Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal — https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

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

What is conversion?[1]

TONY BAKER

Belief in conversion, and the necessity for it, have always been at the centre of evangelical Christianity. D.W. Bebbington in his survey of evangelicalism from the 1730s takes it as one of four hallmarks:

> . . . *conversionism*, the belief that lives need to be changed; *activism*, the expression of the Gospel in effort; *biblicism*, a particular regard for the Bible; and what may be called *crucicentrism*, a stress on the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. Together they form a quadrilateral of priorities that is the basis of Evangelicalism.[2]

The emphasis on conversion is not surprising; it was shaped by the experience of those who became leaders in the Eighteenth Century Awakening, both within the Church of England and outside it. As Kenneth Hylson-Smith puts it:

> All over England men and women, and most importantly Anglican clergy, underwent the same conversion experience and came, often independently, to preach the same Gospel . . .[3]

Conversion has therefore always been a key word amongst evangelicals; but sometimes the more familiar the word, the less we stop to define it, and that in turn can lead to confusion in belief and practice, the more so since conversion is a universal phenomenon which may be documented in non-religious as well as religious experience.[3] In secular parlance, conversion may be more often associated today with buildings than people, but although the estate agents' classic phrase 'ripe for conversion' has provided us with good Thelwell cartoons and lively sermon illustrations, it will not help us with theological definition.

1. Definitions

Here are a number of definitions of conversion to stimulate our thinking, after which we shall subject these definitions and our own assumptions afresh to Scripture itself. Here are the words of Bishop J.R.S. Taylor, writing in 1961:

> Some people are shy of the word 'conversion' . . . : they think of it perhaps, as an emotional excitement, or a stereotyped transaction. But what we understand by it is that divine enlightenment which came to St Paul, for instance, when he met the risen Christ on the road to Damascus. *Phōtismos* is the Greek word for it . . . . It is the breaking in of God's light on the heart, which responds spontaneously to the

wonder of God's forgiveness and the joy of his sonship.[5]

Norman F. Douty wrote in 1973:

> Conversion is a turning . . . a turning from sin (all sins, not merely some), and a turning to Christ (to Himself, not merely to his teachings)[6].

Now two definitions from the Eighteenth Century, first from the greatest theologian who was also a preacher, and then from the greatest preacher who was also a theologian.

In his sermon 'A divine and supernatural light. . .', Jonathan Edwards said:

> This light is such as effectually influences the inclination, and changes the nature of the soul. It assimilates our nature to the divine Nature . . . . This knowledge will wean from the world, and raise the inclination to heavenly things. It will turn the heart to God as the fountain of good, and to choose Him for the only portion. This light, and this only, will bring the soul to a saving close with Christ. It conforms the heart to the Gospel, mortifies its enmity and opposition against the scheme of salvation therein revealed: it causes the heart to embrace the joyful tidings, and entirely to adhere to, and acquiesce in, the revelation of Christ as our Saviour . . .[7]

Now George Whitefield:

> What is conversion then? . . . Man must be a new creature, and converted from his own righteousness to the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ; conviction will always precede spiritual conversion; and therefore the Protestant divines make this distinction, you may be convinced and not converted, but you cannot be converted without being convinced; and if we are truly converted, we shall not only be turned and converted from sinful self, but we shall be converted from righteous self; that is the devil of devils: for righteous self can run and hide itself in its own doings, which is the reason self-righteous people are so angry with gospel preachers . . . In vain we may talk of being converted till we are brought out of ourselves to come as poor, lost, undone sinners, to the Lord Jesus Christ; to be washed in his blood . . .[8]

2. Scripture's Definition

What does Scripture itself say? It may come as a considerable surprise to learn that the noun *epistrophē* occurs only once—in Acts 15.3 in which we are told that Paul and Barnabas were 'describing in detail the conversion of the gentiles'.[9] However, the verb *epistrephō* occurs thirty-six times, eighteen times in a theological sense, principally in Acts and the Epistles. The essential meaning is to 'turn

towards, turn round, return',[10] and contrary to some English translations it is usually active. The emphasis on the verb rather than the noun surely indicates that what is being stressed is not necessarily an 'experience' of some definite kind at a necessarily known moment in time, but an active 'about turn' of the whole person which stems from conviction and need (or why should I do it?), and will subsequently be shown radically in life. Therefore my 'converting' (or my 'turning') and subsequently my 'having converted' is arguably a more scriptural, more helpful, more dynamic way of seeing my becoming a Christian than simply to talk of 'my conversion' as a past event or experience.

