. Luke, the follower of Paul, recorded in a book the gospel preached by him.

² xx. 24, Paul's speech. xv. 7, Peter's speech.

³ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι.

⁴ εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν.

known unto you the gospel *with what word* (τινι λόγῳ) I preached it to you." That he connected the gospel with writing is clear from Galatians iii. 8, "The scripture preached beforehand the gospel,"¹ and Romans i. 1, "The Gospel of God which He promised beforehand² by His prophets in the holy scriptures"—passages which prepare us for the transition from the gospel in the Old Testament to the gospel in the Greek epistles and gospels. It would, indeed, have been strange and, indeed, remiss in a man so gifted as St. Paul if he had not supplied his churches with written summaries of the words and works of the Lord, just as the Greek philosophers published their lectures and dialogues and letters, of which Diogenes Laertius mentions many. St. Paul was educated for a time at Tarsus, which had a famous university. It is suggested that Barnabas was also educated there (Lewin, *St. Paul* i. 9). Tarsus supplied the imperial family with tutors, Athenodorus the Stoic, tutor of young Claudius, etc. It would be strange if one brought up in such an atmosphere would not appreciate the superiority of the written to the spoken word. He would assuredly understand that *littera scripta manet*.

(9) In 2 Corinthians iii. 6 St. Paul comments upon the superiority of the spirit to the letter. "God who made us competent ministers (διακόνους) of the New Covenant, not of letter but of Spirit, for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life,"³ contrasting the new Covenant with the Law (νόμος) as in Romans vii. 6, "in newness of spirit and not in oldness of the letter." This would not, however, justify the inference that a record of the New Covenant was not kept, for literary form is nowhere slighted by him who appeals to the literary remains of the Jewish Church. There is no disparagement here of a work in which St. Paul himself was engaged—the providing the church with writings (γραφαί) of its own. In John vi. 63, the Lord declared that the words or sayings (ῥήματα) he had spoken "are spirit and are life." They would be none the less "spirit and life" when preserved in a more permanent form. He also appealed to the words the prophets had spoken,⁴ which were on a written form. And if the words of Jesus had been in a written form when

¹ ἡ γραφή προεπηγγελάσαστο.

² προεπηγγελάσαστο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.

³ Cf. John vi. 63, "The Spirit giveth life (ζωοποιεῖ), the flesh profiteth nothing."

⁴ ἐλάλησαν. Luke xxiv. 25, "Slow of heart to believe all that the prophets had spoken."

St. Paul penned this passage, he would still have described himself as "a minister of the New Covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit," for the Master's words, written or unwritten, would always be for him "spirit and life." The "New Covenant" here is equivalent to "gospel." See Colossians i. 23, "of which gospel I Paul am a minister" (*διάκονος*). From what he relates in Acts xxvi. 16, he might be described as an "eyewitness and minister (*δπηρέτης*) of the word" (Luke i. 2). "For this cause I appeared (*ᾤφθην*) to thee to appoint thee a minister (*δπηρέτης*) and witness (*μάρτυς*) both of the things wherein thou hast seen *me*¹ (of your visions of me?) and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee." The same Greek word for minister (*δπηρέτης*) is used by Paul and Luke. In fact he used this word and deacon (*διάκονος*) with little distinction. In 1 Corinthians iv. 1, "Ministers of Christ" has the former, in 2 Corinthians xi. 23, "ministers of Christ" has the latter word. Colossians i. 23, "a minister" of the gospel, and 2 Corinthians iii. 6, "ministers of the New Covenant," also have "deacon" (*διάκονος*). Acts xiii. 5, "They preached the *word* and had John as a minister," (*δπηρέτης*), i.e. a minister of the word, to assist in preaching, exposition and baptizing. In Colossians i. 15 he says, "Of which (church) I am a minister (*διάκονος*) to declare fully (*πληρῶσαι*) the *word* of God."² This recalls our Lord's expression "I did not come to destroy but to fulfil" (*πληρῶσαι*), i.e. to give the full meaning to the law and the prophets. If St. Paul was not an original eyewitness, he had at any rate seen visions of Christ and might have been one of those "ministers of the word" who *handed on* their statements (*παρέδοσαν*) to Luke and others, the same verb (*παρέδωκα*) being used by Paul of the manner in which he *instructed* the Corinthians in the facts of our Lord's Life and Passion, etc. (1 Cor. xv. 3).

(10) In the Pauline epistles we have many short summaries of the articles of the Faith, e.g. Romans i. 1-5, Philippians ii. 5-9, 1 Corinthians xv. 3-8, 1 Corinthians xiii, 1 Timothy iii. 16. From these we infer that besides containing much of the Lord's teaching on love, duty and things to come, it would be supremely an historical gospel like that of St. Mark. Both Paul (Rom. i. 1) and Mark (i. 14)

¹ B. Syrr. Arm. Rv. all have *με*, which others omit.

² Acts vi. 4. The apostles suggested that they should be left to the service of the word (*τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου*) and that seven men should serve the tables; but Stephen and Philip and possibly others, began to preach the word.

speak of "the gospel of God."¹ Romans i. 9 has "God whom I serve in the gospel of His Son." His gospel would then be "the gospel of the Son of God." Cf. Mark's phrase "A beginning of the *gospel of the Son of God.*" A résumé of the Pauline gospel would at least contain the following statements :

The Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God, Who was in the beginning in the form of God, Who was sent forth from God according to the scriptures, Who was of the seed of David according to the flesh, born of a woman, born under the Jewish law, Who by His act of self-sacrifice became in the likeness of man, showed humility, patience, forbearance and love to all men, was betrayed, instituted a service of communion, and after doing and suffering what had been foretold of Him in the scriptures, was crucified and died for our sins, was buried, rose again for our justification and was seen by many, was received up into glory and will return to judge the secrets of men "according to my gospel." It would also contain teaching about God the Father and the Holy Spirit, and our adoption and inheritance, and about the rite and meaning of Baptism. It would also contain all or most of the clauses of the Lord's Prayer. His use of the word "gospel" shows the importance of the historical facts of the gospel in his eyes, and although this term has frequently reference to the subject matter preached, it cannot exclude, as we have shown, written summaries of the faith. Common sense would infer that a lifelong experience of the value of sacred documents would have urged that these facts and statements, especially after the Christians had been ordered out of Jerusalem, should be put in the most permanent form possible for the sake of accuracy, and system, and instruction of converts and Christians; but more especially for public reading in the churches side by side with the Old Testament. The need of a Christian lectionary corresponding to the synagogue system would have made itself felt at an early date. The increasing demand for copies not only of the Pauline epistles, but also for copies of the memoirs of the apostles would have created the supply. The *Logia*, called Q, arranged 40-50 A.D.; might have supplied Paul with a source for his instruction. And the Lord's eschatological discourses explain his early exhortations on the *Parousia*. But he stresses personal revelations as the source of his faith in the Godhead of Jesus.

¹ N B.L. omit "the kingdom" in Mk. i. 14.

A VISIT TO MALINES.

BY JOHN KNIPE, Author of "Whited Sepulchres."

THE TOWN.

HALF an hour from Brussels on the Antwerp line, in a fertile plain, Malines, or, as the inhabitants say, Mechelen, has the appearance of a Ville Morte. The red brick houses line the quays of the stagnant canal, which smelt villainously in the sticky heat of a lurid June afternoon. The shops are mean and poor. The restaurants serve good food in dingy and unappetizing fashion. The citizens speak no French but sometimes a little broken English.

In a tiny corner shop of a back street I discovered after much search "The Last of the Lacemakers." She was no longer young and her dark eyes were red-rimmed and lustreless from the strain of lace-making. It was piteous to see how that poor woman was half-blind from working at the beautiful fine lace which was no more in demand, since, as she told me, the machine-made costs less than a quarter of the price and the Brussels factories copy exactly the antique patterns of the famous designs.

THE CATHEDRAL.

The boast of Malines is the marvellous Carillon, which has clearer and more silvery tones than the Carillon of Bruges but is less rich in resonance and depth. On a still evening the sound travels for miles from the high tower of the ancient Cathedral.

The exterior is grand and impressive, but viewed from within the building was disappointing. The nave seemed short compared with the height of the columns. The windows were still blocked where the Boche cannon had shattered the glass. The bombardment of Malines began at five o'clock in the morning that fatal August and it lasted the whole day. The scaffolding against the outer walls showed where the workmen are busy yet repairing the damage done.

AN UNOFFICIAL INTERVIEW.

In the Cathedral, by a curious chance, I had the pleasure of an entirely informal talk with a very interesting priest, one of the local clergy, whom I took to be a chaplain of Cardinal Mercier. After he had most courteously explained the features of the architecture, I ventured to ask if there was any chance of seeing his Eminence at

Vespers. My genial cleric replied that the Cardinal had slightly injured his foot and was unable to leave the Palace. Next I asked him plainly of the famous "Malines Conversations." His manner became a little reserved but he seemed not altogether averse to expressing his opinion of them.

"There have been several, you know," he said with a frank smile. ("A plusieurs reprises.")

"Il ne faut pas croire" ("One must not believe"), I answered deferentially; he was elderly and his manner was very suave and dignified, "that the opinions of Lord Halifax represent those of the majority of the Church of England."

"Evidently not," he returned quickly, and with marked emphasis. "And he can do nothing. He is only a layman, isn't he? (Ce n'est qu'un laïque, n'est-ce pas?) But he is a public person (homme de vue) and as such his ideas have their interest."

Whoever he was, perhaps a Monseigneur, he wore a simple soutane and there was no attendant whom I could ask for the name and rank; the cathedral priest was clearly "in the know" and he did not trouble to conceal his doubt whether anything definite could come of the "Conversations," in the direction of Re-union.

He said that the real difficulty was that *neither side had any real power to negotiate*. Lord Halifax and his friends had not the confidence of their Church and they only represented a party. Of Cardinal Mercier he remarked emphatically: "*Il ne peut rien avancer*" ("He can take no steps forward").

He added that the whole matter had been much misunderstood. He had wished to write a statement himself to the Press but the Cardinal would not allow him to do so.

"It is better to say nothing [more," his Eminence had said. "Restons tranquilles" ("Let us keep quiet").

The popular Cardinal is seventy-four. Lord Halifax is of course eighty-three. It was evident that the latter is regarded as one who believes possible what he desires to believe.

"The Cardinal is tall," observed the priest, "and he looks taller than he is because he is thin. But he looked short beside King Albert last Sunday."

"Would there be any renewal of the 'Conversations'?"

The ecclesiastic spread out his hands expressively. "J'ignore" ("I have no idea"), he said; "only the Cardinal knows that."

And I thanked him for a very interesting and strictly unofficial interview. After which I admired the splendid colouring of Van-dyke's "Crucifixion" in the transept.

But I was meditating on what had been said and could not give my full attention to any picture, however fine.

THE PALACE OF CARDINAL MERCIER.

On one side the Palace is a grey building in Georgian style which faces the street behind the Cathedral. The fourteen windows had white shutters closed to keep out the oppressive heat. The garden wall rises above the stagnant dark water of the canal and a willow tree overhangs it close by a tiny bridge. The Palace extends corner-wise and ends in a modern brick wing where is the library. Or so they told me. I lingered on the bridge looking at the silent house by the quiet backwater where those discussions had been held which startled the world, and aroused so much public alarm and resentment.

As I left the Cathedral my eyes were attracted by a printed notice of "A Dogmatic Congress" to be held there in the first week in August. Who would be the Cardinal's guests in the discreet seclusion of the Palace on the bank of the canal?

Would those same "Conversations" be resumed then—and as before *in secret*?

LONDON INTER-FACULTY CHRISTIAN UNION.

(To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.)

SIR,—We should like through your pages to call the attention of any who may be commencing courses in the University of London this October to the existence of the London Inter-Faculty Christian Union. It is formed of men and women who desire to witness for Christ in the University, and whilst always seeking to deepen the spiritual life of the members, its main objects are—to uphold the fundamental truths of the Christian faith and to bring students to a saving knowledge of the Lord Jesus. Inter-collegiate meetings are held each term and each college branch arranges its own activities, including regular Bible Study and Prayer Meetings. We extend a hearty invitation to those who are like-minded and shall be glad if such would communicate with us as soon as possible. We should also be pleased to answer enquiries.—G. N. M. Aitkens (Charing Cross Hospital), "Winde-Edge," Southborough, Kent; E. Joyce Robinson (King's College), Prestonbury, Westmoreland Road, Bromley, Kent.

"A SAFE, SANE AND CONSERVATIVE REVISION."

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, M.A., Litt.D.

THE present century is witnessing an era of liturgical activity in the Anglican Communion. During recent years the Scotch, the Irish, the American and Canadian Churches have been engaged on a revision and enrichment of the Prayer Book in order that it may be more suitable to meet changing modern needs and conditions. Some of these efforts are not yet concluded, but for the last two years the daughter Church in the Dominion of Canada has been enjoying a fully completed and authorized Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, and the Archdeacon of Halifax, Nova Scotia, has written a most interesting "Story" ¹ of the inception and progress of this epoch making undertaking which is likely to form an exhaustive and standard work on the subject for all time. Certainly no better qualified person could have been found to undertake the task than Dr. Armitage. Besides being the custodian of the new Prayer Book, and the secretary of the Revision Committee, he is a staunch and enthusiastic churchman, who for over a quarter of a century has been rector of St. Paul's, Halifax, N.S., the oldest and most historic church in the Dominion of Canada.

