

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

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

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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



incorporating the Transactions of the
BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDITORIAL

IT is now exactly fifty years since W. J. Mcglothlin produced the collections of documents entitled *Baptist Confessions of Faith*. Although originally published in America, the Baptist Historical Society sponsored a special subscription edition in this country produced by the Kingsgate Press and containing four additional sections. Now, in 1960, a successor to the Mcglothlin collection has arrived from America. Using the same title as Mcglothlin, Dr. William L. Lumpkin has given us a volume of 430 pages, published by the Judson Press and to be sold in this country at the regrettably high price of 42s. The suggestion that the work might be published also in England by the Carey-Kingsgate Press was considered but found to be impracticable.

The new volume is not entirely independent of Mcglothlin for a considerable number of the early Baptist Confessions in this new book appear to have been photographically reproduced from the type of the earlier book and the introduction to some of the documents also owe a good deal to Mcglothlin. In his Foreword, Dr. Lumpkin rightly acknowledges his indebtedness both to Mcglothlin and to the still earlier volume of documents collected together in 1854 by E. B. Underhill and published by the Hanserd Knollys Society of London.

A comparison of the table of contents of this book and Mcglothlin makes clear, however, that there are here some things which are new. The book is divided into six sections and we will glance at each section in turn.

The first section is a brief summary entitled, "Backgrounds of the Baptist Movement." It cannot be said that it is very satisfactory. To attempt such a summary in six and a half pages is brave indeed, but it results in generalisations about Baptist backgrounds which, in the light of modern research, cannot now safely be made—especially as some of the secondary sources quoted are works published several decades ago. The impression is given, for example, that the Anabaptist movement in England during the sixteenth century was both strong and influential—even if those influenced were not aware of the source of the influence. To quote Dr. Lumpkin; "The Anabaptist principles were never entirely forgotten in England: they leavened both the Established Church and the Kingdom; on the basis of them various non-conformist bodies took their rise." (p. 14). As modern research into Anabaptism in England stands today, especially with regard to its influence on the beginnings of Separatism, such a claim—however much we might like it to be true—would be hard to substantiate. Dr. Lumpkin certainly goes some way towards modifying the viewpoint set forth in this first section when, in his introduction to the Separatist Confession; *A True Confession*, 1596, he writes: "The extent of indebtedness of English Separatism to Anabaptism is a much disputed question, but it seems reasonable to conclude that the thinking of the more advanced seekers after reformation in England was in some degree shaped by the thousands of Netherlanders who settled in England, especially along the east coast during the second half of the sixteenth century." This is a much more tentative conclusion than the general emphasis of the first section. It is almost certainly nearer the facts of this matter even though it is not now certain that there was an organised group of Dutch Anabaptists in Norwich when Robert Browne set up his Separatist Church there.

The second section, 'Forerunner Confessions' contains much useful material on the Anabaptist, Mennonite and other early Confessions. It is fuller than the corresponding section in McGlothlin. It is a pity, however, that in connection with the exceedingly important and interesting Schleithem Confession, Dr. Lumpkin does not indicate where further and more detailed discussion of it may be found. We could do with a fuller bibliographical note on this and other confessions. There does not appear to be, for example, any reference to Beatrice Jenny's detailed work *Das Schleitheimer Täuferbekenntnis 1527*, nor to Dr. Payne's article on 'Michael Sattler and the Schleithem Confession in the *Baptist Quarterly*, Vol. XIV, No. 8. In spite of this bibliographical weakness—which is manifest throughout the book—students of Baptist History will welcome this collection of

Anabaptist and Pioneer English Separatist Baptist Confessions. Incidentally, *A True Confession*, 1596, which deserves a place, can scarcely be classified under either of these two headings in spite of the debt which later Baptist Confessions owe to it.

In the third and fourth sections we are given 'Early English Baptist Associational Confessions' and 'English Baptist General Confessions'. This is a departure in arrangements from Mcglothlin. The earlier work separated the English Baptist Confessions into General and Particular Baptist documents, i.e., Arminian and Calvinistic Baptist documents. Dr. Lumpkin's method is to distinguish between Confessions of Associations and Confessions of General Assemblies and so arrange his two sections. This means that the documents in each of the two sections are arranged in chronological order without separate sections for the two streams of Baptist thought. Whilst this method has much to commend it in that it well illustrates the development of group thinking on two levels amongst both groups of Baptists, the student of Baptist History seeking to trace the progress in thought of the two groups will probably prefer Mcglothlin's method. The paragraph at the end of Section 3 headed 'Other Associational Confessions' is disappointing. The opportunity is missed of providing a more comprehensive note about the use and whereabouts of Association Confessions produced in the eighteenth century—and subsequently. Similarly, at the end of the section on the General Confessions in the paragraphs on 'Statements of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland', it is hard to understand the omission of the 1948 Statement on 'The Baptists'. This 'Statement' is probably the most comprehensive declaration of Baptist beliefs in recent times and its omission is all the more regrettable if this book becomes the standard reference book on Baptist confessions for other denominations.

The fifth and sixth sections are of particular interest to British Baptists as they expand considerably the final two sections in Mcglothlin on 'American Baptist Confessions' and 'Confessions of Other Nationalities'. The American Confessions illustrate clearly the variety of expression in which the Baptist witness has manifested itself, though not a few of the Confessions appear to have been produced as a result of controversy within the Baptist ranks. The final section gives us the most recent German Confession of Faith of the Alliance of Evangelical-Free church Congregations (1944); the Swedish Baptist Confession of Faith in a translation, so we are told, by Rev. Eric Ruden, but which appears to be (apart from the alteration of 'will' to 'shall' in paragraph 4) the same translation used by Mcglothlin and attributed to Rev. C. E. Benander; the 1924 version of the 1879 French Confession (a version which is referred to as a condensation, but which in

some sections, notably the doctrinal part appears to be a considerable expansion of the 1879 Confession as given by Mcglathlin); the Doctrinal Basis of the New Zealand Baptist Union and of the Baptist Union of Victoria, Australia, and a Confession of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. All these documents make interesting reading and it is noteworthy to find that the Principle and Ideals of the Baptist Faith as set forward by the Baptist Union of Victoria begins with 'The Child in the Kingdom'.

The book ends with a very brief note headed; 'In Conclusion' which is shown as being the last part of Section 6 but which reads as a concluding comment on the whole book, not simply on 'Confessions of Other Nationalities'. Here again one feels that an opportunity has been missed to make some constructive comment on the differences of emphasis which clearly still exist today in the Baptist world, as reflected in the Confessions, and to remind the reader of the fundamental principles of doctrine which also are reflected in all the Confessions and which unite Baptists the world over.

Whilst we have been critical of points of detail within the book, we would, nevertheless, emphasise the value of having available again the classic Confessions of Baptist Faith. Mcglathlin has been, for too long, out of print. Our criticism arises from a feeling of disappointment. For this book, for which we have waited for so long—useful as it is—could surely have been so much more useful. It seems that Dr. Lumpkin never really decided whether he was going to revise and enlarge Mcglathlin or whether he was going to produce an entirely new and up to date volume on Baptist Confessions of Faith.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

G. W. RUSLING, M.A., B.D.

Vice-Principal, Spurgeon's College, London.

ERNEST A. PAYNE, M.A., D.D.

General Secretary, Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.

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

Minister, Amersham, Bucks.

R. E. COOPER, M.A.

Eltham College, London.

Reviews by:—A. A. ANDERSON, D. D. BLACK, I. R. DUNCAN, S. WINWARD.

The Status of Children

IT is sometimes laid to our charge as Baptists that we do not satisfactorily answer the question concerning the status of children. The *tu quoque* rejoinder, though not altogether beside the point, is unconstructive, and this problem, important enough in its own right, becomes increasingly pressing as a by-product of the baptismal discussion now in progress. At the moment we appear to be less ready to pronounce on this issue than some of our forefathers were.¹ An article in the *Baptist Times*² posed certain of the questions, particularly that relating to original sin, but none of us took the matter up and this fact seems to reflect the uncertainties which many feel. We were reminded that the classical answer of the Church to the situation with which the doctrine of original sin confronts us, has been to baptize the child. As Baptists we reject this answer but how then do we meet the situation? What terms have we come to with the doctrine of original sin in its implications for our children? Dr. G. J. M. Pearce hopes to pursue this aspect of the question in the *Baptist Quarterly* at some future date. Meanwhile I offer one or two comments, not by way of answer to the problems he has raised but bearing on the general question of the status of children.

We should frankly recognise that much of the apologetic for Infant Baptism, which to us often seems so laboured, is quickened by a deep concern about this very matter. It is a concern which goes much deeper than anything evoked by mere sentimentality regarding children. Biblical thought confronts us with the idea of corporate solidarity as well as that of individual responsibility and our theology, including our ecclesiology, must find proper room for the interplay of these concepts. Our controversy with the paedo-Baptist is not over the fact that he finds a place for the child in the life of the Church but that, when he wrongly transfers to the beginning of life the rite which belongs to the New Birth, he either reduces the meaning of baptism (admitting that much of what the New Testament says about it cannot apply in the case of infants), or he makes assertions about its significance which, to us, seem alien to New Testament teaching and which distort and confuse the doctrine of the Church and Sacraments. Of this the *Book of Common Prayer* provides a familiar example in declaring that after baptism the child is "regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church." The difficulties which this kind of

language presents for us have often been stated and they continue with the unfolding process, as for example, when the person about to be confirmed is asked, "Dost thou not think that thou art bound to believe, and to do, as they (the godparents) have promised for thee?" We neither understand how godparents can "promise and vow" what they do, nor how it can be supposed that their godchild is under obligation to honour vows made in his name before he had any choice in the matter. It is unnecessary to dwell upon these problems of which we are relieved by the doctrine of Believers' Baptism. Believers' Baptism, however, so far from relieving the problem as to the status of children sharpens it for us. If it leads us to deny certain ideas quite decisively, what do we positively affirm?

Since it is by Believers' Baptism, and all that goes with it, that we enter the Church, the vast majority among us would take the view that a child who has not yet made his responsible committal to Christ cannot possibly be regarded as a member of the Church nor, most would add, as a Christian. Let us take the latter for a moment. It seems straightforward enough but would we assert it *without any qualification* when in our presence a child has just said his prayers "in Jesus' name"? Were his prayers not sincere, was his trust not real? If not a Christian what is he? We will not speak of the child as a member of the Church but is our denial without any qualification when he is found sharing regularly in the worship of the Church and quite obviously feels at home in its environment? Do we think, much less say, "This child does not belong here"? Of course not, but if he does belong, if he is in any sense one of the family of the Church, what exactly is his status? We cannot rest content with purely negative answers to these questions.

Of the child who is being brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord we can at least assert that *he is a catechumen of the Church*. This term is one with which all students of early Church History are familiar and which has reappeared in modern missionary terminology. It first appeared in Tertullian and "the context shows it to mean an unbaptised person who has been accepted by the Church for instruction and training in the hope of baptism. It shows also that catechumens were admitted to the first part of the liturgy, and dismissed before the offerings."³ The phase of worship to which the catechumen was admitted was that sometimes referred to as "the Liturgy of the Word" as distinct from "the Liturgy of the Upper Room" and this first phase came, indeed, to be known in the West as the *Missa catechumenorum*.

