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

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

Editorial Notes.

THE British Council of Churches held its eighth meeting at the beginning of May. Among the many significant matters which came before it, two were of over-riding importance. There was presented to the Council a report on "The Era of Atomic Power" drawn up by a specially appointed Commission, and the resignation of the General Secretary, Dr. A. C. Craig, was announced. All the churches associated with the Council are under a deep debt to Dr. Craig for what the Archbishop of Canterbury called his "unrestrained and devoted service" during the past seven years. The Council has been in its infancy. There has been much uncertainty and suspicion to overcome. One after another of its most widely trusted leaders—Paton, Temple, Elmslie, Garvie—have been removed by death. Dr. Craig has carried a growingly heavy burden with conspicuous courage and self-sacrifice. He returns now to Scotland to be associated with Dr. Macleod in the work of the Iona Community. It will not be easy to replace him and, indeed, the Council cannot yet be said to have grown into a very sturdy child, but he should not be allowed to go without some expression of the gratitude of British Christians—and not least Free Churchmen—for what he has done.

* * * *

The Report on "The Era of Atomic Power" (S.C.M. Press, 2/-) is a notable document. The weighty Commission responsible for it (which included Mr. Aubrey) was under the chairmanship of Dr. J. H. Oldham and the impress of his mind is clearly evident in its pages. It sets the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 in the wide setting of the new possibilities for evil and good created by recent scientific discoveries and relates them also to the economic and political issues of modern society. It is more successful in its analysis of the situation than in the definition of what should be the Christian attitude. The document is, we venture to think, either too long or too short, and it seems a pity that so much space is given to what is described at "the irresolvable dilemma" whether Christians can in any circumstances approve the use of atomic weapons. We understand, however, that the members of the Commission are

willing to regard this Report as no more than an interim statement and the British Council has referred it to the constituent bodies that they may make clear their reactions to it. We hope that when it comes before the Baptist Union Council adequate preparation and time will be given to its discussion and that the members will have before them not only this Report but also that of the parallel Commission set up by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

* * * *

The Archbishop of Canterbury was invited to the Jubilee Congress of the Free Church Federal Council held in March last, and delivered a friendly speech which contained some very interesting and important passages. Dr. Fisher invited the leaders of the Free Churches to consider whether they wished to revive the question of reunion as a vital issue so that any proposals they might desire to make could be discussed at the next Lambeth Conference which has been summoned for 1948. According to the *Times,* Dr. Fisher went on to say :—

"Reunion, when it comes, if by God's grace it does, will be reunion of the Church of England. It will not be reunion with the Church of England by you. I want you to weigh that phrase. It will not be reunion with the Church of England; it will be reunion of the Church of England, for you and I were in origin the Church of England in this country, and in a real sense we still remain the Church of England in this country. When we come together, we become again the Church of England. But now you would come into it with the traditions which you have grown in the period of dislocation, with your own customs, your own methods, and your own style of pulpit oratory. You have also your own hymn tunes and other things that matter in your daily life. Will all these things have to disappear in a reunited Church? I should say heaven forbid. Should the Free Churches lose all power of self-direction and identity with the past? Heaven forbid. I look forward to a time when the Church of England, having been reunited, the Methodists, Congregationalists, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians will, within that reunited Church, still function with an identity of their own much as the different orders function within the Roman Catholic with an identity of their own. The time might come, if reunion came about, when church notices might specify Church of England (Methodist), Church of England (Congregationalist), and even Church of England (C. of E.)."

Free Churchmen have sometimes criticised the Lambeth Conference of 1930, because more attention seemed to be given to

Anglican relations with the Eastern Churches than with the Free Churches. Dr. Fisher's remarks would appear to place on the Free Churches the onus of asking that the question of a reunited English Church appear on the Lambeth agenda in 1948. The Free Church Federal Council will presumably at its next meeting consider what response is to be made to the invitation of the Archbishop. We read with some surprise, therefore, the remarks of the editor in the April issue of *The Free Church Chronicle*, the official monthly bulletin now appearing from the offices of the Free Church Federal Council, since they might appear to be a prejudging of a most delicate issue.

* * * *

Surprise grows to astonishment and verges on dismay at more recent developments. A member of the Baptist Historical Society, anxious to equip himself for the discussion on Dr. Fisher's speech which he anticipates will take place, wrote to the offices of the Free Church Federal Council and asked if he could have a copy of exactly what was said. He was informed that the Council authorities had no full text of the speech. He addressed himself therefore to Dr. Fisher. We have the permission of our correspondent and of Dr. Fisher to print the reply:

Lambeth Palace, S.E.
3rd June, 1946.

Dear Mr. X,

I am afraid I cannot let you have a text of what I said to the Free Church Federal Council. I was speaking from notes and, as far as I know, there was no verbatim reporter. But I can give you the substance of it in the following four points:

1. I recalled the history of discussions with representatives of the Free Churches on Reunion from 1920 onwards, saying that I must see where we now stood with a view to the Lambeth Conference of 1948.
2. As an aside, I said, as was reported by the Press, that in a reunited Church there should be the possibility of each uniting body keeping something of its former customs and traditions, some measure of identity with its past and some degree of autonomy.
3. But, I said, before there can be a Reunited Church there must be agreement on certain fundamental principles.
4. I ended by asking whether Free Churchmen really regarded the search for agreement as a live issue worth pursuing or not.

Yours sincerely,
(signed) GEOFFREY CANTUAR.

We notice that at the Convocation of Canterbury held on May 22nd, the Archbishop (according to the *Times*) "took the opportunity to correct a report of a speech to the Free Church Federal Council, which, he said, had caused some misgiving. In that speech he said that 'within the reunited Church there was, as he saw it, no need for rigid uniformity of customs; each reunited Church could bring with it some of its long-established traditions and customs and retain something of its own identity and some measure of self-government. All that seemed reasonable, defensible, and even proper.' At that point the newspaper report ended, and some people had the idea that he had put forward that as a self-sufficient basis for reunion. But his next sentence was: 'Before there can be a reunited Church there must be agreement on certain fundamental principles.' The Archbishop added that he thought this could easily have been inferred from the report."

On July 20th, the Archbishop visited the Methodist Conference and, according to the *Times* report, "recalled that when he recently addressed the Free Church Federal Council he asked them whether Free Churchmen really regarded the search for agreement as a live issue worth pursuing. To that he had received no answer so far, except from one man who had described it as 'a phantom, or a mirage.' It made a considerable difference to him to know what was the answer."

* * * *

On these quotations we would make, at the moment, only the briefest comment. Surely the time has passed when pronouncements of this kind should be made from notes; when meetings of the Free Church Federal Council should be held without a verbatim report of the proceedings; when officials should comment on proposals before they have been discussed. Such things can lead only to misunderstanding, frustration and suspicion. We venture also to ask one question. What, on the lips of the present Archbishop, is meant by the phrase "agreement on certain fundamental principles?"

Recent Theological Trends.

THE period before the 1914-1918 War was full of interest alike for the theologian and the social reformer. We seemed to be looking on at the transformation of our society by the spread and development of Christian ideas. The Nation and the Churches seemed all set for a forward movement that would change the whole aspect of our national life, when, like a bolt from the blue, came the first European War, with all manner of repercussions on the national spirit and outlook.

In the theological realm the War wrought mighty changes. In that grim ordeal, men of all creeds and classes were forced to get down to the bed-rock of reality. In individual thought and experience, as in discussion-conclaves, many found themselves asking questions for which they could find no answer. The real quest was to discover what was vital in Christianity, what was the significant Christian experience. It was recognised, and it has been recognised even more strongly in the second European War, that in the stern realities of battle it is the realisation of God that matters, and that those who had known the full stress of the struggle had small patience with anything but sheer reality. Theologians themselves were confronted by searching questions, and sought some authoritative word.

Ere many years had passed we were hearing about the Barthian School and the Barthian Theology. There is no need to repeat the oft-told story of the origin of Karl Barth's theology of the Word of God. But it may be worth while inquiring to what extent we are justified in accepting the domination of theological thought that its main conclusions have been allowed to impose. That goes also for the whole school associated with Barth: for Brunner, for, save the mark, Kierkegaard, whose theological remains were exhumed so many years after his burial to support his successors. One of our most eminent theologians said ruefully some years ago that he had lived to see everything he had fought for in the world of theology thrown over. Many are sharing his sense of frustration as they find the new parrot-cries repeated by writer upon writer with such rasping assurance. Having fought for liberty of thought and the recognition of variety of view, we do not take kindly to those who would snatch from our hands the banners we have at great cost won. We do not take kindly to rigidity of thought or stridency of expression.

Accustomed to believe that the truth about God is too vast to be fully contained in any one mould, we resent the suggestion that at long last men have appeared to whom alone it has been fully revealed, by whom alone it is fully expressed.

Undoubtedly the main trend of our time has been in the direction of a hefty and intolerant dogmatism. Not for long have the pundits been so sure of themselves. At last they have found something they believe to be final and beyond question. All our vaunted bases of acceptability: all our, in their eyes, feeble compromises: all our attempts at reconciliation of contending positions are to-day swept aside by a relentless either-or formula which holds a pistol to our heads and bids us stand-and-deliver. The positive gains that had—so we thought—been registered, the progressive movement we had traced through the jungle of so many crude undergrowths, our faith in the light that lighteth every man, are declared to be but profitless illusion. In an age that has witnessed the power of a political dogmatism to lay a world in ruins, in which, in its latest phase, one bomb has outmoded all other weapons of warfare, we need not be astonished at the rise of a theological movement which is forthright and uncompromising, and gives short shrift to all its predecessors. Our only comfort in the midst of the debacle is in some knowledge of history and its way of rectifying extravagant emphasis in the process of time.

It is not enough, in explanation of the recrudescence of dogmatism, to say that we are living in abnormal, even cataclysmic days. It is not enough to plead in support of this theological assertiveness that the times are out of joint and something summary must be done about it. Emergency measures, panic standpoints, may be necessary in time of war, in the world of affairs. Even there these are temporary, to be dropped when their work is done. But in the world of the mind, this attitude has no place. The emergency with which theology deals—the moral and spiritual condition of men—is with us all the time. It must be faced not in the light of the immediate moment, but *sub specie ætèrnitatis*, in the light of the everlasting truth. Those of us who believe in the Progressiveness of Revelation, who are convinced that God is leading His people to an ever fuller understanding of His ways with men, as also to an ever enlarging appreciation of His Revelation in Christ, are not content to witness, unmoved and unprotesting, the scrapping of everything that has been gleaned by the use of man's intellect—directed, as we believe, by the Spirit of Truth which our Lord told us would be our guide and interpreter—at the *ipse dixit* of men who have been thrown off their balance by the tumultuous upheavals of the age.

The somewhat feeble response from the side of the formerly

prevailing schools of thought is not hard to understand. The upheaval caused by the War had weakened conviction in many quarters. Pre-occupation with war's practical problems turned men's minds away from theoretical considerations. The attitude of the open mind unfitted thinkers for the challenge of a flaming personal faith. There was a growing desire for something more definite in the matter of doctrine than for some time had been current. The shock to any form of optimism which was the result of the War pre-disposed men to listen to any strong positive voice. Perhaps the chief reason for so general an acquiescence was the fact that the new message went deeper than the views it combatted, by-passing most of the main topics that had been the subject of controversy. The Barthians did not trouble themselves with critical discussions. They were not concerned either to affirm or deny the truth of the evolutionary position. Barth himself had no qualms on the question of Biblical criticism. In some directions he went further than the furthest, being ready to criticise and amend not only the texts of the Scriptures, but even the *ipsisima verba* of our Lord. He touched the whole matter of Christian faith at a point much closer to the centre, resolving the entire issue into a contact, direct and dynamic, between the soul and the Word of God. We all know what brought him to this line of thought and action. He had proved the foolishness of preaching that did not grip men with the sense of God. He had discovered the secret of spiritual power, the secret of conversion, in the action of the Spirit of God through the agency of a Word that came alive and laid its grasp upon the individual soul. The inwardness of the Christian experience was in the Revelation of God that apprehended the soul and took it firmly in hand. There was nothing here from the side of man at all. Apart from the action of the Holy Spirit, man was unable either to accept or reject. He was just gripped by a power outside himself that brought him into the full blaze of the Divine Glory and moved him as it desired.

Here was a message that met the demand for stark reality. It was delivered with the accent of uncompromising authority. It brought God and man together—the basic necessity of any vital religion. It narrowed down the *esse* of religion to one short, sharp experience, thrusting on one side everything speculative or mystical as diversive rubbish and silencing all man's questionings and uncertainties. It sorted with a state of mind that was feeling the impact of tremendous challenges in other spheres of life and was already habituated to crisis. More, it was in harmony with the fundamentals of a recognised historic interpretation of the Christian faith and acceptable to many who had been unsettled, even bewildered, by the intellectual upheavals of

the time. Above all, it was a message that enthused those who fell for it, so that a new note crept into their preaching, a note of authority that cut through the polite and polished compromises that held sway for so long. Take up McConnachie's expositions of the Barthian formula and you hit upon something new and strange—a theologian who is so absolutely sure that he is absolutely right, that he does not shrink from telling you that you, who beg to differ, are absolutely wrong. Readers of John Baillie's recent books can detect a wavering from the philosophic calm of his earlier works. *The Interpretation of Religion* is out of print by now; he himself says some of it is out-of-date. No wonder that all our theologians are vitally affected by a message delivered in thunderous tones by a writer who is satisfied that he alone is in possession of the Truth. One *caveat* may be inserted here. It is fact that when Barth delivered his Gifford lectures in Aberdeen he was bitterly disappointed at the lack of interest on the part of the Scots clergy. No one who knows the Scots clergy would be surprised at their lack of interest in anything; certainly in anyone outside their own elect fellowship of scholars. Read any obituary of their departed giants, say Gossip's Moffat, and you will realise the wondrous weight of learning any almost unknown scholar bumps up against in a Church whose scholarship is the despair of the rest of the scholastic world and the unconcealed pride of its clergy. Read Mackintosh's *Types of Modern Theology* and see with what deftness of touch the masters are handled, with what calmness Barth himself is analysed and assessed. When the tumult and the shouting dies, he will probably be again disappointed at his inability to make them his devotees.

One is bound to admit the service rendered to Christianity by Barth and his followers in recovering the inner spiritual experience, and laying supreme emphasis on this. It is thanks to him that we hear in so many sermons to-day the demand that God take precedence in religious faith, that until we have made contact each for himself with the living God we have got and will get nowhere. Here is a return to that personal note which Baptists have always sought to stress. But we cannot estimate the permanent value of his contribution to theology until we reckon up the destructive influence of his dialectic. The worst is seen in Brunner's work on *The Philosophy of Religion,* in which, following his master's voice, he jettisons everything that has been done by thinkers like Galloway and Bowman. According to Brunner, following Barth, there is nothing in the Primitive Religions of any value to the scholar. The only worth-while Philosophy of Religion is the Philosophy of the Christian Religion —as he understands it. Kraemer, in his book *The Christian*

Message in a Non-Christian World, reveals the confusion into which his mind has been thrown as the result of his contact with Barthian thought. But that is only one part of the destruction of good work that must be laid to his charge. All man's seeking after God along other avenues is declared to be of no value at all. The belief that the Roots of Religion, as Baillie holds, are in the moral sense, is questioned; the gateway of mysticism, by which fine souls have entered into the celestial fellowship, is double-barred. Forgetting that it is by the action of his own mental faculties that he has come to his own findings, he discounts the action of man's mind altogether in the religious sphere. Schleiermacher's sense of need, surely to many one road to faith and experience of God, is set aside. Man's entire mental and spiritual capacity is in effect denied by this man, who cannot even allow that the soul, having yielded to God in one great experience, can be trusted to hold on to Him for the future; but insists that it must be prodded into activity by constantly-repeated spiritual urges, very much as a Diesel engine is kept running by an unbroken succession of explosions. Further, in limiting the vital spiritual experience to one standard form, he excludes from the fold of the awakened many who have undoubtedly found God and been found of Him in other ways. And in confining God's approach to the soul to forms that pre-suppose an acquaintance with theological language and thought he makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the wayfaring man, even if he is not a fool, to find the way of salvation.

