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

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

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY

VOL. XVI., No. 3. JULY, 1955.

Editorial Notes

THE event of the year so far as Baptists are concerned is, of course, the Jubilee Congress of the Baptist World Alliance. Included in the crowded programme is a Conference for Baptist Historians and Librarians on Friday, 22nd July, at 2.30 p.m. in Dr. Williams's Library. The chairman is Mr. Seymour J. Price. We understand that Dr. Theron D. Price of Louisville, Kentucky, has been invited to speak on "The Revival of Anabaptist Studies and the Baptist View of the Church," and that Dr. W. M. S. West, of Oxford, and Dr. S. L. Stealey, of Wake Forest, Carolina, have been asked to open the discussion. Admission is by ticket.

* * * *

By the death of Mr. W. Nefydd Lewis, of Gilwern, Abergavenny, the Baptist Historical Society has lost an ardent and persistent advocate and friend. Its need of support was the subject of his last address to the Monmouthshire Association. On his father's side Mr. Lewis was descended from James Jewis, pastor from 1791 to 1837 of the historic Llanwenarth church. His grandfather was William Nefydd Roberts, a Baptist minister who was one of the most distinguished Welshmen of the nineteenth century, and whose Letter to the Monmouthshire Association was reprinted in our issue of July, 1953. Other ancestors included Rev. Daniel Rowland, of Gainsborough, and Rev. Daniel Jones, well-known preacher and hymnist. It is not surprising that, coming from such stock, Mr. Lewis delighted in matters historical.

* * * *

"The Lesser-known Writings of John Bunyan" was the subject of an enlightening address by Dr. Morris West, of Regent's Park College, at the Baptist Historical Society's Annual Meeting at the Church House on 25th April. In spite of an enforced, last-minute change of meeting-place, there was a good attendance and, after tea, a short business session was held under the chairmanship of Mr. Seymour J. Price. This included the usual reports and elections. General approval was given for an appeal to be made for donations to clear the large, accumulated deficit. One gift of £10 had already been promised. It is hoped that when the appeal is issued there will

be a generous response. It was noted that in three years' time the Society will celebrate its jubilee.

* * * *

Just as today the question is debated as to whether certain eminent persons of the past, such as Bunyan and Milton, were or were not Baptists, so at future times it may well be that "Was Lloyd George a Baptist?" will be the subject of argument. This thought has been prompted by the stimulating experience of reading Frank Owen's recent biography of the Welsh Wizard, *Tempestuous Journey*, published by Hutchinson. Throughout the book Lloyd George is described as a Baptist. His baptism at the age of twelve in a brook at Criccieth is recorded, his arguments as a boy on the subject of baptism with the theologically-minded village blacksmith are recalled and there is an amusing account of how, when the Diocesan Inspector visited the village school to hear the pupils recite the Creed and answer questions on the catechism he led his classmates in a conspiracy of silence as a protest against the paedobaptist tenets in the latter.

Was the magnetic orator-statesman a Baptist? The Welsh Baptists regarded him as such. He delivered an annual address at their church in Castle Street, London, and appeared more than once on their Union platform. He took part in the B.W.A. Congress of 1905. But although referring to him as a Baptist, Frank Owen mentions that Berea Chapel, Criccieth, of which Lloyd George was a member, was "of the straitest Baptist sect of the Campbellites . . . 'The Disciples of Christ' they called themselves" (p. 17). This chapel has an interesting history. Toward the end of the eighteenth century it followed the famous preacher J. R. Jones, of Ramoth (Merionethshire)—in spite of the efforts of Christmas Evans to dissuade them—in withdrawing from the Baptists and accepting the teachings of Alexander McLean. This meant, among other things, that its ministry was vested in two elders. One of these was the gifted and versatile shoemaker David Lloyd, grandfather of Lloyd George. In 1843, four years after his death, Berea seceded from the "Scotch Baptists" upon acceptance of the principles of Alexander Campbell. Sixteen years later, David Lloyd's son, Richard, was called to the joint eldership of the church. A man of rare spirit his influence upon his famous nephew was considerable. It seems clear that but for the fact that his people's principles were opposed to a professional ministry Lloyd George would have become a Baptist minister. What a genius was lost to the Baptist pulpit by the action taken in 1798 by Berea Chapel members! It was not for nothing, however, that Lloyd George was described by Lord Rosebery as "the great protagonist of Nonconformity." We notice that Berea is, however, included in the 1955 *Baptist Union Handbook.*

The Priesthood of All Believers

"THE Priesthood of all Believers." It seems an innocuous enough phrase today—a piece of theological tradition worn smooth with the years, and able to be taken for granted. But history shows that this phrase conceals explosive forces, and that it has been capable in times past of kindling the passions of men in an extraordinary degree, and of inspiring them with a courage and devotion of the rarest kind. The phrase is in fact more like a battle cry than a dogma, and if we do not feel its power today as our fathers did, that is partly because conditions have changed. The actual principles involved are as vital as ever, and it may be that, with a change of social climate, we shall once more realise in a new way their great power.

The idea of the priesthood of all believers is biblical, and the Church Fathers recognised it in a general way as a kind of ideal. Tertullian, in his Montanist days, was specially attracted by it, though he did not make much of it. It was with Martin Luther and the era of the Protestant Reformation that the notion really came into its own. For then men realised that here was a scriptural principle which on the one hand expressed something vital about God and their relations to Him, while on the other it pointed the way to a remedy for the great religious evils of their day.

The phrase "Priesthood of all Believers" is based upon a passage in the second chapter of *1 Peter,* although there are echoes of it also in the *Apocalypse* of St. John (chapters i., v. and xx.). The writer of *1 Peter* is trying to get his readers to appreciate the immense significance of their position as members of the Christian Church, and he borrows for this purpose certain metaphors originally applied in the Old Testament to the Jews. Christians must realise—he says in effect—that in the inscrutable wisdom of God the Christian Church has now been given the place in the Divine economy originally intended for Israel. The Jews were called by God (according to *Exodus* xix. 6) to be "a kingdom of priests and an holy nation," and they had forfeited their position by rejecting Jesus Christ. Now by the grace of God the members of the Christian Church have been promoted to that position. They are a holy community called out from mankind to serve God as their king. They are "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession" (*1 Peter* ii. 9). They are to be so united by faith through Jesus Christ that they grow up

together in Him like "living stones," as it were, in a temple destined for the worship and service of God (ii. 5). As the author of the *Apocalypse* puts it: Christ "made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto his God and Father" (i. 6).

The fundamental idea is thus both simple and profound. It is that the Christian Church is a corporate body called into being by God through His Son that it may worship and serve Him, or —as St. Peter puts it—"to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ," and to "show forth the excellencies of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvellous light" (*1 Peter* ii. 5/9). The actual nature of these spiritual sacrifices is not specified, but I think those commentators are right who understand St. Peter to refer, not to ritual actions but rather to living service which the Church is to offer to God. In the light of these and other relevant passages we may say that the New Testament recognises two and only two kinds of priesthood which are of enduring significance. First and foremost there is the Priesthood of Jesus Christ, with which the Epistle to the Hebrews in particular is very deeply concerned. He is our great High Priest, whose sacrifice of Himself once for all on the Cross was accepted by God as a final and sufficient offering for the sins of the whole world. This offering is continued still in the unseen for, as *Hebrews* vii. 25 puts it: "He is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through Him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." In Trinitarian language, we might say that in the triune Being of the Godhead, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are eternally active in that relationship of mutual self-giving which is perfect Love. In addition to this priestly work of Christ, however, and as an outcome of it, the New Testament speaks also of a priestly service which the Church of Christ is expected to render as the manifestation of her union with her Lord. That living expression of the Church's love and duty towards her Master is in fact the "royal priesthood," as St. Peter calls it, which is the equivalent of the Priesthood of all Believers.

This Christian priesthood differs from that so constantly referred to in the Old Testament in three significant respects: First, unlike the Jewish priesthood, it is based solely upon the atoning work of Jesus. His perfect offering of Himself on the cross fulfilled the ancient Jewish sacrifices, satisfied the requirements of the law, and fully accomplished what the Jewish sacrifices had only symbolised and prefigured. Thus there is no longer any further need or room for sacrifices of the Old Testament pattern. Secondly, the Priesthood of all Believers is a service to God which is not confined simply to certain representative officials, but which is expected from all God's people. No one can contract out of it. Every believer is included in the benefits of Christ's passion and

death, and equally every believer must render to his Master that form of service which he is best fitted to offer to the glory of God. This service of believers is essentially a corporate offering made by persons who know themselves to be bound together in a living community through faith and love for Jesus Christ. "Such a priesthood," says Dr. Hort, "is doubtless shared by each member of the community in due measure, but only insofar as he is virtually an organ of the whole body; and the universality of the function is compatible with variations of mode and degree as to its exercise" (Commentary). It is a priesthood of the whole Church. Finally, the Christian priesthood differs from that of Israel inasmuch as it is fulfilled, not in ritual acts alone but in personal service for God as wide and as varied as life itself. F. W. Beare calls attention to the fact that "the Greek word *hiereus*—meaning priest—was never taken over by the Church to denote any office or function in its own ministry" (Commentary). So when St. John says that Christ made us "to be priests (*hiereis*) unto his God and Father," he did not mean that as Christians we are appointed to perform certain ceremonial rites, but rather that, as members of the Church of Christ, we are empowered and obliged by His Spirit to make of our lives a sacrificial gift acceptable to God. Compare the words of St. Paul to his readers at Rome: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service" (xii. 1).

WATCHWORD OF REFORM

So much then for priesthood as it is understood in the New Testament. According to Dr. T. M. Lindsay, this interpretation was generally accepted also in the early years of the life of the Church. "The idea of the priesthood of all believers was firmly rooted in the thoughts of the early Christians even although the constant use of the Old Testament naturally led them from a very early period to draw some comparisons between the leaders of their public devotions and the priests and Levites of the Jewish Church." There was, says Dr. Lindsay, some growth of superstitious accretions. Yet notwithstanding this, "the evangelical thought that the sacrifices of the New Covenant are the worship of the people, and that the priesthood is the whole worshipping congregation was always the ruling idea" (*Church and Ministry*, pp. 307-9). In the course of succeeding centuries, however, the situation underwent a radical change, and a change very much for the worse. It would probably be widely accepted that the third century and, in particular, the teaching of Bishop Cyprian of Carthage marked an important stage in the development of the new outlook. It was from that point onwards that priesthood

came to be identified with a certain class of church officers who were regarded more and more as indispensable mediators between God and the believer, and indeed as judges in Christ's stead. By the 16th century the results of this development had so disordered the life of the Church that pressure towards reform had reached breaking-point. It only required the (at first) moderate proposals of Martin Luther to set in motion forces which disrupted Western Christendom, and in due time gave birth to the great Protestant communions which we know today. The important point for our purpose is that one of the great watchwords of the new Reform Movement was the Priesthood of all Believers. The whole historical situation prior to the Reformation is immensely rich and complicated, but it will be helpful to quote the very careful and not unsympathetic judgment of Dr. R. C. Moberly:

> "There can I suppose be no doubt that, at least to a considerable section of popular unreformed thought, the Priesthood was mechanical, and the Sacraments material, to an extraordinary degree; that outward observance had constantly taken the place of spirituality; that superstitious formalism, hard, cold and unintelligent, had proved too often the paralysis of personal religion; that the Mass was too often, much in the heathen sense, or the Old Testament manner at its worst, a completed sacrifice—i.e. an outward performance of intrinsic efficacy, to be so many times repeated, with a value arithmetically calculable; and so that the Priest stood as a real intermediary between the *plebs Christiana* and its God—to make, by sacrifice, atonement for sin." (*Ministerial Priesthood,* c. vii.).

These are strong words which Dr. Moberly does not use without recognising also what must be said on the other side. His judgment is that the violence of the Protestant reformation is best explicable as a reaction against a religious situation which had become literally intolerable to the common man.

> "The full force of this eager destructiveness turned itself most of all against everything which was connected in popular feeling with Purgatory, and the Mass, and sacrificing Priesthood. Nothing indeed but the hideous exaggerations connected in popular feeling with this whole phraseology could fully account for the abiding savageness of the popular instinct against it." (*ib.*).

