

book. We propose therefore to sum up its merits and defects briefly, and in such a manner that the author himself could not impugn. For we will begin with this measure of commendation, that every advanced theological student should read the book. For the beginner it would be pernicious, as would be such *ex parte* statement; but those whose first principles are established will derive great benefit. It is the '*reductio ad absurdum*' of what has been called "one-text theology," that sort of exegesis which Satan first invented to tempt the Saviour, and which so many theological writers have unconsciously followed. But Mr. Sadler does more. He unconsciously refutes and exposes all one-sided treatment of the Prayer book, by showing how cleverly the method can be invented, and the guns turned upon the supposed defences. Of course he lays himself open in every chapter to severe criticism from scientific theologians, but he is impregnable against those who so far allow their wishes to bias their conclusions as to ignore absolutely the element of compromise in the Elizabethan settlement, and to deny the legitimate existence of any historical High Church party in the Church of England.

So far, then, the book under notice has its value, and we should recommend every Evangelical to read it carefully, and mark it, though not to learn nor inwardly digest. For, when we turn to its pages as an exposition of church teaching, we have too much reason to discover the most flagrant instances of unsupported assertion, directly opposite to the truth. One instance of this will be sufficient proof. Every student of theology is aware that, in modern times, a controversy has arisen as to the translation of '*poieite*' in the words of institution of the Lord's Supper. For the natural meaning, accepted without question in earliest times, another has been substituted, finding its supposed authority in the usage claimed for some passages in the Septuagint. It is known to every scholar that this alleged sacrificial meaning has never been accepted by any impartial authority, or indeed by any outside the ranks of those who find in that rendering an argument of convenient force. But still, as there are large numbers at the present day who believe that our Lord employed that sense, a judicious expositor would refer to it candidly while mentioning that all the weight of scholarship was on the other side. A remarkable letter from Mr. Plummer of Durham University appears in a recent issue of the *Guardian*, recommending to those who are impressed by the bold appeals to the Septuagint the perusal of an essay by Professor T. K. Abbott of Dublin, in which the whole question is exhaustively and decisively examined, proving that these passages even when accurately quoted (when references are given at all), are utterly inconclusive.

Still, if Mr. Sadler had declared his personal belief in the sacrificial sense, and had referred to the numerous adherents which it has obtained among a section of the Church of England, no one could have complained. But what does he say? On page 212 (edition of 1880) we find the writer three times asserting that there can be neither question nor doubt that the sacrificial sense is the only true one. "... unquestionably the terms which He would have used if He had desired to make the most solemn Memorial possible, ... the two words ... each of which is undoubtedly used in a certain

technical sense in connection with sacrifices. ... '*Poiein*' is unquestionably used in a technical Sacrificial sense." Is this candid? Does this inform the young reader of the truth, viz: that not one of such authorities as the Archbishops of the Anglican Church would accept such a rendering for an instant? Does it not studiously conceal the fact that all eminent New Testament scholars without exception, such as Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort, of Cambridge, Sanday of Oxford, Plummer of Durham, Abbot and Salmon of Dublin, would repudiate the sacrificial meaning, not because of any doctrinal prepossession or prejudice, but simply because it is not the true or even the possible interpretation? And is it not acknowledged that to suppress the truth is equivalent to a suggestion of falsehood?

If we were dealing with the utterance of a theological tyro, we might charitably assume ignorance on his part, that his reading had been confined (as is unfortunately the case with too many of our clergy), to party newspapers and books with hardly a higher claim to impartiality. But this loophole is impossible in the case of Mr. Sadler, whose reading is clearly extensive, and who delights in parading detached extracts from writers of other schools, with the apparent desire of claiming them as unconscious witnesses to what he considers the truth. Mr. Sadler must know that the interpretation in question is so from being "unquestionable or undoubted," that it was not thought of two generations ago in the Church of England, and is more than questioned or doubted, is absolutely denied by those whose scholarship he could hardly impugn, and whose fairness he would not dare to question.

On some future occasion we hope to deal with other assertions in this book, but for the present we have endeavoured to show how far it merits to be regarded as a true exposition of the teaching of the Church of England, and a manual suitable for the use of candidates for ordination.

We do not for a moment suppose that any Canadian bishop would venture upon making the extreme theories of such a treatise a test of admission to his diocese. And we freely admit the right of every bishop to select whatever volumes he pleases, whether the list include the Koran and the book of Mormon. But just as we should deprecate the recommendation of a text book based upon the theories of any other party, so we respectfully hope that in the next announcement of subjects, Mr. Sadler's treatise should be omitted.

It is well known that its appearance among the text-books of King's College, Windsor, is to many people of itself a sufficient reason for declining to assist that institution. And there can be no doubt that the growing coolness of our laity towards the Church of England and her Diocesan Societies, and the marked diminution in the number of Church-members in the country districts, according to recent statistics, is due to no cause more serious than the new teaching, based upon such manuals as these, received unquestioningly by young students, and by them taught to their flocks as if it were the gospel once delivered to the saints.

There is no more saddening reflection about the book we have discussed than this, that its title proclaims a glorious truth, distorted and contradicted in the text. For Church