Before describing the Revision in detail Dr. Armitage devotes thirteen most interesting chapters to the history of the movement in which he faithfully and succinctly chronicles the struggles and set-backs during its early stages as well as the patience and persistence of its advocates before their efforts were finally crowned with success. Several of the most enthusiastic pioneers of the movement did not live to see its fruition, since the first proposal for revision was made in 1896, only three years after the General Synod of the whole Canadian Church had been formed. It was decided at that time to provide for the necessary alterations and additions by means of an "Appendix" to the existing Book which would contain the required supplementary services. The Appendix however, although containing much fresh valuable matter, met with little general

¹ *The Story of the Canadian Revision of the Prayer Book.* By W. J. Armitage, D.D., Ph.D. With a Foreword by the Most Rev. S. P. Matheson, D.D., Primate of all Canada. Cambridge University Press. 9s. net.

favour and only had a tentative and chequered existence for three years (1902-5). It never obtained permanent sanction, and was soon entirely forgotten, while owing to a division of opinion between the Upper and Lower Houses of the General Synod the question of Revision was not again seriously undertaken till 1911, when the Synod appointed a committee to deal with the subject composed of all the bishops, thirty-one clergy and eighteen laymen. Archdeacon Armitage emphasizes the prominent part taken by the laity in the Revision movement. An influential layman was the prime mover of the question, and the laity were from the first given a recognized position together with the clergy as joint revisers. He rightly claims that this decision affords the most practical acceptance by the General Synod of the priesthood of the laity and of the fact that the *jus liturgicum* resides in the whole Church. He contrasts with this action the attitude of the Mother Church in which the Revision proposals were entrusted to the Convocations and the concurrence of the laity merely invited at the end. The full share which the laity are now accorded in the Revision discussions in the Church Assembly has not altogether destroyed the force of this criticism, since the final form which our Revision will take is still left to the sole decision of the House of Bishops. Dr. Armitage reminds us that both in the Irish and the American Churches the laity were given equal rights with the clergy in the revision of the Prayer Book. It is more than probable that the full acceptance of the rights of the laity was one of the main factors which in the end achieved a complete unanimity in the results of the Committee's labours. It is significant that it was a layman who proposed the resolution concerning the guiding principle to be followed in the work of revision, which was ultimately accepted, and which at once smoothed the way for a harmonious consideration of the whole question. There is little doubt that we in the Home Church could now have been enjoying a really helpful and valuable revision of the Prayer Book if our revisers had from the start followed the Canadian method and declared that " no change either in text or rubric shall be introduced which will involve or imply a change of doctrine or of principles, it being always understood that the Ornaments Rubric be left untouched." It may be urged that such a course lacks courage to deal with existing conditions and opinions ; but our own painful experience is surely sufficient evidence of the hopelessness and the

dangers of all attempts to placate the aims and desires of extremists by introducing serious doctrinal questions and proposals which merely widen and embitter existing differences without gaining the obedience or allegiance of those who openly profess an ultimate loyalty *only* to the superior authority of an indefinite " Catholic Church ! "

A further wise rule was adopted by the Canadian revisers that a two-thirds majority must be obtained before making any change in the Prayer Book. The discussions throughout were, the Archdeacon informs us, marked by a conspicuous absence of the party spirit and by 1915 a Draft Revised Prayer Book was approved by the General Synod, and this came into a trial use by Christmas. The Canon adopting its use required, however, confirmation at the next Synod, while the new Book needed the approval of the Provincial Synods before it could be finally authorized. A further " Three Years' Study " was therefore given to the question during which several amendments and enrichments were added, and in 1918 the final Revision was approved by the General Synod and permission was given for its provisional use. During the next three years it received the concurrence of the different Provincial Synods, and in October 1921 the final confirmation of the Canon (XII) authorizing it was obtained from the General Synod. The new Book was then officially " proclaimed " by the Primate to come into force from Easter Day, 1922.

Turning to the actual changes and additions effected by the Revision we are struck by the great care which the Revisers displayed that every possible source for improvement and enrichment should be explored and laid under contribution. Thus the new prayers and services are drawn not only from the proposals of our own Convocation revision and from the Scotch, Irish and American Prayer Books, but from the ancient Eastern liturgies, and they also include some beautiful modern compositions by prominent Canadian Churchmen. Viewing the result as a whole it would not be a serious exaggeration to adapt the eulogium which Professor Pollard bestows on Cranmer's work in compiling our historic English Liturgy and declare that the Canadian revisers have " borrowed, and learnt and adapted " " from various sources and whatever they have touched they have adorned," so that our time-honoured and greatly revered Book of Common Prayer, now revised and enriched by numer-

ous seasonable and valuable additions, is likely to secure an increasing hold on the esteem and affections of Canadian churchpeople.

Limits of space forbid any very detailed exposition of the principal changes in the various services or their comparison with our own present proposals. Following the American example a new Red Letter Saints Day is added to celebrate the Transfiguration, while numerous Black Letter Days are added commemorating many notable churchmen included by our own Revisers. Scholars, martyrs, preachers and great saints are represented, so that Athanasius, Justin, Polycarp and Ignatius find a place as well as Thomas à Becket. A significant omission is that of Thomas of Aquinum.

In Morning and Evening Prayer the shortened form may "in special circumstances" be used on Sundays and Holy Days with episcopal sanction, but the General Confession and Absolution are not to be omitted. A new rubric however permits a considerable variation in the different combinations of services which can be used. Thus Morning Prayer can be replaced by a Shortened Form of Litany and Holy Communion, while Evening Prayer may also include the Litany. If the Litany is included with Morning Prayer and Holy Communion it can be commenced immediately after the Te Deum. There are several new Opening Sentences added which are most appropriately arranged for the special seasons of the Christian Year, while "Proper Anthems" are appointed instead of the Venite for Christmas, Good Friday, Ascension Day and Whit-Sunday as well as Easter. A useful "Note" is added to the Apostles' Creed explaining that "He descended into Hell" signifies "into the place of departed spirits." A single comprehensive prayer for the Sovereign and the Empire is inserted as an alternative to the present State prayers. In the prayer for "the Clergy and People" the rather curious statement "Who alone workest great marvels" is changed, as in the proposed revision of 1689, into "The giver of all spiritual gifts"—certainly a far happier expression! The example of the American Church is followed in incorporating the Prayers for "All Sorts and Conditions" and the "General Thanksgiving" in the service for Morning Prayer, while a special rubric regularizes the present universal custom of adding a sermon at the conclusion of the service.

Archdeacon Armitage tells us that there were long and heated discussions concerning the retention and use of the Athanasian

Creed. Eight optional courses of treatment were suggested for dealing with this highly contentious question. Finally, in the end the " Lambeth translation " of the Creed was adopted, while the " Declaration " agreed to in the Canterbury Convocation in 1879 concerning the meaning of the statements in the Creed was added at the end. The rubric was however altered, making its recitation merely an *optional* alternative to the Apostles' Creed. A new rubric allows the use of the Shortened form of the Litany enriched by additional suffrages for modern needs, similar to that proposed in C.A. 84.

In the Occasional Prayers there are numerous welcome additions. A most suitable Prayer for the New Year is taken from the Scotch Book, while two new and beautifully expressed prayers for Missions are added from the Irish and American Books. Valuable prayers are included for Confirmation candidates, the Parish, the Sunday School, Church Synods, times of Election, and for Employers and Workmen. A single yet wonderfully comprehensive intercessory prayer is added, drawn from the Liturgy of the Eastern Church, which will probably soon earn a well merited popularity equal to that now enjoyed by our General Thanksgiving, especially for use at the Evening service. Two very expressive and comforting prayers are added in the Burial Service. There is also a new and beautifully comprehensive Bidding Prayer, especially applicable to Canadian conditions. In the Holy Communion service Our Lord's summary of the Law is allowed to take the place of the Decalogue provided that the Commandments are read once each Sunday—the permissive arrangement allowed in the American Book. Definite efforts were made to alter the Prayer of Consecration in a similar way to that now proposed by the " Green Book " Canon, but they were ruled out of order by the Primate as contravening the guiding principle to preserve the existing doctrinal standard, a further attempt to obtain the permissive use of the Scotch Communion office, including the epiclesis, also failed.

The Confirmation Service is greatly enriched by a fuller explanation of its meaning and by additional questions addressed to the candidates. In the Marriage Service a new rubric strictly forbids any clergyman to re-marry a divorced person whether the innocent or the guilty party. The reasons for the institution of matrimony are concisely and clearly set forth in a single sentence, which is a

great improvement on our present rather coarse and indelicate explanations. Very many distinct improvements are made in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick, but certainly the most practical is the provision which allows the form to be altogether dispensed with "if necessity so require," since it is doubtful if many clergy to-day ever find the existing service suitable in its entirety for visiting the sick. A very useful selection of suitable passages from Holy Scripture is added at the end of this service. In the Communion of the Sick the Irish Prayer Book is followed in the permission to shorten the service in case of necessity, to the Confession, Absolution, Prayer of Consecration, Lord's Prayer and the Blessing, which will render still more unnecessary any provision for reservation.

The new revised Lectionary is adopted with the exception of the Apocryphal lessons, and sixteen selections of psalms receive a permissive optional use on certain occasions in place of the Psalms for the day, except when there are Proper Psalms appointed. The Canadian Revisers have certainly adopted a very reverent and conservative attitude in their treatment of the Psalter.

In the Ordinal we cannot but think that the simple and direct question addressed to the deacon concerning Holy Scripture is a marked improvement both on our present rather ambiguous form or on the wordy alternative proposed in C.A. 84. "Do you believe the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God and to contain all things necessary to salvation?"

Archdeacon Armitage devotes nine concluding chapters to a description of the "Special Services," which form a very valuable addition to the New Prayer Book. Each service is helpfully introduced by explanatory and historical notes. A most appropriate form is compiled for "Dominion Day" and "Occasions of National Thanksgiving," which includes several new and very beautiful prayers written by Canadian churchmen. A special Order of Service for Children, with an appended list of suggested psalms and lessons is a most welcome addition. Another specially useful and valuable new feature is the special Service for Missions which has been most helpfully compiled and arranged to be used as an alternative to the regular service for the day. In this way "Missionary Sunday" will stand out conspicuously and arrest the attention and interest of the congregation, not merely by the special preacher but in the special lessons, psalms and canticles which are all in harmony

with the effort. A similar much needed addition is included in a special form for " Harvest Thanksgivings."

Forms of service for laying Foundation Stones and consecrating Churches and churchyards are also included, as well as special services for Institution and Induction to a benefice which differ in some details from those in general use in our Home Church. For instance, a most useful and significant addition is the Admonition to the people concerning their duty to support the Incumbent with their substance so that freed " from worldly necessities he may devote himself wholly to the preaching of God's word." An innovation which should prove especially valuable is the inclusion within the covers of the prayer book of a very helpful selection of prayers for use in Family Worship. It should do something to revive a supremely valuable practice which, owing to the rush and hurry of modern life, is being increasingly neglected. Undoubtedly the Canadian Church possesses in its new Prayer Book a rich storehouse of most valuable liturgical devotion which should prove an added help and blessing to it in developing its life and work and in carrying on its sacred mission in the great Dominion. Moreover Archdeacon Armitage has rendered a distinct service to his fellow Anglican churchmen in introducing in such a clear, concise and attractive form the salient features of what the Canadian Primate rightly describes as a " safe, sane and conservative revision." Archbishop Matheson at the same time justifies the independent action of the daughter Church in Canada in seeking this practically uncontroversial solution of the Revision problem, by declaring that this method alone enabled it to avoid the very real twin dangers of a probable deadlock on the one hand or of a serious disruption on the other. It would be well if our own Revisers would seriously weigh the Archbishop's warning in this respect, since it seems increasingly doubtful if in the present course of our revision proposals we shall ultimately escape this very Scylla or Charybdis. A thoughtful perusal of Dr. Armitage's interesting and instructive " Story " would probably convince most of our Church leaders that the Canadian example is not only the safest and more expeditious, but also the " more excellent " way of Revision.

BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION

BY THE RIGHT REV. E. A. KNOX, D.D., late Bishop of
Manchester.

"More, they (the Romanists) said he was no perfect Christian that was not anointed by the Bishop with his holy oil. This was another abuse. For whosoever is baptized receiveth thereby the full name of a perfect Christian, and hath the full and perfect covenant and assurance of salvation; he is perfectly buried with Christ, doth perfectly put on Christ and is perfectly made partaker of His resurrection" (Jewel's *Treatise of the Sacraments*).

THE object of this paper is to state, as clearly as is consistent with brevity, the doctrine which is at the back of our present service of Holy Baptism, and its relation to the service of Confirmation. Technical terms of controversy will be excluded, as far as possible. The desire of the writer is to enable the ordinary layman to form a judgment on the changes proposed in the revision of these two services. For the educated lay member of the Church has a right to be put in a position to judge for himself. He ought not to be warned off by injunctions to trust liturgical experts. For his faith the English Churchman is, by the constitution of his Church, directed to Holy Scripture. He is taught to give weight to tradition—the liturgical expert's quarry—only when such tradition is not at variance with Scripture. Churchmen are entitled to exercise jealous care that Prayer Book revision is not made the opportunity for reinstating traditions that were rejected by our Church as contrary to Holy Scripture.

I

BAPTISM THE SACRAMENT OF REGENERATION AND OF INCORPORATION INTO THE CHURCH

In dealing with the Sacrament of Baptism it is essential, first of all, to fix the meaning of the word "Sacrament," and then of the word "regeneration."