It would be a mistake to suppose that Martin Luther was the first to protest against the existing state of affairs. For centuries past, little groups of persons, of whom the Anabaptists were the latest, many of them of humble origin, had borne their witness to truth at the cost of great persecution and suffering. Both the English Reformer, John Wyclif, and, later, the Continental scholars, Erasmus and Zwingli, laboured in the interests of reform. But Luther, it seems, supplied the requisite dynamic; and it was in Luther's teaching about the Priesthood of all believers, in particular, that men recognised once more the authentic accents of New Testament Christianity. Here are some of the things which

this young monk said about the Priesthood and about priests in the earliest days of the Reformation:

> "How if they were compelled to admit that *we all, so many as have been baptized, are equally priests?* . . . Thus it is said, 'Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation' (1 *Peter* ii, 9). Thus all we who are Christians are priests; those whom we call priests are ministers chosen from among us to do all things in our name, and the priesthood is nothing else than a ministry." (*Bab. Captivity,* 396).
>
> "However sacred and lofty may be the works of priests or of the religious orders, they differ not at all in the sight of God from the works of a husbandman labouring in his field, or of a woman attending to her household affairs" (*ib.*, 362).
>
> "Since what we call the priesthood is a ministry, I do not see at all for what reason a man who has once been made priest cannot become a layman again, since *he differs in no wise from a layman, except by his ministerial office*" (*ib.*, 400).
>
> "Therefore a priest should be nothing in Christendom but a functionary. . . . It follows, then, that between laymen and priests, princes and bishops, or . . . between spiritual and temporal persons, *the only real difference is one of office and function, and not of estate*" (*Add. to the Nobility,* p. 164).

Is it any wonder in the face of such a challenge that the rulers of the Church of Luther's day did their best to silence him? Professor G. D. Henderson issues a salutary warning when he says:

> "The Reformer at first expressed himself with impartial enthusiasm and sweeping vigour, but he [later] panicked into a conservatism that came to involve state control and clerical officialism, and an externalism almost as strangulating as that from which he escaped." (*Scot. Journal of Theol.,* March, 1954).

Yet Luther was really only saying at first in his own way what we have already seen to be the teaching of the New Testament. As Dr. Beard says:

> "The Counter-Reformation removed many practical abuses, and might have proceeded to legalise even the marriage of the clergy, without touching the essential principle of Catholic Christianity. That principle is the nourishing of the religious life by sacraments, which can be duly administered only by a sacerdotal order. Whatever church says and means 'priest' is on the Catholic side of the great controversy of Christianity; whatever church says and means 'minister,' in that act proclaims itself Protestant" (*The Reformation,* p. 135).

CONSEQUENCES OF ERROR

Although Luther recalled men once more to the New Testament teaching about Christian Priesthood, he could not undo at one stroke the consequences of centuries of error, and it will be worth while to pause for a moment to consider two of those consequences from which we still suffer today. One of them is the simple fact that for very many Protestants the word "priest" carries still such painful associations that they find it hard to accept heartily the idea of the priestly function even of the Church.

No doubt the phrase "the Priesthood of all Believers" is a Protestant slogan; but it is questionable whether its meaning is generally understood, and there is a widespread tendency to give it an individualistic twist which is anything but Christian. In the New Testament, as we have seen, the governing idea is that the Christian Church as a whole is dedicated to the service of Almighty God. Her members are bound together as a spiritual community rooted in Christ, and so they are "a royal priesthood, a holy nation," whose task it is to worship and serve God throughout the whole range of life's duties and opportunities. In that sense it is true to say that all believers are priests. But they are not priests in their own private right, i.e. as independent individuals. They are truly priests only as they are loyal fellow-members in the Church which is the Body of Christ, and as they share in a sacrificial activity which is common to all, and is inspired by the indwelling Presence of the Holy Spirit. In that way and in that way alone, can they be delivered from an individualism which is none the less wrong because it disguises itself as religious, and be baptized into the self-giving activity of the Spirit of Christ. This truth was well expressed by the late Principal Fairbairn when, in contrasting the witness of evangelical Christianity with the affirmations of Anglo-Catholicism, he said:

> "Further, over against their official priesthood, let us place the spiritual priesthood, the office and function at once common and sacred to all believers. . . . Let us create in our little churches the feeling, certain to lift them above all littleness of spirit or of speech, that they are priestly bodies, where every man by watching and prayer, by personal communion with God and loving intercourse with men, can help to work the reconciliation of humanity and God" (*Studies in Religion and Theology*, p. 138).

The second unfortunate consequence following upon the great controversy about priesthood has been to cast doubt into many minds concerning the subject of the Christian Ministry. In fact, one not infrequently finds the phrase "the Priesthood of all Believers" made a ground for questioning the need or justification for a separated Ministry. Yet that is certainly not the view of the New Testament, which regards the Church's ministry as the gift of Christ to His people (*Ephes.* iv. 11ff.). Nor did the Reformers, in standing for the priesthood of all believers, intend to decry the office of the Ministry. On the contrary, they took pains to assert its necessity. But they did so in terms which ought to relieve any anxiety that they were attempting to fasten a new yoke upon the Church. For the real point of their contention is that the Ministry is not a status but an office in the Church.

> "Let every man then," says Luther, "who has learnt that he is a Christian recognise what he is, and be certain that we are all equally priests, i.e. that we have the same power in the Word and in any

> sacrament whatever, although it is not lawful for anyone to use this power except with the consent of the community or at the call of a superior. For that which belongs to all in common no individual can arrogate to himself until he be called. And therefore the Sacrament of Orders, if it is anything, is nothing but a certain rite by which men are called to minister in the Church" (*Bab. Cap.*, p. 399).

In a similar way, according to Professor Henderson: "Calvinistic tradition maintains that the New Testament knows nothing of any priests but the believers who constitute the Christian community; but on biblical grounds it steadily insists upon a divinely called as well as a duly qualified, ordained and elected ministry" (*Scot. J. Theol.*, March, 1954). Of course there is always the danger, as Milton said, that new Presbyter may be but old Priest writ large. But that is only because it is just as easy for presbyters as for priests to mistake their true standing in the life of the Church. The actual situation could not be better expressed than in the following words of a German scholar:

> "The relationship of the priesthood of all believers to the activity of the Church may be stated best by saying that while genuine Christian piety in the individual believer is the necessary presupposition for all service on behalf of the Church, it is not sufficient in itself, but must be completed by the requisite training and development before the Church is justified in authorising its public exercise. The individual Christian is assured through his 'priesthood' of immediate access to God without any human intermediary, and on this basis he is personally responsible for his own religious and moral development. Nevertheless, it must be understood that this right does not relieve him of the duty of playing his due part in the life of the Church and of the community, and also of learning from the judgement of others" (Schian, *R.G.G.*, IV, 1495).

In passing we may say that this was substantially the position of our Baptist forefathers although they would not all have expressed themselves in quite the same way. The latest Baptist Union statement (1948) on the subject says:

> "It is the church which preaches the Word and celebrates the sacraments, and it is the church which, through pastoral oversight, feeds the flock and ministers to the world. It normally does these things through the person of its minister, but not solely through him. Any member of the church may be authorised by it, on occasion, to exercise the functions of the ministry, in accordance with the principle of the priesthood of all believers. . . . Baptists, however, have had from the beginning an exalted conception of the office of the Christian minister and have taken care to call men to serve as pastors. The minister's authority to exercise his office comes from the call of God in his personal experience, but this call is tested and approved by the church of which he is a member and (as is increasingly the rule) by the representatives of a large group of churches."

Even in this statement there may be detected a slight tendency to confuse the Priesthood of all Believers with ministerial office. That is quite easy to do, for, as we have seen, these two

things are integrally connected. Nevertheless, they are not identical, and the distinction between them needs to be kept clear. The Priesthood of all Believers, in so far as it is applied to individuals, is the indispensable qualification for ministerial office of any kind in the Christian Church. The office itself, whatever it may be, is an additional opportunity to serve which may only be conferred by the Church acting in the Name of Christ. What one finds a little surprising in Reformed statements generally is that not only the administration of the sacraments but also the preaching of the Word is placed under the control of the Church. One would have thought that, with the example of the Old Testament prophets before them, our fathers would have distinguished between these two ministerial functions in such a way as to admit greater freedom in the one case than in the other. But perhaps the situation described by St. Paul at Corinth was not exceptional, and the Church had early to learn by bitter experience that it was not in the best interests of the kingdom of God that the decision "to preach or not to preach" should be left to the unaided judgment of the individual believer. In this as in other respects a man's personal sense of call to public work is not infallible, but should be checked by the judgment of the church.

CONCLUSIONS

Four brief conclusions seem to emerge.

(1) There can be no true relationship between man and God which does not finally rest upon the sole mediatorship of Christ. The Gospel accords to man, both individually and corporately, an extraordinary freedom of access by faith to God—nothing less in fact than the freedom of a child in his father's house—and this in spite of God's holiness and man's continuing sinfulness. This is a paradox which is in fact resolved by the simple, yet sufficient, requirement that the believer's approach to God must always be through Christ. No human mediator is required, or can indeed be tolerated, without violating what our fathers called the "Crown Rights of the Redeemer." Man's freedom and competency in the things of religion derive solely from the Lord Jesus Christ and it is only because we have in Him such a High Priest that we can "draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace" (*Heb.* iv. 16).

(2) If we are to recover for our day the true significance of Priesthood, we must first ask what it meant for Jesus. We are told that Cyprian modelled his conception of the priesthood upon the hierarchical system of the Old Testament. But that was surely the wrong place to begin, as the subsequent history of Cyprian's ideas goes to prove. Christians are to be ruled by Jesus Christ and not by the Old Testament. Therefore, if we ask what the Gospel means by Priesthood we must look to the teaching and

ministry, the passion and death of our Master for the answer. When we do that, we see at once how revolutionary was the change which Jesus wrought. He broke down once for all the barrier between the sacred and the secular. He fulfilled his priestly mission for God most characteristically not in the Temple but in the villages and by the lakeside of Galilee. He was at His priestly work not only when he was praying for men or shedding His blood on their behalf, but as He moved amongst them teaching, healing, forgiving and strengthening them in the love of God. All was done as an offering to His heavenly Father in brotherly love towards, and on behalf of, men. His compassion flowed out to all in ceaseless benediction, such as recalls the beautiful image of Keats:

> "The moving waters at their priestlike task
> Of pure ablution round earth's human shores."

The Epistle to the Hebrews was right when it says: "We have not a high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (iv. 15). Thus, to sum up, we may say: The priesthood of Jesus was set squarely in the context of a sinful, suffering world, which it was His mission to redeem and bring to God. Worship and service were its twin principles. And since the servant is not greater than his Lord, every other priesthood worthy of the name must be based on that pattern, and draw its strength from that divine Spring. For His word to His disciples was: "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you" (*John* xx. 21). "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation" (*Mark* xvi. 15).

(3) We have seen that Christian Priesthood is essentially the priesthood of the Church living in the midst of men to minister to them in the name of Christ, the King. He Himself laid down the outline of this priestly task. It remains for the priesthood of all believers, through prayer and love and service, to fill in that outline, and to give content to the Master's will. (We may recall here the words of St. Paul: "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church" (*Coloss.* i. 24).) That being so, it is vital that the responsibility for this task should be shared by all believers. The Church is not a collection of individuals, any one of whom may be ignored without loss. It is a living organism in which, as in a human body, every member counts, so that as St. Paul remarked: "All the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth . . . maketh increase of the body . . . in love" (*Eph.* iv. 16). Experience has shown that the attempt to concen-

trate power in the hands of a special priestly caste within the Church sets up tensions which are fatal to peace and unity, and hinder the progress of the kingdom of God. The energies of the whole Church are intended to be engaged, and it should be one of the chief tasks of ecclesiastical statesmanship to bring this about. Human nature is such that some Christians have to be exhorted to take their rightful share in the work of the Church while, for others, the temptation is of another sort, so that they tend to appropriate to themselves more power than they can rightly use. It belongs to the wisdom of the Church to adjust the balance fairly, and to see that the maximum use is made of all the resources available. For example, we shall never know what the cause of Christ through the centuries has lost through the Church's failure on the one hand to enlist fully the co-operation of her lay members, and on the other to make adequate use of the ministry of women. It may be true that some believers have little to offer. But, as members of the Church, that is nothing like so important as that they should identify themselves wholeheartedly with the common task, and be encouraged to make their own particular contribution to it.

(4) Finally, in the discharge of her priestly mission, the Church stands in constant need of trained leadership; or, to put it another way, whatever the difficulties connected with the regular Ministry, and they are many—the Church cannot dispense with the services of specially gifted persons qualified to undertake the highest functions in her economy. The preaching of the Gospel, the conduct of public worship, the teaching of the Bible, the care of the flock—these are highly responsible duties necessary to the life of the Church, and requiring a skill and experience beyond the competence of the majority of Christian believers. Those to whom the Church entrusts these functions are not priests in any sense different from that in which, as we have seen, all believers are priests. They are, to quote St. Paul: "Your servants for Jesus' sake" (*2 Cor.* iv. 5). But as leaders whom Christ has given to His Church they are rightly to be held in honour, and no pains must be spared both to secure the finest material for the service of the Gospel, and to give to the Church's ministers the training and support they need.

> "Unto Him who loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father, to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever, Amen."