We will glance in a moment at the structure of the early

catechumenate but first let us rehearse the obvious facts about the child of Christian parents which suggest the appropriateness of the catechumenical idea. The child has been born to parents who intend to bring him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. He is the object of their prayers and will be helped to say his own as soon as he is capable of the simplest petition and thanksgiving. His parents' example will be such as to encourage faith and love towards God. He is in a home in which the name of Christ is used only with reverence and in which the Church is a reality known and loved. He hears and later will be helped to read the Scriptures. He is taken to Church and in the degree possible to him enters into the act of divine worship. Admittedly much of his early prayer and praise, at home and in Church, will be imitative and repetitive in character, but that will not make it less acceptable to God. He is included in the Church's own ministries of prayer and instruction. In a real sense it embraces him in its community and helps him to feel at home in its midst. Much of its worship will be beyond him but it is only from personal participation in the sacraments that he is, for the time being, debarred. Much of his early instruction will be informal, almost incidental, and imbibed unconsciously from Christian example and environment; he will also be given teaching graded to his age and capacity in the Sunday School and the morning worship of the Church. All this indicates that his relationship to the Church is that of a catechumen though his is a *prolonged catechumenate*, beginning in infancy, as compared with that of the person who comes as an adult from paganism. The aim and purpose behind these various ministries is nothing else but that of the catechumenate, for everything that is being done for the child is being done in the hope that he will in due course make his personal response in repentance, faith and baptism.

The pastoral realities of the catechumenate are perfectly familiar to us. What we have not done is to make allowance for the idea of it in our theology of the Church. If we could do this it would mean that we had a category enabling us to give proper formal recognition to a fact we do not question, i.e. that the kind of child we have in mind is, in some sense, in and of the Christian community before his baptism. We rightly emphasize the necessity of conversion and have often pointed out that our restriction of baptism to believers accords with the character of the Church as a redeemed community. But as a redeemed community the Church is called to a ministry of evangelism and reconciliation. By the very fact of this ministry, by the task to which it is summoned in the terms of our Lord's commission, the Church must always have a catechumenate in its midst. The

population of the catechumenate is constantly changing, for its members are in transit towards full Church membership, but the catechumenate itself must be a permanent feature of the Church's life. Our definition of the Church should make room for this fact. Though not yet baptised, those who are in the catechumenate stage are in a *creative relationship* with the Body of Christ. They do not belong to the indifferent or to the opposition.

That the Church consists of believers is, of course, at once a theological truth and a theological abstraction; to risk an impersonal metaphor, it is the garden considered apart from the nursery in which tomorrow's plants are raised. But the Church *as we know it in life*, ever involved in mission, always has its catechumenate and cannot be fully understood or comprehensively described without it. Unlike an alien or parasitic growth the catechumenate is a necessary organ, integral to the Church's function and vital to its future; almost, we might say, the womb of the Body for in it the life is nurtured which eventually issues in the New Birth.

Our congregations contain not only the central core of full committed and communicant members but other persons who are at varying distances from the centre. These others are the incoming traffic. Some turn away again and some seem to get held up almost indefinitely on the outer fringe though they do not turn away. The members of the typical candidates' class are nearly in. It is the Church's pastoral and evangelistic concern to keep all this traffic moving inwards and it cannot be content to let any of it come to a halt. At the same time we must recognise that some who are not yet Church members are believers of sorts. There are adults in the Women's Meeting and the Men's Circle whose relationship with the Church leaves much room for progress but who seem to come under the heading of "he that is not against us is for us." We cannot be complacent about them nor can we whittle down the need for full committal but our account of the Church will not be complete unless it takes account of the presence of these, the learners who have not yet reached the candidates' class, the fellow-travellers who are not yet members of the Party, the children who love and trust the Lord with their childlike faith but are not yet capable of responsible choice. It is not true to pastoral experience to draw one simple line at Believers' Baptism and classify those on one side as in and the others as out. Whether or not we use the term, the idea underlying the catechumenate is important and valuable, not least in helping us to say something positive concerning the children who share in the Church's life.⁴

At this point I should mention that if we do apply the term catechumen to children we shall not be strictly following the usage

of the early Church. Writing of that period, C. L. Feltoe speaks of two grades among those who were unbaptised, (i) catechumens pure and simple, i.e. adherents to Christianity who were, however, looked upon as members of the community (e.g. *Can. Hipp.* 63, 64); (ii) catechumens who sought baptism, and were therefore being subjected to a definite course of instruction with a view thereto.⁵ The latter, our "candidates' class," had in fact moved a stage beyond that of the catechumen, properly so-called. Having applied and been approved for baptism they were now described variously as *phōtizomenoi, electi, illuminandi*. (This distinction recalls the fact that the catechumens, a very large group, included many who remained as such for most of their lives, seeking to postpone the crucial act of baptism to the last possible moment for fear of post-baptismal sin. "Numberless are the inscriptions telling of the administration of baptism immediately before death took place,"⁶ important evidence not always remembered by those who speak of an early universal establishment of infant baptism.) In the early catechumenate there was yet another distinction made. Candidates for admission to the catechumenate proper were called *accedentes* or *rudes* and strictly it was to this class that children of Christian parents belonged. It also included pagans and heretics who were knocking at the Church's door. "When the candidate had given a satisfactory account of his motives for approaching Christianity his preparation for admission to the catechumenate was given in a single instruction. . . . When the catechist had brought this instruction to a close, he asked the candidate whether he believed what he had heard. If the answer was in the affirmative, he was initiated into the catechumenate by the "sacraments" of the signing of the Cross, the imposition of hands, and the administration of salt."⁷ These ceremonies would vary in various places.

It used to be held that there were several grades of catechumen but that view has been abandoned. The classification alluded to in the previous paragraph shows us stages on the way to baptism, in *one* of which a person was called a catechumen. It was the researches of F. X. Funk which led to this clarification and so far as I know it is not seriously challenged today. It still remains true that the various groups are often referred to under the general heading of the catechumenate, and with them also the *neophyti*, the newly-baptized who continued to receive catechetical instruction for a period after baptism. We can use the word catechumen for the children we have in mind provided we do not suggest that this was the exact terminology used in the early Church. Baptists are not given to over-elaboration. I do not envisage even catechumen coming into popular use among us, and

which of us would consent to some transliterated form of *rudes* or *accedentes* as applied to our children! Catechumen will do for the present discussion. It is not the word but the idea that I am concerned with.

The catechumenate, catering for those who are under instruction and participating in worship, does not exclude the children of non-Christian parents. Of these there are not a few in our churches and Sunday Schools. In regard to their Christian upbringing, Sunday School teachers or other Church members stand *in loco parentis* so far as that is possible. The domestic setting differentiates the child of a pagan home from one of Christian parents but as learners in the Church and its ancillaries they stand side by side. Is there any other difference of status, character or privilege as between these two?

We can be certain that both share in the love of God and of both we can assert that they have been born into a world for which Christ died. These affirmations are sometimes given as part of the justification for infant baptism (the former often in terms of *Mark* x. 14) but as such they should surely be abandoned by those protagonists of baptismal reform who would restrict the rite to infants whose parents intend to take their Christian vows and responsibilities seriously. It is also a little difficult to understand those who still claim that Infant Baptism is a declaration of the prevenient grace of God and yet restrict it to the children of such parents. If baptism given in the one case proclaims prevenient grace, what does its denial in the other case declare? The severity of God, visiting the unbelief of the parents upon the children? Or the severity of the Church which is prepared to exercise faith on behalf of one child but not the other? We deeply respect the concern of those paedo-Baptists who feel the scandal of "indiscriminate baptism," of the christening which is little more than a social occasion for the lay participants. There are still some among them however who continue to use arguments which had more point before the baptismal reform movement. In pleading for baptism in instances where the Church sees real hope of Christian instruction and pastoral care, what they are really doing is to point to the significance of the catechumenate. The logical step would be the restoration of the order of the early Church in which baptism came not as the introduction to, but the culmination of, the catechumenate. They would still need an infancy rite, not baptism but one which would include everything that can be legitimately said and done for children in infancy. If our Dedication Service does not do this already it is in principle capable of doing so and we should hasten to make good its deficiencies. Among other things it should certainly allow for introduction to the Church's catechu-

menate, perhaps by admission to the Sunday School's cradle roll so long as the Sunday School be understood not as a separate entity but as an integral part of the Church's life.

A crucial text for discussion at this point is, of course, 1 *Corinthians* vii. 14 and it must be admitted that if paedo-Baptists wrongly employ it in their apologetic, Baptists have made little positive use of it. The background of the verse is familiar. Mixed marriages were not to be contracted by Christians but what of the marriage that had become mixed by the conversion of a partner who as a former pagan had married a pagan? This question had evidently been put to the apostle and his answer was that the continuance of marital relationships in such circumstances was quite permissible. It was not a mixed marriage in the usual sense because the unbelieving partner was consecrated or sanctified through the converted one. (*hēgiastai gar ho anēr ho apistos en tē gunaiki. . . .*) Reinforcing his point Paul went on to argue that if this were not the case the children of the marriage would be unclean (*akatharta*) but as things are, both parents being sanctified, the children are holy (*hagia*). The argument, says St. John Parry, is "by analogy from their conviction about the children of Christian marriage, to the heathen partners of mixed marriages."⁸ Paul's concern at the moment is with the latter but on his understanding of the situation the argument can be used in either direction. Are the children holy? Then it follows that the parents must be, including the unbelieving one. Are the parents holy, including the unbelieving one? Then the children must be too.

The verse provides no support for infant baptism.⁹ The children are not holy because they have been baptised but because they are the progeny of holy parents. If they had been baptised that would have been an alternative explanation of their holiness which would still leave open the question of the unconverted parent. If baptised they could scarcely now be thought of as "unclean" whatever the state of one of the parents.¹⁰ If the verse is far from proving that infants actually were baptised in the Corinthian Church it is also a curious one to employ in favour of the *principle* of infant baptism, though it is sometimes so used even by commentators who concede that it says nothing about the practice in Corinth. This text, says Lightfoot, "enunciates the principle which leads to Infant Baptism, *viz.* that the child of Christian parents shall be treated as Christian."¹¹

It may or may not be significant that Lightfoot spoke there of Christian parents. Was that plural a slip of the pen or did he regard the heathen but "sanctified" parent as Christian? It is a matter of some moment. On the basis of this verse there is as

much ground, no more and no less, for "treating as Christian" the unbelieving spouse as Lightfoot says we should treat the child. Whatever holiness means in this context it means it as much for the one as for the other. "This principle of family solidarity holds good of the *conjugal* tie no less than of the filial derived therefrom."¹² Yet those who find here an argument for infant baptism do not take the discussion further and clarify the position of the heathen partner *vis-a-vis* baptism. If we are to baptise an infant on the basis of this kind of holiness we cannot in principle reject the legitimacy of it for the unbelieving parent. It would hardly be a satisfactory answer, in this instance, to assert the necessity of faith in the case of an adult for this is not an ordinary pagan. He is not "unclean" but enjoys a derived sanctification which puts him in a different category as it does his child. Why indeed should the paedo-Baptist argue against the offer of baptism to a pagan parent thus sanctified? Much has been made of the so-called "household baptisms" of the primitive Church. If the argument is sound why not practise *household* baptism, the *whole* household, including the heathen adult members, instead of selecting the infant members for attention? Does the principle of family solidarity not apply to adults? The introduction of a selective principle fatally weakens the argument from family or household solidarity. This argument should be abandoned or its full implications should be acted upon and, for the latter, the first step would be to declare the legitimacy of baptism for the heathen partner of a mixed marriage. This at least would not be a matter of offering that which is holy to the dogs but that which is holy to the holy, according to 1 *Corinthians* vii. 14. But of course the true step is to leave this verse out of the baptismal discussion altogether.

If however the verse contributes nothing to the baptismal question it does say something on the status of children and the crux of the matter is the meaning of "holiness" in this context. In discussions of the Biblical development of the term it is generally recognised that there was a primary, non-moral connotation. This is not contradicted by the truth that if any person or thing is called holy "it is in a sense derivative from (God) and dependent upon him or upon his will" and that therefore "there is a personal conception of holiness implicit at the source."¹³ It was of course this personal conception which enabled the prophets of the Old Testament to fill the term out with moral content. In the primary sense things a-moral in themselves might be declared "clean" or "unclean"; persons immoral in character might be classified as "sacred" as, for example, the prostitutes attached to fertility cults. "Holy" or "sacred" in this sense meant consecrated to or claimed by the

deity, separated or set apart for religious purposes. It implied no moral judgment but an objective status in relation to the god worshipped.

