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

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

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY

incorporating the Transactions of the BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITORIAL

(The index to Volume XVII will be distributed with the next issue.)

IN the field of Reformation studies, there is probably no subject attracting more attention than that of the Anabaptists. New material is for ever being discovered about them and we hear a rumour of a vast number of letters relating to the early days of the movement having been found recently in a Hutterite Community on the other side of the Atlantic. It is now clear that the Anabaptists were an important and considerable group in Reformation times and that serious Reformation scholarship can no longer ignore them. The Anabaptist movement is of particular interest to Baptists, for within it there occurred in the Reformation the rediscovery of the conception of the Church as a fellowship of believers separated from the state and the natural consequence of such a conception, namely, entry through believers' baptism. We include in this issue a study of five recent publications on the Anabaptists prepared for us by Walter Klaassen, a graduate of McMaster University and at present engaged on Anabaptist research in Oxford.

In the present state of active research there is the inevitable difficulty of providing an up-to-date general account of the Anabaptist movement intelligible to the interested Baptist. There is a great need for a new book on the lines of R. J. Smithson's *The Anabaptists* (London, 1935), which, whilst still very useful, is becoming out of date. We are indebted to Dr. E. A. Payne that he has begun to meet this need in the recently published volume of

The New Cambridge Modern History (*Vol. II, The Reformation,* 1520-59) edited by G. R. Elton. Within the space of a few thousand words Dr. Payne has given a succinct account of the Anabaptists from their origin which he would place in Zürich in 1525 to the collecting together of its scattered remnants by Menno Simons after the severe persecution of the 1530s and 1540s. Dr. Payne succeeds in describing not only the events, but also something of the thoughts of the leaders. This summary cannot be too highly commended. Yet it is only a summary. The enthusiasm, faith, struggles and sufferings of so vast and varied a company of people need fuller statement. It is greatly to be hoped that before long a more detailed history of the movement will be forthcoming.

A further problem facing any student of Anabaptism is that it was not a coherent whole but rather a movement with many strains of thought. The matter is further complicated by the indiscriminate use of the term "Anabaptist" to describe most deviationists from the accepted Reformation party lines. It is therefore very necessary to attempt to separate out the various strands. Ernst Troeltsch classified the ecclesiastical types of the Reformation as Church type, Sect type and Spiritualists. Representatives of the latter two groups were, in the Reformation, and subsequently, classified as Anabaptists, but it would appear that the name "Anabaptist" more accurately belongs only to the Sect type. The most recent attempt at the classification and characterisation of Anabaptism has been made by G. H. Williams in his Introduction to Volume XXV in the Library of Christian Classics, *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers,* ed. G. H. Williams and A. H. Mergal. Dr. Williams in discussing the Anabaptists and the Spiritualists suggests that each group should be sub-divided into three. The former are made up of the Revolutionary Anabaptists representative of whom is the group who tried to set up a theocracy in Münster; the Contemplative Anabaptists such as Hans Denck who stood very close to the Spiritualists, and the Evangelical Anabaptists such as Balthasar Hubmaier, Conrad Grebel and the Swiss Brethren. The Spiritualists fall into similar categories. These are: Revolutionary Spiritualism of the type of Thomas Müntzer, Rational Spiritualism of which Sebastian Franck is a representative, and Evangelical Spiritualism shown in the thought of Caspar Schwenckfeld. For a concise summary of the various groups within the Left Wing of the Reformation one can certainly do no better than to read Dr. Williams's Introduction. Naturally to impose such a classification carries with it the risk of trying to label thinkers who may, in the last resort, defy classification and Dr. Williams will not expect everyone to agree with his conclusions. It is open to question, for example, whether Carlstadt would really be at home amongst the Revolutionary Spiritualists. Such possible points of disagreement do not detract from the great value of the Introduction. Our debt to Dr. Williams does not end

here, however, for he is responsible for the selecting and editing of thirteen documents either written by, or dealing with, Anabaptists and Spiritualists, each document complete with a brief introductory note. It is safe to say that this selection is the most representative collection of documents in English dealing with the Anabaptist groups. The section on the Anabaptists in this volume closes with a "Bibliography of Material in English Translation written by Representatives of the Radical Reformation." In the editorial last July we called attention to the first part of the bibliographical survey, "Studies in the Radical Reformation" by Dr. Williams, published in *Church History*. He has now completed this study in the June number of the same periodical. It is a remarkable survey and provides an excellent starting point for research students.

Yet when the history of the left wing groups of the Reformation has been written and when the various groups have been classified, there remains the still more difficult task of evaluating their thought. We are only at the beginning of this section of modern Anabapist studies. Some indication of the complexity and intense interest of Anabaptist theology may be gained from the volume of essays, *The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision,* edited by Guy F. Hershberger (Herald Press, Scottdale, Pennsylvania) and presented as a Sixtieth Anniversary tribute to Harold S. Bender, the Mennonite Scholar and mainspring of so much of the modern Anabaptist research. The book contains twenty-four essays, three on Anabaptist research and interpretation, three on the rise of Anabaptism and eighteen on the thought of Anabaptism. The essays follow the story of Anabaptist thinking from martyrdom and disrepute to rediscovery and present-day interpretation. They include an essay by Dr. E. A. Payne on "The Anabaptist Impact on Western Christendom," and one by Professor Fritz Blanke on "Anabaptism and the Reformation." These two essays, together with H. S. Bender's own classic, "The Anabaptist Vision" and F. H. Littell's "The Anabaptist Concept of the Church," are most likely to be of the greatest general interest.

Perhaps the most relevant question raised in the book is in a footnote (No. 21, p. 125) in Dr. Littell's essay. It is, in brief, whether you can have a concept of the Church separated from the state when the state is no longer autocratic but democratic—at least in theory. To translate this into the English context is to ask how far the Baptists, for example, having come into being as separatist group under a governmental system somewhat different from today can and ought to remain "separate." Certainly this raises the issue as to *how* different are the political systems of then and now. Yet the answer to the main question is, so far as Baptists in England are concerned, that they are no longer wholly "separate" from the state. But this is a very complex question, all too rarely considered, and one to which we must return on another occasion!

Public Worship

I. THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

L. P. JACKS said that the attempt to define education, though always doomed to end in failure, is a profitable intellectual exercise. I think we may adapt that and say that the attempt to define worship, though equally foredoomed to failure, is a rewarding spiritual exercise. Most preachers engage in it from time to time and urge their congregations to reflect upon what is implied in the meaning of this word "worth-ship." But, in any sense which isn't rather trivial, worship is as difficult to define as are love or life. And for the same reason. What the existentialist philosopher says of life is no less true of worship: "It is not a problem to be solved; it is an experience to be lived through." If, however, we are going to make worship a subject of reflection or discussion, we must find some categories in which to think and talk about it. And, of course, for Christian men the place to find them is the Scripture.

There are two Biblical conceptions with which I think we must work when we are theologizing about worship; one is the Word and the other is the Spirit. We will consider them in turn.

The Word

Since the Reformation, the Word has been the dominant factor in Protestant thought about worship. On the one hand, the presence of God is conceived of, not in terms of a substance whereof we partake, but in terms of revealed Mind and Will to which we give attention. On the other hand, the sacrificial element in worship is conceived of, not as the offering of propitiation through the Mass, but as the self-offering of the worshipping Church in an act expressive of trust in the God who has revealed Himself. On this view, worship is personal encounter. It is God speaking and man heeding. It is I-Thou. In terms of the familiar analysis of this I-Thou made by personalist theologians, worship is the Word being spoken as claim and succour and the Word being heeded in the faith which is obedience to the claim and commitment to the succour.

The Word is the vehicle of the Truth of God. As such, it is objective in the absolute sense. But, so to speak, the vehicle has a destination. The function of a word is to communicate; and communication is a two-term conception. It implies relation. It is

from-to. The Word, then, is *from* God, revealing His Mind and Will, and it is *to* minds that are set to know Him and wills that are set to obey Him. On this conception of worship, the worshipper is caught up into the essence of the thing. What happens is not external to, nor independent of, him; it is not a drama he observes, nor a transubstantiation before which he bows in mystery and awe. Something happens, right enough; something which is, in one sense, objective and wholly other—God speaks. But the point of speaking is to be heard. Communication is the raison d'être of the Word. And, as we have said, communication is two-term; it implies hearer as well as speaker. And so the objective, wholly other, element in worship, though it needs to be insisted upon with all the force at our command, cannot be conceived of as something apart altogether from the worshipper. He is involved in the very essence of the thing, when we think of worship in terms of the Word.

Now, it is just here that one of the besetting sins of worshippers in the Reformed tradition, and particularly Free Church worshippers as we know them, finds its occasion. Their sin is subjectivism. I am thinking of prayers devoted to the analysis or contemplation of the worshipper's feelings, rather than to extolling the glory of God or claiming the objective realities of salvation. I am thinking also of hymns—and of the lush and sentimental tunes to which they are sometimes set—whose chief design seems to be the inducement of an emotion, a feeling warm and comfortable, or bold and excited, according to your taste. I should find it very difficult, of course, to argue that this kind of thing has not been a means of grace to some. Indeed it has; and that is not surprising. If the Almighty can make the wrath of men to praise Him, He can presumably do the same thing with their self-preoccupation and their sentimentality. But we should not continue in sin that grace may abound. The kind of worship which is taken up with the worshipper's own self-consciousness, which consists in taking your own moral temperature or feeling of your own spiritual pulse—that is the shame of the Reformed tradition. It is, in the realm of worship, that corruption of the best which is the worst.

This is not, of course, to suggest that emotion has no place in worship. It is, no doubt, useful to have a word 'emotion' and to think of it as applying to a mode of consciousness distinct from others called "thought" and "will." This way of talking provides us with three useful pegs on which to hang things when we are reflecting on human activity. But it is only a way of talking. The idea that emotion is something which you can either put into, or leave out of, human activity is quite mistaken. All human activity is emotional. Even mathematicians say that mathematical activity, at its highest levels, is attended by a most sublime emotion, though many of us perhaps find this hard to believe! There is not only a knowing of the Truth; there is a feeling of it and a doing of it

also. These are not separable in first-order, but only in second-order, activity, when we are not so much doing something as reflecting upon having done it. And so, of course, one is not, and cannot be, against emotion in worship.

What one is against is the view that worship is a sort of S.T. (the counterpart of P.T.), intended to improve the spiritual appearance or quicken the spiritual metabolism of the worshipper. There may be activities which can be thought of as spiritual gymnastics and for which some sort of case can be made out on psychological grounds; but, whatever these are, they are not worship.

I even find some difficulty in the notion, often put forward, that worship is essentially a response of gratitude. It is a little hard to be clear what this word 'gratitude,' as we normally use it, implies; but, if it is taken to mean a feeling which we experience, then, of course, we cannot tell a man that he ought to respond with gratitude. What sense does it make to tell him he ought to feel what he does not feel? "Ought" implies "can" and, while we can have duties to do, we can scarcely have duties to feel. But does it make poor sense to tell a man that he has a duty to worship God? Certainly not to Christians. If, however, they tell him this, they cannot be speaking simply of his duty to feel something, but to do something: what they are telling him is that he ought to attend to the Word of God.

THE SPIRIT

The second conception with which we have to work in our theology of worship is the Spirit. The doctrine of the Spirit is, I suppose, of all doctrines the most complex, and thought on the subject easily becomes confused, or, at least, passes beyond the limit up to which discussion is possible. So far as worship is concerned, however, certain things seem clear.

The fellowship of the Spirit is realized in the worshipping community; and the worshipping community is constituted by the fellowship of the Spirit. What Acts and the Epistles say of the gifts of the Spirit seems to indicate that it is through the worship of the community that these are apprehended, and it is in the worship of the community that many, if not all, find their most complete expression. Wisdom, knowledge, prophecy, tongues, interpretation, healing, miracles—all are social in their origin and operation. And not least faith—the response of trust and obedience to the Word.

To be in the Spirit, then, whatever else it may or may not mean, is to be in the community; and in so far as we worship God in Spirit, we worship Him from within the community. It is worth noting that the service which, I think, all Christians would agree is most completely an act of worship is also an act of communion; what we do then we do as the Body. For my own part, I find that this communal aspect of worship becomes increasingly important

in my approach to it. To worship is to participate in the self-offering of the Church; to be part of what the worshipping community does, has done and will do. One finds oneself asking less and less such questions as: "Did I find that service deeply moving?" "Did I agree with those points the preacher made?" "Do I feel a better man for having watered my little plant called reverence?" and so on. Now, in worship, the important point seems to be that the faith of the Church is being expressed and one has part in that. I find some refuge from my own confusion of mind in the faith of the Church, and from my own coldness of heart in the love of the Church. My fellow-worshippers become increasingly important to my thought of the significance of worship. And not those I see only, but the Church militant through all the years and the Church triumphant in eternity: and the thought that, in the act of worship, one has part in all that.

