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

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

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY

incorporating the Transactions of the BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITORIAL

THE Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society was held during the Assembly of the Baptist Union in the lounge at Bloomsbury Central Church under the chairmanship of Mr. Seymour J. Price. Having served as Secretary for ten years, Rev. Graham W. Hughes asked to be relieved of the office, and in his place the members elected Rev. W. M. S. West, D.Theol., tutor at Regent's Park College, Oxford. As from the issue of January, 1958, the editorship of the *Baptist Quarterly* will also pass to Dr. West, who will be assisted by an editorial board. In April, 1958, the Society will be celebrating its jubilee, and it is hoped that this anniversary will receive worthy notice at the Assembly. The other officers were re-elected but, in order to give the officers time to prepare plans for improved methods of election, it was agreed not to appoint a committee for the present year. A much appreciated reminiscent address, recalling the persons, ideas and books which had influenced his life and thought, was delivered with characteristic wit and wisdom by Rev. B. Grey Griffith.

* * * *

Up to now the *Baptist Quarterly* has occupied a unique position in the literature of the Baptists of the world. Its claim to be the only journal of its kind will be challenged next year, however, by the changes which are announced to take place in the *Chronicle* of the American Baptist Convention. Beginning with next January's issue the *Chronicle* is to be re-named *Foundations,* doubled in size and

devoted to Baptist history and theology. In the editorship Dr. George D. Younger will succeed Mr. R. E. E. Harkness, who has been editor of the *Chronicle* since it was founded twenty years ago. Eight others, including Dr. Winthrop S. Hudson, will be associated in the direction of the journal, and in addition a business manager and circulation manager have also been appointed. From the position we have hitherto occupied in solitary splendour we send our greetings to our friends of the American Baptist Historical Society and good wishes for the success of their new venture.

* * * *

Meanwhile the ever enterprising Historical Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention have sent to their printers the last set of manuscripts for the *Encyclopaedia of Southern Baptists,* which is planned to appear early next year. Under the direction of Dr. Norman W. Cox 899 contributors and 57 editorial assistants have long been hard at work preparing this two-volumed publication for the press. It will include 4,349 articles and some 90 pages of pictures and will be published by the Broadman Press. We join with our friends of the Southern Baptist Historical Commission in looking forward to the appearance of what promises to be a most valuable work.

* * * *

The way in which many of our churches date their anniversaries is quite irresponsible. They appear to be incapable of distinguishing between the beginning of a cause, the erection of a building and the formation of a church. The dates supplied to the Baptist Union for inclusion in the Handbook are often wildly inaccurate, and the claims made for the age of a church can sometimes be almost fantastic. We know of churches which have held centenary, bi-centenary and similar celebrations, with special meetings, guest speakers, elaborate literature—linked, of course, to a big financial appeal—without having the slighest right to do so, because the date they commemorate is in fact that on which meetings were first held or when a building was put up. If they would only say so everything would be in order. But these events are called Church Anniversaries and, in blissful ignorance of the truth, distinguished denominational leaders, invited to adorn the proceedings, congratulate the churches concerned upon the great event and make eloquent speeches appropriate to the supposed occasion. The anniversary of a church has nothing whatever to do with the date when a building was erected or when meetings were first held, but is the anniversary of the date on which an independent, self-governing church was formally constituted. It is a pity that something cannot be done to put a stop to these "phoney" anniversaries and all our churches learned what is the difference between a chapel, a congregation and a church.

John Howard Shakespeare, 1857-1928

An address delivered at a service in St. Mary's Church, Norwich, to commemorate the centenary of his birth.

WE are here to pay a tribute of gratitude and affection to the memory of a truly great man, who would have reached eminence in many walks of life. He chose the Baptist ministry, and his denomination in this country and overseas owes him an immeasurable debt.

This is not an occasion for any exhaustive biographical account of what Dr. Shakespeare was and achieved. That would take a book. We must be content with a brief and inadequate appraisal of the influence of a full and immensely fruitful life. But it is now 74 years ago since he began his notable ministry in Norwich. Memories are short and few of us can go back so far. It is surely well to recount a few of the outstanding facts, that those of us who belong to a later generation may realize what sort of man he was whom God gave to be our leader, and the measure of his accomplishment. In the memoirs of Sir Geoffrey Shakespeare, his distinguished son, *Let Candles be brought in,* there is a beautiful and moving chapter, telling of his father and something of the work he did, which is worth reading many times.

Shakespeare described himself in his book, *The Churches at the Cross-roads,* a noble plea for the closer union of the Churches, and especially of the Free Churches, as having been reared "a Baptist of the Baptists, a dissenter of the dissenters." He confesses that as a child he was surprised that any intelligent person could be anything else. The idea of attending a church of another denomination never entered the minds of those among whom he was brought up. In his home novels were banned and, outside the Bible, his boyhood's reading was mainly confined to John Bunyan. "The chapel was the be-all and the end-all of everything." His father was a Baptist minister and so was his grandfather who worked in a village, like Goldsmith's parson, "on forty pounds a year." Dr. Shakespeare himself described the little meeting-house, the walls of which he could almost span with his outstretched arms, as "holy ground," so real and intense had been the worship there. But even in the

"sweet and saintly" spirit of his devout mother, no thought of Christian unity seemed to exist.

He tells us that the influence of Joseph Parker and Hugh Price Hughes gave him a new breadth of view and quickly he responded to it.

He began work as a youth with an insurance company. Maybe that was why, many years later, with the help of strong laymen, he caused to be founded the Baptist Insurance Company, which now gives good service to nearly all our Baptist churches. He sat a Civil Service examination and failed, not for lack of ability, but because his fingers, when he tried to write his answers, would not hold the pen and he sent in an almost blank paper. Some of us may be cheered to know that such a thing could happen to a man of such mental power. It consoled me when I read it! What the Civil Service lost, our ministry gained. How many of us ascribe our setbacks to the will of God? Shakespeare did. The hand of the Lord was in it. He was too much a realist to doubt his capacity. The failure meant that God was leading him somewhere else.

He had joined a London church and been baptized. Now he set his face to the Christian ministry. He entered Regent's Park College. As a student he had a distinguished career, with high honours, and in the London University M.A. examination came fourth in all England. He was invited, as a student, to St. Mary's Church, Norwich, to fill temporarily the gap left by the death of its minister, George Gould. His work and personality created such an impression that very soon he was asked unanimously to undertake the charge. Thus he entered into a great succession, following Kinghorn and Brock as well as Gould, a succession greatly maintained until this present time. His preaching was eloquent, dramatic, intensely evangelical and marked with great power. Around him was a company of fine laymen. The names of George White, Hewlett, Jewson, Harry Gould, Willis, Culley, ring bells still.

He threw himself into the religious life of the city and organized a united Free Church mission under the lead of Hugh Price Hughes. Its success made him realize what the churches in unity could do. Thus was born the vision that was to beckon and guide him through many years.

POWERFUL LEADERSHIP

When Dr. Booth, the secretary of the Baptist Union, resigned in 1898, Baptists turned to the young Norwich minister and he was appointed to the vacant post by the Assembly with unanimity. He had already given proof of his quality in a striking address on church extension.

The Union has now come to take a large place in the life of the denomination and of the Christian world. It is difficult for

anyone who knows it today to realize how completely different the picture was then. It was housed in three rather dingy rooms in the old Baptist Mission House. It had no home of its own. It was poorly regarded even by some of the great men of the Mission House who viewed with doubt, and perhaps even a little resentment (for even missionary statesmen are human), the energetic actions of the young secretary who led the Union into a larger place in the thought and life of the churches.

It is not easy now to imagine the obstacles in his way. The denomination had been split in two by a controversy which caused its most illustrious minister, Spurgeon, to sever his connection and that of his church with the Union. He had died six years before, but his followers were many and the feud had gone on. Feelings had been embittered, not so much among the great leaders such as Spurgeon and Archibald Brown on one side and Clifford, McLaren, and Richard Glover on the other, for they always kept a high regard for one another, but among lesser men whose partizanship outran their Christianity. Happily those days are past. Spurgeon's College and his great church are again within the Baptist Union. But Shakespeare had to walk warily during his whole term of office. It has been said that, if he had been secretary when the trouble first arose, his conciliatory statesmanship would have made short work of it. Be that as it may, it cannot be doubted that, as no other man, he fostered the work of healing and, before he left office, the breach had been largely mended. His powerful leadership, personality and persuasiveness drew about him practically all the leading ministers and laymen in our churches, and he converted a denomination, in which the "dissidence of dissent," an independency that at times approached isolationism, was almost a fetish among large sections, into a united and harmonious instrument for combined action in furthering the purposes of the Kingdom of God.

He did it, not by weak compliance with disgruntled and mistrustful adversaries but by bold action, the results of which nobody could gainsay. He won over devoted friends of Spurgeon like John Wilson, Cuff, Gange, Hiley, Greenwood and many others who stood beside him and gave him full-hearted support. They realized his devotion, caught his vision and, with laymen like George White, Herbert Marnham, John Horsfall and John Chivers, marched with him.

Triumph followed triumph. He gave the denomination a new self-respect and confidence. His burning spirit shone like a beacon. When he spoke it was with mastery of his subject and of his audience. I heard him first when my father took me, as a boy, of about sixteen, to Cardiff to hear him and John Clifford speak for the Twentieth Century Fund Appeal. The impression is vivid still of his fine presence, his advocacy and his intensity.

That fund of over a quarter of a million pounds was a daring venture. Baptists had never before attempted anything on such a scale in the home field. They were a bit staggered by their own temerity and could hardly believe it. But they confounded the faint-hearted prophets and surprised themselves. Shakespeare's first big battle had been won. The fund was there, the Church House was built, first steps taken toward evangelisation and church extension, the more worthy maintenance of the ministry, the help in a very limited way of aged ministers and widows, and the encouragement by special scholarships of students seeking to equip themselves by advanced studies for the ministry. To us, all that may look far-off and unexciting, for we have grown used to such appeals and even larger funds. But then it seemed tremendous, and it was. In my own experience I know what it is to persuade a body like the Baptist Union Council to launch out in big efforts. When we got £300,000 for the Superannuation Fund I was warned by business men that, under prevailing conditions, more than half that amount was impossible. When we called for a million pounds in the grim thirties, just before the last war, even men like Dr. Reaveley Glover made speeches urging that we should make it only a hundred thousand. Quite a lot of folk thought it madness but we overshot the mark by more than a hundred thousand pounds. Persuading people to ask for money is a grim business even now, and after many successes. But Shakespeare had to start from nothing—with no victories behind him. God only knows what it must have cost him in toil and trouble. It meant sweat and blood.

A few years later the Sustentation Fund followed. Another quarter of a million pounds was oversubscribed. Its main significance was not in the money raised, but in the use Shakespeare made of it to raise the whole conception and standard of our ministry. He realized that he could not appeal to the laymen of the denomination to accept responsibility for the better support of the ministry without doing more to ensure that it should be adequate for its task. A scheme for ministerial recognition and settlement was put forward. Then the rain descended and the winds blew! It looked for a time as if the gale might not be weathered. There were objections to everything in the scheme, the idea of tests for ministerial candidates, of time-limits on pastorates to avoid the difficulties of good men outstaying their usefulness, of conditions of efficiency for grants-in-aid, of the appointment of General Superintendents as helpers and advisers of the churches and ministers. To some people these last-named seemed likely to be pompous and prelatical personages ruling the churches with iron hands. It looks a bit amusing after all these years, but fears were real. It needed almost endless discussion and negotiation before the scheme was approved. Shakespeare's patience was sorely tried, but when the lightnings

had blazed and the thunders rolled he was still there, on his course. But it had needed all his skill to bring his ship home.

Mention of lightning reminds me of an incident when he invited me to attend a meeting for organizing one of his campaigns. The question arose as to what the leaders in each section of the country might be called. They might be "agents," "leaders," "representatives," "captains" or what not. I saw him look at me, and with the temerity of youth I suggested that, as it was to be a "lightning" campaign we might call them "conductors." The meeting laughed but I don't think he forgave my flippancy for a bit, for these matters were very serious. We finally called them "commissioners," a very good name.

In God's providence he got his scheme and the collections through in time. Its provisions look scanty now but it meant a great deal then. It ensured a minimum stipend of £160 a year. When I left the Union that had risen to double the amount, and under Dr. Payne's fine guidance it has gone to £450 and may soon be £500. Even that is less than £10-a-week wages at which many manual workers would rebel. But with the outbreak of the first world war the assurance even of so small a stipend was a great matter.

That war showed another side of Shakespeare. The old army organization had no place for Free Church chaplains other than Wesleyan Methodists. He asked that some be appointed. Turned down at first, with Lloyd George's help he secured an interview with the formidable Kitchener, then Secretary of State for War. I should like to have been there. The upshot of it was that Kitchener found his match and gave way. A note (says Sir Geoffrey Shakespeare) was afterwards found on his desk: "Find out who these Baptists are." I have heard that another note was found on his desk: "Baptists—a sect of the Jews." If it is true (and I do not know the authority) I am sure it must have been written before the interview, for Shakespeare would not have left him with any such illusion!

Shakespeare had an officer son in the army in whom he had an immense pride, a bold, adventurous young Cambridge undergraduate. He used to attend the church of which I was minister. As he is to speak after me I will not be tempted to say more about him. But it is no wonder his father was interested in the welfare of soldiers and provided chaplains for them and a fine Institute in Aldershot. The chaplaincy work then begun assumed large proportions in the first world war, and even larger in the second when numbers swelled again, and it still goes on. Of the United Navy and Army Board for chaplaincy services Shakespeare became the first Chairman.

