
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

AT two o'clock on the afternoon of Thursday, 30th April, 1908, more than fifty people met together in the Council Chamber at the Baptist Church House and "resolved that the Baptist Historical Society be formed." Much could be written of the activities of the Society over the past fifty years, of the volumes of valuable material for Baptist history published under its auspices; of the assistance given to churches and individuals on matters dealing with denominational history; of the countless articles of importance published first in the *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society*, and then, since 1922, in the *Baptist Quarterly*. But interesting as a review of the past would be, it is of more importance to consider the task of the Society in the light of present-day needs, and to formulate plans for the future.

On the invitation issued for the inaugural meeting of the Historical Society, the aims of the new Society were stated. These remain unaltered, but need interpreting anew in these days. We would suggest four tasks which challenge us now, yet which arise directly out of the aims of fifty years ago.

First of all, there is the need to initiate a drive to ensure the preservation of materials for Baptist history, both manuscript and printed. More than once in recent months we have heard hair-raising stories of church minute books either mouldering away in damp places, or coming to a more sudden end in a dustbin. A system needs to be devised whereby all churches of more than a certain

age are circulated requesting information as to what records are extant and their whereabouts. In this way it should be possible to build up a catalogue of sources available for the various periods in Baptist history. In addition, some of the older churches possess their own libraries. These vary, both in size and value, but there is a real need for the collecting of information as to what these libraries contain. In a similar way, the whereabouts of Association records need to be discovered and noted. A listing and cataloguing of such material would not only enhance the chances of preserving valuable documents but would also facilitate research work into Baptist history. Yet it is not only the older churches which must be considered. We owe it to those who will celebrate the Ter-Jubilee of the Baptist Historical Society to try to ensure that the many new churches now being founded keep full records of the adventures of their early years. Events which appear commonplace to us and therefore not worth recording may turn out to be the very things which interest people one hundred years from now. The phenomena of housing estates and New Towns and the religious and social problems of these could well be of historical importance in years to come. One further thing needs to be said about the preservation of records and that is the importance today of trying to write down some of the still existing oral traditions of events of bygone days. It is very interesting, for example, to note how Mr. C. B. Jewson in *The Baptists of Norfolk* makes use of oral tradition to describe the events of the 1680s in the church at Ingham. These traditions are normally handed down from generation to generation in the same family. In these days, sad to say, the family tradition is breaking down in our churches. It is therefore all the more important that we should consider whether in some way an attempt can be made to record the traditions before they are lost.

Then, secondly, the need remains today to encourage, not only the writing of general Baptist history, but also the teaching of it. We hear much today of the growth of denominationalism resulting paradoxically but understandably from the encounter with other denominations in the various manifestations of the ecumenical movement. It may be true that those people who are fairly regularly involved in actual ecumenical encounters are being driven to examine their own denominational beliefs, but it is open to doubt whether such examination penetrates to the rank and file of church membership who are, of course, ultimately, the Baptist denomination. If we are to proclaim firmly and confidently that Baptist thought and practice are relevant and necessary today, it is surely essential for us to see how and why the Baptist denomination came into being and how and why it has maintained a separate witness until now. Separate be it noted, not only from the State Church, but also from other Free Churches. In the early days, the Baptist Historical

Society encouraged and supported the publication of sources for the study of Baptist history. What is surely needed today is liaison between the Society and, for example, the Carey Kingsgate Press and the Visual Aid Departments on the production of suitable materials to stimulate thought on Baptist life and practice at all levels of church life. In this we must take care that we do not under-estimate our constituency. It is sometimes suggested that we are in danger of encouraging within the denomination what may be called " a pamphlet mentality " by serving up Baptist thought in a light and easily-digestible form rather than providing more detailed material which is real food for thought. No one would want to say that this suggestion is more than a half-truth, but that it does contain some element of truth cannot be denied. In recent months, stimulated partially by the Report on Ordination, there has been conclusive evidence of a fast-growing desire amongst a few to discuss and discover more of Baptist history and theology. Is it not quite clearly a challenge to the Baptist Historical Society to play a part in this discussion and discovery, that the interest of the few may provoke the thought of the many?

Following on from this point, there is, thirdly, the encouragement of research into specific aspects of Baptist history and theology. There are vast tracts of Baptist history which are substantially unexplored. Not infrequently would-be students of Baptist history, both ministerial and lay, express interest in doing some research work. Sometimes a probationer minister expresses a desire to work on denominational history for his probation work, on other occasions laymen speak of their intention to study it for relaxation (a most laudable desire!). There is clearly a need for the Society to draw up a list of the more urgent and relevant aspects of our Baptist life and thought which need to be worked upon. It might then be possible to consider the organization of research work. The founder members of the Society seem to have viewed the sharing in and directing of research as one of their prime objects. Much as they achieved, there remains still more for us to do.

Finally, there is the challenge of this journal, the *Baptist Quarterly*. We have been greatly cheered in past months not only by the increase in circulation, but also by the number of letters we have received. We are most grateful for them and only regret that neither editorial expenses, nor editorial time, permit us to reply personally! But it is our earnest desire to make this publication of the maximum use to readers and to Baptist life in general. We therefore invite suggestions and criticisms. We also invite readers to submit any manuscripts which they may feel suitable for publication. Above all, however, we ask you to do your best to discover new subscribers, for we face the usual story of rising costs. In this connection it should be noted that the *Congregational Quarterly* is,

in future, only to be published three times a year. It is requested, therefore, that all members endeavour in this Jubilee year to gain at least one new subscriber for the *Baptist Quarterly*. This is the sort of suggestion that one hears in so many contexts—so much so, perhaps, that it is no longer taken as seriously as it should be. But is it really asking too much? If we did take this idea at its face value and were successful, then indeed the Society's Jubilee would have been well and truly celebrated. If we believe in the Society it is surely the least we can do.

These four tasks, then, we bring before you. It is hoped that they will be discussed at the Annual Meeting on April 28th at the Westminster Chapel, and wherever else opportunity presents itself in the coming year. It has been said that the denomination cannot afford to be without the Historical Society. That was spoken with the past service of the Society in mind. It is our task to justify that confidence for the future through our work for the people called Baptists.

* * *

It is good to know that the Baptist Union Council, in November last, received the Report on Ordination and that it is now published. It is to be hoped that the wider issues arising out of that report will receive unhurried and scholarly attention. The series of articles on "Baptists and the Ministry" which we intend to publish during the coming year opens in this current issue with a brief article introducing the questions which will be faced.

* * *

Members of the Society will want to offer good wishes to Dr. E. A. Payne, one of our Vice-Presidents, as he assumes the Moderatorship of the Free Church Federal Council. He enters upon his year of office at a time when it seems that the Federal Council, both at local and national level, does not command the interest and support it deserves. It may well be that it needs to re-examine its place in the pattern of the ecclesiastical life in this country. Of recent years the growth of denominationalism, to which we have referred above, the formation of the British Council of Churches and the ever-growing emphasis upon world denominationalism have combined to make its task more complicated. Yet, in spite of that, what surely is needed in Free Church life in this country is a strong lead in encouraging further evidences of the 'togetherness' of the Free Churches—both in thought and in action. It is certainly premature to talk in terms of a United Free Church, especially as that phrase no doubt means different things to different people. But it might well be felt that the time had come for further theological discussion, not only on the issues which divide the Free Churches, but also on those which apparently unite them. It is usually assumed that the

ministries of each of the Free Churches are mutually acceptable. This could be made more manifest perhaps at all Free Church ordination services by the more general use of invitations to ministers of every Free Church to share in such services. Then again, is it to be assumed that membership of one Free Church carries with it membership of another? If this is so, implicitly or explicitly, should it not be more generally known? If this is not so—and Baptists may prove the awkward squad on this issue—let us know why not. These and kindred issues need to be thought out together.

But not only is thinking desirable, surely action is also. We are familiar with the need for experiments in united Free Church witness on housing estates and in New Towns, but what of the rural areas? In many a village there are two, or even three, churches with total congregations and Sunday schools which would scarcely fill one. In these rural communities the need for 'togetherness' is perhaps as urgent as on housing estates. It is in the villages that the Anglican claims are often most strongly pressed and exercised, thus increasing the need for united Free Church witness. Certainly, in villages the problem of Free Church unity is often vastly complicated by non-theological questions such as family loyalties, but this does not mean that the issue should remain untackled. Part of the problem is that many of the local Free Church Federal Councils are situated in towns and cities and do not include the surrounding villages within their jurisdiction. Would it not be possible therefore for the Free Church Federal Council to encourage the three Free Churches chiefly involved in rural areas to initiate a survey of the village situation at what the Baptist would call either Area or Association level?

In all this work towards Free Church unity, however, one danger is ever present. This is what may be called non-denominationalism. It is sometimes said that there is little point in all the theological discussions, for a man moving to a new home will take himself and his family and settle in the Free Church in which he feels most at home regardless of denomination. Some may feel that this is all to the good. But it certainly does not follow that the problem of Free Church relationships is thereby well on the way to being settled. It just will not do to say, for example, that it is good that it matters not to this man, whether his children are baptized as infants or as adults, or whether the minister of the church is called by a church-meeting or placed by a central committee. To encourage such a non-committal attitude towards faith and order, not only betrays the past, but far more important, it seriously jeopardises any hope of a constructive and lasting solution to the problem of Free Church unity. No, there remains much to do. What is required just now, then, are firm and practical suggestions as to the next steps to try and then the courage to take them.

Baptists and the Ministry

INTRODUCTION

THE purpose of this brief introduction is to indicate something of the scope and intention of other articles to follow in this series. What is written here is intended merely to show the broad outlines of matters to be discussed in each article, and it is possible that as the series progresses some adjustments of detail may have to be made.

The first article will deal with the Priesthood of all Believers. This is a phrase so familiar to us all. It is a conception which we are liable to define rather vaguely in our minds as lying at the heart of much Reformation theology and meaning that every Christian is some sort of a minister. But what did Martin Luther really teach about this concept? Has there been any misinterpretation of his thought? Or has it simply been taken to its logical conclusion? These and similar questions need to be faced at the outset of a series such as we plan. This first article, which will consider Luther's thought and its implications, will be written for us by an eminent Lutheran scholar. It will be of great value to have the situation presented to us from outside our own ranks.

Having laid the foundation of our thinking in the first article, we shall move, in the second, to a consideration of the nature of the Ministry. In this the question of the call to the Ministry will be discussed, both the call of God to a man to serve Him and the confirmatory call of a local church to a man to be its minister. In this context a discussion on the meaning and purpose not only of Ordination but also of Induction will naturally be in place. This will lead to the problem of the authority which a minister may be reckoned to possess and also whether the situation demands that there should be any distinction between the sexes in the matter of the Ministry.

But in the present situation all are called to exercise their ministry within the life of a particular denomination, and so the third article will consider the Ministry and the Church in the life of the Baptist denomination. This will raise the issue of the relationship between Ordination and Accreditation. The reasons for, and the theory behind, the Accredited and the Probationers Lists will be

examined. Are these lists theological or organizational? Or are they a little of each? Then again, the institution and development of the office of Area Superintendent needs consideration. Is such an appointment theologically compatible with Baptist principles? All this is another way of asking whether the Baptist Union can or should be viewed in any way theologically. Or is it merely a convenient organization? Three further matters will probably be touched on in this article, namely, the question of missionaries, their ordination and status, the position of ordained ministers in non-pastoral office, whether in theological colleges or universities or schools or elsewhere, and finally the status of deaconesses.

After considering the minister in his denominational setting the next article will look at the Ministry in the local church. This raises the issue immediately as to the responsibilities which belong to the minister on the one hand and the church meeting on the other. Whether the authority in the local church under the divine guidance resides in the minister or congregation, or in both acting together and if in both, what happens when they cannot agree? At this point, too, it will be necessary to consider the layman and the ministerial service which he renders, whether as lay pastor or lay preacher. In view of our firm conviction of the right of the church to invite a layman (or a lay woman) not only to preach but also to administer the Lord's Supper, we need to see clearly the basis of such a conviction, especially as our practice in this matter causes great difficulty to other Christians. Then, in the life of the local church, the office of deacon requires examination in the light of Baptist belief and practice. It may be felt that we do not always accord to this office the dignity and responsibility that it deserves. Should there be any question of ordaining men and women to any office in the local church, to the diaconate for example? There must also be a consideration of the other offices in the local church, whether Sunday-school teacher, youth club leader or caretaker. All need to be seen as part of the life and service in the local church—the Body of Christ.

