
A table of contents for *The Baptist Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bq_01.php

Editorial Notes.

THE Baptist Theological College of Scotland has this autumn celebrated its jubilee. Its roots run much farther back into history than a mere half-century, but it was in Glasgow, on September 25th, 1894, that the present institution was launched, with Professor Joseph Coats, then occupying the Chair of Pathology in Glasgow University, as President. During the past five decades the College has grown in standing and influence, and has played an important part in denominational life in Scotland and far beyond. A distinguished succession of teachers—including Dr. Jervis Coats, Dr. T. H. Martin and Dr. J. T. Forbes—have helped in the equipping of well over a hundred men now serving in varied spheres at home and abroad. The establishment and maintenance of a College is no easy task. The Scottish Baptist College has been faithfully served and generously supported by Scottish Baptists, and has increasing opportunities of usefulness before it. All Baptists will join in congratulations and good wishes to the present Principal, Dr. W. Holms Coats, to his staff, the Rev. James Hair and Dr. A. B. Miller, and to the officers and committee of the College. May its second half-century prove as beneficial to Scottish Baptist life and to us all as has the first.

* * * *

The Report of the Social and Industrial Commission of the Church Assembly issued under the title *The Church and the Planning of Britain* (S.P.C.K., 2/-) is an important and timely document. It presents a valuable Christian commentary on the famous trio of government reports associated with the names of Barlow, Scott and Uthwatt. It sums up "the points to which the Church and Church folk generally, should direct keen and continuous attention." It also indicates useful practical lines of action in localities—a matter of urgent moment in view of the development and rebuilding plans now being made by many local authorities. A reading of the report, however, provokes a number of questions. There is nothing in it distinctively Anglican (save the word "altar" in the last paragraph). Indeed, it strikes notes which for generations were characteristic of the Free Church pioneers of social uplift, more than once referring to the work of Ebenezer Howard and others. Why did not this report come from the British Council of Churches? Why has there been no similar document from the Federal Free Church Council? Is there one on the way? Or, alternatively, cannot the Federal

Council swiftly, and with adequate publicity, indicate that Free Churchmen strongly endorse the main lines of this report and are equally concerned for the Christian values it enshrines?

* * * *

Another recent document worth the attention of Baptists is *Confirmation To-day* (Press & Publications Board of the Church Assembly, 2/-). It is the interim report of joint committees set up by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and it presents material for consideration and discussion on vital issues which face all branches of the Christian Church. The statistics given tell their own tale. It is stated that the approximate number of confirmed members of the Church of England at the present time is over 7,000,000, of whom about 2½ millions, or thirty-five per cent., are communicants at Easter. Of every 100 children born in this country, sixty-seven are baptised at Church of England fonts, thirty-four join Church of England Sunday Schools or kindred groups, twenty-six are confirmed, but only nine continue as Easter communicants. (What are the parallel figures showing the relative numbers of Baptist Sunday School scholars and candidates for baptism, and of the latter how many remain regular, or even annual, attendants at the Lord's Table?) The report is instructive, interesting and candid; it does not present final conclusions or recommendations, but so far as its general tendency can be discerned, it is somewhat disturbing. It makes a welcome plea for experiment. It admits that " it has been said with some force that it is infant baptism rather than adult Confirmation which needs justification." It interprets the latter, in very suggestive fashion, as " ordination into the general priesthood of the faithful," and would have its positive character as the " sacrament of warriors " stressed.

Nevertheless, the framers of the report fail to see how some at least of their problems come from the separation of Baptism and Confirmation and the way the former has been evacuated of much of its New Testament significance by administering it to infants. Many of the members of the committee seem inclined to think that the order Baptism, Confirmation, Communion might well be varied to Baptism, Communion, Confirmation—the first taking place in infancy, the second beginning at the age of eleven or twelve, and the third taking place usually at about the age of seventeen. Whilst this would give added reality to Confirmation, it would remove the necessity of personal faith in the case of participation in the communion service. This would surely be a very dangerous and retrograde step. Baptists will, however, find in this report much to stimulate their own thought about the rite of Baptism, particularly in regard to the age of those to whom it should be administered and the interpretation of its significance.

Some few years ago in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California, Dr. Albert Peel discovered the original notebook of John Penry, the eager young Welsh Puritan and Separatist, who was suspected of having had a hand in the Marprelate Tracts, and who for this and other provocative writings and activities was hanged in 1593. In his lectures, *The Christian Basis of Democracy,* published last year, Dr. Peel made use of some of the material in the Notebook. He has now edited the full text for the Royal Historical Society, and it has been issued in the Camden Third Series, Vol. LXVII, together with a useful introduction. Penry, in the Notebook, denies that he was the author of the Marprelate Tracts, but Dr. Peel, after a careful reconsideration of the very intricate matters involved, thinks he may yet have had some hand in them, and that perhaps Sir Roger Williams, the soldier, was also implicated. The Notebook contains many other matters of interest for an understanding of Elizabethan Puritanism and Separatism. It is good news to hear that, on a recent visit to America, Dr. Peel has also discovered a number of extracts from the sermons of John Smyth, preached perhaps while he was at Lincoln. It is to be hoped that Dr. Peel will have opportunity of editing these and making them available for us without delay.

* * * *

News of these finds leads us to point out how valuable and important, not only for the purposes of historical research, but on account of much wider and urgent contemporary issues, have been the visits which Dr. Peel and other religious leaders have paid to the United States and Canada during the past five years. The need for the maintenance of personal contacts between those in this country and the American Continent is patent to all, and political and military leaders have been compelled to make frequent journeys across the Atlantic. The closest understanding and co-operation is essential also in the religious sphere. Under the auspices of the Ministry of Information and the British Council of Churches, and of the kindred bodies in America, not a few personal missions have been arranged both from and to this country for the purposes of mutual interpretation and friendship. We believe we are right, however, in saying that apart from the visits paid to America by Dr. Rushbrooke, as President of the World Alliance, one by Dr. Hugh Martin while he was in charge of the Religions Division of the Ministry of Information, and the recent brief visit of Dr. Williamson for consultations with the A.B.F.M.S.—all of them "official" visits in a special and restricted sense—no British Baptist leaders have been among the travellers. This is somewhat surprising in view of the strength of the Baptist community in America, and their very generous gifts to the B.M.S. and to the sufferers from bombing. It is also

regrettable, for those in this country with any wide or intimate knowledge of American Baptist life are now very few. The creation of an international Christian leadership is one of the most urgent tasks confronting the churches, our own in particular. It cannot be accomplished overnight.

* * * *

In our last issue we made reference to the illness of Dr. Wheeler Robinson, the honoured President of the Baptist Historical Society. It is a satisfaction to report that he has been able to give a further series of Speaker's Lectures, though his activities continue much restricted. We regret now to have to note the serious illness of our distinguished Vice-President, Dr. W. T. Whitley. Dr. Whitley has had to spend some weeks in hospital. We are glad to learn that he is somewhat better and in good spirits. The Treasurer of the Historical Society (Mr. Allan H. Calder, 36, Marshalswick Lane, St. Albans) invites ordinary members to become Honorary Members at a subscription of one guinea per annum. They will thus further the important work of the Society, and in return receive from time to time special publications in which the Society is interested. During the term of office of Mr. Seymour Price as President of the Baptist Union, editorial responsibility for this journal is in the hands of the Rev. E. A. Payne. Communications should be addressed to him at Regent's Park College, Pusey Street, Oxford.

Ethics and Politics.

"MAN is by nature," said Karl Marx, "if not a political animal, at any rate a social one." It would be more accurate to say that as man is a social being he is inevitably a political one. In the interests of accuracy, too, we may take exception to the term, repeated to the point of tedium in these days, which describes man as a "social animal." In the first place it is a redundancy, since all the animals are social and, in the second, if man is no more than an animal politics may be applicable to him but ethics can never be; the beast of the field has yet to be found which takes an interest in moral laws.

Because man is both a social and a political creature, and because there is at the present time a universal yearning for a better world, the relation of ethics to politics is of indisputable importance. The greatest of the thinkers have always regarded the two as being intimately related, in fact as but two aspects of one inquiry. For the Greeks there was no gulf fixed between them. Plato, envisaging in his *Republic* the ideal State, declined to see the just man as anything else but an essential component of the just society. To separate the ideal of the good man from the ideal of the good State was to him unthinkable, and his vision of the perfect State in this immortal book is as much an essay in ethics as it is an essay in politics, because one without the other is inconceivable. Aristotle likewise wrote his *Ethics* as an introduction to his *Politics*. For these two pre-eminent thinkers, as for the Greek mind generally, an antithesis, far less an antagonism, between the nature and end of the individual and the nature and end of the State simply did not exist and, what is more, had never even occurred to them. The modern man may, therefore, learn from them at least two things, that ethics and politics are inseparable and that it is erroneous, if not indeed impossible, to consider a man as a mere isolated unit, for the springs of his moral life are found as much in his association with his fellows as within his own soul.

It is to the Renaissance, not to the Reformation as the critics of Protestantism affirm, that we trace the rediscovery of the individual with his right to private judgment in things secular and sacred alike and, therefore, the beginning of that sense of antagonism between individual and community which has grown steadily stronger as the years have gone by, and which has now reached, and probably passed, its climax. Writing as far back as forty years ago, Dr. James Seth, in one of his books on ethics, declared that the doctrine of non-interference by the State had very nearly reached its reduction to absurdity and that we had escaped from the serfdom of feudalism to the serfdom of uncontrolled individualism. To-day most people see only too clearly

that this point has been fully reached and that a far closer co-operation in all the spheres of human life is imperative and, if necessary, must be enforced. With, on the one hand, the evils of totalitarianism, the reaction against individualism, wherein the person is submerged under the claims of the State and, on the other hand, the evils of unregulated individualism as two object-lessons compelling attention thinking men are asking how society can steer a course between the Scylla of deadly totalitarianism and the Charybdis of riotous individualism. The answer to that question can only be discovered by asking another; what is the ethical basis of the State? How, in fact, may ethics and politics be brought back into something approaching the close relation they bore to each other in the Greek view of life?

In the quest for a clear answer it is, however, necessary to reverse the Greek order and make ethics precede politics. The manner in which society can be ethically organised can only be decided after a coherent and luminous view of what is good has been conceived. Principles have to be formulated and clarified before the practice of them can be initiated. It is clear that the State is coming into its own again, and one of the perils of post-war reconstruction is that having battled to the death, paying an appalling price in blood and sacrifice, with a monstrous totalitarianism we may find ourselves saddled with a gentlemanly one. That danger can be averted only if the citizens will pursue, before it is too late, a serious enquiry into the ethical foundations of society and will resolve that ethics and politics shall never be separated. One of the tragedies of contemporary history has been that not merely have nations abandoned ethics, but many Christians have abandoned politics. They can atone for this great error by ensuring that in the future ethics shall not cease to be political and politics shall never cease to be ethical. To separate the two, in thought or in practice, is false, and because it is false it leads to disaster.

Such an enquiry into the ethical foundation of the State discloses immediately a number of primary principles, the first of which is that the ethical unit is the person. In all human relationships the person is the fundamental factor, and reverence for personality must be the eternal concern of organisations and States if life is not to become intolerable. Of all the varied phenomena of life on this planet, only the person is rational, only the person is conscious of values and has the desire and capacity to pursue them, only the person feels the pull of moral obligation. The ultimate unit to which all organisations, all spheres of activity or speculation must be referred is man, and history with its forward leaps and backward lapses is an affair, not of concepts and ideas, but of men and of God, while the clue to the understanding of the

universe is that reality is personal. To say that the ethical unit is the person is, however, not the same thing as saying it is the individual. The individual becomes truly a person only in contact and community with others, and to isolate a man from other men is to make him less than a person, because it denies to him those opportunities of self-fulfilment that can be found only in society. The person is therefore the individual in society.

Following upon this first principle is another of primary importance. Every man is to be treated as an end in himself and never as a means to an end. When that principle is fully honoured it serves as a guarantee against a multitude of evils, not the least of which is that of the absolute State. It is a guarantee against the State being regarded as an end in itself, having a mystical nature as though it were a personality itself and possessing rights that in fact only belong to the person. This great Kantian principle, which is really a Christian one, establishes a basis upon which can be secured the dignity and value of the person and formulates the idea of "reverence for personality" into a rule of guidance.

Arising out of this comes the next fundamental principle, that the State is instrumental. While the person is an end the State is a means. Hegel has a great deal to answer for in giving rise to that perverted view of the State which has in these latter days brought misery untold to millions of men and women. "The existence of the State," he declared at one point, "is the movement of God in the world. It is the absolute power on earth; it is its own end and object." But the State is merely a convenient piece of social machinery, an expedient, which has come into being for certain desirable purposes and may, at some future date, dissolve before the construction of some new, more convenient expedient which will be necessary to meet the needs of future generations of men. The State exists for the person, to promote his well-being and so order affairs that it is possible for every man to pursue that form of the good which seems to him the right one. If the State is to be regarded as though it had personality of its own it is equally logical, or illogical, to ascribe the same qualities to other forms of human association as, for instance, trade unions, clubs or churches. But no one in his right senses would regard any of these as ends in themselves. Certainly no Christian with a true conception of his faith would regard a church as anything but instrumental to the will and purpose of God. The mystical view of the State is not only an absurdity, it is a menacing perversion. The State is instrumental and its object is the development and fulfilment of the person.

