

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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



incorporating the Transactions of the
BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITORIAL

THE Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society will be held at 4.15 p.m. in the Baptist Church House Library on Monday, 30th April, 1956. The speaker will be the Rev. M. E. Aubrey, C.H., M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., and his subject: "P. T. Thomson—Pioneer."

The usual business will be transacted. Attendances at these annual gatherings have been most encouraging in recent years, and we hope for a good representation of members and friends on this occasion also. For their convenience it is hoped to arrange for tea to be served at a reasonable charge.

* * * *

Through the kindness of Sir Angus Watson, J.P., we recently received, and read with enjoyment, a copy of his little book, printed last year for private circulation, *The Angus Clan, 1588-1950*. It contains much that is of interest to Baptists for although, as the author confesses, "an accident of locality" made him a Congregationalist, the stock from which he springs was predominantly Baptist. Both his parents were Baptists and, moreover, children of the manse. His father, Alexander Watson, was the son of the blind minister, Rev. James Watson, of Montrose, and nephew of Dr. Jonathan Watson, minister at Dublin Street, Edinburgh. Sir Angus's mother was the daughter of Rev. Thomas Wilkinson who spent a lifetime in the Baptist pastorate at Tewkesbury. It is here that he links up

with "The Angus Clan," for Thomas Wilkinson's mother was, before her marriage, Ann Angus. The family is traced back to the settlement in Hexham in 1584 of one Alexander Angus. Of this family, members of which have figured prominently in the life and work of our denomination, Sir Angus writes: "For centuries they have been Free Churchmen, mostly Baptists, Liberal in politics, and active in all kinds of social work." We are grateful to the author for the gift of this interesting and illuminating little book to the Historical Society's library.

* * * *

" 'Mill Yard' faces extinction " declared Pastor James McGeachey in a letter from London to the Seventh Day Baptist Missionary Society requesting assistance for "the old mother church," according to a report in the *Seventh Day Baptist Year Book*, 1955 (published by the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference at Plainfield, N.J.) which has recently been received by us. The Society could not, however, see its way to responding to the request. Other Baptists beside Sabbatarians would regret the extinction of this historic church which, for some years now, has been meeting "on the Sabbath, commonly called Saturday," in a room on the premises of our Upper Holloway Church in North London. But with only nineteen members (annual budget, £200) the old church does not face very bright prospects.

A membership in the U.S.A. of 6,095 is reported in the *Year Book*. There are also Baptist Sabbath-keepers, affiliated to the Conference, in Africa (1,259), Jamaica (751), British Guiana (121), Germany (299), Denmark (112), with two churches in New Zealand and one in China, in addition to the solitary church in London. Other Sabbatarians, not gathered into organized churches, also exist. Closely associated with the Conference are Alfred University, N.Y. (at whose School of Theology ministers are trained), Milton College, Wisconsin, and Salem College, W. Virginia. The Conference is affiliated to the World Council of Churches and, although not now in membership, maintains friendly correspondence with the Baptist World Alliance and was represented by a delegate at the London Congress of the Alliance last year. Among other activities there is an active Historical Society which, on the occasion of the 200th anniversary last year of Dr. Johnson's celebrated dictionary, exhibited in the Plainfield Public Library, three dictionaries of Nathaniel Bailey, which were the working basis of Johnson's 1755 compilation. Bailey was a member of the Mill Yard church.

* * * *

Amalgamation of two old-established Bedford printing firms has recently taken place. One of them is Messrs. Rush & Warwick (Bedford) Ltd., upon whose presses, for some years, this journal has

been printed. The firm has been in existence for about a century and has specialised in book and magazine printing. One important development following upon the merger is the institution of a co-partnership plan by which the employees of the Foundry Press Ltd., as the new company is called, will share in the profits. We extend our good wishes to the new enterprise.

* * * *

A manuscript, *History of the Baptist Church at Burnham-on-Crouch, Essex*, by Rev. Lionel F. Higgs has been given by the writer to the Baptist Historical Society and will be deposited in its library. The manuscript represents a good deal of painstaking work by Mr. Higgs, and the Society is grateful to him for the gift.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

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

LIONEL F. HIGGS,
Minister, Burnham-on-Crouch.

J. R. C. PERKIN, B.A., D.Phil.,
Minister, Altrincham,

RUTH SLADE,
Member, Baptist Historical Society.

J. B. SKEMP, M.A., Ph.D.,
Professor of Greek, Durham University.

Reviews by G. W. HUGHES, B.A., B.D., J. I. JONES, M.A., B.D.,
E. A. PAYNE, M.A., D.D., H. H. ROWLEY, C. SMITH, M.A.

The Church of Scotland on Baptism

Comments upon the *Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism* (Church of Scotland Offices, 121, George Street, Edinburgh, 2. Price 2s.).

"I THINK we shall avoid much disquietude," wrote F. J. A. Hort to a friend, "by laying it down as a preliminary axiom that we must not expect ever to get to the bottom of the meaning of baptism." Were Hort alive today, however, he would at least have little reason to be dissatisfied with the amount of attention now being paid to this subject, for not since the 16th and 17th centuries has Baptism been examined with such thoroughness as during the last few decades. As a result, much material for a fresh judgment is being accumulated, and it may be helpful to summarize briefly the trend of recent opinion as outlined by the German scholar, Joachim Jeremias. Up till the early 1920s, Jeremias says, it was a common opinion amongst scholars that Infant Baptism is not mentioned in the New Testament, and therefore was presumably not known to the Church of that day. From 1927 onwards, this opinion has been increasingly challenged on the basis of evidence drawn from non-Christian sources, and especially from the Jewish practice of proselyte baptism. Finally, the relevant New Testament passages have been studied afresh in the light of the latest developments in Biblical criticism. The conclusion (we are told) is that our picture of the New Testament position must now be revised, and we must regard Infant Baptism as well-established in the thought and practice of the Early Church.

This is a development of opinion which merits the fullest scrutiny on the part of Baptists. As Jeremias has said, it has hitherto been widely accepted that, whatever the later practice of the Christian Church came to be, the New Testament at least could not be cited in favour of Infant Baptism. Even Paedo-baptists admitted as much. To quote a leading Congregationalist: "The New Testament affords no positive and indisputable evidence that children were baptized in the Apostolic Age. The justification of Infant Baptism is ultimately theological rather than historical."¹

¹ N. Micklem, *Christian Worship*, p. 248.

But those words were written twenty years ago, and it is clear that they would not be allowed to pass unchallenged today. It is therefore with special interest that one takes up the Interim Report on Baptism which has recently been prepared by a Special Commission of the Church of Scotland. The Committee's report consists of 54 closely printed pages, and is as remarkable for the spirit in which it is written as for the number and variety of the issues with which it deals. It forms what I can only call a kind of baptismal manifesto. Indeed, its tone suggests that the authors regard its contents as almost in the nature of a revelation. The Report is not likely to appeal to Baptists in that light; but we must at least pay tribute to the notable industry and zest with which the members of the Scottish Commission have thus far discharged their task. We are indebted to them for having made unmistakably plain the crucial importance of the issues which they have raised. The Christological significance of Baptism, in particular, has never been more powerfully presented, and, amongst much other important matter, this deserves the closest attention.

The character of the Report makes it impossible to do more within the compass of a short review than comment upon some outstanding features. At the outset, Baptists should notice that the Report quite frankly attempts to discredit Believers' Baptism—or rather that interpretation of Believers' Baptism which the authors think is implied by that term. (That their interpretation is erroneous will be obvious at once to Baptists, who do not find the same difficulty in distinguishing between Believers' Baptism and Adult Baptism as this Report does. But that is by the way.) Thus we read: "Those who adhere to 'believers' Baptism,' as it is called, baptising adults only, definitely exclude infant Baptism, thus laying down a law, where the New Testament lays down no law, fixing the age of Baptism. It is certainly wrong to limit Baptism to adult age where the New Testament does not do so, particularly since the very nature of its whole teaching points in the opposite direction" (p. 19). Again: "There is not a word in the New Testament about so-called 'believers' Baptism' . . . the idea of 'believers' Baptism' exclusive of infants is entirely modern, bound up with the Renaissance idea of human individualism and autonomy, and representing a radical divergence from the Biblical teaching about the nature of man" (p. 20). Once more: "The Word of God does not fix the age of Baptism, nor delimit precisely the operation of the Spirit. Therefore to systematise the actions of Christ in Baptism according to some rational pattern of our own . . . by requiring the priority in time of faith to Baptism . . . is to do wrong. Such systematisation is an attempt to control the Holy Spirit" (p. 52). (One is tempted at this point to ask whether, on the authors' presuppositions, it is not equally wrong to make a practice of exhorting parents to bring

their infants to Baptism, lest that too should be "systematizing" the actions of Christ).

In marked contrast to this brusque dismissal of Believers' Baptism are the claims made in the Report on behalf of Infant Baptism. The authors state roundly: "The whole of the Early Church was unanimous about infant Baptism for centuries" (p. 20). The only support offered for this claim, apart from passing references to Tertullian and Origen, is the further statement that "for 400 years at least there was no dispute about infant Baptism in the Church" (*ib.*) Of Tertullian, it is noted that he subsequently retracted the suggestion which he once made to depart from the practice of Infant Baptism (although in fact the evidence for Tertullian's so-called retraction is really very slight); while Origen (whose work is strangely allotted to the second century) is credited with having said that "infant Baptism had been practised in his family from the very beginning of the Christian Church" (*ib.*). (We ought surely to have been given the reference for this remarkable statement). In making these assertions the authors plainly attach no importance to the fact that neither the description of the rite of Baptism in Justin Martyr, nor the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem, nor—still more significantly—the treatise by Gregory of Nyssa "On the early deaths of Infants," give any hint of the existence of Infant Baptism as a regular practice in the Church of their day. Further, the Report apparently regards it as quite irrelevant that such sons of devout Christian mothers as Basil of Caesarea and Augustine of Hippo were not baptized as infants. The authors are content to declare roundly: "The unanimous view of the Ancient Catholic Church predisposes us to regard infant Baptism as the unchallenged practice of the Christian Church from the very beginning" (p. 20).

Bearing in mind this admission (which reads somewhat strangely in view of the expressed intention of the authors to let the Scriptures speak for themselves—*vide* page 4), it is instructive to turn to those sections of the Report where the New Testament evidence is examined in detail. A discussion of this is out of the question here, and must be left to the New Testament exegetes. Yet even a reader who welcomes the more constructive approach which is characteristic of much modern biblical scholarship, may well wonder whether it can legitimately be held to justify quite such a wholesale revaluation of the biblical material on Baptism as is offered here. For, on the strength of the liturgical principles referred to in the Introduction, we are invited to believe that, in the case of all the usual debatable passages—the Blessing of the Children, the Baptism of Households, the Relation of Baptism to Circumcision, not to speak of any others—the case for Infant Baptism must now be regarded as finally proved. Even such

references to children as are found in 1 *John* ii. 1 and ii. 18 are pressed into the service of this new exegesis! Ultimately, the authors conclude: "Not only does the New Testament bear clear and widespread traces of infant Baptism throughout its pages, but it reveals a doctrine of Baptism which requires the Church to baptize its children" (p. 29). This is carrying the war into the enemy's camp with a vengeance! But the dogmatic tone of such language makes one wonder whether in fact the authors are quite as convinced of the validity of their arguments as they would have us believe. Is it possible that the contemporary situation in Scottish parishes has anything to do with it? It would be revealing to know what response the Commission gets to its request that the Presbyteries shall study the Report in outline, and give their findings.

A particularly notable feature of the Report is its failure to distinguish between the language appropriate to the Baptism of Believers and that used of infant baptism. Hitherto, many Paedobaptists have recognized the necessity of some such distinction. For example, C. F. D. Moule: "It is disingenuous (or, at best, ignorant) to transfer to Infant Baptism a weight of doctrine and a wealth of promises which, in the New Testament, are associated only with a responsible adult experience."² But the authors of this Report commonly subsume the Baptism of infants under that of their elders, on the assumption that all the members of a Christian household are included within the covenantal relationship which God has established through Christ. They refer, it is true, to the need for repentance and faith in connection with Baptism, and acknowledge that, in the New Testament period, "Adult converts were of course always baptized on the profession of their faith in Jesus as Lord" (p. 20). They say: "*Christian Baptism* is thus neither ritual purification, nor *ex opere operato* ceremony, but a *divine ordinance involving the proclamation of the Word of God and the obedience of faith in which the baptized are saved by the power of Christ's resurrection from the dead*" (p. 13). Again: "Apart from repentance and faith *Christian Baptism* is unthinkable" (p. 49). Yet their emphasis falls throughout on the corporate rather than the individual aspect of Baptism. Thus: "The *Christian Sacrament* of Baptism properly dates from the pouring out of the Holy Spirit upon the Church at Pentecost" (p. 10). Again: The Body of Christ in the New Testament is "the new humanity which was born of the Spirit in the midst of, and out of, our sinful humanity. . . . That crucified and risen Body of Christ is the Body into which the Church is incorporated in Baptism, so that it becomes through the Spirit one with the Body of Christ" (p. 30). In fact, what the authors are chiefly interested in is clearly not the faith of a candidate prior to Baptism, but his growth in grace within the Christian

² *Theology*, Nov. 1945.

