

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

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

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The 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

JANUARY, 1948

No. 67

## EDITORIAL UP AGAINST IT

WHILE assuming general responsibility for articles appearing in *The Fraternal* we do not claim to be in possession of all the facts upon which the several writers, from time to time, base their statements. The responsibility here is that of the contributors. Subject to this reservation, attention is called to the articles dealing with Religious Instruction. It is clear that Communism in the homeland and overseas acts not merely as a political party but as an anti-religious crusade, seeking to undermine the foundation of the Christian belief and of morality itself. It is evident that greater importance is attached to gaining key positions in the professions and in industry than to the winning of seats in national or local government. To this end Communism seeks to use the present educational system as providing a unique opportunity of furthering its purposes.

There are others, not necessarily Communists, whose influence is equally to be deplored. Quite recently there was brought to our notice the case of a large and important private school where sweepstakes on sporting events are regularly organised by the boys with at least the knowledge, if not the connivance, of the headmaster. In this school also, his Divinity lectures constitute a direct challenge to what most people would regard as the fundamental verities of the Christian faith.

Merely to denounce or deplore is insufficient. What positive measures can Baptist ministers adopt? To found a Training College for teachers, and Public Schools, would be a great step forward, but possibly from a financial aspect impossible. If this is so, parents should be encouraged to send their children to the many Free Church or Baptist Schools where, in place of a non-religious or R.C. atmosphere, the influence is definitely Protestant and Evangelical. Again, as our contributor suggests, efforts should be made to enlist public-spirited members of our churches to become school managers, whose powers are still considerable. More important, the most promising of our young people should have placed before them the high vocation of the teaching profession as providing a worthy life's work.

Finally, we should seek by pulpit ministration, Bible class or Fellowship teaching, and personal influence, to ensure for our growing girls and boys those principles and ideals which are consonant with the mind of the Master, and in the best interests of mankind. If we are "up against it," as our contributor suggests, then, in his pungent phrase—let us meet war with war.

---

## THE CONDUCT OF PUBLIC WORSHIP

*"Our awful ministry."*

—Dean Church.

AS worship is the highest activity of the human soul, so the corporate worship of the Church, in all the variety of liturgical and non-liturgical use, is the highest expression of its life. Its worship is a continuing confession of its dependence upon Him, and a response to His grace in Jesus Christ. Christian worship is not merely the reverent acknowledgment of "the Power behind phenomena," or the divine Source of Goodness, Truth, and Beauty, though it includes the recognition of the unfathomable mystery of His Being. It is the adoration of the Living God. It is imbued throughout with the Gospel the Church proclaims and by which it lives, the Gospel of the Incarnation, the Cross, and the Resurrection of the Son of God. In these days of confusion and dismay, when many, having no belief in God, have no faith in the future, the Church by its worship declares its confidence in Him Who only doeth wondrous things, and raises its triumphant song: "Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name."

It is not, then, with the idea of "making the services more attractive" that we should consider the conduct of public worship, but with the discovery of the hiding places of God's power in the Church, of which its worship is beyond question the greatest. The conduct of worship is that part of the minister's vocation that brings him into continual prominence and thrusts his personality upon the notice of men. It is the work, also, in which he stands most obviously under the judgment of God. As a preacher of the Word an awful responsibility rests upon him, but no less awful is the task of leading the devotions of the people, adoring and bringing them to adore Almighty God. To some a special gift is given. Older men will remember Dr. Richard Glover leading the worship of a Baptist Assembly—the slow raising of the hand, the bowing of the silvered head, the awe that hushed the great congregation, the voice that seemed part of many praying voices in heaven and earth, and the "still dews of quietness" that descended on a multitude made one Soul.

Demeanour, gesture, tone, incited reverence. It was a divine gift, sedulously cultivated, a grace shared by many saints ordained and unordained. But lesser men can reach after it. It does not require spiritual genius to conduct worship worthily, but only sincerity, a sense of responsibility, the reverential spirit, and the determination, by the grace of God, to bring to the duty nothing less than the best that we have and are. Even so it is only with great humility and diffidence, and with the memory of much falling short, that one minister can speak to others on the task.

The "Order of Service" in our churches is generally fixed by tradition, though it is not unusual for a visiting minister to be told that he is at liberty to vary it at his pleasure. It is a liberty not often taken and which should be used with great discretion. The order to which a people is accustomed should never be disturbed without special reason. It is a mistake to think that a sudden departure from it will rouse expectancy. It is more likely to distract the mind than to encourage devotion. Forms of worship can undoubtedly be improved, and it is part of our freedom that we may adapt them to changing needs and circumstances. But the attempt to escape from "dullness" or "monotony" by altering them at our own will has little to commend it. It must be recognised that the great advantage of an habitual Order of Service is precisely that it is taken for granted and the spirit of the worshipper is free to rise above its form.

If a service is monotonous it is not the forms of worship that are at fault but the spirit of the worshippers, and often and primarily the failure of the minister. The Liturgy of the Anglican Church is rightly beloved for its associations, its beauty, and its adequacy. But its relative perfection as a means of worship does not make it independent of the minister. "I have never heard the Liturgy read as Mr. Robertson read it," wrote a hearer of that great preacher. "He carried its own spirit with him; and those prayers so often degraded by careless reading into mere forms were from his voice felt to be instinct with a Divine light and spirit." Those who are dissatisfied with our usual order of service and desire to introduce some liturgical element may have good reasons for their desire, but that it will lessen the demand on the minister cannot be one of them. It may even increase it.

It is the "free prayer" which is the distinguishing mark of our worship, and despite the justifiable use of the great collects and other provided prayers, it will so remain. It is perhaps the most frequent ground of criticism. It is said that it places the congregation at the mercy of the minister's mood, or sometimes of his illiteracy, or, most unpardonably, that it may be directed against some members of the congregation. In so far as there is substance in these criticisms, the remedy clearly lies with the minister himself. It is not enough to repeat the truism that his best preparation for worship is the preparation of his own soul.

It is more to the point to insist that every part of the service should be carefully considered beforehand. He has spent thought and labour on the sermon, but the form and contents of his prayers are too often left to the impulses of the moment. Dr. George Hill, of Nottingham, was once thanked for the beauty of his devotions. "I always write the prayers," he explained. "Why should I be careful about the words I address to my fellow-men and careless about those I address to Almighty God?" Whether written or not, the opening prayer which leads the people to adoration and invokes the divine blessing should, in thought and language, be prepared. Natural fluency may be and frequently is the worst peril of the minister. The gift of speech is not the same thing as the gift of prayer. Chastity of language and elevation of thought are essential qualities of all worthy conducted worship.

