Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

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

Baptist Quarterly 11.14-15 (July-Oct. 1945)

Editorial Notes.

The war is at last at an end, both in Europe and in the Far East. We can and should give thanks to God with full hearts that, after nearly six years, fighting has ceased on land, on the sea and in the air, and that the victory has been won by the United Nations and not, as was nearly the case on more than one occasion, by Germany, Italy and Japan. "It is of the Lord's mercy that we have not been consumed." The victory has been ours through the self-sacrificing devotion of those in the armed forces, and those on the home front, through the resolution and skill of our leaders, and through those imponderable forces and unpredictable chances which clearly work in human affairs. These last the man of faith, who believes in the rightness of his cause, dares to relate to the Creator of the universe Himself, and to the principles of its structure and government. But now that the war is over, the peace has to be won. The dread consequences of six years of fighting are evident all over the world, most pitiably in the lands of the vanquished, but in other and in the long run hardly less dangerous forms, among the victors. Mankind dare not relax its efforts to build a more just and stable order of society and an order that shall match the needs of ordinary men and women in every land and the scientific knowledge and mechanical and material possibilities which now are ours. The aftermath of the 1914-18 war, and the circumstances leading up to the conflict just brought to a close, should surely make us all realise how difficult and dangerous are the affairs of twentieth century man.

* * * * *

All this might have been written had the war in the Far East ended—as it probably would have done within a not very extended period—without the dropping on Hiroshima and Nagasaki of atomic bombs, heralding the release and harnessing by the scientists of the United Nations of the energy that runs the sun. How much these terrifyingly destructive bombs contributed to the date of the end of the war will not be known for a very long time, if ever; it may well become one of the debated questions of history. Whether the bombs should have been used when and where they were is already proving itself a difficult ethical problem, on which the opinions of sincere and morally sensitive men are divided. But the prospects before mankind are so serious that we cannot afford to waste much time or energy on discussing what has been

done. The question is what should now be done? A revolutionary discovery has been made. Vast new forces are at the disposal of mankind. How shall they be used? Atomic force—in the words of the *Times*—"holds without doubt the potentiality of reducing the physical labour needed to sustain life to a small fraction of what is now required, of bestowing undreamed of riches upon all men, of abolishing servile or mechanical toil, and of creating universal leisure for the cultivation of the higher ends of the mind and spirit. All these things are attainable—but are not offered as a free gift. The condition of their enjoyment, that the new power be consecrated to peace and not to war, is a choice set before the conscience of humanity; and in a terrible and most literal sense it is a choice of life and death."

* * * * *

That moral isues are so clearly recognised as now searchingly confronting the world should be welcomed by the Christian man. His concern should be that he and his fellows are ready to give a lead to bewildered humanity. We hope to hear that the leaders of the Free Churches of this country are giving themselves to this and other urgent moral and spiritual issues, as we hope to hear that a united service for Thanksgiving and Intercession has been arranged in London, along the lines of that which took place in 1918. As the war drew to a close, some publicity was given to another very perplexing moral question. Artificial insemination of the human species is now possible. This again opens up the most bewildering and, to most people, shocking prospects. But the issues involved need calm and careful examination. Beside them, questions connected with the remarriage of divorced persons which are at present exercising Baptists and other Free Churchmen, pale into insignificance. Prejudice, reason and fear do not alone halt changes in this sphere any more than they prevent war. It is reported that the Anglican Church has appointed a strong commission to consider the moral and religious issues of a matter which already presents grave problems to both the medical and the legal professions. Free Churchmen should at once set up a parallel and co-operating commission.

* * * * *

The death on May 12th last of Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, Principal Emeritus of Regent's Park College, removes one of the very few British Baptists of this generation known far beyond his own denomination. As an Old Testament Scholar, and as a constructive theologian, he was listened to by all branches of the Christian Church, while the great practical achievement of transferring Regent's Park College from London to Oxford was watched with admiration by many outside our ranks. Nor were these things all. No one man contributed more to modern Baptist

apologetic. Those who dissented from some of Dr. Robinson's views on Biblical and theological questions gladly sheltered behind his exposition of Baptist principles and practices. Elsewhere in this issue will be found tributes to certain aspects of Dr. Robinson's work and character and also one of the last of his occasional writings. Here we note, as is only right and proper, that, next to Dr. Whitley, he was the one who gave the most consistent and generous support to the *Baptist Quarterly*. In season and out of season, both before and after his election as President of the Baptist Historical Society, this publication could count upon his efficient and generous help in matters great and small.

* * * * *

The new Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Cambridge University, Dr. Norman Sykes, devoted his inaugural lecture to a discussion of "The Study of Ecclesiastical History". He traced in some detail the rather belated establishment of special chairs in Church History at Oxford and Cambridge, and the parallel developments in King's College, London, in Durham and in Scotland. In the second part of his lecture he offered some shrewd and interesting observations on modern developments in this special branch of historical study. The vogue for detailed research on a narrow field, which has characterised recent decades, has meant that there has come an unfortunate decline in familiarity with the classics of historical writing. Over-specialisation has been a real peril. Professor Sykes boldly pleaded for the giving of more attention to post-Reformation developments. "The Church historian in concerned with . . . the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world; and dispersed also through nearly twenty centuries of history, yet with a vital consciousness of the unity and continuity of its tradition." Dr. Sykes quotes with approval the observation of Professor Powicke that "from one point of view the Christian religion is a daily invitation to the study of history". For those entering the Christian ministry the adequate study of Church history is essential, and not least at a time when certain contemporary vogues in theology seem to adopt a somewhat suspicious attitude to the historical method. Those interested in the history of their own ecclesiastical tradition may draw encouragement from the wise words of Professor Sykes and gain from them the constantly needed stimulus to set their specialised studies against a wide enough background.

* * * * *

The remarks of Dr. Emil Brunner concerning infant baptism have naturally attracted considerable attention among Baptists. From within the Reformed tradition he says so many of the

things Baptists have long believed, and which they have tried to stress. They hope that Dr. Brunner's searching words will be widely pondered. It is important, however, to give heed not only to criticisms of paedo-baptism, but to defences of it. In this connection, we would draw attention to Dr. John Baillie's recently published Riddell Lectures, *What is Christian Civilisation?* Much of his interesting argument turns, as he himself admits, "on the measure in which we believe the Church to have been justified in the principles governing its admissions to baptism in the various periods." Dr. Baillie is a warm defender of "the Christian doctrine and practice of the baptism of families." We should like to hear Dr. Baillie on Dr. Brunner and Dr. Brunner on Dr. Baillie.

A Great Time to be Alive, by Harry Emerson Fosdick. (S.C.M. Press, 235 pp. 8s. 6d. net.)

As far as style is concerned, this is great preaching. The language, the arguments, the illustrations are models of preaching at its best. It is also courageous preaching. Great courage was required to say in New York, or over the radio, some of the things which Dr. Fosdick has here about power politics, isolationism, and the colour problem. Nor does he shrink from confessing what he considers to be the weaknesses of his preaching in the past. As always, Dr. Fosdick is masterful in the way he holds the attention.

British readers will miss, however, the deeper theological note which characterises preaching on this side of the Atlantic. Dr. Fosdick spends little time on doctrinal matters. His concern is with the practical application of Christianity to the issues of a world at war. At times, one wonders if he quite succeeds. To point out the right road to men is not the same as persuading them to take it. Knowledge is not enough. Something else seems to be needed; a compelling, persuasive word of the Lord that is rooted in theology and that springs more explicitly from the Gospel. All the same, no one can read these sermons and continue to think that the Christian faith is irrelevant in the modern world. One could wish that a copy of this volume might be given to every newly elected Member of Parliament.

W. W. Bottoms.

H. Wheeler Robinson:

I. A FRIEND'S TRIBUTE.

MY acquaintance and my friendship with Wheeler Robinson goes back exactly fifty years. I had gone up to Mansfield in 1894 and it was in 1895 that he entered in company with R. H. Coats, E. W. Franks, L. H. Gaunt, R. M. Moffat and David Stewart. It was with the last named that Robinson developed peculiar intimacy, an intellectual and spiritual kinship the story of which he fittingly recorded in the *Mansfield Magazine* for December, 1933. But I saw much of him, and even then, if I had to sum him up in a word it would have been "thorough". Apart from his being a Baptist like Coats, and, like him again, pursuing the (to most of us) appalling road of Semitics, he had the distinction of not living in "digs", but like Paul, "in his own hired dwelling" in Walton Street, with his widowed mother. Their home was an oasis for me as for others. We did not meet much in class as his course was *sui generis*, but the memory of many an afternoon walk and tea is still clear. Walking and bezique with his mother were so far as recollection serves, his only recreation apart from novel reading. I cannot recall him as a river man. My outstanding impression of him in those days is that of a man who had set his face steadfastly, who knew where he was going; he had his eye on Pitlochry long before he went there, and I should not wonder if Regent's Park was not somewhere on his horizon.

He took his Schools in 1898, a year after me. I think it was a disappointment to him—it certainly was a surprise to his contemporaries—that the examiners (Gwilliam, Cowley and his own tutor Buchanan Gray) did not award him a First Class. It was speedily manifest that they had been handling a first-class man, for in that same year and the next three (partly spent in Marburg and Strassburg) he swept the board of all the University prizes in his subject.

Our ways were devious for a while. I was in India and he at Pitlochry building securely on foundations well and truly laid, and combining with what must have been an inspiring pastorate those methodical and painstaking habits of study that soon began to bear rich fruit in his published work. I remember H. R. Mackintosh of New College, Edinburgh once remarking to me that he knew no man who cut a lawn more closely.

When I settled at Romsey in 1905, Robinson had been two years in Coventry and I spent a day with him there. This was the prelude to closer and more prolonged association in Yorkshire, for he was called to Rawdon in 1906 and I to Bradford three

years later. It was a peculiar joy to have his presence and generous words at my induction. Old Testament Studies at Rawdon being in Principal Blomfield's care, Robinson undertook Church History and Philosophy of Religion, in both of which he quickly made himself at home. He had Latin as an extra and rejoiced as he had not done much at it heretofore. Between 1909 and 1917, when I went to Edinburgh, we saw a good deal of each other, for my home at Menston was only two or three miles from his, and our wives and children also got to know one another. Curiously enough, we both hoped to make our eldest boys Grecians (Bernard learned his Greek numerals, cardinal and ordinal, going up and downstairs), but both went off to Science, in Bernard's case humanized by music.

All the time Wheeler Robinson was going from strength to strength, and it was universally recognised that the right man was in the right place when he went to Regent's Park in 1920, two years before I went to Lancashire College.

I have a hazy memory of dining with him at Regent's, a clearer one of a journey from Paddington to Oxford one Sunday night after we had both been preaching in London. Still more vivid are recollections of him as a fellow examiner at the University of London, and particularly of the inside of a week spent in visiting the Welsh Theological Colleges as commissioners from the University of Wales. That was in 1935 when our colleagues were Dr. Joyce, bishop of Monmouth and Dr. Maldwyn Hughes of Wesley House, Cambridge, both of them now gone. When our journeyings were done we drew up our report at Robinson's home in St. Giles. That same summer I met his daughter Monica at Salisbury in Rhodesia.

The last time I saw Robinson was on a summer day just before he retired, when, with manifest and justifiable pride and joy, he showed my wife and myself over the new Regent's Park, and spoke of what had yet to be added. Oxford had laid its spell upon him since his student days, and his devotion to her was repaid in the end by the affection and esteem with which she welcomed him to high offices.

Wheeler Robinson was a rather heavy smoker—a piper—he introduced me long ago to Dill, which led on to Edgeworth. There was a certain austerity and detachment about him, but he was a good companion and a staunch friend in cloudy days. He always had something fresh to debate and was at his best, a prince among peers, at the summer and winter meetings of the Society for Old Testament Study. There never was a man more ready to share his extensive knowledge with others. And never man more dependable, as I found in connection with our work on Peake's *Commentary* and its Supplement. The last note I had from him

was a kindly warning not to buy a certain American book on Ezekiel which I had fancied.

I have often thought what an International Critical Commentary he could have given us on Isaiah 28-66, in continuation of Gray's work—Gray's mantle descended on him—or on the prophet of his heart, Jeremiah. But his later interests were more doctrinal and philosophical though he remained true to the end to history. A staunch Free Churchman, he none the less had a spirit truly catholic. He never let himself be drawn into denominational machinery; on the other hand, he took part in compiling the revised Baptist hymnbook. What he did for the raising of ministerial efficiency on its academic side, not only in his own communion, will long be an inspiration; but Robinson was more than a scholar and a teacher. He was "far ben" in the things of the spirit. To our eyes he died too early, but he said of David Stewart: "A strange sense of joy and gratitude underlies the sorrow". While he was conspicuously "a workman needing not to be ashamed", one to whom anything shoddy, shallow or pretentious, was abhorrent, he gave the utmost for the highest. He knew and helped others to know "the grace of the Lord Jesus, the love of God, and the koinonia of the Holy Spirit".

A. J. Grieve.

II.

WHEELER ROBINSON: OLD TESTAMENT SCHOLAR.

ON the close of the first world war, Christian scholars of all branches made determined efforts to get into touch with their colleagues in Germany, and do what they could to repair the moral damage wrought by the conflict. They hoped also that by developing close personal relations between people belonging to the two countries they might do something to decrease the chances of renewed conflict. A real opportunity came in 1923 with the news that the world-famous Old Testament periodical, *Die Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* was in serious danger of extinction owing to lack of support. Proposals were at once made from the British side, which were aimed at rendering the journal even more completely international than it had been before the war. The Editor intimated that he would be glad to have a contribution in English, and the British choice fell on Wheeler Robinson, as the person who was most

likely to represent the best that this country had to produce in Old Testament scholarship. His paper on the nature of prophetic inspiration was published in the Z.A.W. in 1923.

Co-operation between Old Testament scholars of all countries developed, and an international gathering was held at Oxford in 1927, and another at Göttingen in 1935. At this last, representative scholars were invited to take part; one from each of the more important countries to read a longer paper and others to offer shorter contributions. The selection was made by the German scholars themselves, as inviting hosts, and they spread their net as widely as possible. Only one University—that of Wales—had as many as two representatives on the programme, but nearly every University in western Europe—to say nothing of America—was honoured by having one name on the list. There was only one possibility for the longer paper from a British scholar, and that again was Wheeler Robinson. When he finished reading it the ablest of the German scholars whispered to a British colleague, "We have no one in this country to compare with this man in his own field." We are justified in believing that he held an unique position, standing head and shoulders above every other scholar of our time in his special branch of Old Testament studies.

Of course, he had his limitations, and, being human, was largely unconscious of them. This, unfortunately, led him to give time and trouble to branches of study with which he was less qualified to deal with than his own speciality. He knew little or nothing of archæology and was not greatly interested in textual criticism. The value of history for him lay in the underlying philosophical issues, particularly that of time and eternity; he never visualised it as a biology of the organised human community. He was not, and never could have been, a higher critic, and, where critical work was necessary, he was content to accept the views of others, not always judiciously balanced. His little book *The Cross of Jeremiah*, for example, contains four chapters. The first is a critical sketch of the book, the other three are devoted to the spiritual values revealed in the prophet's life and work. The one is a third class piece of work; the rest is something above first class. He was, as every higher critic would agree, right in supposing that this particular study was necessary only as a preliminary to fuller appreciation of the text and subject matter, and he was content to let others do it for him. *The Old Testament: its Making and Meaning* devotes about fifty pages to the Prophetic literature. A page and a half is given to the "Making"—quite sound as far as it goes, but far from being a complete statement of the modern position. His small *History of Israel* is magnificent, but it is not history,

except in the sense that actual events are accurately recorded. His commentaries in the Century Bible (Deuteronomy and Joshua), written during the days of his pastorate in Coventry, are neither particularly inspiring nor illuminating (we may contrast the work of men like Peake and Skinner in the same series), and gave little indication of his real greatness. He was a good Hebrew scholar, and the Old Testament to him meant the Hebrew text, not a translation. It is the more to be regretted that he did not concentrate wholly on one side of Old Testament studies and give us a systematised "Theology of the Old Testament." This is one of the big gaps in modern Biblical scholarship, and no man was ever better fitted to fill it. At the same time, he may have felt that the practical administrative work in which a College Principal is necessarily involved would not give him the time he needed. It was no small thing to move a great college from London to Oxford, and then to embark on a building scheme. He believed, too, that good writing must always be done slowly, and he would never have been content with anything less than the best. So the great work was never written, and the world is the poorer for its loss. But we can see the general lines he would have taken from his contributions to Manson's *Companion to the Bible* and to *Record and Revelation,* of which he was himself the editor, and also from his Speaker's Lectures, "Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament," which, it is hoped, will shortly be published.

