

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

Editorial

LAST year the Moderator of the International Congregational Council, Dr. Douglas Horton, delivered some lectures at Mansfield College, Oxford, and before the Assembly of the Congregational Union in London. These he has now reproduced in a highly interesting little book, *Congregationalism: A Study in Church Polity*.¹ For Dr. Horton, the heart of the Church is the congregation and the true apostolic succession is the succession of congregations. While there can be a Church without Popes, Bishops or other officers, there can never be a Church without a congregation and, therefore, Congregationalism holds "an indispensable key to the ecumenical future." Even a Council (i.e. in Britain *Union* or *Association*; in the U.S.A. *Convention*, *Conference* or *Association*) is a kind of congregation for, like a local church, it is composed of believers, it is called and recognised by churches, its constitution is a form of covenant and it has a duty both to God and to man. Its power over the churches, according to Dr. Horton's theory, is not legal but moral only. Being a new body, however, and not merely an amalgam of parts of churches, it has legal power over itself. One would like to read or to hear from a Baptist scholar a statement, drawing on history and theology, on the nature and power of the Baptist Union similar to Dr. Horton's essay on councils in this little book. Incidentally, Dr. Horton informs us that before the Communion Service on the first day of meeting the General Council of Congregational Christian Churches in the U.S.A. rises and repeats the oldest of American covenants, that of Salem, 1629:—

"We covenant together with the Lord and one with an other; and doe bynd our selves in the presence of God, to walk together in all his waies, according as he is pleased to reveal himself unto us in his Blessed word of truth."

We cannot but wonder whether the adoption of a similar practice by the Baptist Union Assembly would not prove the means of grace which Dr. Horton claims it has been found by the General Council.

In this book, Dr. Horton has an essay, "The Unreasonableness of the Separation," which takes its title from William Bradshaw, a 17th century Congregationalist. The term "Separatist" is used not only as a general name for those Nonconformist

¹ Independent Press, 6s.

pioneers who first broke away from the Church of England, but in a narrower sense, to describe those who refused to recognise the Anglican Church as a church at all. Dr. Horton claims that Congregationalism springs not from the Separatists, but from the "Non-Separatist Puritanism" which desired to reform the Church of England from within (he is not explicit as to how they came to be outside it), and he therefore virtually disowns Browne, Barrowe and Francis Johnson. In his attempt to demonstrate the inherent ecumenicity of Congregationalism, Dr. Horton almost falls over backward. He quotes with approval Hooker's phrase, "the loathsome title of Independency." In America, he says, "every church, even the Roman Catholic, is a 'gathered' one," while he commits himself to the extraordinary statement that "Congregationalism may even be called a form of Anglicanism." There are Congregationalists of our acquaintance—particularly in Wales, where they still go proudly by the name which Dr. Horton, following Hooker, finds so loathsome—whose comments upon some of these statements we should like to hear. "Separatism," says Dr. Horton, "swings into a fissiparous course which leads in the end to the atomising of the Church," while "the spiritual children of Separatism in the United States in the twentieth century are the perfectionist sects, Fundamentalist in theology, which proliferate in every part of the country." These two statements we find particularly interesting because Dr. Horton regards the Baptists—whose existence he almost ignores—as of the Separation. In America, Baptists certainly proliferate (it had never occurred to us before that any apology for this was called for), but are they all fissiparous, atomistic and theologically obscurantist? The presence of both American and British Baptists in the World Council of Churches Dr. Horton must surely find rather odd? As for Baptists in this country, we do not think they are less ecumenically minded than their Congregationalist brethren. Dr. Horton gives us a wealth of valuable quotations from early Congregationalist writers, particularly American. We venture to offer him one from an early Baptist, John Smyth:—

"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 compassed 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."

If Dr. Horton would glance at article XXXIX of the General Baptists' confession of 1678 he would discover that the fissiparous, atomistic Baptists vested greater power in councils than he does!

Although critical of some of its features we warmly commend this stimulating, meaty, and sometimes provocative, little book to the attention of all who are concerned with questions of congregational and denominational polity and the relationships between the various communions.

* * * * *

The Society for Old Testament Study is an organisation in which Baptists have been prominent from its foundation in 1917. Sharing in the discussion which led to its formation were Dr. Theodore Robinson (its secretary until 1927), and Professor Witton Davies. Its present secretary is Professor Henton Davies, while Rev. A. J. D. Farrer and Rev. L. H. Brockington have both served in the treasurership, and the list of presidents includes the names of Dr. Theodore Robinson, the late Wheeler Robinson and Professor H. H. Rowley. With the aim of promoting the study of the Old Testament, seeking to include in its membership all who in recognised institutions are concerned with instruction in Old Testament studies, and others who are properly qualified to pursue such studies, the Society—which meets twice a year—has steadily grown in strength, influence and usefulness. It has many notable achievements to its credit, not the least of which is the annual publication of a book list; that for 1952 contains authoritative brief reviews of more than 200 books in many languages dealing with the Old Testament and related studies.² If imitation be a form of flattery its members will be gratified to learn of a similar society which, so we understand, is likely to be formed in the interests of historical theology. That this learned and valuable organisation will continue to flourish will be the sincere hope of many outside the ranks of its own members.

* * * * *

The late Dr. Percy Evans left a considerable collection of notes and papers on Baptism, mostly unordered, reflecting the research of a lifetime. He had, however, made a beginning with the planning and writing of a book, and some chapters exist in rough draft. Dr. Hugh Martin, who is the custodian of these papers, has edited and abbreviated one of these drafts and we are glad to include it in this issue. Dr. Martin hopes to make other sections of the late Principal's work available in later issues of this journal. They should prove most useful in preparing that serious and scholarly book on the subject which we hope will, one day soon, be written by a Baptist theologian.

² A *Short History* of the Society (price 1s.) has been written by Prof. Henton Davies. Copies of this, of the current book list (*5s.*) and particulars of membership may be obtained on application to him at Melrose, Church Street, Houghton-le-Spring, Co. Durham.

Sunday Schools of Today

VERY many of our Sunday Schools today are having to make the best of a bad job. Lack of accommodation and unsuitability of premises are a constant problem to Sunday School teachers and leaders, especially on the new housing estates, where there are such tremendous possibilities for evangelisation. Children are literally being squeezed into every corner of all available premises—even garages—and still they come! Many schools are endeavouring to meet these difficulties by working on a “shift” system, sometimes the same handful of teachers conducting each session. Graded teaching in such circumstances is a triumph and all honour is due to those who are working under such very difficult conditions. The splendid loyalty and devotion of Sunday School staffs everywhere cannot be over-rated.

Obviously in situations like these much “making do” is essential. Yet, when this kind of attitude is applied to other aspects of Christian Education, one is compelled to ask how much “we must just make the best of it” has become a subterfuge instead of a challenge. There is a danger in too readily accepting the inevitable. Many schools, for instance, are woefully under-equipped. Small children must dangle their legs from stiff-backed benches instead of having comfortable-sized chairs which can be arranged informally. Pictures (if any) are old and dilapidated, and quite inadequate either for teaching purposes or to aid a sense of beauty and worship in the department. Expression work media, such as coloured pencils and modelling clay, are in such scant supply that children must wait their turn to use them—and this at a time when day-school education is providing these same children with all the scope and variety of modern educative equipment at its highest standard. Dare we in the Church give our children less than the best? Is it not the Church’s responsibility, rather than the individual teacher’s, to provide the best possible equipment in order to ensure that the religious education of the children is given every opportunity for success?

The Sunday School, as part of the Church Family, is a part of that Family’s financial responsibility. But, of course, that is not all nor even the most important part. The Sunday School is also the educational responsibility of the Church. How far does the average Church member feel responsible for the staffing problems of the Sunday School? Is it a matter of concern to the

Church Meeting that the Primary department is lacking a pianist or the Senior department adequate leadership? Does the Church feel responsible for the appointment of new teachers, on the recommendation of the Sunday School teachers' meeting or the Youth Council and the deacons? How many Church members do not even know the names of those who are carrying out the educational work of the Church on their behalf. How often the work of the School is hampered by lack of staff, or by the teachers bearing so many other responsibilities in the Church that they have no time to fulfil all that their task requires of them—responsibilities that often might be taken off their shoulders by Church members who do not feel called to Sunday School work.

But what of the actual teaching that is taking place in Sunday Schools throughout the British Isles? Looking back over the months in which I have been working as Sunday School Adviser to the Baptist Union I must admit quite honestly that the over-all impression I have received, from the many Sunday Schools I have visited, is that very little progress has been made in the way of new methods of approach to Christian Education in our Baptist schools. Many schools in fact are pursuing the same policy in their Sunday School work as their leaders of some fifty or more years ago! The modern child is being forced into a pattern of worship entirely un-related to his every-day experience and training in day-school and home. Some teachers are still working under the illusion that the child of today is no different from the child of their own day. New techniques of teaching are accordingly regarded with suspicion or even antagonism, and the introduction of activity methods into worship are constantly considered as irreverent. The word "worship" is therefore kept to the narrowly-defined precincts of hymn-singing, prayer and Bible Study, and the policy continues of regarding the good child as the one who sits still and keeps quiet. Moreover it is thought that by so doing the child is actually learning and worshipping in the best and only way possible! How dismally the Sunday School of this type is failing to capture the child's interests, stimulate his desire to worship and allow expression of that desire in ways which are meaningful to his own experience.

Admittedly some general advance has been made in Sunday School work in that most schools nowadays are at least partially graded, though many are only divided into two main departments. Apart from Primary departments (most of which include Beginners' age-groups), I have discovered services still to be very much of the "sandwich" type, however, and little imagination was being used to find fresh means of approach. With the exception of a few outstandingly good Primary and Beginners' departments, the work amongst the younger children, too, can

generally only be described as dull. Weekly teacher training classes and conferences are almost non-existent; in fact I have come across only one Church where there is a hundred per cent weekly training class attendance throughout the whole school, though there are a number of other schools where some sort of training class (most usually fortnightly or monthly), is held for the younger departments only.

It seems to me that by far the greatest difficulty is not so much the lack of accommodation or of equipment, but the lack of really trained and imaginative leadership. How this is to be remedied is difficult to see until the local churches wake up to the fact that they will have to go all out for their own teacher-training schemes, if the quality of teaching and worship is to be improved in their schools, if young people are to be attracted into Sunday School teaching and if the whole purpose of the Sunday School, namely to win children and young people to Jesus Christ and into His Church, is to be fulfilled. One wonders, too, how much of the present appalling shortage of teachers is due in large measure to many years without any teacher-training policy.

What then is inferred by this term "teacher-training scheme," and how can it be implemented in the local church? Quite simply it implies the establishment in every Sunday School of the principle that no teacher (at least in the Primary and Junior departments), who has not attended the weekly Training Class, can teach a class on the Sunday. This is assuming that the church follows the wise policy of recruiting new teachers from the young people's organisation, at about 14-15 years of age, and giving them a trial period of a few months as helpers in the Primary department. During that time they also attend the Training Class so that, when they are ready for the responsibility of class teaching they are aware, too, of their commitment to the weekly preparation class. After three year's teaching and consistent training under the guidance of the Primary leader these young teachers are then ready for two or three years in the Junior department, again, of course, maintaining weekly attendance at Training Class. After this they are able to go on to the more difficult work of teaching in the Senior or Beginners' departments. In these teachers lies the hope of future trained leadership, not only in the Sunday School, but in other departments of the church. Five or six years of such intensive and systematic training should not compare too unfavourably with a day-school teacher's two-year training, for the curriculum covers Bible Study (so vital when Sunday School teaching becomes an alternative to further study and Fellowship in the Bible Class or Young People's Department), Child Study, Story Building and many other useful subjects. More experienced teachers in the other departments,

though not expected to attend compulsory weekly teachers' conferences, would yet be well advised to do so.

This meeting together for prayer and preparation welds the teaching staff into a true fellowship. This in itself greatly aids the worship of the department, for children quickly sense an atmosphere of harmony or discord between the teachers. Moreover, without such a time of preparation the Sunday service itself lacks unity. Lesson guides, of course, are an aid in this direction, and are widely used. For from being "guides" in the right sense of the word, however, they are only too often accepted as "gospel" by teachers who are not provided with training facilities and opportunity to discuss together the relevance or otherwise of the suggested teaching material. Accordingly the lessons are reproduced or even read to the children on the Sunday, regardless of the interests and capabilities of the class. Yet it must be obvious that lesson material can only be alive and meaningful to the scholars as, after background research and study, it has become vital and real to the teachers. In any case, for too long has the idea been prevalent that the lesson is the main part of Sunday School worship, the rest of the service being merely opening and closing exercises. In actual fact departmental worship can only become meaningful to the children when teachers, pianist and leader are together seeking to express the same truth through the whole service—so that hymns, prayers, the introductory talk, lesson, expression work and summary, etc., are all links in the process of bringing boys and girls into touch with one particular new and living aspect of the Christian Faith. This does not just happen. It takes careful and prayerful planning on the part of all the teaching staff to decide first upon the life aim of the worship and then how they will seek to fulfil it throughout the service.