The "long prayer" is perhaps the severest trial of both the minister and the congregation. It is an open question how far it is followed with close attention. It is certainly sometimes wearisome. There is much to be said for breaking it up into short "bidding prayers," and, in any case, the whole should be planned in advance, and a slight pause should be made between the separate petitions. It is the slow meandering of the prayer in any and every direction that often makes it the most lifeless part of the service. It is in the long prayer that, usually, the Confession of Sin (an essential to Christian worship) is made. The right place for this is where our Lord put it in the model prayer, immediately after the Adoration, and not, like a brief afterthought, at the end of the prayer. And the words should be humble and unrhethorical. The Anglican Confession suggests the right direction in which thought should move. On the other hand the Confession in the Communion Service seems too over-strained for general worship.

Many ministers now open the service with sentences from Scripture—the Call to Worship. The Call should be brief, and the hymn that follows should be a hymn of adoration. To begin a service with a wailing or languid hymn is to blunder seriously. Such hymns should very rarely be used at all. Some ministers betray a (probably) unconscious taste for sentimental or even pretty hymns whose right in a hymn book can be disputed. Hymns and music should be robust and worshipful, and should move onward through the service from the initial Adoration to the closing surrender or praise, as a right order of service demands. And it is not to disparage modern hymns to say that few are equal to the strong, confident, doctrinal hymns of our fathers. The choice of hymns should be taken with great seriousness, and a record kept so as to avoid too frequent repetition. It should never be delegated to the organist. He, good man, is apt to think more of the tunes than of the contents of hymns. It is in the hymns chiefly that the congregation confesses its faith, which makes some

of the older hymns doubtfully appropriate. But there is one of the greatest—it is to be wished it were more often sung in our churches—the *Te Deum*. It not only lifts worship to its heights, it makes a congregation conscious of the continuity and universality of the faith of the whole Church. The humblest Baptist Church in some remote village is no less part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church than the community that worships in some distant cathedral. But it tends to wither in seeming isolation. It needs to remind itself of the great and majestic Church of Christ to which it belongs, and how more nobly than in the soaring strains of the *Te Deum*!

And no less important is the choice and reading of the Scripture. Comparatively few in our congregations are now familiar with the Bible, and most know it only from the public readings. It is an advantage of the Anglican lectionary that it ensures that most of it is so read, and it is a growing practice to preface the portion with a few words of explanation. The disadvantage of the lectionary is that the set lessons may have little to do with the theme of the sermon. Freechurchmen have a happy liberty in this respect, but there is a danger that the bias and interests of a preacher may result in large and important parts of the Bible being neglected. This, of course, has a direct bearing on the minister's own familiarity with the Bible, and the range of his preaching. The manner in which the Scripture is read is of the utmost consequence. In the important book, "Has the Church failed?" the late Eric Loveday wrote: "I cannot expect great preaching in every church, but I do expect a reading of the lessons that honours God, the English tongue and the sense of the author. Lessons read properly will do more preaching than most sermons." The hearer of Robertson already quoted says: "The grave earnestness and well-weighed emphasis with which he read the Gospel of the day were absolutely an exposition of its meaning." It is not a dramatic reading that is required, but a reverent, intelligent, and impressive interpretation of the passage read. Not all reading of the Scriptures, either in private or in public, is a reading of the Word.

Leslie Weatherhead, in the book referred to, sums up all that this article aims at saying: "It would be ideal if we would so perfectly arrange a service that those who took part in it became unconscious of the care bestowed on it and overwhelmingly conscious of that for which the whole service was designed, namely, to make God real and be a means of bringing Him near." It is only by such "care bestowed" and by the discipline of his own soul that, by the grace of God, a minister can lead a worshipping people to the glory "of that light which being compared with the light is found before it, more beautiful than the sun, and above all the orders of the stars."

BERKELEY G. COLLINS.

## THE REALITY THAT STARTED IT ALL

THE German philosopher Lessing once urged that it was impossible to make the truth dependent upon the contingent events of history. To many people that seems sensible, even axiomatic. Gautama Buddha told his disciples to forget him so long as they remembered his teaching. That seems noble. Why should it be different with Christianity? Yet the truth of Christianity does depend upon the historical fact that Jesus lived, died "under Pontius Pilate," rose again. The Christian message is inextricably bound up with Jesus of Nazareth, of Gethsemane, of Calvary, of the empty tomb. The burden of the first preaching was not "the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

"Ye men of Israel," cried Peter, when the Christian Church did its first bit of open-air evangelism, "hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs . . . ; Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: Whom God hath raised up . . . God hath made that same Jesus, Whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."

The revelation of God had been given through historic events. The Word had become Flesh. One of the first controversies in the Church arose on this very issue. Even in the New Testament itself there are traces of the retort to doketism. Jesus was a *real* man. He really suffered. He really died.

One of the oddest turns of modern New Testament scholarship has been the attempt to maintain that the early Church was not interested in history. Only late in the day, we are told, did Christians concern themselves with the facts of the life of Christ, when most of them were irretrievably forgotten. There are sayings and stories, preserved because they were useful illustrations for preachers. "As a whole," writes one of this school, K. L. Schmidt, "there is no Life of Jesus in the sense of an evolving biography, no chronological sketch of the story of Jesus, but only single stories, *pericopae*, which are put into a framework." If Bultmann is right we not only have no authentic "Life," but the very stories were invented by the primitive Church, putting its own ideas on the lips of Jesus. The early Church must have been a more remarkable body than its most enthusiastic historians have ever imagined if it could create the sayings of Jesus. It is surprising, too, that having this inventive facility it did not make the sayings more directly relevant to its own problems; and what a pity that there were so many of its problems for which it failed to invent an appropriate saying. The theory is one which it is difficult to discuss seriously!

Not all Form Critics, of course, are as daft as that, and their method of approach to the Gospels has thrown a good deal of light

upon the period before the oral tradition was given written shape. But we have the high authority of T. W. Manson for believing that it is increasingly likely that much of the material which was later incorporated in the Gospels was in written form much earlier than is commonly recognised. He holds that there was an outline of the Ministry of Jesus, a detailed account of the Passion, a collection of the teachings (Q), and possibly other collections of stories, available already when Paul and Barnabas set out on the first missionary journey. (See "A Companion to the Bible," p. 99.)