One of the by-products of this movement is an excessive emphasis on the initiative of God in religious experience. Every other preacher one hears is at pains to proclaim the utter bankruptcy of man in moral and spiritual capital. The one and only remedy for every evil is to bring God on the scene; just as the inwardness of every form of evil, as well as all kinds of failure, is in leaving God out of account. Doubtless that is sound; but it needs elucidating and stating in much clearer terms. What is the exact content of the word God? The setting in which the name of God is used to-day often excludes the central New Testament concept of Fatherhood, so dear to our Lord, so rich in inspirational vitamins, so saving to moral and spiritual sanity in such a time as this. The popular conception, implied if not expressed, is rather that of a detective confronting us with menacing challenge. The popular conception of man denudes him of capacity of any sort in the moral and spiritual sphere. Shakespeare's brilliant soliloquy, "What a work is man," would find no support in the portrait of him by our present-day teachers. Even our Lord's "How much is a man better than a sheep" does not seem to have been accepted by these people as a wise and true

reflection. Even Nuremberg has two sides. Revealer of mankind at its lowest, it is also a throne of justice on which the God of righteousness makes His voice heard. His witnesses are flesh and blood and the outraged conscience of a whole world which, even if it lieth in the wicked one, yet has a sense of right and gives unimpeachable judgment on flagrant wrong. Our own generation has given evidence of a moral consciousness which would be impossible were current theological accounts of human nature the final estimate of its quality.

My last word on these trends is one of doubt and question as to the possibility of getting a hearing for the Gospel in such an age as this by wholesale vilification of man, unrelieved pessimism as to the future of humanity, and the portrayal of a God without understanding of or sympathy with His creatures, writhing under the stress of tremendous ordeals and crushing burdens. Surely He whom we acclaim as Leader, who Himself on the Cross bore the weight of man's sin and sorrow in the struggle to redeem them, will not look without pity on the millions plunged in agony and want by the sins of others? Surely we may believe they are on His great heart of love borne into the presence of His Father, however weak and unworthy as a whole they may be?

The unrelieved pessimism as to the future of the world of which I have already spoken has gained in intensity from the work of another outstanding thinker of our time—Niebuhr. A strong, virile, swashbuckling personality who has defied every accepted canon of procedure in his brilliant career, he is at once an enigma and an obsession to all students of ethics in our time. Of German origin, he belongs to the ignoble fraternity of those who enter theological Colleges and think to find them out for what they are, institutions that have had their day, tied up to tradition and routine, their courses including everything that is least necessary for the training of ministers, omitting almost everything that has any kind of relevance to "the Gods of the things that are," in their absorption with the abstractions of theology. Having the courage of his convictions, Niebuhr soon left College and set out upon the ministry with such equipment as he had picked up outside theological seminaries. Like many another of the untrained, he made good, and his ministry in Detroit was not only successful, but distinguished. To-day, he is the leading light of a famous Theological College in New York; paradoxically enough the leader also of the Christian Socialist Movement in America. Very much to the Left in politics, he is very much to the right in theology. Those who are familiar with his works think of him as a dynamic personality, a brilliant writer, a devastating critic, a provoking and rousing thinker. His delight

is to hammer the orthodox the one moment, then with equal zest turn and rend the liberal-minded. His positive message is forgiveness; but with characteristic whimsicality he would have us believe that the chief Christian affirmation is the resurrection of the body. The main drift of his ethical teaching is pessimistic in its implications. For with almost wearisome reiteration he denies Christian men the satisfaction of any progress, far less victory, in their attack on the moral and social evils of the age, or their positive schemes for the welfare of humanity. His great idea is that the Christian ideal is always in the heavens out of our reach. When in some effort for the good of others we feel that we have to some extent brought the ideal to earth, we are, according to him, of all men most to be pitied. All that has happened is that we have given shape to some idea of our own. All our philanthropies, all our social enterprises, even the missionary movements in our churches, do not bring us any nearer the attainment of the Christian ideal; and the very sense of having attained anything is evidence that we have attained nothing. Frankly, Niebuhr does not seem to believe that the redemption of society can be brought about by the Church. He seems to trust more to the power of law and the advancing sense of right as effectual agents in this sphere. He seems to find, however, his hope for humanity in the permeation of society by the spirit of love and forgiveness. There we would agree with him; but if that love can find no expression in institutions, if our every effort to give it outward form is futile—only the gratifying of our desire for self-expression—his teaching is not very helpful. It may be that his function is that of a critic who rides roughshod over all men's plans and programmes in the determination to probe to the heart their vanity and folly. There is no doubt that his sharp, derisive criticism of honest efforts to Christianise our institutions is depressing and destructive. At the same time, his elevation of the Christian ideal to such unattainable heights gives a dimension to our religion that evokes humility on the one hand and reverence on the other.

It remains to be seen whether the dogmatic, cocksure, assertive pose will impress the mind of an age so caught up in all manner of tangles as ours. The modern man will not be dragooned into intellectual any more than physical submission. Even an apostle of Paul's standing and inspiration sought to *persuade* men. Some of the methods of our dogmatists are likely to be short-lived. Their habit of scouring Europe for orphans of the storm who will be our theological leaders, their weakness for adopting neurotics like Kierkegaard and Dostoievsky in support of their positions, seem to point to a certain morbidness of outlook, which is not characteristic of the New Testament. A theology of crisis

is in place in an epoch of crisis; but crises pass; so may theologies of crisis.

The influence of these movements is found in strange places. The B.B.C., under its present Religious Director, is ultra-dogmatic in its theological standpoint. Anthony Deane, once a very popular broadcaster, tells us in his *Times Remembered,* of the summary manner in which he was dropped by that institution with the advent of the present regime. But other voices are heard over the air that do not radiate so settled a certitude. Julian Huxley, in his latest book, reveals that the much-boosted conversion of scientific opinion to belief in the spiritual may not be so general nor so permanent as some people think. Joad and C. S. Lewis are still struggling with the problem of suffering from scratch as though they were " the first that ever burst into that silent sea." These men have a very large congregation, indicating that there are many, and among them people of character and knowledge, who will not be satisfied with an unreasoning dogmatism. The day will come, also, when the constant harping on man's inability to do or think anything right will bring its inevitable reactions. Along with that the exaggerated decrying of Humanism—under which designation it is deemed just to include almost any fine-flowering of the human spirit—may bring its penalty in the final disassociation of intellect from revealed religion. In that connection the most recent writer on Humanism—L. H. Hough, in his book *The Meaning of Human Experience*—says: " It has always been too easy for a man to say, ' I belong to Athens; I do not belong to Jerusalem,' or to say, ' I belong to Jerusalem; I do not belong to Athens.' In a sense, at its best, Athens represents man marching Godward. And . . . Jerusalem represents God marching manward. But in a very profound sense the two cities belong together. And if it is true that Athens will come upon frustration at last unless it receives the insights of Jerusalem, we must also be honest enough to say that Jerusalem with all its glory needs something which only Athens can give."

There is a worthy dogmatism enshrined in the New Testament. It can be expressed in three words—" The Incomparable Christ." In his latest work, published after his death, Denney gave as his final creed: I believe in God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Here is the real bedrock—that Rock which is Christ.

JAMES HAIR.

Scientific Secularism.

MODERN Secularism takes several forms, but they all have this in common, that they are concerned simply and solely with this present physical world and recognise no other. Common to them all, too, is the fact that they are ultimately self-defeating, in that they make man a tragic figure, of all living creatures the most to be pitied. These characteristics are specially prominent in the case of Scientific Secularism.

Those who suppose that the conflict between Religion and Science has now been resolved are mere ostriches burying their heads in the sand. There are still men of science who stoutly maintain that all knowledge is scientific knowledge, and that we know nothing whatsoever but the things that have been learned by laboratory methods. In other words, they recognise only positive facts and observable phenomena, together with their objective relations and the laws which determine them. There are many, too, who are not scientists, but who are so enamoured of scientific method that they are disinclined to believe anything which cannot be proved, as they say, "scientifically." They assume that in the religious realm we have but faith and cannot know, and they prefer to commit themselves only to what they know, in the false confidence that knowledge is solely of the things they see.

That natural science is rendering great service to mankind in many practical ways is too obvious to need comment. The fact remains, however, that science cannot meet man's deepest need. It has no message for humanity, no gospel. On all the great questions concerning right conduct, the value of human personality, the meaning of life and the purpose of the world, it is as silent as the grave. If there were nothing but the hard facts of science on which to base one's philosophy of life, that philosophy would be a very bleak affair. Such apparently is the view of J. W. Krutch, when he speaks of "the disillusion with the laboratory." "Science," he says, "has always promised us two things not necessarily related—an increase first in our powers, second in our happiness and wisdom; and we have come to realise that it is the first and less important of the two promises which it has kept most abundantly."[1] And, after all, an increase in our

[1] *The Modern Temper*, p. 61.

powers is of little avail unless it is accompanied by an increase in our happiness and wisdom, but it is precisely at that point that science fails us altogether.

Take, for instance, the case of astronomy. Sir James Jeans assures us that the message of astronomy gives no clue whatsoever to the meaning of life. It cannot help us to decide whether life is the climax towards which the whole creation moves; or a mere accident, an unimportant by-product of natural processes; or a disease of matter in its old age when it has lost its high temperature; or (as we should like to believe) the only reality.[2] It is hardly surprising, therefore, that in the name of astronomy man has sometimes been declared to be a mere parasite infesting the epidermis of one of the meanest of the planets. That is a devaluation of human personality which is fatal to any exalted view of life. Similarly, many a physicist assumes, on the strength of his researches, that all phenomena arise from electrons and quanta and the like, controlled by mathematical formulæ; and thus, as Eddington points out, he may conclude that even his wife is simply an elaborate differential equation, though he will be tactful enough not to obtrude this opinion in the domestic circle.[3] The universe, the physicists tell us, is running down like a clock, and the eventual issue is to be the extinction of all life and intelligence. Again, while we cannot but admire the technical skill and efficiency of those scientists who have found out how to release the energy of the atom, nobody seems to be particularly elated by this discovery—on the contrary, there is a haunting fear in men's hearts that this new power will, sooner or later, be put to terrible uses. And if, as is often said, that is Nature's "ultimate" secret, one is tempted to reply: So much the worse for Nature! There are chemists, too, who naively assume that man is simply a bag of salts with a little water, and who foolishly suppose that matter by chemical action produces the mind or soul, so that all the activities of human beings are comparable to what goes on in test-tubes. As A. E. Taylor justly says: "If all we knew about the actual world were only what we can learn in the physical and chemical laboratory, so far as I can see, Atheism might conceivably be true."[4] Nor is the position any better when we enter the realm of biology. Biology may suggest that man is a little higher than the brutes, but it offers no support to the view that he is a little lower than the angels. Many biologists deny that there is any purpose at all in the evolutionary process. Sir Arthur Keith maintains that there is purpose, but insists that it is unconscious purpose (whatever that may be). And what is this purpose?

[2] Cf. *The Universe Around Us*, p. 344f.
[3] *The Nature of the Physical World*, p. 341.
[4] *Does God Exist?* p. 44.

He says that the end Nature has in view is to produce evolutionary units in the form of separate tribes or nations, the members of each tribe or nation being co-operative and public-spirited in their dealings with one another, but suspicious of and on the defensive against the members of all other tribes or nations.[5] If that is a complete and correct account of the evolutionary process, one is constrained to ask: Is there any value in it at all?

To all this kind of thing we inevitably react as Wordsworth is said to have reacted to the scientific theories of the 18th and 19th centuries. What moved him was not intellectual antagonism, but moral revulsion, the feeling that something had been left out, and that what had been left out comprised everything that was most important. As E. L. Woodward said in his broadcast on "The Crisis of Civilisation": "We are in confusion . . . because the scientific method is the best instrument which our intellect has devised, and yet we also know that the results obtained by this instrument do not make sense . . . somewhere we have missed the point."[6] The great achievements of science are justly praised, and we resist or ignore established scientific facts at our peril. But science does not and cannot give us a complete view of reality, and its account of reality is as different from reality itself as a perfectly accurately drawn map of England is different from England. When science has taught us all it can about the physical world and done all in its power to ameliorate our lot, it still remains true that, as A. N. Whitehead says: "The fact of religious vision, and its history of persistent expansion, is our one ground for optimism. Apart from it, human life is a flash of occasional enjoyment lighting up a mass of pain and misery, a bagatelle of transient experience."[7]

There are some scientific men who seem to realise all this, and are, therefore, making futile attempts to save ethical and spiritual values on a purely secularist basis. Julian Huxley, for example, fired by Lord Morley's remark that "the next great task of science will be to create a religion for humanity," has attempted to invent a sort of scientific religion. He regards religion as a biological problem! He finds the essence of religion in the sense of sacredness, and claims that what is apprehended by the religious consciousness is "the Eternal Power, which is outside man, power possibly in part spiritual, certainly in all its most obvious aspects material."[8] This sacred object of religion he declares to be the sum total of the permanent facts of human experience, the facts

[5] Cf. *Essays on Human Evolution* (reviewed by Dean Matthews in *The Sunday Times*, March 24th, 1946).
[6] *The Listener*, March 28th, 1946.
[7] *Science and the Modern World*, p. 238.
[8] *Religion without Revelation*, p. 329.

of the spiritual life, and the facts and forces of Nature apart from man.[9] This is a sort of scientific pantheism—and if everything is sacred, nothing is sacred. He confesses that he has no idea how this new scientific religion can be propagated. The only inference that men would be likely to draw from it is that the religious emotion is a fitful affair, and that the sense of sacredness is an illusion. Certain it is that if religion existed in no other form it would speedily vanish from the earth. Science cannot provide man with a religion. As C. E. M. Joad acknowledges, science "clears the boards for religion, but it has no contribution to the writing of the play."[10] Or in the words of A. E. Taylor: "Once you exclude man's moral life from the concept of the 'nature' to which you make your appeal, and all that 'nature' will witness to will be an Author of superhuman power and ingenuity, whose purposes, if He has any, are quite inscrutable, and may be iniquitous."[11]

Equally futile is Huxley's attempt to find a biological basis for ethics. He insists that the high sense of moral obligation has nothing empyrean about it, but is simply "a result of the nature of our infantile mental machinery, combined with later rationalisation and wish-fulfilment."[12] He claims that ethical standards are provided by the desirable course of the evolution of society,[13] and that the basic principles of evolutionary ethics are "the intrinsic worth of the individual, the brotherhood of man, and the universal duty of kindness and unselfishness."[14] Christianity, he says, merely asserts these principles, while science can "prove" them. But it is difficult to see where the "proof" is to be found. If, as he holds, the evolutionary process produced man by chance and will shortly blot him clean out of existence, there is no basis there for a high valuation of human personality. Further, it is patent fact that men have not normally drawn from the evolutionary process the inference that they are brothers who owe one another the duty of kindness and unselfishness—precisely the opposite conclusion has all too often been drawn. What Huxley probably means, therefore, is that the desirable course for the evolution of human society requires the recognition of the intrinsic worth of the individual, of the brotherhood of man, and of the duty of kindness and unselfishness—and that is a very different matter from an inductive proof of these ethical principles. There is no such thing as a biological basis for ethics. As J. D. Bernal asserts: "Scientific knowledge is of use to find the means

[9] *ibid*, 33, 35, 48f.
[10] *Guide to Modern Thought*, p. 107.
[11] *op. cit.*, p. 14.
[12] *Evolutionary Ethics*, p. 15.
[13] *ibid*, p. 43.
[14] *ibid*, p. 53.

for achieving good things, but it has nothing to do with the determination of what is good."[15]

The fundamental fallacy of scientific secularism is the notion that all knowledge is scientific knowledge, in which case we have no knowledge of those imponderables which alone can make life worth living—human love, the appeal of art, of music, of great literature, and, above all, of the facts of ethical and religious experience. But, as A. E. Taylor has pointed out, when anything is known there is a triple presupposition: (1) that about which something is known; (2) the person who knows this something; and (3) the knowing of it. "The last two factors cannot rightly be left out of account. It may be that if the astronomer, who has swept the heavens with his telescope and found no God, had taken into account not only the heavens but himself and his search, he would have found the evidence which he pronounces to be missing."[16] Or, as E. L. Woodward said in the broadcast referred to above: "There seem to be two kinds of knowledge, of which one kind can be accurately measured, and the other kind defies measurement, but has to be considered in terms of the beliefs of the wisest men over many centuries," beliefs which point to "the affirmation of the religious view of the universe."