The fifth and final article will sum up the series. Let no one of us think that this series is going to be able to answer all the questions. In fact it will probably raise more issues than it solves and we shall certainly not all agree with what will be written. Yet it is confidently hoped that the series will serve to clarify points which are generally accepted and also indicate those issues upon which further study and thought are needed. It will be the purpose of the final article to draw together the threads. The hope is also that in this last article certain suggestions can be made for subjects to be dealt with in subsequent articles in this journal. In this way, although the particular series will have ended, the discussion will go on.

This series, then, will be in a real sense a necessary adventure into present-day Baptist theology. Like most adventures we are confident that it will prove interesting and profitable. It may also turn out to be not a little dangerous!

THE EDITOR

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

J. D. HUGHEY, Jr., Ph.D.
Professor, Baptist Theological Seminary, Rüschlikon.

ERNEST A. PAYNE, M.A., D.D.
General Secretary, Baptist Union of Gt. Britain and Ireland.

E. P. WINTER, M.A., B.Litt.
Formerly Minister, Redditch.

Reviewers: K. BARRITT, W. J. BRADNOCK, W. S. DAVIES, A. GILMORE, HUGH MARTIN, E. A. PAYNE, W. M. S. WEST.

Baptists and Religious Freedom

RELIGIOUS liberty is a subject of perennial interest among Baptists. The Constitution of the Baptist World Alliance states that one of the primary purposes of this organization is "the safeguarding and maintenance of full religious liberty everywhere, not only for our own constituent churches, but also for all other religious faiths,"[1] and every Baptist World Congress issues a manifesto on religious freedom. This may be regarded as one of the fundamental principles of Baptists, one on which they all agree; and in this area Baptists have made a significant contribution. Their interest in religious freedom is related to their emphasis on the personal and voluntary character of true religion.

Of course Baptists do not stand alone as champions of religious liberty. Protestantism, though originally intolerant, is now on the side of religious freedom, or at least of toleration, and so are individuals of many religions and of no religion. No religious communion, however, has a clearer record on this subject than do Baptists.

I

Baptists, along with those of other faiths, have suffered for freedom. Their endurance of fines, imprisonment, and exile has directed attention to its lack and contributed to its achievement. Many have not hesitated to expose themselves to danger when this seemed right.

This was true of Thomas Helwys, the English Baptist pioneer of the early seventeenth century. After he and other refugees in Holland had accepted believer's baptism, he decided that an obligation rested upon him, in spite of danger, to propagate his faith in his own land, and he led a group of Baptists back to England. He took with him for sale in England a book he had written entitled *A Short Declaration of the Mistery of Iniquity*, the first appeal published in English for full religious liberty for all. Very daringly the author made his demand:

> Our Lord the King is but an earthly King, and he hath no authority as a King but in earthly causes, and if the King's people be obedient and true subjects, obeying all humane laws made by the King, our lord the King can require no more; for men's religion to God is betwixt God and themselves; the King shall not answer for it, neither may the King judge between God and man. Let them be heretics, Turks, Jews, or whatsoever, it appertains not to the earthly power to punish them in the least measure.[2]

Helwys was still bolder in the dedication to King James I which he wrote with his own hand :

> Hear, O King, and despise not the counsel of the poor, and let their complaints come before thee. The King is a mortal man, and not God, and therefore hath no power over the immortal souls of his subjects, to make laws and ordinances for them, and to set spiritual lords over them. If the King has authority to make spiritual lords and laws, then he is an immortal God, and not a mortal man. O King, be not seduced by deceivers to sin so against God, whom thou oughtest to obey, nor against thy poor subjects who ought and will obey thee in all things with body, life and goods, or else let their lives be taken from the earth.

This was too much for the government of James I, and Helwys was put in prison, where he soon died. His appeal for religious liberty seemed to be fruitless, but it was the beginning of a struggle which would eventually be crowned with success.

The persistence of Baptists in worshipping God according to the dictates of their consciences, though this brings punishment, is seen in the record of the Broadmead Church of Bristol, England, for 1670 :

> Because we did not know which way they would begin upon us, we shut our public meeting-house door when we understood they were coming. Then they (the informers) fetched constables, and broke open the door, came in, and took our names, for which some of us were brought before the magistrates and convicted. Then, against the next Lord's day, we broke a wall, up on high, for a window, and put the speaker in the next house to stand and preach, whereby we heard him as well as if in the room with us. The bishop's informers come in again, take our names, for which we were again brought before the mayor, and convicted. So they did the third Lord's day. And the fourth Lord's day, the mayor himself, with the officers and some aldermen, came upon us, and turned us out; but seeing they could not make us refrain our meeting, they . . . nailed up our doors, and put locks upon them; so they kept us out by force and power, that we were fain to meet in the lanes and highways for several months.[3]

Such persistence characterized the early Baptists of colonial America, continental Europe, and other areas. It is also characteristic of present-day Baptists in lands where full freedom is lacking. In Spain Protestants frequently face temptations to renounce their faith or surrender their right to worship, but the temptations are resisted, and slowly but surely the battle for religious freedom is being won. In 1954 twenty-three Baptists of the town of Játiva were fined for taking part in an unauthorized baptismal service in a river. (There was no baptistry in their little chapel.) The majority paid their fines, but five young people went to prison, protesting that they would not pay an unjust fine. The whole town heard of the Protestants who had been put in prison, and public opinion was almost wholly on their side. The church began to have better

attendance than it had ever had before, and many new members were received. The authorities in Játiva will probably not be so imprudent as to imprison other people for religious reasons. Thus does religious fidelity contribute to freedom.

II

Another contribution of Baptists to religious liberty has been in the clarification of its meaning. This is needed, for there is often haziness as to what is involved. Baptists are among those of many communions, and of none, who have had something to say on this subject.

They have always insisted on freedom for all religions, in contrast with those who advocate freedom for "the true religion" only. They have demanded freedom for themselves, but not just for themselves. We have seen that Thomas Helwys asked for freedom for "heretics, Turks, Jews or whatsoever." In 1947 the Baptist World Alliance, in its manifesto on religious liberty, declared: "God, in his infinite wisdom, having created all men free, instilling in them qualities of independent judgment, calls upon us today, as Christian people, to maintain this God-given freedom not only for ourselves, but for all men everywhere."[4]

Baptists have distinguished between freedom and toleration. The latter implies that the State regards one religion as better than others but permits the inferior religions to exist. In the Baptist World Congress of 1923, E. Y. Mullins stated the case clearly:

> Religious liberty excludes the principle of toleration in religion. To put the power and prestige of the State behind one form of religion and merely tolerate others is not religious liberty. It is religious coercion. . . . Equal rights to all and special privileges to none is the true ideal.[5]

The elements in religious liberty were enumerated in the 1947 Baptist World Alliance manifesto on the subject:

> Holding the principles of freedom dear, we therefore seek for all people everywhere, and in particular all minority groups, the following freedoms:
>
> Freedom to determine their own faith and creed;
>
> Freedom of public and private worship, preaching and teaching;
>
> Freedom from any opposition by the State to religious ceremonies and forms of worship;
>
> Freedom to determine the nature of their own ecclesiastical government and the qualifications of their ministers and members, including the right of the individual to join the Church of his own choice, and the right to associate for corporate Christian action;
>
> Freedom to control the education of their ministers, to give religious instruction to their youth, and to provide for the adequate development of their own religious life;
>
> Freedom of Christian service, relief work, and missionary activity, both at home and abroad; and
>
> Freedom to own and use such facilities and properties as will make possible the accomplishment of these ends.[6]

Religious liberty may be defined briefly as the right of individuals and groups to hold, publicize, and propagate their religious beliefs and practices and to conduct their religious affairs without external restraint or limitation, and with equality of civil rights, so long as they do not interfere with the rights or liberties of other people.[7]

III

Note next that Baptists have connected separation of Church and State with freedom. Such separation, of course, does not automatically secure religious liberty; it may even bring persecution, as it did in the Soviet Union. From the standpoint of government and religion, however, separation, with friendship and co-operation, is desirable. E. Y. Mullins affirmed "a free Church in a free State" as the religio-civic axiom.[8]

The statements from Thomas Helwys quoted earlier make clear that he regarded government as incapable of ruling in the realm of the spirit, since the immortal God and not mortal man has authority to make laws for the souls of men. Roger Williams was in essential agreement on this point, and in the colony of Rhode Island which he founded there was complete separation of Church and State. Other factors helped to establish this as the American pattern, but the conviction of Baptists should not be overlooked. Baptists of all lands have shared the conviction, though they have not always agreed as to the extent of the separation. Scandinavian Baptists, for example, are quite willing to accept financial aid for their schools, whereas most American Baptists would hesitate about doing so. National traditions as well as religious principles are influential in this realm.

On the Christian's attitude towards the State and the relation of Churches to it, most Baptists would doubtless agree with W. O. Carver:

> In relation to the State, the Church (its members and the churches) should recognize the State as a necessary and divinely sanctioned institution for public order and welfare. We believe in the separate functions and the absolute separation and independence each from the other, of the Church and the State as institutions. In civil matters the State has a sphere of proper authority which the individual and the Church should respect and honour. In the realm of religion the individual and the Church must claim freedom from interference by the State. The State must neither control nor support the Church; nor hinder its free functioning in the realm of the spiritual life and religious relations; the Church must give ethical and moral support to the State, contributing to good citizenship but not seeking or accepting control over the State. The churches, individually and in proper combined expression, by challenge and in judgment, should serve as ethical conscience for the common life of society, including the State.[9]

IV

Baptists have also helped to clarify the reasons for religious freedom. Of course they have often championed religious liberty without knowing exactly why, and when they have attempted its logical defence, they have frequently borrowed the arguments used by philosophers, and by theologians of other communions.

Baptists, however, do have a distinctive emphasis in this area. Their principles call for freedom—the personal and voluntary character of religion, the competency of the individual soul under God, individual freedom to interpret the truth of God, church government by the congregation. As Thomas Helwys insisted, God alone is sovereign in the realm of the spirit. E. Y. Mullins said that it is axiomatic that, " to be responsible, man must be free."[10]

From the standpoint of the individual, religious freedom is important, for each person reaches his highest stature as he uses his mind, heart, and will to enter into relationship with God. From the standpoint of churches, it is important, for these grow in spiritual power as they receive the voluntary support of religiously devoted men and women. From the standpoint of the community and nation, it is important, for freedom in religion promotes and upholds all freedoms and stimulates the growth of inquiring and creative minds. From the standpoint of Christianity it is important, for ours is a personal and voluntary religion whose disciples are won by preaching, teaching, persuasion, and kindness.[11]

The 1939 Baptist World Alliance manifesto on religious freedom contained the following significant statements :

> Worthy religion rests on the conviction that the individual soul is competent to deal directly with God, and has the right and the need of this direct dealing. To deny any soul the full exercise of this privilege is to deprive the individual of his inherent and most sacred right, and to violate his dignity and worth as a human being. Every form of coercive restraint or constraint of a man in his converse with God is both a sin against the individual and a hindrance to human welfare. . . .
>
> Voluntariness in personal and corporate worship, institution and service is essential to vital religion and to spiritual development of society.[12]

V

Baptists have not only thought about religious liberty; they have taken practical measures for its achievement. Sometimes they have acted alone, and sometimes in concert with other friends of freedom. Only two illustrations of Baptist action for freedom will be cited.

In 1767 the Warren Association, centred in Rhode Island, was organized, largely for the purpose of co-operation in securing religious freedom. Soon Isaac Backus became the agent of the Association " to give aid to persons who might be oppressed and harrassed

for refusing to pay taxes to support the ministers and work of the Congregationalists." In carrying out his commission he travelled from place to place, wrote much, and several times appealed to the Massachusetts General Assembly. When the Continental Congress was called on the eve of the Revoluntionary War to consider matters of interest to all the colonies, Backus led a Baptist delegation to appeal for religious liberty, including disestablishment in Massachusetts. They presented their cause in a conference of delegates from Massachusetts and two other colonies, but without apparent success. One man insinuated that the complaints came from fanatical rather than regular Baptists, and another warned that they might as well expect a change in the solar system as to expect Massachusetts to give up her establishment. Separation of Church and State, however, did take place in 1833. Of course, Baptists do not take credit for it, but their efforts doubtless contributed something to the final result.