But our immediate concern is with the alleged lack of interest in the life of Jesus. It is quite true we have no biography in the modern sense. There are many questions to which we should like answers. Much of the Ministry is left unrecorded. But in Mark's Gospel we do have the outlines of the life of Jesus, a story with movement and shape. And when the early Church began to frame its tradition of stories about Him I see no reason to doubt that many were preserved just because they were good stories about the Saviour they loved, and not merely for utilitarian reasons, because they fitted or were thought to fit the contemporary problems of the Church.

Certainly Luke was concerned to present an accurate portrait of Jesus: and he says that "many" had made the attempt before him. There is no reason to doubt the statements in his preface as to his aims and methods. Again and again statements of his that were much criticised and suspected have been proved by modern research to be entirely reliable. Possibly some that are still under fire will yet be vindicated. We need not contend that there are no errors of fact in the Gospel story or that the record has not at times been coloured by the experience of the Christian community. But we can maintain that the writers had an honest desire to be accurate, and were as much concerned to distinguish between what Jesus said and did not say as any modern student. Note, for example, the care with which St. Paul distinguishes between what he believes to be the teaching of the Lord, and his own judgment as to correct Christian behaviour (1 Cor. vii, 10-12, 25, 40).

Luke is interpreter as well as historian. To him Jesus is Lord. But that judgment grows for him out of the facts. He is not inventing facts to fit the thesis. For Luke, the Gospel was in the historical facts. It was bound up with the reality of the life and teaching of Jesus. What Luke wanted to discover and to pass on was the true record of the deeds and words of Jesus.

Not only the inherent probability of the case but the results of generations of the most meticulous examination of the documents—not forgetting Form Criticism—justify us in believing in the substantial accuracy of the Gospel record. "The more critical our study has been," writes C. H. Dodd in "The Authority of the Bible," "the more sure we become that here is a real Person

in history, many sided, often perplexing, certainly too great to be reduced to any common type, and not fully intelligible to us; but for all that unmistakably individual, strongly defined in lines of character and purpose, and challenging us all by a unique outlook on life. . . . After the discipline of historical criticism we do know Jesus better and whatever was faulty in the traditional Christianity that has come down to us, or in our apprehension of it, is confronted afresh with the Reality that started it all." HUGH MARTIN.

### THE ORDINANCES

**M**OST churches have to confess a lack of interest in the Communion Service. Many have not opened their baptisteries for years, for so many members of the congregation feel that the ordinances are needless or only for select souls. This has caused such concern that we now often hear pronouncements which seek to awaken people to the place and meaning of these rites and in these they are most often termed sacraments and stated to be "means of grace." Here I am concerned to show why I feel these to be wrong emphases, unlikely to solve the problem of instructing our people in attendance at the more intimate meetings of the church fellowship.

#### I.

Let us look first at the word Sacrament. We might well use the term were we able to establish for it a meaning pertinent to our view of the ceremonies and isolated from the long history of its use and connotation in other communions. As things are it generally conveys a meaning alien to our thought or is so nebulous as to mean nothing. Because of his religious experience Luther had to dissent from the definition of a sacrament obtaining in his day. He therefore formulated one which is indeed excellent for our two practices of Baptism and the Supper. But for his purpose it had to be modified to cover Infant Baptism and practically dispensed with to allow of his retaining Penance as one of the Sacraments.

Since his day there has been continual redefinition till at last we find that all life is sacramental, i.e., it mediates God to us. In other words by a different route we have arrived at the logical conclusion of the multiplicity of sacraments found in Roman dogma and among their theologians before the hardening of doctrine. Now, reduced to its simplest terms the Roman view is that a sacrament is what the church declares to be such (coupled with the dictum that Christ instituted them among the Apostles). For those who are ready to accept the authority of that church this is a perfectly valid definition. But for us the authority of that church is in question over so many matters that equally so we cannot accept it here. We should, however, maintain that all life for the Christian is sacramental. The meaning the word has acquired

necessitates this conclusion. Baillie shows this to be true when, in his "Our Knowledge of God," he maintains nature "is a sacrament of God." "Just," he continues, "as in the sacrament of Holy Communion the Real Presence of Christ is given in, with, and under the bread and the wine, so in a wider sense the whole corporeal world may become sacramental to us of the presence of the Triune God." Any sacramental theology, summing up as it must the past history of the word, can lead to no other conclusion than this; so when we speak of the Lord's Supper and Baptism as Sacraments we are saying nothing in the least distinctive about them. From this point of view, then, those who say there is no need to perpetuate these ceremonies are right.

Was it this that led us, after a tentative use of sacrament in the early days of Baptist churches, to substitute for it "ordinance"? At least there is no ambiguity about the meaning of the latter and it is good that it has been retained in our hymn book. It is to my mind preferable to terms borrowed from such source; as the Anglican Church. It is self-explanatory. It implies quite naturally the institution of these acts by Christ, and if we understand why He instituted them, gives us sufficient reason for continuing their observance. That both Baptism and the Supper have such dominical authority is now, in spite of steps to undermine it, widely accepted. The disciples understood that Jesus required acts of them. By all means call them sacramental if you wish. Every part of life should be such for the Christian. These two acts have, however, a special place in the individual and corporate life of the Christian not served by anything else.

## II.

Then they are stated to be means of grace, imparting benefit to those who participate. Is this an appeal to an age, generally deemed to be avaricious, in which men ask for a good return for their money? Even the ordinary worship of the church is included in this type of propaganda. It is far from satisfactory and especially so in connection with Baptism and Communion. For it would seem that people come in the mood naturally engendered by this conception of the ceremonies and when they do not at once perceive some benefit, conclude they have been misled. It is useless to admonish them with failing to come in penitence and contrition. So far as they know they have done so. But their attitude is naturally introspective and that rarely leads to a sense of unworthiness. As a matter of fact, an emphasis on sacramental piety appears always to have accompanying it this fact of many absentees. Bartlett has noted the "strange fact, in view of such emphasis upon the sacraments as indispensable means of grace, that persons passed many years, even their whole life, as members in a sense of the church militant, and joining in much of its worship, yet apart from its primary sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist." ("Christianity in History.")