We can fairly insist that the law of right and wrong is as much part and parcel of the structure of the universe, *and as much an object of knowledge*, as the law of gravitation or the law of the conservation of energy. The high sense of moral obligation is either an illusion or the master-light of all our seeing, and a link which binds us to a spiritual world. Neither alternative is capable of demonstration by the methods of science. Every man simply has to choose, and "evasion of choice is a form of choice." Men inevitably range themselves on the one side or the other. Either they affirm by an act of faith that the sense of moral obligation is the realest thing they know, or they affirm, equally by an act of faith, that it is illusory.

Many of those who deny the reality of the sense of obligation are prepared to concede that we are bound to act AS IF it were real. Huxley's ethical argument, in substance, though not in form, runs thus: "We ought to live AS IF the individual had intrinsic worth; to behave to other human beings AS IF the brotherhood of man was a fact; to cultivate kindness and unselfishness AS IF we were under an absolute obligation to do so." A similar plea was advanced by Arthur Koestler in his broadcast on "The Crisis of Civilisation." "I am not sure," he said, "whether what the philosophers call 'ethical absolutes' exist or not, but I am sure that we have to live AS IF they existed."[17] Such pleas

[15] *Science and Ethics* (Ed. by C. H. Waddington), p. 116.
[16] *op. cit.*, p. 34. [17] *The Listener*, March 21st, 1946.

remind one of the argument of Hans Vaihinger in his *Die Philosophie des 'Als Ob'* "We know," he says, "that there is no higher spiritual world, but we are bound, in the interests of morality and of an idealism which is essential to life, to live AS IF there were."[18]

The fundamental difference, therefore, between the secularist, who seeks to conserve ethical and spiritual values, and the Christian is this: The secularist concedes that we have to live AS IF the sense of moral obligation were real (for an inward necessity makes that conviction part of our thought), while the Christian asserts that it is real, and the realest of the real. In the words of Dean Inge: "There is nothing unscientific in the belief in a higher spiritual order, a kingdom of values, of which the natural order as known to science is a partial and abstract representation. . . . If the world of values floats like a luminous haze over a real world of measurable and ponderable things, it is a mirage, for the existence of which it is impossible to account."[19] The highest witness of the human spirit cannot be scientifically explained, and to dismiss it as a thing of no consequence is sheer arrogance. For anything which science knows to the contrary, it may be, as the Christian Gospel asserts, the most significant fact in the whole world.

L. H. MARSHALL.

[18] Wobbermin, *Systematische Theologie*, II., p. 447.
[19] *Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*, p. 197.

Some Recent Contributions to the Study of the Fourth Gospel.

> "For as long as I can remember, I have had more love for St. John's Gospel than for any other book. Bishop Gore once said to me that he paid visits to St. John as to a fascinating foreign country, but he came home to St. Paul. With me the precise opposite is true. St. Paul is the exciting and also rather bewildering venture; with St. John I am at home."
>
> William Temple—*Readings in St. John's Gospel.*

I.

The aim of the two articles which I am presenting under the above heading is to record briefly some of the progress made in recent years in the criticism and interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.

A convenient starting-point is Dr. C. H. Dodd's valuable review of J. H. Bernard's Commentary on John in the I.C.C. series (in *The Congregational Quarterly* for July, 1929). The reviewer states that Bernard's work is the first "full-sized" English commentary on this Gospel since Westcott's, which was apparently completed in substance before 1887, and that it therefore provides the opportunity for a very interesting survey of the progress made in the forty years' interval between the two in "the most difficult critical and exegetical task which the New Testament student can undertake."

It is claimed that advance has been notable in three main directions. *Firstly,* textual criticism had made progress "by the discovery of new MSS. and by vastly more thorough study of the ancient versions. But the changes necessary in Westcott and Hort's text are not so extensive as might have been expected—or as may yet have to be the case pending further criticism." *Secondly,* "linguistic study has made great advances, both in the field of Greek and in the field of Semitic speech which in one way or another lies behind the N.T. writings. The new study of Hellenistic Greek has delivered N.T. scholars from the classical obsession which was the bane of the Westcott school (and diminished the value of the R.V.)." *Thirdly,* the new

advances in "higher criticism" were even more important. "In Westcott's time it was an axiom, with conservative and radical critics alike, that the Gospel was a seamless robe, the work all through of a single mind, transmitted to us in the form (apart from merely textual variations) in which it was composed. Serious inroads have been made upon this theory from all sides. It has come to be widely held that many of the difficulties of the Gospel may be due to accidental displacements since the work was completed. Dr. Bernard e.g. printed chapter six before chapter five. With regard to authorship, the I.C.C. abandons the traditional theory and attributes it to 'John the Presbyter' who is conceived as dependent on the reminiscences of John son of Zebedee, the latter being identified with the Beloved Disciple." Dr. Dodd claims that "the adoption of such a theory by so cautious a scholar may well be taken as marking the definite victory of criticism over tradition in one of its most strongly entrenched positions," even though, in Bernard's actual commentary, as distinct from his introduction, "the concession to criticism is almost illusory."

This illuminating survey by Professor Dodd, necessarily brief, may well be compared with Dr. W. F. Howard's full treatment of "The Fourth Gospel in The Twentieth Century" (in his book *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism And Interpretation,* pp. 33-105).

Incidentally, in Professor Dodd's contribution to *The Study of Theology* (ed. Kirk, p. 229) written ten years after the review cited above, a somewhat less confident estimate of the progress of criticism seems to be implied. "Indeed the state of Johannine criticism can perhaps best be represented by a series of questions. . . . there is no agreed answer to such questions. Johannine criticism is still in a state of flux."

In the light of these general surveys of Johannine criticism, we go on to consider some recent contributions by English scholars to the elucidation of particular problems, all of which are inter-related.

Date and Relation to Synoptic Gospels.

A significant discussion of these questions appears in Mr. P. Gardner-Smith's book *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels* (1938). The author challenges the prevalent axiom of "critical orthodoxy" that the Fourth Gospel is a good deal later than the Synoptics and probably in a relation of literary dependence upon two of them (Mark and Luke). He suggests that John is much earlier than is commonly supposed, and is independent of the other Gospels. His main thesis is that the so-called "Johannine agreements" have been over-stressed, for even

where there are verbal coincidences suggesting literary dependence, the sayings are such as might easily be handed down in oral tradition. Moreover the Johannine background and context is often entirely different, and the most satisfactory way of accounting for the complex of agreements and differences is to suppose that John used Church tradition which was in currency before the composition of the Synoptic Gospels.

Mr. Gardner-Smith examines a large number of passages in seeking to prove his theory. To take one example only, he discusses the accounts of John the Baptist given by the various evangelists. It has often been observed that in the Fourth Gospel the Baptist is not accorded the same degree of independence as in the Synoptists. The latter depict him as a preacher of righteousness with an eschatology and an ethic in his own right, as a person of considerable significance in himself. But in the Fourth Gospel he is insignificant except as a witness to the Christ who is greater than he. The identification of John the Baptist with Elijah (made by Mark) is denied, and his witness to the light is not the most telling testimony to Christ. With regard to chronology, it is implied in John 3 that the ministries of Jesus and the Baptist overlapped, whereas according to Mark 1.14 the Galilean ministry began after John's imprisonment. The more usual opinion of critics as to these discrepancies is that the deliberate depreciation of the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel is due to the growth and opposition of a "Baptist party" whose tenets called for refutation. But Mr. Gardner-Smith offers quite a different explanation. He suggests that John wrote his Gospel at a time when Mark's tradition was not yet regarded as binding upon the Church, and he gives this solution not only for the one problem cited above, but for many similar instances of discrepant record as between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. In his view, John is independent of the other Gospels and is based largely upon oral tradition. In appraising this important work, which has almost convinced some of our leading scholars (see e.g. W. F. Howard *Christianity According to St. John*, p. 17—with some reservations), there are at least three significant points to be borne in mind.

(1) Any theory which largely depends on an appeal to oral tradition is not susceptible of decisive proof or refutation. Oral tradition is such an inchoate and undetermined body of material that we have no precise standards of reference, and every critic is tempted to resort to it to find anything he needs. Gardner-Smith constantly appeals to it, and though many of his claims are not unreasonable, in the nature of the case they remain speculative (compare the many unverifiable conjectures of some of the Form Critics). An appeal to written documents is all too

often indecisive enough, but at any rate it can be checked and discussed in a much more satisfying way than an argument which is hidden in the spacious recesses of oral tradition.

(2) It seems very doubtful whether due allowance has been made in this book for the gradualness of the process by which the Synoptic Gospels became standard and canonised works. The writer frequently uses Johannine discrepancies to assert John's ignorance of Mark and Luke, and suggests, implicitly at any rate, that it is inconceivable that the Fourth Gospel should deliberately contradict the others. But Mark's Gospel did not become canonical, which means to say substantially unalterable in the judgment of its readers, for many years after its composition. It must be remembered that Luke and Matthew freely altered, corrected and supplemented Mark, and Matthew especially soon won an easy pre-eminence over it in the esteem of the Church. Hence, there seems to be little ground for thinking that John, if he had known Mark, would have regarded it as sacrosant. These facts are of course familiar to such a scholar as Mr. Gardner-Smith, but they do not seem to have been sufficiently present to his mind in the writing of his book, and he gives the impression of labouring under an anachronistic attribution of canonicity to Mark.

(3) With regard to the dating of the Fourth Gospel, the main emphasis of Gardner-Smith's book is on Johannine discrepancies at points where dependence upon the Synoptics has generally been assumed. It is natural that attention should be largely fixed on such material in a work of this kind. But surely one is justified in suggesting that where the date of a document is in doubt, the material which is peculiar to itself affords the most decisive criterion. Are the large tracts of peculiar Johannine record of such a nature as to be consonant wth a very early date? If Mark and John are deemed to be almost contemporaneous, as Gardner-Smith suggests may possibly be the case, how are we to account for the familiar and considerable differences in selection of facts, in the setting of the ministry of Jesus, in the types of discourse, and so on, especially if both Gospels are held to be very largely dependent on oral tradition? We cannot solve all such difficulties by referring to the difference between the communities from which the two books emanated. Gardner-Smith puts in a plea for Ephesus as an advanced community where Christian thought would mature more quickly than at other centres. But even allowing for this, there are certain apologetic and polemical emphases in John which seem to demand a comparatively late date, such as his anti-Docetic teaching, for which there would be no occasion in the early days of the Church.

To sum up, Mr. Gardner-Smith seems to have made it an open question whether John actually read Mark and Luke, but he does not carry conviction in suggesting that the Fourth Gospel may possibly be almost contemporaneous with Mark.

Having sought to maintain the relative lateness of John as over against the Synoptics, we must acknowledge, however, that it is not as late as much of past criticism would have us believe. There are definite reasons for modifying the older estimates in this connection. For instance "An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel," edited by C. H. Roberts (1935) and regarded by him as part of a copy made in Egypt during 130-150 A.D., precludes a very late date for the Gospel, and allowance being made for circulation suggests a time no later than about 100 for its composition (if the Ephesian origin of John is to be maintained). As Kenyon put it "This would have been invaluable for controversial purposes sixty years ago . . . and a conclusive refutation of those who would bring the Fourth Gospel far down into the second century." The bearing of "Fragments of an Unknown Gospel," which probably quote from John, is in the same direction.

PLACE OF ORIGIN.

The discussion of date inevitably involves, as suggested above, some consideration of the Place of Origin of our Gospel. It is not surprising that Mr. J. N. Sanders, pleading for an Alexandrian origin in his book, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*, emphasises the fact that the Rylands and Egerton Papyri (referred to in the previous paragraph by their other names) demonstrate that the Fourth Gospel was to be found in Egypt before 150 A.D. He draws out the significance of other familiar phenomena, e.g. the wide use of John by Alexandrian Gnostics, the likelihood of a Christian Logos-doctrine being developed at Alexandria, the large Jewish population of the city and a possible "John the Baptist sect." the uncertain orthodoxy of Alexandria as a ground for the reluctance of the early church to accept the Fourth Gospel. Most scholars who have discussed Sanders' arguments seem to feel that he has made a strong presentation of his positive hypothesis, but that his dismissal of the Ephesian theory is too facile, as is his severance of the First Epistle of John from the Gospel (following C. H. Dodd in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands' Library*, April 1937, on "The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel"). It should be noted, however, that his thorough and painstaking examination of the use of the Fourth Gospel in the Fathers and Gnostics is a valuable contribution, largely unaffected by his point of view. Sanders makes it clear that

John was not regarded as Scripture by any wide section of "orthodox" Christianity until the last quarter of the Second Century.

It is interesting to note that the American scholar, A. M. Perry, had an article in *The Journal of Biblical Literature* for June 1944, entitled "*Is John an Alexandrian Gospel?*" and written before Sanders' book came to his hand. He confesses some of the difficulties in the inquiry, such as "the long night which obscures the history of the Church in Egypt down to the end of the Second Century." Briefly he examines the historical development of the Alexandrian Church, the style and thought of John, and the external evidence (he considers that the Rylands Papyrus suggests, without proving, that John was the first Gospel of our four to circulate in Egypt, and that Egypt was the first place where it circulated). The tradition concerning Johannine authorship and the counter-tradition of the early martyrdom of John he regards as both of little weight. "External tradition regarding New Testament questions is not infrequently mistaken." In conclusion, Perry suggests that if we accept the Alexandrian provenance of the Gospel, as he inclines to do, some fresh light might be cast on a number of New Testament problems, e.g.: would not a new perspective be given to the question of the antiquity and authenticity of some, at least, of its traditions? And would not acceptance of its virtual independence of Paul considerably enlarge our estimate of the common underlying, or "pre-Pauline" tradition of the Church? The writer does not claim to give irrefutable answers to the questions he is discussing, but feels that the evidence warrants raising anew the question "Is not John an Alexandrian Gospel?" Other American scholars such as Kirsopp Lake and R. M. Grant seem to be equally sympathetic.

Background of Thought.

