

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>

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

Seymour James Price

"... let him be the servant of all."

By the sudden death on May 29th, 1959, of Mr. Seymour J. Price, of Eastbourne, the Baptist Historical Society loses one who had been an enthusiastic and prominent supporter of its work for more than thirty years and its President since 1948. Mr. Price became a member of the Society in 1922. In 1928, following the publication of his *Popular History of the Baptist Building Fund*, he was elected Vice-President, Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson being then President and Dr. W. T. Whitley, Secretary. Seven years later, Mr. Price succeeded Dr. Whitley as Secretary and as editor of the *Baptist Quarterly*. In 1946, after the death of Dr. Robinson, a number of changes took place in the direction of the Society and Mr. Price, on giving up the secretaryship, was again appointed Vice-President. In 1948, on the death of Dr. Whitley, he was made President.

Such a recital of the bare facts regarding his official connection with the Historical Society gives little indication of the extent or nature of his services either to it or to the Baptist denomination, nor of the qualities of the man himself. Mr. Price became one of the best known Baptist laymen of his generation, one of the ablest, one of the most devoted, one of the most trusted. By an unusual combination of gifts and a readiness to concern himself with many unspectacular but necessary tasks, he made a unique place for:

himself and was for two decades a key figure for the smooth administration of a score of denominational enterprises.

Born at Cirencester in Gloucestershire on August 31st, 1886, Seymour Price was brought to London as a boy. His parents' first association was with the Baptist church in Newton Avenue, Acton. He used frequently to recall how, as a youth of eighteen, he acted as a steward at the meetings in the Exeter Hall at which the Baptist World Alliance was concerned. Shortly afterwards, he joined the Church Road Baptist Church, drawn there by the preaching of the Rev. W. A. Davis, minister from 1885-1912. At the relatively early age of twenty-three, Mr. Price was elected to the diaconate at Church Road. The ministries of Dr. E. J. Tongue (1913-1920) and Dr. F. Townley Lord (1920-26) proved of decisive importance in the encouragement and development of his interests and powers. With Dr. Lord in particular, he formed a close and lasting friendship, which helped to introduce him to denominational service in the London Baptist Association, the Historical Society and the committee of Regent's Park College. In these circles he met and found inspiration through acquaintance with leaders like the Rev. John Bradford and Dr. J. W. Ewing, with laymen of the calibre of Arthur Newton, Francis Blight and Ernest Wood, and with scholars like Dr. Wheeler Robinson and Dr. Whitley. To this varied and stimulating company the younger man was soon making his own distinctive contribution.

His business as an insurance broker prospered. The help given him in this business by one of his sisters enabled him to spend considerable time on his church and denominational activities. The study and presentation of Baptist history became one of his major concerns. His earliest contribution to the *Baptist Quarterly* was an article in 1925 on "The Office of Church Secretary." It was followed by a series on the Building Fund (later expanded into his book on the subject). Then came a careful study of the first Minute Book of the Baptist Union, next a number of articles based on the early records of the Gill-Rippon-Spurgeon church. "Laymen and Reunion", which appeared in 1931, was a carefully weighed contribution to the church unity discussions of the period and revealed both his sturdy lay standpoint and the deep respect he felt for the separated ministry. The year he became secretary of the Historical Society, Mr. Price published *Upton, the Story of One Hundred and Fifty Years*, one of the best and most readable of local church histories. He quickly succeeded in enlarging the appeal of the *Quarterly*, and in the years prior to the outbreak of war in 1939, arranged at the time of the Annual Assembly a series of much appreciated historical excursions.

By then Mr. Price's work for the L.B.A. and the London Property Board had made him the right-hand man of the London

Superintendents, S. G. Morris and Henry Cook. He took an important part in the vital decisions involved in moving Regent's Park College from London to Oxford. He added to his responsibilities the treasurership of the Particular Baptist Fund, a post which gave him special satisfaction and for which his historical knowledge and business ability well fitted him.

But his motto might well have been 'Nihil baptisticum alienum mihi puto'. Elected to the General Committee of the Baptist Missionary Society in 1939, he was soon appointed treasurer of its ter-jubilee fund and chairman of the General Committee (1941-42). He had earlier undertaken a mission to Jamaica of special difficulty with the Rev. Thomas Powell as his companion. There were many who hoped that Mr. Price might have become Home Secretary of the Society in succession to the Rev. B. Grey Griffith. Instead, he was persuaded to withdraw from his own business and become General Manager of the Baptist Insurance Company, a post he held until his retirement in 1957. During the last year of the war (1944-45) he served as President of the Baptist Union, and in 1946 succeeded the Rev. P. T. Thomson as chairman of the Ministerial Recognition Committee, a task demanding a rare combination of administrative skill, impartiality and personal sympathy and one to which he gave close attention to the end of his life.

His business standing and acumen had gained him a place among the directors of the Temperance Permanent Building Society and this in turn led to two further important volumes, which will remain his literary monument: *From Queen to Queen, 1854-1954*, the centenary story of the Temperance Building Society, and *Building Societies: Their Origin and History, 1958*, to which the Duke of Devonshire contributed an appreciative preface. Much detailed research in unfamiliar places lay behind both these books.

To these many and varied activities and responsibilities, Mr. Price added the chairmanship of the Creed Trust, the Dr. John Ward Trust and the Joseph Davis Charity. To whatever he undertook he brought the same clear mind, sound judgment, mastery of detail and unfailing conscientiousness. His carefully prepared reports, his neat handwriting and clearly formed figures, were indicative of the man. His wide knowledge of men and affairs and his judicious approach to complicated issues quickly inspired confidence. The high standards he expected of others he applied to himself. His devotion to duty led him to deliver his Presidential Address to the Baptist Union only a day or so after the death of his wife. When, on his re-marriage, he moved to Eastbourne, his long and deep attachment to Church Road, Acton, made it difficult for him to settle elsewhere.

The secretary and business man, the deacon and church officer, the historian and denominational leader were singularly blended

in one who was ever loyal to the heroes of his youth, to his colleagues and to many younger than himself. The Baptist denomination will long have reason to remember with gratitude the name of Seymour Price. To some he may have appeared reserved, his very efficiency and meticulousness carrying with them a touch of severity. But others can tell of his love of the Swiss mountains, of cricket and of music. He left himself relatively little time for relaxation, however, choosing to live his life at full stretch, not unmindful of the fact that the end might come, as it had to his father and his sister, suddenly. The ideal that inspired him is set forth in his earliest article in the *Baptist Quarterly*.

"The secretary's office is one that brings with it many trials and difficulties, but the joys and privileges of service far outweigh them. The conscientious secretary will be well aware of the danger that, amid all the details of organisation, his own inner life and spirit may not be preserved, but he will seek never to lose the vision of the One who inspires all his service and who said 'He that would be great among you, let him be the servant of all'."

* * *

The above tribute was written for us by Dr. Payne who shared with Mr. Price in so much of the work of the Historical Society.

* * *

Mr. Price's final service to the Historical Society was to chair the Annual Meeting held on Monday, 27th April. This was well attended, and although again limited in time by the length of the afternoon session of the Assembly, it gave an opportunity for a useful discussion of the Society's future. We shall hope to write more of this in the next issue, by which time we anticipate that the Officers will have met to discuss, not only matters arising from the Annual Meeting, but also the position resulting from the death of Mr. Price.

* * *

We should perhaps draw the attention of our readers to the review in this current issue of the new book *Christian Baptism*, edited by A. Gilmore. This is an attempt, from the Baptist standpoint, to make a scholarly contribution to the present discussion on baptism. In view of the importance of the book to Baptists we give rather more space than usual to the review. The fact that both the Editor and the Review Editor have contributed to the book in question is purely coincidental!

The Concept of Ecumenical Mission*

Delegates to the International Missionary Council's Assembly at Willingen in 1952 felt very grateful to Bishop Newbigin for his stimulating judgment on the missionary enterprise as "having become bogged down in trench warfare," and having in consequence lost its mobility and capacity for dynamic advance.

Those who attended the Ghana Assembly in 1957/58 felt similarly indebted to Professor Freytag for his frank and penetrating analysis of the present missionary situation. As he pointed out, whereas, in the past, Western missions have always had many problems, they have now become a problem themselves. "We are uncertain about their patterns as they are, and even more, the historic, basic conceptions of missions are being questioned." There is no doubt whatsoever as to the continuing necessity of prosecuting the unfinished task; the question is whether our present patterns, and the conceptions behind them, are "the right expression of the obedience God wants from us today." Dr. Freytag drew attention to the new political and cultural situations created by the rise of new nations, the reality of the younger churches, and the growing reality of the ecumenical era. All of these, as he indicated, are tending towards an external limitation, or a deliberate self-limitation, on the part of Western missions. A "lost directness" has resulted from appeals for increasing material and financial aid and less personal help, as well as from changed conditions which often take away the initiative from Western missionaries serving in and under younger churches. There is a growing recognition on the part of churches in the West, and an obviously necessary appeal to churches in Asia, Africa and Latin America to recognize, that the missionary obligation is of the *esse* of the Church. In many cases this raises the question of the validity and necessity of the "vicarious service" of separate missionary societies. "What was a historic expression of genuine obedience in its time becomes an entity in itself, separated from the character of obedience, and stands in the way of a fresh and new expression of the same obedience which is now

* This article is reprinted, by permission, from a *Festschrift* published in Germany in May, 1959, in honour of Professor Walter Freytag.

asked of us." Dr. Freytag has exhorted us to abandon all defensive attitudes, to take actual decisions on the basis of our present insights, and to concentrate on the essential proclamation of the Gospel, with less emphasis on institutional service.

What are these insights which have to be translated into present action? It is the writer's purpose in this slight article, respectfully offered in honour of Dr. Freytag's outstanding leadership in the field of missionary thinking, to suggest with great temerity that the most important of these is the growing concept of ecumenical mission. If we steer our course by this bright star, the Holy Spirit will surely lead us forward out of the doldrums in which the missionary enterprise has of late been becalmed!

In his invaluable Burge Memorial Lecture for 1953, Dr. Visser 't Hooft traced the development of the word "ecumenical." The careless use of this term, as synonymous with "world-wide" or "interdenominational," is to be deplored. This word must never "be isolated from the missionary and evangelistic context in which it belongs. The Christian Oikoumene has only the right to call itself by that name if it remembers that it exists to be the salt of the earth, that is to represent 'the coming Oikoumene' in the midst of the Oikoumene which is the whole inhabited earth." The popular definition of "ecumenical" as "relating to the whole task of the whole Church to bring the Gospel to the whole world" is to be commended. The concept of ecumenicity thus defined, the term "ecumenical mission" was bound to arise.

These words found a dynamic organizational embodiment in the Asia Council on Ecumenical Mission, set up in July, 1955. Although this Council may have been abortive in its claims even to represent Asia, let alone to display the marks of true ecumenicity, it nevertheless led to the formation of the East Asia Christian Conference, now fully recognized by the W.C.C. and by the I.M.C. as the regional organ in East Asia of ecumenical co-operation within the framework of those two bodies. The preparatory conference held at Prapat in March, 1957, declared itself as follows: "Our common evangelistic task has been given to us by our common Lord, Who is Lord both of the world and the Church. We would commit ourselves in common obedience and fellowship to the dynamic pursuit of this divine mission. Already as a result of our meeting we have come more fully to realize that the churches in Asia are eager and ready to share in the world-wide task of Christian mission, particularly in the evangelistic task so insistently needed in our contemporary situation, and to engage in these tasks unitedly convinced that 'we can do together what we cannot do separately.'"

Before taking up the question whether regional ecumenicity is itself a contradiction in terms, let us look at the linking together of Mission and Unity in our accepted definition of the term

“ecumenical.” Since the meeting of the Central Committee of the W.C.C. at Rolle in 1951, increasing consideration has been given to the interrelatedness of these two vital concepts. In a statement then adopted, it was pointed out that : “On the one hand, the missionary movement has been from the beginning imbued with a deep sense of the calling to unity. Because the Gospel is one and the world is one, those who were inspired to recall the Church to its duty to take the Gospel to the whole world could not fail to see a vision of unity which transcended those divisions within which churches unmindful of their missionary calling had been so long content to live. The young churches which have grown up as the fruit of this missionary movement have already, in many areas, formed regional unions of churches, and the fact that the Church is now—for the first time—world-wide, has inevitably compelled Christians to think afresh about its unity. On the other hand, the movement towards unity has from the beginning concerned itself with the Church’s witness to the world. Unity has been sought out of a deep conviction that only together can Christians give true witness and effective service to the world.” Many elements of actual confusion, as well as several implications for both Church and Mission, were pointed out. “The division in our thought and practice between ‘Church’ and ‘Mission’ can be overcome only as we return to Christ Himself, in Whom the Church has its being and its task, and to a fresh understanding of what He has done, is doing, and will do . . . The obligation to take the Gospel to the whole world, and the obligation to draw all Christ’s people together, both rest upon Christ’s whole work, and are indissolubly connected.” It was fully in line with this thinking that the I.M.C. at Willingen boldly and categorically declared : “Division in the Church distorts its witness, frustrates its mission, and contradicts its own nature. If the Church is to demonstrate the Gospel in its life, as well as in its preaching, it must manifest to the world the power of God to break down all barriers and to establish the Church’s unity in Christ.” While every step towards unity will strengthen the churches’ capacity for world mission, prosecution of ecumenical mission is likely to provide in the long run the best stimulus towards greater unity. Ecumenical mission is surely the way forward to renewal of the missionary enterprise.