It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that Paul was here using the word "holy" in this earlier sense for he was not attributing moral qualities either to the heathen parent "sanctified" by marriage or to the children of the marriage. Commentators who refer to the moral influence of the believing parent on marriage partner or child are to this extent off the mark. Holiness is attributed to the child and the unbelieving parent because of their existent relationship with the believer, not because of moral results which that relationship has achieved or may hope to achieve. We have one other Pauline passage¹⁴ in which holiness is similarly attributed to unbelievers. In Romans xi the apostle declares his belief that all Israel is to be saved and he explains his confidence by the use of two metaphors: *ei de hē aparchē hagia, kai to phaurama, kai ei hē riza hagia, kai hoi kaldoi* (v. 16). The first of these metaphors is drawn from the ritual practice referred to in Numbers xv. 19, 20. "It shall be, that when ye eat of the bread of the land, ye shall offer up an heave offering unto the Lord. Of the first of your dough (*aparchēn phuramatos* LXX) ye shall offer up a cake for an heave offering. . . ." The first-fruits being offered (though part only of the whole) the rest of the dough became "holy" too. So with the tree metaphor, the root being holy the branches which stem from it must be. Israel was "beloved for the fathers' sake" (v. 28) and was holy in the formal sense through racial affiliation to the holy patriarchs. In the formal sense only, because Paul is clearly not attributing anything more than that to a people which "did not subject themselves to the righteousness of God" (*Romans* x. 3). It is an objective status to which he is referring in *Romans* xi. 16 and 1 *Corinthians* vii. 14. Admittedly in the former Paul argues from this to the future ingathering of Israel but, as Dodd has pointed out, "it is difficult to reconcile this principle, as it is here applied, with Paul's strenuous denial . . . that descent from Abraham gives any right to the inheritance of his blessing"¹⁵ Certainly it would be rash to conclude by analogy from *Romans* xi. 16 that the child and unbelieving partner of 1 *Corinthians* vii. 14 are undoubtedly destined to be saved. Otherwise we should have an excellent argument for mixed marriages! But Paul himself did not envisage the inclusion of Israel other than by belief in Christ. Of the *Corinthians* passage we must assert that it was an objective status, not yet (and possibly never) an inward reality to which Paul was referring.

By what means was this brought about? Of course Paul

would say that the status derived ultimately from the will of God but it is also evident that in some sense it is mediated through the particular relationship with the believer. Paul does not explain this but it is obvious that the type of relationship, perhaps the physical aspect of it, is important to his thought and that it is not simply a matter of the child or heathen parent being in an environment sanctified by the presence of a Christian. Lietzmann draws our attention to 1 *Corinthians* vi. 15 where the apostle speaks of the result of intercourse with a prostitute. However casual and fleeting a brothel encounter might be, Paul insisted that such intercourse had deeper significance for those concerned. In the case of a Christian and a prostitute it would be a joining to her of "the members of Christ." He quotes *Genesis* ii. 24, "they two shall become one." Intercourse with a prostitute led to a uniting of personalities as did the ordained intercourse of marriage. On 1 *Corinthians* vii. 14 Lietzmann is surely penetrating to an important element in the apostle's thought when he says: "The heathen spouse becomes sanctified through sexual intercourse with the Christian party."¹⁶

Of the sanctification of the children Lietzmann speaks similarly of it taking place in a "mysterious manner, through physical derivation from a Christian man or woman"¹⁷ In the relationship between parent and offspring there is much more than the physical but in this instance it seems as though the physical link was fundamental in enabling Paul to assert the status of holiness for the child. Even if we are not prepared to specify the physical link exclusively the status certainly arises from the bonds of marriage and parenthood.

There is no claim here, of course, that these ties are the *sole* means by which the status could be created. It is additional rather than contradictory to Paul's idea to suggest that, as everything which comes into the "possession" of a Christian is holy to the Lord, so would an adopted child though not by means of physical derivation. And what of the situation when the Church itself, through an orphanage for example, takes a child formally into its care and becomes its responsible guardian? Again it is not a physical relationship which is created but Paul's argument was designed to meet the one kind of relationship under consideration, not to exclude others. May we, using 1 *Corinthians* vii. 14 as a starting point, suggest that in addition to the marital and parental there are special relationships with a Christian or with the Christian Church which may provide a basis for the same assertion that Paul made in the case before him? If so, the status of holiness would not apply exclusively to children physically begotten of a Christian parent or parents.

Setting aside these speculations and restricting ourselves to those Paul had in mind, what content can we give to this derivative holiness? "The conception depends upon the fact that *hagios* and *hagiazō* primarily refer not to moral character, but to the state in relation to God, and the claim of God on the person, even antecedently to the personal response to that claim. . . . Here the word must be used in its primary meaning, as consecrated to, claimed by God."¹⁸ The "consecration" and the "claim" in this instance arise from and are exerted through the personal relationship with a Christian and must in principle be just as applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, to the non-Christian marriage partner as to the child of the marriage.

In what sense can we speak of a claim by God, operative in this case (and possibly in certain others) but not in that of all children? Surely He lays His claim on all and all owe life to the Creator who is holy. Yet this verse introduces a differentiating factor as between one child and another. The difference is that owing to the specially significant relationship with a Christian, God's claim in this instance can be and is directly lodged and asserted. This applies to the whole of a Christian's life, to all that he formerly reckoned as his own and at his own disposal; to all, in fact, that is commonly brought under the heading of Christian stewardship—time, money, the body (now the temple of the Holy Spirit) and here as we see, the marital relationship and its bodily fruit. The heathen partner might be immoral but *as partner in the marriage union* he is claimed by God and proper marital relationships with him are not to be thought of as unclean. "Man and wife are part of each other, in such a sense . . . that the sanctification of the one includes the other so far as their wedlock is concerned."¹⁹ The marriage union is one which the Christian partner can and must offer in view of the fact that God has hallowed it. Thus the objective status of holiness accorded to the unbelieving marriage partner issues in immediate ethical implications for the believer.

Similarly, what is attributed in a non-moral sense to the child has moral implications for his Christian parent. In regard to this child God can assert His claim from the outset because it is a life born and entrusted to the care of a believer. Though the latter may not prejudge the child's own choice when years of responsibility are reached, he has for a few years the opportunity of shaping the child's life. It is salutary for him to remember that parentage, which seems to make a child so much one's own, makes it God's, makes it "holy," and this fact stands against any selfish counter-claim in terms of one's own ideas and ambitions for the child. Parental possessiveness always carries dangers with it but in the case of a Christian it may take on a peculiarly serious

aspect in conflict with the prior claim which God asserts. The latter reinforces every other consideration which summons a Christian to offer his child to God and to make the sustained effort involved in bringing him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

Unfortunately for our present discussion, Paul was simply concerned here to meet the practical question as to whether a newly converted person could continue in marital relationships with an unbelieving partner. It was not to his point to follow up the theological implications and to answer all the questions raised for us by the attribution of a status of holiness to the child or the unbelieving parent. Has this status an absolute quality about it or is it so tied to the relationship with the Christian that if the relationship ceased the status would be nullified (as, for example, if the heathen partner divorced his Christian wife)? If it is a qualified status on what terms could the child forfeit it? If we answer, by lapsing into heathenism or immorality, we recall immediately that these things did not disqualify his non-Christian parent. If on the other hand the status, once accorded, becomes absolute, what of its bearing on original sin? It is of the nature of original sin that it is derivative. May it be countered as such by a holiness which is derivative, proceeding from a relationship with one who is a believer in Christ? Again, if the status is absolute is it further transmissible through the child when he too becomes a husband and a father though he may never have become a believer? Some will feel like answering that this last question at least has an air of artificiality about it and that this arises from the fact that Paul was employing a primitive concept of holiness at this point, a holiness formal rather than qualitative. For those who cannot dismiss the problem in those terms the questions are plainly there, created but not answered by the apostle's advice to his Corinthian enquirers.

One thing seems clear. Paul presents us with a difficulty somewhat similar to that raised by the doctrine of election, though not of the same gravity. Some have followed the doctrine of election through to what they felt was its logical conclusion or concomitant, a doctrine of reprobation. If some men are elected to salvation it seemed to follow that others are not and that these latter must be predestinated to condemnation. To this most of us reply that a conclusion so preposterous stands self-condemned, whether logical or not. But we now have to ask ourselves about the apparent implications of 1 *Corinthians* vii. 14. Certain persons come to a status of holiness solely through their relationship with a believer. It seems to follow that a husband not blessed with a believing wife and a child not blessed with a believing parent do

not enjoy that status unless they arrive at it by some other way. This evidently implies a distinction between one child and another, a position not so impossible of acceptance as the election-reprobation nexus, but still a difficult one to get acclimatised to. Is the difficulty a valid one or does it simply remind us of the effort needed to penetrate and come to terms with certain aspects of Biblical thought? Our democratic instincts rebel against the idea that anyone, theologically speaking, should be born with a silver spoon in his mouth. Paul evidently felt no such qualms and if we are to follow him we shall have to get used to language and ideas that have hitherto been foreign to many of us, as we are having to do in the matter of baptism.

¹ See, for example, McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, 1910, pp. 69, 89, 93, 115, 145, 157, 191.

² By Rev. G. J. M. Pearce, 28th August, 1959.

³ W Telfer, *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa*, 1955, p. 31.

⁴ Some would speak of these children as members, not of the Church but of the congregation or of "the Christian community". But neither of these terms identifies them as distinct from baptised Church members who are also members of the congregation and the Christian community. "Catechumen" and "catechumenate" have this merit at least, that they indicate the learner status quite specifically.

⁵ *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. 3. Art. *Catechumenate*.

⁶ Lietzmann, *The Era of the Church Fathers*, 1951, p. 100.

⁷ J. P. Christopher, *The First Catechetical Instruction of Augustine*, 1952, p. 4.

⁸ *1 Corinthians* (Cambridge Greek Testament), 1937, p. 113.

⁹ An interesting discussion of this point was embodied in the appendix to the London (Baptist) Confession of 1677. See McGlothlin, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

¹⁰ My attention has been drawn to the argument of P. Feine and others that *1 Corinthians* vii. 14 makes it virtually impossible to suppose that Infant Baptism was practised at Corinth since the practice would have presupposed an "uncleanness" which is ruled out by Paul's teaching in this passage. If this argument is valid the verse is not merely useless but embarrassing to paedo-Baptist apologetic.

¹¹ Cited by G. G. Findlay, *Expositor's Greek Testament*, 1904, p. 827.

¹² G. G. Findlay, *ibid.*

¹³ J. K. S. Reid, *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, 1950, p. 216. (Art. SANCTITY, SANCTIFICATION).

¹⁴ I am indebted to Dr. G. R. Beasley-Murray for calling my attention to this and to the argument referred to in Footnote 10.

¹⁵ *Epistle to the Romans*, (Moffatt Commentary), 1938, p. 179.

¹⁶ *An die Korinther I and II* (Handbuch zum neuen Testament), 1931, p. 31.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ St. John Parry, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

¹⁹ Findlay, *op. cit.*, p. 826.

Baptists and the Ecumenical Movement.

I

BAPTISTS are not all of one mind about the Ecumenical Movement. A number of Baptist Unions and Conventions have been prominently identified with all phases of the movement. Some have participated in certain activities and on some occasions, but not on others. A hesitant or critical attitude has sometimes been shown. At the present time ten Baptist groups are in membership with the World Council of Churches: the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, the Baptist Union of Holland, the Baptist Union of Denmark, the Baptist Union of Hungary, the American (formerly Northern) Baptist Convention, the two Negro Baptist Conventions and the Seventh Day Baptist Conference of the United States, the Burma Baptist Convention, and the Baptist Union of New Zealand. These groups comprise nearly one half of the Baptists of the world, but there remain outside the World Council the very strong Southern Baptist Convention of the United States, the Baptists of Canada and Australia, a number of European groups including the All Soviet Union of Evangelical Christian Baptists, and all but a few of the Baptists of Asia and Africa, a number of whom have not yet reached the stage of being fully "autonomous" churches.

