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

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

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY

incorporating the Transactions of the
BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITORIAL

THE Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society will be held as usual during the Baptist Union Assembly week this year. The date is Monday, May 2nd; the place is the Institute Hall at Westminster Chapel; the time is 4.30 p.m. It is anticipated that tea will be available before the meeting. There are two items of Society business which are of considerable importance. We have, first of all, to elect a President in succession to the late Mr. Seymour Price. The officers have a nomination to bring to the meeting, but members are at liberty to make counter-nominations. Secondly, we shall receive an interim report on the discussions which the officers have had with the Baptist Union, in connection with possible further Union support. This matter was discussed at the Annual Meeting last year and the officers have proceeded in the light of decisions taken then. Following the business part of the meeting, Rev. R. E. Cooper, M.A., of Eltham College, will speak on "Some Origins of Ministerial Training amongst Baptists." Mr. Cooper has been engaged on research in this subject in connection with his Triple-Jubilee history of Regent's Park College, the manuscript of which he has recently completed. Undoubtedly Mr. Cooper will have some things to say about present-day Ministerial Training in the light of his researches. We hope that there will be time for some discussion. The time available, however, depends, in large measure, upon you who read this Editorial and who plan to come. Of recent

years the first Session of the Assembly has been growing longer and longer as a result of debates on Public Resolutions and amendments thereto. Consequently many Historicial Society members, who have remained to the end (dare one say "bitter end"!) of the Assembly Session, have been late in arriving for tea and for the meeting. The result has been that the Annual Meeting has become shorter and shorter. Last year we had less than one hour. The officers have looked at other possible times for the Annual Meeting during Assembly Week, but every possibility clashes with other important meetings. We would ask members this year, therefore, if the afternoon session of the Assembly continues beyond 4.30 p.m., to forego the last few minutes and so make it possible for themselves to have some tea, on the one hand, and for the Society's business to be conducted, on the other.

* * *

Our apologies are due for the late arrival of this issue. We would make it plain that neither the printers nor the publishers are to blame. The fault lies mainly with the Editor! Part of the reason has been his moving from Oxford to St. Albans. (Incidentally it should be said that the fact he has moved into the next road in St. Albans to the Society's Treasurer is purely coincidental!). There have, however, in addition, been certain difficulties arising from the non-appearance of promised material for this issue. As the Editor is unlikely to move again—just yet, and as the other difficulties are being sorted out, we do not anticipate so great a delay in the future.

* * *

We are glad to hear that *Christian Baptism,* the symposium edited by Rev. A. Gilmore, has aroused considerable interest both inside the Baptist denomination and also amongst other sections of the Church. We understand that the second impression is nearly sold out and that a third impression is being considered. Interest has been particularly marked amongst scholars in the Church of England, which is not surprising, as the matter of Baptism is very much a live issue amongst Anglicans just now. In the light of this interest we hope to publish shortly some comments on the book by an Anglican scholar. As the debate on Baptism which was sparked off by the book within the Baptist denomination is still proceeding, we refrain from comment—at the moment!

* * *

The Ter-Jubilee celebrations of the Baptist Union are now gathering momentum. We hear of much activity in Evangelism and of much thought being given to the raising of the money. This is as it should be. We need to recall, however, that there is a third strand in the suggested pattern of celebrations and that is Education. Education in the history and principles of the Baptists. There are

encouraging signs from some parts of the country that this important element is being taken seriously. It is greatly to be hoped that members of the Society will see to it that this very necessary theme is nowhere forgotten. It is essential that the denomination is taught the reasons for its very existence. Members of our churches must be Baptists by conviction. In these days of closer co-operation amongst the churches in England the older non-theological distinctions between Church and Chapel are disappearing. This is a matter for rejoicing, but if there do not remain theological distinctions, between Baptists and others, understood and accepted, then the distinctive Baptist witness—and ultimately the denomination—is doomed to extinction.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

E. P. WINTER, M.A., B.Litt.
Minister, Worcester.

G. W. RUSLING, M.A., B.D.
Vice-Principal, Spurgeon's College.

N. CLARK, M.A., S.T.M.
Minister, Amersham, Bucks.

E. A. PAYNE, M.A., D.D.
General Secretary, Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.

Reviews by :—L. G. CHAMPION, C. H. CLEAL, A. C. ELDER, A. GILMORE, J. R. C. PERKIN, DOUGLAS STEWART.

The Administration of the Lord's Supper among the Baptists of the Seventeenth Century

(*a*) General Baptists

DR. HORTON DAVIES wrote[1] in 1948 that there was no account of an early Baptist service of the Lord's Supper. However, in his bibliography he does not note a book by Thomas Grantham, which, in fact, gives such an order.[2] We may analyse this order as follows:

1. Preaching and prayer, as on other occasions.
2. "Decent" preparation of the elements on the Table.
3. (a) Exhortation "to due Humility and reverence".
   (b) Statement of the authority for and Institution of the Supper.
   (c) Statement of its "mystical signification" regarding the Cross of Christ.
   (d) Statement of the spiritual qualifications necessary for all partakers.
4. (a) Taking and blessing of the bread.
   (b) Fraction and Words of Institution.
   (c) Distribution and reception of the bread.
5. (a) Taking and blessing of the cup.
   (b) Libation and Words of Institution.
   (c) Distribution and reception of the cup.
6. Exhortation to gratitude.
7. Prayer of thanksgiving.
8. Fellowship offering.
9. "Hymn of Praise".

This order is of particular interest in that apart from the "Double consecration" it seems nearer to the Westminster Directory than the order of service at either Rothwell[3] or Bury Street;[4] these are the only two early orders of service respecting Independent churches which have come down to us. Both the Westminster Directory and the Baptist order have a richer introduction than the Independent orders. Some detail of Grantham's order call for comment.

Following the precedent set by John Smyth,[5] the General Baptists used no book, not even the English Bible, in their services, for the greater part of the seventeenth century.[6]

With regard to Item 8, the offering had to be at the Lord's Supper because of its two purposes, namely:

(i) The purchase of bread and wine, and plate when necessary.
(ii) The expression of Christian love and fellowship, in relieving "the necesseties of the saynts".[7]

With regard to Item 9, the term "Hymn of Praise" was frequent on the lips of General Baptists, but it did not mean a metrical psalm or a hymn sung to a formal tune by "conjoint voices". It rather meant a solo, prophetic, edificatory ejaculation.[8] "Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs" are all solo activities, comparable with prophesying, preaching and teaching. Grantham, further, would not allow the use of any musical instrument or a choral ensemble.[9] The "hymn" at the Last Supper was no evidence for or against "conjoint singing". Who sang, what he or they sang and the method of singing are all unknown. The singing to instruments of the Old Testament times was a concession to "the gross hearts of the Jews". Thus, the "Hymn of Praise" at the close of the Lord's Supper was a solo outburst of Praise to God by the elder conducting the Supper.[10]

The General Baptists did not engage in psalm-singing, except that the Turner's Hall church sang psalms, including one at the close of the Lord's Supper, after its amalgamation with the Barbican Particular Baptist church.[11] In 1689 the General Assembly thought Sternhold and Hopkins so "strangely foreign to the Evangelical worship that it was not conceived anyways safe for the Churches to admit to such Carnall formaltities".[12] A solo voice represented the whole church, as in prayer; only whereas in prayer the voice was solemn, in a "hymn" it was joyful.[13]

The General Baptists adjoined to the Lord's Supper an "agape". It had a double justification:

(i) It was according to the primitive model.
(ii) It was "necessary that the congregation should be refreshed before it be dismissed".[14] Hence the phrase, "Leg of Mutton Baptists".

The custom, though widespread among the General Baptists in the middle of the seventeenth century, had died out largely by its end; in 1709, only one congregation, that at Lambert Street, Whitechapel, practised it.[15]

The Fenstanton church did not regard this "love-feast" as vital, though it did take it as the proper thing to do from the example of the Lord.[16] Thomas Grantham regarded it as a matter of option: the only vital thing, he learned from 1 *Cor.* 10: 16, was that anything more than the one bread and one cup of the Supper itself must not be abused.[17] A "Feast of Charity" was lawful, but only

the one bread and the one cup of the Supper was necessary. To come to the Supper fasting, however, was equally forbidden by the Scriptures, since the Last Supper followed the Paschal Feast.[18]

Like the other Separatist bodies the General Baptists had a conscientious objection to kneeling at the Lord's Supper to receive the elements, and sat, copying the Last Supper as they understood it.[19] It is not true to say, with R. C. Walton,[20] that they denied that bodily actions could express spiritual intentions. For Grantham, at least, their posture was an act of spiritual obedience to the Lord, who clearly intended the communicants to sit.[21] He disagreed with those who would enforce kneeling but also with those who said that the posture was a matter of indifference. The posture was not essential to the "Ordinance", but it was important and of spiritual significance[22]

The General Baptists objected to the use of a knife on the bread at the Lord's Supper,[23] noting the Scriptural expression, "the breaking of bread".

The order of receiving each of the elements was that which commonly obtains today, namely: minister first, congregation second, and deacons delivering the elements last.[24]

Thomas Grantham appears to be the only General Baptist who gave his people teaching regarding their approach to and use of the Lord's Supper.[25]

(b) THE PARTICULAR BAPTISTS

No detailed order of service for the Particular Baptists has come down to us. However, it cannot have been substantially different from that supplied by Thomas Grantham regarding the General Baptists, since the latter is so similar to that known to have obtained among the Independents.

A few points call for comment.

As for the Independents and the General Baptists the details of the Last Supper constituted a norm for the Lord's Supper. Thus, for example, the Words of Institution were said to the disciples in general,[26] and therefore had to be said to the congregation as a whole. It was wrong of the Anglican priest to repeat them to each communicant, one by one.[27]

Few Baptists sang psalms. Vavasor Powell was the only Baptist in Wales to encourage the practice.[28] Examples of English churches which sang psalms are: Broadmead,[29] Bedford (from 1690),[30] Kiffin's church[31] and Paul's Alley.[32] These all sang psalms at the Lord's Supper as well as at preaching services.

In the last quarter of the century a great discussion arose among the London Baptists on the question of hymn singing.[33] Benjamin Keach propounded that as the Lord had sung a hymn before going

out from the Last Supper, so the church should sing a hymn at the close of the Lord's Supper. By "hymn" he meant the modern hymn, then unknown to English congregations. His argument was resisted by many contemporary fellow Baptists, though Hercules Collins[34] and others supported him.

When in 1668 Keach introduced the singing of a hymn at the close of the Lord's Supper it was the first time that the modern hymn had been sung in England.[35] The hymn was the *ad hoc* composition of Keach and was based on the preceding sermon, itself preparatory to the Supper at which the hymn was sung. After six years he introduced hymn singing on all festal occasions; after another 14 years he introduced the hymn to the regular Sunday worship.[36] At this a group of people left his church to form another at Maze Pond, where all hymn singing was banned.[37] The matter was mooted at the 1689 Assembly, which put it on one side. However, a bitter and wordy dispute descended upon the Baptists. The protagonist of the opposition to Keach was Isaac Marlow. The main apology for hymn singing from Keach was entitled "The Breach Repaired in God's Worship".

The *crux interpretum* was the Gospel account of the Last Supper, and the hymn which Keach was intending to imitate. A main point of discussion was the meaning of "hymn" in this context. The disputants considered the matter generally for the most part, i.e. without reference to the Lord's Supper in particular. Those who sang did so at the Lord's Supper also: those who did not sing at the Lord's Supper did not sing at all. Such matters as the "Mixt nature" of singing by an assembly, women's voices in church, the use of books in worship, solo singing "in the spirit", "stinted forms of worship", as well as textual and exegetical matters were all drawn into the dispute.

At Keach's church and elsewhere the hymn was the very last item in the service. This had Scriptural authority, but also the practical advantage that those who did not agree with the custom could leave before the hymn commenced! That this was so is evidenced by an item in the 1707 Covenant of Communion of the Watford church,[38] previously a sub-congregation of the Horsly Down church of Keach. It says:

> "Whereas several of our members are satisfied in their judgment concerning singing an hymn after the Lord's Supper, we declare that we are willing our brethren and sisters so satisfied should enjoy the liberty of their conscience in the matter, provided it be performed in this order, viz., after the ordinance of the Lord's Supper is concluded, praises to God by our prayer and contributions made and all other business belonging to the church ended. That then those

> who in their judgment are for singing an hymn may stay and so sing without any offence to those who are not satisfied in the practice. And we, on the other hand, declare we will not be offended with any of our brethren and sisters who have not freedom and satisfaction to join with us therein, nor be present while so doing."

