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

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

Editorial Notes.

The Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society was held in the Dr. Williams Library, 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1., on Thursday, April 29th. There was a good attendance of members, who enjoyed the opportunity for fellowship at the tea which preceded the meeting. The Annual Report of the Secretary and the Financial Statement of the Treasurer were adopted and will be published in our next issue. The death of Dr. W. T. Whitley necessitated, all too soon, further changes in the leadership of the Society. Mr. Seymour J. Price, who in 1935 succeeded Dr. Whitley as Secretary of the Society and shortly after became sole editor of the *Baptist Quarterly*, was elected President, and Revs. A. S. Langley, F.R.Hist.S., and Ernest A. Payne, M.A., B.D., B.Litt. Vice-Presidents, in addition to Drs. Dakin and Evans who were re-elected. The Revs. Ernest A. Payne, Graham W. Hughes, B.A., B.D., and Mr. Price were appointed Editorial Board as from the present issue. They will mutually help one another, but, in general, Mr. Payne will be responsible for editorials and reviews, Mr. Hughes for modern articles and Mr. Price for historical.

After the Annual Meeting, Mr. Stephen Jones, librarian, spoke interestingly and authoritatively of the valuable collection of manuscripts, tracts, pictures and books comprised in the Library. He had placed us further in his debt by arranging a display of old books and manuscripts which were likely to be of particular interest to our members. Considerable time was spent in the handling and perusal of these.

* * * *

As stated above an Editorial Board has been appointed, and it is hoped that the next number of the *Baptist Quarterly* will be published during October. Arrangements have been made for the resumption of regular quarterly publication as from January 1st, 1949. Mr. Price, who has been responsible for the present number much regrets its late publication through circumstances beyond his control.

* * * *

We referred in our last issue to the attempt shortly to be made, under Dr. Sidney Berry's leadership, to transform the International Congregational Council into a kind of Congrega-

tionalist World Alliance. At the instance of the I.C.C. a statement on Congregationalism has recently been issued to all the national Congregational Unions with a view to its further discussion and formal adoption at an I.C.C. meeting in Boston in 1949. The statement is naturally of interest to Baptists, whose tradition and polity have been so similar to those of the Congregationalists. The document has this added importance: if it is made the basis of a Congregationalist Alliance, the absence of any reference to the practice of paedo-baptism would apparently make it possible for a Baptist Union organised in the manner suggested to apply for membership!

The statement begins by defining a Congregational Church as "in principle a covenant fellowship, binding the members to God and to one another through Christ, the Head of the Church." This is followed by a quotation from Richard Mather, the Lancashire-born compiler of the famous Bay Psalm Book, whose "Cambridge Platform" repudiating New England Presbyterianism appeared just three hundred years ago. Five supplementary points are then made. (1) Whilst standing for religious liberty and refraining from credal subscription, Congregationalists "have never differed from other Christian communions in respect of the great doctrines of the Christian faith." (2) "The distinctive element in the Congregational polity has been the local church in which each member has his spiritual responsibility . . . . The instrument whereby Christ rules in the local church is the Church Meeting. . . ." (3) Unions of Congregational churches have been on the principle that wider synods and courts should have the same sort of authority as the Church Meeting, with all authority spiritual, "not legislative, coercive and magisterial." This principle of government, it is said, is the essential contribution of Congregationalists to the Universal Church. (4) The ultimate human authority in the church is the whole fellowship which may call out any member to preach or administer the sacraments. (5) Churchmanship of this type is based on respect for the individual and this leads Congregationalists to stand for "political and religious freedom, for economic justice, for racial equality and for equality of the sexes."

There is little here that Baptists are likely to quarrel with except, perhaps, the references to the Church Meeting. If "*the* instrument whereby Christ rules in the local church is the Church Meeting," then He is being given little opportunity to rule in many modern Baptist and Congregationalist churches. Moreover, this statement surely exalts order to the level of faith, and appears to limit the channel of Christ's rule, just as an episcopal or synodal system does, if insisted on as *the* instrument. The truth, of course, is that the Church Meeting is one of the ways in

which Christ has ruled and may rule in His Church. Dare we say more than that?

The full text of the Congregationalist statement appeared in the *Christian World* for January 1st, 1948. It deserves careful comparison with the Statement on the Doctrine of the Church recently approved by the Baptist Union Council and printed in full elsewhere in this issue.

* * * *

We understand that in the United States the Evangelical and Reformed Church (which has 700,000 members and is of non-Lutheran German antecedents) is likely to unite with the Congregational Christian Church (that is, the Congregationalists, as we should call them, who number 1,150,000). Considerable progress has also been made in discussion between representatives of the Northern Baptist Convention and of the Disciples of Christ, and renewed formal negotiations between the two bodies are now likely. Although in origin an offshoot of Presbyterianism, after 1827 the Disciples in America drew many recruits from Baptist circles. They are said now to number 1,700,000 members, which is slightly more than the membership associated with the Northern Baptist Convention.

* * * *

The announcement that Dr. Arnold T. Ohrn, of Norway, has accepted an invitation to become General Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance has given widespread satisfaction. Born while his father was in ministerial service in the United States, Dr. Ohrn grew to manhood in Norway, graduated at Oslo University and has rendered most able service to the Baptist Union of Norway and the Baptist Theological Seminary. At the Atlanta World Congress by his sermon, and at Copenhagen by his outstanding gifts as a translator, Dr. Ohrn became well known and trusted by representative Baptists from every part of the world. It will be a particular satisfaction to those in Britain that, at a time when inevitably much of the work and support of the Alliance must find their centre in America, one so knowledgeable and well-equipped as regards the life of Europe is to be General Secretary. It is welcome news, too, that Dr. W. O. Lewis will be continuing for another year at least his services to the Alliance.

* * * *

Plans for the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches are now well advanced. It is due to meet in Amsterdam from August 22nd to September 4th. The delegates of the Baptist Union are to be the Rev. M. E. Aubrey, Principal P. W. Evans, Mr. C. T. LeQuesne, K.C., and the Rev. E. A. Payne, with Dr.

Hugh Martin and Dr. Dunning as alternates. The Rt. Hon. Ernest Brown has been asked to represent the Baptist Union of New Zealand, so that he also will be present. For many months past, strong international commissions have been at work, and before the Assembly opens four important volumes of essays will be issued under the titles *The Universal Church in God's Design, God's Design and Man's Witness, The Church and the Disorder of Society* and *The Church and International Affairs.* It may safely be affirmed that so elaborate and sustained a piece of co-operative Christian thinking has never before been attempted. It is not going to be easy to establish the World Council on a basis firm enough to sustain it, and yet satisfactory to those of varying ecclesiastical tradition and varying views of the nature of the Church. The guidance and blessing of God should be earnestly invoked by all Christian people. Some commentators have ventured to link the Amsterdam meeting with the Council of Nicaea in 325. It is significant that the forthcoming Assembly was not summoned by any Emperor or secular authority and that it has not to settle theological or ecclesiastical controversies; it is the voluntary coming together of Christian representatives desirous of demonstrating their fellowship in Christ and anxious to discover and serve the will of God.

* * * *

The Study Department of the World Council of Churches has issued a valuable report entitled *From the Bible to the Modern World,* (Geneva); 3s. 6d. from Miss S. Morden, World Council of Churches, 7, Kensington Church Court, London, W.8. It contains papers read at two conferences, one in London and one at Bossey, and summarises the discussions upon them. C. H. Dodd, W. M. Horton, Karl Barth, A. Nygren and W. Eichrodt are among the contributors. The object of the conferences was to discover "the Biblical Authority for the Church's Social and Political Message today." They afforded important evidence of some of the newer theological trends both on the Continent and in America and Britain. We note with some surprise and disappointment that of the fifty scholars who took part in the Conferences not one was a Baptist.

William Thomas Whitley.

IT was with profound regret that we heard of the death of our President, William Thomas Whitley, M.A., LL.M., LL.D., F.T.S., F.R.Hist.S., in his eighty-seventh year, on Thursday, December 18th, 1947. By common consent he was the outstanding British Baptist historian. No one had done more to preserve and interpret the records of our past. We owe a great debt to the research pioneers, Crosby, Ivimey, Rippon, Underhill and others, but all would agree that the debt owed to Dr. Whitley is immeasurably greater. Baptist history and traditions were his close study for sixty years. To this study he brought a trained and disciplined mind, with the result that obscure and disputed points were settled, inaccuracies corrected, and conclusions reached which have stood the test of time. His knowledge of dates, persons and churches was encyclopaedic, and this knowledge he cheerfully placed at the service of others. He was known among Baptists of the five continents as a statesman of international repute, and his correspondence was world-wide.

He was the founder and driving force of our Society, and his service during the past forty years can hardly be measured. Prior to the Society's formation he enlisted, and obtained, warm-hearted support from Dr. J. H. Shakespeare, Principal G. P. Gould, Judge William Willis, and others who were high in the counsels of the denomination. He convinced them, and through them, the Baptist Union Council, of the urgency and usefulness of such a Society; and he it was who, on the instruction of the Council, moved the resolution at the fourth session of the Assembly at Bloomsbury on Thursday, April 30th, 1908, "That the members of the Assembly of the Baptist Union cordially approve of the proposal to form a Baptist Historical Society, and trust that this important denominational work will receive practical and general support." Naturally Dr. Whitley was elected the first secretary and, with unselfish devotion to the work of the Society, he retained this office for twenty-seven years. On his retirement in 1935 he was elected Vice-President, and in 1947 succeeded Dr. Wheeler Robinson as President. He edited the seven volumes of the *Transactions* from 1908 to 1921, and for a further fourteen years was either editor or joint-editor of seven volumes of *The Baptist Quarterly*. Articles by him, both signed and unsigned, enriched all the fourteen volumes, and Dr. Wheeler Robinson's tribute on his retirement may well be recalled: "Dr. Whitley's resignation of the office of Secretary was announced in our issue of last July, and he has now felt obliged to give up his editorial work, performed so generously and faithfully through the last twenty-eight years. The fourteen volumes of the

combined work, are a great and enduring monument of this devotion—both through his own signed contributions, and also through the large amount of valuable material which he has constantly added to the work of others, or as detached notes. We renew the expression of the Society's gratitude to him, its founder and its outstanding worker during so long a period. We hope that we shall still have both contributions and counsel from him for a long time to come." That hope was abundantly fulfilled, for his contributions and counsel continued to the end.

Dr. Whitley was born in Mildmay Terrace, Islington, on May 16th, 1861, but the family soon moved to Epping Forest where, he tells us in his typewritten *Reminiscences,* "the joy was to go blackberrying, armed against adders with a club to dash out their brains when we had pinned them down with a forked stick; but we never saw even one." Those who knew Dr. Whitley at meetings of the Ministerial Recognition Committee will recall that occasionally he asked a candidate "at what hour do you start your studies." Perhaps the genesis of this question is to be found in an early experience at school at Chigwell. "There," he relates, "on the scholarship side, Latin was the staple; the *Public School Latin Primer* introduced to a new world where I got into trouble by thinking that the 'poetry' of exceptions was the main thing, rather than the mere prose of dull rules. Once this was cleared up I shot ahead so that soon I was promoted too fast; and, though I won a football as a prize, found that I could not keep up with the fourth form. The headmaster came to the rescue, and let me use his study from eight in the morning for my 'home-work'." The headmaster's study at eight in the morning, after breakfast at home and a fairly long walk over fields! No wonder that ministerial recognition candidates who considered ten o'clock, or thereabouts, a reasonable hour to commence their studies earned his displeasure.

The return of the family to Highbury introduced young Whitley to the newly opened Highbury Hill Baptist Church, and it was there that his conversion and baptism took place. This church had been fostered by the London Baptist Association during the presidency of W.G. Lewis, of Westbourne Grove, and the saintly James Culross, later Principal of Bristol Baptist College, had been called from Stirling to be its first minister. Dr. Whitley ever remembered this church, its minister and officers, with affection. Its senior deacon, John Sands, was well known in the wider life of the denomination. He had served on the London Baptist Association Council from its inception in 1865, was treasurer of the Baptist Union for approximately ten years from 1869, and was a generous subscriber to various denominational funds. He was more than the wealthy and experienced business

man, however, for he was a personal evangelist ever ready to speak the challenging word for his Lord. And, Dr. Whitley records, "it was to the stately deacon that I owed the direct appeal. 'Was I going to give myself to serve the Lord?' He had taken me for a walk, and I can remember exactly where he came to this point. The church was much perturbed when three brothers applied for Church membership, aged ten, twelve, fourteen. We knew no theology, only our Bible. But mother had drilled us on her own lines, as a notebook still testifies, and the leading deacon followed up: so with two cousins we were all baptised." It was at Highbury Hill that Dr. Whitley developed the taste for music that remained throughout life. There was no organ, but his uncle, Arthur Rooke, led the singing and an unofficial choir of "good singers clustered in the front pews." He specially delighted in oratorios and the Victorian practice of hymn singing and music in the home.

After a year at University College School, in which one or two prizes fell to his lot, he was transferred to a private school in Hastings. Here, he developed qualifications for the future editorship of our *Transactions* and *The Baptist Quarterly*. He relates: "The school was well conducted, and the boarders were encouraged to develop hobbies. I chose printing. . . . In after days I found it quite useful to understand these technicalities, to choose type, estimate the space required for an article, fill a stick, transfer to a galley, make a page, insert to a forme, wedge up the whole, and pull off the sheets required." Securing first prize for mathematics and first for all subjects, Whitley passed on to Cambridge where he gained exhibitions and his M.A. in 1883 and LL.M. in 1889. In his *Reminiscences*, he gives an interesting glimpse of St. Andrew's Street Baptist Church: "So next to Cavendish College on the Hills Road. The head chanced to be a Baptist, and introduced me at St. Andrew's Street Chapel, which was both historic and flourishing. Though many pews were let twice over, yet one large square pew was set apart for college men; quite an advance from the days when a blank wall faced the street, and lofty stout railings protected the chapel from rowdy undergraduates. Robert Hall's pulpit of very remarkable shape, still graced the place, and, in front of it, another large pew held the singers who led assisted by a harmonium . . . My singing tenor helped, and before long I had the choice of the Varsity pew, or the harmonium stool." T. Graham Tarn was the minister at this time.

