

Church and Sacraments might suggest some helpful reflections for Christians who hold aloof from all Churches and ignore all ordinances, and for all who read with discrimination there is much that will prove suggestive, stimulating and strengthening.

J. H. FARMER.

Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus; Darstellung und religionsgeschichtliche Beleuchtung.

Von W. Heitmüller. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1903.

This brochure of 56 pages is an address delivered before an association of ministers at Hanover and again at Brunswick in the spring of 1903. The argument goes to prove that the sacramental view of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper is taught by Paul. With this remarkable thesis to maintain the author indulges in some remarkable reasoning, as might be expected; but he has produced a clever and vigorous presentation of his case. As is customary for a German, he takes his start by attacking the position of another, who had written on the question, Whether the Reformatory estimate of the Sacraments still exists? Or whether the present Lutheran church has not departed from the Reformation ideas of the Sacraments? The author prefers to state his problem thus: Whether the Biblical estimate of the Sacraments still prevails? This brings up the deeper question whether the Biblical view is still accepted as authority? Waiving this, however, he presents his attempt to find out what Paul teaches as to the efficacy and meaning of the two ordinances.

In regard to baptism Herr Heitmüller takes up first the great passage in Rom. 6:1-4. It is almost needless to say that the author has no thought of anything else than immersion as the act of baptism, and his exegesis proceeds on that accepted basis. He also rules out infant-baptism, as having no place in the New Testament teaching. His problem is to discover what efficacy Paul attached in his writings to the baptism of believers. He holds that in the passage cited, and others, Paul teaches ("baptized *into* Christ") that baptism either signifies or actually effects incorporation into Christ. He takes his stand for the latter view and plainly says (SS. 14, 15): "Baptism was

for Paul sacramental action, an action which works not *ex opere operantis* but *ex opere operato*, in the proper Catholic sense." This interpretation the author endeavors to justify by insisting on the literal sense of being actually made one with Christ, in the external act of baptism. This is to be distinguished from both faith and the moral and spiritual life which accompany or follow the act. The act of becoming one with Christ is in the act of baptism. Also the receiving of the Spirit is in the act of baptism, for in 1 Cor. 12:13, Paul says: "For through one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, etc." And the point of connection is found in 2 Cor. 3:17, where the Apostle says: "The Lord is the Spirit." In other passages also the Apostle indicates the actual working of union with Christ and coming into spiritual life as effected in baptism, as 1 Cor. 6:11; Col. 1:13, where our author remarks that by deliverance from the power of darkness Paul cannot mean anything but baptism. And there is more of this sort of assuming the point at issue. In fine, the author's whole contention is that not a symbolic and figurative but actual and operative union with Christ is effected by the act of baptism. It is the common High Church assertion that the literal, material sense of the phrases involved must be held at all hazards. By way of refutation of the symbolic, figurative sense of the passage our author adduces (S. 15f) the following reasons: (a) That the question whether the act of baptism is symbol only or spiritually efficacious is essentially modern and is not historically defensible. (b) That any one who is not influenced by this modern distinction would naturally take the language as literal. (c) That the passage in 1 Cor. 15:29, about being baptized for the dead, settles the whole question, for that undoubtedly means that those who were baptized for the dead acted with a view of bringing the sacramental value of baptism to bear on their departed friends. Our author fails to perceive his begging of the question here, and quietly goes on to put as a final argument (d) that the general position of Paul on faith and grace is not hostile to his contention but rather favors the sacramentarian view. We need not follow the author in these windings.

When he takes up the Lord's Supper our author admits

that the case is not so clear for his view as for baptism; but nothing daunted he pursues his endeavor to make Paul teach High Church doctrine here also. The discussion is confined to the 10th and 11th chapters of I. Cor.inthians. He admits that in the 10th chapter the Apostle speaks only incidentally of the Supper, and designedly in the 11th. The author reasons that the language of the 11th chapter is conditioned by the practical aim Paul had in view and therefore we are more likely to find his actual sentiments in the 10th chapter where he speaks without embarrassment! With this very convenient working principle he proceeds to interpret sacramentarianism into the 10th chapter by assuming that the "spiritual food" and "spiritual drink" spoken of as given to the Israelites mean for Paul the elements of the Supper, and since the first were supernatural so also must be the latter. Further, the reason of contrast applies, namely, in the statement that in partaking of the "table" and "cup" of demons one becomes of the same sort with them; for in partaking of the bread and wine in the Supper one also becomes one with Christ. When our author takes up the 11th chapter he admits that there is apparent discrepancy between these sacramentarian conceptions which he finds in the 10th and the clearly memorial character of the ordinance which every one must see in the long treatment of the matter in the 11th chapter. But a man who has a thesis to maintain is never at a loss for expedients to get around difficulties, and he accounts for the supposed change of tone by saying that in the 11th chapter Paul is treating the matter in a "theologizing" way—whatever that may mean!

Putting together the points of his discussion our author reaches the foregone conclusion that Paul actually does teach that the two ordinances have spiritual efficacy, and not only signify but really effect by their own working in the recipient, in the one case union with Christ, and in the other the nourishing of the life in Christ.

In the second part of his treatise the author seeks to show that these sacramentarian conceptions are part and parcel of various heathen religions, that they therefore belong to the general religious consciousness of man, were assumed and purified by Christianity (especially in

the Supper), and were so inwrought in the common feelings of men that they must have influenced Paul—though of course there is no direct trace of such influence! How ingenious all this and how inconclusive!

E. C. DARGAN.

The Teaching of Jesus Concerning The Scriptures.

By David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D. American Tract Society. New York. 75c.

This is the fourth volume of a new series on "The Teaching of Jesus." The three preceding volumes are "His Own Mission," by Frank Hugh Foster, "The Kingdom of God and the Church," by Gerhardus Vos, and "God the Father," by Archibald Thomas Robertson.

Dr. Burrell, the author, is the efficient pastor of the Collegiate Reformed Church, New York City, and the author of several other excellent books, especially of expository sermons. The vigor, directness and practical force which characterize his preaching are conspicuous in his books. He thinks for himself and has a most unhesitating and ringing way of putting things.

"The question," he says, is to Christians, "one of supreme interest." "As to others, they are at liberty to believe what they like; but those who call themselves disciples of Jesus have no alternative but to renounce him or to accept what he says." This is "the Court of last resort" for them.

When he comes to deal with the perversion of the words of Jesus by some of the critics he doesn't mince matters. He doesn't hesitate to say that a method so distinctly literary as that of the "higher criticism" "lay outside the province of Jesus' work;" but he adds that the radical form of the "higher criticism," as represented by those who insist that no true estimate can be formed of the Scriptures by students of this problem except by first dispossessing themselves of all conviction as to this divine origin and character, had no place in the precept or example of Jesus. "Could he regard the Bible as mere 'literature'? Not for a moment! He believed in it as the one Book, standing solitary and alone, separated from all other literature whatsoever by the fact that God breathed