The first war over, he turned again to denominational fund raising. This time it was a United Fund shared with the Baptist Missionary Society. Again the quarter-million mark was passed.

Part of the interest of it is that women came in for the first time otherwise than as money-raisers. Shakespeare had encouraged and helped to organize the Baptist Women's League and one of the objects of the new fund was to found and equip a college for the training of deaconesses.

UNIFYING WORK

In 1905 he wrote a book on *Baptist and Congregational Pioneers*. In fifty years the world has moved on and I think he himself would regard it as a little out of date. But it is still a rewarding book to read for the account it gives of Free Church beginnings and for its glowing spirit. The soul of Nonconformity breathes in it. Let me give the lines from Lowell with which it ends.

True freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And with heart and hand to be
Earnest to make others free.
They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak:
They are slaves who will not choose
Hatred, scoffing and abuse
Rather than in silence shrink
From the truth they needs must think:
They are slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three.

That was his own spirit. As a young minister attending the Baptist Union Assembly, I can well remember him standing up in a critical gathering, in which it was plain that many had parted from him on the issue of Church unity and feared the way he was taking. Even the authority and prestige of John Clifford was on the other side, though no two men more honoured one another. Quietly but emphatically he ended his brief speech with the words: "I have chosen my path and I will stay in it." He was ready, like Athanasius, to stand alone against the whole world—a real Baptist!

In 1905 with Dr. Prestridge, of Louisville, Kentucky, he took steps to found the Baptist World Alliance, drafting its constitution and himself becoming its first European secretary. It has brought together the Baptists of the world. Last year's World Congress in London will be fresh in the minds of many readers. It was the ninth to be held and drew our people from all over the world.

In widening circles his unifying work went on. The compulsion of his soul did not stop at Baptists of Britain and the world. The evangelical fervour in his blood made intolerable the narrowness and rivalries he detected in the churches with the consequent waste

of resources and man-power. He became the apostle of Free Church unity. One of his greatest speeches was made in Norwich Guild Hall before the National Free Church Council. Following the line of his book, *The Free Churches at the Cross-roads,* it was a strident call to us to close our ranks, in face of moral, social and religious problems challenging churches and nation.

The appeal did not fall on utterly deaf ears, but the difficulties were great—traditionalism, denominational vested interests and self-satisfaction, questions of property. All showed up as excuses, but, as Shakespeare himself realized, there was also a firm core of denominational conviction, though he felt that this should not be an insuperable hindrance to the plan for one Free Church in England. It would have many autonomous parts yet be knit together by a common faith, in a fellowship transcending differences, and in the evangelistic task of taking Christ's Gospel to men. A divided Church, he held, could not save a broken world, which needed the healing touch. The task was urgent. He was scornful of those whose rule was "hasten slowly." The Churches were never likely to move too fast, and were rather in danger of being left behind like a lone, lost straggler in the onward march of mankind. He would not be told it was an impossible goal. The Church is always called to an impossible task, he declared.

The time was not ripe. He was disappointed to have to accept the way of federation rather than of union, and a loose federation at that. Yet out of his eagerness the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches was born, later to be merged with a reconstituted Free Church Council.

Looking back I cannot help feeling that the Free Churches have missed the way and the hour and taken a wrong turning. We seem no nearer Free Church unity than we were then. I fear something went out of the Free Church movement when the Federal Council ceased to be as a body directly representative of the Churches. There has been a lowering of tone and vigour. Most certainly we are very far from making our unity in Christ and in His service as effective as they ought to be, and I for one lament it. There were some who thought Shakespeare erred by trying to force the pace. I think they were wrong so far as Free Church unity is in question. We ought to have been readier, bolder, more willing for sacrifice, more eager to find life by losing it. We may have lost the golden hour and not find such another for generations. Be that as it may, my conviction is that of our leader we may say, if he made mistakes, "The light that led astray was light from heaven." To him the great aim was the Kingdom of God through the service of Christ's one holy Church.

Later, the vision became wider still. The gulf between the Free Churches and the Church of England was a challenge to the idea

of oneness in Christ. Could something not be done to bridge it? The *Appeal to all Christian People* of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 provided the occasion for an attempt to bring the Established Church and Nonconformists closer together. Many conferences were held. I was young, but Shakespeare was after the young men, and, by no means unwilling, I was pressed to attend meetings at Oxford, London, Mürren and Maloja in Switzerland, and other places. We foregathered sometimes with distinguished visitors even from America, but usually with dignitaries, scholars and laymen of the Church of England, to see how we might grow together. I have heard all this described as a waste of time. It was not. I do not regret a minute of it. We gave what we could and learned a great deal, and we were conscious of a Presence and a fellowship that brought us something forever. We were pathfinders or at least explorers. Others will come along and tread again the almost lost trails and go further.

Shakespeare did not live to see the British Council of Churches or the World Council of Churches, but he was one of the forerunners.

Of all the pathfinders none served with more zeal and patient labour than he. He never shirked or faltered when opposed. He was unwearied in trying to bring people together, in seeking to reconcile points of view, in striving to find common ground. Many leading Anglicans were with us and we had men like Jowett, Garvie, Selbie and Charles Brown. Friendships sprang up. The way opened to better feelings, understanding and more concerted action.

Now there has come a pause in conversations and negotiations. Was Shakespeare too sanguine? I think he was. Had he been at Oxford or Cambridge he might have realized better the ingrained strength of some ecclesiastical prejudices and the hold of the Anglo-Catholic section of the Established Church. His brotherly heart seemed unable to understand that anything could come in the way of that drawing together of Christians that to him looked so natural and right. He underestimated stubborn difficulties and paid, in the event, a heavy price for his optimism.

In his own denomination he found hesitation, timidity, mistrust, though I never heard him speak himself one disloyal word. There came upon him a deep cloud of disappointment accentuated by the poor health from which he suffered, for he was always highly-strung, nervous and tense.

I was deeply saddened the last time he called me into his room at the Church House, not long before he resigned, when he said to me, "It is quite hopeless. The Anglicans will never give up their view of the Apostolical succession." It was not the remark itself, but the finality of the way in which he said it, for it seemed to gather up years of disillusionment and frustration. Ill, worn out by his

labours and by consuming fires in his own heart, unable to do anything by halves and fighting almost to the last, allowance must be made for his depression. He had not reached the goal to which he aspired, but he had fought better than he knew. None who went with him in those years of struggle could ever think meanly of him. His light kindled the lamps in us and, if they flicker, they have not gone out. He had the respect and honour of us all.

My memories play about him. I think of his personal kindness to a young student when I came to London for the Baptist Union Scholarship interview. I was asked what line of theological study I wished to pursue, and replied that I was interested in apologetics. Old Dr. Richard Glover was there and growled at me (perhaps to try me out), "Young man, do you think the Bible needs to be apologised for?" I was astonished and was about to reply that I did not see what that had to do with it, but Shakespeare got in first, and with Greenhough, sat on him rather heavily and extricated me from an awkward situation. He much wanted me to become minister of his church at Highgate, which Rushbrooke had just left, and said he would become a deacon if I went, but nevertheless approved my choice of Leicester, and shared the ordination service with Principal Selbie. His encouragement was unfailing. When he came down to Cambridge to stay with John Chivers, he came to St. Andrew's Street on Sunday, and there was always a kindly comment on the services. We played golf on the Monday—I remember he didn't like losing! I recall how once he suddenly decided to stay over the Sunday instead of returning on Saturday, and how he telephoned on Saturday morning for his silk hat to be sent down—an interesting little sidelight on his punctiliousness, his own sense of personal dignity and the manners of those days. Tall, straight, with a fine presence, a face rather drawn and worn, but to me always full of kindness, I see him still and cherish the picture. His intensity made some people afraid of him. They thought him autocratic, but the Union needed an autocrat in those days. His drawing power was immense and he got things done. Clerks in the office dared not look up as he passed through. If one did he would be over to say, "What are you doing now?" If he could be stern with others, he was sternest of all with himself. He hardly ever relaxed, but there was always a welcome and a cheering word for any man he thought was doing his best, and he could be delightful company.

I was privileged to see him from time to time when his life drew to its end. The storms were over. He was rather helpless and tired, yet his eyes shone as I spoke to him of the work, and he was content and happy in the love and care of Mrs. Shakespeare, who at ninety-five years of age is still with us, the devoted helper who spared and gave him to his work and, in the background, sustained him in his constant labours with her gracious companionship and

counsel. The affection and the successes of his children were a happiness and a source of pride.

I think it was Mrs. Shakespeare who first told me he wanted me to succeed him. His approval of my appointment gave me confidence and joy. To those who knew him well he was not only a man of many parts, transcendent gifts and strength of character, but also a lovable, consecrated servant of our people, a great-hearted son of the Church of Christ and a humble follower of his Lord. Whatever others may say or think, nothing will ever shake my own conviction that he was of the true apostolical succession of the ministers ordained of Christ.

"Many years ago," he wrote once, "I learned the secret of rest in my public life, and since then I have cared for one thing only, that my plans and purposes should be after the mind and will of God." Nobly he discharged his trust. We follow after. We reap where he sowed. He laboured and we have entered into his labours.

M. E. AUBREY

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

M. E. AUBREY, C.H., D.C.L., LL.D.,
General Secretary, Baptist Union of Gt. Britain and Ireland, 1925-51.

ARNOLD H. J. BAINES, M.A.,
Member, Baptist Historical Society.

K. W. BENNETT, F.R.G.S.,
Secretary, Baptist Men's Movement.

J. NEVILLE BIRDSALL, M.A.,
Asssitant Lecturer, Dept. of Theology, University of Leeds.

Reviewers: D. LANT, LL.B., L. J. MOON, M.A., B.D., E. A. PAYNE, M.A., D.D., R. E. O. WHITE, M.A., B.D.

Current Trends and Present Tasks in New Testament Textual Criticism

THE discipline of textual criticism with which this essay deals in part is not in our day a favourite department of scholarship: the centre of interest in biblical studies lies in theological topics, and the attention, I presume, of most working ministers is given to the rich sources of sermon material found in the many works on biblical theology which almost daily pour forth rather than to a task which deals so largely with linguistic minutiae, and which, perhaps, from his student days has appeared to be a laborious and pendantic exercise. I think this is a true picture, and its truth is applicable even to the realm of the professional scholar.

For my part, I greatly regret this current neglect of textual topics. Textual criticism, if seriously embarked upon, is indeed a lengthy and laborious procedure, and demands certain qualities which can be caricatured as pedantry; but it is nevertheless a matter of the utmost concern to all those concerned with the exposition of scripture. For, whatever the precise formulation which we each give to our belief in scriptural inspiration, most thoughtful Christians, and I venture to think, all Baptists, attribute to the original words of the New Testament as composed by apostles and "apostolic men" a unique value as mediating in some fashion our God's self-revelation in the Incarnation of the Word. Hence the original text is a treasure to be yearned for and prized greatly—yet we cannot be certain today that we have the ipsissima verba of the apostles in our printed scriptures. The text behind the Authorised Version is at best a sixth century text: and the work of Westcott and Hort takes us no further than the fourth century. Some trust in the one, and some, thinking themselves more in touch with scholarship, in the other; but neither is in fact in possession of his longed-for autographic text. We must keep on with the search, and leave nothing uninvestigated till certainty be ours. We are nearer today to the original text than our forebears, but there is much still to be done—a colossal volume of work awaits us before our goal be attained.

I shall assume in this paper that we know or can easily get to know the advances made by Hort, and his successors such as Burkitt, Streeter and Lake: and shall seek rather to outline some of the

current trends in N.T. textual criticism, and some tasks that lie to our hands.

The prime task of the textual critic is, as I have said, to establish the original text. Two approaches to this goal can be found in present day textual work—a documentary approach, and an eclectic approach. These are not exclusive but complementary. The first is typified by the 1946 Schweich lectures of Günther Zuntz, "The Text of the Epistles": here the author casts away all previous theoretical distinctions between readings as Neutral, Western and so forth; and bases his approach on "the oldest manuscript," namely, the Chester Beatty Papyrus Codex of the Epistles (p. 46). Earlier studies of this papyrus and its fellows have attempted to classify them as Neutral, or (in the gospels) Caesarean: but these categories, while applicable to the earliest manuscript evidence known to Hort and those who elaborated his work, have been found unsuited to the explanation of the papyrus text which is a full century earlier than the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus. Hence Zuntz rightly emphasises that for a true picture of textual history we must base ourselves on this oldest evidence and work down the stream of history, explaining the later categories and types of text (which are probably the results of recension and editorial work) by the earlier evidence in which readings of various categories appear to mingle inexplicably. This may mean that we begin again 'de novo,' but more significantly that we will be a hundred years or more nearer to the autographs. Every newly discovered early manuscript may mean a readjustment of the picture, but a consequent great certainty in our work. Zuntz has thus made a suggestive contribution to the primary work of the text-critic; and his approach demands an exhaustive study of the numerous fragments on papyrus and vellum which we have today. The harvest from these sources is not likely to be as great as from the Chester Beatty papyri, in so far as they are not so extensive in text: but what we do discover will illuminate the new knowledge drawn from the more important manuscripts. A similar approach can be made for the Gospel text, and for the Apocalypse, though the fact that p. 47 (the Chester Beatty manuscript of the Apocalypse) contains a text no less corrupt than Sinaiticus and other significant witnesses warns us that a hundred years further back is not the whole way.

