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

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

THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY

incorporating the Transactions of the BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITORIAL

THE list of members published on pp. 94-6 of this issue has been carefully checked for accuracy but we shall welcome notifications of any corrections which need to be made. For this purpose a postcard to the secretary or treasurer is all that is needed and such will be gratefully received. Another reason for printing the list is the belief that it will help in a drive for new members for our Society. Existing members will know of people who could be approached and a glance down the list will doubtless suggest others. Application forms are available from the secretary but we hope that our members will seize every recruiting opportunity, whether or not they happen to have a form by them. It will suffice so long as the name and address are clearly notified and accompanied by the appropriate subscription. A drive to enlist more supporters scarcely needs justifying in these pages. The Society's work may be unobtrusive but it is important and worthy of the backing of many more than those whose names appear on the membership list at present. Our finances also stand in serious need of reinforcement. It would not take a very great effort to double our numbers. One has only to think, for example, of the flourishing state of our Baptist student societies in recent years to realise that there must be many now in our churches who might be expected to give us their support. We hope that all members will put their thinking caps on and start making those personal contacts which will turn this recruiting effort into a resounding success.

A valuable piece of research from the pen of Mr. C. B. Jewson has appeared in *Norfolk Archaeology* (Vol. XIII). In it he investigates a return of conventicles made for the diocese of Norwich in 1669. The bishop reported to Archbishop Sheldon on eighty-one conventicles or illegal religious societies and this return was the first official account of dissenting bodies in the diocese subsequent to the Restoration and Great Ejectment. Of these only a handful were Baptist. The Quakers, on the other hand, had twenty-one known meetings but Mr. Jewson's suggestion that this total may owe something to the fact that the Quakers scorned secrecy is a reminder that the official list would probably be incomplete for most bodies, including the Independents who were reported as having twenty-nine conventicles. After an introductory survey of the return Mr. Jewson proceeds to an examination of all the conventicles included in it and he provides many detailed notes on them and their leaders. It is a fine piece of investigation, the kind of painstaking work on which historical knowledge is built up. One's only regret is that like the bishop in 1669, Mr. Jewson was unable to identify No. 28, the meeting at Great Snoring. It consisted of thirty to forty persons, contemptuously summed up by the bishop as mostly " silly women."

The General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations is the ministerial counterpart of the better known Dissenting Deputies. With the Deputies the General Body shared in the efforts which eventually led to the removal of most of the disabilities under which Nonconformists once laboured in this country. Although the ecclesiastical situation is vastly different today the General Body still meets twice a year, remembering that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance and remembering, too, that from the beginning it was concerned not only with the freedom of its constituent denominations but with the maintenance and extension of civil and religious liberties generally. It still possesses its ancient privilege of personal access to the Sovereign. An outline of its history by Dr. Geoffrey F. Nuttall has recently been reprinted and this is available, price 1/-, from the Carey Kingsgate Press.

April, 1963

Baptist Wriothesley Noel

ANGLICAN — EVANGELICAL — BAPTIST

THE TIMES of Tuesday, November 28th, 1848, carried a note of great interest to the Establishment. Tucked discreetly in the midst of page five, it briefly reported the secession of a famous cleric from the Church of England. The fanfare that accompanied the withdrawal of John Henry Newman from the discipline of Canterbury to that of Rome had scarcely begun to subside when the secession of the Evangelical party's leading spokesman, Baptist W. Noel, erupted on the London church scene.

On Sunday, November 26th, St. John's Chapel in Bedford Row was crowded to overflowing. *The Times* reporter was barely able to obtain standing room, for ". . . a large number of persons were evidently attracted to the Chapel by curiosity, to ascertain the 'reasons' assigned by Noel for his proximate secession from the established church. They were, however, 'sent empty away' for the rev. gentleman, in the course of his long and able discourse, did not make the most remote allusion to the subject."[1] Although the formal announcement of Noel's move had been made on the previous Wednesday evening, the *Times* correspondent intimates that the possibility of the event had been an open secret for some time. The Bishop of London had either been completely unaware of the developing situation or had chosen a "wait and see" policy, for it was not until November 28th that he sent for the erring cleric. When the bishop discovered that the rumours were true he forbade Noel from further preaching within the diocese of London. Noel chose however to ignore the bishop's order since he had not had the opportunity to speak to his entire congregation. His immediate concern was for the welfare of the congregation whom he wished to provide with ample time for filling the pulpit with strong leadership, hopefully within six months.[2]

Thus it was on Sunday, December 3rd, 1848, at the age of fifty years, that Noel took his leave from the St. John's Chapel and his career in the Established Church. Noel's secession was symptomatic of the increasing pressure within the Establishment to silence the offensive Evangelical party. This piously motivated group within the Church of England was an outgrowth of the Wesleyan revivals of the eighteenth century, revivals that brought rise to a rejuvenated nonconformity but failed to "leaven the lump" of the lethargic state church. The pious Anglican Wesley had filled the pews of

dissent but had only a slight impact upon his own communion. Yet the evangelicalism of Wesley nevertheless had a tremendous influence upon the few. The names of Wilberforce, Macaulay, John and Henry Thornton, and John Newton are but a sampling of those within the church that heeded the call to personal piety and sustained evangelism. The tremendous influence of this group (which never constituted more than ten per cent of the church) receded sharply in the period immediately following the death of Wilberforce in 1833. While Newman was riding the crest of his move for reformation, Noel was being dragged under by the ecclesiastical crosscurrent and undertow which finally precipitated his secession.[3]

Noel, the brother of the Earl of Gainsborough, was born at Leightmount, Scotland, in 1798. He was the sixteenth child and eleventh son of Sir Gerald Noel, Bart. Educated at Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge, he received his M.A. in 1821. Before taking orders Baptist had for some time strongly considered reading for the bar and had been tutored by a special pleader in the Temple. He however abandoned the idea and turned to the church.

His first charge was for a brief time as curate of Cosington, Leicestershire, quite near the Gainsborough ancestral home at Oakham.[4] Although there is nothing to indicate when he chose to follow the religious pattern of the evangelical we can be certain that he had become vocal in his views at some time prior to 1827 for in that year he was called to serve St. John's Chapel in Bedford Row, London. St. John's Chapel was in itself a strange entity for it was wholly subscribed by local evangelicals and merely tolerated by the parish incumbent. It had had such famous preachers as Thomas Scott, Richard Cecil and Daniel Wilson in its brief history, as well as the better known lay names of Wilberforce, Thornton and Macaulay. Following a line of well known evangelical pastors into this unconsecrated pulpit, Noel soon established himself as the leader of the evangelicals in the metropolitan area.

A vigorous advocate of the stylized evangelical approach to religion he was in the *avant-garde* of those promoting home and foreign missions. Perhaps his earliest incursion into print was in the form of an open letter to the Bishop of London concerning the spiritual condition of the metropolis. His conclusion can be summed up quite simply—deplorable.[5] This letter published in 1835 was to be an accurate portent of things to come for it was not enough that he held an unconsecrated pulpit but that from almost the beginning of his ministry he was to stand in open criticism of the established pattern of the national church.

His interest in the educational needs of England's children earned him a place on a board of enquiry constituted by the Royal Com-

mission on Education. This board was created to evaluate the effectiveness of the elementary schools of Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool and certain other towns. His visits included both National and Lancastrian schools and in both systems he found reason to be dismayed. Questioning the schoolboys he received an overwhelming number of abysmal and ridiculous answers. He was on occasion told that Liverpool was an island; Lancashire was one of the great towns of England; and Asia and America were European countries. The recommendations made by Noel included government help in school construction: government provision of teacher training schools: the subsidization of the better masters with government funds; the production of new textbooks (offering prizes to the authors) that would be unobjectionable to all parties concerned; prizes for tracts to educate the parents to the need of their children's education and finally prizes for tracts dealing with the overall need for popular education.

Although laudable by modern standards of educational thought his report as published in 1842 brought immediate and violent censure from nonconformity's leading editor, the Baptist Thomas Price of *The Eclectic Review*. (The student of Victorian voluntaryism has no trouble in understanding and predicting the criticisms levelled against Noel's plan of reforming the educational system.) Basically the objections of Price were focused on Noel's "pessimism" with regard to the results achieved by the nonconformist-supported British and Foreign School Society and secondarily against the "blatant" invitation of government interference in education.[6]

During the Chartist agitation in 1841 Noel was thrust into the public eye when his one penny *Plea for the Poor* appeared in the booksellers' shops. This plea constituted the sole pamphlet from an Anglican's pen denouncing the Corn Laws. Information provided by the publisher of this pamphlet indicates that at least 23,000 copies of this free-trade tract were circulated.[7]

That same year Noel was gazetted as one of Queen Victoria's chaplains despite the strenuous objections of many churchmen. *The Quarterly Review* chose this occasion to review both the *Plea for the Poor* and the event of the gazetting. "We have read this pamphlet, and, had it been anonymous, we should have thought it to be the work of some crazy canter . . ." The gazetting is ". . . an outrage on decency, on the Church, on the Constitution, and on the Queen's Majesty, only to be equalled by the former presentation at Court of the socialist Owen."[8] The Anti-Corn Law League later used excerpts from the *Plea* to support its nation-wide agitation. His free-trade opinions coupled with his outspoken comments on the Establishment had drawn invective glances from the Church during the early 1840's. This estrangement became most

evident in 1845 over the question of the increased endowment of the Roman Catholic Maynooth College.

This seminary in Ireland had been founded by the government to court the allegiance of the Irish priest in the days of the French Revolution. Prior to Maynooth all of the Irish priesthood had been educated in France. There was no immediate opposition to the college; however, within the short span of fifty years, it constituted one of the most bitterly fought issues to arise between organized religion and the Parliament. It is a unique instance of the Church and Nonconformity organizing to oppose a bill that proposed to increase aid by the state (from £9,000 to £26,000 per annum) to the seminary for "popish priests." The principles behind the opposition were radically different. The Nonconformists opposed it because of their concerted opposition to any state subsidy of religion; the churchmen opposed it on the grounds that the bill would further jeopardize the favoured position of the Establishment in Ireland.

As an Evangelical representative, Noel had been requested by the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee (Anglican) to accompany Sir Culling Eardley Smith to Dublin to investigate the problem at first hand. Noel refused to go unless he were able to exercise complete liberty of judgment and speech on the issue. The committee declined to relinquish such a privilege to a man it obviously felt (from past experience) would not hold the party line. The refusal kept Noel in England but it failed to keep him quiet. Noel soon appeared at the very vortex of the agitation by answering the "faithlessness" of the committee with a vigorous letter to the Irish Protestant Bishop of Cashel.

This open letter was entitled quite simply *The Catholic Claims*. The theme of the polemic rested on the premise that any subsidization of religion—Roman, Established or Dissenting—was an illegal infringement of the state upon religion. He called for ". . . those who think the principle of that measure unsound, to consider what course their duty prescribes to them for the future." Thomas Price of *The Eclectic Review* in a disarming burst of enthusiasm claimed that ". . . the appearance of a letter like this from such a man is a significant sign of the times . . . The church question is obviously becoming the question of the times . . ." The publication of such a tract ". . . required a more than ordinary strength of conviction, a rare superiority to the prejudices of his class, and a degree of moral courage with which few are endowed."[9]

The stimulus for this commentary came from Noel's final analysis in which he denied that the church had sanction to receive state financial support or be subjected to any form of external interference.

> "If parliament cannot legislate in favour of true religion (Anglican) they are bound not to legislate against it; if they think it imprudent to support the truth alone, let them leave both truth and error unsupported: . . . Having maintained twelve hundred Protestant ministers in Ireland, that they may preach the gospel to the people, because it was right, ministers (of the government) seem now disposed to educate and maintain two thousand priests to contradict them, because it is expedient. Two great theological armies in the field, each bent on the rout and ruin of the other, they are henceforth to be both generously supplied with ammunition from the same arsenal."[10]

Donning the mantle of prophecy Noel declared that the " . . . principle of paying all creeds is so irreligious, that no nation which is not generally irreligious can long endure it. On this account it seems probable that the maintenance of the Roman Catholic priest would seal the doom of the three establishments in England, Scotland, and Ireland . . . already had the Maynooth Bill given the greatest shock to the establishments of the United Kingdom which they have yet received: and should its principle lead further to the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church, they must shortly fall."[11]

Not content to register only his opinion on the religious issue he attacked the government's overall Irish policy. He argued that if England were to be called a Christian nation with any justification, she must not only give the six and one-half million Irishmen religious freedom but that they must also be given their political freedom. Ireland must have fair laws, a fair administration of justice, representation in Parliament, a fair share of the honours and emolument of the state and help for her starving people. Finally, the Irish must be released from being " . . . called to maintain a national establishment of Protestant ministers to subvert their own creed . . . You call it religious; we declare it to be unjust . . . RELIGIOUS EQUALITY OR REPEAL."[12]

With tongue in cheek, Noel supported his proposals by outlining two ways of approaching a solution to the Irish problem: raise the pay of the priest to that of the Protestant or bring the Protestant down to the level of the priest. One thing was manifestly clear in 1845: the Maynooth Grant was but a pittance, wholly inadequate for its intended task; if endowment is the way then it must in fairness be equal; since the Roman Catholics outnumber the Protestants eight to one then there should be eight times the priests and prelates; since the established church receives £550,000 per year the Roman communion should have £4,400,000 to be equitable; the Roman prelates must not only have reasonable incomes but they must also have seats in the Lords; there is no way out—for

either you pay the ministers of all denominations or you pay none.

