

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS FOR USE IN DISCUSSION GROUPS

Chapter I

THE PERSONS OF THE GODHEAD

1. A says, "The Church should not use illustrations from science in her teaching, because only experts in science can distinguish scientific facts from theories",
B says, "The Church must relate her teaching to that of the scientists, if her message is to be deemed relevant in a scientific age".
What do *you* think?
2. Discuss the statement that "Christ's place and work in the universe is simply an extension of His regenerating effect on the faithful soul".
3. "There is nothing either in science or theology against viewing the universe as a projection of Divine thought". Do you agree?
4. Can you think of any points on which sound theology and scientific facts are contradictory?
5. Could the salvation of man have been effected without the Incarnation of the Son of God?
6. How important is it to believe that Jesus was born of a Virgin? Could He have shared our nature to the full without such a birth?
7. "The Divine purpose in Creation is realized in the fellowship of the Church". Do you agree? What can we do to promote God's purpose to-day?
8. Is it important to believe that our Lord descended into Hades?
9. "The doctrine of a future Judgement implies that until then no man's future state is irrevocably sealed". Discuss the relation between this view and belief in an Intermediate State.
10. Does "realized eschatology" strengthen or undermine belief in an Intermediate State?
11. Discuss the points of difference between a resurrection appearance and a disembodied spirit. Do you think our Lord's resurrection was really necessary?
12. Is cremation consistent with Christian beliefs?
13. How would you convince someone that Jesus rose from the dead?
14. How can we overcome the limitations of language in attempting to understand the Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord? Is precise definition desirable or possible on such questions?
15. Are modern Space Research programmes likely to have any material effect on Christian beliefs and teaching?
16. Find and discuss some passages in the New Testament which connect the coming of the Holy Spirit with both the Father and the Son.
17. Is it possible to be a Christian without believing in the Holy Spirit? (e.g., is belief in the Spirit essential for a valid sacrament of Holy Baptism by which we are incorporated "into Christ"?)

Chapter II

THE SCRIPTURES AND CREEDS

18. "The Church is founded on the Bible",—to what extent is that statement true?
19. The teaching of the Old Testament "is to be understood and applied only in the light of Christian principles". Do you agree?
20. Discuss the value of reading the Old Testament in Public Worship. Are all parts of it of equal value (e.g., the story of Jacl's slaughter of Sisera, and the Book of Isaiah).
21. The Church followed Judaism "in regarding Scripture as the record of revelation, and of unique religious authority". Consider the bearing of this on our differences with the Roman Church regarding the basis of dogmas of the Faith.
22. Discuss: "There is a tendency towards the New Testament in the Old".
23. Do you think that Article VII is justified in distinguishing between parts of the Old Testament which are binding upon Christians, and those which are not?
24. "It is a mistake to suppose that prophetic vision or insight contained a clear picture of the future, every detail of which was realized in the event, prophecy is never equal to fulfilment like that: fulfilment is always richer and more meaningful than prophecy". Do you agree?
25. Discuss the statement: "There are different sorts of truth. If the facts of a story are true but the interpretation they place on God are untrue, is it right to say the story is true?"
26. "No man is ever better than the best he believes". Is this true? If so, has it any relevance to the Creeds?
27. "Every man should be free to reject whatever he dislikes; the Church should not require acceptance of the Creeds". Discuss the weakness of such an argument (e.g., should a man be free to reject any of the Commandments with impunity; what would happen to society if everyone did the same?).
28. "It is better to be a heretic than a hypocrite!" Do you agree? Is it necessary to be either one or the other?

Chapter III

THE NATURE OF MAN

29. The present century has seen great scientific advances which are widely regarded as marks of "progress". Discuss whether it is easier to overcome sin to-day (consider juvenile delinquency, sexual relationships, the effect of modern advertising on morals and standards, etc.). Can industrialized society be regarded as "better" than rural society?
30. Discuss the failure of the evolutionary theory of ethics to account for conscience.
31. "The doctrine of Original Sin is an attempt to explain the universal sinfulness of human nature". Do you agree that there is a tendency to do evil in every person—if so, how do you account for it?
32. Discuss the statement: "Nothing is too good to be true; the better it is the truer it is".
33. God's love in creation and redemption must be the primary thought about His relation to us. Discuss whether such a belief tends to preserve human freedom.

34. Why can man not "turn and prepare himself, by his natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God"?
35. "For beings placed in a world like ours, acceptance of the Gospel involves two things, the prompting of grace to believe, and personal decision to respond". Do you agree?
36. Temptation has been defined as "the conflict within us between what we believe to be the will of God on one side and the pull of evil forces on the other". Is such temptation good for us, or would we be better people without it (e.g., does a person who knows nothing of the will of God experience any *consciousness* of being tempted)?
37. Discuss the nature of our Lord's Temptation in the wilderness. Do we ever suffer similar temptations to-day?
38. How are the two statements in I John i.8 and iii.9 on sinfulness and sinlessness to be reconciled? If we teach that sinless perfection is not feasible on earth, do we undermine the motive for human effort?
39. Article XVI takes an intermediate position between two extremes: (a) the impossibility of forgiveness for the unpardonable sin, and (b) the impossibility of the regenerate committing sin. Discuss the value and limitations of each of the three positions, and show which is in closest accord with your own experience.
40. Should the Church adopt a more stringent attitude towards those who deliberately commit sin? Which attitude is most likely to lead to the sinner's repentance? Should the same rules be applied and rigidly enforced in every case?
41. Show that the general teaching of the New Testament is that Christians still sin, can repent and receive pardon.

Chapter IV

THE SALVATION OF MAN

42. Discuss the relationship between Baptism and justification.
43. "For St. Paul there is no such thing as an isolated Christian, standing alone and by himself". Discuss whether this statement is true, and if so, its implications (e.g. can a man be saved in isolation, without being a member of a fellowship)?
44. "Where moral behaviour is the result of human endeavour . . . it is not possible to avoid a feeling of self-congratulation and pride in independent accomplishment". Is this always so? If such pride is sinful, can human endeavour alone ever produce deeds of merit in the sight of God?
45. Consider why our righteous acts can never establish a claim to divine reward.
46. Article XII rejects two wrong attitudes towards Good Works. Is a true attitude towards Good Works important from a practical point of view (e.g., how significant are they in relation to witness to the outsider)?
47. Consider the error corrected in the Epistle of James, and show how its teaching may be reconciled with that of St. Paul.
48. What is the place of Good Works in Christianity? Are they essential?
49. "The basis of Christian living is unique both in content and method". From such a viewpoint, discuss the statement in Article XIII that "Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God".
50. What should be the dominant motive of Christian conduct?
51. Show from the New Testament that Christian behaviour is not mere obedience to an external code, but the expression of the mind of Christ within the believer.

52. Discuss how the moral sense renders the phrase "a work of supererogation" meaningless.
53. "Conscience commits us to honour the best that we know". Discuss the implications of this statement.
54. When a serious accident causes loss of life and injury sometimes people say, "It is God's will". Do you think it is part of God's purpose that such accidents happen?
55. Predestination is often interpreted as meaning that every detail of human life is dictated by a predetermined Divine plan. Is such a view consistent with the view that man is endowed by God with a free will?
56. If "Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God" does it apply to all men, and should it affect our attitude towards notorious sinners and criminals (e.g., should a murderer be hanged)?
57. Discuss the effect of 'liberalism' in religion on the missionary work of the Church, and on evangelism in general.
58. "One faith, or any form of the same faith, is as good as another". Do you agree? What is the logical conclusion to which such a view leads? Is it consistent with such passages as Hebrews i.1-3; ii.1-4, etc.
59. Discuss the statement: "Consistency itself is not sufficient; it must be a consistency in which expression is given to true thinking".
60. Is opposition and disagreement in thought a good or a bad thing? It is said to be good for governments. Is it also good for religion?

