

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

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

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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



incorporating the Transactions of the
BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY
EDITORIAL

AT the forthcoming Assembly of the Baptist Union plans will be presented for the worthy celebration of the Ter-Jubilee of the Union in 1962-3. In preparation for the Ter-Jubilee the denomination is to be called upon to evangelize, to study and to give. There is to be a four-year plan of evangelism in and through the churches, four years of studying Baptist history and principles and four years to raise at least £300,000.

We suspect that all too little is known as to how much the denomination has owed to the formation and development of the Baptist Union. Too often the Baptist Union receives much blame for apparent failures and little credit for undoubted achievements. Still today, nearly 150 years after its founding, the question is sometimes asked as to the point of the Baptist Union's existence and whether it is anything more than a convenient organization.

If the Ter-Jubilee celebrations are to be enthusiastically carried through and, more important still, if the Ter-Jubilee is to be the occasion of the quickening of the life of the whole denomination to make it more fit to be used of God, then the reason for the Union's existence and its purpose need to be clear to all and accepted by every Baptist. It was our intention to write an editorial on this theme, but we discover it has been already written. During 1811 and the early part of 1812 the *Baptist Magazine* had been advocating the formation of a general Union of Baptists. In the

issue for April, 1812, a letter appeared under the heading "On a general Union of the Baptists" and above the nom-de-plume "Crito". This letter, written exactly 147 years ago, deserves our closest attention as we approach the Ter-Jubilee of the Union, for it sets out with absolute clarity the convictions and spirit of the generation of Baptists who felt so strongly the need for a Union and who brought it into being. The arguments of the letter appear irrefutable.

Mr. Editor,

Having lately noticed in one of your numbers a paper on the propriety of a general Union of the Baptists, I take the liberty of following up the subject by directing the attention of the denomination to an object of so much importance and apparent utility.

A spirit of union, or, an harmonious agreement among men who profess to have for the sole object of all their proceedings, the well-being of their fellow creatures, is not only amiable, as it exhibits the genius and spirit of the Gospel, but highly necessary, as by concurring with one another they act with an accumulative power. Unity of operation has ever been considered the most valuable requisite to the successful accomplishment of any plan, secular or spiritual; and whatever has tended to destroy this has enervated the arm of power, for whatever purposes it was lifted up.

The religion we profess is founded upon a *Spirit of Union*, nor can it exist any longer than this spirit is felt and acted upon. It is not a mere appendage, or external ornament, that may be employed or laid aside, as circumstances require; it is not a public periodical evidence that we give to each other of our holding the same faith; but a principle of love towards God and man that unites believers together by an explicit agreement to promote the divine glory, and the salvation of sinners; to exert their united aid for the revival of a spirit of piety, and for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom. The very life and soul of the gospel of Jesus Christ is love, and where this is felt, our zeal for his cause will be in a similar degree manifest. It was this love, this spirit of union, this oneness of sentiment and design, that fired the zeal of that chosen band who went forth from Jerusalem to evangelize the nations of the world. Let this spirit of union and zeal influence the Baptist ministers of the present day, and it will give existence to those vigorous exertions which, through a divine blessing, may effect a task much less arduous and difficult, but hardly less important, than that which was performed by the primitive teachers of Christianity.

We have numbers on our side; all that is wanted is, harmony of counsel and design, to bring into exercise the effective strength of the denomination. If we act in concert, it is impossible to say what good we may effect for the cause we profess to have so much at heart.

That which constitutes the chief glory of the Church of Christ is its oneness. Its members, however numerous and dispersed, form but one community, governed by the same principles and pursuing the same ultimate end. They are one family, being all the children of the same Father, one holy society, one body, actuated by one spirit. (Eph 4⁴⁻⁶, 16.) This Union of the Church of Christ is not sufficiently manifested by an outward agreement of its members at the present day, and though it is the case that believers do not see eye to eye, and cannot agree with each other on various points of faith and practice, yet cannot we, as a denomination, holding the same faith and the same Baptism, unite ourselves together for the purpose of consulting on the most likely means to ensure peace and prosperity in our churches, and to support those various equitable claims which its institutions have upon the benevolence and zeal of its members?

It is highly desirable that the ministers and churches of our denomination should be united together, that this Union should become visible; a Union by which the most distant members of the community might be called to bear a part, and act in those affairs that are in any way connected with the common interests of the whole body. At present we have no centre of union, no rallying point, no means of ascertaining each other's views and sentiments, on the most probable means of securing the common welfare; no connecting medium through which we can obtain that multitude of counsel which would be attended with safety and prosperity. Hence it is that the exertions of the denomination, though not entirely fruitless, are greatly enfeebled and not productive of that measure of good which might be expected. The insulated exertions of individuals, however great their number, are never likely to be so extensively useful as the exertions of a whole community, when their talents, prudence, and zeal are brought to bear upon the same object with all the accumulated force which union gives to the endeavours of individuals. The attempts of the former are like those of a broken army, every individual of which may burn with the same patriotic ardour and pursue the same glorious design, yet on account of their dismembered state, if they are enabled to keep their ground, it is all that can be hoped for; any successful attempt upon the strongholds of the enemy can never be expected under such circumstances. But

the proceedings of the latter are like the advances of a well organized phalanx, rendered powerful by discipline, having but one object and one spirit; animated by their numbers and their shouts, they rush forward to the field of action with all the resistless impetuosity of an overwhelming torrent. Such a union is wanting amongst the ministers and members of the Baptist denomination, to give greater efficacy to their exertions for the interests of Zion. It would naturally tend to strengthen each other's hands, to confirm the feeble knees, and to raise the drooping spirits of those who at present appear to be labouring in vain and spending their strength for nought; it would rouse the zeal and courage of others and animate them to press forward in the path of duty, though beset with difficulties; it would call forth a public spirit, which is very much wanting, and promote love and concord between distant branches of the Church of Christ. It would unite ministers by the strongest ties of mutual interest and affection, and cause them to feel in a measure which perhaps many of them have not yet felt, the great importance of diligence and earnestness in that great work in which they are engaged. Thus, while it would tend to each other's spiritual profit and edification, when met together, it would send us home to our respective charges, animated and encouraged. Guided by the wholesome and wise deliberations of brethren met for the sole purpose of adopting the most likely measures under a divine blessing, to produce a revival and flourishing state of religion in our churches, we should know how to act with prudence and safety, in our individual capacities, in those spheres of usefulness, where the great Head of the Church has placed us. For we know that too frequently an undertaking is rendered abortive for want of prudence and wisdom in managing it. This might be obviated, if the various undertakings of churches, or associated churches came before the denomination in a collective form, where they might be considered and recommended to that degree of public patronage which their several merits claimed.

It may perhaps, be enquired by some, where is this general Union of the Baptists to be held? Who are to meet? When, and for what purposes? To these I would reply: Let the meeting take place in London, once a year, at that time which might be judged most convenient. London, perhaps, would be the most convenient place, as it is large, central, contains a number of Baptist churches and ministers, and is visited during the course of the year, by many of our country brethren. The persons who meet should be ministers and messengers from the churches, either individual or associate, by which the state of the churches would be known. Such a meeting would embrace

the welfare of our churches, the prosperity of our academies, missions, itineracies, cases, widow's funds, etc., and give that patronage to the *Baptist Magazine* which would render it the permanent and authentic repository of the views and proceedings of the denomination. Much more might be done for all these institutions than has ever yet been done. Their importance to us as a denomination is very great, they highly deserve the patronage and support of the whole community, and loudly call for both at the present day. The exertions that have been made by the Bristol friends for the erection of a new academy, merit the attention of the denomination at large, and call, we hope, not in vain, for their generous support. Were the united churches to take this institution into consideration, in the course of two years the debt might be liquidated by annual collections, and the funds placed upon such a footing as to render the institution as respectable as any in the kingdom. Brethren, we have the means within ourselves; all that is wanting is a Union, to bring those means into exercise, to give them force, and to direct them to proper objects; then through a divine blessing, the work will prosper in our hands.

CRITO

* * *

With the Ter-Jubilee of the Baptist Union in the forefront of our ministry it is certainly appropriate that the article in the series *Baptists and the Ministry* should deal with the relations between the Baptist Ministry and the Baptist Union. We are grateful to the Rev. K. C. Dykes for his instructive article. The growth of the Baptist Union has inevitably raised theological issues which can be no longer ignored. This article faces one of them.

* * *

Before the Baptist Union celebrates its Ter-Jubilee, however, another Ter-Jubilee will have come and gone. In 1810, an academy for the training of Baptist ministers was founded in Stepney. From this beginning came Regent's Park College. Thus in 1960 our Baptist College in Oxford will be celebrating its 150th anniversary. The first Principal of Stepney College was William Newman and he has left for us a diary. The Rev. R. E. Cooper, who is engaged upon writing the history of Regent's Park College, has selected extracts from Newman's diaries which are published in this current issue.

Baptists and the Ministry

THE BAPTIST MINISTER AND THE BAPTIST UNION

BUILDING a bridge between theological affirmation and ecclesiastical administration is a task beset with great difficulties. Current discussions are making us Baptists aware how intricate are these problems with regard to the Ministry. If a man has been elected to the pastorate of a local church, theologically we affirm that he is a minister. Yet as regards denominational organization he cannot be accredited unless he has complied with certain requirements laid down by the Baptist Union. His name can appear in the Handbook in the column for Pastors on the pages devoted to the list of churches. His name cannot appear on the list of ministers towards the end of the book.

The Handbook does not seek to hide the anomaly. It points out, under "Ministerial Recognition Rules."

"The Union acknowledges that there are others whose names do not appear on the above-mentioned Accredited Lists who are ministers of Baptist churches and may rightly be designated Baptist ministers."

This surely is an honest admission that Baptist churches are one thing and the Baptist Union another. No one can feel happy about this state of affairs. If the trend of our time is to transform the Union of Baptist Churches into the Baptist Church, then the measure of how far we are going in this direction will be the extent to which we can tackle the problem of ministerial accrediting.

I

First let us take note of how the present situation arose, though Dr. Payne's forthcoming *History of the Baptist Union* is likely to give us a more precise statement of the facts.

A major aim in forming the Baptist Union was to make better provision for the training and maintenance of ministers. A college as old as Bristol had long been engaged on the task of training men but only a small number of pastors had enjoyed these advantages.

The Union envisaged one of its chief tasks as increasing the supply of ministers who were both godly and learned.

In its early decades the achievements of the Baptist Union were very limited. Yet increasingly its Handbook met a need in giving information about Baptists. In the issue for 1867 we have, for instance, an alphabetical list of Baptist ministers with simply the towns in which they were resident. The note at the top states :

“Great pains have been taken to make this list as accurate as possible . . . The Editor will be thankful to be informed of any errors or omissions, so that they may be corrected or supplied in future issues.”

It appears that for a minister to ask for his name to be inserted was sufficient.

In 1869 changes were introduced. Not only the College where the minister was trained was inserted in relevant cases and the year in which he commenced his ministry, but the list carried this notice at the head :

“Names are added to the List only on the recommendation of tutors of colleges, secretaries of associations, three accredited Baptist ministers or three members of the Baptist Union Committee.”

The 1889 Handbook shows things carried a stage further. “The List of Baptist Ministers” is prefixed in this way :

“A name is placed on this List by vote of the Council of the Baptist Union, who require a recommendation (1) by tutors of colleges, or (2) by secretaries of associations, or (3) by three members of the Council.”

It is more than likely that the Trustees of Funds to which the impecunious minister applied for assistance found this list increasingly useful as supplying some kind of “epistle of commendation.” Certainly when Dr. J. H. Shakespeare was about to launch the Sustentation Fund a ministerial list which would serve this purpose was essential.

