

APPENDIX

ARTICLE I.—THE PERSONALITY OF GOD

ONE of the most important questions, perhaps the most important, in modern theology is the Divine Personality, and that God is personal is, as already seen, the only possible position for theists. Modern investigation into the meaning of Personality should help in understanding and stating the theistic position more accurately and effectively. One line of thought tends to show that the old idea of isolation in personality is not correct, but that, on the contrary, personality can only be fully realised in association with other personalities. If this is correct, if human personality involves and implies fellowship, then it must be as true of the highest personality as of the lowest, and therefore of God as well as of man. How this may be can be studied in some valuable material now available. As an introduction an article should be read which appeared in the *London Quarterly Review* for April 1911 (Vol. I, Fifth Series, p. 280), entitled, "The Personality of God," by the Rev. A. T. Burbridge. In addition to the works referred to in this article reference should be made to the article on "The Trinity," by the Archbishop of Armagh in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. See also *The Philosophy of Religion*, by Dr. Galloway. The subject may also be studied in the author's *The Holy Spirit of God* (chap. xviii).

ARTICLE II.—THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

The question of the Atonement raises the problem of the relation of our Lord's sacrifice to the biblical doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. How are the two to be reconciled? Is there not something incongruous in the thought of the attitude of fatherhood and that of a propitiatory sacrifice? The solution of the problem will be found in a careful consideration of the true doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood.

I.—THE BIBLE TEACHING ON THE DIVINE FATHERHOOD

The terms Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man are used freely in the present time, but often without due thought and care. It is, therefore, well to ask ourselves how far they contain truth and wherein

they suggest what is untrue. The doctrine of the Fatherhood of God is not a truth of natural religion. We see the Divine power, providence, and glory in nature, but not Fatherhood. While love, goodness, truth, and providence are necessarily elements of Fatherhood, they do not belong solely thereto. For this reason men could hardly have imagined the Fatherhood of God, and as a fact they never did do so, for universal Fatherhood necessarily implies universal brotherhood, and such an idea was utterly alien from ancient thought.

In the Old Testament the Divine Fatherhood is found in connection with Israel only, and although it is seen quite clearly there, it is involved in and limited to the Divine covenant with the Hebrews (Exod. iv. 22 f.; Deut. xiv. 1; Psa. lxxxix. 26). The reference in Psa. ciii. 13 is to similarity alone and not to relationship, and even so it is associated with pity and fear, not with love and fellowship. A nearer approach to the doctrine of universal Fatherhood may be seen in such passages as Isa. lxiii. 16 and lxiv. 8, but even there the thought is associated with the Divine Creatorship.

When we turn to the New Testament the doctrine of a Divine Fatherhood is absolutely clear. "The doctrine of the New Testament assumed such different proportions as almost to amount to a new revelation."¹ No longer is God regarded merely as calling forth awe and majesty, but also, and chiefly, is revealed in His nearness, fellowship, and love. God is seen to love man as a perfect Father loves His children (Rom. viii. 15, 16; 1 John iii. 1).

II.—THE MEANING OF THE DIVINE FATHERHOOD

It can only be understood properly in the light of human relationship, for to us all other senses than this must be derivative and metaphorical. It is true that the Divine Fatherhood is not exactly the same as human, and yet the applications of the Divine must be so related to the human as to give a true conception of God. Now the essence of Fatherhood is its relation to sonship, and *vice versa*. They are correlatives, and it is only in this mutual relationship that the terms have any intelligibility. This necessary relationship is always asserted in the New Testament in the various uses of the term "Father," and it is true universally, whatever may be the precise meaning of Fatherhood and sonship. If, for example, we speak of God's universal Fatherhood in creation, we at once think of its correlative in the universal sonship of humanity by creation. If we think of God's spiritual Fatherhood as potential we at once conceive of spiritual sonship as potential. And if we refer to the actual spiritual Fatherhood of God to believers we at once associate with this the actual sonship of believers. Thus there is a strict parallelism between Fatherhood and sonship at all points and in every sense. The idea that God is the Father of all men but that all are not sons is unthinkable.

¹ Sanday, Article, "God," Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, p. 208.

There are three uses of Fatherhood in the New Testament. (a) God is described as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. This relationship between God the Father and God the Son is unique and exclusive, for in this Sonship no creature has a part. No one is "Son" as Christ is, and for this reason He never associates us with Himself by speaking of "Our Father." He always distinguishes between His Sonship and ourselves, as when He speaks of the Father of Me and the Father of you (John xx. 17). (b) God is also spoken of as the Father of the regenerate in Christ. All who believe in Christ as Saviour and Lord have the right to say, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," for their sonship is inseparable from the love wherewith the Father loves Christ (John i. 12; Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iii. 26). (c) He may be called the Father of man in general by reason of universal creation and benevolence. This must be the meaning of St. Paul's teaching at Athens, "Made of one [blood]; we are also His offspring" (Acts xvii. 26, 28). In the first of these three instances the love of the Father for the Son is ineffable and infinite. In the second the love of God is peculiar to the saints as "in Christ." In the third the love of God extends to all mankind, "God so loved the world."

There is no real difference as to the first and second of these instances; only as to the third, and yet even here the difference is not so much as to Fatherhood as to sonship. The question is whether all are sons in the same sense as God is Father. If this is so, are we to understand the sonship literally or figuratively? In a word, is it possible to think of Fatherhood without sonship? Now, to be sons there must be some resemblance to the father, and this can only be physical, or mental, or moral. Children are not created such, for creation by itself is not necessarily paternity. A creator is not a father simply because he has created, and in Scripture the sonship of creation is associated with the term "God," not with "Father." This may be seen in regard to angels (Job xxxviii. 7), and to Adam (Luke iii. 38).

It follows, therefore, that the true bond between son and father must be ethical, and since there is no such ethical bond between all men and God, the inevitable result is that sonship can only be a capacity or a possibility. Yet capacity is not sonship. The fundamental element is the experienced relation of children to a Heavenly Father. This is the truth which Jesus Christ lived, and it is only those who live in a similar manner as the children of the Father in heaven in whom this foundation is laid. This Christian character does not depend merely on the belief of the doctrine that God is the Father of us, but on the loving acceptance of that truth as the practical and controlling principle of our lives.

III.—THE NEW TESTAMENT REVELATION OF THE DIVINE FATHERHOOD

1. When we study the teaching of the New Testament on the Divine Fatherhood we must look first at the Gospels and then at the Epistles.

Omitting all references to Christ, there are only a few places in the Gospels where the term "The Father" is not limited to our Lord. Thus, in John iv. 21-23, it may be questioned whether the reference is to all men or to worshippers alone. For this reason we must decide by general New Testament usage. A careful consideration of the Sermon on the Mount will show that the application is to a specific body, the disciples, and not to all men (Matt. v. 1), and it may be said without question that in the Gospels there is no unequivocal statement of Universal Fatherhood. When we turn to the Epistles the nearest approach to Universal Fatherhood is found in Eph. iii. 14, 15; iv. 6; Heb. xii. 9. In the former two passages the context seems to indicate a reference clearly to the spiritual relationship of believers, while in the latter the antithesis between human and Divine Fatherhood is clear. In any case, it is noteworthy that the clearest teaching on this subject is found in St. Paul, not in Christ. It must surely be regarded as strange that our Lord's teaching is not clear on a point on which so many modern writers lay stress.

Similarly, in regard to sonship we must study both Gospels and Epistles. The Sermon on the Mount is quite clear about the necessity of ethical faithfulness in order to Divine sonship (Matt. v. 9, 45), while the teaching of the Fourth Gospel points beyond all question to a limited sonship (John i. 12). The only reference to universal sonship in the Gospels is found in connection with Adam (Luke iii. 38), and even this is associated with "God" not "Father." Outside the Gospels the nearest approach to universal sonship is found in the words of St. Paul in Acts xvii. 28, 29, but even here it is significant that the terms refer to kinship rather than to childhood, and to God not to the Father. Bishop Westcott remarks that "there is as far as it appears no case where a fellow-man, as man, is called a brother in the New Testament."¹ Thus what is understood as the brotherhood of humanity is not a New Testament idea, which is only concerned with a spiritual brotherhood in Christ.

The parable of the Prodigal Son is sometimes urged in support of the doctrine of universal Divine Fatherhood, and, indeed, it may be said to be almost the only warrant for it. It may be questioned, however, whether Christ was likely to contradict in the parable the rest of His clear teaching. Should not the teaching interpret the parable, not the parable the teaching? The parable is one of three indicative of God's attitude to men, or, rather, of Christ's vindication of Himself in opposition to the murmurings of the Pharisees (Luke xv. 1, 2). The three parables must be taken together if they are to be properly understood, but we do not think of God as a real shepherd in the first parable, or a real woman in the second. Indeed, the same lesson would have been taught in the third parable if the relationship of man and wife had been given. Then, too, the literalness defeats itself, for if the prodigal represents all men, who are to be understood by the elder brother and the citizens? The fact is

¹ *The Epistles of St. John*, p. 55.

that the parable turns on one point only, the attitude and action of Christ's pity and grace, and the omissions prove nothing, since there are other fundamental doctrines equally lacking, like Propitiation, Resurrection, the Holy Spirit, and the New Life. And thus, while the parable is evidently appropriate for its purpose, it is only a figure of speech and cannot be fairly used as the foundation of a metaphysical relation of God to man. To deduce a dogma from a figure of speech is perilous, for it is clear that the parable was not intended as a complete account of the principles and method of reconciliation. Thus the Father was not seeking the son, but only waiting for him, and the son, although a son by creation, had to repent and return as a lost sinner. His natural sonship did not suffice without these. If Christ intended Himself in all three by the figures of the Shepherd, the Woman, and the Father, the Fatherhood of God is entirely out of the question. But, on the other hand, if God the Father is intended, then there is no mention of Christ at all. Thus the argument is precarious, and it is quite impossible to infer that what is omitted is needless and what is inserted is complete.

It is, therefore, plain that while we may regard God as in one sense the Father of all men (by creation), in another and eternally vital sense we cannot, because His complete Fatherhood is only possible through Jesus Christ. The entrance of sin into the world severed the spiritual relationship between God and men as Father and children, and this fact is not usually taken into account by those who think of God as equally the Father of all. It is impossible to overlook our Lord's teaching about those who are "the children of the devil" (John viii. 41-44), thereby indicating a very definite limitation of Fatherhood. Besides, Fatherhood is not the sole idea of Godhead, as a careful consideration of the Bible as a whole clearly teaches. The judicial and kingly aspects must find their place, and, as already seen, Fatherhood and sonship are strictly correlative in every sense, for a Fatherhood without a sonship is unintelligible. It is also significant that Fatherhood in the New Testament is associated with holiness and fear (1 Pet. i. 17), and the only epithets ever used by our Lord in speaking of the Father were "holy" and "righteous" (John xvii. 11, 25). It is only possible to teach the universal Fatherhood of God by ignoring or rejecting the redemption of Christ, for men know the Father only through the work of the Son. "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me." "If ye had known Me, ye should have known My Father also." Universal Fatherhood and sonship tend to cut the cord of evangelistic work and make redemptive effort perilous. It suggests that there is no need of Atonement, for it tends to dispense with it, regarding sin as a trifle and God as good-natured and sentimental.

It is, therefore, essential to state that creation does not constitute men sons in the spiritual sense, for New Testament sonship is based on redemption and regeneration, while the doctrine of universal sonship rests either on a denial of the Fall, or on the assumption of universal regeneration, both of which are unwarranted by Scripture and experience. If the

universal Fatherhood of God and the universal sonship of man are assumed, how is it that there is not a single clear instance of either truth in the New Testament? Surely the truth of our adoption clearly shows that there is some state from which, and another state into which, men are taken. The very fact of "adoption" both socially and spiritually argues against the idea of an universal Fatherhood. By limiting the Fatherhood of God we secure its full meaning and value, for there is no solace or inspiration in telling a sinner that he is a child of God unless we mean that he is potentially one, and needs redemption and regeneration in order to become one in actual fact. Thus the Fatherhood of God has a place in the lives of those who have accepted Him in Christ, which it cannot possibly have in the life of humanity in general, and what is known as the "Brotherhood of Man" is in reality only a physical relationship, for men are brothers in spirit only when Christ is their life and God is their spiritual Father. When these truths are understood we see at once the true relationship and spiritual bearing of the Atonement of Christ on the New Testament doctrine of the Fatherhood of God.

ARTICLE VI.—BIBLE DIFFICULTIES

This question often affects our view of the authority and inspiration of Holy Scripture, and while it is impossible to deal with the subject in detail in the present work a few general suggestions may be offered. When once we have become convinced on adequate evidence that the Bible is the Word of God every difficulty found should be judged in the light of this antecedent conviction. In particular, the question should be considered whether difficulties are not inherent in the very fact of revelation. If the New Testament is the historic record of contemporary writers who were competent to testify to facts which they knew, their evidence ought to have full weight, as assuring us of the truth of the facts, and, as it has often been pointed out, since there was no secrecy, but full publicity by the circulation of these records among people who knew the facts, the Christians of the first century are really witnesses who corroborate the truth of the New Testament, a testimony often sealed by persecution and even death.

The supreme question for ordinary life is whether the Bible is trustworthy, for if so, the facts must be true, and if the historic proof is regarded as adequate, then no subsequent considerations ought to be allowed to counterbalance that proof, since no antecedent probability or improbability can affect this in the face of the evidence, so that the true position to be adopted is that difficulties are to be judged in the light of the evidence, and, as a great textual critic, Tregelles, says, "No difficulty connected with a proved fact can invalidate the fact itself." It is well known that if a scientist finds certain phenomena in nature involving variation from

a great general law he does not thereupon abandon his general conclusion. Nor does a theist give up belief in a Creator because of the difficulties he observes in creation and nature. Since there are difficulties in nature and providence, and since revelation is presumably from the same source there may be difficulties there also. This is the great and convincing principle of Butler's Analogy. If the difficulties are not such as would invalidate the truthfulness of other writers they should have no more weight than in those cases. Further, the question continually arises whether the discrepancies are real or apparent, whether there is absolutely no explanation, or whether we only are unable to solve the problem. The words of Dean Farrar are noteworthy: "The widest learning and the acutest ingenuity of scepticism have never pointed to one complete and demonstrable error of fact or doctrine in the Old or New Testament."¹

Thus it is correct to say that a Bible without difficulties would be itself the greatest difficulty of all, for such a work, presenting no problems and creating no perplexities, would impose a great strain on faith and really provide a weapon for scepticism. The difficulties of the Bible are usually divided into three classes: alleged discrepancies (a) with science; (b) with history; and (c) with ethics. In regard to the first, it will often be found that the discrepancy lies between some interpretation of Scripture and some theory of science, either or both of which may be incorrect, for the general harmony between the Bible and Science is as true as it is remarkable. The question of historical difficulties may be tested at many points in connection with Archæology, and both in regard to the Old and the New Testament, researches during the last fifty years have done much to confirm the truth of the statements of Scripture. The works of one writer, Sir William Ramsay, will suffice to indicate the truth of this contention. The ethical difficulties are chiefly concerned with the Old Testament and are largely due to the failure to recognise the progress of the revelation therein embodied.

Almost every difficulty can be solved by the consideration of the manifest advance of the Old Testament from the elementary to the complex, from the imperfect to the more perfect. Further considerations on this last point will be found in the author's *Methods of Bible Study*. It may also fairly be said that we are not called upon to answer every conceivable objection. It ought to be sufficient to prove the truth of Christianity, and this is very different from meeting all possible difficulties.

ARTICLE IX.—INFANT SALVATION

It is unfortunate that the problem of sinfulness has been closely and almost solely connected with children instead of adults. This complicates the situation when the question of guilt is considered. Most theories

¹ Article, "Inspiration," *Cassell's Biblical Educator*, Vol. I, p. 207.

turn on this point, but it is unwise to shift the emphasis from adults to children, of whom the Bible says so little. Like Baptism, sinfulness should be considered first in the adult, as referring to the normal condition, and only afterwards in children, as to whom the question of personal guilt in the common sense of the term cannot apply. The difficulty lies in the fact that children are sinners, involved in the sin of the race through the headship of Adam, while they are personally guiltless until they in conscious and wilful transgression make themselves personally responsible and liable.

The question of Infant Salvation has, therefore, naturally been prominent in discussions since the time of Augustine. To Augustine, infants dying after Baptism were saved, but if dying unbaptised they were lost, though incurring only the lighter punishment.¹ The explanation of this view is that Augustine is occupied with two lines of thought which he never reconciled: his doctrine of Grace and his doctrine of the Church.² One of these lines issued in the Reformation doctrine of Grace and the other found its development in the Roman Catholic theology of the Church.³

To the earliest of the Fathers salvation was by grace, and this included infants, but later the doctrine of grace became obscure, and the death of infants was regarded as an insoluble problem. As the Church and Kingdom tended to become identified in one visible organisation, the absolute necessity of Baptism for salvation was more and more emphasised, and thus infants who were not baptised could not be saved.⁴ It was this view of the Church that Augustine inherited, and it led to his doctrine that no infant dying unbaptised could enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Pelagianism, with its denial of original sin and of punishment, nevertheless held that infants were outside the Kingdom of God, though obtaining eternal life. But the fundamental idea up to the time of Augustine was

¹ "This is the dark side of his soteriology. But it should be remembered that it was not his theology of grace, but the universal and traditional belief in the necessity of baptism for remission of sins, which he inherited in common with all of his time, that forced it upon him. The theology of grace was destined in the hands of his successors, who have rejoiced to confess that they were taught by him, to remove this stumbling-block also from Christian teaching; and if not to Augustine, it is to Augustine's theology that the Christian world owes its liberation from so terrible a tenet" (Warfield, *Two Studies in the History of Doctrine*, p. 137).