Of course, the establishment of the principle of regular training classes must be grown gradually and must be planned flexibly in order to fit into the particular local situation. But, as already pointed out, the obvious time and place to start is with the young teachers as they commence their Sunday School teaching career. So many leaders, however, fail to challenge them right from the start to train as well as to teach, because they are afraid that they may frighten off these would-be teachers by setting too high standards for them. "You cannot expect young teachers to attend a Training Class, visit their scholars and meet all the other demands that teaching makes on anyone who is prepared to take it seriously. Anyway young people nowadays only come into Sunday School teaching to do us a favour." These are remarks that one hears occasionally. No wonder we are failing to attract and hold young people in the service of Jesus Christ in the Sunday School, if we fail to convince them that such service

demands whole-hearted commitment. What a misconception of the psychology of the adolescent, too, for there is a real thrill in tackling a job that requires one's all, and young people rise to a challenge of high ideals far more readily than to easy compromise.

Many teachers argue that they have no need for training, for providing they have a real love for the children they teach and for their Lord, nothing else matters. Basically, of course, this relationship is vital. That does not excuse one from training, however, but points all the more to the need for it. Real love for children and young people implies a deep-rooted relationship based on a genuine study and understanding of the individual child, his interests, problems, and environment. Nor is it sufficient for a teacher merely to possess a living faith; he must also be articulate in the things of the faith and able to interpret it in terms that young people can understand. We in the churches need much more practical and imaginative training if we are to answer with conviction the arguments and intellectual difficulties of young people today.

All these and many more reasons could be brought forward to substantiate this plea for the adoption of teacher training schemes. This is not to be blind to the difficulties involved, for one appreciates that these will inevitably arise. But meantime, while nothing is being attempted the vicious circle continues and new teachers still receive no training, becoming in turn the untrained leaders of the future. Meantime, too, the standard of teaching and worship continues to be much lower than the best. Just how unfavourably this low standard of teaching, together with poor equipment and generally unsatisfactory environment, compares in the child's mind with that which he receives in day school can only be guessed at, but it is a sobering thought. It is not surprising that many children get the idea that the teaching they receive in Sunday School is of lesser value than that of the day school, nor that so often the critical and intolerant adolescent over-throws what he considers to be out-worn theories, for which he can get little adequate explanation from his Sunday School department. We can no longer expect children and young people to spend an hour a week sitting in dreary surroundings, listening to long and badly-presented lessons which seem to have little real meaning in their own experience. There are, too, many other contra-attractions nowadays and too little home support for us to be complacent about the Sunday School methods of today. It is true that Sunday School attendance is on the increase, but this is the almost inevitable result of the increased birth-rate. The future of the Church is no more secure for this fact, if the increase of younger children is off-set—as it most certainly is—by

the diminishing number of boys and girls in the older departments, who drift away long before they have made any decision for Christ and entered into the fellowship of the Church.

Of course, there are happy exceptions to all this. Many schools I have visited have at least one department which is live, attractive and original, striving to make the very best of its resources and opportunities and where young people are being won for Christ. Each year, too, numbers of teachers and leaders go back to their respective Sunday Schools with renewed zeal and kindled imagination, after attendance at Baptist Union Easter and Summer Schools. Some churches are so anxious to encourage their Sunday School Staff in further training that each year they set aside a sum of money for that purpose. Thus one or two teachers are enabled annually to attend training conferences, or even to take a special course in Sunday School method and youth leadership at Westhill Training College, Birmingham. These courses vary from a three-month course for voluntary workers to a two year certificate course and there are special short-term courses for ministers and theological students. Yet other schools are embarking on the Baptist Union Diploma or the special correspondence course in Sunday School and youth work arranged by the Young People's Department. Many churches arrange their own week-end conferences and a few Youth Secretaries have organised longer ones in their areas. These conferences usually include on the Sunday a tour of observation of one particular Sunday School. This is followed by a discussion period with the teachers about their own practical difficulties and opportunities for further progress.

Much more advice and systematic guidance ought to be given to help and encourage Sunday School teachers. Unfortunately trained leadership is very scarce and one fears that the day is still long-distant when every Association will have the services of a full-time Sunday School Organizer. Meanwhile it should be possible to make fuller use of present training resources by encouraging intensive three or four month training courses in different areas, instead of the extensive policy which is at present being carried out. With one church as a demonstration centre, departmental worship and Training Classes could be built up, whilst group lectures and demonstrations would be held in other centres throughout the weeks. This long-term policy would avoid much of the danger of the present system whereby newly-kindled enthusiasm quickly dies out, because there is insufficient time to help to establish new ideas in actual practice.

The Sunday School, so it is asserted by some people, has had its day. There is no doubt that it has played an important part in the past years, but what of its place in the life of the Church today? The answer is clear. The future of the Church depends

upon the efficacy of the Sunday School, and in these days of uncertainty and disillusionment the urgency of our task is even more apparent. We have to help grow a generation of convinced Christians, many of whom have been brought up in homes totally lacking in Christian tradition. We have to equip these boys and girls to go out into a world that understands little and cares less about the Christian Church. Their training is our responsibility—a privilege that demands the best we have to give in time and energy and mental ability. Maybe the term "Sunday School" is out-dated; maybe in the future we shall have to re-mould the whole pattern of our work of Christian Education. Meanwhile the work can and must go on. It is the responsibility of each individual church to maintain it at the highest possible level so that the work of the Sunday School today may be both truly educational and truly Christian.

JEAN I. GREEN.

Songs of Zarathustra, trans. by Dastur F. A. Bode and Pилоo Nanavutty. (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.)

In the series "Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West," this little book introduces the reader to Zarathustra, or Zoroaster as he is sometimes known, the religious teacher, born in Adarbaijan some 600 years before Christ, who fought polytheism and black magic and preached among other things, the one eternal God of justice and love, dedication to the law of righteousness and truth, mystic communion, freewill and moral responsibility, the regeneration of man and the universe, bodily resurrection and a last judgment. His teaching, which has affinities with the Vedas and Jewish mysticism and had some influence on the development of Gnosticism, is found in its purest form in the *Gathas* or *Divine Songs*, and it is of these that we are here given a translation. A helpful introduction, glossary, bibliography in addition to the text help the reader to understand something of the spirit of this ancient eastern religion which calls men to walk in the path of the Good Mind and the Divine Law.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

Christ's Holy Community

(Aspects of the doctrine of the Church held by the Particular Baptists in the 17th Century.)

THROUGHOUT the seventeenth century the General or Arminian Baptists, who traced their origin to the church of Helwys and Murton, continued their witness, but the more influential group of Baptists was the Particular or Calvinistic sect, whose history begins with the separation of certain antipaedobaptists from the Jacob—Lathrop—Jessy Church, so called because of its succession of pastors, which had been organised by Henry Jacob on his return to England from Holland in 1616. This new Church, like the Independents, whose theology it shared, was concerned to build its ecclesiastical theology on their conception of the Divine Law and their belief that the visible church is God's "holy community." The attitude of the Particular Baptists to Law is well demonstrated in the "Appendix" to the 1646 Confession, which speaks of the Law as having been fulfilled and having no more power over mens' lives, but adds that Christ commands men to follow the same way of righteousness and holds that even the first table of the Covenant, epitomised in the words, "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c.," demands our obedience. Henry Jessy, the pastor of the parent church, who afterwards joined the newer Baptist group, holds that it is by our knowledge of Christ that we come to know and obey the divine Law. "When one knowes Christ in the Gospel of Christ, its the special way to teach them into the thinges of the Law."¹ Yet all Baptists are anxious to insist that the observance of the Law is not the true end of life; rather is it the means whereby the individual believer finds his freedom. Hanserd Knollys, whose name appeared at the foot of most of the Baptists' Confessions in this period, and who baptised Jessy, writes, "The yoke of Christ's spiritual lawes and holy ordinances put upon the neck of his disciples is no abridgement of their liberties, but an enlargement of their beauty and dignity."² Thus the Baptists with the other Separatists searched the Scriptures for God's Law concerning His Church. Yet, the Baptists were by no means as legalistic in their attitude to the problems of both Church and State as were the Independents of the same period. Indeed Samuel Richardson, one of the most influential Baptists in London, and famous for his work, *Of the Torments of Hell*, holds that human necessity must always be counted as a superior motive

¹ Jessy, H., *The Exceeding Riches of Grace*, 1647, p. 94.

² Knollys, H., *An Exposition of the First Chapter of the Song of Solomon*, 1656, p. 48.

for any action than the observance of the written Law; "a course in itself singular and unjustifiable, by reason of some circumstances falling in, may become, not only lawful, but a duty and a sin to neglect it."³ Yet Richardson, with his fellow-Baptists, recognises that the New Testament, being the Will of Christ, is full of His commandments and is thus the only Rule for the Church. This point of view is expressed in the Somerset Confession of Faith in 1656, Christ, "as he is our prophet, so hath he given us the Scriptures, the Old and New Testaments, as a rule and direction unto us both for faith and practice."⁴ The Law of the Scriptures, as it is a covenant of works is abrogated by Christ, and as such has no more hold over us, yet the whole Bible remains valid as a direction for personal and ecclesiastical conduct.

The belief that the visible Church is "Christ's holy community" is constantly reiterated by both the Particular and General Baptists. Article XXIX of the London Confession of 1646 reads:—

"All believers are a holy and sanctified people, and that sanctification is a spiritual grace of the new covenant, and an effect of the love of God manifest in the soul, whereby the believer presses after a heavenly and evangelical obedience to all the commands which Christ, as head and king, in his covenant, hath presented to them."⁵

It is the work of the Church to translate this view of sanctification into ecclesiastical action, and so it was believed that Christ's purpose in creating the Church was to have a community of disciples separated from the world which would glorify Him in the purity of its life and, by this means, would convince those who were not of the Church. Baptism itself represented the experience of sanctification in the lives of believers. The Confession of 1656 holds:—

"That it is the duty of every man and woman that have repented from dead works, and have faith towards God to be baptized . . . therein to signify and represent a washing away of sin, and their death, burial and resurrection with Christ. And being thus planted in the visible church or body of Christ, who are a company of men and women separated from the world by the preaching of the Gospel, do walk together in communion in all the commandments of Jesus, wherein God is glorified and their souls comforted."⁶

Thus the act of baptism represents both the subjection of the Church to the law of its foundation and its essential sanctity.

Because of their adherence to these two principles the Baptists were as anxious as the other Separatist and Dissenting

³ Richardson, S., *An answer to the London Minister's Letter*, 1649, p. 2.

⁴ *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (Hanserd Knollys Society), 1854, p. 83.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

groups, that no "human inventions" should be introduced into either the government or worship of the Church. The whole duty of man in his relationship to God, is plainly set forth in the Scriptures and to add or take away from the written Word is, for these men, a denial of the sovereignty of Christ over His own Church. Hanserd Knollys identifies the imposition of human laws, commandments and traditions upon the saints and churches of God, with the work of Antichrist.⁷ William Kiffin, probably the most famous of the Baptists of this period, holds to this same position and constantly repeats that his beliefs are founded on the fact that, "Jesus Christ is the only head and husband, Lord and Lawgiver of his church and people."⁸ In 1681, Kiffin wrote, claiming that it was as a result of his search for Christ's Law concerning His Church that he was led to forsake the Jacob—Lathrop—Jessy church. He desires no ecclesiastical order other than that laid down by Christ and the apostles, and practised by the primitive Church. "This order I found to be," he writes, "that after Conversion they were baptized, added to the Church, and continued in the Apostles Doctrine, Fellowship, Breaking of Bread, and prayer."⁹ The Baptists regarded their church order as nothing other than the plain sense of scripture. In this same work Kiffin deals at length with the significance of the sacrament of baptism. It is, "the Pledge of our Entrance into Covenant with God, and of the giving up of ourselves unto him in the solemn Bond of Religion, and we are hereby dedicated unto the service of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost"; he goes on, "then must it, of necessity be the First Ordinance, before that of the Lord's Supper."¹⁰ He emphasises that only believers who have made confession of their faith may be baptised and to deviate from this rule is to bring into the fellowship of the Church unregenerate men. As it is the Sacrament of "Regeneration, Institution and Incorporation" baptism cannot be repeated, being the seal of God's covenant once made by God with men."¹¹ Thus, for the Baptists at this time baptism was an ecclesiastical ordinance whose nature epitomised their view of the Church.

The Confessions of this period are of little help in enabling us to determine the relationship between the church polity of the Baptists and that of the Independents and Presbyterians. The 1646 Confession defines the visible body as:—

⁷ Knollys, H., *op. cit.* p. 15.

⁸ Kiffin, W. "Certain Observations upon Hosea 2. 7-8," 1642, p. 10.

⁹ Kiffin, W., "A Sober Discourse of Right to Church-Communion. Wherein is proved . . . That no Unbaptized person may be Regularly admitted to the Lord's Supper," 1681. The Address to the Reader.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* The Preface (p. 6).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

"a company of visible saints, called and separated from the world by the Word and Spirit of God, to the visible profession of the faith of the Gospel, being baptized into that faith and joined unto the Lord, and each to other, by mutual agreement, in the practical enjoyment of the ordinances commanded by Christ, their head and king."

