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

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

Editorial Notes

UNDER the chairmanship of Mr. Seymour J. Price the Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society was held on 28th April in the lounge at Bloomsbury Central Church and drew the best attendance for several years. During the past year much quiet but valuable service had again been rendered, reported the Secretary, in answering inquiries from this and other countries and in assisting the researches of individuals and churches. *The Baptist Quarterly* had appeared regularly. Contacts with overseas societies had been established during the successful Historical Meeting at the Commonwealth Congress last year and the Society was also in touch with the Southern Baptist Convention's Historical Commission. The urgent need of the moment was for new members. Owing to rising costs expenditure had out-paced income and there was now an accumulated deficit of £148. The librarian, Dr. E. J. Tongue briefly reported on the use being made of the Society's library. All the officers and committee were re-elected, while to the three Vice-Presidents the name of Dr. F. Townley Lord (President, Baptist World Alliance) was unanimously added. The members then listened with close attention and evident appreciation to the address, "Baptists and the Great Church" (which appears in this issue) delivered by Dr. Hugh Martin, Vice-Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council. Principal K. C. Dykes moved and Rev. B. Grey Griffith seconded a vote of thanks which was heartily carried.

* * * * *

"Our denomination cannot afford to do without the Historical Society," said Dr. E. A. Payne, General Secretary of the Baptist Union, interposing at one of the sessions of the Annual Assembly a plea for support for the Society. It had rendered notable service for nearly fifty years, he said, and the good name and standing of the denomination were involved in the continuation of the *Baptist Quarterly*. It was concern at the serious financial condition of the Society that prompted these words. Fifteen new Life members would solve the immediate problem. In order to sustain its comparatively small budget (about £200 a year) the Historical Society needs, in addition, a steady stream of new names to add to its—if not very large, certainly world-wide—membership.

* * * * *

Ten years ago the Carey Press initiated a cheap and attractive series of popular biographies. It is regrettable that no more than three—those of William Carey, Andrew Fuller and Robert Hall—appeared. Were the series to be revived (and how else, but by means of such literature, is the rising generation to learn and value its heritage?) one who would undoubtedly be entitled to an early place is John Sutcliff, the bi-centenary of whose birth falls in August. We are glad to include in this issue a brief tribute—the substance of an address given on 10th May at the Sutcliff Baptist Church, Olney, by its present minister. Sutcliff's place in Baptist history, and especially in connection with the Baptist Missionary Society, has not been adequately appreciated. "The Baptist mission in India," wrote Hall in 1814, "is under incalculable obligations to his sagacity and prudence." The Northamptonshire Association and, indeed, the whole denomination felt the influence of this kindly, wise and strong-minded Yorkshireman. But as Dr. Payne wrote in his *The First Generation*, "Sutcliff has remained without the biography to which he was certainly entitled by his worth and influence." It would have been well had that omission been repaired in this bi-centenary year.

A Miscellany. Norfolk Record Society, Vol. xxii.

For Baptist readers of this excellently-produced volume the main item of interest is the reproduction of the accounts kept from 1726 to 1745 by William Watts, deacon and treasurer of the church now well known as St. Mary's, Norwich. Mr. Charles Jewson, who is responsible for their publication here, supplies useful introductory and explanatory notes. Preceded by a list of church-members compiled about 1723, with additions covering the period of the accounts, the various financial items give interesting side-lights upon Baptist church-life two centuries ago. Among other things they show that Communion was not observed unless a recognised minister was available to preside, that it was possible for a minister to conduct worship at a church for very lengthy periods before being appointed its pastor (or failing to secure the appointment, as in the case here of Deodat Hore who was not elected pastor after even a year's probation) and that the afflictions of the poor were of great concern to the fellowship. Gone are the days when beer for the refreshment of helpers might figure in a church-treasurer's accounts! In causing this account-book to be permanently recorded Mr. Jewson has performed yet another useful service.

The Faith of a Surgeon

(*An address delivered at the Baptist Union Assembly,* 1952.)

I BELIEVE that all true healing is "Spiritual" in nature and, therefore, unless it is realised that Christ is Himself at the very heart of all healing processes, and that all methods of healing are the gifts of God, there is no true healing at all. Christ—the Lord—is the Divine Master of all healing and, in the ultimate, God alone gives us health.

It is more than twenty-five years since I started to "walk the boards," as we call our hospital work. In the vast teaching hospital where I started my clinical work there is a long central corridor. At intervals little alcoves extend from the main corridor, where patients' relatives may sit and talk, and students gather and discuss their cases. Around the walls of each alcove there were printed in Latin, biblical texts. One such text commenced "Nisi Domine" (we used to call it the "Nisi Domine" alcove):

> "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city the watchman waketh but in vain" (*Psalm cxxvii.* 6).

In the past quarter of a century since I first saw that text in the alcove of my beloved alma mater, I have become more and more conscious that unless our attempts at healing are so blessed our work fails utterly. The spiritual side, therefore, of our healing work is more important than the physical side—although I do not for one moment belittle the physical side of disease.

Now in our dealings with patients, we must always remember that they are *patients* and not cases. We are not treating diseases; we are treating patients. Indeed, in Nature there are no diseases; there are only sick persons. Our patients are like ourselves, living people with personalities and minds. This means that we must always remember the nature of man. He is a compound of dust and deity. He may be moulded in earth, but there is also a spark of Divinity. We touch Heaven when we lay our hands on a human body—a piece of divine mechanism, the very stuff of Divinity. The human body is the Temple of God. A human person is not merely some sort of complicated machine, capable of description in terms of electronics and biochemistry. A patient is not a test-tube obeying the laws of Chemistry and Physics; he is a compound of body and soul, and our job is to treat the whole man, physical and mental. A man's body and soul are like horses

in double harness, inasmuch that if one falls lame the other suffers and has to adjust itself to the situation. There is complete interdependence and interaction between spirit and flesh. Man is body—mind—soul, all inseparably connected and what affects one part affects another. The human is a complete being, and one cannot divide him into three packages—body, mind and spirit—and send one to the doctor, another to the psychiatrist and the third to the priest.

Now what is disease? It would give a more correct idea of what this word means if we spelt it with a hyphen between the dis-ease. We must get rid of the notion that "Disease" is something that a patient "has got," much as one "gets" a packet of cigarettes, or a box of chocolates. There are two component parts in illness, a physical part and mental part (which, in our medical jargon, we call the psychic part and the somatic part). Bodily and mental adjustment are so intimately associated and, indeed, united that they must be regarded as component and complementary parts of a single entity. It is a universal principle that a physical maladjustment implies a mental one and vice versa. Therefore, when a person is ill there are two things wrong—the physical and the mental, or the bodily and the spiritual. Every bodily ailment produces its own mental accompaniment; therefore, mental adjustment becomes necessary in every illness. In other words we cannot bring about the cure of disease without the corresponding mental (or spiritual) adjustment. This is often very difficult to do, and if there is spiritual maladjustment it can, and often does, interfere very seriously with recovery and convalescence from illness or operation. This was known to Plato who said: "This is the greatest error in the treatment of sickness that there are physicians for the body and physicians for the soul, and yet the two are one and indivisible." This is another way of saying that bodily disease and mental disease are one. Bodily illness, then, affects the mind—the whole personality, dynamically.

Our Lord referred to His work as that of the Physician, and the statement that He went about healing "all manner of disease" applies to the spiritual as well as to the mental and physical. His own words in connection with a mighty work of healing, "I made a man every whit whole," reveal the fact that He dealt with the whole personality. Christ, therefore, concerned Himself with spiritual, moral and physical malady. Jesus never divided the physical from the mental; this was Christ's way, and we must do likewise, for He is the same yesterday, today and for ever.

The Meaning of Illness

This, I believe, gives us the clue to the meaning of physical

disease. For over a quarter of a century, it has been my privilege to deal surgically with organic disease. Now what is the mystery behind all this suffering? What is the problem of Pain? I do not know, with finality, any more than you. A man is pursuing his ordinary mundane path of life—working, sleeping, eating, perhaps occasionally enjoying himself, perhaps too busy to think more than very occasionally about God and Eternity and the eternal verities—when suddenly a stab of abdominal pain brings him low. He is rushed to hospital, where an emergency operation snatches him from otherwise certain death. In a moment his world is shattered, the everyday things of his life are taken from him, and slowly he is made to realise how unimportant these little things of his life really are after all, and that his true good is in another world. He becomes more and more conscious of how utterly dependent he is on God, from whom he draws his strength and gradually gets better. He is made to realise the truth, as Bernard Shaw says in *St. Joan*: "Sometimes if you're worthy enough He will snatch you out of the jaws of death." May it not be that tribulation in these circumstances often becomes a terrible necessity?

Illness and suffering can be a way to an enriched personality. This is the experience of many, although there are exhausting and enervating diseases which do not produce so obvious an effect. I believe, however, that the only rational view of illness is to regard it as a sacrament and, although in our human limitations we cannot understand, yet God has some good purpose in it. I think this is what Robert Louis Stevenson had in mind when he prayed "that the Celestial Surgeon would stab his soul awake." How often have we experienced, in a metaphoric way of speaking, that God has taken our sight away in order that our souls might see? "Through much tribulation we must enter into the Kingdom of God" (*Acts* xiv. 22).

It may not be the whole truth but there is, I feel, at least some truth in the idea of salvation through suffering, in the idea that tribulation brings at least a sensation of the power of God and perhaps a better understanding of His purpose. "For the Lord shall comfort Zion; He will comfort all her waste places; and He will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord." Sickness, then, is often a means of grace, and illness brings many blessings in its train, and we should never forget to return thanks to Him who, alone, is the Giver of life and health and the Giver of every good and perfect gift. I believe, therefore, that the ultimate purpose of illness is good. Often when people discover themselves to be seriously ill, the cry of many is "Why has God done this to me?" Well, I do not believe that God sent their illness; I believe He simply permitted

it, just as He permitted Satan to afflict Job—to Job's eternal salvation and perfection. We, too, when illness strikes us down can turn our thoughts inwards and thence outwards, crying to God for His help and mercy, and so we can make perfect our imperfect lives. In this, is the only meaning of illness for me. And, daily, I see the ravages of pathological processes in all their stark horror! In a way that I do not understand, I demand that the meaning of all the suffering and pain and death that I see every day must be good. Indeed I would find life insupportable if I did not believe this, and if I felt that man was the victim of impersonal forces which were destined to crush him. If I felt this were possible, I would give up Surgery tomorrow. I have, therefore, all through the years been on the look-out for tangible evidences of the good that illness has done to my patients, and now the evidence is overwhelming. In sickness, I have seen my patients rise to the sublimest heights of courage and faith. Surely this has made them better people and prepared them for Eternity, which is really the only true purpose of living?

As an operating surgeon, I have to deal with so many apparently ghastly pathological aberrations of the human body that sometimes I think it is wonderful that anybody has ever believed in the goodness of God. When the sun is shining and you are feeling well, it is easy to believe that

> "God's in His Heaven
> All's right with the world."

But what when illness strikes in all its pathological horror? Dr. Leslie Weatherhead has told us where his own mind finds a bit of anchorage: "We can say, quite definitely, that no good man would send blindness or paralysis or cancer upon his fellowmen. Which of us could snatch a baby from its mother and kill it? Which of us could part two aged people who were all in all to one another? Which of us could send a young husband a tumour of the brain, so that he dies after a ghastly death following months of suffering during which all that made his charming personality slowly disintegrates, and he leaves a widow and two young children? Which of us could send cancer to a young and beautiful young woman on the very threshold of her life? None of us could do such a thing! And surely, therefore, we need not ask ourselves if we are better than God to know that whatever He does, or allows, we can at least assert this, that He does not do it because He is cruel. We cannot understand why God allows pathological disease and so many things to happen, but if God *is* at all (and most of us are in no doubt whatever about that) He must be better than us; He must be more loving, more kind, more just. It is incredible that we possess and honour funda-

mental values, like kindness, goodness and justice and that God does not possess them, or that He could be callous and cruel. In spite of much mystery and bewilderment, and in spite of many arguments that seem to deny God's goodness, man holds on to the thought that God is good because man finds that at his best he himself is good. Jesus told men to argue like that. "If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give good gifts to them that ask Him?" Justice is a good thing so God must finally be just. Love is the best thing in the world, so He must be loving."