What, then, is Ecumenical Mission? Just as every local church ideally and scripturally focuses the Universal Church, so every local missionary enterprise should focus the missionary task of the whole Church. The local church is more than a minute “part” of the whole; it is a microcosm mirroring the macracosm. Similarly, every enterprise of ecumenical mission must mirror the wholeness of the missionary task, and the wholeness of the Church which undertakes it. In a token way, though obviously only in a token way, it demon-

strates something of the total programme by which the Church witnesses interracially, internationally, and interdenominationally, to the relation of the Gospel to the whole of man's human needs. It is essentially a witness to two things, to the unity of God's purpose and to the reconciling power of Jesus Christ. To the unity of God's purpose, because His care is for the needs of the whole man and of the whole of mankind, to redeem one fallen humanity without partiality and on the same terms for all. And to the reconciling power of Christ, because it is through Him, as Lord both of the Church and of the world, that all things in heaven and earth are to be brought into one. Even now it is evident that Christ is to be found both sides of every barrier which men erect against one another, both within and outside the churches. Missionary work is ecumenical, however small its scale, when it manifests the universality of His Spirit and His purpose, and nothing less.

On this understanding of the nature of Church and Mission, it will be seen that regional ecumenicity is a genuine possibility, provided a consciousness of, and loyalty to, the whole task and the whole Church imbue the regional, as well as the local, manifestation. The decision taken at Prapat to include on equal terms fraternal members from Australia and New Zealand within the fellowship and operations of the East Asia Christian Conference was of crucial importance. What might have seemed an "ecclesiastical Bandung Conference," along the lines of "Asia for the Asians," thus became truly ecumenical in spirit and in outward manifestation.

It is to be recognized that there are large numbers of international and interdenominational or interconfessional, as well as undenominational, missions which could not claim to be ecumenical. This is because they fail to reflect the wholeness of the Church, even more than because of the tendency of many of them unduly to narrow the sphere of their application of the Gospel to human need. This is not, as it might at first be taken to be, a judgment based upon attitude and adherence, or non-adherence, to the recognized organs of the Ecumenical Movement. The contention that our Lord's prayer for the unity of all those who believe in Him is to be interpreted in spiritual, not in organizational terms, is a fair one. The fundamental issue, however, is whether that unity is a visible one, through which the world may believe. "By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another." A claim to ecumenicity cannot be automatically denied to those who have not taken up membership in ecumenical councils, so-called. It cannot be conceded, however, to any who, in a sectarian spirit, claim a monopoly of truth, or of "holy orders," and virtually unchurch; or in practice compete with or oppose, the missionary efforts of others who claim obedience to our One Lord.

Similarly it must be denied to such missionary work as ignores, or militates against, the presence of other Christian churches within the sphere of its operations.

A question here inevitably raises itself as to the place of any form of denominational mission in this new ecumenical era. Provided it operates within the spirit and framework of "the whole task of the whole Church," it may be defended at our present stage of ecclesiastical disunity. But it forfeits the possibility of ecumenicity whenever it is nationalistic or denominationalistic. Although the continuance of denominational missions within the ecumenical framework cannot yet be disowned, it is obvious that missionary work which manifests more of the marks of ecumenicity far better represents today the mission of the Christian Church in the modern world. Western missionary societies have been increasingly uniting in inter-Mission co-operative enterprises. The new and exciting factor, however, which opens up a whole vista of new possibilities, is the express desire of Asian churches—undoubtedly to be followed by those of Latin America and Africa—to participate in the world mission of the Christian Church.

The more advance that is made along these lines, the more will practical difficulties emerge, and considerable confusion and heart-burning are to be anticipated. Nevertheless, it is the writer's conviction that this is the sphere in which we are called upon to implement Dr. Freytag's challenge to move forward, step by step, in faithful obedience, expressed in this and that practical decision made in the light of this concept of ecumenical mission. It would be unchristian to hope to see where this obedience will ultimately lead us. In faith we have to go forth, not knowing whither we go. It would be quite unrealistic to think in terms of simply abandoning historic societies and traditional methods. What we are called upon to do is, with a sense of urgency and courage, to keep modifying their structure and operations in an approach towards ecumenical ideals.

The Committee on New Forms of Mission at the Ghana Assembly noted that: "The period since the Willingen Assembly has been characterized by increasing recognition on the part of both younger Churches and older Churches that nothing less than the whole of the emerging world Christian community must become the base of the mission of the Christian Church. This vision has already begun to be matched by action, and is the truly new factor in the present situation." Nevertheless, that Committee also reported that "despite Willingen's clear statement of its new insights and concerns, few new forms of mission have as yet arisen from that stimulus."

The Committee surveyed such advance as has been made, and went on to suggest guiding principles "in the exchange of per-

sonnel designed to further the mission of the Church, primarily at present between one Asian country and another, or between younger and older Churches, but also from other regions to one another as this new form of mission gains ground." It called for provision to be made for some missionary funds to go into a pool in which national and denominational labels would be lost. "Plans should be devised for the use of this pool in meeting special needs and particularly, strategic opportunities, irrespective of national and denominational boundaries, but without breaking existing relationships and responsibilities." A later important section said that "the missionary potential of laymen going abroad in business, professional, and various other capacities should be realized as multi-directional, and not simply from older Church to younger Church areas." Such laymen abroad, and similarly overseas students, should be drawn not only into the fellowship of the churches, but equally into their ministries of evangelism and service. Many churches, both in the West and in the East, could easily make far more effective demonstration of ecumenical mission if this potential were realized and utilized.

It was anticipated that from the new institutes which have been set up in several places for the study of non-Christian religions, and of Christian social responsibility, important suggestions for new forms of mission would arise in due course. Attention was drawn to the vital importance of the production and distribution of far more Christian literature, and to the need of far better use of other modern media of mass-communication. These are tasks which should obviously be prosecuted largely along ecumenical lines.

In all these matters we may hope to receive a new lead from the Commission of World Mission and Evangelism, to be set up if plans for the integration of I.M.C. and W.C.C. are implemented in 1961. In the writer's opinion, the new Division to be established in connection with this Commission should be given executive powers and resources to enter the field of ecumenical mission administratively, as well as inspirationally. This departure from the I.M.C.'s traditional policy of non-assumption of executive missionary responsibility seems necessitated if an adequate lead is to be given. But in no sense should such action replace the direct missionary enterprises of the churches in both East and West. It must be limited in scope, and pioneering in purpose. Not only would anything else be unrealistic and unnecessary; it would in principle be wholly wrong for any such centralized organization to usurp Church responsibility for direct missionary action. The new Division, like the traditional I.M.C., should, and could be, no more of a super-Mission than the W.C.C. is a super-Church—and for the same reasons.

Many problems will inevitably arise regarding the respective scope and functions of this new Division and of the existing Division of Inter-Church Aid. These will often better be met by a policy of "solvitur ambulando" than by paper-work along a priori lines, although the latter will be necessary. It may well be that as time goes on, the Division of Inter-Church Aid will increasingly concern itself with the institutional apparatus which is the legacy of the Western missionary enterprise, leaving the Division of World Mission and Evangelism to concentrate upon its central and essential tasks. The more effectively the Division of World Mission makes every department of the W.C.C. aware of the missionary *dimension* of every aspect of the Church's life, the more desirable will it be that its own *function* be limited to promoting the advance of the Gospel across the frontiers between faith and unbelief. All Christian decision, Christian living and Christian action, as Dr. Freytag reminded us, are part of the total missionary enterprise. The Church's inner life and worship are themselves part of God's missionary action in the world. But on the human plane, the Christian mission at its heart denotes all deliberate action designed to win men and women to faith in and allegiance to Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour. It is this "cutting edge of Mission" which must be the proper business of the new Division.

The Christian Mission, as has often been said, is to be fulfilled to the ends of the earth and to the end of time. Whenever we think in Scriptural terms of the meaning and magnitude of this Divinely initiated task, we find it impossible to think otherwise than of one Church confronting one world with a Gospel relevant to all human need. To think thus is to think in the inevitable category of ecumenical mission. Nothing less is adequate to the condition of this tragically divided world of the twentieth century. To set our small endeavours in the context, not of denominational or confessional advance, but of God's purposes for the whole of mankind is to lift them to a new level of vision and effectiveness. All Christian mission must be based upon missionary churches turned outwards to the world, with the home base anywhere there is a church. Its significance must be seen to be the witness of Christ's reconciling power, as experienced and demonstrated by what is already literally a redeemed cross-section of all mankind, the One Body of which Christ is the Head.

As long as the churches are themselves divided, so long and to that extent will their mission be impaired. There is thus an eschatological element in all thinking about, and attempts to act upon, the concept of ecumenical mission (as was recognized in Dr. Visser 't Hooft's definition already quoted). We are not thereby excused if we acquiesce in divided and competitive missions, undertaken by divided churches, without an earnest and practical seeking

after the ecumenical ideal. For the true function of eschatology in the Christian life is not to put off to a hidden future the vision and obedience which seem too hard for the present, but to enable us here and now to live and work in the power and by the light of that which is still to come.

VICTOR E. W. HAYWARD

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

V. E. W. HAYWARD, M.A.,

Research Secretary, International Missionary Council.

B. R. WHITE, B.A.,

Research student, Regent's Park College.

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

Minister, Rochester, Kent.

TORSTEN BERGSTEN,

Research student in Sweden.

E. A. PAYNE, M.A., D.D.,

General Secretary, Baptist Union.

REVIEWS BY :

A. W. Argyle, W. H. Axford, L. G. Champion, G. Henton
Davies, K. C. Dykes.

A Puritan Work by Robert Browne

Among the documents printed by the Puritan leaders in *A Parte of a Register* in 1590 was one entitled¹ *A Viewe of Antichrist his lawes and ceremonies in our English Church vnreformed*. This work was of composite authorship and the first section² was by "A. Gilbe"³. The first section was composed of four parts made up as follows :

- (i) Page 55, Introduction.
- (ii) Pages 56-7. A table headed "The booke of the generation of Antichrist the Pope . . ."
- (iii) Pages 57-9. A table headed ". . . of the displaying of the Pope and poperie in our vnreformed Church of Englande . . ."
- (iv) Pages 59-65. A table headed ". . . an hundred pointes of poperie, remaying . . ."

This last part, in which in sober fact 149 "pointes of poperie" were listed, also appeared in Antony Gilby's *A Pleasavnt Dialogue* published in 1581. It would appear, however, that some, at least, of this first section was written before the death of Archbishop Parker in 1575 since there was a reference to⁴ "The Pope of Lambeth . . . Matthewe of Canturburie." Gilby⁵ an extreme Puritan, who had been one of the Frankfurt exiles, died in 1585. Another of his writings⁶ *A godly and zealous letter written by Mai. Antony Gilby, about anno 1570* was also printed in *A Parte of a Register*.

The second section of *A Viewe of Antichrist*, from the hand of one signing himself⁷ "T.W.", was also compiled in the form of a table⁸ "Of the bringing in of diuers of the popish corruptions, yet remaying in our Eng. Church." This too had also appeared in *A Pleasavnt Dialogue*⁹ with a note that it was¹⁰ "not put too of the authour."

The third and final section was unsigned¹¹ and is transcribed in full below. (Transcript "A.") It seems possible to date it approximately from two pieces of internal evidence. A *terminus a quo* is given by the reference to¹² the "article of the Bishop of Londons" which was published, according to Strype¹³, on January 29th, 1581. In addition, the *terminus ad quem*, the close of the 23rd year of

the reign of Queen Elizabeth I mentioned in¹⁴ the concluding prayer, was on November 17th, 1581.

The fact that the last section of *A Viewe of Antichrist* was written between the early spring and late autumn of 1581 became far more significant when it was noted that a lengthy portion of it, from line 7 of the transcript, "First, we are taught . . ." to line 102, "newe and (y)earely iniunctions" was reproduced, with certain modifications, in Robert Browne's undoubted work¹⁵ *A True and Short Declaration*.