For Wheeler Robinson was by instinct and by interest a theologian, and his approach was inevitably psychological and philosophical. It was a fortunate thing that his college training gave him the discipline of Hebrew, and that he studied under Buchanan Gray—perhaps the greatest all-round Old Testament scholar this country has ever produced. He was thus able to bring a real knowledge of the Bible to his theological studies. He gave the world a taste of his quality in his *Religious Ideas of the Old Testament,* a book which, though small in extent, is rich in thought, and will stand for generations as the soundest text-book on the subject. The use he could make of his Old Testament knowledge may be seen in other works also, as for example in his *Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*—another book which stands in a class by itself.

One aspect of Wheeler Robinson's greatness was, of course, his ability to absorb the ideas of his predecessors. We must not speak of his reproducing them, for when they appeared in his work, as they rightly and properly did, they had been transmuted by his own peculiar genius and woven into his own general fabric. But, of course, he had his own special contribution to make, and it may be summed up in the phrase "Corporate Personality."

This was a new idea to the theological world—or at least the formulation of it was new—and as long as the Bible is studied it will have an important effect on men's religious thinking. It expresses the psychological fact that the limits of personality were not defined in Hebrew thought in the same way as they are with us, and that a group of what we should regard as separate individuals may be regarded as a single spiritual entity. Similar or parallel ideas have been developed along different lines by Pedersen in Denmark and Johnson in this country, but "Corporate Personality" will be for ever associated with Wheeler Robinson as its most striking and independent exponent. It has already thrown a flood of light on much that was obscure or disputable in the thought of the Old Testament, and it is impossible to forecast the length to which it may ultimately lead us. We may certainly regard it as being the starting point of a new era in the study of Biblical theology.

A scholar may be either an artisan or an artist or, in rare instances, both. Wheeler Robinson's methods were essentially those of the artisan. In studying an idea he would laboriously collect, compare, contrast and summarise the various shades of meaning which might be ascribed to a single word—not infrequently drawing a graph of an idea. He had no patience with the worker who saw his way through a literature by sheer insight, and, while he was reading it, became for the time a sympathetic contemporary of the author. He offered the strongest contrast to the other great Baptist scholar of our time, Reavely Glover, and the two men, tragically enough, never did or could have understood one another. The amazing thing about Wheeler Robinson's genius was that he constantly produced great works of art by the methods of the artisan. Students complained that he was difficult to read. This is inevitable in the case of a great original thinker; nobody pretends that Plato's *Phaedrus* is a suitable book for the nursery. But his style is magnificent, stately and polished, and a student who will take the trouble to study it, not merely to read it superficially, will be amply rewarded, and will feel that he has entered into communion with one of the greatest minds of our day.

One thing, the best of all, must be added. All Wheeler Robinson's work was inspired and controlled by profoundly deep religious experience and feeling. Great theologian as he was, we never get the best of him in his more formal work. For that we must turn to some of his "little" books, productions like *The Cross of Job* and *The Cross of Jeremiah*. Here we have the true man, the scholar whose thought was dominated by the Cross, and whose life was lived in the Christ who was crucified for him.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

The Revelation of Beauty.

IN the past, the strength of Baptists has sprung from their evangelical emphasis. But one of their weaknesses has undoubtedly been too narrow a view of the comprehensiveness of the Gospel. They have often consecrated ugliness as if it were the proper bride of holiness; are not our chapels often no more than "utility" buildings? What is there in them to draw the reverent soul away from the world, and to prompt prayer in a week-day hour?

Yet the Bible itself claims the noblest setting of architecture and music that we can give to it, and this because it is what it is, and before we come to anything it says. It is a revelation of beauty, as well as of truth and goodness. We know that the simplicity of devotion and of Gospel faith can attain to a genuine beauty which is much more than that of outward adornment. But, if beauty belongs to all that God is and does, the fuller application of it, and the personal response to it, can surely reinforce the Gospel and that love of men which springs from the love of God in Christ Jesus. To-day, the literary beauty of the Bible has been re-discovered by many, whose eyes are yet veiled to its deeper meanings. (The numerous "literary" editions of Scripture are the best proof of this.) But we could not claim that the Church in general or Baptists in particular have led the way to this re-discovery.

Let anyone who would hesitate to say that God meant the Bible to be a revelation of beauty give half an hour's quiet thought to the *forms* in which God has given it to us. Not the least service rendered by the Revised Version of the Old Testament is that some of its poetry is set out in the "parallelism" of Hebrew poetry—the repetition of similar thought in somewhat different expression. Thus, when the 29th Psalm says:

"The voice of the Lord is upon the waters,"

it goes on to say the same thing a little differently:

"The God of glory thundereth."

Indeed, the whole psalm is a splendid description of a thunder-storm sweeping up from the Mediterranean to the north of Palestine, and then through the whole land to the south. In contrast with this storm on earth is set the opening and closing verses describing the unruffled peace of the heavenly worship above in its "holy array" (as "the beauty of holiness" here implies). So in the magnificent descriptions of nature in the Book of Job and the delicate use of natural scenery and the details of nature in the Song of Songs. But much that comes to us through the prophets also is given as poetry, and ought to be set out in poetic form, as for example the lovely lyric of the

Vineyard (Isaiah v. 1-7), which our Lord appropriated and re-applied.

The quantity of such poetic form in the Old Testament cannot be accidental. It makes its permanent appeal to the aesthetic side of human personality, which God has surely created to find its supreme satisfaction in Himself. There is a revelation of His beauty as well as of His truth, and both have their service to render in moving the human will into heartfelt obedience. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," and love is the only way to fulfil the law of God. Therefore, whatever makes God more beautiful to us will also make us more able to bring to Him "the gold of obedience." The sixth chapter of Deuteronomy, from which that command is taken, leads up to the redemption from Egypt as that which makes it possible since it makes God more lovable. But redemption itself, in both Testaments, has its aspect of divine beauty, its poetry of divine activity. It reveals beauty chiefly because it *is* beautiful.

So the revelation of beauty passes into the beauty of revelation. The transition, indeed, is imperceptible, which is as it should be when we think of the "attributes" of God. For He is One, and His revelation of Himself is one in the last resort. Some day (or rather when eternity has gathered the "days" of time into itself) we shall see that all nature is gracious and that all grace is natural. If I remember aright (for I cannot check this reference, as all references should be checked) it was the poet Tennyson who, when found gazing at a little woodland pool, said "How beautiful God is!" It may well be that we have to learn to say that of the truths of the Gospel, and to see in them a higher and deeper beauty than of any light that has ever shone on land or sea. St. Paul compared the light of the second creation with that of the first (II. Cor. iv. 6)—a comparison worth pondering for its aesthetic as well as its moral and religious suggestions. What can be more beautiful than the surrender of a soul to the newly-seen light of Christ?

One thing alone is more beautiful, because it is perfect and complete, as no human surrender has ever been. This is the perfect surrender on the Cross of Christ. Its beauty is the more wonderful because it is cradled in so much ugliness, made by men and not by God. The words and deeds of Jesus have their human beauty before we go on to think of their divine meaning. But that meaning enshrines the crowning beauty of the universe, the love of God that enters this world of men in the grace of Christ, the love that creates the new fellowship by the Holy Spirit. The simplicity of the Cross makes its appeal universal. Such simplicity is the highest art, and God is the supreme Artist:

> Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty,
> God hath shined forth.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

Shakespeare's Religion.

AMONG the papers left by the Rev. Richard Davies, Rector of Sapperton, Gloucestershire, and afterwards Archdeacon of Coventry, who died in 1708, was a brief note on Shakespeare which ended with the abrupt words: "He dyed a Papist."[1] The source of his information is unknown, but it is the only report we possess of Shakespeare's personal faith. It is usually dismissed with ridicule. It is "idle gossip," according to Sir Sidney Lee.[2] It is "just the kind of story a parson of the time would delight in crediting and circulating about one of those harlotry players," says Dover Wilson.[3] And Dr. J. J. Mackail agrees: "Seventeenth century Puritanism, which closed the theatres, was ready to invent or accept anything that was to their discredit, or to the discredit of anyone connected with them."[4] Nevertheless, the statement is not to be dismissed so lightly. There is no reason for thinking that Davies was a Puritan or that he delighted in recording discreditable stories about players. The note suggests that he was a man of literary tastes, that he was sufficiently interested in Shakespeare to gather what information he could, and even that, when it was made, Shakespeare's fame was secure. Had not Milton the puritan long since laid a wreath upon his tomb? In any inquiry into Shakespeare's religion the note must be taken into account. But the question, if it can be answered at all, must be set in the large context of his age and, with due regard to their dramatic character, of his works.

When Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558 it cannot be said that England, though anti-papal, was yet a Protestant country. No doubt the Marian persecution had alienated the masses of the people and greatly strengthened the Protestant movement. As Chesterton admits: "It is true, when all is said, that she set herself to burn out 'No Popery' and managed to burn it in."[5] But, apart from the anti-papal feeling, the people were still Catholic in faith. It was mainly the course of events —the excommunication of the Queen in 1570 and again in 1583, the terrible massacre of St. Bartholomew and consequent immigration of the Huguenots in 1572, the Armada in 1588, and the dangerous Catholic plots—which identified patriotism with the

[1] Chambers: *Short Life of Shakespeare*, 232.
[2] *Shakespeare: Life and Works* (*ab. ed.*) 145.
[3] *The Essential Shakespeare*, 130.
[4] *Companion to Shakespeare Studies.*
[5] *Short History of England.*

Protestant cause, that finally converted England. To all this must be added the religious policy of Elizabeth and her statesmen which in a few years, and for the time, did succeed in including the greater part of Catholics and Protestants in one National Church. But in Shakespeare's time the air was thick with theological controversy, and perhaps not since the days of Athanasius when Arianism was debated in mart and street were the great issues of religion more generally discussed.

Shakespeare was born in 1564 of Catholic parents who were married in Mary's reign. At the time John Shakespeare, his father, was prosperous and owned property in Stratford. In the eighteenth century his will was discovered in the roof of one of his houses in Henley Street. It probably dates from these earlier years, and is conventionally Catholic in its devotional clauses. He died in 1601. Shakespeare's mother, who lived until 1608, was Mary Arden, an heiress in a small way, who came of an ancient county family which was devoutly Catholic. It has been widely thought that John Shakespeare became a Recusant in 1592, when his name appears in a list of persons to be prosecuted " for not comminge monethlie to the churche according to hir Majestie's lawes."[6] But opinions differ as to whether he was a catholic or protestant recusant, though the last seems much the less likely. The probability is that he was neither. He was one of the nine mentioned in an appended note: " It is sayd that these last nine coom not to churche for feare of process for debtte." Considering the known state of his finances at the time, and that arrests could be made on Sundays, this is most likely to be the true explanation. There is no evidence that he was a religiously-minded man, and there is ample that, after reaching the civic honours of bailiff, chief alderman, and justice of the peace, he was unfortunate in business. It is generally agreed that Shakespeare was educated at the Stratford Grammar School. The headmaster at the time was almost certainly Simon Hunt, who afterwards became a Jesuit. Another pupil, who may have been contemporary with Shakespeare, was Robert Debdale, who was executed in 1586 for complicity in a Catholic plot.[7]

Beyond his marriage in 1582 and the birth of his children in 1583 and 1585, nothing is known of Shakespeare until 1592, when the famous reference of Robert Greene proves him to be already an actor and a writer of plays, and according to Henry Chettle, of good standing among " divers of worship." But if Sir Edmund Chambers' recent conjecture is correct,[8] he may be

[6] Chambers: *op. cit.* 14.
[7] Fripp, *Shakespeare's Haunts*, 30ff.
[8] *Shakespearean Gleanings*, 53.

identified with the player William Shakeshaft (his grandfather was sometimes so called), to whom, with Fulk Gyllom (another Warwickshire name), Alexander Houghton of Lee, Lancashire, in 1581 left an annuity of £2, commending the two to his heir, Thomas Houghton, with a legacy of player's "clothes." If Thomas could not provide for the men, the costumes were to go to Sir Thomas Hesketh with the request that he should engage these players. The Houghtons were Catholics, and one member of the family was certainly a recusant. All this is, of course, assumption, but, if it prove true, it throws much needed light on Shakespeare's career before he emerges in London as a man sufficiently important to be attacked and defended in 1592. However this may be, in 1593 and 1594 he published his poems *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, and dedicated them to Henry Wriothesley, the third Earl of Southampton, a great patron of letters. The second dedication is in terms of the warmest devotion: "What I have done is yours; what I have to do is yours; being part in all I have, devoted yours." Southampton ultimately became a Protestant, but at the time of these dedications he was a leading Catholic peer.[9]

It could not be but that the world of poetry and the drama into which Shakespeare entered was affected by the grave religious issues of the time. And, despite the sustained attacks of the puritans, it is demonstrable that many dramatists and players took a serious interest in them. Kyd was charged, wrongly as he pleaded, with Arianism, and was even put to the torture. Marlowe was alleged to be an "Atheist" (a vague charge) or, alternatively, with leanings towards Romanism. Ben Jonson was converted to the Roman Church and remained a Catholic for twelve years. Lodge joined the Roman Church and retired from the drama. Marston, after a period of agnosticism, became an Anglican clergyman. Shirley was in Anglican orders but became a Catholic and turned dramatist. Massinger showed a strong predilection for Catholic observances, presented Catholic characters in a notoriously favourable light, and most probably became a Catholic. And among the leading non-dramatic poets Southwell was, of course, Catholic; Daniel's sympathies were with the Catholics; the closest friends of Thomas Campion were Catholics and it is believed by many that he joined them; and John Donne, the famous Dean of St. Paul's, was born and educated a Catholic, and only after long hesitation became an Anglican, and "his most intimate religious poems indicate very clearly that he never ceased to feel the influence of his Catholic upbringing."[10] There was evidently nothing in Shakespeare's associations as poet, actor

[9] *D.N.B.*
[10] *Cambridge H.E.L.*, IV., 198.

or dramatist, to induce a change of religion. Most Catholics conformed to the law of Public Worship.

It is a fair inference that some striking features of his plays illustrate not only the temper of Shakespeare's mind, but the influence of his early training. In several cases where his sources represented the Catholic Church or its representatives in a discreditable light he deliberately departed from them. The earliest instance is in *Romeo and Juliet* (1597). Friar Lawrence is wise and kindly even though his plan goes awry, and he is called a "holy man." But the corresponding character in Shakespeare's source is a vile creature of the type best known to us in Boccaccio's *Decameron*. *King John* (1598) provides an even more striking example. It is true that it contains a passage that seems decisive on the other side :

> Thou canst not, cardinal, devise a name
> So slight, unworthy and ridiculous
> To charge me to an answer as the Pope (III. i.)

On this John Bailey comments : "No Roman Catholic could ever have set his pen to such insulting words. The attack on the Pope, one may notice, is not doctrinal at all. It is, as the English Reformation was, practical, common-sensical, and political."[11] The qualifications seem important. The words are certainly not doctrinal and they are political, and it is to be doubted whether they would give as much offence to the majority of Catholics in Elizabeth's time as they would to-day—we remember Shakespeare's Catholic patron, Southampton. It is doubtful even that they would have offended Catholics in John's own day. J. R. Green's account of the people's reaction to his surrender to the Pope suggests the contrary.[12] The truth is, the English nation had always resented the papal claim to interfere in its affairs, and when Henry VIII. threw off the papal yoke while retaining the Catholic faith, and declared himself Head of the Church, he was supported by the people and in particular by Bishops Bonner and Gardiner, though Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More objected even to martyrdom. It is true that the Bishops changed their mind when they saw the Protestant revolution and the greed of Protestant politicians in the reign of Edward VI., and eagerly welcomed the reaction under Mary. But they under-estimated the anti-papal feeling in the country, and when Elizabeth came to power the nation rallied round her, and Catholic and Protestant were united in resisting the Armada, blessed though it was by the Pope. It is difficult to see why any but the conspiring minority of Catholics should have disagreed with the words in

[11] *Shakespeare*, 21.
[12] *Short History*, 121.

their context. But of far more significance than these few words in the play is what Shakespeare has left out of it. It is based on an older play, *The Troublesome Raigne of King John of England*. This is a fierce Protestant polemic in which contempt is poured on the old faith, monks are murderous and immoral, and the hermit-prophet Peter is a vulgar impostor. All this is expunged by Shakespeare, and he transforms a violent assault on the Roman Church into a presentation of the political struggle between the papacy and England in which his sympathies are with his own country, as were the sympathies of most Catholics. A third instance of his respect for Catholic institutions may be found in *Measure for Measure*. This is based on an old play, *Promos and Cassandra*. In this, Cassandra yields to the passion of the judge Promos to save her brother. But Isabella, the corresponding character, whom Shakespeare makes a votaress of St. Claire, refuses with indignation. He will not sacrifice the honour of a religious character. By this alteration of the plot at a crucial point, and by introducing a new figure, Mariana of the moated grange, he transforms a story of debauchery and cruelty into one of the greatest and most Christian of his plays.

