
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

WORLD sales of the new translation of the New Testament, published on March 14th last, have now passed 2,500,000. The joint publishers, the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses, are still receiving orders for thousands of copies daily. More than four months after publication, the new translation—the first part to be published of the New English Bible—still figures in the best-seller lists.

First reactions to the new translation have, on the whole, been favourable, and it certainly received very great publicity. It cannot be said, however, that all the comments made of the translation were well informed, not even in the better papers. The writer of the leading article in the *Guardian* will surely one day blush with shame (if he has not done so already) when he realizes that what he has criticised is not the new translation but the words of Jesus in the Lord's Prayer; so also will the Bishop of Middleton, whose comment on the new rendering of *Romans,* viii. 28 seems to indicate that he has not read (or at any rate digested) a commenary on *Romans* written during the last couple of decades, whilst the *Observer's* general line that the new work could not succeed because it was not written by one man, and that the need for unanimity among the rival churches, some of them fundamentalist, had always prevented the translators from effectively modernising in the way they were commissioned to do, is a criticism that is not really worthy of reply.

Few responsible critics will have any doubt that what has been produced needed to be produced and has been well produced, though inevitably another group of scholars would have done some things differently.

There is no doubt that the new translation is more intelligible than the old. "Though so far without success" (*Rom.* i. 13) and "secret only for the present until . . ." (2 *Thess.* ii. 7) are both simplifications of the old English verb "to let," in the sense of "to hinder." Moreover, the translators frequently succeed in producing within the text the kind of rendering which previously could only be discovered by those who read Greek or good commentaries. "You are salt to the world" (*Matt.* v. 13), for instance, expresses the general New Testament picture of the disciple much more clearly than the older "Ye are the salt of the earth," and "did not think to snatch at equality with God" (*Phil.* ii. 6) is a great improvement on the more familiar, "thought it not robbery . . ." passage, though here it is hard to resist the conclusion that the marginal rendering is not an even more accurate and illuminating assessment of what was in the author's mind.

For those who like the lively or striking phrase there is plenty of satisfaction. The prodigal son "began to feel the pinch" (*Luke* xv. 14); the people who confronted John the Baptist were "on the tip-toe of expectation" (*Luke* iii. 15); and those who listened to our Lord's discourse on the Bread of Life felt it was "more than (they could) stomach" (*John* vi. 60). Not all attempts at such phrases, however, are as happy, and when we find reference to "another pair of brothers" (*Matt.* iv. 21), the liveliness has become pedestrian.

The faithfulness to the Greek, as one would expect from such a team, is almost flawless and sometimes particularly brilliant. The general statement that the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans (*John* iv. 9) is transformed so as to bring out fully the meaning of the Greek, which is that Jews and Samaritans do not use the same things; the general phrase, "in ranks, by hundreds and by fifties" (*Mark* vi. 40) is transformed so as to give the clear picture of the Greeks that they sat down "in rows, a hundred rows of fifty each," and 1 *John* iv. 19 is faithfully rendered, "We love because he loved us first," omitting the "him" of the Authorised Version. One cannot help but wish, however, that the same faithfulness to the Greek had broken through to give us, "Pay what you owe," thus following the Revised Version and the Greek by omitting the "me" and turning the specific request into a general statement, in the story of the unforgiving servant (*Matt.* xviii. 28), and that the word "watch-tower" (*Matt.* xxi. 23; *Mark* xii. 1) and the word "tower" (*Luke* xiv. 28) had been rendered "a set of farm buildings," a rendering which undoubtedly improves the sense of the

passage and is legitimate in the light of Greek used in recently discovered papyri.

Inevitably, of course, there are aspects of this work which puzzle and sometimes distress. Sometimes one feels the translators have leaned over backwards to avoid the traditional phrase, and not always is the alternative an improvement. For example, are "splendour" and "attired" really better and more accurate than "glory" and "arrayed" in the reference to Solomon? (*Matt.* vi. 29). Sometimes, on the other hand, the traditional phrase is retained when it might profitably have been altered. "Belly" was a good English word in 1611, but the Revisers of 1881 recognized that it was no longer a good English word and adjusted accordingly. Why does it have to come back? Granted it is what the Greek says, but it has nevertheless crude associations in the 20th century and one would have thought that some alternative translation could have been produced. The same desire to portray the precise Greek is not found in *John* iv. 21 where the word "Woman" (or as it might more correctly be translated, "Madam") is omitted completely.

The Anglicanisation of weights and measures too is surely going to present problems in a world where standards and rates of exchange are in a state of flux. It is one thing when it is simply a matter of rendering "talents" by "bags of gold" (*Matt.* xxv. 15), or "ten thousand talents" by "(a) debt (that) ran into millions" (*Matt.* xviii. 24). It is a quite different matter to render the "three hundred pence" or "denarii" (*Mark* xiv. 5) by "thirty pounds." Unless the life of this new translation is shorter than any of us would wish, that figure is going to be dated long before the rest of the work.

The production of the book is one of which both publishers and translators may be proud. To print across the page instead of in columns, to divide according to sense rather than chapters, to save heading for sections, and then repeat the heading at the top of several pages instead of trying to summarise each page separately——all these are features that are worthwhile. So also is the classification of the material on the Contents page, the omission of the title "Saint," and the use of Paul's name in connection with *Hebrews*. Many will consider it unfortunate that there are no marginal references, as at the foot of each page in the Revised Standard Version, but this is a matter which may possibly be rectified in due course; perhaps when the whole Bible is complete.

What the future of this new translation is to be nobody can tell. Perhaps it will not be clear until the Old Testament is completed. It is surprising in a way that the publishers state so clearly that it is "intended and expected to supplement, not to replace, the Authorised Version." Certainly if it were to replace the Authorised

Version a number of problems would be presented. Most people would find it difficult to learn a new version of the Lord's Prayer, and new music would be needed for such passages as the Nunc Dimittis and the Magnificat, to say nothing of the book of Psalms and problems of re-pointing the chants. Yet at the same time there is nothing to be gained by having two versions, one old and one new, continually in use side by side. To fix a date, after which the new translation would become the standard or authorised version would certainly at this point be premature. One can only hope, however, that there will be such increasing veneration for it that the time for such recognition will not be far away.

* * *

We understand that not all readers peruse the Review section of this journal. On the assumption (probably optimistic!) that more read the Editorial, we would draw particular attention to a stimulating review by Dr. Howard Williams on two important books to do with the Christian Sunday.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

BRYNMOR F. PRICE, M.A., B.D.,
Eltham College, London.

VICTOR E. W. HAYWARD, M.A.,
International Missionary Council.

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

DOUGLAS C. SPARKES, B.D.,
Minister, Waterlooville, Portsmouth.

Reviews by: G. W. BYRT, FRANK COOKE, A. DAKIN, A. GILMORE, M. H. TAYLOR, HOWARD WILLIAMS.

Carey and Serampore — Then and Now

IT is not without trepidation that I rise to address this assembly of Baptist historians today.[1] In this year in which we, and when I say we, I mean not Baptists alone, celebrate the bi-centenary of the birth of William Carey, it would be surprising if the subject of our paper were unconnected with his life and labours. That I have been asked to speak about him is no doubt due to my having returned comparatively recently from the place in which he spent the last thirty-four years of his life, so that I have the responsibility of linking your thoughts not simply with what Carey himself achieved and planned 150 years ago, but more particularly with the way in which his achievements have borne fruit in the 20th century, and his plans are still being carried out, though adapted to changing circumstances, in the India of our own day. I take it that I can assume a fairly detailed knowledge of the main events in the life of William Carey on the part of most members of the audience, especially as you will have been refreshing your memories during this year when so much has been written about him. I shall therefore consider it my first duty, as far as possible, to emphasize the way in which Serampore is still maintaining the ideals of the missionary pioneer who first made its name familiar throughout the Christian world.

One of the outstanding events in the calendar of Serampore College is the annual celebration on August 17th of the anniversary of the birth of the founder of the College. This year, of course, there will be a very special celebration to mark the 200th anniversary of the birth of Carey, but even in other years it is remarkable how many people, both Christian and non-Christian, take an interest in the events of the day. Every year a distinguished visitor, generally an authority on Bengali literature, is invited to address the students, who in this way are constantly reminded of the debt which the language of Bengal owes to the Englishman who made such an intensive study of it throughout most of his life, and yet who, as we shall see, found time to study deeply so many other Indian languages as well.

I said just now that there will be special celebrations this year at Serampore, since the bi-centenary of the birth of a College's founder is, in the nature of things, an event which does not occur very frequently. But August, 1961 will mark the culmination of a

series of celebrations at Serampore, reaching back to October of last year. The significance of October, 1960 is one which would appeal, I am sure, to Carey himself, even though it marks the jubilee of an event which occurred long after his own lifetime. For in October, 1910 there came into existence at Serampore what is still known as the H.T.D.—the Higher Theological Department. This title is perhaps as unfortunate as the expression "Higher Criticism" used by Biblical scholars, though there is no connection between the two. It evidently arose at a time when a distinction needed to be drawn between the new course of instruction leading to the B.D. degree, in which the medium of teaching was to be English, and, on the other hand, the Vernacular Theological Department, which had long been functioning in Serampore in order to supply the Baptist churches of Bengal with pastors and evangelists. The 1910 revival of learning at Serampore came about through the vision and energy of George Howells, who had been appointed Principal of Serampore in 1907, and who had been using the interval between his appointment and the inception of the department to arouse interest in the college both here and in America.

The charter granted by the King of Denmark in 1827 had never been used for the conferring of degrees, since the fortunes of both Serampore itself and of the college had declined during the last years of William Carey's life, and his successors were not in a position to make good use of it, even had they been so inclined. The provisions of the charter had been perpetuated in the deed of transfer of the Danish colony of Fredericksnagore or Serampore to the East India Company in 1845, and were still in force in 1910.

In the interval, Calcutta University had been founded in 1857, and Serampore was one of the first colleges to become affiliated to it, along with Bishop's College, which had been founded within a couple of years of Serampore, mainly as an Anglican theological seminary, though by the middle of the century it was also a centre for the teaching of the arts. Bishop Middleton, its founder, and the first Bishop of Calcutta, expressed his point of view in these words: "The time appears to have arrived when it is desirable that some missionary endeavours, at least, should have some connection with the Church establishment. The natives have a preference, all other things being equal, for that which is countenanced by authority; and this seems to point out the propriety of placing this establishment—Bishop's College—within the bishop's reach (I speak for myself and my successors), that they may in some measure superintend its proceedings, and make it apparent that the propagation of our religion is not a matter of so little interest with us as to be left entirely to persons whom none of the constituted authorities avow."[2]

Serampore's affiliation to Calcutta University ceased in 1883, and was not renewed until 1911, under the leadership of Dr. Howells. It has been maintained from that time until the middle of last year, when the connection with Calcutta ceased, and Serampore became affiliated to the new University of Burdwan. By 1911, Dr. Howells had gathered a distinguished staff around him, consisting mainly of theological lecturers from this country, of whom Dr. Theodore Robinson still remains with us to remember Serampore's fresh start. But Howells was not satisfied with a purely Baptist staff. Ever since 1910, Serampore has sought to serve the whole Christian community in India, with the exception of the Roman Catholic Church. And even there, Serampore has unintentionally provided a leader, in that an early member of the staff of the re-constituted college eventually left the Syrian Orthodox Church and submitted to the Roman allegiance, under which he was consecrated as Bishop Mar Ivanios!

This rather full reference to the events of 1910 and 1911 perhaps requires the excuse that it serves to link together the period of Serampore's foundation under William Carey, and that of its present expansion and development, a development which would have been impossible without the fresh infusion of life which took place fifty years ago. In so far as Serampore is now able in some measure to fulfill the ideals of its founder, it is doing so under the impetus, not so much of the original charter, which so long remained a dead letter, as of the Serampore College Act of the Bengal Legislature, passed in 1918, when Dr. Howells was for a time co-opted as a special member of the Legislative Assembly.