The background of thought of this Gospel can hardly be separated from the questions of its place of origin, but a word may be said perhaps, regarding that mingling of Jewish and Hellenistic elements which constitutes one of the problems of interpretation. Dr. W. F. Howard's study entitled, "The Johannine Sayings of Jesus," *Expository Times*, August 1935) was important for its full appreciation of the Palestinian background. He wrote "It is indeed significant that scholars are now beginning to think it possible that the non-Synoptic portions of the Fourth Gospel may go back to traditions which originated in Palestine. Studies relating John with rabbinic literature help to remove the prejudice which puts down every mystical

note in the Gospel to late and non-Palestinian influence. Yet much work has to be done in discovering the sayings of Jesus . . . which have been sometimes obscured through the transforming medium of the Hellenistic idiom as well as of the targumitic paraphrase of the Evangelist" (compare the strong emphasis on the Jewish setting in Howard's *Christianity According to St. John*, pp. 47., 125, etc.). Among those who have most strongly argued for a dual background of thought is C. H. Dodd in "The Background of the Fourth Gospel" (*Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, July 1935). In fact Dodd describes four forms of religious thought which were influential in the world of the Fourth Gospel, viz. Rabbinic Judaism, Hellenistic Judiasm, Greek Philosophy and the Higher Paganism, and Gnosticism. Further reference to this suggestive study may be made later in these papers.

HISTORICAL VALUE.

As to the Historical Value of John, whether there is a "recoil from historicism" in the general treatment of the Gospels or not, it is certainly true to say that there has been a rise in the stock of the Fourth Gospel in this regard. To give some particular examples, there is a growing recognition that Jesus may have exercised an early Judean ministry, and John's dating of the Last Supper is very generally preferred to that of the other Gospels. Some scholars would have it that as a consequence of the work of the Form Critics and the depreciation of the historical value of the Synoptics, all the Gospels are now on much the same level. But this process of "robbing Mark to pay John," as W. F. Howard has called it, is far from commanding general assent. It is interesting to note that two writers engaged recently, in chronological and historical research on New Testament themes, have made very liberal use of he Fourth Gospel, viz., George Ogg, in his book, *The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus*, and A. T. Olmstead in his *Jesus in the Light of History*. The latter postulates that the *narrative* materials in John are taken from an original Gospel of the Son of Zebedee, written in Palestine about 40 A.D. On the basis of this hypothesis, preference is generally given to the order and substance of the Johannine account in narrative passages. But the theory is assumed to be valid without any argument or discussion! It is the weakness of some commentaries also, which are suggestive theologically, that they do not given sufficient consideration to the grave historical "cruxes" in John. Howard appears to be justified, for instance, in saying of Hoskyns' great commentary that "he has concealed with a cloud of words his judgement on the historical question."

AUTHORSHIP.

Finally, a mere paragraph on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. This is a question as to which subjective preference is rife, and the attitude taken towards the external evidence especially varies greatly among scholars. One of the best brief summaries of the controversy appears in Vincent Taylor's little book, *The Gospels: A Short Introduction.* To sum up very inadequately, I should say that the theory of non-apostolic authorship has gained strength in recent years, usually in the form of attributing the work to John the Elder or to an Elder unknown by name (the name "John" is not, of course, attached to the Gospel explicity). Generally the author is conceived as being in close dependence upon the Apostle John. The traditional ascription has not been without some support, e.g., in a trenchant book by H. P. V. Nunn *The Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel.* Perhaps the profoundest conclusion with regard to the problem of authorship, and I do not think this at any rate can be described as an evasion, is that of Hoskyns "There was a workshop in which the Fourth Gospel was fashioned . . . but the author has done his best to cover up his tracks. He has so burnt himself out of his book that we cannot be certain that we have anywhere located him as a clear, intelligible figure in history. So anonymous is his book, so intentionally anonymous, that there is in it, apart from the shy little 'I suppose' of the last verse, no ego except the Ego of Jesus, the Son of God."[1]

DAVID R. GRIFFITHS.

[1] A further paper will follow on recent contributions to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.

Ideals of Citizenship in the New Testament.

ALTHOUGH the relevant nouns and verbs referring to citizenship occur in the New Testament, it is not in those passages alone that we find the guidance the New Testament has to give, nor is there anything like a "constitution" for the new Society. We learn what Christian citizenship ought to be from the life and teaching of Jesus, from the words He spoke about the life of man and its relation to other lives and to God, from the results of the new life as illustrated in Acts, from the response to various situations which called forth the Epistles of Paul and other New Testament writers, and from the spirit pervading the whole of the New Testament.

At the same time, it will help if we examine some of the uses of the word POLITES and its verbs and cognate nouns.

It refers to both the personal and the corporate life; POLITES (citizen or freeman) is a member of a POLIS (city or state); POLITEIA is the condition or rights of a citizen, the life of a citizen, the life or business of a statesman, the condition and constitution of a state, a form of government, a republic, a commonwealth. We cannot escape the word in our day; the citizen lives in a city or state; he has a polity or constitution; a policy or scheme of things; he needs a police force, and he takes part in politics. (Plato in at least one place uses the verb, POLITEUO, which primarily means "to live as a citizen," in the not-so-good sense of "to meddle with politics.")

It has been pointed out that it is only in the writings of Luke, "thorough Greek as he was," that the word "citizen" occurs. (Lk. xv. 15, "a citizen [Revised Version: "one of the citizens"] of that country." Lk. xix. 14, "But his citizens hated him"; and cf. Paul's claim, Acts xxi. 39, ". . . a citizen of no mean city"; and add Revised Version, quoting from LXX., Heb. viii. 11, ". . . and they shall teach every man his fellow-citizen," POLITEN, Authorised Version, PLESION, neighbour.) When Paul made his claim to be a Roman (Acts xxii. 28), the chief captain replied: "With a great sum obtained I this POLITEIA" (Authorised Version, "freedom"; Revised Version, "citizenship," the latter being preferable).

POLITEUMA appears in Phil. iii. 20, where for Authorised Version "conversation" Revised Version has "citizenship," and R.V.m. "commonwealth." Lightfoot notes: "This may mean either (i.) the state, the constitution, to which we belong as citizens, or (ii.) the functions which as citizens we perform. The singular points to the former meaning, which is also more frequent; . . ." Cf. also Lightfoot on Phil. i. 27, POLITEUESTHE, "perform your duties as citizens": "It was natural that, dwelling in the metropolis of the empire, St. Paul should use this illustration. The metaphor, moreover, would speak forcibly to his correspondents, for Philippi was a Roman colony, and the Apostle had himself obtained satisfaction, while in this place, by declaring himself a Roman citizen. Though the word POLITEUESTHAI is used very loosely at a later date, at this time it seems to refer to public duties devolving on a man *as a member of a body*: so Acts xxiii. 1 PEPOLITEUMAI, Revised Version, 'I have lived before God in all good conscience until this day . . .'; where St. Paul had been accused of violating the laws and customs of the people and so subverting the theocratic constitution. . . . The phrase AXIOS POLITEUESTHAI is adopted in Clem. Rom. xxi. Polycarp also, writing to these same Philippians, v., combined it very happily with another expression (2 Tim. ii. 12): 'If we perform our duties under Him as simple citizens, He will promote us to a share of His sovereignty.'"

In Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (i. 444f.) E. R. Bernard writes: "It (POLITEUMA) appears in Phil. iii. 20, where for 'conversation' we should substitute 'commonwealth' (R.V.m.) . . . Saints on earth are to live as worthy citizens of the heavenly commonwealth (Phil. i. 27, R.V.m). The conception of the Church, not as a kingdom subjugating the world, but as a commonwealth gradually extending its citizenship to other lands and alien tribes (cf. Eph. ii. 12 and Ps. lxxxvii.), and thus making them fellow-citizens with the saints (Eph. ii. 19), ran parallel with the extension of Roman citizenship which was going on all the time and was to culminate in the inclusion of all Roman citizens by the edict of Caracalla (A.D. 212)."

As we have said, it is not texts, nor even precepts, which are important, but rather the spirit and general principles infusing society through the lives of men which count. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. v. 16). The guiding principle, ". . . all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to others, for this is the law and the prophets," applied even on the lowest level, would take us far. The new thing is not the teaching, but JESUS Himself. "He was new. If we are to understand the movement, we must in some

degree realise Him—in Himself and in His influence upon men."[1] That is the difference between the method of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament, and the Incarnation is the mark of the difference. "God, Who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son" (Heb. i. 1f. cf. R.V.m.). The prophets spoke as individuals, each with his own version of "Thus saith the Lord," but Jesus "appointed twelve, that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach . . ." (Mk. iii. 14, Revised Version). It was the fellowship as much as the teaching which shaped them, until He was able to leave them, "and from the throne of His heavenly glory to direct their work for the Kingdom of God." While He was with them they began to see and to catch the spirit which should breathe through the new Society, and to learn what its members should be and do.

"Renan thought that the strongest proof of the originality of Jesus was not to be found in the novelty of the truths He taught . . . but in the Society He created." While the Gospels do not give direct guidance on the outward form, there was to be a distinguishing mark, given in a new commandment, ". . . that ye love one another, as I have loved you" (John xiii. 34.) By that alone men were to recognise His Society; "By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another" (John xiii. 35). The creative principle was the love of God, and the moral life of the Christian is life in a Christian community; he belongs not simply to a family, civic community, state or race, but primarily to a Christian community. (There are references which suggest that the Christian Society has the first claim upon the beneficence of Christian men, as well as their devoted service; cf. Gal. vi. 10 and 1 John iii. 16.) The Christian commonwealth is a spiritual commonwealth; in the first place it involves God's rule in the individual life, for it is a personal experience, and this is the common life which is the secret of universal brotherhood. Only new men can make a new world, and in Jesus God reveals the perfect man and makes His purpose known. It is the followers of Jesus who receive the vision of the new Jerusalem.

The "Sermon on the Mount" is more than a disquisition on citizenship; yet it provides illustrations of this theme; the disciple is to have a sanitary effect on the community, as salt, light, and leaven, and he is to seek the Kingdom of God and its righteousness before his own material satisfaction. The whole

[1] T. R. Glover, *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, p. 116. For some of the references that follow the writer is indebted to H. H. Scullard, *The Ethics of the Gospel and the Ethics of Nature*.

tenor of the collection of sayings shows the difference between the Christian and the world. A consequence was that those who belonged to the new Society were not to seek position nor glory, "as the Gentiles do."

Another great point of difference from earthly society is that the new Society has not evolved from man's life, but is a new creation, "coming down from God out of heaven" (Rev. xxi. 2), and the members have not brought it into being themselves; "Ye hath not chosen Me, but I have chosen you." (John xv. 16). Other earthly societies spring from some mutual need or common pursuit, in learning, arts, business or recreation, or are maintained by mutual contract, which is quite different from this new Society depending upon the relation of the soul to God, through Christ; it is the fellowship of those who strive together for the faith of the Gospel. There are therefore no rules, no visible ties linking Christians to one another, even as the Lord with Whom they are united is invisible. "And call no man your father upon the earth: for One is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for One is your Master, even Christ" (Matt. xxiii. 9f. cf. Matt. xx. 26, xviii. 1f.; Mk. ix. 35, x. 43; Lk. xxii. 26; John xiii. 14). The two essential features of the new Society are the frank confession of Himself as Christ the Son of the living God, and the equally frank acknowledgment of wrongs done to the brotherhood. (Matt. xvi. 18, xviii. 17.)

Jesus refused all attempts to make Him the leader of a social revolution (John vi. 15), or even to give judgment in a specific case (Lk. xii. 14); but taking as a whole the teaching of Jesus, we find Him dealing with both immediate and distant questions. He saw where the policy of the Roman Government and the temperament of the Jews were likely to clash, and He gave definite warnings, but there is no framework to which human society must be shaped. There are together the note of urgency and the counsel of patience: "the Kingdom of God is within you" (Lk. xvii. 21), whether it means that it is already present or is inward to man; but, "so is the Kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed upon the earth, and the seed should spring up and grow he knoweth not how . . ." (Mk. iv. 26). There we have the slow growth of the Kingdom, certain in the end, but there is no sketch or chart of the new Society: ". . . it doth not yet appear what we shall be . . ." (1 John iii. 2). The Kingdom is a living organism constantly growing, a building never completed, because it is being built with living stones. (No one metaphor can contain it.)

Christianity lifts morality from the seen and natural to the unseen and supernatural. The moralist attempts to describe a morality which belongs to this world, but Jesus said: "My Kingdom is not of this earth." The moralists would draw the morality

of this earth from the people in it, but Jesus set before men the principles of the heavenly world: "Be ye perfect as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. v. 48). From the human side it *may* be a "discovery," but for the Christian it is a revelation. For this reason, Christians should be prepared to accept the reproach of being "other-worldly." "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world . . . therefore the world hateth you" (John xv. 19). "In My Father's house are many mansions" (John xiv. 2). The Kingdom is not to be confined to this world, and its operations are wider than those which produce visible results. In His High Priestly prayer, Jesus confessed that He did not belong to this world, neither did His disciples. "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John xvii. 16); yet, "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven" (Matt. vi. 10).

The Christian is independent of the world because he is in complete dependence upon God, as was his Master: "The Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He seeth the Father do; for what things soever He doeth, these things also doeth the Son likewise" (John v. 19). This is reflected in the followers of Jesus. The Christian's separation from the world is spoken of by those who had learned of Him. ". . . if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (1 John ii. 15). "Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind" (Rom. xii. 2). "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world, is the enmity of God" (James iv. 4). ". . . I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims . . ." (1 Peter ii. 11). These are texts which can be multiplied.

Man is to live for something higher than that by which the world tests success. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. iv. 4). Cf. John vi. 27: "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you." So Jesus raised the thoughts of His disciples to a higher level: "Fear not, little flock; for it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom" (Lk. xii. 32); cf. 1 John ii. 15: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him."

All this may seem to be abstract, which Jesus never was; for example, when He was asked about neighbourliness, He gave the answer in terms of an individual: "A certain man . . ." So, also, the individual has a personal responsibility to deal with others as he has been dealt with for good, as illustrated in the

parable of the unforgiving servant (Matt. xviii. 23f.). The effect of His life during His earthly ministry was primarily on the individual rather than on society as a whole; Zaccheus realised that his failure in honest dealing was an offence against *people*: ". . . and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation . . ." So, though citizenship is expressed in relationships, it begins with a man, a woman, a child, and if we have in any way caused one "little one" to stumble, we have failed, and worse. (Cf. Mk. ix. 42 and parallels.)

This question of relationships also brings out more clearly the idea of contrast with the world. "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother and my sister and mother" (Mk. iii. 35). All men are not brothers in the New Testament sense of the word, for it is not a natural relationship; it belongs to those "which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John i. 13). The highest loyalty is to Christ (Matt. x. 37), but a man must attend to his family duties even before obeying his religious scruples (Mk. vii. 9f.), of which 1 John iii. 17 and iv. 20 are at least echoes.

There is a sense of depreciation or implied inferiority in the New Testament use of the word "world," though it has its uses, but the Christian has ". . . an inheritance, incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven" (1 Peter i. 4). To the Apostolic writers the world is an evil place. "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world" (1 John. ii. 16). "Wherefore come ye out from among them, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you" (2 Cor. vi. 17; cf. Heb. xiii. 13). Christians, on the other hand, "have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God" (1 Cor. ii. 12). Those who at one time "were without God, being aliens from the commonwealth, . . . having no hope, and without God in the world . . . are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God" (Eph. ii. 12-19). "Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear" (Heb. xii. 28), for, as Paul comments, "all things are yours, . . . the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours" (1 Cor. iii. 22f.).

"World" is used with different connotations, as when John says: "Love not the world . . ." (1 John ii. 15), and also: "God so loved the world . . ." (John iii. 16), that He gave His Son for its redemption. The latter refers to those who have power and will to believe and respond. "The Christian must learn to love the world with something of the love of God, even that part

which is most actively hostile to himself and to the Gospel which he professes." No man can say he loves God if he hates his brother. (1 John iv. 20; cf. ii. 9f.)