Now the Baptist Union itself was to augment stipends. It must therefore have clear rules as to whose stipends it was to augment. If churches and individuals were to subscribe to a Fund, then they had a right to know on what basis it was to be administered. Rules were inevitable, and, not least, rules regarding what qualified a minister to benefit from the fund. Not surprisingly then, a more precise scheme of ministerial recognition was part and parcel of the radical altering of denominational structure and of the money-making which marked the turn of the century.

In 1896 the Assembly of the Baptist Union set up a Ministerial Recognition Committee. Its prescribed object was

“to prevent the unworthy and unfit from entering our ministry; to assist those whom God has called and qualified for service in the pastorate by commending them to the Churches of the Denomination; and to secure for such pastors, among other privileges, eligibility to participate in the benefits of the Funds of the Union.”

The Committee was instructed

“to receive applications in writing from brethren seeking recognition as Baptist Ministers by the Baptist Union; to determine whether, in their judgment, such brethren have the gifts and graces required in a pastor; to encourage young men who are—evidently called by the Lord to the work of the ministry to secure a collegiate training, and, where this is impracticable, to recommend a course of reading, and generally to assist in preparing them for efficient service.”

The Assembly also resolved that Auxiliary Committees should be formed for the purpose of inquiring into the worthiness and fitness of applicants, and of advising the Central Committee on the question whether their names should be inserted in the list of accredited ministers.

Applicants who had passed through a recognized college had to forward

“a testimonial signed by the President and one Professor, as to their character, studies, and satisfactory completion of their college course,”

also a recommendation from the Local Auxiliary Committee

“as to their character and the efficiency of the pastoral work in which they are engaged.”

Arrangements were made for non-collegiate candidates to sit an examination. There was also for non-collegiate pastors, presumably for those who could not be encouraged to sit the examination, a suggested course of reading. It was definitely stated, however, that the action of the Ministerial Recognition Committee was not retrospective. Obviously when initiating such a scheme there would be a considerable number of ministers whose only training had been in the hard school of experience and who, being pastors of proved ability, could not be excluded from the list. The Committee's eye had to be chiefly on the future.

“The Ministerial Recognition Committee is entrusted with a difficult and delicate task,” said the Handbook. “Only gradually can it fulfil the objects for which it has been brought into existence. Churches are urgently requested not to invite any non-

collegiate candidate to the pastorate until they have communicated with the Committee, and candidates are as urgently asked to safeguard their own interests by seeking the co-operation of the Committee in their attempt to enter the ministry of the Baptist Denomination."

Though the Scheme has been revised a good deal since 1896 and the category of Probationer Minister inserted, the broad outline remains unchanged.

In the last revision, adopted by the Assembly in 1953, the purposes of the Scheme are declared to be :

(a) To encourage candidates for the Baptist Ministry to fit themselves for their vocation by means of suitable courses of study and training, to be undertaken whenever possible in a Baptist College recognized by the Baptist Union.

(b) To accord to those ministers who have so fitted themselves and whose qualifications are approved, the recognition of the Baptist Union, and to commend them to the Churches.

(c) To encourage ministers by all possible means to magnify the ministry and to lay upon themselves the disciplinary ideals of their calling.

(d) To take action in case of conduct unbecoming to the ministry.

(e) To facilitate ministerial settlement.

(f) To meet the requirements of denominational schemes, funds and trusts.

Here the objects are perhaps presented more positively than in 1896, with a greater emphasis on encouraging men to exalt their calling by cultural, moral and spiritual attainments, but clause (f) adds weight to our contention that, all along, one of the main purposes of the list has been the very practical one of defining who may benefit from funds raised by the Union.

This need was emphasized again in 1930 by the inauguration of the Superannuation Fund. Only if a minister's name is on the Accredited (or Probationers') List can he become a member of this fund. If membership were not governed by a rule of this kind it is hard to see how such a fund could be kept actuarially sound. Yet the using of the Accredited List for this purpose clearly tends to emphasize one rule governing accrediting, that concerning age of entry. Unless special provisions are made for the making up of arrears, no pension fund can remain solvent if members are admitted to it when many of what should have been their contributing years have gone by. Excluded from the Superannuation Fund an older applicant for the ministry may have to be, but it does not follow that he must necessarily be excluded from the Accredited List.

II

The list renders great service in ecclesiastical administration. Governed by carefully compiled rules, it provides the precise definition needed for trust deeds and legal documents as to who are being described by the term "Baptist Ministers." Whether its underlying principles are substantially true to our theological affirmations concerning the ministry is something into which we must now enquire.

The principle which underlies the list and with which we are now chiefly concerned is that, called of God though he must be, no man can become a minister without being approved and commissioned by the Church, and that the Church here means more than the local church or any *ad hoc* group of local churches: the Church here means local churches expressing their fellowship in the Gospel on the widest possible scale, which while denominationalism lasts, means the national denominational authority, the Baptist Union.

That this principle underlying the list is substantially true to what have been our theological affirmations over the centuries becomes clear when we make allowance for the evolution of denominational organization.

Throughout our history there has been much contention for the competence of the local church to order its own affairs under Christ. Yet because Christ is the Lord not only of the local church but of the Universal Church, to discern His will has meant at least seeking advice from representatives of other churches. Decisions of the local church have not then been solely the decisions of an isolated unit. Further, there has always been implied, though sometimes it has not been made as explicit as it should have been, that, in Forsyth's phrase, the local church is but the outcrop of the Great Church. In practice this has given rise to the desire to have the interest and concern of the Great Church embodied in the presence of representatives of other churches on occasions as important as the setting apart of a minister.

For over two hundred and fifty years there have been some men entering the Baptist ministry after college training. The steps that were taken by way of recommendations from churches and ministers before they were admitted to college, to make sure their sense of call was confirmed by the church, was in essence the same as what is done by the Baptist Union today, when the colleges to a large extent act as agents of the Union.

But in the case of men to whom it was not given to enjoy the advantages of college training, for many decades the following practice obtained. The candidate's own church would hear him preach and then commend him to other churches in the vicinity as an occasional preacher. Later some particular church would in-

vite him to preach for a period with a view to the pastorate. Two church meetings were thus being asked formally to pronounce whether the man was, in the words of the recent Report on Ordination, "gifted 'called' and set apart by God for the work of the ministry". But many more churches and their ministers were indirectly involved, for only through their good will could the candidate hope to secure preaching engagements.

With the possible exception of the rare case where a church made one of its own members its pastor, it would seem that throughout our history the local church has not been in the habit of assuming sole responsibility for discerning who were called to the ministry. Though no specific procedure was laid down, by tradition and custom the task was shouldered by local churches and ministers as their representatives, acting in fellowship.

The attempts prior to 1896 to compile a list of ministers for the Handbook may be looked upon as a method, necessarily somewhat fumbling, of declaring to Baptists throughout the country which men had been approved, by churches acting in fellowship, as called of God to the ministry. The requirement introduced in 1869 of recommendations from specified representative persons underlines the need being felt of authorization from churches rather than merely from a church.

Revolutionary though the 1896 Scheme of Ministerial Recognition may at first sight seem, it had many links with previous practice. It was possible because the Baptist Union was now becoming conscious of itself as the denominational authority, the body which could act in the name of most of the Baptist churches in the country.

The scheme as it has been developed is an attempt to register the mind of the Church at different levels concerning a man's calling to the ministry. The local church gives its judgment; the churches of the locality speak through the Association Committee: the Committee of the College, made up of men drawn from an even larger area and elected to serve because they are the representatives of the churches deemed to have special gifts of discernment, makes its decision. These all report to the Central Ministerial Recognition Committee which, if satisfied, recommends to the Baptist Union representing the churches as a whole.

III

What difficulties does the scheme raise and what objections have been levelled against it? A consideration of difficulties and objections may suggest what future developments ought to be.

The objections appear to centre in the idea that it is more spiritual to proceed in disregard of the scheme. God has issued His call; what the Baptist Union has to say about it is quite im-

material. It may be expedient to comply with the requirements of the Union so as to be eligible for grants or so as to have one's standing enhanced by one's name appearing on an official denominational list but all this is quite incidental to the exercising of an effective Gospel ministry.

In meeting this objection reference might well be made to paragraph 47 of *The Meaning and Practice of Ordination among Baptists* where a definition is given of ordination in terms that are thoroughly "spiritual". In other words here are theological affirmations about divine happenings rather than rules about ecclesiastical administration. Ordination is said to be

"the act, wherein the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, publicly recognizes and confirms that a Christian believer has been gifted, called and set apart by God for the work of the ministry and in the name of Christ commissions him for this work."

The document goes on to call attention to two main points: the Call of God is fundamental, yet ordination is an act of the Church.

There are those who would prefer to speak of ordination as an act of Christ in and through His Church, thus emphasizing still more the "divine happenings". Yet the one way of stating it does not exclude the other. Any service of worship is both an act of the Church and the medium through which Christ acts. But in our view the Report has rightly adopted a form of wording which leaves us in no doubt that the responsibility for this act is laid upon the Church. A decision has to be taken as to whether this believer is a right and proper person to enter the ministry. It is a decision on which much turns with regard to the well-being of the Church. It cannot be taken lightly, yet the Church cannot shrink from the responsibility of taking it. She does so humbly "under the guidance of the Holy Spirit." She may be mistaken. The future may show that this believer who himself was so sure he was called of God to this work was not a suitable person for the ministry. All the Church can say is that she made her decision at the time in good faith, genuinely seeking to discern the Will of God. However saintly any community of Christians may be, it is not given to them to be absolutely sure of the divine will. The Church walks by faith and not by sight even in such a momentous matter as selecting candidates for the ministry. Her task is to discern as clearly as she can which believers have been "gifted, called and set apart by God for the work of the ministry" and in carrying out this task she relies on the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But how may she expect this guidance to be granted to her? She is thrown back on testimonies to the man's ability, recommendations at various levels, interviews, examinations and the record of development under the

discipline of training, for all these are the data to be pondered carefully and prayerfully if the Will of God is to be known. A scheme of ministerial recognition is then implicit in the theological affirmation about how the Lord of the Church grants a ministry to His Body.

There are difficulties in working the scheme which weigh very heavily on the hearts of those who administer it. They concern chiefly the considerable number of pastors of proved ability who either did not apply early enough for recognition or who, having applied, could not pass the academic examinations. It is largely because of these hard cases that the Union "acknowledges that there are others whose names do not appear on the . . . Accredited List who . . . may rightly be designated Baptist ministers."

What can be done to make the Accredited List correspond with the list of pastors of churches in membership with the Union, with the addition of those who are set apart for tasks undertaken on behalf of all the churches?

First there must be on the part of the churches in membership with the Union a definite pledge to assign to the Union the very responsible task of discerning, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, which believers have been "gifted, called and set apart by God for the work of the ministry" and of arranging for their training. The day for any group of churches, much less any one local church, to attempt to discharge this task must be declared to be at an end. Membership of the Baptist Union must be understood to involve such an undertaking regarding the ministry.

The voluntary society aspect of the Baptist Union will have to give way to an explicit statement of what we have increasingly recognized it to be, the means by which local Baptist churches express their interdependency one upon the other and show themselves to be part of the greater fellowship which all churches share in Christ. The Union will have to be conceived as Baptist churches in covenant relationship with each other in Christ.

After due preparation, the member churches will have to be invited to covenant with one another before God to act through their appointed representatives as one body in certain tasks which, society being as complex as it is today, can no longer be handled by a local church or the churches of a small area. High up on the list of this task is commissioning to the ministry. It will be of extreme importance that the churches shall understand they are not handing over these functions to some outside body but assigning them to the greater whole of which they form part. The step will thus be in line with the traditions of the past and the gradual evolution of policy.

