

triumph was due not to the deliberate acceptance of the Papal claims by the reason and conscience of the Church, but partly to external circumstances and partly to calculated ambition backed by force and fraud. The East continued to bear witness to the primitive truth.

To sum up, the contention of the English Church is this. If the claims of the Pope to be the infallible head of the Church and the source of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction are well founded, then a right belief in them is an essential part of the Christian faith. We have the right, therefore, to expect to find clear proof of this in Scripture and primitive tradition. That is just what we do not find. On the other hand, there are facts of many different kinds that show that the early Church knew nothing of any such belief. We cannot suppose that God would have left His Church without as clear evidence for the supremacy of S. Peter's successors as for, e.g. the doctrine of the Trinity. The only possible line of argument in defence of the Roman position is that of development.¹ We are not concerned to deny that the Papacy is a development or that in the providence of God it played a most useful part in conserving the unity and discipline of the Church during times of general confusion when a strong central authority was required. But we may still ask whether the modern Papacy is a legitimate development, and are bound to test it, as we test other developments of Christianity, such as, for instance, the Salvation Army, by the rule of Scripture and tradition and the light of reason. The Roman and Catholic theories of unity are incompatible. On the Roman view the unity of the Church is based upon absolutism. Every kind of power is derived from a single head, the Pope. On the Catholic view the unity of the Church is that of one life in Christ which unites a variety of free and living wills. Every element in the Church has its part.² The Pope is only one among many of the bishops of the Church. On the Roman theory unity is, as it were, imposed from without by external authority; on the Catholic theory it grows from within, as the spontaneous product of the one life that works in all the members of the Body of Christ. We believe that neither historically nor theologically can the Papal theory of unity be justified by an appeal to Scripture, and therefore we are free to reject it without forfeiting our Catholic inheritance.†

that Cyprian's writings were afterwards interpolated to support the Roman view. (Cp. Puller, p. 49 ff., or Benson, *Cyprian*, c. iv. See, however, *J.Th.S.* (New Series) vol. v (1954), p. 19, where modern studies of this question are reviewed.)

¹ We may doubt whether this is really compatible with the Papal Bull that declares the infallibility of the Pope a tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith. But see Dom Chapman, c. vi. § A.

² Cp. Gore, *R.C. Claims*, c. vii. 'The original idea of the Episcopate would have secured for the Church a duly representative government and would have provided, by the confederation of relatively independent Churches, a system of checks upon one-sided local tendencies. The Papacy represents the triumph of Imperial absolutism over representative, constitutional authority, and of centralization over consentient witness and co-operation.' The Eastern Churches on the whole stand for the older view of confederation.

ARTICLES XXV-XXVI

THE SACRAMENTS

ARTICLE XXV

Of the Sacraments

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a

De Sacramentis

Sacramenta, a Christo instituta, non tantum sunt notae professionis Christianorum, sed certa quaedam potius testimonia, et efficacia signa gratiae atque bonae in nos voluntatis Dei, per quae invisibiliter ipse in nos operatur, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

Duo a Christo Domino nostro in Evangelio instituta sunt Sacramenta: scilicet, Baptismus, et Coena Domini.

Quinque illa vulgo nominata Sacramenta: scilicet, confirmatio, poenitentia, ordo, matrimonium, et extrema unctio, pro Sacramentis Evangelicis habenda non sunt, ut quae, partim a prava Apostolorum imitatione profluxerunt, partim vitae status sunt in Scripturis quidem probati: sed sacramentorum eandem cum Baptismo et Coena Domini rationem non habentes, ut quae signum aliquod visibile, seu caeremoniam, a Deo institutam non habeant.

Sacramenta non in hoc instituta sunt a Christo ut spectarentur, aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis uteremur, et in his duntaxat qui digne percipiunt salutarem habent effectum: Qui

wholesome effect or operation: But they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as S. *Paul* saith.

This is one of those Articles in which large and important alterations were made in 1563. The first paragraph, based largely on the Confession of Augsburg, formed the last paragraph of the original Article of 1553. The second and third paragraphs were composed in 1563. The last paragraph of our present Article formed the first of the earlier Article, but has undergone two important alterations, (i) An opening clause consisting of a quotation from S. Augustine has been omitted, (ii) the condemnation of the theory of grace *ex opere operato* has been withdrawn.

Its object may be summed up thus:

(i) To condemn as inadequate teaching about the sacraments held by Anabaptists, Zwinglians and others;

(ii) To restore a sense of proportion in the view of sacraments by a reference to Scripture;

(iii) To make clear that they require a moral effort in the recipient.

N.B.—Allowed = *probat*, i.e. approved.

Duly = *rite*, i.e. with right matter and form and a duly authorized minister. Worthily = *digne*, i.e. with right inward disposition.

ARTICLE XXVI

Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the Effect of the Sacrament

Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in the receiving of the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institu-

De vi institutionum divinarum, quod eam non tollat malitia Ministrorum

Quamvis in Ecclesia visibili, bonis mali semper sunt admixti, atque interdum ministerio verbi et Sacramentorum administrationi praesint; tamen cum non suo, sed Christi nomine agant, ejusque mandato et auctoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum in verbo Dei audiendo, tum in Sacramentis percipiendis. Neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et rite sibi oblata percipiunt, quae propter institutionem Christi et promissionem efficacia sunt, licet per malos administrentur.

Ad Ecclesiae tamen disciplinam pertinet, ut in malos minis-

tion and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.

Practically unchanged since 1553. Taken mainly from the Thirteen Articles and through them based in part on the Confession of Augsburg.

Object.—To condemn the idea of Anabaptists that the personal holiness of the minister was a necessary condition for any valid preaching of the Word or ministration of the sacraments.

§ 1. The word 'Sacrament' has a long history.¹ In classical Latin 'sacramentum' meant 'a sacred pledge'. It was used for a soldier's oath or for caution money deposited to prevent frivolous suits. The word is first used in reference to Christians by Pliny in a letter to the Emperor Trajan. He writes that Christians bound themselves 'sacramento', not to commit some crime (as popular opinion supposed), but rather not to commit theft, robbery, adultery, etc. The word here, in the writing of a heathen governor, must still have its meaning of 'oath' or 'solemn promise'. Its appearance is almost accidental. Its first employment in any technical Christian sense was in the earliest Latin-speaking Church, that of North Africa. Here it was used to translate the Greek word *μυστήριον*. *μυστήριον* originally meant a secret (not anything 'mysterious' in our sense of the word). It is used, e.g. of State secrets. Hence it came to be applied to religious truths that were known only to the initiated or to acts 'where more was meant than met the eye or ear', and where the secret meaning was known only to those who had been taught it. Thus it had quite a wide range of meaning, and its Latin translation, *sacramentum*, had at first an equally wide range. Through the Latin versions of the New Testament it passed into the common vocabulary of the Latin-speaking Church. In the Fathers it is used in its old sense of oath or of any Christian truth or ceremony or ordinance.² But in quite early times we find a tendency to contrast the fewness of Christian with the multiplicity of Jewish ordinances.³ Accordingly, the term sacrament

¹ Cp. Trench, *Study of Words*, pp. 138–139, and more recently E. Masure, *The Christian Sacrifice* (Burns Oates), pp. 79 ff., with the literature there referred to.

² E.g. Tertullian applies it to the baptismal vow. 'In Sacramenti verba respondimus.' He even speaks of Christians being accused 'de sacramento infanticidii'. Cyprian speaks of the Lord's Prayer as containing many great 'sacraments', of the three hours of prayer as 'a sacrament of the Trinity'. Pope Innocent can write of two sacraments in the Eucharist, the bread and the wine.

³ S. Augustine wrote how under the new dispensation Christ 'has knit together His people in fellowship by sacraments which are very few in number, most easy in ob-

came to be limited to those rites which were commanded in the New Testament. The number of sacraments varied with different writers. The fixing of the number as Seven is assigned to Peter Lombard (d. 1164). It is accepted in a decree of the Council of Florence (1439), and finally ratified by the Council of Trent in 1547. Accordingly, at the time this Article was composed the idea of Seven Sacraments had long been familiar.

§ 2. In all teaching about sacraments we have to face an initial objection. Christianity, it is said, is a spiritual religion. God is a Spirit. We are spiritual beings. What God asks for in us is a right inward disposition of the will, namely faith, not the performance of specified ceremonies. We are told to worship the Father 'in spirit and in truth'. What place, then, can outward and material things have in the dealings of spirit with spirit? How can the pouring of water on a man's forehead or the tasting of bread and wine affect the soul's relation to God? History shows that the great danger of religion is that it should sink into substituting forms and ceremonies for spiritual obedience. It would therefore be well for Christianity to shun the danger altogether. Such objections are widespread. They rest not on mere prejudice, but often on a desire for reality. We must face them.

(a) Such objections often rest upon a view of material things and the external world that is not Christian at all. The Christian Church has always contended against the view that matter is intrinsically evil. All material things have their origin in God. The world as He made it is 'very good'. The statement that we are 'spiritual beings' is a half-truth. Man is not only spirit, but spirit linked to and realizing itself through a material body.