It is in keeping with this that Shakespeare has no ecclesiastic like the wicked Cardinal in Webster's *Duchess of Malfi*. Once a privileged Fool makes ribald reference to "the nun's lip to the friar's mouth" (*All's Well*, 11 ii.), but no such characters appear in the plays. Bishops, priests, monks, nuns, are all dignified figures. As Bradley observes: "We perceive in Shakespeare's tone in regard to them not the faintest trace of dislike or contempt."[13] This applies also, with exceptions, to his Anglican parsons. He regards with friendly eye "Sir" Nathaniel in *Love's Labour Lost* ("a marvellous good neighbour, faith, and can bowl well" V. ii.), and the good "Sir" Hugh Evans in *The Merry Wives* ("Serve Got and leave your desires, and the fairies will not pinse you" V. v.). It is to be noticed that he makes both humorous characters, as he does not with their Catholic counterparts. But "Sir" Oliver Martext, the "vicar of the next parish," who makes a brief appearance in *As You Like It* (III. iii.) is exposed by Jaques as an incompetent dullard ("this fellow will but join you together as they join wainscot"). And Master Dumbe, "our minister," who does not appear in person at all in 2 *Henry IV*. 11 iv., is an appropriate spiritual adviser to Mistress Quickly, and only too representative of many of the non-preaching Elizabethan clergy. While Shakespeare looked upon the new order with genial tolerance, it cannot be said that he had the reverence for it he showed for the old. There is some reason, however, for believing that he was

[13] *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*, 350.

acquainted with Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, the great and classic defence of the Anglican Church.

In his important book, *The Elizabethan World Picture*, Dr. Tillyard makes it clear that the general medieval picture of the world survived in outline into the Elizabethan age, though "its existence was by then precarious," and that Shakespeare cannot be fully understood unless this background be taken into account. The world picture, he says, "one can say dogmatically was still solidly theocentric." More particularly, "the Puritans and the courtiers were more united by a common theological bond than they were divided by ethical disagreements. They had in common a mass of basic assumptions about the world which they never disputed and whose importance varied inversely with this very meagreness of controversy."[14] To doctrinal disputes, Shakespeare but rarely alludes. A passing glance can be found in *Love's Labour Lost.*

> See, see! my beauty will be saved by merit.
> O heresy in fair, fit for these days. (IV., i.)

But we should expect to find many references to the Puritans in his plays. The Puritans waged open war upon the drama, and naturally were assailed with many gibes from the stage. They made repeated attempts to have the London theatres closed, and even in Stratford during Shakespeare's retirement their influence induced the Town Council in 1612 to pass a resolution declaring plays to be unlawful, and increasing the penalties against players. And yet Shakespeare married his daughter Susanna to the Puritan Dr. John Hall; he entertained Puritan preachers at New Place; and he certainly read the Bible in the Genevan Version.[15] If it is clear that his Catholic upbringing permanently influenced him, these facts have led some to think that he had Puritan leanings and even that he chafed against his profession, unwillingly making himself "a motley to the view" (*Sonnet* CX.). This last suggestion is probably unfounded. But it is an arresting fact that he has few references to the Puritans and no attacks upon them, and nothing approaching the caricatures in other dramatists, such as Ben Jonson in *Bartholomew Fair*. Indeed, he never introduced a Puritan character into his drama. The humourless Malvolio in *Twelfth Night* is several times called a puritan by his companions because of his quite reasonable objection to the carousals of Sir Andrew and Sir Toby; but he is no "puritan," only, as Maria says: "Sometimes a kind of puritan" (11 iii.). In the struggle between players and Puritans Shakespeare was, as in other matters, above the war. It is evident that he recognised the noble element in the Puritan move-

[14] chap. 1.
[15] cp. Noble, *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge.*

ment, and sympathised with its moral fervour. The finest tribute to Marina in *Pericles* is "She would make a Puritan of the Devil if he should cheapen a kiss of her" (IV. vi.). And he knew that Puritan was a name that covered many distinctions, and included men like the nonconformist saint and scholar in whom Thomas Fuller said "the old Puritan may seem to expire."[16] John Dodd disassociated himself from the somewhat unscrupulous controversy of many of his fellows, and was a great lover of natural beauty—"In this flower, saith he, I can see more of God than in all the beautiful buildings in the world." The clown in *All's Well* says: "Though honesty be no puritan, yet it will do no hurt; it will wear the surplice of humility over the black gown of a big heart;" that is, both the white surplice and the puritan gown are honourable. Doubtless this was Shakespeare's own judgement. Even Sir Toby's words in *Twelfth Night*: "I had as lief be a Brownist as a politician" (III. ii.) betray no animus against those victims of episcopal fury. Shakespeare mocked at no man's religion.

And yet Shakespeare was no Puritan. Whatever sympathy he had for their moral earnestness, he regarded their outlook upon human life as too narrow. He puts the criticism, "Dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?" into the mouth of one of his comic characters (*Twelfth Night*, II. iii.), but it expresses his own attitude to the Puritan asceticism. He had an experiencing and enjoying nature, and freely accepted as part of the divine creation the desires and satisfactions upon which the average Puritan stamped his disapproval. His delight in the coherent sensuous beauty of the world, in his art, in music, in the love and laughter of men and women, separated him from many whom, on other grounds, he esteemed. He sang the *Benedicite*, and never so sweetly as in his last plays, "the setting sun and music at the close." Above all, his unequalled gift of humour, and the wisdom that humour brings, would alone have preserved him from the pride of judgement and spiritual arrogance which were the perils of Puritanism. Nor can we associate him with their passion for impossible certainties, their contentions for the shade of a word, and their claim for new ecclesiastical systems that they only were of divine authority. They sometimes deserved the reproach, as did some of their opponents:

'Tis mad idolatry
To make the service greater than the god. (*Troil.* II., ii.)

And on some graver matters, and this not only with reference to the Puritans, though his mind was metaphysical, he had a

[16] Jessop, *Wise Words of Thomas Fuller*, 42.

distaste for speculation on divine and hidden subjects. This is apparent as early as *Love's Labour Lost,* which is not only a gay burlesque of current affectations of speech, but a light satire on a group of intellectuals known as "The School of Night," which met to discuss social and philosophical questions.[17] It is explicit in Lafue's obviously topical words in *All's Well*: "They say miracles are past; and we have our philosophical persons to make modern and familiar things supernatural and causeless. Hence it is that we make trifles of terrors, ensconcing ourselves into seeming knowledge, when we should submit ourselves to an unknown fear." (II. iii.) On the other hand, the "wisdom of Nature" (*Lear* I. ii.), that is, research into the secrets of nature, claimed Shakespeare's interest, and the tragedy of *Lear* especially shows how he read the current manuals on the subject.[18] But his searching mind, like his Hamlet's, was exercised rather with the profound problems of life and death, and rejected the superficial scepticisms of "philosophical persons" withdrawn from the world of nature and man, like the dilettantes of *Love's Labour,* to "painfully to pore upon a book to seek the light of truth" (I. i.). Lockhart says of Sir Walter Scott, who was so akin to Shakespeare, though he had not his deep sense of the mystery that is man and the mystery that encompasses him: "The few passages in his diaries in which he alludes to his own religious feelings and practices show clearly . . . the modesty with which he shrunk from indulging either the presumption of reason, or the extravagance of imagination, in the province of Faith." The words can be applied without alteration to Shakespeare.

In one grave matter, the licentiousness of the age, he was increasingly in sympathy with the puritan spirit in both Catholic and Protestant which strove against the current. In his great tragic period from *Hamlet* to *Timon* (although he wrote other than tragedies in these years), there is an unmistakable loathing of drunkenness and "vices of the blood." As Bradley says: "The undercurrent of disgust seems to become audible."[19] It should not be exaggerated, as it sometimes is, as though it were an obsession. Obsessions of this kind do not produce Hamlets and Lears. But it may well be that his intense realisation of the tragic depths of life made him painfully conscious of the degradation of sensual sins. It was in this period that he wrote *Measure for Measure,* in which he dealt with the moral problem in the very spirit of the gospels. But he did more than this. The Lady in Milton's *Comus* says:

[17] cp. Bradbrook, *The School of Night.*
[18] cp. Gordon, *A Note on the World of King Lear* in *Shakespearean Comedy and Other Studies.*
[19] *op. cit.,* 329.

To him that dares
Arm his profane tongue with contemptuous words
Against the sun-clad power of chastity
Fain would I something say.

And Shakespeare, in his dramatic way, had much to say. From this time on he created a series of lovely characters upon whose chastity emphasis is expressly laid—Marina in *Pericles,* Imogen in *Cymbeline,* Hermione in *The Winter's Tale,* and above all, Isabella in *Measure for Measure,* whose chastity is a flame of fire:

Were I under terms of death,
Th' impression of keen whips I'd wear as rubies,
And strip myself to death, as to a bed
That, longing, have been sick for, ere I'd yield
My body up to shame. (II., iv.)

But perhaps more significant still is his deepened reverence for marriage (though there is not a line in all his plays that makes light of it) as against the "pre-contract." As is well known, in the Elizabethan age, as for centuries before, the betrothal was confirmed by an oath and attested bond, and was regarded as a civil marriage. It will be remembered that the "marriage lines" of Margaret in *The Cloister and the Hearth* was of this nature. In *Twelfth Night* there is a description of such a pre-contract between Olivia and Sebastian:

A contract of eternal bond of love,
Confirm'd by mutual joinder of your hands,
Attested by the holy close of lips,
Strengthen'd by interchangement of your rings;
And all the ceremony of this compact
Seal'd in my function, by my testimony. (V., i.)

And it is to be noticed that Olivia calls him "husband." In *Measure for Measure* again, it is the old betrothal of Mariana to Angelo that justifies her submission to the Duke's plan that she should secretly take Isabella's place in the assignment, an expedient that repels us unless we realise that, according to Elizabethan ideas, she was but enforcing her rights.

Nor, gentle daughter, fear you not at all,
He is your husband on a pre-contract:
To bring you thus together is no sin. (IV., i.)

It is probable that Shakespeare's own relations with Anne Hathaway were governed by such a betrothal. There is not the slightest indication of any disgrace in the arrangements for their subsequent marriage.

And yet in *The Tempest,* his last play, Prospero ruthlessly denounces the common view of the pre-contract. Says he to Ferdinand, whom he has just betrothed to Miranda:

> Then, as my gift and thine own acquisition
> Worthily purchas'd, take my daughter: but
> If thou dost break her virgin knot before
> All sanctimonious ceremonies may
> With full and holy rite be minister'd,
> No sweet aspersion shall the heavens let fall
> To make this contract grow. (IV., i.)

It is clear that as he grew older, Shakespeare realised the moral dangers of the pre-contract in an age of increasing laxity, and the importance of the marriage bond as sanctioned by the "holy rite" of religion and the Church. A significant incident marked his closing days. His younger daughter, Judith, married Thomas Quiney on February 10th, 1616, in a season prohibited by canon law, and both were excommunicated. Shakespeare had made his will in January, but in March he altered it, considerably to the detriment of Judith. They cannot be wrong who see in this an indication of his displeasure at the circumstances which brought upon the pair the excommunication of the Church. He died on April 23rd, within a month of signing the amended will.

The now familiar figure of a Shakespeare calmly contemplating all creeds and religions with an inscrutable smile, "the Spinozistic Deity," as Coleridge so solemnly called him,[20] is a fantastic illusion which he himself would have blown away with a gust of his great laughter. And Coleridge's further statement, which some modern studies would involve: "I believe Shakespeare was not a whit more intelligible in his own day than he is now to an educated man, except for a few local allusions of no consequence,"[21] he would have dismissed with a reference to his financial profits. Unintelligible dramatists do not make fortunes. The truth is he was a thorough Elizabethan, and, like all great men whose appeal is to all ages, he was firmly rooted in his own age, and spoke to his own generation whose life and background he shared. It is this that is forgotten or ignored by many modern writers who attribute to him the scepticism of the present century. The assertion that he had no personal religion, in so far as it is not a mere reflection of their own agnosticism, is in the main based on a study of the great tragedies. "His peopled but lonely planet," says Dr. Dixon, "swings as if unrelated to any other in empty space,"[22] and he compares Shakespearean tragedy unfavourably in this matter with Greek tragedy, which had a religious background of sacred myth and ritual. It is wholly "secular." Yet certainly it was not written in Hotspur's spirit: "He that kills me some six or seven dozen of Scots at breakfast, washes his hands and says to his wife, 'Fie upon this quiet life! I want work'" (1 *Henry IV.* II. iv.). It is at least as serious

[20] *Table Talk*, 12 May, 1830.
[21] *ib.*, 15 Mar., 1834.
[22] *Tragedy*, 32.

as any ancient tragedy. But it is well to bear in mind a note to Bradley's lecture on "Hegel's Theory of Tragedy": "There is one marked difference between ancient and modern tragedy. Speaking roughly, we may say that the former includes, while the latter tends to ignore, the religious ideas of the time," and he explains that the Olympian gods "are in the same element as Art, while this is, on the whole, not so with modern religious ideas. One result would be that Greek tragedy represents the total Greek mind more fully than modern tragedy can the total modern mind."[23] In other words, Greek tragedy was religious and Elizabethan tragedy was not, because the gods were creations of the imagination, and so the myths could be used freely and adapted to their own purposes by the great tragedians, whereas the Christian religion is not mythical but rooted in history and embodied in doctrines which cannot be varied at will. To this it must be added that the Christian religion is a religion of redemption by the historic act of God in Christ, and therefore it is doubtful whether there can be a Christian tragedy. The great Hebrew poet who wrote the *Book of Job* had to ignore the explanatory prologue when he told of the spiritual agonies of that tragic figure. Job had to remain in ignorance. And the Elizabethan tragedians, for the same reason, were compelled to ignore the Christian revelation. Santayana has a long passage on what he calls the absence of religion, that is a religious interpretation of the universe, in Shakespeare, and concludes that he was indifferent to it.[24] As the same thing applies to the other dramatists, the conclusion seems hasty. Like them, Shakespeare had to isolate his tragic characters and set them moving in a universe from which, of necessity, the illumination of faith was excluded. But this no more implies that he was not a Christian than it implies that his audiences, or for that matter his present-day readers, who were awed and subdued by his tragic genius, were not Christian. It only implies, to quote Bradley again, that "If, as a private person, he had a religious faith, his tragic view can hardly have been in contradiction with this faith, but must have been included in it, and supplemented, not abolished, by additional ideas."[25] And indeed, it was the background of the Christian faith that made the *tremendum* of his tragedies so overwhelming. As Dr. Tillyard says: "Othello's 'chaos is come again,' or Ulysses's 'this chaos, when degree is suffocate' cannot be fully felt apart from orthodox theology." It is because within the bounds of his tragedy Shakespeare presents the grandeur and the flaw of the human soul and the mysteries through which it moves with such preternaural and awful power

[23] *op. cit.*, 95.
[24] *Little Essays*, 168.
[25] *Shakespearean Tragedy*, 22.

that, beyond all other, it exalts and purifies the spirit. Newman called Shakespeare "a great religious poet," and it is chiefly his tragedies that justify the description. Only the divine tragedy of the Cross is adequate to his tragic universe—God in Christ *crucified*. And it is to be noted also that, as Professor Stoll says: "The moral values and even the social sanctions are unbroken."[26] In them Evil is always self-destroyed, while Good, even in outward defeat, shines with unearthly splendour.

There are many who are in no way inclined to the sceptic's account of Shakespeare who are perplexed by his real or apparent silence about immortality. The difficulty is felt most in connection with the great speech in *Measure for Measure*, in which the Duke, disguised as a friar, prepares Claudio, who is under sentence of death, for his execution. There is not a word about the Christian hope. There is much about the vanity of life.

> All thy blessed youth
> Becomes as aged, and doth beg the alms
> Of palsied eld; and when thou art old and rich,
> Thou hast neither heat, affection, limb nor beauty,
> To make thy riches pleasant. What's yet in this
> That bears the name of life? Yet in this life
> Lie hid moe thousand deaths: yet death we fear,
> That makes these odds all even. (III., i.)

And yet *Measure for Measure*, one of the most splendid of the plays, contains the most eloquent expressions of the Christian faith Shakespeare ever wrote, speeches that are not only "in character," but belong to the very soul and significance of the play.

> Why, all the souls that were were forfeit once;
> And He that might the vantage best have took,
> Found out the remedy. (II., iii.)