From 1896 we have been trying to exalt the minister's calling by making regulations with which the minister must comply. We

can get no further till we make corresponding demands upon the churches. Attempts have been made to persuade churches to abide by the scheme and the response has been considerable, but only when a grant is at stake are they compelled to take the scheme seriously. The financial sanction is not a fitting instrument in the Church of Christ. It is far worthier to ask the churches freely to assign the authority needed. Until the churches limit their freedom of action as accredited ministers have long since done, it is hard to see any way forward.

Covenanting on behalf of the churches as just outlined will carry with it a pledge on the part of all who feel called of God to serve as ministers to have their call approved by the Union, whether they be full-time or part-time pastors. Just as in 1896 many concessions were made in the accrediting of those already serving, so would it have to be when by covenanting the churches solve the present anomalies.

We envisage a number of sections in the Accredited List which would then be compiled. In addition to the present categories there would be one for part-time pastors, and another for full-time pastors who have given proof of their ability for the day-to-day work in certain churches but to whom academic tests of the standard at present demanded for the list are too exacting.

The cultural requirements for these last two categories would be fixed as high as practicable so that an educated ministry could be assured, but prescribed reading and essays would have to be offered as an alternative to the examination method of testing attainment. No church would be prevented from calling such a pastor but the appearance of this name in that section of the list should be a reminder to them that the spheres in which he is judged capable to minister are of a special kind.

The aim would be that within a limited period of years from the time the churches made this covenant every minister would appear on the Accredited List. Thereafter no persons would be assuming pastoral office in churches in membership with the Union without first having been tested as to their gifts and calling and directed as to their training by the whole fellowship of churches acting through their Ministerial Recognition Committee.

K. C. DYKES

The Strategy of Satan

“The religious sanctification of relative interests in the spiritual life of the radical is, however necessary, just as dangerous a source of confusion as in conservatism. It leads to the same peril of endowing the egoism of a group or the prejudice of an era with the sanctity of the eternal.”

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

Reflections on the end of an Era. 184

“For we have to struggle, not with blood and flesh but with the angelic Rulers, the angelic Authorities, the potentates of the dark present, the spirit-forces of evil in the heavenly sphere. So take God’s armour . . .”—Eph. vi 12, 13a.

THE purpose of this article is to argue that the publicists, moralists and theologians who are continually propounding their diagnosis of the present moral predicament of the world often go astray in the direction of false optimism or shallow pessimism because they underestimate the strategy and power of the forces of evil. We all know that we are in a dangerous position; that the future of western civilization is so precarious that our fate is, as it were, balanced upon a knife-edge. If we could gain an insight into the nature of the corrupting and violating power in our midst we might begin to understand what must be done, through God’s Grace, to counteract and finally to overcome it.

At this point it will be objected that there is no need to postulate such a power of evil, capable of such conscious scheming. Is it not primarily rather a great negative or denying “contingent” force which universally contradicts and thwarts the good, but in itself is neither personal nor organized—part of the constitution of our environment and as inevitable an accompaniment to our progress as shadow to sunlight? The very difficulty, however, of defining something which may be in essence negative but exercises such a universal *real and positive* force, shows that we are on safer ground in our original definition. If there be any error in this, it is probably in the direction of underestimating the enemy. And, if he is indeed “personal”, this is precisely what he wants us to do.

A few examples will furnish the only means to test the above suggestions. First, the accumulation of "natural calamities" in these days provide a very interesting study in the complex interaction of evil forces and influences. Earthquake, cyclone and flood are presumably neither more nor less numerous and devastating than in the past, but we have in these days an increasing number of what might be termed mixed afflictions. Specimens of these are only too easy to describe. Some are due to the inventiveness of man. It is, of course, a natural phenomenon if an aeroplane is struck by lightning, although in the past this was not possible. If the *Titanic* struck an iceberg, the subsequent loss of life was partly due to the inventive skill of those who had produced such an enormous machine to carry human beings over an hostile element. Responsibility for the accident may therefore, on a rough calculation, be shared equally between natural forces and human ingenuity. In other cases the human contribution to disaster is significantly larger. The tremendous and frightening increase in population in certain areas of the world is due mainly to human interference with natural processes; medical and social reforms have increased the birthrate and decreased the deathrate, and "nature" is no longer permitted to wipe out surplus population, in the wholesale manner of previous centuries, by famine and epidemic. In the absence of any general adoption of any method of family-planning the ultimate catastrophe is likely to be the more terrible because postponed from year to year; some unavoidable interruption in the food-supply may set in motion a chain-reaction with appalling consequences. Here the proportion of human responsibility might be estimated as high as 75 per cent.

Stupidity is perhaps a venial sin, but *Hubris* or overweening pride has also a big share in promoting such disasters. This is also true in the case of those greater calamities, involving the lives of countless human beings, who starve and are wasted by disease in the overcrowded countries of the world. Much of this suffering is due to natural causes, much to human foolishness and negligence, but not a little to satanic elements. These have to be isolated and examined like ultra-microscopical viruses in the human body. Racial prejudices or hatred, national selfishness, corrupt internal administration, are general terms for such, but the very use of these terms covers but another subterfuge of the evil one in our minds. Let us therefore be more precise. Here there may be a man, or a group of men, living in luxury like Dives in the parable, oblivious to the sighs of the poor at their gate; elsewhere, some directors of a vast commercial concern, sitting far away across the seas, determined only on profits, and forgetting that exploitation, while favourable to a few, sometimes spells ruin for many. Or take you or me. In our comfort and prosperity, a genial indifference to the

fate of our fellow men is broken rarely if ever; we proceed complacently and unheedingly down the broad road that leads to destruction; "and many there be which go in thereat."

From these considerations it is easy to turn to a profounder examination of human appetites. Our characteristic lusts have been analysed so minutely by casuist and psychiatrist that only one remark is necessary here. It is simply that Paul's complaint in *Romans* vii 18 : 19 is just as true today as when it was written. My desire to do good is always turning back, so to speak, upon itself; intentions are excellent and the result hideous. But in our personal lives the most subtle of all temptations is the one which we recognize as such in our most enlightened moments. These are not necessarily the most disillusioned; "Oh what a fool I was!" is a remark indicative as much of wounded pride as spiritual insight. But it is the vision of God given to us in some momentary revelation which, like a lightning flash, shows us what we were and are. We soon sink back into our usual slightly uneasy equilibrium of everyday morals. And when the temptation returns, even our recent experience of God's truth about it may not enable us to recognise it. For Satan is an adept at arranging small superficial changes which alter the appearance of anciently familiar sin. So we suggest to ourselves that on this occasion all is different, while in the depth of our conscience we know it is the same.

With most nations and communities such depths of cleverness are unnecessary. Few things are more frightening than that double-edged modern phenomenon: the long-lived lie and the venerable idol. Surely at no period in the world's history was such a multitude of lies released to bamboozle the nations, especially the long-suffering ordinary worker or cultivator. Not only is the air full of them, but the apparatus of publicity is now so elaborate and efficient that words themselves are becoming unnecessary—everything can be taught by pictures. Like the Moslem, who, after seeing an inferior product of Hollywood in a Calcutta cinema, muttered into his beard; "Now we know how white women behave," people *know* because they have *seen*. What we see is, of course, more often a mirage rather than the truth. This however does not concern our pastors and masters; they are mainly interested either in filling up our leisure hours with some kind of entertainment, or putting across the particular propaganda which they want us to believe at the moment. The first section, although often tending to the corruption of public morals, does not concern us here. The second, which is even more prominent under totalitarian regimes, provided us all with idols (miscalled "ideals") which we are to worship, slogans ("manifestoes" or "platforms") which are to be believed, and bright hopes for the future ("main objectives", "freedom and prosperity", "dictatorship of the proletariat" and

the like) which are to be swallowed whole. It is not denied that there is still a minority of intellectuals capable of penetrating these smoke-screens to discover where the enemies of the truth and protectors of vested interests live and work. But even if they know this, they are powerless to destroy them—they are too strongly entrenched. Nothing short of a general catastrophe, such as war, will dislodge them. In that event, their empty redoubts are soon occupied by other would-be tyrants.

So the average man has before him an array of false gods not less numerous, seductive or awe-inspiring than the rows of images I have seen in Hindu temples. The charm of idol-worship is always mysterious to some minds; why a man or woman should so far surrender intellectual integrity as to bow down before such effigies is a question unanswerable by the writer. Yet it is a universal characteristic of human nature: the Tibetan Lama tells his rosary in much the same way as the Italian peasant woman, and the Chinese have, or had, a goddess whose peculiar pleasure it was to rescue those in peril on the sea, like the Mediterranean *Stella Maris*. Similarly, the simple-hearted worker in the Ukraine or Middle West accepts without much question the wrapped-up carrots held before his nose by Krushchev or Dulles. In all this our ancient adversary is confidently busy and generally successful. He inserts into the minds of the "leaders" ample fuel for the never-extinguished flame of their suspicions and prejudices; the longer their tenure of office, the more pronounced the warp in their minds. The latter is always encouraged by those favourite instruments of satanic strategy, the narrow-minded "experts" of all kinds, especially military. It is difficult to foresee any radical change in this particular aspect of politics in any conceivable future. Yet even this kind of prophecy may be falsified by unexpected developments in circumstances.

To most observers the kind of situation here briefly sketched is the most dangerous of all. This type of idolatry leads towards massacres, famines and horrors of all kinds, as well as the ruin of many fair ideals and fervent hopes. Martyrs are numerous, and it often seems that their sufferings have been in vain. Surely nothing could be worse than this. Yet *this* is not the satanic masterpiece; it is not this which causes most mirth in hell. *Corruptio optimi pessima*. It is when the enemy succeeds in establishing himself in the very centre of the opposing camp; when there is a spy on our General Staff. It is here suggested that the main cause of the ineffectiveness of the forces making for righteousness in our present world is that, without knowing it, we are being deceived and bewitched into worshipping, not only idols of the kind mentioned above, but also others which were innocent and holy in the not so distant past but have now become transformed into deceptions and snares.

It might be that most of the above would command general assent from thoughtful Christians. But the conclusion of this essay must, one fears, expect generally equal opposition. If our main thesis is correct, the Satan, arch-deceiver that he is, insinuates himself into places where his presence is not likely to be discovered (until, like the snake in the Garden of Eden, he chooses to show himself) and uses instruments which we all believe he never could use. So any one of us is as likely to be bamboozled as anyone else. The very suggestion, for example, that he is using the Christian Church and Sacraments in many instances is received with horror as blasphemous. Yet we believe that it has happened.

It will perhaps be admitted by many that an introvert Church is an unhealthy Church. A sincere devotion to her Lord, and a concentration upon learning his Will, must be accompanied by a mission to the world outside which is continually reaching out to draw men and women to Him. Everything that interferes with the latter object must become suspect. Yet, to so many outsiders today, organized Christianity appears to be so absorbed in its own affairs, chasing so many apparitions and involved in so many secondary problems, that its victories are unknown, its defeats exaggerated, its activities obscured and its aims impugned. It is allowable to suspect that someone is sowing tares in our precious field. But how can we find and uproot them? A good method is to look in the most unlikely places. A great deal of time and energy is being wasted at present on controversies about episcopacy and "orders." These are actually matters of Church organization and therefore of secondary importance. The influences which cause God-fearing and self-denying men and women to spend God-given opportunities and resources in worrying about them are certainly of no celestial origin. Similarly, undue emphasis upon the holiness and eternity of that extremely fallible organization of human beings, the Church of Christ on earth, tends to exalt to heaven what can only be transformed into the heavenly City by the Grace of God and never the merits of man. The process by which a revelation of God or a sacrament gradually, often by very slow degrees, is changed, in the very presence of those who worship it, into an idol, is never apparent to the human observer. Only by the result is it known; "by their fruits ye shall know them." The history, especially in recent decades, of the Roman Catholic Church, is full of examples of this. But every Communion can furnish instances.