The author's passion for a church freely supported by the people and without any form of coercion led him to suggest further that as the present incumbents died, the state should sell the property of the Establishment to the benefit of Roman and Protestant alike. This was based on the historical observation: "What the state took from the Catholic priests, because it believed that their holding of it was detrimental to the general welfare, it may certainly withhold from Protestant ministers, when all parties see that they could not receive it without similar detriment to the commonwealth . . ."

Finally in a rather more personal vein Noel urged the Bishop of Cashel and his churchmen to advocate their own disestablishment and that of the entire Irish Church. It is at this moment that the evangelical colours fly from the argumentative masthead. Underlying the thesis advocated by Noel was the conviction that the church in Ireland had completely failed to be a missionary church. The doctrine of evangelism—the heart and soul of the Wesleyan conviction—began to speak most clearly in this letter: "Long has the church been rendered incapable of efficient action, by the enmity with which state patronage has surrounded it, but should you now organize a missionary system for the whole island, and all your English brethren to your aid so that the Gospel may be heard in every village, not only in your churches to which the Catholics will not come, but to wherever they may be gathered to listen; the truths of the Gospel, unchecked in their influence by the bitterness . . . generated among the peasantry, may effect a religious change in Ireland . . ."[13]

The missioning emphasis of Noel's theology was forced to turn to the forces of organized nonconformity for expression. From the early days of his London ministry he had been closely associated with evangelical nonconformity and its far-flung missionary interests. Under the auspices of the Evangelical Society he undertook a trip to France in 1846 to visit its mission stations. Noel was also instrumental in the founding of the Evangelical Alliance. His drift from the establishment, in one sense, began on the day that he inherited the rich traditions of St. John's Chapel and did not end until after his resignation in December of 1848. *The Baptist Magazine* in May of 1849 claimed that Noel's secession had cost him a bishop's chair. This observation based solely on his aristocratic heritage did not take into account the scope of his activities within the church. The Evangelicals in 1832 had only one man in the House of Bishops that could be described as sympathetic to their theological position. There is little question in this writer's mind that Noel had so completely cut the political ground from beneath his feet that, notwithstanding his being a Queen's chaplain, he had no chance for the coveted mitre.[14]

A brief two weeks (December 14th) after his resignation, Noel put into the hands of James Nisbet, a London publisher, the preface for a book entitled *Essay on the Union of Church and State.* This book was to be a definitive statement on the reasons for his secession. This was the answer that the people who swelled his congregation on November 28th had expected.[15] The preface began: "As . . . I have frankly attacked the Union between Church and State, I feel constrained to bear my humble testimony to the piety and worth of many who uphold it." He pointedly defends the spiritual character of priest, layman, and prelate and yet obviously feels that only the evangelical churchman possesses the necessary quality of piety A clear dichotomy is drawn between the evangelical and the non-evangelical clergy; ". . . between those who preach the Gospel and those who do not preach it."[16]

Within Noel's biblically-oriented concept of the church he emphasized that it can be constituted only by a group of believers. "Statesmanship no more qualifies to direct the affairs of a Church, then piety qualifies to direct the affairs of a nation. Let each keep to its own sphere of action."[17] He indicated that though a proposal to change the rubrics may in itself be valuable, those in whose hands such a revision was to be done were not qualified. The members of Parliament involved might be men of high principle or no principle—Roman Catholic, Anglo-Catholic, Deist, Socinian, Swedenborgians or Quakers: "They may be religious or profane, young men of gaiety and fashion or old men of inveterate immorality; they may be wealthy or steeped in debt; absolutists sighing for the resurrection of Laud and Strafford, or democrats, who in their dreams see bright visions of republicanism; they may be sportsmen, who are ever foremost at the death of the fox, or keener civic hunters after gold; they may be lovers of pleasure, whose employments are seldom more serious than the opera, and who enter the House of Commons for amusement." And shall this be the council that sits in judgment upon the church of Christ?

The copy of the *Essay* housed by the British Museum provides us with the response of a contemporary churchman to the above argument. He, in a scribbled margin note, writes "i.e. to allow the 'Evangelical' clergy (no more despotic animals in existence) to have their own way." This response to Noel's plea for the ending of secular interference is passionately underlined.[18]

Using the Bible as the rule of faith, the essay demands the dissolution of the union between church and state because ". . . the actual state is irreligious" and there is no scriptural basis for such a union. The argument moves through Mosaic law, prophecy and the New Testament, in each instance supporting the author's claims for disestablishment. "By the Union an irreligious govern-

ment binds the churches hand and foot, rules over them with a rod of iron, will allow no self-government, no reformation, no independent discipline, and is their absolute, irresponsible Lord." Each Christian church should maintain its own pastor on the New Testament model and in the event that poverty prevents this ideal, then other churches should freely support the work.

Noel used his favourite literary weapon of ridicule to pan the Parliament's right to ". . . determine how many successors of apostles there shall be." A minister much less a bishop should never be imposed upon a congregation. The church must maintain its right to the exercise of patronage. In concluding the first half of his essay, which is primarily concerned with political factors, he points to the symptomatic evil of the church rate and tithe. Though he offers nothing new from the cries of distaste that had been coming from Dissent there is a great deal of significance in the similarity of expression. His first set of conclusions reveal the four main principles which served, in his opinion, to buttress the union: ". . . the legal maintenance of the pastors . . . a selfish and covetous disregard of positive duty . . . the supremacy of the State . . . infidelity to Christ, their King and Head." The situation produced patronage ". . . which is destructive to their spiritual welfare." It also "renders them schismatical towards their dissenting brethren and uncharitable to every other recusant. All these four principles are unscriptural, corrupt, and noxious; and by placing the churches of Christ under the influence of men of the world, hinder their free action, destroy their spirituality, and perpetuate their corruptions."[20]

Obviously much of the passion with which this man wrote was produced by the frustration that he met while trying to serve his Christian calling according to his evangelical bent. The claim is made, with wearisome repetition, that only the evangelical churchman is worthy of the cloth that he wears. At one point Noel estimated that only ten per cent of the clergy did their job according to their calling and the rest according to the law.[21]

> "The evangelical minister of an Anglican church is . . . placed in a miserable position. He must not preach Christ in private houses, nor enter into any neighbouring parish where an ungodly minister is leading the people to destruction; he must baptize the infants of ungodly persons; he must teach his parishioners, against all observation, that these infants are members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of heaven; he must take unregenerate young persons at the age of fifteen or sixteen to be pronounced regenerate by the bishop; he must admit all sorts of persons to the Lord's table, though they are not invited by Christ, and must finally, when they die, express his thanks to God

that they are taken to glory, when he has every reason to think that they are lost for ever."[22]

Although Noel's prose tends to be verbose it nevertheless overcomes this overt weakness with a vigorous style that never allows the reader to forget that a crucial issue is before him. The issue for Noel is not merely a political juncture or liaison between the church of Christ and an ungodly national government. The supreme moment of truth for this renegade Anglican is the realization that the union destroys the church's ability to fully preach the Gospel and live the *evangel.* The only solution was a spiritual revival that will destroy the union and bring rebirth to the national church.

"No religious cause requires irreligious means for its advancement. Let us disgrace ourselves by no railing, condemn all personal invective, and be guilty of no exaggeration, for these are the weapons of the weak and the unprincipled; but uniting with all those who love the Redeemer, let us recognize with gratitude every work of the Spirit within the Establishment as well as without it."[23] The above was written by a man who, though filled with passion against a foe, recognized that not all men stood under his condemnation and that there were many of his party who saw fit to remain within the frustrations of the church. Noel continually strove to maintain close ties with these men and to do all that was possible to prevent their alienation from Nonconformity during the latter agitation for disestablishment.[24]

Noel's call for the disestablishment of the Church of England was closely related to his earlier demands for ending the fiasco-laden situation of the Irish Church. Yet in the midst of men who were calling for force to end the union he consistently maintained a line devoted solely to argument and persuasion, denying both the use of physical force and political action. He steadfastly refused to join the Liberation Society or to appear on its platform. However, excerpts of his many writings, particularly the *Essay on the Union of Church and State,* appeared in the publications of the Liberation Society.

One area in which his thinking on the English scene was divergent from his former opinion of the Irish problem, concerned the vast properties of the English establishment. In the early 1840's he had advocated that the Irish church be disendowed as well as disestablished; in the *Essay* however he maintained that the English church should not face disendowment.

Although Noel's mind was firmly resolved to leaving the Establishment it would seem that his plans for the future were undetermined. For some time he seemingly faltered in what appeared to be an inevitable course towards dissent. After leaving his own pulpit he attended the parish church at Hornsey for some time. Then

on March 25th, 1849, he preached at the Scottish church in Regent Square. This was his initial venture into a pulpit outside of the church. Later he took the oaths of 52 George III formalizing his status as a dissenting minister, and during the month of May he preached in the Weigh House Chapel. His return to Bedford Row was cause for comment for on August 9th he was rebaptized by immersion at the John Street Baptist Chapel (virtually next door to St. John's Chapel). Called to serve this chapel in the following September he remained with its congregation until his retirement in 1868. A man whose leadership had already been recognized by one communion was welcomed with open arms by the Baptist Union of Great Britain whom he served as President in 1855 and 1867.

Unpopular causes seemed to lie at the very centre of his life. A total abstainer, he was a prominent advocate of the Temperance Movement during a time when a dry Baptist (or Nonconformist for that matter) was as rare as a unicorn. In one of Noel's rare political appearances, Joseph Parker writes of his speaking at Manchester's Free Trade Hall in defence of the North in 1863 during the American Civil War. He spoke, said Parker, ". . . in his own plaintive and gentle way."[25]

One of Noel's most satisfying experiences was participating in the Sunday evening services which were conducted at Exeter Hall, and supported by the last of the prominent Evangelical churchmen, Lord Shaftesbury. When the parish incumbent forced an end to this attempt to reach the unconverted masses of London it fortified his scepticism towards the church he felt compelled to leave. After a long illness Baptist Wriothesley Noel died at Stanmore, Middlesex, on January 19th, 1873.

Too often the historian exercising his prerogative of hindsight, tends to minimize the courage of his historical predecessors. Although Noel will never be able to muster the impact of Cardinal Newman upon the nation's history it required the same cut of courage to be a dissenter. These words of Thomas Price are flowery in good nineteenth century style and yet valuable because they give us the opinion of a contemporary of this very unusual man: ". . . though the days of martyrs and confessors have passed away for ever, the course he has adopted in relinquishing those prospects, to which his birth, his attainments, and his character, entitled him, brings his orbit far within the circumference of their undying glory."[26]

NOTES

[1] *The Times,* London, November 28th, 1848, p. 5.

[2] *The Times,* November 30th, 1848, p. 3; December 1st, p. 5. Although there is no direct evidence with regard to the Wednesday evening meeting it would appear that Noel announced only his intent and did not set a date for the occurrence.

[3] *Dictionary of National Biography,* vol. xli. NOEL, BAPTIST WRIOTHESLEY. This article is inaccurate in attributing the secession of Noel to the Gorham Case.
[4] *ibid.*
[5] *State of the Metropolis considered in a letter to the Lord Bishop of London,* 2nd ed. 1835, B. W. Noel.
[6] *The Eclectic Review,* T. Price, ed., London, October, 1842, p. 491.
[7] *A Plea for the Poor,* showing how the existing Corn Laws will affect the interests of the Working Classes. B. W. Noel, London, 24 pp.
[8] *The Quarterly Review,* July and Sept. 1841, London, pp. 504-5.
[9] *The Eclectic Review,* August, 1845, p. 312.
[10] *The Catholic Claims,* B. W. Noel, 2nd ed., London, Nisbet, pp. 25-26.
[11] *op. cit.,* pp. 28-29.
[12] *ibid.,* pp. 14-16.
[13] *ibid.,* pp. 46ff.
[14] *The Baptist Magazine,* May, 1849, London, p. 24.
[15] Unfortunately copies of this *magnum opus* are rare items and when one does appear on a bookseller's list its value is unrecognized by the two shillings asked for it.
[16] *Essay on the Union of Church and State,* B. W. Noel, 2nd ed., London, Nisbet, 1849 (604 pp.).
[17] *op. cit.,* p. 20.
[18] *ibid.,* p. 25.
[19] *ibid.,* p. 109.
[20] *ibid.,* pp. 239ff.
[21] *ibid.,* p. 271.
[22] *ibid.,* pp. 468-9.
[23] *ibid.,* p. 604.
[24] He publicly attacked Spurgeon's sermon on Baptismal Regeneration for this specific reason. Cf. A. C. Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists,* London, Kingsgate, 1956, p. 237.
[25] Joseph Parker, *A Preacher's Life,* p. 396.
[26] *Eclectic Review,* December, 1849, p. 664.

KENNETH RICHARD SHORT

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, 1963

We are glad to announce that the special speaker is to be Dr. Robert T. Handy, Professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary, New York. Dr. Handy is an associate editor of *Foundations,* the journal of history and theology published by the American Baptist Historical Society. As previously announced the meeting will be held in the Institute Hall of Westminster Chapel on Monday, 29th April. It will commence at 4.30 p.m. and will be preceded by tea.

Spurgeon and Gladstone

THE historian of the Victorian period is often profoundly grateful that the Victorians were inveterate compilers of scrapbooks. Evidence of the assiduous industry with which press cuttings, photographs, engravings and autograph letters were collected and, with meticulous care, posted in specially manufactured scrapbooks, can be found in the remarkable series of scrapbooks relating to the life of C. H. Spurgeon in the possession of Spurgeon's College, London. Many of these were compiled by Rev. Joseph W. Harrald, Spurgeon's personal secretary whom he used to describe as his "armour bearer." Material for others was gathered, the evidence suggests, by Miss Flora Mary Spurgeon, the great preacher's youngest sister. Miss Spurgeon, it is interesting to note, was awarded the first prize of ten pounds for the best "Teacher's Scrapbook" in a competition organised by *The Sunday School Chronicle* in 1888.[1] It is worth remarking that none of the numerous biographers of Spurgeon seem to have utilised any of the material preserved in the scrapbooks.[2]

In one devoted to recording the celebrations which attended Spurgeon's fiftieth birthday the writer recently discovered two letters from W. E. Gladstone to Spurgeon. They should be added, as hitherto unpublished sources, to the documentary evidence for the friendship of these two great Victorian public figures which is set out in the article by the late Principal H. S. Curr in *The Baptist Quarterly*, Vol. XI, (1942-45), pp. 46-54.