By what means may the person find self-realisation, how may the personality be developed to the full height of its possible

stature? The answer of ethics to that question is that the true development of the person is attained by the living of the good life. Here we are not concerned to declare what form the good life ought to take. It ought never to be imposed from without, and each man must decide for himself. We are only concerned to lay down the primary principle that fulfilment of personality is achieved through the good life and to assert that the aim and purpose of the State is to promote the good life of every member of the community. It is not the function of the State to take upon itself the task of indicating to the citizens the kind of life they ought to live, the ends they must pursue and the values they must cherish, but it is the function of the State to ensure that every person is able to follow that life which seems good to him and it must, therefore, secure to every man his liberty of thought, worship and action so long as that liberty does not encroach upon the liberty of others.

This involves another fundamental of equal importance. In order to foster the good life of its citizens the State addresses itself to two imperative functions, the one negative and the other positive. The first is legal justice, which must be established and maintained to restrain those who would encroach upon the rights, liberties and happiness of their fellow-citizens, and to defend the people from such transgressions. This form of justice is to protect the person from aggression from whatever quarter it is likely to come. A legal system has to be formulated which approximates as closely as any such system can to the moral law and which must have behind it sufficient force to compel obedience. The second and more positive function is social justice. There are many forms of society where the conditions of life are such that it is impossible for the person to attain self-realisation because it is impossible for him to live the good life. In order that the good life may be possible for all the State has the task of setting up and preserving a desirable standard of general conditions. This involves compelling any who are unwilling to make their just contribution to the common welfare to attend to their duties and to discharge their obligations, and it also involves a certain amount of State intereference in the lives of the people to ensure that conditions are what they ought to be, that every man is obliged to take advantage of his right to work, that every man enjoys a reward for his work that is sufficient for his needs, that every citizen shall be educated to an agreed standard, that the State shall, in short, so determine the social environment in all its aspects as they affect the well-being of the citizen that the ethical life is possible for everyone without exception. Safeguards, however, must be assured that the State does not carry this interference too far and so over-step its ethical limits that it ceases to be the

guardian of the person and becomes the proprietor of the person.

The relation of ethics and politics demands that the conception of sovereignty be defined and the seat of sovereignty be determined. In modern times a distinction of great importance has been drawn between legal sovereignty and political sovereignty. The legal sovereign is that power which interprets and administers the laws of a people, while the political sovereign is the supreme power, the final authority in the State from which all other authority, legal and otherwise, is ultimately derived. "Behind the sovereign which the lawyer recognises there is another sovereign to whom the legal sovereign must bow." Ultimate authority is therefore located in political sovereignty, for the true seat of which thinkers of various schools have searched for many centuries. But without diverting to discuss all the possible theories and counter-theories of political thought, it seems right to maintain that from the ethical point of view sovereignty must reside in the will of the people as a whole. This entails a democratic form of state-organisation, which to be truly successful must be an educated and enlightened democracy, allowing freedom of discussion and criticism to minorities and in which all the citizens play their due part and take seriously to heart the responsibilities that lie upon their shoulders. Political sovereignty abides in the whole body of the people, "whatever forms of expression or outlet it may find, and whatever agents may be legally empowered to act or think for it. The real or 'political' sovereign lies in the will of the people."

In the fulfilment of its ethical functions and in all its subsidiary activities, the State must look ahead to that time when the State, as at present constituted, shall have gone out of existence. To look forward to such an event is not to decry the purest forms of cultural nationalism or the noblest type of patriotism, but it does mean the hope that political nationalism will in due course give way to political universalism, that the goal of all human endeavour should be the withering away of the independent nation-state before the evolution of the one and indivisible world-state. The State as it now appears is, after all, but a stage in a long social and historical process which will eventually move on towards another and higher stage. Aristotle was not far wrong when, looking back over this process, he stated, "The family arises first; when several families are united . . . then comes into existence the village. . . . When several villages are united . . . the city comes into existence." From the city stage the process has gone on, and we now have the nation-state. But about this particular form of social and political organisation there is nothing sacrosanct and there is no reason for supposing that it represents the final level to which the historical process can attain; in fact, there is

every reason to the contrary. A theory of man's social life which comes to a sudden stop with the present arrangement of many independent sovereign States is clearly inadequate and, judged by the criterion of either ethics or history, obviously false. Men must therefore look forward to, and work for, the advance of that process, step by step and stage by stage, until the nation-state as we know it at present, has been superseded by the world-state. Beyond that it is, at this level of human knowledge and experience, impossible to see.

Thus we have laid down for our guidance certain primary principles which are drawn out and made plain by any discussion of the inter-relation of ethics and politics. The demands of Christian ethics would call not so much for modification or alteration of any of the foregoing, as for a difference of emphasis and an approach to the whole question from a rather different angle. Beyond the person as the ethical unit, beyond the social organisation lie the truths that personality is highest in fellowship with God, and that form of the State which should be striven for is that which approximates to the City whose builder and maker is God. The purpose of man and the function of the State will be to serve the ends of God while, as Alexander Miller has said in his *Biblical Politics,* " The Christian is called to use the machinery of justice, the social organisation which distributes bread and defends freedom, as an instrument by which he can make His Love operative towards all sorts and conditions of men." The Christian view of life will demand that all questions of sovereignty, whether legal or political, shall be interpreted in the light of the fact that God is Judge and Creator of man and his world; while the hope that out of the present conglomeration of independent nation-states there shall arise one, united world-state will be regarded from the standpoint which Paul adopts in *Ephesians,* that it is the will of God, indeed it is a Purpose even now inexorably moving forward to ultimate fulfilment, to bring the world into a unity around the throne of Christ. Certainly the Christian attitude calls for urgent and unceasing political thought and action on the part of Christian men, provided they bear always in remembrance the fact that life cannot be divided into sacred and secular departments since all is of God, and that even more basic truth that man is a fallen creature whose various and progressive structures all must in time decay, yet whose citizenship is not only of the cities of this earth but of that continuing city in the heavenlies which constitutes his real home. Christians and all others who take a serious view of ethics, however, will unite in seeing that ethics and politics are two sides of the same question. Ethics asks in what does the good life consist, while politics asks how the community may be so organised that the good life is a possibility for every citizen.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

Christian Unity and Church Union.[1]

OUR problem of unity and union calls for consideration in four fields which are relatively distinct although definitely interrelated. It is important carefully to consider these in the light of the various attitudes in different denominations toward these two concepts.

Theoretically all Christians accept, at least in principle, the duty and the fact of Christian fellowship among all those "who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." Doubtless there are very many who have little awareness of this fellowship and no active consciousness of the unity of all believers in our common experience and blessed hope. Most Christians, of all communions, might well cultivate a far more lively and realistic "love toward all the saints."

Church union—certainly all will admit—may be something quite other than this spiritual oneness of all believers in Christ. There are many earnest Christians who believe that outward organic union of all believers in one all-comprehensive organised church not only is not demanded by the teachings or the spirit of the New Testament, but that it is contrary to that teaching and spirit. These insist that in whatever measure such organic union has been achieved it has tended definitely and powerfully to hinder the true understanding of the Christian experience and the vital and characteristic functioning of the Christian gospel. Still, any profession of unity in spirit and sentimental feeling which rejects every form of concrete, visible and working expression is unrealistic and deceptive. If our oneness in spiritual experience can bring us together in no visible fellowship in worship and work, we must question its actuality as experience; and it can certainly have no value as influencing the world.

In the light of the long continued claims of the Roman

[1] At the suggestion of Dr. Rushbrooke, President of the Baptist World Alliance, we reprint the following article, which has appeared in *The Review and Expositor,* the well-known theological quarterly issued by the Faculty of the Southern Baptist Seminary. The author is Professor Emeritus of Comparative Religion and Missions. British Baptists and those of the Northern Baptist Convention (U.S.A.) have accepted membership in the World Council—though the Northern Convention did so subject to drastic reservations drawn up by a special committee appointed to study the subject; Baptists of the Southern Convention (the largest organised group of our confession) have so far felt bound to stand out. This article reveals an interesting trend of thought among Southern Baptists. The topic is of the first importance to us all.—EDITOR.

Church and its history, and in the light of the institutional life and dogmatic formulations of the Orthodox Church, and especially in the light of the now very powerful and persistent tendency and desire on the part of many leaders of the Protestant Churches to effect institutional and organisational union of all Protestantism, it is especially important that clear thinking, loyal obedience and holy sentiment shall be combined in faithful facing of the issues involved in this entire matter.

1. First of all, we need to think of the field of personal and corporate experience of God in Christ Jesus wrought in men by the Holy Spirit. Members of the body of Christ's redeemed and called are separated from "the world" and constitute what Paul calls "a new humanity," and "the family of God" and "the commonwealth of the saints." To deny, reject, or neglect the fact of unity among those thus bound together in the experience and purpose of God in Christ is surely to be ignorant of the nature of Christianity. Here at least is a compelling fact of unity demanding some adequate, practical expression.

2. There is next, the field of creedal definitions and claims, involving doctrinal beliefs. For the majority of denominations these are defined in a series of formally expressed creeds. There is much difference among those who accept the historic creeds as to how many and which are authoritative in the defining of historic Christianity and the continuity of the Christian Church; and concerning both the extent and the forms of application of the authority of the creeds to modern Christian belief and practice. Among the denominations of the congregational type "Confessions of Faith" are usually preferred over creeds. The confessions are less fixed and are more easily subject to revision, and are regarded as having no external and binding authority over modern believers. However, it should be frankly admitted that confessions do have a tendency to function as creeds unless they are repeatedly adjusted to the changing intellectual atmosphere and cultural context of the developing life of human society as a whole. When subject to these adjustments confessions do allow more freedom than creeds; and by so much those who confess their faith ought to be more ready and active for freedom of fellowship than are those who must ever be conscious of being adherents of fixed creeds.

Whether they be creeds or confessions these formulations have always stated the experience and conviction of Christians in a certain cultural context, and at a given stage in development of the Christian movement in history. They have sought to relate themselves definitely to the essential elements of original Christianity and to conserve the continuity of the true Christian life and faith.

Once adopted a creed—and in less measure a confession also—tends to restrain free experience and to fix the limits and forms of thought and life.

Whether we think of creeds or confessions we have here a sphere in which we must seek clear thinking as we face the dual problem of unity and union.

3. Closely related to creedal questions, but readily distinguishable, is the sphere of ecclesiastical forms and dogmas. Here belong questions of the ministry, sacramental concepts, institutional forms and relations. Does the ministry constitute the essence of the church, or is it in any way authoritatively essential to the existence of the church? Did Jesus first create a ministry which should ever be the medium of continuity of His gospel and of His Church and His churches, so that without the ministry there would be no true church? On the other hand, is the church the first institutional creation of the Christ which then under the leadership of the Holy Spirit produces its ministry? To put it in another form, is the ministry essentially structural within the church or is it functional?

Do the physical symbols and the physical experience of baptism and the Lord's Supper *per se*, how-be-it by divine appointment and intent, actually effect some change in the participants, or is this change effected only in personal response by faith to the spiritual presence and operation of God in the participants? As to this there is, then, the further question: Are the value and the effect of the use of these physical symbols dependent on some official and special endowment and enduement in the administrator, or are the reverence of the congregation and the faith of the participants the vitalising factors? In yet other words: Are these ordinances hierarchal and ecclesiastical functions with sacramental impartation, or are they expressions of faith in simple gospel communion?

4. We have still to take account of the field of practical living and work. This involves co-operation in impress and effort of the total Christian following—or of some definite section of that following—in the tasks of proclaiming and applying the gospel to the needs of the world, and to the needs of Christians in the growth and maturing of their experience and in the various relationships into which they are brought. Where even two Christians participate in a joint experience or share a common task we have an elementary instance of unity—it may be of union—in the practical field. The co-operating individuals may be increased, even multiplied indefinitely. Do they continue to work together and share in common experience as individuals, and only as individuals; or may and do groups of such workers link together as groups? Is it essential that groups participating in common ex-

periences and undertakings participate consciously as churches, ecclesiastical organisations? Must they actually represent, and have the formal sanction of, their distinctive groups, or may they be members of a new grouping for the particular ends, without compromising their standing in their distinctive "church" groups?

These questions might be amplified and expounded almost indefinitely. What has been said is probably sufficient to get rather clearly before us the different spheres of human Christian relationships which are involved in our considerations of church union and of Christian fellowship in the "unity of the Spirit" and in the wide ministries of the gospel.

Is it not now clear that in the present state of Protestantism there is no hope of union in one institutional church, so long as we undertake to work it out in fields 2 and 3? There are many considerations, historical, psychological, traditional and prejudicial which ought definitely to show us, not only that all the different Protestant and evangelical believers generally are unprepared for any such ecclesiastical union; but also that such a union would be contrary to the very genius of Protestantism and would tend to suppress the freedom which all believers have and should have in Christ Jesus. "The divided state of Christendom" is for many reasons deplorable. One may venture to question whether it is the "shame" and the "sin" and the "disgrace" so often proclaimed and denounced. Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Hubmaier, Wesley and the rest have long been acclaimed as the great heroic Christian leaders of a vitally essential movement in the life of Christianity. Are we now to change that verdict of four centuries and list them as the arch sinners of modern Christianity because they led in founding objective schisms in the Christian body? Are Roger Williams and John Clarke, Coke and Asbury devilish violators of the established ecclesiastical orders on the American continent; or are they still to be recognised as the apostles of new experience and new freedom in a continent made ready for a modern chapter in the history of the Christian gospel? Having been led into the freedom for which Christ made us free, must we in the interest of ecclesiastical union seek again a yoke of bondage, however plausibly the yoke may be padded and adorned with appealing sentiment and with plausible exhortation to a united front in the face of a needy world?