Church afterwards. Of course, the notion that the faith of the Church actively supports that of the candidate is not new. It has long been a stock argument in defence of Infant Baptism. (Compare the essay of Dr. Micklem already quoted in which he says: "Baptism has no efficacy apart from faith. In infant Baptism the faith is that of the Church, not of the child"). What is new in this Report is the extraordinary stress laid upon the act of Baptism *per se*, introducing the candidate as it does into the Church as the Body of Christ, and so into the living presence and power of Jesus Christ, who is active to redeem and regenerate His people. Compared with this tremendous fact, it seems that the personal attitude of those who are baptized pales into insignificance. Thus the Report: "Though Baptism calls for our personal response, it is not the Sacrament of our repentance, nor of our faith, but of God's adoption and His promise of the Spirit. In Baptism it is He who adds us to the Church which is the Body of Christ. In the New Covenant infants who are baptised learn to call on the Name of God because they have been baptised . . ." (p. 21). "Baptism in the name of Christ is Baptism *in the sphere where Christ reveals His name and works miracles by the power of the Holy Spirit. . .* It is into that sphere of miracle that our children are baptized, the sphere where the whole person, in the unity of body and soul, is the object of the Spirit's operation. Baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus Christ is thus no mere ecclesiastical reception or dedication, but in very truth an ordinance commanded by Christ in which He acts supernaturally by the power of His Spirit. This gives us the greatest confidence in the Baptism of our children and in the hallowing of the Christian home which rests upon the Sacrament" (p. 17). Such language makes one wonder why the benefits claimed for Infant Baptism should be restricted to the children of "Christian homes," especially in view of what the authors say later about the Blessing of the Children in the Gospels. Consider the following: "Was the blessing of the children by Jesus efficacious or not? To that we can only answer: It was without doubt efficacious. Christ's blessing of the infants makes them capable of receiving the Holy Spirit. These children were taken up in the arms of the Word made flesh, their Creator. He who made them, creates in them the capacity for receiving Him. The capacity for receiving Christ must never be judged in terms of the receiver but in terms of Christ the Giver who gives Himself to us. But if these infant children are by His blessing made capable of receiving Him, who can forbid them to be baptized into the name of the Christ who so blesses them?" (p. 25). Granted such presuppositions, we in turn can only answer: Who, indeed? But why, then, not baptize all infants?

The truth is, the authors never really succeed in making clear what they suppose happens in Baptism, least of all in the Baptism

of infants. We are repeatedly told that the rite places its recipients under the care of the Church, and within the sphere of the Holy Spirit's quickening and sanctifying energies. With such ideas, many Baptists will not be disposed to quarrel, for they express something which we gladly recognize as akin to the purposes of our own Infant Dedication Services. But to imagine that this disposes of the objections to Infant Baptism is to miss the real point. As F. J. Leenhardt has said: "On dit souvent, en faveur du baptême des enfants, des choses excellentes à tout point de vue, qui n'ont que le défaut de ne pas être appropriées à ce sacrement."³ Baptists do not reject Infant Baptism on the ground that it sets forth the love of Christ for infants and obeys His will that His Church should receive and care for them. They oppose it because they believe that the use of water in this service perverts the scriptural meaning of Baptism, and so endangers the conception of the Church as a society of believers in Jesus Christ. Certainly this Report will do little to reassure them on these points. Rather the reverse. For there runs through it the persistent assumption that to bring an infant within the "sphere" of Christ's presence and activity (to use the term frequently employed here) is *ipso facto* the same thing as his becoming personally united with Christ. Thus, starting from the fact that at Pentecost the disciples were baptized with the Holy Spirit, the authors continue: "*This corporate Baptism of the Church stands behind the Baptism of every individual and is prior to every administration of the Sacrament of Baptism.* It is only through and within the Church created by this corporate Baptism that true administration of the Sacrament of Baptism can take place. When an individual is baptized within this Church he too is baptized into Christ who was born of the Spirit, who died, and who rose again. Hence his Baptism is his new birth, the beginning of a new life in the Spirit, in which he grows up in knowledge and stature into the manhood of Christ. That is why the Baptism of children born of parents within the Church is so right that it is taken for granted in the New Testament" (p. 32). Baptism, we are told, is "the Sacrament of regeneration, in which we are born anew in Christ and He is formed anew in us" (p. 41). "Being 'baptized into the name of Christ' thus means being baptized into Christ Himself, so that we are grafted together with Him in a real and substantial union, as Calvin usually puts it. . . . It is a living union that grows throughout our whole life and is continually nourished by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The child baptised into Christ is grafted into Him as a branch in the Vine" (p. 18). (The Report admits that "the logic of infant incorporation into the Body of Christ" seems to demand also infant participation in the Lord's Supper. But it rejects this conclusion on the ground that Baptism

³ *Le Baptême chrétien*, p. 70.

is "an act done upon us 'as little children,' but in the Lord's Supper the command is: 'This *do* in remembrance of me'" (p. 28). The weakness of this answer when considered in relation, at least, to the possibility of child-communicants, speaks for itself).

In the light of such teaching, the question may fairly be asked whether the attempt to correlate the Christian Church with the Living Christ is not here pressed to the point at which it falls under the same condemnation as that which the authors of this Report pronounce upon heresies which confound the divine and human natures of Christ. It is one thing to say, in accordance with *Romans vi.*, that "we were buried with Christ by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life," when the candidate is one who thereby professes his personal repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. But it is surely quite another thing to apply this language to infants who are incapable of a personal decision, and to assume that in their case admission into the "operational sphere" of the Holy Spirit is identical with personal adhesion to Christ. Hard as the fact must ever be to accept, the call of Jesus Christ comes to men one by one. He addresses them, not as members of a particular family or tribe or nation, but as responsible individuals, who cannot be admitted to discipleship by proxy, but must make their own personal decision upon His claims. The solemn words of Jesus: "If anyone comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children . . . yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple," remain as a standing warning against every temptation to whittle down the crucial demand of the Gospel for personal repentance and faith.

Thus, in spite of the high intentions of this Report, it is to be feared that it will do little through its doctrine of Baptism to evoke that personal dedication to Christ which its authors plainly desire, and which, in our totalitarian age, seems likely to be our final bulwark in defence of human freedom and responsibility before God. For while the authors admit that "it is total immersion that supplies the ordinance with its most vivid representation" (p. 46), they cannot apparently see that the act of Baptism (whether by immersion or by sprinkling) only becomes *sacramental* when the candidate concerned is able to make it the vehicle of his own personal adhesion to Jesus Christ, thus glorifying the Lord whose Spirit at once initiates and seals the ordinance which His Church observes.

These are but preliminary observations. The final test of this Report will be the extent to which the authors may be judged to have observed their own principle: "*We must try hard to be true and faithful to the distinctive outlook of the Bible and to what the New Testament says to us, letting its teaching criticise us in order that our conceptions and formulations may be re-formed in obedi-*

ence to the mind of Christ" (p. 5). For the real question with which we are all faced today is not when or how the Early Church first began to practise Infant Baptism, but whether the introduction of this rite was an inspired interpretation of the mind of Christ, or was not rather, as Baptists are constrained to believe, such a deviation from it as history and experience alike suggest has done great harm and seriously endangered the very existence of the Ordinance entrusted by Christ to His people. To the fresh examination of that question this Report challenges us all.

R. L. CHILD.

A Baptist Bibliography. Section C-Colby, edited by Edward C. Starr. (American Baptist Historical Society, 1954).

Attention has already been called to earlier sections of this great bibliography. The nearly 300 pages of this fourth section go as far as a series of entries on Colby College, Waterville. They include the fullest bibliographical lists yet prepared regarding William Carey and John Clifford, and are therefore of the greatest importance for British Baptists. Those dealing with Carey occupy fifteen pages; those with Clifford, eight pages. Other British entries of special interest concern writers as varied as Matthew Caffyn, Peter Chamberlain and Abraham Cheare, of the seventeenth century, Alexander Carson, the great Scottish Baptist apologist, Carey's sons, G. R. R. Cameron, John Chamberlain and James Chater, of the B.M.S., and S. Pearce Carey and J. C. Carlile, from more recent times. The entries on Shirley Jackson Case and W. O. Carver will also be of value to many besides American Baptists. Mr. Starr has added to this instalment an attractive essay entitled, "A Garland of Baptist Flowers," in which he indicates some of the problems he is having to overcome in the monumental task he has set himself. All students of Baptist history must be grateful to him for his courage and industry and will eagerly await the appearance of further sections.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

Christian Platonism

MAY I begin by being somewhat autobiographical? From 1934 to 1936 I read for the degree of Ph.D. in the University of Edinburgh. In the second of those academic years there was a room vacant in the Divinity Students' Hostel of the Church of Scotland and I became its tenant. Not all my fellow-tenants were ordinands, but many were. At this time Karl Barth had become a major factor in life at the ordinand level. Hitler had been two years in power in Germany and it was the Confessional Church—that part of German Protestantism that acknowledged only Scripture (and Scripture as understood by the Reforms) as of supreme authority—which was offering real and sustained opposition to the Nazis, while the greater part of the German Protestant Church was calling itself German Christian and acclimatising itself to the Third Reich. Emil Brunner on the calm side of the Lake of Constance in Zürich had written an essay which was very tolerably orthodox by most twentieth-century Lutheran and Calvinist standards, but he left room for some element in man which was not so corrupted by the Fall that it was incapable of response to the Word of God; and Brunner also acknowledged that even fallen man recognised certain ordinances of creation and preservation which made some ordered social life and an ordered system of human justice possible. To this Barth (a Swiss pastor himself once) replied from Bonn in the midst of the German tension with a terrific onslaught headed by the single word "*Nein.*" Nothing in man offered firm ground on to which to throw a bridge from the beyond. In the saving of man from drowning man could not boast that he had swum a few strokes himself: all was of the rescuer.

Edinburgh in 1935 was vastly different from Bonn and somewhat different even from Zürich. But the Scots ordinands were to a man on Barth's side against Brunner. The two wings of the Church of Scotland had come together in 1929: here was a new dynamic for those tied to cumbrous ecclesiastical machinery. Barth's German was terribly difficult, but Sir Edwyn Hoskyns had recently translated his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, and more translations were to follow. So the Scots became Barthians, and an early symptom was their suspicion of one of their recently appointed Professors, because Plato came into his lectures so often. The Professor is still happily with them, so I must give him an oriental name to disguise him; but I will quote the verse in which they lampooned him:

So-so, So-so,
 Give us your answer, do;
 Why ain't Plato
 There in the Canon too?
 His doctrine of transmigration
 Is better than *Revelation*
 His style is neater
 Than *Second Peter*
 And he wasn't a dirty Jew!

The Professor, as I said, is still happily with them: he was not to be easily moved, even when the winds of doctrine assumed the force of a tornado. I am inclined to think that this was all to the good in Edinburgh—but suppose he had held a chair in Bonn? I meanwhile was devoting my whole time to this same Plato whom the Professor was quite unfairly supposed to be attempting to smuggle into the Canon of Scripture.

The autobiography is only intended to give precision to a live-issue within Christianity which still remains live—the question whether and in what sense an understanding of Greek philosophical thought, and in particular of Plato's thought, is an asset to a Christian. Two men who might fairly be called Christian Platonists have died recently: Dean Inge and Clement C. J. Webb. A very great Plato scholar who was also a Christian philosopher was my own teacher in Edinburgh, A. E. Taylor, who died about ten years ago. And now we ask: "Have the conditions in which these men were young—the atmosphere of Jowett's Balliol, the Cairds and F. H. Bradley—gone for ever, and is it not better so? If Hegel standing on his feet leads to the state absolutism of the Germans of both wars and standing on his head leads to the systematic dialectical materialism of Marx, are we not better off without him and the Platonism he claimed to interpret? Must not Hegel, Plato and Christ part company?" And apart from the implications of all this for Christianity, there has been a reaction to it all at Oxford as intense and as sustained as the Barthian movement itself. There has been popular political criticism of Plato as a Fascist by R. H. S. Crossman and K. R. Popper. But behind all this has been the attack on any speculative philosophy and especially on any kind of metaphysical system. Significant utterance, it is said, can only be made about verifiable physical events or in tautologies. Here logical analysis is possible; but statements about the universe or about God are nonsensical in the strict sense. Thinking is an act of attending to collocations of occurrences, not a poetical exploitation of the dream-like and subconscious masquerading as intellectual activity. The study of the use of words and of the use of syntax is the way to philosophic definition. A reviewer in the current number of *Mind* sums up the linguistic movement in English philosophy as "an amalgam of two tendencies: an empirical study of good English

usage and an attempted nullification of traditional metaphysical problemising based on such a study." But the same reviewer points out later on that the linguistic philosophers themselves are finding by taking wider and wider samples of human talking and trying to analyse them that "different philosophic languages are rivals for the total job of furnishing a medium for empirical description and that some sort of criteria should be forthcoming for choosing between them, or for discarding them all but retaining some kind of insight from each." What this amounts to is, he goes on to say, that these philosophers are not now thinking of linguistic analysis as a weapon with which to fight the metaphysical urge, but as a tool to help it achieve some degree of satisfaction and clarity.