² "Augustine's doctrine of the means of grace, i.e. of the channels and circumstances of the conference of grace upon men, is the meeting point of two very dissimilar streams of thought—his doctrine of grace and his doctrine of the Church. Profound thinker as he was, within whose active mind was born an incredible multitude of the richest conceptions, he was not primarily a systematiser, and these divergent streams of thought rather conditioned each the purity of the other's development at this point than were thoroughly harmonised" (Warfield, *ut supra*, p. 135).

³ "Despite the strong churchly element within the theology of Augustine, the development of which has produced the ecclesiasticism of Romish thought, it must be admitted that, on the side that is presented in the controversy against Pelagianism, it is in its essence distinctly anti-ecclesiastical. Its central thought was the immediate dependence of the individual on the grace of God in Jesus Christ" (Warfield, *ut supra*, p. 138).

⁴ Warfield, *ut supra*, p. 148.

that as saving grace could only come through baptism no unbaptised infant could be saved.

In the Middle Ages an endeavour was made to soften this severe doctrine under the influence of Semi-Pelagianism, and in the sixteenth century Roman Catholic writers advocated several opinions, though the general Roman Catholic view is that of the Council of Trent, which made Baptism necessary to salvation without any qualification.¹ This may be regarded as the usual Roman Catholic position to-day, though efforts have been made from time to time to mitigate it by the doctrine of Baptism by intention.

Luther's view was naturally affected by the general doctrine of grace and of the Church associated with the Reformation.² But this was connected with a doctrine of Baptism which emphasised its necessity for salvation, apart, of course, from special cases. Luther also emphasised a Baptism of intention. Yet Lutheran theologians have from the first differed considerably, and the idea suggested seems to be that of an unwillingness to speak definitely on the subject,³ though without doing more than entertain a hope for the salvation of unbaptised infants.

The Anglican position needs careful attention because of the stages of growth among those who had to deal with the subject. In 1536 the Ten Articles explicitly taught that only baptised infants could be saved. "Infants and children dying in their infancy shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, and else not."⁴

This statement about the loss of all unbaptised infants is also found in what is known as the "Bishops' Book" of 1537. But in the "King's Book" of 1543 the final words, "and else not" are omitted. In the First Prayer Book of 1549, among the rubrics which precede the Order of Confirmation is the following:—

"And that no man shall think that any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their confirmation: he shall know for truth, that it is certain by God's Word, that children being baptised (if they depart out of this life in their infancy) are undoubtedly saved."

¹ "The Council of Trent thus made it renewed *de fide* that infants dying unbaptised incur damnation, though it left the way open for discussion as to the kind and amount of their punishment" (Warfield, *ut supra*, p. 155).

² "Men are not constituted members of Christ through the Church, but members of the Church through Christ: they are not made the members of Christ by baptism which the Church gives, but by faith, the gift of God; and baptism is the Church's recognition of this inner fact" (Warfield, *ut supra*, p. 166).

³ "This cautious agnostic position has the best right to be called the historical Lutheran attitude on the subject. It is even the highest position thoroughly consistent with the genius of the Lutheran system and the stress which it lays on the means of grace. The drift in more modern times has, however, been decidedly in the direction of affirming the salvation of all that die in infancy, on grounds identical with those pleaded by this party from the beginning—the infinite mercy of God, the universality of the atonement, the inability of infants to resist grace, their guiltlessness of despising the ordinance, and the like" (Warfield, *ut supra*, p. 172).

⁴ For the full text see Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion*, p. 242.

In the Second Prayer Book of 1552 there was an alteration so as to make the latter portion read—

“That children being baptised have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved.”

No further alteration was made in the Prayer Book of 1559, but in the Prayer Book of 1662 the rubric was transferred to the end of the Order for the Public Baptism of Infants in the following form, which exists to-day :—

“It is certain by God’s Word, that children which are baptised, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.”

It is noteworthy that the statement is not found in the Prayer Book used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. There does not seem to be any reason for supposing that the transference of the rubric from the Confirmation Service to that of Baptism in 1662 was intended to be reactionary. In the *Reformatio Legum* reference was made to the “scrupulous superstition” of the Roman Church in regard to the fate of infants dying unbaptised.¹ It is interesting and significant that this code of laws was, as we have seen, drawn up by a Commission presided over by Cranmer. In view of the Reformation doctrine that Baptism introduced the subject to a new sphere, it was natural to refer to infants as within that sphere, and it is never to be forgotten that extreme Reformers and the earliest Puritans raised no objection to the Prayer Book doctrine of regeneration, since, as already seen, it referred to the introduction into a new state or condition, not to the bestowal of a germ of life or a moral renovation in the modern sense. It should be noted that in the revision of 1552 the opening prayer in the Baptismal Office was brought practically into its present form, with the omission of the words, “And so save from perishing,” and also a recasting of the entire tendency of the prayer. It is, therefore, not accurate to say that the Church of England expresses no hope for the salvation of infants who die unbaptised. It means that our formularies are limited to the simple statement about those who have presumably been brought within the covenant. The *Reformatio Legum* was issued by Archbishop Parker in 1571, and Becon, one of Cranmer’s Chaplains, wrote very definitely and repeatedly on the subject of infant salvation in harmony with the statement of the *Reformatio Legum*. There seems to be no proof whatever that Cranmer ever changed his opinion.

The “Reformed” (or Swiss) view of this question was based on the

¹ “Illorum etiam impia videri debet scrupulosa superstitio, qui Dei gratiam et Spiritum Sanctum tantopere cum sacramentorum elementis colligant, ut plane affirmant, nullum Christianorum infantem eternam salutem esse consecuturum, qui prius a morte fuerit occupatus, quam ad Baptismum adduci potuerit; quod longe secus habere judicamus” (*Reformatio Legum, De Baptismo*).

general doctrine of Divine grace, and was not limited by any idea of means of grace :—

“ It is probable that Zwingli stood alone among the Reformers in his extension of salvation to all infants dying in infancy.”¹

But the question was involved in the doctrine of election and varied with different classes of Reformers. A few held Zwingli's view that death in infancy was one of the marks of election, and it is thought that Bishop Hooper was one of the earliest to adopt this position. At the very opposite extreme some few theologians holding that the only sure mark of election was faith taught that there was no real ground of conviction concerning the fate of infants. This position was subsequently condemned at the Synod of Dort. A third section held that all believers and their children are certainly saved, though the children of unbelievers, dying such, are certainly lost. Yet again, many held that not only was the salvation of the children of believers certain, but there was good reason for holding that as election and reprobation have no place in the unknown sphere of children, some infants of unbelievers were saved and some lost. But most adherents of the Reformed Churches held that the matter must be entirely left to the judgment of God, which would be just and holy. This view is found in conjunction with both hope and the absence of hope.² From all this it will be seen that the Reformed Churches have adopted practically the same position as that of the Church of England, apart from the question of baptism.

“ The Reformed Confessions with characteristic caution refrain from all definition upon the negative side of this great question, and thus confine themselves to emphasising the gracious doctrine common to the whole body of Reformed thought.”³

It will be seen, however, that, as mentioned above, the doctrine of infant salvation was involved in the doctrine of election, and the Reformed Churches held that the children of believers dying in infancy were saved, while declining to pronounce on the subject of the children of unbelievers. Later theologians, representing the Reformed Churches, seem to be united in the view that all who die in infancy are the children of God, not because of the absence of original sin, or freedom from guilt, but simply because God has chosen them in Christ.

But it may be pointed out that this view does not really solve the problem, and the best foundation for believing in the salvation of all infants is pretty certainly to be seen in the universality of the Atonement of Christ. No question of election should be allowed to enter. Infants

¹ Warfield, *ut supra*, p. 199.

² This sketch of Reformed views is summarised from Warfield's article, *ut supra*, pp. 203-211, to which this entire Note is deeply indebted.

³ Warfield, *ut supra*, p. 213.

come into this world with the results of Adam's sin in them, and they are involved in the inherent sin of the race through the headship of our first parents. Whatever may be the meaning of St. Paul's word, "By the offence of one judgment was upon all men to condemnation," infants are assuredly included, but, on the other hand, they go out of this world equally associated with the work of the last Adam, the Lord from heaven. So that we can say of infants, "By the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men to justification by Him." We must not forget that infants come into a world of grace as well as of sin, and the two parallel lines can never be overlooked. While there is, of course, no definite declaration in regard to the salvation of infants dying in infancy, all that we can infer from Scripture supports the view that they are saved on the ground of the Atonement of Christ, and this because although they were born in sin they were not actual transgressors of the Divine law.¹

ARTICLE XIX.—THE WORD "CATHOLIC"

The Church of England, of course, distinguishes between particular Churches and the entire Church of Christ. The preface to the Prayer Book speaks of "the Church of England" and "the Catholick Church of Christ." The title of the Book of Common Prayer is to the same effect, and in Article XIX reference is made to particular Churches. The Preface to the Ordinal also has this important distinction. It is, therefore, essential to understand what is meant by the term "Catholic," as used in the Prayer Book.

Although the word is not found in Scripture, it is so familiar in phrases like "Catholic Church" and "Catholic Faith" that it calls for special notice, more particularly as it is often misunderstood. It comes from καθ' ὅλος, "*throughout the whole*," and its fundamental conception is *universality*; but this idea has been variously applied in the use of the word "Catholic Church." The original idea was that of *geographical diffusion*. The meaning was simply that of universality as in the phrase, "Thy Holy Church universal." It indicated that Christianity was a religion intended for universal diffusion, that all men were eligible for membership. This is the meaning of the word when first used by Ignatius at the beginning of the second century, "Where Jesus Christ may be, there is the Catholic Church."² The word as thus used is essentially expressive of the supreme purpose of Christianity as a world-wide religion. The same idea is conveyed by the word when it appears

¹ This important subject can be studied in the valuable article by Warfield, already mentioned, and also in *The Buried Nations of the Infant Dead*, by Pratt (published by The Pratt Co., Hackensack, New Jersey, U.S.A.).

² Bishop Lightfoot, *Commentary on Ignatius* (Epistle to Smyrna, Ch. VIII, Note); Swete, *The Holy Catholic Church*, pp. 33-41.

next in the letter of the Church of Smyrna on the occasion of the martyrdom of Polycarp, addressed "To all the congregation of the Holy and Catholic Church in every place."¹

This idea of universality was subsequently followed by the thought of *doctrinal purity and completeness* as a mark of Catholicity. By accurate and complete doctrine was understood that which most clearly adhered to the teaching of Christ and His Apostles. This extension of the meaning of the word was directed probably against Judaism, and certainly against heresy. The rise of heresies and schisms seemed to demand this application of the word to describe those who held fast to the complete truth of New Testament Christianity. As Lightfoot points out, the original meaning of the word was "universal" as opposed to "particular," and then later "orthodox" as opposed to "heretical." "The truth was the same everywhere, the heresies were partial, scattered, localised, isolated." We see this secondary meaning of the term as applied to doctrinal correctness and completeness in the phrase "the Catholic Faith."²

Still later came a third application of the term. Geographical explanation and doctrinal purity became expressed in *Church unity and fellowship*. At the outset fellowship was necessarily congregational; then it was widened to include associations of congregations in a town or district. Later came the idea of diocesan fellowship, and still later the fellowship connected with associations of dioceses called patriarchates. Last of all came the great divisions of Eastern and Western Christianity, each with its own view of Catholicity. The word "Catholic," as Greek by derivation, naturally came into use first in the East,³ and did not appear in a Western Creed until nearly the end of the fifth century. Dr. Swete points out that the Church of Rome was long indifferent to the word, perhaps because she did not feel the need of support from the idea of Christian solidarity. There was a narrowness about its use by Rome, and it came to mean only those parts of Christendom that accepted the Roman supremacy. This was probably influenced by the idea of a State or Imperial Church as distinct from the sects which were not authorised by the Roman Government. In the East, Catholicity took the form of orthodox belief combined with the autonomy of certain Churches, while in the West it took the form of ecclesiastical unity in the Papacy. The Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century naturally adopted a position practically identical with that of Eastern Christendom in insisting upon the independence of particular Churches while preserving all the essentials of the Catholic Faith of Christendom.⁴

These three associated ideas of geographical diffusion, doctrinal purity, and ecclesiastical fellowship are all illustrated in the Prayer Book by the phrases, "the Catholic Faith," "the good estate of the Catholic Church," "all who profess and call themselves Christians," "all them that do

¹ Bishop Lightfoot, *ut supra*.

² Swete, *ut supra*, p. 35.

³ Swete, *ut supra*, p. 38.

⁴ Field, *Of the Church*, Vol. I, pp. 89, 90. See also, *Life of Archbishop Benson*, Vol. II, p. 624.

confess Thy Holy Name," "Thine elect in one communion and fellowship in the mystical body of Thy Son," "the Holy Catholic Church."

It will thus be seen that it involves a false antithesis to speak of Christians as either "Catholic" or "Protestant." The word "Protestant" is not opposed to what is Catholic, but to what is distinctively Roman Catholic, that is, to the perversion of Catholic truth and departure from true Catholicity. The various Evangelical Reformed Churches, in accepting those fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith which are found in the New Testament, rightly claim the true title of "Catholic"; and it is noteworthy that in the Bidding Prayer these words occur, "Ye shall pray for Christ's whole Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christ's people dispersed throughout the world."¹

So that we now have the interesting and significant feature of Evangelical Churches all over the world to-day returning to the original idea of the word "Catholic" as expressed in Ignatius, "Where Jesus Christ may be, there is the Catholic Church."² The word is, therefore, most appropriate as testifying to the world-wide extension of the Gospel in the purpose of God. As Christianity is intended for all men, so all Christians form the Catholic Church. The sole use of the term "Catholic" by any one body of Christians is obviously a contradiction in terms. The Church Catholic is the Church universal, not any one Church, however large or well known. In its Catholicity all differences and distinctions, whether of race or position or capacity, are unified and utilised in the one fellowship of the saints in Christ Jesus.³

ARTICLE XXII.—PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

It seems impossible to consider Purgatory without giving some attention to Prayers for the Dead. The statement is sometimes made that as the Article in its original draft contained condemnation of Prayers for the Dead, which was omitted before the Articles were published, "the Church of England deliberately abstained from seeming to express any condemnation of the practice of praying for the departed."⁴ But whatever may have been the cause of the omission, it may be questioned whether this inference is warranted in view of the facts to be adduced. The subject was one of great prominence at the time of the Reformation,

¹ Canons of 1604, No. 55.

² "For its theological content the *locus classicus* is the edict of the three Emperors—Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius, A.D. 380; 'we will that those who embrace this (the Trinitarian) Creed be called Catholic Christians'; and in this sense the great Churches of the Reformation, the Church of England among them, are Catholic" (Review of Dr. Swete's book, *ut supra*, *Nation*, 11th December 1915).

³ For a fuller description of the word and its bearing on several modern questions, reference may be made to the author's *Catholic Faith*, pp. 340-360.

⁴ Gibson. *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 538.

and it has obtained a good deal of attention in recent years. It is, therefore, a matter of real importance to discover what Holy Scripture and the Church of England teach on the subject.

I.—THE MEANING OF PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

Are they prayers for the unconverted dead? This is not the case in the Church of Rome. That Church holds as firmly as we do the finality of this life as an opportunity for accepting or rejecting Christ. Nor is it so, generally, in the case of Anglicans who pray for the dead. They, too, realise the force of the appeal to "now" and "to-day" as the accepted and only time of salvation. Prayer for the dead could be understood if we believed in another probation, in another opportunity after this life, but this is not the teaching of the Romish Church or of the majority of the extreme Anglicans. It should never be overlooked that prayer for the dead does not necessarily involve belief in Purgatory. Such prayer was offered ages before the doctrine of Purgatory arose, and is practised to-day in the Greek Church, which rejects Purgatory as Roman. Prayer for the dead implies belief in benefit accruing in some way without any belief in mitigation of Purgatorial suffering.

The prayers must, therefore, be for the Christian dead. This is the meaning of the practice in the Roman Church, and in the case of those in the Anglican Church who adopt the custom. They both pray for the converted dead and say, "May they rest in peace, and may light perpetual shine on them."

But why should we pray for the Christian dead? They are "with Christ" (Phil. i. 23) in conscious fellowship. They are "present with the Lord" (2 Cor. v. 8). They are "with Him in Paradise" (Luke xxiii. 43). They are blessed, for "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord" (Rev. xiv. 13). The New Testament outlook concerning the blessed dead is one of joy, peace and expectation; we are to remember their past life, imitate their faith, and praise God for them. It seems to be unnecessary and even cruel to pray, "May they rest in peace," for it reflects on their present peace, joy, and satisfaction in the immediate presence of Christ our Lord.