Our very thoughts and prayers are conditioned by certain bodily functions. Our whole spiritual activity is dependent upon the body. An injury to the brain will wreck the finest intellect. A bad headache will disintegrate the devotions of a saint. We cannot explain the relation of the spiritual to the material, whether in human life or in the world at large. It is an ultimate fact that we are compelled to admit, even though our finite understanding cannot grasp it. As Christians we hold that the material is not necessarily opposed to the spiritual. Rather matter fulfils its true purpose when it is subject to spirit and used as a means to the self-realization of spirit. On the other hand, our whole life in this world is mediated by matter. As Dr Moberly says, 'If a man is not spiritual in and through the body, he cannot be spiritual at all.' So the union of spiritual and material

servance, and most excellent in significance, as baptism solemnized in the name of the Trinity, the Communion of His Body and Blood and also whatever else is commended to us in canonical Scripture, apart from those enactments which were a yoke of bondage to God's ancient people, suited to their state of heart and to the times of the prophets and which are found in the books of Moses' (Ep. liv. 1 quoted in the earlier edition of the Article. Cp. also *Christian Doctrine*, iii. 9).

in the sacraments corresponds to and rests upon their union in man himself. Just as in man the material may overcome and degrade the spiritual, the body may become master instead of servant, so in the sacraments the outward side may win an undue predominance. It may become not a means but an end, not the expression of a spiritual state but a substitute for it. But just as the misuse of the body does not render it possible or even desirable for us to attempt to discard it, so the misuse of sacraments is an argument not for their abolition but for their right use. 'Corruptio optimi pessima.' The more that we insist upon the terrible results that follow from the misuse of the sacramental principle, the more we bear witness to its inherent power, and the more urgent becomes the call to claim and consecrate such a mighty possibility for the service of God.

(b) Sacraments are as old and wide as religion itself. We appeal quite rightly to the universal appearance of religion as a proof of its reality and importance. We may extend the argument and claim that the prominence and universality of the sacramental principle is a proof that it satisfies a legitimate and universal human need. In all parts of the world we find sacred ablutions. Partly they symbolize the desire for inward purification, partly they create a sense of purity in preparation for drawing near to God. Again, we find in most primitive worship sacred meals in connexion with sacrifice holding a central place. The original meaning of sacrifice is disputed, but beyond all doubt in historical times these sacrificial rites came to express the communion of the worshippers with their god and with one another. The language in which this idea is expressed is often crude. Sometimes the god was conceived in animal form, and the tribe who claimed kinship with him fed on the flesh of the sacred animal and thus were regarded as feeding on the life of the god. In more civilized tribes the communion was rather sought by sharing a common meal with him. Such rites, often crude, debased, and corrupt, must not be despised. They may claim to be taken at their best, as the efforts of primitive man to realize communion with God. They have their place in the preparation of the world for Christ. If we believe that from the first the Word of God was 'lightening every man that cometh into the world', we find in them a divinely prompted feeling after God, an inspired education of needs and aspirations that awaited their full satisfaction in Christ. Our Lord came to fulfil the highest ideals, not only of the Jews but of the heathen too. Their sacrifices, like the Jewish, were in their degree a preparation for Christ. By the deliberate institution of Christian sacraments our Lord drew men to find in Himself the satisfaction of those needs to which the persistence through long ages of such imperfect rites had borne witness. Christ did not originate but consecrated afresh the sacramental principle. Here, as elsewhere, He came not to destroy but to fulfil.

(c) Sacraments are often called 'an extension of the Incarnation'. Just as Christ took on Him a human nature that through it He might draw near to us, so He still draws near to us in things that we can touch and see. From His Birth to His Resurrection His earthly life was 'broad-based' on matter. The Atonement was wrought out on a Cross with material blood. In His miracles He employed material means as an aid to faith.

Again, in the Incarnation, God's dealings with the world took the form of definite outward historical events. The Atonement is not the less spiritual because it was achieved through certain acts in time to which we can give a date and place. So, too, in His Sacraments Christ still deals with His Church through outward events. While He moved on earth among men it needed faith to discern His authority. Only the eye of faith could discern in the death on the Cross more than the murder of an innocent man. So in the sacramental happenings of the Christian life faith is needed to discover and appropriate their inner meaning; but that does not make them the less real. In the moral and spiritual life, as elsewhere, it is the concrete and particular rather than the abstract and general that counts. The Devil has his sacraments. We all condemn love of money in the abstract. The test comes in the particular temptation to make money by means that our conscience condemns. The further we get down the scale, the more important the concrete becomes. A friend or a glass of beer, very definite and material facts, embody in themselves the spiritual conflict for many a human soul. Christianity is a universal religion, not only for the intellectual but for the plain man, not only for the spiritually gifted but for the dull-witted and the savage. For these spiritual truths need to be enshrined in concrete facts. Through sacraments the meaning of unseen realities is brought home to simple minds. Religion descends from the eternal and invisible to manifest itself in space and time, becoming not one bit the less spiritual in so doing. Just as 'the Word was made flesh', so the living Christ still condescends to the needs of men and makes Himself known to them in the actual and the detailed. Of themselves the water of Baptism or the bread and wine of the Eucharist can do neither harm nor good to the spirit of man—no more and no less than the sound-waves that underlie speech or the colours that form the raw material of the painter's art. But through the spoken word or the painter's scene our spirit can communicate to another something of its own life, thoughts and suggestions, whether of beauty or of shame. So through outward and visible signs Christ communicates Himself to us.

(d) Sacraments are a necessary condition of the social side of religion. If a man wishes to enter into any relations with his fellow-men he must employ material means. The use of a physical medium is the condition of all human intercourse. The glance of an eye, the utterance of the tongue, or whatever it be, all involve the use of

matter. A purely spiritual life, if it were conceivable for a man, would be a life of isolation. The very nature of Christian sacraments emphasizes the social side of all true religion. They are 'a divine provision against spiritual individualism'. Their form is that of ceremonies only possible among members of a society. They remind us that religion includes not only our relation to God but our relation to our brethren. While corporate religion cannot exist without sacraments of some kind, the Christian sacraments are peculiarly expressive of this common life, and, indeed, demand it. A purely individual religion may be most spiritual, but it is not the religion of Jesus Christ.

(e) While all human life is in some measure patient of being brought within the range of sacraments, certain elements in it stand out as primary and fundamental. We can see why our Lord, as it were, focussed the sacramental principle on two great ordinances. He took the two most simple and universal needs, common to all mankind, the need of cleanliness and the need of food, and based on them the two sacraments of the Gospel. As Dr Illingworth says, 'He consecrates an ablution and a meal, the two necessities of our daily life, to be the witness through the ages of His spiritual presence among men.' We cannot limit the sacramental principle to these two rites, of unique authority though they be. They are but the supreme demonstration of the subjection of the material to the spiritual. Even the more private and individual acts of human life may afford the material for sacraments. But Christ ensured that no man should be outside the range of sacramental experience. He shows that sacramental life is not for a few but for all. Starting from the two great sacraments, men may learn to find in the whole of human life a parable of divine truth. Every act and need may be consecrated to the service of God. Human life will only become fully spiritual when it has become fully sacramental.†

§ 3. The Article gives four objects for which Christian sacraments exist.

(a) They are '*badges or tokens of Christian men's profession*'. This view is true as far as it goes, but by itself is inadequate. It was specially emphasized by the Zwinglians. They are the means by which we publicly confess our allegiance to Christ and our membership of the Christian society. Such public confession is in Scripture demanded of Christians (Mt 10²², Rom 10⁹). In heathen lands baptism is recognized by all parties as the decisive act that marks allegiance to Christ. It often costs a man the loss of home and friends. As Article XXVII says, '*Baptism is . . . a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not Christened.*' At home the same is still true in the case of an adult. To be baptized or confirmed is an open act of allegiance. So, too, in many parts of England, to come to communion is to act differently from others.

The very act of coming is an act of witness to Christ. It is felt that a man is compromised by it in a way that he is not by mere attendance at Church. The Christian ought to be prepared to compromise himself publicly for Christ.

(b) *They be certain sure witnesses . . . of grace and God's goodwill towards us.* The fact that sacraments exist is an abiding proof that God in His love wishes to bestow grace on man. Our personal call to use them is a proof that God wills to bestow grace on us personally. They are witnesses of God's goodwill both for the past and the future. As the Catechism says: sacraments 'are a means whereby we receive' grace 'and a pledge to assure us thereof'. In the Holy Communion we thank God 'for that . . . Thou dost assure us thereby of Thy favour and goodness towards us; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of Thy Son.' If we base our assurance of belonging to God only upon passing through certain religious feelings, then our sense of assurance shifts with our shifting feelings. But God's grace is wider and surer than man's emotions. Through a right use of the sacraments, as pledges of God's love, our certainty is made to depend upon definite outward facts about which there can be no doubt.