Well might R. W. Chambers say: "Never does Shakespeare seem more passionately to identify himself with any of his characters than he does with Isabel as she pleads for mercy against strict justice."[27] It is certain that in a play that makes such direct appeal to the Christian faith no Elizabethan would dream that Shakespeare questioned immortality. It is only by ignoring the "basic assumptions" Shakespeare shared with his contemporaries that we can think it. The Duke's speech is not only Elizabethan, it is medieval. "'Be absolute for death,' is an epitome of medieval homilies on the contempt of the world," says Dr. Tillyard.[28] And as for the Duke's method of consolation, it is enough to remember that one of the most cherished of

[28] *op. cit.*, 3.

[26] *Art and Artifice in Shakespeare* (Shakespearean Criticism 1919-35, World's Classics, 76).

[27] *Man's Unconquerable Mind*, 286.

books, the one to which Dante turned for comfort when Beatrice died, was the *Consolation of Philosophy* of Boethius, canonised as St. Severinus. It was translated by King Alfred, by Chaucer, and now by Queen Elizabeth herself. In this beautiful centuries-old book, written by a Christian facing death, there is only a sentence or two about immortality, and the relevant section stresses the transiency and imperfections of all life's gains: "For this is sure, and this is fixed by everlasting law, that naught which is brought to birth shall constant here abide."[29] And Bacon could end his essay *Of Death* in the very spirit of the Duke's speech: "But above all, beleeve it, the sweetest Canticle is *Nunc Dimittis*." Again and again the same note is struck by contemporary writers as consolation in the face of death, and their faith is not to be doubted. The age was, in fact, "studied in death" (*Macbeth* I. iii.). Perhaps, apart from the medieval heritage, this is not to be wondered at in a time when the Plague was a returning visitor, when sudden turns of fortune were of daily experience, and when the scaffold was always a possibility for the highest in the land. But, most of all, it was due to the intensity of life itself as it coursed through men's hearts. They were alive in every fibre of their beings, and for this reason death was great. And it is possible that our modern indifference to death is a sign not of increased but of decreased vitality. Death dwindles as the individual lessens.

It should be observed, too, that Shakespeare's greatest figures, in whom life is most abundant, are at their greatest in death. Even Lear, redeemed at last by love, dies in an ecstasy, believing that Cordelia is living. Hamlet asks his friend to live to tell his story: "Absent thee from felicity awhile," as though, says Wilson Knight, "it is death, not life, holds the deeper assurance for humanity."[30] And Cleopatra, as she approaches death, lifts up her arms: "I have immortal longings in me," and fears lest Iras, who is already dead, will meet Antony first and gain the kiss it is her heaven to have. The last words are "in character," but that death is not the destruction, but in some way the liberation and expansion of the spirit, is clearly implied in the end of all Shakespeare's greatest creations. The timelessness of death is freedom for the spirit, and it is love's own home.

And if we seek for Shakespeare's avowed faith, we have it in the great 146th Sonnet, "Poor soul, the centre of my sinful earth," in which he speaks of the "fading mansion" of the body on which he spends "so large cost." He is Platonic like Spenser, Sir John Davies, and most poets.

[29] *Book II., Met. iii.*
[30] *Wheel of Fire*, 50.

Then, soul, live thou upon thy servant's loss,
And let that pine to aggravate thy store;
Buy terms divine in selling hours of dross;
Within be fed, without be rich no more:
So shalt thou feed on Death, that feeds on men,
And Death once dead, there's no more dying then.

It is as supreme poet and, as his Hamlet would say, "with thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls" (I. i.) that Shakespeare thought of life and death. He knew that he was far more than "the quintessence of dust."

Such harmony is in immortal souls;
But, whilst this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it.
(*Merchant of Venice*, V., i.)

Quiller-Couch once said that if a greater than Ariel were to wing down from heaven and offer him his choice of all the books in the world he would choose *The Tempest*.[31] Love has its little language and it has its great, and all lovers of *The Tempest* will understand. They will feel, too, with him that it is almost a desecration to lay anatomising hands upon it. It is the last of Shakespeare's plays of which he was the sole author. In it he quite plainly bids farewell to the audience which had waited upon his art for so many years. It is his loveliest and most magical bequest to the world. In its unutterable beauty it is unlike anything else he ever wrote, even the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, to which it has a superficial likeness. It has been variously described as a "Dream," a "work of mystic insight," an "irridescent bubble shot across by divers threads of symbolism and suggestion." It possesses, says Dowden, the "quality of soliciting men to attempt an explanation of it, as of an enigma, and at the same time of baffling their enquiry."[32] It is not an allegory, though many have tried to interpret it as one. Lowell, Renan, even in part Dowden himself, and Dover Wilson, have given their own reading of it in this sense. It is a Vision, the crowning work of the greatest of poets with whom thought and imagery were one. As we read it again and again it becomes incandescent with meaning, and meanings below meanings, which cannot be translated into common speech. Its great meaning is in the whole, and not in its parts, as is the "meaning" of a masterpiece of music. We find ourselves held by the suggestiveness of a shipwreck which is yet no wreck; of a sea from whose engulfing waves men emerge with garments unstained but even fresher than before; of an island "full of noises, sounds, and sweet airs," which to one man seems a "desert, uninhabitable, and almost inaccessible," and to another

[31] *Shakespearean Workmanship*, 299.
[32] *Shakespeare: His Mind and Art*, 425.

so rich that it sets him dreaming of ideal commonwealths; of a monster whose lips can be touched with poetry; of an Ariel who is now a sprite of wandering music and now a harpy tearing at the breasts of "three men of sin." We dream significant dreams, from which we are awakened by the voice of Prospero speaking the most famous and beautiful words in the language:

> Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
> As I foretold you, were all spirits and
> Are melted into air, into thin air:
> And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
> The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
> The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
> Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve
> And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
> Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
> As dreams are made on, and our little life
> Is rounded with a sleep.

What does it mean? Is Shakespeare telling us that our life is as insubstantial and unmeaning as an idle dream, that after all it is "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing" (*Macbeth* V. v.)? The play itself contradicts this, for it is full of meaning, and we recall the pregnant words that flash out suddenly from the tempests of *Lear*:

> Men must endure
> Their going hence, even as their coming hither:
> Ripeness is all. (V., ii.)

We observe then, closely attentive to the last words, that, with two exceptions where it has a different meaning altogether, the verb *rounded* in the plays always means encircled or surrounded, as the crown rounds the head of a king or as a soldier is hemmed in by danger. Our little life is enclosed with a sleep, not the end only, but the beginning. It was a commonplace of contemporary belief that the soul *comes* into the body at birth. And we remember Wordsworth's familiar lines:

> Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting:
> The Soul that rises with us, our life's star,
> Hath had elsewhere its setting,
> And cometh from afar.

So Shakespeare and Spenser and others thought. We come from "elsewhere" through the sleep of birth, and we pass elsewhere through the sleep of death. And it is here that we are caught in dreams, dreams of ambition, of desire, of lusts, of banquets of the senses that vanish at a touch, of joys that melt away like mist. "We sleep all the way," said John Donne, "from the womb to the grave we are never thoroughly awake; but pass on with such dreams and imaginations as these." And yet it is not without purpose we are here. The deepest thing in us, deeper than our dreams, is Conscience, which Shakespeare always

reverenced; and if some harpy Ariel rouses Conscience, the dreams are seen to be the unrealities they are, and the universe becomes the sounding-board of truth.

> O, it is monstrous! monstrous!
> Methought the billows spoke and told me of it;
> The winds did sing it to me; and the thunder,
> That deep and dreadful organ-pipe, pronounc'd
> The name of Prosper: it did bass my trespass. (III., iii.)

Keats, who was more like the young Shakespeare than all our poets, thought that the world is "the Vale of Soul-making." It is what *The Tempest* says, with much more. Shakespeare knew what the young Keats had not time to learn, that there is need of repentance and of a divine forgiveness before the "making" can be accomplished, but the meaning of life is nevertheless the discovery and saving of the soul. And the issue of the play is, as Gonzalo says:

> All of us (found) ourselves
> When no man was his own. (V., i.)

But nothing is determined. Man's will is free. If men refuse to hear and persist in pursuing dreams then, like the sensual party in the play, they are hunted away by "hounds." This is Shakespeare's last testament, bequeathed not in stiff allegory but in a vision of consummate beauty.

There is one figure which not even in symbol could be represented in Shakespearean drama. It is the figure of Him whose

> blessed feet
> . . . fourteen hundred years ago were nail'd
> For our advantage on the bitter cross. (1 Henry IV., I., i.)

Of Him, Dr. Forsyth has said, and the words are appropriate to the imagery of *The Tempest*: "They were as men that dreamed; He was as the one wakeful being in a world of dreamful sleepers, and His wakefulness was more than the world's sleep." At His feet, Shakespeare laid his crown.

An unbiassed study of Shakespeare, while it reveals the abiding influence of his Catholic origins, does not confirm the Davies tradition. It is not impossible, but it is very improbable. Apart from other evidence, his very centrality, his reverence for order as he expressed it in the great speech of Ulysses on Degree in *Troilus and Cressida*, and his deeply felt patriotism, make it almost unthinkable that he maintained connection with the Roman Church when it was reduced to a small minority and associated with conspiracies against the State. On the other hand, there is not the slightest ground for believing that he ever questioned the "basic assumptions" of his time, which included the tenets of the Christian faith. There is nothing in his plays to suggest this, and much to contradict it, and some of them no one but a

believing Christian could have written. But it is clear that religious controversy was repugnant to him, especially the intolerant controversy that raged around him. It was not from indifference to religion that he shunned any reference to it, but from a sense of the many-sidedness of life and truth, and the large charity of his mind. No words in Hooker would appeal to him more than these: "There will come a time when three words, uttered with charity and meekness, shall receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit."[33] To all who quarrelled in the name of Christ his word would be:

> Who should be pitiful if you be not?
> Or who should study to prefer a peace
> If holy churchmen take delight in broils?
> (1 Hen. VI., III., i.)

He was an Elizabethan Christian, or if we prefer the words of Professor Stoll, the enemy of all romantic commentators, "a Christian and a Protestant."[34] He was the more a Protestant because of his profound realisation of "the mystery of things" (*Lear* V. ii.), and with all the Christian Humanists of his age rejected the exclusive claim of any Church to possess all the truth of God. To the Church Universal, Shakespeare belonged in mind and soul; and, as Christian, in his broad humanity, his humility, his charity and stress on forgiveness, he was more Christian than Milton or Wordsworth, whose glory mingles with his. To which we may add, with Mark Rutherford: "We need Shakespeare as well as Bunyan."[35]

We can think of him, therefore, in his closing days in Stratford, as breaking the wand of Prospero with a smile, pruning his roses, gossiping with his neighbours, reading his books and his Genevan Bible, and, on Sundays, attending the church which now enshrines his dust. The polemics of the pulpit stormed unheeded over his head. But he joined in the Confession of the common Faith, bowed in adoration and prayer, and worshipped with the humble, the humblest there. And we hear his own voice in the unexpected appeal of his last *Epilogue* (*The Tempest*):

> Now I want
> Spirit to enforce, art to enchant;
> And my ending is despair,
> Unless I be reliev'd by prayer,
> Which pierces so that it assaults
> Mercy itself and frees all faults.
> As you from crimes would pardon'd be,
> Let your indulgence set me free.

B. G. COLLINS.

[33] *Eccles. Pol. Pref.*
[34] *op. cit.*, 74.
[35] *John Bunyan*, 249.

Aristotelian Terms in the New Testament.

THE purpose of the present article is to begin an examination of the Aristotelian terms used in the New Testament, of which there are a considerable number, logical, psychological, ethical and metaphysical; to try to find out how far their Aristotelian meaning is maintained; and to suggest a theory.

Students of the papyri, or of Moulton & Milligan's Vocabulary, which is based on the papyri, may feel that the question is already answered, and that the investigation is therefore unnecessary. But it is none the less valuable to approach the subject from Aristotle's end; to discover and to "freeze" the meanings of the terms he used; and then to apply the results so obtained to the New Testament. The extent to which the old meaning in each case suits its New Testament context will suggest an answer to the problem.

It is much too large a subject to be fully discussed within the limits of one article, as it would run into many thousands of words. It seems best, therefore, to examine a typical instance and to place on record the theory which it seems to imply, though it should be remembered that the investigation of many other words may lead to a modification of the theory. We proceed, then, to a study of the world συνίστημι (or in English *sunistemi*) in the writings of Aristotle.

In speaking of the respective parts played by the male and the female in the procreation of offspring, Aristotle asserts in the Generation of Animals 729a 10- that the male provides the form, and the principle of the movement, i.e. the Formal Cause, and the Efficient Cause, which is sentient Soul, and the female supplies the body, the *hule* : the *sperma* of the male gives *eidos* and *kinesis* to the matter supplied by the female. To illustrate the point he refers to the coagulation (*pexis*) of milk. The milk is the matter and the fig-juice or rennet is *to ten archen echon ten sunistasan.* The rennet gives to the milk, which is just a liquid, a firmness, a consistency, which it had not before. The junket, as we term it, may compare unfavourably with, say, a blancmange or a custard, in consistency; but from the same standpoint it is superior to milk or any other liguid as such. It has a consistency and that is the significant fact. A liquid has no form of its own and accepts that of the container; in the absence of a container it takes the path of least resistance and spreads anywhere and everywhere. It is significant that *pexis* means a "freezing", (compare 743a 5- *sunistatai gar kai pegnutai ta men psuchroi, ta*

de thermoi.) and formless water if frozen can be picked up by the hand in lumps. It is a solid now, and needs no container as it is no longer formless. It is not argued that the coagulated milk can be so picked up in solid lumps; all the same it is no longer a liquid, but a solid. The rennet has imposed a form on it and *has given it a unity* which it did not possess as a liquid, and which it retains. It may be a poor sort of unity, but it is a real unity, especially when compared with the original liquid. *Sunistemi* thus means "to give a unity to", or "establish as a unity".

A passage in the Generation of Animals supporting this is 739b 21-: "When the secretion in the *hustera* of the female *sustei* (is established as a unity—the Greek verb is intransitive) under the influence of the *sperma* of the male, the *sperma* acting very much as the rennet does on milk—for the rennet is milk containing vital heat, *he to homoion eis hen agei kai sunistesi....*" Literally this is, "which brings the homogeneous matter into one and makes it to stand together." The present contention is that *eis hen agei* and *sunistesi* are synonymous, or at the least that the latter is impossible without the former and includes it. Aristotle says that *ta zoia sunistatai kai lambanei ten oikeian morphen* (733b 21-2). If the animals acquire their own *morphe*, that *morphe* is surely one, a unity. If it is theirs, there must be something which is theirs. If their *morphe* is a number of things, either it is not a *morphe* at all, or else it is a complex unity; complex, but still a unity. A *morphe* cannot be other than a unity. And as *morphe* cannot be separated from its subject or *hupokeimenon*, and in any case is not mere appearance but is conditioned by its subject, the latter must share its unity—here *ta zoia ha sunistatai*. It should further be noticed that Aristotle speaks of a *morion tes sustases morphes* (737a 14), thus showing that *morphe*—a unity—is the object of the action indicated by the verb *sunistemi*. It may indeed be objected that *sunistatai* (pass.) is one thing and *sustases* (act. intrans.) another, and that the point is not proved. But Aristotle used both voices of the same subject: 731a 16 *heos an sustesei* (1st aor. subj. act. - trans.) *to kuema* "until (the male) has 'set' the fetation." (Peck); 776a 12 *hotan sustei* (2nd. aor. subj. act. - intrans.) *to kuema* "when the fetation has been set." (Peck); 749a 35 *sunistatai* (pres. indic. pass.) *men oun kuemata*. Thus the objection is overruled.

If, to revert to the illustration of the rennet, it is objected that the original milk must have its *morphe*, the answer is either that qua liquid its *morphe* consists in its being amorphous; or if its colour, weight, etc., are considered part of its *morphe*, it may be countered by saying that its *morphe* lacks what the junket has (i.e. consistency), and that therefore the junket has a superior *morphe* and a greater unity.

