
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

WITH this issue the present Editorship comes to an end. For some time now, the problem of combining the Secretaryship of the Baptist Historical Society with the editing of *The Baptist Quarterly* has grown in dimensions. To perform both tasks efficiently from the midst of a busy pastorate has been proving impossible. So it has been decided to separate them. The Secretaryship of the Historical Society remains, for the moment, unchanged. The editing of this journal is being undertaken by the Rev. G. W. Rusling, M.A., B.D., Vice-Principal of Spurgeon's College, London. We are all most grateful to him for accepting this responsibility.

* * *

Anybody who is in anyway interested in the origins of Baptists should make a point of reading two articles in *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* just published (Volume XXXVI, Number 4, October, 1962). This issue contains articles on both General and Particular Baptist origins. The first "General Baptist Origins: The Question of Anabaptist Influence" by Lonnie D. Kliever, claims to show that the General Baptists had their origin in Congregation-

alism and reveal no Anabaptist influence, in spite of John Smyth's known contact with the Waterlander Mennonites. It is suggested that the Smyth Group was a small splinter of no significance which separated from the main group. The second, "Anabaptist Influence in the Origin of the Particular Baptists" by Glen H. Stassen suggests that Menno Simon's *Foundation Book* directly influenced the Particular Baptists at the time of their origin. The claim is that, whilst the Particular Baptists also arose out of English Congregationalism, the distinctive divergencies in the doctrine and practice of this group which marked it off from other separatists and in particular from the General Baptists, are almost certainly to be attributed to the influence of Simon's *Foundation Book,* either in the Dutch or German form. As an example of this Glen Stassen seeks to show that the baptismal teaching contained in the London Confession of 1644 could well be derived from the *Foundation Book* and claims that it is more likely to have come from there than any other source.

Whilst final judgment must wait upon a more detailed study of these two articles and whilst the claim of the Editorial of the M.Q.R. that these articles "present in admirable and convincing fashion the material which gives the definitive answer to the question (of Anabaptist influences on Baptist origins)," may turn out to be premature, there is no doubt that the theses presented merit the most serious attention.

The Holy Spirit in Baptism

In many quarters of theology there is a renewed interest in the work of the Holy Spirit. No subject however is further removed from speculation than this, because it has a very direct bearing upon the life of the church and of the individual believer. This may be seen, when the relationship with believers' baptism is envisaged. To a study of this relationship this paper is devoted. The immense importance of the subject calls for thoroughness on the one hand and for modesty on the other. I hope to fulfill these obligations by limiting this study to an exegetical treatment of the New Testament passages that are relevant, and by providing the conclusions with question-marks.

There are three texts in the New Testament that mention baptism and the Spirit in one sentence. Each of these is part of, and connected with larger areas of New Testament writing and thought, and their study leads us into these larger areas. They are:

1. *Mark 1: 8 and parr.,* with which are to be connected John 1: 26, 33, Acts 1: 5, 11: 15; the larger area is here the whole of Acts with its manifold connections between the outpouring of the Spirit and the administrations of Baptism, behind which stands the Lucan conception of the work of the Holy Spirit.

2. *I. Corinthians 12: 13,* where the larger area is on the one hand the whole Pauline conception of Baptism and on the other hand the work of the Spirit in the converts, especially those aspects that are, like I Cor. 12: 13, expressed in the aorist tense, such as I Cor. 2: 10. 12, 6: 11, Gal. 3: 2. 3. 14 and especially Eph. 1: 13, 4: 30.

3. *John 3: 5,* and the larger area is here the whole Johannine concept of the new birth, and here also belongs Titus 3: 5.

Baptism and the Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts

The saying of the Baptist about the stronger one who comes after him and who will baptize with the Holy Spirit is found in all four Gospels and the saying of the Risen Lord that before many days the disciples will be baptized with the Holy Spirit clearly refers back to it. But nonetheless the logion of the Baptist offers some very serious critical questions, the most important of which concerns its original form. Matthew and Luke have an addition to it: "and with fire," and the question is whether this is an addition or whether Mark has an omission. Bultmann[1] thinks that the original text did speak of a baptism with fire and that the fire is the fire of judgment.

The mention of the Holy Spirit is in his opinion, a Christian addition, which may have found its way into the tradition already in Q or afterwards at the combination of Q and M by Matthew and Luke. The latter seems hardly possible, since the connection of the logion with the following by means of a relative pronoun in both gospels points to a common source. On the other hand it is almost impossible to deny the logion in some form to M and therefore I would advocate the authenticity of the mention of the Holy Spirit in the logion of John the Baptist.

When we now examine the logion itself from the point of view of our present study, our first task is to analyse the idiom. Strack-Billerbeck records an expression: "in the fire he has dipped himself"[2] but this offers no explanation of the baptism with fire. And the Old Testament idiom offers a good many verbs in connection with the fire of judgment but none that may explain the baptism with fire, or comes close to it. The same is true for the baptism with the Spirit. No expression connected with fire or with Spirit can be found in the LXX which offers an explanation for the wording of the logion. This should not surprise us, since we know that *baptizein* is in the New Testament only connected with the rite of baptism and that the use of this verb and the related nouns *baptisma* and *baptistês* indicates that John's baptism and the Christian baptism were considered something new.[3] How much more then a baptism with fire or with the Holy Spirit! Markus Barth has remarked that the idea of baptizing with Spirit was possible only because the idea of being completely dipped into liquid was no longer felt in the use of *baptizein* and *baptisma,* and he quotes for his support Schlatter and Lohmeyer.[4] He assumes in the expression a reference to a specific happening, not to an abstract idea, but against this two things may be said. First that the idea of a baptism with the Spirit did not gain currency in the first churches, since it is mentioned only once outside Acts; had it been a widely used expression in the New Testament then *baptizein* might have lost its specific force and meaning. And secondly, if the baptism with the Spirit refers to a definite happening (in German: *Vor-gang*), then this happening certainly has found no fixed place in the life of the early churches. It seems therefore correct to assume that the expression "to baptize with the Spirit" is a formation by analogy, called forth by the comparison between the Baptist and the Mightier One. For that comparison dominates the logion, and the mentioning of the Spirit serves to bring out clearly the decisive difference between them. There is also no reason to suppose that John anticipated the replacement of his own baptism by the Spirit-baptism, because very clearly he did not envisage something like the church at all. Just as his own preaching, his baptism was preparatory to the coming of the Kingdom and therefore to the eschatological outpouring of

the Spirit and it was just because of the close links between his baptism and the outpouring of the Spirit, to be administered by the coming Messiah.

When we turn from the Gospels to Acts, we find the logion of the Baptist repeated twice, both times as a word of Jesus;[5] but the difference between the Baptist and Jesus is remarkable: "John baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit," which seems to point to a contrast between John's baptism and the baptism with the Spirit more clearly than the original saying. This may be due to Luke's inclination to ascribe to John only a water-baptism, as Haenchen[6] remarks. Be that as it may, Jesus' words of the coming baptism with the Spirit have Pentecost in view, as is shown by the repeated "promise" the disciples must wait for the promise (14); Jesus receives the promise of the Spirit and pours it out (2: 33); and the promise is to Israel and its children and all that are far off (2: 38). In 11: 15, 16 Jesus' word is repeated by Peter when reporting in Jerusalem on his visit to Cornelius and the reason is obvious. The initiative in this case has been throughout with God and it finds its consummation in the unexpected outpouring of the Spirit which more or less settles the case for Peter and is his final justification for administering the baptism. There is no need to exclude the mention of baptism in 10: 47, 48 as a later interpolation, because in his report Peter does not refer to a baptism, as does Jackson,[7] since as far as Jerusalem is concerned the decisive point is the Spirit, not the baptism. Here then we have a situation where baptism with the Spirit precedes water-baptism and calls for it. But, as we all know, there are different situations in Acts. In 8: 12-17 no outpouring of the Spirit occurs either before or after the baptism until Peter and John "came down, laid their hands on them and prayed for them." They had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, which seems to imply that to receive the Spirit was a different matter for which so to speak authorized people had to come. Then there is the baffling story of Acts 19: 1-7, where the so-called "disciples" have to undergo another water-baptism but this time in the name of the Lord Jesus, and when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them. The most astonishing thing here is that there are "disciples" who very certainly have never heard of the Holy Spirit and very probably not even of Jesus himself. Both make them rather poor and unintelligent disciples of the Baptist or, rather, show how far the movement of the Baptist's followers had departed from their master's message. For our present study these examples suffice to show that the relationship between the Holy Spirit and baptism is undefined in Acts. This is confirmed by a study of the kerygma in this book. The Holy Spirit appears but once in the speeches of Peter and that is due to the happenings of the moment. But bap-

tism, though in itself no part of the kergyma, is very closely connected with the complex of preaching, conversion and faith. And since faith is faith in the Lord Jesus, the believers are also baptized in that very name. The real problem then in Acts does not concern so much the relationship between baptism and the Spirit but between faith and the Spirit and ultimately between the Spirit and the Lord Jesus Christ.

There is but one example where the Spirit is given as a sign that the receivers are true believers and that is in 10 : 44 in the house of Cornelius, but as already said, this is in order to exclude all possible doubt in Peter and the Jewish believers with him that these uncircumcised were genuine believers. In other places the Spirit is not the foundation of faith; it is given to the disciples in order to equip them for their ministry as witness of the Lord and the major activity of the Spirit is connected with the missionary work, not with the conversion of those that believed. There is with Luke no room for the *pneuma pisteōs* as Paul has it.[8] On the other hand Luke stresses the fact that all believers share in the gift of the Spirit; it is their common distinctive as contrasted with the Jews. But faith is never traced back to the creative activity of the Spirit, not even where the supernatural origin of faith is stressed as in 16 : 14. This is due, in the last analysis to Luke's view of the relationship between the Spirit and Christ. In Acts 2 : 33 Peter says that Jesus received the promise of the Spirit after he had been exalted to the right hand of God, but in the Lucan concept of the Spirit this can only mean that He received the Spirit in order to pass it on to his disciples, since He Himself was conceived and born of the Spirit and received the equipment of the Spirit after His baptism. But the Spirit is not his Spirit in the way Paul has it. The Spirit is power but this power is not the power of the resurrection. To receive the Spirit is different from faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, to be baptized with the Spirit is different from being baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Schweizer[9] has pointed out that Luke speaks of the Spirit in an Old Testament terminology. He sees the Spirit as the Spirit of prophecy; its power is the power that enables extraordinary acts. But there are two limitations to this view. The first is that all members of the church share in the gift of the Spirit. This calls for a deeper and broader scope for the work of the Spirit. The second is that Luke has advanced already one decisive step beyond the views of Mark and Matthew as to the relationship between Jesus and the Spirit, With them the Spirit leads Jesus but with Luke Jesus acts full of the Spirit; that means : Jesus is the subject and not the object of the Spirit. And as already said it is Jesus who pours out the Spirit upon His disciples. These two aspects are more than limitations to the Old Testament concept of the activities of

the Spirit. They call for a reinterpretation of the relationship between Christ, faith and the Spirit, and that reinterpretation prepares the way for a deeper understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit. We find it with Paul.

Baptism and the Spirit in I Cor. 12: 13 and in the Corpus Paulinum

The only text in Paul where we find the Holy Spirit and Baptism explicitly together is I Cor. 12 : 13, and we will attempt an exegesis of this text and its context in order to make our way to the concepts that are behind it.

Both *v.* 12 and *v.* 13 are introduced by *gar* and they are therefore explanatory with regard to the preceding verse. But the *gar* in *v.* 12 seems at first sight a little out of place, since the unity of the body is not the explanation of the work of the one Spirit. It is more or less anticipatory because between the thought of the basic unity of the manifold charismata and that of the unity of the Church lie two others, viz. that the Church is a body and that this body is the creation of the Holy Spirit by means of baptism, and only the last one is explanatory of what precedes. It is a question more or less of an inverted order of thought. This inversion is due to the necessity of introducing two things at the same time and of letting the explanation of the one precede the other one. This adds considerably to the communication-load of both verses.