Chapter V

THE CHURCH

61. "Men speak as if Christians came first and the Church after: as if the origin of the Church was in the wills of the individuals who composed it. But, on the contrary, throughout the teaching of the Apostles, we see that it is the Church that comes first and the members of it afterwards." If this is true would the present day members of the Church have any right to originate a new Church (e.g., for the sake of unity) which differed in fundamental doctrine and practice from the Church of the early centuries?
62. "However corrupt the Christians may be, St. Paul does not suggest that they do not belong to the 'true' or 'real' Church". Sometimes we hear people to-day saying, "You may be a member of the Church, but you're not a Christian". Can both of these statements be true? If not, which do you think is true?
63. "The prodigal son was still a son even when he was in the far country; he did not become a son by his act of repentance". The parable illustrates the relationship between God and man. When do we become 'sons of God'? Do we have to do something in order to become God's children?
64. "Truth and loyalty to truth must come first, both for the sake of the truth and for the sake of the Church's mission in the world. A divided Church, each part of which is convinced of the truth as it sees it, is more likely to convert the world to Christianity than a Church united in uncertainty". Do you agree?

Chapter VI

THE CHURCH'S AUTHORITY IN DOCTRINE

65. What is the value of traditions and ceremonies? Is it desirable that they should vary from place to place?
66. If the Church asserted her authority more effectively would it check the spread of sectarianism, or would it foster a reaction which would have the opposite effect?
67. Sometimes people undermine the teaching of the Church by saying, "It's not what the Church says that matters, it's what the Bible says". How would you answer such a statement? Give examples of any real contradiction between the teaching of the Anglican Church and that of the Bible.
68. Discuss the advantages and/or disadvantages of allowing the Civil Power to have rights in Church affairs (e.g., Establishment in the Church of England).
69. "In the New Testament future punishment is usually connected with the Last Judgement and after, and not with the experience of spirits in the Intermediate State". Is this a valid conclusion from the biblical references given on page 140 and 143?
70. Discuss whether the value of using images as aids to devotion is greater than the dangers inherent in such a practice.
71. Can the Invocation of Saints be justified on any ground?

Chapter VII

THE CHURCH'S AUTHORITY IN DISCIPLINE

72. "If too much emphasis is laid on 'edification' people get the impression that worship is primarily for the benefit of man; we ought to think more of what type of worship God desires". Do you agree? What type of worship is most likely to satisfy both God's desires and man's needs?
73. How can we keep our Services traditional without allowing them to become dull and monotonous? Give suggestions.
74. "Fellowship is essential in Christian Worship, and fellowship is fully realized only when worship becomes a common and corporate action". Discuss ways and means of implementing this principle.
75. To what extent should worship be expressed in the everyday language of the people, or should people be taught the language of worship? Is continuity important in worship (the same Bible is read in every generation) or should the forms of worship change to suit each generation?
76. Discuss the reasons for and against clerical celibacy, having regard to the evidence of the New Testament and Church history on the question.
77. Is it desirable that the Church should take disciplinary action against notorious offenders? What form should such discipline take?
78. Should the Church impose discipline on those who break their marriage vows (e.g., by divorce, or remarriage after divorce)?
79. Article XXXIV condemns "whosoever through his private judgement deliberately breaks the traditions and ceremonies of the Church". Should such offenders be disciplined, and if so, what form of discipline would be effective against such individualists?

80. Discuss the dangers (a) of placing too much emphasis on private judgement, and (b) of under-rating private judgement.
81. Over the centuries a great variety of Traditions have developed in the Church. What criteria would you use in assessing the value and importance of particular traditions?
82. The reading of non-canonical writings in the Church's Services was not unknown in the Church's history. Should the practice be continued subject to episcopal or synodical approval of the writings to be read (We already read Pastoral Letters from Bishops and extracts from the Lambeth Conference Reports)?
83. Should the Church make use of modern media in her Services, such as religious films or appropriate broadcasts from time to time?

Chapter VIII

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

84. "The Church grew up round its Apostolic Ministry. There is a given-ness both in its faith and in its form". Examine this statement with reference to the New Testament, and discuss its implications for the re-union of the Church.
85. Would the Church be true to its essential nature as conceived by our Lord, if it had no ordained Ministry? Consider, for instance, the significance of John xx.23, etc.
86. Discuss the reasons for the Roman Catholic Church's denial of the validity of Anglican Orders.
87. Discuss the significance of the words in the Preface to the Ordinal: "or hath had formerly episcopal Consecration or Ordination".
88. Most people seek the advice of a trained doctor or lawyer when they require authoritative opinions on medical or legal questions; why are they sometimes so willing to accept the opinion of laymen untrained in theology when they are seeking the answer to religious questions?

Chapter IX

THE SACRAMENTS

89. Would our Lord have instituted the Sacraments of the Gospel if participation in them were not necessary for salvation?
90. Discuss the connection between Baptism and Confirmation. Which do you think is most important?
91. "Things in physical Nature can symbolize and communicate spiritual reality". Discuss this statement and think out some examples to illustrate it.
92. Discuss whether the principle underlying Article XXVI is a sound one.
93. Is it right to re-baptize someone who has been baptized in infancy? Discuss the presuppositions on which such a practice is based, and see if they are in accord with New Testament teaching.
94. Discuss the evidence for believing that Christian Baptism was instituted by our Lord (cf. p. 190 f.).

95. "Baptism is the means whereby God performs a divine creative act". If so, should we expect to be able to explain the precise relationship between the form of the Sacrament and its effects?
96. Is there sufficient evidence from the New Testament and early Church history to justify the practice of Infant Baptism?
97. Discuss the teaching of Article XXVIII on the Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper.
98. Discuss how sacramental worship can be made an instrument of evangelism.
99. Study the Holy Communion Service and discuss its teaching and devotional value. Would you like to see any changes made in the Service?
100. Is it desirable that the Anglican Communion Service should follow the same basic structure in every part of the world?
101. Discuss, following Article XXIX, how the doctrine of Christ's Presence in the Holy Communion is related to the spiritual state of the communicant.
102. Examine references in the New Testament to the Lord's Supper which indicate that the early Christians received in Both Kinds (e.g., I Cor. xi.23-29).
103. Do you consider that the conception of Transubstantiation is sufficient reason to justify the withholding of the Cup from the laity?
104. Discuss the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews that the sacrifice of the Death of Christ is the end of all sacrifices.
105. Can the Roman sacrifices of Masses be said to resemble the Jewish sacrifices in any way?

Chapter X

CHURCH AND STATE

106. Discuss the facts which led to the development of the Bishop of Rome's pre-eminence. Do these facts justify Roman Catholic claims?
107. Can it be demonstrated conclusively from the New Testament that St. Peter was chief amongst the Apostles?
108. Can the Royal Supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs be justified on theological or historical grounds?
109. Is the teaching of Article XXXVII on Capital Punishment and Pacifism satisfactory?
110. Consider whether our Lord's teaching (e.g., His advice to the Rich Young Ruler) supports the principles of modern Communism.
111. Discuss the instances of "communism" in the Acts of the Apostles, and their background. Do they constitute an obligation upon us to adopt the same practice?
112. Show that while "the right, title, and possession" of wealth are admitted in Scripture, it also teaches the stewardship of wealth.
113. Consider the implications of our Lord's teaching on swearing in St. Matthew v.34-37.
114. Are the Quakers justified in refusing to take oaths?
115. Discuss St. Paul's invoking the Name of Christ or of God in solemn affirmation (Rom. ix.1; II Cor. i.23; Gal. i.20), and consider whether they justify the taking of oaths.

