

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Fraternal / Baptist Ministers Journal* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bmj-06.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bmj-06.php)

# The Fraternal

---

JULY, 1961

No. 121

---

## BAPTISTS OF CANADA

Rev. R. FRED BULLEN, B.A., B.D., General Secretary-Treasurer of the Baptist Federation of Canada.

## FURTHER REFLECTIONS ON CHRISTIAN LOVE

Dr. R. F. ALDWINKLE, M.A., Professor of Systematic Theology, McMaster Divinity College.

## BAPTISTS AND ECUMENICITY

Rev. I. JUDSON LEVY, B.A., D.D., S.T.M., Minister, James St., Hamilton, Ontario.

## WHAT'S WRONG WITH GAMBLING?

Rev. N. LESLIE STOKES, B.A., B.D., Minister, West Green, Tottenham.

## THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE

Rev. G. H. C. ANGUS, M.A., D.D., Tutor, Rawdon College.

## OUR TEACHING MINISTRY

Rev. H. A. SMITH, M.A., Minister, Westgate, Bradford.

## THE CHILD AND THE CHURCH

Rev. W. T. COWLAN, Religious Education Press.

## GOD'S PRESENCE WITH THE BLIND

Rev. OSWALD HENDERSON, Retired Minister, Saffron Walden.

## AMENDMENTS TO MINISTERIAL RECOGNITION RULES

## OF INTEREST TO YOU

## THE WIDER CIRCLE

## BOOK REVIEWS

## BAPTISTS OF CANADA

THE Baptist Federation of Canada, like ancient Gaul, is divided into three sections: The Maritime United Baptist Convention, The Baptist Convention of Ontario-Quebec, and the Baptist Union of Western Canada. In 1943 a large committee of men and women named by the three Conventions met and laid the organisational foundation for the Federation. The preamble to the constitution of the Baptist Federation of Canada reads: "While affirming belief in the autonomy of the local church, and in the voluntary character of all denominational organisations composed of representatives of churches, the Baptists of Canada likewise consider their co-operation in Christian fellowship, for the furtherance of the Lord's work, to be a solemn duty. They further hold that, in view of the growth of the Baptist denomination and of its extension throughout the Dominion, there is need for a national organisation to serve the common interests of the entire denomination, even as the Associations and regional Conventions serve the interests of their respective areas. They have, therefore, resolved to call into existence a Baptist Federation of Canada . . . ."

The wisdom of that statement has been increasingly realised across Canada. There is a growing sense of inter-dependence and mutual concern among Canadian Baptists from coast to coast. From the beginning of this century, Canadian Baptists have made much progress in working together. In 1900 and 1906 preliminary attempts were made to establish an all-Canada Convention. At that time distance and transportation conspired to prevent such action but in 1910 the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board was founded.

Again in 1925 the Baptist Board of Publications was called into being by the Religious Education Committees of the three Conventions because of the conviction that this was another area of common concern in which we can accomplish more for the Kingdom of God, and for our own denomination, by co-operative effort. In the meantime, transportation and increasing communication across the Dominion in every area of life, made it possible to consider again the possibility of a Baptist-Federation of Canada. A Canadian Baptist movement, segmented into three geographic areas, is no longer necessary or feasible. Thus, in 1944, at Germain Street Baptist Church, St. John, New Brunswick, the Baptist Federation of Canada came into being. Its first president was Dr. Gordon C. Warren, Dean of Theology at Acadia University, and since that time other distinguished Presidents from the three areas of Canada have served three year terms. The present officers are: President, The Rev. G. Ward, Regina, Sask.; Vice-President, The Rev. Abner Langley, Moncton, N.B.; Vice-President, Mrs. W. Fraser, Hamilton, Ontario. The first full-time General Secretary was Dr. T. B. McDormand who was succeeded by the Rev. Fred Bullen, January, 1960. The first Assembly of the Federation was held at Acadia University in 1947

and has been held every three years, with the next Assembly meeting in Calgary, Alberta, 2nd-8th July, 1962. The delegates are composed of the moderators and clerks of each Association, the presidents and general secretaries of the three Conventions, editors of Denominational papers, heads of Acadia and McMaster Theological Departments, Board secretaries and representatives from the three Conventions and delegates from every Canadian Baptist Church on the basis of one for every 150 members or major fraction thereof.

Twenty-two Committees of the Baptist Federation of Canada serve in important areas of Baptist concern such as: Evangelism, Home Missions, Foreign Missions, Christian Education, Social Service, Literature, Lay Leadership, Stewardship, Superannuation, Credentials and Ordination, Women's Leadership Training and others. The Committees seek to avoid any duplication of the work done by parallel bodies, usually Boards, of the Conventions. They desire, rather, to supplement such area activity, and take such actions as shall effect helpful co-ordination of activity where possible. An illustration or two at this point should make this matter of relationship clear. The Baptist Jubilee Advance was sponsored by the Federation. The Federation has an annual emphasis committee for each of the five years of the Advance programme in co-operation with six other North American Baptist bodies. Each Convention has similar committees for each year and the Federation's responsibility is to define the yearly objective, prepare and distribute literature and posters to stimulate interest and motivation. The actual implementation of plans and programme is carried out in the Convention areas, and by Convention Committees.

The Federation operates on the basis that we can do together many things which cannot be done, or would be done poorly, if tackled alone. For example, much literature is produced and either sold or given by the Literature Committee. This literature includes the annual Baptist Missionary Scripture Text Calendar of which over 22,000 copies are sold annually; the Minister's Handbook; many leaflets, study booklets, mimeographed brochures and promotional materials. A new detailed programme of stewardship, proven in the Maritimes, is also sponsored by, and made available by, the Federation. The Evangelism Committee is concerned with developing a nation-wide concern for an evangelical emphasis and a Biblically centred teaching ministry. Through the Federation Committee the Denomination co-operates in such inter-church activities as the Tom Rees Mission to Canada and the development of a close inter-convention relation of such programmes as simultaneous evangelism and area conferences. A recent three year itinerary of Evangelist Ivor Powell across Canada was arranged by the Federation. Association with other Baptist bodies such as the Southern Baptist Convention has made it possible for the Federation Radio and Television Committee to make use of the excellent films produced by our neighbours. Because of the existence of this national

Committee the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has accepted the tel-evangelism series and has televised them for the last three years, with resulting blessing to our churches and to previously uncommitted persons across Canada. The Social Service Committee, often in collaboration with similar committees of other denominations, have co-operated in many issues such as the liquor traffic, Sabbath observance, Roman Catholic pressure for separate schools and other current issues. Recently this Committee sponsored participation with other denominations in a Churchmen's Seminar on International Affairs, held in Ottawa in consultation with members of parliament. Similarly, discussions with labour, management and church leaders are arranged for April of this year. Through the leadership of this Committee, Baptists of Canada participate in many relief projects primarily through the Baptist World Alliance. Last year, seventy-five tons of canned meat, the gift of the Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, was shipped to refugee camps in Germany and Hong Kong and several thousands of dollars were raised to assist in other Baptist World Alliance relief projects.