I referred above to the danger of subjectivism in worship. Here we join issue with the kindred danger of individualism. If worship is worship in the Spirit, then surely preoccupation with our individual reactions to what is being done will be taken up into the thought of the act of worship as the act of the whole community. Just as our sense of communion with God should be most intense during the act of worship, so should our sense of participation in the Church. There is surely something theologically inadequate in the notion, seldom expressed but often underlying our thought of worship, that a service is an occasion in which a lot of individuals come together so that each may receive his own private bit of light and inspiration. There are some aspects of Baptist worship admirably suited to guard against this danger of individualism; for example, the common practice of assembling the whole local Church (theoretically, anyhow) for the Lord's Supper and all taking the bread and wine *together*. But one could wish that there were more of the fact of community in our common practice. We sing hymns together; and some, though not all, among us find hymn-singing a completely satisfactory form of worship and look for little else. And we say the Lord's Prayer together. But why not more participation in prayer? Why do we not confess our sins together and give thanks together? We do not like creeds, but there is something to be said for a congregation reciting a creed together—as substituting, for the worshipper's preoccupation with his own inadequate reflections, an identification of mind with the historic faith of the Church. But I am anticipating practical matters, to which I shall turn in a moment.

To summarise so far: there are two conceptions essential to our theology of worship—the Word and the Spirit: God as Truth and Love: worship as communication and participation. They are, of course, complementary to one another. Baptism, for example, is associated both with faith in the Word and with the gift of the

Spirit. Of the Lord's Supper Calvin said that it is both the promise contained in Christ's words of institution and the work of the Holy Spirit which renders it a true means of grace. The Spirit illuminates our understanding of the Word; but we are instructed to try the spirits whether they be of God, and the Spirit that is of God we know by His witness to the Living Word.

II. PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

I should now like to bring before the reader's attention two questions; they are related to one another and I think that they both arise from what has been said so far.

DIFFERENT SORTS OF WORSHIP

The first is: Are there different sorts of worship? Not, of course, are there denominational differences?—obviously there are; but, is there room within one tradition and one theology of worship—our own to be precise—for different kinds of service? Does it make sense, for instance, to talk about worship that is evangelical as distinct from worship that is devotional?

This question arises in my own mind, not so much from theological, as from practical, considerations. I am impressed by the vast differences between religious occasions to all of which we apply more or less identical orders of worship. I am impressed, to be more specific, by the differences between the congregation—and the whole atmosphere of the thing—at a Billy Graham meeting, and at my own Sunday evening service. And I wonder if the same form of worship is really appropriate to both. I concede that the order: Hymn—Lesson—Hymn—Prayer—Hymn—Sermon—Hymn, is admirably suited to an evangelical meeting. But the assumption upon which we proceed is apparently that every service ought to be, in tone and intention, an evangelical meeting. It is this assumption which I call in question.

The proclamation and the heeding of the Word—yes: that is fixed. But how are you going to do it?—surely that question is open and admits of different answers according to the occasion. We are supposed to have inherited a tradition of freedom and spontaneity in worship, and yet we are hidebound in many of our own views on this subject. Hidebound as to what makes a hymn "rousing," what makes a prayer "sincere," and what makes a sermon a sermon. I am not, mark you, advocating the introduction of pleasing novelties in order to make services more "attractive." I am asking whether the Word of claim and succour and the response thereto of trust and obedience, for all men at all times, fits into the same forms. And if the answer is "No," then here is a subject about which we ought to be thinking far more carefully and honestly than many of us do.

If anyone asks what precisely I have in mind, here are one or two points:

(1) Would it enrich the spiritual life of our churches if we had more services devoted to the reading of the Bible and response thereto in meditation and prayer? (The increasing use of the Service of Nine Lessons at Christmas is not to be explained solely by the fact that it gets the minister out of having to prepare a sermon and the congregation of having to listen to one; it has a value of its own which we might realize more extensively.)

(2) Do we hold Communion services often enough? Once a month it is usually; but would we not do well to adopt the practice of some Scottish Baptist churches and hold Communion every Sunday? And, so far as the arrangement of the service is concerned, how do we see the relation of the liturgy of the Word to the liturgy of the Table?

(3) Could we not replace the sermon at some of our evening services by relaying broadcast discussions or T.V. features? The claim and succour of the Word can, as we would all admit, be more effectively presented in these ways, sometimes at least, than through preaching from a pulpit. The B.B.C. would almost certainly co-operate, if churches saw the possibilities in this kind of thing.

(4) One would like to see the introduction of some more theologically adequate liturgical forms into our worship. There are encouraging signs of this in some quarters, and I will return to this point in a moment.

The point I make now is simply that we must not be afraid of change in our forms of worship. We must not be afraid of new forms nor unwilling to learn from other Christian communions. And all this, not so much from the motive that we must make our services more attractive in order to get people there and get them converted; but from the motive that worship is the life of the Church and we are not living to the full.

LITURGICAL DEVELOPMENT

My second main question is: Is there room and need for liturgical development amongst us? Here, of course, I am using "liturgy" in a restricted sense. Strictly speaking, every church has its liturgy; but the reader will understand what is meant by liturgical, as distinct from free, worship. The question then, is: Is there room and need for the use of liturgical, as well as free, forms of worship amongst us? The two are not incompatible; there is some ancient precedent for combining them. In the fourth and fifth centuries, for instance, the "drift" of prayers, rather than the exact formula was given; and in the Roman Church in the sixth century, some measure of improvisation was practised within the prescribed liturgical framework.

The use of prescribed liturgical forms provides some remedy for two defects of entirely free worship :

(1) One is lack of theological wholeness. So much depends upon the minister—surely, too much. Every man has his own limited insights; to take the simplest example, for every man there are some passages of Scripture which seem much more meaningful than others, and the likelihood is that, when the choice of lessons depends upon him alone, these others never get read in his services. And what is true of lessons, is no less true of the hymns we choose, the prayers we pray and the sermon subjects we select. From such individual predilections a liturgy in some degree delivers one and and substitutes for them the collective wisdom and experience of the Church. Something would be gained (and need anything be lost?), if we had order-books prescribing themes, lessons for the day subjects for prayers, even hymns. This would conduce to the proclamation of the whole Gospel. The short answer is, of course, that any man can do this for himself; and up to a point that is so. But the danger of home-made liturgies is that they will fail to express the wholeness of the Gospel just as entirely free worship may. The preparation of a liturgy is a task calling for the collective wisdom and experience of the Church, and we should need to find some means of working this out in the light of the Reformed tradition concerning liturgy. The aim all the time is theological adequacy. It is important to emphasize that; because people sometimes assume that if you say a word in favour of liturgical forms, you must be advocating them on the ground that they provide for a more dignified, grammatical, eloquent, or better-bred act of worship. And they ask whether all that is as important as sincerity. Of course it isn't. But such considerations are entirely beside the point. The point is that the wholeness of the Gospel should be in our worship.

(2) The second defect in our kind of free worship is lack of congregational participation. This, of course, need not be a defect of free worship; the latter can be, and amongst us it once was, punctuated by hearty "Amen's," "Hallelujah's," "Praise the Lords's!" But we are more restrained than our fathers or some of our coloured brethren. In many churches the congregation does not even say "Amen' at the close of the prayers, and I have found that, if you suggest they should, they suspect you of "unBaptist" activities! It is, of course, conceivable, and perhaps in the case of some choice souls it is the case, that a worshipper should sit silent through a whole service and yet be one in heart and mind with the minister and participate in all he says and does. But, on psychological, as well as theological, grounds there is everything to be said for participation which is active. An act of worship is the act of the whole worshipping congregation; it is desirable that what is done should be done, as far as possible, by the whole congregation. This is why there is much to be said for responsive readings and

prayers, for prayers said together, and for affirmations of faith repeated together. What is done, all must do. Just as all take the bread, all drink the cup.

We are not faced in this matter with an either-or. We need both the spiritually uplifting directness and intimacy of the free approach to God and the theological adequacy of liturgical forms, enshrining the experience of the Church and hallowed by use. The notion that you must have either one or the other is surely mistaken. I appreciate, of course, that there are two schools of thought here, which may be differentiated as the exclusive and the eclectic. The exclusive was ably represented by the Rev. Kenneth Parry in his moderatorial address to the F.C.F.C. Congress a few years ago in Liverpool; he spoke appreciatively of Roman, Anglican and Orthodox forms of worship, but said he thought the mixing of things is the great evil, and that those of us who have inherited the free tradition of worship should preserve it pure and unalloyed. The eclectic school, on the other hand, takes the view that we have much to learn from each other, and worship—like Church life in general—is enriched by the influence of different traditions upon one another.

I respect the exclusive view, but incline strongly to the eclectic. I think a growing number, of the younger people especially, in our churches are dissatisfied with our traditional form of worship, the more so if they have had some experience of other forms. There could not, of course, be any question of trying to foist on to an unwilling denomination practices which only appeal to a few. And it is not a case of that. What seems to me important is that within our denomination there should be discussion, exchange of view, experiment, concerning worship—and all of it on a respectable theological plane. We have groups discussing, and promoting discussion, on Church unity, evangelism, baptism—and perhaps other subjects. Worship is as important as any of these—and, indeed, is not separable from them. It is a subject which should be brought before our denomination, and, if necessary, a group or groups should be formed to spread information and stimulate thought on it.

I write this as one who grew up in a small Baptist church, where worship was conducted in a highly spontaneous and extempore manner by lay preachers. In these services I had my first experience of the Word and the Spirit, and of membership within the worshipping community. I am deeply sensible of my own debt to such Baptist worship. Far from thinking poorly of it, I yield to no man in my appreciation of its value as one sort of worship. But I think we have something to learn from communions with a liturgical tradition different from our own. And it is surely paying your denomination no small compliment to assume that it is capable of learning.

W. D. HUDSON.

Modern Anabaptist Research

SOME notable contributions to research in Anabaptist history and thought in the last few years have been published, unfortunately for most English readers, in the German language. It is the purpose of this article to acquaint English readers with the results of this research as found in five recently published volumes. These are, in order of review: (1) Fritz Blanke, *Brethren in Christ,* Zwingli Verlag, 1955; (2) Ekkehard Krajewski, *Life and Death of Felix Mantz, Leader of the Zurich Anabaptists,* Oncken Verlag, 1957; (3) J. F. G. Goeters, *Ludwig Hätzer, Spiritualist and Antitrinitarian,* 1957; (4) *Hans Denck, Religious Writings,* ed. W. Fellmann, 1956, the last two published by Bertelsmann Verlag in the series *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte,* and finally, (5) J. J. Kiwiet, *Pilgram Marbeck,* Oncken Verlag, 1957.

These five volumes present the Anabaptist movement in some of its great variety. Dr. Blanke has written the moving story of the courageous and pathetic attempt to establish a dissenting *Gemeinde,*[1] in the face of a hostile church-state alliance. Krajewski has essentially re-told this story, but follows through it the trail of Felix Mantz, one of the originators of the Anabaptist movement in Switzerland. Consequently his account is wider in scope and time. Dr. Goeters' work on Ludwig Hätzer also overlaps to some extent with the ground covered in the first two volumes, but again it includes new material both historical and theological, since Hätzer stood between the Anabaptists and the Spiritualists Hätzer's activities take us into the thick of the young Anabaptist movement in South Germany. Fellmann's volume of Denck's works is purely theological and the basis of the later theological writing of Pilgram Marbeck. Kiwiet's book tells the story of South German Anabaptism as seen through the life, work, and thought of its greatest leader, Pilgram Marbeck.

I. There is no need to recount again the outward succession of events that led to the formation of the first Anabaptist *Gemeinde* in Zollikon near Zürich, since there are several accounts available in English.[2] What is important is Dr. Blanke's interpretation of the total event based on a careful reading and evaluation of the primary sources.

The life-span of this *Gemeinde* was just two months, from the

first believers' baptism on January 21st, 1525, to the dissolution of the fellowship at the end of March. The whole movement, Dr. Blanke declares, had the characteristics of an "Awakening." The stages of this awakening applied to individuals can be traced as the experiences of these people are related in the records of prison and trial interrogations. (1) The disturbed conscience due to awareness of sin, (2) prayer for a thorough knowledge and recognition of sin, (3) deep conviction of sin, (4) the cry for salvation after sincere repentance, and (5) forgiveness experienced in baptism, baptism being the sign of God's grace and pardon. In baptism God gives grace to the penitent sinner and strength for the new life (36-37).[2a]

The author claims that this eruptive movement of repentance with its consequences is unique in Reformation history and therefore it has to be explained. There are two reasons, one theological and one personal. Already in 1524 the leaders Grebel and Mantz had become convinced that repentance must precede baptism. Without repentance there is no baptism, that is, no salvation. This was the theological reason. The personal reason was that Georg Blaurock, one of the leaders, was a persuasive evangelist, a dynamic and fiery preacher. No doubt he provided the initial impetus for the whole event (40-41).

Dr. Blanke further emphasizes that the Anabaptist movement in Zollikon was a Reformation movement, and not an extension or a resurgence of the Old Evangelical sects of the Middle Ages as some claim. The test ought to be made here, in this earliest Anabaptist *Gemeinde*. The outstanding features of this movement are Zwinglian in nature. The prayer for recognition of sin with the realization that it too is a gift of God; belief in the total depravity of unregenerate man; the teaching of salvation by faith; the conviction of being led personally by God, and above all, the non-sacramental character of baptism and the Lord's Supper; all of these are clearly Zwinglian formulations. Added to this was the fact that the fellowship had all the marks of a Church; preaching, baptism and the Lord's Supper, and church discipline. The Waldensians knew nothing of all this and therefore the case is clear: the Anabaptists were children of the Reformation. Blanke also rejects the frequent charge that social and political motives influenced the growth of the movement as completely without foundation in the sources (43-45).