R. L. CHILD

The Origin of Catholic Unity in Spain

This article forms a part of one chapter in a forthcoming book by Dr. Hughey entitled Religious Liberty in Spain: its Ebb and Flow, *to be published jointly by the Carey Kingsgate Press and the Broadman Press, by whose kind permission the article is here printed.*

"WE had rather have ten million Communists in Spain than one million Protestants. The worst thing that could happen to our country would be a religious division."[1] This statement in a Barcelona newspaper in 1949 reflects the centuries-old determination of influential elements in Spain to prevent the growth of Protestantism and to preserve the Catholic unity of the nation.

Non-Catholic religions enjoy only a very limited toleration in Spain today. Protestant worship has been authorised in certain chapels, but they can have no signs on them, and there can be no preaching or religious services in streets or other public places. With only three or four exceptions, permits to open new chapels have not been given since the latter part of 1947. Proselytism and evangelism are officially forbidden, though not fully suppressed. The Bible and other religious literature cannot be published legally by Protestants, and such literature sent from abroad often does not pass the censor.

Spanish Protestants are not permitted to have their own schools, and their children are generally subject to Catholic instruction in the state and parochial schools. Members of the armed services are required to participate in public religious functions unless excused by their officers, and Protestants are denied the right to serve as army officers. Burial with Protestant rites is sometimes forbidden, and marriage outside the Roman Catholic Church is often impossible for those baptized in that Church even though they have become members of another.

After years of broad religious toleration and even brief periods of full religious liberty, Spain has turned back towards Catholic unity, which became a characteristic feature of Spanish national life in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It is the basis of much Spanish legislation and of the 1953 Concordat between Spain and the Holy See. The bloody persecution which characterised earlier centuries is not present today, but the adherence to the principle of

[1] *El correo catalan*, Barcelona, May 29, 1949.

Catholic unity by Spain's religious and political leaders results in many restrictions upon the activities of religious minorities. This principle is rooted in religion and patriotism.

Many Spaniards are loyal Catholics deeply interested in the welfare and progress of their Church. They regard their country as eminently Catholic and as obligated, therefore, to further the cause of the Catholic Church and to follow its teachings in all of their implications. A defender of the present regime says: "The Spain of Franco . . . is Catholic Spain, the only country in the world that at the present time has known how to crystallize in its laws and its life the full ideal of state Christianity, without the slightest concession to the religious errors of recent centuries; the only country in the world that practises officially and openly the only true religion with all its agreeable and disagreeable, convenient and inconvenient, consequences."[2] No other Spanish government since 1868 has sensed so keenly as the present one the obligation to make the country thoroughly Catholic, but there have always been Spaniards who wanted to follow "the full ideal of state Christianity."

A CATHOLIC STATE

This ideal points back to the religious unity which prevailed in the later Roman Empire and in medieval times, when the states of Christendom were what would be called today Catholic states. A Catholic state has been defined in recent years as "a community which is composed exclusively of Catholic subjects and which recognises Catholicism as the only true religion,"[3] and as "a political community that is exclusively,, or almost exclusively, made up of Catholics."[4] In such a state, as Pope Leo XIII pointed out, the Catholic Church considers it "unlawful to place the various forms of worship on the same footing as the true religion" or to tolerate other religions except "for the sake of securing some great good or hindering some great evil."[5] Advocates of an official policy of Catholic unity in Spain have believed that their country was or could be a truly Catholic state.

Closely tied up with the religious opposition to non-Catholic religions in Spain is opposition inspired by a certain type of nationalism or patriotism. National unity has been regarded by many Spaniards as founded upon and dependent upon religious unity.

[2] Domingo de Arrese, *La España de Franco* (Madrid: Publicaciones Españolas, 1946), p. 18.

[3] Joseph Pohle, "Toleration, Religious," *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, XIV, 771.

[4] John A. Ryan and Moorhouse F. X. Millar, *The State and the Church* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924), p. 37.

[5] Pope Leo XIII, "The Christian Constitution of States. Encyclical Letter *Immortale Dei*, November 1, 1885," in Ryan and Millar, *op cit*, p. 19.

Well known in Spain is the argument that the Catholic religion in early times overcame the geographical and racial barriers that separated the inhabitants of Spanish soil, later on inspired the struggle for freedom from the Moors, and then guided Ferdinand and Isabella in the unification of Spain and the creation of a great nation.[6] When Charles V made Spain the centre of a great empire and Philip II ruled over a mighty and prosperous nation, Catholicism was an all-important factor in Spanish life. Spain's era of national greatness coincided with a period of intolerance and religious zeal, and intolerance and greatness have been equated by many Spaniards. Towards the latter part of the nineteenth century a distinguished Spanish scholar wrote: "Spain, evangeliser of half the planet; Spain, hammer of heretics, light of Trent, sword of Rome, cradle of Saint Ignatius—this is our greatness and our glory: we have no other."[7]

There can be no doubt that the occupation of Spain by Mohammedan Moors and the slow and painful reconquest of the country by Spaniards who professed Christianity gave rise to a fusion of religion and patriotism. It is worthy of note, however, that the period of the Moorish occupation was, on the whole, one of at least limited religious toleration. Christians and Jews lived with a large degree of freedom and tranquility under Mohammedan rule. During the centuries of the Reconquest, Christian and Moorish kings sometimes forgot their enmities and formed friendships and alliances. In the Christian kingdoms, Christians, Moors and Jews lived on better terms than would have been possible in most of the rest of Europe. From the thirteenth century on, however, intolerance on the part of people and governments grew in the Spanish kingdoms, and by the latter part of the fifteenth century it had become an integral part of national policy.[8] At that time such a policy was not peculiar to Spain. The singularity of the Spanish nation in this respect rests upon the deep root which the policy took and its continued vigour long after most of the world had forsaken it.

The new national policy of intolerance received clear expression in the establishment of the Inquisition by Ferdinand and Isabella. To this institution, says one writer, the modern Spaniard owes as much, "whether by attraction or by repulsion, as Britain does to her parliamentary constitution."[9] The Spanish rulers did not, of

[6] Vicente de la Fuente, *La pluralidad de cultos y sus inconvenientes* (Puebla: Imprenta de Narciso Bassols, Editor, 1868), pp. 200ff.

[7] Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles* (Madrid: Librería Católica de San José, 1880-1881), III, 834.

[8] Henry Charles Lea, *A History of the Inquisition in Spain* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1906-1907), I, 52-71.

[9] G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1938), p. 283.

course, invent the Inquisition; they only revived it for Spain and gave it a somewhat different form. They began it as a means of dealing with Jews who had falsely professed conversion to Christianity. In 1478 they requested and received a papal Bull authorising them to set up the Inquisition in their kingdoms, and within a few years the Holy Office was fully organised, with Torquemada as inquisitor general for Aragon and Castile.[10]

The secret procedure of the Inquisition, its use of torture to obtain confessions and incriminations, and its severe penalties made it a dreaded institution. The worst penalty was death by burning (which was executed by civil officials after trial by the Inquisition), but the penances, the floggings, the loss of property, and the long imprisonments were also greatly feared. The Spanish Inquisition presented an impressive combination of the authority of the Church and the power of the Crown, since it represented both Pope and King. In later reigns it was sometimes an instrument of the king's will and sometimes an almost sovereign and all-powerful organisation.[11]

In establishing the Inquisition, Ferdinand and Isabella were doubtless moved by both religious and political considerations. Many Jews had professed conversion to the Catholic faith in order to obtain security and privilege, and others had been swept into the Church by persuasive evangelists. Many of these converted Jews and their descendants became prominent in government and even in the Church; but there lingered strong suspicions of their sincerity, and without doubt there were many who made false professions of conversion or of loyalty to the Catholic faith. These false Christians were considered a reproach to the Church and an impediment to the national unity which was being achieved. It was believed that it would help the Church and the State to bring them into conformity, or to eliminate them.[12]

The Holy Office dealt effectively with the Jews who had accepted baptism, but it had no jurisdiction over the others, unless they had committed some offence against the faith such as proselytism. The peninsula was being unified, and it was regarded as necessary to find some means of removing the Jewish hindrance to national uniformity. Other nations—France and England, for example—had expelled the Jews centuries earlier, and this was the solution decided upon by the rulers of Spain. In 1492, following the conquest of Granada and, therefore, the completion of the Reconquest, the Jews were given the alternative of accepting baptism or leaving the country. This meant, of course, that the way for them to become Spaniards was to be converted to the Catholic

[10] Lea, *op cit*, I, 156-173
[11] *Ibid*, p. 289.
[12] *Ibid*, pp. 89-130.

religion. Some accepted baptism and remained in Spain, but thousands emigrated, amid scenes of terror and misery. When the Pope granted to Ferdinand and Isabella the title of "Catholic sovereigns" (which was passed on to their successors), the expulsion of the Jews was listed among the services to the faith entitling them to this honour. Without doubt, however, their reasons were political as well as religious—probably more political than religious.[13]

There remained one great barrier to Catholic unity—and to national unity, so it was believed—the presence of the Moors in Spain. Early in the sixteenth century they began to be faced with the alternative which had faced the Jews: baptism or emigration. Some left the country, but others accepted baptism and remained, though in many cases they continued to hold more or less secretly to their old religion. Eventually all people of Moorish descent, including many who were genuine Catholics, were expelled from the country. To such extremes was the Spanish nation willing to go for the sake of unity.[14]

THE SPANISH REFORMATION

A new threat to Catholic unity arose in the sixteenth century when a Protestant Reformation started in Spain. One author states that there were probably one thousand Protestants in Seville, one thousand in Valladolid, and one thousand in other parts of Spain,[15] but the number might have been smaller. The significance of the Spanish Reformation does not lie in the number of people involved but rather in their strategic position in Spanish society and the influence which in time they might have exerted upon the Spanish state and the life and culture of the nation. The Catholic writer Balmes declared: "Distinguished ecclesiastics, members of the clergy, nuns, important laymen, in a word, individuals of the most influential classes, were found infected by the new errors."[16] It should be added that there were also people of humble station who became Protestants.

It was in the late 1550s that significant Protestant communities were discovered in Valladolid and Seville. By that time the Roman Catholic Church was in full action against the Reformation in Europe, and the liberty of thought which within limits had been allowed a few years earlier was no longer permitted. Dogma was being rigidly defined in the Council of Trent, and debatable ground

[13] *Ibid,* pp. 130-143.

[14] *Ibid,* III, 318-406.

[15] Frederick Meyrick, *The Church in Spain* (New York: James Pott and Company, 1892), p. 423.

[16] Jaime Balmes, *El protestantisimo comparado con el catolicismo en sus relaciones con la civilización europea* (5th ed.; Paris: Librería de Rosa y Bouret, 1854), I, 466.

was being reduced. The Sociey of Jesus had been organised by the Spaniard, Ignatius Loyola, and had begun its work in support of the papacy. It was an aroused Church which faced the little Protestant movement of Spain.

The powers of the State were also aroused. Charles V had had much trouble with Protestantism in Germany, and he was determined that it should not create divisions in Spain. He and others of his realm had earlier followed a policy of conciliation and had evidently hoped for unity within Christendom. For this reason he had insisted on a Church Council which would reform the Church and thus remove some of the grounds of rebellion. Then he lost hope of a reconciliation between Catholics and Protestants and gave himself wholly to the cause of the Counter Reformation. From his retirement in a monastery, shortly before his death, he urged that heresy be stamped out in Spain as a service to God and country.[17] Philip II accepted as one of the chief responsibilities of his reign the combating of Protestantism at home and abroad. Arms, diplomacy, and the Inquisition were the instruments he used. The Holy Office, which had become quiescent, took on new life.

In four great autos de fe held in Valladolid and Seville in 1559-1560, sixty-two people, most of them Protestants, were handed over to the secular authorities to be burned at the stake, some of them (the repentant) having been first strangled; and a large number received lesser penalties. Autos de fe were common in subsequent years, and Protestants were among the victims, though becoming fewer and fewer.[18] The severity of the Inquisition was sufficient to cause Protestantism to disappear a short time after its inception. The Protestants, says one writer, "were all burnt, or driven by the fear of being burnt into professing themselves Roman Catholics."[19] The combined power of Church and State prevented a religious division.