The former General Secretary and later President of the Baptist World Alliance, J. H. Rushbrooke, was a tireless champion of religious liberty, He used petitions, protests, personal interviews with government officials, and other means in behalf of oppressed minorities. His intervention in favour of Rumanian Baptists was especially noteworthy. After the First World War, people in the new Rumanian territories (where Baptists were fairly numerous) were suspected of disloyalty. The Baptist World Alliance pleaded their cause, and when this did not relieve the situation Dr. Rushbrooke organized a campaign which resulted in protests to the Rumanian Government from many parts of the world. He had interviews with the Prime Minister and the King. Some relief came when Baptists were recognized as a lawful confession, but repression, and further protests followed. The outcome of the struggle was still not completely clear when the Second World War began.

It is often difficult to know what measures to make for religious freedom. The strategy for one country may not be right for another. Sometimes what is attempted seems to do more harm than good. It is obvious, however, that in the past something needed to be done to achieve religious freedom and that still today in some areas the battle must go on. As a matter of fact, constant vigilance is necessary everywhere, for the battle for religious liberty is never won once for all. Baptists are glad to join with others in vigilance, and also in action when that is necessary.

J. D. HUGHEY, JR.

NOTES

[1] Baptist World Alliance, *Golden Jubilee Congress, London, 16th-22nd July,* 1955, ed. Arnold T. Ohrn (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1955), p. 384.

[2] Thomas Helwys, *A Short Declaration of the Mistery of Iniquity* (1612). Facsimile by The Kingsgate Press, London, 1935, p. 69. Spelling modernized.

[3] Quoted in H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Life and Faith of the Baptists* (London: The Kingsgate Press, 1946), pp. 130f.

[4] Baptist World Alliance, *Seventh Baptist World Congress, Copenhagen, Denmark, July* 29-*August* 3, 1947, ed. W. O. Lewis (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1947), p. 118.

[5] Baptist World Alliance, *Third Baptist World Congress, July* 21-27, 1923, ed. W. T. Whitley (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1923), p. 68.

[6] *Seventh Baptist World Congress,* p. 120.

[7] Cf. J. D. Hughey, Jr., "The Meaning of Religious Liberty," *The Quarterly Review,* April-June, 1957, pp. 55-61.

[8] E. Y. Mullins, *The Axioms of Religion* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1908), p. 74.

[9] R. Newton Flew (ed.), *The Nature of the Church* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1952), pp. 294f.

[10] Mullins, *op. cit.,* p. 74.

[11] The Author developed the above points in a commencement address at Union University, Jackson, Tennessee, in June, 1957.

[12] Quoted in Henry Cook, *What Baptists Stand For* (London: The Carey Kingsgate Press, 1953), p. 220.

[13] Joseph Martin Dawson, *Baptists and the American Republic* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1956), pp. 52f.

The Ministry in Historical Perspective

IT is, of course, the Church as a whole which is called to "minister" in the name of Christ. Dr. T. W. Manson was surely right in giving to his brief but effective comment on the pretentious volume *The Apostolic Ministry,* the title *The Church's Ministry.* He was on surer ground still when he argued that any right understanding of "ministry" in the technical sense recognizes it as the ministry of Jesus Christ Himself in and through His Church. But we are asked to consider those called and appointed to special office and service as "ministers" and to set our particular view of the Christian ministry in this more technical and specialised sense against the background of two thousand years of Christian history. The subject is not only a vast one. It is peculiarly complex and controversial. "No question in church history," says Williston Walker "has been more darkened by controversy than that of the origin and development of church officers, and none is more difficult, owing to the scantiness of the evidence that has survived."[1] What he says of the early centuries applies throughout the Church's history down to our own day, though now it is not the scantiness of the evidence that is the difficulty, but the volume of the controversial material.

The New Testament makes it clear that there were various kinds of ministry exercised within and on behalf of the Church of the first century, but provides us with no clear or comprehensive account of them. The position of the Apostles was obviously a dominant one, but the exact nature of their authority is nowhere defined, nor can we be quite sure as to the number of those reckoned as "apostles." Matthias took the place of Judas among the Twelve, but Paul certainly regarded himself, and was regarded, as an apostle, and there were others to whom the title seems to have been given. This is one of the most serious objections to any rigid theory of apostolical succession based on the view that an Apostle was a *shaliach* or plenipotentiary of our Lord, possessing in a special way His authority and commissioned to transmit it to others. Such a view of the essential or truly valid ministry breaks down when con-

[1] *A History of the Christian Church,* p. 44.

fronted with the facts, few though they be, which come to us from apostolic and sub-apostolic times, as well as being difficult to square with what is said in the Gospels and Epistles.

But the importance of the Apostles, singly and as a group, none can question, nor the importance, when most or all of the Twelve had left Jerusalem, of James, the brother of the Lord. These men owed their authority to having been with Jesus, to having been called to specially close companionship with Him, to having been witnesses of His Resurrection, to having heard and obeyed the Great Commission. They were a unique band, and though the exact limits of the company remain uncertain, it is significant that the earliest extra-canonical literature provides no evidence of any tendency to give the name "apostle" to any permanent order in the Church.

What the Apostles did, while still in Jerusalem, was to set aside seven men "to serve tables" (*diakonein trapezais*). These seven were not called "deacons," though later many in the Church saw their appointment as the inauguration of this special office. The Apostles or their immediate assistants—in the case of Paul, men like Timothy and Titus—also had an important share in the appointment of leaders in the little Christian communities which were soon to be found north, south, east and west of Judæa. The New Testament gives us details of the spread of Christianity into the Mediterranean world. Apart from the story of the Ethiopian eunuch, it tells us nothing of the expansion of the faith in other directions. In the Gentile churches the lead was taken, as in the Jewish synagogues, by the "elders," the *presbuteroi.* By virtue of the functions they exercised, they were soon described, at least in some places, as *episkopoi,* overseers. But the Gentile churches, of which we have details in the letters of Paul, had within them varied types of special ministries, all of them regarded as the direct gift of the Spirit. The lists which Paul gives in *Romans* 12 and *Ephesians* 4 are not exactly the same and are probably not intended to be exhaustive. The emphasis in both places is on the varied nature of spiritual gifts and their complementary character. But the Apostle spent himself in seeking to order and unite these communities. When he was on his way to Jerusalem for the last time, he addressed solemn words to the "elders" of the church at Ephesus (*Acts* 20) regarding their responsibilities. When he wrote to the church at Philippi, he made special reference to the *episkopoi kai diakonoi.* How should we translate these words: "bishops and deacons" as in the A.V. and R.V., as does Moffatt, or "the ministers of the churches and their assistants" (Weymouth), "church overseers and stewards" (Way), "superintendents and assistants" (Goodspeed)? Who knows? The offices, and no doubt the functions also, were in course of creation and definition.

The need for oversight and control was soon apparent. There is plenty of evidence of this in the Pauline letters and in the later books of the New Testament. It is to be found also in the *Didache,* in the *Shepherd of Hermas* and in the other early Christian writings. The mere claim to possess the prophetic gift is not enough. It has to be tested by the content of the prophecy and the character of the prophet. By the end of the first century or the beginning of the second, most local churches seem to have had a presiding "elder," who came to be known as *the episkopos.* He had a group of "elders" associated with him and a group of *diakonoi,* whose services were of a more practical kind. The letters of Ignatius, the *episkopos* of Antioch, show us the emerging importance and authority of these officers. The troubles which came upon the churches through the Gnostic and Montanist movements in the second century helped to make the local *episkopoi* the centres of unity and orthodoxy in the Church. They were the link with the Apostles, the guardians of the faith, the leaders in worship, the executors of discipline. Whatever the differences of development in different localities, by the middle of the second century, substantial similarity had been reached. There was a threefold ministry of a specially authoritative kind: bishops, presbyters and deacons. During the next hundred years this pattern became fixed and universal, at least throughout the Mediterranean world. The deacons were not mere "servers of tables," whether or not that was their original function. They were assistant or embryonic presbyters or priests.

Cyprian, in the middle of the third century, thought of the *episkopoi,* the bishops, as forming together a unity, a sodality, singly and together the guardians of the faith and unity of the Church. Already the diocesan bishop was emerging, with authority over a number of churches grouped around a city centre. Already certain of the great sees had become prominent. Inevitably the bishops of Antioch, Alexandria, Carthage, Rome—above all, Rome—exerted great influence throughout the Christian world. At the very time Cyprian was urging that all bishops were equal parts of one whole, bishop Cornelius of Rome was drawing attention to the fact that his church had 46 presbyters, 7 deacons, 7 sub-deacons, 42 acolytes and 52 exorcists, readers and doorkeepers and that it maintained 1,500 widows and needy persons (Eusebius VI. 43 : 11). This would seem to imply a Christian community of perhaps 30,000 adherents. Many of the presbyters were no doubt the leaders of separate worshipping centres. All were regarded as parts of one church, the *episkopos* of which could not but be an important figure, quite apart from the strategic position of Rome itself and its significant associations with apostolic personalities. More than half a century earlier, Irenaeus, born in Asia Minor, but himself a bishop in Gaul, had been in no doubt that "it is a matter of necessity that every church agree with

or resort to (*convenire ad*) this church (i.e. Rome) on account of its pre-eminent authority or prestige (*propter potentiorem principalitatem*), inasmuch as the tradition which is of the Apostles (*ab apostolis traditio*) has ever been preserved by them in all countries." (Adv. Haer, iii, 3).

The spread of the faith and the attacks upon the Church, whether local or on an empire-wide scale, enhanced the position of the ministers. They became the key figures, particularly when the sacraments were widely regarded as having a quasi-magical efficacy. A gulf appeared between those in office and the general body of the congregation, between the *kleros* and the *laikos*. The former became an *ordo*, to use the Latin word, set apart for their tasks by a solemn act of ordination. In the West, only men were admitted to office, though the East long recognized deaconesses as part of the ministry of the Church. As Williston Walker comments: "In practical Christian life the clergy by the middle of the third century were a distinct close-knit spiritual rank, on whom the laity were religiously dependent, and who were in turn supported by laymen's gifts."[2]

The conversion of Constantine and the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the Empire inevitably enhanced the position of the clergy, particularly the bishops. The clergy became a privileged class, exempt from taxation, though official action was taken to prevent men of large fortunes being ordained. It was difficult not to regard them—difficult for them not to regard themselves—as state officials. On the other hand, Constantine described himself as *koinos episkopos* (general bishop) and *episkopos ton ekton* (bishop for the external relations of the Church, or for those outside). Our hereditary prejudice against this situation should not blind us to the fact that the Church as a whole and the best of its leaders never accepted such a view of the position of the clergy. The story of the succeeding centuries is the story of a long continued struggle between Church and State.

The bishop of Rome became the key figure in the struggle. The Roman Church remained orthodox throughout the Arian controversy. She was strong enough to maintain her organization and independence when the barbarians swarmed into Italy. She became the most effective visible symbol of the *civitas Dei*, of which Augustine wrote. The claim to universal jurisdiction in the West put forward by Augustine's contemporary, bishop Innocent I of Rome, was not advanced solely for reasons of personal aggrandisement. It had, of course, no scriptural foundation; it was pretentious; it was fraught with disastrous consequences in the hands of Innocent's successors, who enlarged their claims and surrendered to the temptation to political scheming and compromise in order to secure "papal supremacy." The Church of the West became a great

[2] *op. cit.*, p. 91.

corporation, with increasing possessions and headed by the Pope. Modern High Church apologists for the doctrine of apostolical succession sometimes quote with approval the saying of Professor Bright: "The Church began in a clergy." From the fifth century onwards it was almost true to say that the Church *was* the clergy, at any rate in the West. There, clerical celibacy was insisted on, as a mark of separation of the ministry from the passions and responsibilities of the world. In the Eastern Church, which was much less successful in asserting its independence of the State, celibacy was only insisted on in the case of bishops. But the consequence of this was that almost all the bishops had to be drawn from the ranks of the monks, who sought to escape worldliness and conventional Christianity by way of asceticism.

The next notable development in the general pattern of the Church's ministry occurred in France. There, in the sixth century, the parish system began to develop. In the rural districts churches were built and endowed by large landowners, who themselves appointed the local clergy. For a time episcopal control was haphazard and uncertain. It was the great Emperor Charlemagne (d. 814), who gave the bishops visitorial and disciplinary powers over dioceses and regularised the payment of tithes. Before long, certain metropolitan bishops became known as Archbishops (an honorific title going back to the fourth century) and began to exercise authority over wide areas. This development might have become a serious challenge to the position claimed by the Bishop of Rome. In the middle of the ninth century, however, use was made of the forged Isidorian Decretals—the so-called "Donation of Constantine"—to insist that all bishops had the right of direct appeal to Rome.