It was Dr. Whitley's intention on leaving the University to enter the teaching profession, and Cambridge dons gave him good testimonials. But then he encountered unexpected obstacles. A don, about to take a headship, told him "all my masters must belong to the Church of England." Another took the same view.

However, says Dr. Whitley, "a college in Delhi seemed to open a door where no Church was established, and a prospect which was decidedly attractive . . . But to my great astonishment, when interviewing the authorities, my plain statement that I should be a member of the Baptist Church there proved fatal." No wonder that Dr. Whitley remained an uncompromising Free Churchman. Happily things are vastly different today; nevertheless, in many scholastic appointments and in all national celebrations, the Anglican remains the privileged and the Free Churchman the handicapped.

Later came the call to the ministry, and Whitley entered Rawdon College, of which his uncle, T. G. Rooke, was Principal. His love for his Alma Mater never waned, and when in the mood, he could tell many stories of those far off College days and of the overwhelming hospitality of Yorkshire hosts. During his first short pastorate at Bridlington (1888-1891) he took some of his uncle's classes at Rawdon, and it was hinted to him that he was likely to be invited to join the staff. Before this eventuated, however, Dr. Maclaren of Manchester conveyed to him an invitation from Australia, and in 1891 he left this country to become the first Principal of the newly-founded Baptist College of Victoria. This position he held for eleven years. He also became member of the Senate of Melbourne University, whose LL.D. he gained in 1897, and for five years a lecturer at Queen's College, Melbourne. He also did considerable preaching and lecturing in other parts, and relates that at Adelaide he was bombarded with miscellaneous questions. One question and answer are worthy of record:

Q. "Do you think that secular instruction should be intermingled with theological?"

A. "I should recommend one thing at a time, concentrating attention on each; first, a good general education to hold your own in society; next, the special preparation for the ministry; then seeking and securing a partner for life."

The last recommendation drew attention to a student in a rear seat, who could not disentangle himself from his sweetheart! It may be added that some students still find that disentanglement a difficulty.

Returning to the home country in 1902, he held pastorates at Fishergate, Preston, 1902-1917, and Droitwich, 1917-1928. In both places he was the faithful pastor, caring individually for his people. One who at a later date was minister at Fishergate has testified: "I soon discovered how worthily he had carried out the many privileges of the pastoral office and how firmly

he was established in the hearts of the people . . . But above all he had been assiduous in visitation; much did I hear of his care and kindness, of his praying with his people, instructing them personally and in classes, taking gifts, comforts and food to the sick and needy. In the First World War he made a point of visiting every home just before a man was due to leave for service, whether for the first time or from leave." He also represented his people and denomination on public bodies. It is recorded that the Roman Catholics of Preston gave a course of lectures in the Jesuit College, addressed expressly to Protestants. Dr. Whitley adopted their syllabus and arranged for experts to take part in a similar course addressed expressly to Catholics. The Roman Catholics never repeated the experiment. Another incident of the Preston days may be related. An attempt was made to introduce a fully licensed bar at a new picture palace. On licensing day the bench was packed and the licence granted. Then Dr. Whitley took action. He verified from the Chief Constable that the law required the manager to be on the premises the whole time the place was open. As an interim measure, the architect had been named as manager. Naturally he was not prepared to spend his afternoons and evenings at the cinema, so the licence was never used. No doubt Dr. Whitley chuckled very heartily.

Dr. Whitley's greatest service was rendered in the national and international life of the denomination. He had come home at an opportune moment. Dr. J. H. Shakespeare was transforming the Baptist Union. The Twentieth Century Fund was in process of completion and the Baptist Church House was rising near Kingsway. Shakespeare was determined that Baptists, in today's phraseology, "should be put on the map." Our great men, past and present, were not sufficiently appreciated; our history and world position were hardly realised; John Rippon's century-old vision of a world gathering of Baptists in London had remained a vision. All this was to be altered and Shakespeare needed someone with the historical mind and international outlook to co-operate with him in the organisation of the first Baptist World Congress which was to be held in London in July, 1905. His choice fell on his brother-in-law, Dr. Whitley, and the Preston Church, when approached, freely and graciously liberated him for an average of three days a week during the early months of 1905 and completely for the last month before the Congress. Never was man more blessed than Shakespeare in the unremitting toil and attention to detail which Dr. Whitley gave to the organisation of that first Baptist World Congress. From the opening meeting in Exeter Hall to the closing demonstration in the Albert Hall there were no loose ends, and Dr. Whitley richly deserved Dr. Shakespeare's tribute that "his patience, courtesy, untiring

industry, and business-like methods were beyond all praise." It was typical of Dr. Whitley that, as a diversion from the strenuous organisation of the Congress, he won the Jay Gould prize of £200 for the best work on the Douay Version of the Bible.

Dr. Whitley was now launched on the full tide of his historical and archaeological researches. Wherever he resided he joined the County Historical and Archaeological Societies, and served on their committees. Not only was his pen active, but his spade also came into use, and, near Droitwich, he unearthed the remains of a Roman villa. Service was given on County Education and University Committees; but the main interests of his life centred around the Baptists. Their history absorbed more and more of his time. Papers and booklets dealing with local churches, associations, doctrine and Church government poured forth. They laid foundations on which others have built. As Mr. Payne has made a Bibliography of Dr. Whitley's writings (printed immediately after this article), there is no need to refer to them in detail. It should be said, however, that by his editorship of the *Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptists (1654-1811)* in two volumes, published in 1909 and 1910; the *Works of John Smyth,* also in two volumes, published in 1915; and the *Church Books of Ford and Amersham,* published in one volume in 1912, he made available original material of the first importance. His most valuable works, however, were the *History of British Baptists,* published in 1923 and the *Baptist Bibliography,* published in two handsome volumes in 1916 and 1922. The *History* supplied a need that had long been felt for a modern authoritative history, and all Baptists are indebted to the Regents Park College officers who invited Dr. Whitley to deliver the Angus Lectures in 1922, which led to the preparation and publication of the *History.* Dr. Whitley brought his trained mind and enthusiastic spirit to bear upon the records, and produced a copious work whose conclusions have stood the test and criticism of twenty-five years. Although it will long and deservedly remain a standard work, truth compels the admission that many have found the reading and study of the volume a severe trial. Dr. Whitley was concerned to set forth the facts. Possibly they were dry in themselves but he could make them drier, for he was not gifted with a popular style. The *Bibliography* is the bigger work, and is indispensable to all researchers into Baptist history. The two volumes which cover the period from 1526 to 1837 contain approximately 10,000 entries of the chief materials for Baptist history whether in manuscript or print. It is difficult to appreciate adequately the years of research, the repeated visits to colleges, libraries and museums, the laborious copying and checking of multitudinous entries which this compilation entailed.

Dr. Whitley was elected a personal member of the Baptist Union in 1888, and a member of the Council in 1905. For many years he was chairman of the National Education Committee and an influential member of the Ministerial Recognition and other Committees. Indeed, as the years passed he was looked upon as an indispensable member of any special committee or sub-committee, and no trouble was too great for him that he might give faithful and effective service. At the Annual Assembly at Glasgow in 1933, the rare privilege of honorary membership of the Council was unanimously conferred on him, an honour that he richly deserved.

Reference has already been made to his early love of music. He never lost that love for music was in his heart. In later years he found an outlet for it in the Psalms and Hymns Trust, of which he became a co-optative trustee in 1926. The work of the Trust proved an unfailing inspiration, for the opportunity to enrich the psalmody of God's House, and the privilege of ministering to the widow in her time of need, awoke in him responsive chords which vibrated with the love that inspired them. He was appointed to both the Hymns Committee and the Tunes Committee for the Revised Edition of the *Baptist Church Hymnal,* and for over ten years was chairman of the Trust's Business Committee. His fellow Trustees testified in their memorial resolution that " no service that he could render, however laborious and cumbered with detail, was too small or too onerous."

Very much more could be written of Dr. Whitley's various interests for he was a man of amazing versatility. We have space but to mention his interest in the different versions of the Scriptures; his keenness for the preservation of footpaths and rights of way; his work for the Joseph Davis Charity and similar institutions; his love of travel and visits to India, Canada, the United States, Australia, etc. His eighty-six years coincided with striking changes in the thought and outlook of his fellow countrymen, but he was never surprised by these changes, or by modern discoveries, for he kept himself abreast of them.

We shall often recall him, his kindness, his humility, his generosity, his humour, his hearty chuckle. His end was singularly beautiful. He had been laid aside physically for several months, but mentally was bright and alert. On the morning of the Thursday before Christmas he was at work in his home studying and thinking of his friends, to one of whom he wrote: " Look up St. Paul at Malta. I think I am suffering as his friend was, and feel rather out of things." In the afternoon his outstanding gifts were engaged in the greater things of the Father's home for God's finger had touched him.

SEYMOUR J. PRICE.

Books and Pamphlets by the late Dr. W. T. Whitley.

The Value of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, 1893.

Our Indian Trip, 1896 (with Silas Mead).

The Witness of History to Baptist Principles, London and Melbourne, 1897. Revised edition, 1914.

Church, Ministry and Sacraments in the New Testament, London, 1903.

Roman Catholic and Protestant Bibles, 1905. Second edition, 1908.

Missionary Achievement: A Survey of Worldwide Evangelism, London, 1908.

Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptists, 1654-1811, 2 vols., London, 1909-10.

Studies in Modern Christendom, London, 1910 (with W. Fiddian Moulton).

The Church Books of Ford or Cuddington, and Amersham, 1912.

"The Relation of Baptists to the Evictment" in *The Ejectment of 1662 and the Free Churches,* London, 1912.

Baptists of North-West England, 1649-1913, London, 1913.

Baptists of Yorkshire and North-West England, 1913.

The Works of John Smyth, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1915.

A Baptist Bibliography, London, 2 vols., I 1526-1776, 1916. II 1777-1837, 1922.

The Story of Droitwich, Droitwich, 1923.

A History of British Baptists, London, 1923. Second edition, 1932.

Report of the Third Baptist World Congress, 1923.

Baptist Association Life in Worcestershire, 1655-1926, 1926.

An International Baptist Calendar, 1928.

The Baptists of London, 1612-1928, London, 1928.

Report of the Fourth Baptist World Congress, 1928.

The Baptists of Stourbridge, 1929.

The Work of a Minister, London, 1929 (with M. E. Aubrey).

The Baptist Romance, 1930.

Charles-Marie De Veil, London, 1930 (with W. S. Samuel.)

The Doctrine of Grace: Report and Papers of a Theological Committee of the Faith and Order Movement, London, 1932.

Congregational Hymnsinging in England, London, 1933.

Calvinism and Evangelism in England especially among Baptists, London, 1933.

Thomas Matthew of Colchester and Matthew's Bible of 1537, 1934.

A Handbook to the Baptist Church Hymnary, 1935 (with Carey Bonner).

Early Welsh Influences on the Religious Life of America, (Dr. Williams' Lecture), 1936.

Thomas Helwys of Gray's Inn and Broxtowe Hall, Nottingham, London, 1936.

The English Bible under the Tudor Sovereigns, London, 1937.

Baptists in the Weald of Kent during 290 *Years.*

Botulph's Ycean-Ho. A.D. 654, n.d.

Dr. Whitley also contributed articles to the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, the *Protestant Cyclopædia* and the *Encyclopædia of Education.* He was a frequent contributor to journals such as the *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society*, the *Baptist Quarterly*, the *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*, the *Review and Expositor*, the *Crozier Quarterly* and the *Chronicle of the American Baptist Historical Society.*

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

A Conservative Thinks Again About Daniel.

(Concluded from page 346.)

Daniel 6, the story of the prophet in the lion's den, has a similar relevance in maintaining the faith of the Jewish resisters against those who would force them to abandon the worship of the one true God. In view of the constant animosity revealed in 1 Maccabees against the apostate informers, who allied themselves with Antiochus, we may not inaptly recall the fate of those who sent Daniel to the lions; cf. Daniel xii. 2.

To this correspondence of historical situation must be added the theological likeness between the book of Daniel and the post-exilic age of Judaism. Its doctrines of angels, resurrection, predestination, judgment and limited dualism, together with its general view of piety, do seem to correspond more with what we find in the non-canonical literature. On the whole, Driver's judgment on this matter seems justified: "This atmosphere and tone are not those of any other writings belonging to the period of the exile; they are rather those of a stage intermediate between that of the early post-exilic and that of the early post-Biblical Jewish literature" (Intro., to O.T. p. 477). It certainly is extraordinary that immediately after the crisis caused by Antiochus, in which it is postulated that the book of Daniel arose, there appeared a spate of apocalyptic works, written in a similar style to Daniel, that did not cease till the close of the first century A.D. The likeness extends to content as well as form, though it is true that the high standard set by the exemplar is not maintained in these writings. But the connection between Daniel and the pseudepigraphical writings in general remains as an indication of the age in which the former appeared.

To this conclusion also points the non-inclusion of Daniel in the Hebrew canon of the prophets. A satisfactory explanation for this omission, apart from the postulate of the late date of this book, has yet to be produced.

It is probable that the second century date of Daniel would long ago have been accepted by conservative theologians were it not for certain unwelcome consequences which seem to throw the book into disrepute and therefore degrade one's view of the Bible as a whole. These factors we shall proceed to face.

First of all, there is the obvious objection that the Kingdom of God did not appear after the overthrow of Antiochus: how, then, can he and his kingdom be the forerunners of the con-

summation? In one sense he is not. The juxtaposition of his career and the coming of the Kingdom is similar to the view of Isaiah, wherein the Kingdom is seen close on the heels of the fall of Sennacherib, similar to that of the exilic prophets, who look for the new age consequent on the end of the exile, similar to that of the New Testament seer, who looked for the dénouement after the approaching overthrow of Domitian, similar, we may add, to that portrayal of the End given by our Lord in His eschatological discourse, where no indication whatever is given of the stretch of ages between the fall of Jerusalem and the Parousia. It is, in other words, simply the view of every prophet. It would seem that God has been pleased to show to His servants the issues of time, but not the times themselves. Before this fact, whether in Daniel or in the Gospels' we must bow, not complain. In this respect, therefore, Daniel is on a par with the Biblical prophets as a whole, and the objection falls to the ground.