"A Sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us." For the moment we will set aside the words "ordained by Christ," and will assume that "given" refers to the "grace" and not to the "sign"; a point open to dispute. "It is a means whereby we receive grace and a pledge to assure us thereof." We are bound to ask "Who is the giver of the grace?" There can be only one answer, "The giver is God." We must also ask, "To whom does He give the grace?" There can be only one answer, "God gives the grace to those who receive the grace." The actions of God, if we may use such a term, or rather "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. xl. 29). This is not a mere incidental remark in the course of an argument about God's dealings with Israel. We

must try to conceive of God as He truly is—not as one of ourselves, subject to conditions of time and space, affected in His purposes by that which happens under conditions of time and space. God is. With Him is neither yesterday, to-day, nor to-morrow. We are, indeed, bound to take His promises and warnings, as they are set forth to us in Holy Scripture. We are bound to act as those who are truly responsible for their actions, as those who can accept or reject the love of God. Yet, when we come to speak of a gift of God, and remember that the gift in question is the gift of Himself, whereby He makes us partakers of the Divine Nature, no such gift as that can be thought of as revocable. We may deceive ourselves with reference to it. We may think that we possess it when we do not. But, if God gives such a gift, and confirms His act by an outward and visible sign, a pledge to assure us thereof, if He gives us that sign as a means whereby our faith is enabled to receive the gift, then we pass into a world of realities and certainties, and those, who are baptized by the Holy Spirit in the baptism of water, are beyond all manner of doubt the children of God. The difficulties about Sacraments do not exist, never come into view, so long as we regard them strictly as visible confirmations of what God has already done. The difficulties do not begin, until we assume that human acts are binding upon God, that armies baptized by platoons against their will, or infants of heathen parents baptized indiscriminately, or even infants of godless parents in Christian countries, are all partakers of the Divine nature, because of the fact of their having been baptized. Then it becomes necessary, either to weaken the efficacy of the Sacrament, or, in the case of Baptism, to evacuate “regeneration” of its Scriptural meaning. Either we say that the Sacrament is a *symbol* (of the necessity) of new birth; or that new birth means endowment with faculties and powers to *become* the child of God, which faculties and powers may be atrophied by failure to use them. In either of these cases a low and unscriptural view is taken of the word “Sacrament.” It is clear also from the foregoing considerations, why a Sacrament must be ordained by Christ, and why no rite can be a Sacrament, unless it is ordained by Christ. Only the Giver can ordain visible confirmations of His gift.

We now pass to the meaning of the word “regeneration.” It is, of course, the equivalent of new birth. If one thing stands out pre-eminently in the whole New Testament it is that there is a spiritual birth which is distinct from the natural birth, that natural birth does not convey, nor confer, spiritual birth, and that without this spiritual birth we cannot enter into any sort of relation with God. So far we are on common ground. But we, who are familiar with infant baptism, are apt to overlook the fact that new birth is the equivalent of new creation, and that new creation means “actual conformity with God in character and conduct” (C. Gore, *The Holy Spirit in the Church*, p. 129). Regeneration suggests to us an *infant* life with capacities and powers wholly undeveloped, a state of innocence, perhaps, but not of positive and active good-

ness. Such notions are wholly erroneous. There is nothing in Scripture that corresponds to them. We read no doubt (1 Peter ii. 7) of an appeal to Christians "as newborn babes long for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation," but in the same breath the Apostle says (ver. 9) "ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession, that ye may show forth the excellences of Him Who called you out of darkness into His marvellous light." So, we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ver. 12) "ye are become such as have need of milk, and not of solid food." But it is a disgrace to the Hebrews that they are in such a backward condition, and, in fact, in danger of falling away. So again, S. Paul exhorts the Ephesians (iv. 14) to be "no longer children tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine," but "to grow up in all things unto Him, which is the Head, even Christ." But this childish estate is not wholly analogous to the childhood of natural life. In natural life childhood is a necessary condition. It is no disgrace to children that they are children, speak as children, feel as children, think as children. But to the Christian, who is a new creature in Christ, such immaturity is a reproach. He has become a man. He must put away childish things. He is no longer a child (Gal. iv. 1) "differing nothing from a bondservant . . . under guardians and tutors. . . . He is no longer a bondservant, but a son, and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." We have to keep such passages well in mind when we speak of "regeneration."⁴ It is hardly necessary to add that the New Testament writers do not contemplate in those, who are physically children, the spiritual experiences of full-grown men. Regeneration in those who are physically children will manifest itself in speech, behaviour, and thoughts suitable to childhood. But, for all that, it will be in childhood a *relation to God* identical with regeneration in manhood. In childhood, just as much as in manhood, it will mean "actual conformity with God in character and conduct." The infancy and boyhood of Jesus Christ in no way affected the reality and completeness of His Godhead. Regeneration means, in short, the indwelling of Christ in us by His Holy Spirit. Nothing less than this corresponds to the idea of the new birth or new creation. How it comes to pass that the regenerate do commit actual sin is another question, which must be considered presently.¹

Another source of the difficulties about Baptism arises from the fact that it is a Sacrament of incorporation. The child of God is also a member of Christ, that is, a member or limb of Christ's Body, the Church. As long as we think of the Church as an external corporation tracing its historical origin to Apostolic times, there seems to be no reason at all why incorporation into it should be a Divine act, or be attested by a Divinely ordained symbol: why Baptism should be a *Sacrament* of incorporation. Corporations are

¹ A beautiful picture from life of a "regenerate child" is presented in Dean Inge's account of his child Margaret Paula (Inge's *Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion*, pp. 90-end).

perfectly competent to institute their own ceremonies of admission. If they are religious corporations it is natural that those ceremonies should be of a religious character, that symbolic acts should attest what is being done, and that prayers should be offered on behalf of the Neophyte. But in all these arrangements there is no room for a Sacrament, for the putting forth of an act of Divine grace. On the other hand, if, among the Divine realities, there is a company "whose names are written in Heaven," a society of the redeemed whom the love of God has gathered into communion with Himself, it is not only fitting, but even necessary, that incorporation into this company should be by means of a Sacrament, for into this company none but God Himself can admit any one. On the other hand, by appointing a Sacrament to be performed by men, and in the world of time, God has been pleased to use human agency for administration of the Sacrament. That agency is the Church, and, for practical purposes, that means for us the Christian community in which the Providence of God has placed us. That this community should look upon baptism as admission into its society is right and natural. It is natural also that it should pray and believe that God should do what no human agency can do, that He should incorporate the baptized into the communion whose names are written in Heaven. But, just because we believe in the efficacy of the Sacraments, we dare not assert that every baptized person is so incorporated. We pray for this, we charitably assume this in our baptismal prayers. "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God" (Deut. xxix. 27); "They are not all Israel, which are of Israel" (Rom. ix. 6).

II

THE SINS OF THE REGENERATE

We return then to the question asked before. We inquire how it comes to pass that, if regeneration means "actual conformity with God in character and conduct," sin is found in the character and conduct of the regenerate. That it is so found is admitted by S. John, although he says (1 John iii. 9) "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because His seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God." This is the paradox stated as boldly as words permit (1 John i. 8), "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves" and (1 John iii. 9) "Whosoever is born of God doeth no sin." It has been suggested very forcibly (Law's *The Tests of Life*, pp. 226-28) that the Apostle is here indignantly repudiating the possibility that a man can be a child of God, and at the same time an evil-liver, and yet not cease to be the child of God. That is quite impossible. It is a contradiction in terms. On the other hand we have to remember that our "begetting" is a re-begetting. "If in our case there were no other element than the seed of God present in our nature—no 'old man' to put off, but only 'the new man' to put on—this would be actually true of us (Law, p. 227) (as it was true of Christ). Or, as Bishop

Moule puts it (*Veni Creator*, p. 178), "we see the believer, mortal, sinful, the ceaselessly needy recipient of mercy from first to last, yet so wonderfully visited and inhabited by his Regenerator, his Sanctifier, that along the lines of his own real will there runs the power of the personal Presence, yea, of the personal character, of the Lord the Life-giver. The more the man humbly, in watchfulness and prayer, but with entire willingness and simplicity "yields himself unto God" thus present, "the more shall he, intact in personality, have carried out in him the workings of that mind." The new birth is not therefore the destruction of our personality, and its replacement by another. There remains the self that came into being with our natural birth, with its inherited propensities, and its natural tendency to imitate the world around it and to borrow from that world its standards of right and wrong, "The infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerate" (Article IX). Whenever that self breaks away from the power of the indwelling Spirit, asserting its independence, at once the regenerate falls into sin. But, if he is indeed regenerate, in his regenerate personality he detests and abhors these aberrations, for they are a dethronement of the Personality to Whom he has surrendered his inmost being, a rebellion that must be instantly subdued by falling back upon the Power to which he has committed himself.

The hall-mark of Regeneration, as taught in the New Testament, is the attitude of the regenerate towards the law of God, not only the ceremonial law, but also the moral. To the unregenerate and yet conscientious man the Divine law is just and holy and good. But it presents itself as a body of restraints, inhibitions, and infringements of freedom. That is the view of morality that dominates modern fiction. The hero is always represented as too great, too noble for conventional bonds. Obeying some impulse of his nature, he breaks through them, and emerges into a land of enlightenment, where the story leaves him, as often as not, in the society of his neighbour's wife. The liberty achieved is the liberty of the volcano or earthquake. But it has been an escape from inhibitions. Another attitude to the law of God is that of the man who uses it for self-discipline. Recognizing the righteousness of it and the revolt of his natural self against it, he determines either in his own strength, or by Divine assistance, to work out by obedience a better and nobler self. His life becomes a life of self-chastisement. Two great moral dangers attend it—the danger of despair through the failure of self-discipline, and the danger of self-righteousness, if he is so foolish as to contrast his own with the undisciplined lives around him. The Scripture teaching of regeneration puts the will of the regenerate into harmony with the law of God. For it is the Divine law-giver Who rules in the personality of the new man, so that he loves the things that God commands, and hates what God forbids. But, all along, the regenerate is conscious that it is not his natural self that has acquired these new tastes. It is the spirit of Christ in him that so moves and prompts him. But the Spirit does more. He reveals increasingly the alienation from God, and

the corruption, of the man's natural self. Self-righteousness is wholly inconsistent with true regeneration. "Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

One more difficulty remains to be considered before reviewing the Baptismal services. The more meaning we attach to regeneration, the more necessary does it seem at first sight, that Baptism should be deferred until the new birth has manifested itself, and the more unsuitable appears to be the practice of Infant Baptism. But surely this is to assume that no one can be regenerate until he can both be conscious of regeneration, and give some account of it. Is that really true? Is the free grace of God limited to adults? No one would maintain that it is. The act of free love by which the Holy Spirit of God takes hold of human personality and subjects it to Himself is due to no merit of ours, cannot be brought about by any process of reasoning or self-discipline. Indeed infants have this advantage over adults, that there cannot be any suggestion of merit of their own to offer. Therefore, tender age brings no bar to the grace of God: why should it be a bar to the sacrament of His grace? For the sacrament is a means which God uses in His work of regenerating the soul.

III

THE BAPTISMAL SERVICES: DIFFICULTIES OF REFORMERS

We may now pass to consideration of the Baptismal services, which could not be rightly understood without first knowing what is meant by the Sacrament of Regeneration. The compilation of those services must have presented greater difficulties to our Reformers than any other part of the Prayer Book. They were building on the principle that nothing was to be required as necessary to salvation which was not contained in Scripture, or to be proved and concluded from Scripture. But there is not in the New Testament any explicit mention of the baptism of an infant. On the other hand, they themselves, and the whole nation, had been baptized as infants. If Infant Baptism could not be concluded from Holy Scripture, then there were no baptized Christians alive, except the Anabaptists on the Continent, whose wild excesses had discredited their doctrine. Was it possible to establish the baptism of infants on firm foundations of Scripture? Such baptism could be traced clearly to the times immediately after the Apostolic writings. But on what foundation had it rested?

On the one hand, the whole New Testament taught the necessity of a new birth, and connected that new birth with baptism. On the other hand, it represented the baptized as "having put on Christ," as "led by the Spirit of God," as "risen with Christ" from the death of sin to a life of righteousness. But there were evidently, already, baptized persons, of whom such statements were manifestly untrue, Ananias and Sapphira, Demas, Alexander the coppersmith, Diotrephes. Either baptism and regeneration must be the beginning of a life which came to nothing, the begin-

ning of an eternal life which ended in time, or else it must be possible to receive baptism with profession of faith and repentance, and yet not to receive the new birth. So much was quite evident from Scripture. But it was also evident that, even in the case of adults, the love of God and the action of His free grace preceded the conversion, the repentance, and the faith of the baptized. The act of God in eternity preceded, and was the cause of, all that took place in time. It was not the merit of the convert's repentance nor any natural faith of his that produced regeneration. In fact, he could not truly repent or believe till he was regenerate. If this were so—and from New Testament teaching who would doubt it?—a strong case, an irresistibly strong case, was established for bringing to baptism, and so including in the Christian community, infants who would otherwise be spiritually orphans. To keep them unbaptized was to repeat the fault of the disciples, who would have driven away the babes whom their mothers brought to our Lord. So the Reformers considered that "the baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

It remained to express this belief in a form of service which should preserve all that agreed with it in Pre-Reformation use, and bring out more clearly, by additions or alterations, the grounds on which infant baptism was administered, and the grace of that sacrament.