There is no need to carry this particular story in detail any further. The gradual emergence of the general structure of the Medieval Church has become clear. For all its faults and failings, it was a great Church and within it were those responsible for the partial evangelisation of Western Europe during dark and stormy times. Successful resistance to militant Islam was no small achievement and from within the Church itself there came revival movements, such as those of the Dominicans and the Franciscans. Even if we believe the whole structure and position of the Medieval Church to be departures from the intention of our Lord, we must not write off or ignore what was accomplished in the thousand years between the Council of Nicaea and the days of Wycliffe and Huss. Though there was widespread spiritual famine in many nominally Christian lands and notorious corruption in high places, the theologians, the mystics and the reformers of the Middle Ages are further evidence of the presence of the Holy Spirit within the Church. They came, almost without exception, from the ranks of the

clergy. This we have to recognize, even if we agree with Schleiermacher that "the formation of the clergy into a self-contained and self-propagating corporation has no Scriptural basis of any kind."[3]

We turn, then, to the Reformation of the sixteenth century with a view to noting its consequences so far as the ministry of the Church was concerned. There emerged in Western Europe, and later spread to other parts of the world, four new patterns, the Lutheran, the Calvinist or Reformed, the Anglican, and the Free Church. Because the Reformation was essentially a re-discovery of, or re-emphasis upon, the Gospel itself, all four patterns were directly, in some measure at least, influenced by study of the New Testament and the early Christian centuries.

Luther set himself to free the Church from "captivity." That is how he himself regarded his work. He attacked three "walls," as he put it: the pretended superiority of the so-called "spiritual estate" over the temporal or secular; the exclusive claim of the Pope to be the interpreter of Scripture; and the claim that Councils of the Church could only be summoned by the Pope. That is to say, in order to free himself and the Church from papal authority, he invoked the help of princes and magistrates as the authoritative representatives of the laity. He rejected the idea of the clergy as a separate, superior celibate caste, chosen and appointed by the higher ranks of their own hierarchy. The important thing was to have ministers of the Word and Sacraments, for the Church itself is where the Gospel is faithfully proclaimed and the sacraments rightly administered. Evangelical congregations should, he thought, have a direct say in the appointment of their own pastors. His rejection of the authority of the Pope carried with it the rejection of the episcopal system as it had developed in the Middle Ages. But in carrying through his reform movement, Luther depended on the princes and even spoke of them as "Notbischofe"—bishops for the emergency. In Saxony he and his friends organized a territorial Church. The land was divided into districts, each under a "Superintendent," who had administrative but not spiritual authority over the parish ministers. The Superintendents were responsible to the Elector, that is, the prince of Saxony. All baptized inhabitants were regarded as members of the Church. For Luther, the only ministry essential to the Church was that responsible for the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments, but this was not a ministry to which a man could appoint himself. He must be approved by the laity and the laity expressed themselves through the secular authorities. The pattern remained, and remains, the same in other European lands which adhered to the Lutheran form of the Reformation. But in some places—in Sweden, for example—the "superintendents" continued to be known as "bishops" and

[3] *The Christian Faith*, p. 615.

retained continuity with the medieval succession. When Lutheranism spread to the New World, where there was traditional separation between Church and State, it became congregational in respect of the local congregation and synodal in its wider organization, with the ministers regarded much as they are in the presbyterian churches.

Tho second reformed type of ministry was the Calvinist or presbyterian. Calvin was sure that "the ministry of men, which God employs in governing the Church, is a principal bond by which believers are kept together in one body." His study of the New Testament convinced him that Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists, as mentioned by Paul in *Ephesians* 4, were raised up by the Lord "at the beginning of His kingdom," though He might still raise them up "when the necessity of the times requires." "Pastors and teachers" are those "with whom the Church can never dispose" (*Institutes,* IV. 3 : 4). In his agreement with the city of Geneva in 1541, Calvin based his organization on four kinds of office : those of pastor, teacher, lay elder and deacon. The pastors (whom Calvin is ready to designate "bishops" and "presbyters") had committed to them the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments. Each had his own congregation, though he might in case of need assist in others. The pastors were to meet weekly for Bible study and fellowship. The teachers were responsible for the elaborate Genevan school system. The really new and characteristic feature of Calvin's organization lay in the eldership. Twelve laymen appointed by the civil authorities of the city were to meet weekly with the ministers in a *consistoire* or synod for purposes of ecclesiastical discipline. To a separate group of deacons was committed the care of the poor and the sick. According to Calvin "ministers are legitimately called according to the word of God, when those who may have seemed fit are elected on the consent and approbation of the people." "Only pastors, however, ought to preside over the election," and it is they who should ordain the accepted candidates by the laying on of hands. "It is certainly useful," says Calvin, "that by such a symbol the dignity of the ministry should be commended to the people, and he who is ordained, reminded that he is no longer his own, but is bound in service to God and the Church" (*ibid.,* IV. 3 : 16). So far as standing in the Church is concerned, all pastors are equal, each having his own specific charge. Calvin's system has become the basis of all the Reformed Churches and, like his theology, has influenced a number of other Churches as well. That it is anything like an exact replica of the New Testament Church, few would now dare to assert, nor did Calvin himself really make that claim.

The third ministerial tradition emerging at the time of the Reformation was the Anglican. Even in medieval times the Church in England had been somewhat restive under papal claims and

pretensions. But its ministerial structure was that of Western Europe as a whole. The English Reformation resulted from a conjunction of forces, in which it is not easy to disentangle politics and religion. When after three or four decades of uncertainty, Protestantism prevailed, the religious settlement embodied in the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity recognized the sovereign as "Supreme Governor of the Church of England" and assumed the continuance of a threefold ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, according to the medieval pattern. The marriage of priests had been legalised in 1549. Continental influences secured the inclusion in the Anglican Articles of Religion of the statement that "the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered" (*Art.* XIX). But the party which strove during the next sixty or seventy years for "preaching ministers"—the Puritan party—was slowly ousted from the Church, largely because they challenged the authority of bishops and showed their sympathy with a thoroughgoing Calvinist polity. The Church of England, during the struggles of the seventeenth century and since, has resisted every effort to modify its episcopal structure, and has transmitted that structure (though necessarily without the State connection) to daughter churches overseas. It has come to cherish it more dearly as a possible link with the Orthodox Churches of the East and the Church of Rome and is ready to defend it on grounds of antiquity and expediency. There are even some Anglicans ready now to try to base their form of episcopacy on Scripture and the position of the Apostles in the early Church.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a fourth form of ministerial tradition emerged, however, that of the Free Churches. It owed a good deal to the work and teaching of both Luther and Calvin, but it sat more lightly to church order, placed greater emphasis on the unpredictableness of the Spirit and based itself on the autonomy of the local congregation. It was also much concerned with evangelism aiming at personal committal to Christ. This is the tradition which came out of continental Anabaptism and English Separatism and which found expression in Baptist and Congregational Churches. Each congregation of believers had the right and duty of choosing its own officers, if necessary "without tarrying for any." The freedom this tradition has given has undoubtedly been owned and blessed of God on many occasions and in many places. It has no hesitation in appealing to the vitality and variety of the early Church. It deeply distrusts any alliance between Church and State, and any sharp distinction between ministry and laity. At the same time, many of its most convinced exponents have realized its dangers and have recognized its blind spots. The Anabaptist Confessions, as well as those of the English Baptists and Congregation-

alists, and their successors in other parts of the world, have insisted that the local church must have officers, that they must be properly chosen, that a man cannot take office upon himself, and that, when a man is chosen to pastoral office, it should be with the concurrence and assistance of other pastors. These safeguards have been almost universally insisted on in theory, though sometimes ignored in practice. Moreover, the free and independent local churches of this tradition have formed associations, conventions and unions, and a number of them have found it wise to appoint ministers with wider functions than the pastoral charge of one congregation. In the seventeenth century some of these ministers were called "messengers." More recently, in England, they have gone by the name of "General Superintendents" or "Moderators." At other times and in other places similar functions have been exercised by ministers acting as full- or part-time secretaries of Associations or Conventions. Somehow or other, ministers themselves must be subject to guidance and discipline. Somehow or other, the churches must have channels or agents through whom the wider unity of the Church can find expression.

These four ministerial patterns—not entirely separate from one another—have taken their place in Christian history beside that of the Roman Church. I want in conclusion to offer three or four reflections on the outline I have given.

First, it seems to me clear that, however important be the authority of Scripture, it is impossible to find in it a uniform pattern or one intended to be the norm for all time. I agree with the present Archbishop of York that "to burrow in the New Testament for forms of ministry and imitate them is archaeological religion."[4] The more evangelical way is, as he says, "to seek that form of ministry which the whole New Testament creates." That would seem the only right conclusion to draw from the intensive debate which has gone on among scholars since Lightfoot issued his famous essay on the Christian ministry in 1868.

Secondly, the varied forms taken by the ministry have been clearly influenced — inevitably influenced — by external factors, by political and social conditions, as well as by the general ecclesiastical situation at particular times and places. This is not only true of the effect upon the Church's organization of its struggle against Gnosticism or of Constantine's official recognition of the Church. It is true of the part which the clergy were called upon to play in the Middle Ages. The way in which Baptists and Congregationalists regarded their ministries in the nineteenth century was different from the way they had regarded them in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The effect of reaction from the Oxford Movement in the Church of England is clear. The

[4] A. M. Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, p. 69.

position of the Free Church minister in the United States—the way he is regarded, the functions he is expected to fulfil—is the product in considerable measure of the American way of life. At the present time in the lands behind the "iron" and "bamboo" curtains, new patterns for the ministry are being forced upon the Churches of all traditions. The pressure of circumstances is not something which Christians need regret or always oppose.

Thirdly, whether we welcome it or not, we live today in an ecumenical era, when we cannot ignore the existence, both in the present and the past, of Churches other than our own, which have clearly played a notable part in the furtherance of the Gospel. It is no longer possible for any one Church to say "we and we only have the truth and our church structure is the divinely intended one." None of our structures has been able to prevent abuses. None of our varied types of ministry has failed entirely to mediate the grace of God and nurture Christian character.

It is therefore, necessary to ask oneself, in the fourth place, whether behind and underneath the varied patterns there is any common purpose. Much barren argument has gone on of recent years as to whether this or that ministry can be recognized by some other Church as "valid." Trying to match one part of this structure against some other part of that is much less fruitful than asking what is sought from the specialised ministry as a whole. I doubt whether the distinctions which have sometimes been insisted on between the itinerant and the local ministry or the charismatic and the official ministry are really helpful. An alternative method of treating my subject would have been a comparative analysis of some of the classic books about the ministry, produced by the different church traditions. One might start with the Pastoral Epistles and go on to Jerome's famous letters on the duties of a clergyman and on the death of Nepotian (Loeb edition, Nos. LII and LX, pp. 189 and 265) and then take George Herbert's *Country Parson* (1652) and Richard Baxter's *Reformed Pastor* (1656). One might add to the list Spurgeon's lectures to his students, Bishop Neill's little book *On the Ministry,* and Daniel Jenkins's *The Gift of the Ministry.* Beneath all their differences, there is much in common. It is obviously necessary that there be some leadership in the Church, as in any other society. It is also necessary that there be accepted methods of securing it. "The Spirit bloweth where it listeth," but it is as necessary to discern and test the presence of the Spirit in the twentieth century as it was when the first Epistle of John and the *Didache* were written. When, in 1930, the Council of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland stated, in commenting on the findings of the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order: "We cannot agree that the ministry, as commonly understood, is essential to the existence of a true Christian church, though we believe a

ministry is necessary for its highest effectiveness,"[5] the members were going dangerously near to denying the testimony of Baptist history, Christian history generally and the New Testament.

What, then, are the functions the Church requires its ministers to undertake on its behalf? First, the guardianship and proclamation of the faith; secondly, the leadership of its worship and, in particular, the administration of the sacraments; thirdly, a constant witnessing to and safeguarding of the unity, continuity and universality of the Church; fourthly, the shepherding of the flock; fifthly, the setting of a personal example as "men of God." These responsibilities are not solely those of ministers, but they require special discipline and training, if they are to be regularly and effectively discharged. They may lead a Church to develop several different "orders" of ministry. They appear to me to underlie all the various patterns and structures to which I have referred. I see no reason why we should not all learn from history and, after seeing the lacks, dangers and abuses to which certain patterns have been subject, seek under the guidance of the Spirit of God to improve our own particular pattern. Richard Baxter was undoubtedly right when he said that "All Churches either rise or fall as the ministry doth rise or fall (not in riches or worldly grandeur) but in knowledge, zeal and ability for their work."