The four quotations earlier given, although selected almost at random, all majored on conversion as 'turning' (and we can already see how right that is) and on our turning in faith to the *person* of the only God in and through his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ: Acts 9.35, 11.21, 14.15, 26.20, 2 Cor. 3.16, 1 Peter 2.25 all make this point. It is a conversion that brings a restored relationship with God Himself; it is the beginning (we may reverently say) of a love affair with the God who, we discover, has first loved us. We turn, look into the eyes of God as Father and Friend, and run into the arms of 'the Shepherd and Guardian of our souls' (1 Peter 2.25)—our Lord Jesus Christ being Himself the good Shepherd. John Stott sums it up:

> Christ is Himself the centre of every conversion . . . Paul's essential inward experience is the same for every man . . . : 'it pleased God . . . to reveal his Son in me' (Gal. 1.15, 16 A.V.) . . . Every converted Christian can echo these words from his own experience.[11]

Biblically, you cannot convert to Christianity or to Roman Catholicism or to Anglicanism; the call is to convert to God Himself in Christ.

Further examination of the context of some of the uses of *epistrephō* is enlightening:

(a) Luke 1.16 and Acts 26.20 tell us that, as conversion is a real and responsible human activity, so God calls his servants into a converting ministry. It is prophesied of John the Baptist that 'he will turn back (lit. 'convert', or 'turn' as A.V.) many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God' (Lk. 1.16). Likewise Paul is sent to the Gentiles 'to open their eyes so that they may turn (or 'convert') from darkness to light . . .' (Acts 26.20). It is not quite scriptural to say we cannot convert others; by the grace of God, we can! Perhaps we tend to evade our responsibility behind a cloak of less than honest humility.

(b) Acts 11.21 teaches us that conversion and believing are inextricably linked. True conversion comes because persuasion of the truth as it is in Jesus is bringing belief in Him, although knowledge of that truth may be very limited. In this excellent book, *The Beginnings: Word and Spirit in Conversion*, Paul Helm puts it like this:

> Here is another important way in which in conversion the Word of God and the Spirit of God are united together. Saving faith is not a blind leap. It is not a substitute for knowledge, as if faith begins to operate when knowledge peters out . . . It is reliance upon God's revelation, his actions, declarations, promises . . . Such knowledge may be fragmentary and it may not be deep. It may be second-hand in the sense that it is derived by the person who has it not simply from the Bible . . . but passed on by word of mouth. A believer may not even know there is a bible. But somehow he must come to know of the revealed mercy of God in Jesus Christ. Faith is reliance on that mercy.[12]

Verses that speak of initial believing in Christ are speaking of conversion (for example, John 3.16, Acts 16.34, etc.).

(c) Acts 14.15 reminds us that he who converts to God in Christ will be no loser: 'We . . . preach the Gospel to you in order that you should turn from these vain things [idols] to a living God.' Almost identical is 1 Thess.1.9: 'You turned to God from idols to serve a living and a true God.' We all have our idols before we are converted. No wonder the converted Paul could write 'I count all things to be loss in view of the surpassing value of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord . . .' (Phil. 3.8).