CHANGES INTRODUCED : (1) PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

(1) To effect this purpose, it was necessary, first of all, to make the administration of the sacrament, normally and usually, a public act of the Church. Hitherto, children not born within eight days before Easter, or eight days before Whitsuntide, had been baptized as soon as they were born. Theoretically, lay baptism was only allowed if the child was likely to die—practically, it may have been much more common. The child so baptized was brought to church to be made a catechumen. This was, normally, the public service, solemn and public baptism being reserved for Easter Day and the vigil of Pentecost. For these regulations was substituted our present rule of baptism on Sundays and Holy-days, "when the most number of people come together, and as part of Morning or Evening Prayer." It is deeply to be regretted that this most wise reform has fallen into disuse. Neglect of it has done more than anything else to obscure the meaning of Holy Baptism.

(2) THE FONT WATER

(2) In the next place, pure water, poured into the font at the time of baptism, was substituted for a compound of water with wax, oil and holy chrism. Symbolism, more or less innocent in origin, had resulted, as it often does, in superstition. The prayers used in this benediction of the font had encouraged and fostered superstition. "May the virtue of the Holy Spirit descend upon

the fulness of this font and fertilize all this substance of water with regenerating effect. Here may the stains of all sins be blotted out. Here may nature built up in Thy likeness, and restored to the glory of its first beginning, be purged from all the squalor of its old estate, that every one who enters this sacrament of regeneration may be born again to the new infancy of innocence." In the Prayer Book of 1552 there was left not even the petition which we now have: "Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin." The benediction of the font fostered superstitious ideas. Mystic virtue was believed to reside in the font water. In fact, it had become necessary to forbid its being sprinkled on the bystanders at the font.

(3) EXORCISMS

(3) *Thirdly*, it was necessary to remove a frequent repetition of exorcism. The child, even though baptized, was regarded as possessed of Satan: "Cursed devil, recognize thy sentence and give honour to the true and living God: give honour to Jesus Christ His Son and to the Holy Spirit: and depart from this servant of God in as much as God and our Lord Jesus Christ *has vouchsafed* to call him to His grace and benediction and to the baptismal font, by the gift of His Holy Spirit." This kind of exorcism was repeated at least four times in the service. The salt also that was placed in the child's mouth was exorcised. So was the font water before the various compounds were added to it. The deliverance wrought by the Risen Lord, "From him that had the power of death, that is the devil" (Heb. iii. 14), was but imperfectly realized in the mediæval world. The service reflects in every page the terrors under which the pagan world had lived. We owe to our Reformers, who abolished these exorcisms, a liberation of which little is known or thought to-day.

(4) OTHER CEREMONIES

(4) *Fourthly*, besides the mixing of the font above mentioned, the following ceremonies were made to cease: placing exorcised salt in the child's mouth, laying of the priest's hand on the top of the child's head, placing the priest's spittle in the child's ears and nostrils, and placing a lighted taper in the child's hand. In the Prayer Book of 1549 were retained the giving of the chrisome,¹ and the anointing of the infant. But these were removed from the book of 1552, and in both books the one signing with cross (in place of several crossings) was explained to be a token of enlistment in Christ's army.

(5) SPECIAL GOSPELS

(5) *Fifthly*, a gospel declared by the doctors to be efficacious against falling sickness was removed (St. Mark ix. 17-30), and the gospel, St. John i. 1-14.

¹ The baptismal robe.

But these changes give a very imperfect idea of the really revolutionary alterations wrought especially by the Prayer Book of 1552. For, although several petitions were collected out of the former office, these relics serve rather to illustrate the freedom with which the old material was handled and the greatness of the change effected. The old service consisted of three parts: the making of a catechumen, the benediction of the font, and the rite of baptizing. Of these, the benediction of the font was occasional. It disappeared. The actual rite of baptism was usually domestic (although the sponsorial questions and answers, the anointing, the chrisome, and the giving of the taper included in that rite, were taken in church). All these were recast. The making of the catechumen, predominantly a process of exorcism, disappeared. The new service was essentially a service of public baptism.

IV

THE NEW SERVICE

The new service was made to consist of the following parts: (1) prayer for the regeneration of the child; (2) reading of a gospel, to assure the godparents that the prayer had been heard, and that Christ had promised to bestow all that had been asked; (3) the child's promise, through his godparents, of repentance, faith and obedience; (4) prayer that the child, already received by Christ, forgiven, and gifted with the new birth by the Holy Spirit, might realize in the actual warfare of life the privileges of which he had been made partaker, with the grace of perseverance to the end, especially that all things belonging to the Spirit might live and grow in him; (5) the actual baptism, followed by reception into the congregation, and enlistment into Christ's army; (6) thanksgiving for the mercies received; (7) exhortation to the godparents on their duties.

ITS CHARACTERISTIC BOLDNESS

The contrast between the two services cannot be too strongly emphasized. The old service made the baptized child a catechumen, and completed the baptismal rite by ceremonies charging the child to preserve the innocence with which he had been invested, to guard his baptism, and to keep the commandments, that he might have eternal life. It was essentially a service which removed obstacles, the indwelling of Satan and the guilt of original sin. It was a service which bestowed new birth, grace of innocence, and of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, but left the final entry into eternal life dependent on the use made of this initial grace. The new service, on the other hand, storms heaven, asks for eternal life, asks for partaking of the Kingdom of Heaven, asks for victory and triumph over all spiritual obstacles, and leaves no room for doubt whether these prayers have been heard, but assures the godparents that they have been heard, and gives thanks to God that

He has received the infant for His own child by adoption and has incorporated him into His Holy Church. Especially, it should be noted that the old service contains no mention of incorporation into God's Holy Church.

PRAYER FOR INDWELLING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Before we pass on, attention must be drawn to a prayer in the Pre-Reformation service which appears at first sight to be absent from the Reformed, that is, the prayer that the baptized may be "a temple and habitation of God." It has even been asserted that our baptismal prayers contain no petition that any such gift may be bestowed. Thus Canon Mason writes (*Relation of Baptism and Confirmation*, p. 247), "'Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant,' so the Church prays immediately before the christening of the child, but adds at once, 'that he may be born again, and be made an heir of everlasting salvation.' The nature and extent of the gift to be expected at the font is defined and restricted. It is such a gift, or impartition, as regenerates, not *that which takes up its abode* in the regenerate." In making this distinction Canon Mason appears to have overlooked the words, which do in fact correspond with the Pre-Reformation petition, "Sanctify him with the Holy Ghost." "Grant that *all* things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in him." There is no sanctification apart from "indwelling." It is the indwelling and abiding that "sanctifies." For holiness belongs to God alone. It should be added that Divine indwelling is implied in the prayer for incorporation into the Church. The child, incorporated into Christ's Holy Church, is one of those "several buildings" of which the Apostle writes (Eph. ii. 21) (in Christ): "Each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple, in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit." The conception that anyone can be a member of Christ, and of His Holy Church, and yet not "an abode" of the Holy Spirit, does violence to the very elements of Christian faith. Neither our own service, nor the Pre-Reformation service, gives any sanction to such an idea.

THE EFFECT OF BAPTISM AS TAUGHT BY THE NEW SERVICE

The result of the foregoing examination of our baptismal service seems to establish one point very securely. The Reformers did not depreciate the sacrament of baptism, so far as its spiritual efficacy was concerned. On the contrary, they retained all that they found in the old liturgy of the blessings attached to it, and added others. They also expressed themselves with a confidence not to be found in the old liturgy that the prayers which they offered had been heard. They were not afraid to lay themselves open to the inevitable challenge to reconcile their service with the conditions of actual life. They were fully aware that a large number—let it be so affirmed, if men would, that the majority—of the

baptized did not "lead the rest of their lives according to its beginning." They would have answered that baptism was no magical charm by which sinners were converted into saints; that it was one thing for God to bestow the fulness of His grace, another thing for man to receive it; that nothing would be gained by waiting till men and women gave evidence of conversion to God in their outward life and profession—the story of the Anabaptists was proof enough, how deceptive such evidence might be. Whether the baptized were an infant or an adult, he must be baptized on the assumption that the love of God had called him out of the sinful world into the Holy Church of God. It was also more true to the principle of faith to claim all that God had to give, before the child had done anything to deserve His gifts. At the same time, they were far from regarding the future with indifference—very far, indeed, from forgetting that open confession of Christ is an indispensable condition of discipleship. They made careful provision for the responsibility of the Church to the baptized, and of the baptized to the Church.

V

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHURCH TO THE BAPTIZED

The responsibility of the Church to the baptized. For this purpose the sponsorial system was retained and developed. "The use of sponsors in baptism is of early date. In the time of Tertullian it was established" (i.e. at the close of the second century and beginning of the third) "and is thenceforth frequently mentioned. In the case of adults the sponsors guaranteed the candidate's character, instructed him, accompanied him at the rite, and formed links of union between the new member and the Church. In the case of children, the duty of making the answers devolved upon the sponsors, and their responsibilities were naturally much heavier than when they stood for adults" (Thompson's *Office of Baptism and Confirmation*, p. 185). In this way, Ananias at Damascus may be regarded as a sponsor for Saul of Tarsus.

THE SPONSORS REPRESENT THE CHURCH

But while it is easy to understand such sponsorship, the sponsorship for infants can only become a reality if we bear in mind the solidarity of ancient family life, its unity for purposes of worship, its common responsibility for maintaining the worship of the family deities, and the liability of the whole family to punishment for the guilt of one member. But, whereas these thoughts would lead us to expect the father to be the child's sponsor, we frequently find him and the mother excluded from this office. Why? Not, as is commonly supposed, to provide a Christian protector in case of the parent's death. If that idea came in at all, it was secondary and an afterthought. The sponsors represented not the parents but the new family into which the child was entering. Their

voice was the voice of the Church. Their answers were the answers of the Church. Their promises were the promises of the Church. It is the Church that presents the child to Christ, and the god-parents are the deputies and spokesmen of the Church. The Reformers, therefore, in view of the very high value which they attached to baptism, increased the responsibilities of the godparents, that is, of the Church itself. For, having assured them that their prayers on behalf of the infant were heard, and that Christ had promised all for which they asked, the Church required of them not only the profession of the Apostles' Creed—which was all that the Pre-Reformation Church required—our Church required also renunciation of the world, the flesh and the devil, and an engagement to keep God's holy commandments. The congregation, then and there, through the sponsors, promised to the child about to be admitted into the new family. It is often said that the sponsorial system has broken down. But is it not the Church itself that has broken down? Rent by schisms, split up by social divisions, eagerly seeking to assimilate its life and belief to that of the world, with what front of assurance can it answer the question: Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomps and glory of the world, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them? It was bold of the Reformers to assume the existence of a really holy Church—but without this assumption they must have abandoned the sponsorial system, and, therewith, the baptism of infants.

DISCONNECTION OF BISHOP FROM BAPTISMAL SERVICE

Their boldness, however, went yet further. In the abolition of the old baptismal ceremonies they had broken the last link which directly connected the Bishop with every baptism. The rule that baptism is not to be administered without the consent of the Bishop goes back as far as the time of Ignatius (end of the first century). In the East, where confirmation immediately followed baptism, the Bishop's presence would normally be necessary, as soon as confirmation was confined to the Episcopal Office. It would also be more easily secured, as long as baptism was confined to the festivals of Easter and Whitsuntide. But, in the West, confirmation was deferred till the Bishop should visit the neighbourhood. The chrism, however, still connected the Bishop with every baptism, for it was from the Bishop alone that the chrism could be obtained, and from him a fresh supply must be obtained by every parish priest every year, on pain of deposition. The abolition of the ceremony of anointing cut off this link between the baptized and the Bishop, with the important result that our Church recognized completely and whole-heartedly the baptisms of non-episcopal Churches. It may be said that the confirmation link remained. But confirmation, as it was then administered, appeared to the Reformers "a corrupt following of the Apostles" (Article XXV): a matter of two collects with a signing with the cross on the forehead, and anointing the child's thumb with oint-

ment—a ceremony in which there was no “laying on of hands,” the most formal of services, administered often, so it is said, by the Bishop without even dismounting from his horse.

THE NEW USE MADE OF CONFIRMATION

The Reformers adopted, transformed and made use of this abused and corrupted rite for two new purposes. They made it (1) the climax of a post-baptismal catechumenate, and (2) an opportunity of giving effect to the responsibility of the baptized to the Church. To appreciate the changes thus introduced we must first take into account (a) the charge to the sponsors; (b) the provision of a Church catechism. We may then pass on to the responsibility of the baptized to the Church.

THE NEW CATECHUMENATE

(a) The charge to the sponsors should be read and contrasted with that which it replaced, which was a charge to keep the child from fire and water, to teach him the Lord's Prayer, Ave Maria, and the Creed, to have him confirmed, to return the chrisome and to wash their hands before leaving the church. It is enough to set against this the words: “Ye shall provide that he may learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments and *all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health*; and that this child may be virtuously brought up to lead a godly and a Christian life; remembering always that baptism doth represent unto us our profession; which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ and to be made like unto Him,” etc.

PROVISION OF A CHURCH CATECHISM

(b) *Provision of a Church catechism.*¹ The catechism was originally (i.e. in the Prayer Book of 1549) intended for use at confirmation. The children are to be brought to the Bishop “so soon as they can say in their mother tongue the Articles of the Faith, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and can answer to such questions of this short catechism as the Bishop (or such as he shall appoint) shall by his discretion appose them in.” But by the Prayer Book of 1552 its use was greatly enlarged. The Curate, on Sundays and Holy-days, after the 2nd lesson of Evening Prayer, was bound to instruct and examine the children in some part of this catechism. All Fathers, Mothers, Masters and Dames were to cause their Children, Servants, and Apprentices to attend this catechizing. The Church took seriously in hand the duties involved in the sponsorial relation, appointed regular times to discharge them, and provided the outlines of the Christian teaching that was to be given. In these outlines the starting-point was the fact and meaning of baptism, and that meaning was expressed in the form

¹ It would be entirely erroneous to suppose that the mediæval Church made no provision for instruction of children in the Faith. Various primers were extant, and no doubt used, but not as preparation for confirmation.

of the status of the baptized. He was "a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." He had been "called by his Heavenly Father into a state of salvation."