Now this argument of Dr. Weatherhead is a great help to me. Whatever the meaning of illness—and we must confess we do not know—it cannot be based on a hypothesis that man is the victim of cruel forces destined to destroy him, but it must be based in some mysterious way on the Eternal Love of God. Dr. Weatherhead tells a story of a little boy who was one day suddenly stricken with infantile paralysis, leaving him permanently lame and crippled. "Mummy," he said, "if I can never walk or run again like other boys, will you go on loving me?" You can imagine that mother's answer as she stabbed back her tears. "Then," said the little chap, "I can stick anything." We can never really discover the causes why many of us suffer in body or mind. It may be that our suffering comes from the folly or ignorance or the sin in the great human family of which we are part. And in belonging to this vast human family we must share in its assets and liabilities—in the knowledge of science for good and evil, in the gifts of medicine and surgery for the relief of pain and in the devastating possibilities of the atomic bomb. Much suffering must be regarded as accidental; an accident being defined as an event which God did not intend and man could not foresee. Sick people must not torture themselves by thinking that their suffering is their fault, or that God has picked them out for punishment.

When we are ill what are we to do? The thing to do with suffering is not to torture the mind by seeking its cause, or asking why it should happen to us, but to look ahead and say, "How can I turn this into gain?" In this way the sufferer—the patient—can turn the liability of sickness into an asset not only for himself, but for the whole community. Sooner or later, illness comes to us all, high and low, rich and poor, and in this respect, may I with all humility and gratitude recall the illness and passing of our late beloved King, whose bearing and fortitude under the most grievous and terrible disease that can afflict mankind, will remain for all time a lesson and example to us all and will give ineffable comfort and inspiration to sufferers the world over; truly in death, as in his glorious life of blessed memory our King has set

a high standard for us all. Under the bludgeonings of his dread disease his Faith never faltered, and he showed us even in dire illness that the path of duty is the way to glory.

There are some things we must accept, but to accept an accident (or illness) resentfully or bitterly, to torture one's mind as to whether one deserves it or whether it is good or just, or to moan "Why did this happen to me?" is to doubt God's good purpose, and it actually increases the suffering for ourselves and everybody round us. When we are ill the thing to do is to accept it with a determination to get well, if that is God's will, and a determination to bring good out of evil. This will not only minimise the suffering we have to bear—indeed in many situations it is the first step to recovery—but it will also benefit the community through the witness of courage and, best of all, it will be the means of co-operating with God in such a way that enables Him to use our suffering in His mighty redemptive work for the world. Behind all suffering, therefore, is the Eternal Goodness of God.

We must wrestle goodness out of our illnesses, remembering always that God is love. In this fight God is on our side. God's love did not spare Jesus the Cross, but Jesus faced it, and by co-operating with God accepted the awful liability of the Cross and turned it into the greatest spiritual asset the world has ever known. When Mrs. Josephine Butler's little daughter ran from her bedroom to greet her mother, fell over the bannisters and was picked up dead, her mother devoted herself to motherless girls. Now thousands thank God, not that Mrs. Butler lost her child, but for what she did with her sorrow: what she made out of it. This is the eternal secret behind all illness and sorrow—the secret Jesus taught us of not escaping the thorns of life, but the secret of wearing them as the Crown of Life.

My thesis, therefore, is that illness in humans is for our good and, although I cannot prove it nor explain it, that is my unshakeable faith. I could not bear to treat the ravages of cancer if I did not believe this in my heart. So often do I see it destroy the bodies of people who are particularly good and kind (indeed, cancer is a disease that seems to single out the outstandingly good and kind people of this world, to strike down) that I cannot help feeling that in some mysterious way God is thus working His purpose out. I admit that this is outside my understanding and I leave it at that. Sometimes when I wonder at the suffering and sorrow caused by malignant disease, I remember that:—

> The flowers live by the tears that fall
> From the sad face of the skies,
> And life would have no joys at all
> Were there no watery eyes."
>
> Quoted by the late Professor G. Grey Turner.

God has placed within us great resources for bringing good out of evil and for alleviating our trials in sickness. Our illnesses can become pearls of great price. The cutting and irritating grain of sand gets within the shell of the oyster which it incites and stimulates to secrete from its own resources the means of coating the grain of sand and making it into a pearl. May it not be the same with us in sickness, that we, too, may turn our diseases into pearls? So my own questionings were silenced about the meaning of illness. I had seen so often that the effect of illness was to make people better in mind and soul. God allows their physical illnesses to improve their personalities and after the body has gone the enriched soul would live on for ever. Therefore, what a reward for so transient a physical penalty, so slight an affliction to win so great a prize! In other words, I argued that the mental accompaniments of so enriching a kind were the purpose of illness.

Then, one day, I was called upon to operate on a baby a few hours old. What could possibly be the worth-while mental accompaniments to recompense the helpless and innocent child for its physical pain? It is difficult to reconcile the suffering of a child with the Love of God. I was in a dilemma again. Whenever I operated upon a child, I could not understand why children must suffer pain. A medical professor wrote the other day. "I have seen too many children die of leukaemia or nephritis to believe that 'Man is the object of God's love'." This is, of course, a terrible problem and, is indeed, the stumbling-block of many thinking persons on the threshold of religion. Then the answer came. I was operating upon a baby a few weeks old. For this particular operation the child is brought into the operating theatre wrapped gently, and heavily cotton-wooled, on to a cross; in our surgical jargon we call it a "Cruciform splint." Now here at last was the answer to all illness—A CROSS—the necessary accompaniment to every phase of human life. Suffering in children can be explained on no other hypothesis; it is part of the eternal Cross which lifts mankind to Heaven and is part of God's good plan. There stands the Cross—Eternal, stark, inescapable—at the very heart of mankind.

Prayer and Works

Now I want to ask an important question as to whether prayer can alter the course of the pathological progress of a disease? I believe it can. Dr. Alexis Carrel in one of his books wrote: "I have actually seen the cancerous tissues made new while someone was in the process of prayer." We have seen the effect of prayer on innumerable occasions. Many times when science indicated that the patient's condition was hopeless, their recovery has been rapid and complete. The materialist says that

" imponderable factors " have been at work and that a " spontaneous cure " has taken place. I believe that, in many cases, these so-called " imponderable factors " and " spontaneous cures " are spiritual phenomena; they are the answer to prayer. Spiritual forces have, in fact, influenced the outcome of the disease, and in their absence the patient would have died. Of course, I cannot prove these things in black and white, but my experience leads me to believe they are true. The annals of Medicine are full of instances where the faith and love and courage of relatives —especially mothers—have won the day in the face of the most gloomy and grave medical prognoses. " The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much in its working." Dr. Alexis Carrel says: " Prayer is a force as real as terrestrial gravity. As a physician, I have seen man, after all the other therapy had failed, lifted out of disease and melancholy by the serene effort of prayer." This has also been the experience of innumerable people.

Now prayer does not mean dispensing with effort or perseverance, nor does it mean that the answer is always one we could recognise or desire. But prayer does mean that, whatever the outcome, it is the one God wishes for us. He knows best, and it is not for us to question. Prayer is vital to the course of healing. While I admit this freely, we must not be sentimental about this matter; prayer alone is not sufficient. The patient must do his part and we must do our parts. We must pray, but keep our powder dry. The patient must do all he can to help himself, and while I believe more firmly than ever in the infinite potential in people, their improvement must come always from within themselves. I have no faith in hand-outs of any kind, economic or spiritual. Abraham Lincoln once said, " You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they should and could do for themselves." Now sometimes we have to chivvy our patients and be cross with them, to stimulate them to get better. A young Welsh miner aged twenty-three suddenly lost his sight in a pit explosion. He was shattered by the loss of his sight, and felt life had ended for him. He went on aimlessly for a year. Then the head of a rehabilitation centre, who was also blind, gave him a wigging and spoke sharply to him, and told him in effect to " pull his socks up." That boy is now an expert stenographer; you can dictate to him at 120 words a minute, which he records on a Braille shorthand machine, and then he transcribes from that on a typewriter, and gives you a faultless piece of work.

To bring about recovery, then, prayer should be the motive force, guiding all our other activities. Jesus said " Watch and pray." We must do both; then the power of prayer is great and overwhelming. Prayer and works; both are necessary. For all

"physic and art and excellent industry is to no purpose without calling on God" and "it is vain to seek for help except God bless us."

I must now refer to the great revolution that has come over the face of Medicine in the last four or five years. I refer, of course, to the fact that the hospitals have been nationalised. I know you will not think I am being political in this matter for I can assure you that I am no politician myself, medical or otherwise. Our hospitals have now been nationalised, and the Welfare State provides vast materialistic resources for the medical care of the Nation. That is all very well. But there is a great peril that an over-emphasis on the material side may cause us to lose the voluntary side of the hospital work—the Christian side—the "Prayer" side of it, if you will. I tell you the Hospital which has no prayers said for it is as dead as the Dodo. Nothing in the State Service must be allowed to destroy this side of our work. The Welfare State is producing a changing social order with increased reliance on the State and lessening personal responsibility. The danger of this is a grave weakening of the moral backbone of the people with more emphasis on "rights" and less consciousness of duties. The danger of this attitude is that people tend to ask, "What can I get out of the State?" which is a symptom of moral decay. The ideal of service is our precious heritage and must be re-introduced into the nationalised Service of our profession. Is it not "our proud office to attend the fleshly Tabernacle of the immortal Spirit"? (Lister).

The foundation of hospitals was an expression of deep Christian feelings. They are not merely places provided for the healing of the sick, but are also for solace of the soul. The hospital tradition is that the patients are its guests and must be treated as such. In the new Health Service we must guard this tradition with all our might. A Hospital is not just an assembly of bricks and mortar, of wards and operating-theatres, and Path. Labs. etc. It is a living thing, a collection of suffering and often very frightened human beings, and of the people who minister to their needs. A hospital is not only a matter of finance and construction. Surely this great living organism requires the help of God? That can only come through prayer. Every true hospital should be worthy of having emblazoned over its portals: "This is the House of God and the very Gate of Heaven." The other night a lady rang me up to ask what time the following morning I was proposing to operate on a certain patient. This was a particularly hazardous operation on a critically ill patient, the chances of success being remote. The lady informed me that a group of the patient's friends were meeting in church at the time of the operation to pray for its success. I know that great help

came to us all on that morning, while the prayers of this patient's friends were storming the bastions of Heaven seeking succour for their friend.

I am quite sure that many of you conduct your own powerful prayer circles. In Amersham the pastor of the local Church, a valued personal friend of mine, conducts a prayer circle, and we have had many experiences of the power of this group of holy people. I could give you many examples, some of them very personal ones, about this work, and I speak about it with deep gratitude. I commend the work of these prayer circles to you all. In America almost every church has its own prayer circle, and if a member of the church is suddenly taken ill and goes into hospital, he or she is prayed for at once, and steadily. The work of these prayer circles throughout the world has been richly blessed—and they know, "From Thee all skill and science flow." The New Testament specifically exhorts us to form prayer circles: "Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him . . . and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up. . . . Pray one for another, that ye may be healed." (*James* v. 14-16). Medical science and religion must be united as co-partners in the service of humanity. As I have said, body and soul are closely allied. The parson has his job with the souls of men, but again and again he cannot do it without the help of the doctor. The doctor has his job with the bodies of men, but again and again he cannot do it without the help of the parson. The parson and the doctor cover the same ground and belong to one another, as they always have from the beginning of the Christian era. The historic Christ Himself was a supreme physician, restoring health and life to many who believed in Him.