Finally the author devotes a chapter to a strange event that occurred in June, 1525, after the fellowship had been broken by civil and ecclesiastical pressure. A procession of men, women, and children from Zollikon, with willow wands twisted about their waists, entered the city of Zürich denouncing Zwingli as the big dragon of *Rev.* xii. 3 and calling the city to repentance with cries of woe, woe, woe! What is the explanation of this strange phenomenon? Though there is no evidence of apocalyptic elements among the Zollikon Anabaptists in the sources, Blanke feels that an

undercurrent of prophetic eschatology must have been present, for the words and symbolisms of these prophets are not accidental. Perhaps it was initiated by an individual; perhaps it was merely a deep disappointment with Zwingli and the Church in Zürich (68-75).

When the Anabaptists of Zollikon finally gave in it was a truce of exhaustion and not of conviction. They started their work before the time was ripe, says Blanke. However, no blame rests on them for this, for there must ever be those who will set out on pilgrimage to a new dawn, undeterred by the spirit of the time. Such were the men and women of Zollikon, and we stand in their debt (82).

II. Since biographical details of the life of Felix Mantz are very scarce indeed, the author has actually done little more than tell again the story of the rise of Anabaptism in Zürich and its subsequent fortunes and misfortunes. But even with the paucity of source material, Krajewski has managed to give us a picture of the man.

There is nothing extraordinary about Mantz. He always seemed to remain somewhat in the background. He was a young man, gripped by a conviction, who wrestled manfully with questions that are even today very much in our minds. What is the Church and what form should it take? What is the position of the individual within that Church? What is the relationship of the interpretation of Scripture to the Church? He never looked back once he had put his hand to the plough. Leonhard von Muralt, the prominent Swiss secular historian, has said of Mantz that he was the most quiet and persistent, the most deeply religious, and the clearest thinker of the Anabaptist leaders of Zürich.

Mantz was an educated man for he studied the biblical languages, especially Hebrew, with Zwingli. He seems to have been a leader of the separatists from the beginning, that is, from the time when it became clear that there was a basic divergence of views. Until that time there had not been a Grebel-Mantz group, but now the common disagreement with Zwingli drew them together. It is a Mantz characteristic to shun verbal controversy, and he requested repeatedly to be allowed to dispute in writing.

There is next to no detailed information on his work after the separation had become complete as a result of the first believers' baptism which took place in Mantz's house. He worked in the Cantons to the north, east and south-east of Zürich at various times. He seemed to go only where work had already begun. He was imprisoned in Zürich four times, the last imprisonment ending with his death. Before he died he had come to great honour among the Anabaptists because of his suffering for the faith, but also because of his quiet, winning ways.

That Mantz had learned well from Zwingli can be seen from the main points of his theology. These were: (1) the conviction of the

sole authority of the Scriptures in matters of faith, and this forms the basis for his whole approach. (He did, however, go beyond Zwingli in his application of the principle, and also varied from him in his understanding of it); (2) the doctrine of salvation through faith in the work of Christ. Mantz's distinctive theological position involving his views about the Church, the Sacraments, and the Christian life, was developed in controversy with Zwingli. He stood in complete agreement with the beliefs of the Swiss Brethren as they have been stated above.

Since Mantz was personally active in arranging for the printing and circulation of some of the anti-sacramental tracts of Carlstadt, Krajewski deals with the matter of "enthusiast"[3] influence on the Swiss Brethren. To begin with there is no evidence that Mantz was influenced by Carlstadt's views (43-47). The author then discusses the letter of the Brethren to Thomas Müntzer of September, 1524. His conclusions are that they had come to their own convictions from the Scriptures before they wrote that letter, and that Müntzer's writings, which they said had "taught them a great deal," had merely expressed more clearly some of the things they already held to be true. Thus there can be no question of any theological influence of Müntzer on these men of Zürich. With regard to Bullinger's remarks[4] about the meeting of the Brethren with Müntzer later in the autumn of 1524, the author admits that it could have been so as there is nothing to contradict it, notwithstanding Bender's argument[5] to the contrary, but that it is highly unlikely (49-59).

The sentence of death passed on Mantz was legally justified. In March, 1526, the Zürich Council issued a mandate which provided that anyone found to be re-baptizing was to be executed by drowning. Mantz admitted that he had baptized a woman in April, 1526, and thereby pronounced himself guilty. Zwingli no doubt agreed to the sentence although with reluctance. Mantz went to his death praising God and with the words "Into thy hands I commend my spirit."

Why this severity on the part of the Zürich Council? They saw in the Anabaptist movement a threat to the whole work of the Reformation, particularly since Zürich was increasingly threatened by the Catholic Cantons to the south. They decided to make an example of Mantz. His execution was the beginning of a corporate martyrdom that has no equal.

III. This book on Ludwig Hätzer is not only one of the best biographies in Anabaptist research, but also one of the most penetrating analyses of the movement in so far as the author discusses it. Hätzer was not a true Anabaptist since he was never baptized himself and for other reasons shown below. Goeters calls him a peripheral figure of early Anabaptism.

The broad outlines of his life and wanderings are quickly summed up. He was born in Switzerland about the year 1500. After acquir-

ing a humanistic education in the *via antiqua* he took up the duties of a priest in a village near Zürich, where he was converted to the evangelical faith under Zwingli's influence. Because of anti-Reformation sentiment in the village he left his charge, and was from then on a wanderer. In Zürich he soon found himself in the radical[6] camp, and, because of his views left for Augsburg in June, 1525, where he worked as a proof-reader, at the same time continuing the polemical writing he had begun at Zürich. He entered the eucharistic dispute, came out on the side of Carlstadt, and gathered around him a sort of conventicle. After being banished from Augsburg in October, 1525, on charges of being an Anabaptist, he went to Basle, from where he was reconciled with Zwingli through the mediation of Oecolampadius. In the Zürich disputation about baptism in November, 1525, he took the floor against the Anabaptists. This reconciliation with Zwingli, says Goeters, is to be understood on the basis of the sharp distinction made by Zwingli between water baptism and the baptism of the Spirit. An incipient spiritualism is present here, if not with Zwingli, at least with Hätzer. In Basle Hätzer worked with Oecolampadius, translating his works into German, but had to leave after a year because of a moral lapse involving a servant girl.

At Strasbourg he met Denck and was greatly influenced by him. It was there that he began his translation of the Old Testament prophets, and finished it later with Denck's assistance at Worms. It was completed in six months and met a real need for it was, in 1527, the only part of the Bible so far left untranslated by Luther. It went through twelve editions in five years and was then superseded by the official translations of Wittenberg and Zürich. Both Luther and Zwingli rejected the "Worms Prophets" because the authors were schismatics, but they nevertheless expressed grudging approval of the work. The charge of plagiarism levelled against Luther and Zwingli by some historians is ruled out by our knowledge of the facts surrounding both translations (104-105).

From Worms Hätzer went to Regensburg where he actually baptized four persons, and was considered as an elder by the local Aanabaptist group. From Autumn, 1527 until November, 1528, nothing certain is known of his whereabouts, but that he was not idle is proved from his literary efforts. He was brought to trial in Constance and beheaded on February 4th, 1529 on a moral charge, thus disposing of a dangerous heretic (156-157).

Goeters deals with the development of Hätzer's thought in considerable detail. His overall judgment of the man is that he was not really an independent thinker, but took his ideas from others and drove them far beyond the intentions of their originators. Among his teachers were Zwingli, Hans Denck, the *Theologia Deutsch*, Hans Hut, and Carlstadt.

The main strand of Hätzer's thought concerns the relationship

between Spirit and Scripture. In his early days at Zürich he was an outspoken biblicist. This is abundantly clear from his first work directed against images (17-19). The prologue to this work and his introduction to the minutes of the Second Zürich Disputation, at which he was secretary, state clearly his views of the Scriptures. The Word of God is over all other authority; yes it even exposes other so-called authority as worldly wisdom. The Old and New Testaments he considers as of equal value, the Old Testament being obligatory on Christians in all things except in matters of church ritual. His biblicism had two aspects, ecclesiastical and ethical. The first can be called Biblicist Purism with regard to cultic practice, and the second "Imitatio Christi," the ethical expression of the faith. In these views he was in full accord with the radicals in Zürich, and joined them on occasion in criticizing the Zürich Reformation on these grounds (41). A feature of Hätzer's development from Biblicist to Spiritualist was his view of the Lord's Supper. While in Augsburg in 1525 he adopted Carlstadt's view which was that the bread and wine is not even a sign and assurance of faith, for this is the prerogative of the Spirit, but only a remembrance and proclamation of the Lord's death (63).

It is at this point, says Goeters, that a basic change in Hätzer's thinking takes place. The Biblicist begins to decline and the Spiritualist becomes more prominent. The introduction to his translation of Malachi and Oecolampadius' commentary on it reveals this clearly (84-85). The authority of the Bible is still considered great, but it is now supported with the teaching of verbal inspiration. The Scriptures are no longer important for outward aspects of the *Gemeinde,* the weight has shifted to the individual Christian life. The Spirit is needed to understand the Scriptures. In his contact with Michael Sattler in Strasbourg late 1526, he supported the view that only through faith do men enter the *Gemeinde,* and that baptism is of little value (90).

His gradual drift to Spiritualism can also be seen in his views of the canon of Scripture (127-128). He believed the apocryphal books to be above suspicion and that they ought to be considered as Scripture. He charged the Reformers with limiting the Holy Spirit by circumscribing the canon. Since the Scriptures designated as canonical by the Reformers contained contradictions within themselves, the contradictions between that canon and the Apocrypha cannot be used to prove the non-canonicity of the latter.

The introduction to his translation of the "Prophet" Baruch contains interesting insights into the final shape of Hätzer's view of the relation of the Spirit to the Scriptures (129-130). Faith is the union between the human and divine wills; the denial of one's own will and complete surrender to God. This faith is essentially knowledge and cannot be described in terms of dogmatic orthodoxy or ethical attitude. The Scriptures cannot be the source of this faith,

nor do they mediate knowledge of God, since faith does not come from reading, hearing, or intellectual study of the Scriptures. It comes only from God Himself, and therefore must be sought only in God. Thus there is no identity of the Scriptures and preaching with the Word of God. The Word of God is the voice of the Spirit and above the Scriptures. The written Word shows the way of faith, but the light of the Spirit is needed to understand it. Goeters calls this a union of Spiritualism and mystic anthropology. It clearly reveals the influence of Denck (132), although in a superficial way, and it is important to notice that there was no sign of these spiritualistic formulations until after he met Denck. Hätzer's spiritualism is determined by his mysticism which he got from *Theologia Deutsch.*

His anti-trinitarian views are closely connected with his mysticism and are evident from his edition and publication of the *Theologia,* and also from some of his hymns (135, 138). The denial of the trinitarian formula is also apparently the theme of an unprinted work on the person of Christ (141-146). There seems no real doubt that he denied the deity of Christ and considered him only as the example of the God-man relationship.

Two observations of the author on the events in Zürich during 1524 are worthy of mention. (1) In his discussions of the origins of the Anabaptist movement there he emphasizes particularly the disagreement over the payment of tithes (31-35) and he sees in this the beginning of the division. It was here that the connexion of Church and State most affected the laity and the radicals were determined to overthrow this ancient alliance by refusing to pay. This point, says Goeters, is one of the sources of the apolitical outlook of Anabaptism. (2) The radicals were led to question the whole traditional doctrine of baptism by the things Zwingli had said and by the changes in the liturgy of baptism made by Leo Jud (47-49). They discovered, so Hätzer says, in canonical law that "salvation is promised by the outward baptism with water." They quickly drew the conclusion that paedo-baptism was commanded in canon law, therefore an invention of the Papacy, and thus a "devilish abomination." Comparison with the New Testament showed no command to baptize children, and so the die was cast. Wilhelm Roübli began to preach against baptism of infants in Witikon near Zürich in the spring of 1524.

IV. The works of Hans Denck, South German Anabaptist leader, occupy a singularly unique place within the total picture of religious writing in the Reformation Era, for they are free from the vulgar personal attacks, name-calling, and lack of Christian charity that are so characteristic of the writings of the Reformers, and to a much lesser degree, of other Anabaptist writers. Denck acted upon his conviction that love is the great commandment, regardless of what his opponents said or did. This is reflected in all his writings with-

out exception. He was a man of conviction and independent thought, but at the same time always conciliatory and admitting his own proneness to error, an attitude that was certainly out of keeping with the spirit of the time in which he lived. It is a pity to have to condense his main works, for they are in themselves concise, clear, and free from tedious argumentation.