Such a church has power given it to choose among itself elders and deacons, according to the directions laid down by the Scriptures, while any member who preached the Word was considered competent to dispense the rite of baptism. The one help this Confession gives us in our attempt to determine the relationship between these local churches is found in clause XL, which reads:—

"although the particular congregations be distinct and several bodies, every one as a compact and knit city within itself: yet are all to walk by one rule of truth; so also they (by all means convenient) are to have the counsel and help one of the other if necessity require it, as members of one body, in the common faith under Christ, their head."

The Somerset Confession of 1656 adds little to this, simply holding, "That it is the duty of the members of Christ in the order of the Gospel, though in several congregations and assemblies (being one in the Head) if occasion be to communicate each to other in things spiritual and temporal." That this point of view meant that, in most respects, the local church was regarded as "independent" is demonstrated by the decision of the Assembly of Elders and Messengers of the Particular Baptist Churches, which met in London, September 3rd-12th, 1689. This assembly said of its own powers:—

"We disclaim all manner of superiority and superintendency over the churches, and we have no power to prescribe or impose any thing upon the faith or practice of any of the churches of Christ . . . in those things wherein one church differs from another church in their principles or practices, in point of communion, we cannot, shall not impose upon any particular church therein, but leave every church to their own liberty to walk together as they have received from the Lord. . . That whatsoever is determined by us in any case, shall not be binding on any one church, till the consent of that church be first had, and they conclude the same among themselves."¹²

Yet it must not be assumed from these quotations that the Particular Baptists were not interested to determine the evangelical bond between the various congregations. Hanserd Knollys in particular exercised himself with this problem. In his *Exposition of the First Chapter of the Song of Solomon* (p. 17) he speaks of the mystical unity of the whole Church, "The Spouse of Christ is but one mystical Body, consisting of many spiritual members, compacted and fitly joined together." In his *Moderate Answer*

¹² Vide *The Baptist Annual Register for 1790*, p. 48f.

unto Dr. Bastwick's Book Called, *Independency not God's Ordinance*, Knollys is forced to consider how this spiritual unity must be translated into ecclesiastical practice. In this answer he differentiates between Presbyterian government which allows to the local congregation a large measure of independency and the government which demands that all local churches shall be dependent on the central presbytery. He writes :—

"If by Independent the doctor indeede mean (as it doth appear so to my understanding by many passages in this booke he doth intend) a Presbyterian Government which hath not Dependencie upon any in matters meerly Ecclesiasticall (but upon the Lord Jesus Christ, who is Head of the Church). And if by Dependent hee also intendeth (as in many other passages in his booke seemeth to me to be his meaning) a Presbyterian—Government which hath a Dependencie upon a supream Judicature of a Common—Councell of Presbyters, and who must in matters Ecclesiasticall be subject unto the Decrees, Sentences, Constitutions and Commandments of a Common—Councell, Colledge (sic), or Consistorie of Classicall, Provincially, or synodically Presbyters; Then I do not conceive the Doctor hath not proved (nor will he ever be able to prove) that the Presbyterian—Government—Dependent is Gods Ordinance."

Thus we see that while the Baptists insist upon the autonomy of the local church, especially as against the views of classical Presbyterianism, they do not preclude the establishment of an ecclesiastical relationship between their churches, though this is not fully defined. It is significant that in 1649 the fiery Welsh evangelist, Vavasor Powell, pleads that the controversy between these two forms of polity should be forgotten.

"The differences between Presbytery and Independency, is not so great in the principles (though they differ in several Circumstantialls) as it is in practice . . . but I humbly desire of God, and desire of you, that you would see whether you can reconcile these differences for the case of the nation requires it."¹³

As the Church, Christ's spiritual kingdom, is separate from the world the members of the Church can claim no rights within the secular state other than those which belong to all citizens, whether elect or pagan. The Confession of 1646 speaks of the Christian life as being, "a continual warfare and combat against sin, self, the world and the devil" and from this concludes that "whatsoever the saints possess or enjoy of God spiritually is by faith; and outward and temporal things are lawfully enjoyed by a civil right by them that have no faith." This attitude, is, of course, a denial of that belief in the integration of the "spiritual" and "temporal," which characterised mediaeval society, and which remained one of the presuppositions of the social thinking of many of the Reformers. In England, the Established Church, the Puritans and even the early Separatists had no desire to effect

¹³ Powell, V., *God the Father Glorified*, 1649, p. 57.

the complete separation of Church and State, though many desired to limit the right of the State to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs. The generally accepted social theory of the Baptists was that the Church must remain aloof from all secular matters, though this did not prevent many Baptists from taking an active part in various administrative aspects of the Cromwellian government. In a letter to the Baptists of Ireland in 1653-4, Kiffin complains that there seems to be "raised among you a spirit of great dissatisfaction and opposition against this present authority." He pleads with them to follow the Ordinance of Scripture and subject themselves to the civil authority, adding:—

"Truly, it is more unlovely for us to be found contending against powers, because we profess ourselves to be dead with Christ, being buried with him in baptism, and to be raised with him to this end that we may walk in newness of life, and, as strangers and pilgrims, declaring we seek another city, even that whose builder and maker is God. Therefore the Apostle concludes this, that though we are in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh; a Christians warfare being another matter to another end."¹⁴

In another work Kiffin insists that, in days when the State interferes in religious matters, thereby making men, not Christians, but "formall hypocrites," then it is "high time to hearken to the voice of the Apostle, Act 2. 40, to save ourselves from such a generation, and to come out from them."¹⁵

All Baptists asserted their belief that the invasion of the affairs of the Church by the civil State was a denial of the very nature of the Gospel.

"The preaching of the Gospel to the conversion of sinners is absolutely free; no way requiring, as absolutely necessary any qualifications, or terrors of the Law or preceding ministry of the law, but only and alone the naked soul, a sinner and ungodly, to receive Christ crucified, dead and buried and risen again as through the gospel shall be brought to believe on him."¹⁶

Yet this did not preclude any relationship between Church and State. They held it was the duty of the ruling Magistrate to create conditions in which the preaching of the Gospel might be more effective. The nation should be purged of all that hindered the expression of the truth. The Hanserd Knollys Society edition of *Baptist Confessions of Faith* contains an address from the "Baptized Churches" of Northumbria to Cromwell petitioning him to "suppress all profaneness, idolatry, atheism, blasphemy, the contempt of scriptures, ordinances and seasons of God's worship." This would mean that the State must preserve among its citizens a reverence for the Church, which would remain independent of it. Vavasor Powell, in 1649, fears that, "as

¹⁴ *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (Hanserd Knollys Society), p. 322.

¹⁵ Kiffin, W., *A Brief Remonstrance*, 1645, p. 9.

¹⁶ The Confession of 1646 (p. 37).

heretofore liberty of conscience was too much denied: so now liberty to corruption is too much tolerated." ¹⁷ Hanserd Knollys uses the words of *Isaiah* xlix. 23 in much the same way as they were used by the early Separatists and Puritans:—

"If the Kings of the earth would be the Saints Nursing-Fathers, and the Queens their Nursing-Mothers (laying aside their coercive powers) to bring Zion's sons in their arms, and her daughters upon their shoulders to the Churches and Ordinances of the Lord, submitting themselves to the yoke of Christ, it would be their benefit and Zion's glory." ¹⁸

All Dissenting groups, at this time, desire that the Christian Magistrate shall use his power for the extension of Christ's Kingdom; they differ in their view, whether he may use his "coercive power" to this end.

All Baptist Confessions of Faith insist that it is the prime duty of the magistrate to "tender the liberty of men's conscience." This belief sprang, not from an assertion concerning the rights of man, but rather from their view of the nature of the Church. William Kiffin gives as the reason for his advocacy of toleration:—

"Our subjection to Christ and his Lawes . . . must be raised within us from the consideration of that excellency that is in Christ and his lawes, and from no by-end whatsoever." ¹⁹

Samuel Richardson in his *The Necessity of Toleration* (1647) gives much the same reason:—

"it is God's way to have religion free, and only to flow from an inward principle of faith and love, neither would God be worshipped of unwilling worshippers. It is His prerogative only to force religion, by working faith in men's hearts; for though religion be natural, yet true religion is supernatural, and proceeds from the Spirit of God." ²⁰

It is only in secular matters that the State has the right to interfere with the lives of its subjects. In 1659 a group of "baptized persons" declare:—

"Although we would have a tolleration of men in their several worships; yet we would not have the least tolleration in any person in Civill things, much less of our selves, but we earnestly desire that all unjust, dishonest and evil behaviour against men may be punished, by those who are magistrates, who ought not to bear the sword in vain." ²¹

In matters of religion it is accounted great sin for men to yield to the magistrate who prescribes a false worship. To claim that one's action in such a case was committed as the result of magis-

¹⁷ Powell, V., *God the Father Glorified*, p. 59.

¹⁸ Knollys, H., *An Exposition of the First Chapter of the Song of Solomon*, p. 40.

¹⁹ Kiffin, W., *Certaine Observations upon Hosea*, 2, 7-8, p. 13.

²⁰ *Tracts on Liberty of Conscience* (Hanserd Knollys Society), p. 254.

²¹ *Declaration of Several Baptized Believers*, Single Sheet.

terial compulsion is no excuse for such unlawful obedience. The other early Dissenting groups held that it was the duty of the ruler to tolerate the truth only, but the Baptists claimed that he owed to those who followed error:—

"1. Permission—for approbation he owes not to what is evil—as Matt. xiii. 30, for public peace and quietness. 2. Protection of the persons of his subjects, though of false worship, that no injury be offered to the goods or the persons of any." ²²

Believing as they did that there could be no true religion apart from the personal relationship between man and God, expressed in the act of baptism, the Baptists were always concerned to emphasise that their churches were gathered on a voluntary principle, knowing no compulsion save that of the Spirit of God. The Law of these churches is that contained in the Scriptures and their worship must be according to the pattern of the New Testament. The Church is integrated by its covenant, made by the members with God and each other. Hanserd Knollys in the *Parable of the Kingdom of Heaven* (1674) defines the Church:—

"A true visible constituted Church of Christ under the Gospel is a congregation of Saints, 1. Cor. 1. 2. Called out of the World, Rom. 1. 7. separated from Idolators and Idol Temples, 2. Cor. 6. 16-17, from unbelieving Jews and their Synagogues and all legal observations of holy dayes, and Mosaical Rites, Ceremonies and shadows, Act. 19. 9, Col. 2. 16-17, and assembled together in one place, 1. Cor. 14. 23, on the Lord's Day, the first day of the week, Act 20. 7. to worship God visibly by the spirit and in the truth, Joh. 4. 23, 24, in the holy Ordinances of God, 1. Cor. 11. 2, according to the faith and order of the Gospel, Col. 2. 5."

Thus it is with the nature of the visible Church, as a local congregation, that the Particular Baptists of the seventeenth century are concerned. Of the nature of the relationship between these congregations they have little to say, being content that the local churches should co-operate for the advancement of the Gospel.

D. MERVYN HIMBURY.

When God Goes A-Fishing, by C. T. Follett. (Independent Press, 4s.)

Here is a book to put into the hands of any who wish to make a start in personal evangelism. Or better still perhaps, in view of its brevity, it could be used as a basis for group discussion. As such it would provide admirable preparation for active service in this field. Most of the important points are touched on such as motive, message, qualifications. There are also two short chapters on Bible Study and Public Speaking. The book is simple, sane, and purposeful.

G. W. RUSLING.

²² *Tracts on Liberty of Conscience*, p. 271.

The Baptismal Commission in Matthew xxviii. 19.

FROM very early times the Christian Church claimed that the rite of baptism had not only the sanction of our Lord's own submission to it and His disciples' practice of it, but also the authority of a definite divine command (*Matt. xxviii. 19.*) The authenticity of this command has, however, been questioned on various grounds.

Forsyth (*The Church and the Sacraments*, pp. 185f) urges that baptism "was instituted by the ascended Christ through the Apostles as His will for the Church." As to the command in Matthew's Gospel we are told that "a participial clause seems a very small apex on which to balance such a pyramid"; it is, however, surely not proved that a clause is necessarily of inferior importance because it is grammatically subordinate. Forsyth says nothing of our Lord's own baptism, but claims that we should recognise that "the Sacraments are valid, not chiefly because they were instituted by the command of Christ, but because they arise from the nature of His Gospel in the Church. And there is nothing in that Gospel that prescribes but two, or fetters the discretion of the Church in the matter." Undoubtedly every Christian regards the Sacraments as congruous with the nature of the Gospel, otherwise he would disuse them. Correspondence is not the same thing as origin, however, and it can scarcely be questioned that the sacraments have continued to be observed because of the persuasion of Christians that they are divinely commanded. Christianity is a historical religion and cannot be indifferent to what that fact implies. A rite resting upon an inference from "the nature of His Gospel in the Church" cannot reasonably have attached to it the significance and importance which baptism has historically possessed. What has been a fixed requirement would (as the last words quoted from Forsyth show) become optional and vague. That may be a proper and necessary change, but we cannot disguise from ourselves its magnitude. It would in time transform the whole theory and practice of the sacraments. Forsyth carries with him much modern sympathy in so far as his argument claims that the Gospel shall control the sacrament, rather than the converse, but practical difficulties arise when we ask what that Gospel is. Are we to seek it exclusively in the New Testament, as Protestantism asserts, or is it to be found, as Catholicism has

always urged, in the teaching of the Church? The nature of the Church is defined in relation to the sacraments; apart from the two references in *Matthew*, when we first meet the Church we find her observing sacraments.