(d) Significant also are verses that link converting with repenting, (Acts 3.19 and 26.20; *cf.*20.21, where the link is 'repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ'). We must be careful here that our systematic theology (piecing the jigsaw together) does not become our systematizing theology (forcing together pieces that do not quite fit), for there is considerable overlap in meaning between *epistrephō* and *metanoeō* and *metanoia*. In the parables of Luke 15, our Lord speaks simply of sinners 'repenting', as did John the Baptist in Luke 3. Similarly in Acts 2.38 and 17.30, the call is to repent and not expressly to believe or to convert. *Metanoiō* itself does mean 'change one's mind, repent, be converted'.[13] Nevertheless, where repentance and conversion are both mentioned it probably highlights that there can be a difference in emphasis: a turning *from* that there may be a turning *to*; a sorrow before God for sin, and a turning to God for mercy in Christ.

> The Greek words used throughout the NT are mainly forms related to *metanoein* 'to change one's mind'. This small phrase, however, describes a radical change in the individual's *disposition*, for the change of mind concerns his judgment upon himself and his sin together with an evaluation of God's demands upon him. The transformation implied, therefore, is not merely a matter of mental judgment, but of new religious and moral attitudes (a turning to *God*, 1 Thess.1.9) and of new behaviour (Acts 26.20) as John's preaching spelt out.[14]

In view of the niceties of theological discussion concerning repen-

tance and faith and the *ordo salutis* in later centuries, it is wise to remember the flexibility and overlap in usage in the New Testament. What matters is that in Gospel proclamation we give full weight to the call both to turn from sin and to turn to Christ. 'I don't preach repentance,' said a fellow-minister to me once, 'in case I put people off.' But it is in *not* preaching repentance that we are in danger of keeping people of the Kingdom altogether.

(e) Luke 22.32 gives us a particularly intriguing use of *epistrephō*. There Jesus says to Simon, 'I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and you, when once you have turned again [Greek: *epistrepsas*; A.V.: 'when thou art converted'], strengthen your brothers.' When a backslider is restored by a fresh sight of Christ and a fresh word from Him (Luke 24.34), it can be such a mighty happening that the same word can be used as when we come to faith initially. No wonder those brought back to Christ say 'It was almost like a second conversion!'—for so it was.

However, even if Biblically we may use *epistrephō* both of conversion and restoration, there can be only one *regeneration* by the Holy Spirit, and it is to the relationship between regeneration and conversion that we now turn. Although conversion is an active, responsible, human activity, it is not that alone, and it would not take place at all but for the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit in those who 'were dead in . . . trespasses and sin' (Eph. 2.1) and who 'were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest' (Eph. 2.3). The word for regeneration *(palingenesia)* is used only twice in the New Testament—of the regeneration of the individual by the Holy Spirit in Titus 3.5, and of the regeneration of the world in the Messianic age (Matt. 19.28)—a suggestive parallel. Yet understandably, the word has long since entered the technical theological vocabulary for the work of the Holy Spirit in bringing life out of death (Eph. 2.5), light out of darkness (2 Cor. 4.3–6), and spiritual new birth to a man even when he may be old (John 3.3–8). This the Spirit accomplishes through 'the living and abiding word of God' (1 Peter 1.23–25). Thus we are told of Lydia, for example, that 'the Lord opened her heart to respond to the things spoken by Paul' (Acts 16.14). So, although (as we have seen) God entrusts to his children a converting ministry, He must work with them if there is truly to be an increase (1 Cor. 3.5–7).

R.B. Kuiper tells the following story:

> On a London street a reeling drunkard collided with Spurgeon. He recognised the preacher and asked whether the preacher did not recognise him. When Spurgeon answered in the negative, the inebriate argued: 'But you ought to know me; I'm one of your converts.' To which came the apt reply: 'Right you may well be. If you were God's convert you wouldn't be in your present condition!'[15]

Saving faith is indeed the gift of God (Eph. 2.8), and 'regeneration is a giving of life in secret, in the subconscious'.[16]

Ernest Kevan sums up the classic Reformed view of the relationship between regeneration and conversion like this:

> Regeneration is an act of God which precedes conversion and is properly to be distinguished from it. Regeneration is the origination of life: conversion is the manifestation of it.[17]

Nevertheless we take John Stott's point that

> the terms in which it (the relationship of regeneration and conversion) is expressed sometimes go beyond the actual language of the New Testament.[18]

It seems on the whole most Biblical to say simply that 'Conversion flows from, and is dependent on, the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit.' What a stimulus this is to evangelism—that we may look to God the Holy Spirit to be about his regenerating work! What an encouragement to pray, work and look for conversions, to use all possible legitimate means to save some, and to seek local churches which are always in top gear in the work of the Gospel.