It ought to be beyond question that the polemics, the asperities, the antagonisms, the persecutions, the resentful spirit of revolt need to be transcended in the interest of a genuine Christian fellowship and of the stupendous task and the glorious challenge which face all the followers of Jesus Christ in this our day. Is there not a way to achieve unity and an ever-growing measure of co-operative sharing in the common tasks of a uni-

versal gospel for a human race that must be unified for its salvation, and for which the only hope of unification is in the redemption and the mastery of Jesus Christ in the life of mankind?

Is it perhaps possible on the basis of spiritual unity and of our fellowship in Christ, and in the interest of promoting the meaning of Christianity for the world's redemption and life, for us to unite in the fields 1 and 4? Can we approach such union in spirit and such unitedness in undertakings with the mutual and faithful understanding that our sharing in spiritual fellowship, and our co-operating in common tasks will not be aggressively used by ardent promoters of ecclesiastical union to undermine the positions and the loyalties of any group participating in the councils and the activities of working union? In this spirit, with this understanding, and with honest recognition and living up to the terms of mutual respect and true brotherhood in these two realms (1 and 4) unity and co-operation might increasingly be found. And if thereby some are led on to revision and reinterpretation of our understanding and aims in fields 2 and 3, no violence would be done to any conscience, and we might make real progress in the "Unity of the faith and in the accurate knowledge of the Son of God"; and thereby the Body of Christ might find itself "growing up in all things into Him who is its Head, and making the increase of the body unto the building of itself in love."

The effort to unite in a simple, inseparable movement the ideas and aims of both Oxford and Edinburgh, may be producing confusion and delaying progress. Thus far the World Council continues the "Conference on Life and Work," but seems to be hampered by the effort to include also "Faith and Order." Are not these two separate, even if parallel, movements? One works in our fields 2 and 3, the other in 1 and 4. Does not the genius and intent of the Christian gospel put experience and work in the forefront and call for following on in faith and order? Faith in the sense of living experience and active effort must precede "the Faith" in the sense of formulations of doctrine and forms of worship. If we have faith can we not respect and work with one another whatever our convictions and preferences concerning "the Faith"?

W. O. Carver.

The Christian Approach to the Old Testament.

IN what relationship does the Old Testament stand to the New Testament? Is it, as Dr. Brunner has said, "as the beginning of a sentence is to the end of the sentence"? Or is the Old Testament, to use Luther's figure, the cradle and swaddling bands in which Christ lies? In what sense is the New Testament the fulfilment of the Old? Is there in the many words of God to ancient Israel enshrined in the Old Testament a Word of God for our times? Or is it simply a ladder by which we climb to the New Testament and which we then kick away? Such are questions that emerge when we reflect on the place that both Testaments have had in the life and thought of the Christian Church. There the approach has always been christological and this is still desiderated: "... we need ... books ... which will show to British readers the ways in which the Old Testament, rightly understood, increases our understanding of Jesus Christ."[1]

It is unfortunate in many ways that there has come to be so great a cleavage between the two Testaments, for there are great truths and convictions in both that go far beyond any such artificial distinction in the Canon and which have indeed cut across many human dividing lines such as those of Jew and Gentile, slave and free.

1. THE OLD TESTAMENT AS THE SCRIPTURE OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

Jesus and His followers regarded the Old Testament as Scripture and the early Church naturally continued to do so although it was not until the Council of Carthage in 397 that this fact was made articulate, and by that time New Testament Scriptures were also recognised. It was simply a matter of continuing Synagogue usage, and of accepting as sacred, that is as "defiling the hands," such books as were believed to have been inspired by God through the Holy Spirit.[2] Jesus made reference to Old Testament incidents and passages, and used it not only in controversy with the Pharisees, but drew largely from it for the content and shaping of His teaching—the Beatitudes abound in Old Testament language, the two great commandments come directly from it, and so does much of the content of the Son of Man conception. Acceptance of the Old Testament as Scripture is

[1] G. Phillips: *The Old Testament in the World Church*, 1942, p. 90. "Rightly understood" is an ambiguous expression here.

[2] G. F. Moore *Judaism*, Pt. I., Chap. II.

axiomatic for the whole of the New Testament. It was sufficient at times simply to introduce quotations from it with the words, "As it is written," or "For it is written," though now and again they are qualified as being written either in the Law or the Prophets or the Psalms. For the most part it was the Greek Translation, the Septuagint, with which the New Testament writers were familiar. Their thinking, writing and vocabulary were very largely determined by their familiarity with it, as may be seen not so much in the frequent quotations from it—many of which, as will be seen, stand in a class apart—as in the details of religious thought and terminology. No one may read the fine passage in 2 Cor. iii. 1-iv. 6, contrasting the fading glory of the former ministry with the ever-renewed glory of the ministry of Christ, and enter fully into its meaning and spirit without constant reference to the Old Testament ideas which form the warp, as it were, of the fabric. "One cannot forget for a moment the historic fact that the New Testament was written by men to whom the Old Testament was 'Holy Scripture'; every one of its documents is saturated by the thought, and indeed by the very language of its predecessor, for there is rarely a sentence which does not require a deep knowledge of that predecessor for its proper interpretation."[3]

One very important corollary of this use of the Old Testament, and one that is not always given the place in our thinking that it deserves, is that the early Christians doubtless found much in it that was fully adequate as a revelation of God and a statement of man's faith, and that therefore needed no Christian re-interpretation. The New Testament by no means replaced the Old Testament as Scripture.

2. The Doctrinal Use of the Old Testament.

Hand in hand with the use of the Old Testament as Scripture went the doctrinal use of it whereby events, their meaning or their record, were deliberately shaped by the use of Old Testament speech and idea. This arose inevitably from the belief that the Gospel was the fulfilment of much hitherto unfulfilled prophecy.

(*a*) How far did Jesus Himself use it in this way? "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but to fulfil." The clearest instance in the life of Jesus is the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem where it seems certain that He chose to enter the city in the way He did so as to make a definite claim to messiahship on the basis of the prophecy in the Book of Zechariah (ix. 9). How much more of this kind of recapitulation is to be found in the events of His life is difficult

[3] A. T. Olmstead: *History, Ancient World, and the Bible.* J.N.E.S. January 1943, P. 8.

to say: the Entry into Jerusalem may be an isolated case. When we turn to His teaching, however, we find sufficient evidence that He knew Himself to be the keystone and the fulfilment of God's revelation. The conception of the messiahship which He put into the term "Son of Man" (Dan. vii. 13) may be traced back into the Old Testament in its component elements, but it must be noted that something unique emerged when they were gathered togther in His person.[4]

(*b*) Thus did Jesus Himself lead the way into a doctrinal use of the Old Testament[5] which His followers were not slow to develop. "And Philip opened his mouth, and beginning from this scripture (Isa. liii. 7, 8), preached unto him Jesus" (Acts viii. 35). The experience of the Resurrection and the gift of the Spirit finally sealed their belief in Jesus as the Christ, and intensified their own searching of the Scriptures to find numberless anticipations of their experience in Christ. It was as though, confronted by two facts of religious experience, the one embodied in a book and the other in a person, and both being revelatory and redemptive, they appealed to the book to substantiate the events of the life and to the life to elucidate the words of the book. The appeal was made on the basis of fulfilment—things incomplete or unrealised in the first revelation were seen to be completed and realised in the Incarnation. In this appeal they were helped by the traditional Jewish methods of exegesis with which, as Synagogue attenders, they would be well familiar. Those methods, while not denying that written (and originally spoken) words have a literal and simple meaning, sought to elucidate more difficult or obscure passages by the use of typology and allegory; the former mainly in Palestine and the latter in Alexandria. St. Paul frankly used both methods and even named them: "which things contain an allegory: for these women are two covenants" (Gal. iv. 24); "Now these things happened unto them by way of example (τυπικως); and they were written for our admonition" (1 Cor. x. 11, cf. 6).

Two things need constantly to be borne in mind in speaking of the Old Testament in the New. 1. What was used was not *simply* the Old Testament, it was rather the Old Testament *as interpreted christologically*, that is, as read by the early Christians. It is a well-known fact that texts and passages come to bear meanings that were not originally contained by them, and this is especially so with allegorical and typological methods of exegesis.

[4] Nor must we overlook the inter-testamental Apocalyptic thought and literature as a probable source for some of the elements of the Christian Messianic idea.

[5] Note especially the comment of the two disciples after the walk on the Emmaus road—Luke xxiv. 32.

The subsequent history and use of written words (by the Germans called *Nachgeschichte*) becomes an all-important consideration. 2. There is evidence of the existence from the very earliest times of collections of Old Testament passages compiled, on the whole, for use in controversy with the Jews, and there is every possibility that such anthologies or *testimonia* were known and used by the majority of early Christians. Fulfilment quotations, such as the Matthean sequences, were probably taken from one such anthology. Use of Old Testament passages in this way would practically rule out historical exegesis.

(*c*) Following the New Testament precedent the Church has always used the Old Testament as a source for its doctrine and theology and the christological approach has inevitably fostered the retention of the typological method of exegesis. For Justin Martyr the "Old Testament was a complete Bible, historically and doctrinally" (Westcott), and the same may be said of most of the early Fathers. Indeed many of them, like Justin himself, were converted by the reading of the prophets of the Old Testament. Nor does the attitude of Clement of Alexandria, on the one hand, in setting the Books of the Old Testament on a par with the Greek philosophical writings or that of Marcion, on the other hand, in rejecting the Old Testament altogether, seriously affect this estimate. The Antiochene Fathers at the end of the fourth century, and the beginning of the fifth, pursued a method of literal and exact exegesis which has had permanent influence, but they held also that the historical events had spiritual lessons to teach, and to extract those they pursued the method of typology rather than of allegory. Typology[6] was firmly rooted and held its place alongside the other methods of exegesis through the Middle Ages and the Reformation down to the beginnings of historical criticism. The search for proof texts also continued vigorously, being strengthened by the belief in plenary inspiration. "The period of the religious wars was favourable neither for humanistic studies, nor for unprejudiced history. The Bible was studied as never before, and often with genuine scholarship, but this scholarship was rarely devoted to simple search of the truth, only to the citation of proof texts by which to confute sectarian adversaries. Thus the *odium theologicum* intrenched itself firmly in the field of Biblical scholarship from which it has never been completely eradicated." [7]

[6] There was necessarily some overlapping of the allegorical and the typological and, although allegory was somewhat discounted, it did, nevertheless, continue to exist. Wyclif could write: "Literal" ether historial vndurstondyng techith what thing is don; allegorik techith what we owen for to bileue.—*Is. Prol.*

[7] Olmstead, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

3. The Modern Approach.

Then came the rise of historicism and the methods of higher criticism, beginning with Astruc in 1753 and still continuing in our own times. This new approach tended to shift emphasis from the *revelation* of the Old Testament to the *record* of the individual books and to the development of Israel's religion. Familiarity with the results of historical criticism—forbidding as they often seem when resolved into formulae and capital letters—and a full dependence on them, with almost negligible differences of opinion in details, may be assumed for all Old Testament scholars to-day. This has been a necessary discipline, and has at least three positive values: 1. It has stimulated lively interest in the study of Old Testament religion. Much of the work on the Old Testament in the first quarter of the present century was based on the religion rather than the theology. Davidson's *Theology of the Old Testament,* published posthumously in 1904, admits frankly that "though we speak of Old Testament *Theology,* all that we can attempt is to present the religion or religious ideas of the Old Testament" (p. 11). 2. It has enabled Old Testament scholarship to find its proper place in the whole field of Near Eastern Studies which recent work in philology and archaeology has opened up, and to acquaint itself, as far as possible without prejudice, with those cultures of the ancient world which had contact with Israel. 3. The Old Testament has been studied *for its own sake* by Christian scholars and the shackles of allegorical and typological exegesis have been broken.

More recently, probably within the last twenty years, there has been a marked return to a theological interpretation arising from a belief in the Old Testament as a revelation from God, and not simply as man's record of that revelation. Two forces seem to have been at work to bring this change about, and the same two forces may be seen in its exposition. The one comes from within the sphere of Old Testament studies itself, for it is impossible for a Christian believer to maintain a purely academic approach—its unique and forward-looking revelation of God will burst out at so many points and will be no more contained than the fire of the word of God shut up within the prophet Jeremiah. The other force comes from such theological tendencies as that of the Barthian school with its emphasis on the givenness of revelation. There is a very grave danger that the latter, which is christological in its interest, will place too great a reliance on spiritual exegesis and neglect the firmly established principles of historical criticism and historical exegesis.

The task which Old Testament theologians now face and are pursuing, building on the foundations laid by the detailed critical work of the last century and a half, is that of finding and arti-

culating the fundamental truths about God and man's response to Him revealed therein, and of showing how there is a unity of purpose on God's part in the light of which men of faith have been enabled to understand and interpret the historical sequence of events in which they are involved. This task almost invariably becomes more than an examination and exposition of a static record of events and their interpretation, for there emerges a lively sense of a dynamic, a driving force running throughout the whole of the Old Testament and then driving on beyond into the realm of Apocalyptic between the Testaments, and finally and inevitably into the New Testament and the Gospel. It is the Incarnation which brings to a focus not only the hopes and aspirations of the Old Testament, but also the lessons and discoveries which were made at so many times and in so many varied ways. The nature of that driving force is redemptive, and it is in redemption that we must look for that which binds Old and New Testaments together.

L. H. Brockington.

The Sacramental Significance of Christian Baptism.

TIME has dealt hardly with the Gospel Sacrament of Baptism. Its importance in the fellowship-life of the Church has been minimised by the loose manner of its use, especially among those who practise paedo-baptism. Whereas in time past the baptism of an infant was carefully guarded by an investigated and avowed Christian parenthood, nowadays even that barrier has broken down, and children are presented at the font by those whose only other attendances in the House of God are demanded by the social exigencies of a wedding or a funeral—or another christening.

