

While there's one Scottish hand that can wag a claymore, sir,
 They shall ne'er want a friend to stand up for their right.
 Be damn'd he that dare not,
 For my part I'll spare not
 To beauty afflicted a tribute to give ;
 Fill it up steadily,
 Drink it off readily,
 Here's to the Princess, and long may she live !

But however ready he may have been at this time to "stand up" for the Princess, it shows that he shared in the weaknesses common to humanity; for after his intimacy with the Prince Regent began, he grew colder towards her, and, deserting to the other side, spoke of her only with severity.

(To be concluded.)



ART. IV.—THOUGHTS ON THE DECALOGUE.

THE Decalogue is the centre and pivot of the Old Testament revelation, as the doctrine of the Cross is of Christianity. Sinai and Calvary are the sites on which were reared the two temples in whose shrines respectively the Mind of God was revealed in justice and in mercy, in righteousness and in grace, in demanding from us and in giving to us, or, to use more theological terms, our sanctification and our justification. Hence, as "the Old Testament is not contrary to the New," as the seventh Article of our Church hath it; and, in the well-known words of St. Augustine, "the New Testament is concealed in the Old, and the Old is revealed in the New," they must not be separated, as the Gnostics of old and some of the sectaries of our own day have taught; nor should we join in the raid made against the Hebrew Scriptures, by attacking the authorship of the books, changing the order and sequence of the facts, disputing the validity of the laws and the futurity of the prophecies contained therein, as is the sad wont of the rationalistic school; but our part should rather be to follow in the footsteps of the Apostles and early Fathers and all orthodox teachers in all subsequent generations, and learn, in the suggestive features of the type, to fill in the perfections of the antitype. The Old Testament must be our pædagogus to lead us to the School of Christ. The Ten Commandments, the moral law, have ever been held by the universal Church of Christ to be the embodiment of our duties to God and to man. It is true, and must ever be remembered and carefully guarded, that our justification before God is not the result of the poor and partial obedience which the Christian renders—yet inasmuch as the law is the revelation of the Mind

of God, and is therefore, like God Himself, unchangeable, it must ever remain the standard of our obedience, and all that have the "mind of Christ" must seek not "to destroy but to fulfil the law;" the motive in so doing not being to justify ourselves thereby, but to glorify God by loving gratitude. Our obedience to the law is the effect, and not the cause, of our acceptance with God, but it is the effect, and, as such, is as necessary to our faith as the fruit is to the tree or the harvest to the field. Whatever, therefore, throws light upon any portion of this code of laws, will furnish a theme of interest to the Christian student. It is not our purpose to attempt an exposition of the Commandments, but only to throw out some general remarks, and then select a few passages for special consideration.

If we inspect the two tables of the law, allotting five commandments to each table,¹ we shall be struck with the fact that each table begins with the most heinous sin of its class: the one against God, and the other against our neighbour. And as the commandments proceed in order, the sin forbidden is, relatively speaking, a less grievous one than that which is prohibited in the next preceding commandment. This holds good in both tables: a violation of the second commandment is not so awful an act of presumption as the violation of the first, nor of the third as of the second, and so on. In like manner, in the second table, the perpetration of murder is a deed of deeper dye than the act forbidden in the seventh, which, in turn, is a worse crime than theft, and so on.

But then, it must be observed, that, as the sins prohibited in each table decrease step by step in awfulness and atrocity, so, by inverse ratio, does the spirituality of obedience to the commandments increase. This may best be traced by reflecting that a man who would not dishonour his parents would not dishonour God; that he who would not break the Sabbath would surely not profane God's Name; that he who revered the Name of God would certainly not make an idol: and the man who abhorred idolatry would never set up a rival against the one true God. In like manner, the man who would not covet his neighbour's goods would certainly not do him a worse injury by false testimony which might endanger his character or even his life, and he who respected these might be well trusted not to steal his neighbour's property; and he who would not rob him of the less would not deprive him of his greater and dearer treasure; and he who would shudder at the thought of such a deed would never be guilty of depriving him of the greatest possession of all, that is, his life.