II.—THE FOUNDATION OF PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

Prayer must be based on God's Revelation. Prayer finds its warrant in promise. It is evident that prayer, if it is to be real and definite, must be based upon the Word of God as its warrant and encouragement. The Bible is accordingly full of teaching on prayer. There are examples of prayer, encouragements to prayer, models of prayer, and records of answers to prayer. The Bible is the embodiment of God's revelation in Christ, and as such it is at once the foundation and guide of our prayers.

God's revelation is thus the source and spring of our human response, and prayer is based on God's promises as revealed in His Word. At the same time Holy Scripture is the safeguard and limitation of all prayer, for it is obvious that we cannot pray for everything that might conceivably come into our minds, but only for those things that are included in the revealed will of God. Thus, when our Lord said, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My Name, He will give it you" (John xiv. 23), the "whatsoever" is limited by the phrase "in My Name," which teaches us that it is only as we ask *in union with God's revealed will* that we can really pray and be assured of answers. We can only pray definitely or satisfactorily in so far as we have the Divine warrant for praying. This practice must therefore be based, not on sentiment, but on Scripture. In a matter of this kind it ought to be clear that our desires are not a reliable guide. God, who is love, must understand our yearnings, and we may be sure He would not keep back anything profitable to us. And yet, as we shall see, there is not a single command or promise or example in Scripture. May we not argue fairly on this point from the silence of the Bible? As God has not revealed Himself in regard to this matter it is impossible to pray with assurance, because prayer must be based on Revelation.

Revelation is clearly for this life. God's Word is almost silent as to the details of the future life, and absolutely silent as to any relation of prayer to that life. As to the unconverted, the present life is decisive and final in relation to opportunity; and as to the converted, while there is doubtless growth in the Kingdom of God in the state after death, as there must be to all eternity, yet no one syllable is to be found in God's Word to tell us that our prayers can either effect or affect that growth. If they see the face of Christ, they surely do not need our prayers. And our knowledge of that life is so small that prayer cannot be intelligent, only sentimental, uninformed. "Thy Kingdom come" is not prayer for the dead, because we say, "on earth as in Heaven." Prayer for others is bounded by this life, and after this, prayer is swallowed up in praise.

Prayer for the dead is, of course, quite intelligible on the Roman Catholic theory of Purgatory, though, as already seen, it is not inevitably bound up with it. If souls pass from here imperfect and need purification for eternal glory it is easy to understand how, according to Roman principles, prayer can be made for them. But with the rejection of the idea of a Purgatory, the practice of prayers for the dead tends to fall to the ground. But whether connected or not, the practice is not warranted by Scripture or our Church. Even those who associate prayers for the dead with the Communion of Saints are compelled to limit their prayers to the most general terms, and thereby entirely to alter the idea of prayer from the definite petitions and intercessions which we use on earth. The only justification of prayers for the dead would be to pray for them as definitely and pointedly as when they were here. But this would be to

deny the teaching of the New Testament concerning their joy and blessedness in the presence of Christ.

The question then arises, Is there anything in the Bible which includes the Christian dead in our prayers? Can we discover anything in Holy Scripture from which we may infer that prayer for the dead comes within the scope of the promise—"Whatsoever ye shall ask in My Name"?

Can we find any instance of prayer for the dead in the Old Testament? Not one.

Is there any example or precept as to prayer for the dead in the Gospels and in the life and works of our Lord? Not one.

Can we discover any example or encouragement in the life of the early Church as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles? Not one.

Is there to be found any clear testimony to prayer for the dead in the Apostolic Epistles? Not one.

Is there any instance of prayer for the dead in the Revelation? Not one.

The following passages are sometimes used to justify the practice:—

"Everyone shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt" (Mark ix. 49). But what is here on the subject before us? The text is clearly a symbolical statement concerning spiritual discipline in this life.

"The fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is" (1 Cor. iii. 13). But the whole passage clearly refers to the testing of Christian faithfulness at the judgment-seat of Christ; there is not a hint of prayer for the dead.

"Baptised for the dead" (1 Cor. xv. 29). But whatever be the true interpretation, there is no reference to prayer.

"He went and preached unto the spirits in prison" (1 Pet. iii. 19). This passage, whatever it means, has no reference to the Christian dead, but to certain spirits "which sometime were disobedient."

"The Gospel was preached also to them that are dead" (1 Pet. iv. 6). Whatever interpretation we give to this passage, there is no reference to prayer for the Christian dead.

The only passage in the New Testament that can be adduced as a possible warrant is 2 Tim. i. 18. It is urged that Onesiphorus was dead when St. Paul wrote. The elements of the interpretation of this passage are somewhat as follows:—

(1) It is entirely uncertain whether Onesiphorus was alive or dead. No one can possibly decide one way or the other. This is not a very hopeful way of deriving an important doctrine from the passage.

(2) The assumption that he was dead is, therefore, entirely gratuitous. In 1 Cor. i. 16 and xvi. 15, compared with Romans xvi. 10, 11, we see that households can be referred to without the head of the house being dead.

(3) Then the view that Onesiphorus was dead probably runs foreign

to the context. If we compare verse 15, we see that some had forsaken St. Paul, but that Onesiphorus had not been ashamed of the prisoner and his chain (*vv.* 16-18); then Timothy is urged to the same boldness (*cf.* chap. ii. 1, "Therefore"). There is nothing here to warrant the idea of the death of Onesiphorus.

(4) Even supposing Onesiphorus was dead, it might be possible to express a wish like this for a friend without in the least admitting the principles on which prayer for the dead can be taken seriously. Dr. Swete, believing that Onesiphorus was dead, points out that, even so, the prayer is "for his acceptance in the day of Christ and not for his well-being in the intermediate life."¹

Looking over the entire revelation of God we cannot help observing two things: (a) In the Levitical code, there are minute instructions as to all sorts of sacrifices, and yet, with sacrifices for the dead familiar all around in heathen religions, not a hint is given about them in the Mosaic law. (b) The New Testament, while so emphatic on the efficacy of prayer under all circumstances of life, never once extends the practice to the next world, even though often alluding to the dead and the future life.

From Scripture, therefore, the one fount of essential truth, we have no warrant, no foundation for Prayers for the Dead, but everything that looks in the opposite direction.

We have next to consider:—

III.—THE EARLY HISTORY OF PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

It is generally thought that the Jews prayed for the dead, and that a passage in 2 Macc. xii. points in that direction. Jewish liturgies of the present day certainly have them. But it has been pointed out² that the passage in Maccabees does not necessarily involve Prayers for the Dead, nor is it certain that the present Jewish liturgies are of pre-Christian date. In any case, however, we have no record of our Lord and His Apostles observing such a custom, and it would be very precarious to base a Christian practice of such moment on merely Jewish grounds even if we were sure of them. Nor are we justified in arguing in support of the practice from Christ's silence.

In the Christian Church it is to be carefully noted that the earliest form of the phrase indicated by R.I.P. was not "requiescat," but "requiescit," which states the fact, "he rests in peace." The earliest inscriptions of the Catacombs, too, are "in pace," "in Christo," etc., without any prayer.³ All primitive history points to the remarkable joy

¹ Swete, *The Holy Catholic Church*.

² C. H. H. Wright, *The Intermediate State*, pp. 28-43. See also an article in *The Expositor* for April 1915, by the Rev. J. W. Hunkin, which arrives independently at the same conclusion.

³ De Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Roma septimo saculo antiquiores*; Vol. I; R. Scott, *The Contents and Teachings of the Catacombs*, p. 159.

and definite certainty associated with Christian funerals, the thought of the beloved one being with the Lord overpowering all else. The future had no shadows, and praise, not prayer, was the attitude of these believers.

Dr. H. B. Swete, himself in favour of prayers for the dead, writes as follows :—

1. The first century has scarcely any evidence to offer. . . . The New Testament contains but one passage which can fairly be construed as a prayer for the dead. Early post-canonical writers are equally reticent. The letter of Clement contains petitions of all sorts . . . but makes no reference of any sort to the Christian dead.

2. This lack of evidence continues until past the middle of the second century. . . . It is certainly remarkable that nothing of the [same] kind occurs among the numerous inscriptions on Christian tombs in Phrygia, collected by Sir W. M. Ramsay.

3. It is at Carthage that prayers for the dead . . . are first seen. . . . Yet other Churches do not seem to have followed suit, and Origen's silence is "most remarkable."

4. The conclusion is that there is nothing to show communion for the departed during the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic periods.¹

Surely this absolute silence to the end of the second century is impressive and significant. When prayers for the dead actually began in the Christian Church they were very simple and marked by a true reserve, because of our ignorance. They were merely prayers for the soul's rest, and that it might be placed at God's Right Hand. But the mind of man is impatient of restraint, and so something more definite was wanted to pray for. The order of thought and feeling seems to have been somewhat on this line, though, of course, not always definitely and consciously, nor all at once, but extending through several centuries: (1) Prayer implies need. (2) Need suggests imperfection. (3) Imperfection involves progress. (4) Progress indicates purification. (5) Purification demands suffering, and from this came the fully developed mediæval doctrine of Purgatory which, as we have seen, means purification based on the fact that the full penal consequences of sin are not all remitted in this life.

It is unnecessary to stay to discuss all this in detail, but this much may be said: (1) We can readily see how far it all is from New Testament simplicity; and (2) Suffering is not necessarily remedial and purifying; it often hardens. Joy is on the whole quite as purgative as suffering, and some would say that it is much more so.

This was the state of the case before the Reformation, and we are at once brought to :—

IV.—THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

This calls for our most careful attention and study, and we have to note the following stages of the history.

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1907, p. 500.

(a) In 1549 came the first Reformed Prayer Book, and in it were prayers for the dead, distinct and definite. The prayer now called the Prayer for the Church Militant was then headed, "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church," and a petition for the departed was included in the prayer. There were also prayers for the dead in the Burial Service. But the Visitation Articles of 1549 which enforced this Prayer Book ordered "that no man maintain Purgatory . . . or any other such abuses and superstitions." So that our Reformers prohibited the doctrine of Purgatory while continuing to pray for the dead. This is proof that prayers for the dead are not necessarily connected with the Roman doctrine of Purgatory.

(b) In 1552, came the second Reformed Prayer Book. From this prayers for the dead were deliberately omitted, and the word "militant here in earth" added to the heading of the prayer. The Burial Service was altered in accordance with this so as to express the present joy of the holy dead, "with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity." This change from 1549 deserves careful notice.

Bishop Drury¹ correctly calls this "the absence of direct and unambiguous prayer for the departed." But it is something more, for "what is quite certain is that direct and unequivocal utterances of prayer for the faithful departed were then removed and have never been restored."

One of the Homilies speaks in unmistakable plainness of the needlessness of prayers for the dead.

"Now, to entreat of that question, whether we ought to pray for them that are departed out of this world, or no? Wherein, if we cleave only unto the Word of God, then must we needs grant that we have no commandment so to do. . . . Therefore, let us not deceive ourselves, thinking that either we may help other, or other may help us by their good and charitable prayers in time to come. . . . Neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers: but, as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to Heaven, or else to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption. The only purgatory wherein we must trust to be saved, is the death and blood of Christ, which if we apprehend with a true and stedfast faith, it purgeth and cleanseth us from all our sins, even as well as if He were now hanging upon the cross. . . . If this kind of purgation will not serve them, let them never hope to be released by other men's prayers, though they should continue therein unto the world's end. . . . Let us not, therefore, dream either of purgatory, or of prayer for the souls of them that be dead; but let us earnestly and diligently pray for them which are expressly commanded in Holy Scripture, namely, for kings and rulers; for ministers of God's holy word and sacraments; for the saints of this world, otherwise called the faithful; to be short, for all men living, be they never so great enemies to God and His people."²

¹ Dr. Drury, *Churchman*, January 1909, p. 21.

² The Homilies, pp. 337-340.

This was published within about twenty years of the Prayer Book of 1552. It will be noticed that the condemnation is of the practice *per se*, and not merely when associated with Purgatory. Bishop Drury says this shows the view that was taken by leading Elizabethan divines, and throws at least an important side-light on the facts already adduced.¹

(c) In 1559 one of the reasons in Geste's letter to Cecil against the restoration of the Prayer Book of 1549 was that it contained prayers for the dead.²

(d) At the time of the revision of 1662 a proposal was made to omit the words "militant here in earth," and at one stage a prayer for the dead was actually inserted by some of the Revisers, but rejected by Convocation, and there the matter stands to this day, a thanksgiving for the departed alone being added.

This is the Church of England history on the subject, clear and definite, and surely capable of only one meaning.

In support of this position it can be shown that the Reformers and their immediate successors, men like Cranmer, Jewel, and Whitgift, all rejected prayer for the dead.³

It is said, however, that there are two passages where we pray for the dead.

(1) In the Post-Communion Collect.—"That we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion." But surely the Church above has obtained "remission." These words were drawn up by the men who deliberately omitted prayers for the dead in 1552.

(2) "That with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom." But this is a statement about *them*, and a prayer for *ourselves*. It is in the prayer for the *Church Militant*, and that phrase covers the whole prayer. We thank God for the departed; we do not pray for them.

Such is the Church of England history and doctrine. And if it be said, as it has been sometimes, that prayers for the dead have never been forbidden in the Church of England, we reply that this is true in word, but false in fact. What is the meaning of the changes made in 1552? Either they mean something or they do not. If they do not, or did not, why were they made? Indeed, we may ask what any of the Reformation changes meant? In the beginning of our Prayer Book we have, "Of Ceremonies, why some be Abolished, and some Retained." Prayer for the dead was one of those things that were abolished. Omission, therefore, clearly means prohibition. To say simply that a thing is "not forbidden" would justify almost anything that an individual clergyman might choose to adopt.

The former Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Davidson) distinguishes between private and public prayers for the dead, and says that the

¹ *Churchman, ut supra*, p. 28.

² Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 52.

³ Blakeney, *Book of Common Prayer, its History and Interpretation*, p. 457-458, edited 1866.

Church has deliberately excluded such from her Services.¹ Thus Bishop Andrewes had them in his private devotions, but cut them out of the public Service for the Consecration of Graveyards.²

In the course of a review of a book advocating prayers for the dead, the *Guardian* frankly admitted that the practice was only justifiable on the assumption that the condition of the departed is not fixed at the time of death. When the wording of the prayer at the Burial Service is remembered, "With whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity," it is not difficult to see the position of the Church about the state of the faithful at and after death. There is no doubt that the Prayer Book in its final form excluded all explicit prayers for the departed from the public Services. All Souls' Day has not been recognised by the Prayer Book, and was omitted at the Reformation from the Table of Feasts and the Calendar.³ All this gives force to Bishop Drury's conclusion that "the statement that such prayers are nowhere forbidden (except in the Homilies) is not complete or fair unless the above fact [about the rejection of the practice proposed in 1662] is placed side by side with it."

We must not fail to notice how the New Testament meets the supposed demand for prayers for the dead.

V.—THE SAFEGUARD AGAINST PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

(a) The New Testament generally is our best safeguard.

The burden there is on "now." The whole stress is on the *present*. We are to pray for others now, work for them now, endeavour to save them now. We intercede for them now because of their *need*. There is no revelation of need *then*, but just the opposite.

(b) The doctrine of Justification specifically is our perfect safeguard.

The root of prayers for the dead is failure to realise what Justification means. We are "accounted righteous before God" from the very moment we accept Christ. This Justification settles at once and for ever our position before God. Our spiritual standing is unchanged through life, and our title to heaven is at once and for ever given. Justification is not repeated, it is permanent, and this settles the question of heaven and God's presence once for all. We must ever remember that the Romish doctrine of Purgatory is not connected with Sanctification, but with Justification. It is not part of a process for making Christians holier, but a supplementary process rendered necessary because all the penal consequences are not remitted in this life. Purgatory is required because the debt is not fully discharged here. But what saith the Scripture? "There is, therefore, no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom.

¹ *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, Vol. II, p. 408.

² See Dr. Drury, *Churchman*, *ut supra*, p. 28.

³ *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, Vol. IV, pp. 45-48; 1024.

viii. 1). If only we teach, preach, live, and enjoy that blessed truth we shall never use prayers for the dead.

VI.—RECENT DISCUSSIONS

The question has naturally obtained renewed attention through the War, and certain statements of representative Churchmen compel a fresh consideration of the position of the Bible and the Church of England. The Archbishop of Canterbury in a sermon on 2nd November 1914, and in his Diocesan Gazette, seems to have modified the view expressed in his evidence before the Royal Commission already quoted. While, on the one hand, he is strong against the danger of abuses, such as we find in the sixteenth century and continued in certain quarters to this day, yet on the other he is of opinion that there must be no discouragement of the "devout soul in prayer for the loved one out of sight." These words state the Archbishop's position from both standpoints:—

"My earnest wish is to be helpful, in this time of anxiety, strain and sorrow, to those who, in perfect loyalty to Church of England teaching, feel, and, I think, rightly feel, that they need not cease from reverent and trustful prayer on behalf of husband, son, or brother who has passed from the life we know and see into the larger life beyond.