(c) *They are effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us by the which He doth work invisibly in us.* An 'effectual' sign is a sign that is no mere parable, but conveys the blessing that it symbolizes. These words rule out the Zwinglian view of, e.g. the Eucharist as a bare memorial. As the Catechism says: By 'sacrament' 'I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us . . . whereby we receive the same.' This efficacy of sacraments depends upon the ordinance of Christ. God is the efficient cause (*n.b.* Latin *per quae ipse in nobis operatur*), the sacraments are only instrumental causes. 'Christ is the chief and principal worker in all sacraments as a function of His everlasting Priesthood.'

(d) *By the which He . . . doth not only quicken but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.* Sacraments are an aid to faith. Just as in the Old Testament the Pillar of Fire and the Pillar of Cloud are represented as an aid to the faith of Israel, helping them to believe in a God whom they could not see, so Christian sacraments help our faith to lay hold on God. The use of such simple means helps us to realize both our own needs and the power of God. Our readiness to use them is a test of our belief in God's promise and power (cp. 2 Kings 5¹⁰⁻¹⁴). Again, they offer definite opportunities for acts of faith. They set before us definite promises of God for faith to claim. Faith, like all our other faculties, needs exercise and grows stronger by use. There is often a danger that a newly awakened faith may waste itself in vague emotion. The sacraments afford definite objects on which to focus itself. They provide definite efforts for our wills

to make, and thus have an important place in the education of Christian faith.

§ 4. The Article then goes on to deal with the number of sacraments. It places on a level by themselves the two sacraments of the Gospel. *There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.* These will be considered under the later Articles. Then it proceeds *Those five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel.* We notice that the Article does not deny to them the name of sacraments. 'Commonly called' is not in the language of the Prayer-Book necessarily derogatory. We find, e.g. 'The Nativity of our Lord, or the Birth-day of Christ, commonly called "Christmas Day".' All that the Article insists is that these rites are not to be counted equal to the other two. It then goes on to give reasons for this position. (i) On the positive side they are *such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scripture*; (ii) on the negative side, *They have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.* These reasons need some consideration. The sentences are not very exactly worded. Only Extreme Unction can really be said to have grown from the *corrupt following*, i.e. the bad imitation (*prava imitatione*) of the Apostles. The words can hardly apply to Penance with its mediaeval accretions, still less to the substitution of unction for laying on of hands in Confirmation. Again, Matrimony and Orders may fairly be called '*states of life allowed*', i.e. in the language of the time approved (*probati*) 'in the Scriptures', but neither of the positive reasons applies to either penance or confirmation. The negative reason, however, covers all five. Confirmation is really a part of Baptism, but we have no decisive evidence in Scripture that the laying on of hands was commanded by Christ (see, however, Heb 6²). Christ undoubtedly left with His Church the power to absolve sinners (Jn 20²³), but He did not command any visible sign or ceremony in which that absolution should be embodied. The same is true of Orders (Jn 20²¹⁻²³). We find laying on of hands employed in Scripture for ordination, but we possess no definite command of Christ. So with Matrimony. The most we can say is that Christ 'adorned and beautified' it 'with His Presence', as the Marriage Service says, and S. Paul calls it a *μυστήριον* (Eph 5^{3a}), but the word is not used in any technical sense. The same applies to unction. In neither case did Christ institute a sacrament.

The difference between ourselves and the Church of Rome in the number of sacraments is mainly a matter of words. The mediaeval number of Seven had certain practical conveniences. It met the great crises of life with appropriate sacramental ordinances. Moreover all of them could claim some authority from the New Testament. On the

other hand, the Church of England bases the distinction that it makes on Scripture, and had good reason for doing so. It uses the word Sacrament in a narrower and in a wider sense. In the Catechism it declares that Christ ordained two sacraments only 'as generally' (*i.e.* universally) 'necessary to salvation'. Even the Church of Rome has never gone so far as to assert that the outward and visible sign of the other five was expressly given by Christ Himself, nor yet that all seven are on the same footing. The Council of Trent anathematized any who should say 'that these seven sacraments are equal to each other in such wise as that one is not more worthy than another'.

§ 5. Two of these sacramental rites call for special treatment here.

(a) Penance: (b) Extreme Unction.

(a) The whole conception of Penance rests upon two main truths:

(i) Sin, while in its essence it is an offence against God, is also anti-social. By our sins we injure not only ourselves but the society to which we belong. (ii) The visible sign of union with Christ is life in the fellowship of the Christian Church. No doubt this truth has become obscured by human sin, by the divisions of Christians and the failure of Church discipline. But ideally and, as it were, sacramentally membership in the visible Body of Christ is the normal means of sharing in the divine life of Christ.

When we turn to the Church as it is in Scripture we find that the duty is laid upon it of exercising judicial power over its members. From its very nature it not only possesses the right inherent in all societies of exercising discipline upon members who neglect or disobey its own rules, but it possesses special authority, arising out of its relation to Christ, in dealing with the sins of men. We find our Lord giving to S. Peter as the first member of His new Israel not only the power to 'bind and to loose', *i.e.* to declare forbidden or allowed, but also 'The keys of the kingdom of heaven' (Mt 16¹⁹). Again, S. John represents the Risen Christ as breathing on the assembled Church and saying 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained' (Jn 20²³). We certainly find the Church acting upon this commission. The Church tests men before admitting them into fellowship. Faith and repentance were required of all candidates for Christian Baptism (Acts 2³⁷⁻⁴¹, etc.). It was the Church that claimed to judge whether they truly possessed them. And this claim to judge is not confined to the initial act of receiving into membership. The Church no less claims to judge those who are its members as to their fitness to remain such. 'Do ye not judge them that are within. . . . Put away the wicked man from among yourselves' (1 Cor 5¹²⁻¹³). Those who because of wilful and notorious sin were put out of the Church were regarded as delivered over to Satan (1 Cor 5⁵, cp. 2 Cor 2⁵⁻¹¹, 1 Tim 1²⁰). That is to say, the Church was regarded as the scene of salvation. To be cut off from the Church, as from Israel of old (cp. Exod 31¹⁴)

was to be cut off, not only from a visible society, but from covenanted union with God. Outside God's Church Satan was regarded as having power to inflict special sufferings. Again, when the offender is penitent, the Church equally claims to be the judge of his penitence, and, if it thinks right, to readmit him to membership (2 Cor 2¹⁰⁻¹¹). In all cases alike the Church's judgment is dependent upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who in this as in all things is to guide men into all truth (Jn 20²², cp. Jn 16¹³). A judgment of the Church which was not inspired by the Holy Spirit would not be ratified by God.

Here, then, we find the origin of penance. Just as at the beginning of the Christian life sins are remitted to the unbaptized by baptism (Acts 22¹⁶), so to the already baptized sins are remitted by absolution. Such absolution is primarily the Church's judgment that a man may be rightly admitted to full fellowship and especially to the Holy Communion, which is the supreme expression of Christian fellowship. The life of Christ is normally to be found within His Body, the Church. The Church remits sins by restoring a man to membership in His Body, and retains sins by refusing such restoration. Here, as elsewhere, the authority is that of the Church as a whole, but it is exercised by those who have been commissioned by Christ to act as ministers of the whole Church, *e.g.* the Apostles.

In Scripture and in the earliest days there is no evidence of private confession. Notorious offenders were required to make public confession before the whole congregation. Only after long and grievous discipline were penitents restored to communion. In James 5¹⁶ we find the command 'Confess therefore your sins one to another'. The 'therefore' connects it with the calling in of the elders of the Church to anoint the sick man with oil and to pray for him. There is no mention of formal absolution.

Auricular confession arose first as a preparation for public confession. It was obvious that those who were publicly convicted of sin were not necessarily the only offenders. A man might have fallen from Christ without the Church having become aware of his fall. Hence those who felt themselves in danger of being in this state, consulted privately some spiritual adviser about their true condition, with the object of making public confession and doing penance if such were judged advisable. Further, as primitive simplicity declined, public confession of sins began to be found undesirable. The young were familiarized with gross sins. It was a fruitful source of scandal and even made the basis of prosecution in the law-courts. Hence, the historian Socrates tells us, after the Decian persecution (A.D. 250), bishops in the East appointed a regular officer or 'penitentiary' to hear private confessions, impose suitable penance and grant absolution, where public confession was not judged necessary. In the West Leo the Great sanctioned a similar arrangement (A.D. 440). In this way private confession to a priest became the ordinary way of dealing

with grave sins.¹ Where public scandal had been given, public penance was still enforced. In 1215 the Lateran Council made confession to a priest obligatory once a year. Disobedience rendered the offender excommunicate. As the custom needed defence, the Schoolmen used their ingenuity to provide one. Hence the elaborate mediaeval doctrine of the 'sacrament of penance'.