Two main lines of reasoning indicate that Browne was not merely incorporating a Puritan anti-episcopal tract by another writer but that, in fact, he was reproducing, and significantly modifying, an earlier work of his own.

The first is chronological. Dr. Albert Peel shewed¹⁶ that Browne was still a Puritan during the early days of his stay in Norwich since he signed the Puritan¹⁷ "Supplication of Norwich men to the Queenes Matie" (c. 1580). On the other hand, the first dated reference to Browne as a Separatist was in a letter of Bishop Freke of Norwich in April, 1581. Freke¹⁸ said that Browne had been "lately apprehended, on complaint of many godly preachers, for delivering unto the people corrupt and contentious doctrine. Furthermore, his supporters among "the vulgar sort of people" were "assembling themselves together . . . in private houses and conventicles." The "godly" preachers were the Puritan party of the day. Into such a chronological framework this writing, if it were produced in, perhaps, March 1581, would quite neatly fit.

The second, and more conclusive, reason for ascribing this work to Browne, is based on his own writing *A True and Short Declaration*. Throughout that work he insisted that the prime cause of his separation was hostility to the authority and office of the bishops. Secondly, Browne claimed¹⁹ that before the final act of separation and the taking of the covenant at Norwich he not only sought to win assent for his views by spoken argument but that he "also set dovne in Vwriting his principles." Above all, far from giving any hint that he was interpolating the writing of another man, he appeared to stress that the whole of the parallel section in his own work was his. The following is the passage which preceded without any break between, the introduction of the excerpt from the earlier work²⁰. "He first considered the state of Cambridge, hovve the church of God vvas planted therein. For he iudged that the church vvas to call and receaue, if he should be there chosen and appointed to preach. Then did he thinck on this, vvho should be chiefest, or haue charge before others, to looke to such matters. For the bishops take vppon them the chieftie, but to be called and authorised by them, he thought it vnlavvfull. And vvhy he vvas of this minde, he had these & such like vvarrantes: namelie thei

should be chiefest, vvhich partake vnto vs the chiefest graces, and vse of their callings. And that doeth Christ . . .”

No one reading this passage would doubt that what followed was the fruit of his own thinking. Furthermore, in his version of lines 37-8 of the transcript from *A Viewe of Antichrist* which there read “This is not only against the wickednes of the Bishops,” he rephrased the clause²¹ “This he iudged, not onelie toe be against the Vvickedness of the bishopes . . .” This was surely an explicit claim to the authorship of the passage.

Two further comments may be added. First, no one has ever accused Brown of being incapable of composing his own invective and abuse, and it seems, a priori, highly unlikely that he would adopt the work of some unknown Puritan whose writing was not entirely satisfactory for his purpose, modify it where necessary, and yet slavishly copy whole paragraphs of the remainder almost verbatim. On the other hand, if the author of this last section of *A Viewe of Antichrist* were Browne it would certainly explain why the editors of *A Parte of a Register* allowed the other two sections to retain their authors' identity and suppressed it in the third. It were better that the work appeared, without father and without mother, than that it should have so notorious a parentage.

In Transcript “B” is given the section of the parallel passage from *A True and Short Declaration* where significant modifications were made to the original in *A Viewe of Antichrist*. The remainder of this passage was closely reproduced by Browne. In Transcripts “A” and “B”, spelling oddities apart, the close verbal parallels are italicised. Although a comparison of the two versions will shew that in some degree the correspondence of thought between the two is even greater than the verbal parallels indicate there are, nevertheless, certain important differences.

The fundamental difference between the two versions is in the definition of “the church” in the quotation of *Mt. xviii 17* “Tell the Church.” In Transcript “A” it was stated, in lines 17-18, “By this Church is meant the Ministers and Elders that are chosen out of the Congregatiō to watch ouer the rest of the flocke.” In the same context, in Transcript “B” lines 13-14 “the Church” is evidently “the voice of the Vvhole people, guided bie the elders and forwardest.” Thus, in his interpretation of this classic passage for the seat of final authority in the Church, Browne had moved from a Presbyterian position to a Congregationalist.

This change of view was reflected in other parts of the passage. The omission from Transcript B of the passage in Transcript A (lines 22-29) from “The proceedings of this Church . . .” to “. . . but Christ from one to more” is partly due to its substance being compressed into Transcript B (lines 16-17) “Therefore the meetinges together of manie churches, also of euerie Vvhole church, &

of the elders therein . . ." But the compression also involved a change of emphasis similar to that noted above, namely from the equation of the Church, in this matter, with the Elders alone to the Church as the body of members guided by its Elders. Again a change in the same direction was made from lines 39-40 in Transcript A which read: "if the authoritie of the Church be aboue the Bishops" to lines 27-28 of Transcript B which read "if the authoritie of the church, & of the forvvardest breethren or elders therein, be aboue the bishopes." The insertion of "& of the forvvardest breethren or elders therein" both altered and qualified the meaning of "Church" in that context.

In the light of these examples another small variation between Transcript A and Transcript B gained in significance: in the latter, in the quotations of *John* i 16 and of *Psalms* cxlix 9 the word "all" correctly appears in each case whereas in the former it was in both cases omitted.

One conclusion to be drawn from this is obvious: the alterations made by Browne when he reproduced this passage in *A True and Short Declaration* reflect a profound change of meaning in the references to the seat of authority within the Church. Two other conclusions may also be drawn at this stage which are borne out by further study of Browne's concept of the nature of the Church and the Ministry. First, though the body of the Church was the final seat of Church authority, its decisions were to be guided and shaped by the Elders. Browne did not believe that one Christian's voice or vote was necessarily as valuable or as divinely guided as another. Secondly, the almost purely "functional" view of the ministry which he took, that is that the authority of the ministry was derived less from office than from spiritual gifts can be illustrated from his revision in Transcript B lines 1-2, of his earlier views: "Thei shoulde be chiefest, vvchich partake vnto vs the chiefest graces, and vse of their callinges." It should, however, be added that the word "functional" is not derived from his vocabulary and that it is quite possible that he would have recognised no essential opposition between authority of office and spiritual gifts.

This passage has a further value for, not only does it illustrate the precise nature of Browne's shift of opinion concerning the seat of Church authority, but also it shews how he moved from one position to the other.

The argument concerning the seat of Church authority in both versions follows substantially the same lines and the differences serve to make clear the line of reasoning Browne was using.

In Transcript A (lines 1-39) the argument went as follows: Browne began by pointing out (lines 1-2) "we haue shewed the Antichristian authoritie vsurped by one, and so from one to one

continued to this day in gouvernement and ceremonies." He then established by citing proof texts that (lines 11-12) "none but Christ onely hath full and sole authoritie to make lawes vnto his Church." Next he pointed out that no single person had the right to exercise discipline in the Church on his own (lines 12-16) "but together with those that are authorised by the Church, accordinge to the direction of our Sauour, who warneth vs, that if our brother will not be admonished of his faulte by one, nor by two, then we should tell the Church, *Mat. xviii 17.*" If the matter could not be settled within the local congregation it should be taken to a meeting of the Churches in a province and even, if necessary, to a national assembly (lines 25-26) "if it be a matter of greater waight, to proceede to a greater number." His position was summed up (lines 28-29) "Antichrist . . . in his proceedings goeth from one to one, but Christ from one to more."

In Transcript B the same texts were called to testify to Christ's unique authority then again the authority of a single person was denied (lines 6-12) "Novve next vnder Christ, is not the bishop of the dioces . . . nether anie one vvhich hath but single authoritie, but first thei that haue their authoritie together : as first the church, vvhich Christ also teacheth . . . If he vvill not vouchsafe to heare them tell it vnto the church." In fact the same trend of argument, with the further extension of it setting the final authority not in the Elders as in Transcript A but in the body of the Church, was retained in *A True and Short Declaration*. It will be noted that the pivot of the argument is a literalistic application of *Mat. xviii 17* where the progress is from private rebuke, to rebuke before witnesses and finally, when the offender's defiance has become most grave, rebuke and, if necessary, excommunication, in the presence of the whole congregation. It is this logical and wholehearted application of *Mat. xviii 17* which led Browne to abandon the Presbyterian position he had formerly held. This verse contains the core and kernel of Browne's doctrine of the final seat of authority in the Church: the interpretation followed in both the versions discussed above makes clear precisely why he came to hold it and how.

To sum up it must be confessed that this article is only by nature of a prolegomenon to the full study of Browne's doctrine of the Church and of his place in the development of English Separatist thought. On the other hand, it explains and expounds an essential moment in his thought and in his own development.

BROWNE'S PURITAN WRITING

(Transcript "A")

Nowe that we haue shewed the Antichristian authoritie vsurped by one, and so from one to one continued to this day in gouvernement and cere-

monies, it will bee necessarie brieflie to declare the power and authoritie of Christ Iesus our Lawe giuer, King, and Prophete, which he receyued from God his Father: and then to shewe the authoritie our Sauour hath deliuered and left vnto his Church by the Ministerie of his worde and Discipline.

- 5 First, we are taught that *God hath made all things subject vnto Christ our Lorde, and hath appointed him ouer all things, to bee the head of his Church, which is his body, Ephe. i. 22.* And that of his fulnes haue we receyued grace for grace, *Iohn i. 16. Euen the fulnes of him which filleth all things, Ephe. i. 23.* Whereby it appeareth, that none but Christ onely hath full and sole authoritie to make lawes vnto his Church: neyther is it lawfull for any to exercise the Censures of the Church him selfe alone, but together with those that are authorised by the Church, accordinge to the direction
- 10 of our Sauour, who warneth vs, that if our brother will not be admonished of his faulte by one, nor by two, then we should tell the Church, *Mat. xviii. 17.* By this Church is meant the Ministers and Elders that are chosen out of the Congregatiō to watch ouer the rest of the flocke: by such approbation as the worde requireth, *Actes xiv. 23.* This is that Church, which is called by the Apostle, *The pillar and grounde of trueth, 1 Timoth. iii. 15.* This is that *great honour* which the Lord hath bestowed on his *Saintes, Psal. 149.* The proceedings of this Church in matters of difficultie, if it can not be determined in their Congregation, is to call a meeting of the rest of the Churches in that prouince: and if it be a matter of greater weight, to
- 20 procede to a greater number: yea a generall meeting of the whole Churches of the lande, and there with fasting and prayer to enter into the causes, and to ende the same, example *Actes xiv. 23.* So that we may see this order to be contrarie to Antichrist, who in his proceedings goeth from one to one, but Christ from one to more: This Church or Consistorie hath authoritie
- 30 *about the Apostle about the Prophete, the Euangelist, the Pastour, the Teacher, and euery particular gouernour in the Church. For, the ioyning and partakinge of manie Churches together, and of the authoritie which many haue, must needes be greater and more waightie then the authoritie of anie single person. And this also meant the Apostle, Paule, 1 Corin. ii. 22. We are yours, and you are Christes, and Christ is Gods. So that the Apostle is inferiour to the Church, and the Church is inferiour to Christ, and Christ concerninge his manhoode and office in the church, is inferior to God. This is not only against the wickednes of the Bishops, but also against their whole power & authoritie. For if the authoritie of the church be about*
- 40 *the Bishops, howe should it not followe, but that the Bishoppes may be commanded, accused, and charged by the church: yea also discharged and separated as is their desert?* But now because of their popishe power, canon lawes, and commission, they haue lift vpp their authoritie more high, then the Church can take accountes of them: and not onely by force doe thtust (sic) out and trouble whō they list, but also raigne as Lordes and Dukes in their Dioces, their authoritie must needes be vsurped. For the Apostles did giue accouates (sic) to the church of all their doinges, as we reade in *Act. xi. 4, Act. xv. 2, 3 and Rom. xv. 31.* But these being got about the Apostles, will sit in the throne of Christ: and as Christ is not
- 50 inferiour to the Church, no more will they be. For Christ hath chosen vs sayeth the Scripture, & not we him, *Iohn xv. 16,* and therefore he is greater then vs all. And seeing the church cā not chuse the Bishoppes, nor those hyrelinges, whom the Bishoppes thrust vpon them, thefore (sic) they also will be greater then the church, and with whom then doe they compare them selues in degree but with Christ? and so make them selues antichristes. Naye they presume further then Christ, which would not thrust his Apostles vpon any congregation, nor suffer them to take charge of any which did not willinglie receyue them, *Luc. x. 10.* But these doe force vpon the people euery where, and in sundrie places against their willes, not onely Ministers
- 60 vnknown, but also such as are known to be blinde bussardes, wicked fel-