A similar practice at Alcester about the same time was directly due to the influence of Keach also.

Further, this practice was recommended by the Western Association meeting at Taunton in 1699,[39] thus:

> "In reply to the church at Bampton, we humbly think those who are not for the practice of singing after the Lord's Supper may, without wrong to their own consciences, leave those to their liberty who are, for singing, to stay and sing in the same place where the supper is administered, after those who are not for singing are gone, and this we think will be much more honorourable to the name of God and our holy profession than to send away dissatisfied members by recommendation."

Keach's hymns[40] will be found in his "Spiritual Songs" and "Spiritual Melody". Each was composed *ad hoc* and probably sung but once. Few of those published were written for the Lord's Supper: there was only one celebration of the Supper for every eight preaching services. Few of the hymns for the Sacrament have their imagery controlled by the details of the Supper. Predominantly the hymns are concerned to praise God for Christ and his death in a general manner.

Thomas Wilcox[41] also wrote hymns for the Lord's Supper.[42] While these constitute more tolerable verse than the doggerel of Keach it is not known whether they were ever sung. His compositions were written apparently with more care and at greater leisure than those of Keach, tied as the latter's were to his weekly round of sermon preparation.

In 1697 Joseph Stennett published "Hymns in Commemoration of the Sufferings of our blessed Saviour, Jesus Christ, composed for the celebration of His Holy Supper".[43] Like those of Keach, and of Watts, these are concerned with the death of Christ in a general way. At times one meets specific reference to the Supper itself, as in No. XVI, part of which we quote:

> "How sweet, how charming is the place,
> With God's bright presence crowned:
> Happy his children, who his board,
> As olive-plants surround.

Eat of this feast, says he, my friends,
Who to my courts repair;
Come, dearest children, freely drink
The wine which I prepare.

Here may our faith still on thee feed,
The only food divine;
To faith thy flesh is meat indeed,
Thy blood the noblest wine:

Here we are glad to view thy love,
Thro figures, and in part;
But how much greater joy will't be
To see thee as thou art!"

We also quote in full Hymn V of those of Thomas Wilcox, in which the imagery is controlled by the Supper itself:

"Lo Christ is sacrific'd for us,
Our Passover from heaven;
Now therefore let us keep the Feast
Not with old lumps of leaven.

Who eat and drink unworthily,
Their own Damnation earn;
Because they want a spiritual Eye,
His Body to discern.

Our hearts with care examined,
Let use be stirred up,
To eat of this Celestial Bread,
And drink this sacred Cup.

As often as we eat this Bread,
And drink this sacred Wine,
We Shew our Saviour's death until
He come the second time."

Baptists allowed no musical instruments to accompany their singing.

Some Particular Baptist churches associated with the Lord's Supper a "Love Feast", "dressed for them by a Cook"; and "when Supper was ended, before the cloth was taken away, they administered the Lord's Supper".[45] The Churches of Dr. Chamberlen,[46] Bishopsgate,[47] and Hexham,[48] had such an "agape".

Churches such as that at Broadmead, Bristol, had a week-night service preparatory to the Lord's Supper.[49] The Ilston church had a preparation for one hour in English, then in Welsh, then a

sermon by the pastor, before the "Breaking of Bread".[50] Also, as we have seen, Benjamin Keach preceded the Supper with a preparatory sermon. It is not possible to say whether the majority of Baptists had such preparatory sermons. Benjamin Keach[51] and Thomas Hardcastle[52] (of Broadmead) also gave their people some instruction in making themselves worthy receivers of the Supper, and advice regarding their personal preparation for it.

Attached to the Supper, at Broamead at least, was the reading of the church roll with a view to following up members not present.[53] Here, too, members were received into fellowship at the opening of the Supper, and the names of proposed new members were announced at its close.[54]

The same church, for one, did not expose the elements to the gaze of the people until the Communion service had commenced.[55] Whether here or elsewhere this was done by the practice, now common, of covering the elements with "a fair white linen cloth" during the preceding preaching service, or by bringing in the elements only when the Communion service had commenced, is not known.

Particular Baptists, such as Hercules Collins,[56] insisted that the bread must not be cut with a knife but, like the Body of Christ, be broken. However, it may perhaps have been cut part way through before the service to allow of a nice breaking into walnut-sized pieces at the service proper, as it was at the Bury Street Independent church.[57] Special loaves may have been baked, as in some places in Yorkshire today. Perhaps, too, at some churches, as in some Welsh churches today,[58] there was an uncut and unbroken cottage loaf on the table and from which the minister took out the inside in one large piece with his hands and broke on to the plates.

Finally, we must note, that at some churches so much time was spent at prophesyings, preaching, etc., that the "breaking of Bread" became a very small item of worhip, in point of time. For example, at Lyme Regis,

> In 1657 we find another elaborate timetable for Sunday services through the Summer. From seven to nine there was to be trial of gifts, prayer and prophecy. From nine to twelve, public exercise, and again from one to three. Then followed a private meeting for members only, to communicate their experience, exercise discipline, and pass judgement on the gifts exercised.[59]

It is not surprising that Particular Baptists, so pre-occupied, in point of time, with other "Ordinances", gave not so much as a sentence to the Lord's Supper in their 1644 and 1656 Confessions of Faith.

[1]Davies, Horton: *The Worship of the English Puritans,* p. 93.
[2]Grantham, Th.: *Hear the Church,* pp. 28-30.
[3]Davis, R.: *Doctrine and Discipline,* p. 20. Glass, N.: *The Early History of the Independent Church at Rothwell,* p. 84.
[4]*Church Book;* printed in Rippon, J. *Baptist Annual Register, III,* pp. 516-9, IV, pp. 553-9, 597-6 and *Congregational Historical Society Trasactions,* VI, pp. 333-6.
[5]Smyth, J.: *Differences,* pp. 4, 17f.
[6]Burgess, W. H.: *John Smith,* pp. 129ff.
[7]Smyth, J.: *Works,* I, pp. 38f.
[8]Grantham, Th.: *Christianismus Primitivus,* Book II, Part II, Ch. VIII, pp. 99-117. *A Friendly Epistle to the Bishops,* p. 34. Goadby, J. J.: *Bypaths in Baptist History,* pp. 322-330.
[9]*Ibid.*
[10]*Ibid.*
[11]*Church Book;* printed in Baptist Historical Society Transactions, IV, p. 47.
[12]Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes,* I, p. 27.
[13]*Loc. cit.,* p. 28.
[14]D'Assigny, M.: *The Mystery of Anabaptism Unmasked,* p. 227. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records,* pp. 37, 67-9. *Warboys Records,* p. 272. Goadby, J. J.: *Bypaths in Baptist History,* p. 306.
[15]Taylor, A.: *The History of the General Baptists,* I, pp. 428f.
[16]Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records,* pp. 35, 67-9.
[17]Grantham, Th.: *Christianismus Primitivus,* Book II, PartII, Ch. 7, §II, pp. 82f, §VIII, 92, 95f.
[18]*Ibid.*
[19]*Op. cit.,* §VIII, pp. 94f.
[20]Walton, R. C.: *The Gathered Community,* p. 132.
[21]Grantham, Th.: *Op. cit.,* p. 94.
[22]*Ibid.*
[23]Grantham, Th.: *Op. cit.,* p. 95.
[24]Grantham, Th.: *Hear the Church,* pp. 28-30.
[25]Grantham, Th.: *Christianismus Primitivus, Loc. cit.,* p. 92, §II *passim.*
[26]Powell, V.: *Common-Prayer Book No Divine Service,* p. 22 (§39).
[27]*Ibid.*
[28]Jones, R. T.: *Vavasor Powell,* p. 238. Thomas, J.: *The History of the Baptist Churches in Wales,* p. 96.
[29]Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records, passim.* Hardcastle, Th.: *Expositions,* p. 152.
[30]Scholes, P.: *The Puritans and Music in England and New England,* p. 268.
[31]Whiting, C. E.: *Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution,* p. 97.
[32]Church Book; printed in *Baptist Historical Society Transactions,* IV, p. 47.
[33]Crosby, T. *A History of the English Baptists, IV,* pp. 298-301. Goadby, J. J.: *Bypaths in Baptist History,* pp. 331-349. Whitley, W. T.: *A History of British Baptists,* pp. 187ff. Underwood, A. C.: *A History of English Baptists,* pp. 109-112, 132f. Davies Horton: *The Worship of the English Puritans,* pp. 169-173.
[34]Collins, H.: *An Orthodox Catechism,* p. 44.
[35]Curwen, S.: *Studies in Music and Worship,* I, p. 50 Whitley, W. T.: *Op. cit.,* p. 184. *Congregational Hymn Singing in England,* p. 98. Routley, E.: *Hymns and Human Life,* p. 148.

[36]*Ibid.*
[37]*Ibid.*
[38]*Church Book;* printed in, Stuart, J.: *Beechen Grove Baptist Church, Watford,* p. 16.
[39]Minutes; printed in Ivimey, J.: *A History of the English Baptists,* p. 540.
[40]See for example *Baptist Quarterly,* Vol. XV, p. 326.
[41]Sometimes referred to as "Wilcocks." He is neither the Thomas Wilcocks of the *Dictionary of National Biography,* nor the Baptist, Thomas Wilcox, of the eighteenth century.
[42]Wilcox, Th.: *A Guide to Eternal Glory,* X, pp. 166-174.
[43]The hymns of these Baptists are earlier than, but in the same category as, those "composed on divine subjects" by Isaac Watts (*not* his metrical psalms or scripture paraphases).
[44]Keach, B.: *The Breach Repaired in God's Worship,* p. 53.
[45]Edwards, Th.: *Gangraena,* I, p. 136. Ivimey, J.: *A History of British Baptists,* II, p. 391.
[46]Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Hexham Records,* p. 323.
[47]Ivimey, J.: *Loc. cit.*
[48]Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Loc. cit.,* p. 290.
[49]Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* pp. 106. 165.
[50]Lee, F.: *Baptist Quarterly,* XIII, p. 156.
[51]Keach, B.: *Baptist Catechism,* Q. 104. *Horsly Down Articles of Faith,* XXIV. (These do not give specific guidance, but the inclusion of any reference at all indicates that the matter was of some importance to the writer.) *Tropologia,* p. 622. (Where some specific directions are given.)
[52]Hardcastle, Th.: *Expositions,* pp. 146-151.
[53]Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* p. 86.
[54]*Ibid,* pp. 363ff.
[55]*Ibid.*
[56]Collins, H.: *Some Reasons for Separation from the Communion of the Church of England,* p. 13.
[57]Bury Street Church Book; *Congregational Historical Society Transactions,* VI, pp. 333f.
[58]Dr. E. A. Payne in a letter dated 30.1.53, and some Welsh Baptists subsequently, verbally.
[59]*Baptist Historical Society Transactions,* IV, p. 134.

E. P. WINTER

Baptist Places of Worship

IT is customary to dedicate a church building "to the glory of God." There are two ways in which that phrase may be understood. In the first place a building may be to the glory of God in the sense that *what goes on inside it* is His service and His praise. It houses a worshipping congregation and is the scene and headquarters of various church activities. There is, however, an additional possibility, not by any means opposed to the first but certainly distinguishable from it. *The building itself* may be so designed as to be a standing expression of our faith in God and our desire to glorify Him. It may minister positively and creatively to the activities of those who gather within it. It need not simply accommodate worshippers but may itself assist and evoke worship.

Generally speaking it is the first of these ideas which seems to be reflected in the churches which we Baptists have built. We have thought of them as places inside which the Gospel would be proclaimed, as accommodation for the Sunday School, Youth Work and other activities. If it were a case of either/or this emphasis is in the right direction. The "living stones" mentioned in 1 *Peter* are always more important than the bricks and mortar in which they assemble themselves together. Although we loosely use the word "church" for both the building and its occupants we know that its true meaning refers to the people not the place. But the two ideas I have mentioned are not mutually exclusive and I believe we can legitimately charge ourselves with some neglect of the second, the opportunity of using the very design of a church to the glory of God. There are exceptions, of course, both old and new, but we cannot claim that our churches as a whole reflect an inspired or inspiring tradition in architecture.