There are other world communions, which are similarly divided in their attitude. Some of the Orthodox Churches are in membership with the World Council; some are not. Certain of the Lutheran Synods have not followed the larger Lutheran Churches in joining the Council.

The reasons for these differences of attitude are varied. In some cases they are political. The Churches of China—including those associated with the China Baptist Council and the Church of Christ in China—were at one time in active membership with the World Council. All withdrew soon after the present Communist régime was established there. Though the World Council includes a number of Churches in Communist controlled lands, it has not proved easy for them to share fully in the Ecumenical Movement. In other cases the reasons why certain Churches have stood aside from the World Council may be described as ecclesiastical. Church relations in particular lands have not yet reached a sufficiently

friendly stage for it to be easy for all the Churches to associate themselves together or to grant one another the mutual recognition involved in membership of the World Council. In yet other cases theological and doctrinal difficulties and suspicions stand in the way. All these reasons have affected Baptists, as well as those of other Christian traditions.

Baptists are, moreover, a heterogeneous community, with considerable differences in theological outlook, polity and church practice and, though characterised by a strong sense of fellowship and brotherhood, have no central church authority. Each union and convention determines its own attitudes and standards. A Baptist World Alliance was formed in 1905 and now links together Baptist churches with a combined membership of over 21,000,000. But the preamble to its constitution runs as follows :

“The Baptist World Alliance, extending over every part of the world, exists in order more fully to show the essential oneness of Baptist people in the Lord Jesus Christ, to impart inspiration to the brotherhood and to promote the spirit of fellowship, service and co-operation among them; but this Alliance may in no way interfere with the independence of the churches or assume the administrative functions of existing organisations.”

At more than one World Congress Baptists have discussed together certain aspects of the Ecumenical Movement. They have agreed to differ about it and at a Congress in Copenhagen in 1947, on the eve of the formation of the World Council, it was clearly ruled that the Alliance would be exceeding its rights if it gave direction or advice to its constituent unions and conventions on the question of membership. Each must be free to decide for itself.

All these facts must be borne in mind in considering the part taken by Baptists in the developments of the last forty or fifty years.

II

The Baptists of Britain, the British Commonwealth and America have, since the days of William Carey, shown a notable zeal for foreign missions. The representatives of their missionary societies participated eagerly in the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference of 1910, which is now generally regarded as “the watershed between miscellaneous ecumenical stirrings and the integrating ecumenical movement of more recent times” (Rouse & Neill, *History of the Ecumenical Movement*, 1954, p.217). Baptist leaders in Britain and America, as well as Baptist missionaries in Asia, shared in the subsequent formation of National Christian

Councils and of the International Missionary Council. They accepted the principle of "comity," by which competition and over-lapping were avoided. They, and leaders of the "younger" churches, were present at the great missionary conferences in Jerusalem (1928) and Madras (1938). A number of Baptists have been on the secretariat of the International Missionary Council and have rendered outstanding service to it.

This sphere of inter-church co-operation presented few difficulties to Baptists for thirty years or more. Most of their missionary societies were ready, not only to support the movements which led to the federated Church of Christ in China and the Congo Protestant Council (with its aim of a Church of Christ in Congo), but also to co-operate in "union" institutions of an educational, medical and philanthropic kind. Only in the last decade or so have tensions arisen in certain places. These tensions have been largely the result of hesitations in regard to the association of the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches, and of the withdrawal of the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention from the movement for missionary co-operation in the United States. To understand this new situation it is necessary to consider the Baptist attitude to other phases of the Ecumenical Movement.

Throughout the three hundred years of their history in Britain and America, Baptists have been generally sympathetic towards movements for political reform and the extension of democratic principles. They have sought to apply religion to life and have stood for a high standard of personal self-discipline and against privilege and exploitation in society. Most of the members of Baptist churches belong to the so-called working and middle classes. Baptists therefore found themselves generally in sympathy with the avowedly practical and non-theological aims which Archbishop Söderblom set before the Life and Work Movement and which found expression in the Stockholm Conference of 1925 and the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State of 1937. At the latter conference the Southern Baptist Convention was represented, as well as the Northern Baptist Convention and the National Baptist Convention of the United States, the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, the Baptist Union of Wales, the Baptist Union of New Zealand and the Baptist churches of China. One of the two delegates of the Protestant Free Churches of Germany—the only German group allowed by Hitler to attend—was a Baptist.

By then, however, divergent attitudes to the third main stream of the Ecumenical Movement—that dealing with Faith and Order—had become apparent among Baptists.

III

The initial call to the Churches to discuss questions of Faith and Order was issued in 1910 by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. It was primarily the result of the effect upon Bishop Charles Brent of attendance at the Edinburgh Missionary Conference. Much preliminary preparation was necessary, but both the Southern and the Northern Baptist Conventions in the United States promised to co-operate, and in January, 1914, the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland did the same. The war of 1914-18 broke in upon the plans, and the first World Conference on Faith and Order was not able to take place until 1927 in Lausanne. Many changes had taken place in the ecclesiastical scene in both Britain and America. The historian of the Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. W. W. Barnes, states that between 1911 and 1919 there was a complete reversal of sentiment regarding co-operation with other denominations. This he ascribes to the collapse of the over-ambitious programme for foreign missions sponsored by the Interchurch World Movement of North America (of which John R. Mott was a leader) and to the policy of the American War Department in regard to chaplains, which appeared to favour Roman Catholics in an unconstitutional way. Southern Baptists were entering a period of prosperity and expansion. They turned their energies into purely denominational channels and became increasingly suspicious of united activities. When the time came to appoint delegates to the Lausanne Conference, they withdrew their earlier acceptance of the invitation to participate. So did the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.

The British decision was in part influenced by that of the Southern Baptists. The Baptist World Alliance was growing in influence and had undertaken a large programme of relief at the close of the war. Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke and other leaders were anxious that nothing should be done to offend the largest and strongest Baptist convention in the world. There were also other factors at work. The Secretary of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, Dr. J. H. Shakespeare, had become an eager advocate of Christian Unity, not only pleading for a United Free Church, but stating his own willingness to submit to some form of re-ordination, if thereby a United Church of England could be secured. His own denomination was not prepared for either of these steps and in Britain, as in America, a reaction set in against this phase of the Ecumenical Movement.

British Baptists were, therefore, not officially represented at Lausanne, though two individuals attended at their own expense. Nevertheless, five groups of Baptists sent delegates: the Northern

Baptist Convention, the Baptist Union of Ontario and Quebec, the Baptist Union of Germany and the two small groups of Seventh Day Baptist churches in the United States and Holland. Northern Baptists provided statements on Baptist beliefs for the composite volumes subsequently produced by the Continuation Committee, one of which was edited by the British Baptist, Dr. W. T. Whitley. His companion at Lausanne, Dr. J. E. Roberts, accepted membership of the Continuation Committee.

The British reaction against the Faith and Order movement was shortlived. It was soon felt that a mistake had been made in not sharing in theological discussions with those of other traditions. When Dr. Roberts died in 1929, no objection was raised to his place on the Continuation Committee being taken by the new secretary of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, Dr. M. E. Aubrey. From then on, British Baptists have taken part in all the Faith and Order meetings. To the Second World Conference on Faith and Order, held in Edinburgh in 1937, they appointed a strong delegation of five leaders, the effect of whose presence may be seen in the official report. At Edinburgh there were also present delegates from the Northern Convention, the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec and the Baptist Union of Scotland, together with Dr. J. R. Sampey, of the Louisville Seminary, who had been appointed "the official representative and spokesman of the Southern Baptist Convention" to both the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences. Seven Baptists were appointed to the new Continuation Committee, at the close of the Edinburgh Conference: three from the Northern Convention, three from Britain, and one (Dr. Jesse D. Franks), a Southern Baptist deeply interested in drawing churches and nations closer together.

Dr. Aubrey became a member of the Executive Committee of Faith and Order. He was also a member of the important Committee of Fourteen, charged with the task of drafting a constitution for the World Council of Churches. Both the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences, representing the Life and Work and the Faith and Order Movements, had agreed that their interests and purposes were so closely inter-related that some common organisation was necessary. It had also become clear that differences of social approach were due to differences of theology and that the two movements had much to gain from one another. The time was not yet ripe for the full merging of the oldest ecumenical stream that of missionary co-operation—but there was general agreement that the proposed World Council and the International Missionary Council must be "in association with" one another. The second World War delayed the actual formation of the World Council until 1948, but a skeleton organisation was

soon in existence and rendered important service during the war years.

IV

The presence of Dr. Sampey at the conferences of 1937 and the election of Dr. Franks to the Faith and Order Continuation Committee did not represent any change of attitude on the part of the Southern Baptist Convention. When invited to join the World Council of Churches, the Convention declined on the ground that it had "no ecclesiological authority" (W. W. Barnes, *The Southern Baptist Convention, 1845-1953*, p. 286). There was fear of what were described as "totalitarian trends that threaten the autonomy of all free churches." From 1893 to 1919 the Foreign Missions Board of the Southern Baptist Convention had shared in the Foreign Missions Conference of North America. In the two decades following the first World War there was little or no contact. In 1938 membership was resumed, but when in 1950 the Foreign Missions Conference became part of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Southern Baptists again withdrew. They were extending their own foreign missionary enterprises in Latin America, Asia, Africa and Europe. They had even begun to feel dissatisfied with the "comity" agreements of 1912 which defined the spheres of activity of the Southern and Northern Conventions in the United States. They were increasingly unwilling for any united institutions, any geographical restrictions, any consultation or co-operation with other bodies. If their attitude is to be understood, it must be remembered that in many of the Southern States Baptists have always been the strongest Christian community, possessing great material resources and having few contacts with those of other traditions.

At the Assembly in Amsterdam in 1948, at which the World Council of Churches was formed, eight Baptist groups were represented: the Northern and National Conventions of the United States and the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference, the Baptists of Great Britain, New Zealand, Holland and Burma, and the China Baptist Council. Baptists were appointed both to the Central Committee of Ninety and the Executive. Since 1948 the Baptists of Denmark and Hungary have joined the World Council, as well as the second of the two Negro Conventions of the United States. Though unrepresented at Amsterdam, the Baptist Unions of Wales and Scotland accepted the invitations to join the World Council. The Baptists of Wales have shown little active interest in co-operative movements outside their own territory save in the field of foreign missions. In 1955 the Baptist Union of Scotland withdrew from the World Council "for seven years,"

on the ground of dissatisfaction with its basis and with the avowed hope that this would be elaborated in such a way as to exclude some of those at present in membership.

The other Baptist groups connected with the World Council have shared in its developing activities and have both given and gained much in the mutual exchanges and united enterprises which make up its life. At the third World Conference on Faith and Order, held in Lund in 1952, in addition to the delegates of the American (formerly Northern) Convention, there were Baptist representatives from Denmark and New Zealand and from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec. There are at the present time seven Baptist members of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council, two of them Asiatics, one from India and one from Burma. Baptists are to be found on all the Theological Commissions, which are continuing the work of patient theological discussion.

That the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec have shared in all three of the World Conferences on Faith and Order, although Canadian Baptists are not in membership with the World Council, is due to the fact that the Canadian Baptist community as a whole is divided in its attitude to the Ecumenical Movement. There is now a Baptist Federation of Canada, uniting the three conventions of Ontario and Quebec, the Maritime Provinces and Western Canada. General sentiment in the first of these is favourable to the Ecumenical Movement; in the second and third it is more critical. The question of joining the World Council has been shelved for the time being, lest it prove a seriously divisive issue. A similar situation exists in Australia. Each of the five states has a Baptist Union of its own, but there is also a Baptist Union of Australia, uniting all the Baptists of the continent. In South Australia and Victoria, sentiment is more favourable to the Ecumenical Movement than in New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia, and there is a general desire not to divide the denomination on this matter. The Baptists Union of South Africa has never had many outside contacts. It is, however, associated with the South African Council of Churches, some members of which have joined the World Council.