lowes, and idoll shepheardes. Likewise Christ hath all rule in his hande, as it is written, that we are complete in him, which is the head of all principallitie and power, *Col. ii.*, and he can not sinne, nor offende the law of God, nor be accused by the same. For so the scripture testifieth, that none could
65 reprove him of sinne, though hee offered him selfe to them to accuse him if they could, *John viii.* And he is that high Priest, as againe it is writtē, *Heb. vii.*, which is holy, harmelesse, vndefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher then the heauens. Howe high then doe they lift them selues, whiche will rule alone as lordes ouer the flocke, though the worde hath said, It shall
70 not be so, *Luke xxii. 26*, 1 *Pet. v. 3*. Which will be Rabbies, Doctours, and reuerende Fathers, though we haue but one doctor Christ, *Mat. xxiii.*, which also take vpon them, not as seruantes in the house as was Moses, *Heb. iii.*, but haue sent after him that is Sonne and heire in his owne house, saying, They will not haue him to raigne ouer them, *Luc. xix. 14*. For they haue
75 refused his gouernement, and chosen their owne popishe disciplines in steade thereof. This appeareth, because they enter and take on them their offices in popish wise, and as that lawe prescribeth them, and also doe misgyde the people by that popish tyrannie. For who knoweth not, but that they watche for the liuing, or Bishoprike, when it shall fall, and then sewe & paye well
80 for the same, if they obteyne it: So are they rauenous and wicked persons, as sayth the Scripture, *Zacha. iii.* They are make-shiftes and troublers, seeing they rule rather because they seeke their own aduantage, or glorie, or mischeuous purpose, then the welfare and benefite of the Church. Yea they all looke to their owne waye, as sayeth the Prophete *Esai. lvi. 11* euerie one
85 for his aduantage and for his owne purpose. Who knoweth not also, but that they whiche are not duellie receyued and called to gyde, and that by due consent and agreement, they are eyther Antichristes in the church, or Tyrantes in the common wealth, because they vsurpe in the church or common wealth. Such are they of whom Paul speaketh, 2 *Cor. xi. 20*, that the Corinthians did suffer them to much. For they did suffer if a man brought them
90 into bondage, if a man deuoured, if a man tooke, if a man exalted him selfe, if a man smote them on the face. For in deede the people doe suffer the Bishops, though they take from them their libertie of chusinge good Pastors and refusinge euill: yea they suffer them selues to be robbed, and be beaten
95 by those spirituall courtes, they suffer the great vntowardnes and wickednes of the Bishops to be coloured and hidden by their pompe, authoritie, tytels, and power, and some times by their flattering sermones and pleadings: For they rule by three sortes of lawes, to say, by the ciuill, the Canon, and their commissions, which are three kingdomes vnto them, or as the Popes triple
100 crown, and by pretending the fourth lawe, which is the word of God, they ouer-rule to toe (sic) much: they spare not to come vpon the people with force and power, and they care not to bridle them with newe and [y]earely iniunctions, and articles, to intangle the best Preachers, as in one article of the Bishop of Londons, that the church wardens shall present all Preachers
105 which doe in their Sermons name the vnreading Ministers, dumbe dogges, although they haue the prophet Esai vsing the same words, *Esai lvi. 10*. And our Sauour also calling them blinde guydes, *Mat. xv.* But to extoll them selues, they doe giue commaundements, That what Preacher soeuer doeth not praye for the Bi, of the Dioces in his sermon, shalbe presented: with diuers other such articles, to vpholde their owne glorie. Whereby we plainly see,
110 they seeke to iustifie them selues in all their proceedings, not minding to procure with vs, any other reformation, then that they presenting possesse, whiche is the very plotte to put out the light of the Gospell amongst vs, and to increase the deedes of darkenes: Beholde howe vnder
115 the dumbe ministerie, the Iesuites and all maner of rebellious persons are bredd vpp, to the great daunger of her Maiesties person, & all her best subiects. Therefore they are no better to be thought of, then enimies to the Gospell of Christ, her Maiestie and people, that seeke to keepe Christ

his holy Discipline from amongst vs. Wherefore lette vs neuer suffer
 120 our eyes to take rest, nor eye liddes slumber, till they beholde Christ
 Iesus in his chutch (sic), & antichrist quite thrust out: Let vs crye out
 with the poore Widowe in the Gospell, vntill wee be hearde, *Luc. xviii.*
 so shall wee thorough Gods mercie, obteyne our sute in the ende, to his
 glorie, and the good of all his people.

125 A Prayer

O Lord God, graunt for thy mercies sake, that as Iehoshaphat in the thirde
 yeare of his raigne, destroyed the high places & groues out of Iudah, and
 sent his Princes and Priestes, and gaue them the books of the Lorde with
 them, for to reforme Religion by, and so feare came vpon euery citie, that
 130 they made not warre against Iehoshaphat. So Lorde, we humbly beseech
 thee, to strengthen the Queenes highnes with thy holy spirite, that in the
 23. yeare of hir raigne shee may cast downe all the high places of Idolatrie
 within hir land with the popish Canon lawe, and all superstition and com-
 mandements of men, and to plucke vpp all filthie ceremonies partayning
 135 to the same: And that hir highnes may sende forth hir Princes and Minis-
 ters, and giue them the booke of the Lorde, that thereby they may bring
 home the people of God to the puritie & trueth of the Apostolike church.
 And then shall the feare of the Lorde come vpon euery Citie and
 COUNTRY, that they shall not make warre against our Iehoshaphat, the very
 140 enimies that be without, shall be compelled to bring presentes to hir grace.
 Thus, O Lord, graunt that hir highnes may not onely haue, a happie, longe
 and prosperous raigne with peace of conscience in this life, but also in the
 life to come, hir highnes man enioye, by the merites and death of Christ
 our Sauour, life euerlasting: to whom with the Father, and the holy
 145 Ghost, be all honour, and glorie, for euer and euer, Amen.

And let hir Maiesties true subiectes say, AMEN.

A TRUE AND SHORT DECLARATION

(Transcript "B")

"Thei shoulde be chiefest, vvhich partake vnto vs the chiefest graces,
 and vse of their callinges. And that doeth Christ, as it is vwritten, *of his*
fullnes haue all vve receaued, and grace for grace. Ioh. i. 16. And to him
 hath God made all things subiect saieth Paul, *Ephes, i. 22,* euē vnder his
 5 feet, and hath appointed him ouer all things, to be head of the church,
 vvhich is his bodie, euen the fullnes of him, vvhich filleth all in all things.
 Novve next vnder Christ, is not the bishop of the dioces, by vvhōe so manie
 mischiefes are vvrought, nether anie one vvhich hath but single authoritie,
 but first thei that haue their authoritie together: as first the church, vvhich
 10 Christ also teacheth, vvhē he saieth, If he vwill not vouchsafe to heare
 them tell it vnto the church, & if he refuse to heare the church also, let him
 be vnto the(e), as an heathen mā & a publican, *Mat. xviii. 17.* Therefore is
 the church called *the pillar & ground of trueth.* 1 *Tim. iii. 15* & the voice
 of the Vvhole people, guided bie the elders and forwardest, is saied to be
 15 the voice of God. And that 149. *Psalme* doth shevve this *great honour,*
 Vvhich is to all the *saincts.* Therefore the meetings together of manie
 churches, also of euerie Vvhole church, & of the elders therein, is *above the*
Apostle, above the Prophet, the Euangelist, the Pastor, the Teacher, &
euerie particular Elder. For the ioining & partaking of manie churches
 20 *together, & of the authoritie Vvhich manie haue, must needes be greater*
& more Vvaightie, then the authoritie of anie single person. And this
alsoe ment Paul Vvhē he saith. 1 Cor. ii. 22. Wee are yours, & you are
Christes, & Christ is Godes. Soe that the Apostle is inferior to the church,
 25 *& the church is inferior to Christ, & Christ cōcerning his manhood & office*
in the church, is inferior to God. This he iudged, not onelie toe be against

the Vvickednes of the bishopes, but also against their Vvhole power & authoritie. For if the authoritie of the church, & of the forvvardest breethren or elders therein, be aboue the bishopes, howe should it not followe, but that the bishopes maie be commauded, accused & charged 30 bie the church, yea also discharged & separated as is their desert?"

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ *A Parte of a Register*, 1590, pp. 55-72.
- ² *ibid.*, pp. 55-65 (p. 65 wrongly paged '75').
- ³ *ibid.*, p. 65.
- ⁴ *ibid.*, p. 57.
- ⁵ D.N.B. Article: Gilby, Anthony.
- ⁶ *A Parte of a Register*, pp. 12-19.
- ⁷ *ibid.*, p. 68.
- ⁸ *ibid.*, pp. 65-8.
- ⁹ Gilby, A., *A Pleasaunt Dialogue*, 1581. Unpaged.
- ¹⁰ *ibid.*
- ¹¹ *A Parte of a Register*, pp. 68-72.
- ¹² Transcript "A" lines 103-5.
- ¹³ Strype: *Aylmer*, pp. 53-4.
- ¹⁴ Transcript "A" lines 130-2.
- ¹⁵ Browne and Harrison, *Works*, pp. 399-401.
- ¹⁶ Peel, A., *The Brownists in Norwich and Norfolk*, 1580, pp. 6-8.
- ¹⁷ Peel, A., *Calendar of Seconde Parte of a Register*, 1915, pp. 157-9.
- ¹⁸ Lansdowne MSS. (BM) xxxiii. 13. Reference and transcription given in Dexter, *Congregationalism*, p. 70.
- ¹⁹ Browne and Harrison, *Works*, p. 412.
- ²⁰ *ibid.*, p. 399.
- ²¹ *ibid.*

B. R. WHITE

In the Study

It is only our characteristic insularity that has concealed from us the impasse which British New Testament scholarship has reached. We are aware of the limitations of an approach to the gospel records, governed by psychological or biographical concerns. We know something of the futility of the attempt to separate theology and history in the narrative of the Evangelists, to peel away the endless interpretative coverings in the hope of revealing the "bare fact" in its stark simplicity. We confess the folly of the endeavour to drive a wedge between the Jesus of history and the Christ of apostolic faith.

Yet the road of positive advance still largely eludes us. Either we continue the search along familiar roads, cautiously claiming a few scraps of pre-resurrection evidence of unimpeachable historical authenticity, or else we forsake the quest entirely, take our stand upon the faith of the primitive church, deny the possibility and the necessity of any penetration behind it. Cushioned by the conservatism of British scholarship, and often bewildered and shocked by the radical subtleties of the Bultmannic position, we take refuge in retreat or evasion.

It is thus salutary to be reminded of important recent continental developments, of the real advance that has been registered by disciples of Bultmann on the very basis of the master's work. Old questions are being asked in a new way, and answered with the promise on the basis of the adoption of new procedures and fresh objectives. What is the relation between the message of Jesus and the kerygma of the Church? Can that message be rightly understood until it is seen as dependent upon the action and conduct of the Lord? Will not our estimate of the continuity between the apostolic preaching and the proclamation of the Lord be decisive for the theological problem of the reality or otherwise of the Christ of our faith? These are the questions which Käsemann, Diem, Fuchs and Bornkamm are asking and answering to vital and positive effect. Perhaps it is too readily assumed that historical conclusions carry theological corollaries. Nevertheless, it is the merit of a recent study¹ that it enters into this succession, states the issues clearly, and breaks new ground.

¹ *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, by James M. Robinson, S.C.M. Press, Ltd. 9/6d. 1959.

The old quest of the historical Jesus broke upon the recognition of the Gospels as primarily sources for the history of the early church, and of the kerygma as constituting their centre. The rear-guard action of C. H. Dodd in attempting to establish a kerygmatic chronology of the public ministry was a desperate attempt to underpin the tottering foundations; and its widespread uncritical acceptance should not blind us to its essential weakness. But the possibility of a new quest remains. There is no overwhelming reason for history for faith through their identification of the humiliated pessimism. The Evangelists themselves insist upon the relevance of Jesus with the exalted Lord. The kerygmatic eschatological interpretation of the Christ inevitably made the historical Jesus theologically crucial.

In certain respects, modern man stands in the position of the early disciples. They possessed both their Easter faith and their factual memory of Jesus. It was the interaction of these two ways of knowing that provided us with our Gospels. Until comparatively recent times we could not penetrate behind the synthesis they effected. It is the rise of scientific historiography that has put into our hands a new tool of research and a new avenue of access to the past. It is surely providential that this weapon has become available at a time when the state of New Testament research demands of us a firm grasp of the real historicity of Jesus in the flesh of His incarnation.