Hesitation as to the dependence of Christian baptism upon the direct command of Christ has been felt by many on the ground of textual and historical difficulties as to the "Great Commission" recorded by Matthew alone. In view of the uncertainty attaching to it, *Mark xvi.* 16, cannot be used in support of the Matthean passage, and the alternative endings to *Mark* contain no reference to baptism.

The problems connected with the Matthean passage may thus be grouped:—

(1) The Trinitarian theology of verse 19 is held to be too advanced to be possible in the mouth of our Lord at this stage.

(2) *1 Cor. i.* 17 is thought to be inconsistent with such a commission.

(3) The citation of the verse in a shorter form by Eusebius has suggested that his shorter form represents an earlier and better text.

(4) The Early Church practised baptism into "the Name of Jesus" rather than into the Name of the Trinity.

(5) The universality of the Commission ("all nations") is said to indicate a later development.

(1) It has been held that the theology of the passage represents a later stage of doctrinal development. However, P. A. Micklem in the *Westminster Commentary* shows that "the saying has affinities both in style and contents with the great utterance of *Matt. xi.* 25-30. . . . It has a similar Hebraic majestically rhythmic form; its sentences fall into a single stanza. . . . Again, the earlier saying, as this, includes a claim of universal authority (cf. *xi.* 27a); it includes also a command (*xi.* 28a, 29a) coupled with an assurance (28b, 29b). Further, the former saying, as this, includes a revelation of the mutual relations of Father and Son, and those of man to God (*xi.* 27). Thus both sayings contain elements which link them rather with the later and more developed teaching of the Fourth Gospel than with the general outlook and character of Matthew. "This comparison is somewhat favourable to the authenticity of the later passage (especially in view of the fact that *Matt. xi.* 25-30 has a parallel in *Luke x.* 21-22), but the Trinitarian reference arouses suspicion by its definiteness. Yet the passage is not entirely isolated in this respect. "The earlier Apostolic teaching presupposes the doctrine, and, indeed, in more than one instance gives it explicit shape." (Micklem *in. loc.*, who refers to *1 Cor. xii.* 4-6; *2 Cor. xiii.* 14; *Eph. iv.* 4-6; *1 Peter i.* 2;

1 *John* iii. 23f.) Similar teaching is implied in *John* xiv. 23-26. Especially noteworthy is the Trinitarian implication of the commission and promise recorded in *Luke* xxiv. 49. "Hence the saying takes its place in a context of passages which, even if in a less formal shape, convey the same truth." (Micklem) H. M. Scott (*H.D.B.* V. p. 313f.) notes that the Trinitarian formula "occurs in the most Jewish Gospel, where such teachings are improbable except from Jesus," and that *Luke* xxiv. 49, combined with *Acts* i. 5, comprises "the same elements of doctrine as are contained in *Matt.* xxviii. 19." Even if the Trinitarian reference were deleted, the possibility of a direct command to baptise would not be disproved, though we should no longer have our Lord's *ipsissima verba*.

(2) It is suggested that if Paul had known of such an injunction, he could not have written in 1 *Cor.* i. 17: "Christ sent me not to baptise but to preach the Gospel." (So J. V. Bartlett, *E.R.E.*, II. p. 376a.) If, however, Paul's words are read, as they certainly may be, as setting two tasks in the order of their relative importance, it does not follow that the secondary task is not, equally with the first, a matter of divine command. The idiom by which comparison is stated in terms of negation is one that occurs elsewhere in the N.T. (*Mark* ix. 37; *Luke* x. 20; *John* xv. 16; 1 *Cor.* vii. 10). The concluding words of the verse in question deserve attention. Why does Paul add the words, not apparently arising out of anything previously mentioned, "not in wisdom of words, lest the Cross of Christ should be made of none effect"? It may be suggested that this is a parallel clause in which the apostle is still pursuing his main line of thought. "Wisdom of speech" (margin) refers to an over-emphasis on expression that might nullify the fact to be expressed, "the Cross of Christ", just as an over-emphasis on baptism might hinder the proclamation of the Gospel it expressed. But just as no one would argue from Paul's words to the entire disuse of speech, but only to its proper subordination as means to an end, so the earlier words, in which baptism is placed in apparent opposition to evangelisation, should be interpreted. They deprecate the exaltation of expression above meaning, of rite above Gospel, of symbol above what is symbolised. The use of the singular ("me") is significant here, in view of Paul's tendency to associate others with himself wherever possible. He is laying down no law for others, but stating the circumstances of his own call, which cannot be taken as contradicting the charge given to "the Eleven," though even in the commission to them baptism is introduced subordinately as part of the "making of disciples." 1 *Cor.* i. 14-16 refer to cases where the apostle had himself administered baptism. That he preferred to concentrate on the work of preaching, leaving the administra-

tion of baptism to others, is in line with the similar action of Peter (*Acts x. 48*). Streeter and Appasamy, in *The Sadhu*, report that Sadhu Sundar Singh found it expedient to give up baptising his own converts. A missionary of the Baptist Missionary Society (the Rev. F. W. Jarry of Balangir, Orissa) told the writer that for twenty-five years he had ceased to baptise, to avoid the suggestion of superiority to Indian ministers and also to discountenance the idea that Christianity is a European religion. Analogous motives may well have influenced the Apostle Paul, and all these considerations taken together counteract the suggestion that *1 Cor. i. 17* is a disproof of the authenticity of the commission to baptise attributed to our Lord.

(3) Eusebius in a number of places gives this form of the verse:—

πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τα ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου

“As in one place he expressly comments on the last three words, they must either have existed in some form of the text known to him or have been strongly impressed on his own mind when he wrote.” (*Sweete, Holy Spirit in the N.T.*, p. 123). Kirsopp Lake (*E.R.E.*, II. p. 380) states that the Eusebian citations of the text in the shortened form are twenty-one in number, against four quotations in the ordinary form, but the authorship of two of the writings in which the fuller form occurs is questioned. In another case the fuller form of the text has been attributed to a Syriac translator. If the four quotations are by Eusebius himself, they occur in his later writings.

Lawlor and Oulton, in their edition of the *Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine* (S.P.C.K., 1928. II pp. 19-27) give the results of their special study of Eusebius' methods of quotation. They do not deal with biblical quotations. In respect to indirect quotations they conclude that he “trusted overmuch to a remarkably retentive memory, which on occasions played him tricks.” Instances of direct quotation are given (for example, from passages where Josephus and Philo are cited) where the quotation begins or ends in the middle of a sentence, sometimes with resulting unintelligibility. “Now and again he leaves out elsewhere a portion of the text without giving notice to his readers that he has done so. “We cannot acquit him of the charge of careless writing. The most retentive of memories will lead a historian into mistakes, if it is not constantly checked by reference to the documents.”

It might be contended that such a judgment on Eusebian quotation-methods would scarcely apply to the case under discussion, where the recurrence of the variant is persistent. But in fact Eusebius is not absolutely uniform in his variation from the ordinary reading. Kirsopp Lake (*op. cit.*) says that in his twenty-

The Baptismal Commission in Matthew xxviii. 19 23

one quotations of the passage, while more often giving it in the form quoted above, he sometimes omits everything between ἔθνη and διδάσκοντες. If Eusebius could omit the phrase "in My Name" on occasion, when the words were not necessary to his purpose, his omission of the reference to baptism may be similarly explained. Chase (*J.T.S.*, VI. pp. 481ff.) suggests also that "there is not anything unnatural, still less impossible, in the combination 'make disciples of all nations *in my name*, baptising them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost'."

The Eusebian method, or lack of method, in biblical quotation can be further illustrated if we examine his usage in the *Demonstratio Evangelica*. *Matt. xxviii. 19* is quoted several times, on each occasion "with the omission of the reference to Baptism and the Trinity." (Ferrar. Translation published by S.P.C.K., p. 20). Examining these quotations in order we observe these facts:—

(1) Bk. I, 3, 6, reads, "Our Lord . . . said . . . Go and make disciples of all the nations, and added (ἐπιλέγει) Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." This looks like a split quotation, in view of the inserted words "and added". It would not be unnatural to suppose that Eusebius glided over words not relevant to his subject to reach those upon which he was to comment.

(2) Bk. I, 4, 9, gives the verse as a consecutive quotation. The context refers to the "new covenant", which is "the law" foretold in *Isaiah ii. 3*, as about to "go forth out of Sion." This Eusebius regards as fulfilled in the command to teach in *Matt. xxviii. 19*, which was spoken "in Jerusalem and Mount Sion adjacent thereto." The context thus requires no reference to the baptismal precept.

(3) Bk. I, 6, 24c, again has the verse in a paragraph referring to teaching.

(4) Bk. III, 6, 18d, has the verse thus:—"Go and make disciples of all the nations in My Name, teaching them, etc. . . . and He joined the effect to His word." "What is this effect?" It is the power of the Name that works the expulsion of demons; "even today every demon and unclean spirit shudders at the Name of Jesus as at something that is likely to punish and torment its own nature, and so departs and yields to the power of His Name alone." Here the context seems to have influenced the exact form of the quotation. A reference to the Triune Name would have involved Eusebius in the explanation of matters not germane to his purpose, but he makes what is apparently not so much a quotation as an allusion.

(5) In Bk. III, 7, 136d, the text is thus quoted, "Go and make

disciples of all nations in My Name." The words had been quoted just previously with the omission of "in My Name," and the disciples are imagined as shrinking from so difficult a task, when "the Master solved their difficulties by the addition of one phrase, saying they should triumph 'in My Name', for He did not bid them simply and indefinitely make disciples of all nations, but with the necessary addition of 'in My Name'." So in 138c Eusebius confesses that the Christian preachers could only have succeeded "by the co-operation of Him Who said to them: Make disciples of all nations in My Name." Can it be said that the omission of the words referring to baptism is significant in view of the facts that (i) the context does not require any mention of them, (ii) Eusebius quotes from *Matthew* not consecutively but with interpolated comments, and (iii) in the immediate neighbourhood he combines passages spoken by our Lord on two quite different occasions? He is influenced, not by fidelity to exact phrase or sequence, but by the fitness of the words to his argument.

(6) Bk. IX. II, 445c, refers to the non-reception by the Jews of Christ's grace, adding: "And He bids His own disciples after their rejection, Go ye and make disciples of all nations in My Name. So then, we that are the Gentiles know and receive the prophet that was foretold and sent by His Father." Here again the context necessitates no reference to baptism.

It is possible that the words "in My Name" added to *Matt. xxviii. 19* are the result not of a different text known to Eusebius, but of the influence of *Matt. xix. 20*; "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them." *Matt. xxviii. 19* is followed by a promise of our Lord's constant presence with His people, and the similarity of this promise to that in *Matt. xix. 20* may have led to the transfer of the words "in My Name" in the memory of Eusebius.

A study of the above cases of quotation in the one work brings to us no clue as to the omission of the command to baptise, but it proves the statement that in no case does the context require such a reference.

Kirsopp Lake raises the question whether any other support can be found for the Eusebian text. He points out that in *Apol. i. 61*, Justin "quotes a saying of Christ (Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven) as a proof of the necessity of regeneration, but falls back upon the use of Isaiah and apostolic tradition to justify the practice of baptism and the use of the trine formula. This certainly suggests that Justin did not know the traditional text of *Matthew xxviii. 19* (*E.R.E.*, II, p. 380). In reply it may be urged that the omission to cite a text in a place which to a modern writer seems appropriate is not evidence of the ancient writer's non-acquaintance with it. More-

over, the argument from prophecy is a main theme of the book. "One half of (Justin's) book is occupied with the demonstration that every major characteristic of Christianity had been prophesied and was a fulfilment." (Glover, *Conflict of Religions*, p. 175.) This literary aim would incline the writer to quote an Old Testament utterance in preference to a N.T. text. Further it is possible that Justin's reference to the "reason received from the Apostles" for baptising may cover a general reference to the Gospels which Justin names *Memoirs of the Apostles*. In *Dial* 100, Peter's confession as narrated in *Matt. xvi.* 15-18, is said to be "described in the records of His Apostles." It does not seem to the writer that any support can be found in Justin for the supposed Eusebian text and the absence of variations in all the existing MSS. and versions which contain the passage seems to be decisive proof that the words form part of the original text. It would be an extraordinary thing, if the Eusebian shorter reading had really formed part of the true text, that all other evidence for it should have disappeared. "All the surviving Greek codices were not produced by a band of conspirators. They grew up naturally in different portions of the Greek speaking Church. An interpolation could thus not be foisted into the text of the Gospels and all evidence of its true character be obliterated." (Chase, *op. cit.*)

It should be noted that even if three of the four cases where Eusebius quotes the usual text are (as by Kirsopp Lake) rejected as doubtful, there is still the Letter of Eusebius to the Church at Caesarea quoted by Socrates (*H.E.*, 1, 8, 38.)