I

As we go on from here to consider the way in which Serampore is still reflecting the spirit of its founder, we may first of all think of its all-India range of influence. Carey refused to allow his horizons to be limited by the flat swamps of the Ganges Delta in which he lived. He was constantly pressing outwards from Serampore into remote parts of India, and even beyond the confines of that country. As far back as 1803 Carey and his colleagues were thinking in terms of the provision of the Bible for the people of all parts of northern India. Writing to Dr. Ryland on 14th December of that year, Carey says: "We have it in our power, if our means would do for it, in the space of about fifteen years to have the word of God translated and printed in all the languages of the East. . . . The languages are the Hindostanee, Maharastia, Oreea, Telingua, Bhotan, Burmah, Chinese, Corkin Chinese, Tonquinese and Malay."[3] In a letter written to the Society at home in April of the following year, the missionaries mention the seven major languages

spoken in India in their day, namely (to use the more familiar modern names), Bengali, Hindi, Oriya, Marathi, Telugu, Kannada and Tamil.[4] On a map which was later published to accompany No. XXII of the Periodical Accounts, there are shown, in addition to the languages already mentioned, Malayalam, Gujerati, Sikh (i.e. Gurmukhi), Persian, Kashmiri and Sinhalese. Long before this, before he had been five years in India, Carey was already taking an interest in this last-named language, despite the distance of Ceylon from Bengal, observing that "even the language of Ceylon has so much affinity with that of Bengal, that out of twelve words, with the little Shanscrit that I know, I can understand five or six."[5] If we turn our attention for a moment a few hundred miles beyond Ceylon, we can see from a letter which Carey wrote to his sisters on July 23rd, 1812, how he turned the most unlikely circumstances into opportunities for the furtherance of his translation work: "A particular providence has put it into our power to get a version of the Gospels, at least, in the language of the Maldiva Isles, by means of a native of them who is in Calcutta jail." In the previous year we find him planning to sum up the fruits of his linguistic labours in these words taken from the Periodical Accounts for 1811: "To secure the gradual perfection of the translations, I have also in mind, and indeed have long been collecting material for 'An Universal Dictionary of the Oriental Languages derived from the Sungskrit.' I mean to take the Sungskrit of course, as the groundwork, and to give the different acceptations of every word, with examples of their application in the manner of Johnson, and then to give the synonyms in the different languages derived from the Sungskrit, with the Hebrew and Greek terms answering thereto." This was an ambition which was never realized by Carey, and which has apparently never been emulated by any of his successors.

The interest of Carey's colleagues, Joshua Marshman, in the Chinese language is well known, and it was one in which he was encouraged by Carey himself, who had, even before Marshman began studying Chinese in 1806, seriously considered sending his son Felix, together with another missionary, by the overland route to China. "It is not improbable," he wrote to Fuller, "that Mr. Mardon and my son Felix may go; their way would be to Dacca, then up the Brahmapootra, through Assam, and thus to China." Marshman's son and biographer expressed regret that his father spent so much time in the study of Chinese. His regret may perhaps have been coloured to some extent by memories of his own early wrestlings with that language. Those who have spent any time in studying Chinese will sympathise with young John, who at the tender age of thirteen was already able to recite five books of the Analects of Confucius by heart, and at the same public examination in which he performed this feat he also "held a disputation in the

Chinese language on the following thesis : ' The Chinese language is not more difficult of acquisition than other languages '."[6]

While we may deplore the methods used by the early missionaries in educating their children (Felix Carey was also reasonably proficient in Chinese at the time of the aforementioned examination), we must acknowledge that their motive—the dissemination of Christianity throughout eastern Asia—was a laudable one. Leaving China aside, we may note how Serampore in so many cases was the centre from which missionaries were sent out, not only to mission stations whose names are familiar to us as Baptists—Jessore, Gaya, Monghyr, Delhi, but to many parts of India which have long since been occupied by missionaries of other denominations who were able to build upon the foundations laid by Carey's men. In 1819 a map was printed to accompany the Periodical Accounts, and on it were shown 25 stations occupied by members of the Serampore Mission—ten of them in Bengal, seven in northern India, as well as Colombo and Galle Point in Ceylon and three places in the East Indies.

From Surat on the west coast, now occupied by Irish Presbyterians, to Cherrapunji near the eastern border of India, in which Welsh Presbyterians have long been at work, the map of India may be said to be dotted with places to which men were sent in those early days from Serampore. Cherrapunji was, in fact, the last of the Serampore mission-stations to be opened in Carey's life-time, only about two years before his death, at a time when the British conquest of the Khasi Hills brought it within convenient reach of Serampore, for which it served as a hill-station.

The headquarters of the National Christian Council of India are at present at Nagpur, a city whose political importance has declined in recent years with the re-organization of the Indian states, but which retains its prominence as a centre of communications for the whole country. This city, too, appears to have been first evangelised from Serampore. A brief account of the circumstances will serve to illustrate how Carey's influence reached out into remote parts of India. An officer of the East India Company, Lt. William Moxon, was stationed at Barrackpore, opposite Serampore, in 1805, and was shortly afterwards transferred to Nagpur, where he combined his military duties with evangelistic work, offering his services to the Serampore missionaries. He studied Marathi and distributed copies of the first Marathi Bible translation made by Carey, who had never visited the Mahratta area, but who was nevertheless appointed Professor of Marathi at the Government college at Fort William, Calcutta, and the author, in 1805, of a grammar of that language. Moxon was able to visit Serampore in 1812, taking two months over the journey, and before returning he was baptized by Carey, along with Phoebe Hobson, Carey's niece, whom he married shortly afterwards. . . . It is significant of the attitude of these early missionaries

towards Indian Christians that Moxon applied for an Indian helper who became the first pastor of the newly-formed Church at Nagpur. Ram Mohan, whom Carey sent from Serampore, is described as "a converted Brahmin of the highest caste, who, when a heathen, had set fire to the funeral pyre on which his living mother was consumed to ashes."[7] There must have been many evangelically-minded army officers who were able, like Moxon, to evangelize hitherto untouched areas of India in the course of their military service.

How, it may be asked, is Serampore fulfilling a similar function in the 20th century? There is no longer the same need for a group of missionaries, based on one single station, as in those early pioneering days, but Serampore is once again the 'mother' of a large family, though at present it is a family of twenty colleges affiliated to the theological university instituted by Dr. Howells.

Corresponding to the map issued by the early Serampore missionaries is the map produced more recently by the Senate of Serampore to show how these affiliated colleges are distributed throughout India. They stretch from Ahmedabad and Poona in the west to Cherrapunji and Calcutta in the east, from Saharanpur and Bareilly in the north to Trivandrum and Nagercoil in the south. More than half of them are situated in south India, taking south India to be the area in which the C.S.I. has its churches. So here again we see the extensive range of Sermpore's influence, in a form which could not have been foreseen by William Carey. It may not, however, be too fanciful to see the influence of the early Serampore missionaries indirectly at work even here. The modern university functions of Serampore as an institution which maintains high standards of academic training in theology by means of its L.Th., B.D., and M.Th. examinations, spring from the Serampore College Act of 1918. Prior to that, the Serampore B.D. was granted only to students who were actually studying at Serampore. With the formation of the Senate, however, came the principle of affiliation, though, strangely enough, this is not actually provided for in the Serampore College Act. The first colleges to take advantage of this arrangement, in 1919, were the United Theological College, Bangalore, Pasumalai Theological Seminary in S. India and Bishop's College, Calcutta. The system of affiliation was a natural enough one to follow in India, where it had been in existence ever since the three senior modern universities of India were founded in 1857. In that year, as we have seen, Serampore was one of the first colleges to be affiliated to Calcutta University, whose jurisdiction in those days extended to the north-western extremity of British rule in India, so that St. John's College, Agra, was also one of the first colleges to be affiliated to Calcutta. This system, which was so alien to the tradition of the ancient British universities, was no doubt borrowed from the pattern of the newly-established London

University. In any event, one of those who had most to do with the pattern on which the universities of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay were founded was John Clark Marshman, one of the original members of the Council of Serampore College.

II

A second way in which Serampore is today reflecting the spirit of its founders is through the ecumenical spirit which it displays—ecumenical not only in the far-ranging extent of its influence throughout India and even beyond, but also in the sense in which the word is now more generally used. In addressing a gathering of Baptist historians, it is of course quite unnecessary for me to remind you that those who founded Serampore were sent out by the Particular Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel amongst the Heathen. Just as Baptists of the 20th century are not all cast in the same mould, but hold differing views on such matters as Church Union, so was it also with those early missionaries. The matter on which they held the most pronounced diversity of views, and on which they altered their stand more than once, was the issue of closed or open communion. On this question the views of Carey, in accordance with those of his Midland fellow-ministers, were less liberal than those of his colleagues who, it must be remembered, preceded him to Serampore. When, on his joining them there, the Serampore Church was constituted, it was on the basis of closed communion. In 1805 Carey was persuaded to relax the earlier regulation, and even the wife of the senior Anglican chaplain in Bengal, Mrs. Brown, used to partake of communion at the Mission Church, at the hands of one or other of the Serampore brethren. Ward characteristically writes in his journal: "I rejoice that the first Baptist church in Bengal has shaken off that apparent moroseness of temper which has so long made us appear unlovely in the sight of the Christian world. I am glad that this church considers *real religion* alone as the ground of admission to the Lord's table. With regard to a church state, a stricter union may be required; but to partake of the Lord's Supper worthily, it requires only that a man's heart be right towards God."[8]

This position was not, however, maintained for long. In 1811, Marshman, influenced by Fuller, pressed for a return to the former practice, much to Ward's disappointment. Ward gave way to what was now the majority opinion, and records in his journal: "Mr. Pritchett preached in the morning; after which Brother Marshman interdicted him the Lord's Table." I need hardly say that open communion is now the practice at the Mission Church in Serampore, but I have no idea when the change came about.

As has already been remarked, for the last fifty years the theo-

logical staff at Serampore has been recruited from a wide variety of denominations. At present the Principal is a Presbyterian, and of the other members of the staff, four are Baptists, two of them B.M.S. missionaries, two are members of the Syrian Orthodox Church, one a member of the Mar-Thoma Church, one a member of the Church of South India, and one an English Methodist. Incidentally, it may be of interest to note that at the meeting of the Negotiating Committee for Church Union in North India held in Jabalpur in December, 1959, four of the negotiators were members of the Serampore teaching staff.

When the Senate of Serampore was formed, it was laid down in the Serampore College Act that it should contain, in addition to the President (i.e., the Principal of the College), not more than three and not less than one member of each of the following Christian denominations: Anglican, Baptist, Congregationalist, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian and Syrian. Since that time Church Union, especially in South India, has made it difficult to follow this rule with exactness.

The students who receive their training at Serampore come from all the non-Roman communions in India, including Anglicans, though there is still a tendency for Baptists to predominate. This is at the present time due not so much to a preponderance of candidates from churches connected with the B.M.S. as to the proximity of large numbers of Baptists in the hill-areas of Assam, where American Baptist missionaries are at work. During the last session, apart from post-graduate students, there were 11 Baptists, of whom only two were from our B.M.S. areas, one from Ceylon and one from Pakistan (none, it will be observed, from India), four members of the C.S.I., three members of the U.C.N.I. (Presbyterian), two Lutherans, one Methodist, and one each from the Orthodox and Mar-Thoma Syrian churches. It is unusual to have so few students from the south, and I believe it would be unfortunate if Serampore continues to cater, as it has for the last year or two, so greatly for the north-eastern corner of India.

The great variety of languages represented in the college—15 among the 23 students just mentioned—necessitates the use of English as the one common language understood by all. This has its drawbacks, as it means that far less practical work can be done by the students during their period of training than would be possible in a multi-lingual area such as Bangalore, where the students can almost all be in touch with congregations speaking their own mother-tongue. It must also be recognized that the college at Serampore is situated in a part of India where the Church is very weak, and where, despite a long history of missionary endeavour, the proportion of Christians in the population is far smaller than in the south. At the last (1951) census, the Christians, Protestant and Roman

combined, formed 7% of the population of West Bengal, and in Hooghly district, in which Serampore is situated, the proportion was smaller still, being 8 per 10,000 of the population.

