not happiness, but conflict with hindrances. This supplied the thought-impulse in the Kantian philosophy of history; its epistemological roots lay in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. But it is soon joined by another tendency issuing from Kant's *Metaphysic of Morality*, namely, the idea of freedom. These two tendencies, united, furnish the leading motive of all idealistic philosophies of history; the realization of the idea of freedom is the task of the human race. In the *Critique of Judgment*, where Kant works this out, one may find the foundation for a critical philosophy of history. But I would point out that this Kantian conception of freedom calls for criticism. To insist on the moral value of freedom is well; but is the insistence backed by a satisfactory metaphysical grounding of freedom? Was Kant's a merely abstract freedom? Or was it a force determining the world through power of genuine choice? Such questions cannot be shirked. It should be added, that both the method of attacking the problem of the philosophy of history, and the various attempts at solution, are dealt with in this skilful and meritorious performance.

JAMES LINDSAY.

Kilmarnock.

The Sacraments in the New Testament.[1]

BY PRINCIPAL THE REV. ROBERT RAINY, D.D., EDINBURGH.

IN an address delivered to the Theological Society of New College, Edinburgh, Canon (now Bishop) Gore, contemplating the question how various schools and sects of Christians could be brought together, pleaded with impressive emphasis for a return, on the part of all alike, to fresh and candid study of the acknowledged sources. Effort in this direction is, in fact, characteristic of current Christian literature; but effort is not always sound in method, nor adequate in resource. Mr. Lambert's effort, on the other hand, is admirable on both grounds. The subject of the Sacraments has its own difficulties; these have been wonderfully magnified by 'the subtlety of men'; and a large recent literature has grown up about them. Mr. Lambert knows this literature, critical, exegetical, and theological; and he has furnished a welcome guide through the mazes of the modern discussion. In dealing with negative critics, with mystical High Churchmen, with exegetical problems, and with biblical theology, he is admirably sane and helpful; he is so, alike in the positions he maintains and in those which he recognizes as doubtful or untenable.

Mr. Lambert recognizes that the nature and meaning of Baptism and the Lord's Supper must be the subject of the inquiry, for the N.T. does not lay down a theory of sacraments in general. These two ordinances, therefore, must be separately studied; four lectures are devoted to Baptism, five to the Lord's Supper. In regard to each of them, the lecturer has to keep in view both ancient and modern developments—both the ancient exaggerations of sacramental mystery and sacramental efficacy, and the modern criticism which denies that Christ instituted Baptism, and that He designed the Supper to be a permanent observance in the Church. The two sets of Lectures (ii.–v. and vi.–x.)—for they are really two sets—are very fine historical studies; and they will have to be kept in view by future students. They are marked equally by candour and by firmness; while a certain ease and felicity in dealing with pretentious theories is very observable—perhaps most of all in the opening lecture. We may refer, for example, to the way in which the 'sacramental principle,' as pleaded in recent Anglican books, is explained and exposed, pp. 9–11.

The assertions of negative criticism have to be discussed, and in the end we shall be the better for having had to discuss them; yet they are often too paradoxical to lay any strong hold on the general Christian mind. The same cannot be said of the Roman theory, which may be described as that of salvation by sacraments. That has very powerfully impressed many minds, chiefly indeed for extra-biblical reasons; but it does also claim biblical support. Therefore, while some readers

[1] *The Sacraments in the New Testament:* Being the Kerr Lectures for 1903. By Rev. John C. Lambert, B.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.

may find a special interest in the portions of the Lectures dealing with the subversive critical theories, because these lead into fresh fields of argument, others will turn with more interest to Mr. Lambert's way of dealing with High Church theories of sacramental efficacy; and, of course, this subject has its own place in the Lectures. Mr. Lambert has a firm hold of the essential Protestant view and of the grounds on which it is maintained. The argument in favour of Roman Catholic and High Anglican teaching on this subject really comes back to the sacrament of Baptism; it depends wholly on what can be established with regard to that. It is supposed that certain New Testament utterances afford ground for High Church views of the efficacy of Baptism; and then, by equity of construction, as it were, the same general conception is extended by teachers of that school to the Lord's Supper, and also to other ordinances or ceremonies supposed to possess the same general character. No doubt, great importance is also attached by High Churchmen to the texts regarding the Lord's Supper, in interpreting which they differ so decidedly from the Reformed. But then, while those texts, so interpreted, are made to affirm a remarkable change in the substance of the elements, they do not say anything that can be claimed as teaching High Church doctrine about the influence exerted on the spiritual condition of men. For this, as has been said, controversialists must come back to Baptism. Language is used regarding Baptism in some passages of the N.T. Scriptures which is claimed as lending countenance to Romish doctrine with regard to that sacrament. To settle the real meaning of those statements is one part of the task undertaken by the lecturer. He deals with it, partly by close exegetical study of the context and of the precise terms of the passages in question; partly, also, by a full statement of the mind of the N.T. writers regarding the way of salvation, as set forth in their writings generally. The place and value of both methods have great justice done to them in the Lectures.