So :

*naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret
et mala perumpet furtim fastidia victrix*

natura here being the metaphysical urge in man. But of course it does not follow that Oxford will return either to Hegel or to Plato. And the long anti-metaphysical campaign must be allowed to have gained some important ground. It shows that the decision to accept, or accept tentatively, one metaphysic rather than another implies an act of faith; for to say that your choice of metaphysic is wholly conditioned by the state of your liver is in itself to make an affirmation of faith in a materialist metaphysic. If man were only an intellect, he could be only a sceptic. But if philosophy is a term only properly applied to the sceptical intellect acting sceptically, then scarcely any of the Greek philosophers were philosophers. Most of them were, however, concerned with the intellectual implications of casting a vote for one or other kind of picture of the nature of all being, and in this sense they were metaphysicians.

Plato has clearly shown himself to be aware of this in an interesting passage of the *Timæus* which I give in Taylor's translation (slightly modified) (*Tim.* 51 c, d).

"Are we talking insignificantly whenever we speak of the existence of the various intelligible Forms, and do our words prove to be nothing but verbiage? Well, it would be as improper to make confident assertion without bringing the issue to judgment and examination as it would be to insert a long digression in an already lengthy discourse. It would be most timely if we could here determine this grave question in a few words. My personal judgment, then, I deliver in this sense" (Cornford says here: 'My own verdict, then is this.' The Greek says, 'My own vote I cast thus,' but the reference is no doubt to a jurymen voting rather than to voting in an assembly). "If understanding and true opinion are two and distinct, these Forms, which we cannot perceive by sense but can only have as objects of thinking, assuredly exist in themselves; but if, as is held by some, true opinion is in no way different from understanding, then whatever we apprehend by bodily sense must be assumed to be our most certain reality."

Note here that Plato frankly admits that he is casting a vote and giving a verdict. In that sense his metaphysic rests on an act of faith. He believes that the vision of all reality as a interrelated whole above and beyond space and time, the vision which breaks in on the whole personality of the student who has worked through the preliminary mathematical disciplines, is not a cheat and is not self-produced by the student. In it the beholder is united with reality in real intercourse and only then is his long travail at an end, for Plato, like the mystics, uses erotic imagery; but he uses it in speaking of the supreme intellectual and moral fruition of man: and he does not, incidentally, use it very accurately; for the travail of the soul precedes the intercourse and fruition. However, the vision of reality is for Plato something final. Not only can he say,

Now I have found the ground wherein
Safe my soul's anchor may remain,

but he can claim now to have all knowledge and to understand all mysteries. He will, however, neither wallow in the security of his soul nor feel entitled to spend the rest of his days seeing how everything hangs together and reading the map of ultimate reality. He will realise that he beholds Ultimate Value as well as Ultimate Reality—in fact the Form of the Good is the sun of that upper world, giving it its very life and being. But he will also have a sense of a duty to work what he there sees into the lives of others as well as into his own. The Christian apostle challenges his brethren with the saying: "Brethren, if these things are so, what manner of men ought we to be?" The Platonic Guardian says: "Brethren" (for so he too would address all within the community) "since things are as they are, this is the manner of men ye ought to be," and the non-philosophical brethren are to be expected to have the self-control to accept his precept and personal example and work them into their daily practice.

It is necessary to consider briefly why Plato came to this particular affirmation of metaphysical faith. The Ionian physicists had taken for granted that man was part of a total visible universe and believed that he and it were explicable in terms of the development of an underlying physically real substance. Objective reality was distinct from appearances—all things, and not only seas and rivers, were water for Thales; but objective reality was not of a higher order of being. Parmenides of Elea, a disciple of Pythagoras who struck out for himself, challenged this Ionian assumption. The senses gave specious evidence and suggested specious solutions to the problems of the origin of things: the mind gave quite a different result. The object of the mind, what could be thought, was alone real. Note that even here the emphasis is objective. Reality is there: the mind is such that it, and it alone, cognises Reality. Plato's meta-

physic accepts the absolute distinction between sense-object and mind-object which Parmenides laid down, but it modifies it by saying that the object of mind is a Manifold not a One—it is a world of forms; and secondly that there is a definite correspondence between sensible objects and Forms: a single Form has in the sense-world many reflections or imitations.

But the fifth-century B.C. proved to be the age of the sophists, and it was Protagoras, probably a contemporary of Parmenides, who issued a challenge both to Ionian Physicists and to Parmenidean intellectualists by stating that "Man is the measure of all things." It was Protagoras, not Socrates, who brought down philosophy from the clouds. Gorgias said there was no ultimate reality; if there was it was unknowable; if it existed and could be known it could not be communicated to others. Scepticism and relativism developed, and the verbal antithesis between nature and convention was used to urge the doctrine of the superman who had a natural right to ignore or circumvent the legal conventions erected by the weak to defend themselves. In the midst of this breakdown of standards and while Athens lost the war with Sparta, a queer local product of Athens, Socrates, son of Sophroniscus the stonemason, affirmed a personal mission to care for the souls of each of his fellow-Athenians and to cure each of them of conceit of wisdom. He would not accept that there could be one justice in Thebes and another in Athens. He was too scrupulous to take as much part in politics as ordinary Athenians were expected to take. His story is familiar, but his importance apart from his great personal influence is that he gave to the Greek word *ψυχή* a sense it had not previously borne, and which we can still understand without commentary: a responsible moral agent, a personality capable of good and evil. Plato, his devoted disciple, could no longer think of metaphysics as a purely intellectual problem. Ethical universals must be found a place among the eternal prototypes of physical and mathematical objects. Furthermore, the soul could not be purely contemplative. Intellect and morals coalesce in a moral intellectualism: to know right issues in doing right. Virtue is knowledge and no man sins willingly.

To the Socratic doctrine of the soul Plato added his own important doctrine of the soul—fixing the sphere in which it exercises moral choice and responsibility. Soul not only knows but is the principle of motion. All motion in nature is motivated by soul. The physical world in general, and our bodies in particular, provide soul with material into which to work order and beauty by looking away to the eternal patterns in the Form-world or disorder by turning its vision down to the sensible alone. Judgment and banishment to a lower sphere or promotion to a higher depend on the voluntary choice of the controlling soul. Yet not altogether, for the universe itself has a soul and is a *θεὸς αἰσθητός*, a god present to sense. The

soul of the universe and all other souls derivatively were fashioned by the Demiourgos or Fashioner. It would seem that he may be identified with the "altogether good soul" called God in a unique sense in Plato's latest work, the *Laws*. So then man is a creature within a creature and yet the highest part of his soul comes from his creator. The creator did not create from nothing; matter pre-existed, the Forms-world pre-existed. His task was to fashion in matter a likeness of the Forms. Such is this universe in spite of its imperfections.

All this is in Plato himself—and so is a great deal more, of course. What would we expect a Christian to be interested in here? Here is a Greek philosopher who teaches an unseen reality independent of our minds, though our minds are 'akin' enough to it to rise to contemplate it after laborious training. It is a reality which embodies a purpose of God. We are responsible agents who must control our own bodies and not be controlled by them. We are creatures dependent for life on the will of our creator, but he is good and wills good.

In fact the first bridge between Platonism and Christianity was built by a Jew, Philo, at Alexandria in our Lord's lifetime. In Alexandria Greeks, Egyptians and Jews met and lived together, though each in his own quarter. The Jews were not citizens but could and did have their own law courts for civil cases and in them administered Jewish law. The Jews of the Dispersion in the cities of the eastern Mediterranean tended to become Hellenised in varying degrees. Philo had a first-rate Graeco-Roman education as well as the orthodox Jewish training in the law. He lived from about 30 B.C. to A.D. 45 and as head of the Jewish community in Alexandria went to Rome in A.D. 39 to explain the reluctance of the Alexandrian Jews to the worship of the emperor Caligula, and to ask exemption for them. Philo makes much of the *Timæus*, Plato's dialogue about the fashioning of the world and the world-soul, and in his interpretations of the Scriptures uses the allegorical method to make philosophers of the patriarchs. Even the moderate Rabbi Hillel, grandfather of Gamaliel, would hardly approve Philo; much less would the straiter sects of the Pharisees, who remembered the days of the Maccabees and the supposedly Greek Antiochus Epiphanes. Yet Philo's attempt to use his Greek learning to systematise and explain the doctrine of creation and the doctrine of an intermediary *Logos* is an important link with the later developments in the Christian church. He was making too rapid a reconciliation of Moses and Plato, but he was not necessarily in this being unfaithful to Moses.

It is quite impossible to trace here the story of Platonism and Christianity historically. There have always been those in the Church who cry with Tertullian: "Let them look to it who have produced

a Stoic and a Platonic and a dialectic Christianity," but there have also been those who approved the saying that Plato was Moses speaking Attic Greek. Any real appreciation of Platonism was in fact rendered almost impossible before 200 A.D. by the various forms of Gnostic heresy. The Gnostics held in common a belief in an esoteric Christian illumination not available to simple Christian believers, though they differed widely as to its content. Their elaborate doctrines of intermediary beings might find some support in Philo, but little in Plato himself. Plato, however, is guilty of confining the dialecticians' knowledge of reality to the caste of the trained few, and this (in spite of the vast differences) makes him a dangerous ally for the Church fighting Gnosticism. It was, however, a blessing both for the Church and for Platonism when there arose a new school of Platonic teachers at Alexandria,¹ the so-called Neoplatonists. It was a blessing for the Church, in spite of the fact that Plotinus and his pupils Porphyry Iamblichus and Proclus provided the last assailants of Christianity in the name of pagan philosophy. For Ammonius Saccas, founder of the Neoplatonist School, had among his pupils both Plotinus, the last great Greco-Roman philosopher, and Origenes Adamantius, commonly called Origen, the first great systematic Christian theologian. There was before the Neoplatonists' time already a Christian Catechetical School at Alexandria; Pantæus and then Clement were its heads. Clement was a phil-Hellene who just fell short of being a Gnostic, but in that he did fall short of it was able to give Gnosticism its quietus from the orthodox Christian side. He taught sometimes that the Greeks borrowed or stole from the Hebrews, but at other times that the Greeks had philosophy for their pedagogue while the Jews had the Law. But he was, relatively speaking, a dilettante and unsystematic, failings (if they are failings) which are probably responsible for denying him a remembrance in the Church's calendar. However the systematic philosophic training Origen received in Alexandria makes a marked contrast to Clement and tells in a different way altogether. He does not argue the apologists' questions of the relation of Platonism and Christianity; rather he takes into the service of the faith a mind trained to think in the Platonic system: he makes a defence for the rule of Christian faith which is different from the kind of fence the Rabbis built about the Jewish Scripture. They worked by midrash, a mixture of elaboration and casuistry. They went on with it faithfully even after the fall of Jerusalem and the end of temple worship. No doubt there is a place for Christian midrash, but the Church is indebted to those who dare a wider apologetic as Origen did: the need to commend Christianity to every man's conscience in the sight of God by manifestation of the truth needs the capacity for synoptic vision

¹ Plotinus gave his main teaching in Rome, not Alexandria.

and systematic thought that philosophy and especially the Platonic philosophy ought to give. This does not mean that Plato solves all problems. Nor does it mean that we should emulate Abelard, who according to a remark in one of St. Bernard's letters (quoted by Shorey in his Sather Lectures) "sweats dreadfully in the attempt to make Plato a Christian." We have better historical perspective than Abelard and longer experience, and we freely grant to Barth and anyone else that it cannot be done. The disciple of Plato must unlearn certain things after Baptism: he has generally little chance nowadays to do so before it! He must learn that saving knowledge may be given and is given apart from all training for it and to all who will simply receive it. He must learn that to know is not to will, and that neither his intellect nor his moral strength can meet the desperateness of his real situation. In particular he must own that eternal reality has entered temporal in a supreme particular example: here there is much to challenge him. Augustine in a crucial passage of the *Confessions* points to the vital differences between Platonism and the Gospel.² But when the Cross becomes mercy and not folly to a thinking man he does not stop thinking there will be continuity with his pre-Christian understanding, even though his thinking and phrasing change notably. Augustine sheds his youthful excesses after Baptism but not his Platonic training. After all, the Rabbinic and Pharisaic alternatives to all this do not in fact save a man from pride. What is folly to the Greeks is a stumbling-block to Jews, and there is something of Greek tragic irony in the words of St. Paul at Antioch (Acts xiii. 27):

For they which dwell at Jerusalem and their rulers, because they knew him not nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, fulfilled them by condemning him.

Jew and Greek alike have to admit defeat, but once they have done so each has his particular contribution. The 'Greek' contribution may be simply a feeling for the views of the next man and his difficulties and an attempt to meet them from some systematic position of his own—an appeal to reason and conscience based on but not directly enforcing the authoritative utterances. But when the 'Greek' within the Church weighs up the various metaphysical positions argued out and defended in ancient times, he is likely to feel a special respect for Plato's daring in asserting, with no divine word to guide him, that we live in two worlds and that the unseen really dominates the seen.