The second approach—which I have named 'eclectic'—sets out to establish the text from first principles: i.e. without prejudice as to textual types, it judges between readings by means of a number of criteria, estimating such factors as the author's style and use of Greek, the possibility of harmonisation (especially in Synoptic variants), the historical accuracy of variants as illuminated by local conditions. This approach is best outlined in G. D. Kilpatrick's notable articles "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels

and Acts" and "Western Text and Original Text in the Epistles." Special applications of the method are seen in A. Wensinck's and M. Black's assessment of the worth of the Western Text on the grounds of its reflection of the Aramaic original of our Lord's sayings and of the Gospel tradition: and in the investigations of C. S. C. Williams and K. W. Clark, in recent publications, into the causation of variants which can be traced to theological prejudice or opinion. This method is necessary because, as we have noted at the close of our last paragraph, early though our papyri be, they are evidently not the pure original but display corruptions of varying kinds. In our present situation this type of approach from first principles, utilising our knowledge in every cognate sphere, is necessary and valuable.

These disciplines bear directly upon the recovery of the original text of the New Testament scriptures. There are, however, other trends and tasks in present day textual criticism which are not directly concerned with this search, but trace later developments in the text and later influences upon it. They are not to be ruled out for this reason as without value, for one lesson learnt over the years is that nothing can be judged beforehand to be without significance, for a late Father or a version far removed from the Greek may turn out to be a valuable repository of ancient readings: not only so, but also we need to realise the value of textual criticism as a handmaid, not only of Biblical study, but of Church history too. The tasks I shall indicate are—the establishment of the text of the Diatessaron of Tatian, the investigation of the Byzantine text of the Gospels, and the growing knowledge of the early versions of the New Testament.

The Diatessaron is the name usually given to the harmony of the Gospels, carefully moulded into a mosaic, by the Assyrian Christian of the second century, Tatian. There is some evidence that it went under the name of Diapente in some circles, and from this it has been deduced that a fifth apocryphal gospel was an additional source utilised by Tatian. This is probably true, even if the name Diapente does not bear upon it, but what the source was is at present undecided. It has been considered by some scholars that much textual variation in the Gospels can be traced to the influence of the Diatessaron upon "separated-gospel" texts. This again is capable of over-exaggeration but there is enough truth in it to make the establishment of the original text of the Diatessaron a matter of value to the text-critic. Traces of it in Greek were early lost, since Eusebius in his day could assert that no copies were extant. It was therefore a matter of interest when a small fragment in Greek was discovered during the excavations at Dura-Europos on the Euphrates. However, it is in other directions that we must look for the bulk of the work at present. Tatian's work exercised

a powerful spell over his fellow countrymen, and although no remains are found in Syriac, there are numerous evidences of its existence, and secondary translations of it. We rely, in this area, mainly upon an Armenian translation of Ephraem the Syrian's commentary upon the Diatessaron; and upon an Arabic translation of the Diatessaron itself. Oriental Christianity, and oriental heresy such as the religion of the Manichees, was greatly influenced by the Diatessaron, and other remains of it are found in Persian and Coptic, and in the dialects of Turkestan and the Gobi Desert. The linguistic equipment demanded for this side of the work is considerable; in fact a veritable army of polyglot scholars is needed. The interesting hypothesis has recently been advanced that the earliest translation of the Gospels in Armenian was based on a Diatessaron; and similar suggestions have been made regarding the Georgian version. But it was not only the East that heard gladly the Gospel according to Tatian: his work had widespread vogue in the West, and a number of gospel-harmonies in such tongues as Dutch, German, English and Italian (in their medieval forms) have been shown to reproduce the Diatessaron. Amongst these witnesses is a Harmony in Middle-English which was once the possession and favourite reading of the diarist Samuel Pepys: it is now in Magdalene College, Cambridge. We can learn much of second century Christianity and of popular Christianity in East and West for centuries afterwards, from this elusive but not irrecoverable work, which has been called "the earliest life of Christ" and "the first commentary upon the Gospels." In some quarters there is scepticism both concerning the attainability of the original Tatian-text, and concerning its influence on the Syriac and Latin translations. To speak solely for myself, I am convinced of both these theses, though perhaps a greater caution is required than certain continental savants have exercised.

The second task amongst the secondary pursuits of the textual scholar which I shall indicate, is the investigation of the Byzantine text, that is, the text dominant in the later middle ages which, quite by accident, became fixed as the printed standard (though not in a fully representative form) in the various Greek Testaments of the Renaissance. It has become customary since the work of Lachmann and Hort to consider this text derivative and conflate, and in consequence, of little if any value for New Testament textual criticism. However, Hermann von Soden, the great German textual critic and exegete, restored interest in the text by claiming for it equal antiquity with the other great texts of the fourth century (i.e. what we are accustomed to call "Neutral," "Caesarean" and "Western," though this was not v. Soden's nomenclature). Although von Soden's work was on occasions inaccurate in detail, and certain of his hypotheses untenable, he was a pioneer blazing a trail in virgin territory;

and his work has much to teach us. Those few but assiduous scholars who have ventured under his guidance into the realms of the Byzantine text have found that between the fifth and twelfth centuries, the Greek text was, within certain limits, almost as fluid as during the earlier centuries. The investigation of both manuscripts and citations in the fathers have shown a rich diversity, so that it would appear, for example, that Leontius, John of Damascus and Photius, three leading figures in the history of Greek Orthodox Christianity, used quite distinct and different texts. We have now the task to face afresh, to discover when the Byzantine text was formed, what it is, whether many or one, and how it developed : the medieval minuscules have attained a new importance, and the medieval Greek ecclesiastics prove to have been apparently less stereotyped, in text at least, than we have been led to believe. This investigation may eventually prove to bear on the original text in some measure since readings hitherto thought to be late and corrupt appeared in the Chester Beatty papyrus—and so come into focus once more as readings to be considered with care.

Not unconnected with this is the third task I have chosen to write of, the investigation of the various ancient translations or versions of the New Testament. Here we find the living and abiding voice of the early Christian missionaries in a whole babel of fascinating tongues and scripts : the primary versions (that is, those translated directly from the Greek) in Latin, Syriac, and the dialects of Coptic : the secondary versions (translated from a prior translation but often of no less importance for textual matters)—Armenian and Georgian, Arabic, Persian and Ethiopic, Anglo-Saxon and Provençal. By means of these we can trace what kind of manuscripts and what standards of biblical scholarship prevailed in the churches which sponsored the missions and in the infant churches themselves. Sidelights are thrown on church history—we can note, for example, how those churches with vernacular scriptures early translated, flourished, or endured in persecution (the Coptic and the Armenian, for instance) while in North Africa, where neither Punic nor Berber translations were made, but only Latin for the urban population, the church disappeared before the onslaught of Islam, and the country proves today one of the most intransigent fields for evangelism. At present some versions—the Syriac and the Armenian especially—are attracting great attention, but others are practically neglected : the Ethiopic especially is an area difficult to prospect, but may prove a rich mine of many strata. In all these fields a small band of scholars progresses slowly on.

All these tasks, both in regard to the original text and in connection with the numerous tributaries whereby we trace that source are somewhat hampered by the lack of a comprehensive, accurate and up-to-date critical apparatus, listing all variants and naming

their support. This need will one day be met when the International Greek New Testament Project completes its task. This is a loosely co-ordinated effort on the part of many scholars, directed by American and British committees, to provide a complete critical apparatus. The headquarters and master-file is now in Atlanta, Ga. housed in Emory University, under the direction of Dr. Merrill Parvis who, I believe, is a fellow Baptist of ours.

So the tasks go on individually and are co-ordinated in massive schemes. There is much to be done, and few to do it. May I make a plea for more workers in this field? Whereas some tasks are such that only the highly trained polyglot scholars can accomplish them, there are others which the pastor with ability and good training could well do satisfactorily, providing that he allowed himself a long term over which to plan, read and work. Text-critical studies on patristic citations, for instance, prove a means whereby a man's linguistics are kept in trim, his mind kept alert for subtleties (helpful indeed in expository preaching) and his view raised above the duties and difficulties of the local pastorate to the broader vistas of scholarship and of the church in other ages and climes. So the task, as well as being an end in itself, and contributing to the general effort of text-critical scholarship, would reflect its worth in the mental calibre and the pulpit ministry of him whose recreation it had become.

Text-critical studies and the like have been somewhere, I think by Harnack, described as the " dust and grime " of the theologian's workshop : as necessary to the work of God as the polished product of systematics or pastoral toil. It is a high privilege to labour amidst that " dust and grime " rather than in more evidently glorious places. Our Lord has said that heaven and earth shall pass away but His words never : and in similar vein, that no iota nor tittle shall pass from the Law till all be fulfilled. It would appear that the exact establishment of His words and all the scriptural witness to Him is a prime duty of the Church in every generation. May many within the Church continue to turn their hand to this task.

J. NEVILLE BIRDSALL

Members of the Baptist Historical Society who have not remitted their current subscription are earnestly requested by the Treasurer to do so immediately. Those who are in arrears are even more earnestly asked to remit what is due.

The Baptist Men's Movement

THE subject of this particular study is but forty years old this year and is therefore one of the youngest organizations within our Baptist denomination. It may not, however, be inappropriate to take a brief look at what is, for most of us, a fragment of continuing history within our lifetime.

The basic conception of the Movement is traceable as far back as 1912, when the National Laymen's Missionary Movement was formed and claimed the support and allegiance of a number of our missionary-minded laymen. Amongst these was Mr. W. Parker Gray, of Northampton, and it was his experiences at a Conference of that Movement in Oxford in 1915 and a reception at the Mansion House in May, 1916, arranged by the same Movement, which planted securely in his mind and heart the vision of a Baptist branch. He communicated with the Rev. W. Y. Fullerton, the Home Secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society, and at that time Vice-President of the Baptist Union. Mr. Fullerton (as he then was, his doctorate not being conferred until 1927) seized upon the idea with enthusiasm. He proposed, at the October meeting of the B.M.S. General Committee, that a sub-committee should be appointed to explore the possibilities. It may be of interest to record here the names of the members so appointed: they were Sir George Macalpine, Sir Alfred Pearce Gould, and Messrs. J. Attenborough, A. R. Doggart, C. F. Foster, H. P. Gould, W. Parker Gray, W. Jones, G. J. Long, A. C. Mansfield, E. Morgan, W. W. Parkinson, T. S. Penny, J. Town, A. Tyler, and H. E. Wood.[1]

In January, 1917, they reported back to the General Committee and their recommendations were accepted, as follows:

1. That it is the opinion of the Sub-Committee that the time has now arrived when a Baptist branch of the Laymen's Missionary Movement might, with advantage, be formed.
2. That Messrs. W. Parker Gray, G. J. Long, W. W. Parkinson and A. Tyler be requested to serve as a Sub-Committee, with power to add to their number, to consider the matter in all its bearings and, if possible, to arrange that some action should be taken during the spring meetings.[2]

To these names should be added that of Mr. H. L. Hemmens, for he had been brought in by the Home Secretary at a very early stage

[1] Minutes of B.M.S. General Committee, Oct. 1916.
[2] Minutes of B.M.S. General Committee, Jan. 1917.

in the conversations as the member of the B.M.S. staff who would be best fitted to undertake the clerical side of the organization, when it was formed. Just how wise that choice was, subsequent history has abundantly proved.

The Baptist Laymen's Missionary Movement was formally launched at a Conference of laymen held at the old Mission House in Furnival Street, under the chairmanship of Mr. Parker Gray, on Wednesday, 25th April, 1917, during the Assembly of that year.[3] The Conference began with a brief introduction by the Chairman, and addresses by Dr. Thomas Cochrane, Secretary of the London Missionary Society Laymen's Movement, on "The Laymen's Missionary Movement"; Mr. O. Eatough, of Waterfoot, on "The Work of a District Laymen's Movement"; and Mr. Alec Tyler, of Leicester, on "The Formation of a Baptist Laymen's Missionary Movement and Its Aims." Discussion ensued, after which the following resolutions were adopted:

1. That this Conference of Laymen of the Baptist Denomination having heard and considered the objects and methods of various Laymen's Missionary Movements, approves the formation of a Baptist Laymen's Missionary Movement, and urges its extension throughout the country.
2. The Movement shall exist for the dissemination of information about missions and the promotion of prayers for missions among Baptist Laymen, in order that they may be aroused to take their share in claiming the kingdoms of this world for the Lord Jesus Christ.

The third and final resolution adopted by the Conference appointed Sir Alfred Pearce Gould, K.C.V.O., M.S., as President and twenty-three other men to be the Committee, with power to add to their number. There were forty men present at that inaugural meeting, and it is of interest to note that tea was provided at a cost of 8d. per head, including service!

The other officers, who were elected at the first meeting of the Committee on 18th July, 1917, were Mr. W. Parker Gray (Chairman), Mr. Alec Tyler (Secretary) and Mr. W. H. Crowe (Treasurer).[4] Mr. H. L. Hemmens, as has been mentioned already and as he himself tells us in his autobiography,[5] was brought in at the outset to do the routine work and was in effect Secretary from the

[3] H. L. Hemmens, in his autobiography, *Such Has Been My Life*, p. 146, states that the Movement was formed in the London house of Sir Alfred Pearce Gould, but this would seem to refer to a meeting of the sub-committee which planned the launching.