VI

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE BAPTIZED TO THE CHURCH

The responsibility of the baptized to the Church, or the public profession of the confirmed. To appreciate the value and importance of this new use of confirmation we must first note the differences between the confirmation services of 1549 and 1552. In 1549 the ceremony of the chrisome at baptism had been retained with the implication that a child of tender years may retain his innocence, but will presently come to an age when, "partly by the frailty of his own flesh, partly by the assaults of the world and the devil," he will "begin to be in danger to fall into sin." The purpose of confirmation then was to impart "strength and defence against all temptations to sin, and the assaults of the world and the devil." The implication is manifest. Baptized children have an innocence which is their own possession, though bestowed by grace. That innocence must be maintained and fortified by further grace in confirmation. We are brought back to the idea of a righteousness built up by human effort assisted by the grace of God. The second Prayer Book abolished the chrisome—harmless and picturesque as the ceremony might appear to be—because of its inconsistency with the Scriptural idea of regeneration. The "chrisome," in fact, was inconsistent with the conception that the new birth is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the regenerate, in whom "there still remains the infection of nature" (Article IX). The gift which God bestows on the regenerate is not some precarious and rather imaginary innocence of childhood. It is the indwelling Spirit of Christ whose power in us works "conformity in character and conduct to the will of God." That Spirit belongs to all who by faith "put on Christ." "Ye are all sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 26, 27). The age of the baptized makes no difference in the nature of the gift, but only in the degree in which the regenerate is able to make use of it.¹

Just because of their faith in the greatness of the gift of God, the Reformers found it necessary to provide some service in which the baptized should testify before the Church his acceptance of the gift. Necessarily that service was deferred to years of discretion. Necessarily it assumed a twofold character, the witness of the regenerate to the Church, and the witness of the Church to the now conscious regenerate.

¹ It may be reasonably asked how it comes to pass that the catechism of the first Prayer Book was adopted substantially in the second, if the baptismal doctrine of the two is so different. The answer is to be found in the fact that the catechism marks a stage of Reformation teaching in advance of the first Prayer Book. The catechism, in fact, prepared the way for our present baptismal service.

For this purpose, no service was more fitting than the "laying on of hands." The ceremony itself was the ancient ceremony of adoption. There was precedent for the use of it in the New Testament. It gave an opportunity of connecting the confirmed with a wider circle of the family of God than was afforded by the narrow bounds of parochial life. Through the presence of the Bishop and his part in it, the confirmed was made to realize his place in the Church of God as a whole. It was also a post-baptismal ceremony with precedents in liturgical history. The Church, therefore, determined that the laying on of hands should be used for the purposes above mentioned, and as a service of admission to Holy Communion.

With this object it was so constructed that, while it most naturally referred to baptism, it carefully excluded the idea that some new gift was being conferred which was not bestowed in baptism. The prayer for the seven-fold gift of the Holy Spirit was not a prayer for bestowal of the gift, but for increase in that seven-fold gift already bestowed. The increase connected with the laying on of hands was not some new regeneration but a *daily* increase, a growing up into the stature of Christ. Although the ceremony might not be repeated, it stood not for some solitary event in the Christian life: "Let Thy Fatherly Hand *ever* be over them. Let Thy Holy Spirit *ever* be with them." The reference to Apostolic precedent is not to any command of the Apostles, still less to any command given to them by Christ, but simply to their example, "after the example of Thy Holy Apostles." We do what they did, but we do not administer a sacrament, for that, without express command of God, we cannot do. It would be difficult to conceive a service more full of dignity, more impressive, better calculated to inspire courage and high resolve, more tenderly conveying a sense of the Fatherly love of God, and yet at the same time more carefully guarded against any hint that some grace was being conveyed by "laying on of hands" different from, and superior to, the grace attached to faithful reception of holy baptism.

SOME RECENT TEACHING ON IMPORT OF LAYING ON OF HANDS

A very different view of confirmation has been assiduously inculcated of late years, a reaction, perhaps, in some measure from the Tractarian teaching about baptism. That teaching insisted strongly on the efficacy of holy baptism. But a lamentable contrast was obviously evident between the power connected with baptism in Scripture and in the Primitive Church, and the actual results as manifested in the lives of ordinary Christians. It was natural enough to explain the contrast by deficiency of faith in the sacrament, and by carelessness in the administration of it. It was natural that the Tractarians should hope that their new doctrine, or supposed revival of the old, would be followed by a great uplift in the spiritual life of the Church. These expectations were disappointed. Masses of the baptized remained unconverted. High Churchmen found it necessary to borrow not a little from the

armoury of their Evangelical brethren. Emotion began to take a prominence in the teaching of those whose spiritual ancestors sorely suspected it. Conversion must follow regeneration. Attention also was diverted from baptism to confirmation. Confirmation was exalted as a sacrament. Baptism not followed by it was incomplete. Some advocated administration of confirmation to children emerging from infancy. Others saw in it an opportunity of inculcating in the young the use of auricular confession. Bishops were entreated to multiply centres of confirmation, to administer it to the dying, to refrain from giving addresses, and to trust to the efficacy of the form itself. Among other results of this agitation has been an attempt to prove from Scripture that the Apostles reserved to themselves, and of course to their successors the Bishops, the exclusive right of administering this so-called sacrament. For although no command of our Lord could be quoted as instituting it, in the same way that He instituted baptism and the Lord's Supper, it was held that nothing short of His express authority would have entitled the Apostles to make such use as they made of it. One of the most recent and careful exponents of this view is Dr. Chase, the late Bishop of Ely, whose position and learning compel an attentive examination of his teaching.

VII

EXAMINATION OF BISHOP CHASE'S "CONFIRMATION IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE"

The whole of Dr. Chase's contention really rests on two passages in the Acts of the Apostles. It is true that he adds to these:—(1) 2 Timothy i. 6. He has to admit that it is "perhaps universally assumed that these words refer to Timothy's ordination." Dr. Chase's attempt to disprove the universal assumption is ingenious, but is unconvincing, especially against so great a weight of adverse opinion. (2) Hebrews vi. 1, etc., where the words "laying on of hands" occur as an elementary part of Christian teaching immediately after the word "baptisms." But here again other explanations are perfectly legitimate. The "laying on of hands" follows "baptisms," but immediately precedes "resurrection of the dead." It may well refer to healing of the sick. The argument gains no positive weight from this quotation. (3) Hebrews vi. 4. Here Dr. Chase *assumes* that participation in the Holy Spirit was conveyed by laying on of hands although no allusion to the practice is made in the passage. (4) Hebrews x. 29, "doing despite to the Spirit of grace," is supposed to allude to confirmation, because the reference to the blood of the Covenant is supposed to allude to baptism. The "blood of the Covenant" surely suggests the Eucharist rather than baptism. We may without hesitation reject these alleged supports of Dr. Chase's theory. There is not one of them that is not open to another, and probably better interpretation on the soundest principles of exegesis.

We fall back, then, upon the two passages in the Acts, the laying

on of hands by Peter and John at Samaria and by Paul at Ephesus. Of these Dr. Chase says (*Confirmation in the Apostolic Age*, p. 23), "The Confirmation scenes in the Acts are chosen, we cannot doubt, from many similar scenes. Each is a representative scene for a particular period of the Church's development. The significance of each lies in the fact that it is illustrative." He concludes, after dwelling on the two scenes, that (1) in the Apostolic Church a definite bestowal of the Holy Spirit followed baptism; (2) the outward sign was the laying on of hands; (3) the gift was sometimes followed by an extraordinary manifestation of the Spirit; (4) the minister at least normally was an Apostle; (5) laying on of hands was not confined to one school of the Apostles. . . . "The imposition of hands after baptism is represented as the natural act of the Apostles. No explanation of the origin of the practice is given. In the first days it had an early place in the life of the Church. Short of an express statement to the contrary, we could have no more convincing proof that herein the Apostles were following a command which they had received from the Lord Himself" (Chase, p. 34).

These are sweeping and startling conclusions, and they all rest on the assumption that "*we cannot doubt*" that the two instances are illustrative of the habitual practice of the Church. But what, if we do doubt it? What, if through some lurking uncertainty in Philip's mind, some unbelief in the capacity of the Samaritans to receive the Holy Ghost, the ordinary manifestations of His presence and power were withheld? What, if the Apostles felt it necessary to correct this unbelief by a personal visit? It is clear that the narrative impresses on us the absence of the "manifestations" that were apparently usual in the early Church. "To *each one* is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal" (1 Cor. xii. 7). Or it may even be that the manifestations were absent, because Simon Magus, like an Achan, troubled the newborn Church. Several conjectures are probable, and there will always be as much reason at least to suppose that the Samaria baptism was irregular and exceptional, as that St. Luke mentions it as illustrative.

The laying on of hands at Ephesus is open to the same line of doubt. What, if this occasion also was not illustrative but abnormal? What, if questions may have arisen whether the baptism of John could be followed by a second baptism? In both cases, at Ephesus as well as Samaria, it is to be noted that the laying on of hands was followed by manifestations, not necessarily unusual, but certainly evidential. If so, the laying on of hands may have been an additional and exceptional ceremony in special cases to convey assurance that a baptism, which for some reason appeared to be, or might be held to be, defective or irregular, was in fact perfectly valid. Without going so far as to say that these are assumptions "*which we cannot doubt,*" they may at least have as good claim to consideration as the assumption that the cases are "*illustrative.*"

It would be possible to strengthen this alternative supposition by pointing out that the gift of the Holy Spirit without laying on of hands preceded baptism in the case of Cornelius, and that in the case of Saul of Tarsus it preceded baptism but followed laying on of hands by one who was not an Apostle. Exceptions at least must be admitted. That is not all. St. Luke records four other cases of baptism, the 3,000 on the Day of Pentecost, the Ethiopian eunuch, Lydia, and the gaoler at Philippi, but makes no mention in any of these of "laying on of hands." Again, we read of divisions at Corinth, which turned partly on the person by whom various Corinthians were baptized. Could they not have been settled by the greater gift? If baptism was attended by some inferior gift of the Holy Spirit, surely the confirmation gift, bestowed only by Apostles, would have been the standard of appeal.

Dr. Chase tries to fortify his theory by some twenty quotations from the Epistles relating to the gift of the Spirit, or reception of the Spirit. In *not one of them* is this gift connected with laying on of hands. The mention of baptism is frequent throughout the New Testament. The laying on of hands immediately after baptism occurs twice. We are told that "we cannot doubt" that the two cases were illustrative, and imply an express command of our Lord. But doubts will persist. The plain fact is that Dr. Chase's style of argument would prove with equal certainty the right of the Popes to take to themselves the words "Tu es Petrus."

Prayer-book revision conducted on such lines as these opens the door to much error. But there is no question that Dr. Chase's argument is the basis of the proposed alternative confirmation service, and for that reason it has been necessary to dwell on it.

VIII

CONCLUSION: THE NEW LIFE

But we would conclude on another note. Our whole argument has brought out into strong light two points that need to be emphasized in our Church life to-day. Baptism has shown itself to be the sacrament of a new life, the Divine life brought into our natural life, and that Life is Love. The commandment "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God" is impossible of fulfilment for the unregenerate man. He may be conscious that he ought, as a matter of gratitude, to love God. He may even stir up an emotion sustained by remembrance of all that is beautiful, all that is noble, all that in art or nature seems to carry us beyond ourselves. But, if St. Paul is right in saying that "love never faileth" (1 Cor. xiii. 8), no emotion can really convey all that is meant by love, for emotions are, above all things, transient and evanescent, dependent on moods, and largely on external conditions. Love is essentially the union of two wills in a perfect harmony. The only love wherewith we can truly love God is the communion of the Spirit dwelling in us with the Triune God. The Holy Spirit reveals to us the love that God hath towards us and in us. He communicates the pardon of sin, the glorious

gift of a righteousness that is not our own: He imparts the peace passing all understanding, which floods the soul that is reconciled to God. He also, as our new and true self, cries, "Father, Father." "Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. iv. 6). He translates the wishes—that we call prayers—into conformity with the will of God, and satisfies us that in God's will is our peace. It is only on the foundation of this intimate communion between God and man that any hope can rest for the strivings after a better world, a new social order, a Kingdom of Heaven on earth. Any attempt to build these on impulses of human nature is building on sand. Only a Church that is truly regenerate can bring any hope of regeneration into the world. The Fatherhood of God is the foundation of the Brotherhood of Man, and Holy Baptism is the Sacrament of the Fatherhood of God.