It is usual when describing the ordinances as means of grace to quote Augustine's phrase about the bread and wine being outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace. But this has always seemed to me to be redundant. For signs must be outward and visible and grace in the religious sphere can only be inward and spiritual. So in its simplest terms we learn that the elements are signs of grace, i.e., according to this theory it was instituted for the benefit of the participant—ye: Jesus said, "Do this in remembrance of Me"!

Does it not appear then that Jesus instituted the Supper, I say it in all reverence, for His benefit? We insist on the benefit we derive but that is secondary to Christ's desire for our remembrance and worship. We should gather, not primarily to gain some good, but to offer praise to Him Who is our Redeemer and has already gained for us in that the greatest good. This applies equally to Baptism. We need not deny that grace is received by the worshipper. The Spirit is always present when any meet in sincerity and truth to worship their God *as He directs*. But we must emphasise not our private desire for gain but our submission to our God Who first loved us and redeemed us for Himself.

It is a striking anomaly that this very aspect of the Communion is recognised and maintained in that church from which we have derived the commoner view. The elaborate paraphernalia and ceremony that attend celebration of the Mass is worship, as they understand it, of God. The robes, bells, genuflexions and "incense own a deity nigh," incarnate, so they aver, in bread and wine. In so far as all this recognises that the presence of God compels and demands our worship it is true and right and must, as such, receive our commendation—but it is a feeble expression of it. What God requires of us is the sacrifice of a broken and contrite heart, truth and sincerity of spirit. This it is we ought above all to offer God at the Supper and Baptism, remembering and identifying ourselves with our Lord Jesus Christ. We are to yield ourselves to Him Who is worthy of our all, Who has blessed and benefited us beyond our full comprehension in dying for us. This then we perceive to be the purpose and meaning of the ordinances; that therein we dedicate ourselves to our Master, initially in Baptism and by a constant and frequent renewal at the Lord's Supper. It is our response to His goodness and a vivid portrayal of the means of our redemption, evoking in us praise and worship. We are blessed in that inevitably, and certainly receive more than we give; yet this must remain the prime meaning. We give ourselves because He asks it of us. So these have a distinctive character, marking them off from all other meetings of the church. Let us then call our people to observe them, not in gainful mood, but yielding themselves to Christ, expectant that He will come to us, and in His coming enriched and blessed as none other can be.

L. A. READ.

THE TEST OF GREATNESS IN THE  
CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

IT is difficult to define what is meant by greatness. We are too prone to speak as though a little more cleverness, a larger measure of success, an assertion of authority, are indications of greatness. I am anxious to ascertain if possible how we are to evaluate Christian ministry. There must be criteria by which we measure real and lasting greatness.

What, I wonder, constitutes greatness in a scientist? Science rightly considered is the search for truth or reality. The truly great scientist is he whose mind is acute enough to recognise significant truth. Newton is regarded as one of the greatest scientists of all time because he saw clearly the fact of uniformity of law throughout the universe. Einstein may have modified certain aspects of Newtonian physics, but the Newtonian conception of the universe is fundamental to modern science. It is a necessary part of scientific greatness to be able to impart the aspects of reality so clearly discerned.

When we come to inquire what is expected in a philosopher to claim greatness for him, it is surely that he is able to supply meanings for manifold facts, principles, experiences brought to light by science, history, human activities. It is the philosopher's task to show the outline of a universe of meaning amidst the phenomenal and transient phases of existence.

Plato is still regarded as supreme among philosophers because his meanings have stood the test of centuries of testing—intellectual and practical. Reality may not be exhausted by his description of it as Truth, Beauty, Goodness, but his interpretation cannot be ignored or set aside. Here again you have the gift to see clearly and to make others share the vision illustrating the nature of real greatness. The degree of greatness will depend upon the importance of the vision, and its influence upon thought, experience, action. When we come to think of the test to determine who are supreme artists the canon of greatness is very similar. The great artist is he who is most sensitive to beauty and is able to make us feel something of the wonder of the sublime which is so vivid to him.

Beethoven makes us feel the beauty and poignancy of human experience. Raphael makes us feel the radiant spirituality of our Lord and the glory of true goodness. Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, out of their deep insight into human experience make us feel in spite of all life's vicissitudes and perplexities, what a magnificent thing it is to be human.

When we come to the Christian minister's vocation, are there not also tests to determine the essence of true greatness?

If I were asked to describe the essential characteristics of prophetic personality and function I should select a profound

consciousness of God, an overwhelming sense of the inviolability of the moral law, and the power to communicate this awareness of God, as well as the awe of the majesty of moral imperatives as being definitive.

I sometimes think that there is much confusion about the nature and function of the Christian ministry to-day.

We are expected to be scholars, men of affairs, social workers and much else beside. Some of us cannot hope to be what many people think we should be. Yet since we are called of God, we surely can be what He intends the ministry to be.

I suggest that the first requisite of the Christian ministry is that it should be able to make men intensely conscious of the Presence of the Lord Jesus Christ. This in fact is the prime ministry of the Holy Spirit and it is our privilege to share it with Him. This is why true Christian ministry could not begin until the Holy Spirit was given at Pentecost. Have we not been puzzled sometimes by the fact that ministers who seem to have all the gifts somehow do not impress? They give us no sense of God. We are very conscious of them but they do not make us aware of the Master. Then we have listened to others whose theology we deplore, who seem to lack every pulpit gift, yet they make us deeply aware of the Lord Jesus Christ.

On one occasion a Scottish scholar was induced to listen to Spurgeon. He was invited afterwards to give an opinion. He said, "That young man sits close to reality." Spurgeon had made that scholar very conscious of God. The secret of Spurgeon's power to bring men to decision lay in his ability to make them conscious of Christ in all His redemptive power and grace.

It was said of Alexander Maclaren that when he prayed publicly he lifted the congregation into the very Presence of God. This, to my mind, is great ministry.

During the Welsh Revival the most remarkable feature was that the very presence of Evan Roberts made people conscious of the Presence of God. As ministers we may emulate the scientists in our passion for truth; we may be able to deal effectively with present-day problems; we may be able to present an impressive system of Christian thought, but if we fail to make people aware of the Presence and Power of Christ, can it be claimed that our ministry is effective?

Thus when we consider what it was that won for certain preachers recognition as being truly great, it will be seen that they were great because they were able to mediate the Presence and Power of God. We may lack most of the gifts which command popularity, but the power to make people God-conscious depends upon quality of Christian experience, and this is possible for every one of us, seeing that we were called for this very purpose.