There is a certain mystery about it, "for we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth together until now" (Rom. viii. 22); "we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness" (1 John v. 19), and there is an impending dissolution of the existing order; "... but the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fearful heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up" (2 Peter iii. 10). Yet there is something to be seen beyond all the confusion and suffering: "... the manifestation of the sons of God ... because the creature itself shall also be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God ..." (Rom. viii. 19-21). "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power; for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created" (Rev. iv. 11: "the Apocalypse of the lower creation redeemed from purposelessness and bondage"), and "we, according to this promise, look for new heavens and a new earth" (2 Peter iii. 13).

The life of Jesus was not limited by human institutions, nor formed on any human model, though He would obey the ordinances of men if there was no conflict with the will of God and if they were for the general benefit of society. Sometimes it "becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15); sometimes, "lest we offend them," He will pay the tribute money (Matt. xvii. 27), though strictly speaking He was exempt from payment. At other times there may be need to discriminate: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's..." (Matt. xxii. 17 and parallels). He accepted the secular order, and indeed appears to have gone beyond many of His fellow-countrymen in the respect with which He treated the occupying power; but that power had its limits; "... and after that have nothing they can do ..." (Lk. xii. 4); "... thou couldest have no power at all against Me, except it were given thee from above: ..." (John xix. 11). If the test came, His followers will "obey God rather than men" (Acts v. 29).

The spiritual world in which Jesus lived and into which He introduced His disciples was a Divine Society; in His life and teaching there is a relative indifference to material things ("... but one thing is needful ..."—Lk. x. 42), and He does not seem to be directly concerned about economic conditions and their improvement; He concentrates on the highest things: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these

things shall be added unto you." Those who are not of Him, the Gentiles, seek after these things, but the Christian can trust his heavenly Father, Who "knoweth that ye have need of all these things" (Matt. vi. 32, 33). It is this concentration on the highest things, when His followers have understood it, which has done most to improve material conditions; this effect comes from something beyond the earthly life and teaching of Jesus "By His death and resurrection Jesus liberated men from the bondage of the seen and the temporal, brought life and incorruption to light, and empowered His disciples to testify to all men by word and deed of a kingdom which could never be shaken." Here again we see how the Christian is to be detached from the world, and the best evidence of that which was initiated by the life and death of Jesus is found in the devotion of those who faced poverty and shame, suffering, imprisonment and death, that they might make others partakers of the heavenly gift.

The Christian has "an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven" (1 Peter i. 4); the possession of riches is a dangerous matter, ". . . for the love of money is the root of all evil" (1 Tim. vi. 10), and no "covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ and of God" (Eph. v. 5). Yet even material wealth has its uses, "and they that use this world" must live and use it "as not abusing it" (R.V.m., "using it to the full"; Moffatt, "not engrossed in it"), "for the fashion of this world passeth away" (1 Cor. vii. 31). Riches are to be used rightly, but not loved for their own sake, and what Jesus had to say about money as a symbol of material wealth is not directed against it as such, but against the wrong attitude of mind, and the wrong use of it. A man cannot be in two minds, in two camps; he cannot sow for one crop and hope to reap the benefits of another and different harvest, much less to have both. "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon" (Matt. vi. 24; cf. Gal. vi. 7, "God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap"). Jesus said many hard things about riches and the covetous spirit: "Woe unto you that are rich, for ye have received your consolation." "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God." "Take heed and beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth" (Lk. vi. 24; Mk. x. 25; Lk. xii. 15).

The general line of Pauline guidance is that the Christian is a citizen or colonist of a city which descends out of heaven from God: ". . . your citizenship (POLITEUMA) is in heaven" (Phil. iii. 20). The saints are to live as worthy citizens of the heavenly commonwealth. The idea of citizenship is often given

in the New Testament by "conversation," signifying "manner of life," and definitely associating the conception of life with a relationship with a POLIS. POLITEUMA and its verb is a characteristically Greek expression, for "conduct to a Greek was mainly a question of relation to a state" (J. A. Robinson on Eph. ii. 2). ANASTROPHE and its verb in the New Testament is practically synonymous with words meaning a manner or "walk" of life; the general sense should be understood as "conduct" or regulation of life, and it is significant that the term used in Acts for the life of the Christian is "the Way" (Acts ix. 2; xix. 9, 23; xxii. 4, 22).

Paul did not, any more than his Master, proclaim a social revolution; he sought to Christianise the relationships of master and slaves by making them both Christians. "In fact, Christianity as we find it set out by Paul, and exemplified, however imperfectly, by the Pauline churches, displays the new ethical passion and power which were eventually to win the empire and the world." They lived by "ethical and religious principles which were destined to live and transform the world because they owed their origin to faith in the historical Son of God, Who had opened the Kingdom of God to all believers."

The Apologists of the second century claimed that Christians were a third race, neither Jew nor Gentile, but they refuted charges of being bad citizens of the empire when they refused to worship the emperor; they claimed to be good citizens, and declared that they prayed for the emperor, which was better than mere worship. They were accused of seeking to cause a revolution in society (cf. Acts xvii. 6), but "at the outset a minority group [they] cultivated those virtues which could be practised in their own circles and did not seek to shape the empire as a whole." They did expect the revolution to happen, not by their own efforts, but following the return of the Lord, in sudden apocalyptic fashion. The existing order was accepted, slavery and all else (perhaps as a result of their eschatology), and Paul accepted its advantages, claiming his Roman citizenship, to the furthering of the Gospel. Yet the ultimate result of the witness was that society was transformed not by revolution from without, but from within, by Christians whose life and practice made it clear that society based on slavery was impossible in the light of Christ's redeeming work.

The Christian view of citizenship is that only new men can make a new world; it is the new man in Christ, coming into the fellowship of the Church and living in the world, "as seeing Him Who is invisible," who can discover and operate a long-term policy which will endure. At the same time, we must remember that "this present world is not the end; the full glory abideth

not therein," and realise that our citizenship is in the heavenly places. At the most we are to make this world a colony of heaven, wherein heaven's life is at least reflected as far as we know it. We can only rebuild our cities adequately as we realise that they are the earthly places of habitation of those who are potentially sons of God; we can only re-fashion human society effectively if we make it the fellowship and mutual service of those who are joint-heirs with Christ. "Thus the Christian's attitude to the world is partly hostile, partly friendly; hostile so far as the world tries to convert him, friendly so far as he tries to convert the world." "The idea of universal love is not the result of a change of sentiment in the world, so much as the practical exposition of the true relation of man to God."

So, then, the problem is not to be simplified by talking about the "application of the Sermon on the Mount" (for social conditions in Palestine and the Roman Empire in the first century were vastly different from those of to-day). Rather, our thinking must be based upon the infinite value of each human soul, with all that has come of it in the changed position of individuals and groups; this pre-supposes, historically speaking, belief in the scheme of salvation. Perhaps a reconsideration, from the Christian standpoint, of the theory of "labour-value" might be very useful.

It is not an atomistic philosophy which suggests that the key to the whole situation is an understanding of the true value of the individual, for that value is only known by the new man in Christ, and that is social, a life of fellowship with Christ in God, visible in the Christian Church, and operative as Christians penetrate commerce, industry and politics. The Christian as such has no skill in economics, politics, science or government; what he has is a grave responsibility to use any such skill to the utmost, and to insist that it is used to the greater glory of God, and for the service of his fellows.

A. N. Wilson.

The Church in War-time China.

THE situation in China changes so rapidly that anyone who has been away from the country for a period of some months can no longer speak with authority on current affairs there. As over half a year has gone by since I left China, I am not in a position to write about developments in that country since the Japanese surrender, but during the most of the Second World War I was in one part or another of Free China, and saw the work and witness of the Church in several provinces.

When the Japanese surrender was announced, I was in Sian, at that time one of the two B.M.S. stations continuing to function in China. Four years previously I was also in Sian, which until Pearl Harbour was a frequent target for Japanese bombers. But although at the end of the Pacific War I found myself back in the same city as at the start of that war, I had, during the interval, travelled through almost every province in Free China, particularly in the south, and had seen at close quarters the impact of the war upon the Chinese peasant and the Chinese Church. During my eighteen months' absence from Sian I was out of touch with the work of the B.M.S., but had many opportunities of seeing the way in which Churches with a different Christian tradition maintained their witness in various environments despite peculiar hardships.

In order to form a proper picture of the place of the Church in war-time China, it is first necessary to examine the background against which the Church performed its task during those difficult years. Since the end of the Pacific War and the return of missionaries to what was once Occupied China, much has come to light concerning the way in which the work of the Church there was maintained in spite of enemy occupation and the internment of missionaries. But although "Free" China consisted *ipso facto* of that part of the country which was not under Japanese occupation, it was none the less a country run on a war footing, and a country, too, from which missionaries were, at certain periods, being evacuated in large numbers owing to the threat, which in most cases materialised, of Japanese advance and occupation.

From the middle of April, 1944, until the beginning of December of that year, the fear of further Japanese advance, first in North China, then during the summer and autumn in central and south-western China, finally during the early winter in Kweiyang and in Chungking itself, coloured everyone's mind. In place of the easy optimism of early 1944 that spoke in terms of "the year of victory" and "counter-offensive," there came panic,

or the pessimism which concluded that the Japanese who had captured one impregnable stronghold with little opposition could as easily conquer the next. The more defeatist a rumour, the more readily it gained a hearing; the more strenuously an evil rumour was denied, the greater the suspicion which attached to the denial.

Evacuation became an obsession in every mind—not such an evacuation as took place from some of our big cities during certain periods of the air war, but something much more despairing, because of its finality and the misery it brought with it. As the threat of Japanese occupation grew more intense, the local authorities in one town after another along the line of their advance took three successive steps to empty the town of its civilian population. First there would be a period of voluntary evacuation, when the more cautious would pack up their belongings and make their way to some place of greater safety. The next stage was called "urgent evacuation." During the days that followed this announcement shops would put up their shutters, and the most valuable stocks would be packed and taken away by the shopkeeper and his staff of assistants, by motor-truck if they were exceptionally fortunate, by train if they had enough influence or good fortune to hire a wagon, or by some method of human transport if competition had already become too severe on the railway. Government organisation would close down and move further inland, obtaining transport priority over private businessmen and individual families. The man in the street would pack what belongings he could carry by his own unaided strength and walk to the railway station, there to wait hour after hour for the next train. When it came, he would battle for a place inside, on the roof, or in front of the engine, taking care that his luggage remained intact and was not lost or stolen in the disorder. But even under such conditions, trains have a limited capacity, and in despair, many would give up the contest for a place, and join the long procession of those who escaped on foot to a place of greater safety. These desperate conditions would be intensified by the time the third stage, that of compulsory evacuation, was reached. The life of the city would come to a standstill, and the military would enforce the departure of those who were unwilling to take a step which meant leaving their homes, taking only what could be carried on a pole over their shoulders, and literally stepping out into a future holding no hope of economic security.

With a military situation which led to such desperate abandonment of possessions, security and hope, there frequently went a spiritual apathy and a tendency to consider any state of affairs better than the status quo. Refugees on their way south

or west would comment as they heard rumours of desertion and mass surrender to the enemy, "Who can blame them—what benefit do they get out of fighting, or we out of their continued resistance?" In contrast to our own country, the sympathy of the general public lay more often with a deserter than with the authorities who might be looking for him. As was inevitable in such circumstances, the Government, whether local or national, came in for a good deal of privately expressed criticism, and one old farmer was even heard to express his dissatisfaction by saying that it even rained more plentifully in the Communist area than upon Central Government territory!

The economic effects of the war were disastrous and were more keenly felt than in Britain. In spite of the vastness of China, the repercussions arising from the Japanese advance penetrated to the most remote villages in all the provinces concerned. Provincial Governments, for example, would evacuate from the capital of the province, and as an emergency measure, the various departments, finance, education, health, and so forth, would scatter to previously selected emergency centres. Often these would be, not places of importance, but small market towns chosen for their comparative inaccessibility. The inhabitants would suddenly find themselves coping with a peaceful invasion by their own countrymen, involving a complete dislocation of their economic life, and scarcity for both parties. Again, remote villages would often find their population multiplied several times within a few days as a wave of refugees, permanent or temporary, descended like locusts on the land. Commodity prices, always tending to rise, would soar, in geometric rather than arithmetic progression. Meanwhile, whether the enemy were near or far, taxation would continue on a heavy scale, and crops would be commandeered to feed the defending armies. Since war involved such bitter hardships for the peasant and the small tradesman, it is little wonder that the official exhortation, "Military and Civilians must Co-operate" generally went unheeded, and in some places blood was shed in clashes between civilians and the soldiers billeted on them.

Such were the conditions under which the Church continued its work, particularly in the depressing days of 1944 when no news was too bad to be believed, but also in varying degrees throughout the whole eight years of war between China and Japan. The ordinary Church member could not but be affected by the course of events—he might find himself a refugee fleeing from the Japanese, his son might be conscripted to serve in the army in some distant part of China with no hope of leave, his crops would probably prove insufficient to maintain his family after taxation had accounted for the major share. These hard-

ships he would share with his non-Christian neighbours, to whom he was often an example of Christian faith and patience in the face of such losses as arose out of the war. Furthermore, in many parts of Free China the Church was faced with the challenge of maintaining its witness unsupported by funds or personnel from abroad, at a time when the war made an exceptionally heavy drain on local resources, both of money and of man-power. Scores of missionaries, British and American, were evacuated towards Kunming and India from southern and central China during the summer of 1944 by British military trucks, which were only one means of transport among many. The "free" areas of whole provinces such as Kiangsi and Fukien were left with no more than half a dozen Protestant missionaries apiece, though mention should be made of Swiss missionaries and Irish priests in this area who stayed at their posts, willing to take a chance on their neutrality, in spite of knowing what had happened to neutrals in other invaded areas.

It was my privilege to meet with Christians in several of these centres from which missionaries had recently been evacuated, and to see how the work of the Church was being maintained by the Chinese leaders. It was an interesting experience at a time when I had travelled farther than ever before from Sian, my old mission station, to meet Mr. P'eng, priest in charge of the Anglican Church at Kienyang in Fukien. He had previously been one of the clergy in Sian, and had left shortly before I had arrived there. We spent a happy evening together, talking about our old friends in the North-West and about his work in this his native province. The English missionaries had recently left the city, but the Church continued to go ahead in this important commercial centre, and useful work was being done among the university students. My contact with Mr. P'eng had come about in the first place in connection with medical relief supplies in whose distribution he and some of the local Christian laymen took an active interest. The Church in Kienyang was typical of those I came across in other areas from which missionaries had been evacuated.

While I lived in Shensi, the "Church of Christ in China" had not seemed much more than a name to me. The Shensi Synod of the C.C.C. was co-terminous with the area for which the B.M.S. had long been responsible in that province, and there were no other co-operating missions there. But when I saw the diversity and yet the underlying unity of the various local congregations of the Church of Christ in China in Hunan, Kweichow, Szechuan and Yunnan, congregations made up of Christians from all parts of China who in their war-time homes felt they belonged to the one body, whatever their previous denominational

affiliations might have been, then the name Church of Christ in China came to have a new significance. There are, admittedly, many Protestant missions, both British and American, which do not co-operate in the Church of Christ in China, but broadly speaking, the C.C.C. may be said to have the function of uniting in one General Assembly representatives from the main Christian bodies in China who worship after the Reformed tradition.

One interesting example of the co-operation within the C.C.C. in war-time China, and it is to be hoped, in time of peace as well, is the Church at Kunming. At the time when I knew the Church there, during the spring of 1945, the pastor was a Chinese who had been associated with, and trained by the London Missionary Society in Fukien. There were three missionaries co-operating with him there, two of them English Presbyterians from Swatow, and the third a member of the American Reformed Church. Earlier in the war, one of our B.M.S. missionaries and his wife had served the C.C.C. in Kunming after leaving occupied China.