The first letter may easily be set within its historical context. On Sunday evening, January 8th, 1882, Gladstone visited the Metropolitan Tabernacle for divine worship. After his visit Spurgeon wrote to Gladstone remarking on the unfavourable comment which the Prime Minister's presence at a nonconformist place of worship had aroused in some sections of the press, and enclosing a book of views of Westwood, his private residence. Gladstone replied enclosing two photographs, one of Hawarden Castle and the other of himself in his study. This letter, dated January 16th, is printed in Spurgeon's autobiography, volume IV, p. 184. The letter discovered by the writer followed; Gladstone evidently wanted Spurgeon to have a better photograph of Hawarden.

10, Downing Street,
Whitehall.
Jan. 25, 82.

Dear Mr. Spurgeon,

I found at Hawarden yesterday a better representation of the residence, and I do myself the pleasure to ask your acceptance of it. Believe me

Faithfully yours,
W. E. Gladstone.

The second letter congratulates Spurgeon on reaching his fiftieth birthday on June 19th, 1884. To celebrate this event a sum of £4,500 was raised by public subscription. Spurgeon, with characteristic generosity, gave this away. Gladstone's letter is a remarkable tribute to "the Prince of preachers," even when allowance is made for its congratulatory character. Certainly it cannot have been often, if ever, that such a letter has come from 10, Downing Street to a nonconformist preacher.

Private

10, Downing Street,
Whitehall.
June 18, 1884.

My dear Sir,

I cannot avoid writing a line to offer you my hearty congratulations upon the approach of a day full of interest to many who stand beyond the circle, wide as it is, of your immediate hearers, followers and denominational brethren.

I believe that both you and I belong to the number of those who think that all conscientious convictions, once formed, ought to be stoutly maintained, and who would therefore be called strong Denominationalists.

But without prejudice to this persuasion, and outside the points by which our positions are marked off, there happily exists a vast inheritance of truth which we enjoy in common, and which in its central essence forms, so I rejoice to think, the basis of the faith of Christendom. I therefore ask to unite my voice with the voice of thousands in acknowledging the singular power with which you have so long testified before the world "of sin, of righteousness and of judgment," and the splendid uprightness of public character and conduct, which have I believe contributed perhaps equally with your eloquence and mental gifts to win for you so wide an admiration.

I remain my dear Sir,
With sincere respect,
Very faithfully yours,
W. E. Gladstone.

Spurgeon's friendship with Gladstone was on a personal level, but it is worth raising the question as to whether it had any political significance with regard to the cause of Liberalism in the country at large. Spurgeon did not mind who knew of his Liberal sympathies nor, indeed, of his antipathy toward the Tories. He was the acknowledged leader of the evangelical wing of nonconformity. The friendship of Spurgeon was, therefore, worth possessing not

only for its own sake, but also for the indirect political benefits it could carry with it. A Liberal election handbill of the 1892 electoral campaign preserved in one of the Spurgeon scrapbooks seems to bear out the writer's contention that Spurgeon's political influence was not unimportant. To appreciate the poster one has to remember that in 1886 Spurgeon publicly expressed his strong disapproval of Gladstone's plan to grant home rule to Ireland.[3] Clearly Spurgeon's opposition was keenly felt by the Liberal Party, because the handbill quotes from a letter of Spurgeon to Rev. Charles Williams which was written in 1886. Williams read this letter to a public meeting at Accrington on June 27th, 1892. The letter seemed to show that Spurgeon had had second thoughts about his strictures on Gladstone's plan. This was enough for the Liberal candidate. Spurgeon is quoted under the heading: "The late C. H. Spurgeon on Home Rule. Second Thoughts of a great and good man, 'who being dead yet speaketh'." A candid reader will no doubt think that Spurgeon's approval is qualified, but that did not matter to the Liberal electioneer. "The Bill is not what it was at first. Then I thought it reckless. A Home Rule Bill which will suit all three kingdoms would be a fine experiment, and then, if more became needful, more could be given. It may be, as you say, that Mr. Gladstone sees further than the rest of us. O God, bless him. Anyhow, I am his ardent admirer."[4]

Spurgeon was not, as he himself said, a political parson, but it would be wrong to assume that he was without political influence. The handbill shows that his opinions, when publicly expressed, carried weight. The nonconformist vote played a large part in Liberal electoral success, yet paradoxically enough the Liberal leader was an Anglican of what Spurgeon would have called the "Puseyite" variety. How valuable then to Gladstone was the friendship of Spurgeon not only personally but also politically.

NOTES

[1] Scrap-book compiled by Miss Flora Mary Spurgeon, hereinafter designated as F.M.S. Scrap-book.

[2] For the illustrations used in the new and revised edition of Spurgeon's autobiography recently published by the Banner of Truth Trust (London, November, 1962) under the title *The Early Years* (Vols. I and II of the first edition are now incorporated into a single volume), I have drawn upon these scrap-books.

[3] Spurgeon objected to Gladstone's plan to give home rule to Ireland because in his view it would have meant the abandonment of the Ulster loyalists to a Roman Catholic political majority, and an established Irish Roman Catholic Church. "The whole scheme," he said, "is as full of danger and absurdities as if it came from a madman" (1886). Quoted in *Review of Reviews*, August 15th, 1895, pasted in F.M.S. Scrap-book.

[4] F.M.S. Scrap-book.

D. P. KINGDON

The Baptist Theological Seminary of Rüschlikon

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

RUSCHLIKON, Switzerland, is sometimes referred to as "the Baptist centre of Europe." This is not only because geographically it is near the heart of the continent, but because Baptists from so many countries turn to Rüschlikon for a theological education and for international fellowship. The Seminary has become a very important part of European Baptist life.

1. The History of an Idea

When did the idea of such a school originate? The first public mention of it was apparently in 1908, at the first European Baptist Congress. This body, meeting in Berlin, passed a resolution which, among other things, voiced hope for the establishment of "an international Baptist university college in a central place" ("Baptistenhochschule").[1] The only Baptist seminaries then on the European continent were those in Sweden and Germany.

At about the same time some far-seeing people on the other side of the Atlantic were thinking along similar lines. Soon after the opening of this Seminary, Dr. W. O. Carver, professor in Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, wrote to Dr. George W. Sadler expressing joy over what had been achieved and adding:

> More than forty years ago Everett Gill and I discussed much the desirablity that Baptists have a European centre in Zürich. . . . We were thinking about this as a centre for the dissemination of Baptist concepts of freedom in religion and in all ecclesiastical matters. That early base of our Anabaptist forebears holds geographical and cultural relations to the whole of Europe not matched by any other point, not even Geneva, certainly so far as our message and mission are concerned.[2]

The enthusiasm for an international Baptist seminary in Europe reached a high peak in the Baptist World Congress of 1911. The delegates were deeply moved by accounts of the difficulties and heroism of Russian Baptists and by seeing a number of them in the congress. The Russian pioneer, Pavloff, spoke on the Christianization of his land, and he said, "We must have a college for education of our preachers, but under the present conditions it is not

possible to establish it in our country."[3] Rev. A. J. Vining of Canada gave an impassioned address on "A Baptist Training School for Europe," in which he said:

> They plead—these patient veterans of Jesus Christ—for millions who wait for the coming of the trained evangelist, and the pastor who is "apt to teach." Must these men call in vain? Shall we not gladly answer their appeal? There is one way in which their pleadings may be answered—a way in which every man here may make himself heard. Establish a great cosmopolitan Theological Seminary in the heart of Europe! Make it possible for the young Baptist men of the different countries of Europe to receive training that will qualify them to take the continent for Him who is worthy "to receive glory and honour and power." Give the peoples, whose representatives these men are, a training school, in which young Baptist ministers may receive help that will fit them for leadership, and in this hall are hundreds who will live to see Europe a great Protestant, Christian continent, and Russia the mightiest Baptist stronghold on earth . . .
>
> Men of the North, men of the South, men of the East and men of the West, kindle a fire of hope on every mountain peak in Europe today! Send the good news to millions of waiting, watching people, that we have this day decided to establish without delay a training school for the Baptists of Europe.[4]

The Chairman of the Congress announced that a delegation would be sent by the Baptist World Alliance to Russia to negotiate for the establishment of a Baptist university there. Pledges of gifts to start the school were then and there received, and in a short time $66,000 had been promised. Further pledges were given before the congress was over. With the accumulation of interest the fund now held by the Baptist World Alliance for this purpose amounts to $150,000.[5]

At a later session of the 1911 congress a committee of the Southern Baptist Convention presented a plan for the establishment of a Baptist seminary "specially for the training of Baptist Pastors and Evangelists in Southern and South-Eastern Europe." Funds would be furnished mainly by Southern and Northern Baptists, and property would be held by trustees appointed by these two conventions, but contributions by British and Canadian Baptists were foreseen. The school would be managed by a committee of Americans and British appointed by the trustees.[6]

Conditions in Russia at the time and then the first World War made impossible the establishment of the seminary as planned. By the time the Executive Committee of the Alliance and other representative Baptists met in London in the 1920 the enthusiasm for an

international seminary had apparently been lost. However, the importance of theological education was fully recognized. The following resolution was passed : " We regard an educational policy as of primary importance for the extension of the Baptist denomination in Europe, and we consider that the establishment or strengthening of Baptist seminaries for the training of pastors and evangelists should be undertaken without delay."[7] Interesting also is the opinion expressed that Baptist seminaries " should be established, where possible, in the neighbourhood of universities."[8]

2. The Establishment of the Seminary

The idea of an international seminary seems to have lain dormant until the time of the Second World War. Its revival and implementation are to be credited mainly to Dr. George W. Sadler, the statesmanslike Secretary for Africa, Europe, and the Near East of the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board. Influenced little if at all by previous thinking along this line, he and other Southern Baptists, notably Dr. Theron M. Rankin, General Secretary of the Board, began to think and talk of a school where men from many different European countries could be trained for the ministry. This would be a significant contribution to the evangelization of Europe, the strengthening of the Baptist denomination, and the achievement of international understanding and world peace.

When the war ended, action was taken to make the dream of an international seminary come true. On April 7th, 1948, the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board endorsed Dr. Sadler's recommendation for the " establishment of a Baptist Theological Seminary of graduate level in Europe, probably at Geneva."[9] It was anticipated that the original investment would amount to $200,000 and that $50,000 a year would be needed for maintenance.

When in August of 1948, at a European Conference in London called by the Baptist World Alliance to consider post-war strategy, Southern Baptists announced their intention to establish a seminary in Switzerland, considerable hesitation was expressed. Many people thought that if an international seminary were established it should be under the auspices of the Baptist World Alliance or at least of an international committee. They were suspicious of the motives and distrustful of the ability of Southern Baptists. However, Dr. Sadler announced firmly but courteously that Southern Baptists had decided to establish the seminary and would carry out their plans.

The Conference then adopted the report of its Committee on Theological Education, which included the following :

> The Committee stress the need for seminaries where national groups can teach their ministers in the languages in which they

will preach the Gospel to their people and with special reference to the problems of their own nation.

It was agreed, however, that beside these, and in no way replacing them, there is need of a seminary in Europe which shall be more than a national institution, a seminary which may satisfy the educational needs of several countries and which may be more of a graduate school than some of the smaller seminaries.

The Committee recognize with gratitude the generosity of the brothers of the Southern Baptist Convention of the United States in their plans to establish a seminary in Switzerland which will serve wider than national interests.[10]

It is rather generally recognized now that the Seminary would not have come into being if one Baptist group had not taken the responsibility for it. Because of their numbers, Southern Baptists were better able than any other body to make the kind of investment that was called for. In the first Rüschlikon Trustees' Meeting (1950) Dr. Sadler said :

> It might seem impertinent for one Baptist group to decide to establish an institution of this sort in a distant land, but we knew that such an institution was needed and decided to go ahead. We hope that you do not think that we were unduly impertinent or presumptuous. We certainly have no selfish ends to serve. We have no desire to supplant any other seminary. There should be ample evidence of this in the gifts that have been made to the seminaries in Oslo, Hamburg, Rivoli and Holland, the support given to the seminaries in the Balkans and in Hungary, and the small amount contributed to repair the cloisters of Spurgeon's College. We are not thinking in terms of supplanting but of supplementing the educational efforts of this continent.[11]

The London Conference of 1948 adopted a resolution abolishing the system established in 1920 of having specified Baptist groups co-operate financially and otherwise with particular European Baptist unions.

It was decided that any national Baptist organization should be "free to co-operate with any other Baptist bodies or Mission boards within the fellowship of the B.W.A.," with the understanding that there would be consultation and co-operation to avoid duplication or neglect.[12] Though not intended specifically to do so, this opened up the possibility of a more thoroughly international institution than was at first envisaged by Southern Baptists. They had originally thought that students would come mainly from those countries of

southern and eastern Europe for which the Southern Baptist Convention had been given responsibility in 1920.