It is to be admitted that this state of affairs is generally deplored by the more serious-minded within the Church, and there is much searching of heart in many quarters concerning this obvious deterioration of observance. Why, it is enquired, should not Baptism have an equal place in the life of the Church with the Communion of the Lord's Supper? It is difficult to assign the reasons for Baptism becoming secondary and casual; but the factual evidence that it has become so is indisputable. The balance of our Lord's twofold commission is thus disturbed, and the Christian witness to the world suffers accordingly.

It is possible that we have forgotten in these latter days the original intention of our Lord in providing for the sacramental life of His Church. Dr. J. K. Mozley, in *The Gospel Sacraments*, p. 29, gives us a clear definition of what he understands as the Christian doctrine of the sacraments. "The Christian doctrine of the sacraments," he writes, "refers the efficacy of these rites to the will of God who makes them channels of His grace to *those who approach them in the spirit of repentance and faith, that is with the true moral dispositions.*" (The italics are mine.) We are indebted to Dr. Mozley for that very clear and definite statement. It is unfortunate, however, that in a later portion of the book, when he discusses the sacraments in detail, he appears to have forgotten his own primary thesis. Of Baptism he says: "In the first birth there is a sharing of sin; in the second birth, a sharing of the forgiveness of sin. An adult who comes to baptism may be conscious of this profound contrast between the pre- and the post-baptismal state, as was Cyprian in the famous passage in which he put his own experience on record. But the contrast is there for everyone, adult or infant, who passes through

the baptismal water. It is the passage from the realm of nature to the realm of grace. And in the realm of grace, the first of all necessary blessings is the blessing of the forgiveness of sin. Wherever there is repentance and faith, there is God's answer in the forgiveness of sin. In the case of the infant, those necessary conditions are supplied by sponsors who should be regarded, not simply as the representatives of the infant, but as representatives of the whole Church, praying in its name that he who is to be made a member of the family may receive those blessings without which there can be no family at all." Thus, it would appear, is the Gospel Sacrament of Baptism reduced, on the one part, to being sorry by proxy, and, on the other part, to the expression of a pious hope, which, unfortunately, is not always realised. Is not the weakness of the present position regarding Christian Baptism just here: a confusion of thought as to what is efficacious Baptism "in the spirit of repentance and faith," and the Solemn Dedication of an infant within the family of the Church of God?

If, so far as is humanly possible, we can divest our minds of preconceived notions and traditional ideas of Christian Baptism, and approach the subject from the point of view of pure investigation in the light of our knowledge of the working of the human consciousness, we may get a new understanding of a question which is vital, and therefore fundamental, to the Christian Faith. The material at our disposal is so voluminous that we are apt to answer the question before it is put, and to decide the issue before it is tried. If, however, without looking for any particular interpretation, we discover one which is adequate in the light of present-day knowledge in other fields, we shall surely hap upon a hidden treasure. It is in this spirit of detachment that we should approach the sources of our subject in the consciousness of Jesus and the development of the experience of the Church.

We are justified in rejecting as unsound in these days of newer light on the inner working of the human mind, the separating of a specific subject from the full impact of the whole personality in the source. Looking at the historical Jesus as we know Him through the portraiture of the New Testament, we fail to give full value to the reality of the Incarnation unless we accept all the implications of His human personality. Jesus was a child of the race, as we are children of the race. He bore within Himself the essential nature of man and was heir to the accumulated resources of His heredity. He was an agent of expression, qualifying His surroundings, and an absorber of environmental conditions, influenced by the times in which He lived. Jesus was approached by and sought to approach the men and women amid whom He laboured by the same powers with which we ourselves establish our social contacts. There is nothing miraculous in the

way in which Jesus invited men to follow Him, or in His pungent criticism of the follies and prejudices of Scribe and Pharisee. The characteristic most prominent in the social life of Jesus is naturalness.

The average reader of the Gospels is impressed by the words of Jesus. Even though he may not be able to recall the exact words after he has laid down the book, the content has been presented to him in an unforgettable way. The words of a man always make an impression on the mental periphera. Whether the words are written or spoken, it is what we write or say that is generally remembered. But no one to-day would assert that the words of Jesus are more important than His actions. The Moral Analects of Confucius are, at least, on a similar plane to the recorded sayings of Jesus. Also, we would not care to admit that what Jesus said is the sufficient foundation for belief. Intellectual apprehension of truth is not salvation. Words, even in poetry, are liable to become entangled in the barbed wire of our defences on the circumference of the mind. A codified statement of truth is not sufficient to reach the mainspring of human personality. The will is not often touched by argument. You may convince a man, but the will to believe lies deeper than intellectual conviction. The conscious mind only is touched by verbal teaching. Thus, from the point of view of effective operation on the inner man, we place the parables in the lowest position. We rarely hear of any one being converted by a parable, and probably the men who became Christian through reading, such as the Ethiopian Eunuch and Tatian, would have been the first to ascribe their conversion to deeper causes. As Mr. Thouless says in his *Psychology of Religion*, "Purely intellectual conviction of the existence of God means very little until it has become associated with feelings and experience. The mere proof of the existence of a supreme being would lead us little farther towards a religion than the proof of the existence of finite numbers. A man with a religion of purely rational type would be in a worse position than the devils who, St. James tells us, 'believe and tremble.' We would remain in a condition of profound indifference." We may say, then, that the religion of Jesus, as we discover it in the Gospels, is not merely a religion of words. Pure intellectualism on the one hand, or arid sentimentalism on the other, are extremes He avoided. The religion of Jesus is neither a book of Euclid nor a poem.

Because Jesus was subject to the laws of our human consciousness quite naturally He was affected by processes other than the purely intellectual. Because He was above the laws of human consciousness He founded the Faith on something more enduring than a creed. He knew that a confession of faith tends to become a confession of failure. A creed becomes not merely outgrown;

no creed ever exactly fitted. A chemical formula does not describe a flower. The spectrum does not explain the sun. There are thoughts that lie too deep for tears, and, what is more, too deep for words. In nothing have we gone so far astray as in our trust in the efficacy of an adequate vocabulary. We have ignored the elemental man who resides in each of us behind the more or less rigid screen of evolved civilisation. Directed thinking which employs mostly words is a recent product of the life of civilised man. What about the barbarian behind the prison bars of our convention? Jesus reached the centre of personality by the method of symbolism. He broke through the crust of intellectual apprehension and probed deeply into the affective region of experience.

Thus when we come to the institution of Christian Baptism we are in the world of affective symbolism. It conveys a grace which escapes the definition of words. The truth of Baptism cannot be contained in a formula. There is no rational connection between water and the entrance of a human soul into the Kingdom of God, any more than there is a connection between spittle and speech or clay and the restoration of sight. If we attempt to justify Baptism on rational grounds, we confuse the categories. If we rely merely on the argument of blind obedience to command, surely we are asking too much of those whom we desire to influence for the Christian Faith.

If it is ceded that the symbolic is the only way of reaching the affective region of the mind, there still remains the all-important question as to how a symbolic act may become a sacrament. All symbols are not sacraments. Can we safely assert that all sacraments are symbols? I do not think we can be satisfied with the somewhat crude explanation of the Anglican Catechism. A sacrament is something more than an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace. If it is not more than this, there is a danger lest it degenerate into something less. Perhaps we may accept it as a God-used method of producing an adequate affect in the human soul (using the word "affect" in the psychological sense of an organised system of emotional dispositions).[1] Even here we must be careful of ignoring the volition of the individual and assuming that the affect can be produced without, or in opposition to, the will. That an affect may be produced without, or despite, our will is evident every time we are moved emotionally by music or poetry or visible grandeur; but the affect may be as evanescent as it is momentarily moving. We must distinguish between an affect and an adequate affect. Thus, when Jesus was intent on producing an adequate affect, He made it a condition of fulfilment that the object of His sympathy should have faith. In

[1] See McDougall's *Social Psychology*, Chap. VI, p. 137.

almost every case of the conveyance of His healing power, the comment was, "Thy faith hath made thee whole." In the sacrament of Baptism repentance is added to faith. Baptism thus becomes a channel of the grace of God "to those who approach (the sacrament) in the spirit of repentance and faith, that is with the true moral disposition" (Dr. J. K. Mozley).

In the light of this we can the more readily grasp the meaning of Paul's words to the Roman Church: "Are ye ignorant that all who were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised into His death? We were buried therefore with Him through baptism unto death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so also we might walk in newness of life." One meaning is on the surface of this passage: the experience of Jesus passes through Baptism into the life of the baptised. This transference creates identity between Christ and the believer. The two elements of an effectual sacrament—grace and fellowship—are thus clearly emphasised by the Apostle. Other references to Baptism in the writings of Paul bear out the main idea contained in this passage. He writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. i. 12-17) that he is glad that he baptised none save a few—Crispus, Gaius, and the household of Stephanus. This is not a depreciation of Baptism, but rather a protest against the tendency of certain members of the Church at Corinth to transfer their fealty to persons lower than Christ, or to make Christ one among many others from whom grace could proceed. It was a warning against incipient sacerdotalism of the hierarchic type. Again, in 1 Cor. vi. 11, Paul emphasises the threefold nature of Baptism: "Ye were washed, ye were sanctified, ye were justified." The reference appears to be (1) to the outer symbol, (2) to the accession of grace, (3) to the accomplishment of identification through fellowship. In another place Baptism is compared with the cloud that overshadowed and protected ancient Israel (1 Cor. x. 1, 2) and with the sea that separated in order to allow them to escape from the Egyptians (1 Cor. x. 2). In these similes Paul depicts the symbols of God's presence with His people. In the same letter (1 Cor. xii. 13) the corporate significance of Christian Baptism is stressed, while in 1 Cor. xv. 29, the unity of the Church, both militant and triumphant, is the theme. To the Ephesians he writes: "Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself up for it; that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that He might present the church to Himself a glorious church. . . ." (Eph. v. 25-27.) The fullest meaning is given to Baptism by uniting the whole personality in the symbol and the word, the symbol reaching the lower levels of the unconscious and the word having impact with the conscious, the two combined thus supplying the need of the whole personality.

After the letters of Paul it is to the Acts of the Apostles we look for a record of the development of the doctrine of Christian Baptism in the early Church. There is a reference to the Baptism of the Holy Spirit in Acts i. 5, but in Acts ii. 38-41 we find Peter urging upon his auditors the necessity of repentance and Baptism in the Name of Jesus unto the remission of sins. In this we see that grace is not an imposition from without upon an involuntary subject, but the volitional reception of power through fellowship. In Acts viii. 16, 17 there is the account of the Christian Faith bursting the chrysalis of Judaism, and of Gentiles receiving grace. There is an important passage in Acts xix. where the baptism of John is compared in result with the Baptism of the Christian Church. The content of the symbol is different in the two cases. Jesus has filled the ancient form with His own new life.

In the Gospel of John we have the latest interpretation of the sacrament. Perhaps, too, we have also in this Gospel the clearest insight into the inner meaning and message. In the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus we have described "the conditions of admission to the kingdom, both symbolically with reference to the outward element employed . . . and spiritually with reference to the Divine agency of which Baptism was the pledge." (*Century Bible.*) When the disciples came to Jesus with questions about the baptism of John there is the unfolding of the purpose of the Master, and the clear announcement that John's baptism was but the preparation for the greater and more powerful one of the Kingdom.

Returning to the letters of the New Testament, we find that the writer of 1 Peter uses Baptism as a comparison when he illustrates his point by reference to the safety attained by Noah and his family by passing through the water in the Ark. The writer of the letter to the Hebrews also makes mention of the symbol of water, and refers to its spiritual content in hearts cleansed from evil.

In the earliest documents we read of men and women coming to the baptismal waters, not merely in obedience to a blind command or even in accordance with an ancient custom, but in a realisation of the reception of grace and the completion of fellowship through the act itself. The basic facts of human personality are accepted long before they are understood, and the men and women of the early Church had no such intellectual equipment as would cause them to doubt what their hearts endorsed. In our more critical age we are apt to doubt first and accept afterwards. The less sophisticated intuitively grasp what they cannot always explain. No amount of rationalisation will do away with man's fundamental make-up. There are factors in man which are not

cognisable by the intellectual faculties, which defy analysis. It is not the faith which satisfies even the intelligence for which the world is waiting: it is the faith which will meet the needs of men. We may say with Pascal: "The heart has its reasons which the reason does not know." A clearer emphasis of the function of Baptism in the life of the Church will restore this ofttimes neglected and misused sacrament to its full value, and make it once more worthy to be placed alongside its Gospel counterpart, the Communion of the Lord's Supper.

T. A. BAMPTON.

Repudiable "Bunyan Writings."