Historically, there are some mitigating factors but we should be wise to look for at least part of the explanation in ourselves rather than in circumstances which have been against us. We should not, for example, be too ready to blame the money problem, although it frequents imposes limitations upon us. Among our newer churches there are some which have been built to the tightest budgets and yet do credit to the denomination and to the function they are intended to serve. There are others, sometimes costing more, which do little for the worshipper, and some where one worships in spite of rather than helped by them. Of these the kindest thing one can say is that the opportunity of glorifying God in terms of architecture and design has just not been seen.

In two or three aspects we have paid dearly for a negative element in our Puritanism and architecture is one of the arts which has suffered. There has at least been some lack of interest in, if not actual distrust of, material forms. Of course we have built churches, sometimes very expensive ones. We have had to have premises for our church work. But we have not always been convinced that they could be more than just premises, do more than provide needed accommodation. We have been sure of the truth that it is possible to worship God in any surroundings but not persuaded of the positive part which surroundings can be made to play. I am keen to put this argument in right perspective. Environment does not have the last word in evoking the spirit of true worship any more than it does in the formation of character. But it has *something* to say. It exerts some influence upon us whether we are at work, or play, or worship, and to ignore this is to ignore sound psychology. Nevertheless my chief concern is that to ignore it is to lose an opportunity of glorifying God by the care we put into the design of our churches and by making them expressive of our faith.

Our relative immaturity in the sphere of architecture can be illustrated in two or three ways. Least important, perhaps, but quite significant in its own way, is our lack, even at this date, of an appropriate architectural terminology for the details of Baptist places of worship. Each part of an Anglican church is identifiable by a characteristic and descriptive name but although we have been building churches for three hundred years we still have to borrow words from other traditions. They are not always appropriate in our case. We talk in a rather clumsy way about "the pulpit end" of the church. If we want something less crude we call it the "sanctuary." Yet this is a borrowed term, by no means right for "the pulpit end." The main points in a dictionary definition of "sanctuary" are "a place for the worship of God; the part of a church round the altar; an inviolable asylum which gives protection to a criminal taking refuge there." Only the last of these could possibly be applied to the pulpit end! The second is no use to us at all. The first is serviceable enough though not for this particular purpose. It refers to the whole place in which we gather for worship, not just one part of it. Turning from the pulpit end and the criminal who takes refuge there we come to "the part where the congregation sits." They may be a knave in the pew as well as in the pulpit but are the pews in the nave? If nave is not acceptable dare we admit that "auditorium" might be only too appropriate? I turn to my dictionary again and find that this is defined as the reception room of a monastery, or, nearer to the point, the space allotted to the hearers. Are our congregations merely hearers? Some of us are afraid that they are becoming more and more

passive and leaving too much to the man in the pulpit but that does not truly reflect our tradition.

A certain dependence in terminology is the least important of our problems, however. It is more disturbing when we find that some of those churches which we class among our better examples of architecture have leaned more heavily than in words. They have tried to adapt to Baptist purposes a ground plan which was designed for a quite different theology of the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments. It is easy to account for these adaptations of the Anglican form. They represent an understandable revolt against the drab and the public-meeting-hall types of Baptist church. They reveal a longing for beauty, dignity and reverence. They therefore took over a pattern which gave these things. Aesthetically they are an improvement on the type they rebelled against but they contribute little to a distinctively Baptist or Free Church tradition in architecture. We need not seek to be slavishly different from others but if there is a distinctive Baptist ethos it should be capable of expression in the external forms we employ for our church work and worship. There should be a recognizable shape and pattern about the visible aspects of our life, a stamp and hallmark identifiably Baptist.

Walls have tongues as well as ears and in their own silent way they are constantly speaking to us and of us. They cannot of course proclaim the Gospel in all its range, as a living witness can, but within their limits they can reflect the faith of those who worship within them. "A church building," said Forsyth, "is the outward and visible sign of a local society." But if a church building can thus reflect the faith of a believing community it is also within its power to stimulate and encourage faith. There is truth in Sir Winston Churchill's words: "We shape our buildings but afterwards our buildings shape us." There are good reasons then why we should aim at a better and more consistent level of achievement in this field, thinking of our buildings not merely as so much accommodation for church activities but as themselves capable of declaring the glory of God. Ruskin was right when he said that every true line may tell forth God's praise.

That we have no grounds for complacency is evidenced by mistakes which are still being made in otherwise successful buildings. The mistakes I have in mind are those which suggest a lack of clear-cut purpose and clearly thought-out directives to the architect. If this seems unduly critical I may be pardoned for mentioning that such errors have either to be lived with for a long time or, if rectified, can prove extremely expensive. (A serious error in the setting of the pulpit in one new church may involve the introduction of a bull-dozer because, before the trouble can be put right, a backing of reinforced concrete will have to be demolished!) But

my chief concern is that the present moment is providing us with a chance to be creative in this matter of architecture and design. For one thing we are doing a great deal of building and that fact means architectural opportunity. For another thing, in these post-war years architecture in general has moved into a new phase. Buildings, like furniture, have begun to take on a new look. Not all that gets the name contemporary is pleasing. Some of it represents the exaggeration which commonly accompanies a fresh departure in style. But a new period is with us. We are breaking with the idea that a church must have little pseudo-Gothic touches here and there, in order to be a church. Denominations which commonly set more store on tradition than we do are launching out adventurously in this field, and we must do so too. We must ignore neither the true and characteristic elements in our tradition nor the fact that we live in the 20th century and are building for the future. The important thing, however, is to be clear about the basic considerations which should govern the design of our places of worship. And, with all respects to their profession, we cannot leave all the thinking to the architects. We have to provide certain pointers and even then to watch carefully that our general rules are not transgressed in small details.

For good historical and theological reasons we should inform an architect that the focal point of attention in his design will be threefold, pulpit, table, and baptistry. We should be wise to emphasize this *and to insist that no subsidiary feature be allowed to detract or distract from this composite central feature.* Good psychology reinforces good theology in this matter. One feature of our worship is that it demands a high degree of concentration, second only perhaps to that of the Society of Friends. By comparison, and for those who understand it, the Mass must be one of the easiest acts of worship to follow for it is dramatic, visible action. By its very form it is calculated to hold the attention. With us, on the other hand, the worshipper spends much of his time listening to words; apart from the hymns and Lord's Prayer not even saying or singing them, but just listening to them. Visual aids scarcely exist, apart that is from the two greatest—the sacraments themselves. To participate fully in our service, from beginning to end, involves a degree of concentration which is beyond many. Psychological considerations therefore combine with good architectural principles in demanding that there shall be a point of focus in the sanctuary and theological considerations settle what that point shall consist of.

Design and lay-out must be called in to assist here. The lines of the church must run to pulpit, communion table and baptistry so that the eyes of the worshipper will naturally rest there. This sounds obvious but apply it as a test to some of our churches. Too

often the lines instead of coming to a focus at "the pulpit end" splay out into apses on the right and left. Vestry doors instead of being discreet, to be noticed perhaps but immediately forgotten, are sometimes bold and intriguing features. One of the most common faults is to put the choir where every movement and whisper will invite the interest and speculation of the congregation. If our churches were intended mainly for the performance of sacred music there would be something to be said for putting the choir in a prominent position. In fact such performances are only occasional. Why then let the design suggest that they are the central feature? Why site the choir in such a place that it or individual members of it can so easily become a distraction from worship? Or again, there is that common error whereby a row of organ pipes is allowed to dominate the view. There are many churches where "dominate" is not too strong a word. By their number, size and position they make a commanding feature in a way which should only be allowed for those things which are of the *esse* of our worship, viz. Word and Sacraments. Such considerations have much to do with the matter of focus in church design. We have to know the primary purpose of the building, that to which it is dedicated, and once that is settled the design and lay-out must be made to serve it. Secondary things must contribute and conform to the supreme aim and not by any chance be allowed to become a distraction, much less to usurp the primary position. Incidentally another factor favours my comment regarding the choir for it is agreed by the acoustical experts that the best location for choir and organ is in a small, low gallery over the vestibule *opposite* the "pulpit end" of the church. (The fact that choir members would then be facing the same way as the rest of the congregation would also serve as a gentle reminder, occasionally necessary, that they are one with the whole company which is gathered for worship.)

We appear to be reviving an old and, in my view, rather pointless dispute as to which is the more important, preaching or sacraments, the pulpit or the table. I think this controversy pointless because preaching and sacraments are both central to our worship, and certainly both are fundamental to a denomination which reckons to draw its inspiration from the practice of the apostolic age. The unity of the Gospel which makes them what they are forbids us to range the one against the other. The argument frequently centres round the question of a side or central pulpit. Although I favour the latter as one of the most theologically consistent and characteristic features of our tradition and one which reflects the earliest Christian practice in architecture, I am not altogether convinced by the argument usually made against the side-pulpit, namely, that this necessarily relegates preaching to a secondary position. The important thing for pulpit, table and baptistry is

that they should be within, and in fact constitute, the area of focus, and though this is not so easy to achieve with a side pulpit, it is not impossible. Moreover, those of us who favour the central position need to realize that that alone does not secure our basic aim. While avoiding the mistake of creating a pulpit which is a parade ground it is necessary to design something suggestive of strength, stability and authority. It is no use making a fuss about a central pulpit if we then put in that position something like a match-box in strength and size. Certain pulpits greet the preacher with the text, "Sir, we would see Jesus." Some of them could do with another caption, "Fragile, with care." Others are so small that one dare not move a foot backwards. The price of survival is immobility. Such pulpits, like some of the newer baptistries, may look well as you first enter the church. They look the part and it is only when you get in them that you realize how non-functional they really are. Obviously the architect was pushed for space and perhaps economising on cost; the building committee took it for granted that he would know the elementary needs of these features in a Baptist church and left it to him. But surely the pulpit and the baptistry are among the things which *must* be done properly and no chances taken with them.

I have already alluded to another possible mistake, fortunately very rare. It is hardly credible that in a fine modern church so serious an error should have been made with the pulpit as to require the use of a bull-dozer to put it right. In this case the trouble is that the pulpit (in its setting of reinforced concrete) is so high that even in the fifth row from the front the worshipper has to get his head back in a most uncomfortable position in order to see the preacher. Compare that with our principle that the eyes should run easily and naturally to the focal point. In the same church, I am told, the baptistry cannot be seen from the back rows of the gallery, just the ones which are usually occupied by young people! If there is any difficulty or strain in seeing the preacher, the table or the baptistry, the architect has made a serious error and so has the building committee which approved the plans. Lighting comes into this too. Churches are still being built with windows directly behind the preacher's head so that, against the light, his face gets steadily darker and harder to watch as the service proceeds. The eyes have to fight against such windows for they cannot rest easily and naturally on the minister. As with windows so also the utmost care is needed in the positioning of artificial lights. Acoustics have a lot to do with the question of strain. The difference between lighting and acoustics is that with the former we can ensure that the preacher be seen but even the greatest care with the latter cannot guarantee that he be heard! As factors which aid or hinder physical comfort, ventilation and heating also play their part in assisting concentration; a drowsy or fidgety congregation may sometimes be

due to inadequacy in these arrangements and not always to our sermons.

I have already pleaded that the baptistry should be thoroughly functional. In this the older churches frequently score over newer ones. I know more than one of the latter in which baptism is difficult because of insufficient depth and at least one in which candidates are liable to a banged head because the baptistry is not long enough. However the increasing popularity of the open baptistry seems to be a real advance. Is there any good argument for the closed type? The three things around which our worship gathers, the Word and the two sacraments, should be clearly and centrally in view. An open baptistry is preaching all the time, even when not in actual use. It is an abiding witness to all that wealth and range of truth which the New Testament associates with our new birth through the saving acts of God. Why then put it out of sight? Concerning the table and its setting I would mention one question which seems to need consideration. The familiar rostrum rail may be regarded as a safety measure. But is it in fact a survival from an alien theology? Most of us believe in "open communion," the invitation being given "to all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." This is the one qualification and we almost invariably leave it to members of the congregation to answer the question for themselves. We set up no other "fence" around the table which is the Lord's not ours. Other Christian bodies may fence it on other grounds and I sometimes wonder whether the rostrum rail, as provided for by the architect (who may well come from another denomination), is a relic of those ideas even when it does not represent a fencing of the table to our Baptist minds. We have to watch architects for this kind of unintentional violation of Free Church principles.