Recently I came across two definitions of the Christian ministry. One was given by an Anglican canon of High Church sympathies. "A good definition of the special priesthood," he said, "is that it is the calling, to foster in the laity the deepest possible understanding of their priesthood as believers." The other comes from Professor Richard Niebuhr, in an article discussing the work of American ministers as "pastoral directors." Their first function, he says, is "to bring into being a people of God who as a Church will serve the purpose of the Church in the local community and the world." One might have expected the source of those definitions to be reversed, but they have, of course, a basic similarity. I have tried to set them in historical perspective.

ERNEST A. PAYNE

[5] Cf. 1948 Declaration of the Baptist Union Council: "A properly ordered Baptist church will have its duly appointed officers."

The Lord's Supper

ADMISSION AND EXCLUSION AMONG THE BAPTISTS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

IN *The Fellowship of Believers,* Dr. E. A. Payne wrote that the "terms of communion occupied far more attention in Baptist circles than have theological questions regarding the meaning and significance of the Supper itself."[1] It is our purpose to examine this matter so far as the seventeenth century is concerned.

General Baptists

Like John Smyth,[2] the General Baptists were all "Strict" communionists, and held Table fellowship only with Baptists.[3] We can rule out therefore from the start all discussion of inter-communion with Independents, Presbyterian or Established Churches.

Some churches went further, and would not join at the Lord's Table those who rejected or made optional the laying on of hands upon the newly baptized.[4] The 1656 General Assembly adopted this rule.[5] The Kent Association meeting in the following year made the six points listed in *Hebrews* vi. 1f.* necessary tenets for a true church with which it would hold Table fellowship.[6] The London churches in 1692 excluded from their joint annual Communion service the Hart Street church members, because they had "Received Persons to there (sic) Cummunion that Have not Submitted To the 4th Principle† of the Doctrine of Christ yrr laying on of Hands. Therefore wee cannot Until They Repent Have Communion wth Them."[7] Other churches which made the laying on of hands upon the newly baptized an option, and not a term of Communion, were Slapton[8] and Fenstanton.[9]

Regular attendance at the Lord's Table was both a privilege and a duty. Non-attendance was regarded as a serious matter, and in some churches the names of members were called over at every celebration and the names of absentees noted.[10] Frequently an absence was followed with an enquiring visit. At the Ford-Cuddington church, for example, we find that the names of those delegated to visit the offenders are recorded in the minutes.[11]

* "The foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God, Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."

† V. *Hebrews* vi. 1f.

Despite their strictness in many cases in the matter of the laying on of hands, the doctrine of General Redemption does not seem to have been made one of the terms of Communion.[12] Thomas Grantham, the most influential Baptist in the eastern half of England in the latter half of the century, refused to unchurch others over "the Extent of the Redemption paid for mankind."[13] The Ford-Cuddington church, after some debate, allowed a member to remove to the Particular Church at Hemel Hempstead, without formal dismission, but without censure.[14] It was also agreed to retain within its own membership those who believed in "Particular Redemption," provided that they did not disturb the church by attempting to win others to their point of view or undermine the teaching of the elders.[15] The London Association agreed to this as a general practice for the churches. There was no obligation to grant a "dismissal" to persons who disturbed the peace in the matter, though to do so might be convenient for all concerned.[16]

A General Baptist could communicate with another congregation only if he had the approval of his own congregation and received a "testimonial" from it.[17] We quote *verbatim* one such "testimonial"[18]:

> The brethren in and about Caxton and Fenstanton, to all the churches of Christ whom it may concern, wish grace, mercy and peace, from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love.
> Dear and holy brethren, we commend unto you our beloved brother Thomas Disbrowe, he being a member of the church of our Lord Jesus Christ, received by us, according to the order of the gospel. Wherefore we beseech you to receive him in the Lord, as becometh saints, and to assist him in whatsoever business he shall stand in need of you; and we shall account it as done unto ourselves. Farewell.
> Your brethren in the Lord Jesus Christ.
> Caxton.
> The 30th Day of the 10th Month, 1655.

Exclusion: The local church was the source, seat and area of authority for all that the church did. "The Church, consisting of Elders and Brethren," had *inter alia* "power to binde impenitent sinners under the censures of the Church, and to binde sin upon their conscience: and in case of their repentance, to release them of the same. . . .[19] While the whole church had the power to admit and exclude members, it was the elders who made the formal pronouncements in either case.[20] However, when a member was excluded, if the offence was a "public" one, e.g. a notorious scandal, the exclusion was announced at public worship, i.e. to the world at large; but if the offence was "private" the exclusion was notified to the church privately, i.e. at the Lord's Table.[21]

While the General Baptist churches were in many respects Independent in polity, nevertheless the names of the excommuni-

cated would be published to all the churches.[22] Further the Orthodox Creed of 1678 even allowed a majority of the General Assembly to excommunicate an offender from his own and all the congregations.[23] This right, however, was not universally accepted. What was much more universally accepted was the necessity in cases of dispute, e.g. between the officers and members, or over the excommunication of an elder, to refer the matter to a "consociation of churches" since "in multitude of counsellors there is safety."[24]

Should a church receive into its fellowship one who had been excommunicated elsewhere? Properly and normally the church to receive back a repentant sinner was the one from which he had been excommunicated. But there were three circumstances in which another church might receive him.[25] If he were far removed from the church which had excommunicated him a penitent might be received into the fellowship of another church. If the church to which the penitent one had dissolved since his excommunication he could apply elsewhere for membership upon repentance. Thirdly, if the other churches were agreed the excommunicating church had done grave injustice in excommunicating, one of them might receive into their membership the one expelled.[26]

Excommunication was the end term of an admonitory process which was based on various scripture texts, notably, *Matthew* xviii. 15-18.[27] The churches endeavoured to carry out the procedure exactly as outlined by the Lord in the Gospel. Private admonition was followed by the admonition of the church if repentance was not forthcoming. Excommunication followed the rejection of the second admonition of the church.[28]

When the repentance of the offender was proven, *alias* he had accepted the admonition of the church, the admonitory procedure came to an end.[29] The repentant one was received back into fellowship, even if excommunication had already come. However, due certainty of the penitence was ensured. We shall quote *verbatim* from Christopher Blackwood the procedure at the re-reception:[30]

> Let the Elders in the name of the Church propose these Questions:
>
> 1. Whether he confess the crime for which he was excommunicate.
> 2. Whether he thinks himself justly punished.
> 3. Whether he be heartily sorry for the offence committed.
> 4. Whether he desire the forgiveness of the Church.
> 5. Whether he have a purpose to amend his life.
> 6. Whether he would have the Church, whom he hath offended, to pray for him.
>
> After which, let the Pastor add a grave Exhortation concerning God's wrath against sin, both in punishments temporal and eternal; of the danger of Scandal; of the frailty of man's nature; of true repentance; of free pardon in Christ's blood; of the loving affections God's people ought to show with gladness to a person repenting. . . .

While many offences not repented of could result in excommunication, fundamentally there was only one reason for excommunication: that was failure to "hear the church," i.e. the rejection of the admonition of the church. For example, Thomas Helwys said that not the "committing of sin doth cut off from the Church but refusing to hear the Church to reformation."[31]

However, such as Thomas Grantham[32] and Christopher Blackwood thought that some offences were so grave in themselves that they deserved expulsion from the Table. The latter catalogued such offences as "Living in a purpose of sin" and "notorious sins" such as heresy.[33] Even if the offender repented and submitted to the church he would be suspended from the Table for some four to six months, during which he should give "some proof of his humiliation." Both Grantham and Blackwood cited the case of incest in 1 *Corinthians* v. 11 as their scriptural precedent in this matter.[34] However, it was more often the refusal of the admonition, rather than the offence itself, which invoked excommunication. Thus, we find that for, for example, in the minutes of the Fenstanton church, that frequently the final clause in a list of indictments against one excommunicated has a phrase such as "For despising and contemning the admonitions of the church."[35]

Unrepented moral offences often were the prelude to excommunication. There are examples of drunkenness,[36] a widow's refusal to pay her late husband's debts,[37] being hateful to one's wife, telling of lies out of covetousness, forging a warrant, fornication, adultery, breaking a promise, etc.[38]

An unrepented breach of church discipline could also lead to excommunication. There are examples relating to such matters as refusing to contribute one's quota towards church expenses,[39] and attendance at the parish church.[40]

In this connexion, marriage outside the communion, or against the advice of the church, presented a special problem. The General Assembly frequently asserted that a marriage outside the communion deserved excommunication, and the latter often followed such a marriage. Two consequences were that the churches became weakened numerically, and the Association meetings tended to become occasions of match-making.[41] However, the Assembly of 1656 decided that the churches must accept mixed marriages after the event, and not expect the parties to separate: they must then either accept the parties of mixed marriages in their excommunicate state, or "accept of such repentance as the reality thereof may not be questioned by any circumstances attending."[42] The latter course was preferred and was the policy of the Assembly for many years.[43] There was such a repentance, followed by restoration to communion in the Ford-Cuddington church, in 1697;[44] but such an event seems to have been rare. At Fenstanton two men were excommunicated,

because they "stood to maintain in the congregation that it was lawful for members of the congregation to marry those that are without, and that they persuaded others to yield to the same opinion";[45] the men later repented and were received back again.

Heresies, such as a discontinuance in attendance at or belief in the ordinances, disbelief in the Holy Scriptures, holding a rigid determinism, blasphemy, etc., resulted in excommunication if persisted in.[46] However, unorthodox Christology became a reason for admonition and excommunication only if it produced a dispute within the congregation. This was true of the six earliest Baptist churches,[47] as of later days, as for example at Spilshill.[48]

Both John Smyth and Thomas Helwys stated that excommunication did not affect civil society and natural human relationships as such.[49] However, church members should not partake in avoidable social relationships with those excommunicated,[50] except that "subjects, servants, children, parents, wife or husband, &C. that are bound to him may performe civil and naturall offices to him."[51] The 1656 General Assembly endorsed this view.[52]

The excommunicated were cut off from the body of the church, "as a rotten member whom all ought to shun,"[53] and cut off from the realm of grace were delivered into the realm of Satan and still under the "wrath of God." It was a provisional separation from inward communion with Christ. It was final only if the church had not erred and the offender did not later repent.[54] Then, what was bound on earth was bound in heaven.[55]

It contained "a binding of sin upon the sinner's conscience . . . so that if godly, his heart is for the present more devoid of comfort; if wicked, he becomes more hardened in sin."[56] As those who had never entered the realm of grace, the excommunicate were still to be wooed to repentance.[57] Their burden was not to be made intolerable, and if they were in want they were still to be treated with charity. The joy in heaven over the repentance of one sinner and the eternal law of love were ever to be borne in mind.[58] For the ordinance of excommunication was not "given to the Church for any man's ruine, but for edification . . . that the soul by repentance may come to have inward communion with God,"[59] i.e. it is for the good of the soul of the offender. Other purposes of the ordinance were "to bridle men that are wicked in doctrine and practice," to purify the church, "that the Church may be well reported of," and to deter men from sinning.[60]

However, in later days there seems to have been a reluctance to use the instrument of excommunication, as a final cutting off, and as opposed to provisional suspension, since it was "difficult to know when any man hath sinned the unpardonable sin and so incur a total cutting off from the church."[61]

PARTICULAR BAPTISTS

In contrast to the General Baptists, the earliest Particular* Baptist churches were of the "Open" membership type.[62] However, within about fifteen years there was a "Strict" Particular Baptist church in Bristol[63] and another in Wales.[64] A considerable amount of research in this matter was undertaken by Dr. George Gould, whose book, *Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich,* showed how the term "Particular Baptists" did not necessarily imply any one polity regarding admission to the Lord's Table. Particular Baptist churches might be of the "Closed" Communion or "Open" (alias "Mixt") Communion types, or even have "Closed" membership but with "Open" Communion. Further, he showed, some erstwhile "Open" membership churches became "Closed" later, and *vice versa.*[65]

The 1677 Confession of Faith[66] had a long appendix relating to baptism, which, however, reveals that there was no one mind in the matter of whether the undergoing of "Believers Baptism" was a *necessary* prerequisite to be received at the Supper. The 1689 Assembly had also to agree to differ in the matter,[67] despite the fact that this Assembly was not attended by churches such as that at Bedford, which had "Mixt" membership.[68]

The "Strict" Particular Baptists argued from Scripture and church history, that the right to the Supper depended on Baptism. This was a matter of church order than a theology of church membership.[69] Since the only Baptism acknowledged was that of "Believers," the Lord's Supper was restricted to those so baptized.[70] The Baptist Catechism[71] put the matter thus:

> *Q.* 103. Who are the proper subjects of this ordinance (i.e. the Lord's Supper)?
> *A.* They who have been baptized upon a personal profession of their faith in Jesus Christ, and repentance from dead works (*Acts* ii, 41, 42).