It should be observed that in the above three examples *kuema* is the object of the action in question, which Aristotle defines as *to proton migma theleos kai arrenos,* (728b 34) though he uses it to cover "all stages of the living creature's development from the time when the matter is first informed to the time when the creature is born or hatched. Hence we find *kuema* applied to the embryo or fetus of Vivipara; to the 'perfect' eggs of birds. . . ." Now the *kuema* is an organism. In the embryonic stage, it is true, it is part of a larger organism, the mother; but in so far as it can mean a bird's egg it implies an organism with a relatively independent existence. An organism, then, is given its unity (*sunistemi*) and indeed an organism is the highest type of unity, involving as it does a subject in which every part is related to every other part, and to the whole of which it is a part; and related vitally, not mechanically. Thus *sunistemi* can imply the imposing of an *organic* unity; but it does not necessarily imply this. For, 772b 19- in assigning the reason for the redundance of parts and the production of twins, Aristotle states that if the fetation has been split, several parts come to be formed, *kathaper en tois potamois hai dinia; kai gar en toutois to pheromenon hugron kai kinesin echon an (tini) antikrousei, duo ex henos ginontai sustaseis, echousai ten auten kinesin; ton auton de tropon kai epi ton kuematon sumbainei.* The picture is a little obscure because *dine* normally suggests a rotatory motion, but it need not be pressed here to mean more than rapid motion, because it is the water in the river that is rushing along (*pheromenon*) and Aristotle has just spoken of the fetation's being split (*schisthentos*), which he is now illustrating. The water, then, strikes a rock or some such obstacle at speed (speed must be implied by *-krouo,* or the action becomes a mere slow pushing movement) and is divided into two rushing streams. which Aristotle calls *sustaseis.* They each have their unity *while in motion.* If the water were stagnant it would be level both sides of the obstacle and one quiescent mass; as it is, there are two separate streams, which Peck calls "self-contained eddies." Each moving stream, qua moving, is a unity, though not an organic one.

It is legitimate to argue from the noun *sustasis,* because Aristotle uses it quite clearly as a noun corresponding to *sunistemi*: e.g. 776b 5 *eis de ton ano topon kai tous mastous sullegetai dia ten ex arches taxin tes sustaseos*; and 731b 13 (*ta ostrakoderma*) *sunistatai kai gennatai ek tinos sustaseos geoeidous kai hugras.*

Peck makes the interesting suggestion that *sunistemi* might almost be regarded as the active voice of *gignomai,* though it tends rather to refer to the beginning of the process, the first impact of Form upon Matter. "Give a unity to" covers both require-

ments. An active of *gignomai* would mean "make (a thing) become (something)"—according to the present submission, a unity; and any emphasis on the beginning of the process is safeguarded by saying "*give* a unity to."

A further point, for what it is worth, is the fact that the present writer had gained the distinct impression that *sunistemi* meant "give a unity to" before reading the passage already quoted 739b 24.

Further strong confirmation is found in the Poetics, a treatise on aesthetic philosophy. In discussing unity of plot (*muthos d'estin heis*.....145la 15-) Aristotle asserts that Homer did not include all the adventures of Odysseus in the Odyssey, incidents between which there was no necessary or probable connexion, but *peri mian praxin hoian legomen ten Odusseian sunestesen* which Butcher renders, "he made the Odyssey . . . to centre round an action that in our sense of the word is one." Aristotle continues: "as therefore in the other imitative arts, *he mia mimesis henos estin houto (chre) kai ton muthon, epei praxeos mimesis esti, mias te einai kai tautes holes kai ta mere sunestanai ton pragmaton houtos hoste metatithemenou TINOS MEROUS E APHAIROUMENOU DIAPHERESTHAI KAI KINEISTHAI TO HOLON.*" The plot, then, must be the imitation of one action, and that a whole; and, in addition, the parts must be a unity: for where the alteration of position, or the removal, of a part, disjoints and disturbs the whole, the whole must be a unity. It should be clearly observed that whereas Aristotle actually used the word for "one" in the former requirement (*mias te einai*), in the latter he relies on the word *sunestanai* to express his thought. Literary elegance might suggest that it be translated "cohere", but the above considerations, together with the fact that the verb is in the perfect tense, imply "the parts should be in a state of having been given a unity."

A striking commentary on this is the later statement (1453a 12-) *anagke ara ton kalos echonta muthon HAPLOUN einai . . . he men oun kata ten technen kalliste tragoidia ek tautes tes sustaseos esti.*

The idea of unity is also associated with *sunistemi* in Met. 990a 22 *para ton arithmon touton ex hou sunesteken ho kosmos. kosmos* in itself suggests unity; and if we translate, with Tredennick, "of which the universe is composed", we really imply the same idea. Whatever is "composed" of X is one thing which has X as it constituents.

The Aristotelian meaning of *sunistemi* then is "give a unity to." Is this its New Testament meaning?

An interesting use is found in Romans v. 8 *sunistesin de ten*

heautou agapen eis hemas ho Theos. . . . Following Aristotle we may translate " God gives a unity to His love toward us . . . ", and draw out the implications. In the Cross we see God's love shaped and formed, as it were; it is not vague but has a definite form, because anything which is a unity has a form. It is initiating love (" while we were yet sinners ") and sacrificing love (" Christ died for us "). We see God's love unified in the sense that there are not several different " loves of God." He does indeed reveal that aspect of His love to His people that is appropriate to their condition, stern, sympathetic, encouraging, as the case may be. But it is one love. An analogy may be drawn here between the conception of character and that of love. People with no character at all (not people of bad character, but people without a character) show themselves in a different light in different circumstances; their moral life has no pattern, no unity, and it is impossible to predict how they will act. The truly formed character is a unity; the subject indeed will show an aspect of himself when playing cricket which is different from that shown when he is, say, pleading a case in the High Court; but it is one character. Similarly the love of God, seen in the Cross, is one. The separate, broken messages about it, the different aspects of it, are all in the Cross framed together into one whole message. God has " set " His love in the Cross, much in the way in which we say that cement has " set ", or an amateur photographer speaks of " fixing " his prints. The love of God, seen in the Cross, does not change with every change of our spiritual temperature. The Cross is God's final word about His love to us.

On some such lines as these we can also interpret the passage in Romans iii. 5.

But it may well be argued that the above, though no doubt edifying, is forced and artificial. And we might confidently affirm that the Aristotelian meaning has entirely disappeared, if it were not for two other passages in the New Testament.

2 Peter iii. 5. *lanthanei gar autous touto thelontas hoti ouranoi esan ekpalai kai ge ex hudatos kai di' hudatos sunestosa . . .* has an Aristotelian ring. Bigg (I.C.C.) renders " that from of old was heaven, and an earth subsisting out of water and by means of water." " . . . combined as it is here with *sunestosa*, the preposition (ex) seems rather to express the material out of which the earth was made." This is in line with the quotation already made from the Metaphysics, *ex hou sunesteken ho kosmos.*

In Col. i. 17 we read . . . *kai ta panta en autoi sunesteken,* which is literally " And all things are-in-a-state-of-having-been-given-a-unity in Him." The rendering is pedestrian and dull, but it serves to show how perfectly Aristotle's meaning is maintained, and forms the starting point for a new exegesis. Reference

has already been made to Aristotle's words in the Poetics, *ta mere (chre) sunestanai,* and the use of the same word by St. Paul suggests that Col. i. 17 may be interpreted in the light of Greek drama. If the scientists assert that the world is God's great thought, why should it not be God's great plot (muthos) or drama?

> All the world's a stage,
> And all the men and women merely players:
> They have their exits and their entrances,
> And one man in his time plays many parts,
> His acts being seven ages. . . .

We can then draw from the world drama (this does not mean the Great War, I or II, but the whole universe in time and space) some inspiring inferences. 1. The world is not the chaos and confusion it appears to be. The scuffle on the stage in any given scene is of small moment compared with the stately progress of the plot to its climax. 2. The world is not a tragedy, as Christ is its Author. It looks it indeed; even if it is, the actors seem out of control and the play ruined—a double tragedy, a sordid murderous realism superimposed on a noble tale. But the Author can send new actors on to the stage to do His will and pick up the threads of the original plot, and weave into them the sorry tale of the rebellious actors as a new expression of the plot. In one significant part of the play the Author Himself appeared upon the stage. . . . 3. Each individual life can be a "part" of the whole cosmic drama. Each Christian can say, "I have a place in God's drama." (There is room for a new exposition of the doctrine of election on these lines.)

There are a few other instances of *sunistemi* in the New Testament (Luke ix. 32, Romans xvi. 1, 2 Corinthians vii. 11, x. 18; and xii. 11), but it is hard to interpret them in the Aristotelian spirit. It is obvious, therefore, that the meaning of the word has been modified. On the other hand, enough has been said to show that the original meaning has not entirely been lost. If *sunistemi* is really typical of all the Aristotelian words in the New Testament, the theory suggested is that they partly retain their former meaning, but only partly. They would be like some pieces of an old jig-saw puzzle, which can still be used in the older game but have been chipped and cut and worn and erased, so that they fit another and newer puzzle. But is is only a theory, and it demands considerable research and detailed proof.

RONALD A. WARD.

The Family Business at Nazareth.

WE owe much to the microscopic study of words in the Gospels, and the patient labour of those who, like T. R. Glover and L. H. Jenkins, reconstruct from them a tesselated pavement depicting a mode of life shattered in the days of Josephus, yet revived in a generation, and still to be seen in its broad outline. A further contribution is here offered, as to the industries of Joseph.

When Jesus was about thirty years old, His neighbours at Nazareth were astonished at "the carpenter's son" breaking out in a new line (Matt. xiii. 55). Joseph was not a mere village craftsman, for down at Capernaum others said: "We know his father and mother" (John vi. 42). It would seem that Joseph's reputation was more than local, and that he was living recently. The latter point has not been generally recognised, and has been blunted by the supposition that he was old when he married; a mere guess to support a movement to exalt virginity.

Joseph and Mary went to Jerusalem every Passover (Luke ii. 41). It is highly probable that Jesus did the same after He was twelve. In eighteen years He must have gained a fair acquaintance with lodging-house keepers, and made friends near, as at Bethany and Bethphage. It seems needless to suppose He ever resided in Judæa; Zachariah and Elizabeth were old before He was born, and their son lived in the deserts (Luke i. 80).

Joseph was a carpenter. To that craft Jesus made two allusions; that His yoke was easy (Matt. xi. 30) and that a speck of sawdust in the eye could impair vision (Matt. vii. 3-5). Before Jesus was thirty years old, Joseph was *the* carpenter (Matt. xiii. 55), the leading craftsman in the town. Now, is it not likely that an eldest son would more naturally follow the same craft than devote himself to a side-line?

Jesus was certainly a good observer. His stories and illustrations reveal much acquaintance with small farming, as has been admirably shown. Yet there are two puzzles, an illustration and an incident. Is a mustard-seed the smallest of seeds? Does it grow into a tree on whose branches the birds perch? (Matt. xiii. 32). Doubtless Jesus did not mind humorous exaggerations, as to a wooden beam in the eye, a camel passing through the eye of a needle; but this seems not of their class. Again, on a morning walk, Jesus was hungry, and when He saw a fig tree in leaf, He turned aside to see if it had any fruit; Mark, another

townsman, knew that the time of figs had not come (xi. 13). If Jesus had been a small farmer, would He have had such an unreasonable expectation?

Examine the epithet Carpenter, first to see if it is an adequate translation. With us it is clearly limited to a worker in wood, and others have pointed out that the Greek word has no such limitation. Consider architecture in Palestine, and we find that wood is a rare material. When Solomon needed cedars, he had to import them from Lebanon. At the other end of the scale, it was used for boats on the lake of Galilee, and for rafters on a fisherman's hut (Mark ii. 4). But the standard material has always been stone, which is abundant. Not only walls, but roofs and doors are of stone. The suggestion is therefore made that Joseph worked in this also, as a mason; that if he had put up a sign or presented a bill, it might have read Carpenter and Builder. Test this by the vocabulary of Jesus.

Foundations were much in His thought. The climax of the sermon on the mount was a contrast between rock and sand whereon to build (Matt. vii. 25). When Simon was brought to Jesus by his brother, he was hailed by a new name, Cephas, Rock (John i. 42). That idea is connected with the later leap of faith when Cephas recognised Jesus as the Messiah, Son of the living God. Jesus declared that on that rock He would build His Church (Matt. xvi. 16-18). A story about laying out a vineyard includes the irrelevant detail that a tower was built (Matt. xxi. 33). Another story is of barns to be pulled down and replaced by larger (Luke xii. 18). A third is of a tower whose expense outran the means of the man who commissioned it (Luke xiv. 28); had Joseph lost over such a contract? Jesus spoke also of building tombs (Matt. xxiii. 29), and quoted about the topmost stone being laid (Matt. xxi. 42). A garbled utterance as to a temple being rebuilt in three days (Matt. xxvi. 61) may reflect some hasty employer trying to hustle Joseph. Bad workmanship was noted, as of the tower of Siloam which fell and caused many deaths (Luke xiii. 4); magnificent buildings to which His attention was called elicited a dirge over their total destruction, which He foresaw (Mark xiii.). He thought not only of one-room huts, but of a mansion with many rooms which He would finish to suit every occupant (John xiv. 2). While such allusions point to familiarity with work on a large scale, we find also that once with some friends He was a guest at a home in Cana where were six waterpots of stone (John ii. 6); had they come from the family workshop? First Jesus, then Mary, gave orders to the servants without reference to the bridegroom or the steward: their reputation must have stood high. When we look down to the lake, we find Mary's sister (John xix. 25 and Matt. xxvii. 56),

the mother of the sons of Zebedee. Her residence there may have attracted Jesus to the fishing centre rather than the capital; indeed, there may have been some idea of a branch establishment to specialise in boat-building. In any case, we get a picture of a business known far beyond the inland town of Nazareth, able to engross the attention of Mary's five sons.

Two of these brothers afterwards left short writings, James a formal pastoral and an official decision on a crucial question; Jude a hasty tract. Their writings throw no further light on the business at Nazareth.

Since Jesus committed Mary to the care of her nephew John (xix. 26, 27), He probably foresaw the collapse of the business. Priests who were vindictive and clever enough to ruin the Nazarene lodging-house keepers at Jerusalem (Acts iv. 34-37, vi. 1), would not lose sight of the valuable asset in Galilee. When the storm of rebellion subsided, leaving priests with no temple and no revenue, the Pharisees became the leaders; they chose Tiberias as a headquarters to protect from the Nazarene heresy, It is not surprising that the family business simply vanished, and that the heads relapsed into becoming small farmers like Amos.

But the eldest of the five brothers had prepared them for a new valuation, to lay up their treasure not on earth but in heaven, where their hearts would be also. When He gave Himself in Jordan to a new life, He went wholly about His true Father's business. He chose and trained helpers, first members of a select body, the Church, His partner, to gather material of all kinds, tractable as wood, durable as stone, for building into a palace where He would prepare a home for each who continued His work here. Nearly the last whom He thus converted to the noblest of purposes was His own brother (I. Cor. xv. 7). James rose above Nazareth and its workshop when he wrote at large as bondservant of Jesus as Lord, and owned that His brother had saved his life (i. 1; v. 20).

Such is the true business of every member of the great family of our Father.

W. T. WHITLEY.

From Man to God.

KARL BARTH once said that one cannot get to God by shouting man in a loud voice. This sounds impressive and very Christian until it is analysed. Then it reveals itself as too vague to be of any value. If it means that man is not God and is in a relation of creaturely dependence to Him, then that is a commonplace of Christian theology in every age. If it means that there is nothing in man which can give us any clue to God, His nature and purpose, then it is a statement of extremely doubtful truth. As Canon Quick observed, "there is something in man which gives us a true indication of what God is." (Cf. *Doctrines of the Creed,* p. 30). Let us try and see what this "something" is. We may state the issue first in a question:

Does man's intellectual, moral and spiritual life afford any clue as to the nature and purpose of God?

Many Christian theologians to-day are so convinced of the bankruptcy of humanism of whatever brand that they have little patience with any attempt to start with man when God is under discussion. The moral nihilism of a Hitler has made them doubt the validity of any of man's moral intuitions. Yet this is surely a dangerous proceeding. If man apart from Christ must be as blind as Hitler appears to be to moral realities, then we are assenting to Hitler's judgement of human nature as completely stupid and morally irresponsible. If that is true about unredeemed human nature, then to what can the gospel appeal in man, or do we ask men to accept Christ irrespective of what their reason and conscience say? And is not this spiritual Fuehrer worship with a vengeance? Furthermore, does the New Testament suggest that this is the kind of loyalty and devotion Jesus asks of man?