We who deal with sickness—doctors, surgeons, nurses—must regard the body as our study and our continual care, our active willing earnest care, and we must allow nothing to make us shrink from it. In its weakness and infirmities, in the dishonours of its corruption, we must still value it, still stay by it, to mark its hunger and thirst, its sleeping and waking, its heat and cold, to hear its complaints, to register its groans. Our interest in all this must be greater, far greater, than ever a painter or sculptor took in the form and beauties of its health. Whence comes this interest? A sense of duty may engender it. But what sustains it and keeps it alive, vests it with a moral motive and makes it something of our hearts? Surely only the Lord Himself can build this House! So religion must animate this great work of Healing. Thus the real doctor, one of Christ's disciples, finds his whole mind, his moral nature, and his spiritual being all harmoniously engaged in the daily business of his life, dispensing

mercy to his fellow-creatures and worshipping God in his daily life. This is a mighty task, and how can he accomplish it without the ever-present help of Christ Himself? We doctors and nurses must remain always calm, faithful, effective servants of the sick, and we cannot do this unless the Lord in us is "building the House." Our patients take our skill for granted, and it is only right for them to expect skill; but what they really want, whether they know it or not, is someone who, in addition to knowing his work, would give them confidence, patience, courage, hope and faith. The great majority of our patients, in their hearts, whatever they may say or do, expect us to be to them, "like the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." How can we doctors do all this without the help of our pastoral colleagues?

It has been said of doctors that the majority of them lack the higher and inner life and are strangers to divine things. If this be true of us our work must fail miserably. The great need of our age is an integration between the Christian Faith and the profession of Medicine—between the Christian Ministry and Medical men. Clergy and Doctors must unite, for theirs is one indivisible work. Their objective is identical; the whole man, healthy in soul and body. The Church and Medicine are one profession, and must unite in their great work. Healing and health for the whole man is our objective. We doctors must toil to keep abreast of professional advances, but we must liaise more and more with our ministerial colleagues. Our job, your job and mine, is to serve man in his own person and in his family, relieving his distresses of mind, body and soul because he is not a case, or an average, or a bit of statistics, but a fellow creature bound to us and we to him as members one to another in the family of God whose nature is Love. If our job is the same, then our faith must be the same, the faith that impels us to value, care for, respect each man—in short to love the brethren. Clearly then we both depend on Christ and He must build the House. Such faith is not credulity; it is creative power, whose limit is the heavens. The Ministry of Healing, then, is a joint one in which both professions are united. In this Ministry of Healing we see God's handiwork, answering our prayers and restoring the sick.

In this great work of healing, prayer is the energising force in the application of Medical Science. Very often, even in the bravest of patients, a cold fear amounting to a panic clutches at their hearts as they face a grave surgical ordeal. I have often seen this fear dispelled when their spiritual advisor has visited them and said a word of prayer. A great calm comes over them, their strength is renewed as they wait upon the Lord and they face the grim ordeal with the courage of a giant refreshed. This makes the success of a surgical venture almost certain before we

start. Aristotle said the success of all depends upon the blessing of God, and this is certainly true of surgical operations. That great surgeon, the late Lord Moyniham, used to say that there were always three people present when he operated—the patient, God and the surgeon. As he lifts his knife no true surgeon should be too proud to pray, "Come, Jesus, be our guest and bless what Thou has given us to do. Stand by me, in this truly important task! Grant me success—for without Thy loving counsel and support man can avail but naught." The true surgeon knows in his heart that what Jesus said is true: "Without me ye can do nothing." This is true today even though Penicillin and other advances have brought an almost incredible safety in the technique of modern surgery.

I was passing a church the other day when, on a notice board outside it, I saw the following words, forming a wayside text: "If you are too busy to pray, you are too busy." If this is true of everyday life it is ten thousand times more true when you are ill, because if during illness you are too busy to pray, you are not only too busy, but you are too ill! We perish if we cease from prayer. When grateful patients used to thank Harvey Cushing, the great brain surgeon, he used to tell them "Don't thank me—thank the Lord." This is so true, for a man can receive nothing except it be given him from Heaven.

In the Ministry of Healing it is a great joy to us when our patients get better and return home to their loved ones. But, finally, what about those who are not to return to their earthly homes any more, and who are facing death, the last enemy, as St. Paul says? So often in our work we are conscious that "The Angel of Death is abroad in the land—and you can almost hear the beating of his wings." Can we really see an Angel in the bereavement and anguish of death? Here again we come up against another stern mystery, a great and solemn mystery. Death is the supreme crisis of human experience. It sometimes comes when we least expect it and, indeed, to patients whom we think should get better. All goes well at the operation and yet, maybe after many days of a grim struggle, the patient crosses the Rubicon, leaving his relatives, and all of us, numb with disappointment. In surgery as in other things, "The best laid schemes of mice and men aft gang aglie." This is sometimes our experience. Quite recently I was asked to operate upon a man whose life I was particularly anxious to save. His wife had been in close professional relationship to myself for many years, and he also had become a close friend of mine, and the family were most anxious that I should perform the operation. It was a serious operation, but one that I had performed many hundreds of times. The operation went well and there was every reason to hope

that he would make a speedy recovery. Complication after complication ensued and after fifty days, in spite of all our attempts to restore him to health (when it seemed that we were trying to defeat the very Will of God), he passed from this life leaving us all numb with grief and disappointment. Yes, death is often a great mystery, but surely the only answer is that God wanted our friend for Himself. Man proposes, but God disposes. Enoch walked with God—and Enoch was not for God took him!

In our grief we must always recall that Christ Himself suffered the agonising experience of real, painful, physical death. (Were you there when they crucified my Lord?) We must, therefore, remember that even in the great mystery of death—so often shattering our little world—God is really answering our prayers. Consequently, when we pray for God "to restore health and strength to those who are sick" we should always add, "if it be Thy Will." If we do this we shall know in our hearts that death is no longer the King of Terrors, but the Angel of a Father's Love, and the day when He comes is the Christian's birthday of Eternity. The trumpet shall sound and we shall be saved!

In our war against disease our battle is never ending; but if there is a battle God is in it. If you are fighting for something fine God is at your side and the battle is His. We who are privileged to work with sick people, we who bear with the infirmities of the weak, ministering to those in sickness and even in death, have a great reward. Our reward is great because in this task it is the Lord Himself who builds the House and keeps the City for us.

W. D. Lovelock-Jones.

Picture Map of the Holy Land (Francis Chichester, large edition, 6s. 6d.; desk edition, per dozen, 15s.)

This is an attractive map designed to show the places named in the New Testament. Roud the map and in a decorative border are fifty-three small pictures by Lawrence Stone illustrating events connected with the life of Christ, and there are also biblical references at the foot. Teachers would find it a useful visual aid in their work. The map has also been produced in the form of a 234-piece jig-saw puzzle which, for children, will doubtless have an educative as well as entertaining value.

John Sutcliff of Olney

FEW places as small as Olney have as many claims to fame. In the realm of literature grateful minds turn Olney-ward remembering the gentle William Cowper. In the field of evangelical theology and hymnody, many dream of the Olney of the converted slaver, John Newton. Among the enthusiasts for the sphere of the great biblical commentators this little town is mentally noted for the sake of noble Thomas Scott. In the realm of church music, and especially in the fascinating study of hymn-tunes, the informed gladly recall that the celebrated Dr. Henry John Gauntlett, composer of innumerable hymn-tunes, learned his first music and played his first notes here at Olney.

John Sutcliff[1] knew them all. Cowper and Newton were here when he came in 1775. Thomas Scott was already in the district, being then curate at Ravenstone and, at the turn of the century, succeeded Newton at Olney. Gauntlett may or may not have remembered Sutcliff as a prematurely ageing man of sixty-one in 1814. But Sutcliff's dying memory of Gauntlett was that of a precocious child of nine who presided at the new organ in the parish church of which his father was the incumbent.

When Sutcliff came to Olney he was within two months of his twenty-third birthday. Those twenty-three years held a remarkable story. He was the son of a godly Yorkshire farmer. His parents early instructed him in godliness, and he as early went to work on their farm. Outside his own family he was indebted to two ex-Methodists—Dan Taylor and John Fawcett. Fawcett had been converted under George Whitefield, and while both he and Taylor retained the fervour of their Methodism, they tempered it with the Calvinistic stability that they could find only among the Baptists. Both became pastors of small Baptist causes near Sutcliff's home. At fifteen, Sutcliff evinced a yearning for knowledge, began assisting Taylor in his school at Birchcliffe, Hebden Bridge, and Taylor taught him Latin in return. At seventeen, Sutcliff had been won for Christ, was baptised by John Fawcett and joined his church at Wainsgate. For two years Fawcett was his minister and mentor. Sutcliff entered into a correspondence with him relative to certain bitter discouragements in his own Christian life and experience. Fawcett was not slow to discern the qualities in the youth and gratified his every quest

[1] Sutcliff was born on 9th August, 1752.

for spiritual and academic learning. On Fawcett's side this association of Sutcliff and himself eventuated in the founding of Rawdon Baptist College. On Sutcliff's side it set his feet on the road to the ministry via Bristol Baptist College—and that literally as well as metaphorically. For in the depth of the winter of 1772, John Sutcliff walked the 200 miles from Wainsgate, near Hebden Bridge, in Yorkshire, to Bristol. His object in walking was to save some twenty shillings with which to buy books for his college course. This "pet economy" of his, we are told, was a habit.

At Bristol, under Hugh and Caleb Evans—Baptist worthies of their day—for two-and-a-half years Sutcliff's academic record was brilliant, while his preaching attachment to the church at Trowbridge led that church to seek (but unsuccesfully), to secure him as its minister. A manuscript in Sutcliff's own hand in Bristol College Library enumerates certain "observations or rules" that he laid down for his own conduct and which, as his subsequent life shows, were well kept. After about a year at Bristol, Sutcliff suffered the shock of the loss of several of his relatives, and, in particular, a bosom friend and brother beloved of his own age, William Tommas, in a smallpox scourge that affected severly the West Riding of Yorkshire. John Fawcett wrote him the news about his friend Tommas, and it seems to have deeply affected him, solemnizing his thoughts on life and death.

Although he will always be known as "Sutcliff of Olney," it is but fair to say that he spent six months in Shrewsbury and another six in Birmingham before he came here. While in Shrewsbury he received, in November, 1774, a letter written at the instigation of John Ryland by a Mrs. Mary Andrews, on behalf of the Olney church. It was a request that he would come and preach "with a view", because the church was in a poor state. Its membership had fallen to thirty-eight, and there was no-one to minister the Word. After he had served the old Cannon Street Church in Birmingham, whose minister, the Rev. Mr. Turner, was ill, for six months, Sutcliff finally came to Olney in July, 1775. So the year that saw Thos. Scott settling at Ravenstone, Fuller ordained at Soham, and Carey apprenticed to Clarke Nichols at Piddington, saw also Sutcliff arriving in Olney for a ministry that lasted till his death thirty-nine years later.

Mary Andrews who had written the beseeching letter to Sutcliff was the widow of Squire Andrews, and a prominent member of the church. When Sutcliff arrived he freely tutored her young son in return for accommodation in her large house next to the chapel. There Sutcliff lived until Mrs. Andrews died in 1795 and he himself married in 1796, and thus he was able to purchase books

and to build up what Andrew Fuller afterwards described as "one of the best libraries in this part of the country," which went at his decease to Horton Academy, now Rawdon College.

Sutcliff's first four years in Olney were John Newton's last. We have the evidence of Newton's diary that they were years of deep brotherly fellowship between the two men. On several occasions Newton deferred an engagement at the Parish Church in order to attend a special meeting "at Mr. Sutcliff's." It was Newton who instituted the annual united New Year Services for the young at Olney, which continued until recent years; and twice he writes with feeling and enthusiasm of what he had heard from Mr. Sutcliff's lips at those gatherings.

Before Sutcliff had been in Olney six months there was a gathering of Baptist Ministers here; Newton was present, welcomed and loved by them all. The following day Sutcliff had the first baptisms (six) of his ministry. Was Newton there? The Northamptonshire Baptist Association of 1776 met in Olney, and Newton met with it. In fact, he gave John Ryland of Northampton and Joshua Symonds of Bedford lodging at the vicarage. Into the midst of all this brotherly evangelical fervour young Sutcliff had come. It was at these very meetings that he first set eyes on Andrew Fuller and John Ryland, and formed with them an abiding friendship that led Robert Hall afterwards to refer to the three of them as "that lovely triumvirate."[4]

It is impossible to sever Sutcliff from the early missionary enterprise, and to speak of him without speaking of it would be to distort the subject. The common outlook among Baptists at the time of Sutcliff's youth was hyper-Calvinistic. God's predestination was so excessively stressed that man's responsibility vanished. Sutcliff shared this position for a few years but, by 1780, when he had been at Olney only five years, he was in trouble with some of his people for shedding the fatalism and therefore the antinomianism from his theology. It is a remarkable thing that Fuller, Ryland, and Hall (senior) all became unsettled on these points about the same time. Within five years both Hall, *Helps to Zion's Travellers*, 1781, and Fuller, *Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation*, 1785, had expressed themselves outspokenly in print on the subject. It was a movement of the Spirit, though in Sutcliff's case it came through his reading of Jonathan Edwards and David Brainerd, and—as the writer thinks—through the wholesome influence of John Newton and his moderate, evangelical Calvinism.