Because of the limited scope of this paper it is not possible to deal with each of the seven works separately. His thought will be presented under several convenient, if to some extent arbitrary, headings. Moreover the work *Whether God be the Cause of Evil* will not be included here, firstly because it is available to English readers,[8] and secondly because it bears a strong resemblance to *The Order of God.* The six works reviewed are: (1) *Confession before the Council of Nuremberg,* 1525 [Confession][9]; (2) *Concerning the Law of God,* 1526 [Law]; (3) *Whosoever sincerely loves the Truth,* 1526 [Truth]; (4) *Concerning the True Love,* 1527 [Love]; (5) *The Order of God,* 1527 [Order], and (6) *Retractation,* 1527 [Retractation].

Denck's works were written chiefly in opposition to the Lutheran doctrines of justification by faith *alone,* and predestination. Denck's Law of God, for instance, followed closely upon *De libero arbitrio* by Erasmus and Luther's answer *De servo arbitrio.* He emphasizes repeatedly that, for example, both Paul and James are right, but that choosing one in preference to the other is to build on a half-truth which is worse than a lie.[10]

Fellman's text is a critical edition in the early high German, based on first prints.

A. *Faith.* Where does faith come from? is the first question Denck asks. It is not inherited nor is it from the Scriptures, for "by nature I cannot believe the Scriptures. But that which is within me, not of me, I say, but that which drives me without my will and co-operation, thus urges me to read the Scriptures for the witness they bear."[11] That driving force is Christ, to whom the Scriptures bear witness that he is the Son of God.[12] Therefore the Word of God in the depths of the soul precedes the Scriptures and inspires faith as the grain of mustard seed, and when this faith arises, the darkness of the soul is overcome.[13] "Faith is obedience to the Word of God, be it to death or to life, with the firm conviction that it points to that which is best."[14] It is trust in God's promise through Christ. Where there is no obedience, there is no real trust.[15]

B. *The Scriptures.* The Scriptures are greater than all earthly treasures, but not as great as the living, powerful and eternal Word of God.[16] They are a lantern that shines into the darkness of man's unbelief, but they are the products of human hands, mouth, ears, and eyes,[17] and thus cannot be the source of faith.[18] They are a witness to drive man to the extremity in which he chooses either

God or condemnation, but only a witness to the truth, not the truth itself.[19] Man cannot receive the witness of Scripture unless he has the guidance of the Holy Spirit,[20] and it is only after man knows God that the Scriptures are a guide,[21] chastisement, instruction, and comfort.[22] Only the Spirit can correctly interpret the Scriptures.[23] They help believers to the good and blessedness, but the unbeliever cannot understand them because he has not the Spirit, and if he reads them he will read to his own damnation.[24] Thus a man, chosen of God, may be saved without preaching or Scripture. Not that one ought to neglect preaching and Scripture, but that otherwise all the illiterate, and whole nations, that have not heard for lack of a preacher, would be lost.[25]

C. *The Freedom of the Will.* This forms the basis to Denck's whole approach. God is good and so are all created things because He made them. Man's evil is of his own making and God cannot be charged with it. But God is merciful and His light, the Word of God or the Spirit, shines in the hearts of all men that are born. Men are free to choose or to reject that Word, for God forces no one.[26] "Man is free," says Denck, "in the degree in which he resembles or approaches the source of his being, [God]. The deeper he is in condemnation, the more he is in bondage. . . . No matter how free he is, the good can only be done through suffering. . . . No matter how deep his bondage, he is free to allow the working of the Word of God in him."[27] Man's will is separated from God's by sin.[28] Salvation, for Denck, consists in bringing these wills together again. When the almighty Word of God enters the soul a battle ensues before the human will is overcome, which is despair because of a fear of perishing utterly.[29] The Word tells man that he is to blame for his sin, and as soon as man becomes aware of the Word he is free either to go on in evil or to sacrifice himself in suffering. If he listens to the Word he goes through the sufferings of hell to yield his will to God and become nothing himself.[30] He who resists this suffering sinks into death.[31]

D. *The Law of God.* The outward law that was rejected by the Apostles as a yoke of bondage was given to Israel to remind him of the simplicity of God's law, namely, to love the Lord God only.[32] The law was given not merely that by it we should recognize our sin, but to be fulfilled.[33] If the single-minded love of God is present in man, there is no difficulty in keeping the commandments.[34] Whosoever says that he cannot keep the law denies that Christ has come in the flesh and infers that reconciliation with God is impossible.[35] Natural man cannot fulfil the law of God, but to those who have faith all things are possible, not to men as men, but to men as those who are one with God.[36] A man who has received the new covenant of God, in whose heart the Holy Spirit has written the law, is just. Whosoever fulfils the law of love, thereby also fulfils all outward ceremonies.[37] But the merit for fulfilling the law

belongs to Christ, who alone has completely fulfilled it. We fulfil it in Him, for we are made one with Him by the power of God.[38]

E. *The Sacraments.* Since the law of love is the only one expressly bound on Christians the ceremonies are secondary. They are to be observed only " as a witness and as a remembrance, during which the children [of God] are to witness to and remind one another whereof and to what they have been called, namely, from the world to God, that they may serve God throughout their lives in holiness and righteousness."[39]

Baptism is the sign of the covenant of a good conscience with God,[40] and the initiatory rite (literally matriculation[41]) into the fellowship of believers.[42] Where this covenant is consummated the Spirit comes and ignites the fire of love which purges out all evil. As long as outward baptism is thus practised it is good; otherwise not. It is not necessary for salvation, but the baptism of the Spirit is.[43]

Concerning the Lord's Supper Denck says that as bread is the sustenance of the body when it is eaten, so Christ's body will quicken the soul through the power of God. As the wine refreshes the heart of man and makes it joyful, so the blood of Christ, shed in the love of God for man, will refresh the soul and make it joyful in love, so that it will become one with Christ, even as food and drink becomes, in a sense, one with the human body.[44]

These ceremonies in themselves are not wrong, but where they hinder that higher loyalty to God through the Spirit, they become a burden.[45] He who hopes by these to gain salvation is deceived. It would be better to do without them than to misuse them.[46]

F. *The True Love.* Whosoever desires true love must seek it in Jesus in whom it was perfect. In the measure in which we fasten upon this perfection our blessedness increases. Only what is done by love is good and true. Where Jesus has superseded Moses and David in love, they are to be considered wrong.[47] Since love is the fulfilment of the law, dropping the ceremonies and adding a greater demand to the written Word is not adding or subtracting from the law, but is rather its true interpretation and fulfilment.[48] Love is the touch-stone for all Christian behaviour. This is true, therefore, also in matters of faith where there must be no compulsion. If anyone tries to compel me, says Denck, I must diverge from him. This separation is not because I consider myself superior to others, but that I may search for the costly pearl without hindrance. Nor do I consciously desire any fellowship with error or unrighteousness, even though I too am a sinner and prone to err.[49]

V. The Anabaptists never formulated a system of theology for they were not interested in it. Pure life rather than pure doctrine was their concern. The works of Pilgram Marbeck like those of Hans Denck, his teacher, came into being only in controversy. Marbeck's theology is not systematic but a treatment of points of

disagreement with the Spiritualists on the one hand, and the Lutherans on the other. With these general observations Dr. Kiwiet introduces his thorough if brief work on Marbeck's life and thought and on the Anabaptist movement of South Germany. His reconstruction from the sources presents the picture of a strong, extremely diverse movement, which towards the end of Marbeck's life came to at least a measure of the unity that he so much desired.

Marbeck was born in the Tyrol about 1495. He attended Latin school at Rattenberg and by 1523 was a member of the Council. About 1528 he became an Anabaptist via Lutheranism, lost his positions and left his home, going to Strasbourg. Sometime between 1528 and 1530 he was baptized for in 1530 he became a leader of the Anabaptists in Strasbourg, having found secular employment as an engineer in that city. The South German Anabaptist movement had come into existence through Hans Denck, whose dissent from Luther is described above. His legacy of "Imitatio Christi" and the eschatology of his co-worker Hans Hut were the two strands of thought which characterized early South German Anabaptism. In the early 1530s Strasbourg Anabaptists divided on these lines, the first developing into pure spiritualism, and the other into an even more radical eschatology that eventuated in Münster. Marbeck became leader of those who were left. But because he aroused the ire of Bucer by his bold preaching, he had to leave Strasbourg in January, 1532, and went, presumably, to work in what is now northern Italy. About this time fierce persecution had removed most of the Anabaptist leaders. This, together with the killing and scattering of great numbers of the members, the Münster episode of 1535, and utter discouragement, all but destroyed the once large and virile movement. It was into this situation that Marbeck returned in 1539. Only a few scattered groups had remained and the influence of Schwenckfeldtian Spiritualism was strong. Marbeck saw his main task to be a uniting of all Anabaptist groups. His efforts with the Hutterian Brethren in Moravia failed because of their insistence on communism. However, in 1554 there was a general meeting of Anabaptists at Strasbourg at which time, Kiwiet says, a union almost certainly came about, for after this time the fellowship presents a picture of unity with Strasbourg as the centre.[50] The many factions disappear and we are left with three large groups: the Mennonites in the North, the Hutterians in Moravia, and the Swiss Brethren, which eventually included all the South German groups, in Upper Germany and Switzerland. Marbeck died in 1556.

His literary activity began in 1542 with an edited version of a work on baptism by the Münster Reformer Bernhard Rothmann. Schwenckfeldt promptly attacked it because of its emphasis on the external rite. Marbeck answered with a lengthy discussion of the Sacraments under the title *Defence* (*Verantwartung*). In the mean-

time an attack had come from the Lutheran side. Marbeck parried with the *Elucidation of the Covenant* (*Testamentserläuterung*), in which he set forth the Anabaptist view of the Covenant, challenging the Lutheran view that the Old and New Covenants are essentially the same.

Marbeck's axiom is "The Order of God,"[51] created by God, by which God deals with man, and through which He comes to man. Within this order God limits His power so that it is possible for men to come into living relationship with Him. The greatest limitation of God is that revealed in Jesus Christ. Marbeck has no specific doctrines of man and God as such, but a concept of a God-man relationship, outside of which man as such does not exist. This one all-inclusive "religious order" becomes concrete in the covenant idea (84-85).

The first condition of man was a perfect covenant relationship with God. God made all things good; sin came in by man's choice, that is, conscious disobedience (88-89). Marbeck accepts the notion of original sin, but only alongside of an original grace, and the crucial moment of this twofold heritage is not physical birth, but the point at which each man becomes accountable (92).

This first coverant, which, though man proved unfaithful stands because of God's faithfulness, is basic to all the other covenants as those with Noah, Abraham, Moses, and David. These Old Testament covenants tell the story of God's dealings with man with increasing clarity (93), but are all included under the Old Covenant.

Between the Old and New Covenants there is an absolute difference. Old Testament religion was external; that of the New internal. In the former both temporal and spiritual promises were given, but only the temporal promises were fulfilled. The difference is as the difference between figure and reality, promise and fulfilment, death and life; it is a difference of essence, not of degree (94-102).

The New Covenant is a new beginning and the suffering and death of Jesus is the point of division. Salvation is wrought at that point in history, both for the New Covenant as also for the Old. The coming of the Spirit marks the birth of the visible *Gemeinde*, and the working of the Spirit in the New Covenant is of a different nature than that in the Old (107).

The Holy Spirit gathers the *Gemeinde* by the space-time means of Scripture and preaching, and their effectiveness depends on the faith of the hearer. To the call of the Spirit must be added the response of the subject called (111). In baptism the call of the Spirit and the human confession come together in the solemnizing of the Covenant. Baptism is, therefore, a reciprocal act; man confesses sin and faith; Christ receives him into the Covenant through the *Gemeinde*. Therefore baptism is more than a mere sign (113). It is a witness (*Zeugnis*) that testifies that the believer has been received into the Covenant. It is a witness precisely because it is

joined with the Word of God, and the two must not be separated (136). Since baptism is part of the New Covenant it must be of the intrinsic nature of that Covenant which is reality as opposed to sign. If it be objected that such a space-time thing cannot be spiritual reality, Marbeck answers that within His order God uses these very means to express Himself (137-138).

The *Gemeinde* is a company of believers, all of whom are priests because they all have the Spirit (115). It is the faith relationship between Christ and the believer, and the love relationship between the members. The highest expression of this is the Lord's Supper in which only believers take part. It is a remembrance of what Christ has done for them and what they must do. It is the witness of the members to each other of their oneness in Christ and therefore it is through the Lord's Supper that the *Gemeinde* is kept pure by excluding those who do not live as becomes members of Christ (118-119).