[4] H. L. Hemmens, *ibid.*, p. 146, names William Jones, of Orpington, as the first treasurer. It is clear, however, from the minutes that W. H. Crowe was appointed to the office in 1917. He resigned at the beginning of 1918 to organize the London Federation and was then succeeded by William Jones.

[5] *op. cit.*, p. 146.

beginning, for it was not long before Mr. Tyler was officially designated Honorary Secretary, a position which he held until his resignation, due to ill-health, in 1925. The office of Honorary Secretary continued to be filled until after the second war, but with the appointment of a full-time Assistant Secretary in 1946 it was then discontinued. A glance at the personnel of that first committee, plus those who were co-opted at its first meeting, reveals the names of five who afterwards became Presidents of the Movement: Messrs. J. Arthur Attenborough, A. R. Doggart, W. Parker Gray, H. L. Hemmens and H. Ernest Wood, and four who later were elected to the Presidency of the Baptist Union: Messrs. Doggart and Wood, Arthur Newton and T. S. Penny.

ACTIVITIES

The B.L.M.M. worked along three main lines, as far as organization was concerned, the first being the setting up in cities, towns and districts, of Centres, each with its duly appointed officers and committee. The function of a Centre initially was to band men together for united service on behalf of the missionary cause, such activity often being briefly comprehended in the words "Prayer, Effort and Giving." "Our task as a Movement," wrote Alec Taylor in March, 1918, "is to move men to deeper devotion, greater activity, more fervent intercession and fuller support of the missionary enterprise."[6] It should, however, be stressed that the Movement had been an independent body from the beginning (as indeed has the Baptist Historical Society), although it has owed much throughout its history to the sympathetic interest and practical assistance of the B.M.S. in a variety of ways. Centres sprang up quickly in all parts of the country and as early as 1918 the London Federation was formed, with a closely-knit organization covering most of the sectors corresponding to the L.B.A. Groups. Mr. W. H. Crowe was the energetic secretary of this Federation for the whole of its existence (1918-1948) and was responsible on its behalf for arranging an Annual Dinner to the President of the Baptist Union. This began with one to Mr. Herbert Marnham in 1919 and continued without interruption until war again broke out.

The second strand in the Movement's policy was the arrangement of conferences, both national and local. This policy has continued till this day and Swanwick particularly has become a revered name amongst us. Local conferences speedily became the responsibility of the local Centres or groups of them, but at least one national conference was arranged each year by the Council. The first was held in 1918, in Alec Tyler's spacious garden in Leicester, the second in 1920 at Hope in Derbyshire, and in 1921 there commenced in the same county the long line of Swanwick Conferences at The Hayes which was broken only by the second

war and was resumed as soon as the premises were de-requisitioned in 1948. Between the wars these conferences were practically confined to overseas missionary matters but during the last ten years their scope has broadened somewhat, for a reason which will be obvious in due course.

The third line of approach was through the medium of propaganda. Leaflets, booklets, advertisements and articles in the religious press, and correspondence all played their part, but it was early realized that a regular periodical was an essential. In September, 1918, *The Baptist Layman* commenced its life, strangely enough, as a supplement to *Men and Missions,* the organ of the Laymen's Missionary Movement of the United States and Canada. It would appear to have emerged on its own at the beginning of 1920. It has fluctuated in size and format through the years and has progressed in title from *The Baptist Layman* (1918-1936) via *The Layman* (1937-1944) to *World Outlook* (1945 onwards). It was published monthly until 1924 and quarterly thereafter.

The first concerted effort of the B.L.M.M. was the raising of a War Emergency Fund in the interests of the B.M.S., and by the middle of 1919 the total would appear to have been around £6,500, which was a very satisfactory response indeed.

Two outstanding projects were undertaken in the early years, due mainly to the initiative and drive of Alec Tyler who, himself a business man of wide repute, was accustomed to thinking and acting in a large way. The first was the purchase of the house in Kettering where the B.M.S. was formed in 1792. The deeds were handed over to the treasurer of the Society in a ceremony at "Widow Wallace's house" on 2nd October, 1922, the 130th birthday of the B.M.S. The second was the purchase of a property in North London which was opened the following year as the Sir Alfred Pearce Gould Hostel for Indian Students. To quote H. L. Hemmens: ". . . the venture began and continued for some years with marked success. But . . . conditions changed and eventually the hostel was closed. It had served a useful purpose and, gradually, its scope had been widened to receive guests of any nationality, so that its character became international and its fellowship world-wide."[7]

In 1926, the Movement was invited to take over responsibility for the administration of the Missionaries' Literature Association. This appears to have been an interdenominational body dating back into the last decade of the 19th century. Now, carried on by a small and ageing committee, it was in danger of fading away altogether. Its function was the simple and charitable work of introducing donors of periodicals of every kind in this country to

[6] Circular letter to members of the Committee, dated 18th March, 1918.
[7] *Such Has Been My Life,* pp. 151-2.

missionaries and pastors overseas who would desire to be the grateful recipients and the Movement placed it in the hands of the Rev. C. T. Byford. He had been one of the earliest band of Baptist Union General Superintendents but had had to relinquish his position in 1920 because of a serious illness which left him almost completely paralysed. His was an undaunted spirit, however, and, accepting the invitation with alacrity, he magnificently continued the work of the M.L.A. from his bed right up to the day of his death in 1948. He was succeeded by Mr. E. H. Butcher, who also served until he died in 1953, and towards the end of that year the Rev. W. E. French, B.Sc., who had just retired from the service of the B.M.S. in India, took over. Under his enthusiastic leadership the work continues to flourish and has expanded to serve friends in all five continents.

1927 saw the formation of the Baptist Young Men's Movement, that might almost have been termed a junior reserve of the B.L.M.M. The first Secretary was Mr. Reginald K. Wright, who removed to Africa in the following year, and is now resident in Rhodesia. The first President was the Rev. Sydney G. Morris and he was succeeded by Dr. F. Townley Lord. A later holder of the office was the Rev. Ernest A. Payne, who was President in 1933. The B.Y.M.M. had regular schemes of Bible and missionary study and was used a good deal in conducting week-end evangelistic campaigns in local churches. The upper age limit was 30 (though this does not seem to have applied to Presidents), upon the attainment of which it was expected that members would become associated directly with the senior Movement. The B.Y.M.M. was a casualty of the second war, for by 1946 almost all the 1939 membership had crossed the rubicon and were too old to continue!

DEVELOPMENTS

The Swanwick Conference steadily increased in popularity, the attendances in the 1930s ultimately reaching 300. Probably the outstanding personality of the pre-war conferences was Dr. T. R. Glover and of the post-war gatherings Dr. S. W. Hughes, but very many men played, and still play, their part in the richness and diversity of these week-ends of inspired fellowship. On the other hand, in all honesty it had to be recorded in 1931 that "not many Centres really function today."[8] Would the Movement therefore be reduced virtually to the arrangement of an admittedly successful Annual Conference and the production of an excellent quarterly magazine? Whatever may have been the answer to that hypothetical question it did not need to be produced because at Swanwick in 1933 the Rev. G. W. Harte, minister of Elm Road Baptist Church, Beckenham, had the opportunity of enlarging upon an idea

[8] Memorandum presented to National Council, 29th January, 1931.

which he had already written about in *The Baptist Layman* the previous October, viz., the Contact Club, and in retrospect we can see that this marked the beginning of what was to be a radical change in the Movement's policy and activity throughout the country. To be sure, it was not recognized as such at the time and the published reports of the Annual Conference of 1933 carry no mention of that particular talk. From that time, however, Contact Clubs began to be formed in quite a number of churches, and in 1936 the National Council arranged a conference of men's organizations which was held in London under Mr. Harte's chairmanship. One of the results of this conference was that the Movement was asked to act as a clearing house for ideas and promoting new men's organizations. Similar conferences were held annually in the next three years and then came the war which, unlike its earlier counterpart, caused a virtual cessation of much activity and of all conferences on a large scale for several years.

Towards the end of the war, however, in 1944 to be precise, a conference was held in Oxford which completed the process of change which had begun in 1932-33. At that conference it was resolved that the name of the Movement be altered to The Baptist Men's Movement, the objective was simply defined as "To intensify Christian effort at home and abroad," and it was agreed that the organization should be developed with a view to banding men inside and outside the churches into Fellowships. The pendulum had swung and henceforward, although the missionary passion was in no way abated, the energies of the Movement were to be directed in large measure to sharing actively in the evangelisation of the homeland.

We are as yet perhaps too near rightly to appraise the last decade, but brief mention must be made of the trends of development. In 1946, with the National President, the Rt. Hon. Ernest Brown, C.H., in the chair, a mass rally of men was held in Bloomsbury Central Church. Such a rally has continued to be held every year since, with a normal attendance of between 500 and 700 men. In 1948, a memorandum was prepared by Mr. L. G. Mann, Mr. R. G. Brown and the present writer (who had succeeded H. L. Hemmens as Secretary at the Annual Conference that year), which set out a plan for regional development throughout the country, providing for the appointment of honorary Regional Commissioners in areas co-terminous with the Baptist Associations. New men's organizations in the churches, District Federations and Regional Associations continued to be formed and regional and federation conferences began to be held regularly in different areas.

Many of the old leaders had passed away and a new generation was emerging. The constitution was revised, the National Council was strengthened, and an autonomous Movement was founded in

Scotland. Closer contacts were established with similar movements of Baptist men overseas. The Movement participated in the Commonwealth and Empire Baptist Congress in 1951 and shared in the planning and arrangements in this country for the Jubilee Congress of the Baptist World Alliance in 1955. Some of its members have been privileged to co-operate in the conferences for European Baptist men which have been held in Switzerland at the generous invitation of the Rüschlikon Seminary which is under the aegis of the Southern Baptist Convention of the U.S.A. Now in this present year the Movement has issued a Call to all the men of our Baptist churches to responsible Christian living in the fields of witness, service and stewardship.

The question may be asked as to how the Movement is financed. The answer today is that it is entirely by voluntary subscriptions, mainly from Personal Members and affiliated Fellowships and Contact Clubs. No direct grants are sought or received from any denominational organization, except for three small annual donations towards the work of the Missionaries' Literature Association. Office accommodation and clerical assistance are, however, generously provided by the B.M.S., towards which a quite inadequate grant is made annually by the Movement. Needless to say, the willing co-operation thus afforded by the Society is deeply appreciated.

This brief sketch of the history of the Baptist Men's Movement would not be complete without a concluding tribute to the late Harry Lathey Hemmens, for so long the inspiration, under God, of all its activity. Secretary for thirty-one years, editor of the magazine from 1918 to 1952, President in 1951, he gave lavishly at all times of his gifts as speaker, writer and organizer. He was a modest and gracious man and was deservedly popular wherever he went. When he gave up the secretaryship in 1948 to become editor of the newly-constituted Carey Kingsgate Press, he was the recipient of a testimonial gift and an illuminated address. Immediately following his lamented death in September, 1952, a Memorial Fund was launched, the capital of which now exceeds £1,200, and the interest is applied annually as an H. L. Hemmens Scholarship, awarded initially to a male missionary candidate designated for the Congo field of the B.M.S., in which "H.L.H." had a special interest and which the Movement enabled him to visit in 1938.

K. W. BENNETT

The Signatories of the Orthodox Confession of 1679

(Continued. To be concluded next issue)

29. CLEMENT HUNT, yeoman of Dinton, elder of the church of Cuddington or Ford and Messenger in Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire, succeeded Thomas Monk as the leader of the militantly orthodox wing of the General Baptists. Hunt belonged to a family well known in Dinton since 1560 or earlier, and was probably the son of Clement Hunt and Mary King (d. 1684), who, however, were still Paedobaptists in 1644. The Cuddington church was probably founded a year or two later.[50] Francis Hunt, born in 1660, was perhaps son of the older, not the younger Clement: if so, the latter is first mentioned in 1669, when he was preaching to twenty or thirty very indigent people in the house or yard of William Bate (No. 18). In 1687 he served as constable of Upton, a hamlet of Dinton. In 1688, when the extant Ford record begins, he was preaching at Wendover, Thame, Bledlow, Kingston Blount and Long Crendon. On 24th July, 1689, the church met at Princes Risborough to decide whether to accept the terms offered by the Toleration Act. It was resolved that "wee doe not, nor cannot Approve of and subscribe to the Articles menconed in the said Act . . . (yet notwithstanding) It is further Agreed that something be done by vs in order for the obteyning the Exemptions made and granted in the Act aforesaid Provided wee may Evade such subscription & approbation of the said Articles." Hunt pointed out that Quakers were not required to subscribe the Articles, and that Baptists could take advantage of the escape clause (1 Wm. & Mary, c. 18 s.13). Strictly speaking, this provision was available only to those who scrupled the taking of any oath whatever; some General Baptists held this view, and in 1675 the Amersham church had for a short time refused to have communion with those who took an oath, but the local Lollard tradition was not opposed to judicial oaths and Article 48 of the Orthodox Confession had expressly asserted their lawfulness. Nevertheless Hunt persisted, and at the Midsummer Sessions was accordingly entered as a Quaker, a mistake which is not rectified in the excellent Calendar to the Sessions Records published by the Clerk of the Peace. Jony, Ransome and Wild ignored the church agreement and subscribed the Articles; so did Headach and Clarke "meerly by surprize and through vnadvisedness." Hunt as elder asked the offending brethren not to come to the Lord's Table but permitted them to preach elsewhere. Some rigorists argued that Hunt had incurred the imputation of sin by allowing this, but the church upheld his action and asked William Reeve of Rempstone, Messenger in Nottinghamshire, to visit the offenders. Finally on 24th April, 1690 at an Assembly of the Five Churches, held at Bierton with Reeve presiding, the parties on both sides declared themselves sorry and troubled, and sought to heal the breach by praying jointly to Almighty God and forgiving one another. It may be added that in 1702 Hunt abjured the Pretender without scruple, and that in 1715 his church synod agreed that the ministers' charge in taking the oaths on the accession of George I should be borne by the church.