This example of co-operation within the Church of Christ in China was directly due to the war, but it is not only within the C.C.C.. itself that a spirit of unity among Christians has been developed during the past nine years. Christians dispersed to distant parts of China did not ask whether their fellow-worshippers were Baptists or Methodists—they were only aware of their brotherhood in Christ.

It has often been said that the mission fields are ahead of the home Churches in their progress towards Christian unity. Especially has this been true in the Churches of the dispersion in China. There must be many, both Chinese and British, whose dusty recollections of Ishan, a temporary halting-place in the withdrawal from the Japanese and for a few brief days the emergency capital of Kwangsi province, include memories of the Communion services conducted by the Bishop of Hongkong, to which he invited all Christian believers, regardless of denomination. Outside, in the crowded streets, refugees were selling family heirlooms to provide food for the immediate needs of themselves and their children, labouring for the meat that perisheth, before pressing on to yet another destination farther west. Inside the Church, we who had to live in that same world of transience, fellow believers of varying races and Christian traditions, were yet united in partaking of the Living Bread which came down out of heaven, and were during those moments conscious of our unity, in worship and in a common remembrance, with fellow-Christians in every land and of all ages, with the general assembly and Church of the first-born whose names are written in heaven.

BRYNMOR F. PRICE.

The Story of Pottergate and Ber Street Churches, Norwich.

POTTERGATE.

IN the year 1762, Samuel Fisher came from Nottingham and settled in the pastorate of St. Mary's, Norwich. There he remained for twelve years which in the early years brought success to the Church, but in 1774 Fisher was accused of a grave moral offence, and on January 30th, he was excluded from the Church. Two years later, he appeared before the Church to express his repentance, but as the Church did not consider his repentance to be genuine, he still remained outside its membership. He himself, however, considered that he was sincere and others supported him.

Within a few months of being excluded from St. Mary's, Samuel Fisher had licensed premises for preaching in St. Michael's Coslany, Norwich, in a room called the "Great Parlour," belonging to John Hervey, a carpenter, but later in the year, on November 19th, he licensed "certain rooms called the Wool Room and Chamber, commonly called Norton's" in St. Mary's, Norwich. These premises were his own possession, and in them he commenced preaching to a small company of seven. Sometime later he took over premises in Pottergate which had originally belonged to the Methodists.

In the year 1775, Samuel Fisher was visited by John Johnson, the founder of the sect known as the "Johnsonian" Baptists.

John Johnson was born in March, 1706, at Lostock, Eccles, near Manchester, and was the son of a peasant. He was piously brought up and when 20 years of age became a preacher. In 1741, he became Pastor of the Byrom Street Baptist Church, Liverpool, but he left again in 1747 or 1748, because his doctrinal views were offensive to his congregation. He and his adherents then built a new chapel in Stanley Street, Liverpool, which was opened in 1750. He remained there until his death on the 20th March, 1791, at the age of 85. His wife, whom he had married in 1740, survived him.

Johnson was a man of much vigour and originality of mind, and wrote a number of books, and also established his teaching in new Churches about the kingdom. He had many adherents at Wisbech in Cambridgeshire and elsewhere. It is rather difficult to discover exactly what this man's views actually were. He was a Calvinist who held that Adam's guilt was not

inherited, but Adam's children needed as strong remedies as if they were. He also confounded the persons in the Trinity, and insisted on making this confusion a definite point in his teaching. On account of this the "Johnsonians" were regarded as "Sabellians."

Samuel Fisher, and those who had seceded from St. Mary's, accepted these views, and joined the "Johnsonians." In 1778, Johnson wrote to Fisher congratulating him that a new church had just been formed in Norwich. Apparently at that time, they were worshipping in the Pottergate premises, St. Margaret's Lane. These premises were rebuilt in 1790. Samuel Fisher had the oversight of the Church at Deadman's Lane, Wisbech, as well as the one in Norwich.

In the year 1785, there was a secession from the Methodists in Norwich that joined the General Baptist New Connexion. These people worshipped in a chapel, known as "Ebenezer," in Ber Street, which had been built by an eccentric gentleman, named John Hunt, who was a surgeon, ornithologist and gospeller. The first pastor of the Church was Richard Wright.

Richard Wright was the son of Richard and Anne Wright, of Blakeney, Norfolk, a village that was once a seaport of some importance, having trade with Germany. Richard was born in a labourer's cottage on the 7th of February, 1764. If a scheme, that had been fostered by "the ingenious Mr. Cobb" to revive the Blakeney fisheries in 1769 had been successful, Richard might have become a seafaring man, but the company failed and Blakeney's good harbour saw little trade.

Richard's parents were originally members of the Anglican Church and Anne (1732-1810) was a woman of superior class, strong mind and fair education. She was a cousin of Sir John Fenn, the first editor of the *Paston Letters*. There were six children, Richard being the eldest. Anne Wright became a Unitarian at the age of 70. Richard Wright was sent to school by a relative, a prosperous farmer, but his schooling cannot have been for long as the farmer died, when Richard was 12 years of age. At that time the family had left the Anglican Church and joined the Dissenters. Young Richard became first a farmer's boy, then a page, and then went on trial to an Anglican shopkeeper at Holt and was later apprenticed to a dissenting blacksmith, possibly at Guestwick.

At the age of 16, Richard Wright joined the Independent Church at Guestwick, where the minister was John Sykes, who had been ordained on October 29th, 1776. The preaching was Calvinistic, of the genuine unadulterated type—"not what is called moderate Calvinism," as Richard once remarked. Sykes had no moderation. "Still," added Mr. Wright, "I thank God

that I was once a Calvinist, that I have known by experience what Calvinism is. It was one important step in my progress. However erroneous, its peculiar doctrines are perverted truth, and some precious metal may be extracted from the baser material."

Wright was not without ambition. "Panting to emerge from the lowly vale, where I was placed" as he expressed it, he considered what he could do which would render him "of some value in society." There was born in his heart a desire to win souls for Christ, so without any outward suggestion, or authority from the Church, Richard Wright, when the labour at the anvil was over for the day, began week-evening preaching in the neighbouring villages. It was inevitable that in making such a general appeal to men, he must have departed from the extreme form of Calvinism that his pastor taught. The Church requested him to preach before them, and then ordered him to wait for their consent to preach, and because he would not do so, they turned him out of the Church. The Wesleyan Methodists, hearing of this, gave him many opportunities to preach though he never joined their society. His master, "judging that he would make a better preacher than a smith," kindly gave him back his indentures.

His first call to the regular ministry came from the new Church at Ber Street, and in this chapel Dan Taylor ordained him as Pastor on 29th September, 1785. Richard Wright found it a great advantage being in Norwich, as here were books that enabled him to learn Greek and Hebrew. There was apparently at that time friendly relations between the Ber Street and Priory Yard Churches, as it has been stated that Richard Wright ranked as an Elder in the Priory Yard Church.

In 1787, Richard Wright left the Ber Street General Baptists, and made friends with Samuel Fisher and collaborated with him, though he regarded John Johnson, who at that time was over 80 years of age, as being "to a high degree bigoted and dogmatic."

In that year a curious arrangement was made between Fisher and Wright, that they should preach alternately for six months at Pottergate, Norwich, and six months at Deadman's Lane, Wisbech. This arrangement lasted until 1794, when the Wisbech congregation decided that they preferred to have Richard Wright as their sole pastor. This was partly due to the fact that Wright's teaching had by this time developed a strong trend towards Unitarianism. As the agreement between the two men was broken, Samuel Fisher declined to assert his rights, resigned the Church at Pottergate, which he left in the care of George Barber, and built a new Church in Ship Lane, Wisbech, where he was ordained in 1794. He continued to exercise an oversight of the Johnsonian Churches, until his death at Newark in 1803.

A tablet to his memory in the Pottergate Church, reads: "Samuel Fisher, many years pastor of this Church, died April 27th, 1803, aged 61 years."

The further story of Richard Wright, though it does not concern Norwich, is interesting. After leaving Norwich, he definitely accepted Unitarian beliefs. When his Unitarian views became known, the Johnsonian Baptists rejected him, but the people at Deadman's Lane, Wisbech, accepted his views and became Unitarian. In 1797, he met William Vidler (1758-1816), the "Universalist" Baptist, and converted him to Unitarianism, but was at the same time converted by William Vidler to Universalism.

In 1803, the two friends joined the General Baptist Assembly, which against all precedent ignored a minority vote, so that Dan Taylor and all the evangelicals made formal protest and withdrew.

In 1806, Wright became Home Missionary for the Unitarians, and in 1810 resigned the Pastorate at Wisbech and devoted himself entirely to this work. He brought many Baptist Churches into fellowship with the Unitarians, one such being at Long Sutton. In 1822, he settled as minister at Conigre, Trowbridge, Wiltshire, and in 1827 at Kirkstead, Lincolnshire, where he remained until his death in 1836.

Very little is known of the later ministers at Pottergate. George Barber probably remained Pastor from 1794 until 1806, and during this period John Reynoldson, upon whom had fallen the oversight of the Johnsonian Churches, removed from Newark and settled in Norwich.

The next pastor was Samuel Sly. He was probably the son of a Samuel Sly, who was baptised by Edward Trivett at Worstead on the 19th of March, 1769, and was afterwards dismissed to a Norwich Church. It is believed that Samuel Sly, junr., became pastor about 1806. A tablet to his memory in the Church reads: "Samuel Sly, died April 17th, 1842, aged 68 years, 33 (or 35?) years pastor."

The chapel was possibly rebuilt again in 1840, and that same year Joseph Gray became pastor. All that we know concerning him is again taken from the tablets in the Church. There are two, one to his memory and one to that of his wife. They read: "Mary Beakley, wife of Joseph Gray and only child of George Barber, died December 25th, 1848, wife, mother, friend exemplary; she laid the first stone of this building." The other reads: "Joseph Gray, died January 21st, 1862, aged 75 years, 22 years pastor."

There is one other tablet on the walls, which was evidently to the memory of one of their strong supporters: "In memory of the

beloved wife of William Ward, wine merchant, died November 9th, 1859, aged 56 years."

The Church at Pottergate used a hymnbook especially printed for the Johnsonians. It was pubished by Gardiner & Co., Wisbech, in 1873, and is entitled: *A Selection of Psalms and Hymns for Divine Worship*. It was printed by Winks and Son, Leicester. There are 969 hymns in the book, and are quite up to the level of other books printed about that period.

The next pastor was Henry Trevor. He was a furnisher and upholsterer of Norwich, and was there for 50 years, but toward the end of his life he attended at St. Mary's. We cannot do better than give an account of what the Rev. J. H. Shakespeare said of him when preaching a memorial sermon. Henry Trevor died on May 26th, 1897, and on the following Sunday Mr. Shakespeare said of him: "He felt that he was called to serve God by identifying himself in early life with an obscure sect called the Johnsonian Baptists, which is, I suppose, now extinct. The little chapel in Pottergate was their home. There, morning and evening for 50 years, he was in his place, solemn and devout, at first as a worshipper, and then, according to the usage of the sect, as a preacher. He took up the work of the Sunday School. Year in and year out, never missing a Sunday, without earthly fame or reward, he preached to a few earnest souls, and superintended the Sunday School. This was a quiet unnoticed service which involved much sacrifice and labour, but which he pursued with characteristic determination. As years increased, he gave up the evening service and came to St. Mary's. Then he came for both morning and evening service, transferred the Sunday School to us, and there has been no friend more true, and no worshipper more regular and devout from that day to the Sunday before which he was struck down."

In the year 1898, Mr. F. J. Fenn had a mission conducted in a room on Elm Hill, and he removed from there and took over the Pottergate premises from the Trustees and took control both of the school and the mission. Later, about the year 1913, the Sunday School was amalgamated with the Sunday School at Unthank Road. With the decreasing population in the neighbourhood of the Church, the Pottergate premises were closed, and the whole work of the school centred at Unthank Road. The Church building was reduced to a ruin in the air-raids of 1942, and the schoolroom is now used for industrial purposes.

BER STREET.

As we have already recorded, the Ber Street Church was founded in 1785 by John Hunt, the eccentric surgeon of Norwich, the chapel, which seated between 600 and 800 persons, being

built at his own expense. The story of the strange spiritual pilgrimage of its first pastor, Richard Wright, from Anglicanism, by way of the Congregational, Methodist, General Baptist and Johnsonian Baptist Churches to Unitarianism and Universalism has also been recorded. Richard Wright was at Ber Street little more than one year, but the spiritual pilgrimage of his successor is scarcely less interesting.

Joseph Proud settled there in 1786. He was the son of the Rev. John Proud, of Beaconsfield, in Buckinghamshire. He was born on the 22nd of March, 1745. When he was about eleven years of age his father removed, to take charge of the General Baptist congregation at Wisbech, in Cambridgeshire. Though of limited education, yet under the fostering care of worthy parents, his mind was early imbued with religious principles. In the year 1767 he was called to exercise his gifts as a preacher, and he was invited by the Church to assist his aged father in the ministry. Soon after he removed to take charge of the Church at Kimpton, in Leicestershire, where he remained three or four years. On the 3rd of February, 1769, he married his first wife, by whom he had eleven children. While he was at Knipton he was probably ministering to the Church, but not as an ordained minister, though he attended the meetings of the Lincolnshire Association and was ranked among "the brethren in the ministry." He returned again to Wisbech, and the Fleet Church invited him to visit them as a supply, and his labours being approved, he was invited to the pastorate and settled there in 1780. He was ordained in 1782, and at that time the cause had so prospered under his care that it was found necessary to enlarge the chapel. We find Mr. Proud acting with others in the negotiations between the Lincolnshire Association and the New Connexion, meeting them at Gosberton in 1777, Kirton in 1784, and Boston in 1785.

Joseph Proud's first wife died in 1785, and soon after he married a widow, by whom he had three children, all of whom died in infancy.

Mr. Proud was a man of superior qualifications for the exercises of the pulpit, but discontent arose in the Church, owing to his introducing singing into the public worship on his own authority, being well aware that many of the members conscientiously disapproved of it. As it usually happens each party complained of the other and at length in 1786, Mr. Proud suddenly left Fleet without acquainting the Church of his design.

About this time or a little earlier, John Hunt, the builder of the Ber Street chapel, proposed to Joseph Proud that he would give him the chapel and a residence in Norwich, for the term of his life. He readily accepted this handsome offer, and

in 1786, removed to Norwich and John Hunt became his colleague in the ministry. That same year he published a little poem, entitled *Calvinism Exploded* which passed through several editions. He also held a public disputation with a Minister of the Society of Friends, which was also printed. Other small works, chiefly poems, were also published by him, among which was *The Apostate's Progress*, written after the style of Bunyan and later printed anonymously. In 1787, the Ber Street Church was admitted into the General Baptist Assembly.

About two years after his settlement in Norwich, a physician, resident in the city, recommended him to read the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, and lent him the *Treatise on Heaven and Hell*. Mr. Proud read it and returned it with his opinion that it was the record of the wild and enthusiastic reveries of a fertile yet morbid imagination. Later a firm believer in Swedenborg's teaching, J. W. Salmon, was induced to take a journey from London, accompanied by a friend, expressly to meet him. Mr. Salmon was the guest of Joseph Proud during his stay, and lost no time in introducing the teaching of Swedenborg. Mr. Hunt very sympathetically listened to the teaching, but he was vehemently opposed by Mr. Proud who tried to persuade Mr. Hunt to have nothing to do with the doctrines. Mr. Proud undertook to convince his visitors that they were wrong by public disputation, but under the influence of Mr. Salmon, Mr. Proud became more sympathetic.