However, some churches, such as that at Falmouth, and perhaps that at Bridgewater, had "Closed" membership, but nonetheless "Open" communion, for both Baptists and Independents desiring transient communion.[72] Dr. Gould showed how "Closed" membership had not always implied "Strict" communion. He showed, too, that only seven of the 46 Particular Baptist churches had signed the 1644 Confession of Faith which implied "Closed" membership.[73] Further, John Spilsbury, from whose "Open" membership church William Kiffin later seceded to form a "Strict" communion church, had been a signatory. Clearly that Confession

* This term relates solely to a belief in a "Particular" Redemption, i.e. an Atonement by Christ for the elect alone. It has nothing to do with being "particular" as to who is received at the Lord's Table. The latter erroneous notion is found even in high places outside the Baptist world at times.

did not preclude "Open" communion, or Spilsbury would not have signed it.[74] Thus, both the 1644 Confession and the 1689 Assembly[75] seem to have represented the "Closed" membership but "Open" communion polity.

John Bunyan was the Baptist minister of a "Mixt" membership church, which did not keep separate lists of those baptized as infants, and as "Believers." There is no record of Bunyan's own immersion,[76] though in his controversial writings the first person plural is often used with respect to the Baptist position. Membership did not depend on immersion but on acceptance as a "visible saint."[77] It was membership and not Baptism which was the prerequisite for admission to the Lord's Supper, and a man was not allowed to receive the Supper when he wanted to do so without being a member.[78] Since the only Baptism that Bunyan recognized was that of "Believers," but he did not insist on church members and communicants being thus baptized, some baptized neither as infants nor as "believers" may have been admitted to the Lord's Supper, though there seems no record that this did happen. John Tombe's position was similar to that of Bunyan.[79]

Bunyan denied that Baptism divided the holy from the unholy, that it must precede membership of the church, that it was the initiatory ordinance.[80] "Faith and a life becoming the ten commandments, should be the chief and most solid argument with churches to receive to fellowship."[81] He wanted "scripture proof" that "it is a duty to refuse communion* with those of the saints that differ from them at baptism."[82]

Other churches practising "Open" membership included that of Henry Jessey[83] in London, those sponsored by Vavasor Powell in Wales,[84] Broadmead in Bristol,[85] those started by William Mitchell and David Crosley in the north-west,[86], and those that sprang up because of the work and influence of John Tombes.[87]

Some Baptist churches had covenants, the acceptance of which was a condition of membership.[88] Such said that "Baptism is one branche of the Covenant." "The Covenant and not Baptisme formes the Church, and the manner how."[89] The covenants of churches such as those at Gosport[90] or Horsly Down,[91] were similar to those of Independent churches, but also involved submission to "Believers Baptism." Thus, both Spilsbury who believed in "Open" communion and Keach who believed in "Strict" communion accepted a covenant basis to membership.

Those who accepted "Open" membership making Baptist Baptism optional seem to have made the laying on of hands upon the newly baptized also optional. We instance Jessey[92] and Bunyan.[93] However, the "Strict" Baptist position does not seem

* i.e. fellowship, including, but not confined to, communion at the Supper.

to have necessarily entailed insistence upon laying on of hands. For, while Benjamin Keach, for example, did insist upon the laying on of hands upon the newly baptized,[94] the "Closed" membership churches of the West Country made the matter optional.[95]

Finally, we should note that any church, whether "Open" or "Closed" in polity, had to be satisfied that the one desiring membership and acceptance at the Lord's Table had experienced a work of grace in the heart.[96] This would often involve a personal testimony in front of the church assembled.[97] Here, we quote the words of Benjamin Keach[98]:

> That every person before they are admitted Members in such a church so constituted, must declare to the Church (or to such with the Pastor, that they shall appoint) what God hath done for their Souls, or their Experiences of a Saving work of Grace upon their hearts; . . . . . and also a strict Enquiry must be made about his Life and Conversation; but if through Bashfulness the Party cannot speak before the Congregation, the Elder and two or three more Persons may receive an account of his or her Faith, and report it to the Church. But if full Satisfaction by the Testimony of good and credible Persons is not given of the Party's Life and Conversation, he must be put by until Satisfaction is obtained in that respect. Moreover, when the Majority are satisfied, and yet one or two Persons are not, the Church and Elder will do well to wait a little time, and endeavour to satisfy such Persons, especially if the Reasons of their dissent seem weighty.

As among the General Baptists, attendance was a duty as well as a privilege. At a number of churches, such as that at the Barbican,[99] that at Bromsgrove,[100] and the Crosley-Mitchell group of churches in the north-west,[101] careful observation was made of which members, if any, were absent from the Supper. Avoidable absence, not repented of, would involve disciplinary action.[102]

Many of the Particular Baptist churches recognized each other as true churches and therefore accepted each other's members to the Lord's Table, either temporarily upon the production of a "Testimonial," or as a permanent member following the receipt of a "Dismissal." For example, the churches at Hexham, Co. Durham, and Coleman Street, London, thus recognized each other.[103] But there were exceptions. For example, the Bunyan church refused to grant letters of "Dismissal" to a church either unknown or known to be of "Strict" communion principles.[104]

One could be a member of only one church at a time. In 1696 the Bristol Baptist Association decided that a certain man who was a member simultaneously of both a Baptist and a paedo-baptist church must relinquish his membership of the latter.[105]

One church, or a group of churches, might declare "non-communion"[106] with a church which it found offensive, but no Association or other group of churches could either excommunicate an individual, or declare him a communicant at a given church. Some

would not even allow that an Association could declare even a church outside communion.[107]

A member of a church "that is corrupt or erroneous in Principles" might, if he himself were sound in faith and morals, be received into membership by a "true" church, subject to a satisfactory account of the member being obtained from "the Church that is corrupt."[108]

Often, a number of congregations formed but one church, and had but one pastor, membership, and communion of the Lord's Supper,[109] but met in separate congregations for the hearing of the Word and for prayer. For example, the minute book of Beechen Grove Church, Watford, shows that at one time in the seventeenth century it was a sub-congregation of the "Church in London, meeting at a place called Coal Harbour, Mr. John Spilsbury being pastor."[110] Later the Watford congregation became a branch of the church at Horsly Down.[111] At one time the Watford congregation was partly in membership at Horsly Down and partly in membership at Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead. During this period both groups met together for preaching and prayer, but apparently each had the Lord's Supper only alternate weeks when their own pastor, respectiveiy, administered it.[112] This latter situation must be regarded as unusual; but the fact that the Watford Baptists were only one congregation out of a number constituting one church was not at all unusual. In fact, the General Assembly encouraged the grouping of congregations for "church" purposes.[113] In Wales, the earliest Baptist churches formed one group Church centred at Ilston.

Inter-communion by Particular and General Baptists was dependent on how far the specific Particular and General Baptist churches concerned regarded the doctrine of Particular and General Redemption, respectively, as a *sine qua non* to a true church. For the Nantwich General Baptist church was able to enjoy intercommunion with the Barbican church, London,[114] but not with the Wrexham church,[115] because the former regarded the doctrine of Particular Redemption as an open question,[116] while the Wrexham church regarded General Redemption as a heresy.[117] The Barbican church later merged with the Turners Hall General Baptist church;[118]; but such a merger was rare if not unique.

"Strict" Baptists, i.e. with "Closed" communion, did not allow Independents the right of "transient" communion, as we have seen. But the churches with "Closed" membership but "Open" communion allowed Independents to "transient" communion upon the production of a "Testimonial." If an erstwhile Independent wanted to become a member of such a church he could not be accepted on a letter any more than at a "Strict" Baptist church, but had to submit to "Believers Baptism." In churches with

"Mixt" membership, Baptists and Independents were on an equal footing as regards both "transient" communion and permanent membership.

There was no inter-communion with either the Presbyterian or the Established Church.

Exclusion: The manner of exclusion from the Lord's Table followed largely the same pattern as in the General Baptist churches. It was on the authority of the whole congregation.[119] Final exclusion followed the rejection of the second admonition of the church.[120] All the members had mutual responsibility for the Christian life of each and all of the fellowship.[121]

However, some, such as Keach,[122] recognized three categories of exclusion from the Table, as follows:

1. Suspension is to be when a member falls under Sin, and the Church wants time fully to consider the matter, and so can't withdraw from him, or cast him out.
2. Withdrawal, carried out by some churches, e.g., Bromsgrove,[123] and Tottlebank,[124] was a provisional refusal of Table fellowship with a view to inducing repentance in the offended, after the verbal admonitory procedure had failed. It was for "Backsliders," such as were irregular in attendance, or negligent in instructing children in the faith, or failing to help church maintenance financially.[125] "This sort are still to be owned as Members, tho' disorderly ones: the church must note him so as not to have Communion or Company with him in that sense."[126]
3. Cutting off, And delivering to Satan, such as are obstinate, Hereticks or guilty of those sins that are scarce nam'd among the Gentiles."[127]

If a person was wrongly withdrawn from or excommunicated he or she should apply to another church for membership. If that church was satisfied as to the aggrieved brother's/sister's cause, it should make every effort to have him restored, or, failing that, receive him into its own fellowship.[128] As among the General Baptist churches, an excommunicate or suspended person would be received back into communicant fellowship upon convincing repentance[129]; we have instances of this being done.[130]

The offences, which, not repented of, would lead to excommunication, were much the same as in General Baptist churches. Moral offences loomed large. Examples include misdemeanors with the other sex,[131] slander,[132] breach of promise,[133] debt,[134] drunkenness and irresponsible behaviour,[135] fraud,[136] neglect of family prayers.[137]

An unrepented breach of church discipline likewise would bring excommunication. In Particular, as in General Baptist churches, we find such offences as: leaving off church attendance,[138] at the Lord's Supper in particular, disputing "Closed" communion polity,[139] disputing the necessity of laying on of hands upon the newly baptized in a church where this practice was adhered to,[140]

attendance at a parish church,[141] marriage with unbelievers,[142] preaching without due authority,[143] refusing to contribute to the churches expenses in accordance with the prescribed scale,[144] and deceiving the church officers.[145]

Heresy stubbornly maintained was also a cause of persons being excommunicated.[146] Some thought that this should be punished by the magistrates also.[147] John Miles, the "father" of many churches in S. Wales and in America, summarised those who were hereticks to Baptists as: Unitarians, believers in transubstantiation, those who denied the Ascension, the Second Coming or the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures.[148] When in the New World, Miles forbad the quarrelsome, dissolute and heretical to enter the territory where he was domiciled.[149] A treasurer of the first General Assembly of the Particular Baptists was excommunicated for heresy.[150] Another man was excommunicated for maintaining that the doctrine of the deity of Jesus Christ was "as bad as the doctrine of transubstantiation."[151]

E. P. WINTER

NOTES

[1] Payne, E. A.: *op. cit.*, p. 54 (1944 Ed.).
[2] Smyth, J.: (Longer) Confession of Faith, §72. (De Ries) Confession of Faith, §31.
[3] Mosheim, J. L. von: *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History Ancient and Modern*, pp. 696f. Cf. e.g. Denne, J.: *Truth Outweighing Error, passim.*
[4] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records*, pp. 205f. Taylor, A.: *History of the General Baptists*, I, pp. 330f.
[5] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes*, I, p. 6.
[6] Baptist Historical Society *Transactions*, III, p. 248.
[7] Glasshouse Yard Church Minute Book.
[8] Slapton Church Book, Resolutions 8 and 9.
[9] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records*, pp. 60f., 63, 69, 205f.
[10] Taylor, A.: *op. cit.*, supra, I, p. 428. Payne, E. A.: *op. cit.*, supra, p. 49.
[11] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Ford-Cuddington Church Book*, pp. 5, 13.
[12] Mosheim, J. L. von: *op. cit., loc. cit.* Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History*, II, p. 234.
[13] Grantham, Th.: *Christianismus Primitivus*, Book III, Ch. 5, §IV, p. 34.
[14] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Ford-Cuddington Church Book*, p. 5.
[15] *op. cit.*, pp. 33f.
[16] *op. cit.*, p. 37.
[17] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records*, pp. 155f.
[18] *op. cit.*, pp. 166f.
[19] Blackwood, C.: *Tractatus de Clavibus Ecclesiae*, p. 85.
[20] Smyth, J.: *Works*, I, p. 266, II, p. 412-4, 430f. Taylor, A., *History of the General Baptists*, I, pp. 440ff. Blackwood, O.: *op. cit.*, p. 95.
[21] Taylor, *ibid.*
[22] 1651 Confession of Faith (of 30 congregations of Lincolnshire and Leicestershire), §72.
[23] §39.
[24] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 96.