Our study of confirmation makes evident the true foundation of Christian assurance. Though we dare not call that a sacrament for which we have not the express command of Christ, yet we may find in confirmation a sorely needed stay and support. For in many things we all offend. We are miserable sinners. We have left undone what we ought to do, and have done what we ought not to do. There is no health in us. But is it not our Father's hand resting on us that wrings these confessions from our lips? To the world they are unreal. It cannot believe that it is possible for a Christian to say honestly "that the burden of his sins is intolerable." Something much weaker must be substituted. But the son on whose head rests the touch of his Father's hand is conscious of what his Father is, and of what he himself ought to be. He knows what it is to sin against light and against love, and he needs some assurance against his heart which condemns him. That assurance he finds in the remembrance that it is the indwelling Spirit, Who brings to light with ever-increasing fulness, "daily increasing," the length, the breadth, the depth, the height of the love of God. In a world that has lost count of sin, that seems to find God useful only for the improvement of material conditions, the child of God falls back on an assurance, conveyed to him with the laying on of hands, that God loves him with an everlasting love, and has publicly, in the face of the Church, acknowledged him to be His son indeed. The world may be shaken to its foundations, but the removing of things that are shaken, as of things that have been made, confirms his faith in those things which are not shaken, which remain. He has received a kingdom which cannot be shaken, and offers service well pleasing to God with reverence and awe. For our God is a consuming fire (Heb. xii. 28, 29). But that which is to the world a consuming fire is to him a light shining more and more unto the perfect day.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

DR. G. K. A. BELL'S first publication since his appointment as Dean of Canterbury is *Documents on Christian Unity 1920-4* (Oxford University Press, 7s. 6d. net). The Movement for the Unity of the Christian Church falls into two periods. The first of these covers practically the ten years up to the Lambeth Conference of 1920 ; the second dates from the issue of the Lambeth Appeal to All Christian People in 1920. This volume of nearly 400 pages contains ninety important pronouncements mainly in response to the Appeal from nearly every section of the Christian World. It shows the large interest the subject has aroused during the last four years.

An interesting volume might be written on the preliminary movements of the previous ten years. In its due place would be given to the initiative taken by the Protestant Episcopal Church of America at its General Convention in 1910, when the World Conference on Faith and Order was first suggested. The actual World Conference is to be held in 1927. A number of Commissions of Enquiry have been at work collecting information. They have been very active and a vast mass of important matter has been already got together. In this connection we should like to express our sympathy with the Committee of the Conference on the death of their secretary, Mr. Robert H. Gardiner. A short tribute to his memory has just been issued by Bishop Brent, Chairman of the Continuation Committee of the World's Conference. Those who have been in touch with the Movement know how much it owes to the energy and industry of Mr. Gardiner. His wide experience and untiring activity will be sadly missed. As Bishop Brent says, "The profound impression made upon the Christian world by what he was and did baffles description. It is not too much to say that there is not a Church in Christendom, great or little, ancient or new, that does not know his name and feel kinship with his lofty soul. Better than that, his name carries with it a vision, a responsibility, a purpose, for it was not himself but Christ whom he exalted."

While this effort towards a better understanding was taking

place in America, another endeavour in quite a different part of the world aroused unusual interest. The controversy raised by the Kikuyu Conference is still fresh in all our memories. Indignation at this effort towards co-operation in the Mission Field was very strong in some Church circles. The present writer remembers an animated discussion he had with the Bishop of an African diocese while pacing up and down the Piazza at Venice in the Autumn of 1913. The Bishop was insistent that for the sake of the peace of the Church the C.M.S. must repudiate the whole scheme. Thanks to the wise action of the Bishop of Uganda and the sound judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury the storm was allayed, and we have travelled a considerable distance towards a better understanding of the problem since those days. We have no doubt that this is in a considerable measure due to the Cheltenham Conference. The Conference took up the subject of Reunion, and at one of its early sessions after a calm and deliberate discussion issued a series of Findings pointing out the true relationship between Episcopal and non-Episcopal Churches. Many will recall the shock of surprise—and even of repudiation—with which these were received, especially we may add on the part of some of our Bishops. Yet two or three years later when the Lambeth Conference considered the subject, it found itself compelled by the logic of the position to adopt similar conclusions, with results that are now well known. The group of Evangelical clergy and laity who met for quiet thought on the meaning of the Church of Christ and its unity, had proved themselves true exponents of the teaching of the Church of England. They had simply done what our Church always does. They had sought to interpret the teaching of our Lord and the New Testament.

Dean Bell's collection of documents contains the material for a history of the reunion movement during the past four years. It shows the practical steps that have been taken in various parts of the world, mainly in response to the Lambeth Appeal. In England progress may seem at the moment to be slow. This volume shows the favourable reception given to the Appeal by the Free Churches. Documents from India, Australia and Canada show that greater progress has been made, and that there are greater possibilities of action in the mission field and in new countries. Considerable space is given to the Malines Conversations and the documents arising

out of them. It is clear from recent events that there is not much hope of further development on that side. The Eastern Church has responded favourably. The volume contains one misleading document issued by a section of our Church as a statement of doctrine to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Such misrepresentations are soon valued at their real worth. Dean Bell has had special opportunities for collecting this important series of documents as Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. We have pleasure in joining in the general expressions of thanks to him for a volume of great usefulness and unusual importance. It ought to be in the hands of all who are taking any part in the reunion movement, and they ought to number the great majority of people in every Christian Communion.

The Revelation of St. John the Divine has probably been more variously interpreted than any other Book in the Bible. In consequence many give up attempting to understand it, and do not seek to find any spiritual help in it, while others lose themselves in a maze of bewildering interpretations by applying its symbolism to historical events and personages according to the theories of their favourite exponents. How can the average Christian best use the Book? The question has been answered by Dr. Limmer Sheppard in his *Devotional Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine* (Two volumes, 3s. 6d. each. Religious Tract Society).

Students will always be interested in the problems suggested by the Apocalypse. They will discuss the nature of Apocalyptic literature and the relation of this Book to it. They will weigh the evidence as to its authorship and will accept or reject such views as those recently put forward by Archdeacon Charles. They will endeavour to interpret its symbolism, and will endeavour to find some connection between its visions and the events of history. On all these points there will continue to be widely differing opinions. Dr. Limmer Sheppard shows that there is a profitable use apart from these, and that there can be a devotional study independent of them. There have been three recognized Schools of interpreters—the Historical, the Præterist, and the Futurist, but Dr. Sheppard will not ally himself with any of these. He adopts the simple principle that the Book deals with spiritual principles and not

with historical events. Therefore "the message of the Book is not for any particular age, but for all time." His method is to give a brief but careful explanation of the text of each passage, then to point out one at least of the spiritual lessons that can be drawn from it, and as a rule no account is taken of differing interpretations so that the mind of the reader may not be confused. The most Scriptural and the most reasonable interpretation is selected, as is fitting in a devotional study. Some may not regard this as an adequate treatment of the Book, but when they have gone through the Commentary we have no doubt that they will be satisfied with the lessons they have been taught. Any Clergyman wishing to give his Congregation a course of addresses on the Apocalypse will find that in using this Commentary he is able to give a clear outline of the whole Book, an interesting account of its symbolism, and an abundance of spiritual lessons drawn from the visions. The author has followed in the steps of such wise Commentators as Dean Vaughan, Professor Milligan and Dr. Swete, and has shown "the deep and thrilling spiritual message" of the Apocalypse that has been so often ignored.

Many of us have joined the crowds that assemble round the speakers in Hyde Park, and have heard many strange doctrines. The Christian Evidence Society does valuable service to Christianity in providing competent speakers to present the Christian faith week by week to these gatherings. It is not easy to answer briefly some of the questions that are raised by inquirers. To give a short positive statement without qualification is to appear "cocksure." To attempt a less direct method is to run the risk of an accusation of "shuffling." The Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A., Professor of Pastoral Theology, King's College, has had a long experience of this work, and has developed the method of answering difficult questions to a nicety. He has published five series of the questions asked and the answers given in *Question Time in Hyde Park* (S.P.C.K., 6s. net). The claim made for the volume that it is "A complete manual of Christian Apologetics for the needs of the present day" has been questioned, but it will be found a most useful compendium of valuable information, and a handbook of special value to all who have to undertake such work in parks and public places. The five divisions of the series are (1) Free

Will and Determinism ; (2) The Teaching and Person of Christ ; (3) The Bible and the Creeds ; (4) Christianity and History ; (5) Christianity in History. Evangelical Churchmen would lay the emphasis differently in some of the answers, especially in the section on the Reformation, but in spite of this we recognize the usefulness of the greater part of the work. In addition to the actual answers a number of illustrations drawn from the writings of representative authors give further suggestions to supplement the necessarily brief statements in the replies. Reference is also made to standard books on the subjects treated. An important point in such a book is the index. Special care has evidently been taken to make this as complete as possible. It is headed with the quaint and useful motto, "Works which have indexes are fortunate for letters."

Archdeacon Charles' Warburton Lectures on *The Decalogue* (Messrs. T. & T. Clark, 7s. 6d.) have attracted widespread attention. He treats the subjects from the critical, the historical, and the practical standpoints. His chief aim is to emphasize the practical aspect and "to reinterpret the *Decalogue* on the spiritual and ethical lines already laid down in the New Testament, and to apply its lessons to the crying needs of our own day." Protestant Churchmen will be grateful to him for the definiteness of some of his practical comments in this connection. Thus on the second Commandment he traces the growth of Mariolatry, and points out that since the sixth century the cult of Mary has made gigantic strides, and that "from the twelfth century to the present time she is practically put on an equality with the Three Persons of the Godhead" in Roman homiletical and devotional books. He shows that "of the worship of Mary there is not a single trace in the New Testament." Again in regard to the increasing use of the Crucifix he says, "It is a false symbol ; for Christ is the Lord of life. In confirmation of this truth we cannot too often insist on the fact that the crucifix was unknown in the first five centuries of the Christian Church. . . . At best it is but a revived antiquarianism. No doubt its votaries think to possess themselves of the spirit of that twilight age of religion by imitating its customs and repeating its symbols. In these respects they do imitate the past, and imitate it successfully, but they do not inherit its truth and inspiration, unless their mental development is essentially that of the medieval

period." In his treatment of Communism, Syndicalism and other present-day developments he is equally clear and incisive. In its chief and practical portion the volume is of unusual interest and value.

Dr. Alex. M. F. Macinnes chose as the subject of his thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, *The Kingdom of God in the Apostolic Writings*. It is published by Messrs. James Clarke & Co. (6s. net), with a Foreword by Dr. John Douglas Adam. Its title scarcely does justice to the wide range of its scope. The Publisher's note says, "This volume is not a *thesis* for philosophers but a *lever* to those seeking to lift mankind to higher levels." This indicates its practical purpose. After an adequate examination of the sources and background of the Apostolic writings, written in the light of the best scholarship, and a full statement of the place of the Kingdom of Heaven in its various phases in the New Testament, he turns to the application of its teaching and its significance in the life of to-day. Here he covers problems of thought, belief and conduct, and on all of them he has some stimulating suggestions to offer. We do not say that we always agree with his point of view, but he earns our gratitude by the way in which he opens up lines of thought, and shows the possibilities lying before the united witness of the Christian Church to the great fundamental truths of our common faith.

G. F. I.

"The Church Reform League Chronicle" publishes in its September number a complete list of the Acts of the Church Assembly which have received the Royal Assent, and an interesting article by Viscount Wolmer entitled "Church Reform from Within," in which he describes the setting up of the Church Assembly and surveys the work accomplished, showing how far the Assembly has justified the hopes of its promoters and what its promise of future usefulness now appears to be. The editor of the "Chronicle," in commenting on the present position, expresses the opinion that "what is happening now is the direct outcome of many years of pioneer labour on the part of the Church Reform League, which for nearly thirty years has been, as it is to-day, the only Society solely concerned with the reform of the machinery and organization of the Church in England."

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE QUESTION OF AUTHORITY.

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION. By Edward Grubb, M.A. London :
The Swarthmore Press, Ltd. 3s. 6d. net.

This is a small book on a great subject. Mr. Grubb writes from the Quaker point of view and naturally emphasizes the importance of the "Inner Light." He says: "The principle that the ultimate witness to the truth of God is to be found within and not without the soul of man, that the final Authority in Religion is not outward but inward, lies very deep in the teaching of the New Testament." Such a statement requires considerable explanation. It might seem to make the ultimate witness independent of "the Incarnation and the saving work of Christ for men." This is far from his intention, and he devotes an important chapter "to show a real connection between the principle of Inward Authority . . . and the ideas that are commonly regarded as fundamentally Christian." In a brief space Mr. Grubb covers the chief points of the whole problem. This is stated shortly—to find the true relationship between the outward and the inward sources of Authority, the Bible and the Church on the one hand, and the Spirit and the Inner Light on the other. Some would make the external authority absolute. The Roman Church has declared the Church to be infallible, and the Pope as the organ of that infallibility. He decides what is Truth and his decision is to be accepted without question. Faith is a gift of God by which men are enabled to accept these infallible decrees, and there, individual responsibility ends. Mr. Grubb has little difficulty in showing the futility of these claims. The Bible has its Authority as the revelation of God culminating in Jesus Christ. He is the ultimate external Authority. Mr. Grubb shows with frankness the difficulties that have arisen through criticism in regard to the authority of the Bible, but these cannot shake the supreme place of our Lord. Ultimately, of course, there is the individual response to the Truth presented, and the work of the Spirit brings the inner light on which that acceptance depends. There are three elements therefore in any adequate view of Authority. (1) Jesus Christ as presented in the Bible; (2) the general consent of men as a result of their religious experience from the time of Christ. This is the true meaning of the Authority of the Church, and does not depend on any theory of Church government or organization. (3) The individual conscience as subject to the working of the Holy Spirit producing the "Inner Light." None of these by itself is adequate. Together they form the supreme guide of life and thought. Their relative values will always be a subject of discussion. Dean Inge, recently quoting Mazzini's words that the spirit of man has two wings—the consent of our fellow-men, and conscience, went on to say that "these two wings we may call

Authority and the Inner Light," and that Authority cannot be dispensed with as Religion is in part external. Probably it is true as he suggests that the part of our religion which we accept on Authority ought to grow less. The deeper the inward experience of Christ, the less need of external aids. The history of the Church shows that those periods when the life of the Spirit grew feeble are those in which external aid was most sought, and men endeavoured to supply its place by the organization of the Church, and by attempts to strengthen external emblems of Authority.