A further addition is the sudden equation of Christ and the Church. The N.E.B. goes a long way to eliminate this suddenness by transposing the equation to the beginning of the sentence: "For Christ is like a single body," but I feel that this does no justice to the intentionally startling: "so is it with Christ" at the end of 12. The real information of *v.* 12, to use once again a term borrowed from information-theory, is therefore not: the Church is a single body with many limbs and organs, but: Christ is a body and the unity of the members of that body is at the moment quite secondary. It becomes the focal issue from *v.* 14 on.

Only when this is borne in mind does an exegesis of *v.* 13 become possible. It prepares the way for the expression "we are baptized into one body"—*eis hen sōma ebaptisthēmen.* Markus Barth[10] labels this translation as mystical but I have a suspicion that he banishes everything from the New Testament that does not fit into his juristic categories. Exactly because of the implicit equation of Christ and a body Paul could speak of baptism into one body as he spoke in Romans and Galatians of a baptism into Christ. And it stands to reason that both expressions are equivalent, unless it can be shown that the baptism with the Spirit is something different from the baptism referred to in Romans 6 and Galatians 3. For the

moment we must narrow down the scope of our investigation to the expression "baptized with the Spirit." If this is understood in the way of Acts, then the baptism with the Spirit is not the baptism with water; and then also the baptism into Christ is different from the baptism into the body. But that is excluded by the context and therefore the idea of a Spirit-baptism separated and apart from the baptism into Christ is to be dismissed.

There is also a formal consideration which supports this conclusion; immediately after *ebaptisthēmen* comes *eite Ioudaioi, eite Hellēnes,* etc. There exists no parallel between the varieties of gifts (*v.* 4) and the varieties of functions of the members of the body on the one hand, and the racial and social differences between the members on the other hand. But in Gal. 3 : 27 we find the same thought in a slightly different and expanded form in connexion with baptism, and the putting on of Christ, and it occurs again in Col. 3 : 11 in connexion with the putting on of the new man.

There is reason to suppose that this phrase of the barriers that are overcome in Christ, is part of a baptismal teaching and therefore it seems reasonable that also I Cor. 12 : 13 refers to the same baptism as Gal. 3 : 27, the baptism which is the putting on of Christ or the new man. This baptism is also a baptism into the one body.

But there must be a reason to mention the Spirit in connexion with this baptism. As a figure of speech the baptism with the Spirit was not unknown, though not exactly popular and widespread, as the concordance shows. But Paul never uses it except here and in I Cor. 10 : 2 and in both places in a figurative way, and the reason for that is clearly that he is dealing here with the Holy Spirit. He has described it as the source of the varied gifts and now he describes it as the source of the fundamental unity of the church and its members. But the very fact that he is able to connect the Spirit with the act of baptism shows that there must be some fundamental connexion between the work of the Spirit and baptism. What of this connextion?

We may resolve this question into two separate ones. First: what is Paul's concept of baptism, and second: what is his idea of that part of the work of the Holy Spirit that comes within the context of baptism? Paul's concept of baptism has been studied and described many times. Let me therefore quote Dr. Beasley Murray's summary of it: "Paul saw in baptism a sacrament of the Gospel. . . . Behind and in baptism stands the Christ of the cross and the resurrection, bestowing freedom from sin's guilt and power, and the spirit who gives the life of the age to come in the present and is the pledge of resurrection at the last day . . . Paul saw in baptism the sacrament of union with Christ . . . It involved union with Him in His redemptive acts, both in the rite and in subsequent

life which should conform to the pattern of the passion and resurrection. . . . It involved union with His Body, making the believer a living member, partaking of the life of the whole . . ."[11]

Our next question concerns the work of the Holy Spirit. It comes within the context of Baptism in its initiatory aspects. It has long been noticed that most verbs used in connection with baptism occur in the aorist tense. Now in several passages which deal with the Holy Spirit we find also verbs in the aorist, sometimes in the active, unusually with God or the Spirit as subject, sometimes in the passive, either with men or with the Spirit as grammatical subjects. This gives as a clue to set apart for the purpose of our present study the initiatory aspects of the work of the Holy Spirit from the rest.

A scrutiny of the New Testament vocabulary with the aid of a concordance shows that Paul uses *lambanein* in connexion with the Spirit three or four times. This then seems to be the most general term and a study of its occurrences shows us at once the decisive steps that Paul has taken beyond Luke and its implications for the relationship between the Spirit and baptism.

In Gal. 3 : 2, 14 the Spirit or the promise of the Spirit is received "by hearing with faith" or "through faith." That reminds of the usage of Luke who repeatedly speaks of the receiving of the Spirit as a consequence of faith and baptism. But with Paul there is much more to it than in Acts. In I Cor. 2 : 12 he speaks again of the receiving of "the Spirit which is from God," this time in the context of a Christian theory of religious knowledge, so to speak, for this Spirit is given "that we might understand the gifts bestowed on us by God." These gifts are nothing else than "the secret and hidden wisdom of God," which in turn is the cross of Christ. This fundamental relationship between the understanding of the cross and the gift or the receiving of the Spirit underlies also such sayings as "the Spirit himself is bearing witness with our Spirit that we are children of God" (Rom. 8 : 16) and "no one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit" (I Cor. 12 : 3). The Spirit is "the Spirit of faith" and to receive the Spirit is to enter into that relationship with Christ that is known as "faith." This is also borne out by the fact that for instance in Romans 8 we find as almost identical expressions: "those who are in Christ Jesus," "Christ in you," "you are in the Spirit," "the Spirit dwells in you." From this and other passages Schweizer concludes that the power of the Spirit is identical with the risen Lord, when He is considered not in Himself but in His dealing with the church.[12] For our study this means that to receive the gift of the Spirit is to be "in Christ" and to share his life. This brings us close to Paul's concept of baptism "into Christ."

Another occurrence of the phrase "to receive the Spirit" may

serve to lead us to the decisive step in our study. In Rom. 8 : 15, it reads: "you have received the Spirit of sonship," *pneuma huiothesias,* which in the context of the verses 14-17, means the *pneuma* that witnesses to the *huiothesia* is the coming completion of what Christ accomplished on the cross (Gal. 4 : 5), the redemption of the body (Rom. 8 : 23). To this we shall return presently; for the moment our concern is with something else. For the Spirit is not the only witness to the adoption. In Gal. 3 : 27 baptism plays the part of the witness. There is the sequence of thought: through faith you are sons of God, because you have put on Christ, and that you have put on Christ appears from your baptism which is a baptism into Christ. It seems to me that there is a parallelism between the Spirit and baptism with regard to the adoption and it should be worth while to investigate this parallelism somewhat nearer.

In Paul's baptismal vocabulary several words and concepts occur which elsewhere are connected with the Holy Spirit. Some instances will be given here: (1) In Rom. 6 death is closely connected with baptism. To be baptized into Christ is to have died and to be buried with him. This death means that we have been freed from sin, or "absolved from the claims of sin" (Moffatt). This chain of thought connects baptism with the concept of justification. Now in I Cor. 6 : 11 the justification is described as a work of the Holy Spirit. (2) Again in Rom. 6 we find a close connection between the newness of life and the resurrection of Christ, and the connecting link is baptism. But in Romans 8 the new life is the life according to the Spirit and the Spirit is the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead. Here again we find a close connection between the new life and the resurrection of Christ and here the connecting link is the Spirit.

We are, I think, then justified in concluding that in the terminology of Paul baptism and the Holy Spirit are almost interchangeable. But he never brings them together except in the text that served as our starting point. Why he does so, we can only guess. But perhaps the reason may be that he is conscious of having gone beyond the idea of the Spirit of the "Urgemeinde" and that he thinks it wise to refrain from connecting the Spirit with baptism in order to avoid confusion.

Before leaving Paul we return to the concept of adoption. As we noted, the Spirit witnesses to this adoption, or rather to its coming completion. As such the Spirit is "the first fruits" (Rom. 8 : 23, *aparchē*). Elsewhere Paul speaks of the *arrabōn,* the pledge of what is to come (I Cor. 1 : 22). Now in connexion with this "function" of the Spirit Paul uses the phrases of anointing and sealing and giving the pledge of the Spirit. These three verbs are in the aorist and may be taken to express aspects of the initiatory work of the Spirit, for there can be no doubt that both sealing and anoint-

ing refer to the Holy Spirit. It has been maintained that I Cor. 1 : 22 and Eph. 1 : 13; 4 : 30 have in view a rite of Confirmation different from baptism but Professor Lampe has shown sufficiently that there is no biblical foundation for this view.[13] And if there is no reason to suppose that the New Testament knows of a rite or an experience different from baptism to which the concepts of sealing and anointing could apply, there remains the question what the *Sitz im Leben* of these concepts may be.

To this question there is no definite answer. The sealing is, as Lampe's able analysis has shown, for the age to come, whereas the anointing is best understood as an initiation to Christian service, or rather : a Christ-like service, since He is the Anointed One *par excellence*.

But the fact that *sphragis* from early times on has become the designation of baptism points to the conclusion that in the experience of a second generation of early Christianity the sealing of the believers was connected with baptism. This connection, however, cannot be traced back to Paul. To sum up : in Paul's writing and thinking the initiatory work of the Holy Spirit and baptism are described in such a way and in such terms that they seem to be interchangeable. The obvious reason for this is that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ and the baptism is into Christ. With both the Spirit and baptism are connected the fruits of the Cross and the Resurrection : justification, newness of life, adoption. But nowhere the Spirit and baptism are mentioned together in one sentence except I Cor. 12 : 13 which because of its theme, is the exception that confirms the rule. The reason seems to be that the Spirit and baptism do not belong to the same category nor to opposite categories. They simply do not go into one category. The initiatory work of the Spirit begins before baptism, because it is the Spirit of faith, and it continues after baptism, because it is the Spirit of Christ that dwells in the baptized believer. Only in the momentary happening of baptism there is that close parallelism which we traced.

Baptism and the Spirit in John 3: 5.
The later part of the New Testament.

When we leave Paul and turn to the Johannine writings there is again but one text that mentions the Spirit and baptism in one sentence, i.e., John 3 : 5. The exegetical problems involved in the combined mention of water and the Spirit as the origin of the new birth are widely discussed and described and there is no need to repeat here a story often told. Let me just summarize the main positions :

(1) Bultmann[14] regards the words as an interpolation due to the

desire of some unknown copyist to bring the Gospel into line with the Church's teaching regarding baptism, but his work has left too little trace in the textual tradition to take Bultmann's omission seriously. If accepted however there are no exegetical problems in this text to worry about, and it can be maintained that in John the sacraments play no part.

(2) C. K. Barrett thinks it possible to interpret the word "water" without reference to baptismal rites: "Birth from water" might be held (on the basis of the use in rabbinic Hebrew of *tiphah*, a drop . . .) for semen to mean physical birth; the *kai* is then ascensive . . ."[15] But it remains to be seen whether the expression "of water and the Spirit," thus understood is a likely answer to Nicodemus' bewilderment and a sensible explanation of the *anōthen* of *v.* 3.

(3) H. Odeberg interprets the waters also as semen but the following *kai* as explicative and thinks that a spiritual or heavenly semen, to be compared (and perhaps equated) with the primal heavenly water, which is life-creating, is meant.[16] This interpretation also discards any reference to watre-baptism. According to Barrett the evidence does not seem to be sufficient to support this interpretation.

(4) Markus Barth[17] takes the connective *kai* to be definitive and translates: "of water, that means: of the Spirit" and the concept of water and the Spirit is equivalent to the Johannine concept of "living water." The real baptism is only the Spirit-baptism. The Spirit is the water of which he is conceived who shall enter the Kingdom of heaven. The silent implication of this interpretation is that John 3 : 5 is directed against adherents of baptismal regeneration, and Barth addresses those adherents in very eloquent and devastating words, and he is not in the least emabrrassed by the fact that he must confess that the Gospel of John only *wahrscheinlich* (!) opposes a Christian sacramentalism . . .