In a concluding chapter, J. M. Robinson offers a brave attempt at the establishment of the procedure for the new Quest. If we adjudge it provisional and tentative, the author will not protest. At least he has pointed us in the right direction. A good deal of hard thinking will have to be done with reference to the precise place of the Lord in the eschatological time-scheme that the New Testament supplies. Much consideration will need to be given to the adequacy and legitimacy of the existentialist categories employed. But without any doubt, British New Testament scholarship should grapple more intensively with the understanding of history and historicity that we associate with Dilthey and Collingwood. It is faulty understanding here that has played so large a part in perpetuating the present impasse. When we have learned that Jesus' understanding of his own existence is a possible subject for historical research, we may find not only that an encounter with the historical Jesus is possible but that it proves identical with an encounter with the meaning of the New Testament kerygma.

That kerygma is most systematically expounded in the Epistle to the Romans. It is a writing that has proved fateful in the history of the Christian Church; and heirs of the continental Reformation find it especially difficult to escape its fascination. It was therefore not surprising that Emil Brunner should have entered the field as

commentator, and English readers must now be grateful to H.A. Kennedy for a wholly adequate translation of *Der Romerbrief*. The result is to make available to us a volume² that deserves and will surely secure wider attention than many of the existing studies of the Letter to the Romans.

For this is not, in the technical sense, a critical commentary. It lacks the learned discussion of variant readings and comparative scholarly positions. It eschews the distracting footnote and the lengthy reference to other authoritative discussion. Its task is the exposition of the meaning of the Epistle and its relevance to our time. It seeks to confront us with the God who has spoken and will yet speak to those prepared for such confrontation. It is a theological commentary, supplemented by concluding studies of the meaning and significance of some of the key ideas in Pauline teaching.

As such, it should commend itself to the Ministry and also prove of immense value to those laymen prepared for a serious grappling with the Word of God. Dr. Brunner always makes Paul intelligible. His clarity of thought and expression have been admirably preserved, and we are left with little excuse for any failure in comprehension. The great notes of the Gospel are plainly struck, decisively sounded. There are no awkward chords, no complicated variations.

But it is perhaps just because of this fact that I emerge at the end with a certain uneasiness. It is all just a little too simple and too clear-cut. Dr. Brunner is far more immediately intelligible than St. Paul. This is a strength of the commentary. Is it also its weakness? It displays all the qualities that have made the work of its author so congenial to the Anglo-Saxon mind. But this may point to a failure in depth. In the early chapters we find the usual "common-sense" attitude to and exposition of the pagan knowledge of God. When we reach the issue of predestination, all mystery seems to vanish—however much Dr. Brunner may assure us that it remains illogical to the end. The great paradox of love and wrath is "ironed out" in a few sentences of consummate skill.

It may be that all this is more than a little unfair. Certainly the significant word must be one of profound gratitude for so many treasures so persuasively offered. Yet those who set the exposition of a passage such as chapter five over against that offered by Karl Barth will, I think, discern a difference that is more than one of style.

The Christian doctrine of providence has not, of recent years, been an overworked theme; and the minister, scanning his shelves for illumination, may well find no helpful contribution since the

² *The Letter to the Romans*, by Emil Brunner. Lutterworth Press. 21/-, 1959.

classic discussion provided by H. H. Farmer in *The World and God*. Yet just here are concentrated some of the most intractable and perplexing problems that confront us in the daily life of faith; and one way or another, we are bound to take up a position. Perhaps it is partly due to the dearth of clear and incisive thinking on this issue that Christian congregations cling to so many sub-Christian attitudes and reactions at this point. In any event, those ministers who are aware of the desperate need for relevant instruction and education will welcome a book that grapples constructively with so central a concern.³

It must be emphasized that we are not offered a systematic exposition and attack. Nor are the questions asked necessarily those that would immediately leap to mind. The approach is many-sided. The advance is achieved by way of constant probing, now on this flank, now on that. Nevertheless, to treat of fate, destiny, and freedom, of time and eternity, of tragedy, technics, and prayer, is to attempt a coverage both revelant and satisfying.

This is a characteristically American examination. It never moves far from the contemporary situation. It always takes seriously the secular diagnoses of our time. Yet it remains profoundly biblical and christocentric, never abandons the perspective of faith, ever holds fast to the truths of deepest experience. No simple, easy answers are provided to our queries. Rather are we shown the proper way of rephrasing the questions, and led compassionately to the point of vantage from which we can begin to discern the nature of the answers.

I found the discussion strongest when grappling with destiny and freedom, time and eternity, and most salutary when defending the validity and reality of the tragic and the fateful. We are offered no theological *leger-de-main*, and no *deus ex machina* either. And for these mercies we should be profoundly grateful. But we are constantly reminded that what we are confronting are not inert, obstructive problems to be solved by the application of proper technique, but living mysteries of which we are a part, and which, rationally explored, may reveal themselves as ultimately friendly. To understand this is to begin to discern the truth of our author's dictum that in the end the doctrine of providence is only a kind of theological praise.

It is such an understanding of providence that links it so closely with Christian prayer; and perhaps it is in the practice of prayer that the average Christian believer reaches his most accurate and adequate understanding of the divine overruling. Furthermore, there is a sense in which all the great themes of Christian faith and experience have about them a certain timeless quality; and prayer itself is no exception in its basic independence of changing times

³ *Providence*, by Roger Hazelton. S.C.M. Press, Ltd. 15/-. 1958.

and seasons. That is why the great classics of the spiritual quest still speak to us with power, and still preserve their effectiveness long centuries after they were written. The nature of God and the need of man are constants, and the road to fellowship between them does not change with the passing years.

All this is certainly true. Yet it is not to be denied that we are creatures rooted in earth, affected by the pressures of our own age, moulded by the *Zeitgeist*. Am I wrong in finding just here the reason why so many of the books on prayer, whether of yesterday or of today, fail in the end to speak to my condition, and carry with them a musty smell, a certain remoteness from contemporary living? Their lack is not profundity but relatedness and relevance.

So it is that this fresh study⁴ is to be acclaimed with more than usual thankfulness. The author is at home in the spiritual world. He is also no stranger to the common ways of twentieth century life. He can effectively direct a two-way traffic. He understands the problems of a scientific age, and has learned from literature to comprehend the modern scene. If he deals with the old themes, yet he never fails to make them come alive. Perhaps it is because he has so strong an understanding that God is neither the God of the gaps in our knowledge nor the God of redemption only. He is Creator, Sustainer, Lord of the world.

There is nothing elementary about this book. It demands thought, study, and mental effort. But there is nothing falsely academic about it either. When its teaching has been assimilated, a guide to practical prayer is in our hands. Would that the writer had given us the fruit of his own thinking on that crucial problem, the relationship between corporate and individual devotion! Would that he had also grounded his exposition in the central realities of Christian faith and Christian revelation! For if the understanding and the practice of prayer are to be truly Christian, then the great truths—God in Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church—must be made normative, directive and controlling. It is here that Mr. Magee stumbles. Because of this a great study fails to achieve highest rank.

Many in our time will be found viewing the Church of Scotland with affection, admiration, and esteem; and some of these at least watch the progress of her conversations with the Church of England with mingled anxiety and hope. In such a situation, it was inevitable that her scholars should delve more deeply into the ecclesiological treasures she may have to present and to preserve. A volume⁵ that traces fully the historical roots of the Reformed

⁴ *Reality and Prayer*, by John Magee. Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd. 12/6d. 1958.

⁵ *Corpus Christi*, by Geddes MacGregor. Macmillan & Co. Ltd. 30/- 1959.

Church in Scotland and explicates her understanding of Church, Ministry, and Sacraments will be assured of careful study and attention.

The historical discussion is especially valuable in its examination of the mediaeval period; for it is only against such a background that Reformation controversies can rightly be interpreted. The importance of the Conciliar Movement is clearly shown, and the legalistic framework of so much of the ecclesiological exposition is amply demonstrated. If there is defect here, it is of a kind that characterizes the study as a whole. There is a certain unevenness of treatment, a certain loss of cohesion, a certain lack of organization—as though, at times, the material itself has taken control and escaped the governing hand.

But the reader will move on expectantly to the more explicitly theological section. Nor will he be disappointed. We are given an exposition of the phrase "the Body of Christ" which is notable for sanity and balance. We are reminded of the importance of the Reformed addition of "the exercise of discipline" to the proclamation of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. We are offered the now familiar conception of *episcopē* in terms of ministry held *in solidum*. Those who sit close to the Separatist tradition will welcome the many references to it, and will—we may hope—attend to the criticisms passed upon it. And Baptists, disappointed by a meagre and threadbare defence of infant baptism in terms of the Covenant will note the author's earlier admission that "covenant theology" is largely a seventeenth century product.

Dr. MacGregor clearly discerns the importance of the past for the understanding of the present; and English Free Churchmen should welcome a book⁶ that directs them back to their roots. The publishers have placed us all in their debt by reissuing this pre-war volume in the valuable series of Harper Torchbooks. Here is provided, with an amazing wealth of detailed documentation, the thrilling story of one important aspect of the history of the turbulent years, 1570-1643. These are the formative years of the Puritan movement. To enter into them deeply is to begin to understand the crucial significance of this new manifestation of Christian faith and life.

Haller's concern is with the preacher and the pamphleteer. It is a wise pre-occupation. For the significance of press and pulpit in this era would be difficult to overestimate. Sermons were no new things; and the Puritan preachers stood formally in the succession of their mediaeval predecessors. But from their bastion and fortress at Cambridge University emerged an unending stream of educated and godly divines, to command pulpits and lectureships and chap-

⁶ *The Rise of Puritanism*, by William Haller. Harper & Brothers. 15/-. 1957.

laincies at England's religious heart. With plain speech they fired the people. In homely but biblical imagery they reinterpreted the drama of man's salvation and plotted the course to New Jerusalem.

By itself, the force of this onslaught might have proved irresistible. But it did not stand alone. To the spoken was added the written word; and this was something that other ages had not known. From the press poured forth the manifestos of the new gospel. Religious disputation jostled spiritual autobiography. Learned treatise mingled with pithy instruction.

But events were to show that the Cambridge preachers had unleashed a whirlwind they could not control. In the early years of Charles I, the succession was failing. The repressive measures of Archbishop Laud served only to shift the focal point of the ensuing conflict. Radicals and separatists moved into the centre of the stage, re-applying the teaching of their mentors in ways of which the early Puritans had never dreamed. Gradualism gave place to "reformation without tarrying for anie." With the Civil War, events took command.

Baptists may well find here a more accurate understanding of their origins. No group, in this period, is rightly studied in isolation. If new religious waves were constantly breaking upon the battered shores of seventeenth-century England, beneath them all was the mighty ground-swell which the Puritan preachers and pamphleteers did so much to create.

N. CLARK

Baptism and the Church

BAPTIST FAITH AND PRACTICE IN A BIBLICAL AND ECUMENICAL LIGHT

As this article will have to be published in more than one instalment the reader may be glad to have a list of the section headings which help to show the total argument.

Introduction

- I. The Church according to the New Testament.
- II. Baptism and the Church according to the New Testament.
- III. Baptism and the Church in the Baptist Movement of Today.
 - (1) Is baptism regarded in the Baptist church as an incorporation into both the local church and the Universal Church, the Body of Christ?
 - (2) Denomination and Church.
 - (3) Baptism, Church and the Lord's Supper.
- IV. Baptist Faith and Ecumenicity. Three Positions.
 - (1) "No" to Infant Baptism as a Christian Baptism. Closed Communion.
 - (2) "No" to Infant Baptism. Open Communion.
 - (3) "Yes" and "No" to Infant Baptism. Ecumenical Intercommunion.

INTRODUCTION

THE topic of "Baptism and the Church" has such a range, many-sidedness and current interest that it cannot possibly be elucidated from all sides and exhaustively in the limited space available. The aim of this paper is to confront the New Testament conception of Baptism and the Church with the one within the Baptist churches of to-day. The ecumenical movement challenges the Baptists to face the problem of Baptism and the Church and think it out, and the view-points stated in this paper should be understood as a contribution to present discussion.

It is outside the compass of the task stated to try to give an answer to the multitude of questions included in such topics as "Baptism—a sacrament?" or "Baptism and Faith." A treatment of the topic of "Baptism and the Church," however, must build on a definite position taken to the problems mentioned. As an assumption of the following exposition these two thesis will be valid. (1) Baptism is a sacrament in the sense that it means an activity of God with

man. At the same time Baptism is also an expression of man's surrender to God. (2) Only that Baptism is a right Christian Baptism, which is preceded by repentance and which is received in faith in Christ. The principal thesis of this paper can be stated thus: man is incorporated by believers' baptism into the Church, and the Church is constituted by the fellowship of those believing in Christ and baptized into Christ.