Not long after the London meeting the seminary property in Rüschlikon was purchased. Other sites in the Geneva and Zürich areas were considered, but none seemed nearly so adequate as the Bodmer estate, with its forty-room mansion. The purchase price was approximately $240,000.[13]

Two faculty members, Dr. John D. W. Watts and Dr. John Allen Moore, had already been appointed. Dr. J. D. Franks, who had been serving for some time as Southern Baptists' relief representative in Europe, was made business manager of the seminary and chairman of the seminary committee. These men and their wives took up residence in the newly acquired building and made arrangements for the opening of the seminary. The building had to be furnished, household and office staff members employed, seminary standards and curriculum determined, satisfactory relations with European Baptists established, new faculty members enlisted, and students enrolled. All of these things, and still others, were accomplished.

One of the most significant early developments was the formation of a Board of Trustees made up of Baptists from many different European countries. They were nominated by national Baptist unions and elected by the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board. That most unions nominated their best men in education or denominational administration indicated that European Baptists took seriously the new venture in Rüschlikon. Since the trustees were not responsible for raising funds, their functions were different from those of most trustees. Their duties as outlined in the first trustees' meeting were as follows: to act as a liaison between the seminary and national Baptist groups, to select students who would profit from study in Rüschlikon, to advise the seminary concerning needs in the various countries and ways in which Rüschlikon might help to meet those needs, to help correlate the different school systems and set up standards for admission, and to serve on advisory committees.[14]

The seminary began its first session in September of 1949 under the leadership of Dr. Sadler, who had agreed to serve as acting president during the first year. Besides Dr. Watts and Dr. Moore, the faculty included Dr. Arthur B. Crabtree of England and Claus Meister of Switzerland (soon to receive a doctorate in the University of Basle), who was engaged to teach in a Preparatory Department. Dr. Franks was administration secretary and chairman of public relations.[15] Twenty-eight students, including two Methodists, of sixteen nationalities were enrolled during the first session.[16]

Dr. Sadler (speaking of what the seminary ought to become) declared to the trustees in March of 1950:

1. We do not believe that there is any conflict between Christianity and sound scholarship. We do not want to be high-brow, but we do want to offer the best in Christ-centred education and scholarship.
2. We are now thinking in terms of offering a Bachelor of Divinity Degree. All three of the Southern Baptist Seminaries in America have agreed to recognize and give full credit for all courses and work completed here.[17]

3. The First Fourteen Years

In April of 1963 the Seminary will complete its fourteenth academic year. What has happened during the past fourteen years?

Since no educational institution can rise very far above its faculty, the building up of a strong teaching staff in Rüschlikon has been a major concern through the years. The Seminary, being supported by gifts for missions, has not been in a position to compete with great universities and seminaries so far as salaries are concerned, and it has not offered the challenge of dealing with large numbers of students; but some unusually competent people have appreciated and accepted the opportunity of teaching here.

Dr. Sadler says, "Perhaps the most outstanding event of the first year was the election of Dr. Josef Nordenhaug as president."[18] His Norwegian birth and education, his training in Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, his editorship of *The Commission,* and his American citizenship qualified him well for the leadership of an international seminary. During the ten years of his presidency (1950-1960)—terminated to accept the position of General Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance—he rendered distinguished service in many ways, some of which will appear in the remarks which follow. The point to be emphasized just here is that he was a member of the faculty as well as an administrator and that one of his achievements was the building up of the faculty. Of great assistance to him was Dr. J. D. Franks, who served as business manager of the Seminary until his retirement in 1954.

Three of the original faculty members—Dr. Watts, Dr. Moore, and Dr. Meister—have provided the continuity so necessary for a school by remaining in Rüschlikon (except for periodic absences) until the present time. Dr. Crabtree left in 1957 to accept a position in America. Since 1957 Dr. Watts has held with distinction the position of Dean. Dr. Vella Jane Burch has been librarian since 1952; Dr. Günter Wagner of Germany has been teaching in the Seminary since 1958, Dr. Byron A. Clendinning since 1959, and Dr. Joseph R. Estes since 1961. I joined the faculty in 1952 and became President in 1960. The following persons have been members of the teaching staff: Dr. Heber F. Peacock, 1950-55; Dr. G. R. Beasley-Murray, 1956-1958; and Dr. Thomas E. McCollough,

1958-1961. The school has profited from the services of several visiting professors, including Drs. Sydner L. Stealey, Gunnar Westin, R. C. Briggs, Theron D. Price, W. O. Lewis, J. P. Allen, Jesse J. Northcutt, Dale Moody, Gaines S. Dobbins, Pope Duncan, Wayne Ward and Gordon R. Lahrson.

During the years the curriculum has experienced significant developments—but always in the direction originally foreseen. A small bulletin issued during the first seminary session states:

> The curriculum of the Seminary is based on four years of study comparable to courses in the U.S.A. and England leading to the Bachelor of Divinity degree, and to the regular theological courses in continental universities. The prerequisites for this course include graduation from a recognized Gymnasium with courses in Latin, Greek, History and English (or the passing of an examination to show a proficiency in these subjects . . .) . . . Recognizing the needs of many men for training in Christian service who do not yet have the full classical background of the Gymnasium, the Seminary has established a preparatory course for instruction in the most necessary subjects.[19]

After two years the Preparatory Department was abolished, since it was thought that students could best do their pre-university or pre-seminary work in their own countries. The four-year B.D. course became the heart of the Seminary curriculum. It was decided not to admit students to it on the basis of examination but only, as in the case of most universities, upon completion of the *matura* or similar programme of pre-university study. However, the Seminary has always been open to men who do not meet university entrance requirements. For a while all students who completed at least 24 semester hours were granted certificates of study, but in 1959 it was decided to abandon this practice and to give diplomas to those who completed a specified course extending over six semesters. Since 1957 a research degree (Th.M.) calling for at least one year beyond the B.D. has been offered by the Seminary.

From the very beginning the value of good relationship to the University of Zürich has been recognized. Four Rüschlikon graduates have earned doctorates at the University, all being excused on an individual basis from taking certain examinations there. In February 1962 the Theological Faculty of the University decided that *summa cum laude* and *magna cum laude* B.D. graduates of Rüschlikon will be granted a reduction in the number of fields on which they are examined for the doctorate and that the language certificates which the Seminary now gives its better students will be accepted as evidence that the University language requirements have been fulfilled. This is a significant recognition of the quality of work in the Seminary.

It is apparent to all who come to Rüschlikon that much progress has been made in buildings and equipment. A student dormitory and a library addition to the main building were completed in 1953. The library has been growing steadily, until with its nearly 16,000 classified volumes it is beginning to compare favourably with the better theological libraries of Europe. In 1954 an apartment house, with sixteen apartments for married students and their families, was constructed. In 1956 the president's house was completed, and in 1959 the chapel. A house in Thalwil and land in Rüschlikon for faculty houses have been purchased. The property owned by the Seminary represents a total investment of nearly one million dollars, and the present value is far greater than that. During his administration Dr. Nordenhaug had the satisfaction of seeing the Seminary become the best equipped Baptist school in Europe.

All of the money for property and also the funds for operating expenses (now about $135,000 a year) have been furnished by the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board. Slight progress has been made towards participation by Europeans in the cost of the Seminary. Everybody is now required to contribute to his expenses in either money or work and more and more students are paying in cash at least a part of their expenses. One European Baptist Union makes a small annual contribution to the Seminary budget.

Buildings, equipment, curriculum, faculty—all exist mainly for the sake of students. From the standpoint of numbers of students, and what they have received, has the Seminary proved worthwhile? Without doubt the answer should be affirmative, though the enrolment has never passed fifty-nine. Since the number of Baptist seminaries on the European continent has grown from two to fifteen during this century, the majority of ministerial students can study in their own countries, and only a few come to Rüschlikon for all or a part of their theological education. There is no shortage of seminaries in most other parts of the world, but a few people from Canada, the United States, New Zealand, South Africa, the Middle East and Japan, have come to Rüschlikon to take advantage of the special opportunities in an international seminary. Seminary alumni are serving effectively as pastors, teachers, editors, youth leaders, and missionaries. At least thirteen are engaged fully or partially in theological education. Several have held or hold now offices in their national Baptist Unions. Many have become useful, creative parts of the international Baptist fellowship.

Mentioning international fellowship reminds us of the Rüschlikon summer programme. Beginning in the summer of 1950, under the direction of Dr. Franks, summer conferences became a regular feature of the Rüschlikon schedule. A partial list of the international Baptist groups that have met in the Seminary, some of them several times, includes pastors, laymen, women, young people, mis-

sionary leaders, Sunday school workers, church musicians, theological teachers, writers, school teachers, and persons interested in broadcasting. Since 1959 a summer school has been conducted each year for the benefit of pastors, theological students, and others who want a brief period of intensive theological study in an international environment.

Not only have hundreds of people been instructed and inspired in the conferences and summer schools; they have formed international friendships that have enriched their lives and broadened their influence. The Rüschlikon summer programme, together with the regular academic sessions, has much to do with the fact that European Baptists know each other better and have more ways of co-operating than do the Baptists of any other continent.

Since September of 1961 there has been a European Baptist Press Service in Rüschlikon under the auspices of the European Baptist Federation, with Dr. Moore as director. He gives half of his time to teaching and half to the Press Service. The Seminary pays his entire salary and much of the expense of his office. This is one more way in which the Seminary is serving the European Baptist cause.

European Baptists now realize that the Seminary does not represent an attempt to make Americans or Southern Baptists out of Europeans. It has become at least partially indigenized in Europe. It has not lost all traces of American influence, and most people do not want it to do so; but it has been moulded to a great extent by the thinking, traditions, problems, and needs of Europe. Yet it is not just European; it is truly international. The faculty represents three nationalities and the board of trustees sixteen. Students have come from twenty-eight countries. Representatives of at least that many nations have attended conferences and summer schools. Hundreds of people remember Rüschlikon with gratitude, and thousands speak of it as " our Seminary."

4. The Prospect

What is the prospect for the future? No radical re-orientation is necessary, but the Seminary still has far to travel in order to reach some of its goals, and there are old and new problems to solve.

The co-operation between Americans and Europeans in the Seminary needs further development. Since it is a very expensive institution to operate and since European Baptists are few in number and have many other financial obligations, assistance from America will probably be needed for many years to come. However, the ultimate goal of every mission-sponsored institution is that it shall be supported (and, of course, controlled) by those it serves. Those who study in Rüschlikon will be encouraged to pay just as

much of their expenses as possible. It is hoped that other European Baptists—individuals, churches, and unions—will in time contribute to the support of the Seminary.

As European Baptists gradually assume financial responsibility for the Seminary their participation in its operation will increase. The trustees, through a recently instituted committee system, are already taking a larger share than formerly in Seminary affairs; and they are now elected directly by the national Baptist Unions instead of being nominated by the Unions and elected by the Foreign Mission Board. The board of trustees must probably continue for some time to be an advisory body, but through recommendations to the faculty and Foreign Mission Board it can play almost as decisive a role in the life of the Seminary as if it had direct administrative control.

The non-academic functions of the Seminary are likely to increase. To the summer conferences and the Press Service there will be added a studio for the preparation of radio programmes to be broadcast over commercial or perhaps national stations. The studio will be owned and operated by the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board for the use of any interested Baptist groups and will be supervised by the Radio Committee of the European Baptist Federation. Some members of the Seminary faculty, besides especially employed persons, will be involved in the operation of the studio.

We rejoice over the prospect for development of such non-academic functions. We want Rüschlikon to be more than a centre of theological education. However, it must continue to be that. The number of part-time teachers who will also do other things must be increased, or people must be brought here to give their entire time to non-academic projects. It may be necessary eventually to organize separate administrative departments—academic and special services—for what might be called the Baptist Centre of Rüschlikon. Certainly regular faculty members must be protected from demands upon their time which would cause them to neglect research, writing, and teaching.

We hope for further improvement in academic quality and reputation. High standards have been maintained from the beginning, but the Seminary has probably at times fallen somewhat short of being a "university college." There is a good chance now for it to become precisely that. European university methods which the Seminary faculty regards as inefficient—lectures without course requirements or semester examinations, for example—will not be followed; but the number of seminars will be increased and an effort will be made to enrich lecture courses and to put the work of the Seminary, even for the B.D., on a graduate level. As more and more European Baptists complete pre-university requirements,

the number of B.D. students, and perhaps also post-graduate students working on the Th.M. degree in the Seminary or a doctorate at the University, should increase. We hope the work in Rüschlikon and in the various national seminaries can be so co-ordinated that students will come to Rüschlikon readily, and without undue repetition, for a B.D. or diploma after studying in their own countries. We shall try to keep a faculty which with respect to ability, training, and literary output will compare favourably with university faculties. We hope for an extension of the recognition already granted by the University of Zürich and perhaps for eventual recognition of our B.D. and Th.M. degrees by the education authorities of the Canton of Zürich.

Our aim is to develop scholastic excellence without in any way compromising the Baptist character of the Seminary. Can that be done? Many of our Baptist forefathers and even contemporaries would say no. In the first meeting of the Swedish Baptist Seminary faculty in 1866, it was decided that no degrees such as "Magister" or "Doctor" would ever be granted and that no member of the faculty would ever, and that no Swedish Baptist should ever, receive such a title.[20] Fortunately for Swedish Baptists a broader viewpoint prevailed, and in time even one of the first faculty members received an honorary doctorate. However, in Europe there is still much Baptist distrust of universities—some of it justified, since many young people who go to them are lost to the Baptist cause. One of the most capable Rüschlikon trustees warned recently that university theology and Baptist theology are two different things.