(4) It has been argued that if the Church knew herself to have received her Lord's command to baptise into the Name of the Trinity, it is curious that in the cases of baptism referred to in *Acts* and in the Pauline writings it is not the Trinitarian formula but a shorter one which is employed. Thus *Acts ii.* 38 and *x.* 48, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ *Acts viii.* 16, and *xix.* 5, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ; *Gal. iii.* 27, εἰς χριστόν; *Romans vi.* 3, εἰς χριστόν Ἰησοῦν. We are told that "the obvious explanation of the silence of the N.T. on the Triune Name, and the use of another formula in *Acts* and Paul, is that this other formula was the earlier, and that the trine formula is a later addition. It would require very strong arguments to controvert this presumption, and none seems to exist" (Kirsopp Lake, *op. cit.*)

If stress is laid on the use of the Triune Name by our Lord as fixing a formula, the careful and accurate repetition of which was necessary to the validity of baptism, it is certainly difficult to understand the varying practice of the Early Church. It can be said, however, that the insistence upon such a ritual formula has no affinity to anything else we know of Jesus, and this has led to the rejoinder being made that *Matt. xxviii.* 19, implies the idea

of incorporation into the divine Name. "He is not prescribing a formula" but "plainly revealing the spiritual meaning of the outward and visible rite" (Chase, *op. cit.*). Chase thinks we should translate the passage thus: "Immersing them into the Name": "so surely a Greek-speaking Christian would understand the words. He would regard the divine Name as the element, so to speak, into which the baptised is plunged."

Moulton and Milligan (*Vocabulary*, 1930, p. xiv.) take a different view as to the meaning of *eis*. After referring to "the free interchange of *eis* and *en*", they say: "Nor can those who advocate the rendering 'immersing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' for the baptismal formula in *Matthew xxviii*. 19, do so on the ground that the more familiar rendering in philologically inaccurate. Without entering on the question as to the exact shade of meaning underlying *βαπτίζοντες* it is clear that *eis to 'onoma* may be understood as practically equivalent to *en tw 'onomati* the new light thus joining hands with, and lending support to, the almost unanimous tradition of the Western Church." The Vulgate reading is "*in nomine*."

Chase, however, appeals to Paul's usage, to whose mind he feels that "*eis to 'onoma* in connection with baptism signified not 'in the name of', i.e., by the authority of, but 'into the name of'." This appears to be a case where considerations other than lexical ones may fairly come into play, and the evidence which has been gathered in recent years of the use of "name" where it becomes practically equivalent to "into the possession of," would support a similar interpretation in regard to baptism. For example, Moulton and Milligan (*op. cit.*, s.v. *'onoma*) give instances from the papyri where *eis [to] 'onoma tivos* used of payments made "to the account of anyone," which would seem to justify the translation of the similar phrase in *Matt. xxviii*. 19 by the words: "baptised into the possession of the Father, etc."

Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 146f) quotes an inscription not later than the beginning of the imperial period, which records the purchase of various objects *eis to tou theou [Zeus] 'onoma*. "The person in question, in this connection, is only the nominal purchaser, who represents the real purchaser, i.e., the deity." Just as in the inscription, *to buy into the name of God*, means *to buy so that the article belongs to God*, so also the idea underlying, e.g., the expressions *to baptise into the name of the Lord*, or *to believe into the name of the son of God*, is that baptism or faith constitutes the belonging to God or to the Son of God."

The above evidence seems to establish the possibility of an interpretation of the phrase "into the Name" which would emphasise its meaning (consecration to the service or possession of someone) rather than its importance as a formula which necessi-

tated accurate citation. It is in favour of the first interpretation that *Gal. iii.* 27 and *Romans vi.* 3 do not use ὄνομα. Moreover, in *1 Cor. i.* 12-15, Paul seems clearly to argue that the only justification for anyone saying ἐγὼ εἰμι Παυλον (Moffatt translates "I belong to Paul") would be that he had been baptised εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παυλου. On this interpretation the use of the name of our Lord instead of the name of the Trinity would be explained by saying that "baptism in the name of Jesus is really in the name of the Trinity" (*H.D.B.*, p. 241.)

That such a variation between the One Name and the Triune Name was possible is shown by the fact that the *Didache* uses the Matthaean words in cap. VII. and the shorter phrase "baptised into the Name of the Lord" in cap. IX. In cap. VII. the Trinitarian form of the words is twice given, once in relation to immersion, the second time in reference to affusion, but on the second occasion the article is omitted before each divine name. It is perhaps a small point, but for what it is worth it tells somewhat against the phrase having been, at the date of the *Didache*, a rigid formula, to the precise repetition of which importance was attached.

(5) If the disciples had received from their Lord, on this unforgettable occasion, a command to preach the Gospel to "all the nations," how are we to account for their hesitation about the Gentile mission? Do not the words suggest a later stage of development? Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, p. 291) regards the words as Matthew's attempt to counteract the prohibition to preach to the Gentiles and Samaritans in *Matt. x.* 5 (see also *op. cit.*, p. 514). The history as recorded in *Acts*, however, does not suggest that the apostles were fettered by any conception of the restriction of the Gospel to men of the Jewish race, but that the problem rather was as to how far circumcision was to be required of Gentile converts. In *Acts x.* 45, it is "they of the circumcision" who are amazed "because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." The apostles frequently failed at once to realise the meaning and obligations of their Lord's words, and undoubtedly national prejudices long enslaved them. When, however, the Gentile mission begins, the one question raised is not as to any national limitation but rather as to the ritual conditions to be imposed upon the Gentile believers.

Kirsopp Lake draws an argument against the authenticity of the baptismal command from the fact that *Luke* has no reference to it. He rejects the contention that baptism is implied in the reference to the preaching of repentance and remission of sins in *Luke xxiv.* 47, and says: "Either Luke knew of the commission to baptise (whether in the Triune Name or not) and omitted it, or he did not know it. It seems impossible to find any reason why

he should have omitted it." The reasoning seems to imply the casting of suspicion upon every occurrence in the Gospels which is recorded by only one evangelist, unless we can find a reason for the omission satisfactory to ourselves. That would be an impossibly rigid rule of criticism. There appears to the writer, however, to be substance in the suggestion that for Luke baptism is implied in the mention of the preaching of repentance and forgiveness. The association of baptism with repentance is very frequent in Lukan writings. As Denney (*Death of Christ*, p. 67) says: "In the world of New Testament ideas baptism and the remission of sins are inseparably associated." Such an argument as this will of course not avail to prove anything as to the actual wording of the commission to baptise, but it seems sufficient to meet the hostile argument based on Luke's silence.

The objections to the authenticity of the Baptismal Commission are of differing value and appeal with different force to different minds. It will probably be felt that the really formidable argument arises from the argument that the Trinitarian teachings could not have been given by our Lord at this stage, and from the varying usage of the N.T. as to baptism "into the Name of . . ." If the arguments given against these objections are judged to be insufficient, there would still remain the strong presumption that baptism derived from our Lord, in view of its early prevalence in the Church and the lack of any record of question about its obligation. We should be unable to insist that *Matt. xxviii. 18-20* gave us the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord, but, especially in view of the persistent tradition of a farewell charge similar in tone to this (see *Luke xxiv. 44-49*) we should be justified in presuming that some such command and authorisation were then given. This seems to be the safer course to adopt.

P. W. EVANS.

Mennonite Quarterly Review. Oct. 1952 includes an article on "The Writings of Melancthon against the Anabaptists" and a bibliography on Mennonites in Latin America.

Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society, Oct. 1952 includes a review adding information to the series on Dr. Ward's Trust, *B.Q.*, Jan. 1950-Jan. 1951.

Index to Vol. XIV. This will be distributed with our next issue. We regret the delay.

Johannes Brötli

JOHANNES BRÖTLI¹ was born in the Swiss Graubünden about the year 1494, and began his studies toward the priesthood at the University of Basel in 1517.² Upon the completion of his course he became chaplain in the village of Quarten on the Wallen Lake south-east of Zurich. Influenced by Reformation ideas he married in the spring of 1523. For this he was imprisoned by the authorities and he wrote to the bailiff of Sargans on May 11th defending his action.³ Soon thereafter he was released and banished, and he made his way to Zurich.

Zwingli had been preaching the sufficiency of the Scriptures since his coming to Grossmünster Church as people's priest more than four years before. The Reformation was formally begun by approval of the Zurich Council following a public discussion of the issues in January, 1523. But when Brötli arrived in Zurich with his wife a few months after that, no formal changes had yet been made in the mass, use of images, and other mediaeval forms of worship in the churches. None of the Zurich pastors had dared to marry publicly.

In the nearby village of Wytikon, however, the pastor William Reublin had advanced much further. He had broken fasts, preached against infant baptism, and himself married publicly in the Wytikon church. His radical ideas had found fertile soil in Wytikon and in the adjacent village of Zollikon, and Brötli settled in the latter place. He was often referred to as the priest of Zollikon or the helper in Zollikon, but apparently never held any official position there.⁴

Largely because of agitation by the radicals for positive reform the Council arranged for a public discussion, especially of images and the mass, in October, 1523. Zwingli made it clear on this occasion that he would await action by the Council before instituting any outward changes. The radicals were, of course, dissatisfied with this. Johannes Brötli became a sort of pastor of those in Zollikon, where they were apparently more numerous than elsewhere. He was not supported by them, but worked with his own hands as he wrote later from Hallou.

¹ Many variations in spelling, and the name often appears in its Latin form, Panicellus.

² Oskar Vasella, "Von den Anfängen der bündnerischen Täuferbewegung," *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte*, XIX, Heft 2, 1939, pp. 175f.

³ Walter Amman, "Die Reformation im Gaster," *Zwingliana*, Band VII, Heft 4 (1940, Nr. 2), p. 224.

⁴ Kaspar Wirz, *Etat des Zürcher Ministeriums von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Zurich, 1890), p. 223.

Three fathers from Zollikon along with two from Wytikon, were summoned before the Council for trial on August 11th, 1524, because they had refused to have their infant baptised although they were as much as six months old. Reublin had told the parents that the children should not be baptized until they came to the age of understanding, and he was imprisoned. Brötli is not named in the records, but Fridli and Stephan Schumacher and Heini Hottinger of Zollikon were surely reflecting his teaching when they declared that according to the Word of God children should not be baptised "until they come to their days, when they could accept the gospel for themselves."⁵

The radical leaders had tried to win Zwingli to their views, but by the end of the summer, 1524 they gave this up as hopeless and began to seek contact with advanced reformers elsewhere. They knew little of Thomas Müntzer but had been impressed by tracts of his on faith and baptism. Conrad Grebel, along with five others, wrote to him on September 5th setting forth the beliefs of the radical group in Zurich. Before the letter was sent reports reached them that Müntzer advocated war against the persecuting princes. A postscript letter was then written to accompany the other one, and Brötli was among the signers of it. This second part of the letter warns against the use of force and exhorts Müntzer to be strong in the face of persecution. It states incidentally that there were less than twenty in and around Zurich "who believe the Word of God," i.e., who belonged to the little group of radicals soon to be known as Anabaptists.⁶

Brötli apparently involved himself in dispute with Pastor Nicolas Billeter in the Zollikon church and the two of them along with three or four representatives of the Zollikon community authorities were ordered to appear before the Zurich Council.⁷ The result is not recorded, but events came rapidly to a head. Fathers who had been ordered to have their children baptised had still not complied, and a public discussion on the question of baptism was arranged for January 17th, 1525. Brötli was present, but Grebel, Manz, and Reublin took the lead in attacking infant baptism. The majority party under Zwingli defending infant baptism was, of course, declared victorious by the Council, which ordered that all children be baptised within eight days under threat of banishment for families that refused to comply.⁸

So numerous and determined had the radicals in Zollikon

⁵ Emil Egli, *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation in den Jahren 1519-1533* (Zurich, 1879), No. 566.

⁶ Translation of part of the letter in Harold S. Bender's *Conrad Grebel . . .* (Goshen, Indiana, 1950), pp. 282-287. Original in Stadtbibliothek, St. Gallen, Switzerland.

⁷ Egli, *op. cit.*, No. 604.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Nos. 621f.

become in their opposition to infant baptism that they cast the baptismal font out of the church. The Council ordered that it be put back and that an investigation be conducted to discover who had removed it.⁹

On January 21st the Council warned Grebel and Manz to cease their agitation and four radicals who were not citizens of Zurich, including Reublin and Brötli, were ordered to leave the canton within a week.¹⁰

It was a busy week. The little group of radicals met secretly to decide what their future course should be, for their work had been outlawed by the order of January 21st. They determined to remain faithful to their convictions and boldly set up a new church in effect by instituting adult baptism. A former cleric of Chur by the name of Georg Blaurock, who had recently appeared in Zurich, requested baptism from Conrad Grebel. This was performed (by affusion) and then Blaurock baptised the others who were present.¹¹

There were other secret meetings during the week, with prayer, Bible reading, the baptism of those who were ready for it, and the observance of the Lord's Supper. Blaurock, Brötli, and Manz baptised more than any others. One of the services was in the home of Ruedi Thomann in Zollikon on the evening of January 25th.¹² Brötli and Reublin were there by invitation for supper. Others came later for the meeting. Manz and Blaurock arrived first, then Jacob Hottinger and several others. The ensuing service apparently followed the usual course with prayer, Bible reading, and exhortations to faith. One of the nine men present, Hans Bruggbach, suddenly stood up, "wept and cried out what a great sinner he was." He requested the prayers of his friends and asked for baptism. "Who will forbid that I baptise him," asked Manz. "No one," replied Blaurock. Taking a dipper of water, Manz baptised the convert in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Jacob Hottinger then requested and secured baptism, as did Brötli and others. Then the meeting was closed with the distribution of bread and wine and celebration of the Lord's Supper.