Since the death of Thomas Monk there had been no regular Messenger in Buckinghamshire, and by 1690 it had become clear that Hunt was taking

the lead; other churches often sent for him, and his own church set up a committee (Headach, Bate and Gosse junior) to regulate his journeys.

For some years the Bucks. and Herts. churches had not been represented at the General Assembly. In 1691 letters were exchanged, and next year Wing, Winslow, Berkhamsted and Barnet sent representatives. Clement Hunt held aloof, although this meant that his own position as acting Messenger could not be confirmed. His suspicions were justified; it soon became clear that Caffyn and his friends controlled the Assembly. In 1696 the Bucks. churches seceded, together with others in London, Essex and Cambridgeshire, and formed a new General Association, in which Hunt's leadership was undisputed. Three representatives of the old Assembly who met him on 17th June, 1698 reported that he "was pleased to speak very Slighting & Reproachfull of the Genall Assembly and said he had Endeavoured the Breaking the said Assembly these fifteen years & thanked God he had done it. And also added that he had more peace in what he had done in breaking the Same than in anything he had done in his life time." Hunt's efforts to attract "those Churches who are of ye same ffaith with vs that are yet in communion with them" proved highly successful. At first the only leader who was willing to break with Caffyn was John Lacy of Godmanchester and Wilbraham, Messenger in Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire, but he was soon joined by the venerable Benjamin Morley, who after forty years' service as Messenger had settled at Winslow, and by Dr. William Russell; it was presumably they who ordained Hunt as Messenger. At the meetings in June, 1702, Joseph Hooke of Hackenby, whose election as Messenger had been almost the last act of the General Assembly before its disruption, brought over the Lincolnshire churches. He had recently defended the Orthodox Confession in his *Necessary Apology*, and was asked to revise the Brief Confession. The General Association endorsed Hunt's strict rule against mixed marriages, condemned both Calvinist and Pelagian dissidents in Bucks., and resolved to set up a school of universal learning in London to bring up persons (who by the grace of God should be soberly inclined) to the work of the ministry. In 1704 the old General Assembly capitulated. Both sides signed six articles, the first two of which set forth the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. For the first time the Caffynite churches explicitly repudiated Hofmann's heresy. "The only begotten Son of God . . . did in fulness of time take to himself of our Nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary of whome in respect of the Flesh he was made and so is true God and true Man our Emmanuel." Unorthodox preaching was to be suppressed, but silent disagreement was not to be penalised. With this Hunt might well have been content; he had isolated Caffyn as effectively as Caffyn had isolated him twelve years before. But next year the orthodox leaders overreached themselves. The reunited Assembly resolved that subscription to the new articles should be a condition of admission. The Kent churches at once withdrew and accused the orthodox majority of bad faith. In 1709 a mediating party tried to secure agreement on a new "Expedient," entirely in the words of Scripture, but Hunt and Joseph Hooke, who was facing serious dissension in Lincolnshire, declared that a stronger barrier was needed against Arian, Socinian and Anthropomorphite heretics. Thereafter the breach was complete; the Caffynite churches formed a new General Assembly, and no further negotiations took place until Caffyn and Hunt were dead.

Clement Hunt had some private means, but not enough to pay for his constant journeys. For example, in 1704 the General Association sent him to sit with the Messenger in Cambridgeshire to hear and determine a matter between one Clark and the church at Ely. Hunt was thus partly dependent on freewill offerings, which were often many months in arrear. Each church, and apparently each local meeting, was asked to raise its quota. On 7th April, 1703, the Cuddington-Ford scribe noted: "It doth

Appear yt this Church is behind of what was Alloted to them to pay to Br Hunt 6-7-11 beside ½ A year Dve at St. Thomas Last of which ½ years paymt br: Hvnt hath Recd 9s. 0d." The church merely resolved "yt Br Hunts Arrears be taken further care of ye next Churchmeeting." The meeting at Kingston Blount placed its subscriptions at Hunt's personal disposal. In 1708 five leading members lent the church money to bring its payments up to date; part of this remained outstanding in 1714. Sometimes the deacons made up the amount due. It was characteristic of the General Baptists that they discharged one member's debts and provided straw for another to thatch his house, and yet grudged their pastors an adequate maintenance.

Hunt's relations with his own church were sometimes strained. In 1693 the Hunt and Franklin families were involved in a dispute; they would not go to law before unbelievers, and the matters were accordingly "put to a Reference . . . & writings Are to be made & the Indentvrs to be given In." Meanwhile Henry Franklin and his wife charged Hunt with drunkenness and lying, and later with violating the award made between them. The church held that Franklin had himself departed from the award by seeking after other proceedings, and asked Reeve as Messenger to admonish all parties to submit to the church's determination. Hunt regarded this as a reflection on his own conduct, and at the next meeting the church resolved that their vote had no such intention. Franklin was suspended and then excluded (subject to his right of appeal) "in Like nature as was that person spoken of 1 *Cor.* 5" for reviling his elder and pastor "with Invectives from his penn altogether vnbecoming a wise & good man & much more a Christian," even after he had admitted that his original charges were groundless. Later the Franklins submitted, desired the church's prayers and were received into communion again. In 1695 Hunt was reconciled with John Tripp, after a dispute which may have arisen from Tripp's diverting part of the freewill offerings from the Messenger's fund to other purposes.

Although the Buckinghamshire churches were at one in their belief concerning the attributes of God and the person of Christ, they differed widely on the doctrines of grace. In 1697 the church at High Wycombe was distracted by a Calvinist faction instigated by Benjamin Keach, against whose disruptive activities the General Association protested to the Particular Baptist leaders. On 6th March, 1700, Hunt and others drew up a paper condemning three propositions: that Christ did not die equally for all mankind; that although all men are required to repent, all have not power to do so; and that the motions, operations and inducements of the Holy Spirit are not tendered to all. These opinions were to be borne with, but were not to be preached. Hunt would admit no compromise on what were later called the "three universals": God loves all men, Christ died for all men, the Holy Spirit strives with all men. The General Association endorsed Hunt's action, and at a subsequent day of prayer and fasting, he prayed that God would take away the cloudiness of the minds of all Christians and enlighten them in the faith of universal redemption. Thereupon Edward Hoare withdrew, and when asked whether he could still hold communion with the church he refused to answer. John Coker went further and said to Hunt: "You are no elder of mine, nor never shall be, nor I will never more have communion with you." Some of Hunt's subsequent comments (he was in the habit of annotating the church book) show how much this remark hurt him. Coker, Hoare and Thomas Norris soon set up a separate meeting at Princes Risborough. The church resolved that no elder or member should preach doctrines contrary to the Fifty Articles, but the dissidents contended that the Orthodox Confession itself supported their teaching. At the General Association in May, 1700, it was reported by a Nottingham elder that Benjamin Boyer was preaching Calvinism in

Leicestershire, claiming that his doctrine was that of Thomas Monk and the "fifty stars of the first magnitude" who had subscribed the Confession. The General Association declared this a slander on Monk and advised Boyer's church at Wymeswold to read the Confession for themselves. In Bucks., Robert Wade argued strongly for liberty to sit under Hoare's ministry. On 15th April, 1702, Hunt was asked to expose Hoare's fallacies, but secessions continued and in September Hunt was "desired" and Tripp "appointed" to inform members of their errors. The present church at Princes Risborough was the direct result of this movement, and the earliest Particular Baptist church at Chesham, which later called Norris to its pastorate, probably arose in the same way.[51] Some General Baptists, however, reacted from Calvinism into Pelagianism; the resulting dissensions are outlined below in the note on Henry Goss, junior (No. 42).

By 1703 Clement Hunt had moved to a house at the West End of Westlington in Dinton, which he then registered for worship. As his property was rated at only £8 (reduced to £6 in 1711, after certain landowners had secured a new assessment) he seems to have retired from farming. In 1707 Joseph Hooke, at Clement Hunt's invitation, ordained John Cripps elder in and over the church of Cuddington, but Hunt continued to assist whenever he was not away on visitation. He preached at Princes Risborough, Kingston, Cuddington, Ford, Upton, Bigstrop,[52] Coombe, Cadsden and Loosley Row, but most frequently at home in Westlington. There the church met to observe national fasts and to give thanks for Marlborough's victories.

In 1710 Hunt went to Wycombe to have discourse with Mary Veary, who was keeping company with John Ball, a loose and vain man, who made a song of her, as Hunt sadly noted in the church book. Later he and Cripps directed her concerning her communion. The matter was delicate, as Hunt was also involved in a difference with his old friend and kinsman John Veary[53] "in things of yea and nay"; this was satisfactorily settled and Veary died penitent, but John Begent then accused Hunt of defrauding Veary. The church decided that Hunt and Veary "both did feare God and that neither of them did designe any Evill." Begent lost his temper, compared the church to Billingsgate and then said that if he had lied they might pass it by if they would, "which we Cannot Call true Repentance, because there wanted Contricion." The church at Haddenham invited Begent to preach, although his own church had silenced him. Begent's wife renewed the charges against Hunt, and the church advised him to prosecute her. He declined to do so, and in 1717 Begent sought a reconciliation, acknowledged his errors, desired prayers for the pardon of his sins and was commended to the church at Haddenham under the care of Edward Hoare (not to be confused with Edward Hoare of Risborough, who had died in 1711).

Although Hunt's health was declining, he continued to maintain strict church discipline and to visit backsliders. Drunkenness, mixed marriage and absence from Communion were the most prevalent sins. In a minute of 5th August, 1716, he is called Father Hunt, an unprecedented form of address among General Baptists, though it had often been used by the Lollards. About this time the historic meeting-house at Ford was opened, and on 1st September, 1718, a day of fasting and prayer was held there, with five special intentions:

> first that the Lord will Bee pleased to Raise vp more faithful ministers and those which hee hath Raised moore willing and Able
>
> secondly that God would bee pleased to make all the members of Christ Church willing in their places to Improve their spirituall and Temporall talents To support the Cause of God
>
> Thirdly that the Lord would be pleased to Continue the day of peace and Liberty wee now Enjoy

forthly ,that the Lord will bee pleased to Giue our sister Clarke peace and Ease her of all her Troubles and strengthen her faith in the Lord Jesus

fifthly that the Lord will bee pleased to Crown all owr Endeavours with his Blessing.

In 1719 Hunt opened a new meeting at Towersey, then in Bucks., now in Oxfordshire. His health was failing rapidly; his last sermon at Ford was on 31st January, 1720, and he was buried at Dinton on 13th June. His death marks the beginning of a steady decline of the Baptist cause in and around Buckinghamshire, which a succession of able and devoted Messengers seemed powerless to arrest. Strangely enough, when the revival came in 1785 it started with a few pious people assembled at Dinton Castle, in Hunt's old village.[54]

Clement Hunt's son of the same name was "grieviously plunged in sin and disorder" in 1693, and we hear no more of him. Another son, Samuel, died the same year. John Hunt, a farmer,[55] who seems to have shared the family's irascibility to the full, was ordained deacon by Hooke in 1707, quarrelled repeatedly with his son John and is last mentioned in 1739. Rebecca Hunt, first named in 1743, may be the Mrs. Hunt who subscribed to Ford, c. 1750-67.

It is curiously difficult to form a clear impression of Clement Hunt's character. He took a high view of his office as a successor of the Apostles, reacted vigorously when the authority of Messengers or elders was questioned, and insisted, following Grantham and the Council of Carthage, that the appointment of elders and deacons was subject to the Messenger's approval of their qualifications. Hunt made enemies with singular facility, and even in his own churches commanded respect rather than affection until his last years, when he mellowed considerably. On questions of doctrine he was quite uncompromising, and the whole Baptist denomination owes more to his intransigence than has yet been acknowledged. He alone among the orthodox General Baptist leaders never sought an arrangement with Caffyn. But for his firm stand, the General Baptists would probably have gone the way of the English Presbyterians, and the growth of the New Connexion would scarcely have been possible. Without Clement Hunt we might not have had John Clifford.

---

30. JOHN MOUNTEGUE, junior, yeoman of Waddesdon, was preaching there in 1669 at the homes of John Mountague and William Alley, and at North Marston at John Hartnoll's house. In 1666 John Mountague and Will. Ally witnessed the will of Abigail, widow of John Delafield; there was a long-standing friendship between the three families.[56] John Mountague served as juror in 1679 and 1687, subscribed the Articles in 1689 and signed the Bierton agreement to heal the dissension which that action caused. The only later mentions in the Ford records are that in 1718 Mr. Mountague charged Abraham Ransome with borrowing a coat and not returning it, and that Ann Montague or Mountacute was excluded temporarily in 1695 for marrying an unbaptized person and permanently in 1703 for turning Calvinist.