The establishment and development of Baptist work in Newfoundland has been a project of the Federation Canadian Missions Committee. Over \$150,000 has been raised for this momentous undertaking, an addition to the strong work which was introduced in St. John's a few years ago. Other churches are being founded. Within the last year, Canadian Baptists have co-operated through this Committee to build a church at Corner Brook and during the Easter season a new church will be dedicated at Stephenville. A previous triennial project was a church for Kitimat, British Columbia. The Christian Education Committee of the Federation has performed a tremendous service for all Baptists in the producing of Sunday School materials and literature and other guides for the development of mid-week programmes for every age group. The Board of Publications of Canada was brought into being for this particular purpose, even before the Federation was founded, and has proven the value of a nation-wide co-operative enterprise for the service of our churches. The Overseas Missions Committee is in reality the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board which ante-dated the Federation by more than thirty years. It also proved that Canadian Baptists can work together when they are faced with the challenge of a programme which is too large for one group. In 1959 the Overseas Missions Committee spent almost \$700,000 on work in Angola, Bolivia and India. One hundred and forty one missionaries serve in the three fields, and, in addition to the usual pattern, Canadian Missions have pioneered in agricultural missions, radio ministry, education, and have achieved notable success through medical clinics and hospitals. "A million dollars for missions" is a special goal of The Overseas Missions Committee. The Chaplaincy Committee works in close liaison with the Canadian Council of Churches and is responsible for the appointment of Baptist Chaplains to the

Armed Services. At the present time there are twelve ministers engaged in the active service and many more who give time from their general pastoral duties to serve with local regiments of the militia and cadets.

In the words of the first president of the Baptist Federation of Canada, Dr. G. C. Warren, "The Baptist Federation of Canada is promoting a national Baptist consciousness through its office. The denomination now speaks with a single voice on national, social, moral, economic, international and interdenominational matters." Each succeeding session of the Council develops a sense of one Baptist Brotherhood from coast to coast. Baptist sectionalism is being gradually sloughed off and the Federation is coming to view its tasks and face its responsibilities, not from the provincial or parochial standpoint, but rather from the Canada-wide view. Its main purpose is to promote Baptist fellowship, generate inspiration, disseminate information and be a co-ordinating agency among the conventions.

Since June, 1960, it has been my privilege to visit our churches across the Continent. In spite of the problems of swift changes in population, losses through extra-denominational marriages, the itineracy of members, the infiltration of divisive propaganda and the influence of sectarian movements, it is evident that Canadian Baptists are accepting the challenge. Our country has been described as one of unlimited opportunity and resources. It is my opinion that Canadian Baptists are grasping their opportunities and re-evaluating their resources.

Our work was pioneered by Baptists who came to this land from America and Great Britain with vision and vigour, accompanied by a conviction that God was calling them to difficult but Divine tasks. In the same spirit today, new churches are built, inner-city missions are developed, schools and colleges are erected, missionaries sail across the seas and home missionaries pioneer in frontier towns. A revival of interest in Baptist Men's groups is sweeping across our land and the Women's Missionary Societies maintain the vigorous leadership for which they have been noted.

At the administration levels, there is a concern for new recruits for our work, gratitude for high levels of Christian Stewardship, and assurance that the evangelical zeal of our people will maintain a good record of conversions and baptisms. These qualities were characteristic of our historic beginning two hundred years ago and the Baptist Federation of Canada delights in underlining them today. With Dr. Erik Ruden we say, "Our fellowship is not an apathetic and passive church attendance, or a club for social entertainment. The issue is nothing less than a war between truth and falsehood, light and darkness, life and death."

"Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

R. FRED BULLEN.

## FURTHER REFLECTIONS ON CHRISTIAN LOVE

LOVE is one of those words which is used so frequently and without discrimination that it has almost ceased to have any precise meaning. We love our wives, our dogs, our books, our country: we love strawberries, nice clothes and God. This presents the minister with a peculiar linguistic and theological problem in his preaching and teaching. English, unfortunately, has only one word. The charity of the Authorised Version has become so limited in its suggestion of philanthropy in a somewhat restricted sense that it is quite inadequate to express the depth of Christian love. But what is Christian love? Many will remember Anders Nygren's treatment of the theme in his *Agape and Eros* first published in 1932. Building on the already well-known fact that the New Testament never uses the familiar Greek word for love but has adopted a comparatively colourless word *agape*, Nygren went on to draw his now famous distinction between the two kinds of love. The fact that *agape* had been used in the LXX as a translation of the Hebrew word *ahab* had prepared it for the new role it was to play in Christianity. For Nygren, *agape* is essentially a supernatural love coming down from above, whereas *eros*, whether sensual or mystical, is by nature egocentric. *Agape* is unselfish love which does not need any worth or merit in the object of its attention to draw it forth into activity. *Agape* creates value in the object instead of finding it there and responding to it. This is God's supreme love most clearly manifested in the Cross of Christ. There is no transition from *eros* to *agape* and he is evidently reluctant to speak of man's love to God, despite certain New Testament passages to this effect. The proper response to God's *agape* is faith, and if we love with *agape* love, it is only because God's own supernatural activity is going on within us to liberate the divine love in and through us. On this reading of church history, Augustine is the villain of the piece since he attempted in his *caritas* to combine and fuse two incompatible kinds of love. Luther at this point broke away from his beloved Augustine and restored pure *agape* to its rightful place in Christian thought and practice. What shall we say to this understanding of Christian love? Is it really faithful to the biblical witness, and if we take it seriously, what are the consequences for Christian action?

Professor P. S. Watson in his introduction to the authorised translation of *Agape and Eros* contends that Nygren's thesis has been seriously misunderstood by his critics. The *eros* contrasted with *agape* is not human love in general but a quite specific conception of love of which the classical example is Plato's heavenly *eros*. This *eros* seeks to gain possession of its object, not to be accepted by it. The *nomos* religion of the Pharisee was egocentric and therefore to be condemned in the light of *agape* but the Pharisee's love of God was not *eros* in the technical sense indicated above. Nygren is not saying, so contends Mr. Watson, that there is nothing of value

in Judaism and Hellenism. It is the latter as a religion, not Hellenistic cultural views, which are incompatible with Christianity. Nor is he dismissing all the non-Christian cultures as completely false and worthless. Nygren, indeed, insists that his study is not concerned with value-judgments about the different kinds of love. "Agape and eros are contrasted with one another here, not as right or wrong, nor as higher or lower, but as Christian and non-Christian fundamental motifs." (*Agape and Eros*. Translated by P. Watson, p. 39.) Nevertheless, it is clear from a reading of the whole work that Nygren has passed an important judgment upon eros. Furthermore, if eros is not to be equated with the whole of human love, he has not shown too clearly where the distinction lies. Is parental love, for example, pure eros, completely self-seeking? If not, what kind of love is it? It is not the nomos love of Pharisaic Judaism nor presumably is it agape, since it is manifested by people who lay no claim to the Christian name, whether in theory or practice.

It is intensely interesting to find the reply to these questions coming from, of all people, Karl Barth in Vol. III, Part 2, of the *Dogmatik on The Doctrine of Creation*. (References will be given to the recent English translation of this volume.) There is no need, says Barth, to depreciate human nature in order to magnify the grace of God. Because agape is not eros, this does not mean that the love of the natural man is to be defined as eros in the historical sense (p. 280). If we cannot see Christian love in eros, neither can we see there "humanity". There is a third option. For Barth, "the real natural man is the man who in the freedom of his heart is with his fellow-man". There is a something which is neither agape nor eros and in the light of which justice can be done even to eros. He deplores the violence against Hellenism in much recent theology and does not think it is a mere accident that the gospel, the seed of Israel, took root in the perishing world of Hellenism (p. 282).