Brötli and Reublin left Zurich before their week of grace was past, and made their way to Hallou in the canton of Schaffhausen. Leaving their wives and Brötli's two small

⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 621.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 624.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, No. 636.

¹² *Loc. cit.* See also translation of Professor Fritz Blanke's "An Anabaptist Meeting in Zollikon," *Baptist Quarterly*, Vol. XIV, No. 2 (April, 1951), pp. 51-55. Original: "Eine Täuferversammlung in Zollikon 1525" in *Hortulus Amicorum Fritz Ernst zum sechszigsten Geburtstag* (Zurich, n.d.), pp. 32-38.

children there, the two men went to the town of Schaffhausen, seven miles distant. Grebel was already there, and they were all invited for an evening meal with Sebastian Hoffmeister, Reformation leader in the area, and his associate Sebastian Meyer. Thus cordially received and heard, the Anabaptists understood that Hoffmeister agreed with them in the matter of baptism. It is almost certain that they had some justification for this conclusion. Hoffmeister denied it later in Zurich, but it is quite likely that he was for some time unsettled on the question of the Scripturalness of infant baptism, as were Zwingli, Oecolampadius and other reformers.

Brötli and Reublin returned the next day to Hallou. Reublin proceeded then to Waldshut and other places in South Germany, but Brötli remained in the village of Hallou, where his preaching was well received by most of the people.

From Hallou Brötli wrote to Fridli Schumacher, in whose home he had lived, and to other brethren in Zollikon.¹³ In a style reminiscent of the apostle Paul the letter begins, "Johannes, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to preach the gospel of Christ, by the will of God the Father, to the saints of Christ and called of God, the Christian congregation in Zollikon, grace and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ." Brötli calls the brethren to mind that he preached the truth among them, though supporting himself by working with his hands that he might not be a burden to them. He exhorts them to remain true to the faith. He has heard that some of the brethren are imprisoned. He would be happy if God should allow him to return among them. He tells of the journey to Hallou and the visit to Schaffhausen. He speaks of his preaching in Hallou, declaring that the field is white unto harvest but the labourers few.

In the same letter Brötli makes several personal requests. Of the things he had left with Fridli Schumacher he asks that the meat, butter, and wine be sent to him, also Carlstadt's booklet (on baptism). His wife wants her knitting wool, skirt, and jacket.

The close of the letter is again in apostolic style: "Dear brethren, remain steadfast in the faith, in love, and in hope. Fear no man. Whoever preaches to you another gospel than that which I have preached to you, he is accursed. If it should be possible, send a brother to me to let me know how it is with you for I am much concerned. Greet one another with the kiss of peace! Keep yourselves from any brother who walks disorderly and not

¹³ The letter, along with a second soon to be mentioned, in Egli, *op. cit.*, No. 674; Johann Conrad Füsslin, *Beyträge zur Erläuterung der Kirchen-Reformations-Geschichten des Schweizer-Landes* (Zurich, 1741), Erster Theil, pp. 201-227; Jakob Wipf, *Reformationsgeschichte der Stadt und Landschaft Schaffhausen* (Zurich, 1929), pp. 188-190.

according to that which both he and you have learned. Beware of the false prophets who preach for gain. Flee them! Exhort one another and remain in the teaching which you have received. The peace of God be with you all. Amen. Johannes Brötli, your servant in Christ, now living in Hallou."

As he received no reply to this letter Brötli wrote another two weeks later: "Dear brethren, I know not what I should write to you—nor whether you are still in the faith . . . nor whether you received my letter. If you did, surely there is little of the love of God in you. If not, I can well understand. . . . What shall I say? My heart is afflicted and troubled for your sake in Christ. I have heard, and it displeases me greatly, that certain of you are fallen from the holy faith and from the Word of God which you had accepted and in which you were baptised . . . Oh, the woe of those earthly goods which hinder you. Christ has shown it in the holy gospel."

There follows a repetition of the earlier requests that the things be sent to him, as he does not know whether the previous letter arrived. In this second one, however, Brötli does not mention the Carlstadt booklet; instead he asks for his Bible. He has preached four times in Hallou. "The people are eager to hear the Word of God, but the pastor (Hans Ziegler) is half and half. He is a covetous man and a fornicator . . . I pray you, if you are Christians, remain steadfast. . . . Write me again, what your belief is, and how it is with the brethren."

"Be sure to send me the Bible," Brötli writes again near the close of the letter. "Stand in the faith. Let no man frighten you, and God who is strong will strengthen you! Oh, how strong, I hear, is my brother Manz, and Georg (Blaurock), but especially Felix Manz. God be praised! Conrad Grebel is afflicted, but in the Lord. William (Reublin) was with me recently. I admonish you to remain in the Word and the faith which you once received. If you so remain in it, send a faithful brother to me and also the things I have requested. If you did not receive my message, write me and I shall get it to you. Greet one another with the kiss of peace. May God and his peace be with you. Hans Brötli, your brother in Christ, has written this with his own hand."

The friends in Zollikon apparently responded to Brötli's request and the community leaders also sent three men to Hallou to testify to his good record in Zollikon. The Zurich Council heard of this and wrote to the Schaffhausen Council on April 4th, 1525, warning them against him.¹⁴ They accuse Brötli of stirring up

¹⁴ C. A. Cornelius, *Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs in drei Büchern. Zweites Buch: "Die Wiedertaufe"* (Leipzig, 1860), pp. 249f. Original in Cantonsarchiv, Schaffhausen.

disorder and disobedience in Zollikon by his agitation against infant baptism and by his baptising of adults. For this he had been banished and the Council obliged to adopt strong measures to stamp out the Anabaptist movement among the poor people who had been misled by him and others. It is in this letter that we learn about the men sent by the Zollikon community to testify to the leasers in Hallou that Brötli had conducted himself honourably during his stay among them. This was done "behind our backs," writes the offended Zurich Council, which now directs this warning to Schaffhausen lest Brötli cause as much disturbance and disobedience of authorities in Hallou as he had in Zollikon.

The Schaffhausen Council was glad to receive the warning and sent armed men at once to Hallou to arrest the Anabaptist. The people of the village resented this, however, and made a show of force, so that the arrest could not be consummated.¹⁵

Brötli remained in Hallou for several months at least. Almost all the community was won for Anabaptism, and the adults were baptised on profession of faith. Hans Ziegler left during the year 1525 and Brötli was in effect the village pastor. Involvement in the Peasant Revolt hastened the suppression of Anabaptism in the area, and Brötli and some of his supporters may have fled late in 1525. For a number of years, however, we read of trials of Anabaptists from Hallou. Johannes Brötli must have been a man of attractive qualities. He won followers quickly and in large numbers, and the forces of persecution had a long and difficult time destroying his work.

We know nothing further of Brötli except the brief account of his death (1528) as recorded in the *Martyr's Mirror*, which appeared in Holland early in the seventeenth century and was compiled from earlier martyrologies published as early as 1539. "Pretle" is probably the Dutch spelling for the form of the name which was common among the Swabians of South Germany,¹⁶ which may suggest the field of Brötli's later labours. The account is as follows: "After this, Hans Pretle, who had been a preacher, and then became a servant of the church of Christ, after he had for a long time exercised his office, and led many to the knowledge of the gospel, was likewise burned, for the testimony of Jesus Christ."¹⁷

JOHN A. MOORE.

¹⁵ C. A. Bächtold, *Die Schaffhauser Wiedertäufer in der Reformationszeit* (Schaffhausen, 1900), p. 12.

¹⁶ Alex. Nüesch und Heinr. Bruppacher, *Das Alte Zollikon . . .* (Zurich, 1899), p. 58.

¹⁷ Edward Bean Underhill, *A Martyrology of the Churches of Christ commonly called Baptists during the Era of the Reformation* (London, 1850), Vol. I, p. 58.

Leenhardt on Baptism.

AMONG the vast number of books and articles which have been published in the last few years on the question of Baptism is one which has received scant notice in this country. It is *Le Baptême Chrétien* by Franz J. Leenhardt,¹ professor in the University of Geneva. This is somewhat surprising when we consider that it is a development of arguments in a report presented at a Ministers' Conference at Geneva in 1934, and taken up again at a re-union of Swiss Theological Students, 1943. It was at this session that Karl Barth presented his *Die Kirchliche Lehre von der Taufe*, now so familiar to us through Dr. E. A. Payne's translation, *The Teaching of the Church regarding Baptism*.

In his book Leenhardt deals with the Baptism of John and the problem of the Sacrament, the Baptism of Jesus by John, Christian Baptism in the early Church and as explained by Paul, and he concludes with a chapter on the problem of Infant Baptism. From this survey of recent problems three points stand out as being of particular value to the Baptist.

I. Leenhardt sees in John's Baptism a form of Prophetic Symbolism,² which is scarcely surprising when we remember that John was regarded by our Lord as the last and greatest of the prophets of the Old Order. John was not content simply to preach; like his predecessors, he must do something to give force to his message.³ Leenhardt cites four characteristics of this method:

¹ 74 pp. Published by Delachaux & Niestlé S. A., Neuchatel and Paris.

² *op. cit.*, pp. 12ff. cf. W. F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, (1948), pp. 19-22. C. H. Dodd, ("The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ" in T. W. Manson, *A Companion to the Bible*, p. 386), makes this likeness between prophetic symbolism and a sacrament, though his reference is in connection with the Lord's Supper. cf. H. W. Robinson, "Prophetic Symbolism" in *Old Testament Essays*, (1927).

³ Examples of the way in which the prophets used symbolic action in order to give force to their message can be seen in I Kings xx. 35-43, xxii. 11, Jer. xxvii. 2, Ezek. iv. 4, v. 1-4. Some writers (W. I. Wardle, *The History and Religion of Israel*, p. 177; Oesterley and Robinson, *Hebrew Religion*, pp. 75ff.) have likened this to sympathetic magic which was well-known among some of Israel's contemporaries, but there is a difference. In magic the aim is to control the circumstances by the performance of a certain ritual; with the prophets it was rather that they were so overcome by their message that they needed action as well as word to express it. In fact, the prophets were the people who opposed mere ritual and religiosity as a means of salvation (see H. H. Rowley, *The Re-discovery of the Old Testament*, p. 156.) and in their actions really failed to make a distinction between the word and the act. W. M. Clowe (*The Church and the Sacraments*, p. 69) says the prophets penetrated past the mere rite and past the mere symbol to the spiritual truth symbolised. Thus, for them, the act did not produce the result, but was a symbolic declaration of God's working and depended for its fulfilment upon God's faithfulness to the word proclaimed through His prophet.

- (a) it is symbolic.
- (b) it expresses the Divine Will.
- (c) it aims to give the Divine Will concrete expression.
- (d) it affirms the efficacy of the Word.

A moment's reflection enables us to see how clearly Believers' Baptism by immersion fulfils at least three of these conditions. *It is symbolic* in the sense that it bears some reality to the thing symbolised (cf. *Ezek. vi. 1-4, 11-12*). It is unquestioned that our baptism is linked with the sufferings of Christ⁴ and with our conversion,⁵ and therefore Believers' Baptism by immersion bears a close resemblance to Paul's words when he speaks of being buried with Christ in baptism and rising to newness of life⁶ (*Rom. vi. 1; 1 Cor. i. 13; Heb. vi. 4*).

It aims to give the Divine Will concrete expression in two ways :

- (a) it reinforces a man's announcement to the world of his conversion.
- (b) it reinforces the man's conviction as he sees himself going through the various stages of our Lord's Death and Resurrection.⁷

It affirms the efficacy of the Word because it holds together the preaching of the Word (resulting in conversion) and the act of Baptism,⁸ thereby preventing us from falling into the error of

⁴ see Flemington, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-71, 90-91, 122f.; K. Barth, *The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism*, pp. 16-18; O. Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, pp. 13-15, 19; A. M. Hunter (*The Work and Words of Jesus*, p. 96n.) shows how in Lk. xii. 50 and Mk. x. 38 Jesus uses the word "Baptism" to denote His Passion. The word is also used as a vivid metaphor for suffering in the Old Testament. (Pss xlii. 7, cxlv. 4f. and Isaiah xliii. 7).

⁵ Flemington, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49, says the ideas most frequently linked with baptism in the New Testament are those of "hearing the word" and "believing." (cf. pp. 110f., 116, and "An Approach to the Theology of Baptism" in *The Expository Times*, vol. LXII, 1950-51, p. 357.) Cullmann (*op. cit.* pp. 27-28) admits that Baptism and Confession of Faith go together in the New Testament (cf. Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 42) but says that they need not necessarily be the preconditions of baptism. He discusses the subject more fully in Chapter III. (cf. E. A. Payne, "Professor Oscar Cullmann on Baptism," in *The Baptist Quarterly*, vol. XIV, 1951, p. 57.)