More serious is the charge that, on the assumption that "Daniel" was never written by Daniel, the book is a forgery and so "a lie in the name of God." It is unfortunate that conservative expositors have vied with each other in their use of abuse when making this point. Auberlen e.g. wrote: "Speak of the *fraus pia* in terms as lenient and exculpatory as you can devise, it is, and must always remain, a *lie,* if I consciously, and with a definite purpose pretend to be another than I really am; and moreover it is a lie of the blackest die, if I speak of divine revelations which were never really vouchsafed to me; indeed, according to the Old Testament, this is the very thing which constitutes a false prophet. . . . Would not a true Israelite shudder in his heart of hearts at the thought of inventing divine revelations? . . . From olden times it has been thought a heinous crime to remove boundaries and landmarks; but it is the boast and glory of our day to remove the holiest of all boundary lines, that between truth and a lie, and to invent something intermediate." Language of this kind leads people astray, as it led the present writer astray, and he finds it hard to forgive such men for their unwarranted excesses now that he knows how wrong they are. The fact remains, despite these asseverations of Pusey, Auberlen and company, that the writers e.g. of the Enoch literature were not *villains;* you have but to read the books for yourself to see how absurd the notion is; their contribution to religious thought is outstanding. So also the apocalypse ascribed to Baruch contains passages of the highest spiritual worth. 2 Esdras is one of the most tragic and earnest pieces of religious writing in existence, though it is sent out in the name of Ezra. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs present an ethic that in many ways is an advance on

anything in the Old Testament; doubtless the reason for this is that they represent the outcome of prolonged meditation on Old Testament teaching, but the speeches are put in the mouths of the twelve sons of Jacob. The apocalyptic literature of post-exilic Judaism is rightly claimed by Charles to be the cradle of Christianity, in that it, rather than the legal side of Judaism, preserved the spiritual conceptions of the old dispensation and moulded the thought of the earliest adherents to Christianity. That fact in itself shows that the libel on the pseudonymous writers of apocalyptic is wrong, terribly wrong, and ought never to be repeated again.

Into the complicated reson for the pseudonymous character of the Jewish apocalypses it is not possible to venture here. Whether H. H. Rowley is right in thinking that the attribution of the Daniel prophecies to Daniel was in the nature of an accident due to the necessity of showing that the prophecies came from the same author who wrote the stories (it being presumed that the book first appeared piecemeal, as occasion arose) and that other apocalyptists woodenly copied his example without his reason, or whether more deep-seated factors, such as those adduced by Charles, Gunkel and Guillaume, are implied in the matter, there can be no doubt that the attribution of prophecies to an ancient seer was done with the best of motives. These men did not lie in the name of the Lord; they sent out in a more worthy name than their own, a message they believed to be from God, and so for ever withheld their identity from the world. That sounds more like self-effacement than prevarication, and the men who wrote these books are to be honoured, not vilified. The author of the book of Daniel, if he lived in the fearful days of the persecution of Antiochus, should be accorded a place in the list of the great unknown who serve their God as best they can and are content that none should know but He.

A further difficulty arises, not so much on the hypothesis of its late date, but on the view that the visions find their goal in the age of Antiochus: the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem" until the overthrow of the oppressor and the revelation of the Kingdom of God is not an exact one. If the *terminus a quo* be the usually adopted date of the overthrow of Jerusalem 586 B.C., then we overstep the throwing off the yoke of Antiochus (at the cleansing of the temple) by something like sixty-seven years. On the other hand, the description of xi. 26-27, in common with the other descriptions of the "time times and a half" of the book, appears without doubt to have this ruler in mind. It does not seem permissible, because apparent

error is introduced into the visions, immediately to exclude that interpretation from consideration. The usual explanation of this discrepancy is that the writer followed the inaccurate chronology of his period, other historians being similarly at fault in their records. If that be so, the discrepancy can hardly be a fault on his part. It is also possible that we are to understand the " seventy sevens " simply as a round designation of the period in question. The first seven weeks are specifically mentioned as marking out the interval to the appearance of Joshua and Zerubbabel, the last week is carefully defined because it is part of the author's scheme of the end, but the period between needs no such exactitude; it is sufficient that the prophet can say of Jeremiah's seventy years, " Not seventy, but seventy times seven "; it would be foolish to have said, " sixty-nine times seven plus a little extra." Whatever the truth of the matter be, it cannot affect the question of the date of the book; it is a difficulty in face of the uniformity of the visions and must be settled by the expositors as an independent issue.

Objection is also taken to the identification of the fourth empire with the Greek because in the New Testament it is uniformly interpreted of the Roman Empire. Again, this is a point that has nothing to do with the date of Daniel. It would, however, be more accurate to say that the New Testament writers *re-interpret* the fourth empire as of Rome. It is well-known to students of the New Testament, that Old Testament statements are constantly applied in the New to situations that were never in the mind of the original authors. The Old Testament prophecies applied to Christ by Matthew and the Fourth Evangelist are cases in point, while the use of the Old Testament by the New Testament apocalyptist is original in the highest degree. This is not to say that the New Testament writers were at fault in so using the Old Testament: they were more concerned about the principles involved than exact exegesis, and modern students of prophecy are inclined to admit that such an attitude is more in agreement with the spirit of prophecy than our critical fathers realised (see e.g. Alfred Guillaume's remarks on Matthew's treatment of prophecy in *Prophecy and Divination* p. 176). Though this be admitted, it must not encourage us to neglect the exact exegesis of Old Testament prophecy; in the case of the visions of Daniel, it seems that the primary relevance of those visions was to the kingdom of Greece in its later stages.

Perhaps the most serious difficulty of all is that on the recognition of the fourth kingdom as the Greek, we are forced to postulate the third as the Persian, the second as the Median, and

the first as the Babylonian Empire, whereas we know that the Median Empire did not interpose itself between the Babylonian and Persian. Again, it must be recognised that this is a problem due to the natural exegesis of the book, not to any critical perversity; the older scholars who adopted the Greek view of the fourth empire only had the uncertain testimony of the Greek historians to compare with the Biblical narrative, whereas their modern successors have access to the contemporary Babylonian records. The Median Empire was *contemporaneous* with the Babylonian, and the two were merged into the realm of Cyrus. The author of our book spoke of Darius *the Mede* as succeeding Belshazzar and so felt it legitimate to speak of the Median Empire as stepping into the succession before Cyrus *the Persian* took control. Unfortunately, no one can identify Darius the Mede with any known historic personality. It is the opinion of most modern critics that he is the result of a confusion of traditions relating in the main to Cyrus and Darius Hystaspis. Conservative theologians revolt at the suggestion. In all candour, it must be said that until H. H. Rowley's work is refuted, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires of the Book of Daniel,* there is no alternative open to them, for Professor Rowley has all too well demolished every statement of the various hypotheses concerning Darius the Mede that has yet appeared.

But need the conservative theologians be offended? What if the author of the book of Daniel was confused concerning events that took place in foreign lands four centuries before he wrote? He was not really concerned with the Median Empire, any more than he was with the Babylonian or Persian. Two kingdoms only held his gaze, the Empire of Antiochus and the Kingdom of God: the others came into the picture only because he needed to traverse history from the exile to his own day, in order to put the real prophecy regarding these kingdoms (of Antiochus and of Heaven) into the mouth of his hero. A discrepancy concerning the person of a supposed eastern monarch of long ago had nothing to do with the validity of his message from God. As Rowley himself put it (in *The Story of the Bible,* vol. 1, p. 784), "If . . . these stories were written for an immediately practical end and not as a historical treatise, the author would be more concerned to make them the vehicle of his message than to make them historically inerrant. When Judaism was engaged in a life-and-death struggle, and issues of so great moment were at stake, a mere antiquarian interest in the sixth century would have been but a frivolity."

As far as the essential message of Daniel is concerned, the issue is something similar to the laboured attempts to harmonise

some of the variations in the synoptic accounts of the ministry of our Lord. The question, "Did our Lord heal Bartimaeus before He entered Jericho, while He was passing through it, or as He left it?" is of hardly any importance beside the major one, "Did our Lord really have the power to heal Bartimaeus, and did He actually exercise that power in so remarkable a way?" If He did, then arguments about which part of Jericho, or even which Jericho, was the scene of that act are of little moment; in that hapless individual the powers of the Kingdom of God were manifested, mediated through the Redeemer, and in that is implied our own salvation too, for the Lord of the Kingdom bestows the salvation of God even now on all that will receive it. Similarly, the crucial question in Daniel is, "Did the prophet who put his messages into the mouth of the ancient sage receive those messages from God? Is it true that the Kingdom of God will smite the colossus of world-sovereignty? Will the saints of the Most High possess the Kingdom? Are these visions of the Kingdom that shall know no end in harmony with the Biblical revelation as a whole?" With the New Testament in our hands we do not hesitate to answer, "Yes." Then Daniel is as truly inspired of the Holy Spirit as the prophecies of Isaiah, or the Letter to the Romans, or the Book of Revelation. The only people who could remain unsatisfied with so great an assurance are those who cannot conceive of revelation apart from absolute inerrancy. It is to be hoped that others, equally taught of the Spirit of God, will rejoice in the gain to faith that this view provides, and will realise how untrue is the charge that the affirmation of the late date of Daniel is disruptive of faith in the Word of God.

Finally, whatever our attitude be towards these problems, it is earnestly to be hoped that the extravagant, misleading and hurtful language used by earlier apologists regarding the book of Daniel will for ever disappear. It is monstrous that it should be regarded as a crime to hold the late date of this prophecy, or to dub all who incline to it as "modernist" or "infidel." That this is the prevalent attitude of Evangelicals is undeniable, and it is a slur on their name, for it is demonstrably untrue. Conservative theologians with a regard for fearless research should squash all such characterisations wherever they rise and encourage every attempt to illuminate the Word of God that comes to us in the name of Daniel. Meantime, if the highly respected professor, to whom reference was earlier made, should chance to read these lines, it is to be hoped that his abounding charity will cover the hasty imputation of one who has since become a "sadder and a wiser man!"

G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY.

The Church and Communism.

IT is beyond question that the present time is one of the great turning points in human history, that we are living in the midst of a crisis that affects not only our own national life, but the life of the world. The rising menace of communism is an almost universal phenomenon, but it cannot be isolated from the profound changes in thought and aim that have been gathering impetus for the last century, from the revolutionary advances of science and knowledge with their consequent results in the intellectual, religious, and ethical spheres, from the two world wars which were themselves the effects and liberation of forces long at work, or the great social revolution that characterizes the age. The Church today faces a situation as critical, in some respects more critical, as any it has faced in its long career. There has always been apathy and indifference to be overcome, but in the first age of the Church it is true to say that the world into which it came was waiting for and to a large extent even seeking for the salvation the gospel offered, and every great revival from the Franciscan to the Methodist could count on a response from the masses which, however sunk in ignorance and sin, accepted its basic assumptions. But today those assumptions are challenged not only by the intelligentzia and the half-educated, but by multitudes of ordinary people, and the mind of this generation is preoccupied by hopes and aspirations which, not only among the communists, excite the warmest enthusiasm. Nearly twenty years ago T. S. Eliot summed up the situation as he saw it. "The Universal Church is today, it seems to me, more definitely set against the World than at any time since pagan Rome. I do not mean that our times are particularly corrupt; all times are corrupt. I mean that Christianity, in spite of certain local appearances, is not, and cannot be within measurable time, 'official.' The World is trying the experiment of attempting to form a civilized but non-Christian mentality. The experiment will fail; but we must be very patient in awaiting its collapse; meanwhile redeeming the time: so that the Faith may be preserved alive through the dark ages before us; to renew and rebuild civilization, and save the World from suicide."[1] It is a true account of the crisis of the world and Church at this present hour.

> I tell you naught for your comfort,
> Yes, naught for your desire,
> Save that the sky grows darker yet
> And the sea rises higher.

It is not a time for small thoughts and chirping optimisms,

[1] *Thoughts after Lambeth.*

but for thought on a great scale and for Faith purified as by fire. The world is under the judgement of God, but, as was said long ago, "the time is come that judgement must begin at the house of God." For within the present situation so truly described there is God, and it is with God in the situation and not with the situation apart from Him, that we have to do. It is essential that this fact should be grasped, because it is only too possible that under the pressures of the hour and its concern with the immediate problems of the time, the Church should forget that its primary purpose is to witness to God in whose hand are all the times, and to proclaim an Everlasting Gospel. Our faith is not that there is a God, but that there is a living God who challenges the world in every crisis of its history, as He meets and challenges the individual in every crisis of his life; and that the living God has revealed Himself in judgement and redemption in the tremendous facts of the Incarnation, the Death, and the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. The greatest possible event in history has already taken place in final judgement ("Now is the judgement of the world") and in divine victory ("Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.") If this faith seems dull, commonplace, unromantic, it can only be because familiarity has blinded our eyes and deadened our minds to its splendour and audacious challenge to our dull and commonplace souls. But in the searching judgement of the time it is this faith, with all accretions burned away, that must be recovered and reaffirmed by the Church in all its humbling, exalting, and vivifying power. That such recovery is possible no one can doubt who realises that the Church is not only the bearer of the gospel, but is indwelt by its living Lord, for the divine indwelling is the divine in action. "God's essence," as Traherne said, is "all Act."[2] It is true that the Church on its human side is weak with all the weaknesses of sinful men and women. The treasure is in earthly vessels. It is true that this or that branch, being dead, may be removed from the Vine, or in John's metaphor, the "lamp" of this or that local church may be removed. But the Church, and even apparently dead portions of it, have shown miraculous powers of recovery. A wind from another world has blown across the grey embers, and the flame has again blazed. And it is a fact of most impressive significance that in this very time when the Church faces its great ordeal the supernatural fire is burning brightly in the wide reaches of its missionary enterprize. To despair of the Church is to despair of God. There is no doubt that the Christian Church will survive this epoch in the world's history. It is even possible that it will be the only institution that will survive. It has happened before. "On this Rock will I build My Church and the Gates of Hell

[2] *The Anticipation.*

shall not prevail against it," a "Rock of Diamond," says Dante[3]. It is of the utmost importance that the Church and its representatives, young and old, should confront the present situation with this great faith, and meet the confidence of its rivals with a confidence greater than their own.