The most exquisite physical agony is felt when a junction of sensitive nerve-centres is pierced. The Communion of the Lord's Supper, the Eucharist, is such a centre in the life of the Christian Church. It is not uncommon for us to wonder at the ways of Providence when a useful life is cut off at its prime, or a mother of young children killed outright by lightning. These are extreme

examples of the contingent nature and general chanciness of our environment and our life within it. A greater mystery surrounds the indubitable fact that the Satan has succeeded his instrument, Judas, in being present at the Sacred Meal. For that which should be the uniting place of all Christians, where their love to each other is shown forth to the world, has been the centre of division, bigotry, and even persecution for centuries, and even today Christians cannot unite at the sole Feast at which their Lord is Host. (Compare *Luke* xxii : 26 and *John* xiii : 35.) This is a great triumph for evil, perhaps the greatest of which we can be conscious. By it the Christian Church is not only "divided"—it is continually stultified and fatally weakened. The inspiration and strength which would come from obedient united loving Communion with the Lord is only spasmodically available, or often lacking altogether. A kind of cramp paralyses our organic life; we advance in detachments and occupy outposts, while the enemy from the rear sees to it that no decisive victory is ever won. In the Holy War, as in other wars, co-ordinated effort, carefully planned, is the only means for ultimate victory.

Criticism of the Church by outsiders is often regarded as unimportant by those in its inner circles. We must not forget that the main business of the Church in the world is just with that ignorant outsider, rather than with the vast indifferent multitude whose interest is so hard to stir. So we may regretfully allow him to make his point that the Church is self-centred. He may be right; if not, we must prove him wrong. But the charge just made is a far graver one, for it must needs come from within the circle of those whom the Lord has called to be His own. How far is it justified? The deceiver of the whole world (*Rev.* xii : 9) knows the answer. No single Christian can presume to indict his Church, or any other. It is the world outside, with its ever-increasing masses of heathen, and the events of our time, which furnish the overwhelming evidence. All we Christians can say is : "Lord, is it I?" and pray for forgiveness.

H. D. NORTHFIELD

REMINDER

The Annual Meeting of the Baptist Historical Society will be held on April 27th, at 4.30 p.m., in the Institute Hall at Westminster Chapel. Tea at small charge.

In the Study

BULTMANN'S attempt to demythologize the Gospel has been widely misinterpreted. This curious fact is due partly to the unfamiliarity of the categories with which he works, partly to the pioneering character of his efforts, partly to the ambiguity of his expression. But the result has been that his bold and brilliant re-statement has not commanded the appreciation it deserves. It is surely a sign of the times that it is from a Belgian Roman Catholic that there comes the sympathetic and discerning discussion of which we stand in need.¹

In general, Father Malavez confines his criticisms to the conclusion of his study, where they belong. His exposition and interpretation of Bultmann's thought is acute, illuminating, and dispassionate. He demonstrates—as I would think—conclusively that much recent criticism is unjustified. The Christian message is not swallowed up by an existentialist philosophy. The objectivity of the Christ event is not surrendered. It is the false Cartesian separation of subject and object that is rejected. It is the assimilation of transcendental divine action with "this-worldly" action that constitutes indefensible mythology.

It is true that Bultmann's use of Heidegger is open to attack. He misinterprets his teacher in an unnecessarily nihilistic direction. He grafts upon the preliminary discussion of *Sein und Zeit*, an ontology which Heidegger has not yet expounded. But these are minor causes for hesitation. There is no wholesale capitulation to modern philosophy. The Christian theologian is well aware of the inadequacy of the existentialist conception of inauthentic existence, is ever mindful of the inescapable need of the empowering grace of divine action.

Malavez is profoundly aware of the imperatives which drive Bultmann forward. He knows that scientific advance and philosophical insight create new problems for theology. He knows also that

¹ *The Christian Message and Myth*, by L. Malavez. S.C.M. Press, Ltd. 25/- (1958).

Bultmann's restatement has religious roots, that it represents an attempt to re-apply the Lutheran concept of justification by faith in the realm of knowledge. He attacks shrewdly at all three levels, and inevitably ranges himself at the last with the verdict of tradition. But he leaves the reader with a new appreciation of the gallantry and necessity of Bultmann's theological struggle.

Within the New Testament itself, Bultmann lays particular emphasis upon the Fourth Gospel as illustrative of the early attempt at demythologization. It is thus of interest to set alongside his work the recently published essays of J. E. Davey in the field of the historicity of St. John,² even though Dr. Davey never faces up, at Bultmann's level, to the whole complex question of "history" and "factuality."

If these historical and christological studies combine to make an inconclusive book of uneven merit, it is no more than we must expect. The presence in the Fourth Gospel of a historical substratum would be increasingly accepted. But the process of sifting material demands a mixture of technical competence and intuitive rapport that is rare indeed. Today we possess few scholars with the mastery of historical method of a C. H. Turner. Dr. Davey deals in probabilities and possibilities, and in many cases it is very easy to adjudge his probabilities as possibilities and his possibilities as remote. His enunciation of "foundation pillars" of the historicity of John does not, I think, carry the conviction of Schmiedel's comparable work in the Synoptic field. Similarly, his advocacy of the identification of the John of Ephesus, whose witness underlies the Fourth Gospel, with John Mark seems to underestimate the daunting chronological obstacle.

Nevertheless, such studies are needed and worth making; and the author is aware of the provisional nature of most of his conclusions. He may well be right in his detection of Johannine counterparts to the wilderness temptations dramatized for us in Matthew and Luke. He has certainly made his case for the heavy Johannine emphasis laid on the dependence of Jesus upon his Father; and the attempt to give this dependence more than temporal significance is noteworthy. For the rest—where we dissent we must do better.

J. E. Davey would find in the Fourth Gospel the clue to a more adequate understanding of Christology and Trinitarian belief than the classic formulations of the past ages supply. It is therefore helpful to turn from his tentative movement towards restatement to a fresh examination of early Christian doctrine.³ The notable work

² *The Jesus of St. John*, by J. E. Davey. Lutterworth Press, 25/- (1958).

³ *Early Christian Doctrines*, by J. N. D. Kelly. A. & C. Black, Ltd., 30/- (1958).

of Bethune-Baker in this field has long demanded its successor; and few are in better position to provide it than Dr. Kelly. With a sure hand he guides us from the frontiers of the New Testament to the middle of the fifth century, and if it is patient plodding all the way, at least we never stumble. All students of this formative and critical period will be grateful for the ripe fruits of patristic scholarship, so clearly presented, so cogently argued.

The aim of the author is understanding and impartial exposition. He has, accordingly, quoted generously from the original sources, and has endeavoured to proceed by way of exegesis rather than eisegesis, forbearing to impose pattern and homogeneity where these are lacking. It is true that quotations, superficially carrying one emphasis, may point in quite a different direction when read in the larger context to which they belong. But Dr. Kelly always provides his references, and may justly direct the suspicious critic to search for himself and form his own conclusions.

One of the most valuable features of this survey is the prominence given to the contemporary philosophies which so often provided the Fathers with their categories of thought and modes of expression. We are already familiar with the confusion occasioned by the use of such key-words as *ousia*, *prosopon*, *hypostasis*, in conflicting senses. But we have to learn to look deeper and find controversies illumined by an understanding of the Stoic, Aristotelian, and Neo-Platonic tools that forged expression. We may suspect that even Dr. Kelly has failed to do full justice to this at every point.

Though all is competently done, yet it is the section covering the period from Nicaea to Chalcedon that reveals the author at his best and most confident. The discussion of Christology is superb. Partly this is due to the nature, richness, and greater malleability of the material. Nevertheless, it is no mean achievement to march thus triumphantly through the confused battlefields of the fourth century, bringing order out of chaos. Only very rarely does our mentor fail us—as when the notorious Cyrillian juxtaposition of the *mia phusis* and the *ek duo phuseon* is left in its normal Stygian darkness.

If criticism is to be made, it must be at the point where every expositor and interpreter is vulnerable. Dr. Kelly also has his pre-suppositions. He is a devotee of the Chalcedonian settlement. He has long since given his imprimatur to the decisions of orthodoxy. He knows in advance that what will be rejected is heresy and aberration. Of course he is too good a scholar to rig his evidence, too discerning an interpreter to shout "heresy" loudly before orthodoxy has been established. But pre-suppositions always influence treatment. The reader who is most alert to them will get the most from this notable doctrinal study.

Perhaps we should be grateful that the early Councils failed to provide us with a definite doctrine of the Church. Indeed, the time for framing one is not yet; and we must, therefore, welcome thankfully two recent contributions which shed light upon this area of classic controversy.⁴ In an age pre-occupied with problems relating to the Church's strategy, the Church's action, and the Church's task, Mr. Kenrick offers us a timely corrective. He has not only made his own that profound slogan of the Ecumenical Movement: "Let the Church be the Church", he has also seen its implications. He has learned in personal experience that the Church cannot *act* unless she has reached the deeper understanding of what, in her essential being, she *is*. So he is concerned, first of all and most of all, with the laying of the indispensable foundations, with the nature of the Church, with ecclesiology. Then, and only then, will he move on to enunciate the corollaries, to determine what such an understanding will mean for the working of the Body of Christ—its life, its ministry, its ethic.

This is a dangerous book; dangerous to read, dangerous to criticize. And it takes a bold man to write it. For to believe its thesis is to stand under judgment individually and corporately, to be driven to repentance, revolution, and renewal. If Mr. Kenrick is right, then some of our theory and most of our practice is wrong. The "natural" man in us revolts against so disturbing a conclusion. Surely there is a flaw somewhere. Perhaps there is. But we had best expose ourselves in humble receptivity to this prophetic summons, before we try to draw its sting by adding our question marks and our qualifications.

Nevertheless, criticize we must. This is a good book. It could have been a better one. It moves at breath-taking tempo, challenges with compelling urgency; and therein lies something of its power. But sometimes it moves a little too quickly, lays its foundations too simply and easily, drives in its nails with Christian courage and vigour but with insufficient use of precision tools. Theology is made central: to the bar of theology the work must go. What if the hand at work must be adjudged slap-dash and occasionally unsure!

It will not do to defend the Resurrection with the categorical assertion that disillusioned men were in no mood to imagine it. Such a statement betrays a complete misunderstanding of the psychological springs of hallucination. It will not do to make the distinction between the bread and the wine, the Body and the Blood of the Sacrament, identical with a distinction between life and death. Such an interpretation is patently unbiblical. These are

⁴ *The New Humanity*, by Bruce Kenrick. Collins, 12/6d. (1958). *A Theology of the Laity*, by H. Kraemer. Lutterworth Press, 15/- (1958).

only straws; but they rightly make us pause and examine more closely the central issues. And then, one reader at least is forced to the conclusion that a firmer grasp and a more subtle use of the concept of "analogy" would have led to a more accurate understanding of the relationship between the Church and her Lord.

But we must not evade the impact of what is always a creative call, relevant to our situation. Free Churchmen need to be reminded that the Body of Christ has high claim to be regarded as the determinative New Testament description of the Church. And all devotees of an incarnational theology will profit from the insistence that our primary need is identification not with the world but with our Lord.