⁶ see Flemington, "An Approach to the Theology of Baptism" in *The Expository Times*, vol. LXII (1950-51), p. 356.

⁷ Barth (*op. cit.* p. 9) says that as a man goes into the water and realises the threat to life involved, so also does he realise subsequently how he has been saved, and in this respect baptism by immersion is more symbolic than baptism by affusion.

⁸ see Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, pp. 49, 65, 109, 122f.; Barth, *op. cit.* pp. 19f. H. Cook (*What Baptists Stand For*, p. 100) says preaching must precede Baptism so that the candidate knows what it means; what is expressed and what is symbolised.

regarding them as two separate acts;⁹ infant baptism, on the contrary, separates them by ten to twenty years.

Concerning Leenhardt's second point it would appear at first sight that the upholders of infant baptism have the stronger position, for they agree that as Christ dies for all, so it is God's will that all should be saved; this is clearly expressed when every individual is baptised as a child.¹⁰ But it should be remembered that although infant baptism expresses the Divine Will it does not bring fulfilment, as Flemington himself admits,¹¹ and it is therefore deficient as regards Leenhardt's general understanding of it along the lines of prophetic symbolism. That it is God's will that all should be saved and that His Will should find a concrete expression in our life no one will doubt, but experience has taught us that baptism alone will not bring this about.

Thus in every respect it would appear that Believers' Baptism by immersion bears a close relation to the work of Christ on the Cross and in our hearts. This is not to say, however, that Leenhardt is championing the Baptist cause, for he sees baptism as more than a mere symbol. The number of Baptists today who see in baptism nothing more than a public profession of faith is declining, but there are still many who hesitate at the suggestion that in baptism "something happens". Leenhardt,¹² however, says baptism is not simply a spectacular method to make the preacher's word particularly clear; it is an expression of the Word of God which is both active and powerful.¹³ Consequently, although Leenhardt's work makes us grateful to him for, in some measure, championing our cause, it also makes us realise at least one of the gaps in our theology of baptism. If it is more than a public profession of faith, in what respects is it more?

II. Leenhardt sees baptism to be closely linked with repentance and the giving of the Spirit. He argues¹⁴ that because Jesus is

⁹ Flemington, (*op. cit.* p. 111), says no New Testament passage really separates the outward act and the inward significance. J. Denney (*The Death of Christ*, p. 185), says baptism and faith are "the outside and the inside of the same thing".

¹⁰ Flemington (*op. cit.*, p. 137), puts this forward as an argument in favour of infant baptism.

¹¹ *op. cit.*, p. 142. Cullmann, (*op. cit.*, pp. 66f.), says that Paul's objection to the pre-Christian Jewish administration of circumcision was that the recipients of it so often proved failures, and what he writes about this in Rom. ii, 25ff. fits in so well with what he says about Baptism in Rom. v. ff., and I Cor. x. 1ff., that one must conclude that the thought of Christian Baptism stands behind this chapter. Thus, Cullmann also recognises the need for response, though he goes on to add that where this response is not forthcoming it is not the fault of the *circumcision*, but of the *circumcised*.

¹² *op. cit.*, p. 19.

¹³ see Flemington, *op. cit.*, pp. 20, 61, 63, 79-81, 109, 136.

¹⁴ *op. cit.*, pp. 30ff.

Man, what He did involves us all, and therefore we can say that Pentecost accomplishes the Baptism of Jesus.¹⁵ *Acts ii. 38-39* interprets Pentecost and links it with repentance and baptism, so that baptism is the necessary accompaniment of repentance and the intermediary step between repentance and the giving of the Spirit. Each step, however, is quite distinct. There were two outstanding points about Christian Baptism as compared with the Baptism of John :

- (a) it was in the name of Jesus Christ which signified that Faith had already laid hold on the pardon of Jesus.
- (b) the candidate waited for the Spirit.

This is an understanding of baptism which is now frequently made by writers on the subject. Flemington¹⁶ strikes this note again and again in his interpretation of New Testament Baptism. Cullmann¹⁷ makes the same point and says that in the Early Church it seems to have been the idea that baptism was for the remission of sins and the laying on of hands was for the imparting of the Holy Spirit. Then he stresses that the two rites ought not to be separated. It is true that subsequently he separates faith and baptism,¹⁸ and that from a Baptist point of view he is to be criticised on these grounds,¹⁹ but that he makes this connection between the two acts cannot be denied. Cullmann, however, would put baptism at the beginning of a man's life so as to make it clear what God has done for him, and the question which inevitably arises where repentance, baptism and the giving of the Spirit all go together is why baptism is added to a faith that already exists. In other words, is baptism for Baptists nothing more than a mere appendage to conversion?

In reply to such a claim Leenhardt²⁰ would say that this view makes a false distinction between faith and rites; it is false, because it is contrary to history and psychology, where we learn that the inner life is only intelligible in so far as it comes out in every aspect of a man's being. Flemington,²¹ similarly, says that entry to the Kingdom was not through baptism as such but through the rite which lay behind it; baptism was the "kerugma" in

¹⁵ see Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

¹⁶ *op. cit.*, pp. 60, 67-69, 109f., 122. cf. Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

¹⁷ *op. cit.*, pp. 10ff. cf. H. W. Robinson, *Baptist Principles*, pp. 13, 24.

¹⁸ *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48. Cullmann supports this division from the New Testament, (I Cor. x. 1ff.; Heb. vi. 6, x. 26; Rom. vi.), and says (pp. 27-28) that baptism and confession of faith only go together in the New Testament because of special circumstances. (cf. p. 50).

¹⁹ see Payne, *loc. cit.*, p. 59.

²⁰ *op. cit.*, p. 41.

²¹ *op. cit.*, p. 123.

action. Later,²² he describes it as the external counterpart of the inward attitude of repentance and faith. W. M. Clowe²³ says that only through faith has baptism power to seal the believers to Holiness, which is almost an echo of Brunner's claim that the Sacrament is the place where the union of the inward and the invisible with the outward and the visible is achieved by God Himself and is made to faith.²⁴ Citron²⁵ goes even further and gives primary importance to the conversion experience which he believes to be inseparably linked with the act of baptism; man only becomes aware of what has happened in his conversion when he passes through the waters of baptism. From the negative side, J. R. Nelson²⁶ says that baptism and the giving of the Spirit have been separated to the sorrow of the Church.

Thus we can see that in the linking together of baptism and the giving of the Spirit, Baptists have not only the New Testament, but also a number of modern theologians on their side. This is not to say, however, that all modern scholars take up the Baptist position in rejecting infant baptism. So we come to the third point of interest to us in Leenhardt's treatise.

III. In spite of all that has been said Leenhardt²⁷ still comes down on the side of infant baptism, though not without a plea for a reformation of it, since he considers that in its present form it is not without its misconceptions. In this respect he does not go so far as Brunner²⁸ who considers that the contemporary practice of infant baptism can hardly be regarded as being anything short of scandalous. Leenhardt, however, claims that as the child is unaware of the significance of the Sacrament as a symbolic action, that lack must be filled by those who accept the responsibility of administering the sacrament to it. They must subsequently make the child aware of what God has done for him and how this has already been symbolised on his behalf. Leenhardt admits that it is a deviation from the ordinary understanding of a sacrament which requires a conscious subject, but feels it is permissible *only* where the child is surrounded by Christians who are prepared to accept this responsibility.

Cullmann²⁹ is doubtful about Leenhardt's conception of adult

²² *op. cit.*, p. 124. He quotes P. T. Forsyth, who says it can be subjectively significant because it is objectively real.

²³ *op. cit.*, p. 111.

²⁴ see *The Divine Imperative*, p. 240.

²⁵ see *The New Birth*, pp. 132ff.

²⁶ see *The Realm of Redemption*, pp. 128f.

²⁷ *op. cit.*, p. 71-73.

²⁸ see *The Divine-Human Encounter*, p. 132.

²⁹ *op. cit.*, pp. 28-29.

baptism and infant baptism, but does nevertheless admit³⁰ that where a child is baptised in the New Testament and in true Church practice, the natural membership of a Christian family, or at least the possession of Christian parents, is presupposed, and is a sign for the Church that the Divine baptismal event will in his case be completed and that he will really be incorporated in the Church of Christ. J. K. S. Reid,³¹ similarly, arguing in favour of infant baptism, has no hesitation in saying that infant baptism is the baptism of children of Christian parents and that it can only be rightly administered under certain conditions. Brunner³² makes it plain that this was the presupposition of the Reformation practice of baptism, and that all our ancient baptismal liturgies implied as the essential element the confessions of faith of the parents or witnesses of the baptism, and the vow to provide Christian instruction for the one being baptised. Such facts and statements lead us to agree with Leenhardt that there is undoubtedly a need for a reform of the doctrine.

The question which inevitably arises for the Baptist, however, in a day when Church Union is to the fore is whether, in a united Free Church, we would be willing to accept some method of reformed infant baptism along the lines which Leenhardt suggests. It will be obvious to all that such a reformed doctrine is a long way from any doctrine of infused grace; equally, it will appear to many to be a long way from Believers' Baptism as we have understood it. Nevertheless, is it possible for us to accept it as being a possible interpretation of baptism to be administered alongside the baptism of believers, or are we to stand firm and admit of no alternative whatever?

A. GILMORE.

Rev. E. P. Winter, 18, Bromfield Road, Redditch, who is engaged in research into the theory and practice of the Lord's Supper among Baptists up to the end of the 17th century would be grateful for information relating to our oldest churches.

WILLIAM CAREY:—Mr. J. T. Whitley draws our attention to information given about Carey in "The Registers of Moulton," Vol. 1, Parish Register Society, 1903.

³⁰ *op. cit.*, p. 51. He even dares to say (p. 36) that a child who is baptised and does not later accept Christ in faith is guilty of the unforgivable sin of the New Testament. (cf. pp. 40, 49).

³¹ "Theological Issues involved in Baptism," in *The Expository Times*, vol. LXI (1949-50) pp. 203-204. cf. "The Administration of Holy Baptism" in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vol. III (1950) pp. 173ff.

³² see *The Divine-Human Encounter*, p. 130.

Reviews

Humanity and Deity, by Wilbur Marshall Urban. (George Allen & Unwin, 25s.)

This book is an attempt at a restatement of the traditional view of the relation of God to man. Its central thesis is that "there are natural and logical witnesses for God," and the author claims to restate and revalue natural theology in the spirit of classical western theology and philosophy. Its central section is an examination of the historic proofs of the existence of God and an axiological interpretation of the theistic argument.

The first chapter establishes the starting point, found in the acknowledgement of ultimate values with the cosmological and ontological propositions they presuppose. Then by an examination of the language of religion we are shown that the essence of religion—for the philosopher—is the identity of the highest good and most real being. A further chapter examining and distinguishing the part taken by "myth" in the expression of the religious consciousness prepares the way for the central part of the book. The trend of the very important chapter on "Language and Logic in theology" can be seen in its special commendation of Leibniz, because for him "sufficient reason always implies considerations of value." Once this is accepted, we have the basis of the axiological interpretation of the theistic argument. The other aim of this chapter is to establish the organic continuity of dogmatic and rational theology and their logical relationship. The three great classical arguments are now examined; Anselm, Aquinas and Kant are considered and the axiological nature of their thought brought out. The axiological argument is described as an "argument to presuppositions"; given the acknowledgement of values one must acknowledge that which the values presuppose. The next subject is symbolism and the doctrine of analogy. The concept of the analogy of being is the key to the Christian solution to the problem of humanity and deity. There is a very interesting account of the relation of religion to science and to the humanities, in which, among other things, the "primacy of the axiological" is re-emphasised with support from Plato, Aristotle, Anselm, Aquinas, Leibniz and Kant, and found to be confirmed by the new epistemology of modern science. The theme is completed by calling in the experience of the mystics as the final witness against the two "heresies" the author has been attacking—a religion of mere humanity and a religion of mere deity. He holds that the

notions of humanity and deity cannot be separated without becoming unintelligible.

The affinities of the thought developed in this book can be seen from the authorities whose names are quoted above, and from its one quotation from the Bible—our Lord's words, "Ye believe in God, believe also in Me." It is a statement of Dean Matthews—that "the Deus philosophicus is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"—that receives perhaps the severest condemnation and strongest contradiction of any quoted in the book. Those of us who are still at least inclined towards the view expressed by the Dean, and confess ourselves more at home with the "living, anthropomorphic and psychological" God of the Old Testament and St. Paul, will find here much that challenges us to think hard. The real—and considerable—value of this contribution to the study of the philosophy of religion is its presentation of "the Deity who emerges from the Schoolmen's logic" in the setting of modern scientific and philosophical thought and its thorough treatment of the problems presented by language. The list of chapter headings looks exciting, and the reader is not disappointed.

G. ELWIN SHACKLETON.

Of God, the Devil, and the Jews, by Dagobert D. Runes. (Philosophical Library, New York, \$3.)