Baptism, like the Church, has an inner side and an outer one. Both sides belong indissolubly together and must not be pulled asunder. The theoretical separation of them which will be made here only aims at explaining the rich and many-sided contents of Baptism and the Church. In practice they must be preached and experienced as an indissoluble unit.

I. THE CHURCH ACCORDING TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

Christ was given to the Church, "*which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all*" (Eph. i. 23). Jesus said to Nicodemus, "*Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*" (John iii. 3), and according to Peter all the prophets give witness to Christ that "*through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins*" (Acts x. 43). In the opening verses of the Epistle to the Ephesians Paul salutes "*the saints which are at Ephesus and the faithful in Christ Jesus*", and in the beginning of *i Corinthians* he speaks of "*them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus*," of those who are called," and of "*all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord*." The distinctive mark of God's Spirit is according to 1 John 4. 2 that "*every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God*." And Paul adds, "*For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God*" (Rom. viii.14). As to God's children John gives this negative characterization, "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever *doeth not righteousness* is not of God, neither he that *loveth not his brother* (1 John iii.10). Finally we read in 1 Peter of those "*which in time past were not a people but are now the people of God*" (1 Peter ii.10).

In this choice of quotations a number of characteristics are given of those who belong to Christ's body, the Church: those who have been born again and have received remission of sins, the saints, the faithful, those who are sanctified, called, those who call upon Jesus Christ and confess that he has come in the flesh, those who are led by the Spirit of God and are God's children, those who do righteousness and love their brethren. These people are God's people and Christ's body filled with the fulness of God. This New Testament description can be summarized in the words of the creed *communio sanctorum*, the communion of the saints. The charac-

teristics mentioned here are all of an inner kind. They refer to man's hidden life with God and to his relationship to his neighbour. They express essential things about faith and Christian life. Without these inner religious and ethical qualities the communion of saints cannot exist. The fellowship which is without the love of God and the neighbour does not have the right to bear the Christian name. It is dead even though it is alive in name.

These inner characteristics of the Church, the body of Christ, are not, however, the only ones which the New Testament has given us as marks when we want to localize Christ's Church on earth. There are also definite *outer, objective marks*. From the last pericope of *Matthew* (ch. xxviii.16-20) three kinds of such outer marks can be derived, namely :

(1) *The Word*. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Jesus gave his disciples the task to preach the Gospel and to teach and at the same time he promised always to be present with them. And Christ is still present on earth by his Spirit and his Word both in its spoken and written form, the Bible. In the latter appear the first and foremost distinctive marks of the Christian Church : *the Word*, which is the incarnate, crucified and risen Christ, the Word as a promise and a commission, as a judgement and the power of God unto salvation, as an authority and a norm for faith and life. Where Christ's Church exists, here God's Word is proclaimed soundly and clearly, there it is received in faith and there it works as highest authority.

(2) *Baptism and the Lord's Supper*. ". . . baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." The Lord's last commission was not only a commission to preach and teach but also to *baptize*. On Whit-Sunday when the Church in a way appeared visible to all, it was done by the proclamation of the Word, by baptism and furthermore by breaking of bread, the Lord's supper (*Acts* ii. 40-42, 46). Through the whole history of the Church water baptism in the name of Christ and (or) the triune God together with the Lord's supper have been necessary outer criteria of the presence of Christ's Church, and thus the Church detaches itself from all other forms of human and Christian communities.

(3) *The Ministry*. "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. . . . And Jesus came and spake unto them saying . . ." Jesus directed his commission to *the eleven disciples*. The task of preaching and baptizing was thus given primarily to the apostles, who in their turn transmitted it to their disciples. The succession of Paul—

Timothy is here a typical example. But there existed in the primitive church a number of ministries, namely bishops, presbyters, deacons, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. In the primitive church there was as yet no fixed doctrine and practice as to these ministers but there was a strong consciousness of the fact that some were called to special ministries in the Church. All Christians had to give a reason of the hope that was in them (1 *Peter* iii. 15) and by faith and good works spread the Gospel (1 *Peter* ii. 12 f.). All those who receive the epistles of Peter are requested to "shew forth the praises of Him (God)" (1 *Peter* ii 9). On the other hand, it is almost certain that as early as in New Testament days both instruction in a limited sense and the administration of baptism and the holy supper were regarded as the special calling of bishops and presbyters. In stating this it should also be observed that their ministries were not limited to one single man in each church. It could also be added that among the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century a distinction was made between those who were called and sent to baptize and those who did not have this task. This is not the place to detail the facts of the "general priesthood" and the "special" one in the New Testament and in later history. In this connection it is only important to state that there has existed a special ministry from the primitive church and all through church history, a ministry which has been modelled in different ways at different times and in different church traditions. The ministry in this wide sense is an outer characteristic of the Christian Church.

The primitive Church can thus be described as the community of those who believed *and* were baptized. What has been said so far gives no support at all to the frequent distinction of a "visible" church and an "invisible" one—or to put it another way of an "essential church" and a "cult church." The Church of Christ is *one*, and she is *visible*. The New Testament ideal means that the "essential church" consisting of believing and regenerated men should be identical with the "cult church," i.e. the baptized and communicating congregation. Under the influence of historical development, not least by the victory of infant baptism and the established Church over the independent Church of believers, this conception of the Church was broken to pieces and it became usual to distinguish between the "invisible" communion of saints and true believers and the "visible" institutional Church. Pietism solved the problem by separating the "ecclesiola," the small group of believers, and the *ecclesia*, the big established Church embracing all baptized inhabitants of a country. Other solutions are offered by a Lutheran people's church theology of a Swedish type, which does not even demand baptism for church-membership, much less faith, and modern high-church theology influenced by Anglicans. This theology regards the Church built on infant baptism and

apostolic succession as justified by the New Testament, and it makes baptism the foundation of church-membership. In the Methodist Church they count upon a preparatory membership built on infant baptism and a valid membership built on confession of personal faith in Christ.

The Baptists maintain that the situation in the primitive Church should be taken as a pattern also by later ages for the modelling of the Church in the world. That is the reason why it is necessary to analyse the problem of New Testament baptism in its relationship to the Church, before we turn to the Baptist churches of our age to find out how the New Testament ideal is realized in and by them. Like the Church, baptism can be regarded from two different view-points, namely the inner and the outer ones, and an analysis will show that there is an exact parallelism between the Church and baptism, when they are regarded from these two view-points.

II. BAPTISM AND THE CHURCH ACCORDING TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Except a man *be born of water and of the Spirit*, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God" (*John* iii. 5) and in his sermon on the first Whit-Sunday Peter uttered the famous words, ". . . be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (*Acts* ii. 38). In *Titus* iii. 5. f. both these sides of the contents of baptism are emphasized, ". . . according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." The connection between faith and baptism is stressed both in *Mark* xiv. 16. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" and in *Gal.* iii 26 f. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." The relationship of baptism and baptized man to Christ and his body, the Church, is illustrated by Paul in *1 Corinthians* and especially in the classic passage on baptism in *Romans*, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body (*1 Corinthians* xii. 13), "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also planted together in the likeness of his resurrection" (*Romans* vi 5). Of the relationship of Christ and the Church and baptism it is said in *Eph.* v. 25 f., ". . . Christ loved . . . the Church and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word."

In the New Testament passages quoted above it could at once be observed that baptism is intimately associated with regeneration, remission of sins, the acceptance and filling of the Holy Ghost, faith, sanctification and the growing together into one body in Christ.

Those before mentioned, who, according to the New Testament form the communion of saints, those who believe and are sanctified, those who are born again and led by the Spirit, etc.—can, according to the same authority, be summed up in *those who are baptized*. To be baptized in a New Testament sense is to believe, to be regenerated and filled with the Spirit and, in the deepest sense of the word, “to be planted together with” (“to be one with,” *Weymouth’s* translation) Christ in his death and resurrection. The Church is the body of Christ, and those who are baptized into Christ form one body and are thereby made members of the Church of Christ on earth, of which Christ is the head and in which those sanctified and purified by the word and the water are members. That there could not be a question of full identity between Christ and his body, the Church is evident from the wording of *Eph.* v. 23, where it is said that Christ is at the same time “the head of the Church” and “the saviour of the body.” To be baptized into the Church means thus on one side to become a member of the body of Christ and on the other side to be placed under Christ as Saviour and Lord.

Thus in the New Testament the fact that you are a member in Christ can be expressed in two different ways, namely to believe and to be baptized. (By this it has not been said, of course, that under all circumstances to believe and to be baptized should be the same thing. You can fall away from faith and yet be baptized. We shall return to this point.) The community of the believers and saints is at the same time the community of those baptized. By believers’ baptism one passes over from death to life, from the power of Satan to the Church of Christ; and by this baptism one is incorporated into the fellowship of the believers and those baptized. The New Testament does not know unbaptized believers as members of the Christian Church.

By this *the external side of baptism* has also been touched upon. Baptism has its deep, inner, religious meaning, but it has also an external sociological function to fulfil. On the day of Pentecost people were “added unto” something already existing, namely the Church, by believers’ baptism. By this word—*prosetethesan*—it is expressly stated that the Church was not created on the first day of Pentecost. As a divine thought of salvation in Christ it existed from the very beginning, and as a consequence of the fall of man, God made this saving will of his known in the old covenant through his chosen people. In the man Jesus, surrounded by his disciples, the head and lord of the Church was made manifest to the world, but the Church in its proper sense did not appear until after the resurrection on the first day of Pentecost as a consequence of the pouring out of the Spirit and Peter’s missionary sermon. “Then they that gladly received his word were baptized.” *Acts* is the story

of how one individual and one group of people after another were "added unto" the Church by baptism, and thus the Church of Christ became visible in the world. The inner religious event in baptism had at the same time an outer sociological significance: people were born again and became members of the Church of Christ on earth. Primarily they were received in the local church of Jerusalem, Ephesus, Corinth, etc., but at the same time they were incorporated into the world-wide Catholic Church. Is Christ divided? A self-evident consequence of the belief in the Church as the body of Christ is that it is one and that the local church is part of the vast visible Church of Christ on earth.

Apart from *Acts* the external, sociological function of baptism is elucidated also in *Col.* ii.11-13. There baptism is compared to circumcision, the outer sign and proof of citizenship in the elect people of the old covenant. Thus the work of baptism is to act as a "sign of nationality," which expresses citizenship in the people of the new covenant (cf. the phrase of "the people of God," 1 *Peter* ii. 10). In the same way as circumcision was meant to define a visible and obvious limit between Jews and heathens, baptism should essentially serve as a visible line of demarcation between the Church and the world. All the writers of the New Testament teach us that this line could not be drawn sharply and definitely, not even in the primitive Church. This fact is illustrated, for instance, by the fact that Paul found it necessary to give the following exhortation in 1 *Corinthian* v. 13: "Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." The perfect separation of the Church and the world lies with God alone, and its definite result will not be revealed until the *parousia* and on the day of judgement. In the age between the resurrection and the return of Christ, the task of believer's baptism is to define an *approximate* limit between the Church and the world. The difficulty of defining this limit clearly, i.e. of administering the gift of baptism rightly in this world of sin and death points a twofold reminder—first to the baptizing Church: be careful of baptism, so that it is not misused and fails of its purpose—secondly, to those baptized: baptism does not give any guarantee of salvation. In this age every baptized man runs the risk of losing what he has won by faith and baptism, namely salvation. One can lose the thing, the remission on sins, though one keeps the sign, baptism. But if this should happen, baptism serves as a constant reminder of the lost thing both to baptized man himself and to the world around, so he who has gone away can be driven by baptism to return to the fellowship which he has left.

TORSTEN BERGSTEN

(translated by Nils Sundholm)

(To be continued)

Collecting for a New Building in 1735

When the Messengers, Elders and church representatives met in Glasshouse Yard, Goswell Street, London, in May, 1735, for the Annual Assembly of the General Baptists, the chief item of business concerned the negotiations which had been proceeding for some years with churches in Buckinghamshire and Northamptonshire. These churches were the conservatives of their day. They remained loyal to the ways of their seventeenth-century fathers. Acceptance of the historic creeds of the ancient church presented no difficulties to them. They were suspicious of the contemporary movement away from the traditional trinitarian statements. They objected even more strongly to the growing popularity of congregational hymn-singing. The answer given by the Assembly to the representations from Northamptonshire on these matters was a temperate one and may be read in W. T. Whitley's edition of the *Minutes* (vol. II, pp. 32-34).