The divided state of Baptist opinion is due, in part, to their strongly evangelical emphasis and to the fact that in most lands Baptists have been a "minority church" and have suffered from social and ecclesiastical disabilities. The stronger Churches have not always treated them very generously or granted them full recognition. Many of the Baptist groups are without the resources of personnel and money necessary for full participation in the Ecumenical Movement. Some are influenced in their attitude by

the fact that the Southern Convention, with its more than 8,000,000 church members (more than one third of the world total), at present refuses all co-operation with other Churches. Southern Baptists have given generous financial support in a number of places, particularly in certain European lands. There Baptists are only slowly emerging from the days of active persecution. They have found it difficult to establish themselves in lands dominated by State Churches. Of recent years, however, in eastern Europe, where all the Churches have had to endure the pressures of atheistic communism, the Free Churches begin to find themselves in an unfamiliar position of officially guaranteed equal opportunity with those who formerly tried to suppress them. In Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Rumania, Baptists are now members of National Ecumenical Councils. The decision to join the World Council, taken by Hungarian Baptists in 1956, may well be followed by other groups. European Baptists are less likely than some of those in the British Commonwealth and in Scotland to succumb to the hostile criticisms of the World Council spread in the name of the International Council of Christian Churches. This body not only insists on subscription to a ten-point statement of faith of a "fundamentalist" kind, but would apparently accept the thesis of its leaders that "the Bible teaches private enterprise and the capitalistic system, not as a by-product or as some side-line but as the very foundation structure of society itself in which men are to live and render an account of themselves to God."

V

Baptist representation in the World Council increases. Those associated with it find new opportunities of bearing their distinctive witness and of sharing in united Christian enterprises. This becomes the more important as ecumenical discussion begins to turn to the subject of baptism and as "united churches" come into existence. Baptists stood aside from the United Church of Canada, which in 1925 drew together Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Methodists. Those who were the product of missionary work from Canada and the United States stood aside from the Church of South India, inaugurated in 1947. They have generally shown themselves chary of discussions aiming at "organic union," having a traditional fear of clericalism and of "uniformity" and a determined loyalty to believers' baptism, which they find clearly set forth in the New Testament. In Ceylon and North India, however, Baptists churches which are the result of missionary effort from Britain have joined in negotiations aiming at new and comprehensive Churches of the South Indian pattern, but recognising believers' baptism as an alternative rite to paedobaptism and

confirmation. The final issue of these negotiations is as yet uncertain, but they will clearly have an important influence in other parts of the world.

The constitution of the World Council of Churches provides for the representation of world "confessional" bodies "in a consultative capacity" at sessions of the Assembly and the Central Committee. The General Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance has taken advantage of this opportunity, though his position is inevitably a somewhat difficult one in view of the attitude adopted towards the World Council by the Southern Convention and certain other Baptist groups. The Baptist World Alliance has not yet made clear what its attitude would be to Baptist churches which become part of the proposed Churches of Lanka (Ceylon) and North India, though the schemes of union provide for the maintenance of full fellowship with all those with whom the uniting churches are at present associated. This remains one of the problems of the future, as does the urgent necessity of bringing to a state of real autonomy the Baptist Churches of Asia and Africa, which are still dependent on or under the authority of missionary societies. Whether or not they afterwards decide to join the World Council, they need helping towards wider ecumenical contacts within and outside their own lands. The strength of the Baptist community throughout the world is not properly recognised nor does it find adequate expression.

Every Christian communion is subject to inner tensions. Those which affect Baptists are perhaps more open to the world than is the case with others. Divergent attitudes to the Ecumenical Movement spring, as has been shown, from many different causes. The most important is the variety which has always characterised Baptist life and witness, and which comes from the insistence that local companies of believers must seek the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the light of Scripture and then have freedom to act according to their convictions. Ever since the 17th century and the days of John Bunyan, some Baptists have been prepared for church-fellowship at the local level with paedobaptists, believing that "differences in judgment about water-baptism should be no bar to communion." There have always been those who have realised the inadequacy of a doctrine of the Church which rests solely on the autonomy of a local congregation. Baptists are only beginning to face together the theological implications of the rite of baptism as they practise it. The need for a more articulated theology, which takes account of the variety of opinion, polity and practice among Baptists and other Christians, is increasingly recognised. Whether or not they share actively in the Ecumenical Movement, Baptists are challenged by it. But the differences

among them are accompanied by a strong sense of brotherhood and fellowship. This has remained unbroken in spite of the political and ecclesiastical changes of recent decades.

The direct Baptist contribution to the Ecumenical Movement has been no negligible one. They have much to say to their fellow-Christians which can only be said from within, as well as much to learn. But, in the centuries to come, it may appear that, under God, good purposes have been fulfilled both by those who are within the World Council and are ready to co-operate with their Christian brethren of other traditions in seeking the will of God for His Church and by those who, for the time being at least, remain outside.

ERNEST A. PAYNE

In the Study

I SUPPOSE that it is now universally recognised that from conception to birth the individual recapitulates in tremendously shortened compass the whole growth and development of the human species through all ages. But surely it is something analogous that may often be traced in the realm of personal belief and understanding. For here also the painful progress of the decades and the centuries may be found unrolling itself at break-neck speed in individual experience and apprehension. It is perhaps a powerful imaginative grasp of this truth that will provide the most potent stimulus to an attitude of humble receptivity before the wisdom of the ages.

In any event, therein is to be discerned one reason for the value of a recent historical study.¹ An examination of the last two hundred and fifty years of changing thought about the meaning and importance of miracles was urgently needed; and Dr. Lawton has enhanced the significance of a comprehensive and accurate presentation by relating it to and setting it against its necessary theological and philosophical background. But his survey comes alive as we recognise that its actors and protagonists exert their influence still today, and that battles fought, lost, and won, are constantly rejoined and re-enacted. Theologians may have gained ground and registered enduring advance by the sweat of their brows and with much travail and tears; but large numbers of ordinary church folk are "deist" and "evidentialist" still, and many a ministers' fraternal screams loudly of arrested development.

Indeed, it is the ministry to whom this book should speak most relevantly. To talk of the miraculous is to talk of the nature and action of God, of the freedom of man, of the order of the natural world. It is also to speak of things that lie very close to the heart of the working faith of the ordinary christian man. Wrong-headed or superstitious thinking here may be a menace to the soul. And if the shepherd fumbles, will the sheep see their way? But for the scandal of its price, this volume might be labelled a necessity.

At least it may unreservedly be commended to all who are dissatisfied with easier resting places; those who are uneasily conscious of the inadequacy of the God of the "gaps," of mental

¹ *Miracles and Revelation*, by J. S. Lawton. Lutterworth Press, 37/6d. 1959.

dichotomies, of uncritical and all-embracing acceptances. We are not offered neat and final solutions, and we should not expect them. But we are given a sympathetic and discerning exposition of the nature of historical enquiry and the aims and limitations of scientific method; and if we will walk with Dr. Lawton to the end, we shall find our conception of the miraculous satisfyingly enriched. We shall learn the fatal error of attempting to distinguish miracles in terms of physical nonconformity. We shall realize that they belong at the very heart of christology and revelation. We shall understand that, within the divine action, they hold "the same kind of place as the most significant symbolic actions of a man do to the rest of a man." And perhaps we shall be driven to grapple again with the work of A. E. Taylor and Edwyn Bevan, John Oman and H. H. Farmer, upon whose thinking the most significant of contemporary achievement rests.

It might be conjectured that this patient study would usefully be supplemented by a book² which explores the wider context of these familiar problems; and a first glance at its scope and interest would confirm our expectation. We are offered three associated discussions, one dealing with the Order of Nature, another with Natural Science and the Kerygma, a third with Christian Ethics and the Scientific Age; and these are presented in terms of a crisis of understanding, of belief, and of living. Each examination is relevant, competent, and fair. Together they constitute a unity of apologetic.

Unfortunately the promise is not fulfilled. The ethical enquiry, while negatively valuable in putting a radical question mark against many of our cherished conventional assumptions, is positively disappointing. This is notoriously difficult terrain; but I cannot feel that Mr. Yarnold really illumines it. Certainly he is to be congratulated on having the courage to draw practical conclusions, and thus implicitly rebukes our inveterate tendency to talk in a vacuum. But I fancy that he leaps too easily from theological principles to practical application, and that there is first needed a far more rigorous examination and diagnosis of the complexities of this industrial and nuclear age than his space allows.

Similarly with the discussion of New Testament kerygma. Historicity, the miraculous, and the methods of divine operation, are large subjects, scarcely susceptible of adequate treatment in sixty pages. If we are given little that is new, we need not be surprised or accusing. What we are entitled to demand is that the author's own assumptions and presuppositions be subjected to

² *The Spiritual Crisis of the Scientific Age*, by G. D. Yarnold. George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 18/-. 1959.

the same relentless scrutiny that he brings to those of 19th century science. And at this point many may find his understanding of history and the historical inadequate, and his theological spring-board too uncritically traditional. J. S. Lawton reminds us that "the modern rejection of the miraculous is in one sense due to a refining and intellectualizing of man's intuitive expectation of the orderliness of nature." Surely there is truth here with which Mr. Yarnold has not perhaps fully reckoned.

What is indisputable is that the crux of this study is to be found in the discussion of the order of nature with which the book begins. Here foundations are laid and scaffolding erected. If there are flaws at this point, a good deal of what follows will begin to shake and may finally prove insecure. The wise reader will concentrate his attention in this area and make his own clear assessment before he moves on. I may, however, be allowed three personal comments. I would think that the attempt to introduce the direct action of God at the sub-atomic level where physical causality apparently fails is open to much the same intuitive objections as may be advanced against the endeavour of N. P. Williams to locate the operation of grace in the unconscious region of human personality. I would feel that the real heart of the contemporary crisis of knowledge is to be found not in the realm of physics but in that of biology. And I would conclude that within the common ground covered by J. S. Lawton and G. D. Yarnold it is Dr. Lawton who proves the most satisfactory guide.

Much water has flowed under the bridge since L. W. Grensted gave us his contribution to the Library of Constructive Theology in *The Person of Christ*; and the volume, though sober and weighty, did not prove to be one of the most significant of the series. After the lapse of a quarter of a century, a replacement was overdue, and Dr. Pittenger was commissioned to provide it. He has given us "constructive theology"³ at its best. It is only to be regretted that the work of his predecessor, though commended in a brief footnote, is otherwise sunk without trace.

It is upon the basis of the biblical presentation of the Lord, and in the context of christologies ancient and modern, that Dr. Pittenger essays his own reconstruction. He makes fruitful use of four contemporary trends of thinking, finding in them indispensable keys to convincing theological restatement. Emergent evolution provides a valid interpretation of the world-order; process-philosophy, bringing life and movement to the heart of metaphysics, offers the means of relating God sufficiently intimately to his creation; existentialism gives an understanding of life as

³ *The Word Incarnate*, by Norman Pittenger. James Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 21/-. 1959.

essentially encounter demanding decision; and the new philosophy of history sustains the understanding of events as made living factors in present experience through community remembrance. With such tools the necessary reframing of Chalcedonian christology can be effected.

This is an essay in adventurous reformulation. It comes like a breath of life-giving air into the steamy fastnesses of neo-orthodoxy, and at crucial points it batters down the doors and flattens them. Nothing is more urgently needed than the continuance of the tasks associated with the great figures of the "liberal" period. To wrestle bravely with the modern world of thought and action and to ground the centralities of Christian faith at its heart is to put the whole Church in debt. Here is a book that not only tries but in large measure succeeds. It deserves the highest praise and should be accorded urgent, critical, and sympathetic attention.