Despite the apparent narrowness of their outlook with regard to the practice of open communion, a narrowness which was to a great extent a reflection of the viewpoint of those in England whom they were representing, the early Serampore missionaries were desirous of co-operating as fully as possible with those who were engaged like them in Christian activity in India. Their relations with Anglicans, such as Brown, Buchanan and Martyn, all of whom were their neighbours in Serampore, were very friendly, and the first two Bishops of Calcutta were on good terms with Carey and his colleagues. Middleton, the first of these, was sympathetic with the aims and activities of the Serampore trio, and Bishop's College was founded by him on the model of Serampore.

Middleton was succeeded in 1823 by Reginald Heber who, unfortunately, survived a mere two-and-a-half years, dying on a pastoral visit to south India. Writing to Carey and Marshman in 1824, Heber said: "Would to God, my honoured brethren, the time were arrived, when not only in heart and hope, but visibly, we shall be one fold, as well as under one shepherd! . . . If we are spared to have any future intercourse, it is my desire, if you permit, to discuss with both of you, in the spirit of meekness and conciliation, the points which now divide us, convinced, that if a re-union of our churches could be effected, the harvest of the heathen would ere long be reaped, and the work of the Lord would advance among them with a celerity of which we have now no experience." [9]

The cordial relations with Christians of other denominations extended even to missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church. Marshman received much help in his Chinese studies from a Roman missionary who had spent ten years in Peking. As the latter spoke no English, they communicated with each other in Latin! In fact, Marshman suggested to Ryland that prospective missionaries should be prepared to speak and write Latin in order to communicate with Roman Catholic missionaries.

It is, of course, in connection with their plans for the founding of the college that we see the clearest evidence of the broadmindedness of the early missionaries, who from the beginning wished it to be an institution mainly for training young men for the ministry, not simply of the Baptist churches, but of all Christian denominations. Although in recent years great stress has been laid on Carey's determination to throw the colleges open to Indians of every caste and creed, a determination expressed in the words: "But while this college secures to Christian youth instructions capable of drawing forth all the powers of the mind, it should by no means stop here; it should afford instruction to Native Youths from any part of

India. If none but Christian youth are admitted on the foundation of the College, still its exercises and lectures should be accessible to all," yet a perusal of the prospectus issued in July 1818 shows that the primary intention was to provide training for those who were to become the future ministers and missionaries of the Gospel in India. The main objects there stated may be summarized as follows:

1. The instruction of all students in Sanskrit, and of some in Arabic, Persian and Chinese;
2. The expounding of the Hindu religious texts;
3. Biblical instruction for all students;
4. Training in arts and science, particularly in history, geography, astronomy and natural history;
5. Training in school management.
6. The instruction of some better-qualified students in English, and of some of these in Latin and Greek;
7. The training of certain students for the ministry;
8. The translation of English works into Sanskrit.

All the above objects appear to have in view the instruction of Indian, Anglo-Indian or European Christians, mainly in languages, partly with a view to the translation of the Scriptures and partly in order to bring about a fuller understanding on the part of Christians in India and elsewhere of the religious beliefs of the Indians themselves. It is surely in line with this primary missionary function of the college rather than from purely secular motives, that the prospectus states: "The College shall admit such Hindoo and Mussulman Youth as wish to enlarge their minds, to its various lectures without restriction." At the present time, under the pressure of forces which were not at work in Carey's day, there is no longer the same proportionate emphasis on the training for the ministry and the enlargement of mind of Hindu and Mussulman youth. The latest college report states that in the 1959-60 session there were 991 arts and science students, of whom 40 were Christians, as against 24 theological students.

III

It is arising out of this point that mention must be made of another feature of the pioneer work of Carey and his colleagues, namely, their progressive views on the role of the Indian Christians in the evangelization of their own country, a viewpoint which has been characteristic of Serampore throughout its history.

Within three years of his arrival in Serampore, Ward was emphasizing this principle in his letters home: "It will be vain to

expect that the Gospel will ever spread widely in this country, till God so blesses the means as that *native men* shall be raised up, who will carry the despised doctrine . . . into the very teeth of the brahmins . . . I have constantly made it a point of recommending the making of native preachers as soon as possible; and I hope we may soon see two or three, who are at least more able and eloquent than some good men who are employed in England."[10] John Clark Marshman, writing half a century later deplored the fact that no systematic effort had been made by missionary societies in his own day to carry out these principles. Again, in 1805, the missionaries reiterate the same point in their basic statement of missionary principles: "It is only by means of native preachers we can hope for the universal spread of the Gospel through this immense continent. Europeans are too few, and their subsistence costs too much, for us ever to hope that they can possibly be the instruments of the universal diffusion of the Word among so many millions." [11] In their review of the Mission in the Periodical Accounts, December, 1817, the same point is made, and a parallel drawn with the situation facing the Early Church: "European brethren, indeed, while absolutely necessary to planting the Gospel in India, far more resemble, in their work and their value, the great Evangelists who went forth from Judea—Mark, Silas, Timothy, Titus and others; whose business it was to publish the word, plant churches, set things in order, and from among the native converts, ordain elders in every city. True, they are not, like them, endued with miraculous gifts; but their superior knowledge of the gospel, their steadiness and energy of mind, supply precisely what is lacking in native converts. . . . And whether one brother thus acting as the directing intelligence to twenty native brethren, accustomed to the climate, and thoroughly acquainted with the idiom, habits and ideas of their countrymen, would not be likely to do more than two European brethren alone, it is easy to judge. Twenty European brethren, placed in as many different provinces of India, and thus encircled with native brethren, would go far, in a course of years, towards diffusing that general light throughout the whole of the continent, which might prepare the way for the coming of the Redeemer's kingdom in its fulness and glory." [12]

In the prospectus for the new college, issued in 1818, this same emphasis occurs, as we should expect: "If ever the gospel stands in India, it must be by native being opposed to native in demonstrating its excellence above all other systems." Yet long before that prospectus was issued, as far back as 1811, three days after Carey's 50th birthday, we find the missionaries already planning, and indeed putting into practice, precisely the same pattern of training up native Indian leadership as was set forth in detail in their plans

for the college: "It has long, therefore, occurred to some of us, that the training up of a number of youths to the study of the Greek and Hebrew languages, and of the languages of India, almost from their infancy, would be an auxiliary in the work, the value of which time alone can fully demonstrate . . . A Seminary for training up youths so as to fit them for the work of translations in the various languages of Asia has therefore been for some time in our contemplation . . . We have therefore laid the foundation of such a seminary at Serampore, where youths are instructed in the Greek, Hebrew and Latin languages, while they are acquiring and perhaps conversing in the languages in which they may probably have to examine the translation of the word of God . . . The number of youths in this course of tuition, is at present ten, of whom, six belong to the family at Serampore. The eldest of these is eighteen and the youngest nine. All of them have commenced the study of Latin; five of them are studying Greek, and four Hebrew. One of the latter has also been reading Syriac these three years past." [13]

Carey would no doubt be shocked to find, if he were able to return to Serampore, how sadly the emphasis on ancient languages has declined. By his emphasis on the Indian vernacular and on Sanskrit, as against English, Carey was thought to have misjudged the temper of 19th century India. Certainly at the present time there is a swinging of the pendulum away from the former emphasis on English, and the vernaculars are coming into their own again. But in the new (1960) B.D. syllabus, what will seem to many to be a retrograde step has been taken, in that candidates may now obtain the B.D. Degree without being required to pass in a Greek paper in the examination. Fifty years ago, when the B.D. course was introduced, Syriac was regularly offered, and both Hebrew and Greek were required. Hebrew fell by the way some years ago, and now Greek is beginning to lose its grip. It is some compensation to know that one of the B.D. candidates who has just completed his course took Sanskrit—the first at Serampore for a number of years.

The high standards of linguistic attainment which Carey and his colleagues set before them in planning Serampore College were a reflection of the exacting demands which they made upon themselves whenever it was a question of translating the Scriptures into the various languages of India.

Among the ancient and valuable printed books which are preserved in the library at Serampore, now at last provided with an air-conditioning plant, are many volumes of the Bible in various Indian and other Eastern languages, monuments to the industry of Carey and his colleagues. But there are volumes which antedate those early translations and which are, so to speak, the tools which enabled the translators to do their work. One of the most fascinating of these is

a worn and annotated copy of Walton's *Polyglott* (the annotations are mainly in the neat and meticulous hand of W. H. Denham, Principal of Serampore just over 100 years ago). Is this perhaps the copy which Carey himself used? In a letter to the Society written only a fortnight after landing in India, Carey wrote: "It will be of very great service to us if the society can send out a Polyglott Bible by the next conveyance. Ram Boshoo is a good Persian scholar, and it will certainly help us much."[14] The Committee replied as promptly as one might expect in those days, on August 4th, 1794: "We wish to send this off if possible, with the Polyglott Bible (price seven guineas)—the Malayan Testament, Lowth's Isaiah, etc."[15] More than two years later Carey acknowledged the receipt of Parkhurst's Greek and Hebrew Lexicons (Marshman's copy of Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon is still in the college library), but feared that the Polyglott must now be lost. Fortunately his fears proved ungrounded, for on June 22nd, 1797, nearly three years after it had been sent from England, Carey wrote to say that the Polyglott had arrived, together with Lowth's Isaiah. The latter may not now be considered the last word on Isaiah, but at that time it must have embodied some of the latest Old Testament scholarship by one who is still noted for his pioneer work on the nature of Hebrew poetic literature.

In December of the same year as the Polyglott arrived, while Carey was still in the jungles of Mudnabatty, two years before Marshman and Ward arrived at Serampore, we find him directing a number of questions regarding the correct translation of the Old Testament to Dr. Ryland, and referring not simply to the Hebrew text, but to that of the ancient versions. How many of his successors in Biblical translation work in India have been as conscientious as he was in determining the original form of the text and the true rendering of it? The wonder is not that Carey failed to anticipate the views of the later revisers of the Old Testament, but that he made so conscientious an attempt to employ the best scholarship of his day in the service of the Church in Bengal, which by the end of the 18th century could scarcely be said to exist at all, except in the purpose of God.

Was it perhaps this lack of any visible result of his labours in these early days that drew forth from Carey those frequent cries of despair which we encounter in his letters, a despair and depression of spirit seemingly so unjustified on our view of his achievements as we look back across the past 150 years? One example from many that might be chosen may suffice—an extract from a letter written by Carey to his sisters on November 23rd, 1801: "Indeed I have been often so much depressed that I have concluded myself to be the real cause why this Mission has not been more successful, because it would be inconsistent with the character of God to give

a blessing to the labours of one who lives so distant from Himself and would appear to the world to be a sanctioning of indolence and disregard to His honour and his most holy commandments."

In the letter to Ryland already referred to, containing his enquiries about the translation of the Old Testament, he goes on to say: "I have been thus particular because I consider the importance of having the translation as just as possible. If an individual draws wrong conclusions, or false doctrines from Scripture, they may be refuted or corrected by recurring to the words of Scripture itself and even a false translation in a country like England could not be productive of lasting mischief, because the Hebrew Scriptures may be consulted and the error detected: but here a mistake would be like poison at the fountain head."[16] A few years later, Marshman records in his journal the way in which the Serampore missionaries sought to ensure as much accuracy in their translation as could humanly be expected: "We are now beginning a new edition of the Testament. . . . We have agreed that a proof sheet shall be given to each brother in the mission a week before it be worked off, that we may collect all the advantages which may arise from any one's reading and observation into one focus. Brother Carey and I also intend, if the Lord permit, to go through every verse as carefully as we are able, one reading greek and the other bengalee."[17]

Serampore is no longer a centre of Bible translation in the same way as it was 150 years ago, but evidence that a contribution towards such translations is still being made there may be seen in the presence at Serampore during this last session of two young men taking an intensive course of Hebrew in order better to fit themselves for the work of Old Testament translation in Nepali and Santali.

The men of Serampore were ahead of their day where Biblical translation and careful scholarship were concerned, but there were also other ways in which the stand they took was more progressive than that of their contemporaries. An early problem which they had to face was that of naming their converts. In August, 1801 they decided not to alter the names of Indian Christians on baptism, partly because they were Baptists and therefore repudiated the idea of "christening," but mainly on the Biblical ground that names of heathen origin were retained in the New Testament Church. Whether under Carey's influence or not, it still appears to be the practice in Bengal for Christians to have non-Biblical names, whereas in the south the opposite practice is observed.