---

31. WILLIAM SMART of Oakley and later of Walton in Aylesbury, husbandman, attended the 1660 Assembly and signed its Brief Confession, in which too much was sacrificed to brevity. He and his widowed mother were presented in 1662 as sectaries who did not pay their Easter offerings, but the apparitor certified that Smart was already in Aylesbury gaol. In 1669 he was preaching with Stephen Dagnall to the "middle and meaner sort of people" at Wingrave. Soon after signing the Orthodox Confession he

was indicted for putting a dunghill in the highway, and five years later for absence from the parish church for a month; at the next Sessions, the qualifying period was reduced to three weeks. In October, 1688, he preached at Wendover: when Toleration was secured he made the usual subscriptions and was a party to the Bierton reconciliation. At the 1693 General Assembly he led the attack on Matthew Caffyn and secured a condemnation of his Hofmannite views, but failed to convince the Assembly that Caffyn actually held these beliefs.

---

32. RICHARD GOODCHILD, yeoman of Kimblewick, registered his farm for worship as soon as the law allowed. As it was near the Baptist centre of gravity in the Vale, the Cuddington-Ford church was already accustomed to meet there both for worship and for business. The Whitsun meetings at Kimblewick were apparently an old church custom, rather like the Good Friday meetings at Chenies today, and all other local meetings were suspended in order to allow the whole of the widely scattered congregation to assemble. Richard Goodchild, who was chief constable of the Three Hundreds of Aylesbury in 1691, was a generous host, but took little other part in church affairs. He was responsible for collecting the freewill offerings in the Vale during 1701-02, was deputed to admonish Joseph Delafield in 1710 and was "Representative to Ailesbury" in 1711; Richard Goodchild, junior, was representative in 1710. On 2nd April, 1712, Clement Hunt and four Goodchilds (Richard, Joseph, William and John) were asked to write out the church's charges against John Begent. The result was a truly tremendous indictment, citing over forty passages of Scripture. William and Richard Goodchild were preaching at Coombe in 1712, but after Ford Chapel was built in 1716 the family soon drops out of the story. It was probably better that the church should acquire its own premises than that it should remain dependent on the goodwill of a few members; but, as in many other country districts, there was a definite loss of influence and decline in membership when the meeting-house replaced the hospitality of the farmhouse.

---

33. JEFFERY WILD was a carpenter of Cats Dean (now Cadsden) near Monks Risborough, probably of the family of Arthur Wild of Ellesborough, excommunicated in 1662. The meeting at Scrubwood, 800 feet up behind Coombe Hill, was committed to his care by the church of Cuddington on 24th July, 1689. Contrary to the church agreement of that date, he subscribed the Articles prescribed by the Toleration Act. In April, 1693, Deacon John Tripp of Meadle was asked to "take care of Bro: Wild in his sickness & administer Releife as is necessary." Next February he was fully recovered, and preached at Darvill's Hill near Speen, Wycombe, "Missendon Berry" (Bury Farm, Missenden?) and Coombe. During the next twenty years Wild is often mentioned in the Ford church book, supplying outstations (Kingston Blount, Missenden, Coombe, Westlington), collecting money in the Chilterns according to the Association agreement and admonishing recalcitrant members. When Edward Hoare and his erroneous company seceded in 1701 Wild worked hard to restore the position in Risborough. Among the seceders whom he sought to reclaim by exhortations in public and private were two with the improbable names of Elizidamer and Betteris Clark. The church directed in 1711 that Wild's house at Cadsden should be registered; thereafter it was a regular preaching station, which members in the Chilterns were expected to attend. Wild himself was voted four shillings a quarter. On the accession of George I, an event which the Dissenters regarded as a providential deliverance from renewed persecution, there was a memorable gathering at Cadsden to give thanks. The church

could now safely implement its earlier decision to buy land and build a meeting-house, but even when this was done the members in the Chilterns were directed carefully to attend the breaking of bread at Cadsden every two months. In 1720 John Goodchild was seeking subscriptions for the support of this meeting, and about 1725 it was moved to "Ascot" (qu. Askett or Alscot?); no doubt the Chiltern members were becoming fewer. Wild himself is last mentioned by name in 1712.

---

34. ROBERT FELLOW, a farmer of Bletchley, was one of sixteen separatists in that parish in 1663; he then had two children unbaptized. He was charged with absence from church at fifteen Sessions between Easter, 1683 and the end of 1686. All these proceedings were taken on presentments by the parish constables; a year later, under the Indulgence, he was constable of Bletchley himself. At the Epiphany 1688-9 Sessions, held at Aylesbury during the confusion of the Interregnum, Robert Fellowe and John Chapman of Bletchley were bound over in £20 to appear and answer charges by John Littleheale of Edmonton. The proceedings are unexplained; at the Midsummer Sessions Fellow appeared and swore allegiance to William and Mary, and his recognisance was discharged. He represented the church of Wing at the General Assembly in 1692 and the General Association in 1699. His house was registered for worship in 1693; he served as juror in 1696, was again sworn in as constable in 1699 and is last mentioned in 1702.

---

35. WILLIAM DAVIS is elusive. He may be William, the son of Thomas Davies, who in 1662 obstinately refused to come to Dorton parish church. One William Davis was licensed at Trumpington under the 1672-3 Indulgence; it may be noticed, however, that no other signatory of the Orthodox Confession accepted a licence from Charles II. Another, or the same, William Davis represented Rainham in Essex at the General Association, 1699-1704. In 1691 one Mr. Davis, a Dissenting minister, was active at Olney, where, according to the Vicar, he presumed to inveigh against the Established Church, to hold unseasonable meetings at night and to administer unlawful oaths to his proselytes "to oblige them not to depart from their Principles."

NOTES

[50] Stephen Dagnall was active in the district in 1646. Henry Larimore (see No. 26) was no doubt a Baptist by 1648, for his son, aged twenty in 1668, had not been christened. The church at Wendover, which is descended from Cuddington, dates itself 1649. The date 1716 given for Ford in the *Baptist Handbook* refers only to the present building.

[51] The late Mr. A. E. Webb informed me that this was Dr. Whitley's opinion. For Risborough, cf. J. Owen, *Brief Account of the Baptist Church at Princes Risborough* (1863), citing J. Collett, *Christ's Counsel to Troubled Hearts* (1713).

[52] A farm near Westlington, but in Haddenham parish.

[53] Born 1636; son of John Veary and Rose Hunt, who married 1628. One of sixteen "anabaptists" in Cuddington parish in 1662.

[54] Peter Tyler, *A Brief History of the Churches constituting the Bucks. Association* (circular letter of the Association, 1844; 2nd edition, 1894; edited by James Saunders and dedicated to the churches at Dinton and Ford.)

[55] His lands, including Headache's Mead and Dossett's, were rated at £118, increased to £123 10s. in 1711.

[56] C. O. Moreton, *Waddesdon and Over Winchendon* (1929), p. 189.

Reviews

Baptism and Church in the New Testament, by Johannes Schneider. Translated by Ernest A. Payne. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 3s. 6d.).

Inevitably, in these days, one reads anything written on Baptism as a contribution to polemics: for the debate continues (though very one-sidedly), and the issues grow more obscure as the conclusions, mostly unwelcome, are announced with greater confidence. Dr. Schneider's lecture, however, cannot be so read. For one reason, it is too dogmatic on many debatable points. Proselyte Baptism, for example, is somewhat summarily dismissed as having no decisive influence on Johannine or Christian Baptism; Paul's view of Baptism is held to be "deeper" than that found elsewhere in the early Church, agreeing with that of the first Christian community on certain points but providing "the determinative interpretation of Baptism"; the central issue is stated in the form "The discussion about Baptism resolves itself in the end into the question which Baptism is scriptural?" Neither point is by any means settled: and the third begs the whole question—many would claim (as Prof. Schneider later shows) that infant Baptism *is* scriptural, and others that scripturalness is not essential to validity.

A second reason why the lecture is unsatisfactory polemically is that the many textual and historical questions that cluster around key passages are ignored, and proof-texts like *Mark* xvi. 16, *Acts* viii. 37, *John* iii. 22, iv. 1, 2 and the Pastorals (as Paul's) are quoted with an unshaken assurance that leaves the writer open to obvious counter-arguments. It is, therefore, rather as an exposition of one viewpoint that the essay must be judged, and in this light we cannot but be thankful for so clear an insistence on two of the main issues —the relation of faith and Baptism, and the importance of faith-Baptism to a right understanding of the Church. On the former point, the usual arguments about household Baptisms are led and answered, though Dr. Rowley's valuable contention, that the proselyte Baptism analogy is all against the Baptism of subsequent children of proselytes, is not used; and Dr. Cullman's shrewd thrust—that the New Testament knows nothing of the later Baptism of children of Christian parents is not noticed. Professor Schneider's denial that 1 *Cor.* vii. 14 supports infant Baptism is clearly justified, but some will like his treatment of the verse even less than Dr.

Cullmann's. And there is still need to show the *inner* necessity of faith before Baptism: the appeal to scripture is not entirely sufficient.

On the relation of Baptism to the Church, the issue between People's Church and confessional Church (and the necessity of faith for membership in the Body of Christ) is well presented; the inference, explicitly drawn, that there cannot be two different Baptisms side by side in the same Church would seem to be a side-glance at current suggestions for re-union. The lecture ends, rather abruptly, with the somewhat surprising declaration that the question of the Church has precedence over the question of Baptism. One would have thought, in the light of the New Testament and the previous discussion of faith and Baptism, that the order of precedence is Gospel—Faith—Baptism—Church: one determining the other *in that sequence.*

Dr. E. A. Payne, whose translation reads, on the whole, very smoothly, remarks that the line of argument will be new to many Baptists, "and to some perhaps at first somewhat unexpected and uncongenial." This probably refers, firstly, to the emphasis laid upon the "cleansing" and "remission" aspects of the rite. Dr. Schneider does not connect this very clearly with Paul's doctrine of union with Christ in death and resurrection, leaving a hiatus between two conceptions of Baptism's meaning. Yet the "cleansing" interpretation is prior in time and probably in theology, too. Secondly: the plain declaration that "Christian Baptism . . . is not to be regarded as a symbol, nor as an action which sets forth, however clearly, the inward experience of salvation . . . not sufficient to regard it as merely an act of obedience . . ." may be a salutary challenge to some very familiar but very superficial and unscriptural Baptist conceptions. Thirdly: Prof. Schneider's repeated insistence that "in Baptism something decisive is accomplished by God and Christ" will sound strange in too many Baptist ears. "Baptism results in the forgiveness of sins. . . . Baptism effects the total and complete cleansing of the person. . . . Baptism makes the power of the death and resurrection of Christ effective for us in the accomplishment of the saving process." Such words are too numerous and varied to be unguarded; they represent an attempt to return to a more adequate and more scriptural view of the spiritual importance and effect of Baptism. In so emphasizing the "transitive" and "effective" significance of the rite, Prof. Schneider has shown his understanding of Baptist weakness at this point; until believers' Baptism is so interpreted we shall make little headway in ecumenical discussions of the principles we defend. But emphasis is not enough: there is need for clear interpretation of what that "effectiveness" of Baptism is, and precise definition of what is involved in the "sacramental" understanding of *believers'* Baptism.

Cambridge Greek Testament: Colossians and Philemon, by C. F. D. Moule. (Cambridge University Press, 21s.).

Although it is nearly eighty years since the Cambridge Greek Testament began its invaluable service of student and preacher—eighty years of immense and far-reaching changes in the historical, linguistic, textual and theological approach to the New Testament—the "CGT" has *dated* far less than most commentaries of its period. Nevertheless, new information and new emphases demand recognition, and a revision of certain volumes is now promised, under the general editorship of Professor C. F. D. Moule, who is also responsible for this pioneer volume on *Colossians and Philemon.* The commentary is based upon the Bible Society text (second edition) though this is, unfortunately, not printed. In crown octavo, with comfortable print, 170 pages cannot of course pretend to be exhaustive, but the style is condensed, the documentation full, about one quarter of the space is given to Introduction, and several detached notes are added. In discussions, the tabular form saves much space as well as helping to clarify the argument. All in all, the first impression of slightness of treatment proves on closer reading to be deceptive: very much is given, or at least placed within reach, in brief compass.

In accordance with the current "synthetic" and theological approach to New Testament studies, pride of place is given in the Introduction to the religious thought of the epistle, and this emphasis is fairly maintained in the earlier (though not the later) notes. (It is interesting to remark, as a measure of the change of direction in half a century's study, that the corresponding earlier volume, by Lukyn Williams (1907) with more than three times the space available, does not deal at all with this theme in its Introduction). Other current trends noticeable in the new commentary are a gently critical side-glance at Barthian thought, while dealing with Christ's relation to the cosmos; the full recognition of the catechetical ministry of the apostolic Church; and the excellent treatment (from a Baptist point of view) which we are now coming to expect of the passages on Baptism. The present volume retains the close attention to strictly grammatical exegesis which made the earlier books so fascinating and useful, and which is so priceless a discipline for the student.

The intended readership is deliberately left undefined (p. vi) and this probably explains, if it does not justify, a certain inequality of texture which marks the whole book. The section on the religious thought of the epistle is thin and inadequate for the college, yet difficult for the school; the argument about the reconstruction of the Philemon story seems to say either too much or too little; so does the good, but inconclusive, summary of the debate about the place of Paul's imprisonment. Sometimes the balancing of opinions

seems a little overdone and confusing, especially for the beginner, and one wonders whether those who approach the epistle for the first time via this guide will not receive an impression of much argumentation about difficulties and uncertainties, and little of the original purpose and abiding message of the letter—in spite of the "religious" approach. A clear and positive summary of the contents of the epistle would have been a valuable addition. In the same way, the frequent Latin, and references to German sources, seem out of harmony with the "new readers begin here" tone of the section (by J. N. Sanders) on textual criticism. It is probable that this appearance of attempting to be all things to all readers is imposed by the economics of publishing in an expensive period—the earlier series varied from 2/6d. to 6s.!