Barth would seem to be nearer the facts of the case with his allowance that the natural man is not without the sense of community and the urge to be with his fellow-man. Even the eros man will recognise in the Christian a true man and feel a solidarity with him as man, even if he rejects the distinctive thing which makes him a Christian man. Yet what of self-love too? Can there be any legitimate sense in which it applies to the Christian man? Nygren declares it to be wholly alien to the New Testament understanding of love. He quotes Bultmann to the effect that self-love is presupposed in the famous statement of the law: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God and thy neighbour as thyself" (Matthew xxii, 38ff.), not as something required of man, but as an attitude to be overcome (page 101). Yet is there not a basic self-love which belongs to man as such, and which must therefore be the result of God making him as He has done. Or shall we assert that self-love is a product of the fall, however interpreted, and that in man as God intended him to be, it should not exist at all? The need to define our terms is here urgent.



Does self-love necessarily mean selfishness? Is there no such thing as Christian self-respect or regard for the talents with which one has been endowed? Can there never be a legitimate Christian ambition in the sense of the desire to develop and train one's faculties to the utmost?

Of course, if we define self-love as sheer selfishness, then it is obviously incompatible with agape and it must simply be uprooted from the Christian life. Here again we find Barth saying a wise word in his discussion of the mutual interdependence of the I and Thou wherever there is true humanity. "Egoistic activity—for there is a healthy egoism—can be thoroughly human if, without denying itself as such, it is placed at the service of the summons issued by the Thou to the I" (page 261). If this is the case, then there is a healthy egoism which is not simply destroyed but taken up into the wider network of relationships which link man both to his neighbour and to God. Father M. C. D'Arcy in *The Mind and Heart of Love* has made the same point. "The consequence of uprooting what Nygren calls egocentric love would be, if only he were to follow out the logic of his thought, to extinguish human love altogether" (page 78). This emphasis is not at all incompatible with the affirmation that this healthy egoism, as Barth calls it, must be placed at the service of the summons issued by the "thou" of the neighbour and above all by the "Thou" of God, as we meet Him in Christ.

One other problem emerges which calls for consideration. If agape is essentially a spontaneous outgoing love directed to persons, and this must be true if the pattern of divine love is most clearly manifest in Christ's life and death, then can such agape ever find expression in other than person to person encounters? Just as I cannot in the human sense love everybody for the simple reason that there are millions of people I have never met face to face, and presumably never will do, so if the divine agape is working through me, it can only be directed to those people I actually meet. Yet is there no more to be said? Does not agape involve us in duties which can be fulfilled in other than person to person encounters? William Temple was saying something important when he insisted that social justice is not simply a matter of legal right but an expression of Christian love in those wider social relationships where person to person encounter is not possible.

Finally, Christians must be on their guard against an interpretation of the love of God which would exclude the love of creatures. It may be a fine balance between love of creatures, which is idolatry, and love of creatures which is a true love of God in the acceptance of the claims of the neighbour upon our interests and compassion. Mrs. Dorothea Krook in her recent book *Three Traditions of Moral Thought* (Cambridge, 1959), rightly protests, in her discussion of marriage and the theology of sexuality, against the frequent assumption of many Christian thinkers that abstinence is finer and more spiritually worthy than full communion of body and spirit in

marriage. Marriage is not a sinking, albeit a necessary sinking, to a lower level. It can and ought to be an act of worship. True virginity is not the power to renounce bodily love, but its humble and grateful offering to God. It is false and unworthy to think that the more we love our wives, our friends, our neighbours, the less love we have to spare for God. This is a dichotomy, based on a false theology, which prevents our offering ourselves and all God's created order to Him in grateful praise and adoring love.

RUSSELL F. ALDWINCKLE

### BAPTISTS AND ECUMENICITY

**B**APTIST thinking about the Church has, to a very large degree, been focused on the local church. Granted that we have New Testament justification for this emphasis, honesty compels us to go on to ask if this is the only (or full) truth about the Church that is to be found in the New Testament. The very asking of the question points to the answer. In the New Testament we not only find local churches, but we are made aware of *the Whole Church, as the universal fellowship of those who believe in Christ*. These are not conflicting facts, but are held together, and made one, by the very nature of the Church.

It is not our purpose, in this short article, to discuss the nature of the Church as such. We think of one aspect of this only, namely, the necessary communion that must exist among churches, within the framework of the whole Church. This, quite probably, will be first manifested as fellowship among churches of the same order. But, does it end there? Christian fellowship surely is something much richer than a mere expression of like-mindedness. This type of fellowship can, and does, exist outside the Church, and is a worldly thing. The fellowship, which is of Christ, allows for many differences of opinion, but finds its expression through a common attachment to Him. Thus each part of the Church stands in relationship to every other part, in as much as each in turn is related to Christ, the Head of the Church. We, as Baptists, are forced to see ourselves in relation to all other churches, and as a part of the Church universal. It is this fact which prompts our discussion on Baptists and Ecumenicity.

The word "ecumenicity" (or, the ecumenical movement) is understood in different ways by different people, and, we may add, *often completely misunderstood*. In its correct use, the term means something more than a vague and indefinite reference to some kind of "inter-denominational" activity in which churches may, or may not, want to participate. Nor is the ecumenical movement to be thought of simply as a move to unite the churches, and to be judged immediately on the basis of some pre-conceived notion regarding this, either for or against. There is a much more serious meaning to it that anything thus far suggested.

The word "ecumenical" literally means "pertaining to the inhabited world". This suggests that which is universal, and, when

applied to the Church, refers to "the whole household of faith in the whole world". The fellowship thus suggested is something more than that which takes place on the human level alone. It means fellowship on the basis of a common faith in, and allegiance to, the one Christ. One of the finest statements on this is that which was made by the 1937 *Oxford Life and Work Conference*, and, since this is as true now as then, it is here repeated:—

"The unity of the fellowship is not built up from the constituent parts, like a federation of states. It consists in the sovereignty and redeeming acts of the one Lord. The source of unity is not the consenting movement of men's wills; it is Jesus Christ whose one life flows through the body and subdues the many wills to His."

This statement makes a distinction which is more than academic. Its truth can be expressed in very practical terms. Let us put it this way: The ecumenical movement means more than churches meeting for fellowship, and/or common action, on the horizontal plane alone. The main dimension is *vertical*—that is, in terms of a common relationship to Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church. They come to each other through Him. Churches do not meet to seek for a basis of unity. They meet, rather, around the common centre of unity, even Jesus Christ, who is always present where His Church is manifested. The nearer the churches get to this common centre, the nearer they will be to each other. Our separation from our brothers in the faith may not be the measure of our devotion and obedience to Christ—it may, in fact, mean the very opposite!

When seen in this light, the call to "ecumenical conversation" becomes a very serious matter. No church should regard it too lightly, or turn it down too quickly. Such an invitation should be accepted, or rejected, on the basis of the revelation of Christ's will for His Church and obedience to the same. This certainly must be true for Baptists with their avowed allegiance to Christ as the only recognised Head of the Church.

It may be that many shy away from this on the ground that *they do not know how far it may lead them*. Certainly we do not know. Nor have we any right to know! To draw conclusions at the beginning as to what this may mean, or to set up our limits as to how far we shall go, is to limit the power of the Spirit and to make meaningless our affirmation of "the Lordship of Christ" as the fundamental principle of our church life. He is not our "Lord" if, by ourselves, we decide what we shall, or shall not, do. The question, for the moment at least, is not whether we are willing to unite with some one else, or not. That may be quite misleading. The real question is: are we willing to talk with others, as fellow-Christians, to hear from them their conception of Christian truth, and to share with them our conception of that truth as we see it. Let us be honest! The refusal of any Christian group to share with others on this basis may not be because of certainty regarding the position held, but may well arise from basic fear and uncertainty. Part of the purpose of

ecumenical conversations is achieved when each group, in deep seriousness before Christ, sifts the "chaff from the wheat" in its own thinking.