We do not want clerics who regard Platonism as an aristocratic thing and Christianity a vulgar one. Christianity is *not* Platonism

² *Confessions*, VII, ix. 13, 14 (*Ibi legi . . . ibi non legi*). For a valuable statement of the matter see P. Henry, *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xxxviii (1937), p. 1-23.

for the people as Nietzsche supposed. We have proved the limitations of a theology based entirely on the view that the spirit of man is the candle of the Lord. But there still is in Christian Platonism the power to revive an awareness of another dimension.³ In this broader sense of Platonism there is something that can reach through into the ordinary faith of Christian people and heighten its consciousness. To take a familiar example from Dean Alford's processional hymn, a stanza about the celestial city including the lines,

Flash the streets with jasper
Shine the gates with gold

is followed by one which is not exactly Platonist but in which all Platonists will feel particularly able to join. It needs to be sung in the magnificence of Durham's aisles for its meaning to be felt :

Nought that city needeth
Of these aisles of stone;
Where the Godhead dwelleth
Temple there is none.
All the saints that ever
In these Courts have stood
Are as babes and feeding
On the children's food.
On through sign and token,
Stars amid the night,
Forward through the darkness,
Forward into light.

There lies a pattern city set up in heaven, Plato said, and that city whosoever will may see and seeing begin to inhabit.

J. B. SKEMP

³ For a useful brief history of Christian Platonism in England see W. R. Inge, *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought*. Isaac Watts had a strain of the Platonic in him, but little Platonism has penetrated the present hymnal. Perhaps 428 is the most Platonic hymn in the revised B.C.H., though 781 is a close second.

(This article reproduces almost verbally a paper read to a University group in Durham: the remark that few unlearned things before Baptism was, therefore, made for the benefit of the Paedo-baptists!)

Congo Protestant Missions and European Powers before 1885

(Concluded)

In the field, however, matters were not running so smoothly for the missionaries. At Stanley Pool, where the B.M.S. was very closely associated with the expedition, the people who would not dare to fight "Bula Matadi" were becoming restive after Stanley's departure. At Manyanga, too, there was fighting between the natives and the expedition, but although troubled over the matter, the missionaries supported the use of force as inevitable.⁷⁸ The natives distinguished the missionaries from the A.I.A. by the fact that they did not buy ivory, and healed the sick, and thus they preferred the "Ingleza," and regarded them in some measure as their protectors. Bentley was placed in a difficult position by the chief of Ndandanja, who begged him to open a closed envelope marked "A.I.C. Comité d'études du Haut-Congo : a n'ouvrir qu'en cas de contestation de territoire avec le peuple de Ndandanga ou de Mbanza," since his people were terrified lest it should contain instructions to burn their town. On opening it in these circumstances he was able to reassure the people, but also to realise the way in which the expedition was trying to monopolise all available ground.⁷⁹ Bentley was on his guard against the constant effort of Lieut. Valke to get legal possession of the B.M.S. land and river frontage at Manyanga, and because of its policy of commercial exclusiveness became suspicious of the Comité d'Etudes.⁸⁰

In spite of these doubts, however, Leopold II was able to make good use of the gratitude which the B.M.S. publicly expressed for his work.⁸¹ The propaganda which he sent to Lord Granville in October, 1882⁸² contained two letters of Comber's dated August, 1882, one written to Stanley, and the other to Baynes, and these also appeared in the *Indépendance Belge* a year later,⁸³ when Leopold again needed testimony to the philanthropic fashion in which he was working in Congo.

The importance of the Portuguese claims for his Congo enterprise lay in the fact that Portugal claimed the mouth of the Congo—and without an outlet to the sea the state he was building up would be severely handicapped. Leopold was therefore most anxious that these claims should not be recognised by Great Britain. The B.M.S. missionaries, still experiencing difficulties from the Portu-

guese in Congo, had every reason to join in the agitation against the negotiations—indeed, it was scarcely necessary for Hutton to encourage the Society. When a Portuguese Catholic missionary expedition came to San Salvador in May, 1882, trying to win over the king and his people, and later claimed to have a letter from the Governor of Loanda ordering the immediate expulsion of the B.M.S. missionaries there, Herbert Dixon wrote anxiously to Cohen, the British consul at Loanda, to know whether the British Government recognised the suzerainty of Portugal over the territory,⁸⁴ since the priests were clearly there as representatives of their country. Cohen reassured him that unless the king wished to acknowledge himself a Portuguese subject, the authorities could not compel him to do so.⁸⁵ Later, Senhor Serpa, Portuguese Minister of Foreign Affairs, accused Cohen, in connection with Stanley and "certain English missionaries" at San Salvador, of stirring up the natives against Portugal.⁸⁶

The agitation in England against the recognition of Portuguese claims, carefully watched from day to day by Leopold,⁸⁷ increased in intensity in the spring of 1883. Questions were asked in Parliament, showing the anxiety of the House over the negotiations,⁸⁸ and on 3rd April Jacob Bright introduced a resolution against the recognition of annexation by any power, which would interfere with the freedom of the civilising and commercial agencies in Congo. He was able to bring before the House evidence of the difficulties which the B.M.S. had experienced in San Salvador from the repressive policy of the Portuguese, and stated in contrast how grateful the missionaries were for the work of the A.I.A. In spite of the agitation in Parliament, however, Solvyns remained doubtful of the result.⁸⁹

Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, in replying to Bright on behalf of the Government, was able to say that it had insisted on religious liberty and adequate protection for Protestant missions in Congo. The treaties which had previously been made directly with certain native chiefs, without the recognition of any Portuguese sovereignty,⁹⁰ had stipulated that English missionaries should be free to settle, and the British Government knew that it could not secure less from the Portuguese. There was considerable difficulty over the terms in which this freedom was to be given,⁹¹ but the government could not be satisfied with ambiguous wording, under pressure from the missionary societies, reflected in Parliament.⁹² Portugal was certainly in considerable difficulties, for she had no more desire to see French Catholic missionaries than English Protestants in her Congo possessions, and was jealously guarding the diocese of Loanda against the encroachments of Lavigerie's White Fathers, over which question there was at the time considerable difficulty with Rome. It was not a propitious moment to grant guarantees to Protestant missionaries.⁹³

The difficulty continued throughout the treaty negotiations. In March, 1883 Granville again insisted on complete freedom for

missions, noting that "religious bodies are easily alarmed," but in Lisbon the same situation obtained.⁹⁴ A saving clause was found, for after examining the eighth revision of the proposed Congo treaty, the Portuguese government was ready to accept the safeguards as to the protection of Protestant churches which the British government demanded, provided there was the addition of the words "without any appearance of temples."⁹⁵ This clause was not acceptable, but in July the observant Belgian Minister in Lisbon noted that there seemed more chance of bringing to a conclusion the long-drawn out treaty negotiations, since the remaining points to be settled—among which he listed that of religious liberty—were of minor importance.⁹⁶ In August it seemed to the F.O. that the Portuguese government, anxious to conclude the treaty as soon as possible, was ready to concede many points, including the withdrawal of restrictions on the appearance of Protestant churches.⁹⁷ Although the treaty finally gave full protection for English Protestant missionaries,⁹⁸ however, the missionary societies believed that they could put little trust in the actual carrying out of the provisions.

Throughout the unsettled year of 1883⁹⁹ both the B.M.S. and the L.I.M. consistently denounced the idea of the recognition of Portuguese claims in the Congo,¹⁰⁰ but continued to differ in their views on the solution of the political problem in the region. Relying on the expressed wish of King Leopold to assist them,¹⁰¹ the B.M.S. gave him their full support, but the L.I.M., while regretting the fact that Great Britain had not herself entered into competition for the Congo, upheld French claims, disliking the commercial ends of the Comité d'Etudes,¹⁰² and its policy of exclusiveness. At Pala Bala the L.I.M. missionaries joined with the agent of the Dutch house there to translate for the local chiefs a treaty imposed by Lieut. Van de Velde,¹⁰³ whereupon the chiefs declared in surprise that they had simply believed that the Comité wanted to establish a factory, and had not understood that they were to keep all other traders out, nor that they would themselves be called upon to find men to construct roads.¹⁰⁴ A complaint made by Mrs. Guinness was not well received at Brussels, and the indignant reply of Strauch had to be toned down by Leopold. The King would not allow a reference to the greater complaisance of the B.M.S. towards his Congo enterprise, fearing the Society might take advantage of this.¹⁰⁵ They were fully satisfied, however. In spite of minor disagreements in the field, and the secret regret of Stanley on revisiting Stanley Pool, to find that Lieut. Braconnier had given the B.M.S. such a very good site,¹⁰⁶ the Association had treated the Society well over the question of land. The return of Lieut. Braconnier to Europe in the summer of 1883 was made the occasion for an effort to secure a reduction in the rent paid for the plot at Stanley Pool, and Baynes paid a second visit to Brussels. As a result, not only was the annual ground-

rent reduced from £150 to £10, but even this sum was returned by Leopold.¹⁰⁷ The December *Missionary Herald* reported Baynes' audience with the King and commented with enthusiasm on the graciousness of Leopold. The existing conditions in the Congo seemed most favourable to plans for expansion of the work. Late in 1883 Grenfell took the *Peace's* boat on a prospecting expedition on the upper river, to look for suitable new sites. The district which he chose for immediate occupation was that near the A.I.C. station at Lukolela, Stanley's fourth above the Pool.¹⁰⁸ Stanley was ready to give permission for immediate residence, and offered A.I.C. ground for building, at a low rent.¹⁰⁹

MUTUAL ASSISTANCE

Leopold was still of course anxious to see Belgian missionaries in the Congo,¹¹⁰ but in the spring of 1884 was finding the English Protestants very useful as his allies. The Anglo-Portuguese treaty was finally signed on 26 February, 1884, but there was still time to stop its ratification, and Leopold was sparing no efforts to secure this. The B.M.S. joined in the agitation against ratification, presenting a petition to Parliament on 25 April, followed by the Baptist Union, while the F.O. received a spate of petitions from individual Protestant congregations, the first coming from Clapton Downs Chapel, Middlesex. *The Freeman* of 18 April printed a copy of this, and advised other churches to follow suit, in petitioning the Queen and Parliament. Although unimpressed by the arguments brought forward,¹¹¹ the F.O. had to take some account of the agitation, which insisted that the guarantees so hardly won from Portugal were useless, and that there was no practical possibility that she would change her policy in her African dominions. F.O. officials feared that the Government would be beaten on the Congo question in the Commons,¹¹² but it was to a large extent the opposition of France and Germany to the treaty which caused the decision against ratification.¹¹³

The right of pre-emption accorded to France in April meant a sudden decrease in popularity for the Congo enterprise of the King of the Belgians, but Leopold had many firm friends in England. Bentley, home on furlough, was an indefatigable supporter. His letters to the press¹¹⁴ denounced the Portuguese treaty in no uncertain terms, while an interview with him was published on 20 May by the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which under the editorship of W. T. Stead was beginning to have great influence in both political and social fields. Not only did he criticise the Portuguese treaty, but actively supported the Association.¹¹⁵ Well aware of the fear of France, he declared that while the Anglo-Portuguese treaty, if ratified, would not be recognised by France, and therefore would not keep her out of Congo, this object would be far better attained by strengthening

the position of the A.I.C. Strauch, sent to London in May to calm British fears raised by the agreement with France, found that Bentley had been effectual in rallying W. E. Forster, a Liberal M.P. of some influence, to the support of Leopold.¹¹⁶ Strauch found of considerable use the suggestions of the latter, which accorded in certain particulars with the views of the B.M.S., with whom he was also in touch.¹¹⁷ If Lord Granville was sceptical as to whether Leopold intended to maintain the philanthropic character of the enterprise he had undertaken in Congo, the religious world was not,¹¹⁸ but gave the King its full support.

The treaty was not ratified, and agitation over the Portuguese claims died down, but Leopold still had need of English opinion favourable to his Congo enterprise, working as he was for the recognition of the full political rights of the A.I.C. This he hoped to secure at the Conference of Berlin, called together at the end of 1884 to regulate, as far as possible, the "scramble for Africa."

The B.M.S., in the autumn of 1884, was looking forward to a considerable expansion of the work on the Congo river. A third visit of Baynes to Brussels in the summer had gained for the Society the site at Lukolela, the first station to be planted above the Pool, at a nominal rent, and also, instead of a short-term lease, it was to be held in perpetuity. This same condition was secured for the Stanley Pool site.¹¹⁹ In recording the Society's gratitude to the King of the Belgians, the July *Missionary Herald* set forth a description of his work in Congo, expressing the hope that as a result of it an independent state would be created and recognised there—a state based on free trade principles and securing religious freedom to all. Meanwhile, Grenfell had constructed the *Peace*, and in June was able to write home that a trial trip had been made, that now was the time to plant stations on the upper river, and that the need for reinforcements was urgent.¹²⁰ In July the Committee, urged by Bentley, set forth a plan for ten stations to be planted between Stanley Pool and the Falls, beginning immediately with Lukolela.¹²¹ It seemed that at last the preliminary stage was over, and that work on the upper river, always the aim, was now a possibility.