APPENDIX B

CHRISTIAN INITIATION

W. G. WILSON

IN HIS review of Dr. Thornton's book, *Confirmation, its place in the Baptismal Mystery*, Dr. Lampe declared: "The exegesis employed in this book should rather be described as *eisegesis*, an imposition of a pattern upon the text rather than an exposition of its own inner meaning."¹ The more closely one studies recent books and articles on the subject of Christian Initiation, the more evident it becomes that few writers have succeeded in avoiding some measure of *eisegesis* in their treatment of the New Testament and Patristic writings. It may be that even Dr. Lampe has indulged in a little *eisegesis* in certain parts of his book, *The Seal of the Spirit*. For instance, in his treatment of the *Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* he considers that "it is particularly their baptism which has admitted them [the catechumens] into the brotherhood. The bishop's part is to complete the ceremony with the laying on of his hands, prayer that they might receive grace to serve God according to His will, and signing with the mark of Christ." He then goes on to say: "Confirmation, if we are so to designate the final stage of the initiatory rite, appears to be . . . a complex of subsidiary ceremonies expressive of the bishop's blessing . . . , of his prayer that they may receive grace for positive and active service for God, . . . unction . . . , and of the signing of the Cross . . .", and he concludes: "All these are of relatively small importance as compared with the baptism itself which gives them meaning and of which they are, so to speak, an explanatory extension."² But even a casual reader of the text of the *Apostolic Tradition* will feel that Dr. Lampe is unduly minimizing the significance of the bishop's

¹*J.T.S.*, N.S., Vol. VI, Pt. i, April 1955, p. 112.

²*The Seal of the Spirit*, pp. 135-6.

part in the Initiation. He does not mention that the rite concludes with the words :

Thenceforth they [the newly baptized] shall pray together with all the people. But they shall not previously pray with the faithful before they have undergone *all* these things.

And after the prayers, let them give the kiss of peace.¹

These explicit statements should be sufficient to preclude any suggestion that the baptismal act *without the bishop's part* was sufficient to admit the catechumen into the brotherhood. In this connection it will be remembered that Professor Ratcliff² pointed out that in Justin Martyr's description of Christian Initiation the "washing" of the catechumen is followed by the offering of "prayers in common both for ourselves and for the person who has received illumination", after which "we salute one another with a kiss when we have concluded the prayers" (*Apol.*, lxv). It is surely significant that both in Justin and in the *Apostolic Tradition* the brethren exchange the kiss of brotherhood, not immediately after the "washing" but after the "common prayers" of the Faithful.

A cursory reading of Dix's edition of the text of the *Apostolic Tradition* gives the impression that the Church of his day undoubtedly connected the gift of the Spirit with the bishop's prayer and Imposition of Hands. Hippolytus says,

And the bishop shall lay his hand upon them invoking and saying:

O Lord God, who didst count these thy servants worthy of deserving the forgiveness of sins by the laver of regeneration, (make them worthy to be filled with) Thy Holy Spirit and send upon them Thy grace, that they may serve Thee according to Thy will: (for) to Thee (is) the glory, to the Father and to the Son with the Holy Ghost in the holy Church, both now (and ever) and world without end. Amen

After this pouring the consecrated oil from his hand and laying his hand on his head, he shall say:

I anoint thee with holy oil in God the Father Almighty and Christ Jesus and the Holy Ghost.

And sealing him on the forehead, he shall give him the kiss (of peace) and say:

The Lord be with you.

And he who has been sealed shall say:

And with thy spirit.

And so shall he do to each one severally.¹

Dr. Lampe confesses that if this is the authentic text of the *Apostolic Tradition*, "we should have to conclude that the treatise . . . actually affords early evidence of a divorce in orthodox circles of Spirit-baptism from water-baptism."² He avoids this conclusion, however, by emphasizing that the Latin version of the *Apostolic Tradition* contained in the Verona MS.LV(53) does not contain the words, "Make them worthy to be filled with", in the bishop's prayer. This version suits his argument admirably for it "appears to refer the gift of the Spirit to what has already taken place in the water-baptism rather than to what is going to happen in the 'confirmation' ".³ Hence the value of the *Apostolic Tradition* in this discussion must depend on our answer to a problem of textual criticism. Dix's view was that the Latin version of the prayer is corrupt, the words in question having been omitted, and he based his reconstruction of the original on five other versions, viz.: T, Arab., Ethiop., Boh., and K, all of which agree in reading, "Make them worthy to be filled with thy Holy Spirit." Perhaps more may be said in support of Dix than is allowed by Dr. Lampe, for the Syriac *Testament of Our Lord* (T) and the Arabic *Canons of Hippolytus* (K) are both translations of Greek adaptations of Hippolytus' treatise, while the extant Ethiopic and Boharic versions are based on a Sahidic text. It is probable, therefore, that these versions are all independent of the Verona MS., which Dr. Lampe dates as "the late fifth or early sixth century". At least one of them, the Ethiopic, may be dated c. 500 A.D. There is some justification for Fr. Crehan's verdict that "The agreement of the Arian fragments with the Ethiopic

¹Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

²*Op. cit.*, p. 138.

³*Op. cit.*, p. 136.

¹G. Dix, *The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*, Vol. I, p. 39.

²*Theology*, Vol. LI, No. 334, April 1948, p. 138.

version of Hippolytus is too remarkable to have been the result of later deliberate adaptation."

If the other versions are correct some explanation must be given to account for the omission in the Latin version. It is unlikely that the Latin text was deliberately altered; the corruption must then have occurred accidentally. Dr. Lampe apparently considers that he has disposed of Dix's suggestion of corruption by saying that the Latin text of the Verona palimpsest shows no sign of any major dislocation at this point, nor of any lacuna, and that the manuscript, "though admittedly difficult to read", is reasonably clear. But many students of early manuscripts must feel that Dr. Lampe has not sufficiently exhausted all the possibilities before rejecting the view that the Latin text is corrupt.

The Verona text is not the original translation from the Greek of Hippolytus, but merely a copy, or—more likely—a copy of a copy of the original translation. Eusebius (*Vit. Constant.*, iv. 36) says that the Emperor Constantine ordered fifty copies of the Scriptures to be made for use in the churches of his new capital. No doubt copies were made of the original Latin translation of Hippolytus. The Verona MS. could be a copy of one of those earlier copies in which a line had accidentally been omitted. C. H. Turner considered that the original translation into Latin was made *c.* 420-30 A.D., while Dix pointed out that "The philological peculiarities of the Latin have suggested to most experts in Patristic Latinity that the translation from the Greek was made about the time of St. Ambrose." It is probable, therefore, that at least a century separates the Verona text from the original translation, during which it is reasonable to believe that several copies of the Latin Translation may have been made. A corruption might easily have occurred in an earlier Latin version,¹ through the mutilation of some words at the bottom of a column, or the accidental omission of a line. The fact that the Verona text is reasonably clear, does not, therefore, rule out the possibility

¹ F. G. Kenyon observes that "No two manuscripts of the Old Latin agree with any closeness with one another" (*The Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 1912, pp. 356f). Was it perhaps easier for scribes to err in copying Latin?

of corruption by an earlier copyist. Nor does it exclude the possibility that the scribe who wrote the Verona MS. may himself have omitted a line from the MS. which he was copying, even if that MS. was the original Latin translation.