It is as well, however, to remember that all ecclesiological discussion is likely to be barren so long as it conceives of the Church in terms of an ecclesiastical order. In recent years, pressure of circumstances has forced upon us a new awareness of the place, function, and importance of the "laity"; and the myopia of centuries stands revealed. We need a theology of the laity, a theology which will be more than a footnote or appendix to the congealed doctrinal formulations of our past. Dr. Kraemer offers us a significant, though slender, Protestant counterpart to the great work of Father Congar, which blazed the trail.

Free Churchmen would be ill-advised to imagine that they have long ago solved this problem. Indeed, the distressing phenomenon of the self-assertive laity is directly related to the theological lacuna which Dr. Kraemer is striving to fill. He provides us with an interesting and selective historical survey and a provocative approach towards theological restatement. If we remain dissatisfied, we must build more surely.

The inescapable ambiguity attaching to the term "laity" bedevils the historical discussion, opens it to constant criticism, and leaves behind a deep sense of irritation. And I wonder whether we really know as much about the early centuries as Kraemer's assertions seem tacitly to assume. The attempt at theological restatement is avowedly provisional and should be treated as such. The thought is always stimulating, and often controversial. It is also confessedly one-sided—and perhaps too heavily.

We must agree that something bigger than a new doctrine of work is needed. We must assent to the affirmation that the fresh understanding we seek must be relevant to the laity as a whole rather than to the select and educated minority. We must approve the call for a wholehearted reorientation of our traditional ecclesiology. We must applaud the insistence that the Church exists not for itself but for the world, as *diakonia* and as mission. But we must continue to ask whether there is not demanded of us a yet deeper understanding—an understanding of the place of the laity

in worship, of the normative and directive function of the liturgy of the baptized? At this point Kraemer is strangely silent. But I wonder whether if we fail here we do not fail altogether.

It is always salutary to be reminded that the laity are not an abstract concept but a collection of individuals in need of pastoral care; and one of our most reliable guides to that fascinating terrain where pastoral theology and psychotherapy meet is the American scholar, Wayne Oates. In this,⁵ his most recent contribution, he explores the various kinds of anxiety that afflict, torment, or stimulate mankind, and fruitfully subjects pastoral and psychotherapeutic material to the interpretative scrutiny of biblical insight and theological understanding. Legalistic, economic, and finitude anxiety; the anxiety of grief, of sin, of moral indifference, of the cross; all these and more are given meticulous examination.

The American background is real, though not obtrusive; but there is little that is not applicable to the British scene. The relevant writings of Kierkegaard are plundered, and the fashionable Tillychian categories are heavily employed. Nevertheless, unnecessary jargon is shunned. If this is not always an easy book to follow, it is partly because of the nature of the issues under discussion and partly because of the method of presentation adopted. Sometimes we seem to be grappling with a series of jottings in staccato style rather than a progressive argument. Perhaps this is inevitable where a target is attacked from so many different points of vantage.

An illuminating study such as this prompts three reflections. I wonder how far the effective use of counselling techniques depends upon a certain measure of understanding, a certain standard of education, on the part of the counsellee. If the answer is not clear-cut, yet the question is worth asking seriously, before bright young ministers rush ahead.

More basic still is the emerging sense of tremendous perils attaching to a facile reliance upon techniques. Counselling and the pastoral ministry are fraught with so many dangers. The minister had best begin to learn that he also stands in need of healing, that the relationship within which he must work is one of mutual enrichment, of giving and receiving, never *de haut en bas*. He must never contract out of the pain of total redemption, of the agonizing search for sensitivity of approach and discipline of conversation. Wayne Oates is profoundly right in using as his *leitmotif* the pattern and reality of the Cross and Resurrection.

Beyond all this, there remains the irreplaceable healing power of the community of love. The pastor can never work adequately in isolation, only as representative. The Church remains the Body of

⁵ *Anxiety in Christian Experience*, by Wayne E. Oates. George Allen & Unwin, 15/- (1958).

Christ, where the unacceptable must find acceptance and the unlovely find love. This is at once the point of highest possibility and of deepest failure.

Increasingly, in our age, psychology and associated disciplines intrude into the philosophical domain; and in his latest book⁶ Austin Farrer has again and again to reckon with them. William James defined philosophy as "an unusually obstinate attempt to think clearly." It is a dictum that must be kept firmly in mind by a Gifford Lecturer who sets out to debate determinism and free will against the background of a discussion of "mind and body, speech and conduct, nature and spirit, responsibility and value"; and Dr. Farrer does not fail us. Occasionally he permits himself an anguished *cri de coeur*. "How difficult it is, in philosophy, to advance! After hours of discussion we find ourselves just able, by hard running, to catch up with our starting-point." But we suspect that, while the reader may be flagging, the author is in firm possession of his second wind and good for another hundred pages yet.

This book is more than an essay in metaphysics. The material provided by psychology and neurology is given the important place it deserves, treated fairly, and handled competently and seriously. Argument is directed towards the vindication of free will on the basis of failure to reduce human action to the sum of its determinate factors whose effect is theoretically calculable. Epiphenomenalism is rightly and decisively rejected. But the link between physiological events on the one hand, and conscious intention on the other, is found to reside in a pattern of physical action, correlated with consciousness and productive of real physical effect.

Again and again the author refuses to be led away from the rock of commonsense experience. All things are not what they seem. Nevertheless, in the richly human act of choice and decision lies reality that will stand against a hundred sophisms. Just as solipsism is self-destructive, so deterministic objections will often be found to be double-edged weapons, eating away the ultimate ground on which their exponents stand.

It will be clear that Dr. Farrer is battling in an arena that is of paramount importance for Christian faith—though he himself halts, of necessity, at the outer gates of theology. Almost certainly this is not a definite work of the calibre of *Finite and Infinite*. Too much time is expended on the careful delineation of a position that is to be demolished in a sentence a paragraph hence. Too often the necessities of internal debate make the opponents men of straw and ignore the endless permutations and combinations of the determinist

⁶ *The Freedom of the Will*, by Austin Farrer. A. & C. Black, 28/- (1958).

objector. Yet much ground is permanently gained, the insubstantial demons are banished, and a murky battlefield is floodlit for our generation. And ever and anew, a Farrerian *mot* is dropped into the conflict. It is good to be reminded that "for a discerning palate, one steak differs from another steak in glory."

N. CLARK

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

K. C. DYKES, M.A., B.D.

Principal, Manchester Baptist College.

H. D. NORTHFIELD, M.A.

Minister, Little Sutton, Warwicks.

N. CLARK, M.A., S.T.M.

Minister, Rochester, Kent.

R. E. COOPER, M.A.

Minister, Westbourne Park, London.

REVIEWS by : G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, IVOR BUSE, K. C. DYKES,
A. GILMORE, V. E. W. HAYWARD, R. C. WALTON, W. M. S.
WEST, H. R. WILLIAMSON.

Selections from the Diary of William Newman

WILLIAM NEWMAN (1773-1835) was pastor of the Baptist Church at Bow and a successful schoolmaster. He became the first president of the Stepney Academy, later Regent's Park College, and his diary is a most important document for the historian of the early days of the academy. Several volumes survive. The one used here deals with years of transition and decision in Newman's life and reflects events and sketches personalities of considerable interest. He lived in the age of philanthropic societies. The war with Napoleon was at its height, although the diary ceases before Waterloo. But perhaps of most interest is the picture of the man. Old in mind while still young in years, scholarly, emotional, dedicated, a penetrating critic of his fellows and a stern dealer with his own soul.

It is almost unbelievable that Newman was not able to secure admission to a dissenting academy in view of the intellectual achievement recorded modestly in the diary. The entries mention, incidentally, that he had the opportunity of entering one of the ancient universities but would not do so as it would involve subscription to the Articles of the Church of England. A note (17.12.08) suggests the respect in which he was held for his scholarship. "Trace *bapto* in the New Testament where the ordinance is not referred to, in the LXX, in the Classics, in Philo, in Josephus, in the Greek Fathers. See Dr. Gale's reply to Dr. Wall; Dr. Ryland's *Extracts from Josephus*." He knew Hebrew and was able to review a book published in Arabic. It was his custom to read from his Greek Testament every morning at seven. He was greatly admired by Andrew Fuller and an entry (11.10.13) says, "Mr. Fuller wants me to examine the connection between Baptism and the Lord's Supper". He made a translation of at least part of the New Testament, although this was probably not intended for publication. "I wish I had translated the New Testament for myself as though it had never been done before."

His sermon preparation was usually done on a Saturday and he frequently records that he was most at liberty in the evening service. Comments on his own preaching gleaned from the diary speak for themselves.

"My heart was inflamed."

"On the whole a good day . . . yet much disappointed with my sermons."

" . . . very lame, confused; shreds and rags."

"Much confusion; I wonder that anybody comes to hear me."

"Great fluency, but alas! it was too much the effect of hurry and fever."

"Expounded I Thess. The Rise, Reign and Ruin of Antichrist."

"Hughes says I must be a glutton indeed if I am not satisfied with the praises of my sermon which are given in the Baptist magazine less would have pleased me more. Not knowing the writer, I do not know how much they are worth—*laudari a viro laudato* is worth something. O my God! to Thee be all the praise."

"Levity, self-confidence alarmed me."

"How great is the goodness of God to me. I have not been hindered from attending public worship on a Lord's Day for 25 years. More than 20 years I have been preaching, generally three times a day. Have never been laid aside one whole Sabbath that I can recollect." (4.8.11).

"Could not find a text (sure sign of a bad state); at last preached with some freedom, almost extempore."

"Preached at Austin's, Fetter Lane, on the means to be used for the conversion of ungodly relations—the sermon was delivered without much comfort, after much labour bestowed on it; the pulpit was so enormously high . . . in the evening I was at home."

Throughout his years of service Newman remained a faithful pastor. The demands of the school and later the college, the committees, the need to maintain his reading might well have swamped this part of Newman's ministry but it was never neglected.

His references to Church business meetings could be echoed by most ministers. One was "cold, dull, heavy". Others he describes in happier terms. His notes of their proceedings contain more references to discipline and excommunication than we are accustomed to. His pastoral work included visits to folk with smallpox and to a woman who had attempted suicide. Another woman was visited when she was dying. "Quite unconscious that she is a sinner. 'Did you never offend your Maker?' 'No, not to my knowledge'. 'Did you never feel a conviction of guilt before God?' 'No, never'. And this woman told me she was one of my hearers!" In the margin he notes that the woman afterwards became a penitent.

The spiritual progress of John Ivimey, the black sheep of the

historian's family may be traced in occasional remarks in Newman's diary. "At nine came John Ivimey. He wept like a child; told me his fears with great simplicity; that his religion was nothing more than nature might produce; that he should deceive himself; that his convictions were not strong enough; that if he opened his mind to his brothers they would think him a hypocrite." But the interview and others bore fruit. Three months later (22.3.09) he came "to propose himself for baptism". In April we read that "John Ivimey prayed for the first time, with fear and trembling" at the weekly prayer meeting. Later that month he gave an account of his Christian experience to the Church as was required of all candidates for baptism, and in May he was baptized.

Briscoe, one of the first three students at Stepney who later proved to be very unstable, told his pastor of his desire to enter the ministry. "I catechized him very closely on the motives which led him to think of the ministry." (2.3.09).

Most pastors will testify to his experience of visiting the sick. "Visited a Miss Boys with Miss Humtley. One of the most interesting interviews I ever had with a sick person. I shall not soon lose the savour of it."

The more intimately personal references in the diary come very close to the varied feelings of the minister. He speaks of his few recreations, bathing, gardening and walking. He notes his anxieties about his school and takes care to speak from time to time to his pupils about the state of their souls. Other personal passages speak for themselves.

After a reference to the death of several friends. "And I am still spared! O that it may be for much good. If I am soon to die may I be well prepared. After having preached successfully to others, shall I be cast away?" (3.10.08).