The mind of the Church of England on the subject of private confession is to be found in the Prayer-Book. Here, as so often, the Church of England has returned to primitive practice. Compulsory confession is abolished, voluntary confession is retained. In the first exhortation in the Communion office the conditions necessary for making a good communion are laid down. The duty is enforced of self-examination and repentance. Stress is laid on the absolute need of a 'full trust in God's mercy' and 'a quiet conscience'. Then it proceeds: 'therefore if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.' Again, in the Visitation of the Sick the rubric runs: 'Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which Confession, the Priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it), after this sort.' Then follows the form of absolution. 'Our Lord Jesus Christ who hath left power to his Church, to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' It is remarkable that the English Church retains the comparatively late form, 'I absolve.' If there could be any doubt that the Church of England intended to retain private confession, it is dispelled when we find the 113th Canon of 1603 warning clergy against revealing sins made known to them in confession. Further, it was widely practised in the reigns of Elizabeth, James I and Charles I, and again after the Restoration. The Prayer-Book makes clear two great points about it.

(a) There is no suggestion that we are not ordinarily able to prepare ourselves for Communion apart from auricular confession. Neither Scripture nor the Prayer-Book nor the Primitive Church asserts that 'mortal' sin cannot be forgiven on true repentance without private

¹ The origins of private penance present a complicated problem, which may be studied in K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God*, Lect. v and R. C. Mortimer, *The Origins of Private Penance*. Its development was considerably influenced by the practice of private confession in the monastic life.

absolution. Such a statement is often made but never proved. Although there is no reason to credit the Lateran Council with any but the best motives in making confession obligatory, in actual practice it does not work. It does not make sufficient allowance for human nature. Forced confessions are often formal and not infrequently dishonest. Unless they are inspired by real penitence they are apt to become an easy way of salving the conscience. Sin is lightly regarded, as pardon for it can easily be obtained at the next confession.

(β) On the other hand, confession is not an end in itself but is a means to an end, namely, peace with God. A clear conscience is absolutely essential for a Christian life (cp. 1 Tim 1⁵). If a man cannot attain this by himself, confession is necessary for him. It is notorious that many are unable to quiet their own consciences. Some cannot feel that they are really sorry for their sin. Confession in the presence of another is a real help, since it enables a man to see his sins as others see them, and so is a step to seeing them as God sees them. Others cannot realize the fact of forgiveness. Here the personal absolution comes home in a way that general absolutions fail to do. There is no essential difference in quality between the two. Either avails for the true penitent and neither for the impenitent. There are not different brands of absolution. But it is a simple fact of experience that private confession is a real means to many souls of bringing home the fact of God's forgiveness through Christ. Further, penitence like faith demands self-expression. The self-humiliation of allowing another to overhear the penitent's confession to God, the receiving of a penance which is regarded not as any attempt to make up for the sins but as an expression of willingness to bear whatever punishment God is pleased to send, are all practical outlets of sorrow for sin by which that sorrow is deepened and made more real. However imperfect the penitence may still be, and true penitence is the work of a lifetime, the man still feels that he has tried his hardest. Lastly, auricular confession is a great opportunity of obtaining an independent opinion about our life from one who has had all the facts laid before him, so far as we can do so. Simple people need far more guidance in self-examination and dealing with temptations than is always realized.

Finally, Christianity is, above all, a social religion. Sin injures the whole body. Confession is a universal instinct of man, as a social being. These principles underlay the confessions that we find in the Old Testament (Lev 5⁶, Num 5⁶⁻⁷, Josh 7¹⁹, 1 Sam 14⁴³) and in the New (Mk 1⁵ and ⁴⁴, Acts 19¹⁸). In the development of the Church they have come to find expression in the sacrament of Penance. The priest's absolution is no charm uttered by one who is supposed to possess in his own person some magic power, nor yet is it merely the publication of a forgiveness that God has already bestowed. It is the receiving back by God's family into the Father's home of a brother

who is conscious of having sinned not only against the Father's love but also against the peace and unity of the whole household.†

(b) Extreme Unction

Anointing the sick as a means of healing is a widespread custom. In Mk 6¹³ we read that the Apostles 'anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them'. The same custom prevailed in the early Church, as is shown in James 5¹⁴⁻¹⁶. 'Is any among you sick? let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him.' Such anointing must be taken in connexion with the gifts of healing spoken of in I Cor 12⁹. It was clearly for the healing of the body of the sick person, who, it was hoped, would recover. Later, when the gifts of healing had declined, it became known as *extrema unctio* (i.e. the last anointing after those at baptism and confirmation) and reserved for administration to those at the point of death. Thus *extrema unctio* came to be the equivalent of 'unctio in extremis', and, further, was viewed as bestowing primarily spiritual benefits. Even so the English rite still contained prayers for the sick person's recovery, and then, if the man recovered, it might be repeated. The earliest evidence of its appearance as a religious rite is a letter of Pope Innocent I early in the fifth century. He replied to a bishop who asked for information, that a bishop might certainly anoint the sick with oil, quoting S. James. Further, he made it clear that if the bishop blessed the oil, priests or even laymen might use it in the hour of need. Only those who were under exclusion from the sacraments might not receive it, since it is a kind of sacrament (*quia genus est sacramenti*). The fact that a bishop needed to ask such a question is clear evidence that the custom was not universal. The Pope's vague language shows that 'unction' was not yet an established 'sacrament'. Further, even a layman might administer it. No other reference to unction as a sacramental rite can be found till the time of Pope Innocent III in the twelfth century.¹ The subject was discussed at the Council of Trent. It was declared to be a sacrament, instituted by Christ, representing the grace of the Holy Spirit, cleansing away venial sins and comforting the infirm. The one trace of its primitive use is the statement that the sick man 'sometimes obtains bodily health when it is expedient for the welfare of his soul'. Accordingly, though it is primarily a 'sacrament of the dying' it may be repeated if the sick man recovered. In the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI a service of anointing was still retained 'if the sick person desire it'. In the Second Prayer-Book it was wholly omitted and has never been restored. The defence of the position of the Church of England is that there is no evidence either in Scripture

¹ But the considerable liturgical evidence may be studied in the article on the Visitation of the Sick in *Liturgy and Worship*, pp. 472 ff.

or the practice of the primitive Church that the rite is of universal and lasting obligation. Its use or disuse is merely a question of discipline. In quite modern times a desire for its revival has arisen in connexion with 'faith-healing'. It is a well-established fact that our minds and wills have greater influence over our bodies than at first sight appears. 'Suggestion' has great power for good in the case of nervous disorders and others that at first sight would not seem to come under that head. At the same time there would seem to be no reliable evidence at present that 'faith-healing' is of the slightest value against organic diseases. The use of unction, accompanied by prayer, would, it is claimed, afford a visible means of strengthening the will-power of the patient and give him the opportunity to exercise it. It would regularize the employment of powers of suggestion that beyond all reasonable doubts are genuinely possessed by certain persons and within certain limits efficient. The use of unction has been sanctioned for such purposes by certain bishops. It is a return to its primitive use. How far it is capable of such use depends upon the whole question of the scope of 'mental healing' which is at present under investigation.^{1†}

§ 6. The final section of this Article deals with the right use of sacraments. '*The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about: but that we should duly use them.*' This sentence is not happily worded. 'The Sacraments' would naturally apply to Baptism and the Eucharist: but there is no evidence of any superstitious gazing on baptism, rather the reverse: superstitious ideas about baptism have been fostered by its being performed privately. Unless it is a mere slip, the plural must refer to the two elements in the Eucharist and the allusion is to Corpus Christi ceremonies and the like, referred to more explicitly under Article XXVIII. The remaining sentences follow from the nature of grace. If all grace needs the co-operation of our human wills in seeking and using it, sacraments as means of grace demand a right disposition in the recipient. They are not magical charms or mechanical devices that produce effects independently of our own faith and efforts. Such could have no place in a moral life. Hence '*In such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation. But they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith.*' The allusion is to I Cor 11²⁹, 'He that eateth and drinketh (unworthily A.V.) eateth and drinketh judgment (damna-

¹ Since the above paragraph was written the question of the use of unction and the laying-on of hands for the sick has been further discussed. In 1924 there was published 'The Report of the Committee appointed in accordance with Resolution 63 of the Lambeth Conference, 1920, on *The Ministry of Healing*'. This Report was accepted by the Lambeth Conference of 1930 and in January 1932 the Convocation of Canterbury appointed a Joint Committee to draw up services (1) for Unction and Laying-on of Hands, (2) for Laying-on of Hands without Unction. The services drawn up by the Joint Committee were approved on 6 June, 1935 by the Convocation of Canterbury for provisional use in the province.

tion A.V.) unto himself, if he discern not the body.' The context makes it perfectly clear that S. Paul by judgment (*κρίμα*) means temporal chastisement sent by God in mercy to recall the careless to a sense of their sin (cp. v. ²³, 'that we may not be condemned with the world'). 'Damnation' in modern English means eternal punishment, and here, as in the Prayer-Book, conveys to our ears an entirely wrong idea. In the sixteenth century its use was not necessarily so limited. The practical effect on uneducated people has been and still is to drive them away from Holy Communion. What the Prayer-Book means by 'worthily' receiving is explained by the sixth and last answers in the Catechism and the exhortations in the Baptismal and Communion offices.