On the question of caste-distinctions among Christians the Serampore missionaries were uncompromising from the beginning. To quote John Clark Marshman: "On the baptism of the first brahmin, Mr. Carey and his colleagues were called to fix the rule of practice on this point at the celebration of the Lord's Supper,

and they resolved to exterminate every vestige of caste from the Christian community they were rearing up, and the brahmin received the bread and wine after the carpenter Krishnu."[18] Some years earlier, before coming to Serampore, Carey had already been in correspondence on this subject with the Lutheran missionaries in the neighbourhood of Madras, and had been told by Gericke, one of their number, " With respect to cast, the converts conform to the customs of their cast in not eating with those, or of what has been prepared by those who are of no cast."[19]

The opposition of the missionaries to the practice of sati or widow-burning is too well known to need emphasizing here. What now seems so hard to believe is that there were those, even in 1829, who sought to defend the practice, one to which Carey had drawn the attention of Lord Wellesley as far back as 1805. Seldom could Carey have been happier in the exercise of his position as official Government translator than on that Sunday in December, 1829 when he wrote out the translation of the regulation prohibiting sati. And yet, even now, 130 years later, one still comes across authentic eye-witness accounts of sati being practised in remote parts of India, so firm a hold has Hinduism on the minds of the Indian masses.

Carey's scientific interests were wide enough to embrace not only agriculture and horticulture, as might be expected of one with his country upbringing, an interest which led to his founding the Agri-Horticultural Society of India in 1820, and to his being elected a Fellow of the Linnean Society in 1823, but also included geology and astronomy. A few years ago there was discovered at Serampore a collection of what at first appeared to be some odd pieces of stone, covered with earth and apparently worthless. But an American missionary with a scientific turn of mind cleaned up the stones, which were then seen to be geological specimens, possibly those which were mentioned in Carey's will as a bequest to the college. There is, however, another possible explanation for the presence of this collection, since the annual report of the college for 1822 mentions that a " cabinet of minerals " had been purchased on behalf of the college for the sum of £45. In any case, the collection of stones still stands in the museum at Serampore as evidence of the wide scientific interests of those earlier missionary pioneers exiled to the stoneless alluvial plains of Bengal. That Carey was keen to take advantage of opportunities of widening his own scientific knowledge is evident from a letter which he wrote to his father (December 1st, 1802) in which he mentions that he was in the habit of attending " the Philosophical and Chymical lecture " given by his colleague Dr. Dinwiddie on the Thursday evenings when he was on his weekly visits to Calcutta to teach at the Fort William College.

A more ambitious scientific interest which is also mentioned in the 1822 college report is the plan to establish a medical school at

Serampore: "The Committee in November last addressed a petition on this subject to the Most Noble the Governor-General in Council, mentioning their design of establishing a European Professor of Medicine in Serampore College and respectfully requesting the assistance of Government in meeting the expense. To this petition Government were pleased to reply that they thought the establishment of a European Medical Professor in the College might be productive of great good to the country, and that when a suitable man was procured, they would take their request for assistance in meeting the request into favourable consideration. Encouraged by this generous assurance, the Committee have written home for a man who shall unite sound medical knowledge to sterling piety and a regard for the welfare of India." The plan did not succeed, though the project appears to have been revived in the earlier years of Dr. Howells' principalship. With the existence of Vellore and Ludhiana there is no longer a need for yet another Christian medical college on the same scale in Bengal, and in any case, there is inadequate land available at Serampore for any such expansion.

The first missionaries were men of wider vision than their successors who, in 1875, sold much of the college land to the India Jute Mill. Those who are now planning for the future of the college, however, are concerned to see that the best possible use is made of the land still remaining, and of the buildings erected by Carey together with those of a later date. It is planned that the main building shall in the near future be adapted to house not only the library, with its ancient and modern books, but also the theological department, with perhaps the office of the Senate of Serampore in addition, while the main arts and science classrooms will be in a separate block, though remaining a part of the one college under the one Principal and Council.

The present generation at Serampore can certainly not be said to have forgotten the rock from whence it was hewed, but it is also conscious that regard must be paid to the needs of future generations as well as to the traditions of those who have gone before. We, together with them, might well conclude with the words of William Ward in the year in which the College was founded: "That still Serampore may be Thine, that from thence for centuries to come the word of God may go forth, and 'run and be glorified.' Oh, let it be a house for God as long as a single wall shall be left standing, essentially contributing year by year to the grand result—the conversion of India."[20]

NOTES

[1] Address given to the Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society on May 1st, 1961.

[2] *The Life and Times of Carey, Marshman and Ward,* by J. C Marshman, 1859, Vol. II, p. 235.

[3] *Periodical Accounts,* Vol. II, p. 457.

[4] *ibid.,* p. 536.

[5] *Periodical Accounts,* Vol. I, p. 348.

[6] *Periodical Accounts,* Vol. III, p. 459.

[7] *Oriental Baptist,* March, 1855.

[8] Marshman, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, p. 215.

[9] Marshman, *op. cit.,* Vol. II, p. 293.

[10] Marshman, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, pp. 182f.

[11] *ibid.,* p. 229.

[12] *Periodical Accounts,* Vol. VI, p. 298.

[13] *Periodical Accounts,* Vol. IV, p. 379.

[14] *Periodical Accounts,* Vol. I, p. 66.

[15] *Periodical Accounts,* Vol. I, p. 81.

[16] *ibid.,* p. 396.

[17] *Periodical Accounts,* Vol. II, p. 413.

[18] Marshman, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, p. 177.

[19] *Periodical Accounts,* Vol. I, p. 432.

[20] Marshman, *op. cit.,* Vol. II, p. 191.

BRYNMOR F. PRICE

The Meaning of The Secular

THIS was the theme of a Consultation of University teachers, at the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, Switzerland, upon which I deliberately and gratefully gate-crashed a year ago. Recognizing that this is a subject of growing interest and importance at the present time, I anticipated that such a conference would prove a seminal ground for further thinking in the next few years. And so I believe it will prove to be. The very fact that considerable difficulty was experienced even in defining the term indicated that this is indeed an idea in process of transition. Conventional Christian thinking upon it, however, is certainly getting out of date—and out of touch with the mind of the present student generation. This was strikingly illustrated at the World's Student Christian Federation's Teaching Conference at Strasbourg this last summer on the Life and Mission of the Church. There it was clearly revealed that it is Dietrich Bonhoeffer who holds the minds of Christian students today, as the patron saint of religionless Christianity and of holy worldliness. One of the most popular lectures at that large and very representative international gathering was given by Professor Hans Hoekendijk, who emphasized that "the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh is a 'secular' event: an event in the world and for the world." Christianity, he maintained, cannot be understood except as a secular movement; to treat it as a religion is a fundamental mistake! A Christian is a man who is being redeemed to become a normal human being. Traditional Church structures must therefore give way to open, mobile, flexible groups in living touch with the modern world; the Church must be "desacralized," and Christianity "dereligionized"!

Today secularism is being seen as the key to a vital renewal of the Christian faith, otherwise in many ways so seemingly irrelevant to man in the twentieth century. Yet in this same century, only thirty-two years ago, the I.M.C. Jerusalem Assembly proclaimed secularism as the arch-enemy of God and of the true welfare of mankind. From then onwards we have been accustomed to speak of secularism in its perjorative sense. As Archbishop Temple declared, Christianity is avowedly the most materialistic of all religions; when, therefore, Christians inveigh against "secular materialism," it must be the first, rather than the second, of these two words which they condemn. At Jerusalem, even other great faiths were essentially seen, not as the rivals of Christianity, but as its allies in a world-wide fight against the secularist temper. "We call on the followers of non-Christian religions to join with us in the study of Jesus Christ

as He stands before us in the Scriptures, His place in the life of the world, and His power to satisfy the human heart; to hold fast to faith in the unseen and eternal in face of the growing materialism of the world; to co-operate with us against all the evils of secularism. . . ."

What, then, is secularism? A Scriptural quotation which follows later in the Jerusalem Statement indicates the basis of their definition. "Still ringing in our ears is the call, 'Be not fashioned according to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind'." This is indeed a command which the disciples of Bonhoeffer must seek to understand and lay to heart. Yet this does not resolve our tension or dilemma. For though we all know that the Christian must forswear the world, in the sense of human society organized upon the basis of man's prideful self-assertion in vaunted independence of God, yet the real Biblical distinction is not between this world and the next, but between this age and the age to come—a reality which has already broken in upon this world, because the Son of God is come. As Dr. J. A. T. Robinson emphasizes, Christianity is essentially a this-worldly religion, even though it is a new earth and a new heaven for which it looks. "The only other-worldliness which the Bible encourages is the sort of other-worldliness, if that is the right term, of the Communist, who, like the Christian, refuses to let his thinking or his actions be conformed to the pattern of the present world-order" (cf. *Rom.* xii. 2).

Is, therefore, the bad quality of secularism, not that it is this-worldly, but that it represents the spirit of *this* age, man as the creator of his own destiny, human life with God left out? That is indeed close to the truth. Yet the dilemma persists, for many testify that secularism has been experienced as a liberating and creative force, through which the will of God for human destiny is in fact being fulfilled. The records of the Jerusalem Assembly show that even then at least one voice was raised to this effect. Canon Chas. Raven was thus reported: "All standards have been challenged, and people have been left bewildered. . . . For this the Church was largely to blame. The attitude of the Church, as expressed in its art, music, intellectual expression of its faith, and even its moral standards, has been definitely lower than the best thought of the time."

What lies behind these very contrasting attitudes to secularism? At the Bossey Consultation, Dr. van Peursen, a Dutch Professor of Philosophy, propounded the thesis that secularization means deliverance first from religious, and then from metaphysical, control over human reason and language. Throughout the history of Western science and thought, human reason has been striving for complete liberation from unverifiable suppositions. By freeing itself from all a priori reasoning, science has set itself to learn from the given fact,

and has in consequence made astounding progress. Space and time, instead of being treated as ontological entities, have become logical and mathematical relations in a system of description. "Formerly, moral behaviour was controlled by eternal values rooted in metaphysics. Social planning was guided by social philosophy and by natural law, and even economics was rooted in a kind of philosophy. Today we have in empiricism and existentialism the secularizing rejection of all of this." Through this process of secularization, moreover, it now becomes clear that the Bible itself gives neither metaphysic, nor ontology, nor natural history. "*Genesis* is more explosive than a scientific exposition on the origin of species. It expresses the presence of God in human history. The being of God is not a kind of *summum esse,* but could be translated as *to be with you.* Secularization as a deliverance from metaphysical categories helps us better to understand this language. . . . One is concerned, in Biblical language, with the presence of God, which functions as a liberation of human existence and precedes and enables freedom of research (there is no demonic or divine world; the sun is only created, not a divinity: as such it can be studied) and clarity of language (daily language demanding a concrete attitude towards one's fellow-men, nature, illness, death, joy, etc.)." On the other hand, it is also admitted that secularization presents a threat, for it has within itself a tendency towards self-sufficiency, which hampers our understanding of facts and events in their relation to the presence of God. The ultimate horizon of human thinking may be lost. "The limits of my language are the limits of my world," says Wittgenstein in his *Tractatus.* The tension for the Christian lies in his need to recognize that a metaphysical use of the Christian faith must be renounced, yet this secularization must not be allowed itself to become self-sufficient and an absolute. The Christian's responsibility is to establish real communication with the secular way of life.

Dr. Roger Mehl, a French Professor of Theology, similarly maintained that secularization is essentially a Christian phenomenon, with a Christian origin. "One of the earliest signs of this process was the conflict in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries between the faculty of Arts and the faculty of Theology, especially in the University of Paris. The issue was the autonomy of arts studies and was based on the discovery of Aristotle, by way of Averroes. What here began in the domain of sciences and knowledge eventually led to the disestablishment of the Christian Church and its relegation to the margin of public life." Here is a definition which he has given in one of his published works: "Secularization is the process by which a society disengages itself from the religious ideals, beliefs, and institutions which has ordered its existence, in order to constitute itself an autonomous reality, in order to find itself the principle of its organization and in order to enclose religion in the private

sector of life." Two further quotations will reveal striking similarities to the views of the Dutch professor. "The action of God in Christ does not sacralize but sanctifies the world. It does not create a sacred area of life or society. It is a phenomenon of time, a process of history. Thus eschatology has a direct connection with secularization. The work of Christ has a hidden effect which will not appear until the end of time. The unity of truth is from our point of view a broken unity. We cannot co-ordinate all truth from our perspective. Knowledge in history must therefore be secular. The medieval dream of a total harmony of truth, hierarchically ordered, is destroyed, not only by the secularizing process, but by the nature of God's action in Christ itself." As regards the abiding tension of which we have spoken, secularization "cannot face the final conclusions of its own process. It stops. We discover in the midst of secularized society a process of resacralization. Some turn back to the Church as a sacred structure, some turn to secular religions."