An important theme to be impressed upon the architect is that of simplicity. We can occasionally admire the ornate, the subtle, the complex in designs and decorative features favoured by other communions, but they are not native to us and do not reflect our spiritual ethos. Simplicity has one mundane advantage—it is likely to help the bill—but I am thinking chiefly of its spiritual significance. It can speak incomparably of the beauty of holiness. In buildings as in human character it has a way of conveying dignity and peace and it will certainly reinforce the attempt to focus attention. In a place of worship it ministers on the side of the soul who is seeking to bring every thought into captivity to Christ. It is its nature to concentrate the mind and thus set it free for the adoration of God. Unfortunately simplicity can be confused with austerity or even downright ugliness. Austerity is sometimes forced upon us by the money problem but ugliness has nothing to justify or commend it.

Line, proportion, lighting and colour scheme can all contribute

not only to simplicity but to the qualities of life and gladness. Interior decoration is a specialist art nowadays calling for a knowledge of tonal values, surface textures and so on. Fortunately advice can be obtained, sometimes free of charge providing one uses the materials of the makers who give the advice! Some of our older churches have been transformed by colour schemes which combine the qualities of peace and light. Yet some of our new ones still conform to the authorized (Victorian) version of dull brown and varnish. Reverence and gladness are not alien to each other and a church can inspire both. Within the limits imposed by finance we should strive for buildings which will quicken the heart and spirit of those who enter them. It is possible to spend a lot of money for a result which is sombre and unwelcoming. Do we worship a gloomy God? Are we helping the task of evangelism if we let our churches suggest that we do? First impressions often count for a lot and young people are particularly susceptible to the impact of their surroundings.

It is in no contradiction of the plea for simplicity that I welcome the indications that we are increasingly ready for the use of Christian symbols and in particular the supreme one, the cross. During one period of my student days I occasionally worshipped in a Congregationalist College Chapel in which there was a cross on the Communion Table. When I had got over my first instinctive reaction against it I found that it called my thoughts to Christ and I came to see how irrational my prejudice against it had been. We preach about the cross, we sing about it, we gladly hear about it. Why then should we not look at it? Once again we have been needlessly depriving ourselves through the negative strain in our tradition. I am not pleading for the use of the cross as a magical talisman but simply as the most powerful single symbol there is in Christianity, with associations calculated to evoke penitence and praise. A minister newly settled in his church examined the symbols in the wrought-iron rostrum rail. He discovered them to be a motley collection obviously chosen at random from a catalogue by the architect or builder. Several were from pagan sources and one was the phallic symbol of an ancient fertility cult. Yet the members of that church would not have a cross inside or outside the building! Quite apart from anything so alien as pagan symbols what of those that are harmless but irrelevant? Look around the woodwork, stonework, ironwork, of almost any church and see the inoffensive but quite pointless little designs which are often used. The *fleur-de-lys* motif is an example. I am not aware that there is anything against it but is there anything to be said for it? If the *fleur-de-lys*, why not something distinctively Christian? Why not think all these details out so that if they are to say anything at all they may speak for Christ and for the Gospel?

Our churches should be designed for fellowship. This is another characteristic of our life which should be mentioned to the architect. We strive, not without success, for the character of the church as a family. Though we make room for distinctions of function in our doctrine of the ministry, we have rejected anything approaching the caste idea which might put a gulf between minister and people. Here lies an opportunity for the architect to show his skill at reconciling two principles. There is on the one hand the authority of the Word and of its herald commissioned by Christ. The pulpit whether central or on the side, is meant for authoritative proclamation and we do not expect the preacher to be apologetic about either his function or his message. He is there to declare the Word of God and to lead the people in worship, and both position and style of the pulpit should indicate that. On the other hand he is also a fellow-member of the Body of Christ and we give a good deal of emphasis to the truth, One is your Master and all ye are brethren. A typical Baptist pulpit though it recognizes the authority of the Word and its herald, is not meant to create the impression of distance between minister and congregation. For this reason a long narrow building is to be avoided. A Baptist architect, Mr. J. J. M. Smith, who has looked into the various possibilities regarding shape, maintains that the simple rectangular plan (typical of the old meeting houses and, in origin, dating back to the Roman "basilica" form adopted by the early Christians for their first churches) is still the most suitable for contemporary ideas and needs. Perhaps there is yet room for experiment with other shapes but whether the plan is rectangular or not it seems to help if the length and breadth are not unduly disproportionate. Care in the disposition of the seating also has a lot to do with this problem. Mr. Smith states that theoretically the best plan shape to accommodate an audience listening to a speaker is the semi-circle. If this is unsuitable for church purposes at least we can go part of the way towards it. A number of our churches have the pews or chairs arranged in an arc-shaped pattern. This may suggest a people gathered together around the Word and table and it also contributes to the other principle which I have urged, for by this means all seats face towards the focal point. Worshippers do not have to turn their heads to look at the pulpit or the table. They have to turn to look elsewhere. Such a pattern readily accepts a central aisle which is virtually a necessity for ease of administration of wedding and funeral services. And here once again what is practical also contributes to the question of line. Immediately on entering the sanctuary the eye is led by a central aisle to the primary point of focus.

The church is a family and if we like dignity we are even more sure that we like warmth of spirit. We are not at home in the over-formal atmosphere. But a problem which confronts many ministers

is how to achieve reverence along with the usual homeliness. Friendliness and fellowship belong to the House of God but so do stillness and awe and the kind of quiet in which the soul may prepare to meet its Lord. We all know churches where there is what can only be described as a hubbub right up to the announcement of the first hymn and this is often resumed in subdued form during the offertory, breaking out again in full vigour within a minute of the benediction. (It is curious that some of the worst offenders would at least cut down their conversation to a whisper if they were in a parish church). Chatter hinders proper preparation for worship beforehand and disrupts the atmosphere immediately afterwards. On the other hand there is a value worth preserving in all this. What is the solution? It seems that we must cater for such fellowship in our planning and design. Some churches have found an answer by providing an extra large vestibule in which those who wish to converse can do so without disturbing others who wish to be quiet either before or after the service. Most churches have some accommodation which could be made available. Fellowship is not true fellowship if it is enjoyed at the cost of others.

I readily grant that some of the things I have mentioned would be difficult to apply in the case of dual purpose buildings though even here a little ingenuity can go a long way. I am not suggesting in any case that architecture and design hold the solution to all our problems. They come in a category of things to which we can apply the text: "These ought ye to have done and not to have left the other undone." We need to be more alive to the influence which they can exert, the more so because it is a silent influence at work on us though we scarcely realize it. In the worlds of industry, education and entertainment they are keenly alert to this and we dare not lag behind. We have to give our best thought to our churches while they are being shaped on the drawing board and the care we give will itself be an act of worship. Only the best is good enough for God.

G. W. RUSLING

In the Study

IT is nearly fifty years since the appearance of Buchanan Gray's *Critical Introduction to the Old Testament;* and that fact alone would have gone far towards ensuring a welcome for its successor. But the welcome was made more certain and unqualified by the entrusting of the task to the capable hands of the Professor of Old Testament Studies at Durham. G. W. Anderson was an obvious choice. The result has amply justified the selection.[1]

Inevitably the scope of the work is restricted. The concern is with nature and composition, structure and content. It tends to involve pedestrian presentation from the author and a hard and tiring march for the reader. Occasionally the exposition rises to real heights; but it is significant that the best chapters (on Pentateuch and Former Prophets) are precisely those dealing with sections of the Old Testament front where recent and exciting advances have been registered. For the rest, we must apply ourselves to this book as a necessary discipline. Old Testament theology may hold far more interest and claim more immediate relevance. But without this kind of "critical" foundation it careers crazily to an unproductive end.

Against the background that Professor Anderson provides we may usefully examine the most recent attempt to present a theology of the Old Testament.[2] We are offered four sections, dealing with the person of the living God, the universe and creation, the relationship between God and Israel, and the historical redemptive purpose of the Lord. It is a nice point for discussion as to whether, in the light of Israel's historical self-understanding, section two should really precede section three. But however we may question the ordering of the material, the general approach and perspective must command wholehearted assent. This is church theology, which treats the Old Testament as revelation, as Christian scripture.

The whole is interestingly written and attractively produced. The indexes are adequate. The Hebrew is transliterated. The references to scholarly works are properly kept in quantitative subordination to the text, and are chosen with rare discrimination. Beyond all

[1] *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament,* by G. W. Anderson. Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 12/6, 1959.

[2] *A Christian Theology of the Old Testament,* by G. A. F. Knight. S.C.M. Press, Ltd. 30/-, 1959.

this, the great strength of the book is revealed in its semantic preoccupation. An impressive philological equipment is constantly and soberly employed. The result is the laying of durable foundations, making possible illuminating exegesis and interpretation.

But the significant heart of this study is to be found in a brief chapter of sixteen pages which delineates the five "moments" in the experience of the people of God that give unity to the Old Testament story. Birth, marriage, death, resurrection, final restoration—therein is to be discerned both the pattern of Israel's life and the progression of historical revelation. Israel, God's corporate Son, was given life at the Exodus, was wedded to her Creator at Sinai, died in 587, rose again in the return from exile, and looks towards the consummation. This is the prophetic interpretation. This is the Old Testament's understanding.

I suspect that here we stand on the brink of recognition of something of tremendous importance. Surely, from the Christian perspective, the writing of a sectional theology, whether of the Old Testament or of the New, is a task that can never *in principle,* be really satisfactorily discharged. Because the whole is Scripture, it is a theology of the Bible that is demanded. Certainly this is to require of one man a wide range of competence. But the venture is not impossible, and there is a rich prize to be won.

Already the signposts are being erected. The five "moments" of Israel's history are repeated in the life of the Christ and in the life of the Church of the New Testament; for each and all are "son" of God. But thus to think Old Testament and New Testament together does not mean a flight from the temporality of history or a blurring of necessary distinction. The categories of "promise" and "fulfilment" must be adjudged inadequate. For the Old Testament is more than promise; it has its own intrinsic revelatory significance. Certainly the Christ event is Scripture's controlling centre, and a measure of typological interpretation is inevitable. But the eccentricities of Vischer should warn us against an application of the christological criterion which cuts itself loose from the historical pattern of sonship. The better way is the one that G. A. F. Knight has implicitly pointed. If he has provided us us with our best Anglo-Saxon *Theology of the Old Testament,* yet this other less deliberate contribution may prove to be more important still. The road ahead may remain in shadows. But I think that the lights will begin to shine as scholarship proceeds to working out the implications of a recognition that the Pentateuch is to the Old Testament what the Gospels are to the New, and to building upon the studies of Dodd, Jirku, and Von Rad by relating the kerygmatic proclamations of the Old and New covenants.

Meanwhile the specialists continue their indispensable work; and in the New Testament field the "Black" commentaries continue

to appear with praiseworthy regularity. The latest volume[3] maintains the standard of its predecessors and continues their theological preoccupation. Since this series is, in many respects, most readily comparable with the "Moffatt" commentaries, it may be valid to assess the present study in relation to Hugh Michael's earlier work. Though both scholars wrote from Toronto, this is about all they have in common. Professor Beare provides a much longer introduction and a much shorter exposition. He disagrees about place of origin, favouring Rome rather than Ephesus. He disagrees about the extent of interpolation, arguing for almost all chapter three and half chapter four.

Clearly the strength of this commentary resides in its author's illuminating translation and broadly theological interest. The lengthy appendix on kenotic christology from the pen of Dr. Fairweather is of weight and importance. On the other hand, the defects are bound up with the comparatively restricted space allowed to exposition. We miss the careful consideration of other views and interpretations that was so valuable a feature of Hugh Michael's study. It must be allowed that Professor Beare could not get a quart into a pint pot. But this is so good a commentary that it is doubly unfortunate when restrictions of space impart an impression of unjustified dogmatism to parts of the exposition. As a contribution it stands beside the more significant of its predecessors; but it does not supersede them.

Dr. Beare is quick to emphasize the great importance of the epistle to the Philippians in the history of Christian spirituality; and in so doing he brings us very close to the pastoral concern. The ministerial task is more than one of teaching and exposition. It is not only a St. Paul who must bear on his heart the care of the churches. But pastoral theology is not today an established and coherent discipline. We are given the wisdom of experience from the pragmatic standpoint. We acquire our dubious smatterings of psychological wisdom. But fundamental and unifying theory is almost wholly lacking. This is a lacuna that desperately needs filling.

In general the best work in this field is American rather than British, and it is Seward Hiltner who has lately given to us a noteworthy seminal study.[4] It is pioneering rather than definitive, but it enhances Dr. Hiltner's already considerable reputation. It seeks to establish pastoral theology as "a formal branch of theology resulting from study of Christian shepherding," to delimit its field and plot its guiding lines. Thus its essential concern is to examine

[3] *The Epistle to the Philippians,* by F. W. Beare. A. & C. Black. 16/-, 1959.