DURING his lifetime, and for eighty years after his death, John Bunyan's reputation was jeopardised through books being unscrupulously published as his, bearing authorship initials of "J.B." or else with his full name and—not infrequently—with his portrait as a frontispiece. Among these is one which, in *A Bibliography of the Works of John Bunyan* (Biblio. Soc., 1932) the present writer designated as "repudiable," *Reprobation Asserted.* It bears the imprint "London, Printed for *G.L.* . . . Turn-Stile-Alley in Holbourn." This quarto pamphlet of forty-eight pages was sold at sixpence. The assumption that "John Bunyan, A Lover of Peace and Truth" was its author is refuted by Dr. John Brown (*Life of Bunyan,* 1928 edition), who remarks that there were also "other books passed off falsely in Bunyan's name." In regard to Reprobation, Brown takes "the external evidence first," and, dealing with the above imprint, he says of the initials "*G.L.*" (no doubt intended to represent George Larkin), that "it was this publisher's custom to print his name in full . . . and his place of business was not at Turnstile-Alley, but at the sign of the Two Swans" (without Bishopsgate), and at other addresses. Larkin was the printer of *Grace Abounding,* in 1666, so it seems unlikely that he would have had recourse to another printer for Reprobation, the date of which is queried as 1674 in the British Museum Catalogue. A second issue was certainly printed, in 1696, by George Larkin, Junior. But no such statements prove Bunyan's authorship; and for some years after his death any probable or improbable writing issued as his would have commanded a ready sale. Whatever appeal the external evidence here given makes, it is from the contents of the book itself that decision must be made; so a further reference to Dr. Brown's opinion is helpful: "It neither begins nor ends" (Brown asserts) "in Bunyan's characteristic fashion. . . . Let him [Bunyan] write on what subject he may, he writes not long before he either melts with tenderness or glows with fire. This writer [of Reprobation] . . . is hard and cold in style, thin in scheme and substance, and he is what Bunyan never was—pitiless in logic, without being truly logical." Robert Philip, in his *Life of Bunyan* (1839), also says: "I venture to reject the claims of the treatise on Reprobation to be Bunyan's. . . . They rest on no ground, but their place in Hogg's edition. . . . It is unlike both his [Bunyan's] head and heart. It is not too clever for him; but it is too cold-

blooded." However, despite these two writers' opinions, George Offor (*Works of Bunyan,* 1853) did accept this "valuable tract" as Bunyan's, partly because it was included in Doe's Catalogue in 1698, and more especially as its contents were acceptable to him, for Offor closes his editorial note upon *Reprobation Asserted* with a benediction: "May the divine blessing follow this attempt to spread these important, although to many, unpalatable doctrines."

In 1684 another tract had appeared—"*The Pilgrim's Progress to the Other World,* by J.B., an unworthy labourer in Christ's Vineyard." This was printed for T. Passinger, also of London Bridge. Only one copy is known, catalogued in the Pepysian Library at Cambridge, together with other "Penny Godlinesses." It is but a brief imitation of Bunyan's story, introducing some of his characters and scenes. Three years before Bunyan died, Joseph (or Josiah) Blare, of London Bridge, published in 1685 an eleven-page pamphlet—"*The Saints' Triumph,* by J.B." with a woodcut portrait of Bunyan. There is no evidence of Bunyan having written one word of it.

In 1690 Blare caught the public eye with another publication, bearing a distinctly Bunyan-like title: "*Heart's Ease in Heart's Trouble,*" and which was stated to be by "J.B., a Servant of Christ." Its real author was John Bardwood, an ejected minister. The book passed through a number of editions, and, in 1762, Midwinter, Blare's successor, daringly affixed to its title page the name of "John Bunyan." It had a ready sale for many years, and was, no doubt, profitably read.

Emboldened by these ventures, Blare printed, in 1701, "*Meditations on the Several Ages of Man's Life.* By John Bunyan." This, too, had a portrait, but the work must not be ascribed to him as its author. With this (and dated 1700) was included *Scriptural Poems,* also stated to be by John Bunyan. Over these poems controversy is raised. Dr. John Brown maintains that "their genuineness is very doubtful," an opinion not shared by all, for some (including the present writer) contend that they probably are by Bunyan. Dr. Brown considers that if Bunyan wrote the poems the question of his schooling is settled—that he went to Bedford Grammar School. This is mere conjecture. It was far more likely that the boy Bunyan attended the Free School at Houghton Conquest, a school to which he was eligible to go, and which would account for Bunyan's reference in 'To the Reader' the following lines:

> For I'm no poet, nor a poet's son,
> But a mechanic guided by no other rule
> But which I gained in a grammar school,
> In my minority . . .

The use of the words "rule" and "minority" are not without

significance: both words occur in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, the first when Bunyan describes the "narrow way" as being "straight as a rule can make it"; the second, when Mr. By-ends and his companions explain that in their "minority" they were schoolfellows. (Bedford Edition, 1939/40, pp. 37 and 180).

Although the late Dr. Brown doubted the Bunyan authorship, it is no heresy to believe that Bunyan did write the poems, knowing that when he died his widow and her son, John, disposed of a quantity of unpublished manuscripts, among which may well have been the *Scriptural Poems*. None claim Bunyan to be a poet, despite his rhythmical prose and some acceptable verses in his works.

But an unpardonable piece of effrontery to Bunyan's memory was perpetrated by the same Joseph (or Josiah) Blare when he foisted on an eager public, in 1693, what was stated to be the Third Part of *The Pilgrim's Progress*. The first two parts had been read with avidity, and before the close of the seventeenth century no less than fourteen editions of the First Part (1678) had been printed, and at least five editions of the Second Part (1684). At the end of Part Two Bunyan did say—"shall it be my lot to go that [the Pilgrim] way again, I may give those that desire it an account of what I here am silent about . . ."; indicating his intention of continuing his story. However, when Blare's book was published, a refutation appeared, stating that "The Third Part now abroad was not done by Bunyan. But the true copy *left by him* will be published by Nat. Ponder." This statement by Ponder was either fact or "bluff." He certainly did not fulfil his promise, for no copy of a "genuine" Third Part of *The Pilgrim's Progress* is extant.

The verso of the title-page of the thirteenth edition of the First Part bears the following advertisement: "*The Pilgrim's Progress;* The Third Part; in a Dream, Printed in 1692, is an impostor thrust into the world by a nameless author, and would insinuate to the Buyers that 'tis Bunyan's, by adding a false Account of his Life and Death, not compleating the work as is said, etc. The Skeleton of his Design and the main of his Book done by him as a Third Part remains with Nath. Ponder; which when convenient time serves shall be Published." As far back as 1688 Ponder had complained "Of certain ballad sellers about Newgate and on London Bridge, who have put the two first letters [J.B.] of the Author's name and his effigies to their rhimes and ridiculous books, suggesting to the world as if they were his." Strange to relate, as the popularity of Bunyan's writings grew Ponder's worldly condition decreased, until, in 1699, at the age of fifty-nine, his earthly course had ended. Ponder had suffered financial strain to excess and, perchance, he was unable to raise sufficient money

to print the Third Part as he had intended; or, maybe, he had disposed of the "skeleton" of Bunyan's "design" to Blare and Blare had put this into the hands of a literary hack to "dish up." Blare evades the true authorship of this impudent travesty by omitting a name on the title page. In its place—after quoting Bunyan's original title "The / Pilgrim's Progress / from / this World, / to / That which is to come: / The Third Part / Delivered under the Similitude of a Dream."—Blare follows on with a garbled version of its further description, and adds, "The Life and Death of / John Bunyan, / Author of the First and Second Part: this Com- / pleating the whole Progress." Such a cleverly worded title page was, without doubt, conceived to deceive. And it did deceive, for the sale of this spurious work continued until well past the middle of the nineteenth century, when it ceased to be printed. The so-called Third Part had reached its fourth edition by 1700, and its seventeenth in 1757. Professor Wharey states (Clar. Press, 1928) that fifty-nine editions of it had appeared before the end of the eighteenth century.

It was George Offor's intention to include Blare's Third Part in the Hanserd-Knollys edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, published in 1847; but the Council of the Hanserd-Knollys Society decided otherwise, as "upon examination the extreme indelicacy, or more properly indecency, of some parts, and the absurdity of others," precluded its insertion. To modern readers its exclusion on such grounds seems perhaps absurd; yet the Society's decision was right and proper, because as literature it is far beneath the standard of Bunyan's writings; although, as Dr. Brown remarks, the work is "not without a certain amount of interest and literary power." Admittedly, it possesses a few touches that are Bunyanesque despite its diction generally and its fanciful details being foreign to the genius of John Bunyan. That readers should have accepted it as from his pen is amazing: its contents alone are sufficient proof of its ungenuineness, and its opening sentence denotes a fraudulent intent: "After the two former Dreams concerning *Christian*, and *Christiana* his wife . . . I fell asleep again, and . . . I dreamed another Dream . . ." As Dr. Brown truly declares—"It was a piece of sharp practice . . . and was evidently intended in an unworthy way to trade upon Bunyan's reputation." (*Life of Bunyan*, 1928 ed.)

No trace of its real authorship has so far been found. But in justice to Blare it should be remembered that Ponder—as he boasts of—did procure the "skeleton" of Bunyan's intended Third Part; and, accepting his statement as fact, it is not impossible, nor perhaps improbable, that Ponder's impecuniosity compelled him to dispose of the manuscript; and, if so, why not to Blare? But Bunyan's own part in it was assuredly slight.

As above stated, the public accepted the "Third Part" as a fresh book by John Bunyan, although many who read it must have detected its inferiority and doubted its genuineness. To-day it is of interest to, and is included as a "Bunyaniana" item by, collectors who, however, place no especial value, commercially, on any but the very early editions—and then only up to the tenth (1722). The earliest editions are somewhat scarce and are sought after.

It is difficult and perhaps useless to discuss its contents. It is tedious to read and it entirely fails to "grip." Its diction does not stir up the reader's imagination, nor does it satisfy in other ways. The book is decidedly dull, and, excepting where it faintly resembles Bunyan, it contains situations that are supremely ridiculous. Its reference to the "Holy Apostle Paul"; a "magic crutch"; and a "Chamber of Magic," together with its pedantic and sometimes unseemly language, rule out all thought of Bunyan as its author. The absurd introduction of a Convent, and a discourse on ascetic diet—propagating vegetarianism—with such expressions as "proportionably subservient" and "ignis-fatuus" are not consistent with the simple style of Bunyan. Neither could the argument put forth on the "Virgin Birth," nor the reference to "the Holy Jesus," be accepted as Bunyan's mode of expression. A few conversational parts have the flavour of Bunyan's pen, especially those which are bodily lifted or paraphrased from the First and Second Parts of *The Pilgrim's Progress,* some of which are unnecessarily vulgarised; but the following passage might be claimed as Bunyan's:

> *Spiritual Man:* Your curiosity is dangerous, and may cost you dear; therefore pray be persuaded to turn away your ears from hearing of Vanity and Delusions. You have run well hitherto, do not halt so near your Journey's End.

These last two words may well introduce another publication which is—or is not—a record of Bunyan utterances: it is a book entitled "*Rest for a Wearied Soul,* or The Pilgrim at his Journey's End, being the last Legacy of Mr. John Bunyan, Preacher of the Gospel in Bedfordshire, containing his dying Exhortations to his Children, and their duty to God, their Mother, and to one another. . . . His Godly Meditations when he lay upon his Death-Bed." This is an eight-page pamphlet, with Bunyan's portrait on the title page. It was issued from London and York in or about the year 1700.

A number of other books were printed in the eighteenth century which were alleged to be by John Bunyan. But they may be summarily dismissed.

FRANK MOTT HARRISON.

Chipping Norton Baptist Church, 1694—1944.

"CHIPPING NORTON" appears to be a corruption of two Saxon words which, joined, mean the "Market of the Northmen." These words, together with the nearby presence of the Rollright Stones, suggest that many hundreds of years ago there was a community living on the present site of the town. It is mentioned in the Domesday Book, and a Charter was early granted to the Lord of the Manor, giving him liberty to hold a fair for four days in each year. In 1606 the Borough was incorporated, and one of the Maces may be seen in the Town Hall. The Town Council was formed in the year 1835 at the time of the passing of the Municipal Corporations Act. This town, then in the north-west corner of the County of Oxford, has roots which run deep, and a long development very different from the mushroom growth of so many places reared about the time of the Industrial Revolution.

The Parish Church reflects the prosperity of the Cotswold wool trade during the latter part of the mediaeval period. A one-time Vicar, the Rev. Stephen Ford, who was a chaplain at New College, Oxford, was ejected in 1662, and, according to a history of the town published in 1852, he is to be regarded as the Founder of the "Protestant Dissenters' Meeting" in Chipping Norton, out of which the present Baptist Church eventually sprang. Ford preached among the people until his life was threatened, and he was forced to fly to London for safety. There he preached during the time of the plague. Referring again to local history books, we find that prior to the ministry of the Rev. Stephen Ford, a certain Dr. Butler ministered to Dissenters. All that is known of him is that he was the author of a book on bees and an English Grammar. He was born in 1560 and died in 1647.

The scanty records we have begin with 1694, which is regarded as the official date of the founding of the Church, though the above makes it clear that there was Protestant Dissent in the town many years previously. In 1694 a Mr. John Worth began a short ministry, removing to Marlborough in or about 1699. He was a man of ability, and a sermon of his on the victory of Blenheim was widely known. This was preached at Marlborough.

Then there followed the Rev. John Thorley, who ministered for sixty years. There are tablets to Thorley and his wife in the

present church. He died at the age of eighty-eight. Very little is known of his work, but a book written in 1744 entitled *An Enquiry into the Nature, Order and Government of Bees*, a copy of which was bought recently by one of the present deacons, and read by the writer, reveals his ability and the religious tone of his life. The book is sermonic in style, and he never lets the reader forget that he is a Minister of Religion. The technical importance of the work is due to his revolutionary method of taking the honey without destroying the bees. He writes a lengthy preface, "from his study at Chipping Norton," and there is a long list of subscribers, among them being the Lady Abney of Newington, the Lord Bishop of Worcester, Isaac Watts, Philip Doddridge, and William Fawkner, Governor of the Bank of England, which was constituted the same year as the Church, i.e. 1694.

After the death of John Thorley the cause appears to have become weaker, and for fourteen years there were supply preachers. The only record of that period refers to the occasional visits of the Rev. Mr. Whitmore, of Hook Norton.