What, then, should be the position and responsibility of the Christian theologian and minister of the Gospel? Professor Ronald Gregor Smith gave his answer thus: "My fundamental assumption is that the world which the theologian looks at and the world which the sociologist looks at are one and the same. . . . The centre of the picture is man . . . man in his wholeness as man, and man as responsible for history. . . . Theology is not the elaboration of propositions or doctrines about God. It is not the assertion or maintenance of a specific world-view, or a metaphysic, against some other. . . . The main issue I put provisionally in the form of a question: is the controlling power in human life made by men, or not? My own answer, as any real answer, rests upon a decision. My decision is that the primary and ultimately controlling power is not made by men, but is given to men. . . . It is given to men in such a way that it is also made by them. . . . It is in this paradoxical situation, where man recognizes both his dependence and his independence, his being controlled and his controlling, his being both limited and unlimited, that the main theological issue lies, so far as the perspective leads towards the meaning of the secular. . . . While dogmatics is an absolutely essential discipline for Christianity, especially as the internal or domestic effort to understand what it is concerned with, and furthermore, as the effort to make clear to the non-Christian what its general intention and scope are, so that it may make clear what is the minimum space which it requires as a breathing-space in the world—a true dogmatics must never be equated with a structure or system of thought consisting of a series of propositions, whether inter-linked or not, about God and the world. But a true theological concern has to do with this question, Whence do we receive? The theological key-word here is grace. In less strict but more contem-

porary language—at least in the language of men like Martin Buber and Karl Jaspers—the key-word would be otherness. . . . The God that Christian theology speaks about here is not God in isolation, but God in the world. . . . Christian theology has to try to speak about this givenness in such a way that while God is given in and for the world, the world in turn is recognized as distinct from Him. . . . In Barth's language, God is always subject, that is, He can never be an object of experience, if by experience you mean a direct perceptual apprehension of an object among other objects in the world. . . . His presence is apprehended rather as an action or event in and through the structures of the world, and apprehended in faith. . . . Faith itself is basically a decision about your life, which involves you in a recognition of this otherness which presses in upon you. The focus of this otherness is the historical figure of Jesus, otherwise pregnantly described as the Word which God has uttered, and that means the Word which God has done, in historical human circumstances."

Dr. Gregor Smith also recognized secularist thought, in spite of its complex origins, as deriving from Christian conceptions and Christian experience. He, too, spoke of what happens when an ultimate secularism is reached—not when everything has been separated off into sheer autonomous regions, but when, released from all ideologies, and in complete freedom, man is then left entirely by himself. At this point a question arises which may bring him to a new theonomy. This question is, Who am I? "And the answer comes in the form of another question, 'Adam, where art thou' . . . the liberating word spoken by God in the free historical situation of man." Christian faith, which allows the maximum place for man's freedom and responsibility, springs from God's veiled appearance in Christ. In his conclusion Dr. Smith quoted Gerhard Ebeling: "Because faith does not live on and from the world, it makes it possible to live for the world. Because it puts an end to the misuse of the world, it opens up the right use of the world. Because faith breaks the domination of the world, it gives domination over the world and responsibility for the world. And because it drives out the pleasure and the misliking of the world, it makes room for pure joy in the world."

These sketchy indications of only some of the contents of but three out of a dozen meaty lectures have done little justice to the Bossey Consultation. Some impressive agreements can, however, be noted from a lively conference in which agreements proved difficult to reach. It is hoped that a clue or two has emerged, along with some provocative ideas. Once again we have come upon a phenomenon familiar in Christian thinking—the paradox. For secularization, which has long been regarded as the great enemy of religion, has been shown to have deeply Christian origins. The

disciplines which have successively broken free from an authoritarian and over-arching control have abundantly justified their claims to autonomy, yet thereby they have left man in an increasingly meaningless world. The apparent denial of faith has created a new opportunity for faith. Leaving God out of the world has paved the way for a new understanding of His presence within it. Secularization, which has refused to let religion have the last word in every realm of thought, has found itself quite incapable of saying any final word, and is creating a new vacuum for religion. Is not a divine dialectic revealed in all this? Churches have been turned in upon themselves instead of turned outwards to the world. Yet, thanks to a secularist movement of thought, the thing which Christian students today seem to be most positively sure about is that Christ's ministry is to the world, not just to the Church, and that Christian discipleship means sharing in that service of the world for which He died. The danger is that many of them almost seem to think that the world is always right, and the Church always wrong. They have to learn that the Christian has to be called out of the world before he can be sent into the world. But it is high time that the world came into its own as the true correlative term to the Gospel.

VICTOR E. W. HAYWARD

In The Study

PATRISTICS is a fascinating field. It confronts us with the Church in her great formative period, and helps us to understand her. Of course it remains true that our angle of vision is largely decided for us, that we cannot turn back the clocks and re-live the classic era of church history. The labels of orthodoxy and heresy have already been apportioned, the palms of victory finally awarded, the marks of the vanquished indelibly stained. And the literature that still survives on the whole reflects these verdicts. So much is lost to us, so much known only through the comment of the hostile critic and the captious broadside of the apologist.

But hope does not entirely disappoint. The tools of scholarship are constantly refined and the past continues to yield up its buried treasure. That is why many will turn with interest to a new survey of the scene.[1] Though it follows hard on the translation of the more substantial work of Altaner, yet this summary presentation is its own justification. It is not a study in history or doctrine but a condensed introduction to Christian literature from the close of the New Testament on to Nicaea. Two further and similar volumes are projected to deal with the later Greek and Latin Fathers. Meanwhile, we end with Paul of Samosata and Methodius, with Novatian and Lactantius. A word on hymnody and inscriptions is added, and a note on bibliography appended. The general reader will get most from this study if he has constantly at his side Mr. J. Stevenson's *A New Eusebius.*

The erudition of the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity ensures the basic dependability of this work and prepares us for the mass of scholarly knowledge that in so brief a compass he has somehow managed to insert. Inevitably opinions are advanced without full discussion of the arguments that prompt the conclusions. But alternative views are usually mentioned, and indefensible dogmatism avoided. An early date for the Didache, persistently held by Continental scholarship, is supported; Gnosticism is viewed as a pre-Christian heresy; Montanism is rightly labelled modernistic; the Stoic roots of Origen's philosophical thinking are stressed. Dr. Cross goes against the stream in concluding that the doctrinal affiliations of Novatian are with Irenaeus and Hippolytus rather than with Tertullian—an intriguing suggestion that cries out for development and substantiation. On the other hand, the hallowed dogma of the conservatism of Hippolytus is simply repeated and, some might feel, too readily accepted.

[1] *The Early Christian Fathers,* by F. L. Cross. Duckworth (Studies in Theology), 15s. 1960.

Probably the most fascinating treatment, and certainly the most original, is that afforded to Melito of Sardis. Dr. Cross can describe the recently recovered tract on the Pasch as "the most important addition to Patristic literature in the present century." It sheds a flood of light on the early Easter Festival, and is here adduced as the unique example of a Christian Paschal Haggadah. Whether or not the case is cogently made further examination and discussion must decide. But Melito stands clearly revealed as a significant figure in the Church in Asia Minor in the second century.

It is a far cry from Melito of Sardis to Anselm of Canterbury. But if we enter a new world, it has its own importance and appeal. For in any traditional list of proofs of the existence of God, the so-called ontological proof will be found in the forefront, and coupled with it the name of Anselm its originator. Probably there will be reference to allied arguments to be found in Descartes and Leibnitz, and some discussion of damaging objections advanced by Immanuel Kant. But what if all this is beside the point? And what if Anselm's thought moves on a quite different level to that which so many both of his assailants and his defenders have supposed? For this is Barth's thesis in a book produced some thirty years ago but of sufficient enduring significance to merit the admirable translation of it which Ian Robertson has now given to us.[2] An examination of Anselm's theological scheme, and a discussion of his immediately relevant presuppositions, lead on to a detailed commentary upon the famous chapters 2-4 of the Proslogion. The demands made upon the reader are a working knowledge of ecclesiastical Latin, and a willingness to take theology seriously.

To us there is given the revealed Name of God: "that than which nothing greater can be conceived." From this foundation, the proof of the existence of God can be decided. The concern is not in the end with a potentiality or an abstract existence, but with an existence that is in reality as well as in thought and conception. But there is more than this. For the question at issue is the existence of *God,* of that which is unique, of that which is no part of a general problem of existence. When we speak of God, we speak of the One and only One which cannot be conceived as not existing, which has reality in itself, which is thus independent of the general antithesis between knowledge and object.

Throughout Anselm proceeds with faultless logic; but the nature of his approach and presuppositions must never be forgotten. He works within the circle of belief: his watchword is *credo ut intelligam.* The words of Scripture and direct inferences from them are absolutely valid. To reason he allows full sway—but always within the limits of faith. For the purposes of proof he will leave the

[2] Anselm: *Fides Quaerens Intellectum,* by Karl Barth (S.C.M. Press, Ltd. 25s.). 1960.

question of God's existence open; but as he argues this question he will stand upon the other articles of faith and make use of them. This is the work and method of the Christian theologian, and is therefore begun in obedience and dedication, continued in prayer, and ended in thanksgiving. For to "understand" means for him to see the necessity of one article of faith whilst presupposing all the others.

So he writes as theologian to theologian, as believer to believers. He is not first and foremost the apologist. But clearly he cannot evade unbelief, must reckon with the fool who says in his heart: "There is no God," must come to terms with the impossible possibility of the unconvinced. And he will do this as one who knows that he himself stands on the borderline of unbelief, and therefore as one who knows that his certainty is the gift of God who confronts believer and unbeliever alike.

All this is challenging restatement. It tells us a great deal about the thinking of Anselm; it tells us something vital about the joy of theology; and it tells us not a little about Karl Barth.

During the last decade, thought and discussion relating to the doctrine of the ministry has clearly and decisively entered a new phase. The problems remain in ecumenical confrontation, and in many ways they are still the same problems. But increasingly they are seen from new perspectives, framed in fresh and more flexible terms, thrown into fructifying disarray as a result of cutting back behind their static and traditional formulations. And all this is surely due to two promising features of the contemporary situation. The one is the return to a genuinely theological understanding of Scripture; the other, the growth of experience of and movement towards reunion.

It is from this background that a recent and important study in the theology of the Ministry[3] derives. Canon Hanson finds his necessary starting point in an examination of the Remnant in the thought of Old and New Testament—though perhaps he judges it to be more central and pervasive than the facts allow. He proceeds to investigate St. Paul's belief about the apostolate, and the Pauline doctrine of the ministry as most clearly manifested in the second letter to the Corinthians. Brief reference to the early developments heralding theological separation of Church and ministry by the time of Cyprian prepares the way for some attention to the 16th century reappraisal and the modern debate. The whole is a selective enquiry that attempts to break new ground.

The conclusion reached is that the ministry is the pioneer Church. The apostles were the faithful remnant, the bridge between Christ and the New Testament communities, the nucleus of the emerging

[3] *The Pioneer Ministry,* by Anthony T. Hanson (S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 21s.). 1961.

Church. It means a dynamic doctrine of the apostolate which thinks together a continuing apostolic ministry with a continuing apostolic task. The ministry must be understood in a functional and representative way. It is "given in the Church by Christ to be the Church, to be and do that which the Church, following it, must be and do."