Once again we keep asking: where will this take us? And again we can only say that we do not know. But one thing is certain. It does not lead to union at any price, or in terms of "the lowest common denominator". This common misconception has caused many to refrain from participation in the ecumenical movement. The true position is spelled out clearly in the first of the four principles laid down by the Faith and Order movement:

"Its main work is to draw churches out of isolation into conference, in which none is asked to be disloyal to, or to compromise its convictions, but to seek to explain them to others while seeking to understand their points of view. Irreconcilable differences are to be recorded as honestly as agreements."

It is true that the effectiveness of the ecumenical movement, as any movement, has been damaged as much by its over-enthusiastic supporters as by its enemies. While there are those who, in their enthusiasm, would rush to union by any short cut, this does not represent the best thought in the movement. No church is asked to play down or weaken its own position. The point of yielding may surely come, but it comes only under the direction of the Spirit whose function it is to guide into all truth. Truth and unity within Christ's Church are not always, or necessarily, opposites. There may well come a time when they meet—when the more serious quest for truth points towards unity!

The challenge to Baptists (as to any other group) in regard to the ecumenical movement is two-fold. First, to display that courtesy which prompts us to learn from others, remembering, as we should, that God has blessed others and honoured their particular position. We may learn much from listening to them. The second challenge is to share with others. The ecumenical movement, rather than asking us to surrender our deepest convictions, *affords us an unparalleled opportunity to witness to them*. This is a phase of the whole question that many have not understood, but it is vital.

One concluding thought: One hears much today about the reasons why the churches should come together. One main reason grows out of the dangerous hour in which we live, and the urgency it brings to churches to make a united witness in a sorely divided world. All of this, of course, is not to be minimised. However, there is always a danger in this—the danger that, driven by a sense of urgency, we rush into some kind of a hastily conceived union that overlooks fundamental issues. There *is* an urgency in this whole matter. That is not to be denied. But even though this urgency may be felt more in one time than another, no temporal situation creates it. *The real urgency about the unity of Christ's Church grows out of the timeless fact that it is Christ's Church—and Christ is not divided!*

I. JUDSON LEVY.

## WHAT'S WRONG WITH GAMBLING

FOR many years there has been a specific Free Church ethical orthodoxy with regard to certain social practices, especially the drinking of alcoholic beverages and gambling. This orthodoxy has largely persisted, so that, on the whole, the faithful Nonconformist abstains, and is expected to abstain, from both.

Yet the reasons for such an attitude have not steadfastly been published among us, with the result that many of our people, though feeling it to be wrong to "drink" or to gamble, are very hazy as to why they should so feel. Moreover, in the case of gambling, they are unsure as to whether certain risks (Premium Bonds are a case in point) do in reality constitute gambling.

It is the recognition of this vagueness which has prompted the request for this article, a request deliberately made not to an expert but to an ordinary minister in the pastorate. Is the old Nonconformist attitude to gambling still valid? If it is, why is it? Why is gambling wrong?

We need first a definition. It is difficult to frame one in a few words, but this is fairly satisfactory:

"Gambling is an agreement between two parties, by which something of value will be transferred from one party to the other according to the outcome of an uncertain event, in such a way that the gain of the one is balanced by the loss of the other."

(For most modern forms of gambling, of course, parts of this definition would need to be put into the plural; but a definition that would cover all cases would be very complicated, and would add nothing to our understanding of basic principles.)

If we analyse this, we find there are three elements involved: (a) that of uncertainty; there must be some act or event the outcome of which cannot with certainty be foretold—such as a football match, or a race; (b) that of risk; there must be a transfer of something of value (usually money), the risk of loss; and (c) that of correspondence; the transfer of value is such that the gain of the winner corresponds to the loss of the loser.

For any transaction to constitute a gamble, all three of these elements must be present.

At once we see the difference between gambling and legitimate business risks. In these, the first two elements only are involved; there is uncertainty and there is risk of financial loss because of that uncertainty. But the third element is missing; the money the investor might lose does not correspond to any that some winner might gain. When a man gambles, he takes risks in order to obtain money from others *without giving anything in return*; what he gains, others lose. But the gains resulting from a successful commercial venture do not necessarily involve loss to others. The intention and hope is that there will be benefit to all concerned.

An illustration should make this clear. A business man, let us say, agrees to finance the marketing of a new gadget to help lighten housework. He lays out money. He knows that the gadget may not sell. He takes a risk. If it does not sell, he loses. But no one else loses, and no one profits by his loss. If it sells well, he gains. But no one loses to balance his gains. Those who buy the gadgets get something for their money. There has been risk, but there has been no gamble.

Thus, every gamble is a risk, but not every risk is a gamble. The difference is covered by element (c) in our definition.

This distinction between the meaning of "gamble" and "risk" is important, and perhaps some of us who preach might be more careful about using the words as though they were interchangeable. People who enjoy a "flutter" justify themselves sometimes by saying that life is full of risks. The gambler is not interested in risks as such; indeed, whenever he believes he can do so, he tries to diminish his risk by "inside information", "studying form", etc. (the "etc." covers a mountain of ignorance!). All he wants is the chance of getting other people's money into his hands, without giving any return in goods or services.

We might note now that the purchase of Premium Bonds must be reckoned as a form of gambling. It is true, of course, that an investor does not lose any of his initial outlay if his number does not come up; but he loses all his interest, which is just as real a loss of money. The "draw" is surely but a raffle, in which the prizes of the winners are gained at the expense of the interest of the losers. Recently, the Prime Minister who, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, introduced the Bonds, described them as "having a flutter with the interest".

I turn now to a few of the reasons why it seems to me that gambling is wrong, even in so-called "moderation".

### 1. ITS MOTIVE IS FUNDAMENTALLY SELFISH.

People gamble, for the most part, in the hope of making easy money. They do it to get something, and the more of it the better, for nothing. "Gambling", it has been said, "is nothing but the organisation of selfishness."

"What's wrong with getting something for nothing?" Nothing at all—when the something is a gift. The Gospel itself is "something for nothing", a "free gift" (Romans vi, 23b). But it is a very different *kind* of something, with radically different effects upon character from the results of gambling winnings. I confess I am delighted when out of kindness someone makes me a gift, but I should not be very proud of myself if I thought I was always on the lookout for gifts, regarding every friend and acquaintance as a potential benefactor. No one loves the sponger! But gambling and the receiving of gifts are poles apart. Gamblers do not out of sheer love make gifts to each other; they want to take from each other. Theirs is the sin of covetousness for, contrary to the Tenth Commandment, they covet the money of others. Christians, therefore, who defend

the buying of Premium Bonds on the ground of service to their country might look more closely into their motives. Is it service, or the chance of a prize, which attracts them?

A serious aspect of this selfishness is its indifference to other people, for it involves a deliberate attempt to profit from the losses of those others. Men who in other ways are kindly and even generous will be quite hard-hearted in this matter; they know that poor and foolish people will put money they can ill afford on the "pools" but, they say, "it's their own fault for being so weak". The Christian, at least, will not want to try deliberately to capitalise on the weakness of his fellows; on the contrary, he will remember that "we that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves" (Romans xv, 1). The whole motive underlying gambling is directly contrary to the way of Christ. Selfishness replaces service, and greed replaces love.

And must not the persistent habit of behaving in such a spirit have a degrading effect on the character of him who indulges in it.