This breath of the Spirit was the precursor of the veritable tornado that was to break ten years later. The next gust came in 1784, when Sutcliff persuaded the Association to recommend all the churches to "set apart an hour in the evening of the

first Monday of the month for social prayer for the success of the Gospel, and to invite Christians of other denominations to unite with them in it." The idea itself was not new. The Scots ministers of fifty years before had done it. Jonathan Edwards had done it in his "Humble Attempt." But what was new was the forthright and distinctive missionary emphasis that lay behind this "Call to Prayer."

Of all this Sutcliff was the moving spirit, and the movement continued when, the following year, Carey began his two year's close association with Sutcliff in the membership of this church. Then, Carey became an out-pupil of Sutcliff; Sutcliff directed his reading and study, and was thus one means among others in the hand of God towards the preparation of Carey for his specific missionary vision.

So matters progressed. The next stage of crucial importance was the ministers' meeting at Clipstone in 1791. Fuller and Sutcliff were the preachers. Fuller discoursed on "The Pernicious Influence of Delay," and Sutcliff on "Jealousy for the Lord of Hosts." In that sermon Sutcliff propounded the lawyer's question—"Who is my neighbour?"—and answered it like this: "By your neighbour, brethren, you do not mean the man who lives next door. You mean a fellow creature, a member of the human race . . . let him be an ignorant Negro . . . or an untutored savage . . . he is your neighbour . . . He has a soul . . . a soul that will exist for ever—a soul that has interests equally important with those of your own." Here was Sutcliff pleading the very cause that Carey was to plead. And Carey knew, when he preached his "deathless sermon" at Nottingham the following year, that of all men John Sutcliff endorsed his sentiments. Not only that; before Carey preached his sermon on that memorable day, he had the encouragment of hearing Sutcliff introduce, at the morning session, the business of the day. Wm. Carey is rightly, and with all honour, styled the "Founder" of the Baptist Missionary Society; but John Sutcliff by God's use of him, on the one hand to prepare the churches through prayer, and on the other to prepare Carey through influence and tuition entitles him to be acclaimed the "Father" of the Missionary Society.

What was Sutcliff like as a man? Nearly six feet in height, thin in his earlier years, he had a decided Roman nose that became the butt for facetious remarks among his intimate friends. Fuller describes his face as "grave but cheerful, and his company always interesting." In preaching, Sutcliff was quiet and persuasive rather than gesticulating and rhetorical. He became known as being cautious and capable, and his counsel was sought after from a very wide area. Even Andrew Fuller admitted that when

he was puzzled by the affairs of the Mission, he would saddle his horse and ride to Olney where, with Brother Sutcliff at hand, he could see things much clearer than at Kettering.

It has been supposed that there is no portrait of Sutcliff extant. The writer has lately discovered an old "souvenir portrait gallery" which includes, among other ministers, a likeness of John Sutcliff. An enlarged reproduction of this likeness hangs in the vestibule of the Olney church today, and will afterward find its permanent home in the Cowper-Newton Museum. A similar likeness, however, is included in one of two composite frames now placed in the vestry.

Of the many distinctive features of Sutcliff's ministry, his connection with the Northamptonshire Baptist Association (of which, his predecessor, poor persecuted William Walker, was one of the founders) is worthy of remark. In those days the Association included also churches in large parts of Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Rutland, Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire. In his thirty-nine years at Olney, Sutcliff took a prominent part in upwards of thirty-two annual assemblies. On fourteen different occasions he preached to the Association. Eight times he wrote its annual Circular Letter to the churches. Perhaps the Association's greatest tribute to his integrity and worth was that it appointed him Moderator no less than eight times! "There were giants in the land in those days" and among them, and above them, stood this fine man of pure heart, utter consecration, and devout service—John Sutcliff, respected, loved and admired by them all.

Sutcliff's ministerial life is marked by two clear stages or periods. The first began when he came to Olney, and ended when the Missionary Society was formed and the first missionaries had sailed for India. That was in 1793. Until then he had been planning, promoting, persuading. Nothing essential ceased after this time, but something of greater priority emerged, and God fitted him for it. The Mission was begun, but who was to train the future missionaries? Others might help, and did. But the minds of those who were at the heart of the enterprise were fixed on one man, and that man was John Sutcliff. He had learning, and he had the ability to impart learning. In that very year Providence College of Rhode Island recognised his outstanding ministerial and scholastic abilities by awarding him its honorary Master of Arts degree.

Sutcliff remained unmarried until he was forty-three or forty-four years of age. By 1796 he found his life partner in Jane Johnston of Olney, and a home of his own in Olney High Street. He annexed the house next door and turned it into a residential academy for missionary and ministerial students. There—in what

are now 21 and 23 High Street—until he died in 1814, Sutcliff received and trained upwards of thirty-two men. Among them were Daniel Brunsdon, William Robinson, and Eustace Carey—nephew of William—and other noted pioneer missionaries. There were others who went into the home ministry, such as the distinguished Christopher Anderson who came all the way from Edinburgh, and afterwards returned to do a tremendous work in the Baptist interest in Scotland. Anderson's portrait in oils hangs today in the vestry of the largest Baptist Church in Scotland—Charlotte Chapel, Edinburgh—which he founded.

C. H. Spurgeon once said, "He who converts a soul draws water from a fountain; but he who trains a soul-winner digs a well from which thousands may drink to life eternal." Sutcliff dug his well, deep and wide. None can tell how many have drunk of life eternal because of the academy in Olney High Street.

These are glimpses—and glimpses only—at one of the most remarkable men that Olney ever knew, and that the Baptist Denomination ever had; a man who was a great gift of God to His church for the hour that he so perfectly matched. Had Sutcliff, like Newton, kept a full diary, or, like Cowper and Scott, committed all his work to writing, he might have become as well-known as they. But he was a man who sought self-obscurity in order that his Saviour might be exalted. When dying Carey, in 1834, told his flattering friends not to talk of Carey, but of Carey's Saviour, he echoed Sutcliff's sentiments of a similar hour twenty years before. To someone who reminded him of his achievement in extending the cause of Christ, Sutcliff answered: "It is all as nothing. I must enter heaven on the same footing as the penitent thief; and I shall be glad to take a seat by his side."

KENNETH W. H. HOWARD.

The Armour of Light, by Ralph Byers, *Doing the Impossible*, by H. W. Hitchcock, *A Million Miles to Nowhere*, by J. B. Wilson. (Independent Press, 3s. 6d., 3s. 6d., and 3s. 0d. respectively.)

With attractive, colourful picture (paper) covers these three little book contain in all 121 children's addresses each illustrating a Bible text or some Christian truth. As with the majority of such books, the addresses they reproduce vary in quality, but ministers, teachers and other workers among children in search of stories, incidents and illustrations will find here a useful store of material upon which to draw.

Baptists and the Great Church:

OR INDEPENDENCY AND CATHOLICITY

(An address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society, 28th April, 1952.)

BY the Great Church I mean the one, holy, catholic, apostolic Church, which I should call the Catholic Church if that had not, unhappily, become a party label. It is a perennial discussion, going back all through our Baptist history and certainly not dead yet, and it raises fundamental issues. I do not claim that I am going to say anything new. I merely offer my contribution to a continuing discussion. It is certainly continuing. Recently I saw in manuscript a chapter on the Church by a distinguished Anglican theologian in which he credited us Baptists with a completely atomistic, isolationist doctrine of the Church. He said it was fundamental to our position that individual believers made the congregation by agreeing to join together, and that the Church was made by congregations agreeing to join together. Amongst ourselves I have met not a few young people, both lay and ministers, who were unhappy with what they believed to be our position and were on that account attracted to other denominations.

I want to advance certain propositions and to raise some questions :—

I. *In the New Testament the Great Church is fundamental and prior to the local church.* I take for granted here, what I believe can be demonstrated, that though the word "Church" is to be found in only two passages in the Gospels, yet the reality of the Church underlies the whole life and teaching of our Lord. We search in vain for any detailed plans or formulated constitution, but that Jesus loved the Church and gave Himself for it is the conclusion to which all the evidence points. (See, for example, Flew, *Jesus and His Church* and Headlam, *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion.*)

The New Testament reveals varieties of forms of organisation, diversities of gifts and of doctrinal emphasis, but its central concern is to assert and maintain the unity of the Church. The word *ecclesia* is used in two main senses (*a*) the universal Church to which all Christians belong, and (*b*) the company of believers in a particular place. The sum of Christian people throughout

the earth was *ecclesia* to the early Christians, but the same word was used for the local church, for wherever Christ was in the midst of two or three met in His Name, there was the Church. Yet it is the Great Church that is prior. The author of *I Clement* speaks almost pedantically in his opening words as he expresses this: "The Church of God which sojourns in Rome greets the Church of God which sojourns in Corinth."

(In saying that the Church means all the Christians on earth, I am not, of course, forgetting that *ecclesia* is also a supramundane reality, comprising the angelic host, the saints and martyrs in Heaven, as well as those who still live and witness below.)

One thing is certain: the Church in the New Testament is *not* a federation of local congregations. There are not many churches, but one Church in many places. The local church is the local expression of the one great universal community in heaven and earth. It is sometimes said that what we need is "unity of spirit," meaning good fellowship and absence of competition, and implying that outward unity is unimportant. But what the New Testament is concerned with is "unity of the Spirit," which is much more than mutual kindliness and co-operation. I venture to suggest that Paul would not have understood what was meant by the distinction drawn by those who would make "unity of spirit" a contrast to corporate unity, or even a substitute for it. "Give diligence," he begs, "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one Body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all" (Ephes. iv. 3-4). To fail in preserving the unity of the Church is not to walk worthily and is to imperil its witness to the world. The unity of the Church exists already, a gift of God to be "kept."

A threefold unity is ascribed to the Church in the New Testament; a unity of origin, because it was brought into being by the act of God; a social unity, as the result and expression of the common divine life that is in it; a unity of temper and belief, due to a common loyalty and the pursuit of a common task. The unity of the Church is compared to the unity of a human body (1 Cor. xii. 12-30). No part of the body is autonomous. It is controlled from one centre, otherwise it is seriously unhealthy. But in the oneness is diversity—eyes, ears, hands, and a multitude of constituents that are not so obvious. The life of the personality co-ordinates the component cells. Many members, yet but one body, is the sum of the argument. (Members, of course, means individual Christians in the apostle's parable, not denominations.) Other New Testament metaphors emphasise the same point.

There is one building gradually rising in fulfilment of the Architect's plans. The vine has one life flowing through its branches. The one loaf at the Lord's Supper is a symbol of the unity of those who partake. The Church is thus one, because it comes from God; because it has one governing and directing Head, Jesus Christ; because through all its veins and arteries flows the one life-blood of the Spirit.

It is difficult to maintain the case for any one form of church order from the New Testament: there are pointers towards congregationalism, presbytery, and episcopacy. (See, for example, Streeter, *The Primitive Church.*) There are elements of uncertainty. What precisely was the nature of the authority of the Council of Jerusalem? (*Acts. xv.*). Was the church of Rome or Philippi one congregation or perhaps a church meeting in several centres? Is it not possible that the church in Rome was more like what we should call an association than a congregation? (Payne in *The Fellowship of Believers,* of which a welcome new edition, revised and enlarged, has just appeared, says, on p. 26, that "at the end of the 17th century there was a London Baptist church functioning as one unit for the election of elders and deacons, which had at least seven sections in different parts of the metropolis.") It is not clear just how much authority was claimed or exercised by the apostles, but it is certainly impossible to construct a truthful picture of New Testament church polity and ignore the existence of the apostles: as has been done by some exponents of independency.