There are Baptist insights which must not be lost: for example, the personal and voluntary character of true religion, the church as a fellowship of believers in Christ baptized on profession of their faith, full religious liberty for everybody. The evangelistic and missionary spirit which accounts for Baptist growth, and also for the early enthusiasm for an international seminary, must be nourished and expressed. The history, traditions, and practices of our denomination need to be made known. The Rüschlikon Seminary is unashamedly a denominational school. Its task is the education of persons who will serve—not blindly but loyally and creatively—within the Baptist fellowship.

Professor Fritz Blanke of the University of Zürich recognized the special function of a school like this when at my inauguration as president he said:

> All the [theological] faculties of our country form one concert, and every faculty is playing its instrument. The instrument of Rüschlikon is also an essential one. Every one of our Swiss faculties would like to give its contribution to the understanding of the Bible, of the Christian faith, and of church history. Your Seminary is fulfilling a particular contribution, indeed.

It is your task to underline points of view and aspects which have been neglected until now. Go on, on your way!

This we shall try to do but, of course, not in an exclusive, sectarian way. We shall take all theological knowledge to be our province but shall give special attention to our Baptist heritage.

One thing remains to be said: we shall maintain and strengthen the international character of the Seminary. We shall try always to have a faculty which is international in experience, outlook, knowledge, and understanding. If still other European Baptist Unions begin sending students here, they will be offered representation on our board of trustees. We hope that our student body will become even more international than it has been, including students from eastern and western Europe and from other parts of the world as well.

With a strong faculty, capable trustees, loyal alumni, faithful friends on both sides of the Atlantic—and, above all, with the help of God—the Rüschlikon Seminary will serve more and more effectively as a centre of Baptist education, fellowship, and co-operation.

FOOTNOTES

[1] F. W. Simoleit (ed.), *Offizieller Bericht über den* 1. *Kongress der europäischen Baptisten,* Gehalten zu Berlin vom 29 August bis 3 September, 1908 (Berlin), p. 330.

[2] *Minutes of the First Annual Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Baptist Theological Seminary, Rüschlikon-Zürich, March* 10-11, 1950 (Mimeographed), p. 1. (Hereafter referred to as *Minutes of the First Annual Meeting*).

[3] The Baptist World Alliance, *Second Congress, Philadelphia, June* 19-25, 1911, *Record of Proceedings* (Philadelphia: Harper and Brothers, 1911), p. 233. (Hereafter referred to as Baptist World Alliance, *Second Congress*).

[4] *ibid.,* pp. 240f.

[5] Information furnished by Dr. Josef Nordenhaug, April 5th, 1962.

[6] The Baptist World Alliance, *Second Congress,* pp. 264f.

[7] Baptist World Alliance, *Minutes of Meeting of Executive Committee, and Other Representative Baptists, Held at the Baptist Church House, Southampton Row, London, W.C.1, from* 19*th to* 23*rd July,* 1920, p. 20.

[8] *ibid.*

[9] Clipping in files of Dr. Josef Nordenhaug, without name of newspaper, dated Richmond, April 7th (AP).

[10] Baptist World Alliance, *Minutes of European Conference called by the Baptist World Alliance and of Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Baptist World Alliance Held at the Baptist Church House, London, England, From August* 13*th to* 17*th,* 1948, p. 7. (Hereafter referred to as *Minutes of European Conference*).

[11] *Minutes of the First Annual Meeting,* p. 2.

[12] Baptist World Alliance, *Minutes of European Conference,* p. 6.

[13] *Christian Index,* November 18th, 1948.

[14] *Minutes of the First Annual Meeting,* p. 8.

[15] *Biblical Recorder,* Vol. 115, No. 39, 1949.

[16] *Minutes of the First Annual Meeting,* p. 4.

[17] *ibid.*

[18] George W. Sadler, *Historical Sketch of the Baptist Theological Seminary, Rüschlikon-Zürich, Switzerland* (Mimeographed, 1960), p. 4.

[19] *Baptist Theological Seminary, Rüschlikon-Zürich (Switzerland)* (1949-1950).

[20] The Minute Book of the Bethel Seminary Faculty, photographic reproduction in *Svensk Baptism Genom* 100 *Ar,* p. 94 (Information furnished by Ingvar Gustafsson).

J. D. HUGHEY

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

J. D. HUGHEY
Principal of Baptist Seminary, Rüschlikon, Switzerland.

KENNETH R. SHORT
Faculty of History, Lakeland College, Wisconsin.

D. P. KINGDON
Minister, Purley, Surrey.

N. CLARK
Minister, Amersham, Buckinghamshire.

Reviews by : G. R. Beasley-Murray, D. D. Black, J. R. Perkin, P. H. Rogers, G. W. Rusling, P. G. Saunders.

In The Study

THE English-speaking world has not been well served so far as commentaries on the Psalms are concerned, and the fruits of modern research and understanding in this field have not been readily and widely available. Things have moved fast and far since the beginning of this century, and Kirkpatrick's sober and prosaic exposition with its cautious reaction against a Maccabean dating for the Psalter reads strangely as from a bygone age. It is true that more than a decade ago Elmer Leslie made a sterling contribution in a weighty and still valuable presentation which, while suffering from a tendency to over-systematize, mediated in popular style the emphasis and perspective associated with the work of Gunkel and Mowinckel. But it is only now that the gap has really and satisfactorily been filled by the translation of a monumental study[1] that runs to over eight hundred pages, provides introduction, text and commentary, and is quite amazing value for money.

It is impossible to comment in any satisfactory way upon the mass of exposition. This is based upon the author's own translation from the Hebrew, but the text here provided is that of the Revised Standard Version except where the latter differs in some material way from that of Professor Weiser. The general approach is never merely historical. A sustained attempt is made to provide links with full New Testament religious understanding and to interpret within the context of the whole biblical revelation. Perhaps there is a pointer here to a danger that is not completely avoided. Just occasionally I have the impression that some harsh realities of sub-Christian expression in the Psalms are being falsely argued away by a vision that is slightly too eager to establish their abiding insight and significance.

But the reader who is content with sampling the commentary as occasion arises and need demands will be wise to return again and again to the introductory material. Weiser is not content with a simple form-critical approach which would analyse the Psalter into fixed poetic types in terms of dependence upon an alien oriental cultural background. Attention must be paid to the history of the Old Testament cultus which acted as the bearer of living tradition. Yet this does not mean a preoccupation with agricultural religious festivals such as belonged to Canaanite practice. Rather is the essential rooting of the Psalms to be located in the Covenant Festival of Yahweh, celebrated in the New Year by the tribal confederacy of Israel where, by the word of recitation of the cultic

narrative (of which the Hexateuch is elaboration) and the deed of sacred action, the history of salvation was dramatically re-enacted and Israel was remade as the People of God.

Such a conclusion is not arbitrarily asserted. Rather is it carefully argued by way of a serious examination of this great Covenant Festival of Israel. Weiser admits that the details have not been preserved for us. But he believes that it is possible to disentangle from the mass of Old Testament material the basic ideas and essential character of this annual religious observance; and this he attempts to do. He is then in a position to draw lines, straight and true, to the recurring elements and emphases of the Psalter. It is an illuminating process. It gives the Psalms context and rooting, and thus new meaning.

Now all this is not new; neither is it precisely Old Testament "orthodoxy." It is broadly representative of a view that increasingly gains ground. But here the enunciation is unusually rigorous and exclusive. Let the reader be warned! Whether this sort of restatement will stand in all main particulars, time alone will show. While the experts debate, most of us will continue to be deeply grateful for a work that has important implications for the understanding not only of the Psalter but of the Bible as a whole.

A sustained thrust along a narrow front is what the Abbot of Downside offers to his readers in a book[2] which should command sympathetic attention from all who care for the unity of the Church of God. The narrow concentration of enquiry has the strength of making possible an adequate and painstaking investigation. Does it also invite the danger of an artificial isolation of one aspect of a great reality which demands a broader treatment if truth is to be established? I am not sure. Neither, I think, is the Abbot. But he recognizes the peril, and judges that it will not substantially menace the successful discharge of his enterprise. He will ask concerning the nature of the church as "one." It is an entity—but of what kind?

F. D. Maurice and other theologians have spoken of the church as a society. But if words are really meaningful, more may be involved in this description than they suppose. Three possibilities confront us as we seek to do justice to the church militant here on earth. She may be an invisible entity; she may be one, unique visible community; she may be a potential society, moving towards a visible unity not yet attained. An examination of Scripture disposes conclusively of the first viewpoint and inclines us towards the second. An investigation of the major tract of Christian history reveals not only an unbroken assumption of the second belief but also the virtual impossiblity of any other—unless we are prepared to jettison some basic Christian doctrines, rooted in the Bible, affirmed by church councils, and accepted by Protestant and

Catholic alike. Let the ecumenical movement, then, which in general proceeds in terms of the third possibility, recognize the true logic of its own fundamental perspectives.

There is logic here. There is persuasiveness, and an attractive humility. All roads may lead to Rome. But we are to be convinced by way of a disarmingly apologetic demonstration of the logical impossibility of the tracks to Canterbury and Geneva. Certainly the examination of the doctrinal controversies of the early centuries is to be welcomed not only for its own sake but also for the appraisal and criticism which Abbot Butler provides. Certainly the idea of the church as essentially an invisible entity receives some well-deserved hammer blows. And certainly non-Romans should be provoked to think again. The provisional reservations occur at two points. I am not entirely persuaded that we can arrive at the solution to the particular question at issue unless at the same time we ask and seek to answer other related questions. Nor am I sure that this book quite gets to grips with the problem that may, in the end, govern all—namely the problem of eschatology. The Abbot gives us a dozen pages, but does not perhaps dig deep enough. For the question of eschatology at this point is the question of the theological relationship between Christ and the church, between Head and members. It is good to find it roundly asserted that Roman doctrine does not equate the Kingdom of God with the institutional church. What is not so clear is whether there is any recognition that the Church must be understood not simply in terms of Incarnation but also in terms of Atonement.

A collection of essays[3] by Cambridge dons deserves more attention than most symposia of its kind. Natural theology, comparative religion, biblical understanding, doctrinal restatement, science, ethics, the nature of theological understanding—it is a broad coverage, and a bold excursion that promises well. This is the "broad church" seeking to perform its mission for a new day and generation. It is the work of men who will not abide the tight, closed, withdrawn circle of revelation. It is the assertion of a reasoned faith which takes seriously the world of God's creation and therefore the final unity of all knowledge.

The aim is not set too high. The time for reconstruction is not yet, and definitive answers are not to be expected. What is important is the recognition and posing of the fundamental questions, and a grappling with them rather than an evasion of them. This is why the authors must speak in terms of "soundings," are content to take bearings and write prolegomena. If the result is from time to time a straying from the narrow confines of what we class as orthodoxy, this need not disconcert or surprise. Unless the church gives to her thinkers due liberty to range wide and pioneer she may preserve her garments superficially white and unspotted but she is unlikely to

storm the citadels of the twentieth century. Unless all things are proved, sifted and tested, we are likely to lose our grasp of that which is finally and enduringly good.

In the end these contributors achieve most success not in plotting the future but in exposing the mess that we are in. They rebuke our complacency, expose our predicament, and sound a warning. Science and theology may seem to have come to terms, but we have smothered the conflict rather than solved it. The broad lines of Christian morality may seem clear enough, if somewhat difficult of contemporary application, but perhaps we are not even in sight of a truly creative theological ethic. Natural theology in traditional and conventional form may be open to all the strictures currently levelled against it, but are we to be satisfied with the attempt to reach land through the escape hatch of a positivism of revelation? Other religions can no longer be ignored in a shrinking world, but to what extent are we prepared to begin a sympathetic dialogue and in what terms shall we rightly speak of the supremacy and uniqueness of Christ? These are living issues. We should be thankful for a stimulating discussion of them.

Dr. Vidler and his colleagues cast their net widely. But there are other spots where the water urgently requires to be tested, and where examination reveals it to be almost incredibly murky. Church architecture of the last twenty years in this land may accurately and uncharitably be described as a monument to many things, not least to British insularity. On the continent and to some extent in the New World biblical, liturgical, and theological renewal has been allowed to have its influence on church building, but here the country which has led the world in the building of schools has, with a few rare and striking exceptions, produced a lamentable series of architectural hangovers. It is all very sad; and symptomatic of a terrifying malaise. But at last there are stirrings of better things, and three dates deserve to be recorded. The first is 1957, which saw the formation of the New Churches Research Group, a body of clergy and architects, interdenominational in scope, reaching outside the Christian community, and committed to serious study at depth and continuing research and conversation. The second is 1960, which saw the appearance of a work entitled *Liturgy and Architecture,* written by Peter Hammond, one of the Group's moving spirits, exposing our predicament, enunciating the new insights, and sounding a clarion call to reform. It also witnessed the launching of a periodical, now entitled *Churchbuilding,* designed to stimulate, discuss and inform. The third is 1962, which was marked by the establishment of an Institute for the Study of Worship and Religious Architecture at Birmingham University. Meanwhile various "papers" prepared by members of the New Churches Research Group have been privately circulating. Largely on the basis of these

a composite volume,[4] containing contributions both from the theological and the architectural standpoints, is now set before us.

It should help to remove a great many misconceptions; and it possesses at least two great merits. The central theme is given a wide and generous setting; we are not allowed to go away still harbouring any impression that this is a private ecclesiastical problem. We must indeed proceed theologically, but a true doctrine of the church inevitably demands that the building be related not only to the worshippers but also to the world in which it is set. Beyond this, it is of the utmost importance that the writers are fully aware that there are no neat, universally applicable solutions, and that if a little can be seen clearly and the true line of advance marked out yet the need for pioneering and experiment remains. It is, however, true that the thinking represented here springs mainly from Anglican and Roman sources. For this fact the Free Churches have no one to blame but themselves. Nevertheless, we had better be sure that we do not quite swallow all this whole. There are some nice questions to be faced about the relationship between Word and Eucharist, baptism and infancy, choir and congregation; and at certain points the answers to them will be found to be determinative.