The balance of this Article is further shown by the removal, in 1563, of a condemnation of the phrase '*grace ex opere operato*'.

(i) Originally the phrase conveyed a true and valuable idea. '*Opus operatum*' was contrasted with '*opus operantis*', and implied that the efficacy of all sacraments depends upon the appointment of their author, God, and not on the merit of the officiant or recipient. In this sense it is used by the Council of Trent. It vindicates the important truth that grace is God's free gift. We do not earn or create it by our own faith or moral efforts.

(ii) This became corrupted into the idea, condemned in this Article, that sacraments conferred grace automatically, quite apart from the faith or penitence of the recipient. In this sense it was rightly condemned in the first edition of the Article. As we saw, the blessing that we personally receive must depend on our individual capacity for receiving it, namely, our true repentance, our real belief in Christ and His promises, our desire to surrender ourselves to Him and to employ the grace that He bestows. It has been said, 'The grace of Sacraments does not depend on our faith, but for its effect in us all depends on our faith'; and again, 'Grace without faith may come upon us, but it cannot make us holy.' This second truth was secured by the language of the Article, and the condemnation of the phrase was wisely withdrawn, since it contained a true meaning as well as a false.

The truth of Article XXVI follows from a right view of the nature of sacraments. Here, as in similar cases, we must distinguish between a man's personal character and his official capacity. The evil life of a Christian minister, as of any Christian, brings reproach upon God and His Church. Such, therefore, must be removed. On the other hand, the validity of his official acts is not affected. A bad judge, *qua* judge, must be obeyed, as the king's representative, no less than a good one. So in the sacraments the minister acts not as an individual but as the organ of the Church. God's promises are made not to him individually but to the Church as a whole. Therefore their fulfilment is not affected by his personal lack of faith. On any other

supposition means of grace would always be precarious. So our Lord distinguishes between the official commands of Scribes and Pharisees who 'sit in Moses' seat' and their private conduct. He bids us obey the former, but not imitate the latter (Mt 23²⁻³). Scripture often gives instances of God sending blessings through bad men, *e.g.* Saul in the Old Testament and Judas in the New. We have no reason to suppose that Judas' ministry was any less productive of good results than that of the other Apostles.

HOLY BAPTISM

ARTICLE XXVII

Of Baptism

Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened: but is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed: faith is confirmed: and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

The main body of the Article dates from 1553. In 1563 the language on Infant Baptism was strengthened. The earlier Article had only said that the custom was to be 'commended' and 'retained in the Church'.

It is aimed at (i) the inadequate view of Baptism taken by Zwingly and the Anabaptists; (ii) the denial of Infant Baptism.

§ 1. Christian Baptism has a long history behind it.

(a) The use of ceremonial washings as preparatory to approaching God in prayer and worship is a common feature of many ancient religions. It was a natural symbol for that purification, however inadequately conceived, which the worshipper desired before coming into the presence of God. It corresponded to a universal human instinct. We find such use of water among the Jews. It is commanded in the Old Testament (e.g. Lev 8⁶, 14⁹, etc.). Further, by the time of our Lord the custom had arisen for proselytes to the Jewish faith to be not only circumcised but baptized. Proselytes so baptized were said by their entrance into Judaism to be 'born again'. A 'new creature' (*καινη κτίσις*), the phrase applied by S. Paul in 2 Cor 5¹⁷ to

De Baptismo

Baptismus non est tantum professionis signum, ac discriminis nota, qua Christiani a non Christianis discernantur, sed etiam est signum regenerationis, per quod, tanquam per instrumentum, recte baptismum suscipientes, Ecclesiae inseruntur, promissiones de remissione peccatorum, atque adoptione nostra in filios Dei per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur, fides confirmatur, et vi divinae invocationis gratia augetur.

Baptismus parvulorum omnino in Ecclesia retinendus est, ut qui cum Christi institutione optime congruat.

the Christian, as being in Christ by baptism, was a current Jewish term for a proselyte. The plunge beneath the water in baptism represented a death to the old life and the rising from the water a birth to the new life within the sphere of God's Covenant. The baptism of John can only be understood in the light of such contemporary Jewish custom. It differed from the ordinary ceremonial washings of the Jews because it was not repeated. It was preparatory for the coming of the Messianic Kingdom. In effect John treated the Jews as on a level with Gentiles: they needed to become, as it were, proselytes, in order to enter the Kingdom. Mere descent from Abraham was not enough. God required personal penitence, and such penitence must express itself in public submission to John's baptism (Mt 3, etc.). But John's baptism was only preparatory. It was only a 'water-baptism unto repentance'. Those who received it were at best placed in the closest relation to God that was possible under the Old Covenant. John himself looked forward to the coming of One who would 'baptize with Holy Spirit and fire' (3¹¹). Such baptism would bestow not only forgiveness for the past but new power for the future. Those who received it would enter into the Messianic Kingdom and all its blessings. We read, too, of baptism as practised by our Lord's disciples during His life on earth (Jn 4¹⁻²). This baptism would seem to be on a level with John's. It cannot have been full Christian baptism. Such was only possible after the Ascension, when Christ was glorified and the Spirit was given (cp. Jn 7³⁹). At its highest it was a mark of discipleship, not a means of membership of Christ.

(b) This practice of baptism, already familiar to the Jews and easily intelligible to the heathen, Jesus Christ took and made to be the visible mark of acceptance of Himself as Saviour and of membership in the Christian society. This is definitely asserted in Mt 28¹⁹, 'Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' But the belief that Christian baptism originated in the direct command of Christ does not depend on a single text. His own baptism at John's hands had consecrated the rite for Christians and given it a new Messianic significance. From first to last the New Testament knows of no other means of entrance into the Church. A Christian and a baptized person are synonymous terms. The universal practice of baptism in all churches, Jewish and Gentile alike, starting from the day of Pentecost (Acts 2³⁸) without any hint of questioning or debate, can only be explained by the fact that it was instituted by Christ Himself. Many writers have held that the language of Acts shows that baptism was at first administered in the name of Jesus only (Acts 2³⁸ 'in the name of Jesus Messiah', 8¹⁶ 'into the name of the Lord Jesus', 10⁴⁸, etc., cp. also Gal 3²⁷, Rom 6³). This is possible. There were some who held the name of Jesus Christ by itself to be sufficient, even as late as the fourth century. It was defended on the

principle that baptism in the name of One Person of the Trinity implied baptism in the name of all. On the other hand, it is equally possible that the phrases of the Acts and Epistles are not intended to represent the actual formula used, but rather to distinguish Christian baptism from Jewish baptism or John's baptism. S. Paul, for instance, speaks of being 'baptized into Moses' (1 Cor 10²), with an implied contrast to being 'baptized into Christ', but this does not mean that the formula 'into Moses' was ever used.¹

It is noticeable that the *Didache* both speaks of baptism 'into the name of the Lord'² and also gives the Trinitarian formula showing that the two are not in any way inconsistent or mutually exclusive. Attempts have also been made to show that the original text of Mt 28¹⁹ ran simply 'Baptizing them in the name of the Lord', and was expanded later to correspond with ecclesiastical custom.³ It is admitted that not one of our present MSS contains any hint of this alternative reading, but it is argued that Eusebius of Caesarea several times quotes the verse in its shorter form. He had access to many good and early MSS in the great library of Caesarea, and it is reasonable to suppose that he quotes it on their authority. On the other hand, he quotes the verse in full when he needs it, and it is equally reasonable to suppose that he abbreviated it for his own convenience. We are not greatly concerned to deny that baptism in the name of Christ may have once been common, but it certainly cannot be proved, and opponents of orthodoxy have no right to assume it as true. The language of 2 Cor 13¹⁴ shows that S. Paul expected all Corinthian Christians to be familiar with the type of teaching that is summed up in the Baptismal formula and is strong evidence of its primitiveness.⁴

§ 2. What meaning is given to Baptism in Scripture? Primarily it signified the public acknowledgement of Jesus as Lord or Messiah and entrance into the new Israel. To-day this meaning is seen most clearly in heathen countries, but it must never be lost sight of. As the

¹ The 'name' in popular usage means much more than the 'title'. The name of a god or person was supposed to be, as it were, a real expression of himself. In any case, when our Lord spoke of baptism 'in the name' of the Trinity, He was not primarily giving a form of words to be used. He was expressing the nature of the life bestowed. Men were to be immersed into the full life of the Godhead, as He had revealed it. The Greek word βαπτίζω is not such an exclusively technical word as our 'baptize'. It means 'immerse' in a general sense, and this wider meaning is never quite lost sight of in the New Testament.

² This may mean the Trinity, but the context favours Christ.

³ On the one side see *E.R.E.* ii. 380 a. On the other side Chase, *J.Th.S.* 1905, pp. 481 ff.