Further, it is worthy of notice that each commandment specifies, and is directed against, the greatest and grossest sin of its class. The purport of this is not to exclude the less, but

¹ See CHURCHMAN, No. xxix., New Series, p. 249.

to include all the sins of every degree that come under that particular category. Thus our Lord Himself explained that the sixth commandment prohibited anger as well as bloodshed; and that the lustful eye was as guilty in the judgment of God as the lustful act. This key to the interpretation of the Decalogue opens out before us a vast array of indictments; and as we examine our thoughts and words and works under the scrutiny of such a test, we must confess that "the law is holy and just and good" in itself; but when its strong glory-light is turned upon our hearts, it is a "ministry of condemnation."

Having ventured to throw out these thoughts for the consideration of our readers, we pass on to examine some special passages, which contain features of interest to the critical student. The first passage that seems to contain much more than it appears to do when viewed in the garb of our English translation is the First Commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me," A.V. The R.V. has the same, with the trifling exception of "none" for "no"; but it adds a marginal rendering, "beside Me." With these we may compare the Prayer-Book version in the office of the Holy Communion and in the Catechism: "Thou shalt have none other gods but Me." Let us turn to our Hebrew Bible, and the literal rendering of the words is, "There shall not be (sing.) to thee other gods in addition to My face." Before entering on an investigation of these words, it may be well to see how they were translated in the early versions. The LXX. has *Οὐκ ἔσονται σοι θεοὶ ἕτεροι πλὴν ἐμοῦ*. The other Greek versions have not been preserved in this place. The Syriac has, "There shall not be (pl.) to thee other gods beside me" (*lebar meni*), literally, *outside from Me*—that is, *extra Me, beside Me*. The Vulgate renders, "Non habebis deos alienos coram Me." Some have found a difficulty in the verb in the Hebrew text being in the singular, but this should really cause no surprise, as when the verb stands before its subject in Hebrew it is often in the singular, though its subject which stands after it in position is plural. It will be observed that both the LXX. and the Syriac have avoided all difficulty by rendering the verb in the plural. The word of chief interest in the Hebrew sentence is *My face* (literally, *faces*). What are we to understand by this phrase? As the face is the exponent of a man, of his person, character, abilities and powers, this term is employed in Scripture to convey to us the manifestation of the invisible God, of His being and purposes; the "face of Jehovah" is therefore equivalent to the more frequent phrase, the "Angel of Jehovah." Thus, in Exod. xxxiii. 14, we read: "My face shall go," and in the next verse Moses replies: "If Thy face go not, carry us not up hence." By com-

paring this passage with ch. xxiii. 20, 21, the identity of the "face" with the "Angel" of Jehovah will be apparent. In Isaiah lxiii. 8, 9, this identity is still more emphasized: "He (Jehovah) became their *Saviour* . . . and the *Angel of His face saved them*," where we undoubtedly have a combination of the two passages in Exodus. Now, according to the plainest inferences from Holy Scripture, and according to the unanimous consent of the fathers of the ante-Nicene period, the Angel of Jehovah was identified with the pre-Incarnate Son, the Wisdom and Word of God, the Second Person in the ever-blessed Trinity. And as we have identified the "face" with the "Angel," it follows that by "face" we are here to understand that Divine Agent or Administrator of the Father, by whom He made the worlds and revealed His will and purposes to His people. We must now give our attention to the preposition that stands before this word. The preposition $\lambda\upsilon$, which the LXX. rendered by $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu$, the Syriac by *lebar*, and the Vulgate by *coram*, signifies, radically, *higher*, hence *over* and *above* a thing, and frequently, by a natural consequence, *in addition to*. In this sense we find it in Gen. xxviii. 9, "in addition to his wives." Similarly, in Gen. xxxi. 50, "in addition to my daughters." Deut. xix. 9, "in addition to these three." And in ch. xxiii. 13 (probably), "in addition to thy weapon." And Psa. xvi. 2, "in addition to thee." This seems to have been the interpretation intended by the LXX., as $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu$ is a contraction of $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\upsilon$, *more than Me, beside Me*. So also the Syriac. The Vulgate, from which evidently our English versions are derived, is wider of the mark. It is worthy of notice that all these authorities identify the "face" with God Himself. Taking, then, the preposition in the above sense—"in addition to My face"—we arrive at the following interpretation: Thou shalt have no other gods in addition to My presence or manifestation, as made in the "Angel of the Covenant"—the Logos, who ever represented and manifested the Deity to the patriarchs, and who afterwards, in the fulness of time, became flesh and manifested His Father's glory to the world. Hence in the commandment which seems to insist upon the unity of God with a special emphasis, we find a testimony to the Person of the Son; and this commandment, which teaches the unity of the Godhead, takes us, therefore, a long way on the road to the acknowledging of the doctrine of the Trinity.