"The subject of prayers definitely offered on behalf of those whose life on earth is ended is shrouded in so much mystery as to call for the utmost care and reserve on our part in handling it. 'God is in heaven and we upon earth; therefore let our words be few.' The Church of England, it is hardly necessary to say, has nowhere declared it to be unlawful or erroneous to believe in the propriety and efficacy of such petitions. But as a consequence of exaggerated and superstitious teaching, and of grave misuse, our Church reverently, yet rigidly, excluded from prayers prescribed by authority for public and general use phrases which convey a definite prayer for the departed as distinguished from, or separated from, those now upon earth. For example, the words in our Order of the Holy Communion 'that we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins,' were regarded by high contemporary authority as including the faithful who are beyond the grave, but it cannot be said that in their context they necessarily have that meaning. I desire loyally to maintain the distinction, markedly drawn by Bishop Andrewes and other great Anglican divines, between those beliefs, based upon definite Scriptural proof, the teaching of which is incorporated in our public formularies, and on the other hand opinions and beliefs which fall short of such definite proof. If the distinction be borne in mind, I have no doubt at all that prayers for the dead are permissible to loyal sons and daughters of our Church so long as they do not imply a condition of the departed which our Article XXII ('Of Purgatory') has definitely condemned."

In the same direction are the words of the late Bishop of Durham (Dr. Moule) in his *Christus Consolator* (pp. 96-98), thereby marking a definite change from his *Outlines of Christian Doctrine* (p. 97), where, speaking of the arguments used in favour of prayer for the dead in the early

Church, as against "frequent criticism," he says: "These defences are inadequate, against the total silence of Scripture." The recent utterances of the Bishop are as follows:—

"Upon the grave and tender problem of prayer for the departed, the Bible, so I venture to think, after long reflection, is absolutely reserved. I cannot think, therefore, that the warrant for such prayer is a fact of revelation. Christians who so pray should have a reverent regard, when there is any occasion for such a feeling, for the misgivings of others, in whom, very probably, the thought of spiritual communion with their vanished ones is just as strong and warm as in themselves, and who continually greet them in the Lord, reaching them in Him through the veil. Only, they do not see the warrant for intercessory prayer for them.

"They do think, perhaps, and most justly, that at least the too easy use of such prayer may tend *to muffle* the divine appeals to man to seek salvation to-day.

"Misgivings about prayer for the dead are wholly justified, if the prayer in question means necessarily prayer for deliverance from gloom and pain, rather than a breath of loving aspiration sent after the spirit into its abode of light, asking, as a certainty may be asked for, for the perpetual growth in the emancipated being of the graces and the bliss of the heavenly rest, and its holy progress and education in the knowledge of its Lord. It is undoubted that such prayer for the departed is found in the fragmentary remains of very early Christian literature, certainly within half a century of the last apostles. Never there, nor ever in the inscriptions of the Roman catacombs, I think, does it suggest a purgatorial belief. It might almost be said to be, as regards its spirit, as much salutation and aspiration as petition. But in form it is prayer. And I for one cannot condemn such exercises of the soul, where reverent thought invites to it, in the private devotions of a Christian."¹

These are significant utterances and indicate a desire (due to the circumstances of the War) to modify the Church of England rule about limiting prayer to that which can be definitely proved from Holy Scripture. Now while it is natural to feel intense sympathy with those who have lost loved ones in battle, the question must still be faced in the light of Holy Scripture, for it is part of the purpose of the Bible as the Word of God to guide, guard and control our natural desires and cravings. The following considerations must, therefore, be kept clearly and constantly in view.

1. When the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline issued its Report in 1906 a chapter was devoted to the subject. The Commissioners stated that the Church of England had never formally condemned prayers for the dead, as distinguished from their public use in her services. Representative Divines of the Church, it was pointed out, have again and again protested against the necessity of a connection, such as is by Roman Catholic writers constantly assumed to exist, between the doctrine of Purgatory and prayers for the departed. The Commissioners at the

¹ Thess. iv. 14 (Footnote by Bishop Moule): "Its introduction into public worship is, in view of differing beliefs, another matter, on which I do not speak here."

same time made it clear that they dissociated themselves from all public services and prayers for the dead, concerning which evidence was given, according to their opinion, "significant of teaching which is entirely inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England."

2. It is obvious on the Archbishop's admission in his sermon that "no explicit prayers for the departed at all were admitted into the public language of the Church, and people were taught to rely in these public offices upon that alone which can be definitely proved by Holy Scripture."

3. Then comes the enquiry whether the prayer recommended by the Archbishop is for the Christian or for the non-Christian dead. His words suggest the former, and, if so, the entire problem is raised of the relation of the Christian soul to God. If the soul has passed away as a believer, then its *title* to Heaven through Justification is assured, and prayer in such a case cannot be for anything else than growth in grace. But have we any warrant from Scripture for such a prayer? To ask the question is to answer it. And is it logical to pray for anyone who is confessedly at peace in the presence of Christ? It is generally admitted by advocates of the practice that it implies some need of purification.

4. But another question at once arises.—Is it possible in such circumstances as those of war to limit our prayers for the faithful departed? Is there not an equally instinctive desire, indeed, a greater longing, to pray for those of whose salvation we are not certain? But, if so, we are at once faced with the solemn and serious idea of a second probation, "the larger hope," and again the enquiry comes: Is this according to Scripture? There is no doubt that prayers for the dead do imply a belief in some state of imperfection which needs to be removed, and it becomes a serious question whether the traditional limitation of prayers for the faithful departed can be maintained. As already seen, prayers for the dead did not arise out of Purgatory, but they have always been associated with that doctrine, and if once prayer is extended beyond the Christian dead, some form of Purgatory will assuredly be demanded.

Even the words of the Archbishop are not quite clear when he speaks of the one who has passed away still growing "in truer purity and in deepened reverence and love." This thought of a "truer purity" seems to imply that something in the Intermediate State can minister to a spiritual condition "truer" than that experienced below. But is not such an idea really a confusion between the soul's *title* to Heaven and its *place* there? No one can question that prayer for the dead is associated in most minds with the thought of discipline after death. And in view of the fact that we know nothing about the condition of the departed, is it not fair to urge that we cannot pray for them with anything like the definiteness and assurance we enjoy in intercessory prayer for them while on earth? If our prayers are to be at once satisfying to ourselves and pleasing to God, they ought to be strictly limited to the Divine revelation in Holy Scripture. The great danger is that by the practice of prayer we shall imply that there is some change of spiritual condition

between death and resurrection which we can effect by our intercession.¹

Under all these circumstances, we would, therefore, again urge the following considerations:—

(1) The importance and significance of the silence of the New Testament.—Nothing can be more remarkable than the way in which our Lord and His Apostles never refer to prayer for the dead. “Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord” (Rev. xi. 13). Observe Bishop Moule’s significant words:—

“The Bible . . . is absolutely reserved. I cannot think, therefore, that the warrant for such prayer is a fact of revelation.”

(2) The Witness of the Early Church.—Bishop Moule claims for the practice a time “within half a century of the last Apostles.” But this, as we have seen, is not supported by Dr. Swete. A practice for which there is no real proof earlier than the end of the second century, the time of Tertullian, can hardly be called primitive, and, as Dr. Swete has shown, prayer for the dead is certainly by no means prominent, indeed scarcely noticeable at all, in the earliest Church.

(3) The history of the Church of England.—The changes in 1552 and 1662 tell their own story, and though there are a few who, like Cosin, have intended prayer for the dead in some of the phrases of the Prayer Book, no one can doubt that the balance of evidence is overwhelmingly on the other side.

It is frequently urged that we pray for the dead when we ask in the Church Militant Prayer, “That with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly Kingdom,” and also in the words in the Burial Service, “That we with all those who are departed in the true faith of Thy Holy Name may have our perfect consummation and bliss.” But it may be asked: (a) How could this be the purpose of the Reformers when such vital changes were made by these very men between 1549 and 1552? (b) Is this the real meaning of the words? Surely “we with

¹ Dr. Wace, the late Dean of Canterbury, interprets the Archbishop’s language in the same way, for, after deprecating the introduction of “petitions which imply suppositions respecting the condition of the soul in the Intermediate State, of which Scripture tells us nothing,” he says: “Even the Archbishop’s language might give some encouragement to such suppositions, when he speaks of praying for him . . . who still lives and, as we may surely believe, still grows from strength to strength in truer purity and in deepened reverence and love.” Then, Dr. Wace adds, “whoever believes that does so without warrant of Scripture, and prayer based on such a belief has no authority in revelation. The hope of the Christian is not that his soul will be gradually purified after death, but that, in the words of the commendatory prayer in the Service of the Visitation of the Sick, it may, in death itself, be washed in the blood of that immaculate Lamb, and presented, when it leaves the body, ‘pure and without spot’ unto God. Prayers, in short, which have any tinge of a purgatorial view are unauthorised by Scripture, and inconsistent with a most blessed element of Evangelical hope and faith.” These words are all the more weighty, because Dr. Wace favours prayer to the extent of commendation of the departed to God and that the fulfilment of the Divine promises for the Judgment Day may be realised (*The War and the Gospel*, p. 225 f.).

them ” is different from “ they with us.” Their position is clear, for they are “ departed in the faith and fear of God,” but “ we ” are still here. Further, if the Church Militant Prayer is to have this interpretation, it will imply that participation in the Kingdom of Heaven by the faithful departed is, somehow or other, dependent on our lives ; “ give *us* grace . . . that (*they*) may be partakers.” The absurdity of such an idea hardly needs to be mentioned. But if the statement is properly interpreted to be equivalent to “ like them we,” there is a perfect balance of thought and expression. And if, as it has been well said, we wish to go with a person, it implies that the person is assuredly going.

(4) Our ignorance of the future state and, therefore, the impossibility of intelligent prayer.—What do we really know of the future life? Practically nothing; and at the same time absolutely nothing in regard to any bearing of our prayers thereon. How, then, can we be of service to the dead by prayers for them? Either our prayers benefit them or they do not. To limit prayer for the departed to “ a breath of loving aspiration sent after the spirit into its abode of light ” is hardly likely to be adequate and satisfying to those who are accustomed to the practice.

(5) May we not also enquire whether the War, with all its strain and stress, great as they are, can really make such a change as is involved in praying for the departed? If the practice was wrong before, it must still be wrong, while if it is right now, it must have been right before. Such a revolution as is here implied cannot be justified even by the War.

For further study, see *The Intermediate State*, by Dr. C. H. H. Wright; *The Blessed Dead: Do They Need Our Prayers?* by H. Falloon; *Prayers for the Dead*, by Bishop Drury.

ARTICLE XXVII.—THE MODE OF BAPTISM

Although the Article is not concerned with the method of baptism it is impossible to avoid a reference to it in view of modern controversies. The rubric in the Baptismal Office places immersion first, but allows pouring as an alternative.

“ If they shall certify him that the child may well endure it he shall dip it in the water discreetly and warily. . . . But if they certify that the child is weak it shall suffice to pour water upon it.”

And yet it is clear that the use of the word “ dip ” does not necessarily mean what is usually understood as immersion, for in the case of the baptism of those of riper years the person to be baptised is to stand by the font, and then the clergyman “ shall dip him in the water, or pour water upon him.” From this it is clear that “ dipping ” may mean partial or total, and, strictly, partial dipping is described as immersion, and total

dipping by submersion. It is the latter, submersion, that is held by Baptists to be the only right mode, and it is this that calls for special consideration.

The word used for "Baptism" is βαπτίζω, not βαπτω, and as the latter means "to dip," but is never used for the ordinance of baptism, it is clear that we must derive the significance of the former word from the usage. The word βαπτω is used three times only in the New Testament: (1) The dipping of the tip of the finger of Lazarus in water (Luke xvi. 24); (2) Our Lord's dipping of the sop which He gave to Judas (John xiii. 26); (3) The Lord's vesture dipped in blood (Rev. xix. 13). But it is noteworthy that there is a difference of reading in this last passage, and the Revised Version favours the reading "sprinkled" instead of "dipped."

The various arguments drawn from the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, Classical Greek, and the New Testament can be studied in the author's *The Catholic Faith* (p. 402 ff.).

Christian History and Archæology afford no evidence that the early Christians thought they could not be baptised except by immersion. The only evidence we possess on the point is found in a well-known passage in the Didache (chap. vii) which runs thus:—

"Now concerning Baptism, thus baptise ye; having first uttered all these things, baptise unto the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living water. But if thou hast not living water baptise in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm; but if thou hast neither, pour water upon the head thrice unto the Name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit."

This passage shows that dipping in running water rather than in a baptistery was the method preferred by early Christians, but it shows with equal clearness that dipping was a question of preference and not of necessity. Surely this expresses the true Apostolic spirit, and to insist upon one precise method as necessary to baptism is not only untrue to all that we know of usage, but also out of all harmony with the true conception of the Christian religion.

ARTICLE XXVIII.—THE HISTORY OF ANGLICAN DOCTRINE ON THE HOLY COMMUNION

It is sometimes urged that the Prayer Book and Articles are not in harmony on the doctrine of the Holy Communion, and this makes it imperative to give special attention to the history associated with the various Revisions of the Prayer Book and Articles. There are eight periods to be studied. The First Prayer Book of 1549; the Second Prayer Book of 1552; the Forty-two Articles of 1553; the Eliza-

bethan Prayer Book of 1559; the Thirty-eight Articles of 1563; the Thirty-nine Articles of 1571; the Additions to the Catechism in 1604; and the last Revision of the Prayer Book in 1662.

The fundamental changes between the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 are universally recognised, and it is also admitted that in 1559 the Prayer Book of 1552, not that of 1549, was adopted as the basis. The question is whether at and since 1559 any of the changes made essentially altered the Anglican doctrine. Bishop Gibson thinks this has happened.¹ But other authorities are equally clear that fundamental doctrine has been uniform throughout.² If any such changes have taken place their character must be clearly stated. The vital problem is whether there is any doctrine which can be called "Catholic" without being Roman, which is essentially identical with the Reformed doctrine of Calvin, which Hooker believed and accepted. This is the question which has to be faced.

I.—THE PRAYER BOOK OF 1559

While adopting the Second Prayer Book of 1552 as the basis of the Elizabethan Revision, the "Black Rubric" was omitted. By some this is regarded as a mere technicality, by others as due to a deliberate effort on the part of Queen Elizabeth to win the Lutherans. In connection with this the difficulty about the Ornaments Rubric and the blending of the words of administration found respectively in the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 must be considered. It is now generally recognised that in the action of the Queen and her advisers in 1559 the Roman Catholics were not really in view, but only the desire and determination of the Queen to plant herself more firmly on the Throne by uniting all Protestants, and therefore removing from the Prayer Book anything which might seem to oppose the distinctive Lutheran view.

II.—THE ARTICLES OF 1563

As already noticed above, the third paragraph of Article XXVIII was changed, and Article XXIX, while accepted by Archbishop Parker at Convocation, was refused by the Queen. But this Royal action did not involve any essential change, since Parker was a disciple of Cranmer and held strongly the Reformed (or Swiss), not the Lutheran doctrine.³ Once again, there is no proof of an endeavour to conciliate Rome, because several significant alterations were made in the Articles at this time which resulted in their becoming more anti-Roman than even in 1552.

¹ *The Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 643-647.

² Simpson, *The Thing Signified* (Second Edition); Griffith Thomas, *A Sacrament of our Redemption*, pp. 53-79.

³ Griffith Thomas, *ut supra*, pp. 64-70.

III.—THE ARTICLES OF 1571

In 1563 Bishop Guest claimed to be the author of the new paragraph of Article XXVIII, though, as we have seen, these very words are found in Archbishop Parker's own draft. Guest desired to make it possible for Lutherans, like Bishop Cheney, to accept the Articles. Bishop Gibson lays great stress on Guest's claim to this authorship, but the Judges in the Bennett Judgment practically set it aside as either impossible or unworthy of notice. But in 1571 Archbishop Parker obtained the reinsertion of Article XXIX, which was accepted by the Queen, and thereupon Guest admitted that Lutheranism was henceforward impossible. Somehow or other he brought himself to sign the Articles, but Bishop Cheney did not do so. In 1577 the Lutheran Church definitely denounced the doctrine taught in Article XXIX, and almost used our very words in so doing.

IV.—THE CATECHISM OF 1604

In the sacramental addition to the Catechism Bishop Gibson sees a further endeavour to return to a more "Catholic" doctrine on the Holy Communion.¹ And this contention is alleged by other writers of the same school. But it is overlooked that these Questions and Answers come almost verbally from Nowell's *Catechism*, which is known to be a thoroughly Protestant document of the Reformed, not Lutheran, type.² And several modern writers urge strongly that no fundamental change was made by these additions.³

V.—THE PRAYER BOOK OF 1662

The only point to be considered here is the re-insertion of the "Black Rubric" with the verbal change from "real" to "corporal." It is sometimes argued that this involves a significant and vital change of doctrine. The question is solely one of evidence. It was the Puritans who requested the re-insertion of the Rubric, and there is no evidence of any change of doctrine being intended by those who replaced it in the Prayer Book. The change of terminology was necessary, because the word "real" in the sixteenth century meant the same as the word "corporal" in the seventeenth.⁴ To have inserted the Rubric with the word "real" would have led to misunderstanding, since men like Jeremy Taylor used it to express the presence of a definite Protestant and anti-

¹ *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 647.