[4] *Preface to Pastoral Theology,* by Seward Hiltner. Abingdon Press. 32/-, 1958.

the functioning of minister and church from the shepherding perspective and draw the appropriate theological conclusions. But it does not and cannot stop there. The amorphous nature of prevailing conceptions forbids it. If the chosen land is truly and adequately to be delimited, the contours of neighbouring territory must at least be sketched. So the main exposition of the working out of the shepherding perspective is followed by minor discussions of "organizing" and "communicating." Undeniably the coverage is extensive. Perhaps the range exceeds the grasp.

Dr. Hiltner argues forcibly for the examination of shepherding under the three aspects of healing, sustaining, and guiding; and it is at this point that one of the oustanding features of this book is revealed. For discussion and advance proceed by way of constant reference to the case histories of a 19th century Presbyterian pastor, Ichabod Spencer. This unique and uninhibited record provides the factual material that makes exposition and interpretation live. It reminds us that theory is valid only as it is relevant to the practical situation. It reminds us also of the determinative influence of theology upon action. The reader who finds the characteristically American approach of this work difficult will feel at home with Ichabod Spencer. If he perseveres and masters the message of this stimulating if provisional study, he may be encouraged and equipped to emulate in his day the Brooklyn pastor! And he may learn the difference between pastoral theology and pastoral psychology.

Many of the problems and situations with which the pastor has to deal lie in the realm of sex and marriage. Fortunately debate has begun to move beyond both sentimentalized assertion of conventional teaching and defiant proclamation of intimate mechanics. We have become aware of profounder levels. We have commenced to talk theology—and to apply it. In this advance Derrick Sherwin Bailey has occupied a key position. His careful examination of the tradition in which we stand now gives us an indispensable foundation upon which to build.[5] He reviews at length the teachings of the patristic age, of the mediaeval western church, of the Reformers, of the 17th century Anglican divines. All is clearly and fairly stated; but the report is more than a factual one. We learn not only what was believed, but why; we begin to *understand* the past. It is this kind of discerning study that makes sober reassessment possible. To such provisional elucidation and restatement of a deeply Christian theology of sex the final chapter is devoted.

But any satisfactory theological reconstruction must be firmly founded upon a double base. On the one hand, full account must be taken of the Christian tradition and in particular its biblical basis. This is Dr. Bailey's strength. Not only has he mastered the

[5] *The Man-Woman Relation in Christian Thought,* by D. Sherwin Bailey. Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd. 30/-, 1959.

historical development in all its complex progression, but he has also listened attentively to the voices of the biblical theologians. He understands the importance of the early chapters of Genesis and the Song of Songs. He knows the profundity of the Barthian exposition of the *imago dei*. He has sat at the feet of Martin Buber. He has learned a sympathetic interpretation of St. Paul that refuses any longer to cast him for the rôle of villain of the piece. Yet even all this is not in itself sufficient. For, on the other hand, a completely honest attitude must be adopted towards the relevant knowledge increasingly available from other sources—whether cultural, anthropological, or psychological.

It is just at this point that Dr. Bailey's work is usefully supplemented by a book from the pen of an American writer.[6] Professor Cole covers much of the same ground and, to that extent, may be used as comparative surveyor. But he tends to proceed by way of a close examination of the thinking of representative figures, and naturally gives considerable attention to interpretations of sex offered by the psychoanalysts. From time to time he seems to give unnecessary expression to an adolescent wish to shock the "Victorian" reader; and his own attempt at reconstruction, sane and illuminating as it clearly is, lacks something of the profundity implicit in the approach of Sherwin Bailey. Nevertheless, the challenge he offers is not to be evaded. Again and again he punctures conventional Christian theory by reference to probable or certain biological, sociological, or anthropological fact. It is a cogent demonstration of the inescapable need for ceaseless conversation between the scientist and the theologian if real progress is to be recorded. Many will find themselves unable to follow Dr. Bailey in his volte-face on the question of the subordination of woman to man. Many more will baulk at Professor Cole's defence of a possible future supersession of monogamy. But all who undergo the discipline of thinking together these two informative volumes will find their horizons broadened and their understanding enriched.

If all this appears remote from the immediate pastoral situation, further reflection will prompt a wiser conclusion. Sex, truly understood, is no departmentalized concern, for sexuality reaches to humanity's depths. It is Karth Barth who speaks of the double human duty to live "as man *or* woman" and "as man *and* woman," to affirm both sexual integrity and sexual interdependence. This is the level at which thought must begin. It should bear fruit in humility, and carry with it the faltering realization that it is the mystery of personal existence that confronts us. To accept the responsibility of offering counsel in the context of love and marriage involves more than the willingness to enunciate a few sound Chris-

[6] *Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis*, by W. G. Cole. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 21/-, 1936.

tian generalizations and remedy an ignorance of practical realities. Rather does it involve the attempt, in fear and trembling, to illumine a dawning experience, relate it to its depths, make explicit its significance, and point towards its fulfilment.

To ask who is sufficient for these things is a sign of maturity. Fortunately an increasing volume of wise exposition is becoming available to us. Probably no wide agreement can be recorded as to the most helpful manual for marriage guidance; and this is scarcely surprising. But to any who have thus far sought in vain I would commend the recent translation of a book by a continental physician.[7] Of its kind it is surely one of the best and most reliable discussions available to us. In brief compass it adequately covers the necessary field, and comment is always frank, judicious, and discerning. But the great strength of the book resides in the profound and unifying vision and understanding of Christian marriage that informs its every page. Its importance lies not in any startling originality but in its penetrating grasp of the essence of marital union and intra-personal living. The reader who is alert to the restricted sense in which the word "sexuality" is employed will best appreciate the enormous importance of the distinction drawn between the erotic and the sexual. And one minister at least, after sitting at Dr. Bovet's feet, felt with even keener urgency than before the desperate need for a revision of the marriage service.

Marriage and music may go together. I fancy, however, that the association of church music with theology will sound strangely in many ears. But this fact is only one of many reasons why a book which attempts *their* marriage should be widely read and pondered.[8] It is to be hoped that the unmusical minister will not at once conclude either that it is outside his proper range of concern or that it is beyond his comprehension. True he may make little of consecutive fifths and diatonic melody; but he may learn much even if the rare technicalities elude him. Furthermore, if he has any conception of the influence of hymnody in piety and worship, he will be alert to the necessity of informing his judgment and clarifying his criteria.

Those familiar with Dr. Routley's earlier writings on this general theme will gain most from the present study through being able to draw on a larger context of thought and assumption. Yet those who begin here will find the general lines of argument clear. The discussion of biblical insights, of law and grace, of the dangers of pride and greed, of the need for restraint and cheerful service, is more relevant to the matter in hand than might at first appear.

[7] *A Handbook to Marriage and Marriage Guidance,* by Theodor Bovet. Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd. 12/6, 1958.

[8] *Church Music and Theology,* by Erik Routley. S.C.M. Press, Ltd. 8/6, 1959.

But the treatment is too slight to carry full conviction; important ideas are insufficiently worked out and related; even a certain incoherence of presentation is evidenced. Confidence falters, and revives only when the chapters on "beauty" and "romanticism" are reached. So far as definitions of beauty are concerned, St. Thomas is of more immediate and positive help than Scripture; but the biblical silence is itself significant. Dr. Routley's rendering of a familiar verse from the Psalms as "Worship the Lord with decent ornaments" is perhaps not quite defensible; but if it finally disposes of "the beauty of holiness" we may forgive his exuberance. As for romanticism—the arranged confrontation of the Old Testament with C. S. Lewis is illuminating, and the excursus on Johann Sebastian Bach is cogent and in place. Moreover, the reminder that eschatology is the substitute for romanticism that Christian doctrine offers and demands is both crucial and profound.

This intriguing study draws to its close with some expected comments on organs, organ-playing, and bad music. And if much of this is now familiar, it is still gratefully to be received as from one unusually proficient and discerning. But the great point of this book lies at its heart. It is the elucidation of the real connection between theology and church music by reference to the conjunction of Christ with the Church which is His body. Because the pattern of the Church is the pattern of the Christ, therefore all matters of her life and behaviour must be similarly conformed. It means that church music must be correlative to the life, death and resurrection of the Lord.

This is not mere verbiage. It is the enunciation of a principle of cardinal importance and governing significance. Those who have been trying to make this emphasis in season and out of season will be thankful for the weight of Dr. Routley's authority. To work out all the implications of this truth would be to enter and explore large territories. But certain things are immediately plain. There is laid upon us the duty, in the music of hymnody, of shunning the pretentious, the sentimental, the facile, the complacent. Here also the Cross and Resurrection are desperately and urgently normative. The Gospel brings both its Yes and its No to the standards and aspirations of fallen humanity. Church music must express the proper tensions of the faith, must never bypass the Cross. We must pray, if belatedly, that the compilers of the new Baptist Hymnal had amongst the members of its Tunes committee not only the musically competent, but also the theologically aware—and that these last were prepared to fight.

N. CLARK

John Griffiths: A Missionary Recruit of 1831

IN the *Baptist Quarterly* for January, 1959, I gave an account of two bundles of unpublished letters connected with Samuel Pearce, of Birmingham. A third bundle of papers placed in my hands by the late Dr. S. Pearce Carey came from the same family circle and relate to the Rev. John Griffiths,[1] who went out from Birmingham in the service of the Baptist Missionary Society in 1831 and died of yellow fever after only nine days in Jamaica. Though few in number, the papers tell a poignant story. John Griffiths was a member of the Cannon Street church and had married Louisa, daughter of Rebecca Harris (née Hopkins), sister-in-law of Samuel Pearce.

In the earliest of these letters Griffiths speaks of having been "favoured with a religious education," and of being "very early the subject of religious impulses." But in his early teens he passed through a lengthy period of doubt and uncertainty and this continued even after he became at the age of sixteen a teacher in the Cannon Street Sunday School. Peace of mind came at length and in the summer of 1824, when nearly nineteen, he was received into the membership of the Church by the Rev. Isaiah Birt.

Five years later we find Griffiths convinced that he had been called to the Christian ministry and making application to Dr. W. H. Murch for training at Stepney College. "I have long had an ardent desire for this work," he wrote in September, 1829, "but never mentioned it to anyone, till requested to engage by those upon whose judgment and experience I could depend." His letter includes a clear and careful statement of his "views of the leading doctrines of the Word of God." A letter of resignation from the staff of the Sunday School, written from Derby a few months later, shows how important an influence this work had had on him, though he regretted that he had not given more particular attention to each boy under his care. It was a satisfaction to him to be able to introduce a younger brother to the staff of the school.

John Griffiths' college course at Stepney under Murch and Samuel Tompkins was not a long one. Reinforcements were urgently needed for the mission in Jamaica. Serious and fatal illnesses had thinned the ranks of the missionaries. Most of the planters were

[1] Both the B.M.S. Centenary Volume and the Annual Report of Regent's Park College give his name as Griffith, J., but in all these letters and on the Marriage Certificate the name appears as Griffiths.

hostile to their activities, as well as angry and alarmed at the campaign being waged in England for the abolition of slavery. Among the slaves there was unrest, the product of the often inhuman conditions under which they had to live and work, of frequently deferred hopes of redress and of wild rumours. By the end of 1830, Griffiths had been accepted by the B.M.S. Committee for the West Indian Mission and in January, 1831 received from the Secretary, John Dyer, via his assistant J. Stanger, a list of the things he should take out with him. " Instead of giving the Female list," wrote Dyer, " we have of late presented £20 to the wife of the missionary for her to lay out in clothing. I therefore now enclose a cheque for £40, being £20 for yourself on account, and £20 for Miss Harris. The balance I can pay when you come to town."

The list of things as given by Mr. Stanger is now of some interest. It is headed " Necessary Outfit for Jamaica " :

A Suit Black Clothes
6 Flannel Waistcoats
6 do. Drawers
12 Cotton Shirts
12 Irish do.
12 Cravats. 1 Blk. Silk Hand^{f}
12 White Pocket Hand^{fs}
6 Drill, Jean or Nankeen Trowsers
1 Morning Gown
3 pr. Shoes
1 Hat
1 Silk Umbrella
12 Towels
6 Net Nightcaps
12 Cotton Hose
4 pr. Worsted Socks
1 Boat Cloak
2 pr. Sheets, large
2 Blankets, 1 Counterpane—large
4 Pillow Cases
1 Mattrass of Hair or large Bolster, 4 Feather Pillows
Stationery, Penknives
Razors and Strop
Cloth & Shoe Brushes & Blacking
Portable Desk
Candles & Soap
Earthenware or China, but not Glass

Two remarks are added :

" If Mr. Griffiths has not any particular Friend, a Taylor, a son of S. Stanger at Fen Court will be glad to make his clothes—The Blk. & the Trowsers.