D. J. DAVIES.

## R.I.

**I** TEACH Scripture and Mathematics in a Grammar School, and the combination is not unusual. Many standard mathematical text books have been written by men in Orders. A professor of Semitic languages in the North, well known to us all, recently submitted to me a problem in geometry which he had solved when some of the maths. men of his University had been beaten by it.

While the greater part of my time is given to maths., I have more Scripture teaching than other members of the staff. During each week some 250 boys take Scripture with me. The R.C.s stay away, as also from prayers, even when we sing hymns by Newman or Faber. I cannot say I like the expression, Religious Instruction, especially in the abbreviated form as in the title of this paper and as it is commonly used. Much of my effort is to make the subject seem worth while. It is, in the minds of many boys, rather a Cinderella subject and in some schools the staff holds the same view. No marks are given and no official examination is held, neither does it form part of the School Leaving or Higher examinations, and therefore it must make its appeal without any secondary support.

The attitude of the boys follows their development through the six years of school life. The younger are keen, but there is a falling off in enthusiasm as they reach adolescence. At that stage there is an attitude of indifference or at least an assumption of indifference. It is bad form to show enthusiasm, especially as the value of Scripture for business and professional careers is obviously negligible, at least, so they reason.

It would be wrong to suggest that the work is a dreary, uphill task, and even if it is so at times there are explanations. Many lads, for instance, come from homes where there is no contact with Church or Sunday School. Sunday is the day for odd jobs, games, and the pictures and the pools. They therefore bring a mind pitifully ignorant of the Bible and the kindred subjects such as ethics, philosophy or the history of religion. There is an enormous hiatus, all the more marked because in other subjects the average grammar school boy is so smart.

Some boys' acquaintance with the Bible is limited to a few of its salacious details so-called—such as the reason for John the Baptist's death.

Not all the boys are from homes that have given up religious profession. And, let me add, where there is this ignoring of religious practice there is often a refreshing and gratifying generosity and nobility of personal conduct. The "mediate" effect of Christianity has not yet been blacked out. I have a sprinkling of clergymen's sons and some Salvationists from what may be called fundamentalist homes, and these must sometimes think me a

rather dangerous and unsound guide. Other boys pose as agnostics or even atheists, but I welcome this as better than a languid indifference. It would be incorrect to ascribe their views to the study of such writers as Joad. Joad is simply not read. The boys have licked up a few tags from conversations with their equally ill-informed seniors. Uncle, back from India, had a talk with a Buddhist priest, on the strength of which he assures his nephew that all religions are equally good or bad, equally false or true. There is no God because He cannot be seen in any laboratory. Religion is false because some religious people have been cruel. God, if there be a God, expects nothing much of any of us except kindness. All this is familiar enough to those who visit the parks on a Sunday. Part of my task is to disentangle the ideas so muddled, so pathetic and doubtless, at times, so sincere. I cannot pretend my touch has been inerrant. The threads have sometimes greatly puzzled me in their complexity but I have tried to distinguish the essential ones.

One rule has guided me—I have always, when criticising a principle, doctrine or practice, envisaged at the back of the class the most sincere and competent supporter of that view. He is there to call me to order if I am tempted to an evasion, misinterpretation or a merely superficial argument. These imaginary representatives of the other side sit there in watchful dignity. A Joad, or a Lord Russell, is present. A Jewish scholar (non-Christian) dignifies the classroom. There is a Buddhist saint, a Confucianist or a Mohammedan Oxford graduate who still holds to his father's faith. Doubtless some readers may fear that the presence of these ghostly critics is likely to detract from a splendid opportunity of making a Christian appeal. I respect their opinion, but I differ. The boys are present because the subject is compulsory. Most would stay away if they could. They come from homes that stand for an enormous range of conviction or, alas, grades of indifference or hostility. My duty is to try to show the boys how the religious instinct has worked and is working in divers ways. I express my own conviction as to the finality of the Christian revelation and the supreme claims and Personality of its Founder, but anything in the way of a missionary's approach or Sunday School appeal would be almost a breach of trust and privilege.

I have not indicated in detail how the lessons proceed. In Kent, we keep to the Sunderland Report of Religious Education, though to carry it out fully needs more time than is at our disposal. During a boy's years with us I try to give him an introduction to the noblest parts of the O.T., a closer study of one of the Gospels and the Acts, the knowledge of some great passages from the Epistles and, arising therefrom, an outline of the world's great faiths and some excursions into ethics and philosophy. Sometimes an incident in the school provides ground for discussion, or something in the newspapers. Care is needed here, for mental

palates are too often ruined by the craze for the morbid and sensational.

The work has surprising extensions. One boy's mother gave me some beautiful pictures of the life of Christ which belonged to her dead brother "who had been an earnest Christian" (I had thought of the lad as coming from a not too responsive home). One boy revealed his desire to enter the Church. The Vice-Captain of the School recently recited to me some simple and earnest verses about influence. No, he was not pulling my leg; thirty years of teaching have made me able to detect that kind of thing. The question of survival after death always evokes attention. Too many families have lost dear ones for any cynicism or indifference here. My senior boys, when introduced to some example of non-Biblical inspiration, were much impressed by Plato's assurance of personal immortality as shown at the end of the *Phaedo*.

The work is not easy; teaching mathematics is much easier. Even a man of the highest qualities of mind and character might be far from an ideal teacher of the subject. I have said that I object to the title of Religious Instruction, for we cannot instruct in religion in the sense that, say, chemistry can be taught. The character of the teacher gravely affects his representation of the subject. He could teach some Old Testament history even if he were in an abominable temper, but that would not be R.I. He could teach the history of Israel in a mood of seraphic charm, but that also would not be R.I., though the charm might be, at least in part. Really, every teacher is an R.I. teacher in the ultimate and unique sense, but the one who is specifically detailed to that duty has a rather better opportunity of making a failure or a success of the undertaking.

If any can help by advice I shall be grateful. The editors would pass on letters or perhaps print some in *The Fraternal*.  
*Docendo discimus.*

L. T. COMBER.

---

### MORE R.I.

**I** TOO, teach in a Grammar School, both mathematics and the Bible, and my boys are much like those Mr. Comber meets. They think for the most part that Christianity is a "wash-out," and Bible teaching waste of time, and it is something of a thrill to show them that nothing is more up to date or more on the spot for the modern world.