## 2. IT IS A DENIAL OF CHRISTIAN STEWARDSHIP.

One of the most important contemporary trends in Church life is the new emphasis on stewardship, particularly the stewardship of money. At the heart of that emphasis is the Biblical teaching, not that we should give a certain proportion of our income to God and then be free to indulge the caprices of self-will with the rest, but that *all* our money is held in trust for God; that it comes from God, and must be used for God. The Christian stewardship of money means that we are to use it responsibly—which means "answerably", as those who have to give account of our stewardship.

It does not seem to me that gambling is a use of money for which a Christian would care to answer to God, that it could be practised as a result of serious thought as to the best way of spending one's money, and least of all that it could be argued that it is done to the glory of God.

This appears all the more clear when we consider the matter at the national level. The annual national stakes are now approaching the gigantic figure of six hundred million pounds (the total for 1959 was estimated at £593,600,000). Economically, this is crazy. That so vast an amount of wealth is distributed, not according to need, or ability, or character, or work, but purely on the basis of chance, that this huge sum, apart from the comparatively small number of people handling and re-directing it, is spent on a completely non-productive activity, and adds nothing at all to the wealth of the nation, can hardly be claimed to represent economic wisdom on the part of the British people. Would any reputable economist seriously advance the thesis that such a considerable part of the nation's wealth should be distributed according to luck.

If, therefore, gambling is economically irresponsible, can it be religiously responsible? Can the Christian who wishes to exercise his stewardship conscientiously do other than leave it severely alone?

### 3. IT PUTS LUCK IN THE PLACE OF GOD.

When the Apostle Paul tells us (Philippians ii, 30, RV) that Epaphroditus "for the work of Christ came nigh unto death, hazarding his life" to serve the Apostle, he is thinking of the reckless abandon with which the gambler so often risks his stakes; and he means to imply that Epaphroditus has shown a like abandon as he risked his life for Christ. But he would not have us understand that it was *chance* that his friend so abandoned himself. Paul did not believe that a man's life and future were so determined, for they were in the hand of God, to be held at the disposal of God.

This conviction is quite irreconcilable with the spirit of gambling, for a gamble is a surrender to the control of chance. Luck, not God, is on the throne. In the case of Christians who indulge in mild "flutters", what is made dependent on chance may be small, though that does not alter the principle; but in the case of others it is sometimes pathetic to see how much is made to depend on a win on the "pools". It is no exaggeration to say that this is for some the hope of the future. Chance reigns, not God.

For every gambler, therefore, large or small, there is an area of life over which chance not God is reckoned to rule; all alike, in varying degree, join the ancients in the acknowledgement of *Fortuna*, the goddess of luck. So it is no accident that superstition is commonly a close associate of gambling. The credulous buy numerous lucky charms to bring them success in their ventures; which is hardly to be distinguished from the fetishism of pagan religions.

We believe in a rational and righteous Governor of the universe, whose favours are not to be directed to any simply by virtue of the possession of a lucky charm. Is it by luck that God rules His creatures? The Christian cannot, I submit, replace the God and Father of our Lord even in the tiniest area of life by another; and least of all by a God so unworthy as Chance.

When we consider these things; when we add to them the indubitable connection of gambling with crime, with poverty, and with the suffering which both these bring; when we remember that to gamble, even in a small way, links us with that great army of folk who seem to regard money as the chief good; then surely there can be only one right attitude for the believer. It is to follow the example and teaching of those who brought the Nonconformist conscience to bear on this great social evil, and have nothing to do with it.

N. LESLIE STOKES.

### THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE

**M**UCH has already been written during the past month about the translation of the New Testament in the New English Bible. Readers of the *Fraternal* have been familiar with the contents of the book for many years past, and most will already have formed their own judgement on this new translation. What follows can only be the impressions of another such reader.



Of very great value indeed to my mind is the fact that we have here the considered judgement of a group of leading scholars representative of the non-Roman churches of this land, regarding the text of the New Testament. Bound down to no particular Greek Ms. or text, they have been free to consider every reading on its own merit; and in view of the fresh evidence that has been frequently appearing during the last 80 years, this in itself is a great gain. Even from this point of view we have before us a new translation, not revision.

As was to be expected, 1 John v, 8 (from the Latin version) is not referred to at all: the "pericope adulterae" stands at the end of John's Gospel, with a footnote indicating the places in John and Luke where it is to be found in Mss.; and it is interesting to note that after Mark xvi, 8 the "short ending" to the gospel stands before the familiar "long ending". Where, by the way, have "the Pharisees" gone to from Matthew ix, 34? They are not mentioned in the popular edition: they find a place in a footnote in the library edition, yet they are in all the Greek texts that I have been able to consult, except those that omit the whole verse.

Secondly, there is every encouragement to read a whole book or more at a sitting, and how much more intelligible the message would be to many people if this became a customary practice! To this end help is given not only by the "modern English" style, but also by the general lay-out, and especially the headings giving the main theme, not of isolated paragraphs, but of considerable sections of the gospels and of the longer letters. Particularly difficult to lay aside till the end was reached were the gospel of Mark, the letter of James, Hebrews and Revelation.

Probably opinions will vary chiefly on the style and vocabulary. The translators have been faithful to their instructions to translate into modern English, and have achieved a wonderful uniformity in style, dignified and restrained to my mind almost to excess. It seemed difficult to feel the literary differences between the New Testament writers—Paul, for example, is allowed hardly any broken constructions. And while there are many vivid and illuminating words and phrases, I should find it hard to select a passage that I should wish to learn by heart for the beauty of the language. But this fault, if fault it is, is that of "modern English" rather than of the translators! On the other hand, the meaning is much easier to grasp owing to the clarity of the words used, of the short sentences, and of the simple constructions. Often in the past we have been so charmed by the beauty of words and language that we have not troubled ourselves enough about what the words should be saying to us: and the plain, straight-forward language here used should stab us awake to realise afresh the wonder and truth of the message itself. In some places it seemed as though the translators deliberately forsook the familiar translation, modern English though it might be, to force the reader to think again.

From the reference in the introduction it is clear that the translators were aware of the danger of turning the translation into a paraphrase—and how exceedingly difficult it is to avoid that danger when the constructions and idioms of two languages are often entirely different. A translation into “modern English” instead of “translation English” necessitates in some places considerable divergence from the Greek text, but the claim that they have produced a translation and not a paraphrase is surely justified. A free translation is a far more difficult task than a literal translation, as it inevitably involves judgement on the meaning of difficult passages instead of seeking safety by obscurity, and by the translation of words, not ideas. We are fortunate that we have before us in this book an authoritative judgement not only on the best available text of the New Testament, but also on the exegesis of many debatable phrases. However, many uncertainties remain; and in this connection it should be said that the “Library edition” is greatly to be preferred to the “Popular edition”, for the footnotes in the former, without being cumbersome, recognise that other readings and renderings than that in the text may legitimately be considered (cp. John xxi, 15; Acts xx, 28; 1 Corinthians vii, 36 and many more).

Now for some comments on the translation of words. It is wonderful how quickly English passes from the archaic to the modern by a change in the “little words”, connecting particles and the like—again, therefore, behold, straightway . . . The Revisers followed the rule that one Greek word should normally be represented by the same English word each time it occurs: e.g. in Mark i “straightway” occurs no less than 11 times; in the new translation we find “at the moment when”, “thereupon”, “at once” (twice); “rapidly”, “straight”, “immediately”, and four times the Greek word is untranslated, but rather implied in other words in the sentence. “And it came to pass” disappears entirely: so do historic presents.