" The flannel Waistcoats & Drawers may generally be bought ready made, advantageously.

" If Mrs. G. has time to make the shirts & lighter articles it may be best."

"The Ship should be seen and the Cabin recognised—if available. Bed for the voyage be provided, by the Captain, and Mattrass &c. need not be procured here, as they are as cheap or cheaper in Jamaica.

"If Mr. Griffiths has a sufficiency of any of the above specified, they need not be enlarged except clothing, as Blk. Clothes, Trowsers &c. which are much higher in price in Jamaica. Articles for a Female may be judged of by the above.

"The Portable Desk, is made *solid* & can be had at Fen Court as usual."

On 1st March, 1831 John Griffiths married Louisa Harris in Saint Martin's Church, Birmingham. Two of the children of Samuel Pearce—Louisa's first cousins—had already gone from Birmingham to India in the service of the B.M.S. The Griffiths set sail for Jamaica some ten weeks after their wedding. In a letter she subsequently sent to her father, Joshua Harris, Louisa gave extracts from her journal:

> Monday 23rd. Very fine; pass'd Brighton, slight breeze made but little progress.
>
> 24. Wind more brisk, fine, a little rain, pass'd the Isle of Wight; when sitting at table it has appear'd as if in shore we have had so little motion. In the evening the Captain pray'd with us in a very fervent and feeling manner. When looking at the past and present all appears mercy we feel the prayers of our dear friends in England on our behalf have been answered.
>
> 25. Sailed westward along the English coast but not in sight of land, fair wind and very fine day.
>
> 26. Wind much in our favour, blew very hard, the ship roll'd much and the waves ran so high that at times they broke over the deck all the port holes were stop'd. The sea look'd beautifully grand. Much rain in the afternoon. My dear John and I very sick several times. We could not have family prayer this evening in consequence of the rolling of the vessel and the men being so wet.
>
> 27. Scarcely any wind. In the evening brother Wilcox preach'd. The Captain and nearly all the passengers and sailors were present.
>
> 28. Wind rather more favourable. About 9 at night a Vessel from Teneriffe bound to Bristol spoke to us as she pass'd.
>
> 29. Sunday. My dear John preach'd this morning, nearly every person present, the day very fine, it was delightful to see all the sailors clean'd, and most of them with books in their hand and all wore the appearance of a Sabbath, we felt very thankful we had such a Captain. In the evening Brother Bleby preach'd.
>
> 30. We are now passing the Bay of Biscay, fine wind in the morning but rain and calm in the evening, saw a great number of Porpoises.
>
> 31. Today have little wind and that unfavourable though the day is otherwise pleasant.
>
> June 6. Have just passed the Bay of Biscay, quite calm; they let down the small boat and most of the gentlemen went in it a considerable distance from the Vessel and after being rowed about by some of the sailors for a time returned quite safe.
>
> 11. The weather has been fine but very light winds, are not yet

more than 300 miles from land; it is so calm today that several of the gentlemen bathed in the open sea at the bow of the Vessel, but the pleasure which this would have given to them was very much lessened by one of them getting too far from the Ship he was in much danger and had not my dear Husband been in the water at the time he must have been lost as none of the rest were able to swim so well nor had they courage to go to his assistance, the cry for a rope to throw to him created much alarm at our end of the ship, and I, fearing it was my dear John in danger was as you will readily believe, more alarmed than any of the rest, a thousand thoughts rush'd into my mind, as it were in a moment, and I was almost distracted, but had the unspeakable satisfaction soon after of seeing for myself that he was indeed safe, and heard with much pleasure that he had been the means of saving the one who was in danger.

13. Very calm today, the Captain and some of the passengers went out in the boat and caught seven turtles which were asleep upon the surface of the water.

23. The wind is now favourable, were not certain at the end of last week whether the breeze was the trade wind or not but now find it was. Yesterday cross'd the tropic of Cancer at 32 i/c deg. longtitude. Had much bustle and nonsense on board today, by the ceremony of Neptune coming on board, which is this; one of the sailors dresses himself in a sheepskin and smears himself over with grease and paint and comes on his hands and knees, this is called Neptune, followed by another which if possible is made to look more horrible than himself which they term the Bear, after they have been on the deck among the females they take those of the gentlemen who have not cross'd the line before and having smear'd their faces with tar scrape them with a piece of stick which they call shaving them and then throw a quantity of water and thus the ceremony ends rudely enough as you will believe. Mr. G. and those who did not choose to join in this rough sport gave the sailors some money and were exempt.

July 8. Saw St. Domingo about 7 this morning, were 12 or 15 miles to the south of it; expect to see Jamaica tomorrow morning. Cannot tell the pleasure we feel at the thought of being on shore soon. This morning a Brig spoke to us, appear'd very suspicious and it was believed she was a Pirate (they are frequently met with here), but was intimidated by seeing so many on board and our guns ready for use.

10. At 5 in the morning we saw what are call'd the blue mountains of Jamaica, felt unspeakable pleasure to behold the long wished for Island. At 10 saw Port Royal & Kingston: anchored off Port Royal at 11, were quite charmed with the beauty of its appearance. Most of the passengers went on shore to see the town but as we did not know of any friends being there we intended to spend the day on board and go with the vessel to Kingston in the morning. As we sat reading together two negroes came on board about 12 o'clock. They were sent by Mrs. Phillippo who was there a few days for the health of her little girl.

Mrs. Phillippo was already acquainted with Louisa Griffiths and both she and her husband were warmly welcomed at Port Royal. John Griffiths preached in the evening to a large and attentive congregation and, as he came down from the pulpit, exclaimed: "It is my heart's desire to live and die amongst this people." The next morning the young couple, accompanied by Mrs. Phillippo, made their way to Kingston and, after a few days there, moved

inland to Spanish Town. Within a few hours of their arrival there, however, John Griffiths complained of a headache. The following morning it was clear that he was in the grip of the dread yellow fever. Within a day or so he was dead, having been on the island little more than a week.

It fell to Joshua Tinson, who had spent nine gruelling years in Jamaica, to write to John Dyer in London telling him the sad news. The letter was written from Spanish Town on 20th July, 1831. It is significant of the acceptance by that generation of the costliness of the missionary enterprise in terms of human life and of their preoccupation with public events that the first page of his letter deals with the general situation. Its vivid phrases deserve quotation:

> I know not when this will reach you, as the Packet has just sailed; but whenever it comes to hand, should you not be previously informed on the same subject, it must give you pain.
>
> We live in a most eventful period in reference to this country—which seems greatly to partake of the general ferment felt throughout the Nations—Meetings are being called through the Island, by *Coloured* as well as white slave holders, to oppose government in attempting the abolition of slavery—The slaves are not ignorant of what is going on in England, and many fear that they will soon cease to be quiet under their burdens—Incendiaries are almost daily attempting to set fire to Kingston—A Proclamation has been issued, & read in all the places of worship, offering a £1000 reward for the conviction of the guilty—Men's hearts are failing them thro' fear—and if we are to believe the cry of many,—public confidence is greatly shaken.
>
> Disease as raging with unparalleled violence. The small-pox like a plague, is sweeping through the streets of Kingston, and hurrying to the grave from 12 to 15 persons daily. Many more than 2000, have already died of it in that city alone! It still continues to rage with unabating fatality. 'Tis now appearing with equal horror in this town, yesterday 8 or 9 were buried who had fallen victims to this alarming visitation! Fever is also prevalent. The principal Medical Gentleman here, is so beset with applications to visit the sick & and the dying, that he is forced to hasten through the streets when on his way to his patients, to escape the importunities of new applicants, and this, simply out of compulsion to those he has already under his care.—But I must hasten to write on a subject which comes still nearer home —is filling us all with sorrow & which I scarcely know how to communicate.

By the end of September, 1831, both Mr. and Mrs. Phillippo and the widowed Louisa Griffiths were back in England. Phillippo sent to Thomas Swan, the Cannon Street minister, a full account of John Griffiths' last hours and of the funeral in Spanish Town.

Not long after her return to this country a son was born to Louisa Griffiths. He and his mother found shelter again with Joshua Harris in the house in Birmingham. The bundle of papers given me by Dr. Pearce Carey contains two further letters. The first was

written in May, 1841 by Louisa to her father. She was not expecting to live very long and, after thanking Joshua Harris for his many past kindnesses, commends her boy to his further care. The second dated 21st September, 1854, is from John P. Griffiths himself, by then a young man of about twenty-two years of age living at Elwood Hill, near St. Kilda, not far from Melbourne, in Australia. He writes to one of his Harris cousins on a small slip of thin blue paper. His script is well-formed, clear and regular, easy to decipher, though, in the manner of the Victorians, he saved paper and postage by continuing at right-angles over the earlier part of the letter.

My dear Cousin,

I now take the opportunity of doing what I have so long neglected, writing to you. I was very glad to find a tangible proof in your kind letter that you kept a corner in your memory for me. Your own letter came to hand about a fortnight ago—the "Madras" steamer brought the mail, she was only 57 days in coming. We shall be able by and by to take a trip to your side of the world and back in three months or so. That would be a very pleasant way of getting out of the dust and heat which in the summer here are so very trying. You really can form no adequate idea of a hot wind day. All that has been said of the "blast of a furnace"—clouds of dust so great as to darken the sun—is true and I remember one day last summer the dust blew to such a degree that at midday it was so dark that houses were undistinguishable at a few yards distance. This is no exaggeration. I feel at a loss what to tell you more than in other letters I have about the country. I have not seen much of it, not having been up in the bush or at the "diggins," and there many things that would be interesting to you, from being daily seen lose all the charm of novelty and fail to strike me. So you must write and ask me everything you wish to know. I will not promise to answer all your queries, but all I can I will, you may depend upon my veracity. I think from what my description has been you will not be tempted to make a voyage to Australia. I am glad to hear that you past last Autumn and Spring so pleasantly. I have no doubt you were glad to return home if only to have the pleasure of listening to Mr. Landels, a privilege I should much enjoy. His course of sermons must be most interesting. Can't you send me some sketches of them? Do try. I am much obliged for the "Journal" you sent with your last letter. I will send you an *Argus* from time to time. I cannot now answer Caleb's note. I will soon, tho' I don't think I can promise to enclose an opossum, the postage would be tremendous! Please give my love to him, Rebecca, Anna, Emily, and a kiss for dear little Pearce. I enclose a billet doux for Sophia. I am very glad to hear your Grandma is so well. Give my love to her, please remember me to the Griffiths and Mr. Sing, if you have an opportunity. I ought to have written to him long ago.

The little piece of sea-weed I enclose thinking you might like it, there are great quantities on the beach here & some very pretty shells. Hoping to have the pleasure of hearing from you again soon.

I am with sincere love,

Your affect[e] Cousin,

J. P. GRIFFITHS.

ERNEST A. PAYNE

Reviews

The Apocalypse of John, by Charles C. Torrey. (Oxford University Press, 40s.).

This book was completed by Professor Torrey of Yale a few months before his death in 1956, and the work of publication has been carried out by his daughter, with the aid of " friendly scholars." In the preface Torrey states that he takes " into full account the implications of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of a ' Nazarene Bulletin ' brought to light in 1950," though in Torrey's discussion there are no actual references to, or quotations from, the Scrolls. There is an introduction (90 pp.); then there are critical notes on selected passages (70 pp.); and finally, Torrey's translation.

The introduction deals mainly with the questions of the original language and date of Revelation. As we would expect, Torrey is quite sure that the original language is Aramaic, and that the Greek is a literal translation. So also, as he gave a much earlier date to the Gospels than most scholars are prepared to give, he assigns Revelation not, as is most usual, to the closing years of the reign of Domitian (81-96 A.D.), but, precisely, to the year 68 A.D.