To my mind Barth is refuted in his main concern by John 3 : 5 itself. His sharp distinction between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism, which dominates his book from the first to the last page, forces him to resort to exegetical technicalities as the equation of water and Spirit. It is true that in 7 : 39 Jesus speaks of the Spirit under the image of the living water but that is a very natural procedure in connection with the feast. In our text there is nothing that suggests the same equation except the possible Christian sacramentalism in the background. When we follow the line from the beginning of John's Gospel we find the proclamation of the Baptist: the coming Kingdom, the baptism of repentance and the coming baptism of the Spirit. When Jesus enters upon the scene, the descending of the Spirit shows Him as the One, who baptizes with the Spirit. And in ch. 3 Jesus sums up His own preaching as to the

entering of the Kingdom. The water-baptism of John is not sufficient, that means: conversion alone is not sufficient; to it must be added a change much more radical than the *metanoia*: the new birth, and this birth is *anōthen,* it is from above, it is of the Spirit. But not of the Spirit alone, also of water. This can only refer back to the water-baptism of John, the only time that *hudōr* has been mentioned in a similar context. This means that the new birth does not supersede the rite of baptism. On the contrary it supposes it, not chronologically but theologically, because there is no new birth without conversion. There is in this text no indication that baptism is the means by which the Spirit is conferred. If that were the implication, we could expect more references to it in what follows, but in the *vv.* 6-8 it is exclusively the Spirit that brings the new birth. Especially *v.* 8 to my mind excludes the idea of baptismal regeneration.

But on the other hand the way in which water and the Spirit are joined suggests that there is more to be said than that the water stands for the baptism of conversion as preached and administered by John and that rebirth supposes conversion. Water and the Spirit, conversion and the new birth are one; they cannot be separated and, as the following verses make clear beyond doubt, it is the Spirit that is the creative element in both conversion and the new birth, and therefore also in water-baptism.

It should not, however, be forgotten that in John the Spirit is closely connected with the work and the person of Christ. Eternal life, the fruit of the new birth is to know God and Jesus Christ, whom God sent, i.e. to know God in the Incarnate Word, in the revelation in history, completed on the cross. And the Paraclete will take what is Jesus' and declare it. His work is to create a vital relationship between Jesus Christ and His believers, and that vital relationship rests upon the foundation of the fulfilled work of Christ in the cross and the resurrection. The relationship between the new birth and the work of Christ is also found in I Peter 1 : 3 and is genuine New Testament teaching.

This should be kept in mind when we discuss the much debated text Titus 3 : 5-7. In its context are found several words which are connected with the revelation in Christ: *eleos, sōzein, dikaiousthai tē chariti* and, as Beasley Murray, following Bornkamm, has pointed out, there is a direct line with the earliest interpretation of baptism in Acts 2 : 33, 38.[18] If the eschatological understanding of *palingenesia* and *anakainōsis* is correct, then the text may mean that baptism initiates into the life of the age to come and of the great renewal by the Spirit, but I think that there is more realized eschatology or rather anticipated eschatology in this text. Might not the reference to the event of the outpouring of the Spirit be an indication that *palingenesia* and *anakainōsis* are experienced by

the "us" that God has saved *dia loutrou*? We have good reason to suppose so. But to conclude that the *loutrou* mediates the *palingenesia* is to go beyond the evidence. The genitives are best taken as defining and baptism therefore is understood as regeneration-baptism. This is more than we have found so far but it is still not baptismal regeneration.

Conclusions

Our exegetical inquiry is drawing to its end and our last task is to assemble the conclusions which we have reached:

(1) The New Testament shows no evidence of a Spirit-baptism, subsequent to the water-baptism, as an initiation to a full Christian life. The Lucan accounts in Acts must be regarded as expressions of immediate experiences and not as statements of theological reflection. The Spirit has nothing to give that is not included in the work of the crucified and risen Lord, and in baptism, the cross and the resurrection are realized and effected in the life of the believer. Only an imperfect understanding of the work of the Spirit can maintain the radical split between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism as we find with Pentecostal theology and with Markus Barth.

(2) The New Testament shows on the other hand no evidence of baptismal regeneration or of the bestowal of the Spirit in baptism. In the most daring and far-reaching words of Paul there is no mention of a bestowal of the Spirit, and neither does John make the new birth dependent upon the act of baptism. Only in one of the latest writings of the New Testament, viz. Titus, do we find expressions that might lend themselves to such interpretation. The sealing and the anointing with the Spirit show no clear and unequivocal connection with baptism. That from an early post-biblical date *sphragis* is used as a word for baptism only goes to show that later generations ascribed to baptism what was the work of the Spirit in the New Testament.

(3) There exists a parallelism between the initiatory work of the Spirit and baptism, especially in the thinking of Paul; this parallelism may have prepared the way for the conception of baptismal regeneration in later times, but Paul is too keenly aware of the categorical difference between the Spirit and the rite of baptism to admit their interchanging in his thought and writings. In the Fourth Gospel the Spirit and baptism appear in one breath but there can be no doubt that their parallelism is not one of co-ordination but of subordination.

(4) It may however be inferred from the New Testament that in baptism the Spirit is active and creative. For baptism is no isolated happening; it is believer's baptism and goes with conver-

sion and faith. Both faith and baptism are faith and baptism into Christ and the baptized believer shares in the life of Christ, the fellowship of his suffering and the power of his resurrection.

NOTES

[1] Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition,* 4th ed., 1958, pp. 116, 262.

[2] Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch,* Vol. I, pp. 121f.

[3] Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,* Vol. I, p. 528 (henceforth referred to as Th.W.B.).

[4] Markus Barth, *Die Taufe-ein Sakrament?* 1951, p. 23.

[5] *Acts* 1 : 5; 11 : 15, 16.

[6] Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte,* 1959, p. 111.

[7] Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity,* Vol. I, pp. 340f.

[8] II *Cor.* 4 : 13.

[9] Eduard Schweizer, *Th.W.B.,* Vol. VI, pp. 40gf.

[10] *op. cit.,* p. 327.

[11] G. R. Beasley-Murray in A. Gilmore (ed.), *Christian Baptism,* 1959, p. 148.

[12] Ed. Schweizer, *op. cit.,* p. 431.

[13] G. H. W. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (1951), Chapter V, p. 64-94.

[14] Bultmann, *Das Johannesevangelium.*

[15] C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John* (1958), pp. 174ff.

[16] H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel* (1929), p. 64.

[17] *op. cit.,* pp. 443-447.

[18] *op. cit.,* pp. 143f.

J. REILING

What are the Qualifications of a Gospel Minister?

AN attempt to answer this question was made by the Rev. William Staughton, D.D., in the Circular letter accompanying the Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association in 1807.[1] Born on January 4th, 1770, at Coventry he died on December 12th, 1829, in Washington, DC., in America.[2] He entered Bristol Academy in 1791[3] from the Cannon Street Church in Birmingham, where he had been baptized by the "seraphic Pearce."[4] He showed considerable talent as a young preacher in the Bristol area, and was eventually chosen by the College Lane Church, Northampton, to succeed Ryland[5] but he declined on the grounds of ill-health. The College Lane minute book, however, shrewdly comments "it was well known and more privately acknowledged that his refusal was wholly owing to an unhappy entanglement."[6] In 1793 he went to America, settling in Charleston, South Carolina, having been strongly recommended for the post by Rippon. Rippon wrote to Dr. Furman, "Give me leave to observe that you must not expect Mr. Staughton to be a fair sample of our English brethren in the ministry. You may be certain that he is far above par . . ."[7]

Staughton was the "Anon" who subscribed half a guinea in the original list of subscribers to the Missionary Society, "thanking his lucky stars that he was there, but, true to studentdom, moneyless, even after his five Sundays 'supplying' College Lane." He had to borrow his half-guinea. In after years he used to say, "I rejoice over that half-guinea more than over all I have given in my life besides." As just a bird of passage he modestly withheld his signature.[8] Staughton may have withheld his signature, but he did not withhold his zeal for the missionary endeavour, and in America it was largely his drive and enthusiasm which led to the foundation of the American Board of Foreign Missions. He was the first corresponding secretary of the Board, and played the part of Fuller to Judson's Carey. It is to be regretted that all correspondence between Judson and Staughton "perished by shipwreck of a vessel on passage from Philadelphia to Washington."[9]

The rest of his life was spent in America, his main work being in Philadelphia where he was minister of Sansom Street Baptist Church. While there he started an Academy in his own home,

training many men for the ministry. Eventually the Academy became the theological department of the Columbian College, and Staughton was the first President of the College in Washington, DC.[10] Staughton was a noted preacher in his day and his ministry was much blessed. The Revs. Cox and Hoby in an account of their tour of the States for the Baptist Union in 1836 give a glowing account of his preaching ability. "Many others spoke of the discourses which they had occasionally heard, as if his tones were yet thrilling in their ears, and his impressive manner still fixing their attention. In the families he visited, in the pulpits he occupied, in the public institutions he founded or adorned 'being dead, he yet speaketh' . . . His memory will not soon fade away: and . . . a far distant posterity to whom his fame shall be transmitted is likely to reap the benefit, when his contemporaries have followed him to the dust, and even when the recording tablet shall have perished."[11]

In the Circular Letter of 1807 Staughton left to posterity his views on the required qualifications of a Gospel Minister. It makes interesting reading and gives us an insight into the mind of a man who spent most of his life training men for the ministry, and the principles on which he based their selection for that training. If the same standards were applied to many ministerial candidates today, the candidates and the committees that interview would experience some heart-searching.

The minor issues dealt with briefly

Staughton begins by clearing the ground before launching into his main theme, dealing with "some things regarded as qualifications but which in reality are not."[12]

"We need not prove to you that mere morality of character, powers of eloquence, or heirships to livings are sufficient: a heathen or an infidel may possess them all. But it is necessary to state that:

1. A persuasion in the mind of the subject himself is no genuine proof . . . Most young Christians, brought up out of the horrible pit and taught the excellency of Jesus, feel ardent to proclaim his character to thousands. This anxiety for the salvation of sinners is lovely as a fruit of the work of God in the heart. It designates the saint, but not the preacher.
2. The confident decisions of friends and relatives are not to be trusted . . . Many a fond parent, like the mother of the sons of Zebedee, has wished a child exalted in the service of Christ, without observing the mixture of the motives which govern the heart. To long earnestly that a son or a friend may glorify God in the work of the ministry, is an effect of

grace, while the sentiment we form of his ability may be nothing but nature.

3. Success is no satisfactory proof that a preacher is qualified of God. God has said, "My word that goeth forth out of my mouth shall not return unto me void." This glorious word, therefore, may be quick and powerful though the preacher be held in bonds of iniquity."

Subjectivism, the admiration of friends, and an outward success are not regarded as criteria in this matter by Staughton. Following this he turns his attention to some things which are "often supposed to disqualify but do not."

1. A deep persuasion of our entire unworthiness . . . Self-abasement will aid rather than hinder the work of God. It will trample under-foot the serpent pride, and cast the crown at the feet of Jesus.
2. Great fear and trembling in prospect of the service, should not lead to the conclusion that requisite qualifications are not possessed. When we reflect on the solemnity of the work, and on the awful responsibility of the minister of God we may wonder the dread of the soul is no greater . . . Holy fear is useful and not injurious when it leads to greater faithfulness in the ministry, and to a more entire reliance on the Lord for his assistance.
3. The neglect, or even the contempt of many who profess the name of Christ, does not prove that we ought not to gird up the loins for the labours of a steward . . . But he who condemns a Christian minister possessing only two talents, because he equals not another possessing ten, should fear lest He see it and be angry, who hath said, "Whoso despiseth you despiseth me."
4. The discovery of no immediate or great success should not lead any of God's servants to conclude he has never been called to his Master's work . . . A minister is no adequate judge of his usefulness."

Once again Staughton stands firm against that subjectivism which leads to despair. It seems that the ministry was liable to the same dangers then as today. There are still those who scorn the two-talent man and amid the indifference and materialism of the twentieth century those who minister have to remind themselves constantly they are no judges of their own usefulness.

The Four Essentials

The qualifications for a gospel minister he divides into two types. The essential, without which a man cannot be called a minister,

and the contributory, or those which "tend to adorn, assist, and complete the character."