The next passage which we select for consideration is the closing portion of the Second Commandment, comprising the latter part of the fifth verse and the sixth: "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me and keep My command-

ments." (A.V.) The R.V. renders: "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate Me; and showing mercy unto thousands, of them that love Me and keep My commandments." And a marginal alternative is given for "thousands," "A thousand generations," see Deut. vii. 9. The difference between the two versions in the suggested interpretation of the passage is chiefly marked by the introduction of the comma after "thousands" in the R.V. With reference to the earlier portion of this passage, it is held by some that there is an inevitable heredity of sin, that children, both in moral character and physical constitution, inherit the fruits of parental and ancestral misdoings, and that this is a continuous evidence of the judgment of God against sin, but that such a transmission of suffering for the sins of others is restricted to our present condition, and does not extend to our future state of being. This limiting of the punishment to the third or, at the utmost, to the fourth generation, shows a purpose. Man not unfrequently lives to see the third and sometimes the fourth line of his descendants,¹ and if so, he would survive to see the evil results of his own iniquities, and no chastisement can be more terrible to anyone than to see sons and sons' sons, and those that are born of them, labouring under pains and woes which are the outcome of his own sins, while the sufferers themselves are guiltless before God. On the other hand, the Targum and various other authorities, patristic and modern, hold that such a dark legacy bequeathed from preceding generations was only effective of calamity and disgrace in the case of those who followed the evil example of their progenitors. The objection to this interpretation seems to be that it is self-evident that sinful children are punished as well as sinful parents. In the latter portion of the passage a question arises, does the "thousands" refer to the vast multitude of the obedient, descendants or non-descendants of the pious, all who have been connected with them by any ties? In other words, is the sinfulness of one party transmitted in direct lineage, and confined to such, whilst goodness is diffused generally and collaterally among all the belongings? Or is there here a special promise to the thousandth generation from the starting-point, including all that intervene, and so is the phrase equivalent to *for ever*? We must turn to the original,

¹ Fuerst takes the "third" generation to mean *grandchildren*, and "fourth" *great-grandchildren*. Gesenius and most other critics place each of these a generation more remote. "*Sons' sons*," they argue, is the proper phrase for grandchildren. By this computation grandchildren are omitted from the catalogue, which is very unlikely.

and then consult the versions. We translate the Hebrew literally, and arrange it so as to show the parallel contrasts :

Visiting iniquity of fathers
 On sons, on third and fourth (generations),
 in case of My haters ;
 And doing mercy
 to thousands,
 In case of My lovers,
 And keepers of My commandments.

It will be noticed that the preposition ל is used before "sons," and before the ordinal adjectives "third" and "fourth," but ל before "My haters," "thousands," and "My lovers." The parallel is clear between "visiting iniquity" and "doing mercy," also between "My haters" and "My lovers." Thus "on sons, on third and fourth," will be left to correspond with "to thousands." The same preposition ל being used in the three last places has caused confusion, but this will disappear when we remember that the verb *to visit* is used with לע , and not with ל , whereas *to show mercy* is used with ל , and not with לע . The necessities of the language demanded this difference; thus the parallel between "third and fourth generations" and "thousands" had to be expressed by the variation above stated.

