

Notes and Comments

ARE THE ISSUES OF THE REFORMATION TO BE REOPENED OR CLOSED?

A REPLY TO U. S. LEUPOLD

IT SEEMS that I have been unlucky enough to touch the wrong nerve of Dr. Leupold's sensitivity. My article¹ took it for granted that we could assume the achievements of the Reformation as established and that our task is now to think constructively about the past and the future rather than to keep on waving the Protestant flag. It is unfortunate that the reaction I produced in Dr. Leupold² has led him to put a colour on my remarks that they were not intended to have.

1. He overplays his hand in the degree to which he regards me as reducing issues to a matter of semantics. What I said (and this regarding only one of the points at issue) was that "much of the seeming difference . . . disappears. . . ."

2. Dr. Leupold reports me as averring that while Roman Catholic theologians at Trent stress righteousness by works simply in order to maintain growth in holiness the Reformed failed to appreciate the connection between baptism and justification. This is an unfair juxtaposition of my statements. The true contrast to draw with the first part of the statement would be to go on to say "the Reformed thought it necessary to go over to the concept of sanctification in order to make this stress."

3. I, for one, would not accept a *duality* of Scripture and tradition. The mediate factors in the reception of revelation are plural, not dual.

4. I cannot understand how Dr. Leupold has managed such a topsy-turvy reproduction of what I said about the eucharistic sacrifice. My words were: "The Reformation was necessary in order to recover the evangelical truth that the *Father* had already himself done all that was necessary for man's salvation." I also said that, in recovering this prime emphasis, Reformed theology (not *Roman* theologians, as Dr. Leupold alleges I said) failed to take sufficient account of "man's action in the Son towards the Father" (p. 186).

5. Dr. Leupold charges me with making the Reformers "appear as the originators of a *détour* in Christian understanding" because I am so dismayed by attitudes among their epigones. He himself, however, in a later paragraph, acknowledges Lutheran corruption of the doctrine of the

1. D. W. Hay, "The Issues of the Reformation Reopened," *Canadian Journal of Theology*, 10 (1964), 177-86.

2. U. S. Leupold, "The Issues of the Reformation Closed? An Answer to D. W. Hay," *ibid.*, 12 (1966), 126-28.

theologia crucis and (still later) development among Lutherans of a legalism of their own. Is he then to be allowed to excuse Luther from being the originator of *détours* while I may not have a similar privilege regarding Calvin? In fact, however, I do not wish to claim it. In my opinion, some followers of Calvin have done badly by his theology, but at the same time there are weaknesses even in the great teacher himself.

6. Where Dr. Leupold accuses me of arguing by general inferences I am rather sketching out a general position. I should like to think that his claim is true: "All students of the New Testament today agree that the connection between baptism and justification must be taken very seriously." I am glad that he agrees with me upon the importance of the Lord's Supper in the believer's incorporation into Christ. I should regard baptism as fulfilling the same function because it is (among other things) identification with Christ's dying and rising humanity.

7. I am at a loss to know what Dr. Leupold may be imputing to me by his use of the adverb *conveniently*. Certainly I agree that the rank and file of believers experience the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum*. My concern was simply to assert the ancient doctrine of the Church that her teachers exercise their authority by virtue of this Spirit.

8. As Dr. Leupold seems to realize, my article was written from within the Reformed tradition. I made no claim to include Lutheran attitudes. At one point in my original address I did in fact make a bow to a more wholesome attitude among Lutherans (as I believe) than among Reformed, on the relationship of justification to baptism, but this remark was omitted in the printed version. A reader of the article can see from my frequent references to Reformed (that is Calvinistic) theology, to Geneva (never to Wittenberg), and to those of us who are "on the Genevan side" that I wrote from a Reformed rather than from a general Protestant point of view. It is hardly necessary for me, therefore, to take up the matters that Dr. Leupold draws in from the Lutheran side, but I must disavow the intention he seems to want to lay upon me of attempting "to shrug off the healthy impetus that has come from the Reformers."

DAVID W. HAY

*Knox College,
University of Toronto*

THE EUCHARIST IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

IN HIS ARTICLE "The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel"¹ the late G. H. C. MacGregor adduces four answers to the question: "Why is there no specific reference to the institution of the Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel?" These may be summarized as follows:

1. G. H. C. MacGregor, "The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel," *New Testament Studies*, 9 (1962-63), 111-19.

CANADIAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, VOL. XII (1966), No. 3