1. Godliness is requisite. Under the term we include holiness of heart and purity of life . . . What indeed can be expected from an unconverted ministry? How can an ungodly preacher illustrate the excellency of the divine character which his heart abhors, or the glories of a law he loves to violate? . . . But the root of the matter is not all—the verdure and fruit of a holy conversation are also required . . . He must take heed to himself, his flock, and his doctrine. Hence,
2. Knowledge is requisite. The new man is renewed in knowledge: but spiritual understanding is progressive, and in this it is required that a minister of the Word abound . . . "The priests' lips should keep knowledge and they should seek the Law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts." As if God had said should the Bible be not at hand, the mouth of the priest will supply its absence . . . To obtain the precise degree of spiritual information necessary in a candidate for the ministry is scarcely possible. It seems, however, requisite that he should possess general views on the plan of salvation, of the doctrine of grace, and "the law of the House of the Lord."
3. An aptness to teach is requisite. It consists in a readiness to communicate "the good treasures of the heart" to others. "The well spring of wisdom is a flowing brook" . . . Now the qualification we speak of is like a passage through a wall: it is called a door of utterance to speak "the mystery of Christ" . . . It includes an ardent love for the souls of men, holy diligence, a fulness of ideas, a vigorous memory, and a flowing elocution.
4. There must be a divine call . . . Christ displays his sovereignty in calling to office whomsoever he pleases. His call is delivered not by visiting angels. It is not heard from the flame of a bush, nor from the lightning and clouds of a trembling mountain; nor is it an audible address from our Lord Jesus Christ . . . It is the still voice of God in the soul saying, "Occupy till I come." The subject feels a necessity laid upon him: a dispensation of the gospel committed unto him. The souls of men appear of greater value than he had before conceived—already he begins to travail in birth . . . He would rather be a preacher of Christ than a master of all the mines in the world. In his countenance, in his converse, in his prayer, in his exhortations, his exercises discover themselves. At length they engage the attention of the Church of God."

There are several points of interest here. Notice how much emphasis Staughton puts upon personal holiness, or godliness as he terms it. This living out of the spiritual life, and progress in spiritual knowledge, will be the two factors which ensure that a man will "take heed to himself, his flock, and his doctrine." Lest this should be interpreted in too subjective a manner he makes the final point quite clear, that ultimately the work of the ministry is grounded in a divine call, without which all else is of no account. Subjectivism is to be eliminated at all costs.

A further interesting fact is that in paragraph 2, he can conceive that a man in the pastoral office is capable of speaking the Word of God, even though he had not the Bible. Once again we see the importance of personal holiness in the life of the minister, as far as Staughton was concerned. Though himself admitting the difficulty of obtaining precise "spiritual information," he says that every candidate should "possess general views of the plan of salvation, of the doctrine of grace, and the 'law of the house of God'." One wonders how many men coming forward for the work of the ministry today have been given such instruction at the time of their baptism, or subsequently. Is it really the task of our colleges to give such instruction in matters of doctrine, or should this be the task of each minister in his own church? It is often said there are not enough jobs for the young church members. Perhaps we ought to think less in terms of what can we give them to do, and more in terms of what can we teach them further concerning the faith.

A final point of interest is, that in the fourth paragraph Staughton makes it quite clear that the voice of God is not heard in the sensational experience, but in the certain conviction of the heart that God is calling us to his work. Once again, however, this is not allowed to lead to subjectivism, but it engages "the attention of the Church."

"The Furniture of the Mind and the Affections of the Heart."

Staughton concludes his discourse on the qualifications of a gospel minister by mentioning some matters he considers of secondary importance. Acknowledging that the Apostles were only fishermen, he says, concerning the "furniture of the mind":

"We are sensible that an ostentation of learning may be food for a weak and aspiring mind. Nevertheless as knowledge of almost every kind may be useful to a gospel minister; as in the Bible we have only a translation, behind the veil of which many a beauty is concealed; as we have no reason to expect that extraordinary assistance which the apostles enjoyed, and as education places a

minister of the gospel on equal ground with a learned adversary, to seek an acquaintance with language, history, and other similar studies, whence it can be accomplished, is praiseworthy."

The "affections of the heart" he sees in terms of being "clothed with humility" before the flock. "If he must be the greatest of all he will acquire the elevation by becoming the servant of all!" Willingness to suffer adversity, prudence, true sympathy with human joys and sorrows, he views as further suitable qualifications of a gospel minister. His final plea in the letter is that the brethren will pray for their ministers, and that labourers may be sent into the great harvest-field.

Staughton, though neglected by his posterity,[13] raises in this Circular Letter an important issue. The Letter was written at the express wish of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, and was published by them in 1807, with the full approval of the delegates assembled. It was presumably read in many churches of the Association, and was also sent to other Associations for their perusal. Thus in the Churches, through the medium of this letter, the clear demands of the ministry were set forth for all to hear. It meant that many in the churches would be challenged to think of the call to the ministry and what it involved. We might well ask ourselves today, with so many men leaving the ministry for other posts, who is responsible for putting these claims before the members of our churches. Is it sufficient to leave this matter to the individual, without offering any help or guidance? If not, who should give this guidance: the minister of the local church? Or is it the responsibility of the Association? What part should the Baptist Colleges take in this matter: should they advertize? Inevitably we must ask ourselves what part the Baptist Union, which issues an accredited list of ministers regularly, should play in the task of making known the "qualifications of a Gospel Minister."?

NOTES

[1] *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association* 1707-1807. Edited by A. D. Gilette. Publ. American Baptist Publishing Society, 118 Arch Street, Philadelphia (1851), pp. 440-444.

[2] S. W. Lynd, *Memoir of Rev. William Staughton, D.D.* Publ. Boston: Lincoln, Edmands & Co., and Hubbard & Edmands, Cincinatti, Ohio, 1834.

[3] S. A. Swaine, *Faithful Men:* Memorials of Bristol Baptist College and some of its distinguished Alumni. Publ. London: Alexander & Shepheard, Holborn, 1884, pp. 182-184.

[4] *Northamptonshire Biographies.* Publ. Taylor & Son, Northampton, 1901, No. 27, p. 2. Also Swaine, p. 182.

[5] Letter dated March 24th, 1793 from College Lane. *Biographies,* No, 27, p. 5.

[6] Quote from College Lane Minute Book, *Biographies,* No. 27, p. 5.

[7] Letter quoted in *Biographies,* No. 27, p. 5. Also in Lynd.

[8] *William Carey* by S. P. Carey. Publ. Hodder & Stoughton, 1923 (7th Edition), p. 92. Also *Biographies,* No. 27, p. 3.

[9] Francis Wayland, *A Memoir of the Life of the Rev. Adoniram Judson, D.D.* Two Volumes. Publ. London: Nisbet, 1853. Note in the Preface.

[10] Lynd, *Biographies.*

[11] Cox and Hoby. *Baptists in America: a narrative of the Deputation from the Baptist Union in England to the United States and Canada.* Publ. London: T. Ward & Co., pp. 15-16.

[12] All quotations ensuing are from the Circular Letter—see note 1 above.

[13] The Rev. E. C. Starr (American Baptist Historical Society) in a recent letter confirmed that no extensive work has been carried out on Staughton since Lynd in 1834.

Letters from Staughton appear in the *Baptist Magazine* and *Rippon's Register.*

Baptist Magazine, Vol. 2, p. 495. Vol. 5, pp. 83-84—Letters to Ivimey.
Vol. 7, p. 349—News of American Association.
Vol. 8, p. 171—Concerning sailing of Mr. & Mrs. G. Hough and Mrs. Charlotte White.
p. 298—Letter to Rippon.
Vol. 9, p. 233—Concerning the Conversion of Spencer Cone (Actor).
p. 388—Proceedings of the General Convention in America, and report of Baptist Board of foreign missions in U.S.A.
Vol. 10, p. 310—Letters from Carey, Ward, and Morrison to W.S.
Vol. 13, p. 73—Letter to Ivimey about Washington Theological Semny. and Judson's trials in Burma.
Vol. 15, p. 402—Extract of letter to Mr. Dyer.

Rippon's Register, Vol. 3, p. 121—Letter from Bordentown concerning fever in New York. Also mentions details of the Bordentown Academy.
p. 148—An account of his ordination—in more detail than in Lynd, pp. 42, 43.
p. 267 Letter regretting the passing of Pearce.
p. 293—His Circular Letter for 1801, *The Divine Origin of the Gospel,* published in full.
p. 535—Concluding address by W.S. to Philadelphia Missionary Society. No date. About 1800-1801.

ROGER HAYDEN

Thomas Dawson of Liverpool

NO standard Baptist history makes mention of the Reverend Thomas Dawson of Liverpool, and even W. T. Whitley's regional survey *Baptists of North West England* accords him only an occasional reference. Yet the career of this remarkable man is illuminating in many ways. It marks an important phase in that reassertion of strict Communion principles which culminated in the formation of the North Western Association (1860-76). It throws considerable light on to the struggles of those depressed down-town chapels of Liverpool, whose history is obscured by the more spectacular progress of the great city churches—Pembroke, Myrtle Street, Richmond and the like. It helps to elucidate the curious and unusual process which led to the eventual founding of Manchester Baptist College in 1872; it was the decisive factor in the setting up of the Liverpool Baptist Union. Finally, we learn with surprise, it was a seminal influence on the career of one of that circle of literary men, commonly, though perhaps misleadingly, known as the Decadents.

Thomas Dawson was born at Longwood, Yorkshire, on the 8th July, 1805. Of his youth little is known. He was baptized at the age of sixteen by Robert Hyde, pastor of the Salendine Nook Church, determined to enter the ministry and studied at Horton College from 1832 to 1834. His first pastorate was at Irwell Terrace Church, Bacup, and here he exercised a distinguished and successful ministry for fifteen years. In the summer of 1851 he accepted a call to Byrom Street Chapel, Liverpool.

Dawson had already established a considerable reputation as a vigorous and forthright evangelist, with a zeal for surmounting apparently insurmountable obstacles yet even he must have hesitated long before deciding to embark on such a hazardous undertaking as this. A brief backward glance at the recent history of the church explains his quandary.

Byrom Street was of course the historic Liverpool church which, though founded originally in Low Hill, Everton, had occupied that particular site since 1710. However, having suffered a number of disastrous schisms, it had during the 1830s and early '40s become almost entirely hyper-Calvinist and was on the verge of extinction when in 1846 the L.N.W. Railway Company, anxious to construct a tunnel from Lime Street to Waterloo Road, offered to purchase the chapel below which the tunnel had perforce to run. The sum offered—£4,250—appeared to the congregation extremely

generous, and they accepted it without further ado, using the money to erect a new Strict and Particular chapel in Shaw Street, where worship, despite extensive damage in World War Two, is still maintained.

On completion of the tunnel, it was discovered that the foundations of Byrom Street were undamaged, and demolition was unnecessary. In consequence the Company offered the building for sale to a group of persons anxious to convert it into a low Music Hall. Fortunately, there was at this time living in Liverpool a certain John Johnson, a very wealthy lime merchant and a grandson of the remarkable minister of the same name who had occupied the Byrom Street pulpit from 1740 to 1748. Mr. Johnson was a deacon of Myrtle Street Chapel; he had as a youth sat at the feet of the greatest minister of Byrom Street, Samuel Medley, and he was most unwilling to see the building pass into the hands of a theatrical company. He therefore purchased it himself for £3,000 and opened it for worship as a Mission Hall on the 23rd of June, 1850. The first missionary (not pastor, for a church had not yet been formed) was the Reverend James Smith who remained for only twelve months (June, 1850-June, 1851) and then removed to Shrewsbury, unconvinced that a church situated in such an impoverished and increasingly Catholic area could have a future of any kind.

Thomas Dawson, as we have seen, succeeded in 1851. He must fully have understood that his position was a most unenviable one. The church building was not vested in trustees, being the private property of an individual to whom all collections were remitted and who paid all expenses, including the missioner's salary. His congregation, consisting of about thirty souls, had not yet moreover convenanted together to form a church.

This latter difficulty was soon remedied and on the 8th December, 1851, Dawson had the satisfaction of seeing a church regularly constituted and himself chosen as minister. By the end of 1852 congregations had doubled, partly through evangelistic work, partly through the adhesion of ex-members of Providence chapel which had just closed. Four years of successful work followed. The church was somewhat handicapped by lack of Sunday School accommodation, for their original schools had been allowed to pass into alien hands. Johnson, however, handsomely made good the deficiency and new buildings were erected in Circus Street, entirely at his own expense, early in 1856.