"Lord prepare me for new trials and support me under one which I have long endured" (20.11.08).

"Alas, what a poor creature I am! How weak in body; how imbecile in mind. How slender my literary furniture. I feel ashamed to be treated with so much respect by my brethren at the Coffee House" (7.12.08).

"Spent most of the morning in reading the memoranda I have preserved of this whole year . . . In my studies I have read Ovid's *Metam* and several of Cicero's *Orations*. I have made a little improvement in composition. In the school I have been successful. The church and congregation have considerably increased. My heart is more warmly engaged, I trust than ever in the work of the Lord." (30.12.08).

"This month labour to improve in English." (1.2.09).

Reference to death of Richard Gough. ". . . he was much grieved when my Mother took me to the Meeting House; would have in-

roduced me to the University if I had been disposed to take orders in the Church" (28.2.09).

"My time is cut up into a thousand little pieces, frittered away; and how shall I rectify this?" (27.3.09).

"O for a heavenly unction! When shall I rise to self-possession and that sublime order which some appear to feel?" (31.3.09).

"I must be careful or I shall lose private prayer and reading." (5.7.09).

"Pierced with a thousand petty thorns." (10.10.09).

Referring to a dinner for the poor. "Mrs. Newman and myself provide for the Sunday School 238 buns and 9 gallons of ale." (23.10.09).

"Afternoon—attempted 20 things; could not succeed in any."

"Dear Eliza much perplexed about taking a third servant. Mem. Contrive to order things better on a Saturday." (17.2.10).

"This is my ordination day, 16 years ago. O Thou great Shepherd of Israel, help me to feed the sheep and lambs that increase under my care." (15.5.10).

"Gathered our large pears. One of them weighed $\frac{3}{4}$ lb." (20.10.10).

"Very unsettled . . . read a great deal to little profit . . . flitted from thing to thing." (27.7.11).

"I am in danger of being distressed by an endless variety of pursuits." (21.3.12)..

"Knew not what to do with myself. Alas I have no self-sufficiency; I cannot make myself happy. 'All my springs are in Thee.' Attempted to pray; attempted to read; could not bring my mind to writing; revised and burnt old sermons; preserved a few. O my God undertake for me!" (23.6.12).

"From committee to committee all day long." (18.8.12).

"This week my study has been my delight . . . but my poor body hardly keeps pace with my spirit. Two things to be lamented. My prayers have been too languid. My study of the scriptures has been almost entirely official." (19.9.12).

Advice given to a younger minister. "I recommended to him:—

1. A common-place book.
2. A waste-book for hints of reflection, conversation, reading, etc.
3. An experience book for the state of his own soul, progress in study, etc.
4. A sermon book for texts and sermons in different states of forwardness.
5. An account book including income and expenditure." (25.12.12).

"Have I not too much neglected prayer and private meditation

on the scriptures? Do I not too generally read for others rather than for myself?" (14.8.13).

"Heavy laden with the business of the house. Long discussion on the propriety of wearing a black gown in public ministrations." (25.8.13).

"I have taken pains today to settle my notions on the personality of the Deity." (23.10.13).

"I would not change my pulpit for any throne in Europe." (29.5.14).

"Sent a barrowful of cabbages and lettuces to the penitentiary." (11.7.14).

He had hard things to say about his own preaching and he brought a scarcely less critical mind to the preaching of other men. He was generous in praise and scathing where there was any hint of arrogance or slackness. One can guess how he must have treated his students in sermon class! A list of comments must suffice.

"A pious soliloquy. Would have done well in a good man's closet."

"Stephens addressed the pastor and people—outrè, waspish, coarse, low." Another sermon by the same man was "very puerile."

Other sermons were described as "a shocking perversion of scripture"; "remarkably superficial"; "a very neat sermon but was stiff and cold"; "a few flippant flourishes . . . more puerile than I expected"; "most ludicrous affair". Most damning of all perhaps, "Ward gave the charge or should have done so."

"Very pathetic; sweet simplicity, but it was the simplicity of a great mind."

"Bryant on the plagues of Egypt, very learned, curious, amusing, instructive; throws great light on the holy oracles."

"Cheered and charmed me. Simplicity, favour, solemnity, self-possession; sweetness of manner surprised me. At 3 o'clock it must be a sermon of no common merit that could engage so strongly our attention just after dinner."

"I sat next to Philips. He says Mr. Hall spends half the day in prayer; that he lives in the spirit of supplication; that as he uses his voice, they heard him completely." (6.6.11).

Of Hutchings at Eagle Street. "Very brilliant, but it was the brilliancy of lightning amidst volumes of smoke and peals of thunder."

There are passages of interest to the Baptist historian. A few entries speak of the still youthful missionary enterprise in India. The birth pangs of a new Baptist periodical are hinted at.

"Coffee-House; large company. Andrew Fuller came in with good tidings from India; very reviving. He says Abraham Booth was the first Counsellor in our denomination, now John Sutcliff."

He told us many things concerning Robert Hall; very pleasing; that he has given up his duality notion with reference to the divine nature that he is no longer hostile to the doctrine of total depravity. Once he quarrelled with Fuller on this. 'Sir, you blackguard human nature.' 'Sir,' replied Fuller, 'Don't you blackguard me'." (30.8.08).

"Prospectus of a new Baptist magazine handed round." (20.10.08).

"At coffee-house, a violent altercation between Dr. R(ippon) and Gutteridge concerning the new Baptist magazine." (1.11.08).

"Burditt and Button selling away the new Baptist magazine; never saw such a demand for a new publication." (31.12.08).

"Discussion of the magazine renewed; Gutteridge is very sore still." (10.1.09).

"Mission meeting at the Dutch Church. Mr. Fuller preached on Romans 1 . . . Dr. Ryland on Isaiah . . . Dinner meeting very large. This has been a glorious day." "Meeting at Carter Lane to form a Union. Hinton's address very pretty. Dr. Ryland preached for our Institution at 12 at Devonshire Square . . . I never saw two such days in London before." (24, 25.6.12).

"News of a dreadful fire in the Mission House at Serampore." (14.9.12).

"At 11 went with Fuller, Gutteridge and Burls to see Lord Liverpool on the question of toleration in India. I never was more struck with 'the human face divine' He said but little." (12.3.13).

And there is the wider background. Newman records a heat-wave in 1808 and an eclipse of the sun the following year. In 1811 a spell of sultry weather leads him to wonder if it could be due to the comet that had appeared recently. He shares in the typical non-conformist respect for the Hanoverian monarchy which had brought them considerable freedom after the restrictive measures of the Stuarts. But even the loyal Newman could not ignore the scandalous behaviour of the King's sons. He would have quarrelled with Shelley's description of George III—"An old, mad, blind, despised and dying king" (Sonnet: England in 1819) but might have given grudging agreement to his words about the Prince Regent and his brothers—"Princes, the dregs of their dull race . . ." In other passages he notes the assassination of Perceval, the apprehension of a notorious murderer, a disastrous fire at Covent Garden. And in the second group of quotations given below he traces the events of the Peninsular War.

20.2.09. Mrs. Clarke's examination occupies the House of Commons. The Duke of York appears in a most disgraceful light.

25.10.09. Grand National Jubilee. This day the King enters into the fiftieth year of his reign. Henry III died in the fifty-seventh—Edward III in the fifty-first year—beside those two instances

there is no other since Egbert our first Saxon king almost 1,000 years ago. Fine beautiful morning. Preached from *Psalm 72: 1*. "Give the King thy judgements, etc." At the new school room distributed buns and ale to 279 Sunday School children.

28.6.11. Jackson conveyed us to Windsor. At 7 p.m. saw the King on the Terrace. We were much affected with the sight of our venerable and beloved sovereign, now blind, walking up and down cheerfully, conducted by two of his daughters." (Next day). Went to morning worship with the King in his domestic chapel. He appears to be truly devout. (On the 30th). Went to morning worship with the King; saw him ride out again. Afternoon, returned home. In the coach was a lady who, many years ago, kept the King's dairy at Windsor. She related some anecdotes of the King that were very affecting; his reading the Olney hymns, "How sweet the Name of Jesus sounds," etc.

25.10.10. Jubilee Day. Our King has completed the fiftieth year of his reign. Such a day I shall never see again; perhaps no man ever will in this country.

18.3.13 Most scandalous exposure of the separation between the Prince and Princess of Wales.

The War

9.11.08. Most dreadful expectation of Bonaparte's fury in Spain. He has threatened to crown his brother in Madrid before Christmas.

28.1.09. Read the account of Sir John Moore's death at Corunna.

8.6.08. News of Bonaparte's defeat near Vienna.

14.8.09. All the European continent has been on fire. Every country has been recently engaged in war and (except perhaps Russia) has been the seat of war. How wonderful is the exemption of this island! Holland is now distressed by an expedition. If (as Mr. Booth used to say) there are more godly people in Holland than in England, allowing for the difference in extent and population, how alarming to us. We are not surprised that God should visit the Catholic countries. Oh! may Britain hear the warning voice!

27.10.10. Great anxiety about Lord Wellington. The fate of Portugal, perhaps of Spain, of Europe depends on a general battle . . . May our brave army be preserved. Are there not some pious men in it praying day and night?

23.12.10. The French are retreating from Moscow, grievously harassed by the Russians.

5.7.13. Illuminations for Lord Wellington's victory at Vittoria.

10.7.13. Read at the Ship, Canning's brilliant speech of thanks to Lord Wellington.

24.11.13. Guns fired twice in one day for a victory of Wellington in France and for the re-taking of Dresden.

19.3.14. Great anxiety about Paris, whether the allies will reach it; whether peace will be made with Bonaparte or not; whether the allies will encourage the Bourbons or not.

9.4.14. Revolution in Paris.

10.4.14. News of Bonaparte's dethronement, almost overwhelming. Afternoon, read Daniel 5, "They deposed him from his kingly throne and took his glory from him."

28.7.14. Met the deputation at 1. Gutteridge and Meyer lent their coaches. About 20 of us went to Carlton House with an address of congratulation on the peace. Lord Sidmouth was very remarkably attentive to us. The Prince received us very graciously; we kissed his hand. The Duke of Kent and several of his brothers stood by; the Prince looked ill. I think we shall not see him again unless we have another address soon. I was struck by the splendour and magnificence of the rooms, exceeding by far everything I had ever seen. The day was fine and the levée was exceedingly thronged. The Bishop of Exeter sneered and expressed his surprise that we did not appear in Court dress. He seemed to despise us because we had not on the "Wedding garment." We afterwards dined together at the New London and Dr. Rippon (who read the address in a very tender manner much impressed with the presence of the Prince) presided with much good humour. No sleep that night.

But the passages of most interest in Dr. Newman's diary to Baptists are those which relate to the founding of the Stepney Academy. These are given here in chronological order with the minimum of comment.

23.11.08. Revolving in my mind the necessity and importance of a Baptist Academy in London.

25.11.08. Wrote to Sutcliff . . . to Miss Tomkins on the subject of the Academy.

23.2.09. Mr. Gutteridge stated that we might have an Academy, if applications were made. We could now provide for fourteen students.

13.12.09. Gutteridge asked me if I would take charge of our Academy if they can get the premises at Stepney—of which he had the terms in his pocket.

29.12.09. Committee of the Education Society. Mr. Gutteridge reported that Mr. William Taylor had made a present of £3,600 for purchasing premises at Stepney Green . . . for our new Academy. Walked home in silent, sweet meditation.

2.1.10. Gutteridge reported to the Education Society the donation of Mr. Taylor. Agreed to unite his object with ours.

20.3.10. Kinghorn proposed for a tutor . . . Some unknown

friend has sent a £500 bank note to Tim. Thomas for the Academy. (Note in margin—This was Miss Tomkins!)