Clearly this allows to the Free Churches a great deal of what they have always claimed. Perhaps it allows altogether too much. For my own part, I should find at least two important questions to put to Canon Hanson. I should wish to be more certainly convinced that he has given sufficient weight to the precise scriptural relationship between the local church and the whole *ecclesia,* and to the emphasis upon the ministry as representing the whole Church to and in the local fellowship which may follow from this. I should further wish to be more satisfied than I am that he has done justice to certain unrepeatable aspects of the original apostolate. That the apostolic band are to be understood in terms less of office than of task may be readily agreed. But I wonder whether the interpretation this book advances is the truth rather than the whole truth, and whether for an adequate theology of the ministry a wider frame of reference and some finer brushes are not required.

Nevertheless, here is an invigorating breeze blowing over some dry and parched ground. Those who are ready to do the next ecumenical mile will be wise to expose themselves to it—and pay deep attention to the second letter to the Corinthians before they resume their journey.

It seems then that all contemporary roads lead at length to Scripture, to the historical Jesus, to the contextual background of ancient Israel, to the life of the New Testament community; and appositely enough the series of Black New Testament commentaries continues with a study of the Second Gospel by Dean Johnson.[4] This is such a well-ploughed territory that a new commentary has achieved a great deal if it can but justify its existence. Probably the most interesting and significant of the recent developments have gone along two lines. On the one hand, renewed attention has been given to the question of sources, especially in connection with the composition of the Passion Narrative. On the other, a deepening understanding of the primary importance of arriving at some initial decision as to the purpose of the Evangelist has carried with it an increasing preoccupation with the problem of the structure of his Gospel. It is just here that the work of such scholars as Farrer, Lightfoot, Marxsen, and Carrington becomes relevant—though we must acknowledge with Professor Johnson that as yet their stimulat-

[4] *The Gospel according to St. Mark,* by Sherman E. Johnson (A. & C. Black, 25s.). 1960.

ing suggestions have not been sufficiently assimilated and examined for a definitive verdict upon them to be pronounced.

Nevertheless, this commentator is a shrewd enough judge both of theory and of evidence. His translation is always helpful and illuminating; and his introduction concentrates on the issues that are really of importance to us. The commentary itself is a model for this whole Series. It does exactly what it is supposed to do, being at once "reliable in scholarship," "relevant to the contemporary Church," "full enough for serious academic work." It contains a wealth of learning, and ample reference to those technical studies upon which it inevitably and heavily depends. This is a welcome addition to the extensive Marcan literature; and it merits unreserved praise.

But in all our study of the Gospels we may not forget that of recent years the quest for the historical Jesus has taken a new turn. There is and can be no going back upon the insights of form critical scholarship, for the Gospels remain kerygmatic documents that reflect the history and experience of the apostolic church. Yet the *kerygma* is not to be detached from its historical foundations, and the exalted Christ is not to be severed from the humiliated Jesus. To attempt once more the biographical sketch or the psychological interpretation would be futile. But to seek a historical understanding of the tradition about Jesus may yet be an indispensable task laid upon us. It is this road that a disciple of Bultmann has skilfully trod. He has given us a book[5] whose importance could scarcely be overestimated.

It will be as well to trace carefully the progression of this study. Bornkamm begins with a brief but crucial discussion of the problems of faith and history in the Gospels. These pages should be read and read again, for they present an acute and balanced and discriminating interpretation which is determinative for what follows. Subsequent delineation of the Jewish background of the times leads into a brave if tentative sketch of the personality of the historical Jesus. Thus the way is opened and prepared for substantial chapters upon the Kingdom and Will of God, and briefer sections on Discipleship, the Journey to Jerusalem and Crucifixion, and the Messianic Secret. The story is necessarily carried on beyond the Tomb, and the indissoluble connection between the historical Jesus and the *kerygma* of the community is displayed. Concluding appendices on critical issues provide much relevant material, and might most usefully be read and mastered even before the main text is begun.

That Bornkamm's reconstruction can be challenged at many points will scarcely be denied. He is constantly in the position of

[5] *Jesus of Nazareth*, by Gunther Bornkamm (Hodder & Stoughton, 21s.). 1960.

having to make critical judgments about the Gospel material, and explicit justification for his verdicts is seldom provided. But this is to say no more than that this study assumes a vast mass of preliminary enquiry carried on not only by the author but also by his Continental colleagues. What is important is the approach that governs his presentation, the major emphases he makes, the significant conclusions that he reaches. Whereas Bultmann draws the dividing line between Jesus and Paul, Bornkamm places it between Jesus and John the Baptist who "stands guard at the frontier of the aeons." Whereas Bultmann denies that Jesus claimed Messiahship, Bornkamm will add that "the Messianic character of his being is contained *in* his words and deeds and *in* the unmediatedness of his historic appearance." The Lord does not obtrude his own person, but the Kingdom of God which is his pivotal concern; for the secret of Jesus is the making present of the reality of God. It is just here that there resides the essential and living continuity between the mission and message of Jesus and the mission and message of the apostolic church. There is but one message: the announcement of the dawning kingdom. But for those who live beyond the Empty Tomb, the crucified and risen Lord has become the centre of this Good News. The eschatological interpretation of Jesus becomes the christological interpretation of the Church.

Whether or not this be true, it cannot be denied that the story of Jesus demands as necessary context the story of the Bible. Many biblical works written primarily for laymen are most widely read and appreciated by the generality of the ministry; and a recent comprehensive survey of Scripture[6] may well have the same fate. Yet this book is unusual in that while most ministers desperately need to read it and few if any would fail to profit from it, the serious layman, prepared for some effort and study, would surely find it both an education and a liberation. And curiously enough, if he does begin to flounder it is likely to be in the sections treating of the New Testament rather than in those concerned with the Old.

This is a worthy production; and for three hundred large pages it is not expensive. It contains forty clear and wisely chosen illustrations, and adequate indices. It is written by experts who have, on the whole, mastered the art of communication. It is representative of all that is best and most fruitful in the modern scholarly approach to the Bible.

The reader will look in vain for much of the detailed material that belongs to the technical "introduction," for the minutiae of history, text, and canon. What he is offered is rather more important and significant. There is set before him with impressive competence the unity, sweep, and range of Scripture, and he is initiated into the

[6] *The Book of the Acts of God,* by G. E. Wright and R. H. Fuller. (Duckworth, 35s.). 1960.

self-understanding of a continuing community in whose midst God made history. Ernest Wright deals with the Old Testament with the masterly touch that we associate with our foremost contemporary English-speaking interpreter. R. H. Fuller bridges the gap between the Testaments, and carries on the story to its Christian fulfilment.

If there are problems and questions that remain, they are largely thrown into relief by the very strength of the approach that is adopted. The authors will never countenance the forcing of Scripture into a rigid alien mould, for they have too profound a sense of the uniqueness of the historical. But they do discern biblical unity and are concerned to portray it; and this inevitably demands directing perspectives and controlling centres, and seems to involve as practical corollary material that does not quite fit in. For in both the Testaments there is what may be described as a classic and normative period. In the one case we might delimit it as Exodus to Exile, and describe it in terms of Pentateuch and Prophets (former and latter). In the other case we might think of the half-century from John the Baptist out beyond the Fall of Jerusalem, and work in terms of Gospels and Epistles of Paul. And in each case we are left with canonical material with which it is difficult to come to terms.

So Mr. Fuller is least convincing in his concluding sections. Perhaps this is partly due to lack of space and partly to a certain tendentiousness. But is this the whole explanation? I do not know. But I do sense that Professor Wright faces a parallel if subtly different problem. What can he really make of the long tract of Israel's history after the Return from Exile? Is there a Protestant blind spot somewhere? We used to speak as if the Holy Spirit went underground at the end of the first century, only to emerge again at the Reformation? Do we still think that God went off duty about 400 B.C., not to return until Jesus? And if so, are we right?

N. CLARK

Baptisms at Whittlesford, Cambs, 1760

(A NOTE)

MR. J. MAYNARD, a correspondent to the March, 1960 issue of the *East Anglian Magazine,* quotes an account of a baptismal service held at Whittlesford, Cambridgeshire, in the year 1760. The account was found by Mr. Maynard in a manuscript book written by his aunt about 1880, but it seems that the original document from which the account was taken is no longer extant. Through the kindness of Mr. Maynard and the editor of the *East Anglian Magazine,* the extract from the 1880 book is here reproduced :

> An old manuscript in my possession gives an interesting account of a public baptism in the river at Whittlesford in 1760; 48 persons were baptized near Whittlesford Mill, which was owned by Mr. Ebenezer Hollick, lord of the manor, and himself a baptist.
>
> On a fine May morning about 1,500 people assembled together and at 10.30 Dr. Andrew Gifford, fellow of the Society of Antiquarians and teacher of the baptist congregation in Eagle Street, London, ascended a movable pulpit.
>
> All heads were uncovered and there was a profound silence. After the address, the administrator (who that day was a nephew of the Doctor) came to the riverside accompanied by several baptist ministers and deacons and the persons to be baptized.
>
> The men came first, two by two, without hats and dressed as usual except that, instead of coats, they each had on a long white baize gown, tied round with a sash at the waist; such as had no hair wore white linen caps. The women followed the men, two by two, all dressed neat and clean, their long gowns being of white linen.
>
> It is said that the garments had knobs of lead at the bottom to make them sink. Each had a long silk cloak hanging loosely over her shoulders and a broad ribbon tied over her gown beneath her chest and a hat on her head.
>
> For about 10 minutes the administrator stood expounding *Acts,* Ch. 9, vv. 26 to 39 and then, taking one of the men by

the hand, led him into the water. When he came to sufficient depth he stopped and, placing himself on the left side of the man, he put his right hand between his shoulders, gathering into it a little of the gown to hold. His left hand fingers he thrust under the sash before and the man putting his two thumbs into that hand, he locked all together by closing his hand, and then saying, " I baptize thee, etc." he gently leaned him backward and dipped him once.

As soon as he raised him a person in a boat took hold of the man's hand, wiped his face and he was led into the house and assisted to dress. After the men, the women were baptized, a female friend taking off their hats at the riverside.

In a personal letter Mr. Maynard states that an account, identical with the one above, is contained in a second book which he has, but this account is prefaced with :

Copy from the memoirs of the life and writings of Rev. Robt. Robinson late Minister of the dissenting congregation in St. Andrews Parish Cambridge; Mr. Robinson for several years baptized publicly at Whittlesford in the river adjoining the house of Ebenezer Hollick Esq a weathly and respectable member of his society.

DOUGLAS C. SPARKES

Reviews

Sunday: Christian and Social Significance, by William Hodgkins. (Independent Press, 238 pp. 21s.). *The Day of Light,* by H. B. Porter (S.C.M. Press. 86 pp. 7s. 6d.).

These two books are concerned with the Christian Sunday and its significance for worship and life. This concern is the one thing they have in common. Hodgkins' book deals with all the questions which will be debated in churches, clubs, pubs and sports meetings whenever there is the smell of some change in Sunday legislation. Porter's book will be discussed by students of theology and those who talk of liturgy and the worship of the Church. There was a time when the question of Justification by Faith was argued in German beer gardens. I could wish that the patrons of the Red Lion would show some understanding of what Porter is trying to say.

Hodgkins' book is a workmanlike outline reaching from the Old Testament background to a discussion of the future of Sunday. He moves solidly through the history of Sunday telling us something of the way different periods have responded to its appeals and demands. He provides facts which will encourage reasonable discussion and gives suggestions of his own views. He does all this with diligence like a man unwilling to arouse too much excitement. Memories of his boyhood Sundays will allow him to be nothing but sober, although the passing years have made him more prone to yield to social pressure than would have been decent in the days of his fathers. "It has been said that Sunday observance cannot be enforced by legislation but as we examine the influence of various Acts of Parliament it is obvious that successful enforcement is a necessary corollary of the proper functioning of the Church." The question seems to be—How much of Sunday shall we be allowed to keep and what is the best way of going about it?

Sunday, we are told, is "a three-stranded institution." "Firstly, to religion expressed in public worship and private devotions; secondly, to a break in the normal work effort in order to rest; and thirdly, to recreation, sport and entertainment, in which responsibility is lessened and pleasure heightened." The question, as you will see, is not whether we shall observe Sunday or not but what kind of observance we wish to encourage. The strands however will not remain apart and how are we to weave the threefold cord?