[25] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 102f.
[26] *ibid.*
[27] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit., passim.* Evans, B.: *Early English Baptists,* II, pp. 36ff.
[28] Smyth, J.: *Works,* I, p. 262. II, p. 414. 1610 (Latin) Confession of Faith, §17. Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes,* p. 7. Grantham, Th.: *Christianismus Primitivus,* Book II, Part II, Chap. 4, §IV, p. 70. 1678 Confession of Faith, §34.
[29] Evans, B.: *loc. cit., supra.* Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Ford-Cuddington Church Book,* p. 27. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records,* p. 12.
[30] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 94.
[31] Helwys, Th.: *Declaration of Faith,* pp. 17f. Cf. Smyth J.: *Works,* I, p. 264. Cf. Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes,* p. 7.
[32] Grantham, Th.: *loc. cit.*, p. 153.
[33] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 90.
[34] Grantham, Th.: *loc. cit.* Blackwood, C.: *loc. cit.*
[35] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records,* pp. 11f., 44.
[36] *op. cit.*, p. 9.
[37] Unitarian Historical Society *Transactions,* V, Part I, p. 75.
[38] Underhill, E. B. *Warboys Records,* pp. 277ff.
[39] Whitley, W. T.: *History of the British Baptists,* p. 169.
[40] Burgess, W. H.: *John Smith,* p. 336. Underwood, A. C.: *History of English Baptists,* p. 51.
[41] Taylor, A.: *History of the General Baptists,* I, p. 400. Underwood, A. C.: *History of the English Baptists,* p. 124. Whitley, W. T.: *History of British Baptists,* p. 169.
[42] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes,* I, pp. 23f.
[43] *ibid.*
[44] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Ford-Cuddington Church Book,* p. 27.
[45] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records,* pp. 173f.
[46] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 44.
[47] Evans, B.: *op. cit.*, pp. 22, 27.
[48] Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* II, pp. 234-6. *Baptist Quarterly,* XV, pp. 73f.
[49] Smyth, J.: (Latin) Confession of Faith, §§17f. (Longer) Confession of Faith, §80. (De Ries) Confession of Faith, §34. Helwys, Th.: *Declaration of Faith,* §§17f.
[50] *ibid.* Smyth, J.: *Works,* I, p. 266. Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, pp. 90, 96.
[51] *ibid.*
[52] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes,* pp. 7f.
[53] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 88.
[54] *ibid.*
[55] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, pp. 85-88. Cf. Smyth, J.: *Works,* II, pp. 412-4.
[56] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 89.
[57] Smyth, J.: (Longer) Confession of Faith, §80. (De Ries) Confession of Faith, §§33f. 1678 Confession of Faith, 34. Blackwood, C.: *loc. cit.*
[58] Blackwood, C.: *loc. cit.*
[59] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 90.
[60] *ibid.*
[61] 1678 Confession of Faith, §34.
[62] Gould, G.: *Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich,* pp. 123, 317. Cramp, J. M.: *Baptist History,* p. 369.
[63] Richards, Th.: *History of the Puritan Movement in Wales,* 1639-1653, pp. 204f. Thomas, J.: *History of the Baptist Association in Wales,* pp. 5f.

[64] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* p. 41.
[65] Gould, G.: *op. cit.,* pp. 128-139.
[66] McGlothlin, W.: *Baptist Confessions of Faith,* p. 287.
[67] 1689 Assembly, p. 10, §2. Whitley, W. T.: *History of British Baptists,* p. 176.
[68] Whitley, W. T.: *History of British Baptists,* pp. 176f.
[69] Cf. Ross, J. M.: *Baptist Quarterly,* XV, p. 105, et v.i., n.3.
[70] Keach, B.: *Tropologia,* p. 622. Kiffin, W.: *Right to Church-Communion, passim.* Cocks (alias Cox), B.: *An Appendix,* §XX.
[71] Underhill, E. B.: *Baptist Confessions of Faith,* p. 268.
[72] Letter from L. A. Fereday, T. D., dated 20.11.52.
[73] Gould, G.: *op. cit.,* p. 128, *et passim.*
[74] *ibid.*
[75] Whitley, W. T.: *loc. cit.,* supra.
[76] Hobson, J. H.: *Baptist Quarterly,* IV, p. 100.
[77] Bunyan, J.: *Works* (Offor Edition), II, pp. 650ff. Cf. A Confession of My Faith and Reason of My Practice, *passim.* Differences in Judgment about Water Baptism no Bar to Communion, *passim.* Peacable Principles and True, *passim.*
[78] Armitage, T.: *History of Baptists,* pp. 522f.
[79] Tombes, J.: *Exercitation,* p. 22. Baillie, R.: *A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time,* pp. 79-82.
[80] Bunyan, J.: *Works,* II, pp. 648fff.
[81] *ibid.*
[82] *op. cit.,* p. 656.
[83] Underwood, A. C.: *op. cit.,* p. 103.
[84] Jones, E. K.: *Baptist Quarterly,* XII, pp. 199f. Thomas, J.: *Materials for a History of the Baptist churches in the Principality of Wales from about the year* 1630 *to* 1782, *passim.*
[85] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* pp. 123, 190.
[86] Mitchell, W.: *Jachin and Boaz,* §37; *Baptist Quarterly,* II, p. 66.
[87] Underwood, A. C.: *op. cit.,* p. 69. Baillie, R.: *A Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time . . . Vindicated,* pp. 79-82.
[88] Burrage, C.: *The Church Covenant Idea,* pp. 115-117.
[89] Spilsbury, J.: *Treatise,* title page.
[90] Webbar, J.: *Gosport Articles of Faith.*
[91] Keach, B.: *Horsly Down Articles of Faith. Horsly Down Covenant.*
[92] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Hexham Records,* pp. 346-8.
[93] Quoted verbatim in Armitage, Th.: *History of Baptists,* p. 521.
[94] Keach, B.: *Horsly Down Articles of Faith,* §XXIII.
[95] Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* IV, p. 257. Contrast the Cilgwyn church, which would not admit a James Morgan to communion because when earlier he had been admitted to an English church hands had not been laid on him at Baptism (Thomas, J.: *History of the Baptist Churches in Wales,* p. 280).
[96] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records* pp. 427, 452f.
[97] *ibid.* Keach, B.: *The Glory of a True Church,* pp. 6f., 17f.
[98] Keach, B.: *ibid.*
[99] Wilson, W.: *History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches of London,* III, p. 230.
[100] Church Book. Baptist Historical Society, *Transactions,* I, p. 104.
[101] Whitley, W. T.: *Baptists of North-West England,* p. 77.
[102] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* p. 377.
[103] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Hexham Records,* pp. 309, 332, 346-8.
[104] Harrison, G. B. (Ed.): *The Church Book of Bunyan Meeting* 1650-1821, *passim.* Cf. Armitage, T.: *History of Baptists,* pp. 524f. Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* II, p. 39.

[105] Thomas, J.: *Materials for a History of the Baptist churches in the Principality of Wales from about the year* 1630 *to* 1782, p. 76.

[106] Collier, Th.: *Body of Divinity,* pp. 495f.

[107] Mitchell, W.: *Jachin and Boaz;* Baptist Historical Society, *Transactions,* III, pp. 172f.

[108] Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* supra, pp. 17f.

[109] This might be celebrated at different congregations, but it would be presided over by the same pastor(s), who would administer the Supper at different congregations week by week.

[110] Church Book. Stuart, J.: *Beechen Grove Baptist Church, Watford,* p. 9.

[111] *op. cit.,* pp. 10f.

[112] *ibid.*

[113] 1689 Assembly, p. 13.

[114] Whitley, W. T.: *History of British Baptists,* pp. 167f.

[115] Morgan, D. I.: *Quarterly Witness* (of Crewe and District Association of Baptist Churches), October, 1949.

[116] Whitley, W. T.: *op. cit.,* p. 176.

[117] Morgan, D. I.: *loc. cit.*

[118] Church Book. Baptist Historical Society *Transactions,* IV, p. 47.

[119] 1644 Confession of Faith, §XLII. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* pp. 106, 395f., 407. Keach, B.: *The Glory of a True Church,* p. 20. Mitchell, W.: *Jachin and Boaz;* Baptist Historical Society, *Transactions,* III, p. 170.

[120] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *op. cit.,* pp. 190, 363-7. Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* pp. 24-36. Mitchell, W.: *op. cit.,* §§ 23f.

[121] Webbar, J.: *Gosport Articles of Faith,* §2. Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* p. 7.

[122] Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* pp. 21fff. Cf. Horsly Down Covenant, p. 9.

[123] Church Book, p. 15.

[124] Church Book; quoted verbatim, by the Rev. G. D. Savage in letter dated 21.11.52.

[125] Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* p. 24.

[126] *ibid.*

[127] Keach, B.: Horsly Down Covenant, p. 10. Cf. *The Glory of a True Church,* p. 33.

[128] 1691 Assembly, pp. 11f.

[129] Keach, B.: *The Glory of a True Church,* p. 36.

[130] Crosby, Th.: *Baptist History,* III, pp. 165-181. Bromsgrove Church Book. Discipline Book of the Hanserd Knollys-Steed Church; printed in *Baptist Quarterly,* I, pp. 124f., 181. *Transactions* of the Baptist Historical Society, I, p. 104.

[131] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, p. 121. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* p. 86.

[132] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, pp. 181f.

[133] Goadby, J. J.: *Bye-Paths in Baptist History,* p. 265. Jackman, D.: *Baptists in the West Country,* p. 8.

[134] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, pp. 125f. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *op. cit.,* p. 413.

[135] *Kensworth Pocket Book;* printed in Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* II, p. 177; Cramp, J. M.: *Baptist History,* p. 367; and Goadby, J. J.: *op. cit.,* pp. 273f. Bromsgrove Church Book. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *op. cit.,* p. 377.

[136] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, pp. 181f.

[137] Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* p. 24.

[138] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, p. 125. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* p. 86.

[139] *Baptist Quarterly,* XIII, p. 150.

[140] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Hexham Records,* p. 295.

[141] *Kensworth Pocket Book;* and printed in Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* II, p. 177; Cramp, J. M.: *Baptist History,* p. 367; and Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* I, p. 495. Cf. West Midland Association Meeting 1656.
[142] *ibid.* Alcester church covenant.
[143] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, p. 125.
[144] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Hexham Records,* p. 297.
[145] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, pp. 116f., 124f.
[146] Keach, B.: *The Glory of a True Church,* p. 33.
[147] *ibid.,* p. 34.
[148] *Baptist Quarterly,* XIII, p. 152.
[149] *ibid.*
[150] Goadby, J. J.: *Bye-Paths in Baptist History,* p. 248.
[151] Discipline Book of the Hanserd Knollys-Steed church; printed in *Baptist Quarterly,* I, p. 123.

IMPORTANT

The Treasurer would be glad if subscribers who have not yet paid their current subscription would do so immediately.

Reviews

Biblical Interpretation, by E. C. Blackman. (Independent Press, London, 12s. 6d.).

At present two tendencies appear in Biblical interpretation. One is found among young people who join the church and endeavour to understand the Word of God; too often they are confused by Biblical criticism and take refuge in Fundamentalism because it seems to make matters simpler and because it seems to present a more authoritative Bible. The other tendency is found among Biblical scholars and theologians who are questioning the historical approach, which many of us have come to take for granted, and are suggesting alternatives in terms of allegory and the like. The writings of Scandinavian scholars in recent years, for example, are driving us to reconsider the nature of Biblical interpretation.

This book meets the need of the present day in that it has something to say to both groups. Younger thinkers, who do not fully understand how the critical era began, or how it has been dealt with by such recent scholars as C. H. Dodd and T. W. Manson, will find the chapter on "Modern Criticism" particularly helpful, whilst their more learned brethren, wrestling with problems of interpretation, will find the chapter on "The Development of Exegesis" invaluable as a summary of how our forefathers have tried to understand the Bible. Perhaps some of them will read twice the passage where we are reminded that Luther regarded some allegorical interpretations as "monkey tricks," and believed that Scripture, rightly interpreted, could be understood by all.