Among the many incisive comments, let this suffice. "Church architecture has for a long time been incomprehensible to the modern architect, because the subject has generally been discussed in terms of atmosphere and religious sentiment. On the other hand, Christians have been inclined to regard all modern architecture as a product of materialism." Exactly! Religion is spiritual and worship is cerebral. Until that twin aberration is nailed, perhaps the less we build the better.

It has long been my conviction and experience that students of baptism are apologetically their own worst enemies. If I am ever tempted to doubt the validity of the Baptist case a reading of a book designed to defend infant baptism will instantly restore me to a state of grace. On the other hand I can be serenely confident that I shall arise from the perusal of any standard apologia for believers' baptism a convinced paedobaptist. This curious process makes for wide and varied reading rather than abiding satisfaction. And it suggests to me that there is a certain emptiness and unreality attaching to a considerable part of the current debate. Both sides unload their block-busters with guaranteed accuracy, and the resultant explosions are tremendous. But when the smoke has cleared the enemy positions are apparently untouched, and nobody seems inclined to come over to the other side. It appears that somehow or other the deadly missiles never got within miles of their targets.

I fancy that all this has something to do with major presuppositional discrepancies. Either way it explains why I approach another

book on the sacrament of unity[5] with deep-rooted scepticism. The superficial signs do not encourage. The publishers amuse me with a dust-jacket which portrays what seems to be a cross between a collection plate and a roulette wheel, and irritate me with what has now become a traditional game—the misspelling of the names of Denn(e)y and Culman(n). But the volume is handsomely produced, the author was once kindly enough to give me a sympathetic review, and the book is weighty enough to merit serious treatment. I am not entirely clear as to the audience for which it is primarily intended. But I think that the Anglicans will see the point, the Church of Scotland and the continentals probably won't, and the Baptists ought to treat the whole argument as required reading.

Now this is an enormously thorough treatment of a particular area of enquiry. The range of relevant literature taken into account is immense. The biblical text is taken with tremendous seriousness by one who is determined not to run up imposing theological edifices without having first laboured on the foundations. The most convincing section is surely that which deals with the Pauline epistles, for here a master craftsman has been at work. It is the treatment of the Gospels and of the Acts that occasionally arouses hesitations. I am not at this point concerned with the details of exegesis and interpretation. Obviously there will be disagreement here and there. It is rather the attitude to the material, the way of approach, that raises the important questions. Let us put three quotations side by side. (1) "Our primary object is to discover, not the secondary use to which the Evangelists might have put the sayings, but their meaning on the lips of Jesus." (p. 73.) (2) ". . . there are clear indications that (the Fourth Evangelist) is sensible to the situations in which his teaching is set, and he provides signposts for the right perspective in which to view it." (p. 229.) (3) "By the time the Gospel was composed, baptism in water and baptism in Spirit had come together, and the Evangelist was addressing his readers." (p. 303). Here *in nuce* is the determinative question. How do we use the Gospel material? How far do we use it as evidence for the mind of the Incarnate Lord on some particular theme, and how far as expressive of the mind of the Evangelists?

Let it be granted that there is no easy answer here. Let it also be granted that the issue is sufficiently open for a great many attitudes to be defensible. Nevertheless, our decision at this point will affect our use of Gospel testimony and our method of theological construction. My difficulty is that I cannot quite see where Dr. Beasley-Murray stands, and am not at all sure that he stands with consistency anywhere. The answer we get from the biblical text depends so much on how we put the question; and unless we have adopted some general position we shall tend to frame each individual question in just that way which will provide us with the answer we

desire. Let him who is without sin cast the first stone—yes, indeed! But the reader should be warned to be on the alert.

Let me bring it down to cases. What justification is there for using John 4 : 1 to assist the interpretation of Mark 10 : 38 and Luke 12 : 50? Is not conflation of Gospel material a highly suspect practice? Is it fair to attempt explanation of the various baptismal contortions in Acts without some prior assessment of the standpoint of Lukan theology? What attitude are we going to adopt towards St. John's Gospel? Granted that the Fourth Evangelist has "historical sense," that he was "addressing his readers," and that he was conscious "of the unity yet distinction between the ministry of the incarnate Son and that of the exalted Lord," should this lead us to interpret the Nicodemus episode in terms of the historical context of the Ministry?

It is easier to ask such questions than to answer them. But the answers reveal a man's presuppositions; and it is these that I find so difficult to disentangle in this book. Yet the very raising of such fundamental issues indicates sufficiently the weight and value of this exhaustive study. It should for long stand as the best thing in its field that Baptists have produced, and if the denomination can catch up with its author there may be hope for us yet. Of course, there remains much ground to be traversed. We are not offered any coherent or systematic theology of baptism; only doctrinal implications of the New Testament evidence. But these promote the conclusion that New Testament baptism is to be understood in terms not of mere symbolism but of the fullness of saving grace. Let the author be convicted of high sacramental belief. But let Baptists also realise that it is only on the ground of high sacramentalism that the case for believers' baptism can stand.

[1] Artur Weiser: *The Psalms.* S.C.M. 70s. 1962.

[2] B. C. Butler: *The Idea of the Church.* Darton, Longman & Todd. 30s. 1962.

[3] A. R. Vidler (ed.): *Soundings.* Cambridge. 21s. 1962.

[4] Peter Hammond (ed.): *Towards a Church Architecture.* The Architectural Press. 30s. 1962.

[5] G. R. Beasley-Murray: *Baptism in the New Testament.* Macmillan. 50s. 1962.

N. CLARK

1662 and 1962

ONE of the most valuable results of the commemoration of 1662 has been the publication of a volume, *From Uniformity to Unity*,[1] under the joint authorship of Geoffrey F. Nuttall and Owen Chadwick. A group of scholars from the Anglican communion and a group appointed by the Three Denominations independently began to plan books for this occasion and it speaks volumes for the progress of Christian trust that the two groups decided to unite their efforts. Most composite volumes suffer from inconsistencies of understanding and purpose but here a common loyalty to historical truth has brought about a remarkable unity.

The first four essays concentrate on various phases of the post-Restoration period. Dr. Anne Whitman deals with "The Church of England Restored." This is the essay in which Free Churchmen will find the point of view most unfamiliar. It is salutary for us to see the matter through Anglican eyes and to be reminded that "both Anglicans and Puritans in the prolonged controversies had difficulty in hearing the voice of charity and the arguments of reason." Prof. E. C. Ratcliff deals with the Savoy Conference, which was characterized by obduracy in plenty, not all of it Anglican, but the Conference's failure emerges here almost as a foregone conclusion, in view of the temper of the Cavalier Parliament.

Dr. Nuttall, in "The First Nonconformists," avoids the temptation to provide a martyrology while making clear the reason for the stand of the ejected ministers. One wishes, however, that this essay had been a little fuller in bringing home the personal cost of not conforming and the character of the religious communities that sprang up as a result. If any were under the delusion that 1662 represented the end of the story until the Act of Toleration, Roger Thomas' close study of the intervening period would prove him wrong. His object is to show how the aims of the various groups of Nonconformists varied, some seeking comprehension within a national church, others wanting only liberty to go their own way. An intriguing story is well told but perhaps Mr. Thomas might have ventured to draw slightly more general conclusions from his study.

The advantages of the composite nature of the book are most clearly seen in the double essay on "Toleration and Establishment." Dr. Payne deals with it clearly and concisely from the historian's view-point. It is unfortunate that the period allocated to him was a long one and the available space rather short, but the plan of the

[1] S.P.C.K. 35s.

book makes this inevitable. Dr. Payne's essay illuminates and highlights that of Dr. Edward Carpenter who gives a "study in a relationship." Particularly helpful is the manner in which Dr. Carpenter summarizes the response of ecclesiastical attitudes to the philosophy of the time.

In the final pair of essays, entitled "Towards Charity and Understanding," Bishop Oliver Tomkins sketches the ecumenical background in scholarly and readable fashion and John Huxtable discusses the conversations that have taken place in England. He may fairly claim to have demonstrated his contention that Anglicans now do not desire to disown their Free Church brethren and *vice versa;* nevertheless the overall picture left in our minds is that there is a long way to go. Would a fairer picture have been given if some instances of the practical effect of the change of atmosphere had been offered? One would have liked this volume to contain yet one more essay, tying up the two ends of the story. How does 1662 still speak to us? Does not the perspective of three hundred years enable us to say some things which would help forward a church still in sore need of wise guidance?

The little paper-backed volume by Dr. E. A. Payne and Norman S. Moon entitled *Baptists and 1662*[2] is in many ways the complement of *From Uniformity to Unity.* It is clearly designed to meet the criticism that "Baptists were not involved in the troubles of 1662." The abiding impression of Dr. Payne's description of those Baptists who were involved in the Great Ejectment is one of affection and enthusiasm. Their numbers may not have been many but that does not make the strength of their convictions and their importance to us any less real. In the second half of the book Norman Moon gives us an account, with humour and sympathy, of the provisions of the Clarendon Code and their effect on Baptist church life, and does not fall into the error of assuming that all was well after 1689.

Baptists ought to read this, and also a third book which describes the reaction of Baptists to the church situation as it is developing in 1963. *With Hands Outstretched*[3] is written by Dr. E. Roberts-Thompson, Principal of the Baptist Theological College of New South Wales. From a wide acquaintance with Baptist churches in all parts of the world he calls eloquently for a positive approach to the ecumenical movement and an end to the isolationist position that has characterized some of our churches for too long.

Dr. Roberts-Thompson is at pains to allay some of the suspicions that many Baptists have of the World Council of Churches, and to help us see that extreme independency is foreign to the New Testament ideal of the church, and to the ideal that inspired some of the first Baptists. He applauds the new approach to the sacra-

[2] C.K.P. 3s. 6d. [3] Marshall, Morgan & Scott. 12s. 6d.

ments that emphasizes the action of God, associated with the names of Wheeler Robinson and many of the younger generation of Baptists in this country. He defends those Baptists, particularly in the younger countries, who engage in discussions on church union, and pleads that the witness of Baptists to their undoubtedly Scriptural insights be made from within rather than from without the main stream of world church life. This book deserves a very wide circulation, not only among those who agree with its contents. It is courageous, practical and forthright, and may well be of very great influence. The new point of view among us has not been so resoundingly stated before.

Two weaknesses of this book, however, may cause it to be rejected unread by those who ought to read it. The first chapter is a clear but uncompromising statement of the general position adopted. It might have been wiser to begin with the chapters on William Carey and John Smyth and to show that an ecumenical spirit has characterized Baptists from the beginning. More seriously, one would like to see a fuller biblical exposition of the ideas in dispute. The author acknowledges the Scriptural test that Baptists apply and he uses the best results of modern scholarship, but he does not turn his readers to specific quotations that support his argument. The lack of such exegesis may make the book shorter and easier to read but it will detract greatly from its weight, particularly in those circles where the ideas will be new.

Christianity is moving towards a new day in church relations; the shape of things to come will be partly determined by the attitude of Baptists, and we need all the historical and practical insights we can get to help form an attitude which will prepare us for God's guiding. All these books will help to this end.

P. G. SAUNDERS

BOOKS RECEIVED

P. T. Forsyth, *The Church, the Gospel and Society*. 127 pp. 15s. Independent Press.

H. Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*. Second edition, enlarged. 489 pp. 15s. Oxford University Press.

R. T. Anstey, *Britain and the Congo in the 19th Century*. 260 pp. 38s. Clarendon Press : Oxford University Press.

Reviews

Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: from Newman to Martineau, 1850-1900,* 390 pp. 42s. Princeton University Press.

Professor Horton Davies, formerly of Mansfield and Regent's Park Colleges, Oxford, and now of Princeton, U.S.A., has embarked upon a five-volume study of worship and theology in England from 1535 to the present. This volume, the second to be published, is number four in the series.

The book reflects, as indeed must any work on this period, the constant tension, even clash, between traditionalism and liberalism, conservatism and radicalism. The basic form of the study is a division into Part I, "The Appropriation of Tradition," and Part II, "The Drive Towards Innovation." Whether or not such a division can be sustained successfully as the plan of a book may be an open question. Are the Brethren, the Irvingite Catholic Apostolic Church, and the Salvation Army, for instance, any more the appropriation of tradition that they are the drive towards innovation? But the monumental learning this volume reveals must be gratefully acknowledged. Whether the question is one of architecture, hymnody, literature, pulpit style or biography, Dr. Davies gives us adequate detail, apt summary and very often, pungent assessment. We see something of the "second spring" of Catholicism after about 1850, when a new spirit of vigour and confidence filled that communion. We see the devious routes by which Tractarian influence reached Dissenting worship: partly *via* the Scottish Presbyterian divines, partly through the driving of many Anglicans into the Free Churches in protest, and partly by the focusing of widespread attention on liturgical matters.

We discover, if we had not already guessed, that the formlessness of much contemporary worship among the Dissenters has been under fire before today. A revaluation of free prayer was going on in 1850, the passivity of the congregation was causing grave concern in 1870 (to a Baptist, at that!) and the advocates of a weekly celebration of the Holy Communion were to be found throughout these fifty years. We learn also in fair detail and with ample biographical background, of the many service books and orders produced for individual churches or for whole denominations.