* * * *

The Church is not of this world or of this temporal order, but it is in it, and it claims to deal with the *whole human situation.* Its first answer to its challengers, taken at their noblest, is that they do not deal with it and that their view of humanity, its nature, and its condition is partial and superficial. It ignores the great mystery of human life and in so doing it reduces all human values. The mystery of human life lies in its tragedy, and it is in its tragic sense of life that communism and its fellow-idealisms are most conspicuously lacking. Their charge against religion is that it is "dope," and it can be freely admitted that religion has often been used to justify or perpetuate old abuses, but religion itself springs from a profound sense of the tragic situation of man. Every religion, from the crudest fetich-worship to the purest theism, from the pantheism of India to the most wide-spread forms of Christianity, is in its degree and aim a religion of redemption, of redemption from the ferocious powers of the natural world or from the fierce contentions in the human breast. Not only religion, but the greatest literatures, the profoundest philosophies, have come out of man's passionate conflict with his fate. Suffering, sorrow, and death are in the world, and they mean to man what they mean to no other creature. These are facts of universal experience, to which all history bears witness. The favourite quotation of that great worker for humanity, General Booth, was Goldsmith's

> How small, of all that human hearts endure,
> That part which laws or kings can cause or cure.

No change in the conditions of rich or poor, no conceivable reconstruction of society, can affect the central mystery of human life, its tragic situation. For it is essentially a tragedy of the spirit, of a strange being, not wholly of the natural order, wounded by the very conditions of his existence in that order.

Then again, these social idealisms ignore the significant mystery of human individuality. There is, for instance, in man's breast a recalcritant element, a rebel against constraint, which breaks out against the most considered plans for his well-being. In *Letters from the Underworld* Dostoievsky, that profoundest of Russian writers, makes his hero say: "I should not be surprised

[3] Purg. ix. 105. [4] *The Traveller.*

if, amid all this order and regularity of the future, there should not suddenly arise, from some quarter or another, some gentleman of low-born—or rather of retrograde or cynical demeanour who, setting his arms akimbo, should not say to you all: 'How now, gentlemen? Would it not be a good thing if, with one consent, we were to kick all this solemn wisdom to the winds, and to send all those logarithms to the devil, and to begin to live our lives again according to our own stupid whims?'"[5] It is this rebellion against restraint which necessitates a police-force in ordinary society, and the more highly organised and regimented a society becomes, the more pervading the restraining force must be, until at last, there comes into existence the police state and its universal tyranny. Dostoievski foresaw its coming in Russia. As his exponent Berdyaev says: "This enforced generally levelling, this transfer of the murderous law of entropy into the social sphere, does not mean a victory for democracy. There will not be any democratic liberty, for democracy never wins in revolutions. A tyrannical minority will govern, on the basis of this depersonalization and levelling down."[6] Meanwhile it is to be noted that this innate rebelliousness may be merely wilful as with Dostoievski's cynical gentleman, and is familiar enough in every group and family, or it may be motived by the lowest passions of selfishness and greed, or on the other hand, it may be reinforced by the loftiest motives of liberty and justice. But in itself it belongs to the essential individual life and springs from the intrinsic freedom of the human will. It is the assertion of the free selfhood as against all constraint by other wills. It is the abysmal mystery of a being in nature and yet who rises into supernature by the power of choice. It is part of what we mean when we say that man is a spiritual being to be explained, if explained at all, not by what is below him, but by what is above.

In the third place there is the mystery of man's failure to achieve his own ideals. His reach exceeds his grasp. It is not only that he fails; even in the degree to which he attains he finds a flaw in his success. Except on the level of mechanical and empirical science he is doomed to disappointment. "Ah! Vanitas Vanitatum!" sighed Thackeray as he concluded his greatest work, "Which of us is happy in this world? Which of us has his desire? or, having it, is satisfied?"[7] Sophocles, in the play of this name, represents Philoctetes the hero as suffering from an agonizing and irremediable wound in the foot which only a god could heal. He is typical of humanity. Phillips Brooks has a great sermon he calls "The Giant with the wounded heel,"

[5] *p.* 30 *Everyman Ed.* [6] *Dostoievski, p.* 149. [7] *Vanity Fair.*

based on Gen. iii. 15.—the enmity between the serpent and the woman and her seed. "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel," and he shows how in institutions, society, learning, religious and personal life, what is so noble in aim and striving is halted by some evil defect. Like Jacob, humanity always halts upon its thigh. All the great figures in Shakespearean tragedy have some fault which contributes to if it does not cause the tragical end. Yet not all of this failure is culpable. Some of it is due to the strange passion for perfection in the human mind, the power of dreaming dreams and seeing visions of something greater on before, of conceiving ideals which ever expand with the growing apprehension of them, and are never realised and seem incapable of being realised in time and space. Dora Greenwell's profound thought has at least a tentative justification: "Not only the change which we call death, but probably the whole of this our mortal life, is only a slow and difficult and painful birth into a higher existence; the very breath we draw is part of the travail of creation towards a yet but partially fulfilled aim."[8] This however, goes beyond any hope that an economic or social theory can advance. But when allowance is made for this frustrate passion for perfection there is a defect in man himself, a dark destroying element which entwines inseparably with his noblest parts and striving. "Is there any cause in Nature that makes these hard hearts?" cried Lear, but no answer is given. "When I would do good," wrote St. Paul, "evil is present with me," and the experience is so universal as to need no argument. "Out of the heart of men," said Jesus, "evil thoughts proceed, fornication, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness," and again no argument is called for. It is not that there is not good in the heart, generosity, sympathy, love, capacity for sacrifice, high courage, and striving for noble ends. If it were not so there would be no tragedy in man's moral failure. It is that with all this there is a fatal perversion, a taint in the blood, that betrays man at every step. It is Shakespeare's "vicious mole of nature . . . the dram of eale," Kant's "radical evil," Wordsworth's "poor humanity's afflicted will," Arnold's "Something that infects the world." Browning, the invincible optimist revolted from the flattering optimism that denied it:

> The candid incline to surmise of late
> That the Christian faith proves false, I find . . .
> I still, to suppose it true, for my part,
> See reasons and reasons: this, to begin:
> 'Tis the faith that launched point-blank her dart
> At the head of a lie—taught Original Sin,
> The Corruption of Man's Heart.[9]

[8] *Colloquia Crucis*. 144. [9] *Gold Hair*

The Bible story of the Fall traces it to human pride. Bertrand Russell, as quoted by Niebuhr[10] expresses the same conviction in other words: "Of the infinite desires of man the chief are the desires for power and glory. They are not identical though closely allied. Every man would like to be God if it were possible; some few find it difficult to admit the impossibility," or, as Niebuhr himself believes, it may spring from the inevitable anxiety which to the concomitant of freedom and finiteness.[11] But whatever its ultimate nature it is present as the perverting and destructive element in life. It goes deeper than the ancient struggle between body and soul, the natural and the spiritual. Indeed, the true antithesis is not between the natural and spiritual, but between the spiritual and the carnal, which is a moral term. There is not a power of the body which cannot be and is not abused, not a gift of the intellect that cannot be and is not perverted to an evil purpose. The love of beauty can be a dancing light leading to the bogs of sensuality. The love of truth has been responsible for cruelty and persecution. Even the pursuit of goodness may produce the poisonous fruit of self-righteousness. No discovery in science, no ingenious invention, but can put fresh powers of destruction in the hands of injurious men. Education is no barrier to the forces of hate and greed. As has been proved in two of the greatest wars in history, civilisation itself is a thin crust over raging and violent fires. The "something that infects the world" distorts and directs to a deadly end the noblest of causes. "O Liberty," cried Madame Roland on the scaffold, "What crimes are committed in thy name!" When the poor and oppressed demand justice, how much of their demand is inspired by mere envy of the wealth and security of their oppressors? And how often do they in their turn become the oppressors? How much ambition and thirst for power is disguised as philanthropy or even religious zeal, or perverts an originally pure intent to these personal ends? How much of love is love of self, of the service of others a ministering to self-esteem? In small things as in great the evil works, and in the bickerings, the jealousies, the envies, the malice and the selfishnesses, of the small group, the conflicts and conflagrations of the world are reproduced. The greatest crimes and the meanest, the most terrible oppressions and the tyrannies hidden away in the home or wherever there is dependence of man on man, tell the same sad tale of indwelling evil. And the mystery is deepened when it is realised that those most conscious of it are the saintliest and best of men. It is upon this submerged rock that the world makes continual shipwreck. It is said that a once-famous minister opened his morning newspaper

[11] *ib.* 194.
[10] *Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol. I. 200.

with the words: "Let me see how the heavenly Father is governing the world!" But one recalls the famous passage in Newman's *Apologia* in which he describes the human scene: "All this is a vision to dizzy and appal; and inflicts upon the mind the sense of a profound mystery, which is absolutely beyond human solution. What shall be said to this heart-piercing, reason-bewildering fact? I can only answer, that either there is no Creator, or this living society of men is in a true sense discarded from His presence."

This is the mystery of the human situation, man's inescapable suffering in this world, the assertion of his freedom from good as from evil restraint, and his fatal perversion. It is a tragic situation for which no political creed can provide a remedy, and the creed of communism least of all. On the contrary, the more the whole situation is ignored the more certainly will the costly experiments fail. We are not concerned here with these creeds, democratic, socialistic, or communist, as political or social ideals which can be discussed on their merits, but as, what some even claim to be, substitutes for religion. How can the mere change of external conditions, the replacement of one social order by another, meet the tragic state of humanity or satisfy the profound needs of a solitary human soul? "Men cannot get along without religion," wrote Macneile Dixon, and he wrote as a humanist not as a Christian. "If one is abandoned another is adopted. And all our humanitarianism, all our philanthropy and welfare work, are efforts to fill the great spiritual void left by the decay of faith, drab substitutes for the older creeds. The spirit of man craves for a friendly God, and you give him economics."[12] A "drab substitute" indeed. It is not that economics are of no importance, or that men do not need to be fed and clothed, or that social injustice or ancient wrongs should be tolerated. It is that to deal with these only is, as the old prophet said, "to heal lightly the hurt of the daughter of my people," to ignore the fundamental situation and needs of humanity. "What is man," asked Hamlet,

> If his chief good and market of his time
> Is but to sleep and feed? A beast, no more.

It is because man is not a beast to be contented with removal to a cleaner sty and especially if he pays too highly for it, but a being so great in nature and so deeply wounded that nothing less than a religion on the vast scale of his need can satisfy him. To offer him anything less as a cure for his ill is to throw husks before a prodigal in the far country.

* * * *

This is the radical criticism of communism as a substitute for

[12] *The Human Situation.* 186.

and avowedly, the enemy of religion. Over against it, and all social systems which ignore God, is set the Christian Church, the Divine Society with its revealed doctrines of God and man. It is one of the weaknesses, perhaps the chief weakness, of at least the Protestant defence, that the Church too often is ignored *as integral to the Faith.* The Christian who confronts communism in mine, workshop, or office, often confronts it as an individual defending his own personal belief and experience and not as a representative of the Church, of which frequently in his narrow individualistic religion he has the vaguest and most inadequate ideas. And yet the Gospel is inseparable from the Church and is emasculated when isolated. Without the Church there would be no individual believer for it is from the Church he has received both Gospel and Bible, and to the Church he owes his faith and its experience. It is not the lonely individual, but the Christian Church, the most significant society on earth, which God purchased with His own blood, with its sacraments and especially its Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, that faces the menace and crisis of the hour, and the individual as part and member of it. It is in the world, majestical, significant, spanning the centuries with its own life, and its own enduring, invincible power. And it is this in spite of appearances, it is this in spite of acknowledged and patent weakness :

> Though with a scornful wonder
> Men see her sore oppressed.
> By schisms rent asunder,
> By heresies distrest.

It has been so from the beginning. Nothing can be more severe or justified than the judgement passed by St. Paul on the Church at Corinth, and yet—" Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are," and " Ye are the Body of Christ, and severally members thereof." The truth is the Church is *an object of faith* as is its Lord, and its real history is the history of the indwelling Spirit. Like other societies, as in the case of a nation, its external activities and institutions can be described, the story told of its councils, its creeds and controversies, its divisions and enterprises, all the matter that forms the study of the ecclesiastical historian. But the substantial life of the Church, as of a nation, is not in these things. It is the inexhaustible story of its confessors and martyrs and saints, of its evangelists and poets and workers in every age, of its conversions and self-denials, and most of all of the unrecordable experiences of countless multitudes of men and women who found in their faith consolation in grief, courage in hardship, inspiration in labour, strength in temptation,

forgiveness in sin, hope in danger and in death, and who lived and died in the consciousness of God. It is by the Spirit, by a supernatural power ever renewed in the obscure lives of unnumbered believers, that the Church has lived and still lives. And to all this the Christian of today is heir, and behind him is all the wealth and variety of the Church's experience of the Spirit, and of its witness to the truth to which he himself has to testify. He is not solitary.