Man, we are told in the Bible, was made in the image of God. The author of Genesis no doubt had a more crudely anthropomorphic idea than is possible for us, but if the phrase still means anything, it surely can only mean that man's moral and spiritual intuitions have a divine origin, and therefore are not without significance as to the nature of that origin. If it is said that man's nature is totally depraved, then all moral and intellectual distinctions are destroyed, and we can no longer speak of truth and goodness in any real sense. Jesus Himself does not seem to have been a Barthian (!), for He frequently appealed to man's moral and spiritual insight. If man is totally incapable of recognising and responding to goodness before he meets Jesus, then it would seem to make completely unintelligible

man's recognition of God in Him. If man cannot see for himself that loyalty, love, honour, truthfulness, purity and unselfishness are "good," then no external revelation can give him an extra guarantee. This does not mean that man, having recognised the good, is able to live it effectively. There is an impotence of the will and a guilty conscience which only the Atonement could overcome. All that is argued here is that "under the long tuition of moral experience, the consciousness of the moral claim comes, by an almost imperceptible transition of thought, to be interpreted as an awareness of the divine reality" (John Baillie, *Interpretation of Religion*, p. 348). In other words, faith cannot prove the validity of moral intuitions which a man has not previously felt to be morally compelling. "If there be no God and no future state," said Robertson of Brighton, "yet even then it is better to be generous than selfish, better to be chaste than licentious, better to be true than false, better to be brave than to be a coward." If the moral realities are not accepted as given, then by no other means can their validity be authenticated. A man either knows them to be morally compelling or he does not. When he says that they are not, one may truly suspect evasion or moral dishonesty.

What, then, are the clues in man's nature which may help us in knowing the nature of God?

(a) The moral realities which man discovers as part of the moral order under which he lives.

(b) From man's experience of fatherhood, power and creatorship, we can gain some indication as to what God is, not by exact analogy, but nevertheless genuinely.

"We insist that human fatherhood, power and creatorship themselves teach us, if we think about them deeply enough, that they are not self-sufficient or self-explanatory, but point beyond themselves to an Author, an Authority, and a Power from whom they come and in whom their true meaning is found" (Quick, *Doctrines of the Creed*, p. 31).

Against this whole line of approach, the following objections are frequently levelled.

1. It is often very glibly asserted, and without any attempt at proof, that the moral intuitions of the human race are so varied as to be without value. Where there is such a great difference of opinion, the evidence it affords is insufficient to prove anything. Yet this divergence is not as great as some suppose. Aldous Huxley, who has no Christian axe to grind, rightly declares: "The Ethical doctrines taught in the Tao Te Ching, by Gautama Buddha and his followers in the Lesser and above all the Greater

Vehicle, in the Sermon on the Mount and by the best of the Christian saints, are not dissimilar. Among human beings who have reached a certain level of civilisation and of personal freedom from passion there exists a real *consensus gentium* in regard to ethical first principles" (*Ends and Means,* p. 382).

2. The second objection runs as follows: How can we be sure that the moral and spiritual experience of the human race is not simply the result of the intense working of the human imagination? Is it true, as Feuerbach declared, that *Die Theologie ist anthropologie*? Obviously, all human thought is and must be anthropomorphic. Whatever we wish to explain or describe demands the use of symbols, images and concepts taken from our own human experience. We must look at everything through our own mental spectacles. The vital question, then, is not whether man's intellectual, moral and spiritual knowledge is anthropomorphic. That it must necessarily be, but is it only that and nothing more? Is it only knowledge of man's mind, or is it a means to the discovery of an environment not of his own making? The short answer to this objection is that if such scepticism is directed against one aspect of our experience, namely the religious, then in strict logic it must be applied to the whole. Science and art go the way of religion as simply the play of human imagination about an unknown somewhat. This may be true, but if so, it empties the word truth of any rational meaning and makes nonsense of our human experience.

Surely sane men will not allow themselves to get to such a philosophical impasse unless the evidence is particularly cogent, and that is by no means the case. Intellectual suicide is not the only way out for thinking men. The Christian need not query the psychological account of the mental mechanism which comes into play in religious as in every other human activity. Man's ability to "project" his mind is only possible because man is first a creature of God's mind and bears the image of His heavenly Father and Creator within himself.

If we can get thus far by appealing only to the general moral and spiritual experience of the race, what need is there of Jesus? If He only exemplified more clearly what men have always known, albeit dimly, is not the Incarnation in fact unnecessary?

This again rests on a misunderstanding of God's purpose in sending Jesus. Christianity never said that Jesus came only to tell men that love is better than hate, unselfishness better than selfishness, etc. Many men have known this even before His coming. The significance of Jesus was not in His ethical teaching, which was new only in part, but in Himself. Jesus alone of the moral and spiritual leaders of the race was free from the

torturing gap between the "is" and the "ought," between the present achievement and the ideal aimed at.

Jesus by His atoning love rescued man from the despair of an enlightened and therefore more acutely accusing conscience, and by His Resurrection gave the assurance that the moral struggle will finally reach a victorious term because the moral realities are the expression in human experience of the divine and eternal purpose. Man's moral experience and ability to know ethical principles are powerless of themselves either to make a man a "new creature" or to remove the sting of death. In this sense, God sent His Son for us men and our salvation to do a work which moral man of himself could never have achieved. From man to God, therefore, finds its necessary compliment in God to man and through man.

R. F. ALDWINCKLE.

A Free Religious Faith: A Report presented to the General Assembly of Unitarian and Free Christian Churches, edited by R. V. Holt. (The Lindsey Press, 5s.)

This closely packed little volume is the work of a Commission set up by the General Assembly of Unitarian and Free Christian Churches. It aims at giving to persons who reject authoritarian forms of religion "an exposition of a religious faith which is free and yet definite in content." Part 1 summarises, in some forty pages, the major conclusions of the group on a number of questions, such as The Decline of Religion and its Causes; The Impact of Scientific Discoveries and their Interpretation; Religion in Human History, etc. The bulk of the book, however, consists in a series of "Papers and Notes" which are dealt with in Part II., while two brief individual contributions appear in Part III.

The book contains—as one would indeed expect from the distinguished names represented on the Commission—not a little that is helpful and thought-provoking. But it must be confessed that the disjointed nature of the contents makes it a difficult book to read. And it is unlikely that the average Christian will take kindly to the general outlook which inspires the papers, since that frankly regards Christianity as a stage towards a "world religion" which has yet to come into being.

R. L. CHILD.

A Baptist Oxford Movement.

"I WOULD say quite deliberately that Baptists need an 'Oxford Movement' of *their own order,* so as to give their truth of an individual relation to God its complementary truth of a social relation to Him."[1] So wrote Dr. Wheeler Robinson when analysing the strength and weakness of the Baptists. To-day, this deliberate judgment is receiving so increasing an endorsement from many Baptists that it merits serious consideration.

The Oxford Movement reached goals far beyond and higher than its original objectives. The Established Church was considered to be in danger. The Roman Catholics had been emancipated by the Act of 1829. Three years later the Reform Bill created a new electorate in which Dissenters were numerous. In the following year ten of the twenty-two sees of the Irish Protestant Church, then considered a constituent of the Church of England, were suppressed. This suppression Keble denounced as a "direct disavowal of the Sovereignty of God." Soon after, he joined with John Henry Newman in the production of the "Tracts for the Times." The immediate intention behind these and other efforts was the defence of the Established Church which was erroneously considered to be imperilled. But the Movement survived this negative purpose and ultimately gave to many Churchmen, especially the clergy, a much greater and higher conception of the Anglican Church. The Church was not a department of the State but a Divine institution—the body of Christ.

This was not the only period creative of great Churchmanship. The first half of the seventeenth century witnessed a galaxy of strong Churchmen such as Richard Hooker, Jeremy Taylor and others who, by their writings, awakened in others a great conception of the Anglican Church and a deep and ardent love for it.

A parallel movement in the Roman Catholic Church is seen to arise in the person of Ignatius Loyola. He won from his followers for the Catholic Church a most rigid discipline and absolute obedience. Much in this is alien to our conception of individual freedom and responsibility. But Loyola and the Jesuits inaugurated a great revival of Churchmanship within the Roman Church.

Are such periods to be for ever alien to Baptist history? Is

[1] *Life and Faith of the Baptists,* page 174.

a Baptist Oxford Movement of our "own order" foreign to our genius and distinctive principle? Certainly Dr. Robinson does not think so. Much could be said for the relevance of such a movement. One of the issues of the great ecumenical conferences held at Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937 was a new and higher conception of the Christian Church. We shared in the deliberations of these Conferences and their agreed findings belong to us as well as to others. Such findings brought to sharp focus and forceful articulation the growing thought and feeling of many Christian souls everywhere. The report of the Oxford Conference as given in *The Churches Survey Their Task,* is indeed a modern Tract for the Times. Its relevance is indisputable.

Here we see the necessary spiritual parallel to the collectivism of our days, and the latter is never adequately conceived if considered only as a convenient tool of the Dictators. In the pre-war world of the continent furious economic blizzards blew and political earthquakes disrupted great communities, and before these the individual was so piteously helpless. He craved for the strength of the whole and sought the means of deep integration in it. Professor Baillie says: "The age of rationalistic individualism is now for the most part behind us, and men are seeking new forms of solidarity in their social life. In one part of the world after another there emerges the spectacle of men yielding up their individual liberty, including their liberty of thought, with apparent relief, gladly sinking their lives in the corporate life of this or that party or totalitarian movement." [2] Whatever error or excess is to be found here, so vast a movement is more than the manoeuvres of one or two dictators; it is obviously the inauguration of a new age.

Are there no parallels to this in the spiritual world to-day? We do not minimise what man can do in religious isolation, "when the door is closed." But that does not prevent us from recognising that there are tasks he can perform and truths he can comprehend "only with all the saints." Spiritual individualism, so necessary and valuable in its proper place and degree, can, if made exclusive and absolute, be impoverishing and even perilous. Thus we must not oppose to totalitarianisms, which have something inevitable and something unnecessarily pagan in them, the individualistic ethics of the Christian faith, for in that faith the individual is never seen *per se* but in a community: and individualistic ethics are only half of the Christian ethics. The Christian ethic, too, was never intended to be "unclothed," but "clothed upon" in an adequate community. Thus Professor Baillie continues: "The only community that is likely to be stronger than totalitarianism is a community which is universal,

[2] *Invitation to Pilgrimage,* page 125.

and there is only one such community—that Body mystical, the Church of Christ." [3] This implies for us as Baptists not that we abandon the polity of our fathers, but that we complete it. The commended Oxford Movement would 'give to their truth of an individual relation to God its complementary truth of a social relation to Him."

But it will be asserted that Baptists get their marching orders, not by keeping their ears on the ground, but by fixing their eyes on the Book. True, and may it ever be so. Yet while it would be erroneous to expect to find in the New Testament any proof-text support or refutation of a particular polity, we are not without guidance, and in the light of that it can safely be said that in so far as we can find justification there for the independence we have, we can certainly find justification for a fellowship we do not yet have. In the New Testament Church, the individuality of the part never weakened the solidarity and interdependence of the whole. Paul insists that the members of the body best serve the whole by keeping their distinctive functions inviolate, the seeing of the eye and the hearing of the ear. But these have no meaning, function or life in isolation from the whole. So is it in the Church. Individuality and interdependence are interwoven and inseparable. A single human soul is certainly of infinite value but that justifies no spiritual atomism. God who made the soul also "maketh the solitary to dwell in families." The more deeply we abide in the Vine, the more vitally integrated are we in the life of the other branches, which also abide in the Vine. Whatever may be the implications of this for the Church Universal, our first duty is to recognise and honour what it involves for our own denomination. Does not this plainly call us to a higher conception of and greater loyalty to the local Church and to *those wider fellowships* of which the local Church forms part? Is there any reason or scripture which compels us to believe that there attaches to a local Church in its isolation a sanctity and spiritual authority that does not belong to a hundred such Churches met in prayerful deliberation and sacred fellowship at a County Association Meeting or to two thousand such Churches so met in an Annual Assembly? We have unintentionally built up an assumption that once a Baptist leaves the four walls of his own Church for a meeting place where many other fellow-believers from other Baptist Churches meet, he has left the Communion of Saints for the mechanism of administration. The cohesion which makes a County Association or a Baptist Union one is supposed to be of a lower order than that which makes one the members of a local Church.

Is not this partly responsible for the loneliness often felt by the Minister and for the feebleness which afflicts the local Church?

[3] Page 128.

The former may carry burdens he should never bear in isolation, and the latter requires insights and powers which can be apprehended only with other Churches. Amid the social and economic changes of recent years, what strength and protection have our Sustentation and Superannuation Funds provided to many a Minister and local Church. But amid the deeper and more pagan changes in the community to-day, we need the strength and protection which a spiritual equivalent to the above funds could give —not a unity in finance but a communion in the Holy Spirit. This would be a real contribution to that Baptist Oxford Movement of which Dr. Robinson speaks.

Some implications and requirements of this are clear. We must stop disparaging existing unities, denominations, in the interest of bigger, non-existing unities. We do not necessarily retard any God-intended deeper spiritual unity by a greater loyalty to our own Church, whether local or national. A denomination is itself a measure of achieved union, and we shall awaken no deeper loyalty to it, especially in the young, if we speak of it only as one of " our wretched divisions."

Baptists must develop a churchmanship " of their own order." Our revolt from a formal and unspiritual Church-manship is only the negative movement which still awaits its positive counterpart. At present we know far better the kind of churchmanship we should repudiate than the kind we should promote. Yet if our conception of a regenerate Church membership has any reality in it, then we should have the highest regard for the Church so constituted.

This conception of the local and the national Church or Union involves that issues may arise which demand that individual freedom should sometimes be subordinated to spiritual solidarity. The momentary advantage of the part may have to be sacrificed to the permanent good of the whole. Reference is sometimes made to the fact that a Baptist minister or church secretary can throw every communication he receives from County or National Headquarters into the waste-paper basket. He can, but what he cannot do is to assert his freedom in that way and at the same time maintain his spiritual solidarity with others which he so badly needs. This freedom, however, is being more and more questioned. Many would say :

As in the social world there is a craving for a deeper solidarity : so in our Churches there is a yearning for a deeper fellowship even at the cost of extreme independence.

The value and the glory of our denomination consist both in what we hold in distinction from others and in what we share with others, and we cannot neglect the one without ultimately

" Me this unfettered freedom tires."

imperilling the other. The Church has come to an age of massive organised paganism which can be effectively attacked only by a united spiritual front. Unfortunately this issue is obscured by questions of organic reunion and new divisions unnecessarily thus arise. One group fears that the maintenance and assertion of our distinctive witness will certainly impair unity of fellowship and action with others. The other fears that increasing collaboration and joint action with others will inevitably weaken and ultimately suppress our distinctive witness. Both assumptions are false. We have to seek that spiritual synthesis which will honour both what we share with others and what we hold in distinction from them, and within the Free Church Federal Council and the British Council of Churches we have enormous opportunity for ever greater united witness and joint action without prejudice to what is distinctively ours.

The Forces to-day offer an excellent parallel. There we see ever increasing differentiation of parts with ever deepening unity. New units with distinctive functions are formed, but never to the detriment of the whole. What pride there is in the different regiments. Tell Jock that his famous "51st" should be merged and lost, what indignation would arise. What a tradition the Navy has built up and what pride the sailor has in it. The Air Force has made for itself a name it shares with no other. Yet with all this pride and sectional loyalty, we have

> One army strong,
> One steadfast, high intent;
> One voice to raise the warrior song.

Why should not such a description be actually true of the "One holy Church," and why should not all local loyalties remain intact and still be subservient to "one King Omnipotent"?

"Baptists need an Oxford Movement." What are the Baptists? What is our denomination? Among the many replies made by others to these questions are the following: "The denomination is a treasury from which contributions for our work can be secured." "It is a body of respected influence whose signature would enhance our policy." "It is a reservoir of potential leadership so badly needed for our cause." "It is an arena which provides excellent scope for our movement." The value and legitimacy of these claims are not in dispute. But what is indicated is that amid the pressure on the Church of so many organised secondary movements, the Church itself needs a well-organised movement that has no interest but the power and glory of the Church itself, both local and national.

Thus the first draft of the Oxford Conference report submitted to Commission 5 on "The Universal Church and the World of Nations," speaks direct to our situation. It says: "Let the

Church be the Church. Let the Church know herself, whose she is and what she is. Discerning clearly her own status as the Community of Grace, the organ for God's redemptive purpose for mankind. She must, by a process of the most merciless self-scrutiny, become what God intended her to be." A movement that has that one great objective is a most urgent requirement for us. So our last word is our first: "I would say quite deliberately that Baptists need an 'Oxford Movement' of their own order, so as to give to their truth of an individual relation to God its complementary truth of a social relation to Him."

T. G. DUNNING.

The Economic Consequences of the Church, by Reginald T. Brooks. (Independent Press, 2s.)

This book bravely comes to grips with the social and industrial questions which the Church must face if she is to command the attention of the working population. As the title suggests, there is an emphasis upon the importance of the Church meeting which ought to be congenial to Baptists. It is to be hoped that Church members will heed the call to missionary work in the industrial sphere and in local government. The writer argues that "the powerful and highly individual corporate life" of the Church must be brought into "ever closer touch with the life of society as a whole, so that the harmonies may be appreciated, and the discords sharply felt." Chief of these discords the author finds to be the demand for personal responsibility within the Christian community, and the shelving of moral responsibility which appears inevitable within a system of capitalism, even capitalism controlled to a greater or lesser degree. A social and economic order must be achieved in which a Christian worker, manager or director finds it possible to exercise moral judgment and share democratically in the planning of production.