On the question of language, Torrey will probably be found more convincing than when he was arguing for the wholesale Aramaic background of the Gospels (1933). At least, he seems to succeed in giving a more reasonable explanation than has so far been advanced of the glaring mistakes in grammar and syntax which have been one of the chief puzzles of this puzzling book, and which have caused many scholars to award the Seer's Greek only a bare and grudging pass! These gross grammatical errors have been attributed variously to sheer ignorance, deliberate protest against things Hellenistic, or, with Charles, to the supposition that the author thought in Hebrew and wrote in Greek. Some commentators throw up the sponge (e.g. Bousset, on p. 118, is quoted as finding one of these irregularities *gänzlich unerklärlich.* For a German scholar to confess such things must surely be one of the apocalyptic signs of the end of the world!) But Torrey is not baffled. The explanation is simply that the translator of the Aramaic original takes very seriously the words of xxii. 6-9, 18-19. The book

is "prophecy, the continuation of the Hebrew-Jewish oracles; written by a prophet, in the language of the new revelation, of the Messianic scriptures." Therefore, not only every Aramaic word, but also Aramaic idiom, syntax, and grammar, must be faithfully represented in the Greek. Hence the translator's *apparent* indifference to Greek grammar. "Apparent," because every solecism can be paralleled with correct usage elsewhere, sometimes in the same sentence. The "howler" (incidentally, the beast of xiii. 11 is far less polite in Aramaic—he howls like a dragon!) which meets us in i. 4, "from *he* who is" (thus the Greek) is quite correct in Aramaic. The clause is introduced by the omnipresent Aramaic "di," which T. W. Manson calls a particle, while Torrey describes it as a "notoriously troublesome pronoun" frequently used as "a conjunction." Torrey's point is that the translator wishes to give "di" its full weight, and to show that, in the sacred language of inspiration, the relative pronoun "di," being itself a nominative, makes the case following it also nominative. So, too, in xix. 20, the translator must make "burning" feminine, though "fire," in Greek, is neuter. Semitic languages have no neuter, and use the feminine where Greek uses the neuter. Yet the translator knows perfectly well that "puros" is neuter, as he shows by the article alongside it!

In dating the book just after Nero's death, and before the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., Torrey returns to the position held by scholars like Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort in the last century. He is not always as revolutionary as might appear. Naturally his reasons for this date are partly linguistic. He thinks that Revelation belongs to the time when the Church was still predominantly Jewish, when the status of the "Nazarene Jews" was still that of "a conventicle within the synagogue" (G. F. Moore), and when the sacred language was Aramaic. But his arguments are by no means limited to linguistic considerations. There is a very able and illuminating discussion of the important passage, xvii. 9-11. Perhaps the chief weakness in his arguments for the date 68 A.D. lies in the fact that Revelation presupposes a universal imposition of Caesar-worship (e.g. xiii. 14), a fact which is more relevant to the time of Domitian than to the late sixties.

Two errors in the transliteration of Greek words have been noted on pp. 45 and 49. Also, p. 86 line 1 should read 1 Thess. ii. 16 (not 10).

Professor Torrey has left us, in his last work, a book which will make an important contribution to New Testament studies along at least two lines. One is the demonstration of the unity of the Apocalypse. The other is the light shed upon Christian beginnings, in what, for brevity's sake, we must here call the "Nazarene" period of the primitive Church.

W. E. MOORE

Theology of Culture, by Paul Tillich. (Oxford University Press, 18s.).

The wrong way to read this book is to begin at the beginning and plough through to the end. Such a procedure involves the reader in a discussion with T. S. Eliot on the limitations of art on page 125, a discussion with Einstein on the idea of a Personal God on page 127 and a plunge into theories of morals on page 133. It is too exhausting. For the book is not, despite its title, in any sense a sustained and systematic argument. It is a collection of essays and articles written by Tillich in the last twenty years on a wide range of subjects which can loosely be united under the name of culture, but which are here presented with a minimum of systematization.

This is intended as an explanation and not as a criticism for, rightly used, the book is exceptionally interesting. Its unity lies in the mind of the author who illuminates every aspect of culture which catches his attention, and there is a personal distinction in all its varied discussions. But it should be read a little at a time, subject by subject, so to speak, and it would even be rewarding for those who find Tillich difficult to single out the essays on Europe, America and Russia, which are quite straightforward, and profit from them.

The truth is that Tillich is not a systematic thinker. He has an amazing intuitive insight, rather, into all aspects of the modern situation, religious, political, artistic, ethical, educational and psychological. He opens windows for the mind. He stimulates thought where some of his contemporary compatriots tend to quell it, and each one of the main themes here treated is worth following up for its own sake.

There is, first, his conception of religion as "ultimate concern." We are all bogged down in false concepts of religion as an activity amongst activities, a thing amongst things. All our arguments are bedevilled by this kind of idolatry. "Religion is not a special function of man's spiritual life, but it is the dimension of depth in all of its functions." This is the liberating word which sets us free again to talk to our contemporaries—to communicate—not in terms of our "thing" but in terms of the depth dimension in their science, art, politics, selves.

"Picasso's 'Guernica' is a great Protestant painting." Who but Tillich could have written that sentence, and it illustrates his dynamic and liberating vision of Protestantism. The Protestantism we know is so often a prisoner, as "religion" is, of its own past. So often too it looks to its past for deliverance, not realizing that the past is the gaoler. Protestantism for Tillich is neither dogma nor Church order, but a profound vision, both negative and positive, of the tragedy of our human situation and of the wonder of redemption. This links Protestantism with the art of Picasso and of T. S.

Eliot even when, as in the former case, the unity is unrecognized.

In other works Tillich has already discussed existentialism and here he simply gives a summary, but this leads on to a section on psychoanalysis, the rival or the partner of the Church. Tillich sees it, as he sees other aspects of culture, as predominantly partner. "The growth of the two movements, existentialism and depth psychology, is of infinite value for theology. Both of them brought to theology something which it always should have known but which it had forgotten and covered up. They helped to rediscover the immense depth psychological material which we find in the religious literature of the last two thousand years."

Their second value to both theologian and preacher is to create a new understanding of sin, "which had become entirely unintelligible by the identification of sin with sins, and by the identification of sins with certain acts that are not conventional or not approvable." Tillich is aware that culture is not God's answer. It is man's question. Similarly psychoanalysis is not answer but question. The answer is not technique but grace, but existentialism and psychoanalysis create the conditions in which the Christian gospel can be spoken and heard with understanding.

Perhaps on no subject is there greater confusion both inside and outside of the Church than on the question of the nature of morality, and here the Church is often less than adequate to the Biblical insights she is supposed to mediate. As we tend to have "a religion" so we tend to have "a morality" which creates in us fanaticism "for fanaticism is the attempt to repress elements of one's being for the sake of others. If the fanatic encounters these elements in somebody else, he fights against them passionately, because they endanger the success of his own repression." Such a moral approach is a failure because it depends upon an external authority. "The moral command is unconditional because it is we commanding ourselves." Only internal morality is genuine. "We cannot be obedient to the commands of a stranger even if he is God." So Tillich protests "in the name of the Protestant principle, against the Protestant moralism as it has developed in Protestant countries."

The final sections of the book are much easier going. The difference between Germany and America is finely drawn and there is a splendid analysis of the triumph of Marxism in Russia. The last section of all deserves thorough discussion. It is a plea for *participation*. Denunciations in empty churches of people who are not there is not a form of communication. But the participation must entail also an element of separation, the bringing of the New Being into the world of man's ultimate anxiety. "Medicine has helped us to rediscover the meaning of grace in our theology. This is perhaps its most important contribution. You cannot help people

who are in psychosomatic distress by telling them what to do. You can only help them by giving them something—by accepting them. That was the plight of Luther in his struggle against the distorted late Roman Church which wanted 'that men make themselves first acceptable and then God would accept them.' But it is always the other way around. First you must be accepted. Then you can accept yourself, and that means you can be healed."

DOUGLAS STEWART

The Latter Prophets, by T. Henshaw. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, London, 30s.).

The issue of a book which seeks to interpret the Bible to the layman has long since ceased to be an event. After all the books of this kind which have surveyed the Old Testament or the New Testament or the whole of the Bible, the time has now come to pass on to the next stage where specific sections of the Bible are treated in the same way but in more detail. One of the early steps in that direction is the publication of this book.

Mr. Henshaw begins by clarifying his title. To the Hebrew, the "Former Prophets" meant the four historical books, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings. The "Latter Prophets" also meant four books: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Book of the Twelve (minor prophets).

Of the book's 341 pages, 215 are devoted to these prophets, and space is allocated to each in proportion to its significance in the Biblical record. Isaiah, for example, occupies 53 pages, Jeremiah 41, and Ezekiel 26. Obadiah, on the other hand, is dealt with in 4 pages.

There are five introductory chapters, including an extremely helpful one on "The Forms and Characteristics of Hebrew Poetry," and an extremely difficult one, "The Historical Background." The rest of the book is then given over to the prophets themselves. Each chapter begins with the life and character of the prophet, and is followed by a summary of the book's contents. Other sections then deal with its unity, its permanent influence and its style. The emphasis and tone are scholarly if not original. The author, rightly in such a book, is concerned more to summarise what Old Testament experts are saying than to propound new theories, and on the whole he pursues a good steady course. The findings of critical scholarship are accepted. Ezra, for instance, is put in the reign of Artaxerxes II; Isaiah is dealt with in three quite different chapters (each in its chronological order in relation to the other prophets), and the generally accepted apocalyptic chapters of Zechariah (ix- xiv) are dealt with separately at the end.

Whilst there is nothing in all this with which most readers will

want to quarrel, there will be many indeed who will regret that the sections dealing with the permanent influence of the prophets and their place in the development of Hebrew religion are not dealt with at greater length. Mr. Henshaw at times is better at indicating the prophet's influence over his contemporaries than their influence for all time, though he does his work in such a manner that it should not be difficult for the reader to move from one to the other by his own mental processes.

This, however, raises a further point about those for whom the book is intended. The publisher's "blurb" says it will appeal "not only to theological students, the clergy and teachers, but also the growing number of laymen, who desire to make a serious study of the canonical prophets." This is a bold claim, and one cannot help but wonder how far the latter half of it is true. There is much here that is too difficult for all but a small proportion of laymen, and some that will be heavy going for others who have not delved deep into the teaching of the prophets. This is particularly true of the chapter on the historic background, and one wonders further how many in this category are going to be able to cope with the French and German works quoted in the comprehensive bibliography, not to mention some of the English tomes that appear there also. To many, the price will be but one more obstacle, though it is not expensive by present standards.

There is a very useful collection of appendices, dealing with such subjects as the priesthood, sacrifice, the Messianic hope, feasts and fasts, etc., and although some of these are of broader reference than the canonical prophets, they provide the reader with much useful information.

None of these criticisms, however, should be allowed to hide the fact that this is a very useful piece of work well done, and the publishers are to be congratulated on its production. Errors are few indeed, but R. N. North on page 330 should surely read C. R. North?

A. GILMORE

Tomorrow is a Holiday, by E. H. Robertson. (S.C.M. Press, 8/6d.).

This book is an account of a trip to South America on behalf of the United Bible Societies to study church life and collate material on the place and use of the Bible in the growing churches. It is written in the form of a diary with day-to-day findings, so that we have a series of interesting first impressions and information, some of which doubtless would have been qualified or corrected with a longer stay in any of the countries. For instance "Education in a Catholic country is so angled that the Protestants have to run their own schools," may have been the opinion of one of his in-

formers, but is not a true estimate of the general situation. "Argentina is cooler, broader and theologically more stable than Brazil" could scarcely be substantiated on closer inspection. In San Paulo he writes: "I went to the Baptist Church this morning," but there are over sixty Baptist churches in San Paulo! His use of Portuguese and Spanish words and phrases is marred by a series of mis-spellings which begins on the very first page. "I don't know what should be done with the Southern Baptists," writes Mr. Robertson on the last page, but his findings show that they are doing an excellent piece of work in Latin America and that in Brazil in particular, the Latin Americans can and will in the long run take their own line. In spite of its limitations the book makes easy and fascinating reading.

A. C. ELDER

The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, by Karl Bornhaeuser. [Trans. by A. Rumpus]. (Independent Press, 18/-).

The title page of this book tells us simply that it is the "Only attempt so far at an *adequate* exegesis of these supreme facts of the Christian truth as recorded in the gospels, made by the author with consummate scholarship and reverence for the inspired Word of God." The book itself and the translator's remarks leave us in no doubt that the author and translator alike felt that the objective was achieved and the adequate exegesis provided. There will be many, one hopes very many, who will take leave to doubt whether such is the case.