Boys can understand quite well that the main problem of the world is that of living together, whether in international affairs, or in industrial or domestic life; and the simple fact is that, while the world has found no answer, we have one. The way men found it in bygone years can be illustrated by stories from life to-day.

A teacher apologised to a colleague for her hostility, and found her dislike vanished and a bond of friendship formed. A master apologised to a boy in front of the form for sarcasm, and won confidence in place of dislike. It is the way of a change of heart, a new attitude to people, goodwill instead of bitterness.

The necessity of teaching the Bible in school goes far beyond the aim of leading children to good and happy lives for themselves. The fact is that the whole world, with Britain included, is in the gravest danger of being dominated by materialistic Communism. In particular that threat hangs over the schools. The *Spectator* of 3rd October, 1947, pointed out that "it is essential for the purpose of Communism to create or extend chaos everywhere. It is by fishing in troubled waters that Communism prospers. Therefore the waters must be troubled wherever they can be." Communism is militant. It stands for class war, and incites to it by sowing the seeds of hatred. It has a materialistic philosophy which denies the validity of the absolute standards of Christianity. It has a plan, carefully made and steadily worked to, to disrupt, to weaken and ride to power. This world force of materialism has penetrated every nation. It has infiltrated the schools, the universities. It has influenced our families, our colleagues, and even ourselves.

One of my friends tells me of two Communists who have left factory work for school teaching because there they can spread their ideas more effectively. Another teacher tells me of a man who, for a similar reason, moved from school teaching to a training college. Others have had experience of Communists spreading distrust and dissension in the common room, and doing all they can to propagate Communist ideas. One way of weakening the country is to attack moral standards in regard to sex, and there is evidence of this being done in schools in a variety of ways, by throwing contempt on Christian ideals, by dirty jokes, and by the unconcealed example of an immoral life. All materialism coming out in the lives of teachers plays into the Communist's hand. There are men who stand for "rights," and not doing more than they are paid for. On the sex question I have heard "free love" for boys and girls seriously advocated. For the Bible and religion there is ridicule, and suggestion, backed by superficial reasoning, that science has long ago disposed of such things.

This is a time of war, ideological war, war between two ways of life. If Christians are apathetic and without plan they stand to be defeated and the freedom won through centuries lost. Plan must be met with plan and passion with passion. It has been done in the schools and can be done again. We need to send more and more of our best men and women from the churches into the schools, there to win boys and girls to the Christian way by the love and power of devoted and inspired lives. Further, we must encourage Christian teachers to take their places in

positions of responsibility for the profession, and ensure that teachers' associations are not dominated by an energetic, subversive minority. Christian men and women must be found, too, to serve on the local councils and governing bodies which control the schools.

The situation is one of utmost urgency, and Baptists ought to be in the lead in planning to get more and more men and women of the right type into the schools and into positions where they can affect educational policy.

C. G. CARPENTER.

---

## THE FAMILY

**T**HE Family is a primitive institution and its survival through long ages, only to be attacked in our own day, makes it imperative to study again the question whether it has still a place of importance in the community or whether the breakdown is complete.

The patriarchal Hebrew society, although fundamentally monogamous, yet compelled a man to realise immortality in the birth of a son, and it was his duty, if childless by his wife, to seek a concubine to bear him a son, provided that in so doing no harm was done to any other man. This double standard of morality gave to a man greater licence than to a woman.

Christianity, however, taught the single standard of morality, recognising that both men and women are equally culpable in misdemeanour and equally responsible in marriage.

And now in an age of problems relating to family stability, conscription, housing, war-time marriages, lack of parental control, prolonged separation of husband from wife, big wages for boys and girls, the emancipation of women whose interests divide between home and job, in such an age we find ourselves faced with the disintegration of family life and the introduction of a new single standard of morality without Christian sanctions and encouraged under various philosophical and other disguises.

The Christian tradition of the importance of the family became a political tradition also from as early as the fourteenth century. The Habeas Corpus Act defended the family against the State and settled the question that the Englishman's home was his castle. Children were trained to fear God and honour the King, and all enjoyed the beginnings of liberty. But men advanced in other directions, inventing new devices. Enlightened self-interest ran riot and young children worked long hours in factories and were pushed up chimneys to sweep them. Christian outspokenness forced State control which grew until in war children were evacuated, and parents joining the forces left their children, and it seemed as if the very liberty preached in the great Renaissance period had

itself made possible the disintegration of the family, and the coming of a pseudo-freedom to do as you like, and what is done by one person is entirely his own affair.

We are now faced by such facts as are given by Dr. Mace of the Marriage Guidance Council that :—

One in four first conceptions is outside of marriage.

There are 150,000 abortions annually (one in every five births).

One in every six unmarried women has abandoned her chastity.

And these statistics take no account of happenings inside of marriage.

Or again, the divorce rate has increased from twenty-four in 1857 when divorce with the right of remarriage was made legal, up to 8,000 in 1938 when the Herbert Act became law to 14,000 in 1943, 38,000 in 1946 and, to quote Lord Jowitt, there will be over 50,000 in 1947.

The necessity for action has been recognised by the State and the recommendations of the Denning Committee have been made public (H.M. Stationery Office, 6d.) where the Marriage Guidance Council is specifically mentioned as one of the responsible bodies able to help implement the report.

All this is strong evidence of the damage done. We encounter thousands of men and women who, having failed in marriage, are thrown out into society to cope with their emotional and sexual problems as best they can and at the same time bequeathing a legacy of maladjustment to a future generation.

A Sunday School teacher explaining God to her class said : " God is our Father," and a boy replied : " I don't want any father—mine beats my mother and me." How can we rid the world of such tragic beginnings ?

It is significant that the prime moments in the life of a family—birth, marriage and death—still acquire a religious meaning; there is still a sense of mystery, and awe, which sends a family to church. An implicit recognition that at these points in his history, man is dependent.

It would appear, therefore, that what is needed to redeem modern home life is an extension of the hold which these three high moments have upon the family. At these times we preach the gospel of God's redeeming love. For Christians the problem must first be worked out in the common dwelling, around a common table, in the sharing of household duties and in our own homes. In the learning together to pray and to worship at the family altar so that the child passes out not only from home to school but from home to Church to find a place in the great family of God.

As a consultant for the Marriage Guidance Council I have for years watched experts attempting to prevent the queue of break-downs from getting longer, and doing it successfully, but the best antidote is Christianity exemplified in the family circle. The best

recipe for a successful married life is a stable home life and a happy childhood.