The ideal of Catholic unity, which thus gained such clear and forceful expression at the beginning of the modern era, has continued through the years and has profoundly affected the policies of Spanish governments. It was unchallenged during the long period of decadence following Philip II. Since then it has been challenged, and religious toleration and even religious freedom have been practised, but the ideal of Catholic unity has never been lost. Some Spaniards have regarded themselves as inheritors of the spirit and mission of the Inquisition. Others have wished to avoid the violence of the Inquisition but still have found in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries their standard for the Spanish nation. The following words spoken by the present head of the Spanish state to

[17] Lea, *op cit*, III, 434f.
[18] *Ibid*, 437-448.
[19] Meyrick, *op cit*, p. 423.

a group of Catholic pilgrims from South America in 1950 indicate that he has not forgotten the ideal of Catholic unity :

> You have wished to come to the place from which your ancestors went to carry the gospel to America, and you find the same Spain . . . of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the same noble and intransigent Spain—intransigent, yes, for in the things of the spirit and of the true faith there must be a noble and holy intransigence. . . . When nations have received the divine blessing of a single faith and are living under the true religion, concessions cannot be made to error. . . . We do not want in our country Masons who come to destroy our spiritual unity and our eternal destiny.[20]

J. D. HUGHEY, JR.

[20] *Diario de Barcelona,* June 8, 1950, pp. 5f.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

R. F. ALDWINKLE, M.A., D.Th.
Assistant-Professor, McMaster University, Canada.

P. M. BURDITT.
Member of Park St. Baptist Church, Luton.

R. L. CHILD, M.A., B.D., B.Litt.
Principal, Regent's Park College, Oxford.

J. D. HUGHEY, Jr.
Professor, Baptist Theological Seminary, Rüschlikon-Zürich, Switzerland.

E. P. WINTER, M.A., B.Litt.
Baptist Minister, Redditch.

Reviews : A. W. ARGYLE, M.A., B.D., J. O. BARRETT, M.A., W. D. HUDSON, M.A., B.D., G. D. LANT, LL.B., H. H. ROWLEY, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Theol.D., D.Th., B.Litt., F.B.A.

The Editor is always glad to receive MSS. with a view to publication. These should be typewritten, if possible, and addressed to Rev. Graham W. Hughes, 156, *Reinwood Road, Lindley, Huddersfield, Yorks.*

Baptist Beginnings in Luton

NEAR the Whipsnade Zoological Park, and just off the busy Watling Street where it runs from Hertfordshire into South Bedfordshire, is the little village of Kensworth. It stands high, bare and isolated, on the chalk of the Dunstable Downs range, and here, about the year 1660, a large and thriving fellowship of Baptists used to meet, registering a membership of some three hundred. In this sparsely populated area few of the members lived near their place of meeting and many came from long distances to worship: indeed, some of them probably travelled from as far as thirty miles away. No trace remains today of any site or building, and little is known of the beginning of this church, but evidently it became firmly established and flourished during the Cromwellian period. After 1660, however, a very different state of affairs prevailed, and the members began to suffer persecution, like so many others in different parts of the country. One local historian says of them, "They met clandestinely, outwitted spies, eluded sheriffs, worshipped in woods and dells, quarries and sand pits." Tradition points to one wooded dell which is supposed to have been a regular meeting-place of the Kensworth Baptists during this period. It is a matter for regret that only tradition is available to give information concerning these people. All minute books and written records were destroyed by an early secretary of the church who, being expelled from membership on account of misconduct, took his revenge by this means.

By the year 1675, in spite of persecution, the fellowship at Kensworth was still flourishing and could count among its members nineteen living in the village of Luton, some six or seven miles distant. The difficulties of travel, and of trying to meet unmolested, must have influenced them in dictating a policy of dispersal, for at about this time sixty-five members separated from the Kensworth Church and formed small church groups in their own localities. The nineteen Luton members were among the number, and to them the Baptist cause in Luton owes its beginning.

These members established a church in Luton,[1] but it was a church in the New Testament sense only, for no building did they have for several years. That does not seem to have discouraged them, for by the next year, 1676, they are reputed to have had thirty-nine members. They may have worshipped in the open air at first, but it is known that they frequently met in the Dallow Farm (now demolished), which stood on the western outskirts of Luton. In this building was a space in the roof, entered by a trap-door, and here, by stealth, the worshippers would congregate. One imagines the discomfort and inconvenience which those who were no longer young would suffer in reaching such a spot. One realises too, however, how well rewarded they would feel when the preacher was—as was sometimes the case—their fellow-Baptist and countryman, John Bunyan. Evidently the Dallow farmhouse was a frequent place of resort for him, and there is a tradition that on one of his visits he was hidden for three days in the farm buildings while the officers of the law searched for him. In the Bunyan Museum at Bedford is a key of Dallow Farm which was found with the personal effects of John Bunyan, and it seems evident from this that he had access to the farm whenever he required it, for preaching or for shelter.

The nineteen members who separated from the cause at Kensworth included one Thomas Marsom, who soon emerged as the leader of the Luton church. This "grave and sedate man,"

[1] There are differing opinions about the date of formation of the church. On the one hand, Frederick Davis, in his *Luton, Past and Present* (1874) says: "It appears from a record of the Baptist Church at St. Albans, that as early as 1660 the Church at Kensworth consisted of more than three hundred members, and that in 1675 nineteen of these members were resident in Luton. In all probability about this date, when a separation of sixty-five members took place in the Kensworth Church, the Luton members formed themselves into a separate community, and held their religious meetings at Luton, for there is reliable evidence that they met for worship secretly in an apartment in the roof at the Dallow Farm, now occupied by Mr. Scarborough. (The trap-door by which it was entered is still remaining). This was their hiding place for religious worship in the persecuting days of Charles II. Tradition informs us that John Bunyan often preached the word of truth there."

On the other hand, C. E. Freeman (Curator of Luton Museum) in *A Luton Baptist Minute Book,* suggests 1690 or thereabouts as the date of formation, basing his evidence on records in the possession of Dagnall Street Baptist Church, St. Albans, and the Baptist Church at Dunstable. According to these, a dispute took place about that date between the main body of Kensworth members and the Luton section, which resulted in the latter breaking away from the parent body.

When considering the available evidence, it is conclusive that there was a Baptist community in Luton by 1675 or earlier, and common sense would suggest that it would often be more convenient to meet for worship in their own locality rather than hazard the journey to Kensworth. It is likely (especially if disputes arose) that the Luton members would consider themselves an independent community long before the mother church at Kensworth was willing to "write them off" the roll, and such circumstances could easily account for any discrepancy in dates.

as a contemporary described him, was a fellow prisoner with Bunyan in Bedford Gaol,[2] and he is said to have advised Bunyan first against and later in favour of publishing the first part of *Pilgrim's Progress*. He had an ironmongery business in Luton, and it is even possible that he and the tinker may have had business dealings with each other. At all events, they seem to have been associated in various ways, and there is a supposition that the biographical note on Bunyan at the close of *Grace Abounding* was written by Marsom.[3]

Marsom's imprisonment, like that of Bunyan himself, was for conscience' sake, and his goods were seized by the sheriff on account of the fines he had incurred by preaching, in defiance of authority. But such was the respect in which Marsom was held, we are told, that no one could be found to purchase the goods so impounded. This man of sterling quality became the first pastor, and he must have been a bulwark to the church in the early days. His name appears regularly at the head of the list of deacons, and his influence helped to shape the policy of the church, to the end of his life. He died at an advanced age in January, 1726, and was interred in the burial ground in front of the meeting-house. Three of his sons also held office in the church, but do not appear to have had the force of personality of their father.

FIRST MEETING-HOUSE

The Luton congregation were without a building for the first few years of their existence, during which time they would probably meet at Dallow Farm or elsewhere. But in 1687 the Declaration of Indulgence was proclaimed, easing the restrictions on Nonconformist worship. The Luton members therefore set about providing a meeting place, and first they secured a plot of land. An old record states, "The original meeting house was situated on the right hand side of Park Street, running parallel with an alley, and in an orchard of Richard Highron, labourer, which was sold by him, with six poles of land adjoining, for the sum of £4 16s. 0d., to Thomas Marsom."

[2] In recent times doubts have been cast on the truth of the tradition that Thomas Marsom and John Bunyan were co-prisoners at Bedford and that Bunyan used to preach to the members' meeting in the loft at Dallow Farm. Such doubts rest mainly on negative arguments rather than positive ones (e.g. lack of evidence in minute books and other records, etc.), and do not suffice to explain the strength of the oral tradition which has been handed down through the generations. In support of the ancient story is one striking fact which cannot be explained away: the fact that among John Bunyan's personal effects was found the key of Dallow Farm—surely the key, also, to the tradition.

[3] This suggestion is made in Offor's *Introduction to the Pilgrim's Progress*.

Then came the question of erecting a building, and now a wonderful thing happened. Richard Sutton, a collar-maker, of Tring in Hertfordshire, erected a building on the plot of land near Park Street, and sold it to the church trustees on the 28th July, 1698. It was only a small place, 32 ft. by 26 ft., with a vestry added, but even so, the price must have been one of the lowest ever paid for a church building, for the amount he charged was five shillings. Nothing else, unfortunately, is known of this benefactor or of his relationships with the church. One wonders whether he may have had connections with the Kensworth cause, which would lie between Luton and Tring, but this is merely surmise.

So the church was built and opened. By present-day standards the size seems small for the use of an increasing congregation, but at first there were no seats to take up space, and members would stand throughout the service. The following is an extract from one of the church books, dated March 2nd, 1733: "Agreed at a meeting appointed by the church for that purpose, that leave be given to make pews in the meeting house, only round the outside, and to come out from the wall six feet and four inches." Then follow the names of the persons allowed to make pews, and the resolution concludes thus, "Agreed that none of the pews shall have any locks put upon the doors, and that if at any time the place is full, and any room to spare in the pews, the owner shall freely offer a place for standers to sit in the pews." As sermons were sometimes two hours long and some of the members had long distances to walk, the Sunday services were apt to be somewhat in the nature of endurance tests. The hour-glass which belonged to Thomas Marsom, and which he used when timing his sermons, is still in the possession of the church.

It appears that the number of members increased rapidly, for it was soon found necessary to erect a gallery the entire length of the building, four seats deep. Then in 1788, at a cost of £206 (the whole of which was raised at two collections), the building was made one-third larger and another gallery was added; this time the whole area was pewed.

As the cause at Luton flourished, that at Kensworth seems to have dwindled—perhaps because of its isolated position—and its importance seems to have been transferred to Luton. The wide distribution of members of "The Park Street Old Meeting," as it came to be called, compares with that of the original Kensworth church. In 1707 the membership was 258, of whom nearly a hundred lived in Luton, the rest coming from thirty-six other places, many of them ten miles or more away, so that they had to travel long distances to worship. It was a regulation that members must attend the Communion service, and many would therefore

stay the whole day. An entry in the church book for February, 1745 reads, "Paid for small beer for the friends who stay all Lord's day . . . 4s. 3d."

As time went on, branch churches were formed, notably at Thorn, Markyate Street, Bendish and Breachwood Green, under the care of a panel of "ruling elders," as they were called. Of these, the foremost were Samuel Chase and Thomas Bunker. The latter devoted himself mainly to the oversight of Thorn, which lies off the Watling Street between Dunstable and Hockliffe. This church separated from Luton in 1751 and became an independent cause, but for some reason it did not flourish in that spot. The church was later dissolved and the bulk of the members formed the causes at more densely populated centres at Houghton Regis and Dunstable. The chapel buildings were demolished, some of the materials being used to build the Baptist church at Houghton Regis. All that now remains at Thorn is the old burial ground, where an open air service is held once a year by the Luton Federation of Baptist Churches, to maintain the Baptist claim to the spot.

Religious persecution having ceased, small churches could now stand alone, and the Old Meeting thus gradually lost her branches, which grew up into independent churches, most of which still exist today.

The building extension which took place in 1788, referred to above, did not suffice for long. In 1814 the church had quite outgrown its accommodation and a new building was needed. This time a site was chosen slightly south-west of the original meeting-house, on a plot of land which had been acquired as an extension of the burial ground, which was now full. Here an octagonal chapel, later know as the "Old Round Meeting," was erected, to seat 800 persons.

One possible reason for the steady increase in membership which necessitated rebuilding may have been that by 1807 definite work among young people had begun. It came about in this way: in 1789 a Mrs. Neale came from Northampton to live in Luton, bringing her two daughters. One of them, Mrs. Chase, was a widow with three children and, faced with the problem of educating them, she decided to do it herself. Soon she started a boarding school, and before long her sister, Mrs. Neale, undertook to give Sunday School lessons to the boarders and any others who wished to come. So many children came that the numbers outgrew the accommodation in the home of these ladies, and so, in 1807, the Sunday School was transferred to premises belonging to the church, where it has been carried on ever since. In 1832 a schoolroom was erected on the Park Street frontage which, when later extended, would accommodate 500 children. This was replaced by a new block of buildings in 1924.

The expansion which took place in the eighteenth century continued in the nineteenth and, in fact, all the Baptist churches in the Luton district trace back their ancestry to the mother church at Park Street.

Two of the early ministers had connections with the Baptist Missionary Society in its early years. Thomas Blundell, who came to Luton as pastor in 1804, had taken part in the formation of the B.M.S. He was followed in 1812 by Ebenezer Daniel, "the apostle to Ceylon," who went there from Luton in 1830 as a missionary of the B.M.S. and remained there until his death in 1844.

By the middle of the last century, further rebuilding was necessary and during the pastorate of the Rev. Thomas Hands the present place of worship was erected—not, however, without mishap. The foundation stones were laid and work progressed, the walls of the new building rising close to the back wall of the old "Round Meeting." But on Sunday evening, 4th February, 1866, only half an hour after the church members had left the Communion service, there was a violent gale. This blew down the new wall on to the old building, and so great was the impact and the force of the storm that the "Old Round Meeting" was completely wrecked.