² Dimock, *Papers on the Eucharistic Presence*, p. 306.

³ Simpson, *The Thing Signified*.

⁴ Dean Aldrich.

Roman type.¹ The Rubric really turns on the statement that our Lord's Body is in heaven, not here, and this remained unchanged.

In view of these facts, and it is admitted that they represent in summary the whole of what was done at various times, it is clear that no change of Anglican doctrine was made from 1552 onwards, but that it has remained uniform throughout.

SPECIAL NOTE ON ESCHATOLOGY

It is well known that in 1553 there were four Articles dealing with questions connected with "The Last Things," and while the Church of England is not now committed to any of the statements contained in those Articles, reference may be made to them as included in the Forty-two Articles of 1553 as indicating what was then believed concerning eschatological problems. The subject of "The Last Things," although not included in the doctrinal statements of the Anglican formularies, has naturally occupied very great attention during the last century, but all that can be done here is to indicate in general the views that are held and to refer to some of the more important works upon the subject.

There is, perhaps, no topic on which it is more necessary to keep strictly to the exact words and meaning of Holy Scripture without attempting to draw inferences beyond those which strict exegesis allows. We must carefully examine first the language and then the teaching of Scripture before drawing any conclusions. It is important to study first of all the various words and phrases connected with the future; indeed, it is only by means of the widest possible induction of Scripture passages that we can expect to arrive at a clear idea of its meaning.

1. The great hope set forth in the New Testament is the Coming of the Lord. "From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead." Two works for study are *Ecce Venit*, by A. J. Gordon, and *Jesus is Coming*, by W. E. Blackstone. The precise interpretation of the Apocalypse in regard to the future will be found according to the Historical School in *Daniel and the Revelation*, by Tanner, and according to the Futurist School in *Lectures on the Apocalypse*, by Seiss.

2. The question of future punishment is associated with three general lines of interpretation:—(a) Universalism, implying the hope of universal restitution. For this reference can be made to *Salvator Mundi*, by Cox; *Restitution of All Things*, by Jukes; and *Eternal Hope*, by Farrar. (b) Annihilation, teaching that the wicked will be destroyed and only those who are in Christ will have eternal life. For this the books are *Life in Christ*, by Edward White; *Our Growing Creed*, by W. D. Maclaren.

¹ Bishop Moule, *Pledges of His Love*, p. 143; Tomlinson, *Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies*, p. 264; Soames, *The Real Presence*, pp. 9, 12 f.; Griffith Thomas, *ut supra*, pp. 75-78.

(c) Everlasting Punishment. This is regarded as the orthodox view according to the New Testament. The best work on this, as indeed on the general subject, is *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, by Salmond. (d) Another view which endeavours to harmonise the idea of everlasting punishment with the non-eternity of sin will be found stated and discussed in *The Eternal Saviour-Judge*, by R. L. Clarke; *Reason and Revelation* (chap. xii), by Illingworth; *Sin, a Problem of To-day* (the last pages), by Orr; *World Without End*, and *Veins of Silver*, by Garratt; and *The Victory of Love*, by T. R. Birks. Two small and little known, but weighty discussions will be found in *The Gospel in Hades*, and *Hades, or Heaven?* by R. W. Harden (Combridge & Co., Dublin). Valuable criticisms of the various modern theories will be found in *Human Destiny*, by Sir Robert Anderson, and *Immortality*, by Dr. H. R. Mackintosh. There are also several articles on the different topics included in Eschatology in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopædia*.

A BRIEF SELECTION OF BOOKS FOR FURTHER STUDY

[*Note.* The book list which appeared under this heading in earlier editions of *The Principles of Theology* fell into five sections, thus: Holy Communion (31 items), The Church and Ministry (29 items), Baptism (9 items), The Resurrection (i.e. of Jesus: 7 items), and General (31 items). The selection was almost wholly Anglican; it contained occasional and archaic items; it covered too few topics; and, inevitably, it took no account of writing since 1924. So this new book list has been prepared, containing items ancient and modern which, read in conjunction with Thomas' text, should enlighten and stimulate, if not always convince, the evangelical student who wishes to go further. Dates of original publication (normally in English, in the case of translated works) are given, for the sake of historical perspective; lack of space precludes bibliographical detail or information on reprints.]

1. CREEDS, CONFESSIONS, CATECHISMS

Cochrane, A.C., *Reformed Confessions of the 16th Century* (1966). Texts. Routley, E., *Creeds and Confessions* (1962). Summaries.

Schaff, P., *The Creeds of Christendom* (3 vols., 1876). Volume III contains Evangelical Creeds.

Torrance, T.F., *The School of Faith* (1959). Catechisms, including Calvin's (1541), the Heidelberg (1563), and Westminster's (1648).

Walker, W., *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism* (1893)

The Westminster Confession, Catechisms and Directory are available in one volume.

2. THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

Primary expositors: Rogers, T. (1607); Burnet, G. (1699); Beveridge, W. (1716); Browne, H. (1850); Boulton, T.P. (1871); Gibson, E.C.S. (1896); Kidd, B.J. (1911); Bicknell, E.J. (1919).
 Hardwick, C., *A History of the Articles* (2nd. ed., 1859).
 Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine, *Subscription and Assent to the 39 Articles* (1968).

3. HISTORIES OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

Berkhof, L., *The History of Christian Doctrines* (1937).
 Cunningham, W., *Historical Theology* (2 vols., 1862).
 Harnack, A., *History of Dogma* (7 vols., 1894-99); *Outlines of the History of Dogma* (1893). Tendentious but epoch-making.
 Kelly, J.N.D., *Early Christian Doctrines* (1958).
 Orr, J., *The Progress of Dogma* (1901).
 Nicholls, W., *Systematic and Philosophical Theology* (Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, I, 1969). The Protestant twentieth century.

4. SURVEYS OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

Barth, K., *Dogmatics in Outline* (1949); *Church Dogmatics* (12 vols., 1936-69).
 Bavinck, H., *Our Reasonable Faith* (1909, Dutch; E.T., 1956).
 Beardslee, J.W., *Reformed Dogmatics* (1965). J. Wollebius' *Compendium Theologiae Christianae* (1626) in translation, with additions from G. Voetius and F. Turretin.
 Berkhof, L., *Systematic Theology* (1937).
 Berkouwer, G.C., *Studies in Dogmatics* (14 vols: 1952-).
 Boettner, L., *Studies in Theology* (1947). Inspiration; Christian Supernaturalism; Trinity; Person of Christ; Atonement.
 Calvin, J., *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1559, Latin; E.T. by Beveridge 1845, by Battles 1960); *Tracts and Treatises on the Reformation of the Church*, int. by T.F. Torrance (3 vols. 1959).
 Denney, J., *Studies in Theology* (1894).
 Heppel, H., *Reformed Dogmatics Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources* (1950).
 Hodge, C., *Systematic Theology* (3 vols., 1872-74). Presbyterian.
 Litton, E.A., *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology* (2 parts, 1882, 1892).
 Moule, H.C.G., *Outlines of Christian Doctrine* (1889).
 Quick, O.C., *Doctrines of the Creed* (1938).
 Pearson, J., *The Creed* (1659).
 Strong, A.H., *Systematic Theology* (1907). Baptist.
 Torrance, T.F., *Theology in Reconstruction* (1965); *Theology in Reconciliation* (1975).
 Warfield, B.B., *Biblical and Theological Studies* (1952).
 Harvey, Van A., *A Handbook of Theological Terms* (1964).
 Richardson, A., ed., *A Dictionary of Christian Theology* (1969).

5. ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

- Berkouwer, G.C., *The Conflict with Rome* (1958).
 Carson, H.M., *Dawn or Twilight?* (1976).
 Rahner, K., ed., *Encyclopaedia of Theology* (1975).
 Subilia, V., *The Problem of Catholicism* (1964).
The Church Teaches: E.T. (1955) of selections from ed. H. Denzinger-C. Bannwart-J.B. Umberg-K. Rahner, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (Latin: 31st. ed., 1957).
 Vatican Council II, 1962-65: *Documents* (1966, 1976).
 Wells, D.F., *Revolution in Rome* (1973).
 Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission: *Agreement on the Eucharist* (1971), *the Doctrine of the Ministry* (1973), *Authority* (1977).

6. REVELATION AND THE BIBLE

- Berkouwer, G.C., *General Revelation* (1955); *Holy Scripture* (1975).
 Farrer, A., *The Glass of Vision* (1948). Aspects of inspiration.
 Forsyth, P.T., *The Principle of Authority* (1913).
 Henry, C.F.H., ed., *Revelation and the Bible* (1958).
 Kuyper, A., *Principles of Sacred Theology* (1954; - *Encyclopaedia of Sacred Theology*, 1899).
 Moran, G., *Theology of Revelation* (1966). Roman Catholic.
 Packer, J.I., 'Fundamentalism' and the Word of God (1958).
The Bible Speaks Again: a Guide from Holland (1969).
 Warfield, B.B., *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (1948; *Revelation and Inspiration*, 1927).
 Wenham, J.W., *Christ and the Bible* (1972).

7. GOD: THREE-IN-ONE, CREATOR, KING

- Bavinck, H., *The Doctrine of God* (1951).
 Berkouwer, G.C., *The Providence of God* (1952).
 Farrer, A., *Love Almighty and Ills Unlimited* (1962).
 Forsyth, P.T., *The Justification of God* (1916).
 Franks, R.S., *The Doctrine of the Trinity* (1953).
 Gilkey, L., *Maker of Heaven and Earth* (1959).
 Hodgson, L., *The Doctrine of the Trinity* (1943).
 Lewis, C.S., *The Problem of Pain* (1940); *Miracles* (1947).
 Lewis, H.D., *Our Experience of God* (1959).
 Mascall, E.L., *Christian Theology and Natural Science* (1956).
 Orr, J., *The Christian View of God and the World* (1893).
 Packer, J.I. *Knowing God* (1973).
 Schaeffer, F.A., *The God who is There* (1968); *He is There and He is not Silent* (1972).
 Temple, W., *Nature, Man and God* (1934).
 Wenham, J.W., *The Goodness of God* (1974).

8. MAN: CREATED AND FALLEN

- Berkouwer, G.C., *Man: The Image of God* (1962); *Sin* (1971).
 Cairns, D., *The Image of God in Man* (1973).
 Jenkins, D., *What is Man?* (1970).
 Niebuhr, R., *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (2 vols., 1941, 1943).

9. JESUS CHRIST: SAVIOUR, LORD, GOD

- Baillie, D.M., *God was in Christ* (1947).
 Berkouwer, G.C., *The Person of Christ* (1954); *The Work of Christ* (1965).
 Crawford, T.J., *The Doctrine of Holy Scripture respecting the Atonement* (1871).
 Denney, J., *The Death of Christ* (1902); *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation* (1917).
 Dillistone, F.W., *The Christian Understanding of Atonement* (1968).
 Dimock, N., *The Doctrine of the Death of Christ* (1891).
 Forsyth, P.T., *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (1909); *The Cruciality of the Cross* (1909); *The Work of Christ* (1910).
 Künneth, W., *The Theology of the Resurrection* (1965).
 Ladd, G.E., *I Believe in the Resurrection of Jesus* (1975).
 Machen, J.G., *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (1930).
 Mackintosh, H.R., *The Person of Jesus Christ* (1912).
 Marshall, I.H., *I Believe in the Historical Jesus* (1977).
 Morris, L., *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (1955); *The Cross in the New Testament* (1965); *The Lord from Heaven* (1958).
 Mozley, J.K., *The Doctrine of the Atonement* (1915).
 Murray, J., *Redemption Accomplished and Applied* (1955).
 Orr, J., *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (1907); *The Resurrection of Jesus* (1909).
 Owen, J., *The Death of Death in the Death of Christ* (1648: Works, ed. W. Goold, X).
 Pannenberg, W., *Jesus – God and Man* (1968).
 Quick, O.C., *The Gospel of the New World* (1944).
 Ramsey, A.M., *The Resurrection of Christ* (1945).
 Temple, W., *Christus Veritas* (1924).
 Torrance, T.F., *Space, Time and Incarnation* (1969); *Space, Time and Resurrection* (1977).
 Turner, H.E.W., *Jesus the Christ* (1976).
 Warfield, B.B., *The Lord of Glory* (1907); *The Person and Work of Christ* (1950).

10. THE HOLY SPIRIT

- Green, M., *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* (1975).
 Kuyper, A., *The Work of the Holy Spirit* (1900).
 Owen, J., *Pneumatologia* and other discourses on the Holy Spirit (1674-92: Works, III, IV).
 Smeaton, G., *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (1882).

Thomas, W.H. Griffith, *The Holy Spirit of God* (1913).

11. GRACE AND SALVATION

Berkouwer, G.C., *Divine Election* (1960); *Faith and Justification* (1954); *Faith and Sanctification* (1952); *Faith and Perseverance* (1958).

Buchanan, J., *The Doctrine of Justification* (1867).

Flew, R.N., *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology* (1934).

Hammond, T.C., *The New Creation* (1953).

Kung, H., *Justification* (1964). An important Roman Catholic book.

Nygren, A., *Agape and Eros* (1953).

Owen, J., *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (1677); *Indwelling Sin in Believers* (1668); *Of the Mortification of Sin in Believers* (1656); *Of Temptation* (1658); in *Works* V and VI.

Warfield, B.B., *The Plan of Salvation* (1915); *Perfectionism* (1958).

12. CHURCH, MINISTRY, SACRAMENTS

Baillie, D.M., *The Theology of the Sacraments* (1957).

Berkouwer, G.C., *The Sacraments* (1969).

Forsyth, P.T., *The Church and the Sacraments* (1917).

Quick, O.C., *The Christian Sacraments* (1927).

(a) Church.

Aulen, G., *Reformation and Catholicity* (1961).

Brunner, E., *The Misunderstanding of the Church* (1952).

Bannerman, J., *The Church of Christ* (2 vols., 1869).

Hooker, R., *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594-97).

Hort, F.J.A., *The Christian Ecclesia* (1897).

Kung, H., *The Church* (1968).

Litton, E.A., *The Church of Christ* (2nd. ed., 1898).

Neill, S.C. *The Church and Christian Union* (1968).

Nelson, J.R., *The Realm of Redemption* (1951).

Newbigin, L., *The Household of God* (1957).

Packer, J.I., ed., *All in Each Place: Towards Reunion in England* (1965).

Salmon, G., *The Infallibility of the Church*: abridged edn. by H.F. Woodhouse (1952).

(b) Ministry.

Green, M., *Called to Serve* (1964).

Manson, T.W., *The Church's Ministry* (1948); *Ministry and Priesthood, Christ's and Ours* (1958).

Modern Ecumenical Documents on the Ministry (1971). Four statements involving Roman Catholics.

Morris, L., *Ministers of God* (1964).

(c) Baptism.

Bromiley, G.W., *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers* (1953).

Goode, W., *The Effects of Baptism in the case of Infants* (1849).

Lampe, G.W.H., *The Seal of the Spirit* (1951).

Marcel, P. Ch., *The Biblical Doctrine of Infant Baptism* (1953).

Murray, J., *Christian Baptism* (1952). Presbyterian; paedobaptist.

Warns, J., *Baptism: its History and Significance* (1958). Urges believer's baptism.

(d) *Holy Communion.*

Archbishop's Commission on Christian Doctrine, *Thinking about the Eucharist* (1972).

Brilioth, Y., *Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic* (1930).

Clark, F., *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (1960).

Cranmer, T., *A Defence of the true and catholic doctrine of the Sacrament* (1550).

Dimock, N., *The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (1910); *Papers on the Eucharistic Presence* (2 vols., 1911).

Modern Eucharistic Agreement (1973). Four ecumenical statements involving Roman Catholics.

Vogan, T.S.L., *The True Doctrine of the Eucharist* (1871).

Waterland, *A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (1736).

13.LAST THINGS

Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine, *Prayer and the Departed* (1971).

Berkouwer, G.C., *The Return of Christ* (1972).

Forsyth, P.T., *This Life and the Next* (1918).

Grier, W.J., *The Momentous Event* (1945).

Leckie, J.H., *The World to Come and Final Destiny* (1918).

Pache, R., *The Future Life* (1962).

Rahner, K., *On the Theology of Death* (1969).

Salmond, S.F.D., *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality* (1895).