As Bornhaeuser addresses himself to the task of collating, explaining and harmonising the gospel accounts of the passion, death and resurrection of our Lord, he does so on the premises of his former teacher and master, Adolf Schlatter. They are, that the gospels are the work of the men whose names they bear; that their order in the New Testament is also the chronological order; and that all four were completed before 70 A.D. So at the outset the conclusions of a whole field of New Testament scholarship are quietly set aside and treated as though they had never existed. The standpoint throughout the book is that of a conservative, bent on preserving the harmony and historicity of scripture at almost any cost, and using in the attempt a considerable amount of linguistic skill and theological persuasion.

After sections on Peter's confessions, our Lord's own prophecies of His death and the decision that Jesus must be got rid of, we are taken through the events of Holy Week and beyond, step by step. On nearly every incident Bornhaeuser has some new idea or interpretation—the ghost of Schlatter hovers suspiciously near at times. Some ideas are persuasive, some beg the question, others are difficult to take seriously.

For instance, John's chronology is usually preferred to the Synoptists'. So in *Mt.* xvi. 16 the distinctive point of Peter's confession cannot be "Thou art the Christ," since this was already known (cf. *John* i. 41) but must be the statement "Thou art the (i.e. the only) Son of Yaveh" (p. 10). No explanation is offered of the stark simplicity of *Mk.* viii. 29. If we accept Bornhaeuser's idea of inspiration and chronology, something went sadly wrong with Mark, who, with Matthew to copy from, reported the Caesarea incident, leaving out the key phrase!

In passing it may be noted that the Johannine chronology, supported so strongly at most points, is deserted without comment in the case of the Cleansing of the Temple—recorded by the Synoptists as taking place after the Triumphal Entry and described by John in chapter ii.

The stern words "Get thee behind me, Satan" (*Mt.* xvi. 23) are taken as referring, not to Peter but to Satan. The rest of the verse is dismissed in a line or so, and one is left wondering what is the point of telling the devil that he does not think in divine terms.

On the vexed question of the exact nature of the Last Supper, Bornhaeuser concludes that not even the Synoptists regarded it as a Passover celebration and he supports this view by observing that the point of freeing one prisoner at the feast was to allow him to celebrate the Passover at home. In addition, the crowd who went out to Gethsemane would not have done so had it been the evening when the Paschal meal was eaten. It is suggested that Jesus held a meal as near to Passover time as possible and that He made of it a Passover for His disciples.

In order to find some interpretation of *Mt.* xxvii. 51-53, the words "the holy city" are regarded as meaning the "Upper Jerusalem" from whence the saints appeared to certain people on earth. The special pleading on behalf of these few verses is something one finds it difficult to treat with respect or seriousness.

In attempts to harmonize the Resurrection stories Galilee is identified with the Mount of Olives (*Mt.* xxviii. 7) and *anateilantos* becomes not the "rising" of the sun, i.e. the dawn, but (without any lexicographical support) its "reascending," i.e. the moments after midnight.

Quite long passages in the book are given in Greek and then in transliteration. This is just a waste of space: those who do not read Greek will not profit much from its transliteration, those who do read Greek do not need it.

One cannot recommend this book. It was translated as a "missionary effort among English-speaking Christendom." One may feel we have much better to offer.

J. R. C. PERKIN

The Way of the Cross in Human Relations, by Guy Franklin Hershberger. (Herald Press, Pennsylvania, $5.50.)

Mr. Hershberger has been for twenty years executive secretary of the Mennonite committee on economic and social relations. These 424 pages are an expansion of the Conrad Grebel lectures delivered in 1954.

The author writes from the conviction that the church needs to recover "the cross life of the disciple" which characterized sixteenth century Anabaptism. His chapters on Anabaptist history are extremely valuable and he is surely justified in saying that many principles for which Anabaptists were persecuted have been generally accepted. The early Anabaptists were distinguished by the sharp line they drew between the Old Testament and the New which they said had superseded it. This may be one reason why the author is so emphatic that the Christian is not so much to obtain justice as to do it, and that it is not the Christian's responsibility to serve as the agent of God's "wrath" but to correct injustice by invoking the supernatural order. If only the community were to follow the way of the cross the police function of the State would become unnecessary.

Mr. Hershberger does not deal with the practical problems that would arise nationally and on an international scale because as he explains in a preface this has been done in a previous volume. Even so, the chapter on race relations is remarkably short, though good, and the difficulties of the post-war situation are hardly mentioned.

The author deals principally with the economic situation, and here we see the consequence of his stress upon the punitive or protective function of the State at the expense of its co-operative function. He seems to regard it as unfortunate, and even the consequence of sin, that the State should have undertaken so much responsibility for human welfare. Yet is not the State, at least in a democratic community, simply the people as a whole legislating on behalf of those who are in need of education, assistance, insurance and so on? Evidently it has always been a serious problem for Mennonites as to how far they should participate in secular occupations and especially how far they should assume public office. Since the early days the author thinks the Mennonites have become too uncritical in their acceptance of office and he welcomes signs of a return to the primitive spirit of "we must obey God rather than man."

Unfortunately, when he comes to deal with practical details of business organization and industrial life, he is not always convincing, and sometimes dogmatic to the point of irrelevance. Thus he says, "it is difficult to see how the right to strike can be reconciled with the way of the Cross." Is it then unChristian to withhold

labour which is being exploited? His pages on insurance and mutual aid seem to imply that practices exist in America which would be regarded as dishonest by companies here. His justifiable emphasis on the duties of directorates to shareholders, producers and consumers is not followed by any detailed analysis of what is done and what needs to be done. One feels that those who are wrestling with the daily frontier problems of being "in the world, yet not of it," might be slightly irritated by some passages.

Nevertheless, the book is deeply interesting in its historical sections (for example, those on the "Social Gospel" and Fundamentalism), and challenging in spirit and purpose.

C. H. CLEAL

Church and Church Order in the New Testament, by E. Schweizer. (Zwingli Verlag, Zürich.)

The author of this book is professor of New Testament in the University of Zürich; the book is of course in German, and bears the title *Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testament.* It is a significant contribution to the modern discussion about the nature and order of the church; therefore one hopes that it may be translated into English.

The Greek word *ecclesia* is notoriously difficult to translate satisfactorily; Professor Schweizer chooses the German word "Gemeinde" in order "to express that the New Testament cannot distinguish verbally between the local community and the church." But *Gemeinde* is as difficult to put into English as *ecclesia.* We must understand our word "church" in its most comprehensive meaning.

The book falls into two sections, the first dealing with the variety of the New Testament church and the second with its unity.

The variety of life and organisation found in the New Testament church raises questions about the authority of Scripture for the ordering of the church. Any attempt to reconstruct the New Testament church must be rejected. "A mere repetition of New Testament formulae or organisation guarantees the authenticity of a community as little as a continuing development within a specific tradition." The church must not reproduce scriptural patterns in a legalistic manner, but it must approach scripture "with an evangelical listening to the message contained it it."

A long section of the book is devoted to a consideration of the different conceptions of the church and its ordering found in the New Testament, beginning with Jesus, who proclaims the Kingdom of God in a new way to the whole of Israel, calling out those who responded that they might share His self-giving to and for the world. He was concerned neither with the reform of Israel nor with creating a group of trained teachers as leaders of a new organisation.

"The difference between priest and laity played no part at all." The community of the disciples is an open circle of "those who know the coming of the Kingdom and live in its light."

The gospel of Matthew represents a community concerned with the question of the genuine Israel. The important passages in 16 : 18ff. and 18 : 18 must be read together for they indicate the conviction that the successor of Peter in "binding" and "loosing" is the whole community. Luke represents a view which sees the Christian community as a different type of community, a community which can be entered only by faith in Jesus and baptism. Here is an interest in the developing organisation with its variety of functions. The church is understood as "a pilgrim church, led by the Spirit into ever new paths, living as a missionary church."

Paul develops the doctrine of the church in two directions; on the one hand he stresses the divine activity in the life of the church as the body of Christ, the realm of the Spirit's working, on the other hand he stresses its witness and service in the world calling for proper leadership, right teaching and discipline of individual fellowship.

The survey of the New Testament church is continued through the other New Testament documents, and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, and leads to the statement that "already in the New Testament church at the same time and in the same geographical area groups with quite different forms of life existed side by side." "The modest conclusion is unavoidable that communities existed side by side which understood their nature in different ways on essential points, so developing very varied forms of organisation."

In the section on the oneness (*Einheit*) of the church, Professor Schweizer discusses a number of important themes. With regard to offices in the church, he points out that as a general term for what we call office, on the whole in the New Testament the single word service—*diakonia*—is used. Both Judaism and paganism were familiar with the office of priesthood; Christianity understood all these offices as fulfilled in Christ. Hence the whole Christian community is priestly, but this must be understood in terms of Christ who gave Himself.

The teaching of the New Testament is that spiritual gifts are granted to each member of the church, that each member shares the service of the church, and that each member can baptize, administer the Lord's Supper or speak freely at a meeting of the church. This means "that every member of the church is a witness to Jesus Christ, that being the 'laity' does not release one from this obligation, nor does any 'office' increase the obligation. . . ." This priesthood of all believers is expressed most clearly when the church endures suffering.

With this emphasis upon the obligations of all members goes an

equal emphasis upon the ordered life of the church, so that already in the New Testament church leaders are recognised, e.g. apostles, prophets, teachers, etc. These varied forms of service arise because "God has not granted all spiritual gifts to every member." "The organisation of the church derives from a recognition of the Spirit of God which is characterised by complete freedom; the organisation therefore is functional, a means of order and service, it does not constitute the church."

In discussing apostolic succession, it is stated that "The thesis that there existed from the beginning an apostolic succession significant for the church cannot be held as historically valid." "There was no transmission of apostolic authority." "We can speak only of disciples of the Apostles, not of successors in the Apostolic office." About episcopacy the position is held that it is possible to argue that the modern episcopal office which has developed through the centuries is for the good of the church, but "we must then be quite clear that episcopacy belongs at the most to the *bene esse* and not to the *esse* of the church." "Continuity in the church of Jesus Christ is an essential element. But it is the succession of believers among whom the message is communicated from generation to generation."

About the nature and ordering of worship it is said that "The decisive gift is that of the Word." "All that can be stated in any realistic way about the presence of Christ, is according to the New Testament much more closely associated with the Word than with the Lord's Supper." "The Lord's Supper plays an important part, but the assertion that it became the climax of each act of worship is questionable."

The last few pages of the book summarise certain conclusions, e.g.:

'The church possesses a definite order, but this is not a rigid law. At any time it is open to correction."

"The proclamation of the great acts of God is central."

"Every member of the church must share the service of the church according to his spiritual gift."

"The worship of the church . . . is the centre and aim of the life of the church."

"The church knows that the gospel remains the same through all centuries, and that clear implications are to be drawn from it."

"The church makes no distinction between 'office' and 'service or function'."

This is a scholarly book with an argument and an emphasis similar to that of other books on the church, e.g., T. W. Manson, *The Church's Ministry,* Claude Welch, *The Reality of the Church.* It offers an excellent survey of the New Testament and early patristic material.

L. G. CHAMPION

BOOKS RECEIVED

Roy Freeman Jenner, *Bible Primer.* 10 pp. 10s. 6d. Independent Press.

Otto Weber, *Ground Plan of the Bible.* 221 pp. 27s. 6d. Lutterworth Press.

John Howard Yoder, *The Ecumenical Movement and the Faithful Church.* 42 pp. 50c. Herald Press, Scottdale.

Ruth M. Slade, *English-Speaking Missions in the Congo Independent State* (1878-1908). 432 pp. 400 fr. B.

Eric Routley and Trevor Huddleston, *Characters of the Bible.* 16 pp. 1s. 3d. Independent Press.

James M. Todd, *Prayers and Services for Christian Festivals.* 182 pp. 9s. 6d. Independent Press.

Hermann R. Muelder, *Fighters for Freedom.* 428 pp. 52s. Columbia University Press and Oxford University Press.

James K. Feibleman, *Religious Platonism.* 236 pp. 25s. Geo. Allen & Unwin.

C. K. Barrett, *Westcott as Commentator.* The Bishop Westcott Memorial Lecture, 1958. 26 pp. 3s. 6d. Cambridge University Press.

A. F. Walls (ed.), *The Sierra Leone Bulletin of Religion,* No. 1 (June, 1959). 31 pp. 2s. per copy. 4s. per annum. Board of the Faculty of Theology of Fourah Bay College.