In his private diary, Mr. Proud recorded on "Tuesday morning, 17 June, 1788. Mr. J. W. Salmon came to our house. He lives at Nantwich, in Cheshire, is a member of the New Church, and preaches the doctrines. He preached at our chapel nine times. Never did I hear any man preach with such power, and Divine demonstration. He appears to be the most humble, affectionate, and holy man I ever knew; and I believe I shall never forget what he laid before me. I verily think that the Lord in great mercy sent him to me and the Church for great good: and I trust we have a people prepared to receive further degrees of love and wisdom. O that we may be thus prepared! I love the man most sincerely! and bless the Lord my Saviour for sending him. He staid with us till Thursday, the 26th—that is ten days, and I accompanied him to Dereham, where I took my leave of this dear, dear man." Later Mr. Salmon forwarded to Mr. Proud a copy of *The True Christian Religion, or Universal Theology of the New Church*. Mr. Proud read this book, seeking divine guidance to direct him to the truth, and became a convinced Swedenborgian.

On the evening of Tuesday, 24th of February, 1789, nine persons were received into Church fellowship, by the rite of

baptism administered by immersion. They were baptised "into the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the only God of heaven and earth, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in One Divine Person." At the conclusion of the ceremony, Mr. Proud preached from Ezekiel 27, 22-23. This sermon was printed at the request of the congregation, and is regarded as one of the earliest, perhaps the earliest, published after the formation of the first New Church Society in London. It was entitled: *New Jerusalem Blessings, or the Unity, Purity, and Happiness of real Christians in the last Days, in which the New Kingdom of the Lord is established—Jesus the King thereof, who is the only God of Heaven and Earth.* Later that year he visited London and entered his name in the Society's book. He was requested to write original hymns for the public worship of the New Church, and in the brief space of three months wrote upwards of 300 which were printed in 1790. Additional hymns were printed in a second edition the following year.

Joseph Proud soon became convinced that it would be impossible to remain in Norwich as the minister of Ber Street chapel. Although by the title-deeds, the chapel, minister's house, etc., were his own for life, yet having changed his religious sentiments, he felt that he could not conscientiously hold them, although he had no prospects before him.

The remainder of Joseph Proud's life was spent in the service of the New Jerusalem Church. He became an outstanding man among them. He wrote many books and pamphlets in support of the teaching and served the Church as an ordained minister in Birmingham, London, Manchester and other places. For many years before his death he was the minister of the New Jerusalem Temple in New Hall Street, Birmingham. He died on the 3rd of August, 1826, at the age of 81, and his wife, Susannah, survived for a few months and passed away that same year on the 21st of November, at the age of 76. Edward Madeley, junr. preached a memorial sermon in the New Hall Street Temple on August 20th, from the text John 12, 26. Mr. Proud was much respected by the Swedenborgians

After Joseph Proud had left Ber Street in 1791, he was succeeded by Matthew Dexter. Little is known of this man, but he remained there until 1795, when the Priory Yard pastorate, being vacant, Mr. Dexter and the members of Ber Street united with the other Church, and Ber Street was closed.

There are several references to Ber Street in the minutes of the General Baptist Assembly. In 1798, an effort was made to re-open the chapel, but the Priory Yard people would have nothing to do with it, and the Assembly decided that "nothing can be done particularly concerning it." In 1799, the Assembly

was asked whether its judgment coincided with that of the Trustees "that in consideration of Dr. Hunt's great expenses respecting that place, and in fitting up another for public worship that it be given him." This was agreed, but in 1801, it was discovered that the Deed had been enrolled in Chancery, and must remain for the purposes mentioned in the Deed, and as some of the Trustees would not consent for its return to Dr. Hunt, the matter fell through. We have already seen that Joseph Proud had realised that, having changed his convictions, he could not conscientiously hold the Trust Deed, so in 1801, he sent to the Assembly a copy of the Trust, and "liberally said that he was ready to convey the Chapel and Lands to such Trust as the General Assembly shall appoint." At the same time it was discovered that during his life-time, John Hunt had the sole authority of adding to the Trust, and the Assembly only had the power to do so after John Hunt's death. Obviously nothing could be done without agreement with Dr. Hunt. Matthew Dexter explained the circumstances to the 1802 Assembly, but as Dr. Hunt had not answered the Assembly's letter, nothing could be done.

The Trustees apparently re-opened the Chapel, though exactly what happened is obscure. George Beaumont was living there between 1814 and 1835. There are five books, or pamphlets which it is known that he published, but as to what denomination he belonged is unknown. The pamphlets are varied in character: *The Warrior's Looking Glass,* published in Sheffield in 1808; *Fixed Stars: or an Analyzation and Refutation of Astrology,* published in Norwich in 1814; *The Anti-Swedenborg,* published in London 1824; *The Griper—a letter to John Harvey,* published in Norwich 1830. and *The Complaint—addressed to the Mayor and Aldermen of Norwich* in 1835. This latter was a grouse against the City Officials for allowing two "Green Stalls" to stand in front of two shops which he owned on the Market Square, and which interfered with his trade Further information concerning this man would be welcome.

It is interesting to note that John Hunt, the builder of Ber Street Chapel, toward the end of his life moved to Gissing in Norfolk and joined the Swedenborgians. He died in 1824. It is probable that soon after his death Joseph Proud conveyed the whole of the property to the Trustees selected by the General Assembly. There are references in the the records of the *New Connection* in 1824 which suggest that this was done, and in the life of Joseph Proud it is recorded that that was one of the last acts of his life, but what ultimately became of the property is unknown.

MAURICE F. HEWETT.

Reviews.

The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament (Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York, $2.00.).

The scholars who produced the Revised Version of the Bible had the co-operation of a group of Americans who, as is well known, were ready for somewhat more radical changes than their British colleagues. Had the Americans had their way many of the valuable marginal suggestions of the RV would have been placed in the text. From 1885-1901 copies of the RV published in this country contained an appendix giving the preferences of the American Revisers, in return for which the Americans undertook to refrain from an edition of their own. This agreement having worked itself out, in 1901, the Americans produced what has since been known as the Standard Version, which incorporated their original preferences plus a number of other alterations.

It has long been known that a revision of this Standard Version was being prepared by a strong group of the leading American Biblical scholars working under the auspices of the International Council of Religious Education. Their New Testament has now been published. The Old Testament will, it is hoped, be ready in four years' time. The work is assured of a warm welcome and close study. It follows swiftly upon Father Ronald Knox's new version of the Vulgate New Testament which has already provoked controversy on account of its outstanding merit as a translation, its obvious limitations in view of the text upon which it is based, and the somewhat disingenuous way in which it has been advertised.

This new American version has been most carefully prepared. The work began in 1930. Dean Luther A. Weigle, of Yale University Divinity School, has been the Chairman of the Committee. Dr. Moffatt acted as Secretary from 1937 until his death in 1944 and brought to his task unique experience and unflagging enthusiasm. Other well known scholars who shared in the work of the New Testament section are Professor Goodspeed (himself responsible for one of the most valuable individual modern versions), Professor H. J. Cadbury and Professor J. H. Ropes. Their names are a guarantee of its critical accuracy. The principles upon which the revision has been made are best set out in the resolution passed by the

International Council of Religious Education in 1937:—"We define the task of the American Standard Bible Committee to be that of a revision of the present American Standard Bible in the light of the results of modern scholarship, this revision to be designed for use in public and private worship, and to be in the direction of the simple, classic English style of the King James Version."

The value and success of a revision of this kind cannot be judged hastily. Not for a generation, perhaps, will it be possible to say whether it will effectively replace the Standard Bible or the tendency in certain quarters to use modern translations like those of Moffatt and Goodspeed. One obvious advantage of this version is that it has been designed for use in public and private worship, which means that every effort has been made to match clarity with dignity. The Greek of the New Testament calls, as Dr. Goodspeed has said, "for a direct, familiar style in translation" but one cannot wisely ignore the place which the Book has come to hold in the devotional life of the Church and the numerous associations which have gathered about it. Dr. Millar Burrows claims that there has been a process of "desemitization" in sentence structure, in idiom, and in ways of thought, without, however, any real sacrifice of the clear continuity between the Old Testament and the New. The Greek text of the version is not that of Westcott and Hort, or Nestle, or Souter; it is based on the eclectic principle, now generally regarded as sound, of estimating each variant reading on its merits. Considerable use has been made of the Chester-Beatty fragments, but it is noteworthy that the final divergences from Westcott and Hort are not many. The committee have not hesitated to return from a number of the literal word-for-word translations of the RV and the American Standard Version to the more natural English order of the AV of 1611. They have abandoned the second person singular, "thou," with its correlative forms (except in language addressed to God) and also the plural nominative "ye." It is somewhat surprising to find that the Greek division of the night into four watches and the day into twelve hours is retained as in the older versions. The title page reads, "The New Covenant commonly called the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

Let it be said at once that the first impression made by this Revised Standard Version is an excellent one, and that there may be anticipated for it, both in America and here (so soon as it becomes possible to secure copies)a widespread popularity. We are not surprised to hear that it is already being widely used in the United States in public services and since there seem to be few, if any, "Americanisms," there is no reason why it

should not also be used in this country. Type and paper are all that can be desired. A few valuable notes and references are to be found at the foot of each page. There are a number of words and pasages to which one at once turns when a new version is put into one's hands. Here is what we are offered at a number of familiar places—and the absence of changes is in many ways as important as any changes there may be:—

"Blessed are you when men revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account. Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven, for so men persecuted the prophets who were before you. You are the salt of the earth; but if salt has lost its taste, how can its saltness be restored? It is no longer good for anything except to be thrown out and trodden under foot by men." (Matt. 5. 11-13).

"And he laid his hands upon her, and immediately she was made straight, and she praised God. But the ruler of the synagogue, indignant because Jesus had healed on the sabbath, said to the people, 'There are six days on which work ought to be done; come on those days and be healed, and not on the sabbath day.' Then the Lord answered him, 'You hypocrites! Does not each of you on the sabbath untie his ox or his ass from the manger, and lead it away to water it? And ought not this woman, a daughter of Abraham whom Satan bound for eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath day?' As he said this, all his adversaries were put to shame; and all the people rejoiced at all the glorious things that were done by him." (Luke 13. 13-17).

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God; all things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of man. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it." (John 1. 1-5).

"I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us. For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God; for the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will but by the will of him who subjected it in hope; because the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God." (Rom. 8. 18-21).

"So if there is any encouragement in Christ, any

incentive of love, any participation in the Spirit, any affection and sympathy, complete my joy by being of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind. Do nothing from selfishness or conceit, but in humility count others better than yourselves. Let each of you look not only to his own interests, but also to the interests of others. Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men." (Phil. 2. 1-7).

"Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen. For by it the men of old received divine approval. By faith we understand that the world was created by the word of God, so that what is seen was made out of things which do not appear." (Heb. 11. 1-3).

"Beloved, it is a loyal thing you do when you render any service to the brethren, especially to strangers, who have testified to your love before the church. You will do well to send them on their journey as befits God's service. For they have set out for his sake and have accepted nothing from the heathen. So we ought to support such men, that we may be fellow workers in the truth." (3 John 5-8).

We shall look forward eagerly to the appearance of the companion version of the Old Testament. There the revisers have a far harder task, but also a more urgent one.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

The Ter-Jubilee Celebrations of the Baptist Missionary Society, Commemoration Volume (220 pp. Seven photographs, Carey Press, 6/-).

It was an inspiration to put on the paper jacket of this book Andrew Fuller's snuff-box, in which that first collection of £13 2s. 6d. was taken. Photographs of groups in their Sunday-go-to-meetings, posed on chapel steps, are of less permanent interest. I would gladly have sacrificed one of them to have the picture of the horn box safe inside. The addresses are of varying quality, as must be the case when so many take part. There are very few that let the side down. Some are of outstanding merit. It is good to have securely inside a book that

which I have long prized as a pamphlet, the Rev. E. A. Payne's chapter on the "Prayer Call of 1784." The Rev. B. Grey Griffith's Presidential address is also a historical study of value. Its title is "The Tradition of Great Things" and it deals with the group of five ministers who were the chief founders of the B.M.S. Dr. Lewis, representing American Baptists, connects Carey with the great ones of his own country, from George Washington to Adoniram Judson, some of them (Washington for example) in ways that one had not suspected. Dr. Howells, who has been in the apostolic succession at Serampore, writes excellently of Bible translation there. One marvels again, not only at their linguistic gifts, but at their plodding toil; not only at their wide outreaching—the Bible for the whole of Eastern Asia, but at the business enterprise which introduced moveable type and invented wormproof paper. Above all, Dr. Howells places Carey where he belongs, a prophet and fore-runner of the whole of the Ecumenical Movement: "Opponents of that movement," he says, "are still living in pre-Carey days."

From some of the other speeches there are quotations which, even robbed of their context, may give some idea of the message they contain:—

> "To say as we do, 'there were giants in those days,' and then conclude that the race of giants is extinct, is a fallacy born of our indolence and feeble faith." (Dr. A. S. Kydd).
>
> "In Carey's own India, three million people have been added to the Christian community during the last decade, an equivalent of more than a Pentecost every Sunday." (Dr. A. M. Chirgwin).
>
> "The qualities looked for (in women missionary candidates) were piety and persistence. Some of those who offered were pious but not persistent enough . . . Others though pious were prickly." (Miss Dorothy M. Gotch).

The only misprint (I believe) in the volume comes strangely enough on the title page where Paulerspury has gone wrong. Which reminds me, in that village recently I could not help wishing that it had been possible to rescue the cottage from dilapidation instead of putting a memorial tablet in the parish church. And the tablet—why did it say so much, and why put the Horticultural Society before Serampore College? Some of us have been more moved by the simple stone at Serampore with the name and the verse,

> A wretched poor and helpless worm,
> On Thy kind arms I fall.

SELLY OAK. JOHN FOSTER.

Lay My Burden Down: a Folk-History of Slavery, edited by B. A. Botkin. (Chicago University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1945. Pp. xxii. + 286.)

Baptists have always been interested in freedom, both for themselves and for others, and their fathers played no mean part in the history of the Anti-Slavery Movement. Many Baptists are likely, therefore, to be interested in this book, which presents a series of edited excerpts from interviews with aged American ex-slaves. The interviews were organised by the Federal Writers' Project, and were carried out in 1936 and the following years by a large number of persons, the fruits of whose inquiries are deposited in the Library of Congress, where they are preserved in ten thousand manuscript pages. For each extract contained in the present book, the name and approximate age of the informant, together with his or her district of residence, are given. There are also photographs of some of the persons interviewed. The extracts are mainly short and pointed, and fitted with headings commonly consisting of some well-chosen words from the extract itself.

The material of the extracts is widely varied. Some give memories of the conditions of slavery, both in relation to the owner and within the slave community; some preserve memories of the American Civil War; many contain specimens of negro wit and humour; some reflect their thoughts and fears, their superstitions and their religion, their folk-lore and their fairy-tales. Their language is in substance that of the informants, with its quaint words and idioms, and many of them possess a native literary quality, which has probably lost little at the hands of the narrators and the editor. Others have less point or style, and the reader is apt to think at times that a few more from the ten thousand manuscript pages might have been left in the Library of Congress. They are included because it was the editor's desire to make a balanced impression. It is probable that even now the impression is only partially balanced, and that the reader is mercifully spared passages that might be intolerably dull. Of such there are none in this volume, and the whole is eminently readable. Not a few of them might enliven a dull sermon.