Hodgkins tells us that there are three ways possible for the church in the future. The first is "to let the religious and social situation of Sunday continue to evolve in its own way." This will avoid the peril of unwelcome interference by the Church, but will also mean the shelving of social responsibility. The second way "is to organize by every possible means within its (the church's) power a thoroughgoing presentation of Sunday as a day of rest, worship

and religious education." Hodgkins, I think, would like this if it were possible and feels it has Scriptural justification. But it is not possible, so like a sensible man he yields! The third way would be for the church "to accept the present social tendencies towards greater freedom of recreation and entertainment and follow the lead given by churches in other countries, notably in Canada and America, and concentrate on making the first part of the day a time devoted to worship, and the second part of the day an opportunity for recreation and entertainment." The idea is not that there should be a holy bit and a bit not quite so holy but that Sunday should give people an opportunity to offer to God their worship and their recreation. Porter towards the end of his book moves out of the sphere of liturgical worship and decides to tell us what the worshipper can do. Most of the things are gentle, full of family love, neighbourliness and charity. Then he adds this: "He can drive through the countryside on Sunday afternoon, or survey the spires and bridges of the city, and be certain that in his good time God will gather an unperishing harvest from the field and vineyard of the earth." Fancy that! It reminds me of the Bishop of somewhere at a football match—in the grandstand, of course—waving his umbrella and shouting "An abundantly blessed goal."

It is clear that there are many views about Sunday which somehow need to be harmonized in our national life. The long tradition with different emphases in various branches of the church and yet more outside; the theologians anxious to show what Sunday really means yet who often write in the language of mystery, with gnostic assurance, so that men of common minds, hearing of their views at many hands removed, find the teaching a thing of confusion; the politician weighing the demands of conscience and the claims of expediency; men and women who somehow like a quiet Sunday and those who fail to understand why they should be bound by archaic Sunday laws. With all this there is the weakening of any abiding tradition and the desire to revolt against the old ways. In this, somewhere, you will find the preacher wondering what to say, communicating his uncertainty to wilting congregations.

I think it may be well to look a little at the sermons of two great preachers: F. D. Maurice and F. W. Robertson. Hodgkins mentions neither and I can only believe that this must be because he has overlooked them. They are significant for us because they both try to think theologically in terms not removed from daily living. They both deal with the Crystal Palace case—concerning the opening of "gardens in the neighbourhood of London in which various objects, allowed to be suitable for contemplation on week-days, may be seen—not only on these days but during part of Sunday—are we bound, as Christians and Englishmen, to protest against that design, and to do what in us lies that it may not be carried into effect?"

F. D. Maurice tries to deal with the question in a radical way. He knows that he must not covet the popularity of people nor minister to the prejudices of "religion." He attempts to outline the true meaning of "the Sabbath." His own attitude is strict and disciplined but he will not willingly judge what is right for others. When an Act is passed "making the opening of any places on Sunday penal" he recognizes swiftly the humbug lurking behind an apparent reverence for the Christian faith. "And it is upon this statute, so juvenile, yet so mouldy, that the reverence for the divine day—the godliness of the English nation—henceforth must be understood to depend!" As you would expect he ridicules the Sabbath rest of the rich and uncovers the hidden lives of the poor. You will not find ready-made answers about the Sunday of the future in these sermons but it is honest religion—"Six-sevenths of man's time are delivered over to Mammon; one-seventh is graciously bestowed upon God. So people believe that they are keeping his ordinances. And how much of our religious teaching countenances the delusion!"

F. W. Robertson also tries to get to the heart of the matter. He did not support the opening of the Crystal Palace on Sunday but he refused to support the arguments of Sabbatarians. He also ridicules . . . "The two or three hours spent by the aristocrat over champagne, dessert and coffee are no desecration but the same time spent by a labourer over his cheese and beer in merry company will call down the wrath of God. It is worse than absurd." For Robertson the Sabbath of the Christian is the consecration of all time to God and he leans heavily on *Colossians* ii. 16, 17 and *Romans* xiv. 5, 6. He has, I think, a clearer view than Maurice of the true significance of the Christian Sunday. There is a passage where he speaks most movingly. "If the Lord chastens us, if God were to smite us it would not be because we have regarded a particular day as unessential or because we have played and sported and loved recreation even on a day of rest but because we are selfish, preferring pleasure to duty and Traffic to honour, evil to good, our church more than our faith and our faith more than truth." I quote mainly from memory but that is what Robertson said!

I shall not now deal with possible future legislation. In the long run that will take its form from the value we are able to give to the day. If we fail to show its possible beauty and charm, avoiding both legalism and licence, then we shall get the kind of Sunday we deserve. The opportunities for enjoying Sunday will depend a great deal on legislation but there are some things that should be clear to Christians whatever their circumstances may be.

It will do us no harm to look again at the Jewish Sabbath. This, after all, was the Sabbath of Jesus, and we have so emphasized some of his sayings that we forget that it was a festival he cele-

brated. It is not that we can ascribe our Lord's teaching to ignorance or an absence of understanding. We must recognize that the claims of the Kingdom of God override all Sabbath rules but in doing this we must not ignore the beauty of the day in Jewish thought. This is how Herman Wouk puts it—"The Sabbath is a bride, and nightfall the wedding hour, so that every Friday at dusk pious Jews read the sparkling love poetry of the Song of Songs. . . . The Sabbath is the seal of partnership between God and man in the rule of creation. . . . The Sabbath is the beginning of man's imitation of God. . . . The Sabbath is a day in our time of the Messianic era, a foretaste of the coming peace between man and God, man and nature, man and man. . . ." A day of peace, of discipline, of joy, of communion with God and fellowship with men.

Now this is the strength of Porter's book. He tells us of the Day of Light. It is the day—the first day (or the eighth day) when God went to work as a labourer and gave us the gift of creation. It is the first day and on that day the Lord rose from the grave. It is the day when he first appeared to his disciples after the resurrection. It is the day of the Holy Spirit; the day of worship, of the giving of the good news, of the breaking of bread and the taking of the cup. It is the day when heaven and earth meet and angels and archangels join with men and cry "Holy, Holy, Holy . . ." It is, you see, a day of light and joy. For the Jew the Sabbath became a burden rather than a delight simply because of the sheer demand of utter obedience. For the Christian the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath—it is his way and life we celebrate and this cannot be enchained by any Laws for it breaks out in a new mercy and justice. We are not called upon to preserve some ancient law but to respond gladly to the free gift of grace. Christians who respond with joy to what God has done will influence legislation more than they dream. But if not—then they will celebrate because of sheer thanksgiving. They will not covet the pleasure of imposing obedience on others nor think of religion enclosed in a narrow gully. The Sunday joy will lead to fulness of life in worship, work and play.

"So let none take you to task on questions of eating and drinking or in connection with observance of festivals or new moons or Sabbaths. All that is the mere shadow of what is to be; the substance belongs to Christ." (*Col.* ii. 16, 17. Moffatt).

HOWARD WILLIAMS

The Ancient Near East. James Pritchard (ed.). An anthology of texts and pictures. (Oxford University Press. 380 pp. 40s.)

In the middle fifties two volumes edited by James B. Pritchard, Professor of Old Testament Literature at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California, were published under the

titles, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (2nd edition) and *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. Both proved invaluable tools in the teaching of the Old Testament, but on account of their erudition and scope, not to mention their price, they were beyond the use of all but the most learned. Lecturers in training colleges, school teachers and working ministers, as well as students and lay people, needed something simpler on the same lines.

So it was that this volume came to be published, selecting from the larger works, and keeping a special eye on the relevance of the texts to the Old Testament. The result is indeed *multum in parvo* and pleasantly produced. The texts cover a wide range, beginning with ancient myths, and continuing with legal texts, historical texts, inscriptions, hymns, ritual texts and letters. In most cases there is a short introduction to the text and the margins are kept wide. Any likely references to the Old Testament, or to 197 illustrations that come at the end of the book, are found in this margin, and its width enables the reader to add his own notes as he uses it, thus enhancing the value (if not the appearance) of the book as the years go by.

Summary of such a book is impossible and mere listing of the contents is valueless. It may be worth our while, however, to notice some of the better known texts contained here, as well as those which are nearest to the Old Testament. From Egypt, for instance, we have *The Story of Two Brothers,* so closely similar to the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, and from Mesopotamia we have a myth concerning the Deluge, which is said to offer the closest and most striking parallel to biblical material that is to be found in Sumerian literature. In the legal section, the Code of Hammurabi, containing 282 laws, provides some interesting similarities with Scripture and there are cross references to the relevant texts. From Palestine we have the Moabite Stone, the Siloam Inscription and the Lachish Ostraca, valuable for the light they throw on philology as well as for the background they give us to the times of Jeremiah.

Perhaps one way to assess the value of this book is to compare it with the Old Testament Society's volume, *Documents From Old Testament Times,*[1] edited by D. Winton Thomas, which set out in a somewhat more modest way to perform the same task. Some texts are to be found in both volumes, though Pritchard's book has many that are not to be found in the volume by Thomas. On the other hand the Old Testament Society's volume supplies some valuable notes explaining the text, is written on the whole in a more attractive style, and benefits from having the pictures in the main body of the book rather than having simply a reference in the text followed by a collection at the end. There can be no doubt that Pritchard's book offers more material, but it is questionable whether even now

[1] Nelson. 21s.

it has stepped down to the level of those for whom it is intended. Many of them will be content to continue using Thomas's book, though they would be well advised to use both and to allow one to supplement the other. Pritchard's book (which is our main concern here) cannot be faulted. A. GILMORE

The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr, by Gordon Harland. (Oxford University Press. 298 pp. 42s.).

According to Niebuhr's distinguished colleague, Dr. J. C. Bennett, we have in Gordon Harland's book "an accurate and comprehensive exposition of Reinhold Niebuhr's social ethics." Divided into two parts, his study outlines first the theological structure of Niebuhr's thought and secondly his views on Politics, Economics, War and Race.

At the outset the book comes to grips with the heart of Niebuhr's approach, namely "heedless undiscriminating sacrificial love" as the law of life, though not a simple possibility within history. We are shown its relevance and its sources in the love of the cross and the nature of man, whose freedom ultimately demands such a limitless norm if his selfhood is to be fulfilled.

As Harland shows in his chapter on "Love and Justice," Niebuhr has sought to relate this norm to man's social and ethical problems by way of the concept of Justice—not a "fixed" but a "relational" and "dynamic" term. On account of his finite and sinful nature, man cannot create permanently valid structures of justice, but must seek to embody *love* within worldly structures realizing that any such achievement is only an approximation to the norm and is finally negated by it.

In Part II the chapter on "War and Peace" is disappointing particularly at section 5. That this appears to contain less than Niebuhr's contribution to the subject is partly due to the fact that his book, *The Structure of Nations and Empires,* appeared after this study was completed—a fact acknowledged in the Introduction.

Harland is an admiring and sympathetic expositor, allowing Niebuhr to speak for himself in some lengthy quotations, but he does not leave us unaware of the criticisms levelled against him. The views of Tillich, Barth, Williams and others are represented, though they are used mainly to clarify Niebuhr rather than his critics.

Harland is anxious to dispel the opinion that Niebuhr, obsessed with the doctrine of sin, has been unduly pessimistic in his analysis, and has failed to provide an "adequate positive direction." The same opinion has been expressed in Pacifist literature as an inadequate doctrine of the Holy Spirit as a power which redeems the life of man in society.

A whole chapter (5) is there devoted to "The Resources of Love for a Responsible Society," listing them as "Humility," "Tolerance," "Irony," "Justification by Grace," and the "Church." Those who hold the opinion which Harland seeks to dispel will probably remain unconvinced, and for several reasons.

In the first place, the author would not wish this chapter alone, but the whole book, to vindicate the view that Niebuhr has something positive to offer. Those who find him to be wholly pessimistic often fail to discern to the full the ambivalence of his thought. "Pessimism" and "optimism" are terms better replaced by "realism." Niebuhr does not deter us from the task of asserting the reign of Christ in society, especially since he has done so himself in saner and greater measure than most. But he does draw us back at every point from the heresy which identifies our view of the Kingdom with the Kingdom itself, from simple and irresponsible solutions to ambiguous problems and from the illusion that "heaven" can be built on earth. There are no limits save this one, and if this is "pessimism" then Niebuhr embraces it to the full and we do well to follow his example.