Furthermore, this experience of the Church, is not a mere variety of religious experience, though the student of Comparative Religion of necessity treats it as such. It is distinct in its quality, and is the fruition of a *divine purpose*. The question of a purpose in human history has long been the study of some of the ablest historians, with ambiguous or negative results. The idea of inevitable progress so dominant in the last century has perished in recent conflagrations. The original Marxian notion of an inevitable social evolution from feudalism to capitalism and then to communism, and of economics as its mainspring, is not a notion of purpose. It is of a materialistic necessity. It is only in the light of a revelation, supposing one given, that indications of a real purpose in human affairs can be discerned. And of such a revelation the Bible is the only record in the world. The sacred books of the ethnic religions give no hint of it. But the Bible is primarily the book of a divine purpose, and it is this that gives unity to its varied contents. And it is the Book of the Church, the mirror in which it sees itself, its story from its remote beginnings to the vision of its consummation. The Bible is, of course, sustenance to the individual believer. It gives voice to his aspirations and laments, illumines his trials and sorrows, feeds him with its hopes and promises. But it is all this to the individual because it is something more. It is the record of the divine action in history, of the purpose which includes the individual, because of the community from which he derives his spiritual life and in which he is rooted. It is not simply the story of the gradual unveiling of God, or, from another point of view, the slow advance of ideas *about* God from, say, the crude notions of the historic Samuel or David, through the increasing knowledge of the prophets, one adding this and another that, until we reach the full blaze of Jesus, and all detached from the history in which it is embedded. It is the story of God's dealings with one particular people, in the course of which dealings the revelation is given of His dealings with and His purpose for all. Its subject is not man but God, and the underworking of His atoning presence in the world, afflicted in all its afflictions. It begins with myths of prehistory and it ends with an apocalypse of what is beyond history, both of universal significance; and, between these it traces the

footsteps of God as He moves onward towards the Church.[13] The Church, then, begins its story with the call of Abraham, follows it through the vicissitudes of a tiny nation, and then of a people "hewn" from it by the prophets into a small "Remnant" of believing and expectant souls, the Danielic Son of Man. And then at last the sudden appearance of a community which includes men of diverse races but which regarded itself as the heir of the promise made to Abraham, the goal of all God's dealings with Israel, the reason for all that strange eventful history. As St. Peter says: "The prophets searched diligently . . . to whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto you did they minister these things," and the very great epistle to the *Ephesians* has as its subject the majesty, universality, and ultimacy of the Church as not only the fulfilment of "the commonwealth of Israel," but of a divine purpose formed before the foundation of the world. It is not possible to understand the Bible without realising that from beginning to end, and in the New Testament even more than in the Old, its theme is the Purpose of God to bring into being a redeemed people, a community, a social organism, created and indwelt by His Spirit. And in the New Testament the end is reached in the Church. And here, if anywhere, is to be found the clue to human history.

Once more, if the Church was the object of the longing eyes of the prophets and of the fulfilling of a divine purpose formed before the foundation of the world, then it has some relation to the Kingdom of God, because it is the Kingdom of God which, according to the Bible, is the divinely ordained end of history. The term "Kingdom of God" has been greatly and commonly misused to describe the goal of *human* effort, the improvement of society, the remedying of social evils, the prevention of war by the establishment of international councils, and so forth, in short, the furthering of humanitarian programmes and ideals. All of which is admirable even if it is haunted by the disillusionment that waits on a too optimistic belief in human nature. But it has little relation to the Kingdom of God from which it borrows its name. Because the Kingdom of God in the Bible is a supernatural reality, it is the Epiphany of God, the breaking into Time of Eternity, the long prayed-for Intervention of God who comes, in judgement and saving mercy, to establish His holy will in the world. And it is the good News of the New Testament, the burden of the preaching of Jesus and the Apostles that this Kingdom has come. Jesus does not bring in the Kingdom. It is the Kingdom that brings Him. There were anticipations of it. The light is in the sky before the sun leaps above the horizon; and in prophet and seer and saint, and not only among the Jews, rays

[13] cp Dodd. *The Bible to-day p.* 112.

from the eternal world had penetrated the world-darkness. The Spirit of God was always with men and in them. But now in the fulness of time the "day spring from on high" broke upon the world, and the Kingdom was here. And when men saw it they did not recognise it, or were purblind to its glory which was not of this world.

> They all were looking for a king
> To slay their foes and lift them high:
> Thou cam'st a little baby thing
> That made a woman cry.[14]

And what men desired, and still desire, was the fulfilment of their earthly hope, the redress of their grievances, the satisfaction of the demand they make on their fellows and on life. And the kingdom they seek is a kingdom of their own world, with their own standards, their own methods, their own ends. And when the Kingdom of God came it had no beauty that they should desire it. Jesus, in whom the kingdom was incarnate traversed the judgements of the world, reversed its standards, rejected its methods, refused its ends. The Kingdom was the Kingdom of Heaven, of holy fellowship with God Whose Son He was. It was, if we must use spatial language, heaven come to earth. The ethics of Jesus are the ethics of the Kingdom, and in direct word and in parable He expounded its law of Love, "Be perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect." It was not what Hazlitt called "the morality of good nature"[15] which often passes for it. It is the costly love which St. Paul called the most excellent gift of the Holy Spirit which goes out in reverential self-identification with its object. It is the Eternal Life of God. And it was the influx of this Kingdom which brought Jesus into the world. It was manifest in signs and mighty works, but they were all miracles of love. It shone in His vast compassion, in His unwearying toil, in His association with the outcast and forsaken as of infinite value to God, in His revitalising forgiveness of sin, even in His wrath against the harshness and religious pride of those who sinned against love. He Himself knew temptation, but He was tempted, as all men are, on His own level. It was to take short cuts to His high end, to work for quick returns of love, out of very pity for men to adopt means that fell below the slow and costing methods of love. But He put the temptation aside with tears. In this world the Kingdom of God can only exist and can only conquer, and so only save men, by the labour and suffering of love. For the price of inexorable love is pain. "If any

[14] George Macdonald, *That Holy Thing.*
[15] Essay, *Why the heroes of romance are insipid.*

man would come after Me," He cried, even to the multitude, "let him take up his cross and follow Me." It is the royal Way of the Kingdom, and there is no other. And so He gathered round Him a few men, the nucleus of the Kingdom, and these He taught and trained, and knit to Himself in bonds of loyalty. There were twelve of them, symbolic of the New Israel, the new fellowship of the Kingdom of God. They were firmly His before He entered upon His supreme and most solitary work, the Action in which the nature and power of the Kingdom would be fully manifested.

It is an invincible instinct of the human soul that evil must be expiated, and that when a sinner suffers for his sin he expiates it. It is also instinctively felt that he makes expiation when, at great personal cost, he renders some noble service, or gives his life in some heroic action. Some moral necessity demands that the evil must be atoned for in one way or another. But among the Jews especially the association of suffering with expiation created a serious religious problem when it was realised that suffering fell upon the righteous, and with the growing sense of the status of the individual the problem became acute. It was given to one prophet of profound insight to assert that the sufferings brought upon the innocent, because their lives were bound up with the guilty, might have expiatory value. Such innocent sufferers were the great prophet Jeremiah, and the "holy Remnant" who had been carried into Babylon among the exiles upon whom rested the judgement of God. And, in a series of oracle-poems, he described the great "Servant of God," the personification of the Remnant, the true and obedient Israel, silently and for sins not his own enduring obloquy and death, and so expiating the sin of his people and perhaps even of their enemies. It is not possible to rationalise either the common instinct or the prophet's inspired intuition. It belongs to the "image of God" in man. As Jesus said of His own sufferings, "It needs must be." It is most probable that what the prophet perceived by his inspired insight Jesus recognised apart from him, but the spirit of the "Servant passages" was too much akin to His own to be overlooked by Him. And there is ample evidence that they were much in His mind and that He gave them a Messianic significance. And so, like the prophet's Servant, He yielded Himself, in obedience to His Father's Will and in awful loneliness, to suffer at the hands of men the worst they could do, bringing upon Himself and so exposing, with the revealing which is judgement, the ultimate consequences of their estrangement from the life of God; and in darkness and death, but with a love the darkness and death could not quench, He made expiation for the sin, first of His own followers, then of the nation that had rejected Him, and of the whole world whose sin was focussed in the Cross. "He gave Himself," it is written by one

who denied Him, "the just for the unjust that He might bring us near to God." For God was in Him, and it was God Himself who bore the iniquity of us all. And in that sacrifice and last victory of holy love the Kingdom's deep foundations in the world were laid.

Then followed the Resurrection into enthroned power, the Return in the descending Spirit to the regathered followers, and the Church was launched into history. From now on the term "Kingdom of God" almost disappears from the New Testament, and the Church, the "Body of Christ," the "elect nation," the "Israel of God," takes its place. The Church *is* the Kingdom of God in so far as it has earthly embodiment. Its life is the life of the Kingdom, its laws and ideals are those of the Kingdom. Its Lord is the King Himself. The Church is the extension of the Incarnation and the Cross, or, as Mrs. Herman finely says, "not so much a school and temple of wisdom as an organ of atonement and redemption."[16] If she has no beauty that men should desire her, it is because, like her Lord, she is not of this world; if she is weak with human infirmities, it is because her members are human and sinful, and the Spirit has to strive against the carnal mind in them all and does not compel the will. But in all her weakness and sin she not only endures, but sends forth men and women of heroic fortitude and sacrifice. When Sian was bombed by the Japanese in 1939, 500 Christians gathered for the Communion service, and as the syrens wailed the Company sang:

> This is my Father's world.
> Why should my heart be sad?
> The Lord is King, let the heavens ring.
> God reigns: let the earth be glad.

George Young goes on to relate in his *The Living Christ in Modern China*, a truly great book: "The singing finished and the Communion service continued. Soon we heard the sound of bombers approaching a still city. They passed overhead. Then came the whistle of bombs descending, and the church shook with the explosions. All was quiet again as the planes went home. With grateful hearts we partook of the broken Bread and the Wine, remembering the wounds of Christ," and he adds: "He came into our midst and filled us with His peace."[17] The tree is not dead or dying that produces such fruit as George Young and his heroic Chinese. But here is the Church, the Kingdom of God, in the world with inherent and supernatural powers, but not powers the world can use for its ends, with immortal hope that goes beyond the world of time and space, a Community that struggles here below until it joins the Community above, the

[16] *Meaning and value of Mysticism.* 377. [17] *p.* 200.

Church triumphant in the heavenly places. It calls for faith, for devotion, for the daily carrying of the Cross of Christ, but it is a Creation of God of which no man should be ashamed. And it answers the whole human situation by the truth to which its very existence is a witness, because it brings God into the matter—God as revealed in Christ, having compassion on men and sharing their travail, appealing to men as free spirits to choose the way of His will rather than the way that brings distress upon themselves, and, beyond all, bearing the burden of human sin expiating and taking it away with an eternal sacrifice and a forgiveness that gives hope to all. He is a very present God, and the shadow of the Cross falls athwart the world, and in the shadow there is healing.

* * * *

This is the faith that overcomes the world, with varying emphasis and external forms of system and presentation, the faith of the whole Church of God. It is the faith of St. Peter, in his weakness and denials and pathetic love more truly representative of the Church and of humanity than St. Paul with his spiritual genius, his inspired thought, his iron endurance. But it was his faith too who strove to "fill up that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ . . . for his body's sake, which is the Church." It is the faith of Augustine, and Bernard of Clairvaux ("Jesus, the very thought of Thee") of Francis the troubadour of Christ who bore in his hands and feet the wounds of Jesus, of Aquinas, the "Angelic Doctor," who had such a vision in the Sacrament that he said, "I can write no more, I have seen things which make all my writings like straw," of Luther and Calvin, of Hooker and George Herbert, and Richard Baxter and John Bunyan, of Wesley and Robert Hall, of William Carey and, Newman and Maurice, of George Macdonald, and Spurgeon ("He looked at me and I looked at Him, and we were one for ever,") of John Clifford, the fearless (("I felt that the reputation of the Church was in my keeping . . . and this consciousness drove me to God, so that every morning I sought with the utmost earnestness that I might be kept through the day from anything that would discredit Christ, whose name I had professed, and the Church into which He had brought me"), the faith of Bishop Hannington and Timothy Richards, and George Young, and a great cloud of witnesses. It is this faith in which the individual believer faces the challenge of his world today. And it is all gathered up and concentrated in his personal identification with his crucified and risen and indwelling Lord, "the same yesterday, today, and forever." "The Cross that Jesus carried He carried it for you." Yes, but it is the Cross not only believed in, but accepted as the principle of his own life, in the bearing it after

Christ, in the dying to self and in living the New Life of love and intercession whose springs are in God. Even the inescapable troubles and hardships of earthly experience become part of this self-offering. They have a greater object than the discipline of character, though, accepted as the will of the Father, they have this result. In ways beyond our understanding, as James Hinton maintained years ago,[18] they can be used by God. Not only apostles and martyrs, but stricken hearts and sufferers on beds of pain can, by their loving endurance, reinforce His world-wide purpose of redemption. "Since the suffering which is offered up to Thee," wrote Madame Pastorelli in her long agony, "is a force which it is in Thy power to utilize, here I gather into one sheaf my own sufferings, and cast them at Thy feet."[19] And the powers of the new life in Christ may have a deeper significance still. As it is said in that small masterpiece of biography *Lacordaire*: "There is many a loving, believing heart who never heard or read of *solidarity, reversibility,* or *expiation,* who yet lives and works and prays in the strength of thoughts to which it would not be able to give clear dogmatic expression."[20] But in a profound sense they are sharing in the Cross of Christ. In Christ or in Adam we are members of one another, and no man liveth or dieth to himself. All are responsible for all, and so Schweitzer, driven by the Spirit of Christ, goes to Lambarene avowedly to make some atonement for the colossal sins of Europeans against the natives of Africa, and Aggrey wears himself out in loving labour to heal the wounds made by racial contempt. Solidarity is a fact, and the Christian accepts that fact with all its consequences as explicit in the Gospel of the Atoning Cross. "As He is, so are we in this world." Where the Spirit of Christ is, there is He. The redeemed humanity, ever living on the one great Sacrifice as its daily Bread, is a redeeming humanity, and it is through the cross-bearing and expiating Church, which is the Body of Christ of which we are members, that Christ continues His saving work.