Attractive to read (and handle) this first volume is marked rather by judicious summary of current debate, than by originality of thought or illuminating comment. Inevitably it challenges the question whether the new volumes will continue to serve as long as did the old. It seems unlikely: too many important matters are left as open questions; Paul's imprisonment, the Colossian heresy, the relation to *Ephesians,* the theological problem of the Christology (here posed more sharply than ever), and several textual and exegetical enigmas, remain as elusive as ever. A lot more dust must settle before the definitive New Testament commentary for this generation can be attempted. But this revision of a long-loved series promises to be a milestone on the way, and perhaps a welcome signpost.

R. E. O. WHITE

Sursum Corda, by Sydney H. Moore. (Independent Press, 8s. 6d.).

These brief but scholarly studies of some German hymnwriters will be read with pleasure and profit by all who love hymns and realize their significance in the life of the Church. The troubled background out of which came some of the most triumphant utterances of faith in the 16th and 17th centuries is clearly set forth in these pages and Martin Rinckhart, Paul Gerhardt and Gerhard Terstergen become more than mere names. A chapter on the hymns of the Anabaptists would have been welcome, and it is a pity that Mr. Moore does not acknowledge the fact that the chapter on "Now thank we all our God" appeared in the *Baptist Quarterly* for April, 1954.

ERNEST A. PAYNE

Thanksgiving for Childbirth, and Dedication of Parents: Notes on a suggested Order of Service, by W. G. Baker. (Berean Press, 2s.).

Like the Baptist Churches, the Churches of Christ are faced with the problem of finding some satisfactory equivalent for the

social, emotional and sentimental values enshrined in infant Baptism while refusing its theological implications. The title given to this Order of Service at once reveals the radical standpoint adopted by the author. The Service itself follows closely that of Dr. M. E. Aubrey, but it is set within the Communion Service; the justification offered for this is unconvincing, and it might have been better simply to admit that the weekly morning Communion of the Churches of Christ makes it inevitable. The motive of service to the local community, offered by a "gathered Church" set in a very mixed society, is emphasized here much more than in most discussions of this subject, and the different possible reactions to the delicate problems that arise, of balancing Church principles against popular misunderstanding, are well described—though without resolving the dilemma involved. Where only one parent is a Christian, and the use of the full Christian rite (with solemn question and promises) is only partially appropriate, "it is more right to choose to be weak in logic than to be lacking in love." (Doubtless, but "weak in logic" is so often a euphemism for "inconsistent in practice"). Where neither parent is Christian, a Cradle Roll service in Junior Sunday School is substituted. One imagines this neat adjustment might call for still further resources of pastoral diplomacy and still more involved explanations if the two families concerned happen to be close neighbours! Nor is it clear why, if the full service should be held in church during worship to express the Church's responsibility to the child of a Christian home, any less responsibility should be felt for children of non-Christian background. In a pamphlet anxious to face honestly the "realities" and "anomalies" of the gathered Church's ministry within a Christianized society, it is surprising to find no recognition of the fact that however clearly or often we say what we mean and do not mean, people on the fringe of the Church will continue to find their own meaning in the service, and attribute to baby's "being done" whatever superstitious or religious significance they choose. The Church cannot evade responsibility, in a society indoctrinated with infant Baptism, for what people misunderstand. Nor is anything said of the situation created by other Churches' refusal to accept our "Dedication" as qualifying for confirmation—a sore point with many parents when the fact becomes known later. If infant-dedication in any form is to continue in Churches practising believers' Baptism, this essay probably indicates successfully the form and argument which will ultimately be adopted. But some will remain unconvinced, and prefer to keep the service for Church members, confine it to the home, and develop the Cradle Roll Service as welcome to Sunday School for all children alike. Mr. Baker would put us all further in his debt if he pursued the matter in a full-length discussion.

Exposition and Encounter: Preaching in the Context of Worship; (Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture), by J. S. Stewart. (The Berean Press, 2s.).

A booklet on preaching by Dr. J. S. Stewart needs no recommendation; to read it is to hear again that eloquent, earnest, moving voice and feel afresh the spell of great utterance. The appeal for expository preaching, to deliver us from spiritual provincialism, to confer authority, to make the Bible relevant to our time; and the emphasis that "the aim of exposition is encounter"—meeting with God in the Word spoken within the context of worship—bring home to us again the strength and power of this living prince of preachers. If we wish the lecturer had also told us how to convince modern congregations that the sermon *is* part of worship, how to make modern people *like* the faithful, painstaking exposition of what is written, how to "demythologise" the written Word, so as to reveal its ageless essence without handling the Word of God deceitfully or being hounded as heretics, that only means we wish Professor Stewart would lecture again. And to leave the hearer asking for more is the final vindication of all preaching!

R. E. O. WHITE

The Cross is Heaven, by A. J. Appasamy. World Christian Books; United Society for Christian Literature. (Lutterworth Press, 2s. 6d.).

Bishop Appasamy knew Sadhu Sundar Singh and is at present engaged on a full-length biography of him. Here the Bishop gives us a short account of his life and then an anthology of his writings, culled from unpublished fragments and magazine articles. This is a refreshing little book, because it reminds us that our Lord is not an exclusively Western possession. Sundar Singh approaches Him with something of the Indian preoccupation with mystical religion and the fierce devotion of a Bhakti cult. The result is a new approach to Christ, and one which often makes the reader feel ashamed of his own lukewarm and casual devotion. Much of the book is specifically Eastern and "not transferable," but how much we need a westernised version of this burning devotion!

The Reformed Pastor, by Richard Baxter. A Treasury of Christian Books. (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.).

Dr. Hugh Martin, who is editing this valuable series of reprints, tells us in his foreword that although Baxter was episcopally ordained, and had in fact recently refused a bishopric, he came out of the Church of England on the passing of the Act of Uniformity

in 1662, because he could not accept the view that Episcopal ordination was a necessity. Dr. Martin reminds us that Bexter did not mean "Protestant" by the word "reformed." He meant "recalled to faithful service."

This book, written in 1655, is a powerful plea for re-consecration to the work of the ministry. Baxter's sincerity and zeal shine compellingly through every page and it is a humbling experience to read it. He argues that if a man is to be a pastor at all he should be a pastor after the pattern of God's calling and commission. He does not spare us in exposing our weakness and laziness, our lack of spirituality and our specious excuses for it. Yet there is no bitterness or superiority in him. He has a wide and charitable outlook. It is interesting to find him saying: "Is the distance so great that Presbyterian, Episcopal and Independent might not be well agreed? Were they but heartily willing and forward for peace, they might —I know they might." He would, I am afraid, be deeply disappointed to find that after 300 years they are still so far from being heartily willing and forward for peace.

Dr. Martin has cut Baxter's wordiness down to reasonable proportions without sacrificing any of the argument and has produced a book which every minister should possess and read periodically for the good of his soul—and the souls of his congregation.

Mental Pain and the Cure of Souls, by H. Guntrip. (Independent Press, Ltd., 10s. 6d.).

Dr. Guntrip was formerly a Congregational minister and is now a whole-time psychiatrist at Leeds. This book, he tells us, grew out of a lecture which he gave to old students of New College, London, at an Easter school, and it is especially intended for ministers, though Professor Grensted tells us in his foreword that he hopes that it will also be read by psychiatrists. They will certainly be more at home with Part I than other readers, for Dr. Guntrip takes us through a fairly stiff survey of the history and present position of his subject. He is a devoted pupil of Dr. W. R. D. Fairbairn, to whose work he constantly refers. It is interesting to see how Freud's detached scientific attitude to his subject is now considered to be old-fashioned, and the patient, as a person in a world of persons, is regarded as the victim of unsatisfactory personal relations. This, of course, brings religion into the picture because, as Professor Macmurray has lately been reminding us, religion is concerned with personal relationships. The truly religious man is the man who is rightly related to God and his neighbour. The amateur psychiatrist who, one fears, is often found in the ministerial ranks, will not find much grist for his mill here. But the book will be most salutary for

him, because it will impress on him that the mental and nervous patient needs really expert and lengthy treatment, and cannot be cured by tinkering, however well meant. This book will, however, show him the lines on which modern treatment proceeds, and even more valuable, it will acquaint him with the mise-en-scène of mental pain and disorder.

Prayer and Life's Highest, by Paul S. Rees. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 8s. 6d.).

Dr. Rees became known in this country a few years ago when he was here with Dr. Billy Graham. This series of Bible Studies was obviously delivered to a Conference, and one wonders whether they were given at Keswick.

Dr. Rees has taken prayers of St. Paul from Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and I and II Thessalonians, and in six studies he seeks to discover what was involved in prayer for the apostle. They are competent studies and often deepen our understanding of St. Paul's conceptions, though one would hardly agree with the blurb on the dust-cover that they will "put the reader in possession of wealth so vast as to leave him quite breathless." There are many illustrations and the studies are easy to read. They are sometimes coloured by the writer's theological outlook.

DENIS LANT

Thomas Rudyard, Early Friends' "Oracle of Law," by Alfred W. Braithwaite. (Friends' Historical Society, 1s. 6d.).

This reprint of the Presidential Address to the Friends' Historical Society in 1956 deals with Thomas Rudyard, a practising attorney who was imprisoned under the Conventicle Act in 1670, gave great assistance to Fox and others when they found themselves under arrest and subsequently assisted Penn in America. Rudyard had many Baptists as companions when he was in Newgate and did not get on with them very well. His "pamphlet war" with Richard Hobbs, Thomas Hicks and Jeremiah Ives did not do great credit to either party.

ERNEST A. PAYNE

Faith and Logic: Oxford Essays in Philosophical Theology. Edited by Basil Mitchell. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 21s.).

Students of theology concerned at the current disparagement of reason in theological enquiry, and the growth of illogical, and even incomprehensible, modes of exegesis, who may turn to this volume hoping for support for more rational methods, will be disappointed.

For here is little about logic, as commonly understood, and even less about faith. Here, rather, is an attempt by a group of very earnest and competent Anglicans, at apologetic restatement of fundamental theological techniques—what is meant by Revelation, what is implied in talk about the soul, and grace, how theologians reason, and the logical status and validity of theological statements—in face of the sweeping Empiricist rejection of all metaphysics by the Linguistic Analysis school of philosophy, successors to the Logical Positivists.

Full appreciation of what the various writers offer may well be made difficult for many readers by memories of their own studies in a philosophy of religion which did not concern itself merely with linguistic usage and the logical grammar of sentences, but with a wider synthesis of the partial insights of the various sciences, and the search for answers to ultimate questions about the nature of religious experience and the implications of its astonishing story of development. Presumably philosophy will return in due course to these larger problems, for ever-increasing specialisation in science only sharpens the necessity for some satisfying synthesis, if life as a whole is to be intelligible. Meanwhile the painstaking analysis of types of sentences, the elaborate distinction of the usage of terms—indicative, descriptive, prescriptive, emotive, performative, and the rest—and the seemingly arbitrary erection of empiricist prejudices into tests of the meaningfulness of statements, all seems to be very thin fare beside the range and depth of traditional religious philosophy. In addition, the average minister (at any rate) has little opportunity of keeping in touch with the latest developments in the philosophical debate; he may be surprised to find how far such thought has moved since A. J. Ayer's *Language, Truth and Logic.* In consequence it will sometimes appear that the problems discussed are unreal, and that strange ideas are set up only to be demolished.

In reply it can only be said that the apologetic task must be done, and here it is seriously and thoroughly attempted; and that even the reader only slightly familiar with the field will find reward for patience. Certainly he will find himself looking with a much more critical eye at the language, methods and assumptions of some current theology. He may be profitably disturbed as he watches a keen logical mind dissect the methods of theological discussion, or analyse the meaning of "soul," or the use and "erosion" of parables like "Father." He will be at once stimulated and exasperated—as by the brilliant chapter on Revelation, the most rewarding and the most frustrating in the book. And he will, perhaps, occasionally, simply give up trying to understand what a paragraph is meant to say. But all the while he will be aware that he is wrestling—albeit vicariously—with a genuine problem: the impact of material science and technology upon philosophy has been not

merely to change its direction, but to transform (so far) its nature, and reduce the intellectual glories of Plato and Kant to a mere grammar of science. Philosophy has contracted to Logic, and Logic to Linguistics, all in the service of a scientific materialism that denies not only the truth, but the *sense*, of any statement not either tautological or empirically verifiable. This challenge may evoke impatience, but it nevertheless must be met.

To assess the total impression of a volume so varied and in some points so contradictory, is impossible. Some will lay the book down content to declare that there are a great many more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in *this* philosophy—especially in heaven. Some will be reminded of the frog and the centipede, and wonder how discourse that has stimulated and satisfied the world's best for centuries can possibly be shown now to have been all illogical argumentation about nonsense—even "useful, necessary, profound, or valuable nonsense" (p. 4). Some may suspect that to try to express the realities of religious experience within the limited concepts of this philosophy may prove to be as futile an undertaking as the attempt—say—to reduce the Christian ethic to hedonist terms. And probably all who have thought at all in this field will be strengthened, especially by the last chapter but by other passages also, in their suspicion, not only that the "principle of verification" is itself *ex hypothesi* either a meaningless statement, being itself unverifiable, or else a mere linguistic convention, an empiricist assumption erected into a rule of interpretation; but also that the whole Positivist philosophy is shot through with assumptions as truly metaphysical, and a great deal less respectable, than those which underlie theology itself.