The sense will thus be plain that God visits the iniquity of fathers on children unto the third and fourth generation in case of those that hate Him, and shows mercy to children of the thousandth generation in case of those that love Him and keep His commandments. It may be added that another cause of confusion exists in the fact that "third and fourth" are ordinals, whereas "thousand" is a numeral; but in Hebrew an ordinal form for this number does not exist. "Thousands," therefore, stands for thousandth—that is, the thousandth generation. This interpretation is substantiated by Deut. vii. 9, "keeping the covenant and the mercy in case of those that love Him and keep His commandments to a thousand generations." The difficulty above-named, that the passage states a truism, vanishes when we reflect that if a son saw the iniquity of his father and turned from it, he would at once break the continuity and commence a righteous generation; the meaning must, therefore, be that the punishment of parental sin is laid up for the third and fourth generation on its own account. It may be averted by repentance on the part of the son or descendant; but if unrepented of and repeated, it goes on accumulating guilt and treasuring up judgment. Such was the cause of the Babylonish captivity (2 Kings xxiv. 3, 4). This seems also to be the interpretation which our blessed Lord gave to this awful law of retribution—"Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers . . . that

upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily, I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation" (Matt. xxiii. 32, 35, 36). The LXX. and Vulgate give the somewhat loose rendering of the whole passage which our A.V. does. Whereas the rendering advocated above has the support of the Syriac and the Targum, the former of these expressly adds, "the thousandth *generation*."

The Third Commandment invites us to investigate its meaning. What is meant by the word *לשוא*? The LXX. has *ἐπι ματαῶν*, Aquila gives *eis eicēh*, the Syriac gives a paraphrase rather than an exact translation—"Thou shalt not swear by the name of the Lord thy God in a lie," and the Vulgate supports the LXX., "Non assumes Nomen Domini Dei tui in vanum." Both the A.V. and the R.V. give the familiar rendering, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," the latter adding a marginal alternative, "or for *vanity* or *falsehood*." We have already said that each commandment expresses the most heinous form of the particular class of sins denounced. The sin here denounced is the profanation of the name of God. The exact meaning of the words contained in this commandment ought, therefore, to set before us the most aggravated example of this sin, which will, of course, include all lesser branches of the same. The verb, though its application is various, signifies to *lift up*, to *raise*, to *make to ascend*. In the words that follow, "the name of Jehovah thy God," the *name* is specified to be the great and incommunicable name of *Jehovah*. The radical passage which forms the basis of the one before us is Exod. iii. 13-15, with which may be compared Ex. vi. 3, but the word *name* in Hebrew usage does not mean simply the designation by which a person, whether Divine or human, is distinguished, but the essential qualities, character and attributes of the person. The "name" here, therefore, involves all that is comprehended in that name, the self-existence, the unchangeableness, the faithfulness of God. In the last word of the sentence the preposition means *to*, in the sense of "*belonging to*," hence it will signify, so as to *make it belong to*. And the noun signifies a *vanity*, a *nothingness*, a *lie*.¹ In this sense it is applied to *idols*, as in Ps. xxxi. 7, *the vanities of a lie, i.e.*, of an idol; and in Jer. xviii. 15, "They burnt incense to a lie," *i.e.*, to an idol. The *lie* throughout Scripture is closely allied to idolatry. This word seems chosen here with a special purpose. As the first commandment forbids the belief in any god but the true one, and the second forbids

¹ The cognate verb implies to be *vain*, *empty*, *false*, *lying*.