At least it may safely be said that no New Testament local church thought of itself as self-contained and self-sufficient. It thought of itself as *the* Church of God at Corinth: the local manifestation of the one great reality, whatever measure of local autonomy it may have exercised. Christians were conscious of their brethren in the other centres of the one Church, looking to the same Lord, observing the same sacraments, cherishing the same hope: and they expressed their unity *at least* by consultation, by intervisitation, and by mutual help. It was one Church in many places: not many congregations uniting to make a church. The Great Church came first.

II. *Baptists are not tied to any one form of church government as a matter of principle.* Order may be modified in the light of experience. Even if it were proved, as I do not think it could be, that the New Testament Church was independent or congregational, it would not follow that the New Testament polity was binding upon Christians living under very different conditions. There have, of course, been Baptists, just as there have been Presbyterians and Episcopalians, who have taken a different view, but what I have enunciated is the characteristic and

" official " view, so far as any Baptist view can be. For example, the *Reply of the Baptist Union Council to the Faith and Order Conference of* 1927, said: " We do not hold that any particular form of church government was meant to be inflexible. We have sought to adapt our organisation to the varying needs of times and places, and we are ready to attend closely and sympathetically to the matters involved with a view to greater goodwill and increased efficiency in carrying out the Divine purpose." In *The Life and Faith of the Baptists,* Wheeler Robinson only says, cautiously, " Baptists hold, then, that the congregational polity of a Baptist church is one legitimate way among others of expressing the fundamental idea of the Church,"—though in a footnote he recognises that some among us urge that independency is obligatory.

There were historical reasons why congregationalism arose in the 16th and 17th centuries. It was necessary to reject the conception that the English nation or parish was a Christian church and to assert instead the truth of the " gathered church," that only Christian men and women can make a church. The practical difficulties of a prescribed and persecuted community meeting in secret and with grave hindrances to any communication, still more to any common organisation, with like-minded groups, would make independency almost inevitable, apart from any theological reasons. It was natural and inevitable, and it enshrines elements that deserve to be preserved in any church polity. But Baptists do not stand as a matter of principle and faith for any form of church government. Our witness is in a different realm. In fact, as I proceed to show, different forms have been observed and advocated amongst us. I dispute the right of any man to say that a Baptist is under any obligation to be an independent by conviction.

III. *Accepting independency as our* de facto *method of church government, we ought to recognise that in theory and in practice, independency is not isolationism.* Truly understood, it is based upon the priority of the Great Church. In the well-known phrase of P. T. Forsyth, one of the greatest of Congregational theologians, " the local church was the outcrop there of the total and continuous Church, one everywhere." " The total Church was not made by adding the local churches together, but the local church was made a church by representing there and then the total Church." (*Church and Sacraments,* pp. 60-61.)

We do not as Baptists unchurch others. We recognise that they and we are in the one Church. *The Doctrine of the Church,* a Statement approved by the Baptist Union Council in March, 1948, declares, "Although Baptists have for so long held a position separate from that of other communions they have always claimed

to be part of the one holy catholic Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. They believe in the Catholic Church as the holy society of believers in our Lord Jesus Christ, which He founded, of which He is the only Head, and in which He dwells by His Spirit, so that though manifested in many communions, organised in various modes, and scattered throughout the world, it is yet one in Him. . . . In the worship, fellowship and witness of the one Church we know ourselves to be united in the communion of saints, not only with all believers upon earth, but also with those who have entered into life everlasting."

This is no modern degeneracy. In McGlothlin's *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (p. 79) is reproduced the Confession of the church ministered to in Holland by John Smyth, the father of the General Baptists. In it are these words: "All penitent and faithful Christians are brethren in the communion of the outward church, wheresoever they live, by what name soever they are known, which in truth and zeal follow repentance and faith, though compased with never so many ignorances and infirmities; and we salute them all with a holy kiss, being heartily grieved that we which follow after one faith and one Spirit, one Lord and one God, one body and one baptism, should be rent into so many sects and schisms: and that only for matters of less moment." A similar assertion of the ultimate unity of the Church of Christ is to be found in the Confession of the group which followed Helwys and with him returned to London in 1612, establishing there the first Baptist Church in England (McGlothlin, pp. 88-90).

In practice also we are happily not as independent and isolationist as some definitions of independency would make out. The formation of Associations of Baptist churches was pressed forward as soon as circumstances allowed. In the *History of the Northern Baptist Churches*, by David Douglas, these are descriptions at the very outset of messengers sent by London churches to the north, and letters expressing the desire for closer fellowship from them and from churches in the West of England; and an association in Wales is reported in 1650. Both Particular and General Baptists formed district associations in areas roughly following the county lines. The General Baptists went further and had a General Assembly, which was in existence by 1653, when delegates attended from six counties besides London. It existed to advise the constituent churches; to issue declarations of belief; to unite in propaganda and evangelism; and to decide issues referred to it by individual churches. The Assembly claimed to be a supreme court for the churches, raised funds, sent out messengers, inhibited heretical preachers, and exercised powers of arbitration. In 1651 representatives of thirty congregations in Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and adjoining counties drew up a

Confession to which they invited other churches "in England, Wales, the Army and elsewhere to adhere."

One declaration of the General Assembly of the General Baptists would greatly surprise some modern Baptists. At its meeting in 1693 it affirmed that only an ordained minister was allowed to administer the Lord's Supper, and it re-affirmed this position in 1702. (*Minutes of General Assembly of the General Baptists,* 1654-1728, Whitley pp. 39, 70).

In 1678 a statement of General Baptists from Buckinghamshire, Oxford and adjoining counties went a long way in its provision for General Councils or Assemblies:—

"XXXIX. General councils or assemblies, consisting of Bishops, Elders and Brethren, of the several churches of Christ, and being legally convened and met together out of all the churches, and the churches appearing there by their representatives, make but one church and have lawful right and suffrage in this general meeting or assembly, to act in the name of Christ; it being of divine authority and is the best means under heaven to preserve unity, to prevent heresy, and superintendency among or in any congregation whatsoever within its own limits or jurisdiction. And to such a meeting or assembly appeals ought to be made, in case any injustice be done, or heresy and schism countenanced in any particular congregation of Christ, and the decisive voice in such general assemblies is the major part, and such general assemblies have lawful power to hear and determine, as also to ex-communicate" (McGlothlin, p. 154). Payne, after quoting this adds, "The General Baptists were clearly not Independents in the commonly accepted use of the term," and he refers to a meeting of General Baptist Messengers in 1696 which declared that "independence is very dangerous and detrimental" (*The Fellowship of Believers,* p. 28).

The Circular Letter of the Eastern Association for 1777 (Payne, *op. cit.,* p. 31) urges the importance of the revival of the primitive practice of associating, "as capable of restitution as baptism or the Lord's Supper or any other primitive institute." The Letter points out that Baptists came together in a General Assembly in 1689, "as soon as ever liberty of conscience was granted," and proposes a national union of delegates of the existing provincial associations on rather presbyterian lines. The Baptist Union was not in fact formed until 1813. It disclaimed any authority and certainly possessed none.

It must be remembered that the Particulars were more independent than the Generals. The Particular Baptist Confession of 1677, in the section on the church, says, "As each church and all members of it, are bound to pray continually for the good and prosperity of all the churches of Christ in all places; and upon

all occasions to further it . . . so the churches . . . ought to hold communion amongst themselves for their peace, increase of love and mutual edification." And it goes on to say that when difficulties or differences arise in doctrine or administration "it is according to the mind of Christ that many churches holding communion together, do by their messengers meet to consider and give their advice in or about that matter in difference," though without any jurisdiction or power to impose their decisions.

Very early also the Generals appointed Messengers to have oversight of a district, e.g. in 1656 Thomas Collier was ordained by the Western Association as superintendent of all the churches in the area (Walton, *The Gathered Community*, p. 90). In the General Baptist Buckingham Confession of 1678 a distinction is drawn between Bishops or Messengers, who were officers of the wider church and the pastors or elders who were officers of local churches. The revival of the office of General Superintendent in 1917 was one of the most helpful and far-reaching decisions taken in our denominational life, though it could be wished that they were less occupied in administrative and office work.

It is fair to say that associations, assemblies and other co-operative organs were not regarded as optional but as essential by our fore-fathers. The local church is a true church only if it lives in fellowship with others. Clearly, too, many of them believed in the possession by associations and assemblies of a large measure of delegated authority.

IV. There are two particular issues in this field where we speak with an uncertain voice. I want to ask some questions.

1. *What constitutes a church?* Can any "two or three" get together and call themselves a church, even if the group is created by dissidence? Is a local church really a church if it is not associated with others in the tasks of the Great Church?

The Declaration of Principle of the Baptist Union, in the *Handbook*, says that "each church has liberty under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to interpret and administer (Christ's) laws." What is meant here by "each church"? It says earlier that "the Union shall consist of the churches, associations of churches . . . whose names are given in the *Baptist Handbook* for each year as forming the membership of the Baptist Union." Below, it is laid down that all applications for membership shall be submitted to the Council and accepted or rejected on a majority vote, with an appeal to the Assembly. In other words a church in the Baptist Union is one that is elected to the Union by the Council—which does not take us far to an answer to our question.

In the Statement on the Doctrine of the Church, quoted above, there is more fundamental discussion of principle. It says that local churches "are gathered by the will of Christ and live by

the indwelling of His Spirit. They do not have their origin, primarily, in human resolution." The basis of membership in the church is "a conscious and deliberate acceptance of Christ as Saviour and Lord by each individual." Later reference is made to "the perils of isolation," and emphasis is laid on the value of the B.U., the B.M.S., the B.W.A., and the work of the General Superintendents. "Indeed we believe that a local church lacks one of the marks of a truly Christian community if it does not seek the fellowship of other Baptist churches, does not seek a true relationship with Christians and churches of other communions and is not conscious of its place in the one catholic Church." Admirable! But many questions still remain unanswered. One still wonders if any group of Christians can get together and call themselves a church and demand recognition as such. Should not the concurrence of existing churches, and in most cases the dismissal of a group of members to form a church, be regarded as an essential? This, of course, has often happened. Many of our churches were deliberately formed by the action of an existing church. An interesting example is recorded in James Stuart's *History of Beechen Grove Church, Watford.* This quotes the minute book with reference to the period 1640-45 when a group in Watford were holding meetings but were "not then in a church state, but were a branch of a church in London." As their numbers grew they consulted the churches in London who were in association with them, and they "agreed that we should be set down in a church state in Watford upon certain terms which were agreed to."

Our denomination in the past was hesitant about recognising a group as a church unless provision had been made for regular pastoral oversight and the observance of the sacraments. Payne, in the book quoted more than once above, speaks of the care taken in the closing years of the eighteenth century by College Street, Northampton, in the formation of separate churches in the villages, and many other examples could easily be given. Our forefathers believed that a church was not merely a group of believers, but a disciplined and ordered company with a pastor and sacraments, solemnly associated by a covenant. Are we as particular today?

2. *What constitutes a "minister"?* Can any two or three call a man to the ministry of the Church of Christ? There is nothing so jealously guarded by our churches as the right to call as their minister whom they choose. But churches are not self-sufficient in respect of the ministry—even if they have never sent a subscription to a theological college. No man is an island: neither is any congregation. A church seldom appoints its minister from its own membership. It looks to other churches,

asks the colleges for the names of promising students, consults the superintendents. The ministry is not the concern of the individual congregation alone. The whole denomination is concerned with supply, training, finance, superintendence. Both local church and the B.U. are concerned, and both should have a say in the choice.

This is symbolised, or should be—and in the past it was customary—by the share in the ordination service of neighbouring pastors and often of the college principal and the general superintendent. In the Statement on the Doctrine of the Church it says, "The minister's authority to exercise his office comes from the call of God in his personal experience, but this call is tested and approved by the church of which he is a member and (as is increasingly the rule) by the representatives of a large group of churches. He receives intellectual and spiritual training and is then invited to exercise his gifts in a particular sphere. His authority is, therefore, from Christ through the believing community. . . . Many among us hold that since the ministry is the gift of God to the church and the call to exercise the functions of a minister comes from Him, a man who is so called is not only the minister of a local Baptist church, but also a minister of the whole Church of Jesus Christ."

Yet men still get into our ministry (I am not speaking of our Accredited List) without adequate training or supervision or the consent of the wider church. Is it really part of our claim that any man called by any Baptist church in isolation is a minister of the whole Church of Jesus Christ?