But on the 2nd December of that year this liberal benefactor died, a bachelor and intestate, leaving approximately £500,000. It was to his sister, the widow of the late Richard Haughton, that the bulk of this fortune was assigned, and she, after forgiving various mortgages on Baptist chapels (including one for £1,000 on

Myrtle Street) divided the bequest between her two sons, retaining only a small portion of the original sum for herself. The Byrom Street property she transferred to her son James, an Anglican, who hastily effected an exchange with his brother John, a Baptist, and a member of the Byrom Street congregation.

We can well appreciate the uneasy feelings of the Reverend Thomas Dawson whilst all these complicated transactions were taking place, feelings which must have been aggravated by the repeated non-payment of salary. Anxiously the minister sought another source of income and usefulness; the post of chaplain and registrar of the Necropolis, the great Liverpool Nonconformist burial ground, was vacant, and early in 1857 Dawson received the appointment which he continued to hold till the cemetery was closed by the Corporation in 1889.

It soon became clear that the new owner of Byrom Street was not content to play the same passive role in the life of the chapel as had satisfied his uncle.

Liverpool Baptists were later on to owe an immense debt to John Haughton, but the latter had his own opinions on the future of the Byrom Street building which he envisaged as an evangelistic mission rather than a church, a view contrary to that of Dawson. Accordingly in January, 1861, the minister accepted a call to the tiny chapel in Soho Street, taking most of the members with him.

All the time he had been at Byrom Street, Dawson had not merely been content to fulfil his ministerial duties—indeed he seems to have been the kind of man who is compelled by some inner dynamic to occupy several different positions at once. Ever since the formation of the Strict Baptist Society in 1845 he had associated himself with that body and throughout its subsequent history and frequent changes of name, had remained one of its most loyal supporters. The principal object of this organization was, of course, to train men on strict communion principle as ministers and missionaries, and in 1852 Dawson had found himself appointed northern tutor of the society. Between that date and 1860 half a dozen or so young men lived in the Dawson household for one or two years, receiving pastoral and academic training of a most exacting nature. Though our list may possibly be incomplete, the names of these students appear to have been: J. Argyle, A. Spencer, A. J. Ashworth, E. Parker (later Principal of Manchester College), L. Nuttal, D. Taylor and J. Davies. Even after his removal to Soho Street and later, Dawson continued to take students. R. H. Brotherton, B. Anderton, T. Durant and F. E. Cossey serving under him during this period. The last named however was in Liverpool for only a few months and became the first student of the new Baptist Theological Institution at Bury (1866) which in turn grew into Man-

chester College (1874). The indebtedness of local churches to these students was considerable. Baptist advance in Birkenhead, Egremont, Old Swan, Clubmoor and in more distant places—particularly the Rossendale Valley—was pioneered and sustained by them. Trained in a hard school they were later to render yeoman service to the churches both at home and overseas.

But to return to Dawson at Soho Street. His pastorate here (1861-63) was short-lived and unhappy. The church was in a very sorry condition, and not even the eager supporters from Byrom Street seemed able to revive it. Dawson naturally took it out of the Lancashire and Cheshire into the North Western Association but that was about the only noteworthy feature of his ministry there. Many members drifted back to Byrom Street which Haughton had now re-opened and finally in the autumn of 1862 Dawson with fifty supporters withdrew to Youd's Assembly Rooms in Brunswick Road, and here a new church was formed early in 1863, and received into the North Western Association a year later.

A period of great spiritual advance at once set in. The fifty members had grown to seventy in 1863 and ninety-five two years later. Branch Sunday Schools were founded in various parts of the Everton district and in September, 1863, Mr. Thomas Durant, one of Dawson's pupils, was engaged as co-pastor of the church. The congregation (entirely working-class in composition) now began to look round for a suitable site on which to erect a new chapel.

Not far from Brunswick Road lay an old and abandoned graveyard of great historic importance to Liverpool Baptists, for hard by had stood their first chapel on Merseyside built by Dr. Daniel Fabius in 1705, the graveyard had been added two years later. The chapel had long since disappeared and no interments had taken place here since 1854. It was this somewhat unlikely site which was chosen for the erection of a new church, to be known as "Fabius," a church which would constitute the first Baptist witness in this part of Everton since the Fabius family had removed thence to Liverpool in 1710.

First of all the surviving trustees of the graveyard, both members of Pembroke chapel, were approached, fell in with the scheme, and wrote to the Secretary of State outlining the whole plan. Permission was soon granted to dig up the gravestones, relay them flat, and build the chapel over the burial ground, without the need for many re-interments. Such an arrangement would certainly not be allowed today, and even in 1863 must have seemed somewhat unusual.

All that remained was to secure the necessary financial help. Pembroke and Myrtle Street were both approached and at a joint meeting with representatives of Brunswick Road Church held early

in 1866 in Pembroke chapel, it was decided not only to launch a fund for the Everton project, but to reconstitute this ad hoc committee as the Liverpool Baptist Union. It is a matter of regret that a few months later the newly formed Union had reluctantly to inform Dawson that they were unable to give financial assistance to the proposed new church.

But this was only the start of a long period of troubles for the struggling Brunswick Road congregation. Late in 1866 they received notice to quit their Assembly Rooms, and moved into a hall in Brunel Street, recently vacated by another Baptist congregation which had just built for themselves the present Richmond church. In Brunel Street Dawson struggled on for four years; the money for the Fabius Building Fund came in slowly and mainly out of the pocket of Mr. John Haughton, though in 1870 a loan was obtained from the Baptist Building Fund. But on March 16th, 1870, at a stormy meeting at Brunel Street called to discuss the perilous financial situation, Dawson and his co-pastor, Durant, quarrelled and the former walked out, never to return. When Fabius church was opened in August, 1871, the aged minister was not present and Thomas Durant was elected sole pastor. Three-quarters of the total cost of £2,200 had been provided by Mr. Haughton and it was probably this factor more than any other which had precipitated Dawson's withdrawal.

From this point onwards a heightened degree of discomfort and tragedy creeps into Dawson's life. With a tiny congregation he secured a fresh lease of the Islington Assembly Rooms (1870-73) and another, for a two-year period (1873-74) of a dingy room in Roscommon Street. But church life was impossible in such conditions. Early in 1875 the congregation dispersed, the majority including Dawson rejoining, at a public "reunion" ceremony, the Fabius church from which Durant had recently resigned and where the Reverend W. E. Lynn was now exercising a highly successful ministry.

Despite his advanced age, however, Dawson could not rest content sitting in a congregation; the impulsion to be active in the Lord's work was too strong for him. Accordingly in June, 1875, he and his followers withdrew from Fabius and together with a handful of others from Mount Vernon Welsh church took a room over a stable in Farnworth Street, an area completely bereft of Evangelical witness. Here a church of thirteen members was formed, with Dawson, now a very old man, as honorary pastor. A year later they had increased to thirty and were worshipping in the Drill Hall, Coleridge Street. Now, with a zeal surprising in one so old, Dawson began to raise money for yet another new church. A strange architectural plan was drawn up whereby the new building could be converted into four dwelling houses in case the cause

failed. A site was acquired in Cottenham Street and the church building was opened in October, 1878. The cost had amounted to £1,150, but once again half the money, to Dawson's regret, had been provided by the ubiquitous benefactor, Mr. John Haughton. Though pressed to take the pastorate, Dawson refused for he was now busy preaching regularly at other churches in the city suburbs and even farther afield.

It would have been pleasant to record that the last years of Thomas Dawson were spent in quiet service to the growing Cottenham Street cause which he had done so much to promote, but such was not to be. With the young David Witton Jenkins, the first minister at Cottenham Street, he had co-operated wholeheartedly but Jenkins' successor, the Reverend Thomas Griffiths, proved the type of man with whom he could neither work nor agree. In 1885 twenty members of Cottenham Street including Dawson, were dismissed to form a separate church. "Dismissed" is perhaps a misleading term for the twenty had no desire to leave—indeed they appealed to the Liverpool Baptist Union for redress. It is difficult to apportion blame for this unfortunate incident, but in Dawson's defence it must be stated that Griffiths' ministry was a singularly unsuccessful one; in fact, by the time of his removal in 1887 the Cottenham Street cause had nearly expired.

Thus once again Dawson found himself pastor of a congregation. The twenty stalwarts took a room in Baker Street for four years (1885-90) and then purchased the old United Methodist Free Church in Empire Street for £600. But under their eighty-five year old minister expansion was unlikely. When Dawson died on the 24th October, 1891, the chief stumbling block to reunion with Cottenham Street was removed and the two churches became one again early in 1892, though, we note, the Empire Street building was retained for evangelistic and other purposes till as late as 1910 when it became "Disciple."

Dawson's death marked the end of an era in the history of Liverpool Baptists and at this point we might well conclude our account of his career were it not for the fact that in a definitive literary biography published recently (R. Whittington-Egan and G. Smerdon *The Quest of the Golden Boy* [1960]) he is mentioned frequently and with obvious affection and respect. While the present writer was searching in the Liverpool Record Office for facts relative to Dawson, he observed that one of the pastor's staunchest followers and one-time treasurer of the Fabius building fund was a certain John Gallienne. But not till the publication of the above-mentioned work did it become clear that this gentleman was in fact the father of the celebrated poet and writer, Richard Le Gallienne, for whose academic upbringing and spiritual training Thomas Dawson was primarily responsible. This perhaps accounts for several unusual

features in Le Gallienne's life. How for example could a member of the Oscar Wilde circle possibly pose as a defender of Christianity against atheistic criticism as Le Gallienne did in the early 1890s? His plea for "Essential Christianity" was perhaps impossible, unacceptable to most orthodox Christians (only the radical intellectuals of Pembroke chapel invited him to lecture to them on the strength of it) and is characteristic of much of the confused Utopian speculation of the period. Yet that it should have come from such a quarter at all is surely surprising and explicable only as a flowering of deep respect for things spiritual implanted in the author as a child by his old tutor and friend Thomas Dawson of Liverpool.

Finally, what of Dawson's work remains today? Of the churches which he and his students helped to found, some continue to bear vital witness down to the present, though the two on which most labour was expended, Tuebrook and Old Swan, have long since ceased to be. As regards the two churches for whose foundation Dawson was directly responsible, Fabius and Cottenham Street, only the latter still survives, carrying on valuable work in difficult circumstances such as demand the highest qualities of firmness and zeal from the small congregation which assembles there. Fabius church is now empty and derelict, having been closed recently under a compulsory planning order. Presumably the children who are always breaking in and running about the deserted building do not know of the graveyard which lies beneath their feet. Certainly few people in Liverpool will ever have heard of Daniel Fabius who lies buried there and fewer still of Thomas Dawson to whose labours the church owed its origin a hundred years ago.

IAN SELLERS

A Yorkshire Story

EBENEZER Baptist Church, Scarborough, possesses among its records an autobiographical fragment prepared by its first pastor, William Hague, in 1816, when he was 79 years of age. What follows is based upon this account (a copy of which was kindly lent to me by Mr. R. C. Peart), with some supplementary information from a number of other sources. Personal stories of this kind are the stuff out of which history is wrought, and they frequently show that some of the accepted generalisations are not quite accurate. The eighteenth century was certainly not as dead religiously as has sometimes been suggested. Nor was Baptist extension confined to the New Connexion and the Northampton Association.

William Hague was born in November, 1736 at Malton in Yorkshire, a place notable in more recent Baptist history as the birthplace of both J. H. Shakespeare and the father of Mrs. Herbert Marnham. Hagues' parents were poor and of their six children four died in infancy. At the age of thirteen, William was apprenticed to a Malton barber and, as soon as the six-year term was over, obtained work in Scarborough. His arrival there in 1756 coincided with the outbreak of what the history books call the Seven Years' War. Within a month, the young man had signed on for three years as a sailor, attracted by the large silver buckles on seamen's shoes and the watches in their pockets. Life at sea greatly improved his physique, which had formerly been weakly, but not, he says, his morals. Three times he nearly lost his life and towards the end of his time afloat this helped to make him of a more serious disposition.