Iain Murray quotes Harold J. Ockenga as saying:

> Some reformed theologians teach that regeneration by the Holy Spirit precedes conversion. The evangelical position is that regeneration is conditioned upon repentance, confession and faith.[19]

But this is not the classic evangelical position: this is the classic Arminian position, and frankly I do not encounter it put in that kind of formulated way very often. It is not only not true to Scripture, but it would place on our shoulders an evangelistic burden which none could bear.

Our desire must be so to share, and enable other Christians to share, the Gospel that the converts may, in answer to prayer, have the deepest and most Biblical conversions possible. Starvation rations during spiritual gestation, and after the new birth, radically affect growth and development. It is not surprising that regular feeding with God's Word means some emerge from famine clearly showing they are converted. Perhaps they are newly converted, but perhaps they have been converted many years, yet both denied food and never taught how to find pasture for themselves.

Nor must we think that conversion is only a New Testament doctrine. The Septuagint uses *epistrephō, apostrephō* and *anastrephō* about one hundred and twenty times in a theological sense to render the Hebrew *šûb*[20]: 'Turn back, turn back from your evil ways! Why then will you die, O house of Israel?' (Ezekiel 33.11). Could even Paul be more impassioned than Ezekiel in his calls for conversion? And both Old and New Testaments encourage us with how much can

happen in conversion even when the knowledge of God's revealed truth is limited. Meditate not only on the moving story of the dying thief and the evidence of his conversion (Luke 23.39–43), but on the marvellous incident of the conversion of the sailors in Jonah Ch.1. Note how their praying, attitudes and actions changed in the course of traumatic hours: John Newton was not the only one who was brought into the Kingdom of God through a storm!

Scripture therefore sets before us again the utter centrality of conversion. Is Michael Green overstating it when he puts it like this?

> The life to come is represented to us as continuous with this life. Death has been robbed of its significance, and the two poles in the Christian's existence are his conversion and the coming of Christ.[21]

3. Lessons from the Past

As we seek to relate Scripture teaching on conversion to the circumstances in which God has placed us, we must not make today's common error and come on the bypass, ignoring all we should be learning from church history. For there is nothing new under the sun, and travelling carefully down at least a few of the paths from the past, noting some of the difficulties into which teaching and presentation of conversion have fallen, should enable us to cope better with potholes in the present. We shall touch on one or two areas from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (one of which has erupted into a twentieth century controversy), on a cluster of lessons to be learned from the days of the eighteenth century Great Awakening, on one major issue that emerges from the nineteenth, and ends with the challenge of our own.

(a) Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

First, R.T. Kendall has argued that in a number of directions later Calvinists seriously distorted Calvin's own teaching. This, says Kendall, included reversing

> . . . Calvin's *ordo salutis* by putting repentance ('turning from every known sin') before faith ('looking to the promise alone'). The problem was that many were never quite sure they had repented enough, therefore some of the insights of both Luther and Calvin passed behind a cloud.[22]

You can read both Kendall's arguments and Paul Helm's response for yourself;[23] but wherever the truth lies, we are reminded of the danger of presenting the Gospel as conditional and not free grace: 'God will only accept me if my repentance is sufficient'. Individuals have said to me: 'When I was converted, I'm not sure my repentance was deep enough or sincere enough; so am I converted at all?' In fact, as we

saw, repentance and faith are so much two sides of one coin that it is impossible to exercise true repentance without a measure of faith. If I am digging in the garden, and I hear a voice behind me saying 'About turn! I've got a cup of tea for you', I shall turn round because I already believe what is on offer and anticipate receiving it.