⁴ Cp. also Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, esp. pp. 45-46. There is a Jewish phrase, 'a proselyte to (or in) the name of heaven,' i.e. one who is baptized for God's sake and for no personal motive. In the Talmud there is another phrase, 'baptism in (or to) the name of freedom,' applied to slaves, who, on rising to the rank of freemen, were rebaptized. 'A fine contrast and complement of baptism in the name of freedom is the proselyte's baptism in the name of heaven, or in its Gospel form—baptism in the name of Christ.'

Article says, 'Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not Christian' (a non Christianis).¹ That, indeed, was the only meaning that the Zwinglians and Anabaptists would allow to baptism. It was quite true as far as it went, but inadequate, as the Article goes on to point out. Scripture makes it clear that baptism is not only a sign of profession but a means of grace.

(a) We turn first to the teaching of our Lord as given in Jn 3¹⁻⁸. The question may be raised how far we have here a literal record of His teaching. But in any case when the passage was written Christian baptism had long been established and even if the words are an interpretation of Christ's teaching rather than a record of it, the Church approved them as a true interpretation. Nicodemus apparently regarded himself as fit to enter the Messianic Kingdom just as he was. He had refused to submit to John's baptism as a preparation. He needed to be taught that a man must be 'born again' (or from above) before he can even see the Kingdom of God (v. ³). He must be born 'of water and Spirit' before he can enter the Kingdom (v. ⁵). In other words, the Kingdom of God is a spiritual kingdom and can only be shared by those who by receiving new life possess the capacity for sharing it. The reference to baptism is unmistakable. Nicodemus stands in the same relation to the new Israel as a Gentile to the old Israel. He must become a 'new creature'. But whereas Jewish baptism and even John's baptism was only with water, the baptism that admits into the Kingdom of God is 'of water and Spirit' (ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος—the preposition not being repeated binds the two words into a single phrase). This baptism not only symbolizes cleansing and new life, but bestows them. The water is at once the symbol and the channel of the Spirit. Some have seen an allusion to Gen 1². The new man rises from the water of baptism at the creative touch of the Spirit of God, even as the world sprang to life as He moved on the face of the waters at the first creation. The root idea is perfectly clear. At our first birth we receive the initial capacity for life in this present world: at our new birth the initial capacity for life in the Kingdom of God and 'the age to come'.

This same thought underlies the whole of the New Testament teaching on Baptism. S. Paul speaks of it as 'the bath of regeneration' (Tit 3⁵). More often he expresses the same idea in a slightly different form. By baptism we are incorporated into the body of Christ and become His members (1 Cor 12¹³, Gal 3²⁷). By our natural birth we are 'in Adam', i.e. we inherit a common human nature shared by our fellowmen: by our new birth in baptism we become in Christ (1 Cor 15²²). Christ is the new Adam, the source of a new and regenerate humanity. Henceforward the Christian is to live and do all

¹ Cp. the Baptismal office: '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.'

things in Christ (Eph 1³, 2⁶, etc.). As members of Christ His life is within us (1 Cor 6¹⁵). It is the same relation to Himself as that which our Lord describes in the allegory of the vine (Jn 15¹ ff.). His life is to circulate in us, as the sap of the vine in the branches. Further, S. Paul develops this thought so as to bring out that the birth to the new life must involve a death to the old. In virtue of our union with Christ we share His death and burial, that we may rise with Him to newness of life (Rom 6³⁻¹¹, Col 2¹². Note the aorists in each case, referring to the single definite event of baptism). The symbolism of immersion admirably set forth this truth. The plunge beneath the water represented the death and burial of the old man, the rising from the water the birth to new life in union with the Risen Lord. Henceforth the baptized is to reckon himself 'dead to sin but alive unto God in Christ Jesus' (Rom 6¹⁰ ff., Col 3¹⁻³). Having been made a member of Christ, he is called to live as such (1 Cor 6¹⁵, Eph 5⁷⁻⁹, etc.). In 1 Pet 3²⁰⁻²¹ stress is laid on present salvation begun here and now through baptism. The Church is the ark in which safety may be found.

(b) The blessings of baptism mentioned in the Article are not a number of detached blessings, but flow from the union with Christ thus gained. Baptism is '*a sign of regeneration or new birth*'. 'Sign' is clearly used in the sense defined in the previous Article as '*effectual sign*'. That is, baptism not only symbolizes new birth but conveys it, since by it we are made members of Christ.¹

Again by baptism '*as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church.*' This simply expresses the same truth from another standpoint. The Church is Christ's body. The metaphor of grafting comes from Rom 11¹⁷; the Gentiles are like a wild olive grafted into the ancient stock of the true olive so as to be enriched by its life, the true olive being the Israel of God. *The promises of the forgiveness of sin . . . by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed.* It is as being in Christ that we are forgiven. We have entered into the new life and the stains of the old life have been washed away. In the New Testament baptism is always 'unto the remission of sins', *i.e.* not only an expression of repentance, but a visible sign and seal of God's forgiveness. On the day of Pentecost S. Peter bids the multitude 'Repent and be baptized each one of you in the name of Jesus the Messiah, unto remission of your sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit' (Acts 2³⁷⁻³⁸). Ananias called on S. Paul to 'be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord' (Acts 22¹⁶, cp. also 1 Cor 6¹¹, Eph 5²⁶). As Article IX puts it, '*There is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized*' (*renatis et credentibus*), not because God has favourites and arbitrarily passes over in one man what He condemns in another, but because those who repent and are baptized have faced their sin

¹Cp. the opening of the Catechism, 'My baptism: wherein I was made a member of Christ, etc.'

in penitence and done their best to remedy it by coming to Christ to receive from Him that new life which alone can restore them to spiritual health. Their sins are forgiven them as being 'in Christ'. The actual cleansing of the body with the water is the 'sign and seal' of the inward purification and acceptance by God. A document is sealed when the donor who has promised a gift 'actually makes the thing promised over to the receiver and thereby assures the possession of it to him'.¹

The promises . . . of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost,² are visibly signed and sealed. Again, it is as being members of Christ that we share His sonship. It is through Him we 'receive the adoption of sons' (Gal 4⁴⁻⁵). So in Rom 8¹⁶⁻¹⁷ S. Paul writes: 'Ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received (*ἐλάβετε*, aorist) the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father. The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ' (cp. also Gal 3²⁶⁻²⁷). The objection may be raised 'are not all men children of God? They do not need to be made so by baptism.' This objection confuses potential with actual sonship. God made men to be His children, but sin has come in between God and men. All men have by creation a capacity for sonship, but sin has blinded their eyes and warped their affections. By ourselves we cannot be all that God meant us to be. Can we say that a child is in any real sense a son to his father if he has never seen or known him or if he from the first has been alienated from him? Only Jesus Christ has ever lived on earth a human life as a true Son of God, and by baptism He imparts to us the power of His own human sonship. Only He can fully restore our capacity for filial love and obedience and take away the sin that has destroyed sonship. So, too, it is as members of Christ that we share His election and are among 'the elect people of God' (Rom 16¹³ and Eph 1⁴) and are inheritors of His Kingdom. 'I was made a member of Christ, the child of God and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven' (The Catechism). Baptism, therefore, like the Eucharist, has an eschatological reference; it is a pledge not only of the new life with and for God in this world but also of our final inheritance of eternal life at 'the manifestation of the sons of God', when we shall receive our 'adoption, namely, the redemption of our bodies' (Rom 8^{19, 23}).

Faith is confirmed: and grace increased by virtue of prayer to God. The exact meaning of this sentence is most obscure. The best interpretation seems to be that throughout this paragraph the Article has in view only adult baptism. Infant baptism is not dealt with till the

¹Sadler, *Church Doctrine, Bible Truth*, p. 120.