When the ship returned to Scarborough in 1759 Hague was met with a message that his former master in Malton wanted him to take charge of the shop there for a time. But a few months there, with irreligious companions, left him unhappy and he returned to Scarborough, anxious to learn to read so that he might search the Scriptures. "My master with whom I then was, had a little boy, about nine years old, who could read very well," says Hague, "and he was my bedfellow, and when we went to bed, I used to give him a halfpenny to read a chapter in my good old Bible, and then he went to sleep and I to meditate on what was read." A change of occupation in 1761 took Hague into a better educated family. There he sought the help of a young man to teach him to spell, write and read better, working early in the mornings and late at night so as to become more literate; and "I can truly say that the

Word of God was so sweet to my taste that my heart has glowed within me as warmed with strong wine."

England was being stirred at the time by the Methodist Revival. John Wesley first preached in Scarborough in July, 1759. He was there again in June, 1761, and says in his Journal:

> I had designed to preach abroad in the evening, but the thunder, lightening and rain prevented; however, I stood on a balcony and several hundreds of people stood below; and notwithstanding the heavy rain would not stir till I concluded.

Perhaps twenty-four-year-old William Hague was in the crowd on that occasion. At any rate in that year, 1761, he joined the Scarborough Methodists and records that one morning in the month of July, between 3 and 4 o'clock, while on his knees reading his Bible, he had "such a manifestation of the love of God in my soul as I had never felt before and which I can never forget."

Shortly afterwards Hague narrowly escaped the attentions of the press gang, who seem to have tried to get hold of a number of young fellows who were attending the meetings of the Scarborough Methodists. Fortunately, he was not taken. Faithfulness to his deepening religious convictions led him in 1763 to change his employer. Hague was determined not to work on Sundays and, with the encouragement of his Methodist friends, set up in business on his own. Within a few months he felt secure enough to marry, his bride being a Methodist named Adamson.

Wesley was in the town again in the summer of 1764 and wrote of this visit:

> How is the face of things changed here within a year or two! The Society increased fourfold; most of them alive to God, and many filled with love; and all of them enjoying great quietness.

But internal discussions were about to occur. A Nonconformist minister from London came to Scarborough to see some relatives and was invited to preach in the Methodist meeting. He appears to have been a Calvinist of antinomian tendencies and what he said gave offence and provoked controversy. Wesley was written to and replied: "No person has any right to preach in any of our meetings without a recommendation from me, and such recommendation J. Mc. has not, for he is a predestinarian and ought not to preach in any of our meetings." Hague was presiding over the Methodist society when this letter was read in the presence of the Nonconformist minister. Not unnaturally considerable verbal strife ensued.

Following this disturbing incident Hague began to read some of the works of John Bunyan and the sermons of a number of Calvinist

divines. As a result he became convinced that "the doctrine of free grace was the doctrine of the Bible, of the Prophets, of Christ and the Apostles." When they learned of this, the Methodists turned from him. In 1766 he and four or five others began meeting for reading, singing and prayer in a private house. It is worth noting that it was in this same seventh decade of the eighteenth century that Abraham Booth moved from the Arminianism of the General Baptists and threw in his lot with the Calvinistic wing of the denomination. His widely circulated book, *The Reign of Grace,* appeared in 1768. At the same time in Kent, John Stanger, of Bessels Green, of one of the oldest General Baptist families and later one of the founders of the Baptist Union, was making a similar theological and ecclesiastical pilgrimage.

There had been a Baptist church in Bridlington, twenty miles from Scarborough, since 1698. While it was without a settled pastor, the Rev. William Crabtree, of Bradford, preached there occasionally. Hague walked over several times to hear him. In 1767 Joseph Gawkrodger, son of an Irish episcopal clergyman, who had been baptised at Rawdon, moved from a nine year pioneering pastorate at Shipley to Bridlington. On June 8th of that year Hague was baptised on profession of faith and became a member of the Bridlington Baptist Church. Soon afterwards five others from Scarborough were baptised and together they hired an upper room on the quayside, register;ed it for worship and began to hold regular Sunday services. There, after some hesitation, Hague began his career as a preacher, with a sermon on *John* 5 : 39 : "Search the Scriptures." Before he felt happy in continuing, however, he followed the contemporary Baptist practice and sought the approval of the Bridlington church. After hearing him, the members bid him "go and preach the gospel."

By 1770 there were fifteen members of the Bridlington church living in Scarborough. To avoid continued "fatigue and expense" they applied for permission to form a separate church. This was duly given and in April, 1771 William Hague was ordained as pastor by Joseph Gawkrodger and tall David Kinghorn, of Bishop Burton in the East Riding, father of the more famous Joseph Kinghorn, of Norwich. On May 2nd, 1771, Hague administered the Lord's Supper for the first time. Few eighteenth-century Baptists thought it fitting for any but an ordained pastor to preside at the Lord's Table.

The new church grew quickly. By 1773 the membership had reached forty and the time had come to consider building a meeting-house. The members had long been accustomed to give twopence apiece each week towards the hire of the room in which they met. Hague at first received nothing for his services and even contributed his own twopence. Later he received help from the

Particular Baptist Fund. Among the other beneficiaries from the fund at this time was William Carey, then pastor in Moulton.

A site for a building in Scarborough, 35 yards by 20 in size, was purchased for £60. In July, 1776 the foundations were laid. The previous month Wesley had been again in the town and described the Methodist preaching-house as "the most elegant of any square room which we have in England," and his hearers as "attentive as if they had been Kingswood Colliers." The new Baptist Chapel was opened in April, 1777 with Joseph Gawkrodger, David Kinghorn and John Beatson, of Hull, as the special preachers. By a visit to London three years later Hague collected £130 and all the debt remaining on the building was cleared. In 1790 a gallery was added at a cost of £40; a burial-ground in 1793 was the same amount; an extension to the building in 1801; and a vestry in 1809. Wesley's last visit to Scarborough was in June, 1790, when he was 87 years of age. It was accompanied by a heavy thunderstorm. "I never heard the like before since my return from America," was the old man's comment.

William Hague continued in the Scarborough pastorate for forty-eight years, that is, until 1819. He was still preaching occasionally at the age of 85 and did not die until 1831, when he had reached the great age of 94. Two short pastorates succeeded his long one at "Ebenezer" and then in 1826 Benjamin Evans settled there. A new and larger chapel was soon needed and a period of considerable prosperity and influence began.

Benjamin Evans became a national figure, one of the prime movers in the launching of *The Freeman* and the founding of a new Baptist College at Bury, a noted champion of "close communion," a historian of ability and chairman of the Baptist Union in 1858. But all that is another Yorkshire story.

ERNEST A. PAYNE

In The Study

AFTER Freud, what ? I fancy that this is the really significant question and the proper way in which to frame it; for such was the towering genius of this fantastic pioneer that since he worked and thought and wrote every serious theoriest and practitioner in the psychoanalytic field has had inevitably to come to terms with him. Freud could be rebutted, his work could be affirmed, his thought might be reorientated or developed, but he could not be ignored. The monumental biography provided in the last decade by Ernest Jones not only demonstrated why this must be so, but also afforded the basic material for a critical and philosophical assessment. We begin to understand the man, a child of his age yet a giant of the future, flinging off insights which could not always be satisfactorily comprehended by his formulations, changing his mind, moving on from phase to phase, fruitful and fascinating in the very leaving of the loose ends that were to tantalise and divide colleagues and successors.

So, after Freud, what ? It is possible to provide an answer in neat schematic, Hegelian terms. There is the thesis, supported by most of the published work of Freud and basically defended and delineated by his disciples, Jones, Abraham, Ferenczi. It preoccupied itself with the canonised categories of id, ego, and super ego, pivoted on the genital phase of childhood from the third year and the resolution of the Oedipus complex, worked in terms of instincts, of libido, of sexuality. It was essentially a psychobiology of the organism, reflecting the scientific philosophy of the late nineteenth century. But there is also and over against it the antithesis, having Adlerian roots but enunciated in America particularly by Karen Horney and Erich Fromm. This was marked by a shift of emphasis from the unconscious to the conscious and pre-conscious, from childhood to adult life, from inheritance to environment, from instinct-theory to neurotic character-trends, from id to ego, from depth psychology to a psychology of the development of the ego under cultural pressure, from depth-psychology to a psychology of the development of the ego under cultural pressure, from adjustment to self-realisation. It was basically a psychosociology in harmony with the cultural preoccupations and sociological optimism of the twentieth century American scene.

But thesis and antithesis find their resolution at last in the synthesis which has been steadily emerging within the borders of

Britain. Here the first key figure is Melanie Klein. With her there is the return to Freudian roots, though with far-reaching modifications. Psychobiology and psychosociology give place to true psychology, where the object of investigation is not the organism or the cultural community but the person. The psychoanalysis of children by reference to phantasy material and play technique resulted in the thrust back of the super ego and the Oedipus situation to the first year of life, to the oral phase, and in a shift of emphasis from sexuality to aggression. It meant that the primary importance of the mother-child relationship had finally received adequate recognition. Ferenczi had already moved in this direction away from the paternalistic theory of Freud. With the researches of Mrs. Klein this insight is established.

It is also to Melanie Klein that we owe the beginnings of theory of psychic structure that makes use of the concept of "internal objects." There are unconscious psychic images developed by repression within the inner mental world—some bad, some good, but all emotionally loaded and all removed from relationship with outer reality. Thus is constituted from the earliest months of infancy a world of inner reality which increasingly influences reaction to the world of outer reality. Herein is found to lie both the content of the structure of psychic personality and also the essence of neurosis.

It is at this point that the work of W. R. D. Fairbairn becomes supremely relevant. With him there comes the explicit recognition that the Kleinian researches press toward and demand a completely revised theory of endopsychic structure. It is still upon Freud that we must build, but it must necessarily be both in the establishment of the most adequate Freudian insight and in the drastic reframing of the classic Freudian formulation. The result is the healing of the Freudian divorce between energy and structure, id and ego, and the decisive rejection of the atomistic tendencies which treated instincts, impulses, libido, as though they were some kind of mental entities. Libido is more basic than aggression (*pace* Klein). But it is not libido that seeks, but the libidinal ego; and what it seeks is not pleasure but the object and right relationship with it. So growth consists in the movement from infantile dependence, marked by a truly personal interdependence, a capacity for giving and receiving.

It is because of frustration in the establishment of early satisfactory object relationships that trouble arises. The "object" is internalised and split into a good object and a bad object in the inner phantasy world; and the process inevitably carries with it a corresponding internalisation and split of the ego. Thus is set up an inner arena of relationships perpetuating infantile dependence. Here, and not in the Oedipus situation, is to be found the ultimate

cause of psychosis. It is when the ego has to operate defensively in its struggles against the problems of this early period in which internal bad objects were created that the psychoneuroses appear.

It is to the charting of the territory I have here outlined that a recent volume in the International Psycho-Analytical Library[1] is devoted. Apart from a tendency towards unnecessary repetitiveness in the earlier sections of the book, Mr. Guntrip has done a magnificent job. He is a disciple of Fairbairn, who in *Psychoanalytic Studies of the Personality* gave us a decade ago the fruits of his research. He follows his master closely, and there is consequently little in this book in the way of conclusions that is new. But he does provide an impressive contextual survey of the psychoanalytical field, and in the important and baffling matter of "regression" he does point us beyond Fairbairn's position. Material is amassed, related, and assessed with competence, and the whole is informed by a pleasing clarity of presentation.

This is an area of investigation that is relevant to the Minister and his task. It is to be hoped that we are outgrowing the facile identification of psychology and pastoral theology, of psychotherapy and pastoral ministration. Nevertheless, it would be an equally damaging error to imagine that we can afford to ignore all light thrown by the sciences upon human personality. We must know our God; we must also know our man. At this point the psychological contribution is only one among many. But it may prove to be crucial.

Still Mr. Guntrip should be treated with critical caution and not be accepted too readily. I confess that I always react to the psychodynamic theory of Fairbairn with deep-rooted suspicion. For the fact is that from a Christian point of view it is almost too good to be true. The primary unity of the ego, the priority of libido to aggression, of love to hate, the basic place of interpersonal relationships for all growth towards maturity, the living in the two worlds of inner phantasy and outer reality, the determining nature of infantile dependence—all this and so much more lends itself so readily to the drawing of straight lines from psychology to orthodox belief. It is all so convenient. And the Church is always prone to put its money on the most attractive secular horse, without too much regard for its pedigree, its stamina, or its respectibility. It should not be forgotten that, among his peers, Fairbairn remains very much out on a limb.