Secondly, there is the broader charge sometimes levelled against some Puritans that, for all their theological and pastoral acumen, they could make conversion complicated:

> Unfortunately, as the result of a rational manipulation of Reformed doctrine which went far beyond Calvin into hypercalvinism, they loaded into the conversion experience so much of the developed content of Christian growth that in effect they required believers to become practising mystics before they could be counted as Christians.[24]

We should be able to express the meaning of conversion, profound as it is, simply. Simple should not mean inaccurate. A missionary who was reared in one of the smaller Scottish denominations, was not converted until she left home and went to another church as she began nursing training. When she returned and told her minister what had happened, he asked her sadly, 'Why weren't you converted under my ministry?', and she had to say, 'I'm afraid you made it so complicated.'

(b) Eighteenth Century

A century of great spiritual awakening, with the need for conversion inevitably brought to the fore, brings its own dangers.

First, there was the danger of restricting the free offer of the Gospel and therefore the call to conversion. The argument of the hypercalvinists was

> . . . that only the conscious sinner, the convinced and the contrite, have a warrant to come to Christ. Christ is only to be held forth, they said, to prepared and penitent sinners; none are to be called to believe on the Saviour but those possessing these inward marks.[25]

This amounts to a forgetfulness that the Spirit uses the Word, and if we do not proclaim the converting Word, we cannot expect to see others coming to conversion. There was fierce debate in Scotland in this connexion after the re-publication in 1718 of the Puritan work, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, which asserted the free and universal offer of the Gospel. In England later in the century Andrew Fuller, a noted Baptist theologian, published *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* in 1784 in the same cause.[26] Nor is this so remote from our own day: any restriction in evangelism and a clear call to conversion to groups or individuals that we judge are temperamen-

tally or sociologically 'more likely' to respond to the Gospel is essentially the same error and must grieve the Spirit of God who is both sovereign and gracious.

Secondly, there was the danger, in an age of many remarkable conversions, of making conversion always an experience to be sought or a rigid pattern to fit into. 'The experience was often ardently sought, for others as well as for oneself,' says Bebbington, having quoted the experience of one Sampson Staniforth:

> . . . as I looked up to heaven I saw the clouds open exceeding bright, and I saw Jesus hanging on the Cross. At the same moment these words were applied to my heart, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee.' My chains fell off; my heart was free. All guilt was gone, and my soul was filled with unutterable peace.[27]

Revival truly deepens and intensifies conversion, as everything else in the Christian life. But Scripture still gives the call to conversion without insisting on particular experiences or rigid patterns. Whenever such things become part of the Gospel message, some will be brought into bondage and not freedom. That is why Paul Helm is so wise to write:

> There is a great variety of experience of conversion. For some it is sudden, traumatic. For others it is gentle and almost imperceptible. Some are converted out of paganism or secularism in one sudden moment. Others are gradually converted, perhaps from a Christian or semi-Christian background. There is no stereotype or ideal or 'classic' conversion.[28]

We must, says Helm, see conviction of sin, saving faith and repentance as three strands in conversion, not stages, if we are to avoid legalism.[29]

Thirdly, there was the danger, however unintentional, of manipulation of emotions and personality. Martyn Lloyd-Jones considers that this could be a danger even with Edwards (that his preaching on Hell went beyond scriptural warrant) and Whitefield, whose eloquence and imagination could run away with him. If such could possibly be true of these two giants, how much more may it have been true of others! In *Conversions: Psychological and Spiritual*,[30] Lloyd-Jones does indeed take to pieces Dr. William Sargent's psychological analysis of conversion (Sargent says of Paul's conversion: 'A state of transmarginal inhibition seems to have followed his acute state of nervous excitement'!); but Lloyd-Jones warns preachers that we most certainly still have dangers to avoid in this direction:

> The emotions and the will should always be influenced through the mind. Truth is intended to come to the *mind*.[31]

Fourthly, it is not surprising that the eighteenth century also pro-
duced, in reaction, the error known, after one of its chief proponents,
as Sandemanianism,[32] which argues that conversion consists only of
intellectual assent to the truth of the Gospel. 'It is a bare belief of the
bare truth', says Andrew Fuller by way of criticism. Is it not an error
we are in danger of repeating if, for example, we simply go through a
Gospel leaflet, ask if the reader 'agrees with it' and if so, 'get him to
pray the prayer'?