Dr. Lampe has indeed considered the possibility that some words such as *dignos fac eos repletionis* may have been accidentally omitted if two consecutive lines of the text began with *-tionis*, and the first dropped out accidentally, thus:

Qui dignos fecisti eos remissionem mere-	(34 letters)
ri peccatorum per lavacrum regenera-	(31 ")
tionis <i>dignos fac eos reple-</i>	(23 ")
<i>tionis</i> spiritus sancti; inmitte in eos tuam grati-	(41 ")
am . . .	

He rejects this hypothesis, however, because the omission of the clause ought to have left *et* standing before *inmitte*, and because the line "*tionis . . . reple*" is "unnaturally short." But the omission of *et* could be the work of a redactor; such corrections were often made by scribes copying manuscripts. His second objection loses much of its weight when we remember that Codex Bezae (VIth cent.), which has been attributed to "a scribe whose native language was Latin",¹ contains lines varying in length between 14 and 39 letters per line in the Greek version, and from 15 to 41 letters per line in the Latin version. It is unusual to find such great variation in the number of letters per line in early manuscripts, but in the case of the Codex Bezae "The writing on each page occupies a single column, but is not written in continuous paragraphs but in *kola*, or short clauses divided according to the sense; in this way the corresponding words in the two languages are kept strictly parallel."² The translator of the *Apostolic Tradition* into Latin might have followed the same principle with the object of making the Latin version correspond line by line with the Greek original. The most serious objection to Dr. Lampe's "reconstruction" is the improbability of the scribe or translator ending a *short* line with an uncompleted word such as *reple-*

¹F. G. Kenyon, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

²F. G. Kenyon, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

In the Codex Bezae the scribe generally ended each line with a complete word, even if he had to continue into the margin in order to do so.

The earliest extant fourth century Uncial manuscripts, however, are more generally written in narrow columns of three or four columns to the page, while in the fifth and sixth century "the writing grows larger and the columns broader, so that there are not more than two to a page, and sometimes only one".¹ The narrowest columns in the earliest manuscripts have an average of 12-14 letters per line, though others such as the Rylands Fragment of St. John (P. Ryl. Gk.457), dated c. 150 A.D. or earlier, has single columns to the page with lines of 29-35 letters; P. Oxy. 208: 1781, a third century papyrus of St. John, has an average of 27 letters to the line; while the Codex Alexandrinus (Vth cent.) has an average of some 22 letters per line. The early Uncial manuscripts were written in capital letters without spaces between the words, and usually little variation in the length of the lines (e.g., the Codex Bobiensis, a fifth or sixth century Latin manuscript in rough Uncials, has in ten consecutive lines 25, 27, 26, 23, 26, 18, 28, 24, 22, and 27 letters respectively). Hence, the original Latin translation of the *Apostolic Tradition* might well have been written thus:

EPISCOPUS UEROMANU ILLISINPON-	(27 letters)
ENSINUOCETD ICENS:DNEDSQUI	(24 ")
DIGNOSFECISTIEOSREMISSION-	(25 ")
EMMERERIPECCATORUMPER	(21 ")
LAUACRUM REGENERATIONIS	(22 ")
DIGNOSFACEOSREPLETIONIS	(23 ")
SPUSSCIINMITTEINEOSTUAM	(23 ")
GRATIAMUTTIBISERUIANT	(21 ")
SECUNDUMUOLUNTATEMTUAM	(22 ")
QUONIAMTIBIESTGLORIAPATRI...	(25 ")

It is not improbable that a scribe might have omitted the second line commencing "DIGNOS..." because it is so similar to the earlier line with the same beginning, or more likely because it has the *same ending* as the previous line, viz: "-TIONIS".

¹Ibid., p. 50.

This kind of error arising from the similarity of adjoining words, "which led the scribe's eye to slip from one to the other and so omit the intervening words" is "in one form or another a very common one, and has to be borne in mind constantly in the criticism of manuscripts".¹ It will be noted that our above reconstruction gives lines with no greater variation than 21-27 letters per line. Nor can any objection be raised to this hypothesis on the ground that the lines do not all end with complete words, for in the earlier manuscripts it is quite common to find words broken at the end of lines.² A study of manuscripts reveals, as we should expect, that a line ending with an incomplete word is generally one of the *longest* lines in the column. This is the case in the Rylands Fragment and in most early manuscripts, the Codex Bezae being one of the few exceptions where the margin is used to complete words. Even Dr. Lampe's suggestion if set down as it would appear in an early Uncial manuscript with narrow columns in which the *longest* line contains 23 letters (thereby accounting for the break in *reple - tionis*) would look like this:

QUIDIGNOSFECISTIEOS	(19)
REMISSIONEMMERERIPECCAT-	(23)
ORUMPERLAUACRUMREGENERA-	(23)
TIONISDIGNOSFACEOSREPLE-	(23)
TIONISSPUSSCIINMITTEIN	(22)
EOSTUAMGRATIAMUTTIBI	(20)
SERUIANTSECUNDUMUOLUN-	(21)
TATEMTUAMQUONIAMTIBI	(20)

¹Kenyon, op. cit., pp. 8f. In the original proofs of this article the opening lines of this paragraph read: "The earliest extant fourth century Uncial manuscripts, however, are more generally written in narrow columns of three or four columns in the earliest manuscripts have an average of 12-14 letters . . ."—a perfect modern example of *homoioteleuton*, due to the fact that in copying the author's typescript, the printer's eye slipped from the second occurrence of the word "columns" to its fourth occurrence (three lines lower down in the typescript) and thence continued with "in the earliest manuscripts . . .". The fact that such an error also escaped the notice of the printer's proof-reader illustrates how easily such errors can occur, and reinforces the author's suggestion that the omission in the Verona MS. may be due to *homoioteleuton*.

²The Rylands Fragment of St. John indicates that 7 out of 14 lines ended, with incomplete words. *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel*, Ed. C. H. Roberts, p. 28.

If due regard is paid to the general character of early manuscripts it must be admitted that either of the above reconstructions is extremely probable, and gives a perfectly clear explanation of the omission in the Verona MS. as being due to homoioteleuton. But lest there be any doubt about such a possibility, yet another reconstruction is possible which seems to remove the hypothesis from the realm of mere conjecture, viz:

EPISCOPUS UEROMANUILLIS	(22)
INPONENSINUOCETDicens:	(21)
<u>DNĒDŚ</u> QUIDIGNOSFECISTI	(21)
EOSREMISSIONEMMERERI	(20)
PECCATORUMPERLAUACRUM	(21)
REGENERATIONISDIGNOSFAC	(23)
EOSREPLETIONISSPUSSCIIN-	(23)
MITTEINEOSTUAMGRATIAM	(21)
UTTIBISERUIANTSECUNDUM	(22)
UOLUNTATEMTUAMQUONIAM	(21)
TIBIESTGLORIAPATRIET	(20)
FILIOCUMSPUSCŌINSANCTA	(22)
ECCLESIAETNUNCETINSAE-	(21)
GULASAEULORUM AMEN	(18)

In some respects this reconstruction may be nearer to the original than either of the other two alternatives, since it has less variation in the length of the lines, and it would be extremely easy for the scribe as he was finishing the word *regenerationis* to let his eye slip down to the *tionis* on the line immediately below and thence proceed to write "SPUSSCI . . .", thereby omitting *dignos fac eos repletionis*, "make them worthy to be filled with".