[1] This term will be used throughout this review, for the Anabaptists rarely used the word Church (*Kirche*), and yet it has a wider meaning than congregation.
[2] See Appendix.
[2a] Numbers in brackets are page numbers.
[3] "Enthusiast" is the translation of the German word *"Schwärmer"* which Karl Hall uses to designate Müntzer and Carlstadt.
[4] *Reformationsgeschichte* (Frauenfeld, 1838), Vol. I, p. 237.
[5] S. Bender, *Conrad Grebel* (1950), pp. 112-116.
[6] Radical is used here to distinguish the Purists from Zwingli, and without polemical connotation.
[8] See Appendix.
[9] Words in brackets are the abbreviations used in footnotes.
[10] *Truth,* p. 68; *Law,* p. 58.
[11] *Confession,* p. 21.
[12] *Ibid.*
[13] *Ibid.,* p. 22.
[14] *Order,* p. 97.
[15] *Retractation,* p. 107.
[16] *Ibid.,* p. 106.
[17] *Confession,* p. 21.
[18] *Ibid.,* p. 22.
[19] *Law,* p. 60-61.
[20] *Ibid.,* p. 63.
[21] *Ibid.,* p. 61.
[22] *Ibid.,* p. 63.
[23] *Confession,* p. 22.
[24] *Retractation,* p. 106.
[25] *Ibid.*
[26] *Order,* p. 90.
[27] *Ibid,* p. 96.
[28] *Ibid.,* p. 94.
[29] *Confession,* p. 24.
[30] *Order,* p. 95.
[31] *Ibid.,* p. 92.
[32] *Law,* p. 54.
[33] *Ibid.,* p. 58.
[34] *Ibid.,* p. 54.
[35] *Ibid.,* p. 58.
[36] *Ibid.,* p. 53.
[37] *Ibid.,* p. 54.
[38] *Ibid.,* pp. 52, 58.
[39] *Love,* p. 81.
[40] *Confession,* p. 24.
[41] *Einschreibung.*
[42] *Retractation,* p. 109.
[43] *Confession,* p. 24.
[44] *Retractation,* p. 110.
[45] *Law,* p. 54.
[46] *Retractation,* p. 109.
[47] *Love,* p. 78.
[48] *Ibid.,* p. 80.
[49] *Retractation,* p. 108.
[50] p. 66.
[51] Denck's influence is very apparent here.

APPENDIX

The following is a list of English works related to this review:

E. A. Payne, "The Anabaptists," *New Cambridge Modern History,* Vol. II, *The Reformation,* 1520-59, pp. 119-133.

H. S. Bender, *Conrad Grebel, The Founder of the Swiss Brethren,* Scottdale, Penn.: Herald Press, 1950.

F. L. Weis, *The Life, Teachings and Works of Johannes Denck,* 1495-1527, Strasbourg, 1924.

J. J. Kiwiet, *Hans Denck,* unpub. B.D. thesis Baptist Theological Seminary, Rüschlikon-Zürich, 1954. Very good.

Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers, Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XXV, ed. Williams and Mergal, S.C.M. Press. This volume includes the work by Denck omitted above.

F. L. Weis, *Ludwig Hetzer,* Strasbourg. Weis to be used with caution because he writes in Unitarian interests.

Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision, ed. G. F. Herschberger, Scottdale, Penn.: Herald Press, 1957. A series of essays on Anabaptist history and theology.

W. KLAASSEN.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

W. D. HUDSON, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.
Minister, Atherton, Lancashire.

W. KLAASSEN, B.A., B.D.
Research student, University of Oxford.

E. A. PAYNE, M.A., D.D.
General Secretary, Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.

N. CLARK, M.A., S.T.M.
Minister, Rochester, Kent.

Reviews by: K. BARRITT, A. GILMORE, V. E. W. HAYWARD, W. D. HUDSON, D. LANT, H. MOWVLEY, G. W. RUSLING, S. F. WINWARD.

Some Samuel Pearce Documents

THE story of Samuel Pearce (1766-99), of Birmingham, is one of the great stories connected with the founding of the Baptist Missionary Society. A Plymouth boy, he had dreamed—six years before Carey's famous sermon—of accompanying the first convict ship to Botany Bay and then crossing to New Zealand to evangelise the Maoris. As the young minister of Cannon Street Church, he eagerly joined those in the Midlands who were leading their congregations away from the narrow introverted Calvinism of the mid-eighteenth century. Once the Missionary Society was formed, Pearce became, in the first few years, its most ardent and effective advocate. He longed to join Carey in India, but the committee rejected his pleas—largely, it would seem, because they felt he could be more useful to the cause in this country. Pearce was sought after as pastor in London and in Dublin, but he remained faithful to Birmingham. Then, when only thirty-two years of age, he was stricken with consumption and, after a year of weariness and suffering, passed away —to the lasting grief of all who knew him. There was a rare quality about him. Fuller, with his sledge-hammer personality, Ryland, learned but rather stiff, Sutcliff, cautious in judgment, Carey, with his vision and persistence—all found themselves irresistibly drawn towards one who was younger than any of them. "Seraphic," Ryland called him.

Fuller's *Memoirs* of Pearce appeared in 1800. The book was widely read and several times reprinted. In 1831 it was somewhat enlarged by Pearce's son, William Hopkins Pearce, who had achieved his father's ambition of missionary service in India. Then, more than eighty years later, S. Pearce Carey, who had Pearce as well as Carey blood in his veins, re-told the story of this great-grandfather of his, as a kind of prologue to his more famous and substantial study of Carey. *Samuel Pearce the Baptist Brainerd* went through three editions. It is a glowing book and—with the correction of a few minor errors regarding early B.M.S. affairs, which the author came to know better as he delved deeper into the sources—might well be reprinted.

Recent decades, however, have brought to light a number of new letters and documents. Some years before his death, Dr. Pearce Carey (1862-1953) entrusted me with two bundles of faded and

rather tattered papers, saying that I must one day look through them and decide whether they should be preserved. This I have only now been able to do. To the present article I append a list of the documents, which I am depositing in the Angus Library of Regent's Park College. They are not of great historical importance, though of considerable personal interest. Many of the letters from Samuel Pearce to his wife, and from Sarah Pearce to her sister, are of so intimate a character that to read them, even after the passage of so many years, makes one feel an intruder.

It is obvious that the documents were not in Dr. Pearce Carey's hands when his life of Samuel Pearce was prepared. I think it likely that it was from these papers that he extracted the handful of letters which he printed in the article "Love Letters of Samuel Pearce" (*Baptist Quarterly,* VIII, April, 1936), though the letters there reproduced are not now in these bundles. The only covering is an Eastbourne envelope, bearing the date 11 November, 1916, and the name "Harris." This suggests that they came from a descendant of the Mrs. Harris of Birmingham who was, I believe, Sarah Pearce's sister, Rebecca. To her several of the letters are addressed, including ones from W. H. Pearce and Anna Pearce, who called her "aunt." Presumably, the earlier papers came into her possession on the death of Sarah Pearce in 1804. Two or three of the letters must have been in the hands of Fuller, but probably only two or three of them. He must have had Pearce's important statement of October 8th, 1794, outlining his position vis-a-vis service in India—either this actual document or a fair copy of it.

Pearce Carey states (p. 161) that this document is to be found in Fuller's *Memoirs.* This is not quite accurate. Fuller himself indicates that he had omitted Pearce's reply to the objections that might be urged against his going to India. This is in many ways the most revealing and moving part of the statement. No apology is now needed for reproducing it. Pearce was an extremely tender husband, as well as a devoted pastor. These paragraphs cannot have come easily to his pen.

He has quoted Melvill Horne's remarks that in order to justify a man's undertaking the work of a missionary it is necessary that he be qualified for it, disposed heartily to enter upon it, and be free from such ties as exclude such an engagement.[1] Others, Pearce says, must judge the first requirement. He has himself no doubt about the second. He then continues:

> "But the third thing requires more consideration and here alone I hesitate. I have formed three connexions, each of which has its plea.
>
> 1. I am at the Head of a little Family. My wife is a pious woman. She says, could she see it her *duty,* she hopes she should not object, but she scarce doubts of its being my duty to stay at home. Now I believe she speaks the honest sentiments of her heart, but then I do

[1] See Melvill Horne, *Letters on Missions.*

also think that she is insensibly biassed by her affection for her friends in Europe. Were some of these in the grave I do not think she would have any powerful objections left but let the reason of her reluctance to go be what it may, I seriously enquire whether *her* thoughts are to be my guide? If in this part of ministerial conduct, then why not in all? Where would such arguing lead but to the subjection of every married Preacher to female caprice—and thus a man of God must relinquish all his own views, however just, and designs, however good, unless like Mahomet he can first make a convert of his cadigha.

Mr. Horne thinks it unlawful to divorce oneself by leaving a wife behind. I respect that excellent man's tenderness for the softer sex, but I cannot reconcile his idea with our Lord's remark (*Luke* xiv. 26) or his promise (*Matt.* xix. 29, *Luke* xviii. 29)—If (saith Christ) a man forsake not *wife,* &c. he cannot be my disciple—and if any man *hath* left *wife* &c. for the gospels' sake, he shall receive more in time and life everlasting.

It is certain that if leaving a wife for Christ's sake be a divorce, it is not only justified by the laws of Christianity, but in certain cases is essential to true discipleship, and what case can be more plain than that in point. If anything will justify divorce of this kind surely it must be the case of a man who cannot prevail on his wife to follow him when he is going on an errand of mercy to his fellow men! And in case she *refuses* to go, the guilt must be at her door for the woman is not the head of the man, but the man of the woman.

Should it therefore appear clear to me in other respects, this I hope would (as I am sure it ought) not prevent my entering on the work, for though I believe few connexions have been marked with such uninterrupted mutual satisfaction as ours, yet I dare not call myself a disciple of Christ if I could not burst every earthly attachment for His sake. But such a trial I have not in prospect. My wife says she will accompany me if I go, though reluctantly, and at times she has owned she herself feels as though she could be willing to take a part in the work, particularly on last Lord's day afternoon whilst I was preaching about "living wholly unto Christ" from *Phil.* i. 21, and I have such confidence sometimes in prayer that the Lord will incline her heart as quite encourages me to hope that she will in a short time have no objection left.

As to a family of children, that I think advantageous. It will make a man feel himself at home, the natives will treat him less like an alien, and his children may prove very serviceable to him when he grows old, as Paul Egede assisted his father in Greenland. 2. It has pleased God to make me useful in obtaining pecuniary support for the missionaries already there. Should I desert this post? I think, first, that the mission is now become so popular as to need very little of my help, and secondly, if it did need human help, he that inclined my heart to make application for money and gave me favour in the eyes of so many persons can easily raise up a more active and accessible and successful person than I am, for hath he brought to the birth and will he not give strength to bring forth? 3. My chief difficulty lies with my church in Birmingham. Here it is urged:

1. You have been very useful in England. Why should you risk a certainty for an uncertainty? I reply:
   1. My *future* usefulness *here* is as great an uncertainty as it is abroad.
   2. I ask, Is *uselessness* at home a necessary qualification for usefulness abroad? Mr. Horne, I think judiciously, observes "That from what a man has done in the ministry in England

he may form some guess of what he is likely to do abroad." If so, the argument returns on the objector and the more useful the man is in bringing souls to God in England, the greater his encouragement to make an effort for the spread of truth and holiness in a foreign clime.

2. It is objected The Church has no one to look to when you are gone. It will certainly fall to pieces. I answer:
   1. There's ground for encouragement from a recent fact. What prospect had the church at Leicester when brother Carey left it? They knew of no minister at liberty, yet they cheerfully acquiesced when God inclined his heart to visit Bengal, and the great Head of the Church has abundantly smiled upon them since in giving them a suitable minister and making considerable additions to their number.

   I reply:

   2. That were even the congregation to be dispersed, I do not think the cause should be given up abroad, because the Gospel is preached in so many places at Birmingham that all who are disposed have opportunity to hear it, while in Hindostan millions are perishing for want of having an opportunity of learning the Word of Life, so that the prospect of doing good abroad is greater than of occasioning evil at home supposing even the worst to take place. And indeed every objection which can be urged against my removal from Birmingham might have been with equal force against Paul's leaving Antioch and Ephesus, yet he forbade their remonstrances and chode their unbelief and reluctance to part with him, saying, Why mean ye to weep and break my heart? I am willing not only to be bound but to die for the Lord Jesus."

The completion of this document is the most important find among these papers, but a few quotations may be given from some of the letters. Apart from two brief notes to Samuel Pearce from his half-sister, Anna Maria, the earliest of these letters was written from Alcester the week of his marriage to Sarah, who was daughter of Joshua Hopkins, a grocer, and grand-daughter of Dr. John Ash, of Pershore, a well-known Baptist minister of the eighteenth century.

> "Wednesday," writes E. Hopkins (her stepmother?) to Sarah's sister, Rebecca, then at Bridgnorth, "we attended your dear sister and Mr. P. to the altar of Hymen and completed their present felicity. . . . We met before eight, Mr. Rooker attended in due time, and after drinking a cup of chocolate proceeded to church as little noticed as could be wished. The important ceremony ended, we returned to breakfast and about half past 10 set out for Mosely. Your dear Father and myself, truly happy in the pleasing prospect of the future felicity of the young people, went to the Portway and, after partaking of cake and negus, with our best wishes took our leave and returned to dinner. Your brother and cousin Joshua accompanied them to Mosely, where our common friends Mr. and Mrs. Harwood received them with every mark of affectionate friendship, and about 4 o'clock attended them to their destined habitation in Paul's Yard."

John Harwood was a generous Cannon Street deacon, whose house in Mosely, then a village, was frequently used for services.