(c) Nineteenth Century

This was of course the century which saw the development, *via*
Finney and Moody, of the invitation system and what is still known as
'mass evangelism'. It is the system exemplified in the post-war era by
Dr. Billy Graham, so greatly used of God, and a man respected and
beloved amongst Christians everywhere.

Nevertheless, we still need to ask urgent questions. Did Moody's
earnest desire for instant and immediate conversions lead him and his
successors into a system which can rush ahead of the work of the
Holy Spirit? Does the 'invitation system' too easily give the impres-
sion that someone is converted by getting up and coming forward?
Does the inevitably rushed counselling in often congested areas really
give the respect due to those being counselled, as well as to the Holy
Spirit? If, in the work of the Gospel, it is the responsibility of those
helping the unconverted to 'keep in step with the Spirit', is this a
system which really promotes that? Surely there are better ways
which respect more the nature of spiritual regeneration and human
conversion.[33]

Geoffrey Hart writes:

> Moody's fervent emphasis upon instantaneous conversion left the very
> deep impression that no other sort of conversion was valid. This legacy
> is an almost integral part of evangelical orthodoxy . . . Moody's great
> concern was to 'draw in the net' with the result that evangelism came to
> be thought of almost exclusively as doing just that . . . . 'Drawing in
> the net' can unfortunately and easily become an end in itself, an
> exercise in spiritual gymnastics . . . . It is hardly surprising that
> wrongly understood and badly used it can all too quickly produce a
> crop of what are casually called 'spurious conversions'.[34]

With Dr. Graham's years as an evangelist inevitably now limited,
perhaps this is the time to re-evaluate mass evangelistic methods as
we look ahead to the next generation; but saying this is in no way to
detract from his greatness as an evangelist, and the humble godliness
of his walk with Christ.

Inevitably in moving from Finney and Moody to Graham we have
already in our survey moved into the century in which God has
placed us—which is marked in the West by materialism, secularism,

and pluralism. Yet in the goodness of God, men and women are still being converted. It is particularly encouraging to note the renewed emphasis in some evangelical circles on the inevitability of receiving Jesus as both Lord and Saviour in conversion:

> Jesus is able to save us from sin and death because of his overthrow and defeat of Satan. He is able to save because He is Lord. Consequently it is not possible to accept Jesus as Saviour and *not* as Lord since He saved by being Lord.[35]

In confidence therefore we still call others to convert, to about turn, to the one who is Lord and who will be Judge, but who in mercy became Saviour. The call and warning of Jesus is unambiguous: 'Truly I say to you, unless you are converted and become like children, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven.' But the certainty and generosity of his promise is equally unambiguous. 'Whoever then humbles himself as this child, he is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven' (Matt. 18.3,4).[36] Conversion can never be a merely academic subject. It will surely make us sing again one of the greatest of all hymns, Charles Wesley's 'And can it be'. A single verse encompasses spiritual death, regeneration, conversion and discipleship:

> Long my imprisoned spirit lay
>   Fast bound in sin and nature's night;
> Thine eye diffused a quickening ray,
>   I woke, the dungeon flamed with light;
> My chains fell off, my heart was free;
>   I rose, went forth, and followed Thee.

TONY BAKER is vicar of Christ Church, Beckenham.