How far does it depart essentially from traditional orthodoxy? By no means as radically as might appear, if we take Chalcedon as our standard. And in so far as our problems have changed, our preoccupations much change also. It is enormously valuable to be reminded of the operation of the Logos outside the Christian circle, and to be confronted sharply with the challenge that "Jesus *defines* but does not *confine* God in his relationship to the created world." To take this seriously is to be delivered from a false christocentricity. Similarly, there is real gain in the underscoring of history in terms of community "remembrance," with the resulting indissolubility of Gospel and Church and the necessary delineation of christology in terms of *totus christus*. Fortunately this need not lead us to follow Dr. Pittenger to the Knoxian critical position, with its easy dismissal of problems of historicity.

In the end the point of controversy will be as to whether the essential deity of Christ has been adequately maintained. The sympathies of the author are with the Antiochenes; he safeguards the full humanity of the Lord; he defines the distinction between Jesus Christ and the indwelling of God in other men as one of degree rather than of kind. Nevertheless, his argument is subtle and his qualifications many; and he believes that the *de Deo Deus* is fully preserved. I think he is right. Certainly he is not so readily open to the damaging criticisms that can be levelled against D. M. Baillie. But perhaps he is a little too impatient with the *enhypostasia* of Leontius and its contemporary explications. It is difficult enough to comprehend exactly what the Fathers were trying to say in the context of their philosophical presuppositions and anthropological assumptions, and on this issue Dr. Pittenger may be challenged. But it is an even more hazardous task to

attempt to translate into modern terms what we think they intended to assert. And his measure of success here will surely be debated for many a long year to come.

The widespread understanding of the sacraments in terms of the sacrifice of the Word Incarnate is one of the encouraging features of the modern scene; and a book⁴ which, while ranging far, preserves this emphasis demands attention. If Mr. Every disappoints it is because he casts his net too widely, and too eagerly pursues the quest of *multum in parvo*. The result is that the unifying theme is easily lost to sight, and not a few really major issues remain inadequately explored. In the context of comparative religion, baptism and eucharist, marriage and coronation, are presented and discussed, and treatment ranges from the biblical and the historical to the contemporary. We are provided with an abundance of useful information and a good deal of acute judgment and assessment. But perhaps a more disciplined use of the material would have left the reader without an uneasy sense of inconclusiveness.

Nevertheless these studies are important, and that in several directions. It is pure gain to be so ably reminded of the light shed upon the Christian sacraments by the understanding of the rites of initiation and sacrifice in early religion; and this opening chapter displays a relevant and judicious perceptiveness not always found in discussion of this field. Further, Mr. Every would have us relearn that baptism is fulfilled in eucharist, that the baptismal rite is incomplete until it has reached forward to first communion. An understanding of this fact might make us more careful in our interpretation of early Church discussions, and would certainly assist the return of the sacrament of initiation to its rightful central position. Finally, we are made to see quite clearly the folly of attempting any separation of sacrament, sacrifice, and salvation, and yet to realize how lastingly the traditional terms of controversy have been undercut by a more accurate biblical and historical comprehension. Would that the Protestants who are still fighting 19th century battles would read Eugene Masure!

Dr. Pittenger will certainly find common ground with George Every, but what will he say to Dr. Cullmann.⁵ The Basel Professor has no use for Chalcedon. He declares that "functional Christology is the only kind that exists." Nevertheless, the systematic theologian must build upon the biblical testimony, and the

⁴ *The Baptismal Sacrifice*, by George Every. S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 9/6d. 1959.

⁵ *The Christology of the New Testament*, by O. Cullmann. S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 42/-. 1959.

present work provides for him an examination and discussion that cannot be ignored. The approach is by way of a grouping of the most significant christological titles under four heads, in so far as they relate primarily to the earthly, the future, the present, and the pre-incarnate work of Jesus. Within this scheme each title is discussed by reference to comparative religions, Jewish antecedents, our Lord's own understanding, and general New Testament usage. The adoption of such perspectives proves fruitful and self-justifying. Thus is confirmed the author's conviction that they are imposed and dictated by the nature of the biblical faith.

The reader who is familiar with the earlier works of Dr. Cullmann will gain most from this weighty survey; for most of the characteristically Cullmannic themes reappear. Among the incidentals will be noticed the distinction drawn between the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Christ, and the identification of the Pauline *exousiai* with the invisible angelic powers. Among the essentials will be remarked the controlling and pervasive influence of the principle of *Heilsgeschichte*, and of the central significance of the idea of "representation" (the one for the many) that governs and informs it. Further, it will not be lost sight of that the general line of emphasis and conclusion corresponds fairly closely to the *textus receptus* of current British New Testament scholarship. There is nothing of Bultmann here. And Gnostic myth and Hellenistic influence have a pretty thin time. I think that in substance Cullmann is generally right. But the general reader will be hearing so often what he wants to hear that he had best beware of his critical faculties silently retreating into coma. Perhaps the warning is specially relevant so far as the discussions of the Logos and the Ebed Yahweh are concerned.

I would adjudge the most illuminating chapters of this work to be those which are directed to the examination of the titles, Son of man, Son of God, and High Priest. Sanity and balance combine with a massive competence to provide us with interpretations that will not easily date or be superseded. The once-popular understanding of Son of God as a predominantly messianic category will scarcely survive this frontal attack. The wide-spread delimitation of the significance of Son of man will surely crumble, and the term receive a new and proper fullness, as a result of the rich context in which it is here presented. The tendency to dismiss the title High Priest as a quirk of the author of Hebrews will hardly abide this penetrating and comprehensive discussion. Yet always we must be alert for the possibility presented as confident assertion. Things are rarely as simple and straightforward as Cullmann might make us believe—as a comparison of his fascinat-

ing exposition of Jesus the Prophet with J. A. T. Robinson's recent examination of the problem of Elijah, John, and Jesus, will testify.

Certainly this work could not have been left untranslated; for within its limits of method and material there is nothing in English to rival it. To its significance the now familiar convictions of Dr. Cullmann regarding the connection between Jesus, the Hellenists, Hebrews, and the Johannine literature bear witness. For the ultimate importance of Qumran lies in the light it sheds on the rich variations of Palestinian Judaism, the inadequacy of the simple Jewish/Hellenistic distinction, and the new orientation of our understanding of Christian beginnings that all this involves. For the new picture that must emerge, this study provides indispensable sketches.

Not the least stimulating section of Dr. Cullmann's discussion is his brief examination of the Christology of Hebrews; and the reader, driven thereby to a fresh study of that perplexing Epistle, should count himself fortunate that a new commentary⁶ is ready to hand. He is offered introductory material, translation, and exegesis. Greek is transliterated. Scholarly technicalities are seldom obtruded, and are made subservient to the interpreter's task. The minister and the careful student will be the richer if they will keep company with Father Snell; and his love for one of the neglected books of the New Testament will surely be imparted to them.

In its own way and within its avowed limits, this is a model commentary. It is sane and judicious. Behind it lies an impressive depth of learning. The introductory material is wisely selected, as is evidenced by the inclusion of sections dealing not merely with the usual critical problems but also with key words of the Epistle, its use of the Old Testament, its relation to the expansionism of Stephen, its christology and eschatology. There are adequate indices, and a salutary appendix on the meaning of "blood" in biblical thought. It is suggested with due caution that Barnabas is author, Cyprus the destination, and a Jewish Christian group the recipient.

Not all of the exegesis will win assent. This is inevitable. But it may confidently be claimed that none will close these pages without having garnered a rich harvest of understanding and inspiration. For beyond the section by section commentary, this study presents features of importance and significance. It relates the Epistle to its necessary Old Testament background. It relates the parts to the whole, and the whole to other relevant portions of the New Testament. And it makes use of P.46.

N. CLARK

⁶ *New and Living Way*, by Antony Snell. The Faith Press, 18/-. 1959.

The Diary of William Newman—II.

IN the *Baptist Quarterly* for April, 1959, selections were printed from the earliest extant volume of the diary of William Newman, the first president of Stepney College, now Regent's Park College, Oxford. This further selection of material from the other three volumes also provides background material for the history of Regent's Park College and gives the reflections of a sensitive and cultured man on the events of his times. He writes of the distress of the nation at the farcical trial of Queen Caroline which taxed even his devotion to the Hanoverian monarchy. He was closely identified with the Anti Slavery movement and with the campaign for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts. Matters of interest to the Baptist historian are his references to the controversy with the missionaries at Serampore and, of course, to the life of the Stepney College. He notes the growing pains of the still youthful work. He has problems with staff; the students are at times rebellious being infected with theological liberalism and political radicalism. He mentions a scheme for a rival Baptist University propounded by his gifted but turbulent colleague F. A. Cox. This scheme eventually became lost in the bigger scheme for London University, now University College, London, in which Cox was a leading spirit. The extracts which relate to the college are given without comment and are intended as a footnote to the college history.* For the rest, Newman will be seen to have the same shrewdness of judgement as was revealed in the first volume of the diary. This covered the period July, 1808 to August, 1814. The three volumes dealt with here are :

- (a) August, 1820 to October, 1825.
- (b) October, 1825 to October, 1833.
- (c) October, 1833 to May, 1834.

In 1821, Newman exchanged positions at Stepney with Solomon Young the tutor. Newman retained the presidency and Young became resident tutor. In 1826, Newman resigned altogether. Some extracts from the diary are given in George Pritchard's biography of Newman but they are mainly concerned with Newman's spiritual well-being and material of interest to the historian is overlooked.

Soon after the close of the period covered by these diaries Newman suffered a paralytic stroke and after several months of weakness he died. Although little material is quoted which relates to this aspect of his work, it has to be remembered that throughout

* *From Stepney to St. Giles*, by R. E. Cooper. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 10/6d.).

this whole period he was the pastor of the church at Bow and fully occupied with preaching and pastoral duties.

National Events

15.8.20. The Queen's letter to the King published yesterday makes a deep impression.

17.8.20. This day the Queen's trial commences.

21.8.20. The Queen's cause improves. The great apprehension now is that the King will suddenly put an extinguisher on it by dissolving the Parliament before the Defence begins.

10.11.20. Today the third reading of the Queen's bill was carried by 108 against 99, a majority of 9 but Lord Liverpool withdrew it. The Counsel rushed in to inform the Queen. She sat motionless, but after a flood of tears in her carriage she recovered. The news spread like lightning and the country is full of joy. I sent the students a bottle of Madeira to drink the Queen's health.

17.7.21. All the talk is about the coronation and the unhappy situation of the Queen.

19.7.21. The King's Coronation Day. The bells are ringing. . . . Alarming reports of tumult in London kept us up till near 12. Some were singing "Queen for ever." The poor of the parish of Bow had a dinner at the Coborne School.

8.8.21. Brother Ivimey's little boy came to tell me the Queen died last night at 11. It affected me very much. Our Mary wished the King at the bottom of the sea! I am sorry to perceive this to be a very general feeling. I thought it my duty to oppose myself to this with decision.

19.3.24. New Post Office begins this week. New London Bridge. First pile driven last Monday.

25.4.24. Signed the Petition for the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts.

23.6.24. Saw the Lord Chancellor Eldon reading, writing and hearing Counsel (three things at once).

29.6.24. At the Anti-Slavery meeting, Macaulay junior spoke admirably. What an animating prospect—we have a young Wilberforce, a young Macaulay, a young Haldane.

7.1.28. Test Act Committee very full. Lord John Russell and Lord Holland and John Smith offered to bring in our question as soon as possible.

4.2.28. Test Act Committee. Animated discussion. The Catholics wish to unite with us. We declined it, yet anxious to declare we have no hostility.

4.2.28. Aspland very animated. He said the members of both houses thought more highly of the importance of the Bill

than the Dissenters themselves. . . . He thinks they will next open to us the Universities.

25.4.28. We congratulated each other on the success of the Dissenters' Bill, praised the firmness of the Duke of Wellington who has fought for us against Lord Eldon.