At the opening of the Conference of Berlin, the British attitude towards the Congo was of great importance to Leopold.¹²² The flag of the A.I.C. had been recognised by the United States, and by Germany, but not as yet by Great Britain. Again the views of the commercial and the religious elements in England coincided, in their support of the King of the Belgians. Stanley was doing his best, in addressing meetings of various kinds, to stress the civilising work of the A.I.C., and was quoted with approval by *The Freeman*,¹²³ after this journal had reported on further negotiations at Brussels highly satisfactory to the B.M.S. When Leopold had again returned the annual ground-rent due, as a mark of his interest in the work of the

Society, Baynes had secured a definite agreement that rent due according to B.M.S. leases should only become payable after being demanded by an accredited A.I.C. official.¹²⁴ It seemed unlikely that the demand would be made. *The Freeman* approved of recognition by the United States of the A.I.C. flag, and hoped that the British Government would follow suit, instead of continuing to favour an alliance with Portugal.

The B.M.S. were interested in the Berlin West Africa Conference not only from the point of view of the Society's work in the Congo, but also that in the Cameroons, and it was chiefly their concern for this latter which led the F.O. to suggest that they should be represented at Berlin. The representatives of Leopold were to be found among the delegations of Belgium and the United States,¹²⁵ for the A.I.C., not being an independent state, had no official delegation, and this meant further support for him at the conference. In November Baynes arrived, but early in December he telegraphed for Bentley to join him, as the latter's testimony would be useful. The conference did not officially deal with questions of sovereignty at all, but the meeting ground at Berlin was used as a field where these could be fought out, and they were in reality treated as of greater importance.

France was claiming a great deal of territory on the south bank of the river, based on the Makoko treaties, and Bentley's testimony was expected to help the A.I.C. to combat these claims, for he could speak with exact knowledge of the extent of Makoko's territory, which was not as great as de Brazza had supposed. He arrived on 9 December, and reported at once to Strauch and Van de Velde, to discover what was wanted of him. The B.M.S. had counted the cost of supporting the A.I.C., and thought it to be worthwhile.¹²⁶ At that moment the Association was having a hard struggle to secure the south bank of Stanley Pool, and to get this it seemed that they must relinquish a claim to the Niadi Kwilu valley, which would go to France, and make concessions to Portugal in the south. The former did not affect the B.M.S., but the Society hoped that its station at San Salvador would not come outside the territory granted to the Association, with which it had entirely identified itself.¹²⁷ The final delimitation, however, left San Salvador in Portuguese territory to the Society's great regret.

Before going to Berlin Stanley had been working hard in England to get recognition of the A.I.C. by Great Britain, and this was formally accorded at Berlin on 16 December. Before the end of the conference the Association was recognised as an independent state by all the powers which had not formerly conceded this, and as such was able to sign the General Act of Berlin in February, 1885. By this act the Congo was to be a free trade region; an international commission was to be set up to carry out the provisions of the

conference for the river, and the powers were to combine to suppress the slave-trade. The Association was hardly mentioned by name during the debates, but all the delegates knew that it was the new state being formed on the Congo, which would carry out the programme they fixed. Nor were they under any illusion as to Leopold's position in the Association, and expected him to assume its direction in name, as well as in fact. In April, 1885 the Belgian legislature consented to the assumption of the title of the new state by Leopold, the union between Belgium and the Congo to be entirely personal. On 1 July de Winton, on orders from Brussels, directed a letter to all missionaries and traders in the Congo, proclaiming Leopold the "Sovereign of the Independent State of the Congo," and on 1 August Leopold himself notified the powers of Europe to the same effect.

The B.M.S. was delighted, since its relations with the Association were so cordial. In January, 1885 the committee, instead of ratifying the agreement which Comber and de Winton had made in September that A.I.C. officers at Ngombe should be treated when necessary by B.M.S. medical missionaries, for an annual payment of fifty pounds, offered this service free, pleased to "reciprocate in some slight manner" the generosity of Leopold towards the Society. If the L.I.M. was not so enthusiastic, their magazine at least quoted from Stanley's speeches on the civilising work of the A.I.A.¹²⁸ Stanley was honoured by the B.M.S. at a public breakfast on 28 May, when he was careful to state that the kindness to the missionaries for which he was thanked was shown "by command of the King." Article VI of the General Act accorded special protection to missionaries of all denominations, and there was no reason to expect, judging from the past history of the attitude of the Association, that this would not be given. *The Freeman* even thought it necessary to give warning against too close association with the state in Congo.¹²⁹

In July, 1885 the B.M.S. presented to the King an address, mounted on rollers of African ivory, congratulating him on the creation of the new Independent State of Congo. In his speech of thanks, Leopold declared that his "one sole desire in connection with his efforts on behalf of Africa was the enlightenment and uplifting of the millions of her central region, suppression and extinction of the slave-trade, establishment of a reign of law and order, and the development of an upright and legitimate commerce." In this enterprise he "regarded the B.M.S. missionaries as his friends and helpers." With such a programme before the infant state in the Congo, the future of the new B.M.S. stations to be planted all along the upper river seemed bright indeed. With the recognition of the Congo Independent State, the period of its foundation was drawn to a close, a period in which the King and

the English Protestant missionaries had on the whole been of considerable mutual assistance. *The Freeman* had some foreboding that matters might not always continue to run smoothly, but was anxious "that there should be a grateful remembrance, should difficulties or misunderstandings arise, of the kindnesses shown by Mr. Stanley to our brethren in the early days of the mission 'by command of King Leopold.' God . . . grant to him . . . a rich reward in the establishment of a prosperous and wealthy kingdom on the banks of the Congo!"¹³⁰

RUTH SLADE.

NOTES

⁷⁸ "Yet . . . we thought the action of the A.I.A. quite right, and agreed with them that a severe lesson was necessary on this third effort of the people to drive away the Expedition. Bentley and I have had many a talk about it, and as to what line of conduct we as Christian missionaries under these circumstances." Comber to Baynes, 5 Sept. 1882. B.M.S.

⁷⁹ Two of the clauses read: "The chiefs are bound never to part with any ground to Europeans other than those connected with the Comité d'Etudes. An exception is the ground sold to the Baptist English Mission. This will become the property of the Comité d'Etudes if the lessee ceases to pay rent or leaves the ground," and "The Comité d'Etudes has the right of constructing houses, roads, etc. to the exclusion of any European except the Comité."

⁸⁰ "The king of the Belgians is no doubt a kindly philanthropic man, but there is behind all a large amount of scheming and speculation, which is making use of his money, and repute, also the officers of his army. . . . The Expedition is without doubt a help to us, but might hinder and trip us up sometimes if we are not careful." Bentley to Baynes, 17 Nov. 1882. B.M.S.

⁸¹ They even defended him against de Brazza's charges against the exclusiveness of the Comité d'Etudes du Haut Congo. In March, 1883 Baynes was able to deny publicly that the missionaries had agreed with the chief of Leopoldville station not to give help to any other expeditions, as de Brazza had stated, having, no doubt, seen a copy of the provisional contract signed by Comber and Braconnier, afterwards altered in Europe.

⁸² In F.O. 84/1802. Left by Baron Solvyns, 5 Oct. 1882.

⁸³ 22 Aug. 1883.

⁸⁴ Dixon to Cohen, 2 Aug. 1882. F.O. 84/1807.

⁸⁵ Cohen to Dixon, 30 Dec. 1882. F.O. 84/1807.

⁸⁶ Draft Granville to Cohen, 17 Aug. 1883. F.O. 84/1640.

⁸⁷ "La lettre dans le Times est maladroite mais anti-portugaise. La Pall Mall Gazette, tres répandue à Londres, a eu quelques lignes anti-portugaises." Leopold II to Strauch, 24 Feb. 1883. Strauch papers, Min. des Aff. Et.

⁸⁹ "Le F.O. étant fermement résolu à conclure, des influences locales et dont il peut ne tenir aucun compte, ne modifieront pas, je le pense, ses intentions a cet égard." Solvyns to Frère-Orban, 7 March, 1883. A.I.C. 24. Min. des Aff. Et.

⁹⁰ E.g. Treaty with the King of St. Antonio, 1 June, 1865: "Missionaries . . . are to be allowed to reside in the territory of King Antonio and his successors, for the purpose of instructing the people. . . ."

⁹¹ "On a cru indispensable de remplacer l'expression 'missionary operations' par celle de 'culto religioso,' 'religious worship.' En laissant subsister le premier expression, le gouvernement portugaise aurait de grandes difficultés avec le Vatican." Eclaircissements donnes par M. d'Antas, 10 Jan. 1883. F.O. 84/1803.

⁹² Memorandum by H. P. Anderson. "D'Antas begs us not to let them into difficulties with the Vatican—this is balanced by our difficulties with Parliament." F.O. 84/1803.

⁹³ "Il est bien difficile que la cour de Lisbonne concède explicitement à des étrangers dissidents ce qu'il refuse à d'autres professant la religion de l'état. C'est pourquoi M. de Serpa ne voudrait s'engager qu'à accorder la tolérance religieuse sans le définir d'une manière plus précise." Greindl to Frère-Orban, 17 Jan. 1883. A.I.C. II. 5. Min. des Aff. Et.

⁹⁴ Draft Granville to d'Antas, 15 March, 1883; F.O. 84/1804. Greindl to Frère-Orban, 9 April, 1883. A.I.C. II. 39. Min. des Aff. Et.

⁹⁵ F.O. 84/1806. 29 May, 1883.

⁹⁶ Greindl to Frère-Orban, 26 July, 1883.

⁹⁷ Note by Lister on interview with d'Antas. 1 Aug. 1883. F.O. 84/1807.

⁹⁸ Article VI: All forms of religious worship and religious ordinances shall be tolerated, and no hindrance whatever shall be offered thereto by the Portuguese authorities.

Missionaries of religion, whether natives or foreigners, and religious bodies, shall have a perfect right to erect churches, chapels, schools, and other buildings, which shall be protected by the Portuguese authorities.

⁹⁹ B.M.S. missionaries were to be advised "in a sympathetic manner" not to marry in view of "the unsettled position of the political questions relating to the sovereignty of the Congo river." *Minutes*, Jan. 1883.

¹⁰⁰ B.M.S. memorial to Lord Granville, 21 March, 1883, F.O. 84/1804: *Regions Beyond*, June, July, 1883.

¹⁰¹ Stanley to the head of the Baptist mission, Manyanga, 24 July, 1883. *Tervueren* 50, 47, 174. F. Guinness to T. F. Buxton, 21 Feb. 1883, left by Buxton for Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, 6 March, 1883. F.O. 84/1804, 21 Feb. 1883.

¹⁰² ". . . Stanley is simply working on behalf of a Belgian *commercial* company. De Brazza has higher and nobler aims."

¹⁰³ Such actions were strongly disliked by the representatives of Leopold, Feb. 1883: "Très défiants à l'égard des missionnaires anglais, qui fort souvent précédent les factionnaires de Sa très gracieuse Majesté, nous voyions d'un œil soupçonneux les nombreuses démarches directes et secrètes que faisaient ces messieurs chez les chefs indigènes. Coquilhat, C. *Sur le Haut-Congo*, 1888, p. 103.

¹⁰⁴ Africa No. IV, 1884. Despatches from the Consul at Loanda, 6 Nov. 1883.

¹⁰⁵ Note of Leopold on Strauch's letter of 23 Sept. 1883: "Je n'aimerais pas avoir trop l'air de nous abriter derriere lui. (M. Baynes). Il le saura et deviendra plus exigeant a notre egard." Strauch papers. Min. des Aff. Et.

¹⁰⁶ "Braconnier reported Stanley to have told him that in giving the B.M.S. their site he had given them 'command of the Expedition'." Bentley to Crudgington, 20 March, 1883. Crudgington papers.

¹⁰⁷ *Minutes*, 18 Sept. 1883.

¹⁰⁸ Bentley, *op. cit.*, II, p. 53.

¹⁰⁹ Stanley to Comber, 16 Feb. 1884. B.M.S.

¹¹⁰ Storme, *art. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

¹¹¹ Note by Lister: "I believe these things are got up by paid agents, who go a round of dissenting chapels. . . . Shall we acknowledge merely, or answer that a careful study of the treaty will show that all points to which they refer have been considered?" F.O. 84/1810.

¹¹² Fitzmaurice to Granville, 23 April, 1884. F.O. 84/1810.

¹¹³ Crowe, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-33.

¹¹⁴ *Daily News*, 12 April; *Times*, 14 April, 1884.

¹¹⁵ "The best course would be to refuse to ratify the treaty, and then to hand over the lower Congo to the A.I.A. . . . the King of the Belgians, not the King of Portugal, is the man who ought to be trusted with the guardianship of the gates of one of the greatest waterways of the world."

¹¹⁶ Strauch to Leopold, 27 May, 1884: "M. Forster a désiré voir M. Bentley le missionnaire, et c'est a la suite de la visite de ce dernier que M. Forster a en quelque sorte obligé le Pall Mall Gazette a publier l'article que Votre Majeste a pu lire." Bull. I.R.C.B., 1953. Rapport sur le dossier—"Correspondance Leopold II—Strauch" par J. Stengers, Annex I.