24.4.10. Very judicious letter from Mr. Kinghorn opening his heart.

5.6.10. Breakfast with Mr. Dore. He told me I must take the charge at Stepney. I told him I had two grand objections; one is, I have not body enough; the other I have not mind enough.

17.6.10. Relieved by hearing that Kinghorn is likely to come to Stepney. Dore proposed me last Tuesday.

24.7.10. How much were we surprised to hear a letter from Mr. Kinghorn stating that he declined coming to Stepney.

7.8.10. Fuller said my sermon was the best he had ever heard; that he thought the denomination would look to me in confidence at Stepney. Sutcliffe said he would come all the way from Olney to vote for my election if he had a vote. Is it possible that I stand so high in the estimation of my brethren and fathers?

24.8.10. This afternoon and evening my thoughts have been running over Stepney Green. O my heavenly Father! suffer not my fancy to prevail over my reason; suffer me not to disgrace my profession by any unworthy conduct; suffer not a word to escape that may dishonour thee; suffer not my thoughts to sin!

4.9.10. If the Committee should press it, I should find it the greatest trial I ever had, that I felt many objections.

1. As to myself, I cannot persuade myself that I am competent.
2. I fear that the removal might affect Mrs. Newman's comfort.
3. I feel with regard to the Church that I should become a merely nominal pastor. I am but little better now and I cannot bear the thought of giving up a people so long and so justly endeared to me.

4. With regard to the school . . . must I make a sacrifice of all the pecuniary advantages of my present situation?

5. If I fail I fear I shall not be able to make a good retreat. They told me they had opened the matter to the committee and that it was probable that I should receive a very cordial and unanimous invitation.

19.9.10. Letter from Timothy Thomas advises me to resign every thought of the Academy on account of the discordance of the committee. I feel relieved for myself but more burdened than before on account of the Institution. I had fondly hoped that it would have united all hearts and all hands. A dark cloud hangs over us as a body.

20.9.10. Dore told me that Cox was the person now in view.

16.10.10. Timothy Thomas in the committee informed them that he was authorized by me to put an end to the conversation . . . he thinks it a question whether they will not now send me an invitation!

13.11.10. Ivimey told me that Dr. Ryland assured him that he should feel perfect satisfaction if I were chosen to the office of domestic tutor.

27.11.10. Dined with the Thomases. They gave me a copy of the unanimous resolution of the committee.

1.12.10. . . . Dan Taylor; he expressed his high satisfaction in my being invited to Stepney; remarked that it was a great work and that a man must be very conscientious to have peace in it.

24.12.10. The tutors at Homerton told me I need not be alarmed. I feel much relieved. They gave me their book of laws and regulations.

26.12.10. At 11 came Mr. Kinghorn and stayed with us till 3. We entered largely into the business at Stepney; he encourages me to proceed.

8.1.11. At 11 met the committee; read my answer accepting the invitation with more composure than I had expected.

(NOTE.—Visit to Dr. Ryland at Bristol in January 1811.)

22.1.11. The mighty men of Bristol have inspired me with new vigour.

29.1.11. At 12 met the committee. Was called to the presidential chair.

25.3.11. Removed from Bromley to Stepney—wagon and six carts full!

8.4.11. Came John Paul Briscoe, John Vickers and Samuel Jones to live with us. O that their coming may be a blessing. Gave them many directions and cautions . . . , gave them 1 Cor. 2 : 2 for the scheme of a sermon next Saturday.

9.4.11. The bell rang at 6. Business at 7. Lecture on the article and the five declensions; reminded them, however, that my department is theological. Family worship at 8. Met them at 10. Rehearsal; heard them read the first Psalm, parsing the words of the first verse. Dictated a few lines to be written on the slate to see their orthography, etc. They appear very attentive. Left them soon after 11. My soul is concerned for these young men who seem to be pious. O that I may be the instrument of much good to them. Met them at 2 p.m.; examined in the five declensions.

21.4.11. Dr. Ryland and Waters called for an hour. O for wisdom to direct. The Dr. gave us some galling specimens of ill behaviour among the students.

24.8.11. Bartholomew Day. My pupils read each a sermon on "the value of religious liberty."

Four years—theological department.

1st year. Grammatical theology. Grammar and biblical criticism.

2nd year. Historic theology, including all the facts of the Bible.

3rd year. Systematic theology, including evidences and doctrines.

4th year. Pastoral theology, including all that relates to preaching, Church fellowship and Church government.

26.10.11. At 11 my pupils read their sermons—"the supreme authority of the scriptures derived from their inspiration." Poor Jones lost his temper!

4.11.11. At 8 Mr. Fuller gave my pupils a very serious and affectionate lecture from 1 Thess. 2 on the spirit of their office. I could scarcely forbear weeping.

25.11.11. We have 461 churches in the Baptist Magazine list and 72 without pastors. Surely we need more academies.

24.12.11. At the Fund meeting Gutteridge unfolded the will of Mr. Taylor. He has bequeathed a noble legacy to the fund and his name will be held in everlasting remembrance.

13.1.12. This day my pupils have begun to learn Hebrew.

3.3.12. Fund meeting rather cold. Gutteridge made an address, very tender and pathetic. It appears that Mr. Taylor has left £16,000 or £17,000 to this fund. How great was Mr. Booth's influence! How happy that he had no prejudice against "that Institution."

7.11.13. Our Committee requested Brother Cox to lecture in Mathematics, etc. for three months.

27.1.14. My first lecture on the Greek Testament—a new version of Acts 1 with annotations.

In 1821 Newman's health showed signs of a serious decline and he became non-resident colleague to Solomon Young who had been appointed to help him at Stepney in 1814. But this exchange of positions was not very satisfactory and in 1826 Newman resigned completely. He died in 1835, leaving his valuable library to the college and £1,000 to the Baptist Building Fund, Dr. Newman's Loan Fund.

R. E. COOPER

Reviews

Steps to Christian Understanding. Ed. R. J. W. Bevan. (Oxford University Press, London, 15s.)

This book consists of twelve essays, ten by well-known theologians, both Anglican and Free Churchmen, one by a mathematician, Professor Coulson, and one by an historian, Professor Butterfield. The book is in three parts: (1) *God and the world* (mostly concerned with the relations between science and religion); (2) *God and Man* (with essays on revelation, the Christian view of man, and God in history); (3) *Christian doctrine* (The person of Christ, The Holy Spirit, the Trinity and the Christian hope). The Editor is one of the very few teachers of Religious Knowledge working in a Technical High School.

Such a book, in which specialists write for non-specialists, can be judged on two grounds. First the quality of the material: this test the book passes with points to spare. Here is solid scholarship and sound exposition which the pupils at the Technical High Schools and Grammar Schools will not hear from the pulpit (though they ought to hear it from there) and which only the highly trained Scripture specialist could give them in the class-room. The Christian doctrines are set firmly in their biblical context, and the formulations in modern terms are, on the whole, well argued.

The second test of such a book is more difficult to pass. Have the writers solved the problem of communicating their specialized knowledge to non-specialists? Have they climbed the wall which separates the university quadrangle and the cathedral cloister from the class-room of the secondary school? In my judgement, the book fails to pass this test. It is not that the language, apart from an occasional lapse from grace, is unduly difficult. It is rather that the book wears a slightly old-fashioned air. Perhaps in part this is due to the fact that five of the twelve contributors are Professors Emeritus, or "formerly Canon of . . ." The quotations are, in the main, from Addison, Anselm, Apollinaris, Aquinas, Aristotle, Athanasius, Augustine (to go no further than the first letter of the alphabet in the *Index*). More seriously there is no attempt to examine and to answer the arguments of those who, in 1958, are

the best known and most vocal opponents of Christianity. A good deal of space in the book is devoted to the relations between science and religion, and especially to the meaning of the Christian doctrine of Creation. Yet the most damaging criticisms of Christianity are coming today, not from the physicists or astronomers, but from biologists like Sir Julian Huxley and social scientists like Lady Wootton of Abinger. These are the personalities who air their agnostic views on the television Brains Trust, and write articles in the Sunday papers. These are the people whom the pupils of Grammar and Technical Schools see and read. The conflict between science and religion will have to be fought out again in our time, but the issues will be different: no longer Geology versus Genesis, but whether man is any more than the intelligent servant of the evolutionary process, and any more than a member of a man-made society which the sociologists can study and which they hope to plan and control. On this contemporary issue the book offers little guidance.

ROBERT C. WALTON

Greek New Testament, Second Edition (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 8s. 6d.).

The British and Foreign Bible Society's Greek Testament has been a familiar volume in the studies of ministers and theological students for many years. This new edition has been produced in connection with the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Society, under the editorship of Professor G. D. Kilpatrick, with whose name is associated that of Dr. Erwin Nestle. Thorough testing of a work of this kind involves constant use over a long period, which is impossible for an early review. It seems safe to say, however, that for general usefulness this will be the Greek Testament chosen by many. The print is admirably clear, comparing favourably with the 1956 Nestle. The excellent introduction is in English, a great advantage over Souter in these days of sparse Latinity. Whereas the 1904 edition gave no manuscript authority even for the variants it noted, the 1958 gives an excellent critical apparatus, in some ways (such as the use of the Bodmer Papyrus for the Fourth Gospel) more up to date than any other edition of the Greek New Testament.

We must confess disappointment, however, that the text printed, as a result of what may be felt to be undue caution, is almost identical with that of 1904 (not 904, as we are informed on page vii as a result of a misprint!). It is difficult to understand, in view of this general policy why two very questionable changes of punctuation, at *Mk.* i :1 and *Jn.* i; 3-4, should have been adopted.

IVOR BUSE

The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, by Neill Q. Hamilton. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 6. (Oliver & Boyd, London, 8s. 6d.)

The choice of theme for this book is due to the writer's desire to discover what practical significance lies in the long standing discussion of eschatology and its bearing on the life of the individual Christian. Consequently, although the book embodies a doctoral dissertation it does not move in a rarified academic atmosphere wherein it is difficult to breathe but keeps solid earth ever under the feet.

Beginning with the conviction that Paul's doctrine of the Spirit starts from his christology, the writer examines the Pauline passages in which the Spirit is related to Christ and concludes that the identity which Paul postulates between the two is dynamic—the Spirit mediates the benefits of the new covenant available in Christ, hence in the receiving of these benefits the Spirit and the Lord are viewed as one. That leads on to a consideration of the Spirit and the resurrection. The Spirit is primarily related to the eschatological future, yet as the Spirit who accomplished Christ's resurrection and is the life principle of His exaltation existence He is even now at work in the believer and in the Church, for with the Resurrection of Christ the future has broken into the present. "The Christian's life is altogether a product of the Christocentric, eschaton-related Spirit." To grasp this enables an avoidance of two false extremes—that of sinless perfection, which dissolves the tension between the now and not yet of the Kingdom, and that of a mournful Christianity which forgets that the Spirit of the Kingdom is here.

These views are compared, contrasted and clarified by an examination of the constructions of Albert Schweitzer, C. H. Dodd and Rudolf Bultmann. The whole is ably done.

G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY

Baptism, by Johannes Warns. (The Paternoster Press, London, 15s.)

The issue of baptism is one which is very much alive in ecumenical circles at present, and is likely to continue so for some time. To this debate, the recent translation of this book (first published in Berlin in 1913 in German) makes a valuable contribution. The author was a German Lutheran clergyman who had doubts about the meaning of baptism, and who, on examining the Scriptural teaching on the subject, actually felt obliged to resign his living as a matter of conscience. Its value is further enhanced by the fact that the author was also a master of the Greek language, and one who had written several other books on church history. His competence in both these fields amply befitted him for this task.