26.6.28. The bishops are preparing a King's College in London—Bishop of Chester says it will be open to Dissenters!

6.2.29. Mr. Wilk's funeral. Hundreds of ministers attended and thousands of people within the Tabernacle where the coffin was placed under the pulpit. Rowland Hill's address was very good and he shouted and wept. Tens of thousands of people were thronging all the way as we went in procession on foot, and vast multitudes were found in Bunhill fields where Mr. Hill read a part of the Liturgy.

23.9.29. At nine with Freeman to see Elizabeth Fry in Upton Lane on the Suttée question. She thinks female signatures were not acceptable on the slavery question; advises us not to ask for them. . . . She keeps steadily to the prison discipline question; feels the danger of being dissipated and overwhelmed by a multiplicity of good objects, many of which she can not touch. She thinks it is for everyone to have one object.

26.6.30. This morning at quarter past three our beloved King George IV died at Windsor.

28.7.30 95 of us went up to St. James with addresses to the King and to the Queen. We were most graciously received. He appears to be a most sensible, spirited man. There was an air of seriousness in his manner. The King made an *ex tempore* speech after reading his answer in which he most roundly and loyally declared that he would not interpose between a man and his Maker in matters of religion. The Queen with five or six ladies appeared. She seems to be a modest, simple, benevolent woman with much sweetness of manners. We all kissed the King's hand. Twenty of us by seniority, kissed the Queen's hand. The Duke of Sussex came in with the Queen. Sir Robert Peel introduced us. The Duke of Wellington sat talking with Lord Aberdeen. Lord Hill stood near the King. Brother Douglas fell down the steps of the throne. The King smiled, made an effort to help him up and kindly said he hoped he was not hurt much.

21.7.31. Annual meeting of the Charity School. Lord Henniker told Mr. Gold he would not subscribe if the *girls* were taught to write.

8.10.31. The Reform Bill thrown out by a majority of 41. Some of the newspapers in mourning.

Baptist History

20.6.22. Our Mission Society at Queen Street. Wilberforce spoke charmingly, his silvery tones, his musical voice, his evangelical spirit highly interesting. But there are strong marks of debility; he seems to be shattered. Kinghorn spoke well. Bunting delivered one of the most eloquent stirring speeches I ever heard.

20.9.22. Cox thinks we must recognise the separation of Serampore. It has, alas, already taken place.

1.10.22. Reviving hope that the Serampore Question will be happily settled.

5.11.22. Brother Ivimey told us he had sown the seeds of a new Baptist Church at Canterbury.

6.3.23. Crishno the Caroenter, the first native convert, is dead.

24.6.24. Annual Meeting of our Mission Society. Very animated. Sutton from Mooshedabad presented from a Bramin his poita, his 'holy thread.' Many wept; many clapped, stamped, shouted!

28.12.25. Union collection of hymns (Bristol). Hymns on baptism are to be omitted as sectarian! Every one may see which way the wind blows now. Baptists are ashamed of their baptism, Dissenters are ashamed of their nonconformity. Protestants are crying after the Apocrypha, and if these things grow, Christians will be ashamed of Christ! O Lord, arise and plead thine own cause while many who ought to speak loudly are silent and ashamed.

17.8.26. Saw Mr. Wilson of Olney. He can boast of two things—that he shaved Cowper the poet for a course of years and that he made a wig for Dr. Carey.

23.3.27. Birt spoke out warmly respecting the Serampore brethren, "their covetousness and their pride."

20.11.27. At Carter Lane, large company. Warm discussion of the question, How are we to account for the increase of crime?

30.6.28. Read to the end of Dr. Marshman's pamphlet. He has an extraordinary command of temper. Delusion and confusion from the beginning. Nothing like the organisation of a committee until after Fuller's death. The core of the mischief is the opposition of the juniors.

21.6.32. Annual Meeting of our Mission Society. Full house. Kinghorn commenced. Philipppo, Knibb, astonished all with their fervour and feeling and manly eloquence. Barry the Wesleyan missionary; Stovel; Campbell of the Tabernacle. Rarely, if ever in my life, have I heard such addresses. The excitement was amazingly intense.

24.10.32. Dr. Rippon, green as a plant, juvenile as ever, told

us that this day 60 years ago he came into London. Next day preached his first sermon. Aspland proposed his health. His acknowledgement very serious and tender.

14.11.33. Knibb said he never knew a negro Christian to marry an unconverted woman; that he would be excommunicated if he did. If a missionary of the highest qualifications were prepared to be sent out, having an unconverted wife, he would object if it were his own brother.

Other Notes

17.6.23. Home Mission at 6. Edward Irvine spoke with much intellect and passion; singular elocution; arrogance in abundance; confessed his "trammels"; gloried in them; then called for our commiseration; then despised it; then boasted again that he was a churchman! When he acknowledged our freedom as nonconformists, the people clapped and shouted.

3.10.27. Bible Association very fervent. I congratulated the meeting on the resolution of the parent Society to cast out Bel and the Dragon and Tobit and his dog and the fish and the fumes of his roasted liver and the amorous Asmodeans.

The Stepney College

30.9.20. The students are anxious to debate the Question between Hall and Kinghorn.

3.10.20. The young men in several instances infected with a spirit of Radicalism.

2.11.20. Thought a good deal of resigning my charge as resident here. This is a matter that requires the gravest deliberation. Put down Pro and Con to weigh them.

14.11.20. The students sent by Mr. Griffin a paper full of complaints and charges against me. I heard it read with more serenity than might have been expected. All seemed astonished. The Committee treated me and the other tutors with much respect.

15.11.20. It appears from Kippis's account of Doddridge that he was attacked in the same manner and on the same topic too! All the students were examined (by the committee) and their paper was rejected. The Treasurer gave them a lecture and they were assured that if they would bring another paper without comments and stating facts respectfully it should be attended to.

23.1.21. Dr. Rippon very affectionately inquired again, as he has often done, how things stood here. I told him . . . that I thought the students would not have proceeded so far if they had not been countenanced by persons out of doors.

10.4.21. We sung "The Crowns of British Princes shine." Warne refused to sing. He was afterwards surly as a bear.

13.4.21. I directed the classes to rule their paper book and provide pages and columns for the different parts of speech and thus work out a Grammar, a Vocabulary; in time a Lexicon and Concordance and perhaps a Critical Commentary.

5.9.21. Cox met us at 11. Much time was spent in considering how he might be accommodated with his air pump. Tomkins read a sermon at 12—a very poor thing indeed—very deficient in evangelical sentiment for which most of the students censured him.

31.10.21. The three rebels went over yesterday to Mr. Cox. He gave them no encouragement. Nothing can be anticipated except their expulsion, the other students have unitedly intimated that it will be better for them when they are gone.

2.11.21. Met the Committee at 12. A paper called a Remonstrance was read; full of radicalism. After full consideration, agreed to expel them at once.

25.1.22. Fine morning, the sun shone. I went to Stepney with a light step, but returned with a heavy heart. While I was reading the last two chapters of 2 *Tim*. D. G. (Gould) was reading Byron's *Childe Harold*! I reprov'd him afterwards, not perhaps with sufficient severity.

10.5.22. Gould read a paper on the question, "May we admit Unitarians to Church fellowship?" He introduced the subject very modestly. It soon appeared, however, when I put the question round, that he was strongly inclined to support the affirmative. The Lord preserve him! I expressed surprise that his feelings did not revolt.

7.6.22. Tomkins' essay on the Authority of the Canticles disgusted and pained me. He very broadly insinuated that the book was obscene! I came home with strong feelings and before I sat down to eat and drink, read it through again.

13.12.22. At 10 met Kinghorn at the gate. Five juniors were excused. Seven brought each a paper of four pages on a subject selected by himself out of those discussed during the year. Mr. Kinghorn was all alive; very prompt, acute and candid. A flame of holy fire burned brightly in all he said to them. At the close, he addressed the whole number and concluded with prayer.

21.1.23. Committee at 11. I spoke freely on the prerequisites for a candidate.

1. Has he a mind ?
2. Has he a heart?
3. Has he a mouth?

18.3.23. Closed my lectures on the Greek Testament—260 chapters. I have given them my own version accompanied with remarks, critical, practical and often devotional. And to do this, since August, 1821, I have walked nearly a thousand miles! Mr. Booth read the Greek Testament as he told me, more than 40 times by reading a chapter every morning. Mr. Wesley sometimes faltered in quoting the English Testament, but never in quoting the Greek. Ridley, the most learned of the Reformers, learnt all the epistles of Paul by heart.

4.4.23. D. Gould read an Essay on the Influence of novel reading which was elegantly written, containing a faint and too feeble condemnation.

27.11.24. Read *Acts XXVII*. Question, "Is it lawful to admit unbaptized Christians to Church fellowship?" All in the affirmative except Whitewood and Pearce.

12.1.25. Rumour of a new Baptist college near London.

20.1.25. Walked with Burnside to the Kings Head. He told me about the new college (Cox and Hughes, Shaw, Waymouth—Buckland). Thinks it is a castle in the air.

1.2.25. F.A.C. (Cox) defended himself concerning the new college.

7.10.25. Moris Jones read an Essay on the objections to academies—very good.

8.12.25. Special General Meeting. The Treasurer and Mr. Kinghorn spoke admirably. . . . Mr. Young and myself were requested to withdraw. We went into a room below. A sub-committee was appointed which may lead to important results.

9.12.25. Milcham told me what course was taken. He thinks that there is a party forming of young men against the old, the new school against the old; thinks the Treasurer secretly encourages it. What can I do? Complaints have poured in upon me from all sides.

13.12.25. John says I have committed two offences never to be forgiven. One, strict communion; and the other is, I have not bowed sufficiently to the Treasurer.

6.1.26. Mr. Young thought my removal inevitable. . . . It appears they have determined I shall die, how to put me to death is the only question.

28.1.26. The cause is now perhaps, not the cause of an individual tutor, but the cause of vital religion against a mere heartless form with the decorations of literature and philosophy.

28.3.26. I am greatly perplexed about submitting to the imputations of my young opponents at Stepney.

28.4.26. Mr. Young told me the students were under examination 4 hours . . . did not get home till 11. He believes

that many of them signed a joint letter after Christmas in answer to a private letter from one of the Committee of Enquiry.

29.4.26. Committee of Enquiry at 12. They wished to know if I had anything by way of explanation or contradiction to their report which I understood was made up of 38 questions and answers. I told them there was not time.

Their anxious wish was to obtain a pledge that I would resign if they would drop the proceedings.

I said I will give no such pledge. I have told you solemnly repeatedly and as I thought distinctly, my resignation shall not precede. I am an innocent man and more than innocent. . . . If I were to do so, some would say, "When it came to the point he was seen to shrink from examination." Many are sufficiently disposed to degrade me but it is rather too much to ask a man to degrade himself.

When the vote was taken the select committee were in the utmost distress, first seeking to shelter themselves under the wing of the General Committee then anxious to know if I was not preparing to appeal to the public.

"Then will you destroy all the documents?"

I said, this is premature; I shall burn none and you shall have your liberty. You need not be alarmed about my publishing anything. But if necessity requires, and I should have no friend, I must defend myself as well as I can.

15.6.26. Saw Mrs. Young. She thinks they cannot stay; reminded me of Cox's forwardness to take my place when I ceased to be Resident.

16.6.26. Mr. Young nearly prevailed with the students to write an apology and they went from him to prepare it, but some opposed. He thinks the idea prevailed that if they did so, Mr. Ivimey would get hold of it to print it! F.A.C. (Cox) was in the second rebellion and said, "Be firm" yet voted against the three. Keen remonstrated and he got out by saying "You went too far." J. Groser said he had perfect contempt for F.A.C. I remember that Wayland charged him with aiding and abetting in the grand rebellion of 1820; and Tomkins a few weeks ago acknowledged this to Mr. Young.