THE INCARNATION.

THE CATHOLIC CONCEPTION OF THE INCARNATION. By the Rev. H. Maurice Relton, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* 3s. 6d.

Dr. Maurice Relton discusses in ten sermons matters of present-day importance. His book is a contribution to "The Scholar in the Pulpit" series, and as is to be expected, he weighs his words, thinks clearly and makes his points with a force that proves him to have a knowledge of the human heart and mind. There is no "New Theology" in these addresses. The nearest approach to novelty is in his exposition of the Enhypostasia "which saves us from a belief in the Impersonality of the Manhood of our Blessed Lord which would, of course, be Apollinarian." Dr. Relton sets forth with power and conviction all that is involved in the acceptance of the Adoptionist view of the Person of Christ, and we hope that those who are inclined to accept lightly a position put forward by many contemporary writers will carefully study what he has written. The first three sermons deal with the Incarnation and Person of our Lord and the fourth is an excellent homily on "The Stilling of the Storm," which he turns to excellent practical application. The remaining six discussions deal with the great need of the Church to-day, Life Eternal, Spiritualism, the Other Side of Death, and the Problem of Judas. We have read them all and have found them as enlightening as they are suggestive, and unlike most sermons by men who hold academic positions, they are never severely technical or hard to be understood. Parish Clergymen can easily make them the basis of addresses to average congregations who will be most grateful for the privilege of having passed on to them the thoughts of this distinguished scholar.

"WHITED SEPULCHRES."

WHITED SEPULCHRES. The Story of a Modern Mystic. By John Knipe. London: *Hodder & Stoughton.* 7s. 6d. net.

This is a novel of exceptional power and great dramatic interest. It is doubly welcome to us as it deals with questions of great importance in regard to the welfare of our own Church. Those who look to Rome for their pattern have been fortunate in securing the aid of one or two novelists capable of presenting their position attractively. Here is a writer of unusual gifts who sees the relationship

of our Church to the Church of Rome as we see it, and does not hesitate to assert quite frankly the dishonesty of those who teach Roman doctrine, and in some cases receive ordination from Bishops in communion with Rome and yet remain in the Church of England. The book has roused the indignation of the Anglo-Catholic press, and we are not surprised that the revelations that it contains should be unpleasant to them. At the same time we do not wish to give the impression that the novel is simply a controversial tract. Its story centres round the life of a boy who grew up with peculiar gifts; his mystical powers as he reached manhood led him to a varied career chequered and broken by tumults and passions of intellect and heart. He is seen in circumstances that made him a victim of Jesuit subtlety. Incidentally we have charming pictures of life in Cornwall and in Rome, and we are introduced to a circle of Church life that presents many attractive features. It is a book to read and enjoy.

TWO BOOKS BY A JEWISH SCHOLAR.

- (1) STUDIES IN PHARISAISM AND THE GOSPELS. By Israel Abrahams. Second Series. *Pitt Press*. 10s. (2) SOME PERMANENT VALUES IN JUDAISM. Four Lectures. By Israel Abrahams. *Clarendon Press*. 3s. 6d.

Formerly Senior Tutor of Jews' College, London, Mr. Abrahams has occupied the chair of Talmudic in Cambridge since 1902. To a wider public he is known from works on the history of Jewish Literature, contributions to encyclopedias, and the editorship of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. Last year he delivered the Schweich Lectures on "Campaigns in Palestine." There is, moreover, a much used edition of the Jewish Daily Prayer Book, annotated by Mr. Abrahams.

Mr. Abrahams is a foremost Liberal Jew. He has learnt, as he tells us, much from Christian commentators on the Old Testament; and he has a thorough knowledge of the New Testament. Though his scholarship is thus wide he writes as a lover of his people, a patriotic Jew. His varied and profound learning, however, makes him strive to be absolutely fair to Christianity.

(1) In 1917 Mr. Abrahams published his *First Series* of "Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels." It was designed to be in part a companion to Mr. C. G. Montefiore's *Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. From Rabbinical material Mr. Abrahams wrote extended notes on subjects arising from the New Testament, e.g. "The Sabbath"—"First Century Divorce"—"God's Forgiveness"—"Man's Forgiveness," etc.

The *Second Series* has now appeared, and it can be said without hesitation that no teacher of the New Testament can afford to ignore either of Mr. Abrahams' *Studies*. Of course it is no new thing to bring Hebrew literature to bear upon the New Testament; but a good method has so often lacked historical accuracy in the hands of the unskilled. Not seldom Commentators on a New

Testament book (unless they are themselves Jewish scholars) are found jumbling up citations from all periods of Jewish literature. This has led to false (but accepted) statements (e.g.) such as that in New Testament times there were "Proselytes of the Gate" and "Proselytes of Righteousness." The same kind of imperfect scholarship makes our Lord be present at services where there were liturgical prayers for the dead (which prayers in reality came into the Jewish services in the Middle Ages and from *Roman Catholic* services). When Mr. Abrahams quotes, it is from *Mishnah, Midrash* or *Talmud*, and he gives his references. But those who desire only quotations accurately arranged would seek elsewhere. Mr. Abrahams produces interestingly written essays on such subjects as the Good Samaritan—Whited Sepulchres—The Second Death—The Cessation of Prophecy—The Imitation of God. (This last was originally written as the Presidential Address before the *Oxford Society of Historical Theology*, 1921.) With two or three *Studies* let us deal more in detail beginning with "Some Rabbinic Ideas on Prayer."

The Jewish belief was that "Marriages are made in heaven," and therefore, said the Pharisees, they are beyond praying for. "Raba once heard a man praying that he might win the love of a certain maiden. Raba bade him cease his prayer, urging: 'If she be destined for thee, nothing can part you; if thou art not destined to get her, thou deniest providence in praying for her,'" (p. 78.) *Unselfish* prayer is uncommon in any religion, but it was found in Pharisaism.

"Hanina ben Dosa was once caught in the rain, and successfully prayed for its cessation. But realizing that the world needed the rain he changed his note. 'Master of the world, shall all the world be distressed while Hanina enjoys his comfort?' Whereupon copious showers fell." The Pharisee of St. Luke 15, Mr. Abrahams claims, is not typical, "for Pharisaism conceives all men equally destitute of saving virtue."

In the section on *The Lord's Prayer* Mr. Abrahams' wide modern learning shows itself conspicuously. He in no way supports the contention that this Prayer is a mere collection of Jewish petitions. The Jew, he says, prays: "Forgive us, O our Father, for we have sinned." *The Lord's Prayer* introduces a condition: "as we also have forgiven" (St. Matt.) The author quotes with approval his co-religionist Montefiore: "It [*The Lord's Prayer*] is original in the choice of ideas, and in their grouping. Whoever put it together chose with fine religious feeling and insight." But it is an easier matter for Mr. Abrahams than it would be for us Christians to regard *The Lord's Prayer* (as he apparently does in both the Matthean or the Lucan version) as "the work not of Jesus himself, but of disciples."

An example of a *linguistic* study is No. 1, upon the phrase (in St. Matt. xxvi. 25, 64, etc.), "*Thou hast said.*" Mr. Abrahams maintains that the one, or possibly two, Rabbinical passages hitherto relied upon are not really parallel, and that it is not possible

to class the phrase in the Gospels as an aramaism or a current Rabbinical form of affirmative. Here Mr. Abrahams is in line with Westcott on St. John xviii. 37 (a reference, however, not mentioned by the writer). Westcott cautiously interprets: "*Thou sayest that I am a King,*" as neither a direct affirmative nor negative. Contrast the bold version by Dr. Moffatt: "*Certainly, said Jesus, I am a King,*" which translation of *ὁ λέγεις* is clearly unsupported by evidence. But with all respect to Mr. Abrahams' apparent doubts the present writer cannot resist the conviction that the phrase (1) is an affirmative of some kind; (2) is genuinely Semitic. St. Matthew xxvi. 64 (in the Trial before Caiaphas) has "*Thou hast said*"; but the parallel in (St. Mark xiv. 62) is "*I am.*" Whichever is the more primitive, it is hard to suppose that the variant "*I am*" is *inaccurate*. It is strange that the phrase occurs nowhere outside the Gospels, but in them it comes (in some form or another) seven times (excluding parallels, four). Hence it simply must represent some accepted form of speech. If only one occurrence could have been discovered in *external* literature it would have been claimed as sufficient to establish it as being a recognized idiom. And surely it must go back to an Aramaic original, if no Hebrew can be found. How else can the varying *tenses* be explained in the Greek? Only a semitic perfect tense could produce indifferently *ὁ εἶπας* (St. Matt. xxvi. 64) and *ὁ λέγεις* (xxvii. 11), and this is particularly possible with the verb "*to say.*"

The value of such a note as Mr. Abrahams' seems to be to show how often explanations have been handed down, (however accurate in themselves), lacking the very evidence claimed for them. Perhaps the point will be cleared up satisfactorily as more aramaic papyri are discovered.

This particular essay of Mr. Abrahams is academic scholarship. On the other hand, in almost every chapter of the book will be found material to suggest a sermon topic for the preacher, or a quotation, or an anecdote (e.g. that of Antoninus and the Rabbi, p. 86), to weave into a popular discourse.

In the second volume, *Some Permanent Values in Judaism*, the same author gives out his treasures in a somewhat different form.

Here are no detailed notes or discussions. These *Lectures* were spoken last year at the Jewish Institute of Religion, in New York. Mr. Abrahams deals with his subjects in a comprehensive way; and he never goes far without a clever epigram or humorous touch.

The essays are entitled respectively, *The Permanent Value of Primitive Ideas—Apocalypse—Philo—the Talmud*. The "*Primitive Ideas*" are contained in parts of the Old Testament.

"It is not the great ideas of the Bible that trouble us: those great ideas console, guide, strengthen us. But—what shall we say of those aspects which we have come, in the light of criticism and comparative science, to regard as the smaller ideas of the Bible? These do trouble us." Mr. Abrahams, however, claims that not only were the primitive ideas necessary at the time: even now in many respects they are rightly not obsolete. "If Judaism had not

gone through stages in which God was conceived anthropomorphically, we could not commune with Him as we now can. The God of the Jew is not the God of the metaphysician, He is the God of experience" (p. 8.) Mr. Abrahams would be glad to retain primitive customs if they still possess a spiritual value. On the other hand "would that more of the primitive were dead and buried. Wars and the rumours of wars, tribal antipathies who disguise themselves as patriotisms, superstitions that terrorize without inspiring obsolete dogmas that masquerade as living faith,—these are not viatica, they are impedimenta."—(19)—

It is impossible to comment further than this upon the second of the four Lectures. Upon *Apocalyptic* Mr. Abrahams has many fine things to say. For he is one of the Jews who appreciate its good points. Rabbinical Judaism excluded the non-canonical and canonical Apocalypses from its theology. On p. 27, it seems strange to find the traditional Jewish view as to the duration of Old Testament prophecy. Many of us would make the period nearly six centuries instead of "something over three." Mr. Abrahams' *Judaism* should be read by all Christians who would learn in clearly written and absorbing chapters, at the feet of a great Jewish scholar.

We have deliberately left to the last a quotation bearing upon the Anglo-Catholic controversy. On p. 199 of the *Studies*, Mr. Abrahams tells us that Mal. i. 11 was applied by the Jews of the Dispersion to prayer *apart from sacrifice*. Further, on the same page, the (Post-Reformation) conception of Eucharistic sacrifice as that not of a victim but of *ourselves* receives an authority from even an unconverted Jew of St. Paul's time. Philo said, "They who bring *themselves* are offering the most excellent sacrifices."

THE C.M.S. REPORT.

THE GOSPEL AT WORK: The Story of the C.M.S. 1923-4.

The interest in Foreign Missions is growing and deepening, but the Church is still very far from a full realization of its responsibility for sending the Gospel to the Heathen and Mohammedan world. The Church Missionary Society is doing its utmost to awaken Christian people to the appalling need which everywhere exists, and by means of its Home Missionary Education Scheme it is seeking "to equip every kind of leader in parish life—in Parochial Church Council, Sunday School, C.E.M.S., G.F.S., and the like—for missionary leadership, that by this means every parish may at last be brought to realize its missionary vocation." The chapter on "The Home Base" which concludes this most interesting little volume—for which only one shilling is asked—deserves close attention at the hands of clergy and other parish leaders, but it is probably the earlier part of the book, telling the story of the different Missions, which will appeal to the greater number of readers.

The compilation of the Report is exceedingly well done and we get, not a glimpse only, but a fairly full view of the nature of the work, with its encouragements and its difficulties, its needs and its

hopes, in every one of the Mission fields. The chapter on Africa takes us to Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda, and vivid and realistic is the story. In that on the Near East, we are shown something of the difficulties in Egypt and the Soudan and in Palestine, but the story of Persia is full of hope. Coming to India, the sections on the general position, and the work in the United Provinces and in South India will be of the greatest value in enabling the reader to understand the scope and meaning of the Nationalist movement. The chapter on Ceylon shows that while Mass Movements are not much in evidence there, a strong work is going forward. China's story is of thrilling interest and will draw out the sympathy of Christian readers with the missionaries in the South, in Kwangsi and Hupeh, in Fuhkien, in Chekiang and Western China. May God soon give peace to that disturbed land. It is joy to know that even now some of the sad happenings have turned out to the furtherance of the Gospel. The story of Japan is one of wonderful recovery from the great disaster, but the need is great.