In the family the religion of Christ, Who is Love, should be demonstrated as nowhere else. In this most intimate of all human relationships, we should be able to see a picture of the Love of God for man expressing itself in a human life and triumphing through suffering and death.

KENNETH C. PARKINSON.

---

### A "D.P." IN GERMANY

**B**Y birth and nationality I am a Latvian. I lived and laboured in Riga, Latvia, till the autumn of 1944.

I am a displaced person in Germany now. This means that I am without a country, without a home, and also, to a certain extent, without human rights. I do not know what the world is going to do with me in the future.

I lodge with my family—we are four—in what is called the Baltic D.P. Camp. I live together with thousands of my own countrymen and also with great numbers of Estonians and Lithuanians.

Camp life is not meant for civilised human beings. It disintegrates men and women, boys and girls, and often it happens that they simply go to pieces spiritually, morally, and physically.

We lodge in one of the many wooden huts. There are altogether ten families in our hut. We occupy one small room, which serves as bedroom, sitting-room, dining-room, children's room, and a kitchen. Oh, yes! it is also my "study." This little room has one window, one door, one table, one chair, one ward-and-cupboard, three beds. When the only chair is occupied, usually by a guest, the rest of the family is sitting on the beds.

We are happy when there is spring or summer out-of-doors. The children then can run about almost naked and barefooted. The only window can be kept open day and night. When there is too much sunshine as it is this summer, we feel as if we were living somewhere near the equator. It is so hot in the little room that you simply cannot stand it. The sun comes in through the window all the afternoon and evening; it makes the low roof of the hut very warm. You sit on your bed and big drops of sweat roll down your face.

Round about the camp there is plenty of white sand. When the wind is blowing, the sand covers everything in the room. Then you imagine that the desert of Sahara must be somewhere in the vicinity.

The only window is being kept open day and night in summer. One night I had a terrible nightmare. I dreamt that something very heavy was pressing my chest. When I awoke to find out what

it was, it was—our neighbour's cat sitting on me and keeping watch for the mice. Yes, during the day we have to live and exist, but at night we fight mice and insects!

We are unhappy when autumn or winter is out-of-doors. Then the children have to stay indoors most of their time. The only window then must be kept shut, as it cannot be simply opened when there is frost outside.

The wooden hut is so delicate that it cannot keep the cold out. There is a little stove in the room. To keep ourselves warm we must heat the stove all the day round. But there is not so much fuel. Then we put on our overcoats and sit in them.

Food has to be prepared in the same room, it means that there is plenty of dampness too. Under such circumstances it is no wonder that about thirty per cent. of the D.P. children are T.B. sufferers.

The walls that separate one room from the other in the same hut are made of cardboard. You can hear all that is going on in your neighbour's room, and your neighbour again knows all about you. If I want to say something to my wife or children that should remain secret, I must do it in whispers.

We have two children, a girl of seven years and a boy of four. They must be admonished and restrained sometimes. Our neighbours have children too. They too are being scolded and admonished. Sometimes it all happens at the same moment, so you can imagine what kind of "peace" rules in a D.P. hut.

If anybody has a wireless set, it usually is turned on in the morning and switched off about midnight.

There is no quiet corner in your little room at all. I can hardly concentrate my thoughts on what I am reading. To have a quiet devotional period with my family—almost impossible. In summer I go outside the camp somewhere and take a quiet time for myself, but in winter—only the hours of the dark night are mine. So I meditate and pray in darkness when I am in my bed and when I cannot go to sleep, because the thoughts about past and future keep sleep away for hours.

Life within the camp is rather discouraging. The use of alcohol is widely spread. Where people get strong drink is difficult to say. Plenty of immorality can be found in the camp. German women come and go as "guests" and remain whole nights in the rooms occupied by men only. Venereal diseases too are widely spread. There are larger rooms in barracks and block-houses where many families and individuals live together. The "night visiting" in such rooms is most harmful. There are young women with one or two children. These poor children will never know their fathers.

Believe me, it is not easy to live in a D.P. camp in Germany. But in spite of all, there are fine, good people in the camp who help to make life bearable. In spite of all that I have mentioned we are glad that we are still in the land of the living! These are great

times to be alive. Changes have come already and are coming in the future all over the world; and all kinds of experiences during my refugee years have brought about some radical changes within me too. I have forgotten all the difference there exists between Modernism and Fundamentalism. I have forgotten many things about Barthianism and something else that I knew quite well when I lived in my homeland, but I haven't forgotten that I am and must be a Christian. My theology is my life now.

My present aim is to walk, by the help of God, before my countrymen in a way so that they can see that there is a Power which helps one to be honest and unselfish, and good-tempered, not to use bad language, keep nerves under restraint, etc.

There are more D.P. camps in and about Lübeck. In each of them there are some Baptists. We come together every Sunday for divine worship at the German Baptist chapel in the town. We have our own services in the afternoon when we do everything in our own mother-tongue.

On weekdays I teach English to the D.P.s. I have organised evening classes for adults.

I am also a Y.M.C.A. man. I organised the Latvian Y.M.C.A. section in the camp and was the temporary chairman of the group for some time. I participate in the gatherings with talks on popular themes and so I get listeners by hundreds. I use this splendid opportunity to tell the people something about the living religion, about the all-loving Heavenly Father.

My wife is a Girl Guide leader in the camp. She collects the young girls and tries to teach them the meaning of a good life. So you see, we try to keep ourselves busy and in this way we forget the heaviness of the camp life and are still, thank God, alive spiritually, morally, and physically.

---

## THE MAGAZINE

THE present issue consists of forty pages, a size we hope to keep if funds permit. The increase is possible owing to the loyal response from our members, many of whom have contributed 5s. and 10s., also to increased revenue from advertisements. We acknowledge continued support from our advertisers, all of whom have renewed for 1948 and we are glad to see testimonies that their outlay has produced results. Please note our advertisement columns. Every minister, for instance, should endeavour to increase the circulation of the *Baptist Times*. A *Baptist Times* in every Baptist home. The publication department is able in a variety of ways to supply Church needs. Pay a visit to the greatly enlarged premises or send a letter to the ever-courteous Mr. C. H. Parsons. The splendid service of the Commonwealth Society will be more vivid because of our largely increased overseas membership, and that of the Continental Fund is sadly illustrated by the article from "A Displaced Person." Here are Mission Fields which our ministers should make known to their churches. The Sunday School Union and the C.E. Union—of which latter our own Andrew Wright is Secretary—make a graphic appeal as we travel down the pathway of the years to our own Sunday School and Christian Endeavour days. Please support the work that has meant so much to ourselves and to the church. The quarterly message from Mr. Seymour Price is of interest, not only to our home ministry, but to friends across the seas where, perhaps, there is no denominational insurance company. In 1948, the Home Work Fund will be advocated by B. Grey Griffith, whose drive and leadership has made a difference to nearly every Baptist manse in the country. Both these pages are taken at advertisement rates. Finally, Wolsey Hall, our oldest client, again appears, partly because of the influence of John Pitts, a prominent member of the staff. Most ministers taking the B.U. examination use Wolsey Hall, and its valuable aid is available for ministers and others who may contemplate studying for University degrees. Do please place business with our advertisers and so help them to help us.