Four months later, in July, 1791, the same correspondent had sad news to send about the affairs of the Harwoods. They had suffered in the mob violence in Birmingham and neighbourhood, now usually known as the "Priestly Riots," from the name of the most notable victim. Samuel and Sarah Pearce were then on a visit to Plymouth. Their house and possessions had also been in danger. E. Hopkins writes to them:

> "We did not hear till the alarm was nearly over that your house had been in the least danger, so that it was not in our power to devise means for the security of your property, but we have been informed that Mr. Porter and some other friends were so kind as to take every necessary precaution to remove what was thought proper of your furniture and interfered to preserve the house from the cruel depredations which threatened its destruction. You may now make yourselves quite easy respecting it as the tumult is appeased and every exertion made for the future peace and security of the town and its environs. . . . Our dear friend Mr. Harwood has suffered much. . . . They were obliged to quit their habitation and leave it to the merciless rage of an incensed and cruel mob who endeavoured to make the desolation more terrible, but by the exertions of the servants they were prevented from destroying the barn, stable and ricks of hay to which they set fire several times. . . . It is almost impossible for imagination to picture a scene so awful and distressing as that in which our good friends were involved last Sabbath day instead of going as usual to the sanctuary of God to worship Him. . . . They were witness to the destruction of their house and property by the devouring flames. They left it on Saturday and went to Miss Turner's, but were alarmed very early on Sunday morning when they removed all the furniture they could, but I fear they will find much of it wanting. . . . Our good friends with the three little girls set out for Bridgnorth after sending the two little boys to the school they intended them to go to after the holidays. . . . We were alarmed Sabbath day evening with various reports of their coming hither and threatening to burn the Presbyterian meeting-house and Mr. Cheston's, but happily their designs (if they had such) were prevented."

There is also special interest in the group of letters covering Pearce's lengthy visit to London in the late summer of 1795. He was primarily concerned with getting Grigg and Rodway off to Sierra Leone, but was also able to attend some of the gatherings which marked the founding of the London Missionary Society.

> "I preached yesterday morning in a Methodist chapel," Pearce writes to his wife on September 28th, 1795; "in the afternoon to a mixt communion church and in the evening for Dan Taylor, the champion of the General Baptists. I rejoice to find and *feel* that Christians of different names agree in the essentials of our blessed Religion . . . a Religion whose Author and whose spirit is love. There have been six sermons preached in town at the institution of the Independent Mission Society. I attended on three. The rest though I longed to hear I could not through the affairs of the mission enjoy. It was a most glorious time. Between 2 and 300 ministers of various denominations were present. At the last meeting, Mr. Bogue, of Gosport, looked round the place and said: 'We are come to the *Funeral of Bigotry*. I pray God it may be buried deep and never rise any more.' You, my love, will join me in a hearty Amen to so evangelical a wish."

On a visit to London two years later, Pearce visited William Winterbotham, the Plymouth minister, who had been imprisoned in Newgate for a sermon wishing success to the French Revolution. The 1796 letters from Dublin throw useful light on the Baptist situation there.

The letters of 1799 make sad reading. They are the record of the dying man's progress from Birmingham via Bristol to Plymouth, to and from the village of Tamerton, where he had spent much of his boyhood, then back to Birmingham. These faded papers fill in and correct the details of those months of alternating hopes and fears, of which Fuller and Pearce Carey provide the outline. On one corner of his first letter from Bristol, Pearce wrote:

> "I borrowed a shilling of Mr. Showell last Lord's day to give to a poor woman. Don't forget to pay him again."

The Harwoods accompanied the sick man to Plymouth. Sarah Pearce, with the children—Louisa, William, Anna, Howard and baby Samuel—went to her relations in Alcester, but the letter of May 17th is endorsed in her hand: "The last I received. Having not patience any longer, I set off for Plymouth." The children were left with various friends in Birmingham, but after a few days —smallpox being prevalent—Rebecca Hopkins carried the baby back to Alcester. Sarah Pearce was a brave as well as a devoted woman, but her anxieties cannot have been much eased when, after the return of her husband and herself through Bristol, Dr. Ryland wrote that it was the will of Christ

> "that those whom the Father hath given Him should be with Him where He is to behold His glory, and *we* must not complain if He will confer that blessedness on you sooner than we expected."

To add to Sarah Pearce's troubles, Anna developed whooping-cough and it was necessary to leave her loved baby Samuel with his aunt in Alcester.

A long consolatory letter to Mrs. Pearce from John Newton shows how widely the young Birmingham preacher was mourned. Letters from his father, William Pearce, the Plymouth goldsmith, show what had to be done in those days when there was no central denominational or national provision for widows and orphans. The Canon Street church paid Sarah Pearce her husband's salary for one year after his death. William Pearce wrote to his daughter-in-law:

> "We are much obliged to him (William Winterbotham) and dear Mr. Gibbs for their kind exertions on your behalf, who have been among friends as well out of the church as in it and have with what they generously do themselves promised subscriptions for upwards of £60 —and I am told (for I do not know it for certain) that Mr. Birt will remit it, if he has not done it already, near if not full £100. If other churches who have had a greater share of your dear deceased husband's labours will equally exert themselves, I flatter myself his dear widow and children will be comfortably provided for."

But within a few months the baby Samuel died and Sarah Pearce survived her husband less than five years. The eldest child, Louisa, died when she was nineteen. William Hopkins Pearce (1794-1840), after a boyhood spent in Collingham and an apprenticeship at the Clarendon Press, went to India as a printer, but was only forty-six years old when he succumbed to cholera. Anna, who went to India as a teacher and there married Jonathan Carey (1794-1874), died at the early age of thirty-five. These were the kind of dark shadows that rested over many families in the nineteenth century. Yet by way of Anna something of the ardour and devotion of her father passed over to her own child, Jonathan Pearce Carey (1827-91), and thence to his far more numerous progeny.

ERNEST A. PAYNE.

LETTERS

No.	*Date*	*Writer*	*Place*	*Correspondent*	*Destination*
1.	1787?	Anna Maria Pearce	Tamerton	Samuel Pearce	Bristol College
2.	1789?	do.	do.	do.	Birmingham
3.	7.II.1791	E. Hopkins	Alcester	Rebecca Hopkins	Bridgnorth
4.	21.VII.1791	do.	do.	Sarah Pearce	Plymouth
5.	1791	Samuel Pearce	Birmingham	do.	do.
6.	2.XII.1791	do.	do.	do.	do.
7.	11.VII.1792	do.	Usk	do.	do.
8.	23.VIII.1792	do.	Northampton	do.	Birmingham
9.	11.III.1793	do.	Bristol	do.	do.
10.	1793	do.	Birmingham	Rebecca Hopkins	Alcester
11.	14.VI.1793	do.	do.	Sarah Pearce	Bridgnorth
12.	5.VIII.1793	do.	Uley	do.	Birmingham
13.	1794	do.	Plymouth	do.	Alcester
14.	13.XII.1794	do.	Northampton	do.	
15.	25.XII.1794	do.	Leicester	do.	Birmingham
16.	1795	do.	London	do.	do.
17.	31.VIII.1795	do.	do.	do.	do.
18.	7.IX.1795	do.	do.	do.	do.
19.	28.IX.1795	do.	do.	do.	do.
20.	4.VI.1796	do.	Dublin	do.	Alcester
21.	24.VI.1796	do.	do.	do.	do.
22.	1796	do.	Northampton	do.	Birmingham
23.	1797	do.	London	do.	do.
24.	23.VIII.1797	John Stephenson	do.	Samuel Pearce	London
25.	3.IX.1797	Samuel Pearce	Northampton	Sarah Pearce	Birmingham
26.	29.I.1798	do.	Portsmouth	do.	do.
27.	II.1798	do.	do.	do.	do.
28.	21.II.1798	E. Hopkins	? Alcester	Samuel Pearce	do.
29.	3.III.1798	Samuel Pearce	Birmingham	Rebecca Hopkins	Alcester.
30.	2.IV.1799	do.	Bristol	Sarah Pearce	Birmingham
31.	20.IV.1799	do.	Plymouth	do.	Alcester
32.	24.IV.1799	do.	do.	do.	do.
33.	3.V.1799	do.	Tamerton	do.	do.

No.	*Date*	*Writer*	*Place*	*Correspondent*	*Destination*
34.	10.V.1799	Samuel Pearce	Plymouth	Sarah Pearce	Birmingham
35.	17.V.1799	do.	do.	do.	Alcester
36.	6.VI.1799	Mrs. S. King	Edgbaston	do.	Plymouth
37.	17.VI.1799	Sarah Pearce	Tamerton	Rebecca Hopkins	Alcester.
38.	16.VII.1799	John Ryland	Bristol	Samuel Pearce	Birmingham
39.	1799	Sarah Pearce	Birmingham	Rebecca Hopkins	Alcester
40.	- - -	do.	do.	do.	do.
41.	18.IX.1799	William Pearce	Plymouth	Sarah Pearce	Birmingham
42.	4.XI.1799	John Newton	London	do.	do.
43.	XII.1799	William Pearce	Cowes	do.	do.
44.	12.I.1800	do.	Plymouth	do.	do.
45.	29.III.1800	Sarah Pearce	Birmingham	Mrs. Harris	Alcester
46.	8.VI.1800	William Pearce	Plymouth	Sarah Pearce	Birmingham
47.	2.VII.1800	do.	Tamerton	Mrs. Hopkins, Sen.	Alcester
48.	11.IX.1800	John Ryland	Bristol	Sarah Pearce	Birmingham
49.	23.XI.1800	R. Franklin		do.	do.
50.	8.XII.1802	Benjamin Cave	Leicester	do.	do.
51.	17.IV.1806	Anna Pearce	Worcester	Mrs. Harris	do.
52.	18.IV.1807	do.		do.	do.
53.	11.VIII.1813	William Hopkins Pearce	Oxford	do.	do.
54.	n.d.	Samuel Pearce	Birmingham	Sarah Pearce	Alcester
55.	n.d.	do.		do.	Sheffnall
56.	n.d.	Sarah Pearce	Birmingham	Rebecca Hopkins	Alcester

PAPERS, SERMON NOTES, ETC.

57. Draft Statement by Samuel Pearce re service in India, 8.X.1794.
58. Notes of 68 Sermons on *Hebrews* by Samuel Pearce.
59. Notes on Sermons on *John* ix. 27 and xiv. 27.
60. Verses " Hosanna to the Churches' Head."
61. Closing words of Samuel Pearce, 1799: Notes by Sarah Pearce.
62. Copy of Fuller's *Conversations in Heaven, No.* 1, *Mr. Pearce and Mr. Grant.*

In the Study

EVEN in these days of clerical self-questioning, the privilege and burden of the prophetic function of the Ministry remains. We are ordained that we may proclaim with power and authority the living Word of God. Preaching remains central. Sermon preparation continues to bulk large. Any and every aid is to be welcomed.

Freechurchmen, tending to regard this field as their own peculiar preserve, may learn anew that "the wind bloweth where it listeth" through the recognition that the two most powerful recent voices come from the Anglican tradition.[1] Both have much to teach us. The basic distinction between them lies in the fact that while the one is addressed to the Anglican tradition, the other stems from it.

The biggest service that any work on preaching can perform is to prompt the fundamental questions. Our deepest need is not improved technique but profounder theology and a more adequate understanding of our task. The sermon is and must be rooted in Scripture; and our apprehension of Scripture is changing. To preach from the basis of a storehouse of revealed truths and ideas is one thing. To preach from the foundation of the prophetic and apostolic witness to the saving acts of God, christologically determined, is—or should be—quite another. But how far has theory been allowed to govern practice? As with the message, so with the agency of its proclamation and the situation to which it is addressed. In what sense is the word of the preacher the Word of God, and what will this mean for his self-understanding? What is the nature of modern man, and what the vital characteristics of the twentieth-century scene? These are the important questions. It is here that our hesitations lie. It is those who are aware of the problems and have begun to grapple with them that should command our attention.

Ronald Ward, it is true, writes within the framework of the Anglican tradition. But if his work is a summons to the vicar and the parson to exercise fully and effectively the prophetic ministry committed to them at their episcopal ordination, it is yet fully relevant to the Free Church minister. Indeed, the earlier Baptist background of the author makes it more likely that he will strike his

[1] *Royal Sacrament,* by R. A. Ward. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 12s. 6d.), 1958. *The Ministry of the Word,* by R. E. C. Browne. (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.), 1958.

most powerful spark from his erstwhile brethren. He writes pungently and engagingly. But his presuppositions need to be subjected to careful and reasoned scrutiny. In several ways this is not a good book. Of recent years we have suffered increasingly from the American system of grouping footnotes together at the end of each chapter. Now we are asked to cope with the equally distracting practice of references bracketed within the body of the text. In many cases this might merit only mild protest. But it becomes unbearable in a work in which the early chapters in particular are grossly overladen with references and quotations. It is not at all clear what is the real purpose of this excessive documentation. Statements that are merely peripheral to the argument bring no satisfaction to Mr. Ward unless he can point at once to scholarly works which approve them. The reader having access to this mound of reference books will know where to go already. His less fortunate brethren will probably be prepared to make do with the concluding two-hundred book bibliography!