²Dr Gibson, placing a comma before and after 'by the Holy Ghost', connects the words with both the forgiveness and the adoption. This was the punctuation of the earliest English editions. No question of doctrine is concerned.

second paragraph. In that case the 'faith' that is confirmed is the faith of the baptized. It is strengthened by exercising itself in the sacramental act. So, too, the grace increased is that of the baptized, and it is increased in answer to the prayers either of himself or preferably of the Church. The new life bestowed in baptism is God's gift in response to the prayers of the Church.¹

(c) If, then, baptism conveys all these blessings, how is it that many baptized persons are living openly in sin? Our prisons, for instance, are full of baptized criminals. These facts, it is often urged, disprove any doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Such an objection misunderstands both the nature of grace and the true meaning of 'regeneration'. As we saw, God's grace will do nothing for us without our own co-operation. Baptism places us in a new relation to God: we, on our part, must respond to this and use it. Baptism brings within our reach new possibilities for holiness: we must realize them by the use of our wills. As baptized we have not only new claims upon God, but also new duties and responsibilities towards Him. As members of Christ, we are in touch with new forces for good, but they will only make us holy in so far as we work with them. The failure of many baptized persons does not show that baptism is valueless: it only shows that they have not responded to and used the benefits of baptism.²

Again, much confusion has arisen because the word 'regeneration' has been used in different senses. The Prayer-Book means by it simply incorporated into Christ. All baptized persons are 'regenerate' in this sense. On the other hand, Nonconformists identify 'regeneration' with 'conversion'. They mean by regeneration that spiritual renewal which membership of Christ results in, when it is rightly accepted and used. It includes the conversion or turning of the will to God and the personal acceptance of Christ. In this sense a baptized person who has made no effort to live up to his privileges is not 'regenerate'. If we use Prayer-Book language we say that regeneration needs to be supplemented by conversion. The actual renewal of the soul requires both the gift of the grace of God in baptism and also

¹ If the first section has in mind infant as well as adult baptism, the simplest interpretation would be to interpret the words as denoting an increased blessing won for the baptized by the prayers of the bystanders. Dr Gibson explains it in the light of the prayer in the Baptismal office, in which the minister in the name of all those present thanks God for their call to the knowledge of His grace and faith in Him, and then proceeds, 'Increase this knowledge and confirm this faith in us evermore.' On this view the words describe what takes place in the baptized subsequent to their own baptism, when they are reminded of their own baptism by witnessing another's. In any case the Latin 'vi divinae invocationis' hardly corresponds to the English 'by virtue of prayer unto God', and might be translated 'in virtue of the invocation of God', i.e. of the name of the Trinity.

² We may compare the gifts of baptism to a store of money lying at the bank. A man may possess such and yet be naked and starving because he has not claimed and used his money. His plight does not prove the non-existence of the money. So by faith and obedience we have to claim and use our baptismal grace.

the personal surrender of the will to that grace. A man should be both regenerate and converted. Regeneration is the work of God: it is accomplished in a moment: by it new powers are placed in our grasp. Conversion is our work in conjunction with God: it calls for effort and self-surrender. It may be either rapid or slow. In the Bible we have instances of both kinds. We may be able to point to a definite moment of conversion or not. Many Christians pass through more than one conversion. The important thing is that there shall be a thorough self-surrender to the divine will. Conversion may precede regeneration or follow it. In the case of children who are baptized as infants, it must necessarily follow it. In the case of adults from whom faith and repentance are required, it must have begun before baptism. But conversion is not a substitute for regeneration. It is a call to seek baptism, not to do without it (cp. the case of S. Paul, Acts 9¹⁸, Cornelius and his friends, 10⁴⁷, the disciples at Ephesus, 19⁵). One of the proofs of conversion is the willingness to obey the command of our Lord by submitting to baptism and to confess Him by joining openly the Christian society of which baptism is the visible entrance. Whatever blessings God may bestow outside, by baptism we enter within the circle of God's covenanted mercies. No conversion, however complete, can of itself guarantee full and abiding union with Christ. The normal means of that union, where it can be had is baptism, followed by a life lived in the fellowship of the Church.^{1†}

It is only fair to mention another view of baptism held by many reformers known as the 'obsignatory' view. This view has its origin in Calvinism. Since God's grace is irresistible and given only to the elect, it follows that sacraments cannot in any real sense be 'means of grace'. Rather they are pledges or seals of blessings already belonging to the recipient as a child of grace. They assure him of the reality of the divine blessing. On this view baptism does not make us children of God, it only assures us that we are such or can be such when we fulfil the necessary conditions of faith and repentance, just as the coronation does not give the king his sovereignty, but is the seal of an already possessed sovereignty. This view is still held even by many who have abandoned the Calvinism that originally suggested it. It can hardly be reconciled with the language of the Articles about sacraments as 'effectual signs of grace'. It renders almost meaningless much of the baptismal service, e.g. the words in which after the baptism of the infant we thank God 'that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy holy Spirit', and of the Catechism,

¹ A difficulty is often felt about the words of 1 Jn 3⁹ and 5¹⁴, 'Whosoever is born of God sinneth not' or 'doth not commit sin'. The difficulty is equally great whether 'born of God' means 'baptized' or 'converted'. No one could hold that a converted man never sins. The only answer lies in drawing attention to the present tense (*ἀμαρτάνει*) which refers to a habit of sin. S. John is assuming that the Christian is responding to the position given him as son of God (cp. Rom 8¹⁴). In so far as he does this and realizes the new life, he does not commit sin.

which declares that we were 'made' members of Christ by baptism. In the case of adults it reduces baptism to little more than an aid to faith. In the case of infants it is hard to see on this view that baptism has any value at all. It might just as well be deferred to a later age, when its meaning would be understood by the recipient.

§ 3. We can now turn to the question of infant baptism, always remembering that the Scripture language about baptism is coloured by the prevalent practice of adult baptism. So too, much of the language both of our Prayer-Book and our Article, which is based on Scripture, is applicable in its full sense only to adults. As applied to infants it requires a certain accommodation to new conditions.

(a) Historically there seems no reason to doubt that the practice of infant baptism dates from apostolic times. It is in the fullest accord with contemporary ideas on religion. 'The idea that a parent should enter a religion or covenant relation with God as an individual merely, *i.e.* by himself as distinct from his immediate family would never occur to the ancients, least of all to a Jew.'¹ Every Jewish boy was circumcised when he was eight days old and thus brought within the covenant. In the case of proselytes to Judaism, the children were baptized and, if males, circumcised. The practice was defended on the ground that 'one may act for another to his advantage though not to his disadvantage apart from his knowledge and consent'. We do not, indeed, find any positive mention of infant baptism in the New Testament, but we do not find the slightest hint of any age limit. Looked at in the light not of modern thought but the thought and custom of the first century, silence on the point is most readily explained by the supposition that infants were baptized. We have record of the baptism of the whole households (Acts 16¹⁵, 1 Cor 1¹⁶). S. Peter can bid men repent and be baptized, 'for to you is the promise and to your children' (Acts 2³⁹). So, too, S. Paul sends a message to children based on their membership in Christ's body (Col 3²⁰, Eph 6¹, *n.b.* 'in the Lord'). Infant baptism was certainly practised in the early Church.² The first known objector to it is Tertullian. His objection is based on the ground that infants may fall into sin later, and, since baptism cannot be repeated, such sin may fail to obtain forgiveness: hence it is wiser to delay. These words are evidence for the existence of the practice, and he does not oppose it on doctrinal grounds. Down to a much later date baptism was frequently postponed till the approach of death from a conviction of the unforgivableness of post-baptismal sin, and a desire to have a good time in the present world. But such a practice did not express the mind of the Church. On the other hand, the conditions of apostolic Church life were those of the mission field. And in the mission field then, as to-day, adult baptism is the rule and infant baptism the exception. Children are

¹ *E.R.E.* ii. p. 379.

² It is implied, *e.g.* by Justin Martyr and Irenaeus.

only baptized where both parents are Christian or where some very definite guarantee is given that the child both can and shall be brought up as a Christian. Further, in times of persecution parents might be afraid to have their children baptized.

(b) We cannot doubt that the Church was rightly guided and that '*The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.*' The new covenant cannot be narrower than the old: the New Israel cannot put barriers where the Old Israel put none. It is often objected that infants cannot have faith and repentance. That is indeed obvious. 'Faith and repentance' are necessary conditions, when they can be had. But spiritual life is the free gift of God, and where there is no active disbelief or impenitence to oppose a bar to God's mercy, it does not need faith for its reception. We need not be consulted about our second birth any more than about our first. Children, when they come into the world, enter upon an inheritance tainted by sin. They should equally possess from the first that union with Christ which is the antidote to sin. After all few of us would refuse to pray to God to bless a child. We read of our Lord blessing children who were so small that He could take them up in His arms, and therefore were presumably incapable of faith (Mk 10¹³⁻¹⁶). Our Lord always required faith for the reception of His blessings, where faith could rightly be expected, but in this case He expressly invited little children to come to Him. We cannot possibly tell what precise effect either His blessing or our prayers have on the infant life, but we cannot suppose that they have no effect. So, too, we may not be able to define the inward effect of bringing children to Christ in baptism: the infant cannot recount the story of its spiritual experience. All we can say is that we believe that they receive from Him the best that they are capable of receiving.

Further, infant baptism embodies a profound spiritual principle. Religion starts not with what we do for God but with what God does for us.¹ We do not have to climb up to God first, to earn His goodwill by so much repentance or faith or so many good works. God's love and His free gifts come first, and we are bidden to live up to them. Privilege comes before responsibility. The reverse view seems at first sight to be common-sense, but in practice it has always led to hard and gloomy views of God. We can never be sure that our faith or works have come up to His standard. The true view is an appeal to our trust and gratitude. Above all, it gives us a sure ground of approach to God. As baptized Christians we are God's children, even though we may be His bad children, and we can always fall

¹ Cp. the opening of the Church Catechism, which begins with what God has done for us and then goes on to point out what we are to do for Him. So, too, our citizenship and our home come to us unearned and we have to live worthy of them. We do not have first to deserve them.

back on the sonship that He bestowed upon us. The Prodigal Son had not earned his position as son. He had received it, and used it unworthily. But in the hour of distress he could fall back upon it as a ground of appeal. Though a bad son, he could still cry 'Father'. So, when children are baptized their baptism always remains as a ground of appeal. We do not bid them be good and say that then, if we judge them good enough, they will be baptized. Rather we say they are Christians and therefore must live as Christians. Nothing could be more Scriptural.