A willing sacrifice she takes
The burden of our fall within;
Holy she stands; while on her breaks
The lightning of the wrath of sin;
She drinks her Saviour's cup of pain,
And, one with Jesus, thirsts again.[21]

Is it too much to say that the world is waiting for the Church to

[18] *The Mystery of Pain.*
[19] Eustace, *An Infinity of Questions,* 95.
[20] by Dora Greenwell. See also her Essay on *Prayer.*
[21] R. H. Benson, *The Teresian Contemplative; cp* Wheeler Robinson, *Cross of Job,* 62.

realise more deeply her true nature, and in her members and in her community-life to manifest the atoning presence of Christ? As L. S. Thornton writes: "Only so far as the love of Christ, crucified and risen, is re-embodied in flesh and blood, in holy lives and in a holy society, will men be drawn to recognise and to respond to that love."[22]

* * * *

It is from the vantage-ground of this Faith, and equipped with the weapons of the Spirit, that we survey the world of today and its tidal movements. It was said of Thackeray that "he could not have painted Vanity Fair as he has unless Eden had been shining brightly in his inner eyes."[23] It is the light of the Kingdom of God that illumines the causes that now win the wide support of men. It enables the Christian to acknowledge and appreciate the good in the appeal of Communism, for it draws its strength from the miseries and oppressions of the poor everywhere, especially in the East of Europe where the wretchedness of the masses was greatest. It is not an accident that its Land of Promise is Russia, the home of age-long political and social despotism, and whose literature, from Gogol onwards, was the literature of pity. It is the hope that Communism holds out to the depressed and insecure of all peoples that gains the support of generous spirits and engages the enthusiasm of young hearts. The Christian sees this with understanding and sympathy, and he is condemned by his own Gospel if his compassion is less than theirs. But the Gospel shows him more than this and he remembers the warning of Christ. In a church in Orvieto there is marvellous fresco of the Last Judgement, and among the figures there is a remarkable group of Antichrist and his angels. They are noble figures, and Antichrist especially is stately and beautiful with a strange suggestion of Christ. It must indeed be so, how else could he "deceive the very elect?" It is only on closer inspection that the malignancy of the countenance is perceived. And it is to the closer view of Communism as it meets us today, with its repudiation of God and its reversion to the savage tribalism whose standard of Right and Wrong is what is considered the advantage or disadvantage of the tribe, that the features of Antichrist are revealed. It forges fresh chains on the human spirit and establishes a tyranny greater than any it displaces because it is wholly a Kingdom of this world. The true Christ does not crucify. He is crucified. With Communism of this ideology the Church can come to no terms. If need be, it can only suffer with Christ. The compassion for men which gives

[22] *Doctrine of the Atonement.* 161
[23] Brimley, *Essays.*

Communism its glamour flows in its true channel when it flows through Christian minds and hearts, and inspires Christian statesmen and Christian democracies. For it is only Christianity that teaches effectively the sacredness of men.

On Palm Sunday the Church celebrated what is called the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem. But what a Triumph! Our attention has been focussed on the shouting multitude and the waving palm-branches. Do we sufficiently consider the tremendous irony of that Royal Procession, its derision of earthly power? The King comes in humbleness and poverty. The ass He rides is a borrowed ass. His regal seat is the weather-worn cloaks of His poor followers. And in His face is the shadow of foreknown ignominy and death. Misunderstood by the crowds and His own disciples, and watched by the scornful eyes of the powerful, He rides to His doom. Was there ever so great a repudiation of the things in which men place their confidence? But they are saved by what is above them and not by what is on their level, and it is so that Christ still offers Himself to us all. His Kingdom is not of this world, because it is not of the spirit of this world. But it is only in His Kingdom that, if ever, the world will find healing and peace.

B. G. COLLINS.

A Suggested Source of Some Expressions in the Baptist Confession of Faith, London 1644.

THE purpose of this paper is to draw attention to a probable source of some of the doctrinal expressions in the Confession of the Seven Churches issued in London in 1644. This is a well-known and justly prized document of the Baptist churches who accepted the Calvinistic tradition and has often been described so that it is unnecessary to enlarge upon the conditions of its appearance. It may be sufficient to remark that the Baptists were not allowed any place in the deliberations of the Westminster Assembly of Divines who had been summoned by the English Parliament to adjust the religious affairs to the nation in view of the changed conditions of the period. The Royal favour was neither sought nor given, but the purpose of the Assembly had the hearty approbation of the Scottish Presbyterians. The latter were represented by Commissioners of weighty learning and controversial ability whose animus against all that smacked of Anabaptism is notorious, and it may be taken for granted that while they had any influence upon the deliberations in the Jerusalem Chamber all pleas that the Baptists should be given an opportunity to declare their mind would be rejected with a perfect scorn.[1]

This exclusion only stimulated the productive activity of the Baptist apologists, and the great debate of those stirring times was given an impetus which is astonishing in its magnitude. For the next decade and more, pamphlet after pamphlet poured from the printing presses. Everyone who could wield a pen seems to have seized it with avidity and let all who cared to read the resulting document know what the writer thought of infant baptism. The shocking typography and blurred lettering of many of these paper projectiles bear ample testimony to the urgent persuasions with which the printers were impelled to carry out their part in the vigorous campaign. Among the more important productions was the "Confession of Faith of the Seven Congregations or Churches of Christ in London, which are commonly (though

[1] The 1644 Confession was presented to the House of Commons, Journal of the House of Commons, 29 Jan., 1645/6.

unjustly) called Anabaptists." It was prefaced by the explanation that such a statement was made necessary by the misrepresentations and abuse which were being circulated against the churches represented by the signatories.

The person or persons who actually drew up this Confession are unknown. It may be presumed that someone was responsible for the initial drafting of the document which would then be submitted to the other interested parties for approval. Whatever happened in the process of its formation the need was so urgent that it is scarcely to be expected that existing Confessions of the Calvinistic order would be ignored. I wish to suggest that one existing document in particular seems to have been consulted and used.

My attention was drawn to this possibility when reading through the Confession of Faith authorised for the Church of Scotland by the Episcopal Assembly at Aberdeen in 1616. I could not help wondering where I had read some of its doctrinal formulations before, and after a little investigation discovered that my memory had served me well and that the resemblances were contained in the Baptist Confession of 1644. This was naturally a source of some astonishment to me for it seemed absurd that these two documents could have any connection.

Before proceeding further, something may be said about this Scottish Confession. Its matrix was an Assembly which has long since been repudiated by the Scottish National Church. The Assembly which authorised it was a convention of the First Episcopacy which had been introduced into Scottish ecclesiastical affairs by Royal propensity and in the face of stout opposition from the defenders of Presbytery. The acceptance of the new Confession was enacted in the following terms:

"Item, It is statute, that the simple Confessioun of Faith underwrytin be universallie receivit throughout this whole kingdome, to the quhilk all heirafter salbe bound to sweare and sett thair hands; and in speciall all persons that beare office in the Church, at thair acceptatioun of any of the saids offices; and lykewayes Students and Schollers in Colledges."[2]

This statement is generally known as the Aberdeen Confession.[3] Its features are:

1. It consists of about 3,250 words set out in short unnumbered paragraphs.

2. The doctrine is thoroughly Calvinistic.

[2] *The Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland,* Bannatyne Club, Vol. III, *p.* 1127.

[3] The Confession is printed in *The Booke of the Universall Kirk, pp.* 1132-1139.

3. There are many expressions obviously directed against the Roman Church, but the Confession is not marred by the virulent abuse which was a feature of earlier Scottish symbolics.

4. The format does not follow that of any known Reformed symbol.

5. It does not specifically mention infant baptism though this would be implied, and it is the only Scottish Confession to mention dipping as an acceptable mode of baptising.

The production seems to have been a dead letter from the day it was issued, a consequence which is not surprising to readers of Scottish history. The Presbyterian section of the Church would have nothing to do with the progeny of Episcopacy, and if the Confession had any life at all it can only have been in strongly Episcopal quarters. It is certain that it was largely ignored and soon forgotten. The only adequate notice of its existence is in Dr. C. G. M'Crie's survey of the Confessions of the Church of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1907, and there it is evaluated by this historian in these terms:

"In point of calmness and fairness of judgment, historical balance, and moderation of language, the northern Confession of 1616 is entitled to rank alongside of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and the thirty-three chapters of the Westminster symbol."[4]

The actual composition of the document has to be dated a few years prior to 1616. The draft was the result of the combined labours of Mr. John Hall and Mr. John Adamson, and the revision at the time of the Assembly was committed to a group of five divines among whom the principal reviser seems to have been Mr. Robert Howie of St. Andrew's, the successor to Andrew Melville.[5] The Confession as presented in 1616 may be taken to be chiefly the work of Howie.

Hitherto it has been commonplace to notice that the Baptist Confession of 1644 had a feature paralleled only by the Scots Confession of 1560, namely, that at the beginning of the latter and the end of the former, the composers declare that they are open to correction should their tenets be shown to be unscriptural. The Scots reformers said:

"gif any man will note in this oure Confessioun any article or sentence repugning to Godis holie word, that it wald pleis him of his gentilnes, and for Christiane cherities saik, to admoneise us of the samyn in writt; and We of our honour and fidelitie do

[4] *p.* 27f.

[5] Scot's *Apologetical Narration*, Wodrow Society, *p.* 243; Calderwood, *History of the Church of Scotland*, Vol. VII, *pp.* 233-242.

promeis unto him satisfactioun fra the mouth of God, (that is, fra his holy Scriptures)."[6]

The English Baptists expressed the same sentiment thus:

"Also we confess that we know but in part, and that we are ignorant of many things which we desire and seek to know; and if any shall do us that friendly part to show us from the word of God that we see not, we shall have cause to be thankful to God and them."

This similarity is singular enough, but I do not think anyone has observed the further evidence which I now set down to support the contention that the Baptist Confession has other links with Scotland. I submit, then, some extracts for perusal and comparison. Part of their relevance to the present purpose, it should be noted, is in the fact that they are entire sections set down here in the sequence in which they occur in the two Confessions except where I have noted omissions.

1644	1616
Article III (end)	
God hath in Christ before the foundation of the world, according to the good pleasure of his will, foreordained some men to eternall life through Jesus Christ, to the praise and glory of his grace, leaving the rest in their sinne to their just condemnation to the praise of his Justice.	This God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to the good pleasure of his will, for the praise of the glory of his grace, did predestinat and elect in Christ some men and angels unto eternal felicity; and others he did appoint for eternal condemnation, according to the counsel of his most free, most just and holy will, and that to the praise and glory of his justice.
Article IV.	
In the beginning God made all things very good, created man after his own Image and likenesse, filling him with all perfection of all naturall excellency and uprightnesse, free from all sinne. But long he abode not in this honour, but by the subtiltie of the Serpent which Satan used as his instrument, himself with	In the beginning of time, when God created of nothing all things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, he made them very good; and above all things he made man and angels, conform to his own image, in righteousness and true holiness; but some of the angels of their own free motive sinned against God, left

[6] *Knox's Works*, edited by Laing, Vol. II, *p.* 96.

his Angels having sinned before, and not kept their first estate, but left their owne habitation; first Eve, then Adam being seduced did wittingly and willingly fall into disobedience and transgression of the Commandment of their great Creator, for the which death came upon all, and reigned over all, so that all since the Fall are conceived in sinne, and brought forth in iniquite, and so by nature children of wrath, and servants of sinne, subjects of death, and all other calamities due to sinne in this world and for ever, being considered in the state of nature without relation to Christ.

their original, forsook their habitation, and abode not in the truth, and thereby became damned devils.

Then Satan abused the craftie serpent for his instrument, seducing our mother Eva; she tempted her husband Adam; so both disobeyed the commandment of God, and thereby made themselves and their whole posterite the bondmen of Satan, slaves of sin, and heirs of eternal damnation.
By this fall of Adam all his posterity are so corrupted, from their conception and nativity, that not one of them can do, or will anything truly acceptable to God, till they be renewed by the will and Spirit of God, and by faith ingrafted in Christ Jesus.
(One brief paragraph omitted.)

Article V.

All mankind being thus fallen, and become altogether dead in sinnes and trespasses, and subject to the eternall wrath of the great God by transgression, yet the elect, which God hath loved with an everlasting love, are redeemed, quickened, and saved, not by themselves, neither by their own workes, leste any man should boast himselfe, but wholly, and onely by God of his free grace and mercie through Jesus Christ, who of God is made unto us wisdome, righteousnesse, sanctification, and redemption, that as it is written, Hee that rejoyceth, let him rejoyce in the Lord.

Albeit all mankind being fallen in Adam; yet only these who are elected before all time, are in time redeemed, restored, raised, and quickened again, not of themselves, or of their works, lest any man should glory: but only of the mercy of God through faith in Jesus Christ, who of God is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption; that according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

Article VI.

This therefore is life eternal, to know the onely true God, and whom he hath sent Jesus Christ. And on the contrary, the Lord will render vengeance in flaming fire to them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This then is life eternal to know the true God, and whom he hath sent Jesus Christ: whereas vengeance shall be taken on all them that know not God, and do not subject themselves to the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ by the obedience of faith.

Article VII.

The Rule of this Knowledge, Faith and Obedience, concerning the worship and service of God, and all other Christian duties, is not man inventions, opinions, devices, lawes, constitutions, or traditions unwritten whatsoever but only the word of God contained in the Canonical Scriptures.

We believe, that the rule of this knowledge, faith, and obedience, yea and the whole worship of God, and of all Christian conversation, is not the wit or will of man, nor unwritten traditions whatsoever; but the wisdom and will of God, which is sufficiently revealed in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

Article VIII.

In this written word God hath plainly revealed whatsoever he hath thought needful for us to know, beleeve, and acknowledge, touching the Nature and office of Christ, in whom all the promises are Yea and Amen to the praise of God.

(Three paragraphs on the authority of Scripture. The second and third is as follows.)

We believe that all points of faith and worship are so set doun in the Word of God, that what is obscurely proponed in one place, is most clearly exponed in other places; neither receive we any interpretation of any Scriptures in these matters, which is not warranted be other Scriptures. . . . Jesus Christ, whose person, office, and benefits they most clearly and fully sett furth unto us.

Article IX.

Touching the Lord Jesus Christ, of whom Moses and

The Lord Jesus Christ is declared in Scripture to be the

the Prophets wrote, and whom the Apostles preached, he is the Sonne of God the Father, the brightnesse of his glory, the ingraven forme of his being, God with him and with his only Spirit by whom he made the world, by whom he upholds and governes all the workes hee hath made, who also when the fulnesse of time was come, was made man of a woman, of the Tribe of Judah, of the seed of Abraham and David, to wit, of Mary that blessed Virgin, by the Holy Spirit comming upon her, and the power of the most High overshadowing her, and was also in all things like unto us, sinne onely excepted.

eternal Son of God begotten from all eternity of the Father, by whom also he does sustain and govern all things that he has made: And this Eternal Son of God, when the fulness of time came, was made man of a woman, of the tribe of Judah, and of the seed of David and Abraham, even of the blessed virgin Mary, by the holy Ghost coming down upon her, and the power of the most High overshadowing her, by whose marvellous and divine operation, the Son of God was made man of a human body and soul, and in all things like unto us, sin only excepted.