Again, this so-called "pessimism" is to be understood only within its historical setting. As Harland points out, the word to indicate the character of Niebuhr's work is "relevance" and Niebuhr had first to be relevant to a generation within which the liberal optimism of the Social Gospel was rife, with its superficial view of man's condition and its confidence that the Kingdom was round the corner.

Finally, there is a distinction to be made. Niebuhr would not and could not deny that the Holy Spirit works in power through individuals to accomplish great redemptive changes within society. But is this his main concern? This phenomenon surely belongs to the realm of personal ethics which may come close to heedless, sacrificial love. It does not, however, belong to the realm of social ethics where the Christian must, in the spirit of the Gospel, become a pragmatist as he seeks to establish justice in the midst of self-interested forces which can never be wholly eradicated, but which must be balanced against each other amidst the realities and use of power for the common good.

It is hoped that this book will be welcomed as an introduction rather than a summary of Niebuhr's work, and that it will be pondered by those who detect the inadequacy of our present-day evangelism. Mr. Harland has made available to us a key to the work of a man whose passionate concern ought to be ours, namely "so to understand and present the historic Christian faith that its insights and resources might bring illumination and healing to the frightening problems and perplexities of our age."

M. H. TAYLOR

Take and Read, by E. H. Robertson (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d., pp. 128).

The Bible has a very wonderful way of unexpectedly speaking with authority, with convincing and convicting power, and it often does so in times and circumstances in which it was assumed that it had nothing to say.

Mr. Robertson was assigned the task of finding out what has been happening to the Bible during these troubled war and post-war years. His discoveries in European and in many other countries make an inspiring record which will deepen the reverence and gratitude of Christian people for the Scriptures.

Most of the material contained in this valuable little book has been gathered during the author's travels in Europe, and is used to urge, explain, and encourage Bible Study by means of "Bible Weeks."

A full, detailed account is given of successful Bible Weeks that have already been held; clear guidance is given as to the best way of conducting them, and Mr. Robertson stands revealed as a wise, competent and experienced leader. No group of Bible students wishing to arrange and hold a "Bible Week" can afford to be without this helpful guide.

This method of Bible Study is very thorough and yet simple and adaptable and yields rich gains. The passage to be studied is selected and accepted by the group. It is then subjected to the most careful and searching examination to find out what it meant to those to whom it was proclaimed or for whom it was written. What was the Word of the Lord for them, then and there. Having answered that question the group then embark upon the vital task of relating that Word of God to themselves, to their own lives and to the situation in which they find themselves here and now.

This is not superficial, sentimental Bible reading: it is Bible *study* at depth. It is a method of studying Scripture which comes "full circle" and honestly seeks to know what is God's Word for us, Here and Now. Effective Bible Study demands the service not only of the humble reverent heart but also of the honest, informed mind. Here in the use of "Bible Weeks" is a practicable technique for engaging in it. How many Take and Read and Use it?

G. W. BYRT

An Enquiry into the obligation of Christians to use means for the conversion of the Heathen, by William Carey, with an Introduction by E. A. Payne (Carey Kingsgate Press, 10s. 6d. pp. 87).

This is a facsimile of the original edition issued in 1792. It is issued now in connection with the anniversary of Carey's birth (1761). Previous facsimiles were issued in 1892 and 1934. As a book

it is delightful to handle and to read. The 18th century printing and page set-up is a pleasing contrast to the printed page with which we are familiar. The subject matter is of absorbing interest and this not only to the historian but to the average reader. Carey's style itself is a model and might well be imitated by all who have something they wish to communicate. His material is offered in plain straightforward language with a logic that is impeccable. To this day we marvel at the sheer ability of this young man whose educational advantages had almost all been created by himself.

He first examines our Lord's Commission and shows that it is binding on all Christians at all times. He then gives an account of missions from Paul to the Moravians of his own day. Then he gives statistics of the state of the world—extent of each country, population and religion—then he deals with the practicability of something being done, answering the usual objections, and finishes with practical suggestions for doing it. A very comprehensive study in some eighty-odd pages.

But the thing that gets us every time we examine Carey is his modernity. His ecumenical outlook is only now being put into effect. Yet it was clear as day in his own mind. His conception of the native is ours. "Barbarous as these poor heathens are, they appear as capable of knowledge as we are," and so on. Again he emphasizes pity and humanity, and the rightness of taking the benefits of our civilization to the needy. On the qualities required by the missionaries he is particularly clear-sighted. "They must live amongst the people and much in the same way as the people themselves live. They must have regard to and understanding of the life and customs of the people. They must have a clear idea of what they are there for, careful not to resent injuries, nor to think highly of themselves." In fact if those who are training President Kennedy's young men and women who are going out to help the backward countries should care to have a look at the *Enquiry* they would find a good deal of sound relevant advice that they could pass on.

It only remains here to say that this new facsimile edition is enhanced in value by the brilliant introduction by Dr. Ernest Payne, who as usual brings out new facts, this time about the printers and publishers of the original book.

A. DAKIN

Ethics and the Gospel, by T. W. Manson (S.C.M. Press, 12s. 6d., pp. 109).

This book consists of six lectures given originally as an extra-mural course at the University of Manchester on the biblical foundations of Christian Ethics. Dr. Manson had begun the task of revising and enlarging his notes for publication when death halted

the work and denied us of the book which would have resulted. The Reverend Ronald Preston who completed the revision has put us all greatly in his debt by giving us a further opportunity of sitting at the feet of a beloved teacher.

As one would expect, the insights of this book delve into full biblical sources rather than into a string of isolated texts. For example in the Old Testament background Dr. Manson does not turn to the prophets as the mainspring of Hebrew ethics. He expounds the ethics of a kingdom. He examines the concept of Semitic monarchy and seeks the source of Hebrew ethics in a relationship between the King of Kings, the Lord's anointed King and the people of the Kingdom. God commands only what He Himself exemplifies. In examining Judaism and the Law of Moses Dr. Manson uses the dictum of Simeon the Righteous who declared that "True and lasting civilization rests upon three foundations, the Law, Worship, and the imparting of Kindnesses." This exposition penetrates to the motive springs of Hebrew ethics and leads him to re-examine the relationship of Jesus to the Law of Moses. "The tendency in the past has been to make the difference between Jesus and those who went before Him something like this: that the old Law insisted on the outward good whereas Jesus insists on the inward motive. This will not do." The real differences are to be found within the deeper insights of our Lord's Messianic ministry. For example, the great commandment to "Love the Lord thy God" and "Thy neighbour as thyself" are the quintessence of Jewish Law and not of Christian Ethics. "Love as I have loved you" is the characteristic hallmark of the Christian ethic. Again, he commands only what he exemplifies. In dealing with the earliest Christian community, Manson suggests that they thought of themselves neither as a synagogue nor a church, in our sense of the word. "The Kähäl or ecclësia is not primarily a prayer meeting . . . it is the people of God in full exercise of all their communal activities." To examine the ethics of the early church Manson finds a nearer analogy of its form in communities such as the Essenes. The Christian community was not just a worshipping society: like Judaism it was a full community in every sense, and its ethics are examined within this context. In the final chapter the procedure indicated is that of stripping off mistaken interpretations from the original teaching of Jesus, and applying the words not as laws but as power lines to the heart of every ethical situation.

The final words of the book are, "Christian Ethics is a work of Art." So is teaching the Scriptures. In this Dr. Manson was a supreme artist and his creation, *Ethics and the Gospel*, is worth more than it costs to buy.

FRANK COOKE

BOOKS RECEIVED

Marie Farques, *The Old Testament, Selections, Narrative and Commentary.* 341 pp., 18s. 6d. Darton, Longman and Todd.

Bernhard W. Anderson, *Rediscovering the Bible.* 272 pp., 21s. Lutterworth Press.

Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of Saint Luke.* 255 pp., 30s. Faber & Faber.

Alfred Wikenhauser, *Pauline Mysticism.* 256 pp., 25s. Nelson.

George F. Tittmann, *What Manner of Love.* 183 pp., 18s. Darton, Longman & Todd.

G. D. Yarnold, *The Bread Which We Break.* 119 pp., 10s. 6d. Oxford University Press.

W. Rowland Jones, *Diary of a Misfit Priest.* 190 pp., 25s. Geo. Allen & Unwin.

William Barclay, *Fishers of Men.* 19 pp., 2s. 6d. Berean Press.

Henri Eberhard, *Jacob.* 152 pp., 8s. 6d. Independent Press.

R. Ernest Bailey, *Peril at the Grange.* 166 pp., 7s. 6d. Independent Press.

H. M. Lamb, *Week-End at Windhover.* 131 pp., 7s. 6d. Independent Press.

Charles Cleall, *The Selection and Training of Mixed Choirs in Churches.* 132 pp., 9s. 6d. Independent Press.

P. T. Forsyth, *Christ on Parnassus.* 297 pp., 17s. 6d. Independent Press.

W. H. Thorpe, *Biology, Psychology and Belief.* 60 pp., 4s. 6d. Cambridge University Press.

Erik Routley, *Music, Sacred and Profane.* 192 pp., 12s. 6d. Independent Press.

M. I. Boas, *God, Christ and Pagan.* 187 pp., 25s. Geo. Allen & Unwin.

A. G. Matthews (ed.), *The Savoy Declaration of Faith and Order,* 1658. 127 pp., 9s. Independent Press.

T. F. Torrance, *Conflict and Agreement in the Church, Vol. 1. Order and Disorder.* 331 pp., 45s. Lutterworth Press.

J. B. Wharey (ed.), *John Bunyan: the Pilgrim's Progress.* Revised by Roger Sharrock. 365 pp., 63s. Clarendon Press.

R. E. Cooper, *So You Have Left School.* 32 pp., 1s. Carey Kingsgate Press.

Malvina J. Shields, *Congo Close-ups.* 39 pp., 1s. 6d. Carey Kingsgate Press.

H. J. Wotherspoon and J. M. Kirkpatrick, *A Manual of Church Doctrine According to the Church of Scotland.* Second Edition. Revised and enlarged by T. F. Torrance and R. S. Wright. 132 pp., 15s. Oxford University Press.

Leslie Cooke, *Gracious Living.* 15 pp., 1s. 3d. Independent Press.

Leslie Hemingford, *Yesterday, Today and Forever.* 16 pp., 1s. 3d. Independent Press.

K. L. Parry, *A Supplement to a Companion to Congregational Praise.* 40 pp., 4s. Independent Press.

R. Niebuhr, *Nations and Empires.* 306 pp., 25s. Faber & Faber.

Ronald Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York.* 330 pp. 63s. Longmans, Green & Co.

Aidan Pickering, *Your Life of Our Lord.* 133 pp. 7s. 6d. (limp), 6s. 6d. (hard). Darton, Longman and Todd.

A. P. Carleton, *John Shines Through Augustine.* 79 pp. 2s. 6d. Lutterworth Press.

Denis Baly, *Palestine and the Bible.* 82 pp. 2s. 6d. Lutterworth Press.

John A. Irving, *The Sociay Credit Movement in Alberta.* 369 pp. 48s. Oxford University Press.

C. T. Wood (ed.), *Where We Stand. Archbishop Clayton's Charges,* 1948-57. 55 pp. 6s. Oxford University Press.

James Gray (ed.), *Towards Christian Union.* Twenty-five years of thought and action in the Churches of Christ, 1935-60. 103 pp. 12s. 6d. (art), 10s. (kromecote). Berean Press.

Billy Graham, *Billy Graham and die Teenager,* 55 pp. No price. J. G. Oncken.

Malcolm L. Diamond, *Martin Buber. Jewish Existentialist.* 240 pp. 21s. Oxford University Press.

J. H. S. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland.* 456 pp. 42s. Oxford University Press.

Robert Lloyd Roberts, *Fifty-five Questions and Answers about that Mysterious Creature called Man.* 65 pp. $1.50.

Owen D. Pelt & Ralph Lee Smith, *The Story of the National Baptists.* 272 pp. $3.75. Vantage Press, New York.

F. W. Bakewell, *Building a New Church.* 84 pp. 3s. 6d. Independent Press.

Kathleen Martin, *Son of the Mayflower.* 136 pp. 7s. 6d. Independent Press.