Discussing the distinction between "conjectural emendation, which must be utterly discarded" and the "just use of internal evidence", Dr. Scrivener felt that the latter was justified "where external evidence is evenly, or at any rate not very unevenly balanced".¹ Discussing rules of internal evidence "alike applicable to all subjects of literary investigation", he mentions

¹Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, 1883, p. 492.

Griesbach's preference for "the briefer reading", but qualifies his own acceptance of that principle by saying: "Yet it is just as true that words and clauses are sometimes wilfully omitted for the sake of removing apparent difficulties, and that the negligent loss of whole passages through *homoioteleuton* is common to manuscripts of every age and character. On the whole," he concludes, "the indiscriminate rejection of portions of the text regarded as supplementary, on the evidence of but a few authorities, must be viewed with considerable distrust and suspicion." The fact that the Verona MS. is the only authority which omits "makes them worthy to be filled with" against the unanimous testimony of T.Ar.E.Boh.K. for its inclusion, the facility with which it can be demonstrated that the Latin omission may be due to *homoioteleuton*, and the extreme difficulty of accounting for the agreement of T.Ar.E.Boh.K. if the Latin be regarded as the true text, weigh heavily in favour of the retention of "make them worthy to be filled with" as part of Hippolytus' text. A study of Hippolytus' other writings also supports the longer text against the Verona MS., and caused even Dr. Lampe to admit that "On the whole, it is probably fair to say that Hippolytus' own conception of the matter stands not far distant from that of the oriental versions of the *Apostolic Tradition*".¹ What is more natural than that Hippolytus' own views had been derived from the apostolic tradition which he had received? On one point at least Dr. Lampe concurs with Dix, namely, "that there is no question of Hippolytus himself being an innovator or composing" the *Apostolic Tradition* "out of his own imagination. It is not a new use, introduced for the first time by its author." Hence, if our hypothesis of *homoioteleuton* in the Latin version be accepted, the *Apostolic Tradition* must be accepted as a very early witness to the association of the Holy Spirit with the Laying on of Hands by the bishop as an integral part of early rites of Christian Initiation.

We need not concern ourselves in the present article with the Apocryphal Acts, which are of uncertain date and "essentially popular and untheological". But Justin Martyr's account of

¹Op. cit., p. 147.

Baptism is of such importance that Dr. Lampe's version of it cannot be allowed to pass without comment.¹ Surely he is indulging in a little *eisegesis* when he says that Justin rests the authority for Baptism on John 3. 5: "Expect a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"? If too much emphasis has sometimes been placed on Justin's alleged silence concerning Confirmation, perhaps too little notice has been taken of his silence concerning the Holy Spirit in his account of Baptism and its effects. Justin describes how the candidates for Baptism "are taught to pray, and beg God with fasting, to grant them forgiveness of their former sins; and we pray and fast with them. Then we bring them where there is water; and after the same manner of regeneration as we also were regenerated ourselves, they are regenerated; for in the Name of God, the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, they then receive the washing of water: for, indeed, Christ also said, *Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.* And that it is impossible for those who are once born to enter into their mothers' womb, is plain to all."² It is obvious that Justin here associates the water with forgiveness and regeneration, and loosely cites John 3. 3 and alludes to 3. 4 merely with reference to regeneration. Apart from the reference to the Threefold Name, he does not mention the Holy Spirit. If he had wished to suggest that baptism in water was "the sacramental medium of the gift of the Spirit", he would surely have mentioned John 3. 5. When he goes on to state the "reason from the Apostles for so doing", he gives the objects of baptism as being "that we might not remain the children of necessity and ignorance, but of choice, and of knowledge; and that we might obtain remission of the sins we had formerly committed; in the water, there is called over him who chooses the new birth, and repents of his sins, the name of God the Father . . . and in the name of Jesus Christ, . . . ; and in the name of the Holy Ghost, who foretold, by the Prophets, all these things about Jesus; does he who is enlightened receive his

¹Op. cit., pp. 109f.

²Apol. 61.

washing." Justin's silence concerning any gift of the Holy Spirit as an effect of baptism in water cannot be ignored. True, in arguing against the necessity for circumcision, he says, "What need have I of that baptism, who have been baptized with Holy Spirit?"¹ but Professor Ratcliff has satisfactorily shown² that this is to be interpreted figuratively rather than literally, and does not, therefore, contradict his earlier account. Hence Justin's writings, if they do not contain explicit references to Confirmation, neither do they explicitly associate the gift of the Spirit with baptism in water. At the same time, it will be observed that Justin's account of baptism contains nothing inconsistent with the account given in the *Apostolic Tradition*. That Justin regarded the Baptism of Jesus as typical of the Christian sacrament Dr. Lampe does not deny, but he emphasizes that Justin "does not actually say so". Neither does Justin actually say that the gift of the Spirit is received through baptism in water, though Dr. Lampe would like us to infer that such was Justin's view. In the case of Justin the *argumentum e silentio* is obviously a two-edged sword which can be used quite effectively against Dr. Lampe's main thesis.

Discussing the significance of the Baptism of Jesus, Jeremy Taylor observed, "There are some who from this story would infer the descent of the Holy Ghost after Christ's baptism not to signify that confirmation was to be a distinct rite from baptism, but a part of it,—yet such a part as gives fulness and consummation to it", but he rejected this view on the ground that reason and the context are both against it, "because the Holy Ghost was not given by John's baptism; that was reserved to be one of Christ's glories; who also, when by His disciples He baptized many, did not give them the Holy Ghost; and when He commanded His apostles to baptize all nations, did not at that time so much as promise the Holy Ghost: He was promised distinctly and given by another ministration."³ John 4. 1, 2, here referred to, is certainly difficult to reconcile with the view that in the Apostolic Age the Holy Ghost was

¹Dial. 29.

²Theology, Vol. LI., No. 334, April 1948, pp. 135-9.

³"Discourse on Confirmation", in Heber's *Works*, Vol. XI, p. 236 (1839).

associated with Baptism without Imposition of Hands. If we exclude the events of the Day of Pentecost and the case of Cornelius and his household (which has been called "the Pentecost of the Gentiles", and is accepted on all sides as being "exceptional"), there is no *explicit* evidence in the Acts of the Apostles to indicate that the Holy Ghost was normally given in baptism without the Imposition of Hands. There is no explicit mention of the Laying on of Hands in the cases of the Ethiopian eunuch (8. 39), Lydia (16. 14f.), the Philippian gaoler (16. 33), or Crispus and the Corinthians (18. 8), *but neither is there in any of these cases the slightest suggestion that baptism conferred on them the gift of the Holy Ghost*. It has been pointed out by more than one writer that there are several passages in Acts which draw a contrast between John's baptism with water and Christian baptism with the Holy Ghost (Acts 1. 5; 11. 15, 16), while other passages (8. 16; 19. 5) regard baptism as a mere water rite in contrast with the gift of the Spirit received through the Laying on of Hands. Some expositors place these passages in two different categories, but for our present purpose we need only observe that all these passages have one thing in common, *viz., they do not associate the Holy Spirit explicitly with baptism in water*. In the case of Paul, too, it should be noted that the Holy Ghost is not explicitly associated with his baptism (9. 18), and when he recounted his experience to the people of Jerusalem he did not associate his baptism with the gift of the Holy Ghost but with the washing away of his sins (22. 16). Ananias was sent to Paul that he might receive his sight *through the Laying on of Hands* (9. 12), and he told Paul that he had been sent "that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost". The use of "fill" is reminiscent of the experience of the other Apostles on the Day of Pentecost when they too "were filled with the Holy Ghost" (2. 4) *without any reference to baptism in water*. Obviously the case is exceptional and not to be taken as a normal case of baptism. It is clear that Paul received both baptism and Laying on of Hands, and if the Holy Ghost is to be directly associated with either, all the evidence points to his association with the healing through the Laying on of Hands. There

remains only the events of the Day of Pentecost which can scarcely be regarded as conclusive evidence that baptism was believed to confer the gift of the Holy Ghost without the Laying on of Hands. There is no indication that Peter and John were doing anything *new* in Samaria (8. 14ff., the passage is considered more fully below), and there were twelve apostles present who could have conferred the Holy Ghost upon the new converts by Imposition of Hands.