the making and worshipping the image of any creature, so does the third forbid the confusion of the true God with an idol. They were not to worship God under the form of an idol, or to ascribe the name of God to any such image. This was the sin of Aaron when he made the golden calf; he called it by the name of God: "These be thy gods," or rather, "This is thy God, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt;" and "To-morrow is a feast to Jehovah" (Ex. xxxii. 4, 5). He ascribed the name of God to a senseless vanity. The commandment thus interpreted will read: "Thou shalt not lift up (or ascribe) the name of Jehovah thy God to a vanity," that is, to an idol of any kind. We see, therefore, the different degrees and forms of idolatry forbidden, and each commandment has its own proper and peculiar scope. It is needless to repeat that this interpretation, which gives the greatest sin of its class, includes all false swearing, perjury and profane speech, which are all an applying of the sacred name to what is vain and empty and unreal.

This is not the place to enter upon what is called the Sabbath controversy; our purpose is only to point out some latent features of interest in the Fourth Commandment. The opening word "Remember" has a twofold aspect: it reminds us of the past, when God created the world, and rested on the seventh day, and sanctified it, and it also points to the future, that in all generations we should observe the day of rest. This commandment is a sacramental one. The Sabbath is a sacrament, whose outward sign is consecrated time, and its inward signification is the "rest that remaineth for the people of God." This "Remember" may be compared with the *ἀνάμνησις* in the institution of the Eucharist; it is the memorial of the past, and the assurance of the future. Another feature of interest is that this commandment, which concerns the *seventh* day, is itself divided into *seven* sections, and the central section contains *seven* particulars, thus: (1) Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; (2) Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work; (3) But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; (4) [In it thou shalt not do any work—i., thou; ii., nor thy son; iii., nor thy daughter; iv., nor thy man-servant; v., nor thy maid-servant; vi., nor thy cattle; vii., nor the stranger that is within thy gates]. (5) For in six days the Lord made the heaven, the earth, the sea, and all that in them is, (6) and rested the seventh day, (7) wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it. Thus the signature of the covenant number of *seven* is imprinted on the commandment, itself witnessing, as it were, to its purport. The whole framework of the composition has been minutely and elaborately worked out in Forbes' "Symmetrical Structure of

Scripture," where much interesting matter, in addition to the above sketch, will be found. Some difficulty has been felt, especially of late years, that man should labour for six days, and rest on the seventh, for this reason, that in six days the Lord made the heaven and the earth, etc., as though the days in both these instances denoted the same periods of duration; but this is by no means stated, neither is it necessarily to be inferred. It is now granted almost universally that the *days* of Gen. i. were not days of twenty-four hours in length. This is evident from the statement that the sun was not appointed to his present office till the fourth day, according to the narrative; the three previous days, therefore, could not have been regulated or limited by his influence. Moreover, according to the Hebrew mode of reckoning, a day begun in the evening and ended in the evening following, but these days began with an evening and terminated with a morning—that is, the space of half a day—they could not, therefore, be days after the ordinary mode of computation, rather were they days in the calendar of heaven, and not reckoned according to the almanac of earth. They were æons or ages of a more exalted chronology—not meted out by the rising and setting sun, but by the eternal word of God. We may at first sight be somewhat puzzled that the language makes no distinction between the vast periods of Divine energy, and the narrow boundaries that circumscribe man's little labours, but this ceases when we remember that the word *day* is employed in Holy Scripture for various spaces of time. Thus it designates the ages that were occupied in the works of creation, and also the period of the earth's revolution on her axis. As there is in this commandment a comparison made between the works of God and the works of man, so is there between the incalculable ages and the few brief hours that refer to each respectively. The æon of the former is microscopically reflected in the latter. As the tiny pupil of the eye reflects the gigantic orb of the sun, so does man's working time reproduce in miniature the ages of creation, and man's Sabbath the rest into which God entered and still continues on the seventh day.