Lastly, many objections to infant baptism depend for their force on a falsely isolated view of the sacrament. As we have seen, the grace given in baptism does not transform us without our own effort. It needs to be claimed and used. Accordingly, the child must be taught that he is a member of Christ and all that such membership involves. If he never learns his position as a child of God and makes no effort to avail himself of the powers placed within his reach, that does not show that infant baptism is of no value: it shows rather that the divine gift is being left unused.¹ Further, life of all kinds can only be realized by development, and that development needs the right environment. By baptism infants not only receive the power of a new life, but are placed in the Church in which this new life is to be progressively developed. Our natural human life depends for its growth upon fellowship. A child after birth needs to be fed and clothed if it is to be strong and healthy. Later on it needs education and instruction. So the baptized infant requires food and nursing for its soul if it is to grow up spiritually sound. The Christian child is to come to self-consciousness within the Church. He is to be taught all that his life means and the grand possibilities that it contains. Hence the need of godparents, who in the name of the Church promise to train the child. Accordingly, teaching on baptismal regeneration must never be separated from the thought of the Church as God's family in which the new life is to be realized. The gift of God in baptism implies as its background His gifts to the Church as a whole. It is very doubtful whether it is right to baptize infants indiscriminately as is too often done to-day, when there is no real security that they will be brought up as the Prayer-Book directs. God-parents are too often selected not for spiritual but for worldly reasons. As a result, baptism comes to be regarded either as a mere form or else as having a vague magic efficacy. The failure to mark any difference in later life between the baptized and the unbaptized is put down not to

¹ We may compare the case of the insincere adult who is baptized, without real faith and penitence, e.g. Simon Magus (Acts 8¹³ ff.). When his insincerity is disclosed he is bidden to repent and amend his life: but there is no suggestion of rebaptism. We might have supposed that his unbelief and sin would have hindered the reception of the gifts. Rather the blessings of baptism have been given once for all and they await the will that will use them. He is to obtain remission of sins in virtue of his relation to Christ founded in baptism, not by a new baptism.

the failure of man's co-operation but to the absence of divine efficiency. Much as we deplore the refusal of the Baptists to administer baptism to infants, at least their position witnesses to the fact that Baptism means a great deal. That is a truth that the Church of England needs to restore to its due prominence.¹

§ 4. What is the relation of Baptism to Confirmation? In apostolic times it would seem that Baptism included a laying on of hands (Acts 19⁶, cp. Heb 6²) and possibly an anointing with oil (2 Cor 1²¹⁻²², 1 Jn 2²⁰ and 27). The language about anointing may be purely metaphorical, but washing and anointing commonly went together. We find no explicit mention, however, of anything but baptizing with water in Acts 8³⁸ and 9¹⁸. In Acts 8¹²⁻¹⁷ we find baptism distinctly separated from the laying on of hands and the gift of the Spirit connected with the latter. Philip clearly possessed only authority to baptize. The Apostles came to lay on hands. Beyond all doubt in the custom of the early Church Baptism, unction, and the laying on of hands formed a single sacrament, like the bread and wine of the Eucharist. Origen, for instance, can write, 'Through the laying on of hands the Holy Spirit was given in Baptism.' In the West the laying on of hands was restricted to bishops, and owing to the difficulty of obtaining a bishop became separated from Baptism. The title 'Confirmation' is late and purely Western. In the Greek Church the laying on of hands has dropped out. Infants are baptized and anointed with oil that has been specially blessed by the bishop for the purpose. That is, Baptism and Confirmation are still one. In the West, unction has been dropped by ourselves and the laying on of hands by the Roman Church. It is usually held that the 'form' of Confirmation is prayer for the gift of the Spirit. It is doubtful whether either unction or the laying on of hands can claim any higher authority than that of the custom of the Church. Many hold that the universal use of the laying on of hands by the Apostles from the first points back to a definite command of Christ, but that the command has not been preserved. In Heb 6² the 'laying on of hands' is included among the 'first principles of Christ'. Very possibly this implies that He Himself taught it. The arguments are strong but not absolutely conclusive.

In primitive times Confirmation, whatever the relative prominence of unction or laying on of hands in local practice, was part of a single sacrament of Christian initiation, by which the candidate was transferred from this world into the life of the Church, cleansed from sin, made a member of Christ, anointed with the Holy Spirit, and 'sealed unto the day of redemption'. Like baptism with water the Confirma-

¹ The importance of Baptism is also obscured by the custom, in defiance of all Prayer-Book rules, of administering it in a hole-and-corner fashion instead of in the presence of the congregation. The whole idea of admission to Christian fellowship loses its natural expression. We have substituted 'Private Baptism' in Church for Public Baptism.

tion part of the rite had the once-for-all character proper to initiation, and the intervention of the bishop as the chief pastor and priest further emphasized its initiatory significance. In the West the direct episcopal ministrations of Confirmation has been fairly consistently maintained, but practical difficulties due largely in the first instance to the unprimitive size of dioceses led to the separation of the rite from baptism. This in turn raised the theological question of the relation of the gift bestowed in Baptism to that bestowed in Confirmation. The question was never a major issue in the patristic age, but where it is explicitly expounded or discussed, particularly in the third and fourth centuries, Confirmation is said to bestow the Holy Spirit. Side by side with this evidence the Fathers, following the apparent emphasis of the scripture references to Baptism, sometimes speak as though baptism with water was of sole importance. In the mediaeval West where the difficulty of administering Confirmation was acute the initiatory significance of the rite was largely lost and it became a separate and almost superfluous sacrament for 'the increase of grace', *augmentum gratiae*.¹ At the Reformation the Church of England retained the Western practice of separating Confirmation from infant baptism but restored its initiatory character in two ways. First, the close relation to baptism was brought into prominence by including in the rite the renewal of baptismal vows, and secondly it was re-affirmed that admission to Holy Communion was restricted to those who had been 'confirmed or were ready and desirous to be confirmed'.²

Modern discussions of the pastoral use and significance of Confirmation have revealed a general desire to retain traditional anglican practice. There remains the theological question of the relation of the gift in Baptism to that in Confirmation. Varying views are current in the Church of England. One emphasizes the need that persons baptized in infancy should, on arriving at years of discretion, explicitly assume the responsibility for obedience to the vows already made in their name. Through this personal act of faith and acceptance of responsibility the significance of Baptism comes to its fulfilment and in the Confirmation Service the whole act is supported and blessed by the prayers of the Church. This view has a continuous history since the sixteenth century. For another view, also widely held, the laying on of hands has a more sacramental character and is the means of a special gift of strengthening by the Holy Spirit, but no negative inferences about what is bestowed in Baptism are drawn. This view can claim considerable support from the Prayer Book

¹ Thomas Aquinas, *Sum. Theol.* III, lxxii. 6, 'ita se habet confirmatio ad baptismum sicut augmentum ad generationem.'

² The rubric (based on the Sarum Manual) at the end of the Order of Confirmation dates from 1549, except for the qualifying clause which was added in 1662. The modern Roman practice by which children are commonly admitted to Communion before they are confirmed continues to deprive the rite of its true initiatory character.

rites.¹ Another view, while accepting the value of the renewal of vows, regards Confirmation as a sacramental rite which completes the sacramental act begun in baptism and bestows the gift of the Holy Spirit.² Thus baptism *as a sacrament* is incomplete until Confirmation. As a corollary of this view it is usually denied that the Holy Spirit is given in baptism. This interpretation can appeal to evidence in Scripture and primitive tradition. So long as practice continues to be uniform and the traditional order of Baptism, Confirmation, and admission to Communion is maintained it may not become urgent for the Church as a whole to decide the problem of the respective parts played by Baptism and Confirmation in the total act of Christian initiation.³†

¹ In the baptismal service we pray 'Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant that he may be born again'. The Bishop prays that the confirmed 'may daily *increase* in the Holy Spirit'.

² The ancient prayer (from the Gelasian Sacramentary) which in our rite precedes the laying-on of hands still (in spite of the change of 'Send into them' to 'Strengthen them') appears to imply that the seven-fold gift is now to be given for the first time. Moreover, persons baptized as adults are not dispensed from Confirmation though they have 'answered for themselves' at baptism (see rubric following Baptism of Such as are of Riper Years).

³ 'The existence of some questions which defy definition is the price we have paid for the great advantages of administering Confirmation at an age of discretion' (*The Theology of Christian Initiation*, p. 23). But plans for re-union which involve statements about the functions of bishops may make it difficult to avoid a decision on some issues concerning the theology of Confirmation.