INDEX

- ABSOLUTION**, 320, 356
Adam, State of, 159
Adoration, 404
Advent, Second, 87. See *Coming*
Albertus Magnus, 217
Alexander of Hales, 217, 348
Altar, 317, 318, 419, 421-423
Amphilochius, 106
Anabaptists, xxix, xxxvii; 135, 156,
 179, 199, 227, 231, 313, 366,
 368, 480, 483
Angels, Invocation of, 307
Anglican Orders, Validity of, 457.
 See *Orders*
Anthropological Argument for God, 8
Anthropomorphism, 15
Antinomianism, 194, 205, 480
Apocrypha, 91; Article VI, 103-120
Apollinarianism, 41, 69
Apostles' Creed, 146, 147, 148
Apostles, relation to ministry, 314-316,
 324, 327, 337
 Corrupt following of, 353
Apostolical Succession, 324, 337, 338
Aquileia, Church of, 64, 148
Aquinas, Thomas, 179, 201; on Works
 before Justification, 211; In-
 dulgences, 217; 225, 242, 294;
 Sacraments, 348, 358, 367
Arianism, 36-38, 41, 69, 148
Ariminum, 69
Arminianism, xlix; 179, 244, 245
Articles, Need, xxv, xxix
 Value of, xxv-xxviii; 489
 Relation to Lutheran Confessions,
 xxx
 Relation to Swiss Confessions, xxxii
 Rome and, xxxiii; 486-488
 History of, xxxiv
 Ten Articles of 1536, The, xxxvi
 Six Articles of 1539, The, xxxviii
Thirteen Articles of 1538, The,
 xxxix
Forty-two Articles of 1553, The,
 xxxix-xlii
Thirty-eight Articles of 1563, The,
 xliii
Thirty-nine Articles of 1571, The,
 xlvi
Lambeth, 1; 243
 Subscription to, l-liii; 491-494
Puritan Objections, xlix
 Purpose of, liv
 Interpretation of, lvii
 Analysis of, lix, lxi
 Relation to Prayer Book, 485-486
 Character of, 489
Ascension of Christ, Article IV, 81
 Meaning, 81
Athanasian Creed, 146, 147, 149-151
Athanasius, 30, 36, 38, 55, 93, 114,
 149, 288, 396
Atonement of Christ, 50-64, 227, 414
 Etymology, 51
 In New Testament, 52
 In Old Testament, 54
 In Prayer Book and Articles, 54
 Theological Interpretations, 55-59
 Necessary Aspects, 59-62
 Difficulties in Preaching, 62-64
 See *Death of Christ*
Attributes of God, 15-17
Augsburg, Confession of, xxx, xxxi;
 3, 33, 65, 73, 90, 156, 184, 199,
 230, 231, 265, 272, 281, 313,
 346, 360, 365, 368, 370
Augustine of Canterbury, 95
Augustine of Hippo, 94, 106; and the
 Apocrypha, 114, 115; the phrase
 "original sin" attributed to,
 158; against Pelagianism, 161,
 200; on Sin against the Holy

- Augustine of Hippo—*continued*.
 Ghost, 235; Predestination, 241-242, 246; the Church, 279; laying on of hands, 315; "Sacrament," 347-348; Unworthiness of Ministers, 367; the Wicked and the Lord's Supper, 406, 408; Rites and Ceremonies, 441; Infant Salvation, 502
- Authority, Article VI, 116-133
 Need, 116
 Source, 116
 Seat, 116-117
 Basis, 117-120
- Authority, Church, Article XX, 281-290
 History of Article, 281
 Nature of, 283
 Limitations, 284
- BANCROFT, Archbishop, lv
- Baptism, Article XXVII, 371-387
 Meaning in Scripture, 371
 Meaning in Article, 373
 Its Condition, 374
 Effects, 374-376, 380-387
 Subjects, 376-380
 Mode, 521
- Basle, Confession of, xxxii; 293, 302
- Belief and Trust, distinction between, xx
- Bellarmino, 127, 206, 217, 302, 321, 359
- Bernard, St., 251, 358
- Beveridge, lvi; 235, 376
- Bible, 103-133. See *Scripture*
- Bible and Church, Article VI, 125-132
 Article XX, 285-289
- Bilson, Bishop, 65, 425
- Bishop, 322-327. See *Ministry, Episcopacy*
- Bishops' Book, xxxviii, xl; 352, 503
- Black Rubric, xlvi, note; 403, 523, 524. See *Declaration on Kneeling*
- Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, 234
- Both Kinds, Communion in, Article XXX, 411-413
 History, 412
 Roman Catholic Practice, 412
 Anglican Position, 413
- Boulton, 197, 220, 422, 443
- Brentius, xxxi
- Browne, Bishop Harold, on Articles, 197, 225, 369, 421
- Bucer, 242, 330
- Bull, Bishop, 203, 204
- Bullinger, xxxii, xxxiii; 331
- Burnet, lvi; 235, 330, 442, 450
- CALVIN, xxxii; 68, 179, 231, 242, 246, 356
- Calvinism, xlix; 179, 235, 244, 246-248, 398
- Canon, The, 105-106
 Books, 106-107
 Grounds, 107
 Old Testament Canon, 108
 New Testament Canon, 109-110
 Process of Canonisation, 110-113
 Limits, 113-115
- Canonical Books, 103, 104. See *Canon*
- Canons, lv
- Capital Punishment, 475
- Catholic, 506-508, and National, 443-446
- Causation, argument from, 7
- Cecil, 515
- Celibacy, Clerical, 429-433. See *Marriage*
- Ceremonial Law, 281-285, 440-446
- Ceremonies, Church authority on, 281-290, 440-446. See *Church*
- Chalcedon, Council of, 33, 41, 42, 94, 122, 149, 292, 295
- Cheney, Bishop, 401, 524
- Christological Proof of God, 12
- Christology, Chalcedon, 41
 Modern, 42
 History of, 42
- Church, The, Article XIX, 265-280
 Its Place, 266
 Foundation, 267
 Purpose, 267
 Progress, 268
 Nature, 268-271
 Visibility, 271-275
 Invisibility, 275
 "Notes," 276-277
 Discipline, 271, 434-438

Infallibility, 272-275
 Authority, Article XX, 281-290
 Relation to Scripture, 285-289
 "Church to teach," 287
 Relation to Individual, 289-290
 Church and State, 438, 462-469
 Civil Power, 461-469
 Clement of Alexandria, 305, 325, 396, 481
 Clement VI, 217
 Clergy, 313-338. See *Ministry*
 Coleridge, 119
 Coming (Second) of Christ, Article IV, 87
Communicatio Idiomatum, 40, 43, 49
 Communion, Holy, 388-426. See *Supper*
 Communion of Saints, 308
 Community of Goods, Article XXXVIII, 480-482
 Comprecation, 307-310
 Concomitance, Doctrine of, 413
 Concupiscence, 172-175
 Confession, 293, 320, 321, 327, 356
 Confession of Augsburg, xxxi. See *Augsburg*
 Confession of Wurtemberg, xxxi, xliii. See *Wurtemberg*
 Confessions, General, xxix
 Lutheran, xxx
 Augsburg, xxxi
 Wurtemberg, xxxi
 Saxon, xxxi
 Reformed, xxxii
 Confirmation, 353-355
 Consecration of Bishops and Ministers, Article XXXVI, 452-458
 Consensus Gentium, 5
 Constance, Council of, 293
 Constantinople, Council of, 93, 94, 95, 148, 292, 293, 305
 Consubstantiation, 397
 Controversies of Faith, authority of Church in, Article XX, 281-290
 Convocation and the Articles, xxviii, xli, xlvi, xlvii
Corpus Christi, Festival of, 399, 404
 Cosin, Bishop, 331
 Cosmological Argument for God, 7

Councils, General, Article XXI, 291-297
 Fact of, 291
 Number, 292
 Summoning, 293
 Fallibility, 294
 Sanction, 295
 Relation of Church of England to, 296
 Covenant, 344, 378, 380, 382, 392
 Cox, Bishop, xlviii
 Cranmer, Archbishop, Influence on Articles, xxxvi-xlii; *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, xlviii-xlix; on the Descent into Hell, 65; View of Episcopacy, 329; the Lord's Supper, 390, 402, 419, 451
 Creeds, Confessions, and Articles, xxiv; 489-494
 Creeds, Article VIII, 146-152
 Apostles', xxv; 148
 Nicene, xxv; 148
 Athanasian, xxv; 149-151
 Grounds of acceptance, 123, 147
 History, 148-151
 Use, 151-152
 Criticism, Biblical, Article VII, 141-145
 Cup, withholding the, 411-413. See *Both Kinds*
 Cyprian, 275, 327, 366, 396, 421
 Cyril Lucar, xxxiv; 114, 149
 Cyril of Alexandria, 292
 DEACONS, Ordination of, 432
 Dead, Prayer for, 508-521. See *Prayer*
 Death of Christ, 49-50
 Fact, 49
 Form, 50
 Purpose, 50
 Scope, 50
 See *Atonement*
 Declaration, King Charles I's, liii, lv
 Declaration on Kneeling, 403, 412
 Decretals, Forged, 294
 Deism, Article I and 17, 27
 Deity of Christ, 37
 Fact, 37

Deity of Christ—*continued.*

Method, 37

Deity of Holy Spirit, 22

Denney, Dr., 238

Depravation of Nature, 164-165

Descent into Hades, 65-72. See *Hades*

Difficulties, Bible, 500-501

Discipline, Church, 434-438. See

Excommunication

Divine Nature of Christ, 33

Docetism, 37, 73

Doctrine, meaning, xxiii

Dogma, meaning, xxiii

Dominicans, 225

Donatism, 367

Dort, Synod of, xxxii, 1; 179, 243,

244, 331, 505

Double Procession, 94-96. See *Pro-*
cession of Holy Spirit

Dowden, Bishop, 149, 151, 410

EASTERN Church, xxxiv

Ebionism, 37, 93

Edward VI, Articles of, xl

Election, 237-257. See *Predestination*

Elizabeth, Queen, xliii, xlvi; 282, 300,

406, 412, 429, 448, 523, 524

Ephesus, Council of, 292

Epiphanius, 114, 148, 305, 473

Episcopacy, 319-338

Erasmus, xxxvii

Erastianism, 437

Eschatology, 81, 525

Eternal Generation of the Son, 36

Eucharist, 389-426. See *Supper*

Eucharistic Sacrifice, 420, 426

Eusebius of Cæsarea, 106, 112, 148,

473

Eutylianism, 41, 86, 149, 292

Evangelical Revival, 244

Evil, 155-160. See *Sin*

Evolution, Theism and, 9-11

Excommunication, Article XXXIII,

434-438

Purpose of Article, 434

Teaching, 434

Scripture, 435

History, 436

Erastianism, 437

Reformation, 438

Ex opere operato, 346, 358-364, 369

Experience, relation to dogma, xxvi-
xxviii

Extreme Unction, 353-355

FAITH, xx-xxii

Nature, xx, 191

As Trust, xx

As Creed, xxi

Rule of, xxii

Relation to Revelation, xxii

And Justification, 184-185, 191-198

And Works, 200

Fall, The, 158-164

Fatherhood of God, 495-500

Filioque Clause, 94, 96, 148, 149

Final Perseverance, 236-257. See

Predestination

Flesh and Blood, 74

Flesh and Bones, 74

Formula Concordiæ, xxxi; 407

Forsyth, Dr., 249

Forty-two Articles, xxxix. See

Articles

Foxe, xxxvii

Francis à Sancta Clara, 487

Free-will, Article X, 176-183

Meaning, 177-178

History, 178-180

The Problem, 180-183

Future Life, 137

GARDINER, xxxvi, xxxvii, xxxix; 197

Geste (Guest), Bishop, 401, 402, 406,

524

Gibson, Bp., 148, 225, 328, 368

409, 416, 523, 524

Gnostics, 122, 135, 178

God, Article I, 3-31

Existence, 3

Character, 6

Proofs, 6-14

Nature, 14

Attributes, 15

Holiness, 16

Transcendence, 17

Immanence, 17

In Nature, 18

In Relation to Sin, 19

Christian Revelation, 20

Fatherhood, 64, 495-500

- Goodrich, Bishop, *xlvi*
 Goods, Community of, Article XXXVIII, 480-482
 Good Works, Article XII, 199-209
 Meaning, 199
 Relation to Faith, 201
 Gore, Bishop, 130, 321, 324, 423, 424, 492
 Government, Church, not by ministry alone, 316
 Grace, Article X, 175-183
 Meaning, 177
 Prevenient, 177
 Co-operating, 177
 Means of, 362-364
 Guilt, 159, 167-169
 Gwatkin, Dr., 326
- Hades**, Descent into, Article III, 65-72
 Meaning of word *Hell*, 66
 Fact in New Testament, 67
 Meaning of, 67-69
 History of Doctrine, 69-70
 Relation to Intermediate State, 70-72
 Hall, Bishop, *lvi*
 Hampton Court Conference, 243, 354
 Hardwick on the Articles, 225, 299
 Heaven, Christ in, 83
 Hebrews, Epistle to, in relation to Ascension, 85
 Hell, Descent into, 65-72. See *Hades*
 Helvetic Confessions, *xxxii*; 101
 Henry VIII, *xxxv*; 196
 Hilary of Arles, 114, 149
 Holiness of God, 19, 20
 Holy Spirit, 90-99. See *Spirit*
 Homilies, Article XXXV, 447-451
 On Justification, 196-198
 On Sacraments, 352, 450
 Their Obligation, 449
 On Prayer for Dead, 514
Homoousios, 36, 38, 94, 148
 Hooker, Richard, 86; on Justification, 188, 192; Good Works, 202; Sanctification, 208; the Church Invisible, 269; *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 284; the Ministry, 317, 319; Sacraments, 349, 356, 358; Intention, 370; the Real Presence, 398; Ceremonies, 442
- Hooper, Bishop, 231, 340, 503
 Hort, Dr., 148, 182, 266, 471
 Host, Elevation of, 404
 Humanity of Christ, 39
 Impersonality, 46
 Huss, John, 293
 Hypostatic Union, meaning of, 40
- IGNATIUS**, 325-327, 337, 396
 Images, Article XXII, 305
 Immaculate Conception of Virgin Mary, 225-226
 Immanence, Divine, 17-27, 39
 Immersion, 521
 Incarnation and Trinity, 22, 32-49
 Fact, 37-41
 Method, 43-47
 Chalcedon Doctrine, 41
 Indulgences, 216, 217, Article XXII, 303-305
 Infant Baptism, 377-380
 Infant Salvation, 501-506
 Inspiration of Scripture, 118
 Institution of a Christian man, *xxxviii*
 Intellect, relation to theology, *xxi-xxii*
 Intention, Doctrine of, 367, 370, 455
 Intercession of Christ, 85
 Intermediate State, 70
 Invocation of Saints, Article XXII, 306-310
- JAMES**, St. and St. Paul, 205-206
 Jansenists, 179
 Jeremiah, quoted in Article XXXIX, 484
 Jerome, 106, 114, 115, 326, 473
 Jerusalem, Church of, 148
 Jewel, Bishop, *xlvii*; 202, 207, 266, 271, 445
 Josephus, 113, 114
 Judgment, Christ coming to, Article IV, 87
 Justification, Article XI, 184-198
 Meaning, 185-187
 Roman Catholic Doctrine, 187-189, 195
 Basis, 189
 Means, 191
 Value, 192
 Homily, 196

- Justification, Article XI—*continued*.
 Faith and Works, 199
 Lutheran Doctrine, 202
 Bishop Bull, 203-204
 Bishop Gore, 204 note
 Germ theory, 204
 St. Paul and St. James, 205-206
 Works before, 210-214
- KANT, 157, 170
 Kenosis, 44
 King's Book, xxxviii, xl; 352
- LAITY, withholding Cup from, 411-413. See *Both Kinds*
 Lambeth Articles, 1; 243
 Laodicea, Council of, 107
 Lapsed, The, 231-235
 Lasco, John a, liv; 330
 Latimer, Bishop, 309
 Latin, Use of, 340-341
 Laud, Abp., xlix; 243, 244, 282, 296, 333
 Lawgiver, Moral Law points to a, 157
 Law of Moses, Article VII, 137-138
 Leo X, Pope, 217
 Leo XIII, Pope, 315
 Life, Eternal, in Old Testament, 137
 Lightfoot, Bishop, 316, 317, 318, 326-327, 338
 Logos, Doctrine of the, 34, 35
 Lombard, Peter, 348
 Lord's Supper, 388-426. See *Supper*
 Luther, Martin, Confessions, xxx, xxxi; xxxvi, xxxvii; on Free Will, 179; Justification, 203, 206; Indulgences, 217; Predestination, 242; Sacraments, 350, 355, 360, 361; Transubstantiation, 397; Infant Salvation, 503
 Lutheranism, Influence on Anglican Church, 237, 259, 282, 523-524
- MACEONIUS, 93
 Magistrates, Civil, Article XXXVII, 461-479
 Mantua, Council of, xxxi
 Marcion, 140, 436
 Marriage of Priests, Article XXXII, 429-433
- Teaching, 430
 History, 431
 Anglican position, 432
 Martensen, Bishop, xxvii
 Martyr, Justin, 114, 178, 306, 327, 348, 403, 421
 Martyr, Peter, xlviii; 330, 385
 Mary, Queen, 243
 Masses, Sacrifices of, Article XXXI, 415-420
 Matrimony, as Sacrament, 352, 353, 355
 Melancthon, xxx, xxxi, xxxvi; 212, 242, 355, 361
 Melito of Sardis, 114
 Merit, Christ's, 189, 218-220
 Merit, Human, 190, 218-220
 Military Service, 475. See *War*
 Ministers, unworthiness of, Article XVI, 365-370
 Ministry, Article XXIII, 313-338
 The Fact, 314
 Source, 314
 Call, 314
 Equipment, 314
 Purpose, 315
 Medium and Mediation, 316-321
 Intention, 321
 Form, 322
 Analogy of Synagogue, 323
 Perpetuation, 323
 Continuity, 324
 Episcopacy, 325-327
 Anglican view, 327-332
 Modern, 333
 Controversies, 334-338
 Succession, 337
 In mother-tongue, Article XXIV, 339-341
 Mohammedans, 130, 241
 Monotheism, 20, 25, 142
 Monothelitism, 293
 Montanism, 231, 366, 368
 Mortal Sin, 230
 Mother of our Lord, 225-226, 307
 Mother-tongue, speaking in, Article XXIV, 339-341
 Mysticism, 132, 267
- NATIONAL AND CATHOLIC, 443-446
 Natures of Christ, 33-42