Much light should come to the “untrained layman” (Acts iv, 13) as well as to others by many of the translations that have been chosen; e.g. “dedicated people” is hardly an elegant phrase, but far more meaningful than “saints”; “wrath” becomes “retribution” or “dreadful judgement”; “righteousness” is “God’s way of righting wrong”, though no change is normally made in the rather difficult verb “justify”; “propitiation” is “the means of expiating sin”. To take another group “Praetorium” becomes “Headquarters”; “the 9th hour” is “3 in the afternoon”; “5 talents” is “5 bags of gold”; and “a denarius” is “the usual day’s wage” and so on.

There are many questions one would like to put to the panel: would it be in order for members to write a series of articles, say in the *Expository Times*, explaining some of the decisions reached? Let me take two words, in closing, by way of illustration.

“*Adelphos*”, “brother” has often been represented as being a distinctive, almost technical term, used among the Christians in the

early church. If this were the case one would expect the same word in English to be retained throughout as the normal practice. The translations of it, however, suggest that there was nothing unusual or characteristic in the use of the term. So in Acts it appears in English as "brothers", "friends", "members of the congregation", "companions", "Christians", "brotherhood"; while in 1 Thessalonians, "brothers" and "friends" seem to be used alternately.

And what of the word "*ekklesia*"? There seems to be room for careful study here. The translators use the word "church" sparingly. As for the two instances where the word occurs in Matthew, it is translated "church" in xvi, 18; but "congregation" in xviii, 17. In Acts and the epistles "congregation" is the normal translation where the local community is concerned. Is "church" used only to represent the whole body of Christians throughout the world? But if so, an exception to this rule seems to be made in the case of the Christians in Jerusalem (Acts xv, 4, contrasted with the "congregation" in Antioch in verse 3, and xviii, 22). Or is there some other explanation? How thrilling it would have been to be able to "sit in" during the discussions!

Clearly then in a variety of ways this new translation has a great deal to teach us all, whether we are familiar with the Bible or not. Now that we have the most authoritative text and translation available of the Word of God, expressed in English as clear and simple as the subject matter will allow, will the English-speaking peoples of the world show their gratitude to the translators for their labour of love by becoming the People of the Book, and responding to its message?

G. H. C. ANGUS.

*The Gospel of St. Luke.* Margaret Avery. R.E.P. 7s. 6d., boards; 6s. 6d. limp. 128 pp.

This volume is one of a series of handbooks (The Pathfinder Series) designed for teachers and pupils in middle forms of grammar schools and upper forms of secondary modern schools. Its author was until recently senior lecturer at Avery Hill Training College and is well known for her admirable works for day and Sunday school teachers and others engaged in Christian education among children and young people. An introduction deals with the purpose, sources and authorship of the Gospel, and there follow sixteen chapters of commentary, each one concluding with suggestions for further study. Maps, line drawings and diagrams are also included. Miss Avery draws on the findings of up to date critical scholarship and writes with an experienced teacher's grasp of religious instruction methods. This is a book which can be unreservedly commended to day and Sunday school teachers, Bible class leaders and young lay preachers, who are prepared to give themselves to serious Bible reading.

J.E.T.H.

---

---

THE BAPTIST INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED  
4, SOUTHAMPTON ROW, LONDON, W.C.1

To the Members of the Baptist Ministers' Fraternal.

Dear Friends,

“ Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—  
Of cabbages—and kings—”

At lunch recently the Rev. R. W. Thomson, the Assistant General Secretary of the Baptist Union, told me that a ministerial brother whom he had recommended to write to me about the insurance of a chain of offices expressed surprise and said he did not know that Baptist Insurance dealt with “ that kind of thing ”. Apparently he thought we insured only church premises, manses and their contents.

Although we specialise in church insurances, we do in fact deal with “ all kinds of things ”.

My quotation from Lewis Carroll is not out of place for we have on our books among other multifarious risks, a boot and shoe manufactory; boats on the Broads; stationers and grocers. We even have a policy in the name of “ H.M. the Queen ” to satisfy the requirements of a special form of legal interest.

If your problem or that of any of your people is insurance of any kind, then please write to me. We shall do all we can to help you.

Yours sincerely,

C. J. L. COLVIN,  
*General Manager.*

---

---

## OUR TEACHING MINISTRY

IT is a curious thing that even in our Baptist churches we tend to forget that the work of ministry and mission belongs to the whole Church. When we speak of the ministry of the Church most of our people will still think primarily of the work of ordained ministers, to whom, they imagine, the mission of the Church has been primarily entrusted. We seem to be suffering from a spiritual *apartheid*, two groups within the Church set over against each other—the ministers who minister, and the laity who are ministered unto.

We would all presumably agree that this is a terrible misconception, for we would believe that, on Biblical and historical grounds, it is the *whole* Church which is commissioned to bring the good news of redemption through Christ to a disbelieving world, that it is the *whole* Church which is engaged upon the work of the royal priesthood. But this misconception dies hard and colours our attitude to much of the work which God has given us to do today. We say that the Church is “out of touch” and must contact the “outsider”, and so we organise great campaigns; we say that the Church must go into industry, and so we train industrial chaplains; we say that the Church must go into our schools, and so ministers leave their pastoral office to take up teaching appointments. While all these things may well have their value, the underlying misconception is still influencing our thinking. The Church *is* in contact with the outsider; the Church *is* in industry; the Church *is* in the schools, because the lay members of the Church are to be found in all these places. It is they who ought to be carrying out the ministry and mission of the Church in the places where they live and work, for they are members of the Body of Christ, charged with the continuation of His ministry in our own day.

We regret that the impact of the Church upon the world today is not as great as it should be. The answer, however, is not simply to send more ordained ministers out of the pastorate into specialised posts, but rather to train our lay people to fulfil the office which is properly theirs. If they are failing in their work, the fault lies with the ministers who have not given them a high enough conception of their task nor trained them adequately for it. This, surely, is the office of the minister within the whole body, “to equip God’s people for work in his service, to the building up of the Body of Christ” (Ephesians iv, 12, N.E.B.). It is in this context that we must see the tremendous importance of our teaching ministry.

What, then, have we to teach our people? First and foremost, we must teach them the true meaning of worship. Here the ministry and mission of the Church must find its ground and basis and here the Church will find motive and strength for the work of God. We have to teach them that worship is not a sacred concert or a way to “enjoy” one’s Sunday evening, but that it is the scene of a great dialogue between God and man, the setting forth in reading and

sermon of the mighty acts of God and the response of His people in repentance, faith, thanksgiving and dedication. We need to teach our people that worship is not a monologue from the pulpit, but a co-operative act, in which the congregation has as important a part to play as the minister. We must teach them that worship is central not only to the Church's life but to their own lives as well. We might well base our teaching on the preface to the new *Orders and Prayers for Church Worship* (E. A. Payne and S. F. Winward, C.K.P.), and we will find that all this will be a revelation to many of our people who have been worshipping for years. But we will also find that for them and for the Church, worship will become a much richer and more meaningful experience.

Then we must teach our people the basis of our faith and not assume that they ought to know it all! Hendrik Kraemer has put the need well: "If the specific place of the laity in the world is at the frontiers, where the real dialogue between Church and world becomes an event, the laity at large needs a new orientation, a new grasp of the whole realm and scale of the reality of Christ, and a new equipment. This holds true for a great number of faithful Church members, accepting implicitly the Christian faith as they hear it presented in Church and keeping to its observances, but in fact ignorant in regard to the Christian Faith and its relevance to the world" (*A Theology of the Laity*, p. 172). We will deplore the present lack of knowledge of many of the people of our congregations, but we have been at fault in assuming too readily that it was necessary for people only to listen to our sermons in order to achieve a real grasp of the faith. We have too often told them to read their Bibles for themselves, recommended a set of study notes, and felt that our responsibility ended there. Certainly the sermon must be one of the principal means of Christian education, and yet the fact remains that many people have listened to us for years, and yet still have grave difficulties and doubts in their minds concerning the faith.