This is all set in the context of the Church's problem, which the author believes to be the enabling of those who come into church membership to read their Bibles with ease. There is an alternative to Fundamentalism, which must be clarified; introduction must now make way for interpretation. The last chapter is therefore headed, "The Present Task in Biblical Exposition."

It is a work that will repay careful study, though the reviewer wishes that in many places the style was a little simpler, and the division of the subject matter a little more obvious. This is especially so in the final chapter, where more definite and specific conclusions would be particularly welcome.

One Finger for God, by Stuart B. Jackman. (Independent Press, London, 12s. 6d.).

What is the connection between what the Church believes and the lives of men and women? What is the link between what the

Christian does on Sunday and what he does the rest of the week? These are the questions which many people are asking, and they are basically the questions which called forth this book. But let no one imagine, therefore, that what we are given is a theological treatise, or a book which ministers need to simplify for their congregations. The author writes not about theology, but about people.

First, he shows what happens when men and women take their Christianity seriously and practise it without counting the cost. To illustrate his point, he takes us to the mountains of Papua and to the church in Madagascar and Bengal. He then asks what happens when the church preaches the Gospel without facing up to its social implications, and he takes us to South Africa and Jamaica. Then, just before British people can cry, "Shame!" he comes back to the homeland and paints pictures, beautiful and sordid, to show where the Church of Britain fails when she might succeed.

Mr. Jackman has an arresting style, and few books dealing with such weighty problems combine such an easy approach with such a stirring challenge to the individual reader. The book literally reads like a novel, and yet you can never forget that what the author is saying is true. There is much here of which the Church should take note, and the only criticism one would venture is the fear that Mr. Jackman's challenge may lead to a *mere* social gospel; a religion without a Cross. But that will depend upon the reader more than upon the writer.

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, by H. H. Rowley. (S.P.C.K., London, 2s.).

Ever since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, the layman has found himself asking what value these Scrolls are to him and to his faith. Many suggestions have been made, some of which have hinted that these Scrolls have revolutionised New Testament study. It has even been claimed that Christians and Jews have been prevented from indulging in honest scholarship because of their religious loyalties, whilst New Testament scholars have boycotted the whole subject.

In this lecture, Dr. Rowley examines some of these more extreme ideas, showing that they depend partly on a doctoring of the evidence concerning the Sect, and partly on the dismissal of the evidence of the New Testament, followed by the substitution of something quite different out of the imagination of the writer. What the Scrolls really do is to *supplement* our knowledge of the background of the work of Jesus, but it is fantastic to suggest that they give us any evidence of the nature of early Christianity.

The man who wants to read the opinions of others, and to see those opinions critically, would get great help from this little book.

A. GILMORE.

Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan. Third Revised Edition. (Christian Literature Society, Madras, 2s. 6d.); *Services Proposed for Use at the Inauguration.* 75 Naye Paise. Both books obtainable in England from the Lutterworth Press.

So far as I know, the present negotiations in North India and Ceylon are the first in which Baptists anywhere have officially participated. Some discussion, not always well informed, has taken place among British Baptists. It is the Baptists of North India and Pakistan who have to make the difficult decisions. The first requirement on our part is an understanding of their very different situation, as a small part of a small Christian body confronted by an overwhelming non-Christian mass, and also sympathy with the motive behind the scheme, a desire for a truer and more effective Christian witness. It is also right that they and we should approach any such proposal with caution: a union achieved through disloyalty to conscience would be worthless.

In any true union of churches there must be give and take. And Baptists will beware of regarding all they do now in Britain as essential Christianity, or even as essential Baptist practice, remembering how far in some respects we have departed from the ways of our own forefathers. The Plan is, in fact, a blend of episcopacy, connexionalism and independency, and elements from the experience of all the negotiating churches are included. I can refer to only three points: church membership, the ministry, and baptism.

Our fundamental Baptist contention that the church is composed of believers only is admitted. Only those who have been baptized and have publicly confessed their faith are members in full standing. Those dedicated or "baptized" in infancy are, equally, "members under instruction."

In the initial unification of the ministry there is no repudiation of past ministries and no re-ordination, but a service of mutual recognition and re-commissioning for wider service. There are to be bishops, representatively appointed with constitutional functions, ultimate authority residing, under Christ, in the church as a whole.

The more centrally directed church would involve less departure from accustomed ways than here, since our Baptist churches in North India already accept the supervision of the District Union and the missionary.

Baptism is defined as "a sign of cleansing from sin, of engrafting into Christ, of entrance into the covenant of grace, of fellowship with Christ in His Death and Resurrection, and of rising to newness of life." Infant baptism and believers' baptism are recognized as alternative practices. Any minister who has scruples about baptizing an infant can ask another to officiate. Baptists will be free to retain their own belief and practice. What they have to decide is whether they are ready to be in a united church with those who believe, as

they do not, that infant baptism is in accordance with New Testament principles.

The only point at which I have serious misgivings relates to the position of one baptized in infancy who later desires baptism as a believer. Proposals for a personal reaffirmation in a service of immersion of the promises made on his behalf in infancy, which seemed to me a promising way of surmounting an anomalous situation, did not prove acceptable. Some Baptists said it was not baptism and rejected it; some paedobaptists said it was re-baptism and therefore inadmissible. The Plan is undesirably vague on this issue.

Otherwise I find nothing to which I conscientiously object, though some things I would wish different. And I find much that I welcome gratefully. Anyone who proposes to speak, write, or vote on the proposals should first procure and read at any rate the first of these documents.

HUGH MARTIN

The Baptists in Norfolk, by C. B. Jewson. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 7s. 6d.).

This is a fascinating book. It tells not only of the origins of the Norfolk Baptists and the life within their churches but also of the considerable contribution which many of them made to the life of the community—notably in Norwich. After a section on the Origins and Early Developments, Mr. Jewson goes on in Parts II and III to write of the Kinghorn Era 1739-1832, and of Victorian times. It was these two sections which the reviewer found of greatest interest. What an intriguing man Kinghorn must have been! Quite clearly, too, as Mr. Jewson says, the debate between Robert Hall and Joseph Kinghorn on the Communion question is relevant material for consideration in the present ecumenical age and it is, therefore, perhaps a pity that the author could not have devoted more space to the matter. The life of the Norfolk Baptists in Victorian times again is relevant today in view of the need for recapturing the ideal of Christian Citizenship. Time and again we hear of the Association or of local churches expressing clear and forthright opinions upon the matters of the day—and making certain that the resolutions reach influential people. How that concern needs to be recaptured today! The final section deals with the twentieth century and of the effect upon Baptist life of the wars, and upon Baptists and political life of the splitting of the radical movement into the Liberal and Labour Parties. The century shows too the decline of much of the family tradition for so long the backbone of Baptist life. Yet there is at least one exception to this decline and one which, for obvious reasons, receives all too little attention in this book, namely the "House of Jewson." The

contribution of this family to Baptist life like the story of the Norfolk Baptists themselves goes on. This latest contribution in book form is indeed a worthy one.

Yet there are many questions raised by this book which need answering. To mention but three from the first section. One would like to know how much in the earlier years of Elizabeth I the then Bishop of Norwich, the Puritan sympathiser and returned exile John Parkhurst, himself often in trouble with the Queen and Archbishop, encouraged what Mr. Jewson has called the "rising tide of Puritanism." One would like to know, too, more about the relationship of these Puritans to Robert Browne and the first Separatists, and of both these groups to the Anabaptists. Then again, had the religious emigrants from Norwich any contact soon after 1635 with the remnants of independent groups still in Holland? It is surely noteworthy that both the Yarmouth and Norwich churches of 1643 and 1644, made up of returned exiles, were covenant churches and wrote into their covenants an undoubted echo of the famous "further light and truth" clause of earlier independancy.

One critical word must be written concerning the production of this book, which is, on the whole, so attractive, and that is its almost complete lack of references. The value of material cited in this book is immense and yet its usefulness to subsequent students of Baptist history is greatly lessened, in that there is little indication given of the primary sources from which it is gleaned. The answer can scarcely be that all the quotations are given from the secondary source of the Rev. M. F. Hewett's typescript. But even if many citations are given from the typescript some information is needed as to Mr. Hewett's sources and their availability. It is indeed a pity that so scholarly and interesting a book should have its usefulness limited in this way.

But when all this has been said Mr. Jewson's contribution to the history of East Anglian Baptists is considerable, and this book should be read by anyone interested in Baptist history.

W. M. S. WEST

The Organist's Guide to Congregational Praise, by Eric Routley. (Independent Press, London, 12s. 6d.).

The author, a minister and organist, has set out to provide for organists, notes upon the interpretation of all the hymns to be found in *Congregational Praise.* At first, one is tempted to ask whether such a formidable task is either necessary or desirable, but on reading the book the opinion is rapidly formed that Dr. Routley's racy notes can be of real value, provided the advice given in the foreword is taken to heart—"that the notes are here to start organists thinking, not to stop them thinking."

The author's basic belief that the interpretation of a hymn begins with a thorough understanding of the words cannot be too strongly stressed, and his enthusiastic recommendation of many fine tunes will, it is hoped, kindle a similar enthusiasm in his readers.

In an introductory chapter, valuable advice is given on the general principles of accompanying hymns.

For the organist at a Congregational church, who does not aspire to professional standards, this book ought to become a distinct acquisition.

KENNETH BARRITT

Early Bible Illustrations, by James Strachan. 86 pp. (text), plus 126 woodcuts, with notes and illustrations and an Appendix on the woodcuts of the "Great" Bible. (The Cambridge University Press, 18s. 6d.).

This is an altogether delightful little book. The work of an amateur in the truest sense of the word, it will be read with pleasure as much by the bibliophile and expert as by the casual reader. Mr. Strachan, a retired Inspector of Schools, is modest about his qualifications for writing it, but he has no need to be. Having been asked about some of the pictorial woodcuts in a copy of the "Great" Bible of Henry VIII which had once belonged to George Fox, he soon discovered that the greater part of the literature on the subject was in French and German and concluded that there was room for the sort of book he has now produced.

The ten chapters cover the period from the earliest printed pictures of 1415, notably from the *Ars Moriendi* and the *Biblia Pauperum,* to the end of the 16th century when the fashion for such illustrations began to die out. With no little skill, Mr. Strachan traces the history of the use of these woodcuts from one text to another. He shows, for instance, how the woodblocks used for the Great Cologne Bible, published by Heinrich Quentel between 1478 and 1480, fixed a style that prevailed for several generations, and he produces evidence to show that in those early days the actual blocks themselves were probably passed round from printer to printer. His detailed studies of the illustrations of the English Bibles of the 16th century have a special fascination.

In the main, the accompanying reproductions are excellent and where they fall short it is probably because of defective originals.

Although it is no part of the author's purpose, this book has something to say to those who are interested in the modern use of visual aids in the art of communication. But primarily it is a book just to enjoy.

W. J. BRADNOCK

The Seven Letters: Christ's Message to His Church, by Hugh Martin. (Carey Kingsgate Press, London, 7s. 6d.).

This excellent little book cannot but be of help to preacher and Bible student. It is well written and well documented, and presented with Dr. Martin's usual directness.

The author offers a free and independent translation of the text of the letters, and his opening chapters serve as a good introduction to this section of the Apocalypse. There is a good chapter on "Christ or Caesar" which gives the historical setting for the Seven Letters and passes to its modern parallels. Along these lines, Dr. Martin gives, within the limits of his space, an adequate commentary on each Letter and shows the relevance of each to the modern church. As he writes, explaining the abiding appeal of this part of the Apocalypse, "the Letters throw light on the life of the early church at the outset of the grim struggle with Rome," and they "proclaim picturesquely and forcefully truths of living and eternal validity for the Church today and in every age, and for the individual Christian."

W. S. DAVIES

An Essay of Accommodation, being a scheme for uniting Presbyterians and Congregationalists drawn up c. 1681. Dr. William's Library. Occasional Paper, No. 6, 3s. 9d.).

There is here printed for the first time a draft scheme prepared by London ministers in the closing years of Charles II's reign. It was not acted upon, probably because any such agreement would have brought further troubles on Dissenters; but it circulated among them in manuscript and must have been known to those who drew up the famous *Heads of Agreement* in 1691, when toleration had been secured. The *Essay* is here printed side by side with the *Heads of Agreement* and Mr. Royce Thomas, of the Dr. William's Trust, provides a brief introduction and some useful notes. This publication should be noted by students of the period and those interested in modern efforts to unite Presbyterians and Congregationalists.

ERNEST A. PAYNE