V. *Whither?* I cordially recognise not only the initial historic inevitability of congregationalism, but also the value of the independent emphasis. I am no advocate of any rigid ecclesiastical system. Both for religious and practical reasons certain responsibilities should rest in the hands of the local congregation. But I see no mystical significance in this, nor do I regard independency as divinely ordained. If episcopalians and presbyterians can learn from us—and in recent years both have moved in a congregational direction—we can also learn from them. Or, indeed, it might be sufficient if we would consent to learn from our forefathers, some of whom in some respects were wiser than we are. We ought to be inter-dependents, not independents, and certainly never isolationists. If independency means that a local congregation is self-creating, self propagating, self-supporting, self-contained, self-governed, self-sufficient—no church is or could be or ought to be. Such a system is—or would be, because we do not have it in practice—unscriptural in basis, unworkable in practice, and un-Christian in spirit.

Democracy is not quite the right word to use of a Christian Church. It suggests wrong standards and comparisons. A

church ought to be a Christocracy. But allowing the term as representing something of value in our Baptist life, we still have to ask, if the local church is a democracy, what about its relations to other similar democracies? British democracy works, and must work by delegated authority. It is no principle of democracy that the Rural District Council is self-contained and has the last word. I believe that there are many matters where we should delegate authority to associations and the national Union.

And if it is the Christocracy that we emphasise, I am sure that Christ may be in the midst of the Baptist Union Council or Association as truly as of the church meeting. I recall a fine passage in the Report of the B.U. Polity Commission (November, 1942, p. 6). "The final authority over the Church of Christ is none other than our Lord Himself and we believe that His mind for His people is communicated through the Holy Spirit. The local church has access to that mind as it earnestly seeks to know the Lord's will. But is the Spirit's guidance only made known to the local church? . . In our concern to guard the autonomy of the local church we have not always remembered that the Spirit of God speaks in guidance not only to the individual church, but also to a fellowship of churches who have bound themselves together in the service of our Lord, whether in a district group, or an association, or a Union. The churches in their corporate life, in virtue of the indwelling Spirit, can say with the New Testament Church, 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us'."

Our togetherness is as vital to us as our independency, and as much a part of our history. Let us preserve our freedom to be led by the Spirit to the most efficient polity in His service. We have much to learn about an ordered liberty from our own history; to say nothing of the experience of other denominations. Should we not be in a better position to plan and to use our resources, in evangelism, in church extension and church closing (quite as vital an issue in some places) and in a host of ways, in meeting the needs of the contemporary situation, if we had a properly delegated system of authority, over the denomination as a whole, and not only over the aided churches? We need a flexible polity to meet a new situation. We have not yet learned how to harmonise the local and the catholic; the necessary local autonomy and initiative, with the equally necessary co-operation and fellowship and common action in matters where more than the local church is concerned.

HUGH MARTIN.

The Holy Spirit and Personal Experience

NO enquiry into the nature and work of the Holy Spirit would be adequate without some consideration of the Spirit's work in our personal life. Members of the Church believe in the Holy Spirit, but they might be at a loss to say just how the Holy Spirit works in their own experience. It is not necessary to be able to analyse the composition of the air in order to live by breathing. Even so, ministers of the Gospel cannot afford to be in ignorance here. It is here, more than anywhere else, that we test our theology and find it adequate as a scientific understanding of our experience. Moreover, it is just here that we can prove to ourselves and to others that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is not dry and formal, but one which touches our life at every possible point. Again, it is only as we understand it ourselves that we are able to teach others. We are members of the Body of Christ, and the Body of Christ is a very special sphere of the Spirit's influence. But we are thinking now of ourselves as individuals and in terms of personal experience whilst ever remembering that it is as individual members of the Body that we make our contribution to the life of the Body as a whole. What we are about to say is in no sense a denial of that social emphasis which has surely been apparent throughout our study.[1]

We begin by noting that there are two ways in which, as individuals, we experience the power of the Spirit—the way of Communion and the way of possession. Regarding the way of Communion we know fully how in communion with men and women of like mind with ourselves we receive a strength and a power which otherwise would be beyond us. This simple fact is the rational explanation of the power of community life. Union has always meant strength, and nowhere is that truth more apparent than in the experience of the Christian Church. In regard to the way of possession we must go a little deeper. The thought of being possessed by God rather than of enjoying communion with our fellowmen in God is, at first sight, something lower, if not even repulsive. And we have, in the Gospels, those cases of being possessed by demons; these we cannot ignore, since it is with a background of demon-possession that the Gospels portray the work of Christ. However much we in these days have outgrown those ancient beliefs in demon-possession, or, with the help of modern psychology, give to those Gospel cases another

[1] This concludes the writer's series of three articles on the Holy Spirit.

interpretation, the fact remains that we do know what it means to be possessed. A man in a bad temper is possessed. But there is also another kind of possession. We can be possessed by the good as well as by the bad. We know what it means to be possessed by our work, or by a book, or by an experience in pastoral life. Possessed in a book, a man may have even forgotten the breakfast which he has just eaten and, looking up from the book, have asked for the meal. One can become possessed to the exclusion of the rest of consciousness. We become lost in our work or lost in the preparation of a sermon. A doctor can be lost in a diagnosis of a case, he stands by the bedside of the patient and is oblivious to all else until the diagnosis registers in his mind. We know, too, the experience of being lifted above ourselves so that we do work which even, on reflection, surprises ourselves. In all these experiences we have, somehow, an additional source of power coming into us from outside; a power which makes us more truly ourselves than otherwise we should be; a power which works for good. It was after studying Dr. Leonard Hodgson's book on the Doctrine of the Trinity that the writer became fully aware of how fruitful and approach these experiences were to an understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit, and he acknowledges his indebtedness to that illuminating theologian.

Let us now turn to a saying of our Lord, one which chronologically must be placed towards the close of the ministry. Its position in the Gospel is in the Little Apocalypse of *Mk. xiii.* Jesus is warning His disciples of the difficult times which lie ahead of them and of the persecutions they will have to endure for His sake. He says, "When they lead you to judgment, and deliver you up, be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak, but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye, for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit." We are all aware of how these words have been misused. Dr. James Black tells us of a celebrated evangelist who was invited by Dr. Denny to address the students at New College. The visitor advised those students for the ministry to test their faith in the Holy Spirit by occasionally going into the pulpit unprepared and, opening the Bible at random, speak from the first text that caught the eye, trusting, he said, to the Holy Spirit. Dr. Denny concluded his rebuke of the speaker by saying that he confused inspiration with desperation. Dr. Black adds that for himself it would be perspiration too! We know how easy it is to take a saying like this, remove it from its context, and apply it to situations for which it was never meant to apply. It is both easy and dangerous to do that with any saying of Jesus. But this particular saying is, nevertheless, capable of a much wider application than its immediate

setting. After all, it would have not been of much use to prepare beforehand any defences, for the simple reason that the early followers of our Lord never knew at what minute they would be arrested, nor could they know the exact charge which would be brought against them until the moment when they appeared before the magistrate. What these words of Jesus surely mean is that the disciples must be the kind of men who could meet the crisis when it came. In that sense they would be able to say the right word, and that right word would be given to them. The Christian is the kind of person who can see his way through an emergency because he possesses a character which has been trained in the school of Christ; thus he relies on the Spirit of God to assist him, and such reliance is never misplaced. Now, as Dr. Hodgson says, this meaning is not read into these words, but read out of them. Our Lord's own life is the outstanding example of this kind of experience.

From this starting point we can begin to understand the activity of the Spirit in our personal experience. There is so much in our life which can be ascribed to the Spirit's power, once we begin to think about it. Dr. Hodgson gives two examples of the right approach in our personal experience to the power of the Spirit. The first is concerning our prayers. He writes:—

> "As we kneel to pray, we pause to recollect who we are and what we are doing. Moved by the Holy Spirit we are coming into the presence of our Heavenly Father, brought in by the Lord Jesus whom we adore and worship as He takes us by the hand and presents us to our Father. We have turned aside out of the world, but as we offer ourselves, our souls and bodies, we bring with us all our worldly interests, for they are His interests—or should be. We offer our sins that they may be forgiven; we offer our interests He cannot share that He may wean us from them; we offer our thanks for the victories and joys that He has given us, our petitions and intercessions for all those people, causes and things with which He wills us to be concerned. And as we rise to return to our life and work in the world, we look out in our mind's eye beyond the wall of the room or Church where we may be, we look out into all the world around as those who are being sent forth, united with Christ and enightened by the Spirit, in order that we may share God's joy in all that is good and true and beautiful, His grief at all that is ugly and base and sinful, His labours in overcoming the evil and building up the good."

The second concerns ourselves in the pulpit. It runs thus:—

> "It has been a great help to me personally to realise that what I have to pray for to the Holy Spirit as I kneel before entering the pulpit, is that for the next twenty minutes or so I may be enabled to forget everything except this message and this congregation, and to put my whole self in bringing it home to them. Then, when I am in the pulpit, the time for prayer is past, the time for action has come. So, too, it is with all activities. The gift of the Spirit for

> which we need to pray is the gift of concentration. The fruit of the Spirit is to be found in our power to bring our whole mind to bear upon the matter in hand."

Here there is practical guidance for ministers, lay preachers and those who have specialised Christian work to perform. As ministers we have two messages to prepare for each Sunday, plus innumerable addresses to other sections of the Church. In all our preparations we should be conscious of the Spirit's help. For the Spirit is not an excuse for hard work but the power to work hard. No preparation is too arduous for the delivery of God's eternal Good News. But having, under the Spirit's guidance, made our preparation, we then enter the pulpit and in a way not realised by the evangelist in Glasgow we do rely on the inspiration of the Spirit. We give ourselves to our message. As preachers we know that it is only as we give ourselves to our message that the message becomes effective. But what is that giving of ourselves to our message but a possession by the Holy Spirit? There is a need for teaching such as this for those about to enter the Ministry. Its truth can be tested every Sunday by every serious preacher of the Gospel. Is it not a fact that as preachers we can take for granted this movement of the Spirit? We have not been as Trinitarian as we supposed we were.

But the work of the Holy Spirit in personal experience can be seen in every department of life. To understand that work in our own experience fits us to interpret that work in the experience of others. When a young man or woman comes seeking baptism and Church membership is he or she not moved by the Spirit and, if so, why not say so? Why should we be hesitant to speak about the Spirit? As reasonable beings we are fully aware of the danger which obviously attends this habit of ascribing experiences to the Holy Spirit. Nothing is so tiring and no one so boring as the person who is always speaking as if he were specially inspired by the Spirit. Church History abounds with examples of absurdities along this line of conduct. But the answer to this is not a suppression of all reference to the Spirit, but a right understanding of the Spirit. Paul did not meet the crisis at Corinth by forbidding all reference to speaking with tongues; what he did was to insist on an interpretation of those tongues and then he went on to show those uncritical Corinthians that the fruits of the Spirit were in fact very homely virtues.

Dr. Wheeler Robinson has called our attention to what he describes as the Kenosis of the Spirit. We are all accustomed to the Kenotic theory in regard to the Person of Christ; how the earthly life of Christ was a descent on the part of Godhead into our human experience; how Jesus lived as a man and suffered as a man. The same truth applies equally to the Holy Spirit. The

Holy Spirit works in the Church but, owing to the imperfections of the Church, cannot do His perfect work; He is hindered by the frailty of the human material. In the same way the Holy Spirit is frustrated in our own personal life. The Holy Spirit suffers a kenosis in every individual. But the goal of the Spirit is surely the establishment of the kingdom and the perfect harmony of individuals within that kingdom. At present we fall far short of all that the Spirit is capable of doing in and through us. But the power of the Spirit is present, and the more we understand, by experience and meditation, of the power of that Spirit the nearer we shall be to being the kind of people Jesus intended us to be.

H. CLARKSON.

Disciples of All Nations, by Basil Mathews. (Oxford University Press, 12s. 6d.)