Christian education in Sunday School is based on the sound educational premise that children learn best in small groups, where there is an opportunity for question and discussion. We do the same thing for our young people in Bible Class, and in the training for Church membership. It seems strange that we then, by and large, abandon this excellent method and expect them to continue in the apostles' doctrine only in the more formal atmosphere of Sunday worship and Mid-week Service, or on their own. It is significant that all over the world the Church has been turning to a revival of Bible study, but especially Bible study in small groups, where people have an opportunity to discuss their difficulties and to work out the application of the Biblical message to their own situation. E. H. Robertson has described most helpfully in his latest book (*Take and read*, S.C.M.) how this method of Bible study has been carried out in different countries. We will, and must, carry on with our expository preaching, but we must also adapt these

methods of Bible study to our own situation, so that our people may have the opportunity to make the message of Scripture their own; and to see how it affects their everyday life. Such group Bible study may well mean a complete change in the pattern of our Church life, and it will certainly mean a great deal more work for us; but the results, as has been found elsewhere, will be startling and invigorating. We shall be equipping God's people in the best way possible for work in His service.

Out of such study will naturally come to our people a conviction of their part in the ministry and mission of the Church, and they will begin to see that the very nature of the Church is evangelistic. Happily many of our churches have already grasped the idea that the mission of the Church is constantly to be exercised, and visitation missions are increasingly popular amongst us. Unhappily they tend, even now, to be something "special" and not an integral part of the Church's ongoing life. When our people have grasped this, we still have to teach them *how* to carry on their work of evangelism. At a recent conference I heard a group of laymen accuse ministers of always urging personal evangelism, and yet never being specific about the many problems which faced people who were trying to take a Christian stand in the factory or office. Rarely are Christian ethics seen here in terms of black and white, and the Christian can and does find himself in great confusion as he seeks to make his witness. We must continue to preach the principles from the pulpit, but we should also be concerned to teach our people how to apply these principles in their own situation. Have we thought of gathering together the members of our congregation who work in a particular industry to discuss their problems with them? Have we thought of introducing this subject into the Church Meeting, so that we can help one another out of our varied experience? In such ways as this we ought to be alive to the need to teach our people how their part of the mission of the Church is to be exercised in their varying situations.

Much more could be said about our teaching ministry. I have said nothing about our duty to prepare Sunday School teachers for their work, nor about the need to show the congregation their part in the pastoral ministry of the Church. But enough has been said to show the part of the minister in the ministry and mission of the whole Church. We must teach the Church to be the Body of Christ, equipping God's people for their service to Him. If we do our work badly, the effectiveness of the Church may well suffer. If we do our work well, we will probably find that we have to change the whole pattern of our ministry; we will certainly find that we will be involved in a great deal of hard study and thinking, and we will need to show leadership, understanding and infinite patience. We need to recall then that the God who called us to a teaching ministry will also equip us for our task.

H. A. SMITH.

## THE CHILD AND THE CHURCH

**D**R. WEST can be assured that his article "The Child and the Church" in the January 1961 issue of the *Fraternal*, was welcomed by many of his brethren; he has rendered a valuable service to the denomination in general and its "church centred" educationalists in particular.

But some, and the writer is one, will want to question the wisdom of one or two of his practical suggestions, which we may assume were made with a view to integrating the child and school into the Church Family. Others, whether they agree or disagree with these suggestions, will want to question his interpretation of the aims of "various Sunday-school Guide Books".

Let us look first of all at his practical suggestions. It is encouraging to learn that Dr. West is asking us to do away with the "tacked on" Dedication Service; nor is it surprising that he should commend for our use the appropriate section of the new *Orders and Prayers for Church Worship* by E. A. Payne and S. F. Winward. It is, however, disturbing to find him suggesting that "as an alternative to the congregation standing, the commitment, slightly amended, can be accepted on behalf of the Church by the Church Secretary or Sunday School Superintendent", and then go on to recommend occasional Cradle Roll services.

In the writer's view, neither practice will ultimately serve the Cause for which the article pleads: "the need for the Sunday School to be seen constantly as part of the Church"; in other words, for the elimination of the false dichotomy of Church and Sunday School.

Some Baptist ministers, using Dr. Aubrey's *Ministers' Manual*, have not found it difficult to set the Dedication Service within the worship of the Believing community, when it takes place at the beginning of morning worship and in place of the children's address or children's lesson, because in this *Manual* the congregation is asked "to stand in your places" and "to join in the welcome of the Church to this little child, and to unite with these parents in thanksgiving and supplication".

Such a practice does, however, presume that (a) the Church is fully committed to a Family Church principle, and (b) the minister has previously visited the parents and explained the meaning of the service for the Church, parents and child, and has carefully explained the meaning and significance of the responses.

Churches and ministers following such practices can, and do, arrange for parents and friends to be welcomed by the Church Secretary and Cradle Roll Secretary, in the Deacons' or Choir Vestry, prior to the service. These two Church representatives have found it convenient to bring the Dedication party into the Church during the singing of the last verse of the first hymn, and remain with the parents and friends during the opening acts of worship in the Church, and until such time as it is considered right for the



# TER-JUBILEE

---

1961 - 1962

## CALLING YOU TO SERVE NEIGHBOURHOOD NATION WORLD

The Rev. C. H. Cleal will be glad to make suggestions for conferences and meetings and for practical projects in neighbourhood service.

Write to him at:—

**The Citizenship Department, Baptist Union,  
4, Southampton Row, London, W.C.1.**

---

## BIBLE STUDY

Notes for private study, or for use in training groups and mid-week services

**The Restoration  
of Conversation** —studies in the Epistle to the  
Ephesians by the Rev. W. Ernest  
Moore (Tutor, Rawdon College).

This set of notes was designed as the basis of the Bible Studies for the Denominational Conference in May, 1961, at Swanwick. Copies are now available.

**In the  
Service Royal** —studies in the fundamental Christian  
beliefs by the Rev. T. F. Valentine  
(formerly Young People's Secretary,  
Baptist Missionary Society, now the  
minister at Teddington).

This set of notes was designed for the use of the Baptist Students' Federation a few years ago. In response to many requests it is now made available for general use.

---

Copies of the above, 6d. each, post paid from  
The TER-JUBILEE OFFICE, BAPTIST CHURCH HOUSE,  
4, SOUTHAMPTON ROW, LONDON, W.C.1.

Dedication group to leave, usually at the same time as the children leave for their departmental activities. In churches where the Secretary of the Cradle Roll is assisted in her (the Church's) work, by a number of visitors, recruited from a Church Friends scheme, her presence at the Dedication reinforces and makes plain the principle of the Church caring for its children.

The minister standing at the Communion Table when the group arrives, symbolises to the parents the welcome of the worshipping community. After the congregation are seated the Dedication Service proceeds and at the close of it the minister, on behalf of the worshipping family of God and as a symbol of the promises made by the Church, gives the parents not only a Dedication Certificate, but a Bible or New Testament in which is inscribed the name of the child, the date of Dedication, the promise of Church and parents, and signature of the minister. (See *Orders of Prayers for Church Worship*, Payne and Winward, page 127.)