It becomes obvious by this comparison that these identities, similarities, and general agreements, both of expressions and order of treatment call for an adequate explanation. Before this is attempted I should like to make it quite clear that I have selected the above sections because they are the most suitable to the purpose of demonstrating a connection, and that the remainder of both Confessions contains very great dissimilarities, particularly in the sections dealing with the sacraments. This means that the greater part of both Confessions is not being dealt with in this examination. It would be true to say, however, that if it were granted that the above extracts do establish the fact of borrowing there are many topics in the 1644 Confession other than those quoted which are suggestively similar in treatment to their exposition in the 1616 Confession. They could easily be explained of course, as simply Calvinistic in phrase and tone if direct association were denied. Such, for example, would be an adequate explanation of the sections in both dealing with the offices of Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King. It might also serve to explain the section on the attitude to the civil magistrate which was such a sensitive point in seventeenth century thought. The earlier symbol affirmed, that " All their subjects are bound in duty to obey them in all things they command lawfully, not repugnant to the will of God; and that they are obliged to pray for them daily, that under them they may lead a godly and peaceable life."

The 1644 form read:

" . . . that in all lawful things commanded by them, subjection ought to be given by us in the Lord: and that we are to make supplication and prayer for kings, and all that are in authority, that under them we may live a peaceable life in all godliness and honesty."

Again, if the indebtedness is granted, it might be held that the Baptist Confession improved some of the statements of the Episcopal Confession by the insertion of more vigorous and picturesque language as, for example, in the affirmation on perseverance. In 1616 it was phrased:

" We believe, that the elect being renewed, are sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, in such sort, that albeit they bear about in their flesh the remnants of that original corruption, and albeit they offend through infirmity, and through the intisements thereof sin grievously to the great offence of God: yet they cannot altogether fall from grace, but are raised again through the mercy of God, and keeped to salvation."

The later Confession stated:

" Those that have this precious faith wrought in them by the Spirit, can never finally nor totally fall away; and though many storms and floods do arise and beat against them, yet they shall never be able to take them off that foundation and rock which by faith they are fastened upon, but shall be kept by the power of God to salvation where they shall enjoy their purchased possession."

I turn now to consider what can be said on general historical grounds on the problem set by the presumed relationship existing between the two Confessions. Those who have read some of the early literature of the Genevan tradition will have no difficulty in reaching the conclusion that many of the expressions cited were stock phrases culled from the Institutes, and in so far as this is so, the Confessions have a common source. The Baptist document furnishes the reader with Scripture references (none were given in the Aberdeen Confession) and the composer could easily have increased the appearance of doctrinal orthodoxy thus acquired by also noting the appropriate pages of the Institutes. I think it would be a fair judgment, however, to say that the acceptance of a vocabulary of terms and ideas does not go very far to account for the particular combination of terms and ideas as are found to be common to these two expositions. This judgment is strengthened by my failure to discover any other Confession in the Genevan tradition before 1644 which offers a parallel worthy of mention. The same themes are dealt with but there is no trace of the similarities existing between the two Confessions in question. So far as I can discover the relation-

ship is unique in so far as these doctrinal statements are concerned. There is an interesting parallel to the method employed, for it is well-known that the Westminster Confession of 1647 was indebted to the Irish Articles of Ussher.[7] The latter were incorporated almost verbatim in a most remarkable piece of unacknowledged borrowing—probably the most notable in all the history of symbolics.

The position would be considerably simplified and the main source of scepticism removed if it could be shown that it was in some degree possible for the Calvinistic Baptists of London to be connected with Scotland. Indeed, more than this would require to be shown, for in contemporary Scotland the Aberdeen Confession was probably unknown to all but a few who cherished memories of Episcopacy. It is this latter factor which makes the problem so puzzling. Even though it was proved that a Scotsman was associated with the London Baptists, could the improbable be accepted that he knew about the Aberdeen Confession and further possessed a copy of it? Nothing less than this is the measure of the major difficulty.

I have two suggestions to offer neither of which is conclusive. The first is that there can be no doubt that, that there was a Scotsman among the Calvinistic Baptists of London at the time of the publication of the Confession and that, moreover, he occupied a leading position among them. The evidence for this is in Dr. Featley's account of a debate between himself and four "Anabaptists" at Southwark on October 17th, 1642.[8] The debate was opened for the Baptists by "a Scotchman" who took quite a considerable part in the later discussion. He was accompanied by another Baptist whom Featley calls "Cufin" and who is easily identified as William Kiffin, one of the signatories to the 1644 Confession. That places the anonymous Scotsman right in the centre of the group who issued the manifesto and incidentally brings to notice the first Scotsman (so far as is known) who became a Baptist. No more is known of him than Featley records, and an examination of the names that have survived from the period has not produced one with an obviously Scottish flavour. If as a matter of fact his name is not on the lists of known Baptists in London about 1644 and there is no further reference to him, this is in itself a singular matter which might well appear strange if he was as prominent among the Baptists in 1642 as Featley suggests. One possible reason for his disappearance, if he did disappear from the London circle, would be that he had removed from the area. This leads to the second

[7] Fully discussed and illustrated in *Minutes of the Westminster Assembly*, Mitchell and Struthers, 1874, Introduction.

[8] *The Dippers dipt*, Seventh edition, 1660, *p.* If.

suggestion I have to make. It is just a conjecture, but it seems to fit into the puzzle. About the year 1643 a Gilbert Gardin of Tilliefruskie, Aberdeenshire, caused some perturbation in Presbyterian circles by his advocacy of what was called "Brownism" and is stated to have been excommunicated for his opinions. Shortly afterward he appears to have removed to Edinburgh and Robert Pittilok says he suffered close imprisonment there for more than a year and a half on account of his beliefs.[9] Pittilok who seems to have known him, has no hesitation in naming him as a Baptist. He was a man of some standing "known to be pious and of a blameless conversation." The question will be asked: How did such a person come to be in the vicinity of Aberdeen in the year 1643 or thereabouts? At that time the district did not contain anything approaching to Anabaptism, though "sectaries" had appeared shortly after the Second Reformation of 1638 and caused the General Assembly to pass an "Act for searching Books tending to Separation" in 1643. It has been generally held that these were exiles of the Episcopal period returning from Ireland to enjoy what they thought would be the more favourable conditions of their homeland. Where Gilbert Gardin came from is unknown. Like Melchizedek he just arrived. His family name was a common one in Aberdeenshire and it is fairly certain that that was his native place.[10] Can it be that he came north from London? If he did, and the dates coincide, then this would both explain how a Baptist arrived in the alien atmosphere of Aberdeenshire, and how the Aberdeen Confession travelled to London. It would also settle the question of why the theological Scotsman of the Southwark debate vanishes from Baptist records in the South.

The story does not finish at this point. How the Aberdeen Confession travelled South may be conjectural, but how it travelled North again in its new dress is beyond dispute. The 1644 edition of the Baptist Confession was revised in 1646. Considerable alterations were made, but in the main the passages borrowed from or similar to the Aberdeen Confession were left intact. This revision was reprinted in England and again, in 1653, at Leith—the first Baptist Confession of Faith to be published in Scotland. The Scottish reprint is supplied with a preface and dated "Leith, the 10 of the first moneth, vulgarly called March, 1652/3," and it is "Signed in the name and by the appointment of the Church of Christ usually meeting at Leith and Edinburgh,

[9] Tracts Legal and Historical, 1. *The Hammer of Persecution*, London, 1659, reprinted Edinburgh, 1827, *p.* 9.

[10] Ample illustrations occurs in *Selections from the Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen*, Spalding Club, 1846.

Tho. Spenser, Abra. Holmes, Tho. Powell, John Brady."[11] The purpose of the publication is stated in the address "To the Impartial Reader," which affirms that the Confession contains "the principles and substance" of "our Faith and Order," a phrase which has a modern touch in it.

Not a single comment betrays any recognition of its likeness to a previous Scottish symbol, nor might any have been expected considering the short span of life enjoyed by the Episcopal document. Men like Robert Baillie, for example, conscientiously studied both the 1644 and the 1646 versions and never suspected that the application of a little higher criticism would yield something of interest to them for their armoury of anti-Anabaptist missiles. Baillie's opinions were set down in his "Anabaptisme the True Fountaine of Independency, Brownism, Antinomy, Familisme, etc.," published in 1647. He was frankly puzzled about the Baptist Confession. He resented its orthodoxy according to Calvinian standards of doctrine.[12] "The London Anabaptists' Confession," he wrote, "is such an one as I believe thousands of our new anabaptists will be far from owning, as any man may be able to say without a spirit of divination, knowing that their usual and received doctrines do much more agree with the anabaptists in Germany than with that handful who made this Confession."[13] The future Principal of Glasgow University just turned a Nelsonian eye on the publicly declared evidence lying before him and let his prejudice rule the day. What is more to the present purpose is that one of the most telling points he could have made for his Presbyterian readers had completely escaped his notice, namely, that the Confession was based, in its doctrinal sections, on a production of the hated Scottish prelacy, for had such a connection been known no further argument would have been required to cry down the London Confession. His judgment about the extent to which the Baptists of his day would subscribe to the contents of the Confession must have shaken the reliability of his prophetic gifts when he learnt that reprints were not only called for in England, but that the offending document had been reprinted at Leith.

ROBERT B. HANNEN.

[11] Copy in the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh.

[12] Dr. Daniel Featley also refused to believe that it represented the truth. He wrote, "if we give credit to this Confession and the Preface thereof, those who among us are branded with that Title, are neither Hereticks, nor Schismaticks, but tender-hearted Christians". A Censure of a Book, in *The Dippers dipt*, Seventh edition, 1660, *p.* 177.

[13] *pp.* 18, 28. Baillie had probably never known the Aberdeen Confession. He would only be 18 years of age when it was published.

Reviews.

Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, by Gersham G. Scholem. Schocken Books, New York. Original edition 1941, Revised 1946.

The book is based on the Hilda Sroock Lectures for 1938, and the author speaks of the book as intended not only for the research student, but for the much wider circle of those who take an interest in questions of Jewish history and religion. It should be said, however, that the research student will find this book of immense value, both for the material of the lectures, and for the valuable notes and bibliography. Not only the Jew, but the Christian also will acknowledge his debt to Professor Scholem for this penetrating and sensitive study of Jewish religion throughout the Christian era.

The book opens with a discussion of the general characteristics of Jewish Mysticism. Whatever the idiosyncrasies of the particular mystic, or mystical school, the governing factors are always the positive contents of Judaism. Even in its heretical forms, the mystic seeks to interpret the classical faith expressed in the scriptures. It is as a member of the community of the people of God that the mystic walks the mystic way, and he seeks to explain his living experience and intuition in terms of the faith in the Unity of God Who manifests Himself in Creation, Revelation and Redemption, Who has revealed Himself in the Torah. The use that is made of allegorisation, symbolism and myth in the interpretation of the Torah find their counterparts in much Christian mystical literature. It is the necessary straining of language to meet the needs of a real experience.

Then follows a chapter on Merkhabah Mysticism and Jewish Gnosticism, which covers the period up to the 10th century A.D. and discusses the literature especially of the Hekhaloth books. The characteristic form of expression is that of the celestial chariot of Ezekiel, and the passage through the seven heavenly palaces. The dangers of the mystical experience are recognised, and it is in this connection that use is made of magical elements to preserve the soul on the mystic way. Yet the concern is not to practise magic, but to come into the presence of the Holy Majesty of God. The Movement is a small aristocratic sect whose secret knowledge is not to be made public. A notable feature of this school is its "apocalyptic nostalgia," natural enough during a period of Jewish persecution.

The chapter on Hasidism in Mediaeval Germany (12th and

13th centuries) describes a movement of decisive importance for an understanding of the religious development of German Jewry. Notable features are its eschatological interest, and its emphasis on asceticism, ataraxia or "serenity," and extreme altruism ("What is mine is yours, and what is yours is yours—that is the way of the Hasid"). The devotion of the Hasid is movingly described on page 95 in a quotation from Sefer Raziel, "The soul is full of love of God and bound with ropes of love, in joy and lightness of heart . . . . For when the soul thinks deeply about the fear of God, then the flame of heartfelt love bursts in it and the exultation of innermost joy fills the heart. . . . all the contemplation of his thoughts burns in the fire of love for Him." A remarkable development of Hasidism is its doctrine of hypostatic distinctions within the Godhead—The Divinity Who "maintains His silence and carries the universe," the visible Glory by which He reveals Himself to the mystic, and the Holiness or the hidden presence of God in all things.

Lecture IV discusses Abraham Abulafia and the doctrine of prophetic Kabbalism. The aim of this movement is to release the soul from all sensory absorption by concentration on abstract spiritual matters, that thus there may be an intimate union and conformity of the human and divine will (Devekuth). This, rather than the ecstatic experience, is the purpose of Kabbalistic practice. To this end much use is made of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet as having no apparent content which can bind thought. Abulafia produced methods of meditation, by permutation and combination of the letters, leading to controlled modes of association whereby the mind is enlarged and liberated to apprehend the Divine. When the mystic reaches the summit of the mystic ladder, he enters upon the stage of prophetic vision. While it must be admitted that Abulafia's teaching could and did become perverted to the exercise of magic, it was for him, and the great Kabbalists, a way of mystic contemplation of the holy names. He vigorously repudiated magic as a perversion of true mysticism. The long quotation on pp. 147-155 is a fine study in mystical practice.

The two lectures on the Zohar are of great importance. The first consists of an argument in which it is shown that the book is substantially a unity and that the author is Moses ben Shemtob de Leon, and that it was written between 1275 and 1300. The following lecture discusses its theosophy, i.e. its mystical doctrine of the workings of God. The innermost Being of God, En-Sof, the Infinite, is unknowable. Nevertheless He is active throughout the universe and thus has certain attributes which represent stages of the divine Being. There are ten such fundamental attributes, which are at the same time stages through which

the divine life pulsates back and forth and thus manifests Himself to the Kabbalist. In the Zohar, the Torah is a *corpus symbolicum* of that hidden life in God, in which every word may become a symbol. It is worthy of note that the love-symbolism which appears in so much non-Jewish mysticism, appears also here, but in a characteristic way. It is not used for the union of man with the divine, but for the relation of God to Himself in the world of the Sefiroth. "Every true marriage is a symbolical realisation of the union of God and the Shekinah," and the Shekinah is the archetype of the mystical community of Israel. We have here a striking parallel to St. Paul's thought. The spiritual outlook of the Zohar is defined as a mixture of theosophic theology, mystical cosmogony and mystical psychology and anthropology.