One cannot quite see the point of the attack upon those who say "politics but not party politics." The writer does not specify the party which he favours, and surely implies that the Church might give general support to a progressive programme without committing her members to support of one political party. However, he is surely right in foreseeing a situation in which the Church might need to "throw her weight behind some political organisation which is willing to fight for the cause" which has commended itself to the Christian conscience.

CLIFFORD H. CLEAL.

Barton-in-the-Beans.

IN the year 1745 a group of seven people, six men and one woman, formed themselves into a Christian Church in an obscure Leicestershire hamlet. When its centenary was celebrated in 1845 there were more than forty churches in the Midland area which were in its direct descent. What the number has grown to today the present writer has been unable to verify with exactitude, but it is certainly large enough to make the bi-centenary worthy of special notice, even though wartime conditions have made impossible any worthy public commemoration of it. As a "mother" church Barton-in-the-Beans has a record with few equals in Baptist annals.

It was not as a *Baptist* church, however, that the actual beginning was made. Evangelical zeal rather than denominational interest was the impelling motive, and the cause was well established before the pioneers decided on its name. Their first meeting-house, erected and paid for before the end of the first year, expressed ideas that derived from the Moravian Brethren. It had a large rostrum, with room for many preachers or leaders, while the upper story was devised for the living accomodation of the unmarried members of the society. This Moravian Settlement plan, however, did not meet with local approval, and it was never carried out. After lengthy discussion it was decided to adopt the name "Independent". This involved no association, however, with the denomination of that name. It simply expressed the fact that the little community claimed the rights of a self-governing community, free from all outside authority or control.

Ten years passed before the church became definitely Baptist. It was not a sudden decision, but the culmination of a long process of development and gradual emergence into fuller light and knowledge. They began by following without question the almost universal custom of infant sprinkling. When convinced, by their independent study of the New Testament, that its mode was immersion, they adopted that mode, though still only for infants. Further study led them to abandon infant baptism altogether, and to substitute for it a simple ceremony that was the prototype of our modern infant dedication service. The next step was into full recognition of New Testament teaching and practice concerning both subjects and mode of baptism. When that position was reached, entirely through their own independent study of the matter, they showed a like independence in the way that they faced the practical problem that emerged. They sought no outside aid. Two of the leaders among the company of Barton preachers

respectively baptized each other, and then together baptized all the other members of the little community who were prepared to follow their example.

But to go back to the beginning. We have just referred to the "Barton preachers". That is the most significant expression in the early story of this notable piece of Christian enterprise. Many Churches and Christian organisations owe their origin and development to the inspiring leadership of an outstanding personality. Not so at Barton. From the beginning it was there a matter of team work, and so it continued throughout all the earlier period. Of the original seven, two were appointed elders, with full preaching and pastoral responsibilities, while two others were their recognised assistants, and the band of preachers increased in number with the growth of the work.

The Countess of Huntingdon was at that time residing at Donington Park. One of her servants, David Taylor, began evangelistic work in the neighbourhood. In 1741 he visited Glenfield and Ratby, two Leicester villages, where among his converts was Samuel Deacon, father of the Samuel Deacon who was later to become the most famous of the Barton preachers. Taylor was joined by others in the work, which spread to neighbouring villages, including Barton. Here the pioneers met for a time with violent opposition, but they weathered the storm, and the work became firmly established. The first service at Barton was conducted by John Taylor, a schoolmaster, in 1743. He was not related to David, though for some years they laboured together in itinerant evangelism, both in the Midands and in other parts of the country.

The Barton preachers travelled widely. They were all engaged in arduous secular toil during the week, but on Sundays they were to be found preaching the Word over a very wide area. When one remembers the road and travel conditions of the mid-eighteenth century it is difficult to understand how they accomplished so much, but the fact remains that within fifteen years they had established causes not only in their own immediate vicinity, but also in the neighbouring counties of Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, and Warwickshire. Apart from those farthest afield the home circuit had so grown that in 1760 it became advisable to establish five centres for the community instead of the one at Barton. They were at Barton, Melbourne, Kegworth, Loughborough and Kirkby Woodhouse. The Barton group included Hugglescote, Markfield, Stanton, Hinckley and Longford. The Lord's Supper was administered at Barton and Hugglescote alternatively, but even with this limitation of the area there were members who had to travel as much as twenty miles to attend these sacramental services.

Each of the five groups had its own ministers and was a self-governing community. But they did not become independent of one another. Independence was for them a precious principle of church polity, but they did not interpret it in isolationist terms as so many of their successors have done. They were independent, or interdependent, members of a wider fellowship. The preachers of the scattered groups met for monthly conference, generally at the Mother Church, and there were quarterly united gatherings for the members, held in rotation among the groups.

The Barton group had three regular ministers, one of whom was Samuel Deacon, Sen^{r}. Six years later, in 1766, a further sub-division of the area was agreed upon, and Hinckley and Longford became a separate church. Their joint membership numbered fifty, but within seven years it had grown to nearly two hundred, and they were strong enough to become two separate communities. For a short time after 1766 the now more restricted Barton group had a period of decline, or at least of arrested progress. This was chiefly due to ministerial losses, but fortunately it was not long before that particular problem was solved, and renewed prosperity set in, under the remarkable ministry of Samuel Deacon, Jun^{r}. In 1798 the final sub-division of the group took place, and Hugglescote became independent. Meanwhile there had been considerable extension in the immediate Barton area, and causes had been established and chapels erected in a number of the surrounding villages. Today the Barton Church still works as a group, with branches in six villages.

It is impossible here to tell fully the story of the wider extension of the work initiated and long supervised by the Barton preachers. It is summarised, however, in the following list taken from the official association records on the occasion of the Centenary in 1845. It is not a complete record, however, for *inter alia* it does not include the churches at Coalville, Whitwick and Coleorton, which were all founded by workers from Hugglescote before 1845, or that at Shepshed, daughter church of Loughborough.

TABULAR LIST OF CHURCHES.

IN THE MIDLAND DISTRICT OF THE NEW CONNEXION OF GENERAL BAPTISTS,

Showing their relation to the Church at Barton.

CHURCHES.	PARENTAGE.	DATE OF ORIGIN.
BARTON	... ...	1745
MELBOURNE	Barton	1760
Cauldwell	Melbourne	1785
Ashby and Packington ...	Melbourne	1807
Austrey	Ashby and Packington ...	1808
Measham and Netherseal ...	Ashby and Packington ...	1840
LOUGHBOROUGH	Barton	1760
Leake and Wimeswold ...	Loughborough	1782
Broughton and Hose	Leake	1806
Quorndon and Woodhouse ...	Loughborough	1804
Rothley and Sileby	Loughborough	1802
KEGWORTH	Barton	1760
Ilkiston and Smalley	Kegworth	1785
Castle Donnington	Kegworth	1783
Sutton Bonnington	Kegworth	1795
Long Whatton and Belton ...	Kegworth	1798
KIRKBY WOODHOUSE	Barton	1760
HINCKLEY	Barton	1766
Longford	Hinckley	1773
Longford (*Union Place*) ...	Longford	1827
Thurlaston	Hinckley	1814
Wolvey	Hinckley	1815
HUGGLESCOTE	Barton	1798

The above Churches came in a direct line from Barton—the following originated in a union of effort by the Barton preachers and their coadjutors, aided by others.

Sutton Coldfield	... ...	1775
Birmingham	... ...	1786
Nottingham (*Stoney Street*)	... ...	1775
Nottingham (*Broad Street*) ...	Nottingham	1818
Beeston	... ...	1804
Derby	... ...	1791
Derby (*Sacheveral Street*) ...	(Divided in 2 Churches) ...	1831
Duffield	... ...	1810

The Church at Friar Lane, Leicester, existed before the formation of the Barton Church, but had nearly become extinct: its resuscitation and extension may be attributed to the labours of the Barton preachers, their coadjutors and successors.

Leicester (*Friar Lane*) ...	... ...	1660
Leicester (*Archdeacon Lane*)	Friar Lane	1799
Leicester (*Carley Street*) ...	Friar Lane	1823
Leicester (*Dover Street*) ...	Friar Lane	1823
Leicester (*Vine Street*) ...	Archdeacon Lane	1841
Billesden	Friar Lane	1820

Churches also exist at the following places, the origin of some of which is not known to the compiler, but most of them no doubt sprang from the above:—Belper, Burton-on-Trent, Coventry, Cradeley Heath, Fleckney, Smeeton, Hathern, Market Harborough, Northampton.

Apart from being a prolific mother of churches within its own Midland area, Barton has its honourable place in the wider history of the General Baptists. When Dan Taylor determined to revive the General Baptist cause by the formation of a new Connexion, one of his first steps was to make overtures to the five groups of churches into which the original Barton Church had been divided. He met with a cordial response. They sent representatives to the perliminary meeting held at Lincoln in 1769, and at the historic meeting in London in the following year eight of the nineteen ministers who were present were from the Midlands. If the Yorkshireman, Dan Taylor, has the honour of being the builder of the New Connexion of General Baptists, the Barton churches provided him with his chief and most reliable foundation stones.

The Barton preachers included some remarkable personalities. They were men from humble walks of life, but many had outstanding gifts. Joseph Donisthorpe, the blacksmith, Francis Smith, Nathaniel Pickering, John Grimley, Samuel Deacon, Sen^{r}., John Whyatt and William Smith were but a few of those whose record is worthy of remembrance. And in the second generation there were many others who maintained the succession, with Samuel Deacon, Jun^{r} outstanding among them. He was born in 1746, and was baptised in 1766. He had been apprenticed to a clockmaker, and he set up in business for himself in Barton. The business he established was later carried on by his descendants down to quite recent years, and had a wide reputation that endures to this day. He hesitated a long while about taking part in preaching work, but his hesitancies were at last overruled by the strongly expressed judgment of the church on the matter, and in 1779 he was duly appointed to the pastorate, Dan Taylor taking part in his ordination. He filled that office for nearly forty years, and became one of the most widely known and honoured General Baptist ministers of his time. In the denomination his literary output, both in prose and verse, was excelled only by that of Dan Taylor himself. His hymns had a wide popularity, though it has not endured, and only two were included in the *Baptist Hymnal* when that book was issued as the official General Baptist Hymn book in 1879.

Another famous name associated with Barton is that of Goadby. Joseph Goadby was born at Market Bosworth, where his father had a business and also held the office of Parish Clerk, in 1774. In his late teens he began to attend the ministry of Samuel Deacon, and in 1793 was baptized and joined the Church. Soon afterwards he began to preach, and showed such promise that on his Pastor's recommendation he was accepted as a student at Dan Taylor's Academy in the Mile End Road. At

the end of his course he received three calls, but they were all declined, and he returned to his native district, and began his ministerial work in the little village of Packington, near Ashby-de-la-Zouch, which was one of the branches of the Melbourne group, and quite near to Barton itself. A few years later Ashby and Packington ceased to be a branch of the Melbourne Church, and Joseph Goadby became its independent minister, with charge also of a new cause that was established at Measham. He remained in this pastorate until his death in 1841.

The next two generations of this remarkable family figure even more prominently in General Baptist history. The eldest son of the Ashby minister, another Joseph, became minister of Dover Street, Leicester, and later of Woodgate, Loughborough, while the second son, John, went to Orissa as a missionary. Joseph Jun^{r}. had five sons, of whom four entered the ministry. Joseph Jackson, Thomas, John Orissa, and Frederick William. Thomas became the principal of the Midland Baptist College. John Orissa and Frederick William both died in their middle thirties, the former in India, whither he had gone in the footsteps of his uncle, and the latter after a ministry at Bluntisham and Watford that was giving very high promise. He is remembered as the author of the hymns "A crowd fills the court of the Temple", which was composed for the Barton School Anniversary in 1878, and "O Thou whose hand hast brought us unto this joyful day", written in the same year for the opening of the new Beechen Grove Chapel, Watford.

As a final tribute to Barton's widespread influence and fame it may be recalled that it is on record that an Orissan convert once naively asked if London were as large a place as Barton!

PERCY AUSTIN.

NOTE.—The story is fully told in Adam Taylor's *History of the English General Baptists* (vol. 2), and in *Historic Memorials of Barton, Melbourne, and other General Baptist Churches*, by J. R. Godfrey. There is a *Memoir of Samuel Deacon*, and the record of the Goadby's is enshrined in the composite family biography, *Not Saints but Men*. It is also worthy of note that Abraham Booth, later the pastor of the leading Particular Baptist Church in London, began his career as a Barton convert, and as minister of the branch church at Kirkby-Woodhouse; and that Dr. and Mrs. John Buckley, of Orissa, went forth from Barton churches.

Reviews.

The Fellowship of Believers, by Ernest A. Payne. (Kingsgate Press, 3s. 6d.)

In this age of many questions, thoughtful Christians cannot escape a fresh consideration of the important question, what is the Church? For such a task, Mr. Payne's well ordered and carefully documented book is a welcome help. The purpose of the book is clearly defined, as Mr. Payne tells us that his pages are "intended as no more than a preliminary submission of some of the historical evidence that has to be considered and some suggestions as to its bearing on modern issues" (p. 14)—a modestly accurate statement of the contents. In thus enabling us to make an historical approach to our problem, Mr. Payne is rendering considerable service, for he quotes from documents and books all too little known among Baptist folk, and the evidence which he presents is so skilfully selected and ordered that his conclusions emerge with a clarity no reader can mistake. Both preachers and scholars who seek to clarify in their minds and message the Baptist doctrine of the Church will be indebted to Mr. Payne, and will be especially grateful to him for the extensive quotations which he gives; they are a most valuable feature of his book. The two appendices, A and B, also are a useful addition, while appendix C may stimulate further reading on this subject.

When the book is considered as a whole, however, certain gaps appear upon which information is needed in the building up of any complete doctrine of the Church. The titles of the chapters—The Subject and the Sources; The Visible Church; The Ministry of the Church; The Lord's Table; Baptism; Some Modern Issues—show that most of the ground is covered; but one notices the omission of any section dealing with worship apart from the two ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Table. Does it denote a lack of perspective in our Baptist tradition that a book of six chapters can give two to a consideration of rites and none to a consideration of worship? The changes which have occurred in customs of worship in recent years suggest that this part of our churchmanship needs thinking about as much as any other. The same applies to the Church meeting, about which Daniel Jenkins has written so forcibly. Is this inherent in our Baptist witness? What place did it occupy in past days in the

life of our churches? That Baptists need "to recover a more serious churchmanship" at public worship and in the Church meeting as well as at the Lord's table is a conclusion Mr. Payne makes on page 89, but references to worship and the Church meeting are all too brief. Again, as Mr. Payne points out, the development of such work as that of the B.M.S. or the B.U. implies a larger conception of our churchmanship. He writes: "Due recognition of special gifts and special functions has always been an essential part of true churchmanship" (p. 48). What does this imply for the development of local organisations e.g. Sunday school attached to the local church? Such work is an important part of Church life to-day, and many are expressing their churchmanship through it. Is this a right conception? What is the place of leaders of organisations in the Church? What is to be the attitude of the Church to them and their work? This brings us also to the consideration of the many social and public works in which Baptists are engaged. What is the relation of these to their churchmanship? Many Baptists have been prominent in educational and social work, and have regarded this as an expression of their Christian life. How far are the boundaries of the activity of the fellowship of believers to be carried?

We turn now to ask, what does the historical approach along which Mr. Payne so surely guides us teach us about the Church? Four answers may be suggested:

1. The variety of Baptist practice and theory. We must not forget that in us two streams unite, that of General and that of Particular Baptists. There were differences between these groups, and within each group there were differences of custom and thought. "There has been variety in our life and sometimes tension. Things stressed in one generation have sometimes fallen into the background in the next, only to be revived later on. It is a rich and diverse tradition to which we are able to appeal" (p. 16). This variety is interesting, and a realisation of it is a safeguard against a dogmatism not unknown among Baptists; but it makes any appeal to history inconclusive.

2. The isolation of individual congregations is not inherent in Baptist witness. Dr. Wheeler Robinson calls attention to this in his preface! The presence of numerous Ministers at an Ordination, the experiment of Messengers, the formation of Associations, the drawing up of Confessions by groups of Churches, all suggest the wider fellowship. These are not "optional and secondary," but a "necessary expression of Christian fellowship" (p. 27). Mr. Payne summarises his chapter on the Visible Church by writing: "These various citations make clear that from the seventeenth century Baptists

have regarded the visible church as finding expression in local communities of believers who constitute themselves churches by the election of officers, the observance of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and Christian discipline, and who find an extension and expression of their life in free association, first with other churches of their own faith and order, but also with all other groups of Christians loyal to the central truths of the apostolic Gospel" (p. 32).