In our consideration of Justin Martyr and the Acts of the Apostles we have deliberately emphasized the paucity of *explicit* statements associating the Holy Spirit with baptism in water, in order to illustrate and emphasize the dangers inherent in the use of the *argumentum e silentio*. That argument has often been used to deprive Confirmation of any real significance or apostolic authority. As we have seen, it could also be used virtually to deprive baptism in water of any real significance or association with the Holy Spirit. The Convocation Committees pointed out that "there are only three passages which closely connect the Laying-on-of-hands with Baptism, Acts 8. 14—17 and 19. 1-6, and Hebrews 6. 2".¹ But we notice that they mention only *two* passages which *explicitly* associate the Holy Spirit with baptism, *viz.*, Acts 2. 38 and 1 Cor. 12. 13.² It might justifiably be argued, therefore, that there is as much explicit evidence for deducing that Imposition of Hands was the normal concomitant of baptism as there is for associating the Holy Spirit with Christian baptism. There is no explicit evidence that the Ethiopian eunuch, Lydia, the Philippian gaoler, or Crispus and the Corinthians did not in fact receive the Holy Ghost. True, but if we are to use the *argumentum e silentio* consistently it must also be admitted that neither is there any evidence that they did not also receive the Laying on of Hands (an apostle was present in at least three of those cases). Dr. Lampe appears to be very inconsistent in his use of the *argumentum e silentio*. On the one hand, he regards the lack of explicit evidence in the cases of Lydia, Crispus and the Corinthians, and even Apollos, as no evidence that they did

¹Baptism and Confirmation To-day, 1955, p. 38.

²Op. cit., p. 36.

not receive the Spirit, but a few lines later¹ he regards Paul's silence concerning the Laying on of Hands in his teaching on Baptism as an "obvious objection" to the view that Confirmation was practised in the Apostolic Church as a regular part of the initiation ceremony. Here may it be said in passing that although St. Paul associates the Holy Spirit with baptism but does not mention the Laying on of Hands explicitly, he frequently speaks of "receiving the Spirit" and uses the same words which St. Luke uses to describe the reception of the Spirit which followed the Laying on of Hands (Acts 8. 17; cf. Rom. 8. 15, Gal. 3. 2, 1 Cor. 2. 12, 2 Cor. 11. 4). W. F. Flemington suggests: "Perhaps the true explanation of St. Paul's silence about the Laying on of Hands is to be found in the fact that to him the symbolism of *immersion* was far more expressive of the particular teaching he desired to emphasize. The mention of the Laying on of Hands in Hebrews vi. 2, side by side with 'teachings about baptisms', in a list of Christian 'fundamentals', would seem to confirm the view that in the first century A.D. the Laying on of Hands was generally understood to be a concomitant of baptism."² St. Paul's action in Acts 19. 1-7 corroborates this view, which is more convincing than the suggestion that on that occasion he was merely correcting an "irregularity".³ Dr. Lampe thinks it is surprising that St. Paul does not mention Laying on of Hands in his list of ministerial *charismata* in 1 Corinthians 12. 4-10. But neither does he mention Ordination, Baptism, or the Eucharist; he seems to be more concerned with the diversities of gifts rather than the means by which the gifts of the Spirit are received. He does, however, ask: "Are all apostles?" (12. 29), and the context clearly suggests that he meant that not everyone had the same gifts or powers as had apostles (e.g., the power of conferring the gift of the Holy Ghost through the Laying on of Hands, Acts 8. 18, cf. 2 Tim. 1. 6).

In the Introduction of his *Discourse on Confirmation* Jeremy Taylor describes the Holy Spirit as "the Spirit of regeneration

in baptism, of renovation in repentance; the Spirit of love, and the Spirit of holy fear; the Searcher of the hearts, and the Spirit of wisdom, and the Spirit of Prayer. . . . It is the same Spirit working divers operations. For He is all this now reckoned, and He is everything else that is the principle of good unto us; He is the beginning and the progression, the consummation and the perfection of us all: *and yet every work of His is perfect in its kind* . . . The Spirit moved a little upon the waters of baptism, and gave us the principles of life; but in confirmation He makes us able to move ourselves. In the first He is the Spirit of life; but in this he is the Spirit of strength and motion."¹ The 1948 Lambeth Conference affirmed that "the dissociation of the Holy Spirit's operation from any part of [Christian] Initiation is strongly to be deprecated, as is also the attempt to measure His operation quantitatively",² and this view has been endorsed by the Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York.³ As the Giver of Life He cannot be dissociated from our regeneration, which is the beginning of our New Life in Christ, and in the Prayer Book rite we are fully justified, therefore, in praying: "Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant that he may be born again." On the other hand, as the Archbishops' Theological Commission pointed out in 1948, "There is no language in the Baptismal Service for Infants which *explicitly affirms* that the gift of the Holy Ghost, *apart from His regenerative activity*, is conveyed through baptism itself."⁴ It is impossible to justify the extreme contrast between "water-baptism" and "Spirit-baptism", which has been pressed too far by many modern writers. Much of the confusion and many of the wrong conclusions have sprung from a misguided use of the *argumentum e silentio*. Acknowledgement of the Spirit's regenerative activity in baptism does not require a denial of his Fulness being conferred in confirmation through the Laying on of Hands. We have seen that there is good reason to accept Dix's version of the Bishop's prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition*, which associates

¹Op. cit., p. 67.

²*The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*. p. 44n.

³As suggested by J. E. L. Oulton, Pamphlet on *Confirmation*, A.P.C.K., p. 8.

¹*Works*, Vol. XI, pp. 230f.

²*Report*, p. 110.

³*Baptism and Confirmation To-day*, 1955, p. 35.

⁴*The Theology of Christian Initiation*, 1948, p. 16.

baptism with the "forgiveness of sins by the laver of regeneration" and proceeds to pray that the newly-baptized may be made "worthy to be *filled* with thy Holy Spirit" (Cf. Acts 2. 4, 9. 17), followed by the Imposition of Hands by the bishop.