¹¹⁷ *Id.* Annex II.

¹¹⁸ Fitzmaurice, *Life of Lord Granville*, London, 1905, II, p. 356.

¹¹⁹ *Minutes*, 17 June, 1884.

¹²⁰ Bentley, II, p. 634.

¹²¹ *Missionary Herald*, Aug. 1884.

¹²² Strauch to Lambermont, 2 Oct. 1884: "Les dispositions du public anglais a notre égard . . . serviront probablement de base aux instructions de sir Edward Malet." Conf. de Berlin, I, 59 bis. Min. des Aff. Et.

¹²³ 3rd Oct. 1884.

¹²⁴ Baynes' report to the committee, 30 Sept. 1884. B.M.S.

¹²⁵ The Belgian plenipotentiaries were Lambermont and the Belgian minister at Berlin, and Banning was one of the Belgian delegation, while the American minister, a sympathiser with the Association, co-opted Sanford and Stanley.

¹²⁶ "There is no doubt that if the French get the territory they want, they will remember anything the B.M.S. says or does. But after all . . . it would be pretty much the same, whether we speak or not, if the French succeeded. However, you will have counted all that cost, and if you have brought me here you mean me to open my mouth. . . ." Bentley to Baynes, 10 Dec. 1884. Bentley papers.

¹²⁷ "I have begged Mr. Stanley not to yield to the Portuguese north of the Ambriz River, on which are the Arthington Falls; as the Portuguese will then get the great ivory factories but it will save San Salvador, all the Bakongo, and the best part of the Zombos. . . . You will see the A.I.A. will have to make large concessions, but nothing vital to us, for what is vital to us is vital to them." Bentley to Baynes, 12 Dec. 1884. Bentley papers.

¹²⁸ *Regions Beyond*, Feb. 1885.

¹²⁹ "We hope our missionaries will not put their trust in princes, that they will jealously guard the independence of the communities they found, that they will not covet the patronage nor ask for any exclusive privilege of the powers that be on the Congo." *Freeman*, 5 June, 1885.

¹³⁰ *Id.*, *art. cit.*

The Inspiration of the Bible

(Concluded)

NOW we must consider perhaps the most difficult question connected with this study. Is the Bible the Word of God? Of course, the obvious answer is that it all depends what you mean by "Word." It will be of value if we consider the Old Testament use of this idea. The word of God was creative (e.g. the divine fiat at creation); the word of God was revelational, in that it always showed an aspect of God's Person and character; the word of God was reproofing (*Jonah* i. 1 and iii. 1f.); and the word of God was renewing (*Ez.* xxxvii., especially v. 14). The phrase is often used where we should just say "God".

It is fairly plain how it was that our Lord came to be described in the terms of the Logos doctrine in the prologue to the Fourth Gospel. Whatever his debt to Philo, the author is clearly dealing with Old Testament ideas. The word of God is creative (*Col.* i. xvi. and 17), revelational (*Jn.* xiv. 9 and *Col.* i. 15a), reproofing (*Jn.* iii. 19) and renewing (*2 Cor.* v. 17). In fact, the Bible shows us in its entirety what the author of the Fourth Gospel shows us in brief span, that Jesus was the Word made flesh, and that the Word was God. Therefore, in the theological sense of the term "word" the Bible cannot be the Word of God, because that is only accurate when applied to Christ. For, although the Bible can both reveal God and reprove man, it can neither create nor renew of itself. We ought to speak of the Bible as the record of the Word of God rather than as the Word of God. Yet perhaps the latter expression is useful, as it reminds us that the "thought" of God is made known to us through the Bible which contains the "words" of God. But it is doubtful if a strong argument may be presented for applying the term "Word" to the Bible in a primary sense.

Principal Cunliffe-Jones applies the term "Word of God" to the Bible in a primary sense, because it is from the Bible that we claim our total knowledge of Jesus Christ. Yet almost immediately afterwards he is forced to make the point that of course we do not preach the Bible. He goes on: "The Bible is the word of God because it is the abiding testimony of the Christian church that the divine revelation is made known in the Gospel declared in scripture." (*Authority of the Biblical Revelation*, p. 104).

Dr. Rowley says: "To me the Bible is the word of God. This

does not mean that in all its parts it attains a uniform level of revelation or that we are justified in thinking that because a passage is in the Bible it gives us exact knowledge of history or science, or absolute insight into the nature and will of God. Christ alone is the Word of God that gives perfect insight into his nature and will, for in him alone is the absolute revelation of the heart of God." (*Relevance of the Bible*, pp. 24-25). It is plain that Dr. Rowley wants to keep the term "word of God" for the Bible, but realizes that really it is only properly applied to our Lord. The use of the capital does a little to simplify the confusion, but more careful use of the term may perhaps help to keep our view of the Bible in proper proportion.

As we work towards the inspiration of the Bible it is obvious that sooner or later we must mention the *Unity* which marks the relation of the Testaments to one another and makes it possible for us to call the Bible a book and not a collection of books. In referring to the Word of God we have demonstrated the unity which is shown by our Lord's fulfilment of the Old Testament, and we need not spend much time in elaborating the point in such a journal as this—how the old covenant of God with Moses and Abraham was fulfilled in the establishment of the church as the New Israel, a new chosen and elect people; how the law, which for so long had governed the behaviour of the Jews, was fulfilled in the freedom and discipline of the Spirit; how the fine insight of the Suffering Servant Songs was fulfilled by the Passion and Death of Christ; how the idea of the character of God and the place of man is fundamentally the same in both Testaments, and so on. Dr. Rowley's Whitley Lectures on this theme will make rewarding study for those interested; while the many parallels shown by scholars to exist between Old and New Testament passages reveal how steeped in the history and literature of the Jews the early Christian writers were.

AUTHORITY

We have passed through the stages of Literature, Religious Literature, Historicity, Uniqueness, Subject Matter (Revelation and the word of God) and Unity. Now, on the basis of all that has gone before, we assert the *Authority* of the Bible. Each of the points mentioned before provides a different kind of authority. A great many analyses of Biblical authority have been proposed, but the one which is used most frequently and has recently gained the approval of Mr. C. S. C. Williams in his revision of McNeile's Introduction to the New Testament is that which sees two kinds of authority in the Bible—*potestas* and *auctoritas*. The former is dogmatic authority, often of an official nature, like a government order on housing or rationing; the latter is the authority of an individual because he is an expert in a certain field, e.g. Bertrand Russell on

matters philosophical or Anthony Hopkins on matters musical. The Bible has both kinds of authority clearly enough; its writers were men of keen spiritual insight, experts in the field of theology (in the proper sense of the word), while the Church has accorded to it dogmatic authority, regarding the Scriptures as the basis of all Christian doctrine and practice and as "containing all things necessary to salvation." Speaking of *auctoritas*, Mr. Williams says: "The New Testament is a collection of masterpieces of spiritual music. Its authority is that of spiritual experts, and we treat it as we should treat the authority of any supreme expert on his own subject" (p. 478).

We are here dealing with an authority intrinsic to the nature of the book, quite apart from any appeal it may have for us individually. This we may call the "objective" authority of the Bible, although we cannot apply the word in its strictly philosophical sense. This "objective" or dogmatic authority may be what Principal Cunliffe-Jones has in mind when he speaks of a Final Authority in Scripture, i.e. right and power united. It is the acceptance of this authority which is the source of man's true freedom. (*Authority of the Biblical Revelation*, p. 13).

In Dr. Dodd's scholarly and devotional work, *The Authority of the Bible*, we find the same distinction as in Mr. Williams' work, but it is expressed in a slightly different manner. There is the authority of truth itself which needs no justification and is its own evidence, and there is the authority of persons who may reasonably be supposed to know the truth and are able to pass it on. On the former Dr. Dodd comments: "If the Bible has authority as a revelation of truth it is in some sense which is not incompatible with its human imperfection" (p. 18). Unfortunately, Dr. Dodd deals mainly with the second kind of authority, as do most of the modern writers on this subject. In fact a remark on page 30 almost rules out the *potestas* altogether in favour of the *auctoritas*: "It is not their words that are inspired, as one might say perhaps of 'automatic writing'—it is the men who are inspired. Their powers of mind, heart and will are heightened beyond the common measure."

We have done no more than raise a problem, far too profound and involved for an answer to be attempted here, but the younger generation of Christian students will have to find an answer for themselves.

In the first quotation from Dr. Dodd the Word *Truth* was used. It is essential to say something about that word, for the "objective authority" for which we have been arguing is closely linked with the question of the truth of the Bible. This question has perplexed countless ordinary Christian people as well as the scholars. "Is the Bible true?" Again, it all depends what you mean by true. There is a sense in which the *Genesis* creation story is true, although

obviously it is not a scientific account of the coming into being of the material universe. In a different sense the common-sense injunctions of *Proverbs* are true, although they cannot be said to have all the marks of the philosophical moral judgment. In a third sense the parables are true, although it is not necessary to suppose that the people and events in the stories are historical. Again, the Gospel is true, but that does not commit one to the view that every single item in the New Testament concerning the life of our Lord must be believed at all costs. The difference between historical fact and spiritual truth is one we have been very slow to learn, and this accounts for much of the difficulty experienced in the handling of the Fourth Gospel. If we try to say it is true in the sense of being historical fact we not only miss the main point of the writing, but we create problems which need never worry us. When one sees violent attempts to use the long discourses of this Gospel as sheer history one can only wonder what the author himself would think of a so-called enlightened age which could so miss the point of what he has to say. If we concentrate on the two main senses of truth, historical fact and spiritual truth, we may safely say that the Bible is true in both senses, sometimes in one, sometimes in the other, sometimes in both. There may be another sense in which the Bible is true for us, tested by experience, but that belongs properly to our next point and not to what we have called the "objective" aspect of authority.

The Bible has authority, from the "Thus saith the Lord" of the prophets to the "I say unto you" of our Lord. In it we find the authority of men of genius, but also the command and oracles of God; from the Ten Commandments with their negative application to the two positive commands of the New Testament; from the old stories handed down in *Judges* where men are superhuman and heroic, raised up to defeat the enemies of the Lord, to the searching parables, where men are sinners, but are prepared to defy all the powers of earth to witness to the change made in their lives by the Gospel; from the picture of God as supreme in creation in the *Genesis* story to the picture of God as supreme at the end of the world in the vision of *Revelation*.

This authority, we maintain, is there in the Bible whether we accept it or not; it is there even for the non-Christian person. Here we must part company with Principal Child who implies that the best way to demonstrate the authority of the Bible is to let it speak for itself by reading it "receptively, Christologically, critically and ecumenically." (Cf. article in *The Fraternal*, April, 1954). All these imply the subjective approach, relevant only for those who are already Christian. We close this section with the noble words from the Coronation service when the Queen was presented with the Bible: ". . . we present you with this book, the most valuable

thing that this world affords. Here is Wisdom, here is the royal Law : These are the lively Oracles of God."

RELEVANCE

Until now we have endeavoured to follow a line of thought from the realm of literature through to the question of authority. We can go no further on that line, for the academic approach leaves us just short of the goal we seek. We cannot make another step without introducing the subjective factor into our reckoning. This may be called the *Relevance* of the Bible, using that portmanteau term to cover the whole realm of Christian experience, individual preference, personal consideration and private devotion. Many more profound things might have been said on the "objective" side, but there would still have come a point where the subjective would have to be given due weight.

Christian people will approach the Bible in a different spirit from others. They will form attachments to some parts of it; and naturally so. As long as those personal likings are not used as academic arguments, well and good. A devotional approach to the Bible will reveal great wealth for us. Some parts will lead us closer to God than others. But then, "The dramatist does not put the whole, or necessarily, any part of his direct meaning into the words spoken by this or that character." (H. Wheeler Robinson, *Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, p. 170).

The relevance of the Bible for our own day must be tested by experience. Only then shall we learn how much we depend upon it. Well may Billy Graham write: "For without the Bible this would indeed be a dark and frightening place, without signpost or beacon." (*Peace with God*, p. 14). While we could not accept the sentiments of the context of this remark, the section on the Bible is worth consideration as showing the influence of Scripture on the Christian life. The situations of the Bible are those of our own day. Who knows for certain that the Lord is not using the materialistic forces in the world today to chastise the slackness of his Church? (cf. letter in *Methodist Recorder*, May 13th, 1955, where Rev. F. Ockenden discusses this point in relation to the hydrogen bomb.) Assyria was seen as the rod of Yahweh's anger in ancient times; there are plenty of things in the world now which may be fulfilling precisely that function.

Emil Brunner has a brilliant illustration about the Bible in *Our Faith*. He says it is possible to buy a record with the trade name of "His Master's Voice," and be told that if you play it you will hear the master, Caruso's, voice. So you will, or at least you will hear a record of it; but there will be other noises as well. The needle may scratch the record, and it is possible to concentrate so fiercely on the scratching that the effect of the master's voice is completely lost

on you. (p. 19). Perhaps we may extend the illustration a little to complete the picture. If the needle does scratch slightly, there is not much to worry about, but if the scratching is really bad, there is no point in saying that it is a good record; far better admit that the master's voice can be heard despite the recording.