- Divine, 33-42
 Human, 39-40
 Nazianzen, Gregory, 294
 Nestorianism, 41, 86, 292
 Newman and the Articles, lvii; 189,
 274, 298, 420, 450, 488
 New Testament, 108-113. See *Canon*
 Nicæa, Council of, xxxiv; 30, 94, 95,
 148, 273, 292, 304, 305, 437
 Nicene Creed, 95, 98, 146, 147, 148,
 149
 Novatians, 231
- OATHS, Article XXXIX, 483-484
 Oblation, Christ's one, Article XXXI,
 414. See *Death of Christ* and
Atonement
 Old Testament, Article VII, 134-145.
 See *Testament*
 Omnipotence, Divine, 16
 Omnipresence, Divine, 17, 18
 Ontological Argument for God, 6
Opus operatum, xlv; 358-364, 383
 Orders, Validity of our, 335, 457
 Ordinal, Article XXXVI, 452-458
 Origen, 106, 114, 178, 301, 305, 396
 Original Righteousness, 155, 156
 Original Sin, 156-160. See *sin*
 Ornaments Rubric, xlv; 523
 Orr, Dr., 250
Ousia, 30
- PANTHEISM, 17, 27
 Papal Supremacy, xxxvii; 469-475
 Pardons, Article XXII, 304
 Roman Doctrine of Indulgences,
 303, 304
 Parker, Archbishop, and Articles, xliii-
 xlv, xlvii, lv, 523, 524; on
 Justification, 184, 189; Authority,
 281-282; the Lord's Supper, 401-
 402; and the Wicked, 406, 408;
 Both Kinds, 411
 Parliament, Church and, 464-466
 Passover, The, 391
 Paul of Samosata, 37
 Paul III, Pope, xxxi
 Paul VII, Pope, 291
 Paul, St., and Doctrine of Justification,
 186-194, 201
- And St. James, 205-206
 Pelagianism, 160-161, 178, 201, 242,
 245
 Penance, xxxvii; 352-356, 437
Perichoresis, or Co-inherence, 31
 Perseverance, Final, 236-257
 Personality, Divine, 18, 19, 495
 of Holy Spirit, 21, 95
 Personal Religion, Articles on, 153
 Person of Christ, 32
 Person, the theological term, 30, 31
 Peter, Supremacy of, Article XXXVII,
 469-473
 Philo, 35, 113
 Pius IV, Pope, xxxiii; 306, 395
 Pliny, 347
Pneumatomachi, the, 93
 Polytheism, 18
 Prayer Book, Articles and, 485-486,
 522-525
 Prayer for the Dead, 303, 508-521
 Meaning, 509
 Basis, 509-512
 History, 512-513
 Anglican Doctrine, 513-516
 Safeguard, 516
 Recent Discussions, 517
 Predestination, Article XVII, 236-257
 Outline of Article, 237-238
 Nature, 238-239
 Proof, 239
 Effect, 240
 Safeguard, 241
 History, 241
 Problem, 244
 Ecclesiastical Arminianism, 245-246
 Calvinism, 246-247
 Scripture, 250-257
 Presence, Doctrine of, 408-410, 450-
 451
 Priesthood, 316-323
 Priest, the term, 316-323
 Private Judgment, 289-290
 Procession of Holy Spirit, 94-96
 Processions of Sacrament, 357, 404
 Protestantism, in Articles, lvii, lviii
 Punishment, Capital, 475
 Purgatory, Article XXII, 298-310,
 510, 514
 Roman Catholic Doctrine, 300

- Purgatory, Article XXII—*continued*.
 History, 301
 In Greek Church, 302
 Relation to Intermediate State, 302
 Relation to Justification, 303
 Puritans, The Articles and, xlix-1; 235,
 243, 284, 354, 437
 Pusey, Dr., 320
- RADBERTUS, PASCHASIUS, 397
- Rationalism, 132
- Reconciliation of God to man, 50, 53,
 60
- Redditio Symboli*, 147
- Reformation, English, xxxiv
- Reformatio Legum*, xl, xlviii; 3, 33, 90,
 104, 146, 147, 229, 258, 265,
 281, 295, 352, 368, 480, 483,
 504
- Regeneration, 381-387
- Relics, Article XXII, 305
- Religion, Corporate, Articles on, XIX-
 XXXIX
- Religion, Individual, Articles on, IX-
 XVIII
- Repentance after Baptism, 231, 232
- Reservation, 403-404
- Resurrection of Christ, Article IV, 73-
 89
 Teaching of Article, 73
 In New Testament, 74
 Proofs, 75-80
 Theology, 80-81
- Return of Christ, Article IV, 87. See
Coming
- Revelation, xvii-xx
 Meaning of, xvii
 Problem, xvii
 Possibility, xviii
 Probability, xviii
 Proofs, xviii
 Method, xviii
 Progressiveness, xix
 Purpose, xx
- Ridley, xxxvi, xlii
- Righteousness, Divine, 57, 58, 207
 Human, 208
- Rites, Church authority for, Article
 XX, 281-290
- Ritschlianism, xxviii; 38
- Rogers on the Articles, lv; 33, 67,
 211, 225, 235, 247, 330
- Romanensis*, use of term, 298
- Rome, Reformation and, xxxiii
 and the Articles, xxxvi-xlviii; 486-
 488
 Supremacy, 469-475
- Romish, 298-300
- Royal Supremacy, 463-469, 475-479
- Rufinus, 68, 69
- Rule of Faith, Articles VI-VIII, 104-
 152
- SABELLIANISM, 30, 96
- Sacraments, Articles XXV-XXXI,
 343-426
 Meaning, 343
 Relation to Word, 344
 Relation to Faith, 344
 The term *Sacramentum*, 347-349
 Nature, 349-351
 Purpose, 351
 Number, 351-357
 Use, 357
 Effect, 357
 Roman Catholic Doctrine, 358
 Reformation Principle, 359-364
 And the Ministry, 363, 365-370
- Sacrifice, Eucharistic, 420, 426
- Sacrifice of Christ, Article II, 32;
 Article XXXI, 414
 See also *Death* and *Atonement*
- Sacrifices of Masses, Article XXXI,
 415-420
- Saints, Invocation of, Article XXII,
 306
- Salvation, Infant, 501-506
- Salvation only in Christ, Article XVIII,
 258-260
- Sancroft, Archbishop, 331
- Sanctification, 208-209
- Sanday, Dr., 45, 112, 325, 332, 336,
 446
- Schmalcald, Articles of, xxxi, 300
- Schwabach, Articles of, xxx
- School-Authors, 210, 211 note, 212,
 358, 359
- Scotus, Duns, 179, 201, 225, 242, 348,
 358

- Scripture, Sufficiency of, Article VI,
 103-133
 Canonical Books, 103-106
 Canonicity, 106-108
 Canonisation, 108-113
 Apocrypha, 113-115
 Character of Scripture, 115-120
 Inspiration, 118
 Sufficiency, 120-123
 Supremacy, 123-133
 Practical Use, 132
 Difficulties, 500
 Semi-Pelagianism, 161, 178-201
 Session of Christ, Article IV, 83-87
 Sheol, 66. See *Hades*
 Sin, Article IX, 155-175
 Original, 156-160
 Sin and Law, 166-169
 Sin and Evolution, 166, 167, 168
 Christ without, Article XV, 223-228
 After Baptism, Article XVI, 229-235
 Against the Holy Ghost, 230, 234-
 235
 Roman Catholic Doctrine, 161
 Reformation Doctrine, 162
 Modern Theories, 169-171
 Sinlessness, Christ's, Article XV, 223-
 228
 Sinlessness, Christian, Article XV, 227-
 228
 Sinlessness, The Virgin's, 225-226
 Sixtus IV, 225
 Socinianism, 37
 Soldiers, Calling of, 475-479
 Solifidianism, 198
 Sonship of Christ, Article II, 32-36
 The term Son, 33
 Son of God, 34
 Son of Man, 34
 Eternal, 36
 Spires, Diet of, xxx
 Spirit, Holy, and Trinity, Article V,
 90-99
 In Old Testament, 91
 In New Testament, 91-93
 In Church, 93
 History, 93-94
 Procession, 94-96
 Doctrine, 95
 Deity, 96
 Place in Christianity, 97-99
 State, Church and, 438, 468-469
 Stillingfleet, lvi
 Stoics, 241
 Subscription to Articles, l-liii; 491-494
 Substance, the term, 30
 Supererogation, Works of, Article XIV,
 215-220
 Meaning, 215-216
 History, 216-217
 Truth, 218-220
 Supper, Lord's, Cranmer's Views,
 Articles XXVIII-XXXI, 388-
 426
 History of Article XXVIII, 388
 Meaning in Scripture, 389-394
 Meaning in Article, 394
 Roman Doctrine, 395-397, 399
 Lutheran Doctrine, 397
 Calvinistic Doctrine, 398
 Anglican Doctrine, 400-403, 522-
 525
 Erroneous Uses, 403-405
 The Wicked and, 406-410
 Supremacy, Papal, 469-475. See
 Papal
 Supremacy, Royal, 463-469, 475-479
 Swete, Dr., 85, 308
 Swiss Reformation, xxxii, xxxiii
Symbolum, meaning of the term, 146-
 147
 Synagogue and Christian Ministry, 323

 TABLE, The Lord's, 317, 421, 425
 Taylor, Rowland, xlvi
 Teleological Argument for God, 8
 Ten Articles of 1536, xxxvi
 Tertullian, *Trinitas*, 30; Old Testa-
 ment, 114; Purgatory, 301;
 Invocation of Saints, 306; the
 Ministry, 327; Sacraments, 347,
 366; Sacrifice, 421; Ceremonies,
 441; Roman claims, 472
 Testament, Old, Article VII, 134-145
 Unity of Old and New Testaments,
 135-136
 Spirituality, 136-137
 Temporary elements, 137-138
 Permanent elements, 138-141
 Problem to-day, 141-145

- Theism, Proofs of, 6-14
 Theodosius, Emperor, 292
 Theology, Meaning, xxiii
 Biblical, xxiii
 Dogmatic, xxiii
 Perils of Systematic, xxiv
 Natural, 5
 Traditio Symboli, 147
 Theophilus of Antioch, 30
 Thirteen Articles of 1538, xxxix
 Thirty-eight Articles of 1563, xliii
 Thirty-nine Articles of 1571, xlvi
 Thomist, 179
 Toledo, Council of, 94, 109
 Tongue, Use of Unknown, 339-341
 Torgan, Articles of, xxx
 Tractarian Movement, 189, 332, 333,
 338, 363
 Tradition and Scripture, 127-132
 Traditions, Church, Article XXXIV,
 439-446
 Transcendence, 17, 27
 Transubstantiation, xxvii; 293, 395,
 400
 Travers, 330
 Trent, Council of, xxiii, xlviii; 90,
 105; on the Scriptures, 115, 127-
 128; Original Sin, 162; Free
 Will, 179; Justification, 184,
 187, 190, 192, 196; Good
 Works, 201, 206; Works before
 Justification, 212-213; Indul-
 gences, 217; Predestination, 242;
 Purgatory, 299, 302, 304; Images
 and Saints, 305-307; Use of
 Latin, 339-341; Sacraments, 351,
 359, 361, 363; Intention, 369;
 Transubstantiation, 395; Both
 Kinds, 413; the Mass, 416-420;
 Celibacy, 430, 432
 Trinity, the Holy, 20-31
 Meaning, 21
 Method of Approach, 21
 Derivation of Doctrine, 22
 And Incarnation, 22
 New Testament Teaching, 22-25
 In relation to God as Love, 24-25
 In Old Testament, 25
 Vindication of Doctrine, 26-30
 History of Doctrine, 30-31
 Trullan Council, xxxiv; 431
 UNCTION, Extreme, 353-355. See
 Extreme
 Unitarianism, 27-39
 Unity of Godhead, 21, 24
 Unworthiness of Ministers, Article
 XXVI, 365-370
 VALENTINUS, 436
 Via Media, lvii-lviii
 Virgin Birth, 47-49
 Virgin Mary, 225, 226
 Virtualism, 398
 WAR, Article XXXVII, 475-479
 Warfield, Dr., 250
 Waterland, 149, 349, 376, 422
 Westcott, Bp., 84, 112, 152, 317, 421
 Westminster, Confession of, xxxii;
 101, 244
 Whitgift, Archbishop, 334, 384
 Wicked, Lord's Supper and, Article
 XXIX, 406-410
 Will, Free, 176-183. See *Free*
 Word of God (Bible), 103-133. See
 Scripture
 Word of God (Christ), 34
 Wordsworth, Bishop, 299, 309, 325,
 432
 Works before Justification, Article
 XIII, 210-214
 Works, Good, Article XII, 199-209
 Wurtemberg, Confession of, xliii; 33,
 90, 104, 176, 184, 189, 190,
 199, 282
 Wycliffe, 293
 ZWINGLI, xxxii; 153, 242, 360, 361,
 398, 505

INDEX TO SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

GENESIS	NUMBERS	2 SAMUEL
i. 1 4, 7	iii. 12 59	xviii. 33 59
i. 2 25	iii. 28 378	xxi. 14 51
i. 26, 27 9, 25	vi. 24-27 26, 29	xxxiii. 1, 2 121
ii. 17 160	viii. 14 372	
ii. 18 433	xix. 9 372	1 KINGS
iii. 3 160	xxiv. 13 289	ii. 3 108
iii. 15 136		
iii. 22 25	DEUTERONOMY	
vi. 5 164	iv. 2 285	2 KINGS
vi. 12 163	vi. 4 14, 25	xiv. 6 108
viii. 21 164	viii. 15-20 121	xxii. 142
ix. 6 165	xvi. 3 391	xxiii. 2 108
xi. 7 25	xvii. 18 108	xxiii. 10 66
xv. 1-6 191, 205 <i>twice</i>	xxv. 4 121	
xv. 6 185, 205	xxix. 10, 12 378	2 CHRONICLES
xvii. 7 378	xxix. 29 241	xxx. 16 108
xvii. 22 25	xxx. 9-13 108	
xviii. 2 25	xxx. 24-26 108	
xviii. 16 25		EZRA
xix. 1 25	JOSHUA	iii. 2 108
xxii. 205 <i>twice</i>	i. 8 108	
xxii. 2 34	iii. 10 14	NEHEMIAH
xxii. 12 34	v. 13-15 25	ii. 8 66
xxii. 13 59	vi. 2 25	x. 28 108
xxv. 8 71	ix. 11 59	
xliv. 33 59	xi. 15 108	JOB
	xv. 8 66	ix. 2 185
	xxiv. 26 108	xi. 8 66
EXODUS		xiv. 4 163
vii. 1 317	JUDGES	xv. 14 163
xx. 2 141	iii. 4 108	xxv. 4 163
xxiv. 4-7 108	xiii. 8-21 25	
xxix. 1 372		
xxix. 4 372		
	1 SAMUEL	PSALMS
LEVITICUS	x. 25 108	xiv. 1 163
iv. 15 59	xvii. 59	xvi. 10 66, 67
v. 17 227	xxviii. 19 66	xvi. 11 137
xxv. 47-49 60		

PSALMS (*continued*)

JEREMIAH (*continued*)

MATTHEW (*continued*)

xix.	108, 116
xix. 1.	6
xxv. 9.	297
xxix. 3-5.	26
xxxv. 19.	121
xlii. 2.	14
xliv. 15.	66
li. 4.	186
li. 5.	163
lix. 10.	177
lxxiii. 24.	137
lxxvii. 6.	121
civ. 34.	341
cxix.	108
cxix. 3.	219
cxix. 16.	319
cxix. 6.	16
cxix. 2, 3, 6.	16
cxlv. 7.	16

PROVERBS

viii.	25
xvii. 15.	186
xxv. 1.	108

ECCLESIASTES

ii. 5.	66
--------	-----------	----

SONG OF SOLOMON

iv. 13.	66
---------	-----------	----

ISAIAH

vi. 1-3.	16, 26, 29
viii. 19, 20.	108, 289
ix. 8.	121
xxxiv. 16.	108
xl. 13.	25
xli. 4.	14
xliv. 6.	14
xliv. 8.	139
xlvi. 12.	14
xlvi. 16.	25, 91
xlvi. 19.	25
lv. 11.	189
lxiii. 9, 10.	91
lxiii. 10-14.	25

JEREMIAH

ii. 1.	121
vi. 26.	34

vii. 31.	66
x. 10.	14
xvii. 9.	164
xxxi. 31.	392
xxxvi.	107
xxxvi. 4.	108
xliv. 4.	54, 167
xlvi. 1.	108