One must also question the claim that the "best way to bridge the gap between the child's Dedication and the age for coming to Sunday School or Family Church, is through the Cradle Roll Secretary". The Cradle Roll Secretary is certainly a most important person in Church life and is not sufficiently recognised. He or she should not be relegated to the almost forgotten role, so common in most Baptist churches today. The place of the child in the life of the Church and the importance of integrating the home into the family life of the Church, are surely not emphasised by presenting a Cradle Roll certificate at an occasional Cradle Roll Service; but at an annual and specially planned Family Service, e.g. Mothering Sunday. Such a service, to quote Dr. West, "may result in varying degrees of bedlam, but this does not detract from the value of the service".

During this annual, specially planned and timed, Family Service, the Cradle Roll certificates would be presented, but at such a service there should be present not only the parents to receive the certificate, but couples who have been married in the Church, together with children of any parents whose children have been dedicated and who are already on the Cradle Roll. The service would in fact focus annually the duty of parents to bring up the child in "the nurture and fear of the Lord", the dual responsibility of parents and Church to "labour together", and also the sanctity of the marriage vows. Such a service reinforces in several ways the claim that "beyond the individualistic decision for Christ there is the community of the Church in a congregation of which the child is himself being nurtured", and makes real the principle of "coming togetherness" which is a fundamental concept of the Family Church principle.

As for Dr. West's legitimate plea that "teaching in the Sunday School must not consist simply of Bible stories or stories of great heroes of Church history, used solely as examples of the way to

live", most of us would agree. But if there be an implied criticism of the Concise Guides, it should be pointed out that it is at least their objective, as expressed in their own words: to "attempt to interpret the Bible stories in the total context of God's activity towards man and man's response".

The writer would be the last to claim that all is well with the content and method of Sunday School lessons based on the B.L.C. Courses, but for them it can be claimed that they do at least try to show the child "his place in history and the Church's role in it".

W. T. COWLAN.

Dr. West comments anent the criticism of his suggestion that the Church Secretary or Sunday School Superintendent should stand alongside the parents during the ceremony of Dedication, and make a response on behalf of the Church; that he thinks it of value that the congregation should "hear their response" from "one of their number standing actually alongside the family and child". This could be in addition to and not alternatively to the congregation itself standing as well.

#### GOD'S PRESENCE WITH THE BLIND

"THE Practice of the Presence of God" is a phrase made familiar to us by Brother Lawrence, who, some centuries ago, testified that the Presence of God was as real to him amid the duties of the Monastery kitchen as in the chapel of his devotions. This testimony makes a special appeal to Christian people who may have lost their sight. They have the compensating advantage of being more free from those outward distractions of the world of sense and sound, which tend to hinder concentration on the development of the spiritual life. Shut out from the world of action, they are more shut in to the realisation of the Presence of God.

Seated next to another patient at the hospital, some time ago, waiting for an interview with the specialist, the writer remarked to his neighbour "Does not the loss of sight throw you back upon God?" To this he readily assented. One makes the discovery of inner spiritual resources previously unsuspected.

In a recent broadcast, a well-known poet and public servant described his first reaction to the loss of his sight. In masterly language he said he was held by his faith in God, an anchor sure and steadfast. And so, to use the title of a book published recently "The world we have forgotten" becomes, and may become to those who know Jesus Christ, reversed, and the spiritual world, with all its opportunities of discovery and exploration, becomes the world of growing reality.

A soldier, blinded in the last war, recently gave his testimony over the air. Previously, indifferent to religion, the reading of the Braille New Testament brought to him a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ. This experience he expressed by saying "I was made blind

in order that I might see". One is reminded of the poet's words:  
 " Power was with him in the night,  
 That makes the darkness and the light,  
 And dwells not in the light alone."

In the night of his handicap, the blind man may know the meaning of that power, and rejoice in it.

That wonderful American lady, Helen Keller was triply handicapped, with the lost of sight, speech and hearing. The time came when it was necessary for someone to speak to her about God. For this purpose good Bishop Phillips Brooks was chosen. He spoke to her of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, as a God of Love. To this she replied "I have known it for some time, but did not know His name." Thanks be to God that, though physical sight may be withdrawn, the blind also may practise the Presence of God, through faith which is in Jesus Christ our Lord.

OSWALD HENDERSON.

*An Enquiry.* William Carey. Carey Kingsgate Press. 10s. 6d.

Realism, imagination, vision, these are the characteristics of the Enquiry. Statistics may be cold, but Carey makes them speak with warmth and passion. Here is an example of how to prepare and present a project to a public yet to be convinced. Here is a modern book, alive, vital, challenging. The modern Missionary Movement has achieved much, but the task today is even greater than in 1792. If we can make the hard statistical evidence of the world's need of Christ glow with the practical passion Carey achieved in the Enquiry our Churches will begin to expect great things from God and attempt great things for Him. Mission is a mark of the Church. For helping us to realise this we owe much to Carey. The reader will be grateful for Dr. Payne's Introduction, which sets the book in its context and underlines its present significance.

N.B.J.

## ANGOLA

As we go to Press there is evidence that the spirit of Carey and Knibb is alive among us again, anent the "dreadful campaign resolved upon by the Portuguese Government". C. J. Parsons packed into his five minutes on the air a lot of information known at first hand to few but missionaries. And there is evidence that Churches and ministers are being stirred to further action on the Assembly Resolution. In Southend, particularly, the ministers under the lead of L. E. Addicott and E. L. Blakebrough, are on the holy warpath, organising meetings, approaching M.P.s and the Portuguese legation, getting letters and information into the Press. If such activity sprang to life all over the country in our Churches and Associations, if letters of protest were sent and meetings of protest were held and resolutions of protest were forwarded, we might "light such a candle, by God's grace" as would not easily be put out.

## AMENDMENTS TO MINISTERIAL RECOGNITION RULES

SINCE 1958, at the request of the Principal and other representatives of the London Bible College, the Baptist Union Ministerial Recognition Committee has given renewed and careful consideration to the conditions under which applicants for the Baptist ministry who have received training at a Bible College or Training Institute may be given ministerial recognition. At its meeting in March last, the Baptist Union Council received and adopted a number of fresh recommendations from the Ministerial Recognition Committee.

The Committee noted that in loyalty to the Baptist colleges which are in membership with the Union, and in view of the nature and constitution of the London Bible College and other similar colleges which offer theological training, students trained at these colleges cannot be treated in exactly the same way as those trained at a Baptist college. At the same time, it was recognised that there is some hardship in treating men who have spent three years in full-time instruction at a Bible college or Training Institute in exactly the same way as men who have permission to undertake a pre-probationary pastorate while preparing for the Baptist Union examinations.

The Ministerial Recognition Committee had already agreed that the names of men who have been at the London Bible College and have secured the B.D. degree, shall, other things being equal, be placed on the Probationers' List after two instead of three years. The Committee has now reaffirmed its view that whenever possible candidates for the Baptist ministry should seek training at one of the theological colleges in membership with the Union, and this reaffirmation was unanimously endorsed by the Baptist Union Council in March, 1961.

The new proposals require a candidate who has been trained at a Bible College or Training Institute to have an interview with the Committee of a Baptist Association at least two years before he comes before the Baptist Union Ministerial Recognition Committee, and that at the time of the Association interview he be a member of a Baptist church. He must also be at least twenty-two years of age at the time of his appearance before the Baptist Union Committee. The examination requirements, and the various reports concerning his fitness for the ministry remain unchanged. The period of pastoral service, however, a candidate must give in one church before his name may be enrolled on the Probationers' List, may be reduced from two years to one year if he has a theological degree, and from three years to two if he has a University Diploma in Theology.

A copy of the whole rule as amended may be obtained from the General Secretary of the Baptist Union.

W. G. CHANNON, *Chairman, Ministerial Recognition Committee.*

ERNEST A. PAYNE, *General Secretary, Baptist Union.*