One might imagine that this catastrophe would confound and discourage the members, but some at least were not to be daunted by it. There was, for example, a young couple who had arranged to be married at the Old Round Meeting: but the storm intervened, and on the date of the wedding the church was a ruin. The ceremony had been planned to take place and take place it did, however, despite the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune." A picture exists, showing the young couple before the minister, pledging their vows amid the rubble and planks of the ruined building. If this was typical of the people's spirit, who can wonder that before long the church members had rallied to begin the work of reconstruction? This was completed in 1870, when the present church building was opened.

In more recent times, pastors of the church have included the late Frank Thompson, the late F. J. H. Humphrey, and the late J. A. Sutherland; and Dr. T. G. Dunning and the Rev. G. H. Woodham. The late Harry Mander, a former President of the Baptist Union, was a scholar and teacher in the Sunday School and confessed Christ in baptism in the church.

At the beginning of the present century, during Mr. Thompson's ministry, a large block of Sunday School buildings was erected behind the church. These were then, and are still—under the present minister, Rev. D. H. Horwood—used extensively for the evangelisation and training of the many young people who

look upon Park Street as their spiritual home. And so we await the pages in the history of the church which it will be their privilege to unfold to another generation.

P. M. BURDITT

Yorkshire United Independent College, by K. W. Wadsworth. (Independent Press, 8s. 6d.)

In preparation for the bicentenary of its foundation, which falls in 1956, the Rev. K. W. Wadsworth, one of its former students, has written this history of the Congregational College in Bradford. The author has worked hard at his sources, and pleasantly as well as competently tells the story of the early Yorkshire Dissenting Academies, and their successors, setting them in the social, political and religious background of the times. The present College was opened in 1877, and had a flying start with A. M. Fairbairn as Principal. In 1888, by which time Fairbairn had moved to Oxford, the Rotherham Congregational College united with the Bradford College, though not without much heart-searching, as we should expect. Since then the Bradford College has had its flourishing and declining periods, and Mr. Wadsworth conveys the impression that its future has recently been the subject of debate. The decision has been taken to continue its work, and the hope of Yorkshire Baptists as of Congregationalists is that the decision will be abundantly justified in coming years. The interest of the story would have been increased if Mr. Wadsworth had told us more about the theological outlook of the institutions about which he writes, and if he had told us also of the work done by men trained at Bradford. There is a slip on page 70. The B.M.S. was founded in 1792 not 1793.

Tyndale Echoes. (J. W. Arrowsmith, Ltd., Bristol, 5s.)

This is a beautiful little book, both in content and format. It consists of extracts from the prayers and sermons of Dr. Richard Glover, Minister of Tyndale Church, Bristol, 1869-1911. The book breathes the author's serene faith in the goodness and love of God, and is particularly suitable to put into the hands of the sick or troubled. Many who have seen photographic representations of Dr. Glover will wish that there had been one in this little book.

JOHN O. BARRETT.

Believer's Baptism and Confirmation

AT a time when the nature and significance of Baptism have once again come to the forefront of theological discussion, modern Baptists have tended to give undue attention to Karl Barth's rediscovery of some of the New Testament truths about Baptism which in all modesty we can claim to have known for some considerable time. For that reason, we have probably underestimated the very interesting developments which have taken place in Anglican circles in regard to the meaning of Confirmation. If, with a great deal of modern Baptist apologetic, we insist that the essential point in our Baptist witness is not the retention of an external rite for antiquarian reasons but the safeguarding of a certain conception of the church as the "gathered community," we must ask ourselves whether ours is the only way of securing a "fellowship of believers." Does our insistence that Baptism and personal faith are inseparable really matter if the ultimate result is the same, namely conversion and personal committal to God in Christ? Plausible as this sounds, it cannot conceal the difference between the Baptist and the Anglican conceptions of the Church. Whatever attempts individual Anglicans may make to link Confirmation with a more personal appropriation of the Gospel, the fact remains that the vast majority of Anglicans will not admit that faith, in the sense of intelligent conviction, is an indispensible requisite of church membership.

If some Anglicans feel that this is too one-sided a statement, the answer must be that the theological confusion concerning the nature of Confirmation readily lends itself to such misinterpretation. The Roman view is that Baptism in infancy constitutes a complete act of initiation with Confirmation as a rite of strengthening when the Holy Spirit is given, not for regeneration but for the fortifying of the Christian in the struggle against sin and the living of the Christian life.[1] This view seems to have prevailed even in the Protestant communions until quite recently.[2] This attempt to give to infant Baptism the full spiritual significance it has for believer's Baptism runs into great difficulties both psychological and biblical. "The transfer of adult conditions to the child (may I repeat?) led to all kinds of theosophic speculations about the implanting of a germ of the new life to be long latent in the soul. Theories teemed, handling the darkest region of natural mysticism or psychological obscurity."[3]

There are recent signs, however, of an attempt to rethink the theological significance of Confirmation. The Book of Common Order, 1940, of the Church of Scotland includes the following elements in Confirmation :—

1. The ratification or confirmation of baptismal vows, including public confession of faith.
2. The confirmation of the candidate by the Holy Spirit, through the prayer and imposition of hands (or elevation in blessing) of the minister.
3. The formal act of admission to the Lord's table.[4]

This includes the three elements which Baptists too have always regarded as essential—public confession of faith, the gift of the Holy Spirit and the admission to the Lord's table, which normally follows Baptism in a Baptist church. Our chief misgiving concerns the first point, namely the ratification or confirmation of baptismal vows. These vows were not, of course, made in the first place by the person who now proclaims his faith at Confirmation. They were made by proxies or sponsors. But does this really matter? If these vows now become the expression of the personal faith of the confirmed candidate, what more can be expected? Baptists would not wish to question the reality of faith in such a candidate whose Confirmation obviously expressed his personal repentance and faith. Nevertheless, it is a confusing of the issue because this is not how Baptism is understood in the New Testament and, whatever the theological theory may be, the connection of faith and Baptism is not clearly established in the minds of many by such a practice.

Dom Gregory Dix has recently developed an emphasis found in some earlier Anglican writers by his insistence that water Baptism "incorporates a man into that Body (that is the church) from the eternal point of view, but the gift of the 'Spirit' in Confirmation is what makes him a living member of that Body within time. Thus only the confirmed may take part in the Eucharist, which is the vital act of the Body in time."[5] To an outsider, this looks like an attempt to have the best of both worlds—the full spiritual significance of believer's Baptism with the retention of infant Baptism. This leads to some curious conclusions. Confirmation is here made to coincide with the gift of the Spirit, presumably given for the first time at this point. Infant Baptism incorporates the child into the church from "the eternal point of view," even though he remains without the Spirit until the moment of confirmation. Baptists themselves have never been as rigorous as this. We have never said that the Spirit is absent until the moment of Baptism, though we have contended that the repentance and faith which precedes Baptism makes possible a bestowing of the Spirit not otherwise given. The conclusion to be drawn from this Anglican apologetic is that "the meaning that the Western church has tried to impose on infant Baptism, with doubtful success, should be reserved for Confirmation regarded as the second phase in the whole Christian rite of initiation."[6]

It might be replied by Anglicans who hold this view that the difference between our conception of the gathered church and the Anglican view is not a real antithesis. The child at Baptism is incorporated into Christ and becomes a member of the Kingdom, but only at Confirmation does he first adopt his vows as the expression of his personal faith and only then is he admitted to Communion. Is this not in fact what happens in a Baptist church? The stage of repentance and personal faith marks the entry into full membership of the Christian fellowship with the enjoyment of all the privileges and benefits thereof, including that of attending the Lord's Supper. But what is the position of the child in the Anglican church between infant Baptism and Confirmation? Would Dom Gregory Dix say he is not a member of the Church, even though in some sense incorporated into the Kingdom? Baptists would not hesitate to answer this in the affirmative, since we do not equate the Church and the Kingdom and for us to say that a child is not a member of the Church is not to declare it to be outside God's love and care: unless we are thoroughgoing Augustinians, in which case it is doubtful whether Baptist principles can be successfully grafted on to such a theological basis.

Presumably there may come a point when actual sin and wilful rebellion against God may put a person outside the Kingdom. But this is true on any view of the Church. No one maintains that infant Baptism necessitates repentance and faith when the age of Confirmation is reached. Nor do Baptists deny that children may, as they grow, fall away, although Jesus said of them: "Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." The mysterious gift of freedom, which is the mark of the growing personality, make possible the denial of God and His purpose for the individual life.

Theoretically it may be admitted that Confirmation might come to signify repentance, faith and regeneration, in which case the spiritual content of the act would be the same as we believe to attach to believer's Baptism. Nevertheless, the history of the Church seems to prove that the retention of infant Baptism has made it extremely difficult to give this full and unambiguous meaning to Confirmation, apart from the manifest disadvantage of using the rite of Baptism in a sense nowhere found in the New Testament. The suggestion that infant Baptism may not be admission to full membership of the Church, since it does not include participation in the Lord's Supper, hardly seems to be borne out by Anglican comment. The Bishop of Derby points out that Confirmation is not a matter of theological necessity as far as First Communion is concerned, since the rubric provides for the admission to Holy Communion of those who are "ready and desirous to be confirmed."[7] Commenting on the view of Dix and others, he goes on to say: "yet if the logical reference is to be drawn, and if it were to be

maintained that a Christian who had been baptized, but who was as yet unconfirmed, had been incompletely baptized, I should for my part find it impossible to agree. Baptism, I should maintain, is in Western usage a sacrament complete in itself; and in the New Testament also (despite the evidence for the use in some instances, and probably in some areas, of the laying on of hands as an associated or added rite) the primary emphasis is upon Baptism, rather than upon anything corresponding to what has come to be called Confirmation."[8] Professor A. M. Ramsey declares: "It is emphatically the teaching of the Prayer Book that in the rite of Holy Baptism we are made members of Christ and of the Church which is His body."[9] As Professor Lampe himself points out, the Dix thesis would not only make "Confirmation a sacrament in the fullest sense (which the Anglican articles deny) but the great sacrament without whose reception no man could call himself a Christian."[10]

Baptists cannot forget too that Confirmation is the Bishop's special prerogative, and the above theory would not only make Ordination depend upon the episcopacy for its validity but also the first full entrance of the Christian believer into membership of the Church. It thus seems as if this attempt to give to Confirmation the full spiritual significance of believer's Baptism is by no means as yet a matter of common consent within the Anglican church itself. Baptists will thoroughly agree with Dr. Rawlinson, Professor Lampe and others that Baptism is itself a rite of complete initiation and that the New Testament nowhere suggests Confirmation as completing it or being itself the condition of full entrance into the Church. Yet are they themselves not in difficulty by such insistence, for they must defend infant Baptism as a complete rite of initiation on their premises and they cannot therefore give to Baptism its full significance for the believer without a doctrine of baptismal regeneration as applied to the child; a view to which they are obviously not attracted. Dix and others evidently want to find a place for repentance, faith and the gift of the Spirit as conditions of church membership, but they needlessly complicate the question and have recourse to very dubious argumentation by refusing to associate these things, as the New Testament does, with Baptism itself.

Nor is the attempt of P. T. Forsyth, writing more than a generation ago from a very different point of view, any more successful. He too thinks that in this matter we may have the best of both worlds. "Baptism unto faith has as good a right in the principle of the gospel as baptism upon faith."[11] His constantly reiterated criticism that the Baptists are individualistic because of their insistence on conversion reveals a serious misunderstanding of the Baptist position. Our emphasis on the necessity of repentance, faith and conversion does not exclude the priority of the divine

grace or the "objective" nature of the divine redemptive act in Christ, nor have Baptists considered conversion as separate from that incorporation into the Christian fellowship which the New Testament everywhere emphasizes. Nor have we denied the importance of Christian nurture whether in the Christian home or in the Church.

Whether the truths for which Forsyth contends can only be secured by separating Confirmation from Baptism is more than doubtful. While we are sympathetic to all attempts to make Confirmation more expressive of personal repentance and faith, most Baptists would still feel that the effort suffers from its manifest departure from the New Testament tradition. This is not because we deny the divine guidance of the Church under new circumstances, or cling to the New Testament in a mere antiquarian sense, but that the separation of Baptism from its spiritual presuppositions has led to obvious abuses in the church practice of infant Baptism and has also resulted in the theological confusion as to the real meaning of Confirmation to which the above discussion affords ample testimony.

R. F. ALDWINKLE.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "Spiritus Sanctus . . . in confirmatione augmentum praestat ad gratiam . . . post baptismum confirmamur ad pugnam." St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, Pt. III, Q. LXXII, A.1. Cf. Rawlinson, A. E. J., *Christian Initiation*, p. 16.
[2] Turner, H. W., Confirmation, cf. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. V, No. 2.
[3] Forsyth, P. T., *The Church and the Sacraments*, p. 199.
[4] *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. V, No. 2, p. 150.
[5] *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 5, No. 2, p. 155.
[6] *Ibid*, p. 157.
[7] Rawlinson, A. E. J., *Christian Initiation*, p. 31.
[8] *Ibid*, p. 27.
[9] Lampe, G. W. H., *The Seal of the Spirit*, p. VII.
[10] *Ibid*, p. XIII.
[11] Forsyth, P. T., *The Church and the Sacraments*, p. 211.