NOTES

1 A paper read at the Church Society Conference, April 1990.
2 D.W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain* (London, Unwin Hyman, 1989, p. 3).
3 Kenneth Hylson-Smith, *Evangelicals in the Church of England* (Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1989, p. 10).
4 Stephen Smalley, article 'Conversion' in *New Testament Dictionary of Theology* (Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1988, p. 167).
5 Bishop J.R.S. Taylor, *What is Evangelicalism?* (London, Falcon booklet, 1961, p. 7).
6 Norman F. Douty, *Union with Christ* (Swengal, Pa., Reiner, 1973, p. 131).
7 Quoted by J.I. Packer in *'Jonathan Edwards and the Theology of Revival'*, paper in *Increasing in the Knowledge of God* (Report of 1960 Puritan Conference, p. 15).
8 George Whitefield, *What is Conversion?*, reprinted in *The Banner of Truth*, 79 (April 1970, pp. 29–31).

9 All Bible quotations are from the N.A.S.V., unless otherwise indicated.
10 J. Goetzmann, article 'Conversion' in *Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, Vol.1 (Exeter, Paternoster, 1975, p. 354).
11 John R.W. Stott, *Our Guilty Silence*, (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1967, p. 103).
12 Paul Helm, *The Beginnings* (Edinburgh, Banner of Truth, 1986, p. 68).
13 J. Goetzmann, *op.cit.*, p. 357.
14 R. Kearsley, article 'Repentance' in *New Testament Dictionary of Theology*, p. 580.
15 R.B. Kuiper, *God-centred Evangelism* (London, Banner of Truth, 1966, p. 218).
16 Paul Helm. *op.cit.*, p. 97.
17 Ernest F. Kevan, *Salvation* (Grand Rapids, Baker, 1963, p. 64).
18 John Stott, *op.cit.*, p. 108.
19 Quoted by Iain Murray in *The Invitation System* (London, Banner of Truth,n.d. p. 18).
20 See J. Goetzmann, *op.cit.*, p. 354, for helpful references.
21 E.M.B. Green, *The Meaning of Salvation* (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1965, p. 195).
22 R.T. Kendall, article '*Conversion is a vital part of faith*' in *The Times*, May 5, 1984.
23 See R.T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford, O.U.P., 1981). and Paul Helm, *Calvin and the Calvinists* (Edinburgh, Banner of Truth, 1982).
24 Richard F. Lovelace, *Dynamics of Spiritual Life* (Downers Grove, Inter-Varsity Press, 1979, p. 233).
25 Iain Murray, article '*The Free Offer of the Gospel*' in *The Banner of Truth* 11 (June 1958, pp. 8–16). See also John J. Murray, '*The Marrow Controversy—Thomas Boston and the Free Offer*', paper in *Preaching and Revival* (Report of 1984 Westminster Conference); David C. Lachman *The Marrow Controversy 1718–1723* (Edinburgh, Rutherford House, 1988).
26 See T.E. Watson, *Andrew Fuller's Conflict with Hypercalvinism*, paper in *How Shall They Hear?* (Report of 1959 Puritan Conference, pp. 22–29, and Andrew Fuller, *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* in *Works* (London, Bohn, 1848, pp. 150–190).
27 Bebbington, *op.cit.*, p. 5.
28 Helm, *op.cit.*, p. 81.
29 Helm, *op.cit.*, p. 87.
30 See D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Conversions Psychological and Spiritual* (London, Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1959).
31 Lloyd-Jones, *op.cit.*, p. 39.
32 See Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, '*Sandemanianism*' in *Profitable for Doctrine and Reproof* (Report of 1967 Puritan Conference, pp. 54–71), and Andrew Fuller, *Strictures on Sandemanianism* in *Works*, pp. 256–294).
33 See Michael Green, *Evangelism in the Early Church* (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1970), especially chapter 8 'Evangelistic Methods' and the *Epilogue*, evaluating modern evangelistic practice. Iain Murray, *The Invitation System* is critical, while R.T. Kendall gives a spirited defence in *Stand Up and Be Counted* (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1984).
34 Geoffrey W. Hart, '*Evangelicals and Evangelism*' (C.P.A.S. Fellowship Paper 290, 1975, pp. 5,7,8).
35 John C. Chapman, *Know and Tell the Gospel*, (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1981).
36 The verb is *strepho*, not *epistrephō* and the mood passive, not active (a reminder that we cannot straitjacket Scripture's vocabulary!).