3. The importance of the Ministry in the Baptist life. It would be a shock to some in our Baptist churches to-day to read that the Ministry is necessary to the Church. We do well to ponder sentences like these: "The seventeenth century Confessions make it clear that no company of believers would have been regarded as properly constituted as a church or in a full church-state until officers or ministers had been chosen" (p. 35). "Church officers, duly chosen and commissioned, were regarded as necessary to the proper functioning of the church" (p. 49). "Our fathers would surely have questioned whether a community of people could rightly be described as a church if they had not some kind of regular pastoral oversight, and if the sacraments, and in particular the Lord's Supper, were not regularly observed among them" (p. 82-83).

4. The need for understanding the meaning of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The emphasis of Baptists seems to have been upon the qualifications of the individual to take part in these services and upon the mode of administration. Writing about open and closed Communion, Mr. Payne remarks: "It has occupied far more attention in Baptist circles than have theological questions regarding the meaning and significance of the Lord's Supper itself" (p. 54); or again about Baptism, he writes: "Baptist apologetic has inevitably tended to concentrate far more on questions of the subject and mode of Baptism than on questions of meaning" (p. 70). This has clearly brought the danger of needless divisions, and implies a re-orientation of Baptist thought so that the meaning of these services becomes central. These conclusions suggest that Baptists need to do a good deal of constructive thinking about the nature of the Church.

Such reflections upon these results of the historical approach to our conception of the Church inevitably raises further issues. Ought we Baptists to give more attention to the Ordination service at the beginning of a ministry? Would this make the work of the ministry more significant in our churches? Should the Ordination service, as something separate from a "Recognition" service, be an act of the whole Baptist fellowship and not merely of the local church? Questions about the ministry raise questions about the relationships of congregations to one

another, and their responsibilities for one another, and the place of each congregation in the fellowship of Baptist churches. Is the General Baptist experiment of Messengers a valuable one for us to develop? It seems hardly accurate to say that they "exercised functions analogous to those entrusted of recent years to the General Superintendents appointed by the Baptist Union" (p. 37). Dr. Whitley makes it clear that the Messengers were first appointed as evangelists, and then continued oversight over the churches they had founded; while the Orthodox Creed of 1678 quoted by Mr. Payne on page 37 calls them bishops, and suggests that "they have the government of those churches that had suffrage in their election." This is a much wider office than that of the Superintendents with their association with the Sustentation Fund. The conception of the Messenger is a more worthy and dignified one, and closer to the function and spirit of the New Testament Church. The book itself raises questions about Baptism and the Lord's Table and their relation to church membership and their connection with the experience of the Holy Spirit (p. 75). All this brings us to the fundamental question: What is our standard for any decisions upon the ordering of the life of the Church? Is it the New Testament? But scholars are agreed that many different practices can be justified on the basis of the New Testament. Is it to be historical precedence? But history shows many different experiments. Dr. Wheeler Robinson asks: "Is there any test of methods of organisation and government save that they should be the best to promote the faith and service of the Gospel?" (p. 6). Is this what Mr. Payne means when he says that Baptists "have claimed the guidance of the living Spirit of Christ present within His Church, a guidance inspired, confirmed and held in check by appeal to the Scriptures and, in particular, to those of the New Testament. The final court of appeal has been neither to church pronouncements nor to history and tradition as such, but to the conscience of the Church inspired by the Spirit of God as a result of the study of the Bible" (p. 17)?

The fact that Mr. Payne's book raises more questions than it settles is all to the good if it leads to systematic and prayerful thinking about these questions. At the same time, we must not fall into the danger of concentrating so much attention upon the Church as if an institution, its officers, rites and customs were all-important in the Christian life. That would not be true to our Baptist witness. It may be asked, indeed, whether the word "churchmanship," which appears so frequently in the book, properly belongs to Baptist vocabulary. The title is an altogether happier phrase! Our task in developing our doctrine of the Church is that of exploring the meaning of personal faith in

the saving love of God and of the fellowship of the Kingdom created by that love through our faith. Christians will be to the world what the soul is to the body not through dwelling on their churchmanship, but by developing the fellowship of believers.

L. G. CHAMPION.

Son of Man and Suffering Servant A Historical and Exegetical Study of Synoptic Narratives Revealing the Consciousness of Jesus concerning His Person and Mission, by Edward A. Mcdowell (Broadman Press, Nashville, Tennessee. 216 pp., $2.00).

It may be helpful in introducing this book to give some details concerning the author. Dr. Mcdowell is the son of a Baptist minister and a product of Furman University and the Southern Baptist Seminary. He has had a very varied experience as a reporter, as private secretary to Governor Mcleod of South Carolina, and as pastor of several churches. Since 1935 he has been a teacher at the Southern Baptist Seminary, where he is now Associate Professor of New Testament Interpretation.

The scope and purpose of the book are indicated in the subtitle. The author seeks to establish at least three conclusions of importance: "(1) The patterns which Jesus accepted for His character and mission as Messiah coincide with the picture of the Messiah to be found in the higher prophetic stream of the Old Testament; (2) There is a consistency in the character and purpose of Jesus which may be traced from the beginning to the end of His ministry; (3) The consistency of Jesus had its origination in His knowledge of the character of God gained by reason of His unique relationship to God the Father, and in His firm adherence to the principle of redemptive love as seen in the character of the Servant of Jehovah pictured in the latter part of the book of Isaiah" (p. 15).

The method adopted is to choose some outstanding phases of the ministry of Jesus and to examine these "historically and exegetically." Hence the chapter headings are: The Decision in the Wilderness, The Declaration at Nazareth, Jesus and John the Baptist, Caesarea Philippi (two chapters), Jerusalem, Beyond Calvary.

Dr. Mcdowell indicates some of the critical positions which he accepts in his introduction. He rejects the conclusions of the Form Critics, accepts Streeter's four-document hypothesis, and makes very sparing use of the Gospel of John "because it presents its own peculiar problem."

This book is somewhat uneven and difficult to assess. There are many examples of painstaking and careful investigation,

some passages of suggestive exegesis, and a reverent appreciation of the profound issues which underlie the problems in the Gospel narratives which are expounded. But, on the other hand, a number of points call for criticism. The book would certainly benefit from compression, particularly in the disproportionate passages sometimes devoted to the Old Testament background, and in the reiterations of the consistency of Jesus. The style is frequently too verbose and rhetorical for a work of scholarship. (Perhaps the worst example is that on p. 133: "There leaps from His lips a sentence that is like a dart from the depths of a cauldron of fire, pointed with a flame that will sear and burn as it falls upon the ears of those who stand by and listen in paralysed amazement.")

There is no discussion of the following controversial matters, all of which seem to demand treatment in such a study as this: Is "The Son of Man" a corporate conception in the New Testament? Does it not possibly mean simply "man" in one or two of its occurrences? Is the idea of the Messianic secret a literary device? Is the Last Supper a Passover meal? It is surprising that there is no reference to the work of C. H. Dodd, T. W. Manson, Vincent Taylor and R. H. Lightfoot, nor to any German scholars except Schweitzer.

Dr. Mcdowell sometimes puts forward new suggestions which are interesting, but I do not feel that the following are convincing: That Jesus, by His rejection of the second temptation, renounces the Temple (34-35); that there were two visits to Nazareth (47); that John the Baptist made a distinction between the Messiah and "The Coming One" (77); that the "coming" of the Son of Man "in the clouds with great power and glory" in the "Little Apocalypse" of Mark xiii. and parallels is not the Parousia, but the end of the Jewish state and Temple worship and "the emergence of His Gospel as a real factor in history" (118-123). The sending forth of the angels to "gather together His elect from the four winds" (Mark 13, 27) "may well be applied to the conversion of men of every nation to the Gospel"! (123). With regard to the triumphal entry, Dr. Mcdowell finds it easy to defend Matthew's mention of two animals (an ass and a colt). "This presents no difficulty, since the animal upon which Jesus rode was one that had never been ridden before; that is, a colt—a fact which would explain the presence of its mother" (154). Most scholars are agreed that Matthew misread Zechariah ix. 9 as a reference to two animals instead of one.

The textual problems in Luke's version of the Last Supper are inadequately dealt with. The author accepts the longer "Neutral" reading, and makes the unlikely suggestion that in

Luke's thought Jesus would be drinking the second cup "in the dispensation of the Kingdom of God" (the Lord's Supper thus signalising a "coming" of the Kingdom).

Two renderings of the Greek of Luke's Gospel must be briefly mentioned. In Luke 17, 23 *mian twn hemerwn* is translated "the chief (or first) of the days" (of the Son of Man), and so referred to the Parousia. This rendering of *mian* in an ordinal sense is possible, but not probable here. It is rejected in J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. II., p. 439, but considered possible by Bruce (*Expositor's Greek Testament*) and Plummer (I.C.C.). J. M. Creed adopts the more usual translation.

The rendering of Luke xix. 31 (and parallel in Mark), *Ho kurios autou chreian echei* as "the owner of him has need" (p. 155), is not impossible, but seems strained, and is not supported by any commentator or translator to my knowledge.

There are the following misprints: "Israelties" (p. 29), "deliberatetly" (p. 48), "corroboratetd" (p. 154), "martrydom" (p. 157).

The book is well produced and pleasant to read.

D. R. GRIFFITHS.

The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, by H. H. Rowley, D.D. (Carey Press, 5s. net.)

Those who were at the B.M.S. Summer School in September, 1944, at Cambridge, will welcome the printing of these four lectures. It is well that they should reach a wider public. Dr. Rowley expresses the hope that "this little study will not alone stimulate interest in the missionary message of the Old Testament, but will evoke some response to the claims of that message, and the fulfilment of the mission. It should be said at once that this is a book to be read and studied, especially by those who are eager to share in the rich heritage of our Christian Faith. One might go further and wish that it could be put into the hands of many for whom most of the Bible, the Old Testament certainly, is a closed book, regarded as having no relevance to our present day.

The first chapter considers the work of Moses, and rightly judges that in that work there are profoundly significant ideas out of which the post-exilic ethical monotheism could and did arise. In the Exodus, God was revealing Himself as a Saving God and an Electing God. Israel was saved, not for any inherent virtue, but in her weakness and need, in order to reveal the Saving purpose of God. She was chosen that she might serve God. Failure to serve meant renunciation of her election. Moses was himself a missionary to the Israelites in Egypt, and led them to that great Covenant, a pledge of loyalty to this Saving God.

(This chapter would be worth reading if only for the sake of the ideas involved in Election and Covenant.) Thus Missionary enterprise is shown as not humanitarian only, nor primarily ethical, but as the inevitable outcome of real religion. Where there is no true religion, there will be no effective missionary activity—and the converse is true.

Chapter II refers mainly to the pre-Exilic prophets and some of the Psalms and contains some helpful translations of the passages referred to. We doubt the statement that the goal of obedience was painted largely in terms of pleasant ease, although Old Testament religion consistently suggests that only as man lives in a right relation with God can he know the full bounty of the natural world. Surely, too, an effective missionary purpose must be concerned first with the Glory of God, from which alone can come an enduring compassion, free from sentimentality and patronage. Dr. Rowley's exposition of Isaiah ii. 2ff, Micah lv. 1ff, should be most carefully considered. It is full of importance for our day.

We read with gratitude the treatment of the Servant Songs in chapter III, and felt, as Dr. Rowley obviously feels, the great significance of these words for the Church, the New Israel, the Body of Christ. It is with these implications that the closing chapter is concerned, and the argument moves with a fine sense of inevitability towards the three closing paragraphs, which none can read unmoved by their challenge and inspiration.

A. S. HERBERT.

Humanism and Christianity, by W. S. Urquhart. (T. & T. Clark, 11s.)

This is a valuable and important book. It consists of an expanded form of lectures delivered in the University of Edinburgh in 1939 under the Croall Trust by the Emeritus Principal of the Scottish Church College, Calcutta. The object of the lectures is "to develop the thought that the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ ought to be the guiding principle of every action of our lives, and that it provides the only world-view which is religiously and philosophically satisfying." Dr. Urquhart may be said to stand in the great Alexandrian tradition. He is eager to relate the Gospel to the best thought of the day and to grapple with the intellectual problems of the age. After describing the scientific determinism at present so widely current, he considers the attempts to escape from it by way of psychology, by way of humanism, and by way of naturalistic religion in the modern west and the ancient east. Each of these attempts is carefully set forth and acutely criticised. The lecturer then turns to Barthianism and devotes four chapters to an examination of

its very different answer to the religious problem. This is the real heart of the book. The argument is close and searching. Dr. Urquhart fully appreciates the motives that have led Barth and Brunner to their characteristic emphases. He believes, however, that "revelational authority does not depend upon abruptness, but rather upon harmony and congruence with the rest of our experience," and he points out patiently and persuasively how unsatisfactory are the paradoxes upon which Barthians rely. His intimate knowledge of Indian religion enables him to produce a number of interesting formal parallels between Barth and Sankara. The closing chapters expound a higher Christian humanism based upon the kinship of God and man in the Incarnation. Dr. Urquhart's pages contain many excellent quotations, the fruit of very wide reading, and also many striking observations of his own. War-time difficulties and delays have led to a number of uncorrected printer's errors which should be put right in the second edition which this candid and competent piece of Christian apologetic deserves.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Heart in Pilgrimage, by E. R. Micklem. (Indepenent Press, 2s.)
Worship and Social Progress, by Wilfred Allott. (Allen and Unwin, 2s. 6d.)

It is an encouraging sign in Free Church life that a good many books on prayer are being issued. Mr. Micklem's little volume is an excellent addition to "The Forward Books." He reminds us that the primary meaning of the verb "to pray" is earnest entreaty, and goes on to do a much-needed work in answering the widespread contemporary notions that petitionary prayer is superfluous, unscientific, or an irreverent attempt to persuade God to change His plans for our personal convenience. It is a merit of Mr. Micklem's argument that he puts petitionary prayer firmly in the setting of worship. In the remaining chapters, Mr. Micklem expounds prayer as fellowship between God and man, as intercession, and deals with the place of corporate prayer. *Heart of Pilgrimage* is an ideal book to put into the hands of thoughtful young people.

Baptist readers will find *Worship and Social Progress* much less to their liking. They cannot but consider the author's analysis of the human situation inadequate, and his understanding of the message of the New Testament gravely defective.

JOHN O. BARRETT.

BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The following have joined the Society of recent months:

HON. MEMBERS.

Mr. J. E. Pickup. Mr. H. Wrigley. Mr. D. Jackman.

ORDINARY.

Mr. K. W. Allen.
Rev. S. Andrews.
Rev. W. W. Bottoms, M.A.
Mr. T. Coats.
Rev. R. Stanley Cox, B.A.
Rev. A. Cutts.
Mr. A. E. Clarke.
Rev. S. C. Crowe.
Rev. T. Cooper.
Mr. J. Carpenter.
Rev. S. J. Dewhurst, B.D.
Rev. D. R. Griffiths, B.A., B.D.
Mr. G. S. Green.
Rev. G. D. Hooper.
Rev. M. F. Hewett.
Mr. C. T. Le Quesne, K.C.
Mr. D. T. Morgan.
Rev. W. G. Owen.
Rev. D. S. Russell, M.A., B.D.
Mr. C. Richards.
Rev. F. R. Schofield, B.A., B.D.
Rev. A. Stockwell.
Mr. E. J. Sewell.
Rev. A. R. D. Simpson.
Mr. G. R. Tilley.
Rev. J. C. Whitney.
Rev. W. R. Weeks.
Mr. E. P. Winter.
Rev. A. J. Westlake.
Mr. E. Williamson.
Mr. W. H. Drury Yule.
Mr. C. H. King.
Mr. J. N. Lock.
Mr. D. Nield.

DECEASED.

Mr. Theo. Clark, J.P.
Mr. F. Mott Harrison.
Mr. E. A. Hobbs.
Mr. T. S. Penny, J.P.
Mr. C. W. B. Simmonds.
Rev. F. C. Spurr.
Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

(*Two Years to* 31.12.44.)

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
To Balance from 1942	31	17	8	By *Baptist Quarterly*:			
Sales	2	6	7	1943 ...	37	1	6
Subscriptions:				1944 ...	65	15	3
1943	97	16	0	Issue to Hon. Members of *Studies in History and Religion* ...	60	6	0
1944	98	18	6	Postages, &c. ...	6	1	2
				Stationery ...	2	8	6
				Insurances ...	4	4	0
					175	16	5
				Balance in hand	55	2	4
	£230	18	9		£230	18	9

FUNDS.

Reserve Fund for Life Members	60	10	0
General Reserve	50	0	0
General Fund Balance	55	2	4
	£165	12	4