Private Prayer: Suggestions and Helps, by A. Herbert Gray and George Barclay. (Independent Press, 9d.)

This excellent little booklet divides prayer into Adoration, Thanksgiving, Confession, Petition and Intercession, with a note, suggested readings and prayers on each. By way of preface it has an act of recollection which will be found an invaluable help in setting the mind in the right direction for prayer.

DENIS LANT.

Who may administer The Lord's Supper?

THE Baptist reply to the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 included the following: ". . . any full description of the ministerial functions exercised among us must also take account of other believers who, at the call of the Church, may preside at the observance of the Lord's Supper or fulfil any other duties which the Church assigns to them." We are to attempt now to discover how far such a statement would have represented the views of our seventeenth century forebears.

(*a*) General Baptists

About the time of his se-baptism John Smyth questioned "whether the Church may not administer the Sacraments before there be any officers among them."[1] He does not question that the pastor should administer the Supper if there is a pastor, though he allows equal power in the matter to a "teacher."[2] In his subsequent Confessions of Faith, however, he assumes that the pastor or other teaching elder administers and says, "It is not lawful for every brother to administer the word and sacraments."[3] Yet, a little later still, shortly before he died, he still was questioning "whither (sic) the Church may not as well administer the seales of the Covenant before they have officers as Pray, Prophesy, Elect Officers and the rest."[4]

Thomas Helwys was more radical than John Smyth and, in fact, accused the latter of concern for "outward succession" in the Church when he repented of his se-baptism before he had looked for someone else, such as a Mennonite pastor, to baptize him.[5] Helwys, as Burrage pointed out,[6] was more sure than was Smyth about this matter, and, where John Smyth questioned, Helwys confidently asserted that any congregation, whether or not it has officers, "may come together to Pray, Prophecie, breake bread, and administer in all the holy ordinances."[7]

By 1625 there were five General Baptist congregations in England. These had some correspondence with the Waterlander (Mennonite) church of Amsterdam, with a view to receiving recognition for the purposes of inter-communion.[8] There were differences between the English and Dutch regarding such matters as the frequency of the Supper, the ordination of ministers and the administrator of the Supper. The Mennonites would not recognise

the English Baptists as true churches. One reason was that, while it was the custom of the English to wait for the "episcopus"* to celebrate the Lord's Supper, yet they could not see why they could not celebrate it in his absence by authorising a member to do so. As W. T. Whitley explains, "there was not a full minister for each of the five churches, and that made it impossible to observe the Lord's Supper at each church on each Lord's Day,"[9] if they waited for the "episcopus." While the English regarded proper authorisation as necessary they could not agree that this necessarily implied ordination by the laying on of hands.[10]

This viewpoint seems to be maintained in the "Orthodox" Creed of 1678, agreed to by the General Baptists of the Midlands, which was based on the Westminster Confession and attempted to conform to that as closely as Baptists could. Instead of "a Minister of the Word lawfully ordained"[11] we find the phrase, "those only who are rightly qualified, and thereunto called, according to the command of Christ."[12] This avoids the word "ordained," and perhaps allows a "gifted disciple," duly authorised by the local church to administer the sacrament if there is no pastor.

However, Thomas Grantham, leader of the General Baptists of the eastern counties, allowed no one but an ordained minister to administer the Supper; and said that if, in the absence of a pastor there is a "gifted disciple" sufficiently gifted to administer the Supper, then he is fit to be ordained pastor in the full and permanent manner.[13] This point of view was also maintained by the General Assembly of 1693, for when there was put to it the question, "whether a Gifted Disciple as such may Lawfully Exercise Discipline and Administer the Ordinacon (sic) of the Lord's Supper abroad in the Churches without Ordinacon. It was resolved in the Negative."[14] The 1702 Assembly concurred.[15]

Thomas Grantham was clear that Baptism must be treated differently from the Lord's Supper in this connection. "Baptism must be dispensed out of the Church, or where there is only a Disciple and an Instructor. . . . It is no reasoning therefore, that he is a Disciple only, may baptize; *ergo*, He that is a Disciple only, may minister the Lord's Supper; for let this Argument run, and it will make Ordination an insignificant Trifle, and every man to have the same power in the dispensation of Ordinances."[16]

He allows a "messenger" to administer the Lord's Supper, on the grounds that he was ordained.[17] However this was resisted by the Lincolnshire Association, which maintained that "preachers" who were ordained, but not elders in particular churches, could not preside at the Lord's Supper.[18] This was to assert against the claims of an ordained "messenger" such as Grantham, who was not however an elder in any church except the one which sent him forth, that the ground of administering the Lord's

Supper was not ordination, but the authority of the particular church where the Supper was being administered.

In general, Baptists were insistent that everything done within or in the name of the local church was duly authorised by that particular church. For example, in 1654 the Fenstanton church made the following resolutions :—

> " First, That it shall be lawful for any person to improve* their gifts in the presence of the congregation. Secondly, That it shall be lawful only for such as are approved by the congregation, to preach publickly to the world. Thirdly, That it shall not be lawful for any person to go from place to place to preach, except they be sent by the congregation."[19]

They must have been equally strict with regard to the administration of the sacraments. The Kent Association was equally strict.[20]

Among the numerous items relating to fixtures for preaching and " breaking of bread " at the various sub-congregations of the Ford-Cuddington church[21] are the names of a number of people delegated to preach from time to time, but only two names occur in connection with the " breaking of bread " appointments. We do not know whether these two were pastors or ordained, but it is clear that just these two men were authorised to administer the Supper.

Not all General Baptists insisted on the one who administered the Lord's Supper being an ordained pastor, though a number did, but all insisted that everything was properly authorised by the local church. If there were the local pastor then he administered the Supper without question.

(*b*) THE PARTICULAR BAPTISTS

With the Particular Baptists also we find some divergence of opinion. Some, such as Thomas Collier[22] and Benjamin Keach,[23] said that the sacraments should be administered by no one but a pastor duly called and set apart. The Western Association Meeting at Broughton, likewise decided, in 1691, that according to Scripture only a person set apart by ordination could administer the Lord's Supper.[24]

The Kensworth church, a group of congregations in Hertfordshire, held that only the pastor could administer the Supper, it appears; for it appointed an assistant pastor to help maintain the regular administration of the Supper at its various constituent congregations.[25] Similarly, Blaenau[26] and Swansea[27] group-churches had two elders each to enable the sub-congregations to receive the Lord's Supper regularly, both in time and manner. It was the same elsewhere in Wales.[28]

However, some Baptists were less rigid, and gave power " to

others besides ministers to celebrate . . . even the Lord's Supper, without so much as the presence of any Ministers."[29] Despite the fact that William Mitchell wrote[30] that only a pastor, lawfully called, could administer sacraments, some of the churches started by his colleague, David Crosley, celebrated the Lord's Supper without a pastor, although with some scruples.[31]

The 1677 Confession of Faith said that the Lord's Supper was to be administered by "those only, who are qualified and called according to the commission of Christ."[32] That Confession followed the Westminster Confession as closely as Baptists could, yet in this matter it is less explicit than "a Minister of the Word lawfully ordained."[33]

The Baptists were attempting to cover certain exceptions in avoiding the word "ordained." One such exception is suggested by the minutes of the 1693 Western Association meetings in Bristol.[34] The Association said that only elders might administer the sacraments; but an elder might administer it who had been "called to the office by the suffrage of the church, who had not yet been ordained by the laying on of hands."[35] This modifies the ruling of two years before, mentioned just above. The Association's revised opinion is exemplified in the practice of the Broadmead church in Bristol. It would not celebrate the Lord's Supper when either it had no pastor or was deprived of one temporarily, e.g. when he was imprisoned. During the Civil War, when the Broadmead church, then of the "Open" membership type and including both Baptists and Independents, was pastorless, it was joined by the Independent church from Llanvaches which had a pastor in Walter Cradock. Then the joint church held the Lord's Supper with Cradock administering it.[36] On a number of occasions the church omitted the Supper because of the lack of a pastor,[37] yet the church did not insist on the one administering having been ordained with the laying on of hands; but it did insist on him being the duly authorised pastor, on whom hands would be laid later.[38]

However, some churches were even less rigid. The same 1693 Western Association further appealed to the churches "to prevent all such from exercising their pretended gift," for "some persons, who being vainly puffed up by their fleshly minds, do presume to preach publickly without being solemnly called and appointed by the church thereto, and some to administer the ordinances."[39] Daniel King, of the Warwick Church, said that any "disciple" may baptize or break bread," although "after the Church hath officers, then it properly belongeth to them."[40] In 1684, Hercules Collins, pastor of the Wapping-Walthamstow church was in prison: the church meeting suggested that a Mr. Roofes should administer the Supper meanwhile. The pastor objected. The matter was not dropped even after his release and return. Finally, at a church meeting "it

was againe maintayned Ratified and Confirmed: by ye deliberate Aprobation & Authority of ye Chu: that it is lawfull for a Bro'r whome ye Chu: shall Judge Able to Oppen ye Nature of ye Ordinance; (Tho hee bee nott called to ye Office of an Elder) To Administer the Lds Supper."[41]

Another possibility for the pastorless congregation was to call in the pastor of a neighbouring church. However, some Baptists would not allow this, notably Benjamin Keach[42] and William Mitchell.[43] But the Assembly in 1689 decided that "an Elder of one Church may administer the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper to another of the same Faith, being called upon to do so by the said Church; tho not as Pastor, but as a Minister, necessity being only considered in this case."[44]

All agreed that the pastor was the proper person to administer the Supper, when he was available; but prolonged lack of pastors, because of "inter-regnums" or imprisonment, saw differing points of view emerge. However, all agreed that the proper authorisation of the local church was necessary, even when ordination was not made a pre-requisite.

E. P. WINTER.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Smyth, J.: *Works*, I, p. 313. Cf. II, pp. 419f.
[2] Smyth, J.: *Principles and Inferences*, pp. 18-20.
[3] (Longer) Confession §80. An earlier draft added "except those only who are called and ordained to it" (Evans, B.: *The Early English Baptists*, I, p. 269). Cf. (Latin) Confession, §16 and (De Ries) Confession, §28.
[4] Smyth, J.: *Works*, II, pp. 419f.
[5] Whitley, W. T.: *History of British Baptists*, pp. 30-32. Underwood, A. C.: *History of English Baptists*, pp. 39-47.
[6] Burrage, C.: *The Early English Dissenters*, I, p. 253, II, pp. 182-4.
[7] Helwys, Th.: *Declaration of Faith*, §13.
[8] Whitley, W. T.: *Op. cit.*, pp. 51f. Underwood, A. C.: *Op. cit.*, pp. 50f. Evans, B.: *The Early English Baptists*, II, pp. 22-35. Burrage, C.: *Op. cit.*, I, p. 273. Baptist Historical Society *Transactions*, IV, pp. 250-4.
[9] Whitley, W. T.: *Loc. cit. supra.*
* An ordained minister of a church or churches.
[10] *Ibid.*
[11] Westminster Confession, §XXVII.
[12] *Op. cit.*, §XXVII.
[13] Grantham, Th.: *Christianismus Primitivus*, Book II, Part II, Ch. 7, §VIII, p. 93.
[14] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): Assembly *Minutes*, p. 39.
[15] *Op. cit.*, p. 70.
[16] Grantham, Th.: *Loc. cit*, p. 94.
[17] Grantham, Th.: *Hear the Church*, p. 28.
[18] Underwood, A. C.: *Op cit*, pp. 119f. Taylor, A.: *History of the General Baptists*, I, p. 419.
[19] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records*, p. 98.
[20] Baptist Historical Society *Transactions*, III, pp. 249f.
[21] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Ford-Cuddington Church Book, passim.*
* *i.e.* exercise, utilise.