It was the opening of Bliss's Tweed Mills in 1757 which made for a revival of interest and prosperity. The worshippers sought the advice of Benjamin Beddome, Baptist minister of Bourton-on-the-Water, and he advised the friends to apply to Bristol Academy. Thomas Purdy was sent as a "Probationer," and continued as such for two years, being then acknowledged as the settled minister. On the first of August, 1775, a Church was formed of fifteen persons baptised at Hook Norton, with three others transferred from neighbouring churches. Purdy was ordained on September 14th, 1775, and was, therefore, the first Pastor of a Baptist Church in Chipping Norton. The previous congregations had been of the Independent order. A broad covenant was drawn up to include the remnant of the Independents, but, according to the minute book, ten years later it was resolved to denominate the cause as "A Particular Baptist Church." The original covenant was accordingly revised. Calvinistic doctrines are easily discovered in the covenant. It was signed by seven men, none of whom has descendants in the Church to-day.

During this period there are accounts of several Fasts being observed by the members on account of the state of war. In 1776 a National Fast was appointed by the Government, and on that occasion the service of Worship and Prayer lasted for three hours.

A story of this period concerns a young man, the eldest son of a respectable family, who was warned never to enter the Meeting House, where, according to his parents, "dreadful doctrines were taught." He was, however, employed by one of the

deacons, a man of such excellent character that the youth was puzzled that so bad a religion could have produced so good a man. He would not break his promise to his parents, but he listened at the window to the voice of the preacher and was converted. He made known the facts and suffered much hardship, but was the means of converting several of his brothers and sisters. In 1779 a piece of ground was enclosed for burials. The last interment there was conducted by the present minister in December, 1940.

A long eulogy of the character and ability of Thomas Purdy, who died in 1802, is recorded in the minutes. He was succeeded by B. H. Draper. Draper was a native of Cumnor and worked at the Clarendon Press in Oxford. A fellow-worker introduced him to the fellowship at New Road Church which called him to the ministry. He was trained at Bristol College, and after a five years' pastorate at Chipping Norton, moved to Coseley in Staffordshire. He was a frequent contributor of verses to the magazines of the period.

After the short ministry of Draper, William Gray took over the charge. (Mr. Parker Gray, of Northampton, is his great-grandson.) Gray had the great advantage of being the assistant of Abraham Booth, of Prescott Street Church, London, a minister who rendered distinguished service there for thirty-seven years. After a few years in London Gray had a short pastorate in Devonport, coming to Chipping Norton in 1809. He sustained a most fruitful ministry, and also turned his house into an Academy for the training of young men. He stated that "Religion flourishes in this town and in the villages around." The Meeting House, built in 1733, was greatly enlarged in 1817. It is recorded that the afternoon service was often crowded. There was seating accommodation for about 500, and the communicants averaged about 100. During this period there were several village stations served by the parent church. In the minute book there is the record of a very lengthy letter to the Church, selections of which follow: "I believe it is well known that on a Sabbath afternoon many persons cannot obtain a place, and many others are so crowded as to render their situation uncomfortable. . . . And besides these things, what seems to me equally distressing, there is no place in the lower part of the Meeting where the poor, to whom the Gospel is to be preached, can have free access. . . . Dear Brethren, I doubt not but the cause of the Redeemer in every part of the world is our subject . . . but there are reasons why the cause of Christ should be peculiarly regarded by you: It is the place of first impressions; the place wherein which your faith has been built; the place in which you hope your children, when you are no more, will rise and call you blessed. . . . I am

fully aware of the difficulties of the present time which press almost upon every class of society . . . but the wall of Jerusalem was built in troublesome times . . . and if it be put off some of you may sleep in the silent tomb and there is no work or device in the grave whither we all hasten."

The cost of the extension was about £2,300. Mr. Gray appealed by letter and in person to churches far afield, and money was received from London, Wellington, Cambridge, Birmingham and many other places. Whilst the work was proceeding the Church met by courtesy of the Wesleyan Methodists in their sanctuary in Diston's Lane at 8.15 a.m. and 2 p.m. on the Sabbath, also on Friday nights.

Records are scanty during Mr. Gray's period, but long lists of baptisms are given, and there was jealousy with regard to the purity of the fellowship. Discipline was exercised rigorously. Mr. Gray resigned in 1825 to become the minister of College Street, Northampton.

During the ministry of the Rev. G. Stonehouse, which began in 1838, a resolution was unanimously passed in favour of the Emancipation of the Slaves. The Church also decided to refuse to receive to communion any person known to be the holder of a slave in any part of the world. Mr. Stonehouse left in 1845 to become the president of the South Australian College.

Short pastorates followed, and in 1859 there came the Rev. William Green. During his period the present handsome sanctuary was erected. Strangely enough, there is no record in the minutes of this project. From newspaper accounts it is gleaned that the Rev. William Brock, of Bloomsbury, preached the first sermon, and the evening meeting was presided over by Sir Samuel Morton Peto. The cost was over £2,300, and it was freed from debt within a few weeks of the opening date, which was January 8th, 1863. A large part of the cost was met locally, £650 being contributed by Sunday-school teachers and scholars. Three months later the Rev. J. P. Mursell preached on the occasion of the cancelling of the debt, and alluded to the time when he had resided in Chipping Norton forty years earlier, giving the congregation the benefit of some facts previously unknown. There is no account in the minutes of what he said, but from other sources we can piece together some of his remarks. Mursell, when quite a young man, came to study at Gray's Academy, and was joined by James Phillippo, who was to be one of the pioneers of the emancipation of the West Indian slaves. Phillippo was a candidate for the B.M.S., and Mr. Gray was selected by the committee of the Society as the preceptor of the young missionary-to-be. The two young men were drawn together in bonds which lasted through life. Their friendship was sealed by an exchange

of Christian names, Mr. Mursell adopting the name of Phillippo, and Mr. Phillippo that of Mursell. One called himself James Phillippo Mursell, and the other James Mursell Phillippo. The study of the young men was situated above the sitting-room of Mr. Gray, and as the heart of Mr. Phillippo succumbed to the charms of a local maiden, it was agreed that a sign be given from the window as to whether he was in or not. Most likely the Gray family were never aware of many things that went on above their heads! In this speech there is no doubt that Mr. Mursell paid warm tribute to the work of William Gray.

After Mr. Green's ministry there followed two short pastorates, and then Thomas Bentley came from Coventry and exercised a long and distinguished ministry from 1869 to 1896. Mr. Bentley, who is still remembered by the seniors, was a preacher of a very fine order, and during his time the church prospered greatly. A sermon he preached on the Future Life a few days after his fourteen-year-old daughter, Emily, died, caused deep feeling. Many alterations of value were made to the premises, and for several months the church met in the Town Hall. His ministry was terminated by recurrent ill-health. A presentation was made. He died a few years later, and there is a tablet in the present church. His family presented the umbrella stands in the pews to his memory. In 1897 the Rev. E. G. Lovell commenced an all too short ministry of two years, moving to Morningside Church, Edinburgh, and dying there in the flower of his life.

During the forty-four years of the present century there have been four occupants of the pastorate. The Rev. R. E. Jenkins came from Cardiff College and laboured with great success for thirteen and a half years. He is now in the neighbourhood again, being the pastor at Little Compton. The Rev. Samuel Brown, from Spurgeon's College, succeeded him at Chipping Norton, removing three years later to Sandy. His was the difficult period of the first world war. Many remember his sermons, and how he was able to rise to the great occasion. He was succeeded by the Rev. H. Ellis Roberts, who after twenty-five years' service at Thrapston, came and ministered for thirteen years, retiring in 1931 but remaining in the town, and still preaching when occasion demands. During his ministry the present fine organ was erected as a memorial to the fourteen who lost their lives in the 1914-1918 war. The present holder of the pastorate is now in his thirteenth year, and the church is still vigorous, filling a place in the life of the community and the Association, which she has entertained many times. Seventy-two members have been received during the present pastorate. Since 1775, when the church became Baptist, there have been seventeen ministers, all of whom, including the present one, have been greatly indebted to a loyal band

of lay workers who have given freely of their time, money and abilities to the varied services of the Church, Sunday School and Village preaching. The Sunday School is now 158 years old. The C.E. has celebrated its jubilee and is still a strong society. The Church has served large numbers of men and women of the Forces during this war, and has offered hospitality to Dominion and American troops, including a large number of coloured ones, descendants of the slaves for whom the church had a deep concern a century earlier. The membership contains a large number who are closely identified with the work of the town and district, and on several occasions has supplied the Borough with its principal citizen. The Church has justified its existence in the past, and though its fellowship is conceived very differently to-day from the time when the Church Meeting was the hub, it can be truthfully stated she is justifying her existence in this year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and forty-four.

F. H. ROLLINSON.

John Clifford.[1]

PASTOR, SOCIAL REFORMER, NATIONAL LEADER,
FIRST PRESIDENT OF THE BAPTIST WORLD ALLIANCE.

JOHN CLIFFORD was the hero of my youth. He captured me as he captured hundreds of young men. He was my "father in God." When I first came to Westbourne Park as a raw country youngster of fifteen, I should not have called myself a Christian, but his preaching gripped me. I recall, as if it were yesterday, the Sunday evening and the very spot where, as I walked down the gallery stairs after the service, the conviction suddenly came that I had made the great surrender and stood in a new relation to Jesus Christ. In this church he baptised me. I was a member here for several years. This place is to me holy ground. For nearly forty years John Clifford was my friend, and during that time I took no great decision without consulting him. It was on his advice that I studied two years in Germany before I entered the ministry—little he or I dreamed then what a providential preparation this would prove for the work that came to me after the war! He counselled me to accept the call given me by my brethren of all parts of the earth to become their Commissioner for Europe. I had to lead and administer their relief enterprise—the greatest thing the Baptists of the world ever did in common. (The fund itself amounted to a quarter of a million sterling.) I had to assist the spiritual work of our people in the war-torn lands, and above all, to defend their religious freedom and the religious freedom of all others wherever it was attacked or imperilled. As long as he lived, Dr. Clifford acted as chairman of our Advisory Committee, entering into the spirit of the enterprise and rejoicing that one of his "boys" was carrying on work so congenial to his own mind and heart—reconciling and healing work. In fact, for thirty of the forty years I knew him, I enjoyed Dr. Clifford's confidence in a degree rivalled by few and I think, outside his family, surpassed by none. And my revered friend remained my hero. Right on to this day there is for me a peculiar thrill in recalling anything in my life that had a parallel in his. I like to remember that his college—the Midland—was mine, his University of London mine. When my brethren called me to the presidency of the Baptist Union the consciousness of following

[1] This article reproduces notes of a speech delivered at Westbourne Park Chapel at a celebration of the centenary of John Clifford's birth. It is printed without revision.

him added to my gladness, and the same spontaneous and irrepressible feeling lent its glow to my year of presidency of the National Free Church Council. The joy of serving as General Secretary[2] of the Baptist World Alliance is to me enhanced by the knowledge that my hero was its first president, and that in strengthening the sense of brotherhood throughout our world-communion I am building on the foundations our Greatheart so well and truly laid. Next to that of the Lord Christ, no personal influence has entered into my life as deeply as that of John Clifford. I loved him, and love him still, for surely, surely, I may adopt Tennyson's word:

> I trust he lives in Thee, and there
> I find him worthier to be loved.

It is impossible then for me in this church to speak without emotion of one who to me means so much. How can I regard John Clifford with detachment? I think the most difficult task ever laid on me came when the Oxford University Press asked me to write the article on him for that standard work, the *Dictionary of National Biography*. To deal in bare facts, to endeavour with cold impartiality to fix and describe his place in the story of our time, to suppress the adjectives that affection prompted, was not easy. Happily, my subject was in himself so great that embroidery was superfluous. In sober truth he "belongs to history." It is an apt demonstration of his assured place in English life that his portrait was in the National Portrait Gallery within a few months of his death. The rule is to admit no portrait within ten years of the death of its original; exceptions are only permitted in the case of men and women of unquestionable eminence. John Clifford's eminence admitted of no doubt.

Let me say of him first of all this: that he was among the very foremost of British preachers. "There were giants in those days"—pulpit giants, and not a few of them Baptists. Yet in our communion a triumvirate stood aloof from the rest. In consisted of Spurgeon, Maclaren and Clifford. I would not claim that judged solely by published sermons John Clifford would be admitted to the first rank. Personality is an indispensable element in preaching. The immense energy held in leash, the winning tenderness, the cumulative power of a closely-knit argument enforced by the gesture that needed to be seen, and the singularly flexible voice that needed to be heard—the full effect of that personality could not be mediated by cold type. Those who knew him could read without much loss, because in effect we saw and heard him as we read; but not all were thus privileged. But to

[2] This was the case when the address was delivered: in 1939 Dr. Rushbrooke followed his hero in the higher office of President of the Alliance.

hear him! I recall an evening when there sat next to me in the gallery a young Welsh student who had come to London for an examination. He listened to the preacher with rapt attention, and as the sermon closed he turned to me with flashing eyes and glowing face: "*That's* what I call *preaching*," he exclaimed, "and I heard Parker this morning and Liddon this afternoon!" The student was Thomas Phillips.

Dr. Clifford indeed held that a sermon was something to be spoken: he even gave utterance half seriously to the paradox that "a good sermon is never good literature." Yet his unhurried and carefully revised work is good literature. Archbishop Alexander of Armagh, himself a great writer, acknowledged his personal debt to John Clifford's "depth of thought mated with a singular majesty of expression."