In a short notice of this nature it is only possible to mention some of the gems which this book offers. The author throughout makes it quite clear that for him baptism is a Biblical question as well as a Church question. His first chapter deals with the teaching of Scripture concerning baptism, and his last with the significance of Biblical baptism for the present time. As regards the Church question, the author has no doubts whatsoever that infant baptism is practised in order to maintain the idea of a State Church, and he says so continually. Infant baptism arose and gained ground for two reasons: superstition and the State Church. "It was very unfortunate that the superstition of the multitude accorded with the necessity of the State" (p. 87). From here he goes on to argue that believers' baptism has its place not only because it is Biblical, but also because it is a protest against mass-Christianity. It is very refreshing to read the arguments to show that the development of infant baptism was not at all the natural development which many modern paedo-baptists would have us believe; and also to read the admission that infant baptism has point and meaning, followed by the question, in italics, "But has the Lord appointed baptism for this purpose?" (p. 150).

From the Baptist view-point, this book is valuable in that it is basically the Baptist position, by one who was not himself a Baptist but an exponent of the Scriptures, whilst at the same time it draws attention to some points where not even Baptists have been as faithful to Scripture as we sometimes like to imagine. So that it is both a defence and a challenge. Moreover, it brings together within a comparatively small compass much ammunition which will be very useful to future Baptist writers on this theme.

The style is easy to read, and is in places both prophetic and forceful; the translation, by G. H. Lang, is good; and the Paternoster Press is to be congratulated on producing such a timely volume so efficiently and at such an extraordinary low price. There are misprints on p. 55 (Tertullian), p. 217 (Utrecht), p. 237 (1911 instead of 1611), and p. 304 (Willams).

A. GILMORE

Christianity among the Religions of the World, by Arnold Toynbee.
(Oxford University Press, London, 8s. 6d.)

This book consists of four lectures delivered by the author in 1955 to three important theological seminaries in U.S.A. under the auspices of the Newett Foundation.

Dr. Toynbee suggests that the basis on which the major living religions may be fairly compared should be sought in the "attitude or spirit of a religion" rather than in its particular beliefs, or the corresponding standards of conduct attained by its adherents. He

then outlines the characteristics of the modern world, in which the main element challenging all the higher religions, is "the worship of collective human power," "armed with new and fearsome weapons, both material and spiritual," particularly exemplified by Nationalism and Communism.

With a view to meeting this challenge, the author sketches the ground common to all the higher religions, chiefly their conception that "Man is not the highest spiritual presence in the universe." Therefore he urges that they should subordinate their traditional rivalries, and make a new approach to one another, characterized by greater open-mindedness and open-heartedness than before.

He then turns to consider the place and responsibility of Christians in this matter, and suggests that if Christianity is to face the future with confidence (which by its nature it may), Christians "should try to purge their religion of its western accessories, and of its traditional belief that Christianity is unique." Here he has something provocative and debatable to say about Christianity's claim to exclusiveness, and its intolerance.

Dr. Toynbee asserts his belief that God, because He is Love, has granted some revelation of His truth to the exponents of other higher religious faiths. But he also considers that Christians should continue to preach, and in particular to exemplify, the truths and ideals of the Christian faith to others; and that if it is proclaimed in the spirit of humility and charity, adherents of other faiths may be won to its allegiance.

Dr. Toynbee writes as a Christian, and historian, but makes no claim to be a theologian, nor has he had practical experience of preaching Christianity to devotees of other living religions. There is much in this book that is informative and freshly expressed, and for which one is grateful. But while one agrees that other religions should be considered sympathetically, and with due appreciation of the truth they preserve, we cannot but continue to believe and proclaim that Christ is unique, and that Christianity "has the fullest vision, and gives the greatest means of grace."

H. R. WILLIAMSON

The Kingdom of Free Men, by G. Kitson Clark. (Cambridge University Press, 18s. 6d.)

This book offers a liberal re-education. It is a broadly-based apologia for the ideals and practices of what may be termed the "liberal democracies" as over against the totalitarian States of the present day. It is also a penetrating discussion of the fundamental application of Christian principles to political life. Dr. Kitson Clark is Reader in Constitutional History in the University of Cambridge, and this book is based upon a series of open lectures given by him at the invitation of the Divinity Faculty. Although

the subject is deep and abstruse, Dr. Clark's treatment is extremely lucid and persuasive. He has a remarkable facility for "seeing the opposite point of view." His arguments are thoroughly realistic, his illustrations are contemporary, and his conclusions are models of clear statement.

The Kingdom of Free Men of which Dr. Clark writes "corresponds to no earthly kingdom, is ruled on no special ideological theory, and is inhabited by men and women of all nations, peoples and languages." Some of us might have preferred some such title as "The Nature and Necessity of Freedom," as giving a more informative and attractive indication of the contents of the book. What is needed now is a summarized version in a popular 2s. 6d. edition. For it is above all the mythical "man in the street," or rather thousands and thousands of men in the street, who really ought to read what Dr. Clark has to say.

On such a subject, it would have been easy to be platitudinous and inconclusive. Dr. Clark, however, continually challenges us to re-examination of "the obvious." He keeps his feet on the ground all the way, and leads us to a moving conclusion.

The author makes evident that there is less difference between the liberal and the totalitarian State than we like to imagine. He stresses the dangers of large organized mass movements of political opinion, the rootlessness of modern urban life, the uncertainties and frustrations as well as the dull routines of modern economic conditions, and the inevitably growing power of the expert, the technologist and the propagandist. He offers an impressive study of religious persecution in Europe since 1945, and makes accurate reference to what has happened in China. He gives a critique of determinism and materialism, and discourses on the values and problems of education. He analyses the concept of freedom, and indicates the danger of not equally studying what freedom is from and what freedom is for.

Dr. Clark's central assertion is that the principle of freedom is of supreme importance in human affairs because of the absolute value of the independent thoughts and actions of individual men and women. Yet he leaves us under no illusion as to the very limited nature of all human freedoms. The essential difference between the totalitarian and the liberal State is that in the latter there is an intention to respect individual rights as far as possible, whereas the former seeks to make all its subjects' choices for them.

Will this liberal intention survive in the Western world of to-morrow? Dr. Clark shows clearly many grave threats even in Great Britain. His book is another call to eternal vigilance.

VICTOR E. W. HAYWARD

The Whole Gospel for the Whole World, by Alan Walker.
(Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London, 8s. 6d.)

Slight though this volume is, it strikes a different note from most current writing concerning evangelism. It insists that if modern man is to hear the message of personal salvation that message must be couched in a social context. Only then is the whole Gospel being proclaimed.

"The evangelist in our world who, when asked for comment on the hydrogen bomb and atomic war, says: 'No comment' . . . who looks on the racial ferment of the world and says: 'No comment' may save trouble for himself, but he has no full saving word for this generation." To try to tackle the 20th century with a 19th-century theology is not only hopeless but can be pernicious. "Some forms of narrow evangelism have contributed more than their share to the shame of unethical religion."

But will not the broadening of the presentation lessen evangelistic passion? The question is often nervously asked, with a certain trembling for the ark. William Temple, described by our author as "that great Archbishop," ought to be sufficient reassurance. Alan Walker himself is certainly living proof that to take stock of the great social issues of our day, at bottom moral, can increase the yearning to win men for Christ. He is in no danger of becoming a mere social reformer. "Personal evangelism without the fashioning of a social conscience is largely futile. Social witness which has lost touch with its evangelical base is impotent."

The best-known evangelist in Australia, Alan Walker, left the Superintendency of the Sydney Methodist Mission to direct Australia's Mission to the Nation, launched in 1953. There are several references to this Mission throughout the book and a brief account of it is given in an appendix.

E. G. Homrighausen of the World Council of Churches declares in the Introduction that Alan Walker occupies a significant place in ecumenical Christianity, while in a Foreword Dr. W. E. Sangster, who has seen his work in Australia, American and Europe, urges Christians everywhere to face up to the challenge the book presents.

K. C. DYKES

The Baptist Union: A Short History, by Ernest A. Payne. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 21s.)

The task of the historian is not only to record the events of the past but also to trace the developing pattern in these events. On occasions the historian is accused of discovering patterns where there are none, of imposing his own interpretation upon the happenings he describes. In this present book, Dr. Payne can never have been in danger of laying himself open to this accusation for

the pattern is crystal clear. The history records the process of the growing together of autonomous Baptist churches of differing emphases—both theological and non-theological. Not surprisingly, it is a story of remarkable achievement in the face of difficulties and disappointments and we are led through periods of sunshine and cloud, of hopes and fears. We are reminded of the founding of the Union in the vestry of John Rippon's church in Carter Lane, close to the southern end of old London Bridge. We are told of the first years of the Union's striving to clarify its purpose; years of organization and re-organization; of progress under J. H. Millard and especially in the latter years of the nineteenth century under S. H. Booth. After the disturbing events of the Down Grade Controversy—a disturbing yet fascinating story—we are brought to the threshold of the twentieth century with the Union ready for further advance. At that point there came into office J. H. Shakespeare, a prophet amongst Free Church leaders. The story of the development of the Union under Shakespeare in the years immediately prior to the first world war is quite outstanding. In this period the Baptist Church House was built; almost all the departments of the Union were developed; considerable sums of money were raised and, in fact, the Union as we now know it came into being. Events from 1920 onwards are of more recent memory, with attempts to halt the decline in church membership by various schemes of evangelism; with more money raising and with further organizational development bringing still closer together the churches within the denominational body.

The unfolding story is told carefully and often vividly. It is a book which is indispensable to anyone who genuinely desires to understand how the denomination stands today and the problems and decisions it faces. That means it should be in the hands of every member of every Baptist church in fellowship with the Union, for the story is unfinished. The pattern of growing together is clear enough but it is as yet incomplete. To the present reviewer, fascinating though the story was and essential though it was to read, the most thought-provoking section in the whole book was the Introduction in which Dr. Payne summarizes in masterly fashion the chief achievements of the 150 years and shows that certain questions concerning the Union must now be faced.

“For a century and a half—indeed, for three hundred years—successive generations of Baptists have wrestled with the problems involved in the effective co-operation of local churches which claim to be autonomous. What should be the basis of association or union? What its functions? How should it be related to other societies within the denomination? What should be the relationship of the Union to other denominations

and churches whose policy is of a different kind? These questions have become more complicated and pressing of recent decades. They do not admit of easy answers or ones simply in terms of what is practical or expedient. Inevitably they raise theological issues concerning the nature of the Church and the purpose of God." (p. 2.)

There was only one man who could have written this book and that was Dr. Payne, but it is inevitable that although he writes as a Baptist historian he cannot but write also remembering that he is the General Secretary of the Union whose story he tells. Clearly then he can, in his Introduction, only ask the questions without suggesting how they can be answered. This is a pity but inevitable. Some may feel that the Introduction is out of place in this book but it seems to this reviewer that it provides the essential link with the first chapter of a new book which can and must now be written entitled *The Baptist Union: Its Implications and its Theology*. In his Preface Dr. Payne suggests that some readers may find it more congenial to read the Introduction at the end rather than at the beginning. It should, however, be read both before and after reading the rest of the book. Through a movement of the Spirit a General Union was formed in 1813 and under God has existed and prospered and moves now towards its Ter-Jubilee. The decade during which this Ter-Jubilee is celebrated should be a period of thinking through and establishing on a sound theological basis this inheritance.

Apart from the colouring of the jacket, the Carey Kingsgate Press are to be congratulated on an excellently produced volume, properly indexed and with eleven useful appendices.

W. M. S. WEST