[22] Collier, Th.: *Body of Divinity*, p. 474.
[23] Keach, B.: *The Glory of a True Church*, pp. 16f.
[24] Letter from the 1691 Association to Whitchurch Baptist church. Contents conveyed verbatim in a letter from Mr. L. C. May, 14th October, 1952.
[25] Kensworth "pocket book"; entries under 1688 and 1694. Cf. Ivimey, J.: *History*, II, p. 174.
[26] Thomas, J.: *Materials for a History of the Baptist Churches in the Principality of Wales, passim.*
[27] Thomas, J.: *History of the Baptist Association in Wales;* printed in Rippon, J.: *Baptist Annual Register*, IV, p. 23.
[28] Thomas, J.: *Op. cit.*, p. 13.
[29] Baillie, R.: *The Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time Vindicated*, p. 83.
[30] Mitchell, W.: *Jachin and Boaz*, §15; printed in the Baptist Historical Society *Transactions*, III, pp. 168f. Cf. p. 160.
[31] Whitley, W. T.: *Baptists of North-West England*, p. 76.
[32] McGlothlin, W.: *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, p. 269.
[33] Westminster Confession, §XXVII (V).
[34] Ivimey, J.: *History*, I, p. 527 (verbatim record). Underwood, A. C.: *History of the English Baptists*, p. 130. Goadby, J. J.: *Bypaths in Baptist History*, p. 210.
[35] *Ibid.*
[36] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records*, pp. 29f.
[37] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Op. cit.*, pp. 34f., 106, 284, 395f.
[38] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Op. cit.*, p. 383.
[39] Ivimey, J.: *History*, I, p. 527.
[40] King, Daniel: *A Way to Zion sought out*, p. 59.
[41] Kevan, E.: *London's Oldest Baptist Church*, pp. 60f.
[42] Keach, B.: *The Glory of a True Church*, pp. 16f.
[43] Mitchell, W.: *Jachin and Boaz;* printed in Baptist Historical Society *Transactions*, III, p. 168.
[44] 1689 Assembly *Minutes*, p. 18.

Jairus, a one-act Play, by T. A. Dewing, Speedwell Plays. (Independent Press, 1s.)

This play is for eight male characters and two female. Despite the fact that it only runs for thirty minutes, the delineation of character is so deft that we feel that we know the people. The play presents excellently the contrast between the impact of our Lord's warm humanity on ordinary people and the rigid conventionalism of the scribal religion of His day.

Spurgeon's Homes, by Graham W. Hughes. (Spurgeon's Homes, Birchington, Kent, 6d.)

This is a reprint of the story of Spurgeon's Homes as told by the Editor of *The Baptist Quarterly* in an article printed in this periodical. It sets out clearly and impressively the establishment and subsequent history of this fine piece of practical Christianity. There are a number of illuminating photographs.

DENIS LANT.

Reviews

The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation, by Le Roy Edwin Froom. Volume IV. (Review and Herald, Washington, D.C.).

With this volume a massive achievement is brought to a close. Professor Froom, of the Seventh Day Adventist Seminary in Washington, has completed an unrivalled essay in the history of interpretation, surveying in not far short of four thousand pages the views put forward by various writers from the earliest days as to the significance of the prophecies of the books of Daniel and Revelation. The fullness and detail with which this study has been carried through is beyond all praise. Two of the earlier volumes have been reviewed in the *Baptist Quarterly* (xiii, pp. 41ff., and xiv, pp. 89f.), and the qualities which marked them are again in evidence in this volume. The interest here, however, is a more particular one, since this volume is concerned with the background out of which the Seventh Day Adventist movement arose, and with its history.

The early part of this volume deals with American religious life in particular, though its links with British life and thought are fully recognised. Then the keen interest in these prophecies awakened by the French Revolution and all the events which followed it is traced down to the rise of Millerism, which became in due course Seventh Day Adventism—though the Seventh Day element did not belong to it at the start. Most of the interpreters began with the canon of interpretation that the seventy weeks of Daniel extended to the Crucifixion, which they placed in A.D. 33, from which they worked back to the decree "to restore and to build Jerusalem." This was commonly identified with the mission of Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes I, which was dated in 457 B.C. It is curious that the arithmetic of these calculators was defective, since there was no year 0. Moreover, it was unfortunate for their theory that in the account of Ezra's mission nothing is said about any command to restore and build Jerusalem. The interpreters usually believed that the 1260 days of the rule of Antichrist stood for that number of years, and was to be equated with the three and a half years of the book of Daniel. Since Antichrist was equated with the Pope the misfortunes of the Papacy in A.D. 1798 were believed to terminate that period. The interpreters differed as to the beginning of the period according to whether they used solar years, or turned 1260 lunar years into a smaller number of solar years. The overthrow of Antichrist did not bring in the millenium,

though in 1812 the President of Yale believed that this happy period had already begun. Like other interpreters at that time, however, he was directing attention to the 1290 days and the 1335 days of Daniel. Here, again, it made a difference whether the reckoning was by solar years, or lunar years converted into solar years. Moreover, interest was next focused on the 2300 evenings and mornings of Daniel, and a period of 2300 years was calculated, beginning from the same date as the seventy weeks. This led to the expectation of the Second Coming of Christ in 1843, by the same erroneous assumption that there was a year 0. This expectation was widespread before William Miller took it up. He and his associates founded their movement on this expectation, but they soon corrected the arithmetic and put the climax in October, 1844. At the same time they moved the Crucifixion back to A.D. 31, by recognising that the reckoning of 490 years from 457 B.C. should bring them to A.D. 34, but by noting that the cutting off of the Anointed One took place in the middle of the last week.

Then came the pathetic disappointment. During the last week before October 22, "Millerite merchants closed their stores, mechanics forsook their ships, and labourers left their employers. There was a putting away of all worldly things and a breaking away from all worldly pursuits." On the great day they waited with confident hope, only to find a disappointment which they afterwards compared with that of the first disciples after the Crucifixion. The subsequent reorganisation of the movement, and its adoption of sabbatarianism, are then recorded.

The whole story, related not alone in the 1,300 pages of this volume, but in the whole work, is of the greatest interest, and to the reviewer is profitable for instruction. Sometimes the reader finds it wearisome to read through so many interpretations which are so much alike, yet marked by subtle differences. The interpreters have so many figures to play with that there is abundant room for their ingenuity to seize on something promising to bring the events of their own day, or of the immediately expected future, into the prophecies. Sometimes they worked back from a given event, such as the Crucifixion or the French Revolution or the termination (temporary) of the Papal power in 1798, and cast around for something promising at the other end; sometimes they worked forwards from some event of the past to a date just ahead of their own time for the expected termination of a period. But so many periods could be used, and they could be shortened by lunar-solar conversion, or made coterminous at one end or the other, or treated independently of one another, and so many events of history, whether of the past or the present, could be seen out of proportion, that an unlimited field always lay open for the ingenuity of the interpreter. The Millerite disappointment was the most dramatic and pathetic

in the whole history of interpretation of these passages, but the uniform lesson of the whole story is that every effort to apply these canons of interpretation to them has led to demonstrable error. The faith in the Second Advent does not need to be sustained by the assumption that a cipher that would satisfy our curiosity to know the future if only we could break it lies in our hands. The Wise Virgins were not feverishly trying to break a code to know when the Bridegroom would come, but kept their lamps trimmed.

For the incredible industry which Dr. Froom has brought to his study the reviewer is filled with undiluted admiration. Every reader, from the simplest to the most learned, can profit by its study and enlarge the borders of his own knowledge. The lessons to be drawn may be variously expressed by different readers, but few will withhold from the author their recognition of his immense and exhausting labours and of his eminence as a historian of interpretation.

H. H. ROWLEY.

The Book of the Acts, by F. F. Bruce. "New London Commentary on the New Testament." (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 25s.).

Mr. Bruce, Head of the Department of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Sheffield, has followed up his useful Commentary on the Greek text of *Acts* with this one on the English text (the American Standard Version of 1901).

The text is printed and expounded paragraph by paragraph, and useful footnotes are added. The scholarship is erudite and up-to-date. The more important variations of the Western text are carefully noted. For the most part the exposition is sound and helpful, frequently lighted up by a happy illustration, like the parallel between the conversion experience of Paul and that of Sundar Singh.

The chief ground for adverse criticism lies in the construction of the book. In a volume of 555 pages only 27 are given to the Introduction, and there are no appended essays. This means that the difficult critical questions which should have received extended and systematic treatment are dealt with only in odds and ends in the course of the commentary.

The writer's standpoint is conservative, and he hardly does full justice to the arguments which have been brought against Luke's accuracy on some points of detail. For instance, the difference between the conception of "speaking with tongues" in *Acts* ii, 4 (where it means speaking in foreign languages) and that in *Acts* x, 46, xix, 6, 1 *Cor.* xii-xiv (where it means ecstatic utterance) is glossed over. The discrepancies between the three accounts of Paul's conversion in *Acts,* and the fact that Paul's own account in

Galatians i, resembles only the last in *Acts*, are too lightly dismissed.

To save Luke's accuracy Mr. Bruce identifies Paul's second visit to Jerusalem described in *Gal.* ii, with that of the "famine visit" in *Acts* xi, 30. But the events recorded in *Galatians* ii. are far more like those of the Council visit of *Acts* xv. (the third visit in *Acts*), though they cannot be wholly reconciled even with them. To explain why *Galatians* does not mention the "apostolic decree" set out in *Acts* xv, that Epistle is dated by Mr. Bruce shortly before the Council of *Acts* xv. (p. 300), being in that case the earliest of Paul's epistles. But there are serious objections to this. The subject-matter, style and phraseology of *Galatians* indicate that it was written in the period when 2 *Corinthians* and *Romans* were written. It may be doubted whether anyone would have dreamed of saying that *Galatians* was the earliest of Paul's letters but for the supposed necessity of reconciling the events described in *Galatians* with every relevant detail in the narrative of *Acts*. And even if the early date of *Galatians* is accepted the difficult question still remains, why did not Paul mention the "apostolic decree" when writing to the Corinthians (if he knew of it and had taken part in framing it) thereby avoiding a long argument on the food question, or at least reinforcing the decision to which the argument led?

Luke does not seem to have been in full possession of the facts. Though a companion of Paul, he was apparently not in the inner circle of the apostle's confidence. From *Acts* we learn little of Paul's distinctive doctrine, and the author seems unaware of the existence of his epistles. When Luke came to write *Acts*, probably Paul was dead. For the events which he had not himself witnessed Luke had to rely on second-hand or third-hand sources. He did the best he could, and has supplied us with an invaluable historical background, accurate in broad outlines, without which the Epistles would be far less intelligible than they are. As Mr. Bruce remarks: "it is Luke that we have to thank for the coherent record of Paul's apostolic activity" (p. 27). But the attempt to prove exact correspondence in every detail between all of Paul's own accounts, which must be accepted, and those of *Acts* has broken down.

Mr. Bruce rightly says (p. 25, n. 30) that *Acts* could not have been written after 90 A.D., by which time Paul's epistles became generally known; for the author betrays no knowledge of them. But it seems unlikely, we may add, that it was written before Paul's death, for surely Luke would have checked his account by consulting Paul, if that had been possible.

While we have expressed disagreement with some of the findings of this Commentary, there can be no doubt of its deep and devout scholarship, or of its usefulness as a guide, not only to ministers and students, but to laymen as well.

A. W. ARGYLE.

Jehovah's Witnesses, by Royston Pike. (Philosophical Library, $2.75.)

This book professes to give an objective account of the origin, teaching and practice of an extraordinary sect founded by Charles Taze Russell about 1872, which in 1884 became a new religious organisation named the Zion's Watchtower Society. The fantastic doctrines and speculations of this sect, now called Jehovah's Witnesses, appear to reveal a marked incapacity for logical thought. We are confronted in this book by a tissue of contradictions, most of them inherent in the subject, but some due to the author's treatment of it.

Jehovah's Witnesses "accept the Bible as God's Word—the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. In this respect at least they are fundamentalists of fundamentalists" (pp. 32-33). "The Bible is God's Word, and God's Word cannot err" (p. 41). Yet they do not believe in the Incarnation, and they reject the doctrine of the Trinity, which they hold to be the teaching of the devil. They hold an Arian view of Christ as a created being. "In effect they are unitarians" (p. 36). They teach that Jesus was not crucified but impaled on a tree, and they identify him with the Archangel Michael (p. 51). They deny that Jesus is God's only Son. God, according to them, had two sons. The other was Lucifer, later named Satan (p. 39). It was not until October, 1914, that Satan was expelled from heaven (p. 50). The second Advent or Parousia of Christ (interpreted spiritually) took place in 1874 (p. 62). The Witnesses deny that the redeeming work of Christ was completed on the Tree or that those who trust in Him are saved from their sins and inherit eternal life (p. 56). Russell taught that the ransom for all, procured by the man Christ Jesus, does not give or guarantee eternal life or blessing to any man, but it does guarantee to every man another opportunity or trial for life everlasting at the universal resurrection. Each man must then prove by obedience or disobedience his worthiness or unworthiness of life eternal, being justified by works (p. 57).

The author of this book nowhere adequately observes that whatever this teaching is, it is certainly not fundamentalism or belief in the inerrancy of the Bible. It is a contradiction of the Bible which they claim to accept in its entirety as the infallible Word of God. But the author adds inconsistencies of his own. He writes: "They accept the Christian ethic, and we have every reason to suppose that in their daily lives they strive to put into practice the teaching contained in the Sermon on the Mount" (p. 30). Yet he has told us that "the Witnesses seldom have anything but abuse for their orthodox rivals" (p. 6), thus continuing in the Russellite tradition (p. 15), and, we may add, in that of "Judge" Rutherford, who declared that "the ecclesiastical systems, Catholic

and Protestant, are under supervision and control of the Devil" (*Deliverance,* p. 222). This is a strange way of carrying out the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount!