The Ninth Commandment is very freely rendered in our Bible and Prayer-book, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." The literal translation of the original is, "Thou shalt not answer against thy neighbour as a witness of a lie" (*עַד שֶׁקֶר*). In the corresponding passage in Deut. v. 18, we find, "A witness of a falsehood." The LXX. in both places has *οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις—μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ*, the Vulgate "Non loqueris falsum testimonium," and similarly the Syriac. In a former paper we have shown that in the parallelistic arrangement of the decalogue the ninth commandment corresponds

with the third. The connection between them is striking. "Thou shalt not lift up *the Name* to a falsehood, whether concentered in an idol as a lying likeness of Deity, or uttered by the lips in attestation of a lie." Compare with this, "Thou shalt not answer against thy neighbour as a witness of a lie." In both cases a libel is forbidden; in both cases the "honour due" is implicitly insisted on and enforced.

In the Tenth Commandment, "Thou shalt not covet" is repeated before both "house" and "wife." In Ex. xx. 17 the verb is the same, but in the copy of the law as given in Deut. v. 18, "wife" stands first and "house" second. The verb before "wife" is the same as in Exodus, but the verb before "house" is אָוָה. The LXX. has ἐπιθυμήσεις in all places. The Syriac also has the same verb throughout, and the Vulgate in Exodus has "non concupisces"—"nec desiderabis," and in Deuteronomy it has "concupisces," and does not repeat the verb. Neither the repetition of the verb in the original in Exodus, nor the variation of the verb in Deuteronomy, denotes a separation of the commandment; but there is an interesting difference between the meanings of the verbs in Deuteronomy which we may notice. רָמָה signifies *desire*, as excited by some object outside one's self, and אָוָה, a *desire* that arises from within; the former is the result of incentive, and the latter of impulse.

These sporadic notes may stimulate the student to seek and find other latent thoughts in this portion of Holy Scripture—the law in which the Psalmist delighted to have his meditations all the day long.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

Correspondence.



THE THEOLOGY OF BISHOP ANDREWES.

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—The excellent articles on Bishop Andrewes in *THE CHURCHMAN* for July, 1889, p. 21, and for August, 1889, p. 587, by Rev. N. Dimock, are most seasonable; but attention should also be directed just now to Dean Goode's masterly examination of his views in his remarkable work, "The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist" (Hatchards), vol. ii.

Yours sincerely,

C. H. DAVIES.

Littleton Drew, Sept. 27th.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words on Mr. Dimock's notice of Hooker, in his article on Bishop Andrewes?

At page 528 he says: "An attempt has been made to isolate the teach-

ing of Hooker. This attempt," he says, "will be found to break down completely under examination."

Now, in every other respect I readily own that Mr. Dimock's defence of Hooker is perfect. But where Hooker is isolated is as to bread being the means of conveying the grace. I know that the part of the Catechism which teaches of Sacraments was not written till after his death. He cannot, then, be accused of controverting an existing formulary. But his teaching does.

First, let us hear Hooker: "The question is . . . whether, when the Sacrament is administered, Christ be whole within man only, or else His body and blood be also externally seated in the very elements themselves; which opinion they that defend are driven," etc. So he goes on to speak of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, as if there was no possible theory of grace accompanying the bread—that grace being what St. Paul calls His body and blood. We have Hooker again (vol. ii., p. 352, Keble's edit.): "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament." Again: "I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them."

So much for Hooker. Now for the Catechism. We have a Sacrament defined: "An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us . . . as a means whereby we receive the same." So much for both Sacraments. Then specially for the Eucharist: "The bread and wine are the outward and visible signs" by which the inward part, the spiritual grace, is received. This grace St. Paul calls the body and blood of Christ. *Bread* is the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace which St. Paul calls the body of Christ. This outward and visible sign is ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the inward *spiritual* grace. The presence, then, is to be sought elsewhere than in our hearts, even in the bread when it is given to us. It may be said that if the grace comes on us in the eating of the bread, that meets the requirement; that there must be two parts in the Sacrament. But unless the grace comes to us *with the bread* the Catechism errs, and the bread is not the means whereby we receive the grace.