The present number is printed by a new firm but we cannot part from Messrs. Morton Burt and Co. without a word of appreciation for their services over many years. It was only the abnormal increase in costs which made it imperative for us to try elsewhere.

So we face another year of service to the ministry, praying that the Magazine and the Fellowship may be channels through which God's blessing may reach our increasing and widening circle.

## OUR APRIL ISSUE

The General Superintendents have kindly made themselves responsible for the next *Fraternal*. The issue will be edited by A. J. Klaiber, and Mr. Aubrey will contribute a Foreword. We anticipate an interesting issue.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*A History of the English Baptists.* A. C. Underwood, D.D.  
(Kingsgate Press. 12s. 6d.)

This is a very welcome book, and I understand it is being welcomed, and that deservedly. I saw it being read by a woman in a railway compartment, and in conversation she told me that it surprised her that the story was so interesting. That is a tribute not only to the story but to the writing. And to-day a young minister informs me that he intends to make it a basis for address and discussion at his Young People's Meetings. The publishers' advertisement claims that this is no "dry as dust" treatment, and the reading of the book verifies the claim.

Dr. Underwood tells our story from the first days. I am glad that he gives a place to the Mennonites and Anabaptists, though he says that "Anabaptism cannot be regarded as the seed plot of the English Baptists' movement, whose origin must be sought elsewhere and is to be found in these native Englishmen, who carried the principles of the English Reformation to their logical conclusion."

And so through eight chapters Dr. Underwood tells of our beginnings, both of General and Particular Baptists, our growth in the years 1640-1660, followed by Persecution, and then with decline and Revival to consolidation, and a last chapter on the events and outlook more near to our time.

So far as I am competent to judge, no great movement is omitted, and no salient fact overlooked. Certainly the facts are many and yet the "wood" is not lost for "the trees." This is due to the clear writing and the style that conceals style. Perhaps this is further due to the fact that we are kept all the time in close touch with real persons, and, led by Dr. Underwood, not only to note their deeds and read the words, but also to understand their thoughts and motives.

Occasionally I differ from him in opinion, and less occasionally on the facts. For example, I think it is a little unfair to Timothy Thomas to say that "Booth was the only London minister to give it (the Missionary Society) any support." Neither would I use the word "genial" to characterise Fuller's correspondence with the Serampore Triumvirate. "Intimate," if you like. And, while agreeing with the presentation of the facts (necessarily limited in scope) concerning the "melancholy" controversy between the Committee of the Society and Serampore, it must not be thought that the trouble arose simply because "Metropolitan influence now became dominant." Of the thirty-five members of Committees mentioned on page 197, the great majority were from the provinces and even on the Central Committee there were

representatives from Oxford, Cambridge, Northampton, Maidstone, Reading, Norwich, and other places, in addition to London. This, however, is a small matter compared with the excellencies of this "History." There should be a copy in every church.

Our thanks are due to Dr. Underwood.

B. GREY GRIFFITH.

*Oslo Calling.* By Mabel Small and Norman J. Bull.  
(The Religious Education Press, Wallington, Surrey;  
93 pp., 2s. net.)

The authors and publishers can be congratulated on issuing this inspiring account so soon after the conclusion of the second World Christian Youth Conference at Oslo in July. Despite limitations of space the descriptions given of the conference are really vivid. You would think you were there. Further, the gist of the main addresses and the subjects discussed in the group meetings is a remarkable bit of condensation, for it still manages to convey the chief ideas of the conference. The book brings Oslo to the ordinary young persons in our churches who would like to have gone but were unable to go. They can share its thought and its spirit by means of this book in their Fellowships and C.E. Societies. There are questions to discuss and practical issues arising out of the conference in which they can share as they follow the suggestions made. It will be useful preparatory reading for Amsterdam, 1948.

*A Theology for Youth.* By Henry David Gray, Ph.D. (Religious Education Press, Wallington, Surrey; 144 pp.; 5s. net.)

This book is written by one who approaches theology with the scientific outlook. It is a clear, workman-like statement of the main doctrines of the Christian faith and is written in language that will be readily understood by young people. On the whole it is a fair presentation, avoiding the extremes of modernism and literalism. It is particularly useful in showing the new interpretation and value that the scientific approach has given to the study of the Bible.

It is inevitable that the attempt to cover so much ground in so small a space should leave some subjects inadequately treated. This is noticeable especially in the summary of the life and work of Jesus; in the discussion of the divine-human elements in Christ, where a statement of some of the classic theories of the two natures would have been helpful; and in the treatment of sin and the Cross, where the author gives most emphasis to the subjective and revelatory aspects.

Baptists will find the much-too-brief paragraph on Baptism unsatisfying and poor, and at least one section of the Church of England would want to dissent from the suggestion that that Church

does not hold the theory of apostolic succession. As a book to set young people thinking, this is one to welcome, and it is made all the more valuable by the inclusion of well-chosen questions for discussion at the end of each chapter.

*Christ is Alive!* By G. R. Beasley-Murray. (Lutterworth Press; 178 pp.; 7s. 6d. net.)

The author, one of our own members, has done a timely work in setting out clearly the evidences of the Resurrection and the implications of that event for Christian faith and life. Taking the moderate, critical view of the documents of the New Testament, he examines the data carefully and marshals his arguments with refreshing vigour. There is an obvious (and acknowledged) dependence on Mr. Frank Morison's *Who Moved the Stone?* but the author brings much independent thought to his task. His enthusiasm leads him at times into doubtful generalisations. The later chapters, reprints of articles, add to the value of a book which preachers will welcome and which, incidentally, deserves an index.

---