We are told (p. 8) that "the faithful and true witness" (*Rev.* iii, 14) is recognised by the Witnesses to be Jesus Christ. On p. 14, however, we learn that Russell believed the words to refer to himself! Either the author has failed to notice any contradiction here or he is a master of reticence. The well-known defects in Russell's moral life are admitted (pp. 15-17), but their significance appears to be underestimated.

While, however, the author's judgment is generally too lenient, in one respect he seems to do the Witnesses less than justice. On p. 32 he says that in their teaching comparatively little is said about the love of God. "In their conception of God there does not seem to be very much of the Heavenly Father who is slow to anger and quick to pity his erring creatures." Yet he admits (pp. 52f.) that they have so stressed the doctrine that God is love as to deny that there is a hell of eternal torment. This seems to be the most commendable feature of their otherwise unchristian teaching.

It would be tedious to review all the arrogant and extravagant speculations which are here exposed, concerning Armageddon, the Millenium, and the rest. It appears that the Jehovah's Witnesses select the least significant bits of the Bible, especially the more enigmatic symbols of the books of Daniel and Revelation, take them out of their context, give them fantastic and arbitrary interpretations relating to modern times, treat them as a sort of *Old Moore's Almanac* of prediction, and magnify their importance so that they overshadow all the central doctrines of Scripture. Their excesses constitute a warning of the dangers that beset those who would build a theology exclusively, or even mainly, upon eschatology.

A. W. ARGYLE.

Robert Wilson Black, by Henry Townsend. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 12s. 6d.)

No one could meet the late Mr. R. Wilson Black without realising that he was a man of exceptional force of personality. Even allowing for the fact that he was a wealthy man who used his money generously in the service of the churches it was remarkable that within a few years of being linked with the Baptist denomination he should have been elected President of the Baptist Union. This is a story of a man of outstanding business capacity and of intense devotion to the cause of Christ. Although Mr. Black in his earliers years showed a lively interest in housing conditions in Fulham and maintained a generous concern for orphaned children throughout his life, his chief interests came to be the work of his

own church (Twynholm), the Temperance cause, and evangelism. He was a Victorian, and seemed to some of those who knew him not quite at home in the presence of such new phenomena as the Ecumenical Movement and the Welfare State. His service to the causes which captured his interest was unstinted.

Mr. Black believed in employing business acumen in Christian work. It was due to his foresight, capacity, and generosity that the Free Church Federal Council secured its present premises on advantageous terms. The United Kingdom Alliance benefited similarly. Once his interest had been gained it was Mr. Black's hope to benefit the Baptist denomination in the same way. Dr. Townsend has told the story of the Russell Square scheme in some detail. It is obvious where his own sympathies lie, and some of his readers will share his view.

J. O. BARRETT.

Some Young People. Compiled by Pearl Jephcott. (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 12s. 6d.)

King George's Jubilee Trust was founded in 1935, and at the express wish of King George V it was devoted to the welfare of young people. In the course of its work the Trust came across various recurring problems in connection with youth organisations, and finally decided to undertake an enquiry into the membership of such organisations, its distribution over the adolescent period, leakage of members, reasons for joining and leaving, and so on. Naturally a large number of the organisations which are involved are attached to Churches, and this report should be read, marked, learned and inwardly digested by Church officers as well as Church youth workers.

The guinea-pigs were 900 boys and girls spread over two thinly-veiled districts in North London, one suburban area of Nottingham, and four villages, three in Oxfordshire and one in Bucks. Of course the job of making contact with and interviewing young people at such a self-conscious age is a very delicate one, but the interviewers were wise enough to wonder sometimes whether the answers given represented the real reasons, conscious or unconscious, for the youngsters' actions, and they often make shrewd guesses.

The picture is not a particularly cheering one. The aimlessness and apathy of the vast majority of the people interviewed makes a sad contrast with our rather grandiose talk about modern education. The interviewers became almost pathetically excited when they found someone with a real purpose or a steady hobby. The aimlessness of the vast majority of the parents obviously overshadows everything, and even if school manages to light some kind of flame, it is soon dowsed by parental apathy and dull work when the youngster leaves school. Many of those interviewed said simply

and flatly that they weren't interested in religion, although the interviewers took this to mean that while they acknowledged the existence of God, they were not interested in Churches, and drew very few, if any, conclusions for their lives from whatever belief they held.

Of the 900 interviewed, about two in three did not belong to any youth organisation. Nearly half the boys were members, but only one in four of the girls. The reasons for not belonging were, of course, many, but some general trends were observable: (1) Many of the organisations were flooded with younger children. The adults did not seem to appreciate the enormous importance young people attach to age-group gangs. (2) Shyness in the sense of great difficulty in integrating oneself into a new community. This could have been overcome in many cases had the leader had the intuition to see it and the concern (and time) to give a little personal attention. (3) The dinginess of premises and unimaginative leadership.

Some hard but necessary things are said under the last head. One of the great failures of organisations is to be an alien organisation in a closely-knit community. The leaders come and go and make no real contact with the district, and they are content to take the "easy" youngsters who like to come from far and near without enquiring why some of the people on the doorstep don't come and trying to get their allegiance. The investigators are certain that there are vast stores of untapped interest among parents and neighbours, and if only organisations would enlist their help and enthusiasm, premises could be transformed and new activities started, and, what is more, the organisation would become part of the district.

There are many other wise findings which we should do well to ponder. The scene is not all black, and generous tributes are paid to the amount of work and interest put in by a vast army of voluntary workers. If only a little more discernment and initiative were added! Miss Jephcott's closing words are: "Whatever the nature of the agent to be employed in the future, the enquirers were unanimous on one point, that the spark which first lights up the possibilities of leisure more often than not comes from the friendly concern of one older person for an individual boy or girl." The setting down of a factual survey of this kind might result in unrelieved boredom, but Miss Jephcott's lively style, humour, and deft touches of atmosphere recreate the scenes for us and make reading a pleasure.

DENIS LANT.

Ordinal and Service Book. (Oxford University Press, 8s. 6d.)

Not a few Baptist ministers have reason to be grateful for the *Book of Common Order* issued by the Church of Scotland in 1928.

In 1931 the first edition of this *Ordinal and Service Book* was issued, and it now appears in a revised form, and includes services of Licensing of Probationers, Ordination, Induction, the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the Dedication of a Hall-Church, as well as prayers for constituting a meeting of a Court of the Church. Presbyterians have long had a reputation for insisting that everything should be done decently and in order, and this book, with its ordered reverence in procedure, its dignity and economy of language, admirably reflects the Presbyterian temper. But the book arouses curiosity. Why should certain tunes be more or less laid down for some hymns and not for others? Why is the Communion Service encouraged in connection with the Licensing of a Probationer and not for the Ordination of a minister? There are doubtless reasons, and some reference to them in the Preface would have been helpful.

J. O. BARRETT.

Stolen Legacy, by George G. M. James. (Philosophical Library, New York, $3.75.)

The author attempts to prove (*a*) that the Greek philosophers practised plagiarism and did not teach anything new, and (*b*) that the source of their teachings was the Egyptian Mystery System. Pythagoras' geometry, Socrates' "Know thyself," and Plato's theory of ideas and account of the cardinal virtues were all stolen from the Egyptians. Greek philosophers did not, however, exhaust the resources of Memphite theology, and if only men of science would study it "with the key of magical principles for its interpretation," they would be able to "unlock the doors of the secrets of nature and become the custodians of unlimited knowledge" (p. 150). The "New Philosophy of Redemption" for the black people of North Africa is to be found in a recognition of the debt that all cultures owe to theirs, "the oldest civilisation in the world" (p. 161). Such a recognition on the part of Africans will induce self-respect and, on the part of white people, humility. When the contribution of African culture to world civilisation is properly recognised, "race relations should tend to be normal and peaceful!" (p. 157). The debt of Greek philosophy to the Egyptian Mysteries has not perhaps been sufficiently recognised; and the charge may be just that the attitude of white to black has been far too much that of the culturally superior to the culturally inferior. But, on both counts, the author wildly overstates his case.

God and Space-Time, by Alfred P. Stiernotte, Ph.D. (Philosophical Library, New York, $3.00.)

This book is sub-titled, "Deity in the Philosophy of Samuel Alexander," and is a detailed study of the famous 1920 Gifford

lectures, "Space-Time and Deity." The work is in two parts. The first, called "Exposition," analyses Alexander's notions of Deity ("Even God himself does not as actual God possess deity attained, but only the nisus towards it"), and the religious sentiment ("The religious sentiment is the sense of our outgoing to the whole universe in its process towards the as yet unrealised quality of deity"). Dr. Stiernotte discusses the relevance of these conceptions to the problem of Evil, the question of Immortality and the fact of Good and Great Men, as this is set forth in Alexander's system. In the second part, called "Evaluation and Criticism," the author finds reasons for rejecting Alexander's notion of deity, i.e. "infinite, ineffable deity in the distant future," but he wants to retain the "nisus," the dynamic force behind emergent evolution. The true religious sense is reverence for the nisus and the highest type of "emergent," i.e. "the religious genius who unites in himself a universal value with such intensity that his life and the value are completely suffused in an 'incarnation' of human excellence and cosmic creativity."

W. D. HUDSON.

A Devotional Commentary on The Shorter Oxford Bible, by William J. Shergold. (Independent Press, 12s. 6d.)

This title might mislead some readers. The book is not a series of meditations, but a simple, straightforward working commentary. In his foreword Dr. Leslie Cooke tells us that the Lay Preaching Committee of the Congregational Union asked Dr. Shergold to provide a correspondence course for lay preachers. This material has now been brought together in book form, and provides a continuous exposition of The Shorter Oxford Bible, the divisions of which are consequently retained. Dr. Shergold has not aimed at being critical. He has simply explained and clarified. His connecting narrative is especially valuable in setting the material in perspective. While necessarily sketchy and restricted in its scope, this book will be of great value to lay preachers, day and Sunday-school teachers, and all who want the Biblical passages put into their context and clearly explained without technicalities.

A Discourse on the Life to Come, by Stephen Hobhouse. (Independent Press, 6s.)

Mr. Hobhouse, the well-known Quaker and writer on mysticism, has now passed his span of three score and ten years, and is considerably enfeebled in body, though his mind seems as clear as ever. He tells us that he has often been kept in his room for long periods, and enforced imprisonment and weakness have made him give much thought to the life to come. Our Lord gave men very little information about this further life, "hardly . . . more than an

assurance (and what a glorious assurance!) that they would still be fully alive, enjoying always His heavenly Father's love and care, and that in many cases there would be a complete reversal of the lot of rich and poor, powerful and humble." In view of this admission by Mr. Hobhouse it necessarily follows that his little book is speculative and imaginative. He draws largely on the poets, also on the mystics but, more surprisingly, on the spiritualists. He is always reverent but such speculation will only help some people. Others will regard it as presumptuous or merely unnecessary. The reference to *Matt.* xxxv, 41, on p. 70 needs correction.

Prayers and Praise, by Nathaniel Micklem. (Independent Press, 6s.)

The prejudice against " set prayers " among the Free Churches has meant that those who have felt a need for them have often been driven to seek what they need in the Divine office of the Catholic Church. It was in order to meet this need that Dr. Micklem published his little book of Protestant offices in 1941. It now makes a welcome reappearance in a revised edition. The valuable introduction and essay on " The Christian Life " stand as they were. Dr. Micklem reminds us that " we cannot let the praise of God wait upon our moods and feelings." And, I would add, our health. There are moments when from weariness or ill-health we cannot summon up the necessary spiritual impetus to form our own prayers. We are often guilty of telling sick people to pray when they are unable to make the effort, for body and spirit are more closely knit than many people care to acknowledge. In these moments of dryness, tiredness or sickness an office becomes a necessity if we are to pray at all. Dr. Micklem has put his offices in a new and more convenient order and has re-written some of them. He has varied them all so as to bring in a second hymn, or part of a hymn, usually at the expense of one of the prayers. This is in accord with our Free Church tradition, where hymns are the usual vehicle of our response to the Word of God. We are grateful for this welcome reissue.

DENIS LANT.

The Man at the Bell and other Talks to Children, by A. Whigham Price. (Presbyterian Bookroom and Independent Press, 5s.)

This collection of thirty children's addresses is as good as anything of its kind which has appeared in recent years. Several of the talks have been published in the *Expository Times,* but there are also new ones. Each starts from a text, and draws out its lesson in a clear and interesting way. There is no waste of words. There is one talk for each of the following: Christmas, Sunday after Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Palm Sunday, Easter, Sunday after Ascension, Whitsun, Trinity Sunday and Harvest. Those who have to give a children's address every Sunday will find this book just what they need. And even children would really enjoy reading it!

W. D. HUDSON.