I do not want to discredit "the judicious." I am only defending the language of the Catechism, and showing that, in comparison with that, Hooker must be said to be "isolated."

Your obedient servant,

CHARLES CROSTHWAITÉ

(Canon and V. G. of Kildare).

We have sent Canon Crosthwaite's letter to Mr. Dimock, and he replies as follows:

I feel sure that upon further examination Canon Crosthwaite will find that there is no real difference between the teaching of Hooker and the teaching of the Church Catechism.

The subsequent addition to the Catechism on the subject of the Lord's Supper is but a breaking into *two* of what had been *one* answer in Nowell's Smallest Catechism: "The body and blood of Christ, which in the Lord's Supper are *given* to the *faithful*, and are by them taken, eaten, drunken, only in a heavenly and spiritual manner, but yet in truth . . . our souls are refreshed and renewed by the blood of Christ through faith; in which way the body and blood of Christ are received in the Supper. For Christ as surely makes those who trust in Him partakers of His body and

blood, as they certainly know that they have received the bread and wine with their mouth and stomach."

And this teaching is nothing more than was constantly defended and maintained—and rightly so—by the Reformed.

I must only ask space for one or two examples :

1. Bishop Hooper (who led "the extremer school of Reformers," see Mr. Medd, *Intr. to first book of Ed.*, p. xii.) says : "I believe and confess . . . that always and as often as we use this bread and wine, according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood." (*Later Writings*, P.S. edit., p. 49.)

2. Bishop Jewel (stigmatized as "an irreverent Dissenter," but whom Hooker pronounced to be "the worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years"—*Ec. Pol.*, B. II., ch. vi., § 4) says : "We teach the people, not that a naked sign or token, but that Christ's body and blood indeed and verily is given unto us ; that we verily eat it ; that we verily drink it ; that we verily be relieved and live by it." (*Sermon and Harding*, P.S. edit., p. 448.)

It may be worth while to add a selection of a few extracts from Reformed Confessions of Faith.

1. The later Swiss Confession, 1566, says : "By this holy Supper . . . the faithful . . . receive the flesh and blood of the Lord." (*Hall's Harmony*, p. 317.) "By spiritual meat we mean not any imaginary thing, but the very body of our Lord Jesus, given to us : which is received of the faithful . . . by faith." (*Ibid.*, p. 318.)

2. The Belgian Confession, 1566, confirmed 1579, declares : "As truly as we do receive and hold in our hands this sign . . . so truly we do by faith . . . receive the very body and true blood of Christ." (*Ibid.*, pp. 336, 337.)

3. The Irish Articles of 1615 say : "But in the inward and spiritual part, the same body and blood is really and substantially presented unto all those who have grace to receive the Son of God, even to all those that believe in His Name." (# (*Neal's "History of Puritans,"* vol. iii., p. 517.)

A comparison of Hooker, *Ec. Pol.*, B. V., ch. lxvii., § 7, 8, 11, and 12, will show that his teaching did not fall short of this teaching of the Reformed.

I have been as brief as possible, but I venture to add that I have endeavoured to enter fully and at some length into the subject in "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," No. VI., where much additional evidence will be found.—Yours faithfully,

N. DIMOCK.

Eastbourne, October 9th, 1889.

Review.

The Epistles of St. John. Twenty-one Discourses, with Greek Text, Comparative Versions and Notes, chiefly exegetical, by WILLIAM ALEXANDER, D.D., D.C.L., Brasenose College, Oxford, Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. Hodder and Stoughton, 1889.

AS an expositor of the writings of St. John, the Bishop of Derry—the Chrysostom of the Irish Bench, has very special qualifications. In the volume before us the critical powers of the theologian are not more apparent than the spiritual insight displayed, combined as it is with an earnest and tender appreciation of all that is best in modern culture. The plan pursued is eminently popular, inasmuch as while no real difficulty is evaded, much of the extra-critical matter is deferred to