We should have little to add to what the lecturer has said on this branch of the subject; indeed we believe that his positions, rightly understood, cover all we should care to say. We may remark, however, that sometimes expressions are used which suggest to ordinary ears a needlessly bare conception of the sacraments (*e.g.* of Baptism), and so tend to weaken the argument. In dealing with the question, What is meant when it is said, 'Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord'; or, 'He saved us by the bath of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost'; or, 'As many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ,' it is obvious that we should, no doubt, be on our guard against overstating what Baptism was ordained to do, but that also, on the other hand, we should have present to our minds the full biblical significance of the ordinance; for that must furnish the explanation of those and like texts, in so far as Baptism is referred to in them. We know how difficult it is on this subject to use language that shall not be liable to misconstruction on one score or other. But when, for instance, we find it said in the Lectures that Baptism 'in its inmost essence was no more than the sacrament of the public confession of faith in Christ, and so of union with the visible Church' (p. 140, and equivalent phrases elsewhere), we feel indeed that we can make room in those terms for the substance of what we ask for. But we miss something; and we doubt whether the apostle, whose teaching is there described, would have chosen words like these to express it.

There are two considerations which Mr. Lambert appeals to repeatedly, and most reasonably, in explanation of the way in which Baptism is sometimes referred to. One is the close connexion in time between Baptism on the one hand, and the earliest profession of faith by converts on the other, which obtained in early Christian days. The epoch of Confession and the epoch of Baptism all but coincided. The other is the 'tremendous psychological importance of Baptism to those converts,' as carrying home to their consciousness and their conscience the sense of forgiveness and the realization of their transition into a new sphere.[1] In explaining these, especially the latter, Mr. Lambert makes us feel that there is no real difference between him and us. But perhaps there is room for further considering the 'psychological importance' which Baptism was meant to have, not only in earlier but also in later days, and the grounds on which that must rest. Mr. Lambert has a firm hold of the principle that sacraments presuppose faith,—to faith they address themselves, and to faith they disclose their significance. But,

[1] See pp. 110, 152, 168, 190.

that being supposed, why not frankly say that Baptism is to faith the seal, not merely of union to the visible Church, but of regeneration, of forgiveness, of the beginning of the new life and all which that implies. It is so, certainly, after the manner of a sacrament; but in that character it surely embodies not merely our confession before men, and not merely our relation to the Church, but first and most our relation to the Lord Himself. We do not doubt that Mr. Lambert thinks so, but he seems to us sometimes to shrink from explicitly saying so.

We desiderate, in fact, an eleventh Lecture, to gather up and set forth what the New Testament suggests as to the doctrine of sacraments, *i.e.* as to their place and use and benefit. It is most true that we have no chapter of doctrine concerning sacraments, as such, in the New Testament. It speaks only, as occasion arises, of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. But, not the less, it gives the material and the suggestions towards a doctrine that will cover them both; and surely the field of contemplation thus opened has its own interest and profit.

God deals with us by His word, not the less really that His word comes to us through men, and is by us too often ill dealt with when it comes. But it is most interesting that, about the very same things, He proceeds further to deal with us by institutions — outward administrations that are events in an experience. Why this should be so —the place, the use, the benefit of it—is a most rewarding topic. Then the nature of these institutions. In the word God speaks to us, — in prayer, or in the act of faith, we reply to Him. But in a sacrament He and we are acting both at once. He has appointed the washing, and we have come to be washed. He has appointed and gives the bread and wine, and we take and eat. His hand and our hand meet. We strike hands, confirming it that our hearts have met and are meeting in regard to benefits which are as definite as they are priceless.

We feel sure that Mr. Lambert has another Lecture in his head, which, when it appears, will let us see how the N.T. teaching reaches out to the sacramental doctrine of the Shorter Catechism.

We have no criticism and no suggestions to offer in regard to the Lectures on the Lord's Supper. The various questions seem to us to be very wisely and effectually dealt with. We should like to add that, without any parade of arrangement, Mr. Lambert has taken his topics (which recent discussion has made many and miscellaneous) in a happy, natural order—easy to read and to remember.

Why Jesus did not Answer.

By the Rev. John Reid, M.A., Dundee.

'We cannot tell. . . . Neither tell I you.'—Matt. xxi. 27.

Sometimes a feeling of perplexity comes over us at our Lord's refusal to answer certain questions. Here, for instance, is a question put to Him by the responsible rulers of the people. 'By what authority doest Thou these things, and who gave Thee this authority?' Why should He not answer? Surely it was an opportunity of letting them know the truth. Here at last, we might say, He is face to face with the men whose influence would be of the greatest value to Him, who even had a right from their position to put the question. Yet He practically refuses.

Then we see that this refusal exposed Him to grave misrepresentation. These rulers and all who were opposed to Him might now say, 'He is a pretender. He can make great assertions and claims before the people who are ignorant, but when the rulers ask Him to give an account of Himself He has nothing to say. He evades their questions. He cannot say before them what He says outside. Listen to Him no longer. He is discredited.'

Then, again, the reason for refusing to answer the question seems somewhat trivial. It looks as if He did not wish to answer. What had His question, as to whether John the Baptist come from God or not, to do with the question they had put to Him? John was dead. All questions