In the lecture on Isaac Luria and his school we are shown the influences of the persecution and expulsion of the Jews from Spain during the 15th century. There is a new interest in apocalyptic and Messianism. The aim of the mystic is to evoke and release those powers that shall bring about the "End". Expulsion and suffering are interpreted as redemptive, the birth-pangs of the Messianic era; the Jewish community must be prepared.

Then follows a discussion on Sabbatai Levi and his prophet Nathan of Gaza, and the movement that sprang up in Palestine, and spread to many parts of Europe. It is not in the direct line of Kabbalism, but a tragic offshoot. Its Messiah was a maniac-depressive and apostate to Islam. In its extreme forms it was deliberately anti-nomian. Yet its motive was to defeat sin—from within, in order that there might be a restoration of all things to God. The ninth Lecture deals briefly with Hasidism; the latest phase. This movement of Polish and Ukrainian Hasidism has nothing to do with the earlier Hasidism in Germany. It begins with Israel Baal Shem about the middle of the 18th century and is still a factor in Polish and Russian Jewry. The remarkable feature of this movement is that it is an attempt to transform Kabbalism into a popular movement while at the same time eliminating the exaggerated Messianism of earlier movements. Connections are traced between this movement and moderate Sabbatianism, although the fact seems not to have been apparent to the leaders of the new Hasidism. It is marked by its charismatic quality and a kindling of the emotions. It has produced a remarkable number of saint-mystics, and they in turn became leaders and teachers in the Jewish communities in which they lived. "The orginal contribution of Hasidism is bound up with its interpretation of the values of personal and individual existence. General ideas become individual ethical values." "Personality takes the place of doctrine." It began as the product of direct, spontaneous religious experience.

It needs only to be added that Profesor Sholem has brought to his task wide learning, penetrating and honest criticism, and a sensitiveness without which no book on Mysticism can be of value. The book is not easy reading, for the nature of the subject would make that impossible except for the initiate. It contains some misprints, most of which are noted on a separate "Errata" slip. Sometimes a happier phrase might have been used, e.g. p. 83 speaks of religion and theology being "suspended in the vacuum of Revelation." But these are small points, and one would wish to express deep gratitude for a study, finely conceived and finely executed.

A. S. HERBERT.

Philip of Spain and the Netherlands, by C. J. Cadoux. (Lutterworth Press, 18s.)

Roman Catholicism and Freedom, by C. J. Cadoux. (Independent Press, 7s. 6d.)

Though it was completed in 1944, the first of these books did not appear until some weeks after the deeply regretted death of its author in August of last year. Dr. Cadoux had been since 1933 Vice-Principal and MacKennal Professor of Church History at Mansfield College, Oxford. His scholarship was wide and meticulous. In spite of strong currents flowing in a contrary direction, he held firmly to what he called "evangelical modernism" and to pacifism. He was a doughty controversialist, an ardent champion of Protestantism, a generous and devoted Christian man with many engaging personal qualities. Baptists were indebted to him not only for the important series of books which bear his name, but also for the tutorial help he so readily gave to students of Regent's Park College.

Both the books before us were the fruits of Dr. Cadoux's concern about Roman Catholicism and its record. *Philip of Spain* has as its sub-title "An Essay on Moral Judgments in History." The historian, Dr. Cadoux argues, ought not "to leave unused his ethical judgement," though he must obviously be very careful in his apportionment of praise or blame. In the second chapter he deals with what he calls "Catholic Revaluations in History," suggesting that even in the pages of the *Times Literary Supplement* there may be traced a subtle tendencious favouritism towards books which whitewash persons and episodes rightly condemned by an earlier generation of historians. He singles out in particular Mr. R. Trevor Davies's *The Golden Age of Spain* and Dr. W. T. Walsh's *Philip II*, and in the remainder of the

book submits their treatment of their subject to a searching critical examination. In the course of his argument Dr. Cadoux deals with the main personalities in the struggle between Spain and the Netherlands in the second half of the sixteenth century—Philip II, the Duke of Alva and William of Orange; and also discusses the character of the Inquisition and the nature of the resistance offered by the Dutch. His final conclusions are in the main in line with those of Motley.[1] It may be questioned whether the method adopted by Dr. Cadoux was the best one for his purpose. He seems often to fall between the stools of a plain historical narrative and a controversial essay. Nevertheless, there is much that is interesting and important in these pages. We doubt whether Dr. Cadoux gave sufficient attention to the part played by the Anabaptists in the period under review; their numerical strength was considerable, particularly in the early stages of the struggle; they were themselves consciously taking a line different from that of Lutheranism and Calvinism; and they were notable pioneers in the claim for that religious tolerance and freedom so dear to Dr. Cadoux.

The second of these books first appeared in 1936 and this is a fourth edition. It is a vigorous hard-hitting plea, heavily documented, for vigilance in the face of Roman claims and methods. Dr. Cadoux offers detailed evidence for his belief that, had she the power, the Roman Church would again persecute, even in this country. The book belongs to a type of controversy and an attitude of mind to which many are now antipathetic on both the Roman and Protestant sides. It was well, however, that at least one so painstaking, alert and well-equipped as Dr. Cadoux should have gathered together the facts set down here and in his larger and more important volume, *Catholicism and Christianity*.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

History of the Homeland, by Henry Hamilton. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 18s.)

This is the fourth in the series "Primers for the Age of Plenty" edited by Launcelot Hogben. Professor Hogben's contributions to the series, *Mathematics for the Million* and *Science for the Million*, have achieved a remarkable popularity. To say that the last in the series is competently written is only

[1] The Oxford University Press has recently published a lecture by the Duke of Berwick and Alba entitled *The Great Duke of Alba as a Public Servant*. It is a skilful eulogy of the type which so distressed Dr. Cadoux, but it promises the speedy issue of many new contemporary documents.

what one would expect from the Jaffrey Professor of Political Economy in the University of Aberdeen. It is unlikely, however, to be a "Social History for the Million"—Trevelyan is more like to achieve that distinction.

The aim of the book, say the publishers, "is to deal with the history of some of the things that matter most to people to-day . . . . it traces the background of social questions which are of burning topical interest to the ordinary citizens of today. It deals with Human Needs. There are chapters on the Land, on Food, on Dress, on Health. It records the Rise of Capitalism in Britain and America" etc., etc. The author in his introduction says that he believes, "that history can furnish us with rational grounds for hope in the future of the human experiment; but it can do so if, and only if, it helps us to shed traditional beliefs and customs which obstruct a lucid recognition of what is essentially new." One has the impression that the traditional beliefs and customs to be shed are those of the Christian religion. It is significant that while he thinks dress and the specialist in British society are important enough for a chapter each, there is no chapter on the place of religion. Religion comes into the story. It is not that we have "Hamlet" without the Prince of Denmark. But almost every time he shows himself, he is heckled and pelted for ruining the play!

It is difficult for those who do not share the Christian experience to do justice to the Christian achievement. Armed with a Freudian psychology, they find it impossible to believe that men have acted from even remotely pure religious motives. Prof. Hamilton's treatment of the Pilgrim Fathers is typical of his judgments on religion. "The Pilgrim Fathers had started a great wave of emigration of those who sought a land where freedom of conscience was permitted; but economic motives were ever present and it was a combination of these two that accounts for the steady flow of colonists down to about the Restoration." (p. 376.) Speaking of earlier attempts at colonization in the New World he says ". . . . nearly all colonial schemes gave prominence to the missionary value of their work. Though this was doubtless a secondary consideration the prominence given to it shows that it was politic to make as much of it as possible." (p. 369).

If by "economic motive" he means that they wanted to make a living, that is reasonable enough. The Separatists could not make a living in England while worshipping God according to their conscience. But if by "economic motive" he means—and we feel that this is what he does mean—that the most powerful urge in men is to make money, why did not those simple people compromise their consciences and make a fortune in England?

Why choose—we use his own words—"the expectation of a terrifying journey across the Atlantic and settlement in a land about which all sorts of alarming and uncanny stories circulated. . . . It is not surprising that people did not rush to exchange the comparative security of life in England for the risks of disease and death attending emigration."

Many will feel that in this judgement of motives, John Masefield is nearer the truth when he says in his preface to the *Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers*: "They were plain men of moderate abilities, who, giving up all things, went to live in the wilds, at unknown cost to themselves, in order to preserve to their children a life in the soul."

There are many other points at which readers in the Christian tradition will be at variance with Dr. Hamilton. For example, of Wesley he asserts: "They will say, and rightly so, that Wesley's appeal to the common people, to whom the state as yet guaranteed no safeguard of freedom of ignorance through the medium of public secular education, was due as much to the fact that he shared their superstitions as to the fact that he interpreted their worldly aspirations." (p. 550.)

Or on slavery. Without wishing in any way to minimise the contribution of other Christian bodies, it is at least a partial truth to say, "Quakers, Wesleyans, Evangelicals all played a notable part in the movement, but it is to the first perhaps that the greatest credit is due." (p. 453.) Baptists and Congregationalists may claim some credit for the abolition of slavery in Jamaica, but to be able to write a chapter on the abolition of the slave trade and never mention David Livingstone suggests a somewhat narrow historical outlook.

On a question of fact, Baptists will wish to challenge Lecky, whom the author quotes with approval, when he says, "The persecution of which *every* Protestant Church was guilty was measured by the same rule . . . .The Protestant persecutions were never as sanguinary as those of the Catholics." (p. 543.) We would begin with the first declaration in English history of the principle of toleration presented to James I by Thomas Helwys in 1612, go on to Roger Williams, of whom J. B. Bury has said, "To Roger Williams belongs the glory of having founded the first modern State which was really tolerant . . . ." through a continuous asertion of the principle of complete liberty of opinion, speech and writing, to the present day.

This is history with a purpose. The author believes that the study of history, "can give to young people, and those who teach them, courage and confidence to face an unknown future without the impediments of outworn traditions. Instead of stultifying and discouraging an adventurous curiosity about human destiny it can

fire human beings with faith in themselves and in the capacity of man to establish peace and prosperity on earth." (p. 14.)

"Public secular education" is a "safeguard of freedom from ignorance." But the really important question is whether secular education, whether life without religion, can give us not merely knowledge but wisdom. There is little in recent history to justify optimism. We may not agree that "history teaches that history teaches nothing," but reviewing the post-war years, the struggling United Nations, the emergence of another world of poverty in the midst of plenty, we may well doubt whether knowledge is enough. We know how to feed our people. We know that another war will exterminate the people of these islands and perhaps bring civilisation to an end. But is the effect of this knowledge making for a world community which Dr. Hamilton sees is desirable and necessary? We doubt whether it is. The optimism of writers like Dr. Hamilton leads in the end to the bankrupt pessimism of H. G. Wells in his last phase—"Mind at the end of its tether." The optimism of the Christian has reckoned with man's failure to will what he desires and in the love of Christ offers a dynamic which can carry men past these otherwise insuperable barriers. "In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek . . . but all are one."

History of the Homeland is nevertheless a stimulating book and brings together a great deal of material to be found only in specialist studies. It is enriched by 114 illustrations, many of which are taken from contemporary prints and really do illustrate the text. The name of J. F. Horrabin is a guarantee that the maps are excellent and a series of time-charts by Mr. B. C. Lewis helps in the appreciation of events and their interconnections with the social background.

C. B. WHYATT.

The Orthodox Rebel, Roger Lloyd, (Latimer House, 10s. 6d.)

This is a new edition of a book, first published in 1932, with the title of *The Stricken Lute.* Because of his conviction that such a description in no way truly epitomises the character of Abelard, Canon Roger Lloyd has renamed his revised edition *The Orthodox Rebel.*

At first sight, the new title is subject to the same criticism as the old. Although Abelard by no means regarded himself as a heretic, by his Church's standard of orthodoxy he was condemned. Nor did a more submissive "rebel" than he ever adorn the index, for Abelard was ready to retract what he had written, at the behest of authority, even when he could himself see nothing wrong with it!

Canon Lloyd, however, means his title to declare the intention of his book—to vindicate Abelard's orthodoxy and to demonstrate his greatness. To this end, it attempts to estimate Abelard's thought in relation to his career and the problems of his day. It tells vividly the romance and tragedy of Abelard's life and the reader cannot fail to be moved by the sufferings of the attractive genius whom Canon Lloyd portrays with great sympathy and understanding.

The real disadvantage of its method is that, in so short a book, any attempt to estimate Abelard's significance must suffer from the attention the author gives to the details of his sad and romantic story. This has resulted inevitably in a somewhat arbitrary use and interpretation of his material—notably of the Abelard-Héloise correspondence.

Yet, within the rather too brief compass Canon Lloyd has allowed himself for so controversial a subject, he has succeeded remarkably in capturing the atmosphere of Abelard's life and times. His brief review of the Scholastic controversy in particular is admirable.

W. THOMAS WILLIAMS.

John Clifford: A Fighting Free Churchman, by G. W. Byrt. (Kingsgate Press, 6s.)

The younger generation "just missed" John Clifford and there are so many of our seniors to whom he is still vivid that we are made deeply aware of how much we missed. If Mr. Byrt's book heightens that feeling, it also brings John Clifford to life for those who could not know him in the flesh. It makes satisfying and stirring reading. Bold and clear in its lines, it gives the impression of beng a balanced portrait though one could have wished for a final chapter attempting the (perhaps difficult) task of a general appraisal. At all events a well-told story such as this should not peter out at the graveside. A particularly valuable feature of the book is its quotations in which Clifford himself speaks. That is no reflection on Mr. Byrt's own descriptive powers. Without ever becoming merely eulogistic, he makes us realise how great was Clifford's stature. Some of the outstanding impressions gained are those of the breadth and depth of his ministry, his forthrightness on issues calling for the prophetic voice and conscience, his delicacy in situations which called for and found the statesman. Above all his Christlike humility, zeal and love. This book should be very widely recommended and read, but especially by young men and not least those who are at the beginning of, or preparing for, the ministry.

G. W. RUSLING.