We read, in the last chapter, of the magnetism of the Victorian pulpit giants and their marathon sermons. (Edward Irving and John Angell James each preached for nearly three and a half hours; the former renewed his strength while hymns were sung, the latter by oranges thrown into the pulpit by anxious hearers.) The general love

of sermon-tasting is portrayed; the strong personalities of the preachers is vividly sketched (Joseph Parker ended a sermon on the Armenian atrocities with a fervent "God, damn the Sultan!"), and the need of the generation for sustained and confident doctrine is given with sensitivity and understanding. Underneath all the superficial likenesses and dissimilarities of these great men lies their relevance to their day and their unwavering grasp on the truth of the Incarnate Christ. In this, even Spurgeon and Newman were one. Whether Dr. Davies' choice of Newman, Roberston, Dale and Spurgeon, or the reasons he gives for this selection, will convince everyone is open to doubt and it may be thought that the sketch of Robertson is less vivid than of the others. Many will feel that Alexander McLaren deserves a place among the great—in Manchester, too, not in Liverpool! (p. 82).

A similar curious lack of detail is noticeable when Dale's *Manual of Congregational Principles* is discussed (pp. 203 and 346), as there was quite a violent tussle over the publication of the controversial section dealing with the sacraments. Strange also is the omission of mention of the view almost amounting to Baptismal Regeneration held by some early members of the Churches of Christ. On the other hand Binney's sermon on the occasion of a murderer's apprehension even after he had fled to the United States is mentioned twice (pp. 229 and 289).

These are minor points, however, in a book of lasting value, which all ministers would do well to read. Certain familiar questions will be posed, almost depressing in their relevance. Why have we heeded so little the warnings of those who, 100 years ago, tried to free Dissenting worship from its bondage to ministerial whim and congregational passivity? Why do the "long prayers" still persist? Why is so much preaching fervently irrelevant, dealing fully with situations existing only in the speaker's mind? Dr. Davies has given us a scholarly tribute to the past. It is a sharp indictment of the present; but more, it is history in the best sense, in that it indicates some plain answers to our present liturgical plight.

J. R. C. PERKIN

K. Heasman, *Evangelicals in Action: an Appraisal of their Social Work in the Victorian Era.* 310 pp. 30s. Bles.

As did the author in searching for her material, many readers of this book are going to feel that they are on a voyage of discovery and some, perhaps, will be even more surprised than she was at certain of her findings. She is concerned with Free Churches, evangelical Anglicans and undenominational evangelical organizations. She shows that in most realms of social service in the Victorian era they played an important part and in some their rôle was of

quite major significance. She is not grudging in recognising what others did and equally she points out weaknesses in the work of the Evangelicals. Nevertheless, the latter emerge with a record which in sum total may astonish even those who stand in the same tradition.

It appears that three-quarters of the voluntary charitable organizations in the second half of the 19th century were Evangelical in character and control. They ranged over the numerous and varied needs of the time such as poverty, education, the orphan, the teenager and the aged, the prostitute and the criminal, the afflicted in body and mind, the armed forces. Sometimes they broke completely new ground, as in their concern for sailors, or filled gaps in existing services such as those for the care of the sick. Sometimes they introduced new methods, as with handicapped children. It was a weakness that they did not often see the necessity of legislative changes but they played an important part, not least by their publications, in drawing attention to social problems and their work influenced legislation which others brought about. They were often modern and forward-looking in their approach and were "largely instrumental in the evolution of the principles and concrete forms of social work which are followed today." The author constantly notes the human touch and the regard for the individual as such which characterized their efforts. And, so far from being exclusively concerned with the individual's salvation, men such as Moody straightway pointed the convert to some form of social service. Not all were equally enlightened or successful but this is a story which, taken as a whole, calls for no apologies. It may cause present-day Evangelicals to ask themselves if they are living up to this fine feature of their tradition.

Free Churchmen will observe that *inter alia* there is important material here for the study of "the Nonconformist Conscience." Indeed the picture which Mrs. Heasman has pieced together will need to be noted by social and Church historians generally and absorbed into their thinking and writing. Conceivably they may modify some of her findings; on the other hand her considerable researches have by no means exhausted the mine and further evidence is likely to confirm most of her points and to extend the range of her general thesis. This is a fascinating and scholarly book which retains its objectivity even while it communicates the enthusiasm kindled in the author as she did the research for it. She is a lecturer in Social Studies at Queen Elizabeth College, London, and received part of her education at Walthamstow Hall.

G. W. RUSLING

Paul Tournier, *Escape from Loneliness*. 192 pp. 21s. S.C.M. Press.

"Man is a gregarious animal," we are frequently reminded, and none of us contemplates loneliness without a shudder, unless we

know that it will be shortlived. Loneliness is in the forefront of problems which our community must tackle as part of its new approach to mental health, and which our church fellowships are increasingly recognising as one of the great challenges to their neighbourliness. But do we really know what we are up against? Dr. Tournier, Swiss psychiatrist and devout Christian, opens our eyes through the pages of this book to the enormity of the problem and points the way to the answer.

Turning our attention from the loneliness typified in the solitary widow, he unearths areas of our lives in which we endure, or through which we produce in others, a loneliness which frustrates love, service and faith. Our tendencies towards impersonalism, independence, possessiveness, and justice rather than mercy, block our attempts to achieve true fellowship in family, business and national life. Almost every page bears glimpses of the lives of his patients, in whose problems we see mirrored our own and those of our relatives and acquaintances. In his comments on these, Dr. Tournier reveals his rich wisdom and rare humility, his deep psychological insight and confident faith. Religion and psychiatric treatment are too often regarded as alternative remedies; here they are clearly displayed in the complementary rôles which each properly plays in the healing of sick people.

The book was first published in Switzerland in 1948. The clarity, appeal and facility of style of this present publication are a tribute to translator as well as to author. The constant reference to apt illustration from Dr. Tournier's wealth of clinical experience helps theoretical considerations to evoke significant material from our own memories, and maintains the personal relevance in which lies so much of the value of this book. It will thus be of value to all as individuals. To those who enjoy the privilege and carry the extra responsibilities of marriage and parenthood, of office in Church, social order or national affairs, Dr. Tournier offers special help. Here are explanations of much that baffles and frustrates. Here, set forth with peculiar clarity and force, is once again the unique relevance to our varied needs of Christ's spirit of reconciliation and fellowship, which knows no loneliness.

P. H. ROGERS

Herbert Keldany, *The ABC of the Vatican Council.* 41 pp. 2s. 6d. Darton, Longman and Todd.

So great has been the divide between Catholicism and Protestantism that most Protestants find it difficult to know what is going on in Rome and to understand it even when they hear. The recent Vatican Council has focused a new interest in Roman Catholic affairs and those who have found themselves in difficulty trying to understand it may well get some help from this little booklet pub-

lished before the Council, summarizing the work which the Council intended to do and explaining the method by which it intended to do it.

Studia Liturgica. An International Ecumenical Quarterly for Liturgical Research and Renewal. Vol. 1, No. 3. 25s. per annum.

Slowly we are being made to see that the Liturgical Movement is not something that is to be suspected by Baptists but it is to be welcomed by them. We are being taught that it is not first of all concerned with vestments or colours or even with read prayers. It is a movement which is aiding us to forge a strong link between worship and theology; it is an attempt to bring the wholeness of the Gospel into our worship. Further we are being made to realise that we have much to learn from communions with a different liturgical tradition from our own. It is the express aim of *Studia Liturgica* " to establish a means by which people in all the churches who are dealing with liturgical renewal and research can meet one another and exchange ideas."

The third issue of the quarterly magazine was published in September, 1962. The first two articles are a contribution to the commemoration of the tercentenary of the Book of Common Prayer 1662. The first is a review of the various revisions leading up to 1662 and comes to the conclusion that it is " sadly inadequate as a vehicle for the worship of the twentieth century congregation." The second article is entitled " The Book of Common Prayer: Its Virtues and Vices."

As in all three publications the study of the Sacraments is given a prominent place and those who were unable to be present at the Swanwick conference in 1961 will have greatly valued the notes and comments in all three issues.

Worship is the supreme act in human life and *Studia Liturgica* is providing us with an opportunity for the whole Church to study matters of worship and liturgy together. It is a pity the price is being increased.

D. D. BLACK

C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology.* 124 pp. 15s. A. & C. Black.

This brief work represents an approach to Paul's theology from an unaccustomed angle. It proceeds on the assumption that if Paul was not a systematic theologian, he yet laid the foundations for systematic theology in his exposition of the story of God's dealings with men. The term *Heilsgeschichte* comes near to defining what that view is, but it does not quite reach it, for, " Paul sees history gathering at nodal points and crystallising upon outstanding figures —men who are notable in themselves as individual persons, but

even more notable as representative figures. These men, as it were, incorporate the human race, or sections of it, within themselves, and the dealings they have with God they have representatively on behalf of their fellows" (p. 5). Of these representative men of the ages the chief are Adam, Abraham, Moses and Christ. The author accords to each of them a lecture and provides an additional and concluding one on eschatology under the title "The Man to Come."

There can be little doubt that Professor Barrett is right in drawing attention to the importance of the representative element in the thought of Paul. The central significance of the comparison between Adam and Christ in Paul's writings is now becoming rehabilitated in Pauline studies—not for the increased veneration of Adam, be it said, but for the better understanding of Christ. This treatment by Dr. Barrett of the theme of representation will aid many to grasp its importance to Paul. Unfortunately it is precisely in the opening chapter, with its consideration of Adam, that the reviewer found most cause for questioning. Dr. Barrett has chosen to commence his study of Adam by tracing the manner in which Adam developed into Antichrist; that is hardly likely to enable the reader to grasp the significance of Adam to Paul. In the thought of the Apostle Adam is the type of Him that was to come—the Christ; this is a key to understanding his doctrine of Christ, of salvation and of the Church as the Body of Christ; as a category of thought it constantly moves beneath the surface in Paul's Letters, even though it does not often actually appear to view. I find it difficult to believe that Paul at the same time consciously modelled his picture of the Man of Sin also on Adam. The "beasts" of *Daniel* and *Revelation* have surely been taken straight from the watery wastes of Babylonian mythology, not from the Garden of Eden, and the Antichrist has a similar home. The splendid figure that lies behind *Ezekiel* 28 is hardly likely to have been connected by Paul with the first man Adam; in fact, he is much more like the Son of Man of 1 *Cor.* 15. 45ff, but Paul will not have been conscious of that either. This illustrates the necessity of distinguishing between archaeological features of mythology—like fossils in the earth—and the living elements of mythological thought that become pliable material in the hands of a master thinker.

On the other hand it is misleading for this to be cited as an example of Dr. Barrett's exposition of his theme. There is a very large amount of valuable material that sets Paul's teaching in an illuminating and instructive perspective. When "demythologizing" certain elements of Paul's doctrine the author does not make the mistake of discarding the structural elements that hold it together. In this as in many other respects, Dr. Barrett is a sure guide.

G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY

Baptist Historical Society
List of Members, 1963

Adam, Rev. J. H. G., Cambridge.
Angell, L. W., Sutton, Surrey.
Ashley Smith, J. W., Wigan.

Baines, A. J. H., Chesham.
Baker, A. C. A., Cheam, Surrey.
Baker, J. A., W.15.
Barnes, Rev. A. L., Wolverhampton.
Barnes, Rev. I. J., Watford.
Barrett, Rev. J. O., N.2.
Batten, C. R., Willingdon, Sussex.
Beaumont, J. W., Harrow.
Becket, Rev. C. W., Harrow.
Beckwith, F., Leeds 6.
Bell, R., New Barnet.
Bennett, K. W., Barkingside, Essex.
Bennewith, W. H., N. Watford.
Benson, Rev. J. V., Allerton, Bradford.
Bergsten, Dr. T., Sweden.
Berry, Rev. M., Huntingdon.
Black, Sir C. W., S.W.19.
Black, Rev. D. D., N.8.
Blake, Rev. G. H. T., Cinderford, Glos.
Bomford, Miss F. E., Atch Lench.
Bond, Rev. F. W., Leeds 17.
Bottoms, Rev. W. W., 4 Southampton Row.
Boulte, D. C., Whitton, Middlesex.
Bowdler, Dr. D. G., Liverpool 15.
Bowman, Rev. T. E., Tenterden, Kent.
Brennan, Rev. R. H., Stotfold, Beds.
Brewer, Dr. J., Loughborough.
Briggs, J. H., S.E.24.
Briggs, P. E. T., Stanleyville, Congo Republic.
Brockington, Rev. L. H., Oxford.
Brown, Principal A. L., Birmingham 20.
Brown, Rev. B. S., Victoria, Australia.
Brownlee, G. L., Walderslade, Chatham.
Bruen, Rev. N., Brighouse, Yorks.
Bunday, Rev. H. E. P., Chipping Sodbury, Glos.
Burnie, Rev. D. E., Ilkeston.
Buss, Rev. W. H., Tankerton, Kent.
Butler, Mrs. J. B., Chard, Som.
Bryan, Rev. F. C., Cambridge.

Calder, A. H., St. Albans.
Catherall, Rev. G. A., Liverpool 19.
Cawley, Dr. F., Edinburgh.
Cawte, Rev. D. J., Nelson, Lancs.
Champion, Dr. L. G., Bristol 8.
Chesterman, A., de M., Craven Arms, Shropshire.
Child, Rev. R. L., Oxford.
Chilton, Rev. F., Blaby, Leics.
Chown, Rev. J. L., Wolverhampton.
Clark, A. S., Great Missenden.
Clark, J. L., Wallasey.
Clark, Rev. N., Amersham.
Cleal, Rev. W. J., St. Leonards on Sea.
Clement, Rev. A. S., Great Missenden.
Clipsham, Rev. E. F., Brighton.
Coats, T., Motherwell.
Cole, C. T., Welwyn Garden City.
Colvin, C. J. L., 4 Southampton Row.
Cooper, Rev. R. E., S.E.9.
Cook, N., Corby.
Cottle, K. J., Westbury on Trym.
Court, W. F. E., Taunton.
Cox, Rev. W. H., Abingdon.
Crabtree, Dr. A., Philadelphia, U.S.A.
Craven, Dr. W. H., Halifax.
Cribb, Rev. R. J., c/o 4 Southampton Row.
Cross, Rev. H. G., Plymouth.
Cross, Rev. L. C., Birmingham 20.
Crowe, Rev. S. C., Oxford.
Crowther, Rev. A. W. H., Stafford.
Crunden, Rev. P. H., Ipswich.
Cumming, Rev. G., Eastbourne.
Cuthbertson, Rev. S. D., Blaby, Leices.