Yet, if caution be maintained, certain provisional suggestions may be advanced. This theory of personality structure is clinically based, logically coherent, and tied fast to commonsense. I think it may be forcefully argued that the true way forward does lie in

[1] *Personality Structure and Human Interaction*, by H. Guntrip. The Hogarth Press Ltd. 45s. 1961.

the building upon Freudian foundations. And this needs saying if only because so much of modern Christian thinking has made use of and related itself to the theories of Jung rather than Freud. I think also that one of the main reasons for this is not far to seek. It is surely due to the assumption that the Jungian emphases are the most congenial to the Christian position. Superficially this might seem indisputable, but a more discerning investigation does not provide confirmation. In one of his later writings Erich Fromm probed this issue, and enabled us to see quite clearly that the Christian warfare is not with Sigmund Freud but with his erstwhile colleague. It is not the least of the indirect gifts of Mr. Guntrip's study that it helps to buttress the conviction that in its relevant emphases Christian belief is on the side not only of the angels but also of reality.

Two further volumes in the Old Testament Library[2] maintain the high standard already set. Needless to say the commentary on Exodus is the work of a first-classs scholar who, despite his familiar concern with oral tradition and form criticism, holds to the fundamental importance of the analysis of sources and is careful both in text and exposition to distinguish, relate and contrast the familiar J, E, and P. The Yahwistic compilation is assigned, in accordance with contemporary trends, to the period of the united kingdom, and P is dated in the usual fashion; but Noth is suitably and wisely cautious in his attitude to the Elonistic document. Against Rudolph and Volz he maintains belief in E as a separate source, but he is hesitant as to the possibilities whether of dating or of reconstruction.

If this work is compared with Von Rad's Genesis, there becomes apparent a certain loss of profundity, or artistry, of theological penetration. Partly this is due to the difference in material to be treated. Genesis leads itself more readily to the broad canvas. Exodus has indeed the high points in Mosaic call, deliverance, and covenant-making, but P increasingly forces his preoccupations to the front and ties the commentator to the minutiae of exegesis. Yet perhaps this is not the whole story. The student who is unfamiliar with Noth's post-war work on the Pentateuch should be alert to and constantly reminding himself of a problem of historical scepticism. For this continental scholar the history of Israel properly begins after the settlement in Palestine, the traditions of the earlier period are not in general of primary historical value, and Moses is not of pivotal significance in the Exodus story. Is it perhaps because of the inevitable suspension of judgment about the faith of Israel in its desert days that this commentary, outstanding

[2] *Exodus*, by Martin Noth. S.C.M. Press Ltd. 40s. 1962. *Theology of the Old Testament*, Vol. I, by Walter Eichrodt. S.C.M. Press Ltd. 50s. 1961.

as it is, seems at times to be lacking both life and depth ? Nevertheless, the governing word must be one of grateful recognition of a wealth of painstaking and accurate exegesis.

Whatever may be lacking in Noth's exposition is amply provided in the translation of Eichrodt's first volume. Of any work such as this we must ask two questions. How successful is it in grappling with the problems involved in the writing of an Old Testament Theology ? How far within the approach chosen does it do justice to the material ? On both counts the positive verdict must be awarded.

The author devotes a concluding appendix to the examination of the principles determining the recent Old Testament Theology of Gerhard von Rad. This latter presentation which conceives the expositor's task to be basically the echoing of the Old Testament's own historical and confessional recital, which bears marked resemblance to the standpoint of Ernest Wright, and which abhors all preoccupation with the theological world of Israel's faith, is in stark contrast to Eichrodt's own position. He defends that position still, with its search for Israel's unique realm of belief, its attempt to proceed in a systematic way that yet does justice to historical movement, its grasp of the covenant concept as epitomising God's action in history and thus as providing the key that will open up the Old Testament in its structural unity. So the present volume discusses the law and cultus of the covenant, delineates the nature of the covenant God, and discusses the covenant officials and leaders, whether prophets, priests, or kings.

It is hard to realise that this work was prepared as long ago as 1933. Granted that what we have is a revised edition, it yet remains a staggering achievement. It is so very markedly a book of the nineteen sixties, giving the impression that Old Testament scholarship has just about caught up with Eichrodt. The learning is massive, the style pleasing even in translation, the references to the relevant literature discerning and comprehensive. Throughout the author betrays an openness towards evidence that refuses to twist and distort for the sake of fitting a hallowed pattern or confirming a current theory. Consequently he is not among the extremists on any issue, and may be adjudged by some to be unduly conservative in his critical conclusions. But whatever be the verdict on this detail or that, the overwhelming impression left is of one who has really stepped inside the faith of ancient Israel. The best of the continental scholarship of the last forty years has been sifted, assessed, and pressed into fruitful order by a master hand. Amid so much of merit it is arbitrary to grade or select. But I cannot forbear to single out for special mention the treatment of early prophetism, for this is a field that seldom obtains in English works the illuminating exposition it requires. Perhaps we are at

last beginning to appreciate the crucial impact of the Solomonic monarchy upon the faith and cultus of amphictyonic Israel, and thence the lines that must be drawn from the political disturbances of the 8th and 9th centuries and the prophetic participation therein to the Elohist historical document and even to Deuteronomy itself. This is not Eichrodt's direct concern. But he has an unerring sense for the big issues of faith and the two contingencies of the history that brings them to birth. The translator records his own conviction that "this is incomparably the greatest book in its field." From a more limited knowledge I gladly underline and confirm that assessment.

The appearance of No. 33 in the Studies in Biblical Theology series[3] remind us that much water has flowed under the bridge since the first of these monographs appeared; and increasingly there are to be heard suggestions that "biblical theology" has had its day. Professor Barr, in his recent work *The Semantics of Biblical Language,* launched an unhibited frontal attack upon some of the familiar techniques of its characteristic exponents and left a multitude of searching question marks across the field. In his present study he concentrates his troops on a narrower area and examines the work of Marsh, Cullmann, and J. A. T. Robinson on the so-called biblical concept of time, in so far as they apply certain lexical procedures in their understanding of such key words as *kaires, chronos,* aion. A mighty sledgehammer is wielded to crack a fragile nut.

The author deplores the shift of attention from accurate translations and textual commentaries to the word-studies and the theological dictionaries. He criticises the easy assumption that biblical terminology teaches us truth. He demands that we refuse to allow the interpretation of words in terms of some general context of biblical thinking to divert our attention away from a strict examination of actual syntactical contexts. He is extremely doubtful whether there can be said to be a biblical view of time in any meaningful sense whatever. And he concludes from these particular criticisms that current ways of viewing and stating both the unity and the distinctiveness of Scripture will need to be drastically modified.

Is he wholly right? Clearly he has uncovered some flimsy foundations. A theory and a technique have led some biblical expositors to propound conclusions that in certain respects fly in the face of plain incontrovertible scriptural usage. There has grown up a mystique about biblical words that badly needed challenging. But I fancy that the wise man will refuse to be stampeded or to draw too many far-reaching conclusions too quickly. "Words are symbols, and symbols, moreover, which

[3] *Biblical Words for Time,* by J. Barr. S.C.M. Press Ltd. 13s. 6d. 1962.

disclose something of the realities they express." So John Marsh has written. James Barr objects, and partly ridicules. But important as semantics may be, it is folly in this day and age to imagine that any of us lack or should lack philosophical presuppositions. Perhaps it is in this area that the battle must be continued.

Meanwhile, I can imagine Professor Barr at work with a blue pencil on Volume 5 of the series: *Religious Perspectives*.[4] Its author is one of the commanding American Old Testament scholars of our time, whose reluctance to write has impoverished us all. But now at last we have from him a small but challenging study in Israel's ethis and ethics of which it might be commendation enough to say that it stands in the tradition of Paul Minear's *Eyes of Faith*. The way of the Word, the symbols of the way, the beginning of the way, the way of the leaders, the way of worship, the way of the future—these are chapter headings which prepare us for the approach that Professor Muilenburg would take. He cuts open the historical life of Israel, and with deft strokes provides us with the cross-section that invites us to look within. He is not blind to the shifts of historical progression, but his emphasis is on unity and distinctiveness. He shares, though at a deeper level, the insight of Matthew Arnold, who would declare that it is this people Israel which knows the way the world is going.

This is no pioneer work. It tells a familiar story. Yet its author has seen and expounded with unsurpassed clarity the eternal significance of the Old Testament, and he writes with a rare verve and power. Amid the mass of superficially similar presentations his prophetic call could so easily be passed over and disregarded. It should not be.

Perhaps it is salutary to step at last outside the charmed circle of faith and confront the apologetic task, to question our assumptions, to ask concerning the rationality of our belief. A slim volume[5] which is subtitled *The Logic of Religious Belief* promises to be a relevant guide, and those who sampled the author's previous work *Language and Christian Belief* will expect the working of a keen mind and know something of the way they will be asked to tread. Because we cannot oppose faith and reason we need philosophy. We must enquire about the logical status of our religious assertions. We must distinguish the various types of these assertions. We must face the problems of verification and falsification. Such a programme involves Mr. Wilson in some acute criticism of the attitudes of contemporary Christian thinkers, of Coulson, Mackintyre, and

[4] *The Way of Israel*, by J. Muilenburg. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. 15s. 1962.

[5] *Philosophy and Religion*, by John Wilson. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d. 1961.

Farrer. It leads him more positively to conclude that the religious claims of primary significance are the assertions that appear to express "facts about the supernatural," that the attempt to provide a firm rational foundation for such assertions must proceed by way of religious experience, that religious experience can qualify as cognitive experience, that a way of testing informative religious assertions can be envisaged. All this is valuable, and much may be valid. But the justification of this study lies, it seems to me, not in its affirmatory conclusions, tentative as they are, but in the clarification of thought that it provides and in its stubborn refusal either to abate the claim for commitment or to countenance the irrationality of faith. We may not be entirely clear as to what it is that we should be saying to our generation. But at least we should be utterly clear that there are certain things we cannot and must not say. Religious assertions do not fill in the gaps left by science. They are not self-justified in the sense that no evidence should be expected for them outside themselves. They do not derive validity solely on the basis of authority. We must cease to argue in these kinds of ways. For in the end, to forsake rationality is to destroy faith.

N. CLARK

Reviews

Karl Barth, *Theology and Church.* 358 pp. 37s. 6d. S.C.M. Press

This volume is the sixth in a small series which the S.C.M. Press is issuing as *The Preacher's Library;* the series has the excellent aim of helping "preachers in the basic problems of their task of proclaiming the Christian Gospel under modern conditions."

Will this book, consisting of twelve lectures delivered by Barth between 1920 and 1926 and an introduction by Prof. T. F. Torrance, achieve this aim? Any preacher who reads it must be prepared for some hard thinking; but would not much preaching be stronger if it derived from harder thinking? Some will make the judgment that much of the material is too academic to help the preacher, and this probably is a true judgment about Barth's discussions of the theological positions of Schleiermacher, Feuerbach and Wilhelm Herrmann, who was Barth's teacher in Marburg.

Yet careful reading of these lectures takes one beyond the academic to fundamental questions about the nature of religion, and that must always be the concern of the preacher.

The introduction by Professor T. F. Torrance, occupying 54 pages, is a valuable addition to the book; after a short description of Barth's development, the purpose of the introduction is stated to be not an exposition of Barth's mature theology, but an attempt "to reveal the context in which it is to be understood, to show the direction in which it has moved, and to indicate the great concerns in connection with which it has been elaborated." The introduction then discusses the themes of theology and culture, theology and the church, theology and secular knowledge.

In 1918 Barth published his *Commentary on Romans.* Not everyone will agree with Prof. Torrance's assertion that "Karl Barth is the greatest theological genius that has appeared on the scene for centuries," but few could deny that the *Commentary on Romans* initiated a new era in Protestant theology, or that Barth's Church Dogmatics, which began to be published in 1940, constitute a major contribution, perhaps the outstanding contribution, to theology in the 20th century. Barth may prove to be as significant as Aquinas or Calvin.