There is obviously, as the authors repeatedly suggest, a great deal more thinking still to be done before the confusions are cleared and the philosophy of the scientific age finds a balanced expression. It is good to know there are those who are qualified as Christians, as well as Logicians, to contribute to it. The book is beautifully and accurately produced, and the editing unobtrusive, but sufficient.

The Making of the Sermon, by Robert J. McCracken. (Student Christian Movement Press, Ltd., 10s. 6d.).

It is probably unfair to judge a book by what one hoped for, and a discussion of sermon-making by the occupant of the Riverside Drive pulpit admittedly raises exceptionally high expectations. But even when allowances are made, this book is a disappointment. Dr. McCracken *chats* about preaching in general, the various types of sermon, the need of a good style, and only in the last ten pages reaches "the making of the sermon." This section begins, as many

will think, with the main work already done, with text and theme chosen and abundant accumulated material ready for sifting. But it is probably up to that point that most help is needed. The regular quotations tend to hamper what argument there is and lend a superficial air to what could have been a serious discussion of the many questions which beset preaching in a non-literary, "visual," propaganda-resistant age — problems of authority, translation, "demythologising," preaching-as-worship, and the special problems raised by radio-preaching, by "mass-counselling," by the relation of preaching to the changing forms of culture (especially to the preaching-theatre), and the decline of preaching in the revival of liturgical worship. True, most of these questions have little to do with sermon-making, but neither has Dr. McCracken's line of thought. The necessity of possessing a sense of divine commission is emphasized, but the difficulty of preserving this under modern conditions (time-limit ministries, appointment by popular election, fixed retirement dates, severe limitation of preaching-time, and public opinion about the pulpit) is not considered. In lectures to first-year theologicals, the various points made doubtless had value, though one suspects that some of the judgments expressed would occasion vigorous discussion—"Personal quality is the secret of spiritual power"; "what they valued most was . . . interest"; "the calibre of a minister can be judged by his library" (this last, with the book itself priced at 10s. for two hours light reading, seems particularly heartless). A minor blemish or two (as the typographical inconsistency, pp. 30, 39, 43, 45; "skillfully," "self-anatomy," and "The Gates of *the* New Life"—missing the point of J. S. Stewart's title) do not spoil a very pleasing format. One would like to think Dr. McCracken would lend his mind and pen to a much more thorough examination of his subject before he finally lays it aside.

The Deacon: His Ministry in our Churches, by the Moderators of the Congregational Union. (Independent Press Ltd., 1s. 6d.).

The Moderators of the Congregational Union have here produced a statement on the qualifications, work, responsibilities and methods of election of the Church Diaconate (together with a sketch of its history, and a summary of denominational, financial and legal information concerning its duties) which should prove of inestimable value. It will recall experienced men to their earlier vision and dedication, and kindle in newly-elected leaders a worthy conception of their privilege. The whole of the counsel is as justly applicable to Baptist as to Congregational circles "only more so"; a Baptist edition (merely substituting our own denominational terms and addresses) produced in collaboration with the Independent Press would be most useful. The ideal is described in full awareness of

the actual conditions prevailing in local churches, and the aims are defined in a wholly admirable way. One delicate responsibility—that of handling applications for membership—is not mentioned; and some brief treatment of the conduct of Deacons' Meetings would have been welcome. A larger question arises from so closely integrating deacons and minister in the pastoral oversight of the Church; in practice, the tendency to equate minister and deacon (except only in preaching) can lead to confusion of authority and leadership, and the minister's special training and function (and his comparative isolation from church family feuds!) can be overlooked. But this is a fault merely in emphasis: deacons, old and new, should buy and keep this profitable handbook and read it afresh on the anniversary of their election every year.

The Ministry of Our Churches: by the Moderators of the Congregational Union. (Independent Press, 1s.).

Baptists cannot read this "report" of twenty years' of Congregationalism without quickened sympathy and a shared concern. Four pages of graphs show decreases over twenty years in ministers, students, churches, and membership; a sorry story too like our own. The Preface declares, "Plainly no task is more urgent than the recruiting of the right kind of man (and woman) for the full-time Ministry." But despite the steep rise in "deletions" in recent years nothing is said of the related (and equally urgent) problem of keeping the recruits already gained. Publication of the figures reveals considerable courage, though one looks in vain for any explanation or analysis of causes. In fact the graphs have no relation to the chapters of the report, which deal instead with the minister's duties as evangelist, pastor, preacher, trainer of lay-leaders, and leader of the whole Church. Most of the counsel here offered is already familiar to those who have sat under pastoral-theology "pep-talks" in ministerial Retreats, and as so often it loses weight by being offered by men who are "Moderators" and "have all been Ministers of Churches"—that is, eminently *successful* men, who have now left the front-line ministry they so eloquently magnify. Nothing at all is said about study, either for the minister's immediate work or for his contribution—all too rare—to the theological thinking of the day. For ourselves, probably the highest value the Congregational Report could have would be to provoke a similar, and equally courageous production, with comaparable graphs, and a thorough analysis of all the factors at work, by a group of our own ministers, not all of them highly "successful," and none of them out of pastoral office. A misprint in Graph 1 (288 for 228) makes the position look worse than it is, and one on page 27 ("responsibile") has a nice touch of irony.

Antidote to Doubt, by A. E. Gould. (Independent Press, 6s. 6d.).

The recurrent note of evangelistic appeal makes one want to commend this book as at least aware that there is more to evangelism than emotion, and that problems of *belief* must be faced in the approach to the unconverted. Nevertheless it is not easy to conceive the readership intended, or the purpose which determined the method chosen. Describing at the outset the dangers of the modern "infection" of unbelief, the writer expounds in reply the seven clauses of the Apostles' Creed; he eschews "proof" as foredoomed to failure (although the first chapter marshals "evidence" and the tone of the whole book is argumentative), and declares "What I intend to do is to state my personal faith . . . tell you what I believe." One wonders how much conviction this will carry to anyone seriously afflicted with intellectual perplexities about Christianity, especially when—owing to the method followed—a disproportionate emphasis is laid upon subjects like the Virgin Birth, the present state of the dead, and the correct interpretation of a passage in *Job,* and when one feels that occasionally the real weight of objections that can be raised against Christian beliefs has not been fairly represented. As an elementary introduction to classic Christian affirmations, for Bible-class use, the book has real promise, in spite of phrases like "non-objectivisible space," "supra-polar space," "moral relativism issuing in ethical neutralism." Some unguarded remarks on the Trinity, on the state of the Church, and on the witness of Nature (pp. 14-15, which weaken somewhat the argument of the first chapter) will not help the earnest wrestler with religious doubt, and the impact of the whole would have been greatly strengthened if some simple suggestions about how to *find* faith had been added to the all-too-brief closing remarks on the necessity of personal encounter.

Training in Visitation, by L. R. Misselbrook. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 2s.).

It was doubtless an excellent idea to follow up the account of the Leavesden Road (Watford) evangelistic experiment (*Winning the People for Christ*) with this summary of the kind of training and preparation involved; but this booklet has nevertheless an intrinsic value of its own, and may well exercise the wider influence. Here, the main questions hitherto left unanswered are considered, and in a simple, direct and convincing style the teaching and counsel given in intending visitors is set down, and their experiences shared. Among all the literature evoked by the present concern for evangelism, these two booklets are probably the most sane and realistic, and by their concentration upon the evangelistic task of the local

Church, the most likely to achieve *permanent* results. Of course some questions remain, especially the prior question of the spiritual quality of the Church into which the outsider comes—so often to be disappointed. The excellent chapter on leading men to Christ will not please all Baptists; and any implied assumption that any Church, any Minister, can do this kind of work is false: "He gave *some*, evangelists." On the other hand this extremely useful account of Christian friendship in action with evangelistic motive has relevance wider than that of evangelistic methods. One is left with simple but urgent questions: Can this kind of work really be organized, especially when it involves doing other people's washing, or minding the baby—does not this kind of thing depend wholly upon individual offering, and being trusted? Is organization *necessary:* are not Christian people everywhere doing just these things, without being "teamed" to do it? But especially: Would this booklet stir *my* Church to attempt it more often, more widely, and to greater effect? It is certain that if this moving story does not, then nothing will.

R. E. O. WHITE

The Cross in the Church, by Stephen Neil. (Independent Press, 4s.).

This book contains four lectures given at the L.M.S. Summer School in 1956. They are printed as delivered with, the writer says, "a few minor concessions." A few more concessions would have improved the book considerably and avoided some jarring phrases and unfortunate statements. For example, the reference to the observance of Communion in most Free Churches is the opposite of the truth, at least as far as Baptists are concerned.

There is no doubt about the liveliness of the lectures and the scholarship of the lecturer. He considers first the various groups responsible for the death of Jesus; then the redeeming purpose of God in Old Testament times, in Christ and in the Church; then the fact of conflict and of the persecution of Christians in a world of sin and pride; and finally the present-day issues and conflicts. This is a stimulating book to mind and heart and good value for money.

The Seven Deadly Sins, by Billy Graham. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 5s.).

The power of Billy Graham as a pungent and penetrating preacher is evident in this small book. He is direct, challenging and personal, but largely limits his consideration of these sins to the individual, disregarding our involvement in them as members of a sinful society.

When Christ Comes Again, by J. J. Muller. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 7s. 6d.).

The writer of this book is Professor of New Testament Theology in a Seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church in S. Africa. His point of view is a conservative one, but he is not bigoted or unbalanced in his treatment of the Second Coming. He bases his teaching upon the Scriptures and honestly tries to take account of all the passages relevant to this subject and attempts to reconcile them. Whether readers can follow him all the way or not will depend largely on their own particular view of the Scriptures.

The Wondrous Cross, by H. F. Lovell Cocks. (Independent Press, 5s.).

This is a very helpful little book, especially suitable for Lent reading. It gives an account of God's plan for salvation in simple terms but with the evidence of real scholarship and deep faith. The thirteen short chapters are full of meaty and wise teaching, and many preachers, as well as Church members, will get much stimulus from reading them. It is such a book as we should expect from the writer, that keeps us near to the heart of our Christian faith but never lets us forget the world in which we live.

The Story of the Cross, by Leon Morris. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 8s. 6d.).

This is a devotional study of *Matthew* xxvi-xxviii, based upon Lenten addresses given in Melbourne, Australia. The writer works through these three chapters section by section, meditating on each, and giving evidence of scholarship and a discerning devotional spirit. There are many stimulating thoughts here, and few lay preachers (or others) could read this book without getting many ideas for sermons and mid-week addresses.

L. J. MOON

Prayers and Bible Readings for Young Wives' Clubs, by Marjorie Shave. (Independent Press, Ltd., 2s. 6d.).

This little book contains twenty sets of Bible Readings and prayers on topics of particular interest to young married women. They include material suitable for Christmas, Easter, Whitsun and Harvest, and the book will be most valuable in the hands of a sensitive club leader.

Praying: How, When, Where and Why, by Muriel Lester. (Independent Press, Ltd., 4s.).

Anything which Miss Lester writes is sure to have a deeply spiritual atmosphere and this book is no exception. It is, however, a pity that a

book which seems intended for beginners is not more specific and concrete. Miss Lester is well acquainted with the devotional life of the Eastern religions, and it may be that this is one reason for the fact that she often tells us little about the simple, concrete side of the prayer life. This book, in my judgment, will be of most value to those who are already well launched on the life of devotion. To them it will be a stimulus and enrichment.

DENIS LANT

Beautiful Hands, by Reginald Morrish. (Independent Press, Ltd., 6s.).

These short meditative essays reflecting upon incidents of everyday life are by the author of *Christ with the C.I.D.,* and breathe an atmosphere of simplicity, Christian sentiment, charm and quietness of mind as far removed from anything associated with Scotland Yard as can well be imagined. Neither argument nor exposition is here, a somewhat unsophisticated faith is assumed, and some of the incidents which awaken reflection are neither memorable nor significant. Yet the total effect is pleasing, and for minds weary of "stimulus," "tension" and "problems" the result is soothing. When the writer strays beyond his field, to consider Spiritualism, the resurrection, the Advent, or preaching, his touch is much less sure; one wonders if he has yet understood the problems. But such lapses apart, the book is excellently suited as a gift to those whose immediate need is not discussion or doctrine, but a simple, heartening reminder of comfortable things.

What Jesus asked, by S. W. Carruthers. (Independent Press, Ltd., 2s. 6d.).

Twelve of the simpler questions which Jesus put to His hearers form the link which unites these otherwise varied children's talks into an attractive series. The lessons are simple and practical, dealing with the essential but often overlooked elementary steps in the development of Christian character, while the Scripture background is used with reverent and often illuminating imagination. Perhaps here and there a little further elaboration would add weight to a rather thin impression, but on the whole both content and form make this a worthy aid to children's worship.

R. E. O. WHITE

A Handbook of Congregationalism, by Ernest J. Price. (Independent Press, 3s.).

As a handy, pocket-sized, clear and concise guide to the beliefs and practices of the Congregationalists this useful little book—now twice revised since its original appearance in 1924—could hardly be improved upon. It is not correct, however, in stating that Baptists adhere to immersion simply because it was the primitive form of baptism. The reviewers copy (the only one, he hopes) was marred by the omission of pp. 65, 68, 69, 72 and the duplication of pp. 66, 67, 70 and 71.