28.8.26. Called on Dr. Evans (of Bristol College). He says his case was like mine—one ungrateful pupil . . . I had many.

25.1.27. Wrote a letter to the Committee relinquishing my claim on the annuity at Stepney.

R. E. COOPER

Reviews

Studies on Baptism, edited by James Gray (Churches of Christ Publishing Committee, 2s. 6d.).

Bishop Westcott predicted more than fifty years ago, that the next great controversy in the Church would be "Baptism." The appearance of yet another book on this subject is a further reminder of the fulfilment of that prediction. *Studies on Baptism* is a small book of fifty-seven pages written by six members of the Union Committee of the Churches of Christ. We are told in the preface that "these studies were completed before the publication of *Christian Baptism*, edited by A. Gilmore and written by a group of Baptist ministers." As was inevitable in so small a book, little evidence is adduced for some of the statements made, and less than justice is done to some of the convictions and arguments of paedo-baptists.

The writers have obviously set out to defend and advocate believers' baptism; but that does not prevent them from making some trenchant criticisms of what they call "believer-baptist churches." Such churches "have often distorted their own witness" by spiritualising, by individualism, and by isolating baptism from churchmanship. Special stress is laid on the truth that "believers' baptism is no individual rite: it is bound up with the Church and entrance into it as the Body of Christ." The relationship of baptism to the gift of the Holy Spirit and to the rite of the Laying-on-of-Hands, is also helpfully discussed. While claiming that "believer-baptist churches are as active as the mass-churches in their love and care for little children," it is admitted that they "have grievously defaulted in not giving regular liturgical expression to their pastoral responsibilities concerning infants."

The real issue between infant and believers' baptism is admirably set forth. God deals with sinful men as *persons*. "This is the root of the matter, for the baptizing of the necessarily unwilling and unknowing infant admits legal or mechanical or magical views of the Divine-human encounter." The criticism so often made against us, that we deny the prevenient grace of God is effectively answered. "It can scarcely be more clearly said than by the constant affirmation of the believer-baptist churches that baptism is a *response* and the Church is a *responsible* fellowship, that prior to all human action is the gracious action of God."

Making due allowance for the fact that it is little—this is an admirable little book. It might well be read as an introduction to the much larger book *Christian Baptism* referred to above. It will be, because of its brevity and simplicity, of especial value to busy

laymen and young people, and the questions on each chapter, found at the end of the book, will be useful for group discussion.

STEPHEN WINWARD

A Treasury of Christian Verse, editor Hugh Martin, C.H., D.D. (S.C.M. Press, 9s. 6d.). 126 pp.

One tends nowadays to approach yet another collection of poetry with a feeling that one has seen it all before. The large anthology is bound to contain something new or unfamiliar (though probably also unimpressive), but the small book will comprise mainly the well-worn favourites; and how unfortunate it is that we should dismiss with the contempt of familiarity the "Nativity Ode," Blake's "The Lamb," or the wonderfully beautiful little carol "I Sing of a Maiden."

It is refreshing therefore to find a small anthology which, first, has a theme—"It is concerned with Jesus Christ Himself"—and which secondly omits some of the familiar and includes a number of poems which, whilst not always unfamiliar, nevertheless acquire a freshness in this particular context. Dr. Martin has boldly included some writers comparatively little-known, and some not strictly orthodox in their views. Consequently, and not really surprisingly, he has strengthened rather than weakened the total impression of the immense effect of the life and death of Jesus Christ on the lives and ideas of ordinary men and women.

The collection begins with Medieval verse, its unselfconsciousness and simplicity perhaps best revealed in the extract from Cynewulf, "Christ the Corner Stone." Familiar names appear representing the Elizabethan and metaphysical periods, but many well-known 18th century hymns are omitted. The unexpected names and unfamiliar poems are chiefly 19th and 20th century, and it is in John Bannister Tabb's "Christ and the Pagan" that the theme of this enjoyable little book is plainly expressed:

"... none may grope
Beyond eternal hope."

IAN R. DUNCAN

A Light to the Nations: An Introduction to the Old Testament, by Norman K. Gottwald. (Harper & Brothers, Publishers, New York, \$6.50).

The author of this book is Professor of Old Testament at Andover Newton Theological School, and he is already well-known in this country as the author of "Studies in the Book of Lamentations."

His new book is a worthy attempt to make a synthesis of

an Introduction to the literature of the Old Testament, a history of Israel, and the Theology of the Old Testament. In spite of the wide scope of the work, the author has succeeded in giving us a reasonably detailed account of most points of interest and importance, and he has expressed not only his own views but also those of other scholars thus giving us a brief but clear outline of the present position of Old Testament Studies as a whole.

The book contains 33 maps and although most of them are rather small in size, yet they are quite adequate for the illumination of the respective periods of history. There are also eight different charts dealing with subjects such as the Chronology of Hebrew Literature, Kings of the Divided Monarchy, etc. The book includes also some fifty well chosen illustrations. An interesting feature of the book is a glossary of the technical terminology of Old Testament Study, and many students of the Bible will find it most useful. There are also lists of books recommended for further reading, the main commentaries, and special studies on the different books of the Old Testament. The Appendix includes a very valuable selection of various Near Eastern Texts, such as the Babylonian Creation Story, the Tell el-Amarna Letters, Assyrian Annals, etc.

The book is well written and equally well produced, and it is one of the best of its type. The author's sketches of the different Old Testament personalities are clear and often very well put; e.g. the author thinks that Solomon is the most overrated figure in the Old Testament, the pampered son of David who "inherited the sins of his father without David's virtues" (p. 202).

In the chapter on Hebrew Prophecy the author points out two widespread misconceptions: the idea that the main, if not the only, function of the prophets was to foretell future, and that they were nothing but social reformers. "No prophet," says the author, "leaped across the centuries and foresaw the specific person Jesus of Nazareth" yet some of the prophets' deepest convictions were His and "the spirit of his ministry was that of prophecy incarnate" (p. 275). The main difference between the social reformers and the prophets was that the former talked about the rights of man while the latter spoke of the Word of Yahweh.

Professor Gottwald does not always follow the views of the majority, but even in such instances other views are given due consideration; e.g. in the discussion on the sign of the child Immanuel, he comes to the conclusion that the most likely candidate for Immanuel is a son of the prophet Isaiah (p. 321).

The author deserves our thanks for this readable and helpful book.

A. A. ANDERSON

The Pastoral Calling, by Paul Rowntree Clifford, 162 pp. (Carey Kingsgate Press, 10s. 6d. net.)

Perhaps there are two reasons why the number of books written about the task of the minister is steadily increasing. One is external, the minister finds himself in an office the value of which has been called into question by the majority of his contemporaries. The second is internal, due to a deeper understanding of the nature of the Church and a movement for the renewal and reformation of the churches in the light of these fresh insights. But any reformation of the Church which is the fruit of indifference to one's own tradition is immediately suspect. This book, which is an attempt "to expound the nature of the ministry from within the Baptist tradition in the British Isles," shows no such indifference. The author, who is lecturer in Pastoral Theology at McMaster University, has another aim "to interpret and apply what seem to be some of the more valuable insights of our American brethren into the mission of the Church and its ministry."

The main argument of the book is that the ministry should be defined in terms of the Pastoral Office "grounded in the interpersonal character of the Gospel itself."

The writer briefly outlines the account of the nature of the Baptist ministry put forward by Dr. Dakin 15 years ago and 11 pages later comes to the conclusion that on "historical doctrinal and practical grounds it is inadequate." Then he seeks to show that "The Separated Ministry" is true not only to the principles of the Primitive Apostolic Community but is also implicit in the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. His authority is the call of God and the outward election and appointment of the Church.

He then examines various views of the Ministry and comes to the conclusion that "the concept of Pastor, the shepherd of the flock should be the dominant one in our thinking." He lays down three essential requisities of the Pastor, all of which are grounded in the reality of a man's relationship with God.

It is in the light of the person to person relationship that the author interprets the proclamation of the Word. "The truth is that the preacher has the double duty of expounding the given Word of God and relating it to the actual needs of the congregation to which he ministers."

The chapter dealing with the pastoral relationship many will find most helpful. The author, having given a fourfold analysis of the nature of the ministry that we have to offer, goes on to show the objectives of every pastoral visit not forgetting to warn

us against the dangers of the counselling relationship. "The Pastor will be a good listener." Though the response that he makes will be different in every situation it will take one of four forms, "passive, opportunist, interpretive or questioning."

The final chapter points out that the minister cannot cover the whole field himself and he seeks to show how the whole community must share in the pastoral care. A plan for visitation evangelism which has proved successful in the United States; the integration of Church and Sunday School so that all feel a part of the one family; instead of an evening service on Sunday which is just the repetition of the morning service, a Vesper Hour and the introduction of group activities makes us more conscious of the influence of the North American Scene.

The reader will notice many omissions in the presentation of the calling of the minister. For example, it is part of his office to listen to what God is saying to the whole Church. He will see it as his duty to present to his congregation the mind and the experience of the Great Church. He will help the local Church to become a genuine outcrop of the great Church in that particular place.

One of the most disturbing elements coming especially from the other side of the Atlantic is that the minister must preach to the needs of the people. The supreme test to which the Gospel and preaching is being put is "Is it relevant" and not the vital question "Is it true?". The Gospel is concerned with man's ultimate needs, with his need for forgiveness and redemption. In the experience of the reviewer men and women are more conscious of their less-than-ultimate-needs. The starting point for our preaching must NOT be the needs of M. Jones, etc. (P. 73) but the Gospel in its fulness. Indeed the first result of preaching may be to reveal to these that what they think to be their needs are but trivialities. The minister must beware lest, in satisfying the penultimate needs of his congregation, he prevent them from knowing their real need.

The author has laid down several principles for the pastoral care of those who have "a difficulty" or "a problem." One wishes that he had been just as generous in sharing his experiences amongst those who have no "difficulties" and no "problems." A well furnished home; an assured steady income; the children doing well at school and "just as good as those pious people who go to your Church" and so on. For Christ came to rescue men not only when they were at their worst but even more so when they were at their best.

The Rev. Paul Rowntree Clifford has achieved one other object and that is that he will provoke any reader to a far greater

study of the Pastoral Calling and for this reason such a reader will be grateful for the detailed bibliography.

D. D. BLACK

BOOKS RECEIVED

- G. D. Yarnold, *The Spiritual Crisis of the Scientific Age*. 207 pp. 18s. Geo. Allen & Unwin.
- J. S. Lawton, *Miracles and Revelation*. 284 pp. 37s. 6d. Lutterworth Press.
- D. Roy Briggs, *The Christian Year*. 40 pp. 1s. 6d. Independent Press.
- R. W. Hugh Jones, *His Power in Our Lives*. 14 pp. 1s. 3d. Independent Press.
- R. Osborn, *Humanism and Moral Theory*. 115 pp. 18s. Geo. Allen & Unwin.
- Robert Duce, *Stepping Stones of Faith*. 15 pp. 1s. 3d. Independent Press.
- Eric Routley, *Ecumenical Hymnody*. 32 pp. 3s. Independent Press.
- A. G. Matthews, *Introduction to Calamy Revised*. 68 pp. 5s. Independent Press.
- John Macleod, *Rambles With Young Folk*. 89 pp. 6s. Independent Press.
- James Stewart, *The Message of Job*. 139 pp. 12s. 6d. Independent Press.
- Edith Deen, *All the Women of the Bible*. 410 pp. 15s. Independent Press.
- C. T. Follett, *Everyman's Church*. 15 pp. 1s. 3d. Independent Press.
- H. F. Lovell Cocks, *The Lord's Prayer*. 15 pp., 1s. 3d. Independent Press.
- Cecil Northcott, *Good News From Africa*. 16 pp. 1s. 3d. Independent Press.
- The Geographical Background of the Bible. Part I the Old Testament. Section I. Assyria and Babylonia. A Film strip and Notes. Educational Productions.