We venture to append one or two remarkable missionary stories from this most excellent report:—

“A settler who had lived for many years in a Moslem land is responsible for the following story. He happened to have on his farm a headman who was a Christian; the man's wife was far away in a distant part of the country and the husband was not happy in being away from her. It was suggested to him that he should bring his wife to the farm, but to this he objected that he did not wish to break up his home in his own country. His employer, being cognizant of Moslem practices, then suggested that the man should get a second wife, and so be provided for both on the farm and in his own country. Great was his surprise when the man replied quietly but impressively: ‘You forget, sir, that I am a Christian.’”

“On the morning of Easter Day an impressive service was held in the church at Menouf, when three sheikhs, formerly students in the Azhar University, but now converted and baptized, introduced an inquirer from a neighbouring town. He was received publicly before the congregation by the missionary in charge, and admitted into the Church as a catechumen. The sermon on this occasion was preached by Sheikh Boulos, who himself had been baptized by a missionary of the Society some sixteen years previously.”

“A Brahman lawyer is quoted as giving a striking testimony to the growth of Christianity in India. ‘Though there have been Moslems in India for a thousand years, you never hear a Hindu say to a Moslem: I wish you were more like the Prophet. We have only known of Christianity for a quarter of that time, but there is no educated Hindu who would not say to any Christian: ‘I wish you were more like Jesus Christ.’”

“Miss Nethercote tells of a visit to a Brahman house, where on the wall she descried, amid many gods and goddesses, the photograph of a former woman missionary, and lying near by it a well-

used New Testament. She was met with the question: 'Why are you alone? In my young days Miss Bland had five or six missionary helpers. Tell them to send more missionaries. We are praying for them, we want them.'

"An extraordinary case of unrest was a remarkable propaganda carried on by a man named Tang, sometime an inquirer in one of the Christian Churches in Chengtu. With a smattering of Bible knowledge and using Christian terms, he announced the inauguration of a seventh and final religion, amalgamating the 'six religions'—Confucian, Buddhist, Taoist, Moslem, Roman, and Protestant, with himself as king. He issued pamphlets foretelling fearful calamities to take place in September, when two-thirds of the world would perish. Some of the language seemed to be borrowed from St. Matthew xxiv. This prophecy spread with remarkable rapidity, not only through the province of Szechwan, but through almost the whole of China. Minute instructions were given how to prepare for the last three days. Consequently temples were crowded with worshippers, non-mission schools had to close down days before and after the predicted date, and people generally were in a panic. But of the Christians and pupils at Anshien it is recorded: 'I do not know of a single one of our people or school children who was disturbed. Several of the children said to me, 'Of course we are not afraid; we know this is all superstition.'"

PRECIOUS STONES.

THE PRECIOUS STONES OF THE BIBLE. By the Rev. C. W. Cooper, F.G.S. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* 2s. 6d. net.

The author of this most interesting book is a well-known Evangelical clergyman, Vicar of St. Paul's, Canonbury. "For some years," he tells us, "it was my hobby to collect and study cut semi-precious stones; later, through the encouragement of Mr. W. J. Lewis Abott, F.G.S., gem expert, St. Leonards-on-Sea, I extended my collection and study to the more precious gems. This led to a study of the stones of the Bible. On discovering that very few books discussed the subject with any degree of independence or fullness, and that not a few of the ordinary books of reference repeated manifest errors, I felt led to write this treatise." We are sincerely glad he followed the leading, for he has given us a volume of real value, replete with information which cannot easily be found elsewhere, and we are sure it will lead readers to pursue further this fascinating study. He divides his volume into five parts: i, Precious Stones of the Bible; ii, Breastplate of the High Priest; iii, Precious Stones of the Breastplate; iv, The Ephod Described; v, The Urim and the Thummim. We quote the following passage from one of the most interesting chapters of all, that on the Breastplate of the High Priest:—

"If we may count the Breastplate as nine inches square, and divide the width into three, allowing a moderate margin between

the stones, it seems quite probable, as Professor Myres says, that they may have been as large as one-and-a-half inches or possibly two inches wide. This consideration almost seems to rule out the likelihood that the third stone was the modern emerald. Such a gem would indeed be wonderful.

“ A question of much importance, and one which greatly helps to determine the nature of the stones used in the Breastplate, arises in regard to the sources from which the early Israelites obtained their precious stones.

“ That EGYPT was a primary source is clear from several passages in the Bible. We have the story of Rachel stealing the images of Laban, her father. These images were *Terafchim*, and the word is so rendered in the Revised Version (Gen. xxxi. 19).

“ They were little carved gods, or amulets, in precious stone, which, under the designation *Thmei*, were worn by the Egyptian judges and priests. In Genesis xli. 42 we read the story of Pharaoh placing upon his own finger, an engraved seal used as the royal signet.

“ That precious stones were among the spoils which Israel took from the Egyptians at the time of their exodus, is clear from Exodus xxv. 3 and 7, where we read: ‘ This is the offering which ye shall take of them. . . . Onyx stones, and stones to be set in the ephod, and in the breastplate.’ From this later text we may also conclude that the stones were not phenomenal in size and substance, though certainly they were of immense value.

“ Another source for gems was ARABIA. In Genesis ii. 12 we are told the land of Havilah was famous for its onyxes, and therefore for agates also.

“ The Queen of Sheba brought precious stones to present to King Solomon (1 Kings x. 10). The navy of Hiram also brought from Ophir precious stones (1 Kings x. 11), which were so plentiful that Hezekiah made treasuries for precious stones (2 Chron. xxxii. 27). Ezekiel, speaking of the great riches of Tyre, speaks of the merchants of Sheba and Raamah, who occupied her fairs with ‘ all precious stones and gold.’ ”

ROAD-MENDING ON THE SACRED WAY.

ROAD-MENDING ON THE SACRED WAY. By the Rev. J. M. C. Crum, Rector of Farnham. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 6s. net.

Those who accept the judgment of the modern critics on the synoptic problem find themselves faced by many perplexities. This book is a serious attempt to help them through these difficulties, and the author aims at being as “ untechnical as possible.” He suggests an analogy,—“ old methods of Road-mending,—the homely seated Road-mender of old days, with his large spectacles, and his stone-heap and his hammer, and his patient attention to individual stones and so on.” But we remember having seen a horrible machine with enormous teeth, that tore up the road yard by yard,

and we almost expected Mr. Crum to compare modern methods of Biblical criticism with this ruthless engine. But no, he is content with the analogy and hesitates to venture on a comparison though he mentions "modern Road-menders," gangs, engines and such-like, and tells us that "the less we think about ponderous machineries in this connection, the better." But when we turn to page 103 for example, and use red, blue and purple pencils, as he suggests, we seem to have left the sacred way in a sorry condition and we begin to wonder if the narrative looks much better than the roadway after the aforesaid machine has torn it up, and to ask what the person whom Mr. Crum designates "the modern reader" makes of it all. He himself, writing of the 270 verses common to St. Matthew and St. Luke, which he has purple-pencilled (which verses are supposed to come from a lost gospel), says—"they are in a most confused disorder," and that St. Luke's portions in particular are "in a shocking tangle." Are there any portions unidentified because only one writer made use of them? Mr. Crum's answer is "one can only guess," which does not seem to help us much! This is an example of the sort of conjecture to which one is driven by the theories of the critics, and with this we must rest content since it is outside the scope of this notice to examine this treatise point by point. The style is somewhat disjointed and a synopsis, or an index, or both, would have been useful. Mr. Crum is always reverent and often illuminating, and it is evident that a vast amount of patient research lies behind these pages.

S. R. C.

Early in October Messrs. Macmillan will publish CHRISTUS VERITAS, an Essay, by the Right Rev. William Temple, D.D., Bishop of Manchester. (10s. net.) This book is a sequel, or rather a companion, to "Mens Creatrix," which was published in 1917. The earlier book was mainly philosophical in its aim; this is mainly theological. In "Mens Creatrix" the author tried first to set out a philosophic view, without any deliberate reference to Christian revelation or experience, and then to show that the Incarnation in fact supplied the one great need of philosophy. "Christus Veritas" begins where "Mens Creatrix" left off, and has been written with the Christian revelation full in view from the outset.



CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

The Church Congress.—As in previous years there will be a large stall at the Church Congress Exhibition at Merton Fields, Oxford, during Congress Week, when the publications of the League and books recommended by the Committee will be on sale. Clergy and other members are specially invited to visit the stall, to inspect and purchase the literature on view, and to mention it to their friends, particularly drawing attention to the books and pamphlets on Prayer Book Revision and Prayer Book Teaching.

We would also draw attention to the excellent series of calendars, motto cards and framed verses written and issued by the Rev. R. F. P. Pechey, which will also be on sale. These are artistically illustrated and beautifully arranged. They are suitable for placing on a desk or wall. The calendars are published at 1s. 3d. and 1s. 6d., the motto cards at 1s. 6d., framed at 2s., 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. In addition to the New Year's and Christmas verses, Mr. Pechey has also prepared an excellent birthday motto card entitled *A Birthday Wish* which is issued at 1s. 6d.

N.G.L. Publications.—A new list of the publications of the League has now been prepared and will be sent on receipt of a postcard.

Prayer Book Teaching Pamphlets.—Three additions to these pamphlets have just been issued: No. 20, by Bishop E. A. Knox, entitled *Misuse of Prayer Book Revision: to Promote the Counter-Reformation*. Bishop Knox has given us a most valuable pamphlet which should be circulated all over England. The real issues in the present controversy have never been put more clearly. It is clear in thought, strong in argument, and cogent in its appeal. Bishop Knox shows that the proposals before the Church Assembly commit the Church to giving its authority to two mutually exclusive systems: to the Mass of the unreformed Church, and to the Communion Service of the Reformers; and the Bishop notes the position of the intelligent layman who tries to find out for himself and for his children what the Church teaches. "Will he really respect a Church which in regard to the great Sacrament of union utters two voices, gives two wholly discordant explanations, and takes no trouble to come to a determinate decision on one of the greatest problems that has confronted Christendom?" No. 21, by the Rev. Dr. C. Sydney Carter, entitled *The English Church: Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant*, embodies the material contained under these headings which appeared in *The Record* newspaper some time ago and which Dr. Carter has re-arranged and re-written by special request. The pamphlet is written with knowledge, and will be exceedingly useful for general circulation, as it illustrates the principles of our Church's teaching. No. 22, by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, is entitled *A Short Sketch of English Church History*, and is a useful and interesting survey of the growth of the Church of England since before the Norman Conquest until the present day. The value of the pamphlet is increased by a useful chronological table which is printed at the end. These pamphlets now number twenty two and the full series will be sent post free on receipt of a P.O. for 2s. 6d. They are issued at 2d. each.

Alternative Communion Offices.—The Rev. Dr. A. C. Downer has published an interesting and valuable little volume entitled *The Alternative Communion Offices*, undertaken at the instance of Bishop Knox, who has taken a considerable interest in the publication and has contributed some of the more important notes. The book supplies a lack which has been widely felt, and Dr. Downer's endeavour to exhibit in parallel columns the various proposals for Alternative Communion Services in contrast to the Communion Service of the Church of England in the Book of Common Prayer will be of considerable help in following the several revision proposals. Dr. Downer has naturally not been able to include the alterations made by the House of Clergy at the recent summer session, but the pamphlet is published with wide margins so as to enable readers to fill in further material for themselves from the published reports and so keep the matter up-to-date. The pamphlet is published at 2s. net.

Dr. Griffith Thomas' Books.—The sudden and lamented death of the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., in the United States, deprives us of a writer whose competency and knowledge were unique. Those who have not copies of two books of his, published by the N.C.L., would do well to obtain them immediately. The first volume, *The Catholic Faith: a Manual of Instruction for Members of the Church of England*, was issued first in 1905, and has been through several reprints. In 1920 a new and revised edition was issued, bringing the total issue of the book to 30,000. The book, as the subtitle indicates, is a manual of instruction, and answers exhaustively and with references to authority, two questions: "What is the Church of England?" and "What does the Church of England teach?" It is arranged in the order of the Book of Common Prayer. Part 1 deals with the relation of the individual Christian to God, according to the Prayer Book, and how that relation is formed and maintained. Part 2 deals with the relation of the individual Churchman to his fellow Churchmen in regard to doctrine, worship, and practice. Part 3 deals with the relation of the individual Churchman to some important questions of the day. *The Catholic Faith* has a useful index, and is issued in four styles: 3s. 6d., 2s. 6d., 2s., and 1s. 6d. net. *A Sacrament of Our Redemption* is the second book by Dr. Griffith Thomas published by the League. This book was first issued in 1906, but was practically re-written and issued as a second edition in 1921, having in view the discussion in regard to the Communion Service which was taking place in connection with the Revision of the Prayer Book. The book deals with the institution, meaning, and history of the rite of the Lord's Supper, the "Sacrament of our Redemption." Dr. Thomas first of all declares the right method of approach to the study of the rite, and points out that, in the midst of conflicting views, the only way of approach is to get behind controversy to the institution of the sacrament in the New Testament record, and the reader's attention is drawn to the connection of the Lord's Supper with the Jewish Passover feast, with its wealth of symbol and memorial. After carefully examining the gospels and epistles in relation to the institution of the Holy Communion, Dr. Thomas gives an excellent summary of the New Testament teaching. Five chapters follow in which the writer traces the various changes that took place in our Book of Common Prayer, and finds in that book to-day just "the same simplicity of statement, the same spiritual standpoint, the same general view of the institution," as are found in the New Testament. Three closing chapters deal with current unscriptural views of the Lord's Supper, brought in through the Tractarian movement.