In church, in private reading, on the radio, or in almost any other way, the Bible can come home to us. God will use the words of the Bible to make His will known to us. If we may use one other idea from Dr. Dodd, this time from *According to the Scriptures* (p. 131-2) we may show how important this subjective side really is for a strong modern interpretation of the Bible. He is speaking of prophecy, but his remarks admit of a wider application. "The ultimate significance of prophecy is not only what it meant for the author, but what it came to mean for those who stood within the tradition which he founded or promoted, and who lived under the impact of the truth he declared . . . the meaning of the writings cannot remain static while the life to which they belong changes with the centuries."

So we have two main points: the long line of thought bringing us to the point of Authority, which we claim is "objective," and the point of Relevance. On the strength of these two positions we must state our claim that the Bible is inspired. The final step cannot be argued. Its logic depends on what has been said on the two previous points. By the inspiration of the Bible we mean its elevation or animation by supernatural means. With the writer of 2 *Tim.* iii. 16 we would agree that God has inspired the production of the written word. The very nobility, antiquity, history and veneration of the Bible lead us to suspect that it is inspired. The knowledge we have of it, mediated by the Holy Spirit, confirms these thoughts.

After discussing the Bible as the Word of God for some four pages, Dr. Brunner closes with these searching words: "Now, are there any other questions? It is my opinion that if this is the way the matter stands, there is only one conclusion to be drawn: Go now and began at last to listen attentively to the Master's voice." (*Our Faith*, p. 20).

J. R. C. PERKIN.

The Calling and Ordination of Ministers in the Eighteenth Century

THE Baptist Church at Burnham-on-Crouch was in all probability founded in 1659. The earliest minute book in existence bears the date December, 1673, but by that time there was obviously a church of some standing in existence. Other evidence points to the earlier date. The first minute of a Church Meeting, dated 1699, occurs in between pages of contributions and disbursements, at the reverse end of the book, quite clearly indicating that such meetings were unusual or rarely recorded. Unfortunately the month is missing owing to the destruction of the corner of the page. At that meeting there were some thirty members present, twenty-seven of whom signed the minutes. The minutes record the fact that at that gathering two members, Thomas Lilly and Henery (sic) Fields "were chosen for elders to serve the Lord by the Church in and about Burnham, when they shall be orderly ordained to that office." It is obvious, however, that the simple resolution of the church was not sufficient for the purpose, as a year later the Church asked for a Messenger to be sent from the General Baptist Assembly to ordain these two men. These Elders were clearly ordained not only to minister to the congregation at Burnham, but also to like congregations in the district. This proved to be the beginning of a considerable succession which was sustained fairly continually until 1755 when the name of John Steben appears as Elder for the last time.

In 1772 Ham Stacey, a farmer, said to be an Arian, signed himself as Minister, the first use of that title. As far back as 1762, however, his name appears as having the meeting in his house.

The two Elders above-mentioned headed the list of those who signed the minutes until the first-named dropped out, but Henery Fields' name is perpetuated till April, 1728. The next to succeed him was John Cable. "On the 12th day of March, 1729," all the members that were met together did make choice of Brother John Cable to serve the Church as an Elder." The Ordination took place on the 6th May, 1729, which was kept as a day of fasting and prayer "to begin at 9 a.m. and end at 3 p.m." There is, however, in this appointment, no reference to serving "about Burnham." In all probability he was elected to be the presiding Elder in the Church at Burnham itself.

It is quite clear that at this time the question of appointment, recognition and ordination of elders was exercising the minds of our churches. Many of them had no regular ministry and, in some cases, as at Burnham, there was a plurality of Elders or Pastors. J. J. Goadby, in his *Bye-paths in Baptist History*, tells us that in 1704 the Church at Burnham presented "a case" to the General Assembly of General Baptists "in respect to the calling of ministers." This was answered by the Assembly in seven breviate. These declared that any brother who felt that he had a gift to be improved for the benefit of the church, ought to be permitted to express the same, and both he and the church ought to be willing to abide by the decision of the Church Meeting. Breviate No. 7 is perhaps the most important for the present purpose. "We look upon it to be the duty of every member of Christ's Church to love and encourage every gifted brother, and to pray for him, with all seriousness; which may be the means to prevail with God to enlarge their gifts, and to send forth more labourers." This, undoubtedly, was not only an answer to the question set by the church at Burnham, but a general directive to all the churches in the General Association of General Baptists.

The time from the death of Ham Stacey in 1789 until the early years of the next century were years of decline and struggle. In that year "there were but four members liveing (sic) and one of them a Judas," but largely through the instrumentality of John Elliot, a native of Burnham, residing then in Clapham, the work was revived. A new sense of ministerial significance came in 1808. John Garrington, at one time a sailor, now a schoolmaster in the town, had been appointed Secretary in February, 1801, to which office he added that of "Cashier" a few years later. When Mr. G. J. Pincharde, a surgeon, an apothecary, a midwife and a minister, resigned the pastorate in 1808, Mr. Garrington, who had already "read sermons" in the interval prior to Mr. Pincharde's ministry, was again called upon for the same service. He had already been called out by the church to preach the Gospel, during the ministry of his pastor, but "being dependent upon his school for a livelihood, and wanting confidence in his own ability for public preaching," he hesitated to conform to the will of the church.

Later that year, however, "he felt obliged to commence public preaching and thereafter till the May of the following year he preached twice a Sunday and once in the week at home," still without any intention or desire of becoming pastor of the church. After considerable delay in securing a minister and particularly after the visit of a Mr. Adams of Bristol Academy who came "on probation" for eleven weeks and was even then declined, the way appeared quite clear for the one practical solution—namely, the calling of John Garrington to the vacant pastorate. This the church

did unanimously in May, 1810, but the young schoolmaster's diffidence and "the weighty considerations which needed careful thought" preventing him from accepting the invitation which the church pressed upon him again in the December of that year.

It was not till the March of 1811, that this able young man of thirty-three years "after much prayer yielded to the invitation of the Church." A minute of the previous month records a Church Meeting at which "much conversation took place relative to Bro. Garrington being ordained pastor of the Church, which, however, from the view that Bro. Garrington has of the vast solemnity and greatness of the charge and of his insufficiency and his unworthiness did not come to a resolution."

That diffidence was finally overcome and at an Ordination Service in May, 1811, which lasted from 11 a.m. until 3.15 p.m. the good man was ordained.

John Garrington became the Apostle of the Dengie Hundred. Among the many ventures of faith in the district which he either inaugurated or helped was the work at Tillingham which had been commenced by a missionary sent from the Essex Association of that time, a forerunner of the present one. This church was put under his pastoral care. Ten years later the members at Tillingham felt that the time had come when "the Lord will build up Zion at Tillingham." They presented a "humble petition" to the church at Burnham to be dismissed "in order to form a separate and distinct Church." This was later done and at the meeting when the church was formally founded amid very moving scenes, Bro. George Wesley (sic) was "ordained" after recalling the circumstances of his call, making a statement of his faith and the "articles" he hoped to make the subject of his future ministry. Thus the church both at Burnham and at Tillingham seemed to have moved towards the modern conception of the call and recognition of the minister.

LIONEL F. HIGGS.

Mennonite Quarterly Review, January, 1956, has articles on Anabaptist pacifism, the Balk Mennonites, the Risser Letters and the use of mediaeval theological writings among the Anabaptists.

Reviews

The Study of Missions in Theological Education. An historical inquiry into the place of world evangelisation in Western Protestant ministerial training with particular reference to Alexander Duff's Chair of Evangelistic Theology. Vol. I to 1910. By O. G. Myklebust. (Egede Instituttet, Oslo. N.Kr. 27.80).

This is an absorbing and important contribution to the question of ministerial training and to the literature on missions. Well qualified as a research historian and rarely hampered by linguistic difficulties, Mr. Myklebust has pursued vast enquiries in universities and seminaries on both sides of the Atlantic. He has marshalled his material with skill and rendered it here in an English version for which, proof-reading apart, he had no need to apologise. The book has a drive about it which suggests a zealot as well as a scholar. The scholar has kept it objective, the zealot is clearly out for converts. He finds that in Europe and America there are many theological halls which make no provision for "missions" and that even where this is a required subject of study it is usually in a subordinate position. This assertion is made in the present tense, although his research has been mainly in the period up to 1910. He would doubtless admit that things have not stood still in the last forty-five years, but obviously feels that Western Protestantism as a whole is still committing a serious sin of omission in theological education.

His heroes are of course those who have fought for a worthy place for "Missions" or "Missiology" in ministerial training. By this he does not mean, for example, the insertion of occasional lectures by missionaries on furlough but the recognition of Missiology as a major and vitally relevant theological discipline, without which future ministers and missionaries are not being realistically prepared for their work. What he has been looking for is the treatment in all its varied aspects of the whole subject of Christian expansion among non-Christians. It is not surprising therefore that he devotes special attention to Alexander Duff's Chair of Evangelistic Theology. The vision which Duff had was not fulfilled, as the author shows in examining the history of the chair until it petered out and was succeeded by the more modest Duff Missionary Lecture-ship, but the "grand experiment" set forth an ideal which was not invalidated just because this particular scheme failed. The author's critical estimate of the venture and the reasons for its failure is penetrating. Duff's standing as a missionary statesman emerges enhanced rather than otherwise.

So far as possible all the countries of Western Protestantism

have been brought within the author's purview. The chapters are laid out in chronological order and begin with an interesting survey of efforts prior to the nineteenth century. It was, however, only when Missions assumed world proportions that Missiology began to gain real recognition. The two outstanding dates were 1867 and 1910. In 1867 Duff began his professorship, C. H. C. Plath (largely inspired by Duff) set an even more ambitious scheme before the Berlin Mission, and Rufus Anderson delivered a series of lectures in Andover Theological Seminary, Boston, which was the first series of its kind in America. "Edinburgh 1910" marked the beginning of a new era and made a "decisive contribution" to the cause with which this study deals. 1910 saw also the death of Gustav Warneck, the first full-time professor of Missions in Germany and one of several figures whose importance is well brought out. In his account of such men as Warneck, F. A. E. Ehrenfeuchter ("the real founder of the subject of missionary theory"), and others, the author goes some way towards justifying his assertion that Germany formerly led the way in developing a Missionswissenschaft, but he does not prove his statement that this leadership was maintained until World War II.

It is interesting to learn that the oldest Chair of Missions in America still in existence is that founded in 1899 in Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, but Baptists do not figure prominently in this account and British Baptists hardly at all. The author might have referred to such as Fuller and Carey in his allusions to the wider aspects of missionary apologetic, for he does not always stay within the sphere of college instruction. Within that sphere itself, it is difficult to believe that such as Dr. John Ryland, when Principal of Bristol, and Dr. Angus, when Principal of Regents, gave no sustained attention to the subject. Yet the author appears to have found no evidence to the contrary.

These comments do scant justice to the range of this book and the interest which it sustains throughout. As a bibliographical source alone it is worth its cost. It is described as No. 6 of the Studies of the Egede Institute and its publication was made possible by a grant from Norwegian Research Council for Science and the Humanities. The price in English currency is, I understand, about 24s. The name "Clarke" should be inserted on p. 249, line 3.

Truth is Immortal. The Story of Baptists in Europe, by I. Barnes. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 8s. 6d.).

The strengthening of Baptist ties resulting from the Jubilee Congress of the B.W.A. will ensure a special welcome for this book. There must be many in this country who now wish to know more of our churches on the Continent, and Mr. Barnes has provided an

attractive introduction to the subject. He has found an apt title in the words of Balthasar Hubmaier. It is a story of survival and achievement in the face of great odds which is here related, and the author has succeeded in communicating the fervour and firmness of conviction which have sustained these communities, some of which are still so very small. If anyone still doubts the significance of our World Alliance he will find here how much it has meant to our brethren in Europe.

Two maps of Europe are provided, one for the period before 1914 and the other for 1919-39. I would suggest that this invaluable aid be supplemented by more detailed maps for cc. 2-6 in any future edition which may be called for. Another useful feature is the bibliography which must cover most if not all of the readily accessible material to which the reader may turn for further study. Mr. Barnes's account, which has been enhanced by his first-hand knowledge of Continental Baptists, is deliberately popular in scope and aim and whets the appetite for a full-scale treatment of the subject. The difficulties confronting anyone who attempts such a work would be very great, in some respects almost insuperable. People who have to struggle for their very existence are often too preoccupied to commit their story to writing.

G. W. RUSLING.

Belief and Unbelief since 1850, by H. G. Wood. (Cambridge University Press, 12s. 6d.).

Men have always complained that things are not what they were and there is the temptation for every age to claim that it is, par excellence, the age of transition. But 1850 to 1950! When was there a century to compare with it, particularly in the realm of belief, which is the concern of this book.