The Assembly also had to consider requests from Great Yarmouth, Wendover and Haringworth for help with the building of new meeting-houses. Each of these cases was approved and the friends were advised that they "either by Messengers appointed for that Purpose or by Letters, apply to such Persons and Churches within their reach, to desire their assistance in so good a Work." (*op. cit.*, p. 34.)

This the Baptists of Haringworth had already done. The village lies in the northern part of the county of Northamptonshire, not far from the Rutlandshire boundary. There had been a Baptist community there since the middle of the seventeenth century. In the days of persecution under the Clarendon Code it had been led by a local farmer and carpenter, whose descendants for three or four generations were to play influential parts in Baptist life. The Stangers provide an early and notable example of a family succession among the Baptists. In the 1730s, the leaders of the Haringworth church included Matthew and James Stanger, two of the sons of the farmer-carpenter. Their brother, William, had moved to Moulton and, in addition to farming there, was pastor of the local Baptist church and a "Messenger," which among the General Baptists meant one with wider duties of oversight and leadership. William Stanger was one of the six Messengers present at the Assembly in Goswell Street in May, 1735.

There has recently come into the possession of the Baptist Union, a letter sent by the Harringworth church to the Wisbech church in March, 1735. Though more than two hundred years old, it is in an excellent state of preservation and will be kept in the library at the Baptist Church House. It explains that the Harringworth friends were under the necessity of providing themselves with a new meeting-house and were having to do this at Morcott, in Rutlandshire. The letter is addressed "To Mr. William Fisher, at Emmene nere friday bridge and nere Wisbich in the Isle of Ely and County of Cambridge" and was sent by way of London for delivery "by Wisbech Bagg."

Like the General Baptist cause in Harringworth, that at Wisbech dated from the middle of the seventeenth century. William Fisher was the Elder or pastor there from 1732 to 1747.

The text of the letter is as follows :

To the church and congregation of baptised believers professing the general redemption and love of God in Christ to all mankind, etc. in and about Wisbech and Emmne we your beloved brethren in the same faith in and about Harringworth and North Luffenham—send greeting.

For as much as it hath pleased God in the course of his common providence to suffer our antient meeting at Harringworth of near an hundred years standing to be broken up by reason every tenant there is under the tennor and command of one landlord who is very much averse to our cause and a great enemy to dissenters in general and so will not suffer any meeting to be kept in any of his holds and houses since last Christmas and there is not a house in the town but what is his excepting three or four whose owners are also enemys to the baptist cause without any just occasion so from those considerations we are faced for the churches publick good and convenancy and the honour of the gospell to buy and purchase a place at Morcot in the county of Rutland partly in the midst of our congregation : and it must be paid for on Lady Day next, and though it is very convenient yet much out of repair for that use; so that what with buying and repairing we are not ourselves able or capable to compleat the same but must paune it will we can have supply—do therefore beg and desire of you our brethren in the same faith if you please to be assistant in Christian charity to cast in your mites to help us herein, as we have always at all times when desired been willing and free to contribute and be assistant in such cases of necessity to others our brethren and as aforesaid we have been willing to help others, so we now have cause to beg the like help of you and others in the same faith, promising if ever you or others should have the like occasion we

shall not be negligent to contribute our mites according to our abilities as we hope you will be ready and willing at this time in our necessity to help us, and what you please to do in this behalf we would beg and desire you would not delay it, and that it might be conveyed to our friend Abraham Bull of Whittlesea and from thence to Mr. James Watts at Thorp by Peterborough or any way safe the first opportunity so we in behalf of the rest of our friends wishing all Grace and the love of God may continue grow and abound amongst you, subscribing our names as here underwritten

ffrom the Church at North
Luffenham in the County of
Rutland
dated March 2d 1734-5

Matthew Stanger
Ja. Stanger
Tho. Slater
Jos : Slater
Robert Young
Danll. Curtis
? Will paidmor
Samuel Meres
Stephen Curtis
William Laxton

friends whoever of you pay the
postage of this letter we will
pay you again and for your
trouble

Of the signatures Matthew and James Stanger have already been mentioned. Stephen Curtis was no doubt the son of a man of the same name, who is known to have been a leader of the Harringworth church and who died in February 1727. (See J. H. Wood, *A Condensed History of the General Baptists*, 1847, p. 155.)

On the inside sheet of the letter is a list of fifteen names and contributions of 1/6, 1/- or 6d. totalling 12/- in all. Postage is noted as costing 7d. 11/5 is said to have been "sent to our Brethren" on April 6th, 1735. William Fisher gave 1/-. Among the other contributors were John Sharman and Simon Tiptaft. A John Sharman was Elder in Wisbech from 1710 to 1723; this was perhaps his son. A Simon Tiptaft appears as a representative of the Horsleydown Church at the General Baptist Assemblies in 1746, 1751, 1758 and 1760.

The church at Wisbech joined the New Connexion in 1785; that at Morcott did the same in 1816. In due course both entered into membership with the Baptist Union.

ERNEST A. PAYNE

Reviews

Christian Baptism, edited by A. Gilmore. (Lutterworth Press, 27s. 6d.)

The modern discussion about baptism has now assumed considerable proportions and has drawn scholarly publications from almost all the major Christian communities; but the contribution from Baptists has been limited. In an introductory chapter to the book under review, Dr. Payne makes the careful statement that "Baptist scholars have not been entirely silent" and he rightly suggests that ". . . there is a growing feeling that Baptists should share in the present discussions."

This book on Christian Baptism, in which ten scholarly Baptist ministers have written chapters, is a genuine contribution to the modern discussion; it will be welcomed by Baptists as by members of other Christian communities and it should be widely read. The editor is to be congratulated that although the individual chapters are of varying merit they are all fitted into the general theme and they all serve to develop the total argument of the book. Here is a symposium that possesses an inherent unity.

Let it be stated at once that the book presents a powerful advocacy of believers' baptism. Here is a mass of carefully documented scriptural and historical material leading to numerous theological statements and judgments which together form a solid foundation for the practice of believers' baptism. Every Baptist minister ought to study this book diligently; then he will realise the significance of believers' baptism together with the scriptural and historical evidence by which it is justified. Since the Baptist position is presented in this careful, scholarly manner the book may be regarded also as a contribution to ecumenical discussion and it will no doubt be studied with much interest in those areas of the world where Baptists are considering schemes for church unity.

But it must not be supposed that the book provides easy reading for Baptists. We are not here concerned with the challenge of the book to those who hold the Paedo-Baptist position; that challenge is forceful and penetrating. The concern of this review is with the manner in which the book raises questions which Baptists must ask themselves, and continue to ask until more adequate answers are formulated.

Here is one question that needs to be faced. Have Baptists rested their position too complacently upon the practice of the Apostolic Church? "Baptists . . . have tended to assume that because believers' baptism was the practice of the apostolic age, it must be obligatory in all ages." This sentence from the chapter on "Scripture, Tradition and Baptism" puts the position fairly; it then goes on to make the important statement that "essential practice arises out of the very nature of the Gospel itself." That is a theological task! Baptism is to be grounded not merely in apostolic practice but also in the nature of the gospel. Here is a point of view emerging frequently in the book and particularly discussed in the last chapter on "The Theology of Baptism" which is of very real importance.

This has been the point around which so much of the modern discussion, especially in regard to the evidence of Scripture, has centred. It is no longer adequate to cite apostolic practice and to quote *Romans* vi, for in numerous books the practice of Infant Baptism is being justified on the ground of Biblical theology. It is a merit of this book that it does present the New Testament evidence with careful exegesis and that especially in the chapters on the epistles of Paul and on I Peter it does seek to uncover the theological justification for the baptism of believers.

Yet this long section of the book, extending to about 130 pages, is not altogether satisfactory. Old Testament scholars will not be happy to find the discussion of Old Testament themes under "Jewish Antecedents" and will want a more adequate discussion of such theological concepts as the covenant, the people of God, the nature and mediation of Divine mercy, the significance of ritual practices. New Testament scholars will not feel that justice has been done to the significance of John the Baptist to whom a separate chapter might have been devoted. If the theology of baptism must be "written around the two poles of the baptism of Jesus at Jordan and its fulfilment in His death, resurrection and ascension" as the book claims, the work of John the Baptist belongs to Heilsgeschichte and not to Jewish antecedents, and much more must be said about the theological significance of John's baptism within the totality of God's purpose. This would lead to a fuller exposition of the Baptism of Jesus than the book presents, in which more might properly be made of the unique relation of the Son and the Father involving the Son in His work as Servant in which is included the creation of a Messianic community sharing his death and resurrection life.

But the chief lack in this whole New Testament section is the absence of a chapter which would collate the exegetical results, so attempting to assess the development of the doctrine accompanying the rite. What is needed is what has been attempted in the Church

of Scotland report on "The Biblical Doctrine of Baptism" published late in 1958, where the exegesis is not so satisfactory or comprehensive as in the book under review but the theological basis is much more fully stated. Such a chapter would press home to Baptists the question about grounding believers' baptism not upon apostolic practice but in the nature of the gospel.

A second question that Baptists need to face is this: Have Baptists ignored too readily the traditions of the churches and jumped too easily from apostolic practice of the first century to the modern Baptist movement in the 17th century? The historical section in "Christian Baptism" will both raise and help to meet this question.

Baptists will note carefully in the chapter on "Baptism in the early Christian centuries" the factors which promoted the development of the practice of infant baptism; these factors include a "failing grasp of the Biblical doctrine of grace," "an imperfect grasp of the full Pauline conception of the faith-union of the penitent believer with Christ through personal self-committal to a personal Saviour," "popular sentiment expressed in a concern for the welfare of the children of Christian parents," "the doctrine of original sin." Defenders of infant baptism will want to launch a vigorous attack upon these positions, but they are positions well fortified with references to the writings of the Fathers. What is significant, of course, about these assertions is their reminder that changing theological emphases led to changing practices; so we are back again at the intimate association of baptism with theology.

If infant baptism was not established so easily as some defenders of the position have asserted, it is interesting to read in the chapter on "Anabaptists and the Rise of the Baptist Movement" that the Reformers also had serious doubts about the baptism of infants. "Zwingli hesitated longer than Luther and at one point appeared to reject infant baptism." Does that explain some of their fierce opposition to the Anabaptists? It is more generally appreciated today that the Anabaptists were not all fanatics, but do represent certain implications of the Reformers' experiences and teachings carried to their conclusion. The excellent survey of the Anabaptist movement and of the rise of the modern Baptists will be appreciated by many, even though at times it appears to be more a historical survey than a chapter in a discussion on Christian Baptism. But that is justified with the comment that the historian writes to "illumine the work of the theologian"; with this is the important reminder that the renewing of the practice of believers' baptism "was accompanied by a definite ecclesiology." Whatever judgment is passed upon early Baptist desires to re-institute the apostolic church life, their perception that the practice of believers' baptism belongs to a doctrine of the church is important.

The historical survey which concludes with an account of

"Baptismal Controversies 1640-1900" is a reminder that the Baptist position has at times been justified by arguments which we are no longer able to hold, and is important in showing that baptism cannot really be discussed except by reference to doctrines of church, of faith and grace, of the work of Christ and the purpose of God. Perhaps the most significant aspect of this historical survey is that it is in the book at all! It is at least an attempt to recognize that the ongoing life of the Church through nineteen centuries cannot be ignored.

A third question posed by this book and needing to be faced may be expressed in this way: have Baptists placed such an emphasis upon the necessity for personal decision and upon the value of the act of baptism as individual witness as to obscure and at times to lose sight of the realities of God's saving acts in Christ? It is just here that the need for a theology of baptism becomes evident. This book will render a service to Baptists if it deepens the awareness of a need for such a theology and helps to meet the need.

It is undoubtedly a merit of the book that the fundamental theological issues implied in the biblical and historical sections are made explicit in the last chapter on "The Theology of Baptism." Here it is rightly claimed that Baptism "is grounded on the atoning work of Christ which it applies and extends"; therefore "its theology must always be an inference from Christology transposed into its true eschatological key." This approach, of course, implies a criticism of the undue emphasis upon the human elements of decision and witness. "Baptism is a sacrament of the Gospel, not of our experience of it; of God's faithfulness, not of our faithful response to Him . . ." Some will feel that the paradox is too sharply presented, that baptism cannot take place until the proclamation of the Gospel becomes personal experience of Christ and God's faithfulness is realized in personal response. This is true, yet it is equally true that a sharp paradox can serve to make a needed emphasis.