This is a fuller and in some ways different version of the book published in America as *Forward Through the Ages*, and its manuscript was in the press at the time of Basil Mathews' death in March, last year. Indebted inevitably to Dr. Latourette's famous seven volumes, but based also on Mathews' own world-wide personal contacts and the knowledge gained from forty years spent in studying and teaching missionary history, this absorbing book outlines in fewer than 300 pages the story of the spread of Christianity from the beginning to the present-day. It could not be regarded as suitable as a college text-book and was probably not intended for that purpose. But as a popular account of the expansion of the Church it could hardly be improved upon. Colourful, racy, gripping, this is the book to put into the hands of anyone whom one would wish to interest in the history of the Faith. The final section, dealing with the period 1910-1950, is particularly valuable. The seven maps are admirable, and there is a useful table of dates and biblography. While the book necessarily has limitations from the point of view of the serious student, nevertheless as a clear, live and vivid presentation of the subject it deserves to be warmly commended.

Baptist Churches in the Bedford Area.

(Continued)

COTTON END BAPTIST CHURCH

THE Bunyan Meeting records show that during the persecution, 1660-1672, and in 1677-80 and later, they were holding some of their meetings at Cotton End. In 1670, Thomas Thorowgood, a weaver at Cotton End, at whose house services had been held, was fined nineteen pounds and distraint made upon him. All he had, including his trade implements, were taken from him. The present work was begun by Francis Holcroft, but the church was not formed until 1776, some years after his death. Wilson refers to it as the Cardington Dissenting Meeting House at Cotton End, and the Maulden Church Book shows the reception of a member in 1802 from Cardington, Cotton End. The church was too poor to support a minister, so help was given from the "Baptist Fund in London" until 1797. The chapel was twenty-eight feet square, and was enlarged in 1796, 1805, and 1810, and rebuilt in 1837. Samuel Whitbread gave 120 guineas for restoration at Bunyan Meeting, and some of this money was spent in providing the spreading, many-lighted brass chandelier, which is now in the vestry at Cotton End. The Church Book shows that it was in 1776 Strict Communion, with nine foundation members; but they altered the rules so as to admit Mr. Thomas Taylor, paedo-baptist, as a member. In 1832 the church declared for Open Communion. Among the Pastors was John Holloway, 1822-1831, who gave at his induction a remarkable confession of Faith. John Frost, Pastor 1832-1878, was a Congregationalist who started in 1840 an "Institution for the education and training of young men for the service of the Home Missionary Society," and continued it until midsummer 1874. He had 127 students in all. Among the men who applied was William Booth, but for some reason he went instead to a Methodist College, and eventually became the founder of the Salvation Army.

CRANFIELD BAPTIST

The Church Book begins in 1792, but 1660 is claimed as the date of the formation of the church. It is said that S. Gibbs, a decided Baptist, was turned out of the Rectory at Newport Pagnell at the end of 1659 or early 1660, and set up a Dissenting Meeting

there, and began to preach at Cranfield also. William Wheeler is said to have been Pastor at Cranfield 1662-69. Calamy says that he was Rector at Cranfield in August, 1661, but that his successor was instituted on October 15th of that year. He petitioned about 1670 for release from prison to which he had been committed on a charge of keeping a conventicle in his house. He died at Cranfield in February, 1672. His book, "A Spiritual Portion of Heavenly Treasure bequeathed by Mr. William Wheeler, late minister of the Gospel, and Pastor of a Church of Christ at Cranfield, in Bedfordshire, as his Last Legacy to his Wife and Children" (London: 1670), is treasured by the church. His successor, Nehemiah Coxe, was Pastor in 1674 and 1675. We shall meet him in connection with Maulden. The church has had eighteen Pastors in all. It was re-formed with eight members in 1776, after being thirty-two years without a Pastor. The present chapel was built in 1770, and enlarged in 1820. There is a Calvinistic confession of faith. It was decided to admit unbaptised believers in 1795. Many leaves have disappeared from its Church Book, some of them cut out. The church has had some times of dissension, and some members seceded in 1848 to form a separate church.

EVERSHOLT: PARTICULAR BAPTIST

According to Wilson there was a church here at the end of the 17th century which was represented at the General Assembly in London in 1689 and 1692. Edmund White was Pastor in both those years. Matthew Dutton resigned the pastorate in 1730. The dates of formation and dissolution are uncertain. There was a General Baptist congregation in the village early in the 18th century, but nothing is known about it except that Joseph Garnett was Pastor in 1701.

FLITWICK BAPTIST

The Maulden Church Book shows that on February 13th, 1804, it was resolved to remove the Flitwick Sabbath evening service from Mr. Ellis' to Mr. Beales'. Mr. Ellis had claimed £1 per annum: Mr. Beale had offered the use of his house free, except candles. We do not know when these meetings began, or when they ceased; but the Flitwick Church Book tells us without any dates that some residents at Flitwick were members at Maulden, and used to walk the two or three miles there. Then some young men from Ceylon Baptist Church, Luton, used to drive out in a wagonette and hold open air meetings on the Green at Flitwick, and Mrs. Cousins provided tea for them. Later, they rented a cottage at Gravel Pit Lane at 1/- per week; and afterwards held meetings for about three years at Mrs. Cousins'

cottage; two services on Sundays and a mid-week meeting. Twenty or thirty used to attend, and Mr. Cousins helped the singing with a concertina until Ampthill lent a harmonium. Mr. R. Goodman, School Superintendent at Maulden, gave the site in King's Road. F. B. Meyer came one day to see Mr. Goodman, who took him to see the ground and Dr. Meyer prayed there for God's blessing on the work. The chapel was opened in April, 1907, and Maulden transferred eight members to the new church in 1909, including Mrs. Cousins and Mr. and Mrs. R. Goodman.

HAYNES: STRICT BAPTIST

Between 1660 and 1672 Bunyan Meeting Church used to hold some of their services at Haynes; but whether the present work can be traced back to that date is unknown. The only information obtainable is the name of a Pastor of fifty years ago, and a statement that the present chapel, which will hold 150 people, was opened in 1934 in place of a building that had been about 100 years in use.

MAULDEN BAPTIST

The church was formed in 1672, in which year John Bunyan obtained a licence for Nehemiah Coxe to preach at a cottage belonging to Sarah Tomkins, widow. Nehemiah Coxe was son of Benjamin, who was Minister at Bedford in 1643. A member of the Bedford church, Nehemiah was a cordwainer or shoemaker, and there is a variation of the word in the following story. Coxe was once before the magistrates for preaching the Gospel. The charge was in Latin, so Coxe addressed the court in Greek and Hebrew. The lawyers complained that they did not understand these languages, and Coxe replied that as they had charged him in Latin he had the right to reply in other learned languages. The Chairman of the Bench told the lawyers, "Gentlemen, this cordwinder hath wound you all up," and dismissed the case. Coxe was not long at Maulden; he then had a short pastorate at Cranfield, and thence went to a London church, and became also a fashionable physician.

In 1726 a chapel was built on the site of Sarah Tomkins' cottage. The original Church Book has disappeared and the present book begins on October 26th, 1768, with "A Brief Chronology of the principal Events relating to the Church of Jesus Christ assembling at Maulden in the County of Bedford." In that year the present chapel was built, and William Coles began a pastorate of thirty-seven years. Coles' daughter Anne was the second wife of Andrew Fuller, of Kettering. The chapel was enlarged in 1802, and practically reconstructed in 1862. During Coles' pastorate, meetings were started at Houghton Conquest, at

Greenfield, and at Ampthill. It is not known what became of two of these, but the Church Book has many references to Ampthill and afterwards to Flitwick. When the latter church was formed, and Mr. and Mrs. Goodman were transferred to it, the church at Maulden invited them to continue to attend all meetings of the church, and Mr. Goodman presided at some church meetings at Maulden. In 1808, when S. Hobson became Pastor, the evening meeting took place at Ampthill. 1845 has a note that it is believed that the church was originally Open Communion, but became Strict during Mr. Coles' pastorate, and again became Open Communion in 1808. At the end of the Book are seventeen Articles of Faith (Calvinistic) and the following:—

"We Believe that the singing of Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs vocally is an Ordinance of the Gospel, to be performed by Believers, and that everyone should be left to their Liberty in using it.

"We believe that Baptism is an Ordinance of Christ, that Believers are the only proper subjects of it, and that the only Scriptural mode of administering it is by Immersion in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

Several entries in the Church Book show that the financial position was difficult. For a time they shared a Pastor with Flitwick; but each of these churches now has its own Pastor. The original Church Book has gone. It was of such interest that it was borrowed in 1923 for exhibition at the Baptist World Congress at Stockholm, was duly returned, and then disappeared.

POTTON OLD MEETING: STRICT BAPTIST

John Wesley wrote in 1762 that he could not find a living Christian at Potton, but wild beasts in abundance. He was evidently not much impressed by what he saw at the ancient Parish Church. But there was a very different ministry at Everton, less than two miles away, where John Berridge had begun his great work in 1756. Berridge died in 1793 and it is probable that some of his people began the work at Potton. The date is unknown, but the chapel was registered in May, 1802, and the first entry in the Church Book is dated 1800. The best known Pastors have been Edward Blackstock, 1826-35, and William Site, 1846-61. In recent years it has depended upon supplies.

RAVENSDEN: PRIMITIVE BAPTIST

The Rev. Timothy Richard Matthews, B.A., was Curate-in-Charge at Colmworth from 1818-1830, and from 1825-1830 was assistant chaplain at what was then called the House of Industry at Bedford. He became chaplain in 1830 and removed to Bedford, and made his Sunday services open to the public, who came in

large numbers until, in 1832, the authorities restricted the meetings to inmates. Within nineteen weeks his congregation built the large chapel in Bromham Road, which he called Christ Church. The Bishop refused a licence, but, of course, that made no difference. Matthews lived in the rooms under the chapel, and died there in 1845. His people buried him behind the chapel, but his body and the stone tomb were afterwards removed to Colmworth Churchyard. The chapel is now the Bromham Road Methodist.

Matthews was a great open air preacher, and was in the habit of gathering a crowd by blowing a trumpet, and he became well known in all the district around Bedford. He cannot be claimed as a Baptist, for he would not abandon the baptism of the infants of believers; he used to baptise them—not sprinkle them. It was his custom to baptise converts, usually in the river at Bedford. His register shows 430 such baptisms there between 1837 and 1842. One of these was a paralytic woman who was assisted into the water; but after baptism called out "I can walk," and proved it by walking ashore.

Among his converts were Thomas Symons, a gardener at Ravensden, and his wife, Hannah. They used to walk three-and-a-half miles on Sunday mornings to the meetings at Bedford; and he accepted their offer of the kitchen of their cottage as an afternoon preaching station. When this became too small they hired a barn and turned that into a chapel; and Hannah Symons began to collect money for a better building; but Matthews' work had ended some years before she had enough money. Meanwhile preachers from Bunyan Meeting and Howard Chapel, Bedford, supplied the pulpit at Ravensden. Zion Chapel was opened in 1853, and enlarged in 1863, but the date of the formation of the church is not known.

The old Minute Book has disappeared, and the earliest note in the present book records the death of Hannah Symons in March, 1885, "who had for many years had the management of the business of this Church." It is known that John Green, Superintendent of the School gave the land. The church rules say that all persons admitted to membership may be immersed on profession of their faith in Christ. The community is described as the Primitive Baptist Church Meeting at Zion Chapel, Ravensden. Over the pulpit hangs one of the trumpets that Timothy Matthews used. His Communion Service is still there.

RENHOLD BAPTIST

The work was started by Wilden, three miles away, some of whose members lived at Renhold, and cottage meetings were so well attended that in 1872 they asked Captain Polhill-Turner for a site for a chapel. The opposition of the vicar delayed matters

until the next year. The congregation dug the foundations in the summer evenings. The chapel was opened in September 1873, and in December, the church was formed with twenty-three members. The articles of faith are not Calvinistic, but some of the foundation members were strongly so. They used Spurgeon's "Our Own Hymn Book." For some years they had no organ and the hymns were given out verse by verse, and the singing led by a precentor. About forty years ago the church had a revival, which began at prayer meetings.

RIDGMONT BAPTIST

It is generallv believed that John Bunyan preached several times at Ridgmont and at least once in the Parish Church. The church was formed in 1701 and the Church Book starts on September 22nd of that year, when thirteen persons entered into covenant relations, mixed Communion, and declared, "We judge union with Christ, soundness in judgment in fundamentals of the Gospel and an holy conversation to be the only and sufficient grounds of the communion of saints." In May, 1770, the church became Strict Communion, but it has long had baptised membership with Open Communion.