Dr. Wood gives a picture of the comparative intellectual stability of "the good old days." It is the kind of picture which is given in more detail in the opening chapters of Philip Magnus' life of Gladstone. Then came Darwin. And the higher critics. And Freud. And the Logical Positivists. But Christian belief survives them all. Dr. Wood shows how and why Christian faith survives. Developing his argument with a coolness which is quite reassuring, he comes to the place where he is able to hold the fundamental Christian conviction "that Jesus Christ has come to us from God's side."

Here is an enlightened survey of a century's spiritual pilgrimage. The presentation of such a scene in such a completely satisfying way is some feat. Here is the tying up of ends that so many of us in our intellectual indolence prefer to leave hanging loose. The reading of a book like this is a challenge to 'finished' thinking and an altogether health-giving experience.

(On p. 3 the Lord's Day Observance Society is misnamed "Association" and in a footnote on p. 6 R. C. Walton is given as R. D. Walton).

J. ITHEL JONES.

The Mennonite Encyclopedia, Vol. I, A-C. (Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pa., 1955, \$10.00).

Six years ago attention was called in these pages (*Baptist Quarterly*, XIII, p. 51) to the project, to which the three major Mennonite bodies in North America had committed themselves, of an encyclopaedia which should be a comprehensive reference work in English on the Anabaptist-Mennonite movement. The first of the four volumes which are planned is now available. Its publication is an event of major importance for all concerned with Free Church history, for there is growing agreement among historians that the roots of this history run back to the left wing of the Reformation. The widely scattered Mennonite communities are "cousins" of the Baptists and Congregationalists, and their acquaintance should be cultivated much more consistently and sympathetically than has been done of recent generations.

An impressive board of Editors, supported by an editorial council, is in charge of this venture. They are led by Dr. H. S. Bender, of Goshen, Indiana. For the European material he has been able to draw on the *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, which began to appear in parts of Germany more than a quarter of a century ago and which it is hoped soon to complete. Many of the articles are translations from the German work, but much new material has been added relating to the American Mennonites and to their missionary enterprises overseas. It has also been possible to make use of the more important publications of recent years. Printing and format are admirable and the maps and illustrations add greatly to the value of the work. The illustrations, for example, include thirteen pages of pictures of Mennonite meeting-houses in different parts of the world.

Since this particular volume includes articles on Calvin and Bullinger, Bucer and Capito, and on Blaurock, of the early Anabaptist leaders, as well as articles on Augsburg, Austria, Amsterdam, Basel and Bern, the student may easily gain from it reliable and up-to-date material on the early history of the Anabaptists. He will also find articles on admission into the Church, Ban, Baptism, Church, Communion, Community of Goods, Confessions of Faith and Conscientious Objectors, all of them important for an understanding of the convictions, polity and practices of the movement. The series of articles on Alcohol should also be noted. Such material is nowhere else so easily accessible. It is to be hoped that

this encyclopaedia will at once be placed in the libraries of all of our colleges.

Naturally, there are not many direct allusions to this country in this volume. Those that there are make one wish that it had been possible to associate some English scholar with the work. There are articles on Baptists, Brownists and the Congregational Church, all of which might with advantage have been somewhat elaborated and revised. It is, for example, strange that none of Dr. Whitley's writings finds a place in the bibliography attached to the article on the Baptists. There are entries on Henry Ainsworth, William Ames and, of a later age, William Henry Angas, and these should not be overlooked by the English student.

In a brief notice of a volume of 750 pages, one can do little more than call attention to the richness and importance of the material. In further printings, the strange slip on page 191 will no doubt be corrected. It is there stated that Hymn No. 2 in the *Ausbund* is based on the Athanasian Creed; on page 137 the Apostles' Creed has already and correctly been named in this connection. On page 28 the comma should be after Morley, not after Swanton, in the designation of Ainsworth's birthplace. It ought also to be noted that the first Baptist church in Scotland was started by soldiers from Cromwell's army (p. 229). But to mention such points may appear almost churlish. This is a most welcome and excellent publication. The further volumes will be eagerly awaited. If they make Baptists envious, they may perhaps also stir them to some similar enterprise.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

I Saw It. Not CommUnism but CommOnism, by T. E. Huntley. (Comet Press, New York, \$3.00).

In 1953 a member of the Un-American Activities Committee alleged that 7,000 Protestant clergymen in the U.S.A. were on the side of Communism, whether as unwitting dupes, fellow-travellers, or actual agents of the party. The author of this volume, who is pastor of Central Baptist Church, Saint Louis, Missouri, was among those named as subversive, and the book was published as a reply to the charge. The addresses which it contains have, however, been drawn from over twenty years of conscientious ministry and deal with a variety of subjects ranging from Motherhood to the Church, as well as the special theme which prompted its publication. Much of the idiom is strange but one can imagine the impact which some of these addresses must have had on those who heard them delivered. Not the least interesting section is the appendix which describes some of the progressive work done in the Central Baptist Church and provides a glimpse into the dedicated life of a Negro Baptist minister.

G. W. RUSLING.

Cistercians and Cluniacs, by M. D. Knowles, O.S.B. (Oxford University Press, 3s. 6d.).

The ninth annual lecture under the auspices of the Friends of Dr. Williams's Library, delivered in September, 1955, by Professor David Knowles, fully maintained the high standard of interest and scholarship set by earlier lectures. It dealt with the controversy between St. Bernard and Peter the Venerable in the twelfth century, in which the former advocated the more puritan order of the Cistercians as superior to the laxity and luxury which had overtaken the Cluniacs. The lecturer points out that the Cistercians were returning to the more balanced Rule of St. Benedict, but that they did not escape the sins of spiritual complacency and pride, while Peter was himself responsible for many reforms at Cluny.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

John: the Gospel of Belief, by Merrill C. Tenney. New London: Commentary on the New Testament. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 25s.).

The author is known in the U.S.A. as one of the ablest of younger Baptist teachers and preachers. Here he supplies the Bible student with a most helpful commentary on the Fourth Gospel. The clue to the interpretation of *John*, he believes, is in its literary structure and, accordingly, he proceeds to an analytic study based upon the book's natural structure. In so doing he largely leaves aside the kind of critical questions in which scholars delight but sets out to meet the need of the preacher and student who wants to know what is the aim, theme and teaching of *John*. Dr. Tenney, however, tends to overwork his analytic, schematic method. Nevertheless as an expository guide—from the conservative viewpoint—to the thought and spiritual significance of the Fourth Gospel, this is a volume which many will be glad to have and will find its pages useful and rewarding.

G. W. HUGHES.

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

Dr. Le Roy Froom has brought to a conclusion a great work for which he deserves the highest praise and the warm gratitude of many students. This third volume was the first to be issued, but the last to come into the hands of the reviewer. The other volumes have already been reviewed in the *Baptist Quarterly* (xiii, pp. 41ff., xiv, pp. 89f., and xvi, pp. 134ff.), and the reviewer would repeat his

recognition of the scholarship and the skill Dr. Froom has shown as a historian of interpretation. In his four volumes he surveys the interpretation of the apocalyptic passages in *Daniel* and *Revelation* from the earliest times. The present volume covers the American writings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and European writings of the first half of the nineteenth century. We have biographical information about the various writers, and an account of their views fully documented, and often supported by actual quotation.

Most of the writers whose work comes under consideration here were Protestant and worked with common principles. The Preterist and Futurist, the pre-Millennialist and the post-Millennialist all figure in Dr. Froom's pages, but most of the writers dealt with work with the year-day rule and identified the Papacy with Antichrist. All shared the common delusion that in the Scripture passages which they expounded there is a cryptic chart of the ages, and that if only we could break the code we could know the future. But despite their common presuppositions they found much room for manipulation.

In the Biblical passages we find a variety of figures—the seventy weeks, the numbers 1260, 1290, 1335, and 391 (the last based on *Rev.* ix. 15). By starting at different points widely different results can obviously be obtained. Thus the 1260 years have been started by different writers in the years A.D. 365, 410, 455, 529, 533, 540, 606. Some writers have believed that two or more of these periods began simultaneously, while others have thought two or more ended simultaneously. Hence despite the community of basic principle we have a bewildering variety of results. A few samples will suffice to illustrate this. In 1639 Cotton believed the 1260 years would end in 1655, while about a century later Clarke moved the date on to 1758 or 1759. In 1813 Cunninghame believed this period had ended in 1792, while in 1828 White thought of 1843 or 1844. In 1747 Jonathan Edwards thought the period had ended in 1716, while in a work published in 1774, but delivered as lectures in 1739, he had calculated that it would end in 1866. In 1809 Hales argued for the year 1880. Similar varieties could be adduced for the other figures. In 1835 Fry held that the 1260 years ended in 1797, the 1290 in 1827, and the 1335 would end in 1872, while in 1813 Cunninghame thought all these three periods would end simultaneously.

The Lisbon earthquake of 1755 was seen out of focus by some contemporary writers, who found it referred to in Scripture, while the outbreak of the French Revolution was later believed by others to be indicated in the same passage. The dethronement of the Pope in 1798 was hailed as the end of the Papacy, but soon it was held that this was only a wound, and in 1811 Lathrop believed that the

Papacy would come to a final end in 1842. In 1832 Wolff declared that the Second Advent would take place in 1847, while in 1836 Wilson announced that the Resurrection would take place within fourteen years. In 1829 Addis believed that 1843 was the focal point of prophecy, while in 1859 Cumming moved the focal point to 1867.

Most of these writers believed that the climax of the ages was just ahead of their own time, and so we find a steady moving on as one after another proved to be a misleading "student of prophecy." For all of these writers had one other thing in common, beside the basic principles on which they worked. They were all wrong, and all proved to be blind leaders of the blind.

It is precisely here that the reviewer finds the lesson of this superb study in the history of exegesis. It is an illuminating exposure of the mirage of this kind of study of prophecy, showing that it is wiser to discard the fundamental principle that we have here a cryptic key of the ages. A principle which has for centuries misled everyone who has trusted it can hardly deserve credit, and the vast number of those it has misled testifies to their easy credulity, rather than to its respectability. The man who can boast that he has swindled everyone who has trusted him is hardly likely to find fresh dupes, but it is safe to say that they will long continue to come forward to be duped by the principles of interpretation so magnificently exposed by Dr. Froom. Dr. Froom himself belongs to a body which shares something of the outlook of the writers whose works provide the basis for most of this volume, though there is no longer the disposition to make precise calculations. The reviewer is persuaded that its consistent failure has discredited it irretrievably. It is for this reason that his gratitude to Dr. Froom is so sincere, and his recognition of the objectivity and fineness of the scholarship and the vast amount of research that has gone into the preparation of these volumes so free from bias. He especially deserves the thanks of those who reject the whole approach to these passages of Scripture, which has provided so sorry a story.

H. H. ROWLEY.

In the Beginning, by Roger Pilkington. (Independent Press. Limp 4s., Cloth Boards 5s.).

What A. S. Peake describes in his Commentary as a "once burning question," the relation between the *Genesis* narrative of the creation and modern science is still a very real problem for many of our young people in Grammar and Secondary Modern schools, especially when the science master is an atheist or agnostic and the minister or Bible-class leader in the church is a "fundamental-

ist," insisting that the Bible is right and science wrong. The boy is presented with an either-or; either the Bible or science. Faced with that choice most boys today will accept the teaching of science and reject that of the Bible. That was Roger Pilkington's first reaction when the Natural History Museum told him that the fossil bones he had found in an old quarry were those of an Ichthyosaurus which had lived about a hundred and fifty million years ago, while his school Bible told him that the world itself was created only in 4004 B.C. It was when he knew more about the Bible and about science that the problem was solved for him. This book is the story of the solving of that problem. It is a fascinating book, well produced and illustrated and calculated to hold the allegiance of our intelligent young people to the Bible and the Christian faith.

Ceylon Advancing, by H. J. Charter. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 6s.).

The author, a B.M.S. missionary in Ceylon from 1906-1945, has given us a very interesting history of the B.M.S. in Ceylon since the work was begun there by James Chater in 1812. The story has been told against the background of modern political, economic and religious conditions in Ceylon, the granting of Dominion status to the island in 1948, the growth of the spirit of nationalism, the improvement of transport and communications, of electrical power and food supplies under the Colombo plan, and, most significant of the factors in modern Ceylon, the remarkable revival of Buddhism, itself closely bound up with the national aspirations of the people. This book is warmly commended to anyone interested in the B.M.S. and in Far Eastern affairs generally. There are some good photographs, but a map would have been a useful addition.

CYRIL SMITH.

Oxford Junior Study Bible. (Oxford University Press : Cumberledge.. Sheldon Type Edition, 11s. 6d. Ruby Type Edition, 8s. 6d.).

These two new, illustrated Bibles are in the Authorized Version. A particularly notable feature of both is the "Concise Helps" at the end which provides a great deal of valuable information and forms a clear and extremely helpful guide for the younger reader to the history and contents of the Scriptures. Maps, geographical notes, table of dates and an index to the usefulness of the volumes. The Sheldon edition takes its name from its attractive and legible new type face, here used for the first time, designed specially to overcome the difficulties peculiar to the printing of the Bible. This, certainly, is a handsome volume. To any who wish to make a gift of a Bible to a younger reader—or, indeed, to obtain one for themselves—it may be wholeheartedly commended.

G. W. HUGHES.