This is a collection of essays, or perhaps one should say comments, of varying length and on a wide variety of subjects, within the field of ethics and religion. The author, it seems, is well known on the other side of the Atlantic, but for others of us the biographical details provided are welcome. He is a Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Vienna, the writer of numerous books (mostly on philosophical subjects) and the editor of sundry scientific journals. Couple all this with an intriguing title, and a peculiarly striking front cover and it is not perhaps surprising that the book arouses interest. It must be confessed that one reader at any rate found his hopes disappointed. True, the writer puts his finger on some real problems of relationships both with man and God, but his handling of them is not uniformly helpful. There is religious sincerity here and humanitarian passion is evident in a constant championing of the oppressed. It is clear that Dr. Runes is on the side of the downtrodden and therefore of the angels. But woe betide everyone else! One would gather that the Church's ministers spend most of their time "blessing bayonets," that pews are full of bigots, and that the science of theology is pursued by men altogether born in casuistry. There are no half measures. In prayer, it would seem, most people are merely ambitious, or

roundly hypocritical or simply naive. (Among the prayers condemned is that of the parent for the sick child, the reason being that "the Lord doesn't make little children sick so that prayers, no matter how ardent and anxious, may make Him heal one and let a thousand others perish . . ."). The author's other works may be as distinguished as the opinions quoted on the jacket suggest, but if so this is not up to his usual standard. It suffers from chronic indignation, not all of which is righteous.

G. W. RUSLING.

The Sabbath: its meaning for modern man, by A. J. Heschel. (Farrer, Straus & Young, New York, \$2.75.)

Dr. Heschel is Associate Professor of Jewish Ethics and Mysticism at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, and his book gives us some idea of how an orthodox Jew regards the Sabbath. Christians usually emphasise the grim and unyielding nature of the Jewish Sabbath in order to emphasise by contrast our Lord's attitude to it. Consequently this book will be a deeply moving experience for most of us. It is the offering of a poet and lover. Dr. Heschel holds that Judaism marked the transition from the hallowing of things and places to the hallowing of time. In true Jewish fashion he holds God's revelation to be in time and not space, as evidenced by the fact that "eternity uttered a day." The abstentions of the Sabbath rather than being bonds are analogous to the *via negativa* of the mystics because they guard the holiness of the Sabbath by saying what it is not. The real value of this book, however, is that it admits us into the author's joy and love. "There is a word that is seldom said, a word for an emotion almost too deep to be expressed: the love of the Sabbath." "Friday eve, when the Sabbath is about to engross the world, the mind, the entire soul, and the tongue is tied with trembling and joy—what is there that one could say?"

The production of the book is on a scale we have forgotten in this country, and enhances the feeling that one is dealing with a poem, not a treatise. One exhortation we should do well to observe: "One must abstain from toil and strain on the seventh day, even from strain in the service of God."

The Infinite Way, by Joel S. Goldsmith (George Allen and Unwin, 8s. 6d.)

In a world so taken up with the things on which one can bark one's shins it may be argued that any view which places the spiritual before the material is valuable. Even so, it is difficult to know what to say about this little book. It tries to state an amalgam religion of the Huxley-Heard school in Christian

terms, and in consequence the New Testament exegesis is sometimes startling. For example: "Jesus said, 'If I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you.' Was this not clear enough for all to understand? If you do not look away from the personal sense of salvation, meditation and guidance, you will not find the great Light within your own consciousness." So, "We come now to face our orthodox superstitions and to leave them, Was Jesus sent into the world by God to save it from sin, disease or slavery? No. God, the infinite Principle, Life, Truth and Love, knows no error, no evil, no sin and no sinner." The essence of true prayer is to realise that we are never separate from our good. "That which I am seeking, I am." "Here ye learn that 'the Kingdom of God is within you' and therefore prayer must be directed within to that point of consciousness where the universal life, God, becomes individualised as you or as me." The author's evident devotion to Vedanta makes his Christian transcription necessarily of the Christian Science school. Thus "The sense which presents pictures of discord, disease and death, is the universal mesmerism which produces the entire dream of human existence." "There is no evil. Let us therefore stop resistance to the particular discord or inharmony of human existence which now confronts us." "When we are confronted with any person or circumstance that appears to be mortal we must realise 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God' and all that appears mortal is allusion or nothingness. We will fear no mortal and no material circumstance because we recognise its nothingness." This is all very well for the spiritual dilettante, but would it have saved a John Bunyan or a C. H. Spurgeon? One suspects that "salvation, meditation and guidance" had to come in there, and that Enlightenment by capital letters might have proved insufficient.

Sri Auribundo and the Soul Quest of Man, by Nathaniel Pearson.
(George Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.)

Sri Auribundo was an Indian philosopher who died in 1950, and in these five essays Mr. Nathaniel Pearson, who was closely associated with him, expounds the first twelve chapters of his work *The Life Divine*. In the Preface, Mr. Pearson says: "Although the result of his work thus became more completely veiled from our outward-seeming judgment, we must not lose sight of the fact that in Sri Auribundo's written works we have for these present times the widest and most comprehensive knowledge of the Divine Reality that the world has yet known." Sri Auribundo's attempt was apparently to bring East and West together by trying to penetrate behind their divergences of approach to the primitive

knowledge of Reality expressed particularly in the Vedas and Upanishads. The wholeness of this vision became split into the passivity which seeks to experience "the Transcendent Calm and Silence" and which degenerated into illusionism in the East and on the other hand the effort to bring down into the world the very bliss and ecstasy of that Divine Reality," an active endeavour which degenerated into agnosticism in the West. Unfortunately like most of these endeavours at religious integration the result is rather too wordy and too vague to convey very much to a Western mind. Whether it would convey more to an Eastern mind is an open question. Mr. Pearson says that ". . . all cosmic Being is essentially an embodiment of Consciousness and that this pure Consciousness is itself a Being, or more properly an all-extensive Existence. In other words, Consciousness itself is the underlying reality of Cosmos." Although he thus sets aside the Eastern conception of an impersonal absolute, his capital letters bewilder at least one Western reader.

Religion and the Modern World. (George Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.)

The eight lectures here reprinted formerly appeared in the *Hibbert Journal*, and formed the series which inaugurated the London School of Religion. Let it be said at once that they are in a different class from the well-meaning but woolly attempts to find common ground among different religions with which we are now so unhappily familiar. These lectures are characterised by scholarship and spiritual insight. Viscount Samuel opens the series with two lectures on "What is happening to religion today?" and "Does religion stand to reason?" In the former he makes valuable suggestions indicating a possible way out of the old "freewill v. determinism" impasse. Dr. R. H. Thouless follows up with "Has psychology explained religion away?" in which he considers particularly the work of William James, Leuba and Freud. Fr. Cotbishley, S.J., makes a singularly lucid and valuable contribution on what can be a uselessly vague subject, "Do the mystics know?" Dean Matthews' assignation is "Religion and Religions," treated with characteristic scholarship and charity; but the really thorny question of "Religion and world unity" is left to Sir S. Radhakrishnan. His solution seems based on the Hindu discrimination between "essential spiritual experience and the varying forms in which this experience has in course of time appeared." He will hardly expect to escape a charge of syncretism in some quarters. Canon Raven speaks on "Is there a Christian politics?", and Sir Wilfred Garrett on "The Christian attitude to economics." While agreeing that "Christian" politics and "Christian" economics do not exist as such, both lecturers make valuable

suggestions for Christian action in their respective spheres. Altogether, a stimulating and worth-while little book.

DENIS LANT.

Church Organ Accompaniment, by Marmaduke P. Conway.
(Canterbury Press, 9s. 6d.)

Here is another most useful book from Dr. Conway, in which he deals with the subject of organ accompaniment in its application to the service of the Church and gives the reader the benefit of his experience by practical hints and suggestions. Beginning with a historical survey of the use of instrumental accompaniment in the church service from the earliest times, the author faces the development of Church Music and continues with chapters on the accompaniment of the present-day service, including brief notes on Plainsong. A notable feature is the chapter devoted to the Psalms, each one being discussed with a view to providing the appropriate background of organ tone, not forgetting the desirability of dispensing with the organ occasionally. Organists called upon to supply the accompaniment for performances of *Messiah* and *Elijah* will be particularly interested in the sections specially concerned with these works. Dr. Conway deals with each number separately and in detail and his hints on performance are most instructive. As he points out, an acquaintance with the full score of such works is a great advantage in translating the pianoforte accompaniment into a satisfying and effective organ-representation of the real thing: some examples of adaptation of pianoforte accompaniment are given in an appendix. Dr. Conway stresses the fact that real musicianship is needed in these matters and, in this connection, he emphasises the many requirements which an accompanist should be able to fulfil. The book is written in a very readable manner and will be a welcome addition to the organist's library.

FRANK DODSON.

Congregationalism and Reunion, by P. T. Forsyth. (Independent Press, 5s.)

Specially republished in preparation for next June's meeting at St. Andrews of the International Congregational Council, this stimulating little book reproduces two lectures delivered by Forsyth over 30 years ago. The amazing thing is that almost nothing in these pages has been rendered out-of-date by the passing of more than three decades. On the contrary, what Forsyth has to say here is as relevant and timely as though it had been written since the Archbishop's Cambridge sermon or the issue of the *Church Relations in England* report. The first paper, in Forsyth's inimit-

able way, lays before Anglicans the Free Church point of view and declares that unity lies not in order or sacraments but in the Gospel and is a question of the authority of God rather than the affinity of Christians. In the second paper Forsyth, now addressing his own people, says that Congregationalism stands for autonomy but that if local autonomy does not serve "the supreme autonomy of the Great Church amid the powers of the world" the ecumenical, the prophetic and the apostolic notes will be lost. In reunion discussions he states, Congregationalists must stand firm on the issues of ministry, polity and belief, i.e. they must demand recognition of their existing orders, insist that unity is not a matter of polity, for no polity is sacrosanct, and they must declare that in respect of belief they are "in the true Catholic succession, which is the Evangelical," doing so not by means of a creed for individual subscription, but as a confession of living faith. The publishers have done well to issue this profound yet clear and illuminating book. Always wise, often trenchant and epigrammatic, it will be welcomed in circles wider than Congregationalism alone. Certainly Baptists will profit from reading it.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

Spiritual Healing, by Arthur Dakin. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 9d.)

This is as stimulating and provocative in print as when delivered as an address to the Ministers' Fellowship. With his main emphases—that psycho-analysis is work for the expert, that in healing by suggestion and praying for the sick we must add, "if it be God's will," and that our main business in this sphere is prevention and getting men spiritually healthy from the start—there will be general assent. But queries may arise about the assertion that, "there are no conditions that we can stage to make miracles possible. . . . Nor is faith enough. . . . I should be hopeless, I think, if I had to believe that God's power and mercy was at all times exactly and nicely conditioned by my faith." One would agree that "an excessive subjectivism is disastrous" and that miracle "is God's work and not ours." But that staggering statement in the first two Gospels about the inability of Jesus to do mighty works because of their unbelief sticks in one's mind. "Unbelief and contempt of Christ stop the current of His favours," said Matthew Henry. Surely the implication here is that more faith would have made more mighty works, even if we cannot equate the two mathematically? But this pamphlet will do nothing but good. Whether it provokes agreement or disagreement, both will become better informed.

E. BUCKLEY.

The Tree of Life and other verses, by Nathaniel Micklem.
(Oxford University Press, 7s. 6d.)

These excellent poems express, under the image of the Tree of Life which links heaven and earth, the "questionings of sense and outward things" of a wise and scholarly mind. Dr. Micklem challenges our acceptance of the explanations and definitions of the powers around us given by scientific knowledge or cold reason, and he suggests that they are no nearer wisdom than mythology or even superstition; he asks his questions always from the firm assurance of Christian faith.

Written in compact Spenserians, they cannot be read hastily, and they stimulate speculation by their careful but pleasing expression of thought. This form is notoriously difficult to handle happily, but here the thorny problem of Spenserian diction is only occasionally raised.

The rest of the book contains poems in various metres with a more personal and domestic approach, all pleasing and some outstanding. The light verses at the end recall the author's searching humorous glances over his spectacles; they are a cheerful conclusion to a thoughtful and attractive book.

DAVID J. DANIELL

The Atlantic Community of the Early Friends, by Frederick B. Tolles. (Friends Historical Society, 2s. 6d.)

In these interesting pages is reproduced the presidential address given at Lancaster last August to the Friends' Historical Society by Dr. F. B. Tolles of Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania. It shows how, following the comparative failure of Quaker missions to Europe and the East, the Friends found in N. America a field so well prepared by Puritanism that a fruitful harvest was gathered by the Quakers who, from 1655 onwards, travelled back and forth across the Atlantic in considerable numbers. The result was the growth of the Atlantic Community, a remarkable fellowship united by love, a common faith and the constant interchange of epistles and personal visits. It is a remarkable story of courage, faith and zeal and is here told with great skill.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.

Scottish Journal of Theology, Dec. 1952 (4s. 6d.) contains articles, "The Command of God the Creator" by W. A. Whitehouse, "The O.T. Conception of Miracle" by H. Knight, "The Ecumenical Significance of Anglicanism" by S. Bailey, "The Term 'Life' in Syriac Theology" by A. F. J. Klijn, a revaluation of St. Anselm by C. R. Walker, and a study of *Mark xvi.* 1-8 by C. E. B. Cranfield and the usual reviews. [Published quarterly by Oliver & Boyd].