That the memories of the aged are often confused, and not to be taken as giving invariably reliable evidence, is well-known, and is recognised by the editor. These excerpts are not, therefore, to be read as materials for the historian, but rather as materials for those who would get into the mind of these men and women, and get the flavour of it all from their point of view. Occasionally one meets a hoary old favourite. Here, for instance, is one which I seem to have heard long ago. I wonder if it really records the experience and the wit of Siney Bonner, of Alabama, who was

about 90 at the time of the interview? It is a story which Baptists sometimes like for psychological, though hardly for logical, reasons:

> Master John had a big fine bird dog. She was a mammy dog, and one day she found six puppies out in the harness-house. They was 'most all girl puppies, so Master gwine drown 'em. I axed him to give 'em to me, and pretty soon the Missus sent me to the post-office, so I put the puppies in a basket and took 'em with me. Dr. Lyles come by where I was setting, and he say, "Want to sell them pups, Siney?" I tell him, "Uh-huh." Then he say, "What 'nomination is they?" I tell him, "They's Methodist dogs." He didn't say no more. 'Bout a week after that Old Missus sent me to the post-office again, so I took my basket of puppies. Sure 'nough, 'long come Dr. Lyles, and he say, "Siney, see you still ain't sold them pups." I say, "No, sir." ' Then he axed me again what 'nomination they belong to. I told him they was Baptist dogs. He say, "How come? You told me last week them was Methodist pups." Ha! Ha! Bless God! Look like he had me. But I say, "Yes, sir, but you see, Doctor, they got their eyes open since then." He laugh and go on down to his newspaper office.

Some of the stories bear on their face the evidence of confusion—though whether that confusion is in the mind of the interviewed negro or farther back is another question. There is one delightfully garbled account of a Biblical story, into which a bit of folk-lore has been skilfully woven. It is the story of *Nigger*demos of Jerusalem, who was suffering from lumbago and who climbed a sycamore tree in order to see Jesus, who was parading about the city on a colt. When Jesus called Niggerdemos down and invited Himself to his house for a meal, the coloured man came down so fast that he scraped the bark off the tree in places—and incidentally found that his lumbago was cured—and therefore the sycamore tree has been blistered ever since.

The real value of the book, however, is not the literary value of a collection of stories, but the human value of its window into the life and thought of the slave. There are passages simply and artlessly told in a matter-of-fact way, carrying their own authentication, that make the reader shudder—unless Belsen and Buchenwald horrors have rendered him insensitive. Yet they are not given an exaggerated emphasis, but fitted into the picture of the experience of the slave as a whole, with its joy and its sorrow, its laughter and its tears.

H. H. Rowley.

With His Stripes . . . A Study of the Atonement, by H. V. Larcombe, B.A., B.D. (Kingsgate Press and Carey Press, 1s. 6d.).

This modest little book, consisting of eight addresses delivered to the congregation of Sutton Baptist Church, is a most useful piece of Christian apologetic, and a welcome illustration of the possibilities of theological preaching, in the right hands. The style is both scholarly and popular, and Mr. Larcombe is to be congratulated on an achievement which reflects credit upon pastor and people alike.

The first four addresses survey the Biblical doctrine of the Atonement, and, while the exposition is necessarily very compressed, it is, with some slight qualifications, sound, well-balanced and interesting. The most significant omission is the absence from the New Testament section of any adequate reference to the fulfilment by Jesus of the sacrificial conception which Mr. Latcombe recognises as present in *Isaiah* 53 (*see p.17*). He believes Jesus construed the Cross as "the realisation of the prophecy of the Suffering Servant" (*p.24*). But, beyond this, his exposition makes no use of the idea of Sacrifice. Two further addresses are devoted to historical theories, and here one suspects that, in spite of the perspicuity of the style, Mr. Larcombe's congregation may have felt some difficulty in following him on to ground which for many must have been unfamiliar. (Was it not, by the way, Gregory of Nyssa, rather than Origen, who was responsible for the bait metaphor? *p.31*).

The final address, "Towards a Modern Restatement," will inevitably arouse differences of opinion. Let it be said at once that no congregation could fail to be deeply impressed by the preacher's positive emphasis. Mr. Larcombe repudiates the making of "a sharp distinction in our minds between God on the one hand and Christ on the other" (*p.28*). In the Cross, God is active on our behalf manifesting Himself "in His supreme character of a sin-forgiving God" (*ib.*). And, as man views the drama of Divine suffering there enacted, "he is changed, he is won! If God is like that, he cries, then I want to know Him, serve Him, love Him, for He is worthy of my heart's most utter devotion" (*p.41*).

This is well and finely said. Nevertheless, one cannot but wish that Mr. Larcombe had expanded his restatement to make room for further important elements of whose relevance he is himself conscious (see p.*41*). In particular, his anxiety to do justice to God's gracious act in Christ in reconciling the world to Himself, leads him to neglect the part played by Jesus as our "Representative" (*p.28*). Is it really true to say that "it is God Himself Who does everything that has to be done

(*p.28*)?" Jesus did not think so. He knew that He had a work to do, too, and was "straitened" until it was accomplished. (See: *Jesus and His Sacrifice,* by V. Taylor; and *The Gospel of the New World,* by O. C. Quick). An endeavour to bring out this aspect of the Atonement would have added greatly to the value of a treatment which, even as it stands, is most stimulating and helpful, and furnishes material which many groups might well use as a basis for discussion. (In a new edition, the words "Socinius" on *p.36* and "is" on *p.41,* need correction).

R. L. CHILD.

Reconciling the World, by Albert Peel, Litt.D. (Independent Press, Ltd., 5s.)

Dr. Peel, Editor of the *Congregational Quarterly,* has gathered, in this small book, eleven addresses, five of which he delivered during Holy Week, 1942, in America, two in Great Harwood during the 1914-18 War, and the others in Britain during the War that has just ended. The addresses are heavily dated and located, and all have war as their setting; but it is good to remember that the walls can be built in troublous times, and the author deals with eternal truths and applies them to the immediate situation. He seeks to lay sure foundations, and urges the Church to vital advancement.

All the addresses breathe the air of assurance, and should strengthen the faith of the reader—"The Eternal God is your refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms" (p. 14). "We *know* that we have found a good thing . . . We have added to faith, knowledge" (p. 72). It is on this sure foundation that the Church must apply itself to the vital tasks of to-day, if it is to survive. All vital movements from the 13th Century have been "marked by an intensity of conviction and a completeness of dedication" (p. 79).

There is throughout a practical and ethical note, and no one who catches the spirit of the book will read the seventh chapter, on "Every Man's Responsibility," without re-applying himself to his task by God's grace.

W. J. GRANT.

Religion and the Family, by Geoffrey Hoyland (George Allen & Unwin, 6s.).

In the autumn of 1944, Mr. Geoffrey Hoyland broadcast two series of talks on religion and the family. The substance of the talks he offers us in this little book. He believes that in the changing condition of modern society what is needed, in addition to social security, better housing and larger families, is a new

conception of the meaning of love and marriage and the co-operation of parents and children in united activities which will foster the sense of the family as a true community, the "family gang" as he irritatingly persists, almost without variation, in terming it. While parents should profit considerably by the valuable practical guidance offered for home training in religion through Biblical stories, Christian ethics and prayer, greater prominence might well have been given to the fruitful part to be played in this task by that great ally of the home, the Church. His treatment of juvenile delinquency, too, appears superficial. But the chief defect that mars an otherwise useful contribution to this subject of religion and home is not the author's matter but his manner. Judging by the style alone one might be excused for imagining it had been written by a hearty young curate. Slang expressions like, "heavy stuff," "wisecrack," "get the hang of" are surely unnecessary. Mr. Hoyland warns his readers against talking and writing down to children. He should guard against talking down to adults. There are, however, many good things and much wise counsel here, based on wide practical experience, and we should agree with his thesis that only on the foundation of ideal families can the ideal society be built. For the sound advice he offers towards achieving that purpose Mr. Hoyland is to be thanked.

GRAHAM W HUGHES.

Four Feet on a Fender, by J. R. Edwards (Carey Press. Cloth Boards, 3s.; Paper Covers, 2s.).

More Nature Parables, by Gordon Hamlin, B.A. (Carey Press. Cloth Boards, 2s. 6d.; Paper Covers, 1s. 6d.).

Four Feet on a Fender is a collection of twenty-four children's stories, some of which have appeared in the *Baptist Times*. The stories vary in quality, and whereas a book of stories for children should appeal to one particular age group some of these stories are suitable for younger children while others can appeal only to older children. The style is sometimes abrupt, disjointed and allusive, and some of the stories are spoilt by "catch phrases" such as "agin the Government." There is one misprint on page 45, "overhead" for "overheard."

In *More Nature Parables* we have twenty-four short stories, two for each month of the year, each pointing some moral or illustration from nature. It is not a nature book but essentially a book of parables. Each parable is very short, and if used for the Children's Address would need to be expanded, but children should find this little book interesting and enjoyable.

CYRIL SMITH.

Goodly Fellowship. A Centenary Tribute to the Life and Work of the World's Evangelical Alliance, 1846-1946, by John W. Ewing (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 5s.)

Dr. Ewing has carried out a difficult task with characteristic discretion, knowledge and sympathy and the result is a volume which holds the interest of the reader throughout. It is to be feared that the aims and achievements of the World's Evangelical Alliance are not very widely known or understood today, and that some of the high hopes of the founders have not been fulfilled. This centenary record should do much to call attention to the work of the past hundred years, as well as gain further support for the Universal Week of Prayer, the championship of religious liberty, the defence of Sunday and other causes with which the Alliance is concerned. Edward Steane, of Camberwell, was one of the founders. Of recent days, W. Y. Fullerton and Dr. Ewing himself have been among the Baptists most prominently associated with the work. This volume is enriched with many excellent illustrations. It should find many individual readers and also a place in Baptist libraries all over the world.

The Christian Layman Looks Ahead. Edited by Frank H. Ballard, M.A. (Independent Press, Ltd., 5s.)

The interesting series of ten addresses here printed was delivered on Sunday evenings at the Hampstead Garden Suburb Church—rightly described by its minister as "one of the most catholic congregations in the country . . . interdenominational not only in constitution but in practice." From its own membership it could call out those competent to speak on Economics, Industry, Housing, Music, the Press, Science and Religion, and various other modern issues. Many Christian fellowships less rich in talent would find this a useful book for discussion and might well be led by it to devise their own series of lay-sermons, some of which might come home more closely to the ordinary individual than do some of these. Mr. Ballard contributes an introduction and an epilogue on "The Greatest Need of All." The book is attractively produced and is dedicated to the twenty-three persons connected with the church who lost their lives in the War.

How to Help People (The Pathfinder Press, 1s. 6d.)

A covering letter sent with the review copy of this booklet and signed by the Hon. Director of Evangelism for the diocese of Rochester, states that it was written by the Rev. Sam. Shoemaker, of the U.S.A. It is difficult to see why this should not

be indicated in the text itself. The twelve papers of which it consists deal in able, effective and practical fashion with what has come to be called "personal evangelism." They are illustrated by many cases from the author's own contacts.

The Baltic Review, Vol. I. No. 4-5 (The Baltic Humanitarian Association, $1.)

This issue of a magazine produced by a group of "displaced persons," in Sweden contains a brief article on "The Latvian Baptist Church," by the Rev. E. Spigulis, B.D. He states that in 1939 there were 109 Baptist congregations with a total membership of 12,192. At the time of the Soviet occupation in 1940, all religious education was prohibited, the Baptist Union House in Riga was "nationalised" and the seminary and publishing departments were closed. "Several other church buildings were taken away by both occupation authorities [i.e. Russians and, later, Germans] to be used as political assembly halls or barracks for soldiers. Moreover, a considerable number of Baptist people were deported to Russia . . . As Latvia became a battlefield in the summer of 1944, nearly two thousand people from the Baptist congregations have fled from Latvia to Germany (including also the majority of the Union's leadership and 28 preachers). About 200 have escaped to Sweden, mostly from the churches along the Baltic Sea." Swedish Baptists have given generous help to the refugees. There are six Latvian Baptist congregations in the U.S.A. and eleven in South America.

C. J. Cadoux, *The Congregational Way* (Basil Blackwell, 1s. 6d.)

The Vice-Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, here sets out with characteristic care and clarity his attitude to the "conversations" now proceeding between Congregationalists and Presbyterians and expounds what he understands to be essential Congregational principles. He believes that organic union between the two bodies would be impossible without sacrifice of principle.

The Nature of the Church according to the witness of the Society of Friends (Friends' Book Centre, 9d.)

This statement has been prepared by the Committee on Christian Relationships appointed by the Society of Friends in Great Britain for presentation to the Commission on the Church set up by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order. It should receive the attention of all those thinking about the doctrine of the Church.

R. L. Child, *The Blessing of Infants and the Dedication of Parents* (Kingsgate Press, 6d.)

Principal Child deals with the origin, history and implications of what has come to be called in Baptist circles, though not very happily, "Infant Dedication." He believes it to express an aspect of Christian truth that needs affirmation, but points out the importance of care and thought in the arrangement of the service. This is a useful booklet. It is a pity it is not better printed. The earliest example of a service for infants which Mr. Child cites comes from the practice of the Barton preachers in 1755. A much older and more interesting case is the practice of Hubmaier at Waldshut in 1525.

P. Rowntree Clifford, *Becoming a Christian* (Kingsgate Press, 9d.)

There is here reprinted the script of four talks broadcast from the Memorial Church at West Ham in January, 1946. The passages of Scripture and the prayers used in the services are included to form a devotional commentary on the addresses, which are simple, direct and effective. This is modern evangelism of high quality. We wish the booklet could have been issued for widespread distribution at a lower price.

C. T. LeQuesne, *Sir Alfred Pearce Gould, K.C.V.O.* (Carey Press, 1s.)

It is something of a shock to discover that it is nearly a quarter of a century since this gifted and great-hearted Baptist surgeon passed away. None who met him or heard him speak on behalf of medical missions or the temperance cause will ever forget the impression he made. This able and graceful tribute by his son-in-law will revive many grateful memories.

Henry Cook, *Speak—That They Go Forward* (Kingsgate Press, 3d.)

This is the report of a Committee set up by the Baptist Union Council to consider the "Spiritual Welfare" of the Baptist churches in this country. It is frank and challenging on every page, and the manner in which it has been drafted by Mr. Cook should make it easy to discuss in Church Meetings, diaconates and Ministers' Fraternals. And after discussion there should be action.

P. A. & P. R. Shepherd, *Fleet Baptist Church,* 1846-1946 (Kingsgate Press, 1s.)

There are no highlights in this story, but it was worth putting together, not only for the benefit of the present members of the

church, but for future record, and because in many ways it is typical of Baptist extension and growth. Since 1937 the Church at Fleet has had the oversight of work in Crookham as well.

T. Wigley, *Christianity and the Modern Need—A Modernist Approach* (Modern Churchmen's Union and the Union of Modern Free Churchmen, 6d.)

This booklet is by a veteran and unrepentant "Modernist." He quotes effectively from a wide range of reading, but his practical conclusions are not very clear. "The significance of Jesus lies in man's faith that what Jesus was man also may become, if he is willing" (p. 18). But, then, man does not seem to be willing. And how is the uniqueness of Jesus to be explained?

W. S. Flowers, *A Surgeon in China* (Carey Press, 1s.)

These extracts from the letters of Dr. W. S. Flowers, of the B.M.S., who from 1942 to 1945 led the Hospital Unit sent to China by the British Red Cross, are introduced by a well-merited commendation from Lady Louis Mountbatten. We have here, as she says, "an inspiring tale of courage, perseverance and incredible achievement." When the paper and printing situation improves, it is to be hoped that these letters will be re-issued, in whole or in part, in a worthier format, or, better still, that Dr. Flowers will give a connected account of his experiences.

D. B. Perley, *Whither Christian Missions?* (Assyrian National Federation, New Jersey, U.S.A., $1.00)

This is the revised and enlarged edition of a pamphlet which first appeared in 1944. It is a vigorous attack by the Secretary of the Assyrian National Federation on a Basra missionary of the Reformed Church in America who has written favourably of the Arabs and their policy in regard to the unfortunate Assyrians. It is also a renewed, learned and fervent appeal on behalf of a community who claim descent from the Nestorians.