But it would be a pity if irritation and annoyance were to blind the reader to the real merits and the profounder inadequacies of this challenging and impressive *cri de coeur*. No preacher can study the chapter on the use of the Greek Testament without becoming aware of a fabulous mine of unsuspected treasure. No priest can read the pages relative to the Preacher and the Fellowship without gaining new understanding of the crucial place of the sermon within liturgical worship. No pastor can pass by the section on the Preacher and his Daily Life without gaining a new sense of the contemporaneous application and illustration of the living Word of God.

Yet the caveats remain. We are offered treatments of Synoptic Parallels and of the Sermon on the Mount. They illumine. They abound in provocative material. But they do not wholly satisfy. We never quite leave behind the moral truism, the religious principle, and the brooding aura of the three-point sermon with all of the static view of Scripture that it enshrines. The curiously eclectic use of Gospel material—via Huck's synopsis—would command more wholehearted consent if it were more obviously controlled by clear and evident hermeneutic principles. Even the conservative is driven to sigh for a salutary injection of the canons of form criticism.

I suspect that what is really wanting is a chapter entitled: The Great Lacuna. Mr. Ward largely ignores the Old Testament. Perhaps it is a fatal omission. For to confront the Old Testament in preaching is to be forced to measure up to most of the great underlying problems. It forces us to relentless application and explication of our new understanding of Scripture. It compels us to take seriously the dynamic unity of the biblical record. Mr. Ward takes us half the way. His chapter on Preaching Epistles from Gospels is far and away his most important contribution. Thus to think the

Epistles into the Gospels, the Gospels into the Epistles, is to advance triumphantly. It is the wider range that is needed—the thinking of the Old Testament into the New, the New into the Old.

R. E. C. Browne does not directly help us at that point. But he does speak to our condition. He probes the fundamental questions of which I earlier spoke, and goes far towards providing the adequate and satisfying answers. We might fairly say that he offers an Essay in Communication—so long as this is not taken to imply a superficial discussion of techniques. It is the nature of the Gospel preached and the nature of the World addressed that between them determine modes and methods. So it is that his conclusions always stem directly from foundations firmly laid. The working minister may find Mr. Browne baffling and elusive, may turn with relief to Mr. Ward and his reservoir of sermon material. But I suspect that *The Ministry of the Word* will prove to be one of the great books on preaching of our generation.

Of one thing at least all competent works on preaching leave us in no doubt, that the tools of our trade are legion. From biblical studies, church history, theology, philosophy, psychology, and many other disciplines, we derive our equipment. It is a matter for profound thanksgiving that the best work in these fields, whether British, American, or Continental, is increasingly becoming available —though at a price!

Certainly, no one who understands the Faith in terms of historical revelation can be indifferent to advances in our knowledge and understanding of Old Testament history. Martin Noth's *Geschichte Israels* has, in this area, long ranked as a classic, and is now available to us in competent translation.[2] Easily and skilfully we are conducted through the tangled story of Israel, from the Palestinian settlement to the Bar Cochba revolt. The result is a clear, connected and convincing narrative.

Nevertheless, the careful reader will be alert to some large assumptions in the earlier pages. Sacred Anglo-Saxon landmarks have vanished almost without trace! There has been at work a deep-rooted scepticism about Mosaic traditions and the confirmatory evidence of archaeological discovery; history begins with the Settlement; the amphictyonyic confederation emerges only on Palestinian soil. This is the work of an exponent of Tradition-History, relying heavily on form-critical tools. His precursors are Alt on the one hand and Gunkel on the other. So it is that while the story of political development can be confidently told, the assertion of the informing Faith that made the dry bones live is lacking. Here is an influential challenge to the widespread British reliance on early biblical traditions. It may be refuted, but it must be met.

Whatever our estimate of the historicity of the biblical narrative,

[2] *The History of Israel*, by M. Noth. (A. & C. Black, Ltd., 42s.), 1958.

we are at one in our increasing recognition of the importance of Old Testament theology. For long enough we have suffered from the lack of any standard and reliable work in this country; and we still look in vain for N. W. Porteous' half-promised contribution. The reader of German had no problem. He could always refer to one or other of the sacred trio, Eichrodt, Koehler, and Procksch. But comparatively few are fortunate enough to surmount the language barrier; and even the appearance in 1955 of Jacob's *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament* obviously failed to meet this problet completely. Now, however, the industry of the translator is harvesting a rich yield. The work of Eichrodt is under translation. The studies of Koehler, Vriezen, and Jacob have already appeared.[3]

It must be admitted that Koehler's work is neither a good book nor a reliable guide. Of all the standard Old Testament theologies, this is the one that least deserved translation. It has a wooden, static quality that recalls the lecture hall at its worst. Despite its claim to recent revision, it clearly remains a product of the 1930s, in presentation and methodology looking to the past rather than to the future. Koehler finds the sovereignty of God to be the inclusive theme of Old Testament theology, and follows Sellin in grouping his material under the three titles of God, Man, Judgment and Salvation. Here, in handy reference, is a mass of scholarly information. But today we are very conscious of the disastrous effects of the importation of presuppositions alien to Scripture itself; and at this point the author is open to damaging criticism.

Vriezen, for his part, is fully aware of the problems involved in the writing of any Theology of the Old Testament. He prefaces the main body of his work with a lengthy and valuable discussion of all the relevant issues that must be faced; and if his examination of Torah, Nebiim and Kethubim is disappointingly jejune, the section on exegesis is magnificently successful. He seeks to clarify and maintain the distinction between Old Testament theology and the religious ideas of Israel, to allow the place of the Old Testament as part of the larger Christian Scripture to govern constantly the presentation and selection of material. The criterion of relevance is revelational, that is to say, in general Yahwistic; and the central concern is with the prophetic testimony, precisely because the Old Testament finally emerges and survives under the impact of the prophetic criticisms evoked by the great events of Israel's history. The heart of Scripture is the eschatological perspective; the *leitmotif* of the Old Testament is the prospect of the Kingdom of God; the underlying idea of biblical testimony is the fact of communion between the Holy God and created, sinful man.

[3] *Old Testament Theology,* by L. Koehler. (Lutterworth Press, 35s.), 1957. *An Outline of Old Testament Theology,* by T. C. Vriezen. (Basil Blackwell, 42s.), 1958. *Theology of the Old Testament,* by E. Jacob. (Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 30s.), 1958.

All this is illuminating, profound, and methodologically impressive. Perhaps it is because the reach is so vast that the grasp fails, because the promise is so great that the fulfilment disappoints. The theology is worked out with suitable classification: God, man, the relationship between God and man, the intercourse between man and man, God, man and the world in the present and the future. But the treatment is discursive, and we tend to lose our way. Is it too readily assumed that we know what is revelation and what is primitive survival? If the Gospel fulfilment must in some sense govern our understanding and explication of the Old Testament promise, can we too easily forget the necessity for a two-way traffic? The questions remain. Nevertheless, those who can endure to the end will find here much of abiding worth.

Edmond Jacob attempts less than Vriezen, but always remains within his competence. He would probably not claim to have provided the definitive answer to the baffling problem of how the Theology of the Old Testament should rightly be written. He has, however, laid himself fully open to the impact of contemporary discussion, and he is acutely aware that the history of Israel itself is "a part of the theology, that is to say a word and a revelation of God." In the light of a careful initial consideration of methodology, he delimits his theme, and finds that his ruling concern must be with the presence and the action of God. He treats first of the characteristic Aspects of God, continues with an examination of the Action of God (including creation, anthropology, and the cult), and concludes with a somewhat brief discussion of sin, death, redemption and eschatology. Invaluable bibliographies are grouped in a more satisfying form than in the French edition. The whole is an attractive volume, which is a joy to handle and read. We may hope that a British scholar will match it. Meanwhile, it remains an outstanding Theology of the Old Testament, and the most handy and reliable work available to us in this field.

It is increasingly being realized that Old Testament theology cannot be adequately expounded without attention to New Testament fulfilment. A competent study of New Testament theology is thus doubly welcome at this juncture; and Alan Richardson has provided us with a work of singular sanity.[4] He has his own problems of methodology to face, and those familiar with his earlier work on Christian Apologetics will not be surprised at his conclusions. He is no foe of the scientific method. From the standpoint of apostolic faith he frames his hypothesis, tests it out against the variety of evidence, and claims for it validity, coherence, and the measure of proof available in such a field. The writing of New Testament theology must begin with presuppositions, with principles

[4] *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, by A. Richardson. (S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 30s.), 1958.

of interpretation. Better to have them in the open than to leave them concealed, unrecognized, and therefore undefended. For his part, Richardson takes his stand with Augustine. Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis!

The treatment offered is thematic—even, to some extent, credal. The person, life, and work of Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church, Ministry and Sacraments, are among the subjects carefully examined. Again and again, the creative factor is found to be the mind of the Lord working upon Old Testament Scripture and its rabbinic interpretations. The debt to the Jew is crucial: the debt to the Greek is practically non-existent. The perspective of inaugurated eschatology runs through the whole like a silver thread, and is applied with a delicacy of understanding that is rare and beyond praise.

And yet, at the end, we are left with certain hesitations. Perhaps the weakness of this book is that it has so few loose ends. In its way it is a work of art. But the symmetry is obtained at the expense of the awkward configurations which also demand their place. Does the content of the New Testament theology really conform so exactly to pattern? May affirmations really be made in the unqualified manner and the black and white fashion that Richardson favours? Certainly he is entitled to his conclusions; and the New Testament scholar will supply the question marks for himself. But will the average ministerial reader? We miss the adequacy of footnote reference and explanation which would initiate us into the travail of mind through which the author must surely have passed before this study came to birth. We look in vain for a bibliography to match the admirable indexes. This is an "Introduction" of outstanding merit. The general reader should pay it the best compliment of all, and study it critically.

To turn from biblical to theological studies is sometimes to enter a new world; but the very reverse is the case when the study in question is the English translation of Karl Barth's monumental Church Dogmatics, a new part-volume of which has now appeared.[5] Here is not only dogmatic theology but also biblical exegesis on the grand scale. And if the exegesis is sometimes questionable, it is always provocative and generally illuminating. Add to such riches the frequent excursus in the field of historical theology, and the result is a treasury of original thinking, stimulating comment, and factual information, unparalleled in our time.

The general British antipathy to Barth is a curious phenomenon, in which sheer ignorance and misunderstanding surely play a large part. It is a hard saying—but a true one—that there is probably no effective antidote other than a careful reading of Barth himself. Little books about him will not do. In his foreword to the English

[5] *Church Dogmatics*, Vol. IV, Part 2, by Karl Barth (translated by G. W. Bromiley), (T. & T. Clark, 55s.), 1958.

edition of Weber's *Introductory Report on the Church Dogmatics,* Barth has commented brutally but on the whole justly: "Am I deceived when I have the impression that there I exist in the phantasy of far too many—even of the best men—mainly, only in the form of certain, for the most part, hoary summations; of certain pictures hastily dashed off by some person at some time, and for the sake of convenience, just as hastily accepted, and then copied endlessly, and which, of course, can easily be dismissed? However, I could hardly recognize in them anything else than my own ghost! God as 'the wholly Other'! Kierkegaard's 'infinite qualitative distinction'! For me creation is non-existent! By me culture and civilization are damned! With me ethics is impossible! According to me the Church is Noah's ark on Mount Ararat! Her task consists in preaching an otherworldly Biblicism and an inactive quietism! All in all: 'neo-orthodoxy' with a faint flavour of nihilism! What else? Should I weep or laugh? Is this the only way in which I am known in the English-speaking theological world in spite of all the translations that have appeared so far? How does one read, how does one really study there. . . .?"

Certainly, the intending reader of the latest part-volume should turn first to its predecessor (Vol. 4, Part I), for what we now have is the second instalment of a magisterial examination of the doctrine of reconciliation. The earlier study worked from the standpoint of the divinity of Christ and expounded the Atonement in terms of the high-priestly work of the God who became a servant. Here the procedure is reversed, and on the basis of the *verus homo* the Atonement is treated in terms of the royal Man in whom we are exalted to fellowship with God. We accept without surprise the acute discussions of Reformation doctrine. We applaud the dynamic reinterpretation of the Chalcedonian symbols in the light of the life and deeds of the historical Jesus. Perhaps we hesitate at the difficult conception of the pre-existent humanity in the decree and purpose of God. Nevertheless, when this book has been assimilated, it can be preached.

N. CLARK.

Reviews

Group Dynamics in Evangelism, by Paul M. Miller. (Herald Press, Scottdale, Penn., $3.50).

Having made various experiments for the past ten years in House-Group work as a method of evangelism, I read with special interest Paul M. Miller's book. Personal evangelism, visitation evangelism, mass evangelism, all have their place, but have we yet realized that Christian fellowship itself is the most potent method? " Christians need to be informed that Christian fellowship does have evangelistic power. Many Christians do not realize this." Because Christ is present in the Christian group, and His love is embodied in its personal relationships, it can act like a magnet on " them that are without " and meet all their basic human needs. Because the approach is gradual and indirect, resistance to the Gospel can be overcome, and the convert " already has a made-to-order group in which to begin to grow in his Christian life." In chapters one to eight there is a general discussion of the methods and aims, the problems and the leadership of the small Christian group; but it is probable that most readers will find the last two chapters of greatest value. Here the New Testament *koinonia* is described, and the reasons why it is a powerful evangelistic force and agency are given. Some indication is given on how to prepare a congregation for fellowship evangelism, which " means throwing Christian friendship and fellowship around unchurched people through the group life of the church." Ministers and laymen concerned with the task of evangelism will find this book suggestive, stimulating and helpful.