Dakin, Dr. A., Westbury on Trym.
Davies, Rev. E. W., N.3.
Davies, Dr. G. H., Oxford.
Davies, Rev. R. E., Llanerchymedd, Anglesey.
Davies, Rev. T. E. Sims, N.21.
Davies, Rev. W., Cardiff.
Davies, Rev. W. S., Whitchurch, Hants.
Dawler, Rev. W., Newport, Mon.
Dawley, R., E.C.
Dawson, F. W., Leeds 6.
Deverell, F. W. R., Bath.
Dewhurst, Rev. S. J., S.E.25.
Dunning, Rev. T. G., S.W.18.
Dyer, Rev. C., Plymouth.
Dykes, Principal K., Manchester.

Earle, Rev. E. S., Clevedon, Som.
Edgeler, Rev. H. J., Hastings.
Edwards, E., Abergavenny.
Evans, Rev. C. L., Spalding, Lincs.
Evans, Rev. E. G., Barton, Cambs.
Evans, Rev. E. W. P., Liverpool 23.
Evans, Rev. M., Ebbw Vale, Mon.
Evans, Rev. W. G., Whitchurch, Cardiff.
Elwyn, Rev. T. S., Walgrave.
Fairbairn, G. G., Reading.
Fairbairn, Rev. N., Penarth.
Fancutt, Rev. W., Stanmore, Middlesex.
Farr, Rev. G., Manchester 21.
Feek, P. G., Pershore.
Fereday, Rev. L. A., Sevenoaks.
Fisher, E., Birmingham 20.
Fisher, J. S., Clevedon, Som.
Floyd, Rev. L. R., Sutton, Surrey.
Fox, Rev. H. J., Portsmouth.
Freshwater, Rev. J. H., Thornton Heath, Surrey.

Gale, H. F., Bedford.
Geary, H. W., Kettering.
Gilmore, Rev. A., Worthing.
Glover, Rev. G. F., Harrow.
Glover, Rev. J. R., Morecambe.
Goodland, Rev. P. J., Stanmore, Middlesex.
Goulding, Rev. C. R., W.5.
Green, Rev. Dr. R., Leeds 6.
Grenfell, Rev. F. J., c/o B.M.S.
Grice, E. B. Le, N. Walsham, Norfolk.
Grief, E. R., Spalding.
Griffiths, Rev. D. R., Penarth.

Hackley, Prof. W. B., Richmond, Va., U.S.A.
Haddock, Rev. M. G., Carmarthen.
Haden, Rev. R., Waterfoot.
Hair, Rev. J., Brighton.
Haley, Rev. G. H., Halifax.
Hall, Rev. C. S., Portsmouth.
Hamlin, Rev. G. H., Bristol 8.
Hammond, T. L., Sutton, Surrey.
Hanson, J. R., Elland, Yorks.
Hardiman, Rev. C., Birmingham 20.
Harris, B. L., Brockley.
Harris, Rev. D., Wolverton, Bucks.

Harrison, F. M. W., Wollaton, Notts.
Hasler, Mrs. H. M., S.E.4.
Hayward, Rev. V. E. W., Pinner, Middlesex.
Hemmens, Rev. F. E., W.12.
Herbert, Rev. A. S., Birmingham 30.
Hicks, Rev. D., Watford.
Highcock, Rev. R., Walsall.
Himbury, Principal D. M., Melbourne, Australia.
Hough, J. E. T., 4 Southampton Row.
Hubbard, Rev. A. T., Blackburn.
Hughes, A. R., Dumbarton.
Hughes, Rev. G. W., Hyde, Cheshire.
Hughey, Dr. J. D., Rüschlikon-Zürich.

Ikin, C. W., N.W.11.
Inkley, Rev. S. R. J., Wolverhampton.
Ironmonger, E. E., N. Hinksey, Oxford.

Jacobson, Rev. A. E., New Hampshire, U.S.A.
James, Dr. C. D. T., Dulwich.
James, Rev. E., Seaford.
Janes, Sir H. C., Angmering, Sussex.
Janisch, Rev. H., Worthing.
Jenkins, Rev. L. H., Falmouth.
Jewson, C. B., Norwich.
Johnson, Dr. A. R., Cardiff.
Johnson, Rev. B. J., Crawley.
Johnson, Rev. W. Chas, 4 Southampton Row.
Jones, Rev. D. A., Normanton, Yorks.
Jones, J. D., Blackwood, Mon.
Jones, Rev. J. I., Cardiff.
Jones, Rev. N. B., Manchester, 3.
Jones, Rev. R. A., Nailsworth, Glos.
Jones, Rev. T. E., Bangor.
Julien, Rev. J. R., Leeds 16.

Keeling, D., Leigh on Sea.
Kemp, Rev. N. W., Hong Kong.
King, W. E. Tankerton.
Kingdon, Rev. D. P., Purley, Surrey.

Labrum, Rev. E. W., Minchinhampton, Glos.
Lane, Rev. L., Wellington, Som.
Law, Rev. W. A., Worthing.
Lee, J. W., Sheffield 7.
Le Quesne, J. G., N.W.3.
Lewis, B. S., Oxford.
Little, Rev. E. B., Kings Langley.
Little, Rev. F. G., Kelso.
Llewellyn, J. P., Rhos-on-Sea.
Lloyd, D. H., Westbury on Trym.
Logan, Rev. H. D., Hemel Hempstead.
Luce, Rev. D. W., Tonbridge.
Lucas, P. E., Bideford.
Ludlow, W. C. A., Portsmouth.
Lugh, Rev. J. S., Bingley, Yorks.

Mallard, Rev. I. M., Broad Clyst, Exeter.
Marchant, Rev. C., Luton.
Martin, Dr. H., E. Grinstead.
Martin, Rev. C. H. E., Canterbury, Australia.
Marvell, Miss H. E., Chelmsford.
Matthews, Rev. A. J., Sutton, Surrey.
May, Mrs. K., Colchester.
Middlebrook, Rev. J. B., N.6.
Mills, A. W., St. Albans.
Minett, H. C., Taunton.
Misselbrook, Rev. L. R., Rushden.
Mitchell, R. F., Newbury.
Monckmom, Rev. D., Jamaica.
Monger, Rev. J. D., Monmouth.
Moon, Rev. L. J., Ilford.
Moore, Rev. B. G., W. Australia.
Moore, Rev. C. H., Thetford, Norfolk.
Morgan, Rev. C. C., Northampton.
Morgan, Mrs. J. M., Barking, Essex.
Morris, Rev. S. G., N.2.
Morris, S. M. V., Ilford.
Mowvley, Rev. H., Bristol 6.
Mullis, Rev. K. R., S.E.13.
Myerson, Rev. L. P. N., Hawkhurst.

Neave, Rev. A., Mansfield.
Newman, A. S., Wellington.
Nicholas, Rev. J., S.W.6.
Nicholson, Rev. J. F. V., Manchester 14.
Norgaard, Dr. J., Denmark.

Odam, C. L., New Orleans, U.S.A.
Ottaway, Rev. G. C., Pinner, Middlesex.

Page, G. E., Lancing, Sussex.
Parkinson, Rev. K. C., Welwyn.
Pawney, C., Chilwell, Notts.
Payne, Dr. E. A., 4 Southampton Row.
Perrin, Miss V., Hinckley.
Peterken, H. T., Eastbourne.
Pewtress, Rev. H. H, Taunton.
Pickup, J. E., Accrington.
Potts, Rev. A. J., Dorking.
Price, Rev. B. F., Bromley.
Price, E. V., Gresford.
Price, Rev. K. S., South Croydon.
Prosser, Rev. G. P. R., S.E.9.
Pugh, Rev. J. P., Rhayader, Radnor.
Purdy, Rev. M. V., Manchester, 23.

Quayle, J. C., Bewdley.

Rankin, Rev. W. E., Pewsey, Wilts.
Reeves, Miss M. E., Oxford.
Rendall, Rev. J. C., Worthing.
Roberts, Rev. J. S., Morriston.
Robinson, Rev. R. J., Rye, Sussex.
Rollinson, Rev. F. H., Bridlington.
Rowlands, Rev. J. R., Llanfachraith.
Rowley, Dr. H. H., Manchester.
Rusling, Rev. G. W., Shirley, Croydon.
Russell, Rev. D. S., Rawdon.
Russell, J. P., Woolsery, Bideford.
Ryder, Rev. E. T., Cardiff.

Sargeant, W. G., Newhaven.
Saunders, Rev. P. G., S.E.11.
Savage, A. W., Worthing.
Savage, Rev. G. D., Burnley.
Scott, Rev. A. B., Brazil.
Scragg, Rev. W., Prestatyn.
Sears, N., Twickenham.
Secrett, I. R., Milford, Surrey.
Sellars, I., Alsager, Stoke.
Senior, O., S.W.16.
Shackleton, Rev. G. E., Didcot.
Shapton, D. A., Westbury on Trym.
Sharpe, Rev. E. P., Oxford.
Sheppard, Rev. J. H., Warrington.
Skemp, Prof. J. B., Durham.
Skirrow, H. W., Chelmsford.
Simpkin, A. L., Sheffield 11.
Sleeman, F. M., Exeter.
Smallbone, Miss F., Abingdon.
Smith, Rev. G., Sheffield.
Smith, Rev. H. A., Bradford 9.
Sparkes, Rev. D. C., New Malden.
Sparrow, Miss S. J., Yealmpton, Plymouth.
St. Amant, Dr. P., W. Virginia, U.S.A.
Stanford, Rev. S. W., Herne Bay.
Stephens, Rev. R. J., Maidenhead.
Sterry, Rev. G. W., N.W.3.
Stevens, W., Smethwick.

Stocks, Dr. P., Rhos on Sea.
Stone, Rev. S. M., Hitchin.
Summerfield, Mrs., Romford.
Swift, Rev. W., Newcastle on Tyne.

Taylor, D., Hazel Grove, Cheshire.
Taylor, Rev. G. H., Dewsbury.
Taylor, Rev. H. J., Burford.
Taylor, Rev. M. H., North Shields.
Taylor, Miss R., Harrow.
Terrell, Rev. S. E. H., W.C.1.
Thomson, Rev. R. W., 4 Southampton Row.
Thorne, Rev. W. G. E., Willenhall.
Timson, A. E., Kettering.
Tongue, Dr. E. J., Seaford.
Trent, Rev. H. W., Gt. Shelford.
Tuberfield, Mrs. T. B., Stourbridge.
Tucker, Rev. J., Nottingham.
Tucker, R. J., Worcester.
Tunstall, A. C., Sutton, Surrey.
Turner, H., Cardiff.
Turner, Rev. W. J., Watford.
Twichett, F. G., Cheam, Surrey.

Valentine, Rev. T. F., Teddington.
Vinson, E., Faversham.

Wade, Rev. O. L. F., Leicester.
Walker, Rev. M. J., N.11.
Walker, Rev. R. J., Southampton.
Walkington, W. E., Hull.
Wallace, Rev. S. J., N.W.10.
Watson, Rev. H. L., Great Kingshill.
Weaver, Rev. W. J., Earley, Reading.
Weaving, Miss E. A., Gloucester.
Weeks, Rev. W. R., Faversham.
Wenger, Rev. E. L., B.M.S.
West, Rev. M. O., Bristol.
West, W. P., N.17.
West, Dr. W. M. S., St. Albans.
Westlake, Rev. A. J., Plymouth.
Wheatcroft, Rev. R. H., Shipshed.
White, Rev. B. R., Oxford.
Williams, Rev. G. G., Geneva.
Williams, Rev. M. F., Exeter.
Williams, Rev. W. E. M., Newport.
Williamson, G., S.W.17.
Williamson, Dr. H. R., Sutton, Surrey.
Willmer, H., Cambridge.
Willmott, Rev. A. E., S.E.25.
Wilmshurst, J., Purley.
Wilson, Rev. W. B., Halifax.
Winn, W. E., Spencerfort, N.Y.
Witard, Miss G. D., Braintree.
Withers, Rev. P. W., Gloucester.
Woolford, Miss J. W., S.W.16.
Wood, Rev. E. J., Bexley.
Woollacott, G. C., New Malden.
Wright, Rev. E. W., Frinton.

The following libraries and other bodies are also subscribers:

Angus Library, Oxford.
Baptist Union Library, London.
Baptist Union of Scotland, Glasgow.
Bristol Baptist College.
Birmingham Public Library.
Broadmead Baptist Church, Bristol.
Cloughfold Baptist Church.
Dr. Williams's Library, London.
Friends' Reference Library, London.
Furman University Library, S. Carolina.
Gould Library, Oxford.
Leeds Central Library.
Manchester Public Library.
National Library of Wales.
New Zealand Baptist Historical Society.
Rylands Library, Manchester.
South Carolina Baptist Convention, Columbia, U.S.A.
Spurgeon's College Library, London.
Stockport Public Library.
West Midlands Association.

A REQUEST TO OUR READERS

Will you please—

★ Look through the membership list

★ Notify the editor of any inaccuracies

★ Join in the effort to enlist new members.