EZEKIEL

i. 1.	121
xvi. 51, 52.	186

DANIEL

vi. 26.	14
ix. 2.	108
ix. 11.	108

AMOS

viii. 10.	34
-----------	-----------	----

HABAKKUK

ii. 4.	185
--------	-----------	-----

ZECHARIAH

iv. 6.	91
vii. 12.	108
xii. 10.	34
xiii. 7.	25

MALACHI

i. 10, 11.	421
i. 12.	318
iv. 1.	136

APOCRYPHA :

2 MACCABEES

xii.	512
------	-----------	-----

MATTHEW

i. 18.	91
i. 20.	91
i. 25.	34
iii. 11.	372
iii. 16, 17.	24

v. 17, 18.	135
v. 21.	139
v. 22.	66
v. 24.	189
v. 48.	228
x. 20.	96
x. 28.	66
xi. 19.	186
xi. 25.	24
xi. 27.	xx, 33, 36
xii. 31, 32.	234
xii. 37.	186, 206
xii. 38, 40.	74
xv. 3.	128
xvi. 13-19.	274, 284
xvi. 16.	14, 34, 148
xvi. 17.	49, 284
xvi. 18.	266
xvi. 21.	74, 389
xvi. 23.	171
xvii. 23.	74
xviii. 17.	266, 287
xviii. 18.	320
xix. 16-22.	219
xix. 28.	382
xx. 19.	74
xx. 28.	53, 54
xxii. 29.	121
xxii. 32.	137
xxv. 31-46.	256
xxv. 34.	238, 239
xxv. 41.	238, 239
xxvi. 26-28.	389
xxvi. 27.	413
xxvi. 29.	399
xxvi. 63.	34
xxvii. 52.	81
xxvii. 63.	74
xxviii. 18-20.	148, 330, 377
xxviii. 19.	24, 93, 372 <i>twice</i>

MARK

iii. 14.	314
iii. 17.	34
iii. 28, 29.	234
vi. 13.	354
vii. 3.	130
vii. 4.	372
vii. 8, 9.	130
vii. 18.	361
viii. 31.	74

MARK (continued)

JOHN (continued)

JOHN (continued)

ix. 31 74
 ix. 49 511
 x. 13-16 378
 x. 22 216
 x. 34 74
 xii. 26 137
 xii. 30 219
 xiv. 22-24 389
 xiv. 58 74
 xvi. 11 78
 xvi. 15 82
 xvi. 16 150, 259
 xvi. 20 83 *twice*, 177

i. 4 213
 i. 9 213
 i. 14 34 *twice*, 381
 i. 18 xx, 24, 28, 34
 i. 29 158
 i. 32, 33 92
 i. 34 33
 i. 37 267, 314
 i. 51 82
 ii. 1-11 399
 ii. 19-21 74
 iii. 3 382
 iii. 13 36, 41, 82
 iii. 16 24, 34, 191
 iii. 18 34
 iii. 25 372
 iii. 36 150, 152, 259
 iv. 21 152, 191
 iv. 24 15, 16
 v. 18 33
 v. 19, 20 36
 v. 22 88
 v. 24 xxi, 303
 v. 27 88
 v. 39 121, 135
 vi. 44, 45 177, 252
 vi. 51-58 389
 vi. 57 14
 vi. 62 82
 vii. 37-39 83
 viii. 19 499
 viii. 41-44 499
 viii. 44 385
 viii. 54 36
 viii. 56 137
 viii. 58, 59 34
 x. 7 399
 x. 16 276, 278
 x. 27, 28 252
 x. 31 34
 x. 33 34
 x. 34 121
 xi. 44 76
 xi. 50 54
 xii. 48 150
 xiii. 3 82
 xiii. 10 187
 xiii. 26 522
 xiv. 2, 3 82, 87
 xiv. 6 xx, 499
 xiv. 7 499
 xiv. 8 14
 xiv. 12 83

xiv. 16 96
 xiv. 23 510
 xiv. 26 96
 xiv. 28 82, 83
 xiv.-xvi. 92
 xv. 1 392
 xv. 5 178, 278
 xv. 25 121
 xv. 26 24, 96 *thrice*
 xvi. 7 81, 83
 xvi. 13, 14 24
 xvi. 16 83
 xvi. 30 34
 xvii. 1 24
 xvii. 3 14
 xvii. 8 24
 xvii. 10 36
 xvii. 11 64, 82
 xvii. 12 121
 xvii. 17 228
 xvii. 18 24
 xvii. 19 228, 277
 xvii. 23 24
 xvii. 25 64
 xviii. 9 121
 xviii. 37 121
 xix. 7 34
 xx. 1-10 79
 xx. 6, 7 76
 xx. 17 83
 xx. 19-13 317, 320 *twice*,
 324, 330
 xx. 22 96
 xx. 28 24
 xx. 30, 31 121
 xxi. 23 87

LUKE

i. 1-4 121
 i. 28 181
 i. 30 181
 i. 35 33, 48, 226
 ii. 7 34
 vii. 12 34
 vii. 35 186
 viii. 31 66
 viii. 42 34
 ix. 22 74
 ix. 38 34
 ix. 51 82
 x. 7 111, 121
 x. 35 216
 xi. 38, 39 372 *twice*
 xii. 10 234
 xii. 42 274
 xvi. 23 66
 xvi. 24 385, 522
 xvi. 26 66
 xviii. 13 53
 xviii. 33 74
 xx. 37 137
 xxii. 19, 20 389
 xxii. 70 34
 xxiii. 43 66, 67, 509
 xxiv. 13-35 79
 xxiv. 27 136
 xxiv. 27-44 121
 xxiv. 39 74
 xxiv. 52 83

i. 1-4 121
 i. 28 181
 i. 30 181
 i. 35 33, 48, 226
 ii. 7 34
 vii. 12 34
 vii. 35 186
 viii. 31 66
 viii. 42 34
 ix. 22 74
 ix. 38 34
 ix. 51 82
 x. 7 111, 121
 x. 35 216
 xi. 38, 39 372 *twice*
 xii. 10 234
 xii. 42 274
 xvi. 23 66
 xvi. 24 385, 522
 xvi. 26 66
 xviii. 13 53
 xviii. 33 74
 xx. 37 137
 xxii. 19, 20 389
 xxii. 70 34
 xxiii. 43 66, 67, 509
 xxiv. 13-35 79
 xxiv. 27 136
 xxiv. 27-44 121
 xxiv. 39 74
 xxiv. 52 83

xix. 7 34
 xx. 1-10 79
 xx. 6, 7 76
 xx. 17 83
 xx. 19-13 317, 320 *twice*,
 324, 330
 xx. 22 96
 xx. 28 24
 xx. 30, 31 121
 xxi. 23 87

ACTS

i. 1 121
 i. 11 87
 i. 15 267
 i. 16 98, 117
 i. 22 75
 ii. 98, 320
 ii. 4 83, 267
 ii. 23, 24 252
 ii. 25-31 67, 68
 ii. 32 75, 81
 ii. 33 82, 83, 96
 ii. 37 210

JOHN

i. 1 24, 34, 36
 i. 1-18 25
 i. 3 149

i. 1 24, 34, 36
 i. 1-18 25
 i. 3 149

ROMANS (*continued*)

x. 17	xxii, 351
xi. 26	256
xii. 1	425
xii. 5	276
xii. 6	182
xii. 16	171
xiv. 17	207
xv. 4	121, 139
xv. 6	24
xv. 16	317
xvi. 10, 11	511

1 CORINTHIANS

i. 2	208
i. 14-17	386
i. 16	511
i. 24	25
ii. 8	41
ii. 10, 11	24
ii. 13	110
iii. 11	259
iii. 13	511
iii. 15	301, 303
iv. 6	182
v. 1	232
v. 3-5	266
v. 7	52, 391
vi. 2	256
vi. 14	81
vi. 15-18	385
vi. 17	278
vii. 7	219
vii. 14	379, 382
vii. 25	216
viii. 1	341
viii. 4	24
viii. 6	48, 148
ix. 5	432
ix. 9-14	121
ix. 13, 14	393 <i>twice</i>
ix. 21	140
x.	317
x. 2	372
x. 4	399
x. 11	139
x. 16	389 <i>twice</i> , 392
x. 17	394, 399
x. 18	393 <i>twice</i>
x. 21	393
x. 23	341
x. 32	268
xi. 2	128

1 CORINTHIANS

(continued)

xi. 7	165
xi. 14-16	283
xi. 20	389
xi. 23-26	389
xi. 26	392, 399, 413
xi. 27	413
xi. 29	357, 393, 409
xi. 30	233, 393
xi. 31	393
xii. 3	98
xii. 12	269
xii. 13	98, 374, 382
xii. 27	385
xii. 28	268, 322
xiv. 12	340
xiv. 14-17	339
xiv. 26	283, 340, 341
xiv. 34	283
xiv. 37	111, 121
xiv. 40	283
xv.	81
xv. 1, 2	259
xv. 1-4	75, 81
xv. 3	52
xv. 5	324
xv. 10	178
xv. 20-23	75
xv. 22	159, 163
xv. 23-28	87
xv. 29	511
xv. 44	81
xv. 50	74
xvi. 15	511

2 CORINTHIANS

i. 1	121
i. 24	284, 316
iii. 6-16	323
iii. 14	xviii
iii. 17	197
v. 8	509
v. 10	303
v. 17	381
v. 18	51, 53
v. 19	60
v. 20	51, 189
v. 21	53, 54, 190 <i>twice</i> , 381
viii. 9	48
x. 5	208
x. 13-16	106
xii. 4	66

2 CORINTHIANS

(continued)

xii. 19	341
xiii. 5-7	253
xiii. 10	341
xiii. 14	24, 93

GALATIANS

i. 1	121
i. 8, 9	259
ii. 16	200
ii. 20	178
ii. 21	207
iii.	185
iii. 6	205
iii. 10	191
iii. 13	53, 54
iii. 22	207
iii. 24	136, 140
iii. 26, 27	374
iv. 5	375
iv. 6	96, 97, 375
v. 1	180
vi. 16	106

EPHESIANS

i. 3	497
i. 3-6	251
i. 3-14	270
i. 4	238, 239, 257
i. 5	238, 239 <i>twice</i> , 249, 251
i. 7	53
i. 9	239, 249
i. 11	238, 239, 249
i. 14	87
i. 15-23	270
i. 19, 20	75
i. 22	266, 268, 278
ii. 1	164
ii. 10	200, 251, 257
ii. 16-18	53
ii. 20	274, 277
ii. 21	341
ii. 22	24
iii. 9	116
iii. 10	266, 268
iii. 11	238
iii. 18	267
iv. 3	276
iv. 6	24
iv. 8	83

EPHESIANS (*continued*)

iv. 9 67
 iv. 11, 12
 314, 315, 322, 341
 iv. 13 276
 iv. 14 xxiii
 iv. 30 92

PHILIPPIANS

i. 1 322
 i. 6 200
 i. 19 96
 i. 23 303, 509
 i. 27 xxi
 ii. 5-8 44
 ii. 6 24, 36, 48
 ii. 12 252
 ii. 13 . 177, 239, 252, 362
 iii. 12 228
 iii. 19 171
 iii. 21 81

COLOSSIANS

i. 1 121
 i. 14 53
 i. 15 34, 48
 i. 18 34, 266, 268
 ii. 6 209
 ii. 9 24, 36
 ii. 15 68
 ii. 17 138
 ii. 18 307
 ii. 22 xxiii
 iii. 1 83 *twice*
 iii. 2 171
 iii. 20 379
 iv. 16 111

I THESSALONIANS

i. 5 xxi
 i. 8-10 87
 i. 10 81
 iii. 11 25
 iv. 1 121
 iv. 2 110, 121
 iv. 2-8 121
 iv. 13-18 88
 iv. 14 75, 81, 518
 v. 21 284
 v. 23 228
 v. 27 111, 121

2 THESSALONIANS

i. 11 239
 ii. 5 88
 ii. 13 208, 239, 251
 ii. 15 . 110, 121, 128 *twice*
 iii. 14 110, 121

I TIMOTHY

i. 10 xxiii
 i. 17 14, 16
 ii. 6 53, 54
 ii. 10 200
 iii. 1 200, 322
 iii. 2 432
 iii. 12 432
 iii. 15 284
 iii. 16 148
 iv. 1 xxiii
 iv. 3 433
 iv. 6 xxiii
 iv. 13, 14 314
 v. 10 200
 v. 18 111, 121 *twice*
 v. 25 200
 vi. 11 207
 vi. 20 128

2 TIMOTHY

i. 9 238, 239
 i. 10 137
 i. 12-14 128
 i. 15-18 511, 512
 ii. 12 82
 ii. 19 252
 iii. 8 253
 iii. 15 125
 iii. 16 98, 117, 121
 iii. 17 121
 iv. 2, 3 xxiii
 iv. 8 303

TITUS

i. 2 14
 i. 4 xxi
 i. 5 314
 i. 6 432
 i. 9 xxiii
 i. 16 253
 ii. 10 xxiii
 ii. 12 207
 ii. 13 87
 iii. 5 382

PHILEMON

i. 17 59

HEBREWS

i. 224
 i. 1, 2 xix, 121, 139
 i. 2-5 33
 i. 3 83 *twice*
 i. 6 34
 i. 8 24
 ii. 224
 ii. 12 266
 ii. 15 70
 ii. 18 83
 ii. 23 34, 256, 266
 iii. 7 98, 117
 iii. 12 14
 iv. 2 357
 iv. 12 144
 iv. 14 82
 iv. 15 83, 224
 v. 1 317
 vi. 1 85, 200
 vi. 4-6 232
 vi. 9 233
 vii. 19 136
 vii. 24 83 *twice*, 316
 vii. 25 83 *twice*, 86
 vii. 26 83
 vii. 26-28 224
 vii. 27 83, 415
 viii. 1 83 *thrice*, 85
 viii. 3 84
 viii. 8, 9 323
 ix. 3-5 83
 ix. 10 371, 372
 ix. 11 138
 ix. 12 85, 415
 ix. 14 83, 200
 ix. 24 83
 ix. 26-28 415
 x. 1 85, 138
 x. 7-17 24
 x. 10
 x. 53, 83, 208 *thrice*, 415, 425
 x. 11 138
 x. 12 52, 83 *twice*, 138
 x. 13 83
 x. 14 53, 208
 x. 21 83
 x. 26-29 233
 x. 29 235
 xi. 137, 192, 207

HEBREWS (*continued*)

xi. 1	xx
xi. 4	53
xi. 6	xx, 4
xi. 8-19	205
xi. 40	71
xii. 16, 17	231
xii. 18	71
xii. 23	71
xiii. 4	432
xiii. 7	316
xiii. 9	xxiii
xiii. 10	317, 318, 393
xiii. 15	425
xiii. 16	425
xiii. 17	316
xiii. 20	82

JAMES

i. 5-7	357
i. 21	xxi
ii.	205, 340
ii. 2	266
ii. 19	xxi, 24
ii. 24	205, 206
iii. 2	219
iii. 6	66
iii. 9	165
iv. 17	219
v. 13	354
v. 14	266, 354, 355

I PETER

i. 1	121
i. 2	251 <i>twice</i>
i. 2-5	239
i. 3, 4	75, 497
i. 11	96
i. 12	110
i. 15	219
i. 16	208
i. 18	53
i. 19	224

I PETER (*continued*)

i. 21	75, 81
ii. 4	278
ii. 4-6	274
ii. 5	316
iii. 15	xxvi
iii. 18	53, 415
iii. 18-iv. 6	65-72
iii. 19	511
iii. 21	372
iv. 6	511
v. 3	314

2 PETER

i. 1	24, 121
i. 10, 11	252
i. 21	98, 117, 121
ii. 4	66
iii. 15	121
iii. 16	111, 121

I JOHN

i. 5	16, 121
i. 7	392
i. 8	158, 219, 227, 228
i. 9	186
i. 10	158, 227, 381
ii. 1	83, 233
ii. 2	53, 82
iii. 4	166
iii. 5	158
iii. 9	232
iii. 10	207 <i>twice</i>
iii. 12	200
iv. 8	16 <i>twice</i>
iv. 9	34
iv. 10	34, 53, 63
iv. 15	278
iv. 16	16
iv. 19	188
v. 1	152, 191, 278
v. 16	233

2 JOHN

i. 9	xxiii
----------------	-------

3 JOHN

i. 6	266
i. 9	266
i. 10	266

JUDE

i. 3	xxi, 121
----------------	----------

REVELATION

i. 1	xvii
i. 2	111
i. 3	111
i. 5	34
i. 6	316
i. 8	16
i. 18	52, 83
ii. 7	66, 67, 289
ii. 18	34
v. 6	52, 83
v. 9	53
v. 12	52
vii. 2	14
vii. 17	83
ix. 11	66
x. 7	111
xi. 13	520
xii. 11	52
xiii. 8	52
xiv. 13	303, 509
xix. 10	307
xix. 13	34, 522
xx. 4-6	256 <i>twice</i>
xx. 12-15	256
xxi.	256
xxi. 27	256
xxii. 6-9	111
xxii. 18, 19	121, 285