Even if the evidence of Hippolytus is accepted, however, we must still enquire whether the Laying on of Hands is merely a "subsidiary ceremony" which became attached to baptism in the second century, or does it derive from the apostles as the normal concomitant of baptism in the first century? At one time Acts 8. 5-19 and 19. 1-7 would have been accepted as conclusive evidence on this point, but more recently it has been suggested that these passages represent exceptional rather than general procedure in the Apostolic Age. But before we examine some modern expositions of Acts 8. and 19. may we draw attention to Jeremy Taylor's exposition of Hebrews 6. 1, 2, which has not received as much consideration as it merits. "Here", he says, "are six fundamental points of St. Paul's catechism, which he laid as the foundation or the beginning of the institution of the Christian Church; and amongst these imposition of hands is reckoned as part of the foundation, and therefore they who deny it dig up foundations. True, the imposition of hands signifies confirmation, ordination, absolution, visitation of the sick, blessing of single persons (as Christ did the children brought to Him), and blessing marriages. Now the last three are not pretended to be any part of this foundation; neither reason, authority, nor the nature of the thing, suffers any such pretension: the question then is between the first three. Now it cannot mean absolution of penitents, for there is no evidence that the Apostles used that ceremony in their absolutions, and since baptism is one of the principal parts of the foundation, they needed no absolution but baptismal, which is 'for the remission of sins'. Nor can it mean ordination, because the Apostle says he is going to leave the foundation, and 'go on to perfection', that is, to higher mysteries. Now in rituals, of which he speaks, there is none higher than ordination. Furthermore, 'laying on of hands' in the context follows immediately upon baptism, and in the very next words of his discourse he does enumerate and

apportion to baptism and confirmation their proper and proportioned effects: to baptism, illumination, according to the perpetual style of the Church of God, calling baptism *photismos*—'an enlightening'; and to confirmation he reckons 'tasting the heavenly gift', and 'being made partakers of the Holy Ghost', by the thing signified declaring the sign, and by the mystery the rite." Taylor concludes his exposition by saying: "He calls it 'the doctrine of baptisms and laying on of hands': by which it does not only appear to be a lasting ministry, because no part of the Christian doctrine could be changed or abolished: but hence also it appears to be of Divine institution. For if it were not, St. Paul had been guilty of that which our blessed Saviour reproves in the Scribes and Pharisees, and should have 'taught for doctrines the commandments of men'. Which, because it cannot be supposed, it must follow that this doctrine of confirmation or imposition of hands is apostolical and Divine. The argument is clear, and not easy to be reproved."¹ This exposition is very relevant to present attempts to deprive confirmation of any Scriptural authority, and is in no way weakened by the fact that modern scholars may not agree that St. Paul is the author of Hebrews. Neither Dr. Lampe nor Dr. Oulton attempt to expound the passage with any confidence. The former finds it "hard to understand", and with obvious uncertainty suggests "we may perhaps *suppose* that the ceremony of fellowship and identification in the apostolic task has come to be applied to ordinary converts . . ."² Dr. Oulton dismisses it in a sentence by saying: "We cannot limit the laying on of hands mentioned in Hebrews vi. 2, to any one rite known to us."³ Until more convincing evidence is forthcoming to prove that the reference to Laying on of Hands in Hebrews 6. 2 *cannot* mean what we now know as confirmation, we are not unduly perturbed by the fact that in some other passages baptism is mentioned without any explicit allusion to Laying on of Hands.

Undoubtedly, as Dr. Lampe says, "the imposition of hands

¹Works, Vol. XI, pp. 249ff.

²Op. cit., p. 77.

³Op. cit., p. 7.

in Acts and Hebrews calls for further study".¹ But if there are difficulties in the traditional interpretation of Acts 8. 4–19, 19. 1–7, and Hebrews 6. 1, 2, which sees in these passages the apostolic precedents for confirmation, the alternative interpretations advanced by modern writers also leave many anomalies and questions unanswered. Dr. Lampe, for instance, in attempting to explain why Philip's converts had not received the Spirit in their baptism, is driven to the terrible expedient of suggesting that until Philip's action was endorsed by the leaders of the Church, "the gift of the Spirit which was received through membership of the Spirit-possessed community was withheld".² If, as Dr. Lampe believes, the gift of the Holy Ghost was normally received through baptism without the Laying on of Hands, are we to infer that in "an unprecedented situation" the unworthiness, ignorance, or excessive zeal of the minister of baptism may hinder the effect of the sacrament? Has any man power to withhold the gifts of God? It can hardly be suggested that the Holy Spirit disapproved of Philip's action, for, as Dr. Lampe says, the Spirit in Samaria "confirms the word of God with signs and wonders"³ (Acts 8. 6), which surely indicates the Spirit's approval. How can this approval be reconciled with the suggestion that the Holy Spirit was withheld from Philip's converts "until the fact had been demonstrated that the leaders of the Church were in full accord with Philip"? According to Acts 1. 8 our Lord's last words to the disciples were: "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria . . ." Could anyone knowing of those words be in any doubt about the propriety of admitting Samaritans into the Church? It is inconceivable that Philip should not have heard of Jesus' last words: in all probability his last words, like the last words of many outstanding personalities, were most widely discussed and reported in the early Church. It may indeed have been those words of our Lord which inspired Philip to go on his mission to Samaria. If he told the Samaritans of the words of Jesus, as

¹J. T. S., Vol. VI, Pt. i., April 1955, p. 115.

²Op. cit., p. 70.

³Op. cit., p. 74.

is most probable since they would be in the best possible justification for his preaching to them and baptizing them, can they have been in any doubt as to whether they should be accepted into the Church? Dr. Lampe mentions Barnabas' visit to Antioch as a parallel to the Apostles' visit to Samaria, *but there is no mention of the Laying on of Hands by Barnabas*, which is surely remarkable if the imposition of hands was used in the Apostolic period as "a token of fellowship and solidarity". The suggestion that some kind of "ordination" is implied in Acts 8. 14–17 and 19. 6 has met with so little support that it need not be discussed further.

Dr. Oulton suggests that Acts 8. 4–17 describes "a new departure in the Church" inasmuch as Samaritans were for the first time baptized and that the visit of the Apostles was necessary because Philip "in preaching and baptizing went beyond his ordained commission".¹ He considers that the passage "does not assert that the Samaritans did not receive the Holy Spirit in baptism", and he finds parallels between Acts 2. 41–7 and 8. 5–13 which indicate "a life in the Spirit" among the Samaritans prior to the visit of the apostles.² But the fact that Philip, immediately after the Samaritan episode, continued to preach (8. 35, 40) and to baptize (8. 38) is surely fatal to Dr. Oulton's suggestion that Philip in Samaria "went beyond his commission". If he had indeed exceeded his commission we should expect the apostles would have taken some steps to prevent the repetition of such an error either by reprimanding Philip or by giving him a fuller commission. There is no evidence that either was done, and Philip cannot have been conscious of having committed any error or he would not have continued to preach and to baptize. The chapter ends by informing us that Philip "preached in all the cities until he came to Caesarea", that is, he returned to work in Samaria—a further indication that he cannot have been conscious of having exceeded his commission. Is there any other evidence from the history of the early Church to support Dr. Oulton's view that in Acts 8 and 19 "the manifest tokens of

¹Op. cit., p. 7.