If the necessity for the personal response of faith is not forgotten, we may allow that the needed emphasis is upon the objective realities of God's saving acts. And the two poles of God's saving acts are Jesus Christ in His death and resurrection, and Jesus Christ in His power and glory at the End. If "the pattern of New Testament baptismal interpretation is Christological through and through," this must be the "pattern of the whole Christ seen in its proper eschatological perspective." Hence baptism belongs to the time of the Church, i.e. "it is marked by the dual sign of fulfilment and unfulfilment." Deriving from the work completed by Christ on the Cross it takes its place in the life of the worshipping, witnessing community which is the body of Christ, finding its fulfilled significance only in the realization of the End. So it may be said that "our redemption was accomplished at the cross and resurrec-

tion, it is accomplished at baptism, it will be accomplished at the parousia."

Not all Baptists will accept this theological exposition, for some will assert that it is capable of impersonal, sacramental interpretations which are foreign to Baptist insights. But no one can deny its value as a challenge to Baptists to engage in much more serious theological thinking and to endeavour to give a more solid and objective foundation to the practice of believers' baptism.

Included in this stimulating chapter is a brief attempt to provide a theological explanation of the place of children in the church and the responsibility of the church towards them. What is called "the instinct of the church" in developing a sacramental act in regard to children is seen to be right, as Baptists who hold Infant Dedication services must admit. If then we reject the baptism of infants because the nature of the gospel requires the baptism of believers, we must find some theological justification for the attitude to children which all sections of the Church have adopted. The line of thought suggested is that Christian marriage provides "the link between the children of Christian parents and the Body of the Lord." From the marital union "in Christ" derives the theological relation of infants of Christian parents to the Church, and that relationship is a real, though indirect one." This is a matter that requires much more thought; but at least this chapter starts the thinking.

The final question provoked by this excellent and valuable book is this: what still needs to be done? As far as Baptists are concerned this book may be regarded as the real beginning, but only the beginning of certain tasks. We need a much fuller theological exposition of the total Baptist position. It is inadequate to assert that Baptists generally accept the Apostles Creed, but hold particular views about the Church and its ministry, about baptism and the Lord's Supper, about the obligation for evangelism and the right to freedom; we need an integrated, systematic presentation of the doctrines of grace, of the work of Christ, of the nature of the church, of faith and baptism, of Christian life and hope as these are implicit in the witness of Baptist churches. If that task can be fulfilled, we can then go on to the task of examining, in the light of the theological exposition, Baptist organizations, practices, systems. The results of this second task might be somewhat disturbing, but disturbance often betokens life. Together with these two tasks is a third challenge, namely that we shall understand the relevance of all this discussion to the task of communicating the gospel. Here it is easy to fall into the temptation of regarding all this discussion about baptism as an ecclesiastical logomachy, perhaps even worse, as a sinful escape from the stern demands of discipleship in the 20th century society. If the discussion is valid at all it

must be shown to be essential to our apprehension of the truth as it is in Jesus, and then its results must enrich and guide the proclamation of the gospel to the unbeliever. Here, therefore, is the most searching question implied in this book: can Baptists formulate their experiences and understanding of the Christian Gospel in a manner so coherent in its theological exposition, so clear in the practice of its church life and so characterized by the spirit of Christ that it will be recognized as an essential contribution both to the thought and life of the universal church and in the communication of the gospel to the world.

This book may be a sign that we can look to some of our younger scholars and ministers to labour at these important tasks.

L. G. CHAMPION

Hegel, a Re-examination, by J. N. Findlay. (Geo. Allen and Unwin, London 35s.)

It is well known that since the deaths of Bradley and Bosanquet, a vast revolution has taken place in philosophical thinking, a revolution due to some extent to the writings of Wittgenstein and A. J. Ayer. This revolution has taken the direction of empiricism and semantics, and a profound dislike of system-making, of the *a-priori*, and of "unverifiable" metaphysical speculation in general. This movement has resulted in a neglect of not only the English so-called Neo-Hegelians mentioned above, but also of Hegel himself, as well as a hostility to most of the thinkers of the past. "Yet," says Dr. G. R. G. Mure, in the preface of his *Study of Hegel's Logic* (1950), "there may still be some students of Philosophy . . . who feel a sense of oppression and sterility when they attempt to labour in the confined atmosphere of modern philosophic thought . . . To them it may still seem that 'there is a world elsewhere' and that the wider fields in which great thinkers used to range and sow have long enough lain fallow."

It seems probable that many readers of this short review will share this feeling. The philosophical students among them will assuredly welcome the appearance of Professor Findlay's new and, in many ways, illuminating volume on the great German thinker, the more so because the author, who is a great-nephew of Olive Schreiner, a Rhodes scholar, and a recent President of the Aristotelian Society, and who has been a Professor at King's College, London, since 1951, writes from the point of view of one who has lived through the revolution mentioned above, and was himself a student under Wittgenstein, and who is therefore well qualified to look back at Hegel from a new point of vantage. It is this fact, indeed, which gives the book much of its value and some

advantage, from the point of view of the present day student, over such previous great commentators as Edward Caird, Sir John Baillie, McTaggart and Stace.

After three very important chapters in which Hegel's notion of Spirit and his Dialectical method are dealt with, the author proceeds to give in greater detail a sort of thread which he hopes will help the reader to cope more successfully with the bewildering contents of the Phenomenology of Spirit, the Science of Logic, the Philosophy of Nature, and Hegel's other major works. The volume closes with a highly important section in which the author attempts a brief but profoundly interesting re-assessment of Hegel's contribution to human thought.

Throughout, he stresses the empirical side of Hegel's teaching and denies that he is "a transcendent metaphysician, one who deals with objects and matters lying beyond our empirical ken" (p. 19), nor that he is "a subjectivist, one who thinks the realm of Nature . . . exists only *in* or *for* someone's consciousness, whether . . . of a mind like ours, or of some cosmic or supercosmic mind" (p. 19). Likewise he denies that "Hegel thought that our mind (or the mind of God), *made* up the world in some witting or unwitting fashion" (p. 19). He thus stresses far less than Stace does, the Idealist principle of the ultimate identity of Thought and Being, which, however hard to accept, if abandoned, seems to lead back to the Kantian Thing-in-Itself. Stace represents this as being absolutely fundamental to an understanding of what Hegel was trying to say, and if so, we seem to be offered here a somewhat watered-down version to fit the spirit of the present age. It is not easy to say who is right, but the present reviewer has always thought that the empirical and realist elements undoubtedly present, had to be "taken up" into a larger Spiritual whole, answering more nearly to Stace's interpretation.

Findlay describes Hegel as the philosopher who took Christianity most seriously, but even the one sentence quoted above from p. 19, indicates how far he was from the Theism of the Christian churches. Indeed, there are many passages in the book dealing with the subject of Teleology, which would place him rather with the Emergent Evolutionists of the Alexander type. One cannot explore this further in a short review in which it is possible to glance at only a few aspects of this thoughtful, well-informed, but very difficult book. Findlay remarks that the reading of Hegel is "mental crucifixion," and one can only add that the reading of Findlay's book is not exactly an easy ride in a Rolls Royce and can scarcely have been intended for philosophical tyros.

W. H. AXFORD

The New Testament Text of St. Ambrose, by R. W. Muncey.
(Cambridge University Press, 1959, 32s. 6d.)

This book belongs to the New Series of Texts and Studies (Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature), edited by C. H. Dodd, and is intended to be correlated with a new critical edition of the New Testament, sometimes called the "New Tischendorf" which is being prepared by a joint Anglo-American Committee.

The introduction deals first with the accuracy of the New Testament quotations of Ambrose, which generally show agreement either with the ordinary Greek reading or a variant, or with some Latin MS. authority. A misprint occurs in one of the examples here: *inveniamus* (p. 14, II *Cor.* v 3) should be *inveniamur* (as on pp li, 83).

It is shown that the New Testament text of Ambrose is predominantly Old Latin, but has several agreements with the Vulgate, and therefore probably represents a comparatively late stage in the development of the Old Latin text. Ambrose is also a witness to certain readings which are peculiar to the Codex Bezae. Some readings in which Ambrose differs from the Textus Receptus have a strong degree of probability. For instance, in *Matthew* iv 4, Ambrose has "*non in pane vivit homo, sed in omni verbo dei*," which agrees with D. Lat. b, Syriac and Jerome.

The introduction then deals with the syntax and vocabulary of the New Testament text of Ambrose. Particularly interesting is the distinction between *amare*, the rendering of *philein*, and *diligere*, the rendering of *agapan*. The distinction seems to be that the former expresses the personal love of human affection, the latter is more used of reverential love towards God and man. In *John* xxi 17 Ambrose points out the distinction with reference to our Lord's own words: "*denique tertio dominus non iam, diligis me? sed, amas me?*"

Examples are given of "Europeanisms" and "Africanisms." We are told that there are marked difference(s) [another misprint here, singular for plural, p. 65] between the European and African texts, but a wise warning is added that too much stress must not be laid on these differences. There are instances of "African" readings in various MSS whose connexion with Africa had never been suspected.

A list of Graecisms is also given: for instance, the use of the preposition *in* with the ablative to express the means, instrument or manner of an action, due to the Greek construction with.

The introduction concludes with Notes on some select quotations from the New Testament; and then follows the reconstruction of the New Testament text of Ambrose.

This volume is of fascinating interest to the textual critic, and an important contribution towards establishing the original text of the New Testament.

A. W. ARGYLE

The Law, the Prophets and the Writings. Hebrew Old Testament.
Edition of 1958 (British and Foreign Bible Society, edited by
N. H. Snaith).

The Bible Society in general and Principal N. H. Snaith very much in particular are to be warmly congratulated upon the handsome new edition of the recently published Hebrew Bible. It is 92 years since the Bible Society printed its first Hebrew Bible, and it is 25 years since this present edition was mooted. The years of the war meant a delay and the proof-reading alone took twelve years.

This is not a revised edition but a new edition of the Hebrew Bible, and it is based on certain Spanish Hebrew MSS in the British Museum known as Or. 2625-7 and Or. 2375. For a long time Hebrew Bibles have been based on an edition printed by Jacob ben Chayyim in 1524-5, called the second Rabbinical Bible. (The first Rabbinical Bible was published in 1516-17 by Felix Pratensis.) It has long been believed that Chayyim's bible was based on Hebrew MSS, reliable and ancient, and the product of a compromise between the two branches, Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, of the Western (Tiberias) Massoretic tradition as distinct from the Eastern tradition in Babylonia. More recent research, however, has shown that Chayyim manuscripts were not very old or reliable.

In 1937 Kahle published the third edition of Kittel's Hebrew Bible, and this, unlike the first two editions which were based on Ben Chayyim's text, was based on a MS dated about 1000 A.D. from the Public Library in Leningrad. Kahle chose this MS as representing the best Ben Asher text available, and as some five centuries older than Ben Chayyim.

Dr. Snaith believes that his Spanish MSS represent the true tradition of Ben Asher, and so his resultant text is very close to Kahle's edition, though based on different MSS. Dr. Snaith's Hebrew Bible includes many improvements. Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, though unfortunately not the prophets, are printed in poetic form. Great care has been taken with the pointing and the accents, and the Hebrew text is very much easier to read. Tables of readings from the Law and the Prophets for all Sabbaths and special Days have been added.

The editor and the publishers have placed many generations of scholars and students in their heavy debt.

G. HENTON DAVIES

The Apostolic Ministry, by Arnold Ehrhardt, Scottish Journal of Theology, Occasional Papers, No. 7. (Oliver and Boyd, London, 8s. 6d.)

There are those whose doctrine of the Ministry turns almost exclusively on how they suppose it to have been constituted in the early centuries. For them this booklet is essential reading. One suspects they will find many of Dr. Ehrhardt's contentions disturbing, if not scandalous, and will not be slow to put forward counter-arguments. The majority of us will inevitably be left perplexed, for who are we to pronounce judgment on such highly technical matters?

The wealth of scholarship which Dr. Ehrhardt brings to the task is truly amazing. Whether it be in Biblical exegesis of both Old and New Testaments, Rabbinic practice, Patristics or Roman Law, he moves with such ease that one is left gasping.

The titles of the four chapters are : *The Meaning of "Apostolic," Ordination, The Apostolic Succession and Episcopacy*. On the face of it the argument is easy to follow, for each chapter consists of five or six theses on which in turn an exposition is offered. The citation of five of these theses may give some indication of what the reader is in for :

The ministry of the Church began in a spirit of strife and dissension. The ordination of the Seven is meant by St. Luke to establish a precedent for all ordinations in the Catholic Church. The ordination of St. Stephen conferred upon him the judicial power which is the property of the Apostolic ministry. The Apostolic succession of ministers in the early Catholic Church was brought into being by Rome's integration of the Jerusalem system of the Apostolic ministry into her own Church organization. Episcopacy is distinguished from all other ministries of the Church by its duty to signify, through the laying on of hands, the continuance of God's Holy Spirit within the institutional Church.

K. C. DYKES