RISELEY: STRICT BAPTIST

In 1838 some people "who desired to introduce the Gospel in its purity into the benighted village of Riseley, with 1,000 inhabitants" began meetings, and built a chapel; a church was formed in February, 1839. In 1844 they were unable to give a transfer of a member to Bunyan Meeting because that church practised mixed communion, but they sent a letter giving that member an honorable character. An entry in the Church Book in 1897 says that they had been without a Pastor for thirty years, and that no records had been kept, but that the services had been held regularly.

In 1900 there was a baptism, the first for many years. In 1937 a Communion Service is noted as the first for about eight years. In 1945 the membership consisted of two women, and services were infrequent. The chapel has since been sold.

G. E. PAGE.

(To be continued)

Reviews

Submission in Suffering and other essays on Eastern thought, by H. H. Rowley, D.D., F.B.A. (University of Wales Press, 12s. 6d.)

Dr. Rowley's erudition and versatility are a constant source of amazement to his friends. Here he has reprinted three lengthy essays in comparative religion. They show a predominant interest in Chinese thought, which Dr. Rowley says is a field to which he has turned "as a recreation" ever since his years as a missionary in Shantung. The longest essay, which provides the title to the volume, first appeared in 1942 and has already proved of great value to students of comparative religion. It sets out the attitude to suffering—particularly innocent suffering—in the main religious traditions. Acceptance and resignation have been inculcated by most of the world's great teachers. But Professor Rowley's careful examination shows that there are profound differences in the explanations that have been offered and the quality and character of the response suggested. It is the teaching of Mo-tzu which Professor Rowley finds most akin to that of our Lord, though even with Mo-tzu there are differences of setting and emphasis which make a gulf between his solution of the problem and that set before men in the Cross. The second essay discusses the parallels to the Golden Rule found in the words of the Chinese sages. Here again Dr. Rowley is led to give considerable attention to Mo-tzu, though he concludes that the Chinese heretic did not call men into any direct relationship with God, whereas this was the essential context of the teaching of Jesus. In the third essay we have a valuable study devoted entirely to Mo-tzu, who almost certainly lived between 480 and 380 B.C. and whose writings have received increasing attention in both East and West in the last three decades. Whilst frankly recognising the criticisms that may be levelled against Mo-tzu, Dr. Rowley insists on the greatness of his spirit and the heights of self-sacrifice and unselfishness which he attained. All three essays provide material for the preacher and the general reader as well as the student. This volume is attractively produced and moderately priced. Its conclusions are supported with a characteristic wealth of footnotes and bibliographical material. Baptists will note with interest and satisfaction the use that has been made of the lecture on Mo-tzu delivered by Dr. H. R. Williamson in Tsinanfu in 1926.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

The Kingdom of Jesus, by John D. Stoops. (Philosophical Library, New York, $3.75.)

Mr. Stoops, who recognises his debt to Cransford Toy, his teacher in the Old Testament, John Dewey, who taught him psychology, Santayana, who informed him that drama interprets history, and Walter Rauschenbusch who gave him his lessons in the social gospel of Jesus, gives here a frankly modernist interpretation of the Gospel of Jesus and His Kingdom. It may be doubted whether the general conclusion, "The concept of Christ is the symbol of the integration of the individual into a world-community of righteousness," does justice to the New Testament evidence. There is a good deal of naïveté, too, e.g., "The teaching of Jesus gives us the psychological technique for the creation of a system of mental and moral power which is more powerful and more durable than the power system of Hitler or of Stalin." The chapter on the gospel of Paul, with its emphasis on the derivation of the Pauline pattern from the mystery religions is altogether too sweeping, and to state boldly that the Fourth Gospel "belongs to the timeless world of Greek thought" and that it "comes into sharp conflict with the historical, social, Jewish type of thinking of Jesus" provides proof of the author's prejudice rather than the pure Hellenism of the evangelist who conceded that "Salvation is of the Jews." The Toy—Dewey—Santayana—Rauschenbusch approach of Mr. Stoop's book is an interesting American phenomenon, but whether Jesus or the Apostle would recognise "the Kingdom" is another matter.

D. Eirwyn Morgan.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Religions, by E. Royston Pike. (George Allen & Unwin, 30s.)

This useful and well-produced volume is unlike most of its kind in that it has not been compiled by a large staff of specialists. but is the work of Mr. Royston Pike alone. To this formidable task he has brought the knowledge, experience and reputation for accuracy gained from his authorship of several works on ethics and religion and his association in the editing of other encyclopaedias. Believing that the art of the encyclopaedist should be that of an impartial expositor rather than the apologist or critic, Mr. Pike has done his work in the conviction that, since all religions are sacred to those who profess them, the student should pursue his inquiries with an understanding and reverent spiirt. In these 400 or so well-printed pages an immense amount of information concerning the religious beliefs and practices of mankind and the great personalities connected with them has been

skilfully summarised. To the Baptists a page-and-a-half is devoted, presenting a balanced account of their history and beliefs. But their great strength in America, and their not inconsiderable numbers in Russia and the fact of their being the world's largest Protestant communion might well have been mentioned. John Clifford, William Carey and Dr. H. E. Fosdick are each accorded separate entries, but John Smyth and Thomas Helwys figure only in the general account of the Baptists. The renowned Alexander McLaren is mis-named "Andrew." Carey's significance surely earns him a longer notice than half the space allotted to Wesley. Nevertheless, here in one compact volume is treasury of facts, sympathetically, clearly and expertly compiled and presented, undoubtedly meeting a real need.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

The Church of the New Testament, by L. G. Champion. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 7s. 6d.)

The preface informs us that this book is based on lectures delivered to a group of ministers assembled at Ruschlikon, Switzerland and that the lectures were the outcome of several years' reflection on the subject and the shared discussions which took place in "the Classroom" held at the author's church at Rugby. This at once determines the scope and nature of the work. Further, Dr. Champion tells us that he has tried to give a straightforward account in plain language of the life of the New Testament Church, and in this he has succeeded, though it is a pity he has abstained from footnotes and references to other works on the subject. To have done so would surely have helped the reader, stimulated by Dr. Champion's book, to a further investigation of a subject which occupies so central a place in our thought today. It is not easy to write anything new on the nature of the Church of the New Testament, but the author has succeeded in presenting the subject-matter in a most refreshing way and the book will be invaluable to those who desire a simple straightforward introduction to the ever-thrilling story of the beginnings of the greatest fellowship in the world. We can thoroughly recommend this book, especially to ministers engaged, as the author was, in conducting study groups. The beginnings of the Christian movement, the message of Jesus, the function of the Church and its place on the social order are covered. More might have been said about the concept of Covenant and the place and work of the Spirit but, of course, the author is limited by the space at his disposal and the nature of his original audience. The book does, however, stress an important truth, often overlooked,

viz. that the new life offered through Christ and communicated largely by the quality of the life of the members of the Fellowship is such that its proof must largly lie in the very quality of that life. Yet, in the New Testament, this witness is spontaneous and unself-conscious. Otherwise, as the author points out, it would degenerate into the very Pharisaism our Lord denounced. If this book helps members of the Church to realise how important is the quality of their own life as a witness to the faith then it will not have been written in vain.

H. CLARKSON.

Nervous Disorders and Religion, by J. G. McKenzie. (Allen & Unwin, 9s. 6d.)

Containing the substance of the Tate Lectures given at Manchester College, Oxford, in 1947, this is a companion to Professor McKenzie's *Nervous Disorders and Character*. It is more general in scope than the title suggests. The first two chapters outline a psychological doctrine of man and there follow chapters on inner conflicts, guilt, spiritual healing, the types of religion inimical to mental health and the kind of religious experience by which the personality is liberated and unified. The author, who clearly is considerably influenced by the work of Karen Horney, rejects the old instinct-theory, regarding the self as a unity whose very nature is to realise the personality as a harmonious whole by satisfying the biological needs of self-preservation and reproduction and the personality-needs for affection, status and rational unity. Having spent thirty years dealing with neurotic disorders, Dr. McKenzie concludes that the way to wholeness is by religion—not the legalistic or authoritararian kind, but that which, by commitment to God's power and goodness and by trust in His faithfulness leads to partaking of the life of God, enjoying fellowship with Him and sharing with Him in His creative and redemptive purposes. In this way the *telos* of our being, the image of God in man, realises itself. Pastors, social workers and others who counsel and seek to help human beings in this modern age will appreciate and benefit from reading these enlightening and helpful pages.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

Light in Darkness, by Helen Olney. (George Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.).

This is a book of devotional readings for a year along the lines of Dr. Oldham's *Devotional Diary*. Whereas, however, Dr. Oldham contented himself with provision for four months, the

author of this book has set herself the high target of providing for every day of the year a text, a prose passage, a verse passage, and a prayer. It is hardly surprising if on a first reading some of the daily subjects seem to fit together rather loosely and some of the quotations are not of the first class. But in any case it is a little unfair to read through for criticism passages which are intended for leisured, devotional reading, and there is much of real value in the book.

DENIS LANT.

The Mystics of Spain, by E. Allison Peers. (Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West). (George Allen & Unwin, 9s. 6d.)

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Spain produced an incredible outburst of ascetic and mystical literature. Most of us know of St. Teresa of Avila and St. John of the Cross, but this book introduces us to a number unknown to the reviewer even by name. We are lucky to have Professor Allison Peers as our guide through this uncharted territory. His knowledge of the authors and editions is unique. His own translations of the complete works of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross are already established authorities, but here he translates for us representative extracts from the lesser writers. Within its small compass the book analyses the reasons for this flowering of mysticism, provides us with an admirable historical sketch which sets the various authors in their correct relation and perspective, gives us a selection of works on the whole literature, and finally gives us extracts from each author with a note of the editions and criticism available. Mysticism has usually been suspected by the orthodox, and certainly the word has often been used as an umbrella beneath which all kinds of excess and woolliness might shelter. Happily it is now being recognised that there is a genuine mystical apprehension of God, though not every one may be prepared to agree with Professor Peers that "mysticism, far from being the vague, ethereal thing of popular belief, is the most exact science in existence." The difficulty is bound to remain that great mystical literature can only be produced by people of intense religious experience, mystical make-up and literary genius. It is hardly to be wondered at, therefore, that there has only been one St. Teresa and one St. John of the Cross, or that the extracts given here are of varying value. But this book is a most valuable introduction to its subject.

DENIS LANT.

Friar Lane: 1651-1951, by Douglas Ashby. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 7s. 6d.)

The author's researches have established 1651 as the date of the earliest reference to the existence of a Baptist Church at Leicester, though Fox's *Journal* indicates that there were Baptists in the city even earlier. For two hundred and thirty years that church has possessed a meeting-house or chapel in Friar Lane. In spite of the dispersal of population it still bravely maintains its witness there, and through its Sunday school and youth work fulfils a real need. In the careful and informative record which Mr. Ashby here gives us, the history of the cause is traced through sunshine and storm over the course of three hundred years. Friar Lane, which stands in the General Baptist tradition, has known some notable ministries, like those of J. C. Pike and James Bishop and, as Dr. Payne states in the foreword, its people "have made to the spiritual and social health of their city and neighbourhood a contribution which cannot be measured." To the denomination the church gave A. C. Underwood, its most distinguished product. For the author, whose family roots are deep in the church, this has obviously been a labour of love; he has done his work well and provided a readable and accurate account of a church whose story deserved to be told.

Home and Children, by Marian Grant (Carey Kingsgate Press, 7s. 6d.)

Written at the request of the Joint Standing Committee of the W.M.A., and the B.W.L., this competent book aims to help both mothers and fathers in the responsible task of parenthood. Advice is offered for the numerous problems likely to arise during the period covered by the months preceding the birth of a child down to adolescence. As we should expect, moral values are emphasised, and it is made clear throughout that parents have more influence than anyone else on their children's lives and that for happy homes and the development of right character the centre of the family circle must be Jesus Christ. A helpful list for further reading is provided and the book has the advantage of an attractive jacket. Mrs. Grant has done her work well. Always interesting and full of common-sense, this is a book which many parents will be glad to have and it should be of service to leaders of women's meetings and young wives' groups. The pity is that those who most need to read it are unlikely to be prepared to spend seven-and-sixpence on purchasing it.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.