The importance of the present book is that it gathers writings from Barth's formative period after his *Commentary,* and before he began his Dogmatics. In these lectures he is wrestling with concepts of revelation, of the Word of God, of the nature of Christ, of the

function and authority of the church. In all this he is concerned about the Christian task of witness. What is it that the preacher has to communicate? What does the church bear witness to?

To such questions Protestants and Catholics offer different answers. In two important essays Barth formulates his thought over against the Catholic position. Barth insists that Protestants and Catholics must take one another seriously, and be prepared to enter into true conversation: "In the Christian Church there is truly a Master and a Lord"; so that if Protestants claim to be a church, to be in the church of which Christ is Lord "We are in the same room with the church which calls itself the Roman Catholic Church." Protestants and Catholics, who differ so much, obey the same Lord and are in the same "church-room." Once we come to this realization we know that the Roman Church, by its very existence, addresses questions to Protestans to which we should listen. Barth tries to listen and understand, even though he is not able to accept; indeed, he expresses evangelical conceptions of grace and faith with clarity and force. I find this essay a significant illustration of true ecumenical conversation.

In view of much modern discussion, I turned expectantly to the essay on *The Concept of the Church.* I found many sentences to reflect upon. "The Church is the place and instrument of the grace of God." "The splendour of the church can consist only in its hearing in poverty the Word of the eternally rich God, and making that Word heard by men." "By the fact that Christ took his cross upon himself, and became obedient unto death, the Church has been shown its position and nature." "The Church is holy so long as it obeys, not so far as it commands."

The word obedience can be applied to theology as well as to the church. ". . . theology consists essentially in the concrete obedience to concrete authority." This, of course, raises questions about the source and nature of authority, and about the nature and place of obedience. It is in regard to such questions that Barth's strong emphasis upon the authority of what is given by God, of the revealed Word of God which is Jesus Christ is made. Theology with its human discussions, formulations, intellectual propositions, must always seek to be in obedience to the Word, and this obedience implies the activity of service. "Such service to the Word is preeminently the purpose of the church, and it is also the purpose of theology in its specific place in the Church"; for theology serves the revelation when it serves the preaching.

In this book Barth the preacher becomes Barth the theologian, pondering deeply profound questions. Out of those years of strenuous discussion has come a theology which may serve Christian preaching everywhere, and so serve the Divine Word.

L. G. CHAMPION

Edmund Flood, *No Small Plan.* 118 pp. 14s. Denton, Longman and Todd.

This book is difficult to summarise because it is already, in a sense, a summary, endeavouring to outline the plan of God in history. It is a plan of friendship. God, the source of all that exists, uses his power for the benefit of man, to bring him into a close relationship with Himself. The result is a wholly new way of life. "We can, if we wish, take part in a development by which our manhood, like Christ's, is perfected by an unimaginable intimacy with God."

The plan is brought to focus in the Passover, the Last Supper and the Eucharist. At the Passover, with its sacrifice, commemoration of the Rescue and Covenant, and its meal, men were bound with God in the closest ties of friendship. The Last Supper differs from the Passover, as the New Testament differs from the Old, in that Jesus added "a new sight on God and how He acted with men." God was now acting through His Son to bring man to the Father. In Him this friendship was now offered. In the words over the bread and wine, Jesus made known, not only that somehow he became present in them, but especially as the Servant who made possible, by his death, a deeper intimacy with God—the new covenant in His Blood.

The continuation of this Salvation-History is the Eucharist, where God's plan is still at work, bringing us into fellowship with Himself through the action of Christ. This third section of the book was, for the present reviewer, by far the most interesting. It is a potted history of the Mass, pointing out what is essential and what is not. The five actions are clearly pointed out with a helpful commentary on each. All else leads up to the Eucharist, or simply confirms it. Here Christ is brought to present existence and as we join with Him in a movement to the Father (sacrifice) the plan of God is effected in us today. The final action, the Communion, only confirms that we are linked into a common unity and share the intimate companionship of Christ.

As you will have gathered, the author is a Roman Catholic. It is all the more delightful therefore to feel at home on so many of his pages. Here is the Biblical Scholarship for which we look, and we are not unduly surprised by such features as the special treatment of Peter (p, 29f) and the shabby treatment of preaching (p. 59)—or is it? There are some tantalizingly brief, though suggestive, references to "Real Presence," "Sacrifice" and "Transubstantiation." The third bears comparison with a chapter of Leenhardt's in *Essays on the Lord's Supper.*

The author is not uncritical of the present shape of the Mass and makes a plea for simple, direct and meaningful words and actions. This makes it surprising that he considers "that we no longer share in the same large piece of bread" as a not very serious loss. The

Mass must speak to us of the plan of God and make it effective for us today. We pride ourselves in more simple ways of worship that are easily understood, but we know that we too must learn this lesson. The liturgy must adequately express what God is doing. Our "orders of service," as deformed as the Mass though in different ways, so often do not.

It is not clear for whom this book is intended. There are notes at the back for the specialist, but it is written for that unknown quantity, the general reader. The writing is fresh, though sometimes the argument is difficult to follow. But the ecumenically minded, anxious to grow in common understanding, will be helped and pleasantly surprised. More's the pity that 117 pages between paper covers cost 14s.

M. H. TAYLOR

R. P. Martin (ed.), *Vox Evangelica,* Biblical and Historical Essays. 75 pp. 6s. Epworth Press.

This first volume of essays by members of the Faculty of the London Bible College sets a good standard. H. C. Oakley's contribution on "The Greek and Roman Background of the New Testament"' is a useful study with references to a number of N.T. passages. The political and religious environment of the first century Christians is sketched in some detail. But the Jewish element in the N.T. background cannot be ignored; not only because of its importance, but also because it cannot be dissociated from the Greek and Roman elements. To this extent the theme of the essay is something of an abstraction. The second essay by L. C. Allen deals with Isaiah 53 : 11. Following Professors G. R. Driver and D. Winton Thomas he translates the fifth word in the verse "by his submission," in place of the more familiar rendering "by his knowledge." Thomas has also sugested the same translation of this word in Daniel 12 : 4, and Mr. Allen sees in this another link between the thought of the book of Daniel and the Servant Songs. Allen then links Romans 5 : 19 with these O.T. passages and so finds yet another bit of evidence of the N.T. interpretation of the mission of Christ in terms of the Suffering Servant.

The third essays is contributed by the Editor on "The Composition of I Peter in Recent Study." Mr. Martin makes a careful summary of the attempts to find the Sitz-im-Leben of the epistle. He accepts the hypothesis that 1 : 3-4 : 11 is a baptismal address (or two addresses) but rejects the view of F. L. Cross that it is a liturgical document. He is rightly critical of Bultmann's attempt to reconstruct an early confession of faith from 3 : 18-22, and maintains that I Peter as a whole is a genuine letter.

Dr. Guthrie gives a good survey of the changing attitude towards

the idea of Pseudepigrapha in the New Testament from Luther's day to our own. The author's attitude is conservative, but not dogmatic. His essay, however, is somewhat inconclusive; as a discussion, however good, on the possibility of N.T. Pseudepigrapha cannot be based only on comparative external evidence, but must deal with the internal evidence of the documents in question. We hope Dr. Guthrie will undertake this further investigation with the same regard for objectivity of judgment as is revealed in this article.

The last essay on "A Nineteenth-Century Nestorius" by H. H. Rowdon is a revealing account of the persecution for heresy of B. W. Newton by another "Brother," J. N. Darby, from which the reviewer learned much. If this essay is more informative than edifying, this is not the fault of the author. Altogether here is excellent value for 6s., although the essays deserve a better binding.

GEORGE FARR

The Apostolic Fathers. An American Translation by Edgar J. Goodspeed. 18s. 6d. Independent Press.

This is the work of a distinguished scholar who won world renown by his translation of the New Testament and other works of New Testament scholarship, and has now been called to higher service. This is an admirable book. In addition to the translation, which is lively, vigorous and usually accurate, a brief introduction dealing with authorship, date, occasion and purpose prefaces each book. The original Greek editions have been carefully studied and compared, including a papyrus manuscript (the Michigan papyrus) of the Shepherd of Hermas, dated A.D. 250-275 and discovered in 1922. It is the first time this fragment has been included in a collection of the Apostolic Fathers. Dr. Goodspeed has made constant use of its testimony, in Campbell Bonner's fine edition (1934) to correct and improve Lake's text in his *Apostolic Fathers* in the Loeb Classical Library.

The author has also included a translation of the *Doctrina,* which he places first as almost the oldest and certainly the most primitive document in the list. No Greek manuscript of this curious little work has yet come to light, and the two known Latin manuscripts of it or part of it have been mistaken for translations of the *Didache.* Actually, as Dr. Goodspeed convincingly shows, it is the source of the Greek Didache, and of the Greek Barnabas, as well as of most of the later documents that have long been regarded as reproducing material from the Greek Didache. Evidence for this conclusion is set out in an Appendix.

Thus, this is not merely another translation of the Apostolic Fathers. It is a real contribution to patristic scholarship. There is,

however, no discussion of the controversy now surrounding the date of the Didache. It is simply described as a little church manual prepared, probably in the region of Antioch, toward the middle of the second century.

Dr. Goodspeed himself describes his version as a franker, more modern and unflinching translation than those of his predecessors. He also claims to have made advances at a few points in Greek lexicography. We are inclined to question the accuracy of his translation here and there. For instance, Ignatius, *Ephesians* 18: "My spirit is a humble sacrifice to the cross." The Greek *peripsema tou staurou* means "an offscouring for (lit. of) the cross," and the reference is to I Cor. 4: 13, which is obscured by Goodspeed's translation. Nevertheless on the whole the translation is excellent and reliable.

A. W. ARGYLE

G. Kitson Clark, *The Making of Victorian England.* 305 pp. 30s. Methuen.

In this discussion of factors which went into the creation of Victorian England one of Dr. Clark's main objectives has been to draw attention to movements and forces which have been hitherto neglected. The result is a book of consuming interest and one which will surely need to be pondered by future writers on this period. The author turns his attention to a variety of themes such as progress and survival, population, industrialization, the changing patterns in society and politics, and in every chapter there are the signs of original reflection on evidence brought out in his own and others' recent research. As an instance of the freshness of mind with which he has gone to the scene of operations one may mention his serious discussion of the drink problem and the temperance movement. Future historians are not going to accept all his conclusions on this or other matters but he has shown convincingly that they will neglect such questions only at the risk of a distorted picture.

It is fitting in this journal to emphasize the interest which the book will have for students of Church history. This is true not just because the longest chapter is devoted to "The Religion of the People" but because Dr. Clark's whole approach is conditioned by his belief that probably in no other century, except the 17th and perhaps the 12th, "did the claims of religion occupy so large a part in the nation's life, or did men speaking in the name of religion contrive to exercise so much power." The effect of this conviction is that we have a highly competent general historian seeking to understand and assess movements of religious life in 19th century England in a way which, so far as I am aware, has not been

attempted by anyone since Halévy. The element of detachment, coupled with a real effort to judge sympathetically and fairly, results in a new look and stimulating comment even on questions which in themselves are familiar ground to Church historians. It is true of course that there are insights and appreciations which can only be gained from within and Free Church readers will feel this at certain points as much as any. They will, for example, question the author's judgment when after several very pertinent remarks on the decline of Nonconformity at the close of the Victorian era, he goes on to say that "probably more than other religious bodies they had drawn their strength from ways of thought and expression which were native to the nineteenth century and were now becoming obsolete." This is on the way to becoming a general comment on the nature of Nonconformity and as such will not stand close scrutiny. There is an error of fact on page 43 for it is not correct that after 1871 all posts and prizes at the older universities were open to Free Churchmen; there are divinity chairs from which they are still debarred, an anomaly in this ecumenical age which surely calls for rectification. But these are details which by no means detract from the fact that there is much for us and other denominations to ponder in this refreshing discussion and Dr. Clark will only rejoice if anything he says stimulates research among people such as ourselves. He is, let it be said, a good friend of research students, including persons to whom he has no direct teaching responsibility. He will have had mixed emotions over the fact that a book which he dedicated to Dr. G. M. Trevelyan came off the press but a few weeks before that great historian's death.

G. W. RUSLING