What was distinctive in Clifford's preaching? I would answer: a certain prophetic quality. He saw all life from the point of view of one who everywhere discerned God at work. Never was a ministry of wider range. He left nothing outside his purview. The first sermon I heard from him was on the Sunday following the death of the Earl of Shaftesbury, and the subject was "Lord Shaftesbury, the typical Christian Socialist." Sermons dealt with the "New Democracy," with scientific conceptions of Evolution, with gambling, and other social evils, with the books that young people were reading. He shrank from nothing. John Clifford's titles were often "secular" in sound, but his preaching was never secular. Moral passion informed every utterance, and the sense of the living God permeated all. Touch what he would, he was concerned for souls and for that Kingdom of God which is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." He might speak of topics the daily press was discussing, but how differently! His prophetic insight cast upon them the light of God. I remember once crossing Europe with Dr. T. R. Glover. Our train had passed through the Simplon tunnel to the Italian side, and we were skirting the shores of Lake Maggiore. Here are some of the loveliest views in Europe. I had seen them often—the beauty of mountains, of trees and flowers, the peaceful lake, the white-walled dwellings with their bright red roofs set in relief against the green hillsides and the blue water. I revelled in the outlook, but Dr. Glover was quite indifferent. When we returned over the same route he was explosive with enthusiasm. The difference was only this: it was a cloudy, dull day when we first passed through, but when we came back the sun shone in splendour and gave a new value to the scene. All the colours were vivid; a glory not seen before transfigured the scene that once was dull. That was the change John Clifford's preaching brought. Commonplace tasks and people were illumined

with new glory. Even the struggles of public life were to him no mere party scrimmage, but part and parcel of the mighty stirring of the Spirit of God. The term "secular" became meaningless. There were no limits to the authority and love of God in Christ.

It is from this point of view that John Clifford's public activities have to be judged. The "Nonconformist conscience" was the phrase of Price Hughes, and it was incarnate in John Clifford. With what energy he threw himself into public life! For years he was regarded as the leading platform speaker in the country. His influence was a governing factor in the overwhelming defeat of the Balfour Government that had made itself responsible for the inequitable Education Act of 1902. I leave aside the story of that famous struggle; it is familiar to you all. John Clifford's popular gifts—"popular" in the best sense, for he never played down to any audience—were then revealed to the whole English-speaking world. But what I emphasise is the spirit of the man amid all the fierce clashing of opinion. He had no dread of controversy; he was "ever a fighter," but how scrupulously fair! Not a shadow of personal bitterness! He always took care to state an opponent's position at its strongest, and in the opponent's own terms. He was careful to master his facts. I recall only one responsible attack on his veracity. It was made by the Anglo-Catholic leader, Lord Halifax, father of the present holder of the title; and I would not now refer to it even incidentally were it not that I am able to add that when Clifford's challenged statement was proved, the frank apology of Lord Halifax showed him to be no less an English gentleman than his opponent. For John Clifford was a gentleman; it was for truth and great causes that he fought. He used clean weapons: falsehood and meanness were to him alien and abhorrent. Magnanimous—that old fine word described the core of his personality even in controversy.

Magnanimous, utterly fair! How those qualities marked his attitude in international affairs. He strove to understand the other side. That is where we often fail. We see, for example, the dangers and evils of National Socialism in Germany—the militarisation, the overthrow of democracy, the cruel treatment of Jews. We don't acknowledge, as we ought, the responsibility resting on the victorious powers, including ourselves, for refusing the German democratic republic a square deal. We gave Adolph Hitler his chance. We are too ready to underline evils and remain silent about beneficial achievements. It is difficult to be just, and it is dangerous. To attempt it usually brings attack from both sides; but Clifford, radical as he was in outlook, startled us again and again by his attitude of resolute justice in dealing with international issues.

Yet make no mistake—he was English, intensely patriotic; read his book, *God's Greater Britain,* or think of the eloquence with which he was wont to appeal to the heroic chapters of his people's story. "God's Englishmen" meant as much to him as to John Milton. He loved his country. He gloried in the nobler elements of British life, but he did not deify his nation or his race. This church building was in danger of being wrecked by mob violence during the South African War. That war shocked the conscience of the man in whom conscience was ever king. Silence was impossible; he spoke out, to the hurt of the Church's finance—that was a comparatively slight matter, but also to the weakening of cherished friendships—that was far more, he felt that! John Clifford regarded war with horror and loathing. He was one of those who laboured to the very last day to avert the Great War. I know the inner story of the years of struggle by the band of British Christians led by the noble-hearted Quaker, Joseph Allen Baker. It included John Clifford, Lord Dickinson, the Dean of Worcester and others. Archbishop Davidson had a part. Newton Marshall, till his lamented death, was in with us, and for some years I was editor of the *Peacemaker,* the organ of the movement. When the war broke out we had gathered at a peace conference in Constance. The irony of it! The Great War was a veritable nightmare to Clifford. Had it been possible to wash his hands of responsibility he would gladly have done so, but conscience was king. He believed there are things worth dying for! He was not one whit less loyal to conviction in supporting his country in 1914, and lending his influence to maintain her cause, than when he refused support in the days of the South African struggle. He stood for the rights of conscientious objectors, but was himself a conscientious assenter. He did not accept the position that the use of military force is in no conditions justifiable, and he would not have endorsed a statement which appeared yesterday that "the soldier-saint is a contradiction in terms." The name of General Sir Henry Havelock is engraved on a foundation stone of this Westbourne Park Church. Those who understand what it cost such men as John Clifford to assent to war should know that he who dreads having to take such a tragic decision is of all men most concerned to exert his last ounce of strength and influence to suppress provocative speech or act, and positively to promote friendship. With all his heart he is constrained to work and pray that the grim necessity of supporting war may never be thrust upon him. "Give peace in our time, O Lord," aye, and give peace in the time of our children and our children's children!

Let a few words be devoted to John Clifford's wide and deep Christian outlook. He was the largest-hearted Christian I ever knew. Of course he was a Baptist. He allowed no doubt of that.

He spoke often of the day of his baptism as having brought a larger reinforcement of his inner life than any other one day of his life. He reckoned the ministry of this Baptist church a calling so high that no alternative career—not even that of the Member of Parliament he might easily have become—could compare with it. The supreme honour of his life he counted his election by his brethren of all lands as first president of the Baptist World Alliance. *A Baptist,* but what did that connote for him? It meant a personal self-committal to his Lord. It meant that he laid all the stress there. He felt himself a brother of all who shared that experience. And that immediacy of inner fellowship with his Lord made him free. To him the Church was the fraternal association of Christ's free people—a democracy, or rather a Christocracy. As free under Christ, the communion to which he gave his loyalty had no room for a priestly caste, and was not dependent on any body of officers, bishops or others. But here is the point: John Clifford was no narrow sectarian: he never unchurched any. He stood very near to his Free Church brethren; he co-operated gladly with many Anglicans; I have heard him again and again speak with high appreciation of Catholic saints. The unity of the universal church which includes all the faithful —he rejoiced in this. He was the highest of High Churchmen, but the universal church of his vision was far too great to be brought within the cramping restrictions of a single visible organisation. That was his essential criticism of proposals for the fusion of all the churches into organic union. This, to him, meant a lowering of the ideal, a limitation of freedom; it involved the imposition of creeds, it involved exclusions. "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." He held that when, with variety of interpretation but mutual love, men follow the truth as they see it in Jesus Christ, the unconstrained spiritual unity made manifest in a common quality of life amid variety of organisation, without legal or canonical regulation or authoritarian control, will prove the only true and full answer to the prayer of our Lord. If I may use a political figure, he thought of unity on the lines of the British Commonwealth of Nations, where the links are those of a common spirit, rather than on the lines of an authoritarian state where all the parts stand in precise and defined relation. He cared intensely for faith, little for creeds; a great deal for order provided that freedom remained unimpaired, but for "orders" nothing at all.

Here, as everywhere, John Clifford was the prophet of freedom and of democracy. Does that imply that he represented a lost cause? It is a searching question. Never were freedom and democracy challenged as they are to-day. They have collapsed over nearly the whole of Europe. When we ask why, the answer

is everywhere the same. The democracy of Britain and the Dominions and of the United States of America has been possible through the discipline of character which the Churches, and supremely the Free Churches, have furnished. Democracy cannot maintain itself except on the dual foundation of knowledge and character. It has fallen in Europe either from lack of knowledge —because the people were too ignorant and inexperienced for self-government; or from lack of character—because there was no vision of a common good, but only a confused struggle for sectional or class or party advantage. John Clifford stood for freedom and democracy. He believed in them intensely, but he knew freedom would be abused and self-government lost unless an informed and disciplined citizenhood sustained both. Were he here I am convinced that he would reaffirm his faith in the common man, but he would call the common man, as he always did, to make himself in knowledge and in character worthy of freedom and capable of playing his part in a democratic state. And of one thing above all am I certain, that if he stood to-night where I stand, it would be to utter a ringing challenge, especially to the young men, to hold by freedom and democracy, and he would tell them that the one sure and adequate source of inspiration and power for free men and women is found in the fellowship of the Lord Jesus whom he loved in his youth and served through all the toil and joy, the conflict and the victory, of his glorious life.

J. H. Rushbrooke.

Baptist Missionary Society History.

THE provision of an adequate, authoritative history of the Baptist Missionary Society was agreed upon two or three years ago by the General Committee of the Society as a highly desirable object and one to which some part of the Terjubilee Fund might well be allocated. The B.M.S. is the oldest of the modern societies. It has undertaken notable pioneering work in many fields. It has extensive enterprises in India, China, Africa and the West Indies, and still plays a most important part in missionary policy at home and abroad. It has, however, been singularly behindhand in the provision of a competent record of its work, and the lack of such a record becomes more and more serious as the years pass.

Most of the larger British Societies took advantage of their centenaries to secure for themselves careful and extended accounts based upon study of the documentary material in their archives and Minute Books. Richard Lovett prepared two substantial volumes for the London Missionary Society, and in addition a valuable biographical register of all missionaries was prepared. The subsequent more popular accounts of the L.M.S. by Silvester Horne and J. C. Harris have been largely based upon Lovett. For their Terjubilee next year the L.M.S. has commissioned the Rev. Norman Goodall to prepare a volume supplementary to Lovett and carrying his story through the past half century. In 1899 Dr. Eugene Stock produced a very important three-volume history of the Church Missionary Society. It was the product of many years of study and constant sharing in missionary administration. The British & Foreign Bible Society secured a five-volume history from the gifted William Canton in the early years of this century. Last came the Methodist Missionary Society with a lengthy history in five volumes by Professor G. G. Findlay and W. W. Holdsworth. The standard histories of other societies might be mentioned, but these will suffice. Beside the works mentioned, the B.M.S. Centenary Volume seems a poor thing. It is a series of essays on the different fields—essays of very varying style and uneven worth—and those who have used the supplementary tables will know that they are by no means always accurate.

The matter of is greater importance than many realise. A carefully documented history is of value not only to the Society itself, but also to the Christian Church generally and to the independent historian. A recent and pointed illustration of this

may be found by a study of the later volumes of Professor Latourette's great *History of the Expansion of Christianity,* and in particular its matchless bibliographies. In tracing the story of the last one hundred and fifty years Dr. Latourette has inevitably to depend to a very large extent on the historical material published by the different missionary bodies and churches. The way in which a particular group or denomination can figure in the main record must depend in large measure on the way in which the story of particular enterprises has been set down. British Baptists cannot complain if they are sometimes in danger of being overlooked, since they have not taken great trouble to record what has been done by their agents, or, if there is a record, it is too slight, popular or romantic to give confidence to an historian.

What material of quality does the B.M.S. possess? In 1842 F. A. Cox produced a two-volume history of the first half century of the mission. Cox was an able man and one who shared in the founding of London University. He had the advantage not only of a limited field, but also of access to the early records of the Society. Further, as a young man, he had met many of the leading figures. His account is careful and discriminating, but he wrote much too near the time to appreciate the full significance of what he was recording. John Clark Marshman's *Life and Times of Carey, Marshman and Ward, embracing the History of the Serampore Mission,* first appeared in a two-volume edition in 1859. Marshman was a man of wide learning and ability. He had accompanied his father to Serampore as a boy of six and shared in the life of the historic settlement. He had thus unrivalled opportunities for securing material for his work which will always remain a most important source-book for a study of the work in India up to 1837, the year of Marshman's death. Subsequent studies of importance on early B.M.S. work in India have focused attention almost exclusively on Carey and an important series of biographies has been produced, of which those by George Smith, F. D. Walker, and, above all, Pearce Carey, should be mentioned. Apart from these studies not a great deal of work on B.M.S. foundations has been attempted. The present writer included a certain amount of new and formerly unpublished material in *The First Generation,* but the B.M.S. papers and letters are not easy of access and they need the attention of a trained archivist. It might well be considered whether, in more spacious times, an edition of the letters of Carey should not be attempted. It has long been recognised that a new full-length biography of Fuller is desirable, and substantial progress has been made with a collection of his letters, more than four hundred of which can still be traced, many of them apparently not known to or used by earlier biographers.

Of B.M.S. work in India since 1837 only the most scanty

records are available—a few biographies generally of poor quality, a history of Serampore College, Pearce Carey's *Dawn on the Kond Hills,* a score or so of pamphlets, and the recent *Ye are My Witnesses: the Work of the B.M.S. in India during One Hundred and Fifty Years,* Calcutta, 1942, which contains much most valuable material but needs setting against the wider background of the developments of the last century and a half in India and elsewhere.

The work of the B.M.S. in Jamaica has been fairly adequately recorded, as may be seen from the bibliographical notes in Latourette, Vol. V. There is still, however, a good deal of research required regarding Baptist work in the West Indian islands other than Jamaica. At one time this was of considerable proportions. Some record of Baptist enterprises in the East Indies will shortly appear in *South-East from Serampore,* Carey Press, 1944. Had it been available sooner it might have supplemented both the World Dominion Survey, *The Netherlands Indies,* 1935, and the sentence in Latourette, Vol. V., p. 279. For Africa there is no adequate account of the abortive Sierra Leone episode, and the Cameroons Mission appears almost solely in the two biographies of Saker. The Congo Mission has been relatively well written up, though there is now need for an historically objective volume relating the story to the opening up of Africa and giving references to documents, etc. A beginning has been made with the recording of the China Mission, thanks to the writings of E. W. Burt, the autobiography and biography of Timothy Richard, and a few smaller books, but the story needs treating on a more generous and connected scale, and, as will be seen by a reference to Latourette, Vol. VI., what there is needs to be better known.