STEPHEN WINWARD.

Principles and Practice of Preaching, by Ilion T. Jones. (Independent Press, London, 17s. 6d.).

Whenever preachers congregate, " sermons " is a popular topic of conversation, and there is much in this book to stimulate that kind of conversation. Written for the experienced preacher who wishes to re-study his methods, as well as for the young man just beginning his ministry, the preacher who reads it carefully will find his vision of his task enlarged. He will want to keep it on his shelves and to look at it often. After an opening chapter on the purpose and importance of preaching, there follow sections on planning, prepar-

ing and preaching a sermon, together with a conclusion on building up a reservoir of material.

This last section is of special importance, for the American approach to planning one's sermons well ahead, so as to ensure a carefully-balanced diet for one's hearers, and so as to avoid the worst effects of hand-to-mouth preaching, is in advance of much pulpit work in this country. Several specific suggestions are made for series and courses of sermons. Other sermonic suggestions may also be found throughout the remainder of the work.

Another good section is the one on the right and wrong approaches to Biblical preaching, exposing many failures which we hope do not exist but which we fear do; worthy also of note are the sections dealing with types of outlines, the study of which would bring variety of approach to many a preacher, and the one on methods of delivery. There are twelve pages of bibliography at the end, and each section concludes with a few suggestions for further reading.

Some comments savour more of the American scene than of the British, as for instance where we are told that the preacher sees enough fruit from his efforts to know that spiritual transformations take place consistently in those who listen to sermons on soul illnesses (p. 27), and in the suggestion that ideas come trooping into the preacher's mind (p. 25). This is probably true also of the enthusiasm for catchy subject titles. If anything, there are too many quotations, and the author would do well to take his own advice on p. 146 where he deals with the wise use of quotations in sermons, while words like "reconcilement" (p. 46) and "laxness" (p. 59) jar a little on the British ear. But these are niggling criticisms in a work which is extremely good and helpful, which has refreshed the soul of the reviewer as he has read it, and which will most surely do the same for many others.

A. GILMORE.

Study Notes on Romans, by J. R. C. Perkin. (Carey Kingsgate Press, London, 4s. 6d.).

No church could fail to benefit from a study of Paul's letter to the Romans and these well-balanced study notes which Dr. Perkin has succeeded in providing in eight short chapters ought to be widely used as an aid to such study. Naturally their size demands that much be passed over with little or no comment, and no two persons will entirely agree as to what should have been put in or left out, but the great value of the book is that it helps us to see the Epistle as a whole. Although ministers will find little new in it, they will no doubt find it useful to be reminded of the broad and comprehensive sweep of Paul's thought and of the natural divisions in the letter which Dr. Perkin brings out so clearly. The general reader will find it of inestimable value as a guide and introduction

though he may be puzzled by such unexplained phrases as "semi-gnostic heretics" on p. 82, and he would have been helped more if the Greek words had been printed in English characters.

It is to the credit of the author that he faces the difficulties of Romans squarely and is not afraid to admit the weakness of Paul's argument in such passages as ix. 19-21. Where there are differences of interpretation he presents fairly and clearly the various points of view and often leaves the ultimate choice to the reader.

The questions at the end of each chapter are reminiscent of college exam. papers and we may wonder how many people will be prepared to provide written answers. The purpose might have been better served if the questions had been designed to stimulate discussion on the letter and its relevance to contemporary situations.

It is good to have such a useful book available at such a modest price.

H. MOWVLEY.

Early Sites of Christianity, by Peter Bann. (Faber & Faber, London, 21s.).

This is a readable travel book by a German surgeon, illustrated with a number of excellent photographs. The author begins his story at the Rome airport as his plane takes off for Athens, and he then successively describes Athens and Greece, Mount Athos, Istanbul, his journey through Asia Minor to Antioch, the Lebanon, Damascus, thence by bus across to Baghdad and from there to Ur and Babylon, and finally to Jerusalem and Sinai. The account is embellished with observations and reflections, bits of history, and descriptions of monasteries, scenes and people of today. The interest of the reader is well held throughout, and he will rise from the reading of the book instructed in many things and with a more vivid impression of scenes which formed the background of Biblical incidents. In the introduction the author expresses the somewhat naïve suggestion that Adam's tomb may one day be found by the excavator, though he admits that it is unlikely. This is a masterly understatement. The publishers say that the book has been a best-seller on the Continent, and it may be expected to have a wide sale in this country.

H. H. ROWLEY.

Whitehead's Metaphysics, by Ivor Leclerc. (George Allen & Unwin, London, 21s.).

Most philosophers, in this country at any rate, have for some time tended to treat Whitehead the metaphysician much as plain men treat Shakespeare or the Bible. They speak of him with respect, but they do not read him. There are some signs, however, that the philosophical climate is becoming more congenial to metaphysics,

and so it is possible that, any time now, reverence for the great man will give place to a lively and critical interest in what he actually said. Dr. Leclerc, who is lecturer in Philosophy at Glasgow University, has written what he describes as "an introductory exposition" of Whitehead's metaphysical theories, as these appear in his later writings, particularly *Process and Reality, Adventures of Ideas,* and *Modes of Thought.*

Whitehead's metaphysics arose from his earlier preoccupation with the logic of science, especially from the task, which he set himself, "of developing a new concept of ultimate fact to replace the scientific concept of simply located particles of matter"; but Dr. Leclerc maintains that Whitehead fully recognized this for what it was: "a specifically philosophical; more precisely . . . a metaphysical" task, and not a mere extension of the scientific inquiries which he had been conducting. "We can only form such a conception," said Whitehead, "in terms of fundamental notions concerning the nature of reality. We are thrown back upon philosophy" (*Adventures of Ideas,* p. 203). The special interest of the author lies in the new way in which Whitehead posed traditional philosophical questions, and so was led to original and novel answers.

So far as your reviewer is competent to judge, this seems to be a faithful representation of Whitehead's thought. The book is certainly written in a readable and, so far as its subject-matter allows, readily comprehensible style. Most ministers and students have dipped into Whitehead; if they wish to go beyond that, they could not do better than start with Dr. Leclerc's introduction. He promises that another book is to follow, in which he will offer a critical examination and assessment of Whitehead's metaphysics.

W. D. HUDSON.

At Sundry Times. An Essay in the Comparison of Religion, by R. C. Zaehner. (Faber & Faber, 21s.).

An electronic brain, translating English into Russian, is said to have rendered "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak" by a sentence meaning "the whisky is agreeable but the meat has gone bad." This book by the Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics at Oxford is strong meat, but its spirit is extremely agreeable!

The work is an expansion of five lectures delivered in 1957 before the University College of Wales at Aberystwyth, together with an appendix on the Qur'anic conception of the mission and nature of Jesus Christ. Much ground is carefully covered in a limpid style, and there is a wealth of clarifying, not clogging, quotation. This is a volume to be considered by the expert and enjoyed by the layman alike. For it is as timely as it is stimulating.

There has been an increasing recognition of late that Christianity must come to grips in a new way with the great non-Christian religions of the world, which so far from being moribund, as commonly supposed only a few decades ago, have recently proved themselves capable of great resurgent power—though whether this is to be understood in terms of cultural renaissance rather than of religious revival has yet to be established. Such a "coming to grips" obviously calls for a fuller and sustained effort honestly to understand. But will it mean grappling with honoured foes or embracing helpful friends? Does Christ stand over against all religions, including Christianity, or is He the fulfilment of the true but partial insights of all the great historic faiths?

Dr. Hendrik Kraemer has strikingly asserted that the real encounter of the Christian faith and the world's religions is only just beginning. He too has challenged Christians to a far greater discipline of thought and action. But whereas Dr. Kraemer passes judgment upon all religions from the standpoint of "Biblical realism," Professor Zaehner, who respects the former's uncompromising faith, yet seeks to prove a contrary thesis. His contribution is similarly important because he also is uncompromising about the essentials of the Christian faith, accepting, for example, the doctrine of the Fall, the scandal of the Cross, the reality of the Atonement, and the vital significance of the Resurrection. The great debate continues.

The Christian starts with the idea of God; Hindu and Buddhist start with the idea of the human soul. The only common ground is a concern with eternity. Israel and India clearly differentiate the prophetic and mystical types of religion, while Islam has the supreme claim to *Biblical* realism! Professor Zaehner seeks to show how Christ fulfils not only the law and prophets in Israel, and the hopes of Zoroaster in Iran, but also the mystic tradition of India as finally expressed in the Bhagavad-Gita and the Bodhisattva doctrine.

VICTOR E. W. HAYWARD.

Responsive Praises and Prayers for Minister and Congregation, by Stephen F. Winward. (Hodder & Stoughton, limp cloth, 2s. 6d.).

It has often been ruefully admitted during the last few years that the liturgical revival is leaving the Free Churches behind. The Parish Communion movement is now firmly established in the Church of England, while the Catholics are adopting Dialogue Mass, yet we, the champions of religious democracy, are obliged by our form of service to leave everything to the minister, while the congregation's only opportunity of joining in is by means of the hymns. A congregation cannot take part unless they have a copy of the words being used in front of them.

Mr. Winward's excellent little book goes far to supply this lack, and it is published at a price which makes it possible for most churches to consider buying it in bulk. It is classical in feeling and catholic in selection. Much of it will receive unqualified welcome from all Baptists, but its use of creeds and litanies may cause others to feel that some parts of it could not be used with comfort in Baptist churches.

The Psalms have traditionally been used for responsive reading, and the large selection here is fully justified. The Canticles fall into the same category. The selection of prayers of adoration, confession and supplication is sufficiently wide that over-familiarity and parrot-like repetition can easily be avoided. The uses of the Apostles' and Nicene creeds will be occasional in most churches, but Mr. Winward supplies alternative confessions of faith in the words of scripture. The responsive devotions covering the Christian Year are especially welcome.

DENIS LANT.

When Christ Comes and Comes Again, by T. F. Torrance. (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 12s. 6d.)

The sixteen sermons in this book are not offered as examples of the art of preaching. They have been shorn of illustration and rewritten in the hope that they may help preachers to examine the content of their sermons. Preaching is sometimes judged, for good or ill, according to whether its method and technique fall in with those conventionally associated with the "evangelical tradition." Those very techniques may fetter the Word of God or cover a very thin presentation of it.

Thus, though the title might suggest that this book is occupied with but one or two aspects of the Gospel, the addresses range over the broad canvas of human need and God's answer to that need in the saving work of Christ. As one would expect the author strikes the classic notes of Reformed theology. He shows the wholeness needed in preaching which is truly evangelical. Old and New Testaments, Word and Sacrament, Worship and life, find their proper integration here.

We need not follow Dr. Torrance in all he says in order to appreciate the strength of these sermons. There are the inconsistencies unavoidable for an evangelical paedo-Baptist and, inevitably, other passages also at which one must agree to differ. I question, for example, whether the almost completely negative treatment of Nature on p. 88 does justice to the Hebraic point of view.

These things apart, however, this is quality material and should feed preachers' souls as well as sermons.

G. W. RUSLING

The Music of Christian Hymnody, by Erik Routley. (Independent Press, London, 30s.)

With his new book on the history of the hymn-tune, Dr. Erik Routley again places church musicians in his debt. Starting with the Lutheran Chorale, he traces the course of this "homely" art-form up to the present day, and to the most recent hymn book—the Revised (1950) Ancient and Modern, and the B.B.C. Hymn Book of 1951. Written mainly from the standpoint of English Protestantism, he nonetheless includes chapters on the Hymnody of the Roman Catholic Church, and on Welsh and American Hymnody.

Considering the fact that over one thousand tunes are reviewed, such a plan could easily have resulted in a monotonous catalogue of the names of tunes; but on the contrary, this account always remains fascinating, full of pungent phrases, which convey concisely and graphically the author's meaning. For instance, here is a vivid quotation in which 18th-century Methodist music is put in its place—"the notable facility with which this flamboyant but trivial music by-passes the intellect and induces a false sense of spiritual well-being." The author's assessments of composers and their styles are equally shrewd and penetrating.

Dr. Routley provides two hundred music examples of less accessible tunes, and with the additional aid of the 1933 edition of The English Hymnal, the story can be followed quite easily.

Baptists will naturally be interested to hear the author's verdict upon their own hymn book. Here is the sole reference to it: "Nonconformity offers the Congregational Hymnary (1916), and the Baptist Church Hymnal (1936), both either ignorant or shamelessly reactionary." The Congregational denomination has removed itself from this biting, but at the same time, legitimate censure, by producing the excellent Congregational Praise (1951). We can only hope that whoever is responsible for any future new version of the Baptist Church Hymnal will have the necessary appreciation of historical perspective, and the musicianship, to produce a volume of praise worthy of a place alongside the other great modern hymn books. I urge all Baptists interested in Church praise to read and digest this admirable book.

K. BARRITT