²Op. cit., p. 16.

the Holy Spirit are granted in order to demonstrate that an irregularity had been set to rights"? In the absence of corroborative evidence, the traditional interpretation of these passages seems preferable, since it has the support of Hebrews 6 and the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus and is not explicitly contradicted by any other passage in the New Testament. Dr. Oulton's attempt to show that the Samaritan converts had received the Spirit *before* the visit of Peter and John is unconvincing. Not only is it at variance with Acts 8. 15f., but his parallels between 2. 41-7 and 8. 5-13 are manifestly inconclusive evidence. Reason and the context both suggest that the "joy" mentioned (8. 8, cp. 12. 14) are the people's first and natural reaction to the signs and miracles of healing wrought *by Philip*, who had already been endowed with the Spirit, as Dr. Lampe points out. The baptisms *followed* the performance of the signs according to the order of events in the text (8. 12). There is no evidence that anyone other than Philip performed signs and wonders, or that signs *followed* the baptisms (had such been the case the Laying on of Hands would have been superfluous). The fact that *homothumadon* ("with one accord") is often used in Acts of hostile, *anti-Christian* Jews and Gentiles (7. 57; 12. 20; 18. 12; 19. 29) renders its occurrence in 8. 6 inconclusive as evidence of "life in the Spirit". Finally, whereas the three thousand who were baptized on the Day of Pentecost "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine" (2. 41, 42, 46), Acts 8. 13 does not refer to *all* the new converts at Samaria but only states that Simon Magus "continued steadfastly" with Philip, and neither the context nor his subsequent conduct suggest that his steadfastness was motivated by disinterested devotion, or a necessary indication of "life in the Spirit".

On the whole, therefore, acceptance of the traditional interpretation of Acts 8. 14-17 and 19. 1-7 is preferable and more easily justified than the above-mentioned theories. Perhaps the opponents of the traditional view have laid too much stress on the alleged silence of St. Paul, and the Verona text of the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, and have paid too little attention to the significance of Hebrews 6. 1, 2.

APPENDIX C

MODERN COSMOLOGY AND CREATION

J. H. TEMPLETON

Formerly it was theology which was responsible for directing attention to the subject of creation; the Christian doctrine of a single world-order that began at a particular point in the past, and will end at some future date has a rather special place in the history of cosmological speculation. At present the origin and destiny of the universe is being widely discussed in intelligent circles, but now it is science that is raising the question. The aim of this note is to emphasize what creation properly means, and then to look briefly at the latest theories of the cosmologists.

The root idea in the conception of creation in the Christian sense is that of dependence, the resting of the visible, temporal order on the invisible, eternal order. It means that nothing whatever other than God has existence by itself and in its own right. All that is and wherever it is owes its being to the divine will and sustaining presence. A thing that existed by itself, some brute entity that stood in no relation to anything else, would not be a creature; creaturehood points to an external cause of existence. There is no better way of expressing the dependence of the world on God than the standard biblical one, in both Old and New Testaments, of attributing it to the outgoing of the Mind of God in the utterance of His Word. Science cannot get behind things at the point of origin and analyse the nature of the contact between the visible and the invisible; it has no formula for creation. Its business is to take Nature as a going concern, to investigate its movements and changes, and discover the laws determining them. Cosmology deals with things in their furthest range; it studies the nature and structure of the entire universe, including the question of its origin and final issue, in so far as this is implied by a knowledge of how Nature actually works.

As understood to-day cosmology is among the youngest of the sciences, and may be said to have begun in 1917 with the publication of some notes by Einstein on the bearing on cosmology of his General Theory of Relativity. Since then, the new methods and techniques developed by astronomical investigation have greatly increased the date for a modern view of the universe; but it will be readily appreciated that recent discoveries are variously explained and interpreted. At the moment several questions of first-rate importance for cosmology are under vigorous discussion and we shall have to await their settlement. With this in mind, what has the present trend in cosmological theory to say on the Christian view of a world beginning and ending with time? Thirty years ago Sir James Jeans compared the universe to a clock that was running down, but which must once have been wound up in some mysterious way, and Eddington held that the principle on which this running-down movement was taking place, the Second Law of Thermo-dynamics (the decreasing availability of energy), was so important that if any fact contrary to it were established, the whole system of knowledge would be upset. It was on the strength of this Law of Entropy, as the Second Law of Thermo-dynamics is sometimes called, that Bertrand Russell made his famous prediction that the final result "towards which the whole creation moves" is a universe in ruins enveloped in eternal darkness.

But now the advocates of the New Cosmology, of whom Professor Hoyle is the best known, believe that this catastrophe will be averted, not by any violation of the Law of Entropy in the behaviour of existing matter, but by the appearance of new matter. According to their 'steady-state' theory, the loss of energy in the universe is counterbalanced by the coming of new matter which goes into the formation of new stars and galaxies, so that the general features of the cosmos are preserved. This process has always been going on; the universe is for ever the same, without beginning or end.

The most recent researches carried out at the Mullard Observatory at Cambridge under Professor Martin Ryle, and employing the method of radio-astronomy, throw doubt on

the 'steady-state' hypothesis. This work consists of recording radiation signals from outer space which have been travelling towards the earth for ages. When the message of these signals is interpreted, they tell something about cosmic conditions before there was ever an eye to behold the starry heavens above. If the 'steady-state' theory is true, if the source of these signals, the radio-active matter distributed throughout space, is always the same, then their record should present a regular picture; but it does not; there is a diminution of the signals, like the petering out of the flakes towards the end of a snowshower. Of course, where such an immense recession into time is involved, and so little can be done in a short period in tabulating results, definite conclusions cannot be expected; but the indications there are show a falling off in the amount of signals being received, which would suggest a failure in the source. Convincing support for the 'steady-state' view is wanting; there is no real reason for thinking that the universe has eluded the sentence imposed by the Law of Entropy, which means that the most certain element in the scientific outlook is the end of the world.

Jeans postulated that the original state of things was a colossal volume of space suffused with radiation of extremely low density, while the hypothesis favoured to-day, the Abbé Lemaitre's, is the exact opposite of this. He assumes that in the beginning all the matter of the universe, at an inconceivably high density, was packed into a comparatively small space: time and events began with the violent disintegration of this mass. Eddington was unable to reconcile himself to the idea that this 'Big Bang' was the absolute beginning; however plausible it seemed as an explanation of an expanding universe, he could not help feeling that something very different preceded it; matter must have reached this explosive state by a less spectacular process, although he had no notion of what it was. The diminution observed in the later radio signals compared with the earlier ones may be due to their greater remoteness from the primal cosmic eruption.

Whether the eventual conclusion of science is that the universe had a beginning and will come to an end, or that it is

everlasting, it has nothing to do with the real meaning of creation, the world's dependent relation to God. Some great Christian thinkers have been attracted by the idea that the course of the world is endless. So long as it was thought of as created and sustained by God the question of its duration was indifferent, or at least not so important, and the belief in a limited time process was accepted as part of the Christian faith. Nevertheless, it must also be recognised that the doctrine of a universe having a beginning and an end has close ties with the conviction which has supported the faith of Israel in times of testing such as no other people has undergone—that history has a purpose the substance of which is the giving and fulfilment of the divine promises. Promise and fulfilment are the termini of a limited historical scheme, and since the *raison d'être* of the world is to provide the scene for the working out of this scheme, it too is limited. This is not the place to attempt tracing the influence of this conception on Jewish-Christian tradition; but it will be a matter of considerable interest to see if science confirms the cosmology which went with it.

The following books are recommended for further reading with the reminder that the state of knowledge in the department of cosmology is fluid at the moment; but it is hoped that the answers to some important problems will be forthcoming within the next decade or so.

- F. Hoyle*: THE NATURE OF THE UNIVERSE.
A. C. B. Lovell: THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE UNIVERSE.
W. de Sitter: KOSMOS.
E. Whittaker: THE BEGINNING AND END OF THE WORLD.
E. Whittaker: SPACE AND SPIRIT.
 RIVAL THEORIES OF COSMOLOGY (A discussion by H. Bondi, B. Bonnor, R. A. Lyttleton, and G. J. Whitrow).