To supply the gaps in B.M.S. history and to make a connected authoritative narrative of the whole is a very substantial task. So much preparatory spade-work has first to be done. At the request of the B.M.S. and with the painstaking help of Miss J. A. Booth, the present writer has undertaken a threefold task: (1) the compilation of a register of all those who have served as agents of the B.M.S., with brief biographical details—already some 1,600 names have been listed, and to these must be added several hundred wives, perhaps as many as a thousand, since in the early days of the mission the serious cost in human life among women caused frequent second and even third marriages; (2) a bibliography of printed material dealing with B.M.S. history; and (3) a list, so far as it can be compiled, of MS. sources, diaries, letters, etc., many of which are in private hands. The farther these enterprises are carried the greater are seen to be the dimensions of the task, to which they are but preliminaries. Both the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the London Missionary Society

have not only employed skilled staff to deal with their records, but have had valuable grants in aid from the Pilgrim Trust and other bodies, for their documents are seen to be of the greatest historical value. It is only in the West Indies and in Congo that, apart from the early episodes of struggle with the East India Company, our B.M.S. story is of vital importance to the secular historian. But for the Christian Church at large, and the Baptist section of it in particular, all that has been accomplished in and through the B.M.S. is of significance. It is to be hoped that the matters here referred to will have the constant interest and sympathetic co-operation of all Baptists.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Reviews.

The Relevance of Apocalyptic, by H. H. Rowley. (Lutterworth Press, 8/6.)

In the summer of 1942 Dr. H. H. Rowley, of University College, Bangor, delivered four lectures at the Vacation Term for Biblical Study held at St. Hilda's College, Oxford. It is substantially these lectures which Dr. Rowley now offers us under the title of "The Relevance of Apocalyptic," and they represent a survey of the Apocalyptic Literature. As such the published lectures are doubly welcome, for the book comes not only to fill a gap in the shelves of most serious students of the Bible, but also to give guidance to us in these days "when apocalyptic commands much interest."

Dr. Rowley begins with a chapter describing how apocalyptic thinking and writing began, and he does this by reference to several of the leading ideas common to this way of thinking. He shows too how Old Testament prophecy, especially its apocalyptic elements, and foreign ideas and influence made their contribution, though neither of these was so important as the actual historical circumstances of the Maccabean age which really gave birth to this literature. This chapter, brief yet copious in illustrative matter, also helps us to understand the difference between eschatology and apocalyptic.

In the two middle chapters of the book the author gives us a brief introduction to the apocalyptic writings from Daniel to the Book of Revelation, dealing with their principal characteristics and content. Of special interest here is the treatment of the Little Apocalypse of Mark xiii., etc., and the lengthier treatment of the Book of Revelation. On the score of usefulness alone one is truly grateful for such a handy and compact reference book to these works.

In the last and most important chapter Dr. Rowley seeks to extract the leading principles of apocalyptic and to show their relevance for us to-day. In particular he attempts a new interpretation of the devil (Beliar) by giving a new turn to the idea of corporate personality, and it is very probable that his suggestion will be acceptable to many people who are concerned with the problem. The apocalyptic writers were concerned with a new order, and so their teaching that new orders are the gift and work of God, and that new orders mean new men is of vital significance for Christians in these days.

In the result then Dr. Rowley is to be thanked for such a useful and clear book on a much neglected and difficult field. Ministers will find it useful also because it will give them a firm standpoint from which to deal with all the extravagancies which they so frequently meet. The new interest in the beginning and the end, manifest in science as well as in religion, places new emphasis on the importance of mythology and apocalyptic, and so the present book helps in the larger issues also. Dr. Rowley is to be congratulated on the timely nature of his book, and the Lutterworth Press, so increasingly important, on a shrewd publication.

G. HENTON DAVIES.

From Jesus to Paul, by Joseph Klausner. (George Allen and Unwin, 15/- net.)

Dr. Klausner is Professor of modern Hebrew and Literature in the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. He is a man of immense learning in his own field, and he is already famous for his *Jesus of Nazareth,* to which the present book is really a sequel. In an interesting preface Klausner tells that he began his research into the origins of Christianity in 1907. It took him fifteen years to write his book on Jesus, but from the first he felt that he must go beyond Jesus to answer, if he could, two great questions that seemed to call for solution: first how was Christianity transformed from a small Jewish sect in Palestine to a great non-Jewish world movement? and second why did the Jews so forcibly reject it and adhere firmly to the Jewish faith? It is these two questions that provide the motive for the present book, and for over twenty years Klausner has been wrestling with them. In 1929 much of his material was destroyed in the anti-Jewish disturbances in Jerusalem, and it was five years after that before Klausner could resume the work he had planned. In spite of many difficulties he has at last managed to finish it, and Christian students must be glad that he persevered. Naturally they cannot accept his main conclusions because they differ in their attitude to the fundamental postulates. But the book is a storehouse of information, and considering that the writer is an orthodox Jew, the treatment is wonderfully sympathetic. We approach Paul from the Jewish angle, and that means that we not only understand him better, but we realise also what a mighty transformation was wrought in his whole mental and spiritual outlook by the vision on the Damascus road.

Klausner treats his subject in seven parts, but strictly speaking there are only two, the background and the amazing man who stands out against it.

The background as Klausner paints it is very illuminating.

We have first a discussion of Judaism outside Palestine, and here we are faced with the fact that the Jews of the diaspora were inevitably affected by their Gentile surroundings. They were loyal to the old faith, but they saw it differently, and this does much to explain both Paul and the success he had among proselytes and "God-fearers" when he preached the new faith. Next, we are shown a picture of pagan thought and religion, the collapse of the old religions, and the tendencies in both philosophy and religion (with its mental cults and strong sacramentalism) all of which, from another point of view, made possible the "transformations" of the Jewish religion of Jesus into the Christianity spread by Paul. Next, the literature is analysed, both in Hellenistic Judaism and the New Testament, and lastly we come to an examination of the Christian movement before Paul came into it. This for Klausner (and for us) is really the crux of the book. Was pre-Pauline Christianity fundamentally different from Christianity as Paul later on taught and disseminated it? Klausner really answers Yes, though he points out that even before Paul's time Christianity was beginning to be something different from the religion that Jesus Himself taught, because, under Hellenistic Jewish influence (for example in a man like Stephen) it was being modified. Jesus, Klausner insists, was not a Christian but a Jew, and His message was designed for Jews. He no doubt considered Himself the Messiah, but He was the Jewish Messiah, and He never intended to found a new religion, a religion that would be so different from Judaism that Jews could not accept it and at the same time be loyal to the traditions of their fathers. It is clear that this demands a reading of the mind of Jesus that Christians would not endorse. Klausner sees Christianity as something other than the religion of Jesus. It began with Jesus, but it was modified by the entrance into the primitive community of Hellenistic Jews and finally transformed by the remarkable man we know as the apostle Paul.

To Paul Klausner devotes the second half of his book, and the discussion is both interesting and illuminating, especially on the side of Paul's debt to Judaism. The last chapter discusses the rather intriguing question, What is Paul for the Jews? We know what Judaism thought of him in the old days, and Klausner quotes some of the statements made. He says, as we would expect, that there is much in Paul that Judaism must reject. But when all is said Paul is still a Jew, and, Klausner says, a Jew of outstanding ability. One gathers that Klausner admires him. Though he cannot follow him, Klausner tries to look at him with real understanding and sympathy, and his work gains as a consequence, Paul, he says, was a man of unusual personality with a combination in himself of contradictory qualities that were never quite har-

monised, strong hatred and deep love, masterfulness and humility, above all mysticism and practicality. Paul thus took the centre of the stage inevitably, and his influence transformed Christianity from the inside while his administrative power and adaptability to conditions enabled him to work out a missionary policy for the Church that made it rapidly triumphant. Item by item Klausner analyses Paul's central ideas both theological and moral, and in his own way he shows how Paul turned the crucified Jesus into the exalted Son of God, the Lord and Head of the Church.

Christians, of course, will feel about Klausner's analysis—as they do about Gibbon's famous "causes" for the spread of Christianity—that the vital thing is completely omitted. But none the less they must feel grateful for all the knowledge that has been brought to bear on the subject, because it enables them to see familiar ideas in new lights, and anything that does this for the New Testament is of value. Klausner himself sees little hope of the Jews as a people embracing Christianity, but, so long as scholars on both sides can write about each other understandingly and sympathetically, we must inevitably come nearer together.

HENRY COOK.

The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England, by Ernest A. Payne. (S.C.M. Press, 6/-.)

The need for a fresh survey of the history and principles of the English Free Churches has been felt for some time. The well-known books by Silvester Horne and W. B. Selbie were both written before the first World War, and since the former appeared the religious climate of England has undergone a change. In 1900 Nonconformity was "excited, confident, eager," and, perhaps, even a little strident. To-day it is hesitant and a little discouraged. It is this situation which has drawn Mr. Payne into undertaking a fresh evaluation of the Free Church contribution to English life. His task was by no means an easy one. At one and the same time he had to tell the story of a movement covering more than three centuries, to keep his eye at each period on the contemporary background, and to bring to life the chief actors. He has succeeded brilliantly. Behind the book is a wide range of reading from which he has made a judicious selection. Within the space at his disposal, he cannot tell us all about everything; but what is remarkable is not how much he has left out but how much he has got in. The technical difficulties of handling and presenting so much material have been surmounted with remarkable success. The style is clear and concise, displaying considerable verve at times. We cite the following as an excellent piece of compression: "Take away Milton and Cromwell, Owen and

Baxter, Fox and Bunyan from the records of seventeenth-century England and what living voices remain? Jeremy Taylor and Sir Thomas Browne? The Cambridge Platonists? These are fainter voices, whereas the others still speak directly to our modern need in language that the simplest may understand."

Many readers will probably turn eagerly to the chapter which deals with the period 1900 to 1939. "Hesitant" is the epithet Mr. Payne uses to describe it, realising how difficult and dangerous it is to describe. With the turn of the century, the golden age of Nonconformity came to an end. It is not easy to be precise about the causes underlying the decline. It is part and parcel of that drift of civilisation from religion which has affected the Established Church quite as much as the Free Churches. In the great industrial centres of the North the Free Churches began to decline from the time that the capitalistic system and political Liberalism were challenged by the working classes, for whom the Labour Movement became (to quote the words of one of its leaders) "the new religion which gives a chance to all." Mr. Payne has no first-hand knowledge of conditions in the industrial North, where the decline in Free Church life is most pronounced, but he writes of the whole problem with a refreshing candour which may ruffle the complacency of some who dislike facing facts.

What of the future of the Free Churches? Mr. Payne realises that this is a question which cannot be answered without an appreciation of the contribution of the Free Churches to English life. He shows how rich and varied this has been, stressing such things as their contribution to the foreign missionary enterprise, hymnology, education, philanthropy, the trade-union movement and the cause of religious and political liberty. He brings out the abiding value of their stress upon personal conviction in religion, their belief in "gathered" churches, their emphasis upon the priesthood of all believers, and their endeavour to relate religion to life. These, he is confident, are things which must survive, otherwise the life of England will be sadly impoverished. He notes how profoundly the political life of Germany has been influenced for evil because it never had a thorough-going religious reformation such as the Separatists carried through in England. All these considerations provide Mr. Payne with solid grounds for believing that English Nonconformity and its American counterparts are not so bound up with a capitalistic order of society, and with Liberalism, which was the political faith of capitalism, that they are doomed to extinction, now that we are passing to a planned economic order. In any new order of society, the Free Church stress on the sacredness of human personality will be required. He nevertheless refuses to join the facile prophets of an early revival, nor will he dogmatise about the form it will take.

He favours a much closer union of the Free Churches along the lines suggested by Dr. Shakespeare. Here some of his Baptist readers will hesitate; and so will some Methodists. Methodist union has not been the unqualified success its advocates confidently predicted. Our own view is that many, but by no means all, Methodists would rather re-unite with the Church of England than go into a united Free Church. All Free Churchmen will, however, agree with Mr. Payne that what they need is leaders who realise that we are standing at one of the major turning-points of history, and who can face the new world with understanding, courage and creative imagination, and think in "global" terms.

A. C. UNDERWOOD.

Shorter Notices.

The Drum Language of the Lokele Tribe, by John F. Carrington (*African Studies,* Witwatersrand University Press, Vol. 3, No. 2, June, 1944.)

In our last number we called attention to an important paper by Mr. Carrington on "The Tonal Structure of the Kele Language." Here we have the first fruits of the important studies he has been making in the Drum Language of one of the main tribes in the Yakusu area. It is a fascinating article and shows Mr. Carrington's great gifts for investigation of this kind. It is much to be hoped that the book on African Drums which he is understood to have prepared will soon be made available in this country.

George Edmonstone, a Great Baptist Benefactor, by J. A. Allwood (Carey Press, 6d.)

The Baptist Union, the Baptist Missionary Society and the Devon Baptist Association all benefited under the will of Mr. George Edmonstone, who died in 1888. In Devon Mr. Edmonstone's name is still kept green by grants mainly for church extension from the trust fund created out of his bequest. Mr. Allwood has done well to tell the story of his life of service, first under the East India Company and later in Torquay. There will be many who will find interest and inspiration in these pages.